

# Econ 501A Solutions HW2

David Zynda

September 7, 2018

**Problem 1: Prove that for finite  $X$ , a complete and transitive  $\succsim$  has a utility representation.**

Strategy: (1) First construct  $u(x)$  (2) Show that  $u(x)$  represents  $\succsim$  i.e.:

$$x \succsim y \iff u(x) \geq u(y)$$

One way to solve this is:

$$\forall x \in X : u(x) = |\{y : y \in X, x \succsim y\}|$$

Another way to solve this is using Rubenstein's way:

**Definition:** an element  $a \in X$  is minimal if  $x \succsim a$  for any  $x \in X$ .

**Lemma:** If any finite set  $A \subseteq X$  There is a minimal element.

**Proof:**

By induction on the size of  $A$ ,  $A$  is a singleton. By completeness, the only element is minimal.

Assume  $|A| = n$  is true. For  $|A| = n + 1$ , let  $x \in A$  then for the set of  $A \setminus x$ , there is a minimal element denoted by  $y$ . If  $x \succsim y$  then  $y$  is minimal in  $A$ . If  $y \succ x$ , then by transitivity then  $z \succ x$  for all  $z \in A \setminus x$  and therefore  $x$  is minimal.

**Problem: Prove that for finite  $X$ , a complete and transitive  $\succsim$  has a utility representation.**

**Proof:**

Construct a sequence of sets inductively. Let  $X$  be the subsets of elements that are minimal in  $X$ . Hence  $(X_1 \neq \emptyset)$

Assume that we have constructed  $X_1, \dots, X_k$ . Now if  $X = X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \dots \cup X_k$ , we are done. If not, define  $X_{k+1}$ , the set of minimal elements in  $X - X_1 - X_2 - X_3 - \dots - X_k$ . And by lemma  $X_{k+1} \neq \emptyset$ .

Since  $X_i$  is finite, we must be done after at most  $|X|$  steps. Define  $u(x) = k$  if  $x \in X_k$ . To verify that  $u$  represents  $\succsim$  let  $a \succsim b$ . Then  $b \notin X - X_1 - X_2 - \dots - X_{u(a)}$ .

Thus,  $u(a) \geq u(b)$

**Problem 2:**

- (a) if  $\succsim$  is complete,  $B$  contains two elements  $\implies C \succsim (B) \neq \emptyset$  if  $\succsim$  is not complete,  $B = \{x, y\}$ . Since  $\succsim$  is complete:  $x$  not succsim  $y$  and  $y$  not succsim  $x$ .  $X \in C_{\succsim}(B), y \in C_{\succsim}(B)$

If  $\succsim$  is not complete, then there exists  $x, y \in X$  such that  $x$  not succsim  $y$  and  $y$  not succsim  $x$ .

- (b)  $\succsim$  complete and transitive,  $\mathcal{B}, C_{\succsim}(B)$  satisfies finite nonemptiness.

We already proved that for any finite set, there exists maximum element (minimal above in prob 1) in  $X$  by induction. Denote this maximal element by  $X^*$ . By definition, for any finite  $B$ ,  $\exists x^* \in X$  such that for any  $y \in B$  finite,  $x^* \succsim y \implies x^* \in C_{\succsim}(B)$

So,  $C_{\succsim}(B) \neq \emptyset$ .

### Problem 3

$X$  is finite. Consider  $C(\cdot)$  defined on all nonempty subsets of  $X$ . Then: there exists a complete and transitive preference  $\succsim$  such that it generates the choice rule  $C(\cdot)$  if and only if  $C(\cdot)$  satisfies weak axiom and finite nonemptiness (Proposition 3.1b). This implies that  $C_{\succsim}(\cdot)$  satisfies finite nonemptiness by proposition 3.2. Then  $\succsim t \implies C_{\succsim}(\cdot)$  has weak axiom.

So,  $C(\cdot) = C_{\succsim}(\cdot)$ .

Essentially, repeat 3.3 in lecture notes.

### Problem 4 (3.3)

$X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  is a finite set of prices of wine with lower the price lower the subscript on  $x$ .

(a) Ann always chooses the cheapest bottle. Is her choice rule rationalizable?

First answer yes or no. If yes, then define a preference. Then, show that it is complete and transitive. Show that the choice rule generated by this preference is equal to Ann's original choice rule ( $C_{\succsim}(\cdot) = C_A(\cdot)$ )

The preference Ann has is:  $x_i \succsim x_j$  if  $i \leq j$ . So, it is complete. It is transitive (easy to show). For any  $B$  the choice rule  $C_{\succsim}(B) = \{x_{i^*}\}$  where  $i^* = \min\{i : x_i \in B\}$

Then  $C_A(B) = \{x_{i^*}\}$  and  $C_A(B) = C_{\succsim}(B)$

(b) Bob's choice rule second cheapest in a set. Show that his preference does not fulfill weakness axiom. This would then imply that his choice is not rationalizable.

Consider  $B = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$  and  $B' = \{x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ .

Bob chooses  $x_2$  in  $B$  and  $x_3$  in  $B'$  So, it violates the weakness axiom.

(c) Also not rationalizable since in one set she could choose an  $x_i$  but another set she chooses nothing.

### Problem 5

Consider single valued choice rule.

(i)  $C(\cdot)$  satisfies WA.

(ii)  $x, y \in B, B'$  and  $x \neq y$  if  $C(B) = x \implies C(B') \neq y$

(iii)  $x, y \in B, C(B) = x, c(B') = y \implies x \notin B'$ .

(iv) to (ii):

WARP states that if  $x$  is revealed at least as good as  $y$ , then  $y$  cannot be revealed preferred to  $x$ . Then  $x, y \in B : x \in C(B) \implies x \succsim y$ . And if  $y \notin C(B) \implies x \succ y$ .

So, if  $y \in C(B')$  then you cannot have  $x$  in this choice set.

(ii) to (iii): Proof by contradiction. Suppose  $x \in B, y \in B, C(B) = x$

*To be continued in the next recitation*