

Marjit, Sugata

**Working Paper**

## Conflicting measures of poverty and inadequate saving by the poor: The role of status-driven utility function

WIDER Working Paper, No. 2012/58

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

United Nations University (UNU), World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER)

*Suggested Citation:* Marjit, Sugata (2012) : Conflicting measures of poverty and inadequate saving by the poor: The role of status-driven utility function, WIDER Working Paper, No. 2012/58, ISBN 978-92-9230-521-5, The United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER), Helsinki

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/80978>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*



UNITED NATIONS  
UNIVERSITY

**UNU-WIDER**

World Institute for Development  
Economics Research

Working Paper No. 2012/58

## **Conflicting Measures of Poverty and Inadequate Saving by the Poor**

The Role of Status-Driven Utility Function

Sugata Marjit\*

June 2012

### **Abstract**

In the presence of inequality a status-driven utility function reconciles the conflict between income-based and nutrition-based measures of poverty. Moreover, it can explain why the poor tend to save less, an established empirical fact in the developing countries. The result is independent of the assumption of imperfect capital market. The paper attempts to integrate various strands of literature on status effects.

Keywords: inequality, inter-temporal consumer choice, utility, poverty

JEL Classification: D63, D91, D11, I3

Copyright © UNU-WIDER 2012

\* Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta, India, e-mail: marjit@gmail.com.

This study has been prepared within the UNU-WIDER project on 'New Approaches to Measuring Poverty and Vulnerability', directed by Jukka Pirttilä and Markus Jäntti.

UNU-WIDER gratefully acknowledges the financial contributions to the research programme by the governments of Denmark (Ministry of Foreign Affairs), Finland (Ministry for Foreign Affairs), Sweden (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency—Sida), and the United Kingdom (Department for International Development).

ISSN 1798-7237

ISBN 978-92-9230-521-5

## Acknowledgements

The author is indebted to Pranab Kumar Das, Ravi Kanbur and Abhirup Sarkar, and seminar participants at ISI Delhi and Jadavpur University for comments. Thanks are also due to Dilip Mookherjee for making me aware of the relevant literature on status and bequests. The usual disclaimer applies.

*The World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER) was established by the United Nations University (UNU) as its first research and training centre and started work in Helsinki, Finland in 1985. The Institute undertakes applied research and policy analysis on structural changes affecting the developing and transitional economies, provides a forum for the advocacy of policies leading to robust, equitable and environmentally sustainable growth, and promotes capacity strengthening and training in the field of economic and social policy making. Work is carried out by staff researchers and visiting scholars in Helsinki and through networks of collaborating scholars and institutions around the world.*

*[www.wider.unu.edu](http://www.wider.unu.edu)*

*[publications@wider.unu.edu](mailto:publications@wider.unu.edu)*

UNU World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER)  
Katajanokanlaituri 6 B, 00160 Helsinki, Finland

Typescript prepared by Anne Ruohonen at UNU-WIDER

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s). Publication does not imply endorsement by the Institute or the United Nations University, nor by the programme/project sponsors, of any of the views expressed.

## 1. Introduction

A fundamental query involving the preference pattern of any individual in a society has to deal with the social influence on individual consumption behaviour. The idea of conspicuous consumption and the so-called Veblen effect are quite well known in economics. Very recently Sivanathan and Pettit (2010) have confirmed the fact that individuals are quite sensitive to their relative status in the society and would like to 'mend' their 'self', under constant attack from various social pressures, by taking recourse to status-signaling consumption behaviour. A series of experiments confirm such a pattern of human behaviour. This is one of the building blocks of the utility function that we use and the subsequent analysis.

The paper starts off by highlighting a well-observed empirical phenomenon discussed extensively in the literature on poverty in India. Patnaik (2007) and Deaton and Drèze (2009) have dealt with the conflict between income-based measure and nutrition-based measure of poverty. In India people moving above the poverty line with greater monthly expenditure on overall consumption demonstrate lower nutritional intake. Thus Patnaik (2007) asserts that actual poverty estimate is far greater than the optimistic figure provided by the government. While Deaton and Drèze (2009) analyze various reasons for such a behaviour, not much emphasis is given to the role of status-driven consumption pattern, although they do not altogether ignore such a possibility. That social inequality can influence individual's consumption and induce greater consumption of the so-called status good, becomes quite relevant for such analysis. Thematically this is undermined and under-explored in the poverty literature. We shall eventually demonstrate how preexisting social inequality can lead to the conflicting measures of poverty.

