#### 444 Lecture 2

**Introducing Games** 

Brian Weatherson

1/10/23

### Day Plan

Utility

Ordinal and Cardinal Utility

**Dominance Arguments** 

Some Famous Games

#### Game Outcomes

There are two natural ways to specify the outcome of a game.

- 1. Describe the physical situation that results.
- 2. Describe how much **utility** each player gets from that result.

0000000000

• We are usually going to be focused on the second.

### Utility

- We are usually going to be focused on the second.
- That's because we want to know what makes sense from the players' perspectives.

00000000000

### Utility

- We are usually going to be focused on the second.
- That's because we want to know what makes sense from the players' perspectives.
- And just knowing the physical outcomes doesn't tell us that.

0000000000

# What is Utility

• It's not score.

- It's not score.
- The players are aiming to maximise their own number, not maximise the difference between the numbers.



A memorable scoreboard

• The players would prefer a 3-4 result (i.e., 3 for them, 4 for other player) to a 2-1 result.

- The players would prefer a 3-4 result (i.e., 3 for them, 4 for other player) to a 2-1 result.
- So this is very much unlike soccer, even though the numbers will often feel a lot like soccer scores.

• It's not money, for two distinct reasons.

- It's not money, for two distinct reasons.
- First, the players might care how much money the other players get.

#### Consider these three situations

- 1. Billy gets \$90, Suzy gets \$100.
- 2. Billy gets \$100, Suzy gets nothing.
- 3. Billy gets \$110, Suzy gets \$100.

How do you order these in terms of utility to Billy, from highest to lowest?

• We don't know given just this description.

- We don't know given just this description.
- If Billy wants Suzy to get money, he might prefer option 1 to option 2.

- We don't know given just this description.
- If Billy wants Suzy to get money, he might prefer option 1 to option 2.
- If Billy wants Suzy to not have money, he might prefer option 2 to option 3.

• It's not money, for two distinct reasons.

- It's not money, for two distinct reasons.
- Second, getting twice as much money typically doesn't produce twice as much utility.

It is, more or less, desirability.

• Outcome  $O_1$  has more utility for player X than outcome  $O_2$  iff X prefers to be in  $O_1$  than  $O_2$ .

# **Utility and Numbers**

• Now you might have noticed something odd there.

### **Utility and Numbers**

- Now you might have noticed something odd there.
- We are trying to define this numerical quantity, but we've just told you something about when it is bigger or smaller.

### **Utility and Numbers**

- Now you might have noticed something odd there.
- We are trying to define this numerical quantity, but we've just told you something about when it is bigger or smaller.
- Surely we need to say something more, like how much bigger or smaller it is in different situations.

# Day Plan

Utility

Ordinal and Cardinal Utility

**Dominance Arguments** 

Some Famous Games

### Utility

A utility function (for a particular agent) is a mapping *U* from situations to numbers satsifying this constraint.

•  $U(S_1) > U(S_2)$  iff the agent is better off in  $S_1$  than in  $S_2$ .

#### Welfare

This isn't part of the formal theory, but we usually implicitly assume (at least in our narratives), the following principle.

The agent is better off in  $S_1$  than in  $S_2$  iff, given a choice and assuming they are fully informed, they prefer being in  $S_1$  to  $S_{2}$ .

That is, we'll usually speak as if a radically subjectivist view of welfare is correct. I've been doing this already, and I'm going to keep doing it.  When we say that we're working with ordinal utility functions, really the only principle that applies is the one from two slides back.

### **Ordinal Utility**

- When we say that we're working with ordinal utility functions, really the only principle that applies is the one from two slides back.
- Higher utilities are better, i.e., are preferred.

### **Ordinal Utility**

- When we say that we're working with ordinal utility functions, really the only principle that applies is the one from two slides back.
- Higher utilities are better, i.e., are preferred.
- The term **ordinal** should make you think of 'orders'; all an ordinal utility function does is provide a rank **ordering** of the outcomes.

#### Two Functions

So if we're working in ordinal utility, these two functions describe the same underlying reality.

	$U_1$	$U_2$
$O_1$	1	1
$O_2$	2	10
$O_3$	3	500
$O_4$	4	7329

### **Cardinal Utility**

 In cardinal utility theory, the differences between the numbers matter.

### **Cardinal Utility**

- In cardinal utility theory, the differences between the numbers matter.
- The numbers now express quantities, and the two functions from the previous slide do not represent the same underlying reality.

• There is a fussy point here that's worth going over.

### Cardinal Utility (Detail)

- There is a fussy point here that's worth going over.
- Even cardinal utility functions don't come with a scale.

### Cardinal Utility (Detail)

- There is a fussy point here that's worth going over.
- Even cardinal utility functions don't come with a scale.
- So two functions with different numbers in them can still express the same underlying reality.

