

Microeconomics I, 2023/2024
Master of Science in Economics
Problem Set 1

Lorenzo Bozzoli*

17/11/2023

Question 1 *Suppose preferences are represented by the Cobb-Douglas utility function $u(x_1, x_2) = Ax_1^\alpha x_2^{1-\alpha}$, for $A > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.*

1. *Check that the Cobb-Douglas utility function is increasing in each commodity and that it is a strictly concave function. Once established concavity, what can you deduce on the properties of the Walrasian demand?*
2. *Considering an interior solution, solve for the Walrasian demand functions. Are the preferences that $u(x)$ represents homothetic?*
3. *Consider the logarithmic transformation $v(x) = \ln u(x)$ of the Cobb-Douglas utility function above and verify that the Walrasian demand functions are identical to those previously derived.*
4. *Suppose that the preferences of a consumer are represented by the utility function $u(x)$, and consider the transformation $v(x) = f(u(x))$. When is it that the transformation does not alter the original preference order? Is this the case of the previous questions?*
5. *Using the Walrasian demand functions, derive the consumer's indirect utility function. How does it vary with respect to wealth?*

Question 2 *Consider a generalization of the Cobb-Douglas preferences that can be used to model the consumption of addictive goods, such as coffee. Let the utility function be:*

$$u(x_1, x_2; r_1) = (x_1 - r_1)^\alpha x_2^\beta$$

with $\alpha + \beta = 1$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, $0 < \beta < 1$ and $r_1 > 0$. Notice that the above utility is positive only for $x_1 \geq r_1$ and $x_2 \geq 0$. Assume that for $x_1 < r_1$ and for $x_2 < 0$ the utility is zero. Good x_1 is

*e-mail: lor.bozzoli@gmail.com

an addictive good (coffee) with addiction level r_1 . One interpretation is that the more coffee the consumer has consumed in the past, the higher the addiction level (r_1).

1. Draw an approximate map of indifference curves.
2. How does the utility function change as r_1 changes? Interpret your findings.
3. Compute now the marginal utility with respect to x_1 . How does this marginal utility change as r_1 changes? Explain your findings.
4. Write down the Utility Maximization problem (UMP) and solve for the Walrasian demands for x_1 and x_2 .
5. Provide a definition of a normal good. Is good x_1 a normal good?
6. Compute the change in $x_1(p, w)$ as r_1 varies. Interpret your result: why does the consumer consume more of good 1 if she is more addicted to it?
7. Check whether the Walrasian demands for good 1 and 2 are homogeneous of degree zero in (p, w) and satisfy Walras' law.

Question 3 Consider the following utility function: $u(x_1, x_2) = \phi(x_1) + x_2$ with $\phi'(x_1) > 0$, and $\phi''(x_1) < 0$. At first, assume no particular functional form for $\phi(x)$. Consider $p = (p_1, p_2)$ strictly positive and $w > 0$.

1. Represent the indifference curves corresponding to this utility function and compute the Marginal Rate of Substitution ($MRS_{1,2}$) between commodity 1 and 2, explain its meaning.
2. Write down the Lagrange function for the UMP problem.
3. Write down the first order conditions for this problem. What do the first order conditions tell you regarding the value of λ ? (Hint: Does the value of λ depend on p_1 or w ? Why is this the case?)
4. Solve for the Walrasian demand for commodity x_1^* . Does it depend on wealth? Is good 1 a normal good, an inferior good or a neutral good, i.e. a commodity in which the wealth effect is null?
5. Compute $\frac{\partial x_1^*}{\partial p_1}$. You should find a negative sign, is this related to your findings in 3.?
6. Continue the exercise under the assumption $u(x_1, x_2) = \sqrt{x_1} + x_2$. Provide an explicit solution for the Walrasian demands for the two commodities.
7. Under what conditions on p_1, p_2 and w is the Walrasian demand for good 2 strictly positive?
8. Write down the budget lines for $(p_1 = 1, p_2 = 1, w = 1)$ and for $(p_1 = 1, p_2 = 1, w = 2)$. Find graphically the optimal consumption bundles that solve UMP. How do they look like? You should find that $x_1^*(1, 1, 1) = x_1^*(1, 1, 2)$? Is this consistent with your previous findings? Explain.