Banerjee and Duflo (2007) reporting on various country studies have emphasized the fact that in general the poor do not save what they should. In other words the bias towards current consumption is a remarkably consistent empirical fact valid for a large cross-section of the developing countries. Fafchamps and Shilpi (2008) have demonstrated how the presence of richer persons in a community affects the perceptions of well being of the individuals. Such perception coupled with the status-driven consumption behaviour can lead to a bias towards current consumption. The dynamic extension of the basic framework yields this result without being dependent on further complex assumptions.

In an interesting paper Moav and Neeman (2010) derive the inadequate saving result in terms of a framework with bequests, as initially modeled in Galor and Zeira (1993). They also use the notion of social status as a basic driving factor which via conspicuous consumption affects current bequests and hence may perpetuate poverty trap. Essential ingredient of this type of analysis is the existence of an imperfect credit market which does not allow everyone to borrow and lend at a given rate of interest. In our framework we abstract from all such complexities and use the evolution of social distribution of income as a driving force.

One must mention that there is a literature on status and growth pioneered by Cole et al. (1992) and later extended by Corneo and Jeanne (1998). The message of this literature is that the aspiration effect i.e. the effort to attain higher status induces agent to over-accumulate relative to the standard case i.e. without such concern for status. In a general

context, therefore, two offsetting effects must be considered, one that pushes the individual to consume more and the other when saving intensity is higher. We shall reflect on this issue in course of our analysis. Interestingly to highlight our concern we have a way to block the ‘over-accumulation effect’ due to concern for status.

A voluminous literature discusses the impact of social status, relative income and relative rewards on productivity such as Hopkins and Kornienko (2010), Ku and Salmon (2010), on optimal taxation such as Beath and Fitzroy (2010), Kabur and Tuomala (2010) and on network such as Ghiglino and Goyal (2008). However, these papers do not deal with the issues we are discussing in this paper.

The paper proceeds as follows. In the next section we discuss the issue of possible conflict between income and nutrition-based measures of poverty. In the third section we analyze the saving problem in a simple two-period framework. The last section concludes the paper.

## 2. Basic framework

We start from two possible axioms on how perceived social inequality affects the individual welfare.

*Axiom 1: Inequality hurts*

This implies that having below average income in a society reduces individual utility. Our assumption will be that being above average does not matter, but being below definitely hurts. This asymmetry is deliberate to highlight the implications of belonging to the downside of inequality.

*Axiom 2: Inequality increases MU for status good*

Having lower than average income increases the marginal utility of conspicuous consumption or consumption of the status good. This is directly drawn from experimental psychology literature where intensity of desire to consume the status good seems to be greater among those who are affected by social inequality.

We now invoke a simple log linear utility function with  $N$ , the consumption of nutrition good and  $L$ , the consumption of luxury or status good or non-nutrition good.

$$U = f\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right) \left[ \log N + \phi\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right) \log L \right] \quad (1)$$

$\bar{y}$  is average income of the reference social group.  $y$  is individual income levels.

$$f\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right) \begin{cases} = 1 & \text{for } y \geq \bar{y} \\ < 1 & \text{for } y < \bar{y} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$


and  $f' < 0$ . [Follows from Axiom 1]

$$\phi\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right) \begin{cases} = 1 & \text{for } y \geq \bar{y} \\ > 1 & \text{for } y < \bar{y} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

and  $\phi' > 0$ . [Follows from Axiom 2]

We shall not discuss price effect and assume prices to be equal to one.

Figure 1



Source: Author's illustration.

If inequality truly hurts,

$$f\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right) \left[ \log \tilde{N} + \phi\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right) \log \tilde{L} \right] < \left[ \log N_0 + \phi\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right) \log L_0 \right] \quad (4)$$

Where  $(\tilde{N}, \tilde{L})$  are optimal consumption levels for  $y < \bar{y}$  and  $(N_0, L_0)$  are the same for the benchmark case with  $y = \bar{y}$ .

