

# Contents

<b>List of Figures</b>	vii
<b>List of Tables</b>	viii
<b>1 Introduction</b>	1
<b>2 Relative Consumption and Majority Voting</b>	9
2.1 Introduction . . . . .	10
2.2 The model . . . . .	12
2.2.1 Specifications and efficiency . . . . .	12
2.2.2 The decentralized election outcome . . . . .	15
2.2.3 The centralized election outcome . . . . .	16
2.3 Comparison . . . . .	17
2.3.1 Public good provision . . . . .	17
2.3.2 Welfare . . . . .	19
2.4 Conclusion . . . . .	22
Appendix . . . . .	24
2.A Comparative statics . . . . .	24
2.B Public good status effects . . . . .	24
<b>3 Relative Consumption and Trade Unions</b>	27
3.1 Introduction . . . . .	28
3.2 The model . . . . .	30
3.2.1 Preferences . . . . .	30
3.2.2 Production . . . . .	30
3.2.3 Pareto efficiency and welfare maximum . . . . .	31
3.2.4 The market equilibrium . . . . .	32
3.3 A constrained trade union . . . . .	34
3.4 An unconstrained trade union . . . . .	38

3.5 Summary . . . . .	39
Appendix . . . . .	41
3.A Proof of proposition 1 . . . . .	41
3.B Proof of proposition 2 . . . . .	41
3.C Proof of proposition 3 . . . . .	43
<b>4 Relative Consumption and Liability Law</b>	<b>45</b>
4.1 Introduction . . . . .	46
4.2 The model and the social optimum . . . . .	48
4.2.1 The model . . . . .	48
4.2.2 The social optimum . . . . .	50
4.3 Decentralized decision-making under tort law . . . . .	51
4.3.1 Strict liability . . . . .	51
4.3.2 Negligence . . . . .	55
4.4 Discussion . . . . .	59
4.4.1 Example . . . . .	59
4.4.2 Assessing the importance of status-seeking behavior . . . . .	61
4.5 Conclusion . . . . .	62
Appendix . . . . .	64
4.A Strict liability with full compensation . . . . .	64
4.B Strict liability with modified compensation . . . . .	64
4.C Negligence with due-care obedience . . . . .	65
<b>5 Relative Consumption Effects of Private and Public Goods</b>	<b>67</b>
5.1 Introduction and related literature . . . . .	68
5.2 Survey structure . . . . .	69
5.3 Results . . . . .	71
5.3.1 Descriptive results . . . . .	71
5.3.2 Why are some goods more positional than others? . . . . .	74
5.4 Conclusion . . . . .	81
Appendix . . . . .	83
5.A Survey questions . . . . .	83
5.B World Values Survey . . . . .	87
<b>6 Relative Consumption Effects and Non-Monotonic Preferences</b>	<b>89</b>
6.1 Introduction . . . . .	90
6.2 Related literature . . . . .	91

6.3	Survey . . . . .	93
6.3.1	Design and sample . . . . .	93
6.3.2	Survey results . . . . .	97
6.4	Conclusion . . . . .	102
	Appendix . . . . .	104
6.A	Survey questions . . . . .	104
<b>7</b>	<b>Exploring and Explaining Relative Consumption Effects</b>	<b>107</b>
7.1	Introduction . . . . .	108
7.2	Related literature . . . . .	109
7.3	Design and sample . . . . .	111
7.4	Survey results . . . . .	114
7.4.1	Treatment effect . . . . .	114
7.4.2	Explanatory approach . . . . .	117
7.5	Conclusion . . . . .	125
	Appendix . . . . .	127
7.A	Survey questions . . . . .	127
7.B	Robustness checks . . . . .	129
7.B.1	Socio-economic variables . . . . .	129
7.B.2	Treatment effect . . . . .	129
7.B.3	Explanatory approach . . . . .	133
<b>8</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>135</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>139</b>