

Advanced Microeconomics I

Fall 2023 - M. Pak

Problem Set 4: Suggested Solutions

1. Show that $c(F, u_2) \leq c(F, u_1)$ for all distributions F if and only if there exists an increasing concave function $\psi(\cdot)$ such that $u_2(x) = \psi(u_1(x))$. (Hint: use Jensen's inequality).

Solution: Any concave function $g(\cdot)$ satisfies Jensen's inequality:

$$\int g(x) dF(x) \leq g\left(\int x dF(x)\right).$$

For any distribution F , we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_2(c(F, u_2)) &= \int u_2(x) dF && \text{by the definition of certainty equivalent} \\ &= \int \phi(u_1(x)) dF \\ &\leq \phi\left(\int u_1(x) dF\right) && \text{by Jensen's inequality} \\ &= \phi(u_1(c(F, u_1))) && \text{by the definition of certainty equivalent} \\ &= u_2(c(F, u_1)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $u_2(c(F, u_2)) \leq u_2(c(F, u_1))$ and $u_2(\cdot)$ is increasing, we have $c(F, u_2) \leq c(F, u_1)$ as desired.

2. A strictly risk-averse decision maker has initial wealth W and faces possible loss of $D < W$. The probability that the loss will occur is $\frac{1}{2}$. Suppose insurance is available at price $q < 1$ per unit, where q is not necessarily the fair price.

- (a) For what values of q will the decision maker want to buy strictly positive amount of insurance?

Solution: The DM's expected utility is

$$\begin{aligned} U(x) &= \frac{1}{2}u(W - qx) + \frac{1}{2}u(W - D - qx + x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}u(W - qx) + \frac{1}{2}u(W - D + (1 - q)x). \\ \Rightarrow MU(x) &= \frac{1}{2}u'(W - qx)(-q) + \frac{1}{2}u'(W - D + (1 - q)x)(1 - q). \end{aligned}$$

For $x^* > 0$, we need require $MU(0) > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}u'(W)(-q) + \frac{1}{2}u'(W-D)(1-q) &> 0 \\ \Rightarrow q &< \frac{u'(W-D)}{u'(W) + u'(W-D)}. \end{aligned}$$

- (b) Suppose the decision maker exhibits decreasing absolute risk aversion. Assuming that the optimal insurance purchase x^* is an interior solution (that is, $x^* \in (0, D)$) determine whether x^* is increasing or decreasing as the initial wealth, W , increases.

Solution: FOC for interior solution is given by

$$\frac{1}{2}u'(W - qx^*)(-q) + \frac{1}{2}u'(W - D + (1-q)x^*)(1-q) = 0.$$

Differentiating this w.r.t. W yields

$$\begin{aligned} u''(W - qx^*)(-q) + u''(W - qx^*)(-q)^2 \frac{dx^*}{dW} + u''(W - D + (1-q)x^*)(1-q) \\ + u''(W - D + (1-q)x^*)(1-q)^2 \frac{dx^*}{dW} = 0 \\ \Rightarrow \frac{dx^*}{dW} = \frac{-u''(W - qx^*)(-q) - u''(W - D + (1-q)x^*)(1-q)}{u''(W - qx^*)(-q)^2 + u''(W - D + (1-q)x^*)(1-q)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $x^* < D$ and DARA means

$$W - D + (1-q)x^* = W - qx^* + (x^* - D) < W - qx^* \implies R_a(W - D + (1-q)x^*) > R_a(W - qx^*).$$

Therefore, the numerator is:

$$\begin{aligned} &-u''(W - qx^*)(-q) - u''(W - D + (1-q)x^*)(1-q) \\ &= -\frac{u''(W - qx^*)}{u'(W - qx^*)}u'(W - qx^*)(-q) - \frac{u''(W - D + (1-q)x^*)}{u'(W - D + (1-q)x^*)}u'(W - D + (1-q)x^*)(1-q) \\ &= R_a(W - qx^*)u'(W - qx^*)(-q) + R_a(W - D + (1-q)x^*)u'(W - D + (1-q)x^*)(1-q) \\ &> R_a(W - qx^*)u'(W - qx^*)(-q) + R_a(W - qx^*)u'(W - D + (1-q)x^*)(1-q) \\ &= R_a(W - qx^*) \underbrace{\left(u'(W - qx^*)(-q) + u'(W - D + (1-q)x^*)(1-q) \right)}_{=0 \text{ by FOC}} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $\frac{dx^*}{dW} = \frac{(+)}{(-)} < 0$.

3. Consider an investor whose utility function over money is

$$u(w) = 2w^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The investor can invest in a riskless asset that returns 1 (gross return per ¥1 invested) for sure, or a risky asset that returns 1.4 with probability $\frac{3}{4}$ and 0.8 with probability $\frac{1}{4}$.

