

# Microeconomic Analysis

Mark Dean

Homework 3

**Due** Thursday 27th September

**Question 1** Prove the following simplified version of Szpilrajn's theorem

**Theorem 1** *Let  $\succeq$  be a partial order on a finite set  $X$ . Show that there exists a linear order on  $X$  which is an extension of  $\succeq$ .*

**Question 2** Consider a binary relation  $\succeq$  on some finite set  $X$  which is transitive and reflexive but not necessarily complete.

1. Show that there exists a utility function  $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that represents  $\succeq$  in the sense that

$$x \succeq y \rightarrow u(x) \geq u(y)$$

$$x \succ y \rightarrow u(x) > u(y)$$

2. Clearly this representation is 'worse' than the standard one, in the sense that we cannot recover  $\succeq$  from the utility function. To get round this problem, we can use a **multi-utility representation**. A multi-utility representation of the relation  $\succeq$  on  $X$  is a set of functions  $\mathcal{U}$ , where each  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  is a function  $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and these functions represent  $\succeq$  in the sense that

$$x \succeq y \text{ if and only if } u(x) \geq u(y) \forall u \in \mathcal{U}$$

Show that a multi utility representation has the same information as the original binary relation -i.e. there is a unique preference relation that is consistent with any multi-utility representation.

3. One interpretation of the multi utility representation is that each object can be ranked on a number of dimensions, and you are only prepared to say that  $x$  is better than  $y$  if it is at least as good along all dimensions, and better on one. With that in mind, show how you can construct a multi-utility representation for the partial order  $\geq$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . (i.e.  $x \geq y$  if and only if  $x_i \geq y_i \forall i \in \mathbb{N}$ )
4. Show that any transitive, reflexive relation on a finite set  $X$  admits a multi utility representation.

**Question 3** One modification of the standard economic model used to capture some idea of bounded rationality is to introduce the notion of consideration sets: rather than maximizing across all possible alternatives, the decision maker only considers a subset, and chooses the utility maximizing option in that subset.

**Definition 1** We say a set of choice data can be explained as choice with consideration sets if there is (i) a utility function  $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and (ii) a consideration set correspondence  $\Gamma : 2^X / \emptyset \rightarrow 2^X / \emptyset$  such that  $\Gamma(A) \subset A$  and

$$C(A) = \max_{x \in \Gamma(A)} u(x)$$

For simplicity, let's assume that we are dealing with choice functions (not correspondences), there is no indifference and  $X$  is finite

1. Show that a model of choice from consideration sets can explain any choice function
2. Now add the restriction

$$\Gamma(A) = \Gamma(A/x) \text{ if } x \notin \Gamma(A)$$

We will call the model in Definition 1 with this restriction added 'Model A'.

Determine whether the following methods of constructing consideration sets would satisfy this property

- (a) Top  $N$ : The decision maker is choosing between cars, and in any choice set considers the top 3 according to safety rating
- (b) The decision maker is choosing between jobs and has three criteria: wage, holiday and proximity. In any choice set they consider only the alternatives that are best in each category

- (c) The decision maker is choosing between hats, and considers all which are at or below the median price
3. Find a set of choices that cannot be explained by model A.
  4. Show that, if choices are produced by model A then they must satisfy the following condition:

For any non-empty set  $S$ , there exists  $x^* \in S$ , such that, for any set  $T$  including  $x^*$

$$C(T) = x^* \text{ whenever}$$

$$(i) C(T) \in S \text{ and}$$

$$(ii) C(T) \neq c(T \setminus x^*)$$

5. Show that  $\alpha$  implies this property, but not visa versa
6. Show that, under model A, if  $x = C(A)$  and  $y \in A$ , then it is not necessarily the case that  $u(x) > u(y)$ . Define the relation  $xPy$  such that if, for some choice set  $A$  such that  $x, y \in A$  and  $x \neq y$  it is the case that  $C(A) = x \neq C(A \setminus y)$ . Show that under model A  $xPy$  implies  $u(x) > u(y)$
7. Show that the condition in part 4 guarantees that the relation  $P$  is acyclic
8. (Hard) Show that the condition in part (4) is enough to guarantee the existence of a representation of the form of model A