### Cardinal Utility (Detail)

The standard way to put this is that (cardinal) utility is defined only up to a **positive**, affine transformation. That means that if  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are related by the following formula, then they represent the same state of affairs

$$U_2(o) = aU_1(o) + b$$
 where  $a > 0$ 

#### Celsius and Farenheit

 The main real world cases of scales that are related in this way are temperature scales.

#### Celsius and Farenheit

- The main real world cases of scales that are related in this way are temperature scales.
- To convert between Celsius and Farenheit you use the formula F = 1.8C + 32.

#### Celsius and Farenheit

- The main real world cases of scales that are related in this way are temperature scales.
- To convert between Celsius and Farenheit you use the formula  ${\it F}=1.8{\it C}+32.$
- But the scales are just two ways of representing the same physical reality.

• So there is no such thing as one outcome being *twice* as *good* as another.

- So there is no such thing as one outcome being *twice* as *good* as another.
- But we can say a lot of things about differences.

• If the difference between  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  is the same as the difference between  $O_2$  and  $O_3$ , that will stay the same under any positive affine transformation.

- If the difference between  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  is the same as the difference between  $O_2$  and  $O_3$ , that will stay the same under any positive affine transformation.
- Indeed, for any k, if the difference between  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  is k times the difference between  $O_2$  and  $O_3$ , that will stay the same under any positive affine transformation.

Dominance Arguments •00000000

**Dominance Arguments** 

# A Simple Game

	Left	Right
Up	4, 1	2, 0
Down	3, 0	1, 1

Here's how to read this table.

**Dominance Arguments** 00000000

- 1. Two players, call them Row and Column.
- 2. Row chooses the row, Column chooses the column - between them they choose a cell.
- 3. Each cell has two numbers the first is Row's payout, the second is Column's payout.

# Left Right Up 4, 1 2, 0 Down 3, 0 1, 1

 Whatever Column does, Row is better off playing Up rather than Down.

	Left Righ	
Up	4, 1	2, 0
Down	3, 0	1, 1

 Whatever Column does, Row is better off playing Up rather than Down.

Dominance Arguments 00000000

 We say that Up strongly dominates Down.

	Left	Right
Up	4, 1	2, 0
Middle	5, 0	0, 0
Down	3, 0	1, 1

 Adding options doesn't change things.

Dominance Arguments 000000000

	Left	Right
Up	4, 1	2, 0
Middle	5, 0	0, 0
Down	3, 0	1, 1

 Adding options doesn't change things.

Dominance Arguments

 Up still dominates Down, even if it isn't always best.

	Left	Right
Up		0, 0
Middle	2, 0	2, 0
Down	0, 0	3, 1

This is **not** a case of dominance.

000000000

	Left	Right
Up	3, 1	0, 0
Middle	2, 0	2, 0
Down	0, 0	3, 1

This is **not** a case of dominance.

Dominance Arguments 000000000

 Even though Middle is never the highest value, it isn't dominated by any one option.

Dominance Arguments

# **Strong Dominance**

Strategy  $S_1$  strongly dominates strategy  $S_2$  if for any strategy S by the other player(s), if S is played, then  $S_1$  returns a higher payoff than  $S_2$ .

#### Weak Dominance

Strategy  $S_1$  weakly dominates strategy  $S_2$  if for any strategy S by the other player(s), if S is played, then  $S_1$  returns a payoff that is at least as high  $S_2$ , and for some strategy by the other player(s),  $S_1$  returns a higher payoff than  $S_2$ .

The difference is that weak dominance allows for ties.

Dominance Arguments 000000000

#### Two Dominance Notions

#### Strong Dominance

Always better.

#### Weak Dominance

- Never worse.
- Sometimes better.

	Left	Right
Up	4, 1	2, 0
Down	3, 0	<b>2</b> , 1

- I've changed the payoffs in the bottom right cell.
- Now Up does not strongly dominate Down.
- But it does weakly dominate Down.

Some Famous Games

	Соор	Defect
Соор	3, 3	0, 5
Defect	5, 0	1, 1

Ordinal constraints

• 
$$c > a, d > b$$

• 
$$a > d$$

Cardinal constraints

• 
$$2a > b + c$$

	Соор	Defect
Соор	5, 5	0, 4
Defect	4, 0	2, 2

# Stag Hunt

Ordinal constraints

• 
$$a > c, d > b$$

Cardinal constraints

• 
$$a + b < c + d$$

	Self	Other
Self	0, 0	4, 1
Other	1, 4	0, 0

	Attack	Retreat
Attack	-99, -99	2, 0
Retreat	0, 2	1, 1

	Rock	Paper	Scissors
	0, 0	-1, 1	1, -1
Paper		0, 0	-1, 1
Scissors	-1, 1	1, -1	0, 0

#### For Next Time

We're jumping ahead to section 2.5 of Bonanno.