LECTURE 5 MARKET DEMAND EXCHANGE ECONOMY

Question 1: Pareto Efficiency vs. Pareto Improvement

- Statement 1: if an allocation is Pareto efficient, there is no room for Pareto improvement.
 - True or false?
- Statement 2: if an allocation is not Pareto efficient, there is still room for Pareto improvement.
 - True or false?

Question 1: Solution

- Both are true
- By definition, from some allocation X to some other allocation Y is a Pareto improvement if from X to Y, at least one consumer is better off and no one else is worse off
- □ If an allocation is Pareto efficient, there is no way to make one consumer better off without making someone else worse off
 - In other words, there is no way to have a Pareto improvement
- If an allocation is not Pareto efficient, there is a way to make one consumer better off without making someone else worse off
 - In other words, there is room for Pareto improvement

Question 2: Feasible Allocation

Recall an allocation is feasible if

$$x_1^A + x_1^B = \omega_1^A + \omega_1^B$$
$$x_2^A + x_2^B = \omega_2^A + \omega_2^B$$

An alternative definition says that an allocation is feasible if

$$x_1^A + x_1^B \le \omega_1^A + \omega_1^B$$

 $x_2^A + x_2^B \le \omega_2^A + \omega_2^B$

The total amount of each good consumed does not exceed the total amount available

Question 2: Feasible Allocation and Pareto Efficiency

Tangency condition

$$MRS_{1,2}^A = MRS_{1,2}^B$$
 (1)

The allocation must be feasible

$$x_1^A + x_1^B = \omega_1^A + \omega_1^B$$
 (2)

$$x_2^A + x_2^B = \omega_2^A + \omega_2^B$$
 (3)

□ Substituting (2) and (3) into (1), we can express the contract curve in terms of x^{A_1} and x^{A_2} or x^{B_1} and x^{B_2}

Question 2: Feasible Allocation and Pareto Efficiency Cont'

- Suppose there are in total 8 units of good 1 and 4 units of good 2 in an economy
- Suppose the consumers' preferences satisfy more is (strictly) better
- □ Is the allocation (1, 1, 1, 1) Pareto efficient?
 - Under the alternative definition, this allocation is feasible

Question 2: Solution

- □ No!
- □ For example, (2, 2, 2, 2) is a Pareto improvement
 - Both consumers get higher utility than at (1, 1, 1, 1)
- □ Is (2, 2, 2, 2) Pareto efficient?
- An allocation where the total consumption of a good is less than the total endowment is not Pareto efficient
 - When more is strictly better
- Pareto efficient allocations will still satisfy

$$x_1^A + x_1^B = \omega_1^A + \omega_1^B$$

$$x_2^A + x_2^B = \omega_2^A + \omega_2^B$$

Question 3: Meaning of Prices

- In the exchange economy
 - There is no income/money
- But the competitive equilibrium refers to
 - A pair of equilibrium prices
 - And an equilibrium allocation
- If there is no money, what do prices mean?
- □ For example, what does it mean if the price of good 1 is \$2 and the price of good 2 is \$1?

Question 3: Solution

- All we need to know is the relative price of the two goods
 - It tells us the relative scarcity of the two goods how the two goods can be exchanged in the market
- □ If the price of good 1 is \$2 and the price of good 2 is \$1, it means
 - □ The consumer needs 2 units of good 2 to exchange for 1 unit of good 1
 - If the price of good 1 is \$20 and the price of good 2 is \$10, it does not make any difference

Question 4: Numerical Example of Competitive Equilibrium

Suppose consumer A's utility function is

$$U^{A}(x_{1}^{A}, x_{2}^{A}) = x_{1}^{A}x_{2}^{A}$$

Suppose consumer B's utility function is

$$U^{B}(x_{1}^{B}, x_{2}^{B}) = x_{1}^{B}x_{2}^{B}$$

- Consumer A's endowment is (10, 6) and consumer B's endowment is (10, 4)
- \square Find the equilibrium prices P_1 and P_2 and the equilibrium allocation

Question 4: Solution

Consumer A's optimal choice

$$\frac{x_2^A}{x_1^A} = \frac{P_1}{P_2} \tag{1}$$

$$P_1 x_1^A + P_2 x_2^A = 10P_1 + 6P_2$$
 (2)

Consumer B's optimal choice

$$\frac{x_2^B}{x_1^B} = \frac{P_1}{P_2} \tag{3}$$

$$P_1 x_1^B + P_2 x_2^B = 10P_1 + 4P_2 (4)$$

Market clearing

$$x_1^A + x_1^B = 10 + 10 = 20$$
 (5)

$$x_2^A + x_2^B = 6 + 4 = 10$$
 (6)

Question 4: Solution Cont'

□ (1) and (3) give us

$$\frac{x_2^A}{x_1^A} = \frac{x_2^B}{x_1^B} = \frac{P_1}{P_2} \quad (7)$$

Plugging (5) and (6) into (7)

$$\frac{x_2^A}{x_1^A} = \frac{10 - x_2^A}{20 - x_1^A} = \frac{P_1}{P_2}$$
 (8)

Solving

$$\frac{x_2^A}{x_1^A} = \frac{10 - x_2^A}{20 - x_1^A}$$

We get

$$x_1^A = 2x_2^A$$
 (9)

Question 4: Solution Cont'

□ Plugging (9) into (8)

$$\frac{P_1}{P_2} = 0.5$$
 (10)

□ Plugging (9) and (10) into (2)

$$P_1 2x_2^A + 2P_1 x_2^A = 10P_1 + 12P_1 \implies x_2^A = 5.5$$

The equilibrium allocation is

$$x_1^{*A} = 11$$
, $x_2^{*A} = 5.5$, $x_1^{*B} = 9$, $x_2^{*B} = 4.5$

Question 4: Comment

- \square In the previous example, we can only solve for the relative price P_1/P_2
- Relative price is what matters
 - In the previous example, we just need the price ratio to be P_1/P_2 =0.5 in equilibrium
 - It does not matter if P_1 =2, P_2 =4 or P_1 =3, P_2 =6
- It is convenient to set one of the prices to 1
 - Such a price is called a *numeraire price*, such a good is called a *numeraire*
 - If we set good 2 as a numeraire in the example, then P_1 =0.5

Q&A on Lecture 5