Invoking the Envelope property it is straightforward to interpret (U) as

$$\frac{dU}{dy} = f'\left(-\frac{\bar{y}}{y^2}\right) \left( \log \tilde{N} + \phi\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right) \log \tilde{L} \right) + f \cdot \phi'\left(-\frac{\bar{y}}{y^2}\right) \log \tilde{L} > 0$$

$$\text{Or, } -\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y^2}\right) f' \log \tilde{N} - \left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y^2}\right) \log \tilde{L} [f' \phi + f \phi'] > 0$$

Since  $f' < 0$  and  $\phi' > 0$ , a sufficient condition is given by

$$[f' \phi + f \phi'] < 0 \quad (5)$$

Note that if  $y$  moves up the ladder  $f(\cdot)$  increases but  $\phi$  drops. Or put differently if  $y$  drops from  $\bar{y}$ ,  $f$  goes down to a value less than 1, but  $\phi$  increases, the net effect has to be negative if inequality has to hurt in equilibrium. We shall return to condition (5) later.

It is obvious that in equilibrium

$$\tilde{N} = \frac{y}{1+\phi} \quad (6)$$

$y$  is assumed to be large enough to make the log value in (6) positive.

We are interested in the level of consumption of  $N$  as  $y$  increases from below  $\bar{y}$ . Given  $\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right)$ ; (6) is a very standard outcome. When  $\phi = 1$ , by virtue of having this specific utility function,  $\tilde{N} = \frac{1}{2}y$ . However, when  $\phi > 1$  and if both  $y$  and  $\bar{y}$  increase when we increase  $y$ , relative social status can worsen leading to an increase in  $\phi$  and a net reduction in  $\tilde{N}$ .


$$\frac{d^2 N}{dy} < 0 \text{ iff } \mu\sigma > \frac{1+\phi}{\phi} \quad (7)$$

$$\text{Where, } \mu = \frac{d\phi}{d\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right)} \cdot \frac{\bar{y}/y}{\phi} \text{ and } \sigma = \frac{d\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right)}{dy} \cdot \frac{y}{\bar{y}/y}.$$

$$\text{As } y \longrightarrow \bar{y}, \phi\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right) \longrightarrow 1, \frac{1+\phi}{\phi} \longrightarrow 2.$$

$$\text{As } y \longrightarrow 0, \phi\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right) \longrightarrow \infty, \frac{1+\phi}{\phi} \longrightarrow 1.$$

Figure 2



Source: Auhor's illustration.

If  $\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right)$  increases with  $y$ , the consumption of  $N$  reacts according to the magnitude of  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$ . While  $\mu$  reflects the cultural perception of relative status,  $\sigma$  reflects the elasticity of distribution. If either of them is very weak, we should not have any conflict of measures of poverty. If either of them is zero, we are back with the standard case. If either of them is very high we shall have our interesting results. Also greater is  $\left(\frac{\bar{y}}{y}\right)$  and lower is  $1/\phi$  chances are greater that the conflict will arise. Inequality has a direct bearing on the nutritional estimate of poverty.

### 3. Dynamic behaviour

We shall now highlight the case of inadequate saving by the poor. In fact in our framework we do not need any assumption regarding the behaviour of the capital market. We use a simple two-period model which can have a 'present and future' interpretation. We have a small open economy where product prices are frozen from the rest of the world. Agents can borrow and lend at an exogenously specified rate of return. Agents can also accumulate capital. The simple two-period model brings out certain essential dynamic features regarding rate of accumulation, status effect and saving.

Two time periods are denoted by subscripts 1 and 2.



The problem facing the agent

$$\max_{\{N_1, L_1, N_2, L_2, K\}} f\left(\frac{\bar{y}_1}{y_1}\right) \left[ \log N_1 + \phi\left(\frac{\bar{y}_1}{y_1}\right) \log L_1 \right] + \beta f\left(\frac{\bar{y}_2}{\tilde{y}_2}\right) [\log N_2 + \phi_2 \log L_2]$$

Subject to,

$$(y_1 - N_1 - L_1 - K)(1+r) + y_2(K) - N_2 - L_2 = 0$$

Where,  $\tilde{y}_2 = y_2(K) + s(1+r)$  and  $s = (y_1 - N_1 - L_1 - K)$ .  $K$  stands for investment.  $y_1$  is considered as given to start with and  $0 < \beta < 1$  is the discount factor.