- (a) Suppose the investor's initial wealth is ¥1000. Letting x denote the amount invested in the risky asset, write the investor's expected utility as a function of x .

Solution: We have

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 1000 - x + 1.4x = 1000 + 0.4x & \text{with probability } \frac{3}{4} \\ 1000 - x + 0.8x = 1000 - 0.2x & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{4} \end{cases}$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} U(g(x)) &= \frac{3}{4}u(1000 + 0.4x) + \frac{1}{4}u(1000 - 0.2x) \\ &= \frac{3}{4} \left(2(1000 + 0.4x)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \left(2(1000 - 0.2x)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

- (b) Find the optimal amount to invest in the risky asset.

Solution: Investor solves:

$$\max_x \frac{3}{4} \left(2(1000 + 0.4x)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \left(2(1000 - 0.2x)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)$$

FOC is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{3}{4} \right) \left(\frac{4}{10} \right) (1000 + 0.4x)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \left(\frac{1}{4} \right) \left(\frac{2}{10} \right) (1000 - 0.2x)^{-\frac{1}{2}} &= 0 \\ \Rightarrow \left(\frac{3}{10} \right) (1000 + 0.4x)^{-\frac{1}{2}} &= \left(\frac{1}{20} \right) (1000 - 0.2x)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ \Rightarrow \left(\frac{10}{3} \right)^2 (1000 + 0.4x) &= (20)^2 (1000 - 0.2x) \\ \Rightarrow x &= \frac{(400)(1000) - \left(\frac{100}{9} \right) (1000)}{\left(\frac{100}{9} \right) (0.4) + (400)(0.2)} \approx 4605.263. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $x^* = 4605.263$ is greater than the initial wealth. So, if so-called "short sale" is possible, the investor will borrow additional \$3,605.263 to invest in the risky asset. If borrowing is not possible, then the investor will put the maximum amount in the risky asset. That is, $x^* = 1000$.

4. An investor with initial wealth w_0 is trying to allocate her wealth between a safe asset with constant return $R > 0$ and a risky asset with random return \mathbf{z} , where \mathbf{z} has distribution function F and $E[\mathbf{z}] > R$. Letting x be the *proportion* of wealth invested in the risky asset ($0 \leq x \leq 1$), her wealth will be:

$$w = ((1-x)R + xz)w_0 = (R + x(z - R))w_0,$$

where z is the realized return. Suppose the investor's utility over wealth, $u(\cdot)$, exhibits constant relative risk aversion. Show that the optimal proportion of wealth invested in the risky asset is independent of her initial wealth. That is, show that $\frac{dx^*}{dw_0} = 0$.

Solution: The investor's expected utility maximization is

$$\max_x \mathbb{E}[u(w(x))] \iff \max_x \int u((R+x(z-R))w_0) dF(z).$$

The first order condition is

$$\begin{aligned} \int u'((R+x^*(z-R))w)(z-R)w dF(z) &= 0 \\ \iff \int u'((R+x^*(z-R))w)(z-R) dF(z) &= 0 \quad (*) \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating the FOC (*) with respect to w yields (note that we use chain rule on x^*)

$$\begin{aligned} \int u''((R+x^*(z-R))w)(z-R)^2 w \frac{dx^*}{dw} dF(z) \\ + \int u''((R+x^*(z-R))w)(z-R)(R+x^*(z-R)) dF(z) &= 0 \\ \Rightarrow \frac{dx^*}{dw} &= \frac{-\int u''((R+x^*(z-R))w)(z-R)(R+x^*(z-R)) dF(z)}{\int u''((R+x^*(z-R))w)(z-R)^2 w dF(z)} \end{aligned}$$

Looking at the numerator, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int u''((R+x^*(z-R))w)(z-R)(R+x^*(z-R)) dF(z) \\ &= \int \frac{wu''((R+x^*(z-R))w)(R+x^*(z-R))}{u'((R+x^*(z-R))w)} \left(\frac{u'((R+x^*(z-R))w)(z-R)}{w} \right) dF(z) \\ &= \frac{\text{constant}}{w} \int u'((R+x^*(z-R))w)(z-R) dF(z) \quad \text{by CRRA} \\ &= 0 \quad \text{by (*).} \end{aligned}$$

So, $\frac{dx^*}{dw} = 0$, as required.

5. Consider a decision maker who faces following two gambles

- Gamble A: Roll a fair, six-sided die. Get paid according to the number on top.
- Gamble B: Roll a fair, six-sided die until an even number comes up on top. Get paid according to the number.

Which gamble will the decision maker prefer? What does it depend on?

Solution: As seen in the graph below, F_B first order stochastically dominates F_A , so any decision maker with non-decreasing $u(\cdot)$ will prefer B over A .

