

Submission to the *Journal of Answers to Gollier*  
James M. Sallee

Submitted January 27, 2005

**Exercise 82**

*Consider the following nonseparable intertemporal preferences:*

$$U(c_1, c_2) = \ln(c_1) + \beta \ln(c_2 - kc_1).$$

- Interpret  $k$  depending on whether it is positive or negative.
- Show that the optimal consumptions  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  are respectively decreasing and increasing with  $k$ .

**Solution 82**

**Part 1:** If  $k$  is positive, then consumption is habit-forming, and  $k$  represents the degree of habit formation. This means that, in the second period you care about the *growth* in consumption. Intuitively, this would cause a consumer to consume less in the first-period, since they suffer a penalty from that consumption in the second-period.

If  $k$  is negative, then consumption is durable, and  $k$  represents the degree of durability. This means that you enjoy a boost in the second-period from the first-period consumption. Intuitively, in the two-period model, this will cause an increase in first-period consumption since you enjoy part of that consumption again in the second period.

**Part 2:** The solution requires explicating a budget constraint. Let  $c_1 + c_2 \leq \bar{C}$ . It is clear that the constraint will bind. Substituting  $c_2 = \bar{C} - c_1$ , we can consider the unconstrained problem:

$$\max_{c_1} \ln(c_1) + \beta \ln(\bar{C} - c_1 - kc_1).$$

This yields a basic first-order condition in terms of  $c_1$ . We know that this will define a global maximum by the strict concavity of the objective function:

$$\begin{aligned} FOC : \frac{1}{c_1} + \frac{\beta(1+k)}{\bar{C} - (1+k)c_1} &= 0 \Rightarrow \\ \bar{C} - (1+k)c_1 &= -\beta(1+k)c_1 \Rightarrow \\ c_1 &= \frac{\bar{C}}{(1-\beta)(1+k)}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote this optimal first-period consumption as  $c_1^*$ . We can determine the marginal change in  $c_1^*$  from a change in  $k$  by simple differentiation:

$$\frac{\partial c_1^*}{\partial k} = \frac{\bar{C}}{1-\beta} \frac{-1}{(1+k)^2} < 0.$$

The sign of this derivative follows directly, assuming that  $\beta < 1$ . A rise in  $k$  causes a *decrease* in first-period consumption. Since the budget constraint will always bind, a rise in  $k$  must therefore correspond to an *increase* in second-period consumption.