Optimization and simple manipulations yield

$$\frac{f_1}{N_1} + \beta A(1+r) = \beta \frac{f_2}{N_2} (1+r) \quad (8)$$

$$\text{Where } A = \left[ \beta f_2' \left( \frac{\bar{y}_2}{\tilde{y}_2} \right) (1+r) \Omega_2 + \beta f_2 \phi_2' \left( \frac{\bar{y}_2}{\tilde{y}_2} \right) (1+r) \log \tilde{L}_2 \right]$$

$\Omega_2$  = optimal value of the second period utility.

$\{\tilde{N}_1, \tilde{L}_1, \tilde{N}_2, \tilde{L}_2, \tilde{K}\}$  are to be treated as optimal values.

From (5) it follows that  $A < 0$ .

Now,

$$\tilde{N}_2 = \frac{\tilde{N}_1(1+r)\beta f_2}{f_1 + \beta A N_1(1+r)} \quad (9)$$

Similarly,

$$\tilde{L}_2 = \frac{\tilde{L}_1(1+r)\beta f_2 \phi_2}{f_1 \phi_1 + \beta A L_1(1+r)} \quad (10)$$

$$\text{Also note that, } y_2'(\tilde{K}) = (1+r) \quad (11)$$

Equation (11) is a significant condition because even if increasing  $\tilde{K}$  improves future utility apart from income, so long as  $r$  is given exogenously, the rate of accumulation does not change. Note the difference between this structure and the status-driven growth models. Social status is likely to increase  $K$ . but given that the alternative return is  $(1+r)$  as derived from the bond, marginal product must adjust to  $(1+r)$ . thus the level of  $K$  remains the same with or without concerns for status as long as  $r$  does not change.

Let us now compare the amount of savings with or without concerns for social status.

$$\tilde{N}_1 + \tilde{L}_1 + \frac{\tilde{N}_1(1+r)\beta f_2}{f_1 + \beta A \tilde{N}_1(1+r)} + \frac{\tilde{L}_1(1+r)\beta f_2 \phi_2}{f_1 \phi_1 + \beta A \tilde{L}_1(1+r)} = y_1 - \tilde{K} + \frac{y_2(\tilde{K})}{(1+r)} \equiv R(\tilde{K}) \quad (12)$$

With  $f = \phi = 1$  and  $A=0$  we get the standard outcome.

$$N_1^0 + L_1^0 = \frac{R(K^0)}{(1+\beta)} \quad (13)$$

Note that,  $K^0 = \tilde{K}$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{N}_1 + \tilde{L}_1 + \frac{1}{(1+\beta)} \left[ \frac{\bar{N}_1 \beta f_2}{f_1 + \beta A \tilde{N}_1(1+r)} - \beta \tilde{N}_1 \right] + \frac{1}{(1+\beta)} \left[ \frac{\bar{L}_1 \beta f_2 \phi_2}{f_1 \phi_1 + \beta A \tilde{L}_1(1+r)} - \beta \tilde{L}_1 \right] = N_1^0 + L_1^0 \quad (14)$$

Two sources of saving S and K are financed by  $[y_1 - (\tilde{N}_1 + \tilde{L}_1)]$ , therefore a direct comparison between  $(\tilde{N}_1 + \tilde{L}_1)$  and  $(N_1^0 + L_1^0)$  will be relevant.

(14) suggests the following

A set of sufficient conditions, that guarantee aggregate saving to be lower in the case with the concern for social status, are

$$\left. \begin{aligned} f_2 &< f_1 + \beta A \tilde{N}_1(1+r) \\ f_2 \phi_2 &< f_1 \phi_1 + \beta A \tilde{L}_1(1+r) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (15)$$

Consider the case that the income distribution is invariant over time i.e.  $f_1 = f_2$  and  $\phi_1 = \phi_2$ . They can still be less than 1 as  $\bar{y} > y$ . [If  $f_1 = f_2 = \phi_1 = \phi_2 = 1$ , then we are dealing with the standard case.] under this situation (15) can never hold as  $A < 0$ . Therefore saving will be greater than in the normal case. Strong implication of this observation is that if social inequality is not changing overtime, agents wish to save more to improve their situation. Even if extra dose of K is not forthcoming as  $K^0 = \tilde{K}$ , saving in terms of the other asset should be greater. This is also the basic intuition behind status-driven growth literature, the so-called positive effect of concern for status. Better status gives better utility.

