

Chap. 20

#2

a) $V_H \equiv$ human wealth

$$V_H = 40\,000 (1 + 1.05 + (1.05)^2) \cdot (0.75)$$

$$\boxed{V_H = 94\,575}$$

b) $V_{TOT} \equiv$ total wealth

$$V_{TOT} = V_H + V_{NH}$$

where $V_{NH} \equiv$ non-human wealth

$$\Rightarrow V_{TOT} = 94\,575 + 100\,000$$

$$\boxed{V_{TOT} = 194\,575}$$

c) $T \equiv$ total number of years left to live.

$$T = 3 + 7 = 10.$$

$$\Rightarrow AC = \frac{194\,575}{10} = 19\,457.5/\text{year}$$

$AC \equiv$ average (or constant)
consumption level.

$$d) V'_{TOT} = 194575 + 20000(0.75) = 209575$$

$$\Rightarrow AC' = \frac{\$209575}{10 \text{ years}} = \$20957.5/\text{year}$$

She can increase the annual consumption level by \$1500.

$$\begin{aligned} e) V''_{TOT} &= 209575 + 7 \cdot 0.6 \cdot 40000 \cdot (1.05)^2 \\ &= 209575 + 7 \cdot 26460 \\ &= 394795 \end{aligned}$$

N.B. • Earnings during last year of work = $40000 \cdot (1.05)^7 = 44100$

• Annual retirement earning = $0.6(44100) = 26460$

• I assume first year bonus to still be given.

$$\Rightarrow AC'' = \frac{\$394795}{10 \text{ years}} = \$39479.5/\text{year}$$

20.3 Investment Decision

$$I_0 = \$100\,000$$

$$\delta = 8\%$$

$$\pi_t = (1 - \delta)^t 18\,000\$, \quad t = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

N.B. assume that $\pi_0 = \$18\,000$.

The present value of the stream of future profits is

$$PV_0 = \$18\,000 \left[1 + \frac{1-\delta}{1+r} + \left(\frac{1-\delta}{1+r} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{1-\delta}{1+r} \right)^3 + \dots \right]$$

$$\Rightarrow \left(\frac{1-\delta}{1+r} \right) PV_0 = \$18\,000 \left[\left(\frac{1-\delta}{1+r} \right) + \left(\frac{1-\delta}{1+r} \right)^2 + \dots \right]$$

$$\Rightarrow (1-\beta) PV_0 = \$18\,000$$

$$\text{where } \beta = \frac{1-\delta}{1+r}$$

$$\Rightarrow PV_0 = \left(\frac{1}{1-\beta} \right) \$18\,000$$

$$a) \underline{r = 5\%} \Rightarrow \beta = \frac{1-0.08}{1+0.05} = 0.876$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{1-\beta} = 8.0645$$

$$\Rightarrow PV_0 = 8.0645 \cdot \$18\,000 = \boxed{\$145\,161}$$

Since $PV_0 > I_0 = \$100\,000$,
the manufacturer should buy
the machine.

$$b) \quad \underline{r = 10\%} \Rightarrow \beta = \frac{1 - 0.08}{1.10} = 0.8364$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{1 - \beta} = 6.11$$

$$\Rightarrow PV_0 = 6.11(18\,000) = \$110\,024$$

Since $PV_0 > I_0$, at $r = 10\%$, the
investment is still worthwhile.

$$c) \quad \underline{r = 15\%} : \beta = \frac{1 - 0.08}{1 + 0.15} = 0.8$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{1 - \beta} = 5$$

$$\Rightarrow PV_0 = 5 \cdot 18\,000 = \$90\,000 < I_0.$$

With a rate of interest equal to
15%, the investment in a pretzel
machine is not worthwhile
anymore.

#20.4) Investing in Education

a) We compare the values of human wealth in both cases.

let $V_H \equiv$ value of human wealth without further education

$$V_H = 38(\$40000)(0.6) = \$912000.$$

let $V_H' \equiv$ value of human wealth with professional school.

$$V_H' = 36(\$40000 \cdot 1.10)(0.6) = \$950400.$$

N.B. The salary with professional school is $\$40000 \cdot 1.10 = \44000 , but we must remove two years without salary.

For someone who considers only the average income over the life cycle, he would be willing to pay up to

$$\$950400 - \$912000 = \$38400.$$

in tuition fees.

b) Income tax = 30%:

$$\Rightarrow V_H = 38(40000)(0.7) = 1064000.$$

$$V_H' = 36(44000)(0.7) = 1108800$$

$\Rightarrow V_H' - V_H = \$44800 > \$38400 \Rightarrow$ lower income tax renders education investment more attractive.