Next consider the case that ceteris paribus,  $\bar{y}_2$  is really high relative to  $\bar{y}_1$  i.e. the rest of the society, possibly those with income level much greater than the agent are going to grow substantially so that  $f_2$  is really low relative to  $f_1$  and  $f_2 \phi_2$  relative to  $f_1 \phi_1$ , then (15) will hold and  $(\tilde{N}_1 + \tilde{L}_1) > (N_1^0 + L_1^0)$ . Therefore, aggregate saving will be lower. The intuition is that if the agents perceive that their social status will be eroded substantially in the future they will prepare their consumption reducing saving.

Consider the case where  $f$  and  $\phi$  matter but not their change. So  $f_2' = \phi_2' \simeq 0$ . this will make  $A \simeq 0$ . Then it is entirely between  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  or  $f_1\phi_1$  and  $f_2\phi_2$  and how low is  $f_2$  relative to  $f_1$ . Thus apprehension about future has a direct impact on current saving.

If we wish to compare the static and dynamic case one feature is very clear. In the poverty problem  $\phi$  is very important in determining the trade-off between N and L whereas in the dynamic case it is really  $f$  that is critical.

#### **4. Concluding remarks**

The purpose of this paper has been twofold. First, to provide a theoretical explanation behind the conflict between nutrition and income-based measures of when consumption depends on relative income status. The second motivation has to do with the relevance of status-driven consumption behaviour leading to inadequacy of saving by the poor. The simple dynamic model identifies the trade-off between saving augmenting and saving reducing effects of social status.

The log-linear utility function we work with yields standard outcomes when the concern for social status is absent. But drastic alteration of results is possible when we introduce the idea of relative social status in an otherwise simple utility function.

The large body of literature has discussed various types of economic problems under the assumption of concern for relative social status. Our approach is specific and focused. The result on the measurement of poverty yields a theoretical insight towards one of the most worrying consequence of growth. The result on saving is derived independent of any added assumption on credit market or any other behavioural assumption such as bequests.

## References

- Banerjee, A. and E. Duflo (2007). 'The Economic Lives of the Poor'. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(1): 141-168.
- Beath, J. and F. Fitzroy (2010). 'Status, Happiness and Relative Income'. IZA Discussion Paper No. 2658.
- Cole, H.L., G.J. Mailath, and A. Postlewaite (1992). 'Social Norms, Savings Behavior, and Growth'. *Journal of Political Economy*, 100(6): 1092-125.
- Corneo, G. and O. Jeanne (1998). 'Social organization, status, and savings behavior'. *Journal of Public Economics*, 70(1): 37-51.
- Deaton, A. and J. Drèze (2009). 'Food and Nutrition in India: Facts and Interpretations'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 44(7): 42-65.
- Fafchamps, M. and F. Shilpi (2008). 'Subjective welfare, isolation, and relative consumption'. *Journal of Development Economics*, 86(1): 43-60.
- Galor, O. and J. Zeira (1993). 'Income Distribution and Macroeconomics'. *Review of Economic Studies*, 60(1): 35-52.
- Ghiglino, C. and S. Goyal (2008). 'Keeping up with the neighbors: social interaction in a market economy'. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 8(1): 90-119.
- Hopkins, E. and T. Kornienko (2010). 'Which Inequality? The Inequality of Endowments Versus the Inequality of Rewards'. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 2(3): 106-37.
- Kanbur, R. and M. Tuomala (2010). 'Relativity, Inequality and Optimal Nonlinear Income Taxation'. Mimeo. Ithaca: Cornell University.
- Ku, H. and T.C. Salmon (2009). 'Incentive Effects of Inequality and Economic Development'. Mimeo. Tallahassee: Florida State University.
- Moav, O. and Z. Neeman (2010). 'Status and Poverty'. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 8(2-3): 413-20.
- Patnaik, U. (2007). 'Neoliberalism and Rural Poverty in India'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42 (30): 3132-50.
- Sivanathan, N. and N.C. Pettit (2010). 'Protecting the self through consumption: Status goods as affirmational commodities'. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(3): 564-70.