

Seminar 4. Elasticity of Substitution

(and a bonus for Choice with Uncertainty)

Xiaoguang Ling
xiaoguang.ling@econ.uio.no

October 9, 2020

This review part is to help you to understand Elasticity of Substitution step by step. It contains the following key points:

1. The $|\text{slop}|$ of indifference curve is **Marginal Rate of Substitution** (MRS);
2. MRS shows the relative importance of the two commodities;
3. The relation between MRS_{12} and $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$ shows the **substitution status** between the two commodities;
4. The relation between MRS_{12} and $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$ can be expressed by **Elasticity of Substitution** σ_{12}

After this part you will understand:

1. $\sigma_{12} = 0 \iff$ Leontief preference
2. $\sigma_{12} = \text{constant} \iff$ CES
3. $\sigma_{12} = +\infty \iff$ Perfect substitution

Note that I will use MRS instead of $MRTS$ by default in this part, because we have spent more time on consumer theory and MRS can be easily generalized to $MRTS$.

1 Substitution along an indifference curve




Figure 1: You have to give up Δx_2 to consume 1 more Δx_1

When we move along $u(x_1, x_2) = \bar{u}$, we can observe the following facts:

- The small increase of x_1 (i.e. Δx_1) is always followed by some small decrease of x_2 (i.e. Δx_2). Angle α reflects how much you have to give up (substitute).
- $\alpha = -\frac{\Delta x_2}{\Delta x_1}$ depends on the relative amount of x_1 and x_2 , i.e. $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$ (Note Δx_2 is negative here).

Intuition: To keep utility the same, you need to give up Δx_2 to consume Δx_1 .

Two questions:

- How to calculate $\alpha = -\frac{\Delta x_2}{\Delta x_1}$?
- How to describe the relation between α and $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$?

2 Marginal Rate of Substitution (MRS)

When x_1 increases one very small unit, we define $\angle \alpha$ as Marginal Rate of Substitution (MRS).

$$MRS = \alpha = -\frac{\Delta x_2}{\Delta x_1}$$

We can calculate α in the following 2 ways:

Method 1 (2-D thinking)

When line segment $A - B$ and $D - E$ are extremely short, $-\alpha$ is simply the slope of the indifference curve.

Similar to Jehle & Reny 1.27 in seminar 1, an indifference curve can be seen as the graph of a function $x_2 = f(x_1)$ given some utility \bar{u} . Thus $\alpha = -\frac{dx_2}{dx_1}$.

Method 2 (3-D thinking)

Given $u(x_1, x_2)$ is a differentiable function (recall the hill-like 3-D graph I showed you). The small change of $u(x_1, x_2)$, i.e. $\Delta u(x_1, x_2)$, can always be attributed to the small change of x_1 and x_2 . "Marginal utility", $\frac{\partial u(x_1, x_2)}{\partial x_1}$ and $\frac{\partial u(x_1, x_2)}{\partial x_2}$, show how "effective" the two commodities are :

$$\Delta u(x_1, x_2) = \frac{\partial u(x_1, x_2)}{\partial x_1} \Delta x_1 + \frac{\partial u(x_1, x_2)}{\partial x_2} \Delta x_2$$

(See also [Total derivative](#).)

Now, let's keep $u(x_1, x_2) = \bar{u}$, i.e. $\Delta u(x_1, x_2) = 0$, we have

$$0 = \frac{\partial u(x_1, x_2)}{\partial x_1} \Delta x_1 + \frac{\partial u(x_1, x_2)}{\partial x_2} \Delta x_2$$

$$\alpha = -\frac{\Delta x_2}{\Delta x_1} = -\frac{\partial u(x_1, x_2)/\partial x_1}{\partial u(x_1, x_2)/\partial x_2}$$

Intuition: The more important x_1 is, the more x_2 you'd like to give up.

Another virtue of the 3-D thinking is that it can be easily generalized to many-dimension problems. Given utility the same, **to consume more commodity i** , how much commodity j must you give up? This is called the **Marginal Rate of Substitution of good j for good i** :

$$MRS_{ij}(x) = \frac{\partial u(x)/\partial x_i}{\partial u(x)/\partial x_j}$$

Similarly, in the case of Production theory, given the quantity of production the same (along an isoquant), **to increase input i** , how much input j must be decreased? This is called the **Marginal Rate of Technical Substitution of input j for input i** :

$$MRTS_{ij}(x) = \frac{\partial f(x)/\partial x_i}{\partial f(x)/\partial x_j}$$

Here the word "Technical" refers to the technology $f(x)$.

3 α and $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$

The relation between α and $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$ also reflects the substitution nature of the two commodities. Note that we can use angles to express $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$. For example, in Figure 2, $\angle AOB = \frac{AB}{OB} = \frac{x_2^1}{x_1^1}$. Similarly, $\angle COD = \frac{CD}{OD} = \frac{x_2^2}{x_1^2}$.




Figure 2: MRS changes much




Figure 3: MRS changes a little

The change of $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$ can be expressed by $\angle\gamma$. When $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$ changes γ :

- in Figure 2, the "slope" MRS changes a lot.
- in Figure 3, the "slope" MRS changes a little.

Now let's think about an extreme case. In Figure 4, when $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$ changes γ , MRS does not change ($MRS_{12}(x) = \frac{\partial u(x)/\partial x_1}{\partial u(x)/\partial x_2} = 0.5$). That is, MRS is independent of $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$.




Figure 4: Perfect substitution

You're never bored with x_1 comparing with x_2 , no matter how much x_1 and x_2 you consumed. This can only happen when x_1 and x_2 are in nature the same commodity.

For example, x_1 is an apple, while x_2 is a pack of 2 apples. The quality of the apples are the same and the only difference is the amount per package. Since you can always substitute a 2-apple pack with 2 single apples, we call this condition as "**Perfect Substitution**".

Another extreme example is Leontief preference. In Figure 5, when $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$ changes γ , MRS changes from $+\infty$ to 0.




Figure 5: Leontief Preference

We already know with Leontief preference, you believe x_1 and x_2 are totally different and can only make sense with a certain proportion, like bread and cheese. There can be **NO substitution** between the two.

4 Elasticity of Substitution σ_{12}

We want to know the relation between α and γ , i.e. MRS and $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$:

- "1% change of $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$ " will lead to how many percent change of MRS .

$$\begin{aligned}
 ES &= \left[\frac{\text{some \% change of } MRS}{\text{some \% change of } \frac{x_2}{x_1}} \right]^{-1} \\
 &= \left[\frac{\frac{dMRS}{MRS}}{\frac{d(x_2/x_1)}{x_2/x_1}} \right]^{-1} \\
 &= \left[\frac{d \ln(MRS)}{d \ln(x_2/x_1)} \right]^{-1}
 \end{aligned}$$

- Inside brackets: when $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$ changes 1 percent, how many percent MRS changes. E.g. 0 if perfect substitution, $+\infty$ if no substitution.
- Why inverse? We want it to be $+\infty$ when perfect substitution, and 0 when no substitution (more intuitive).

Similarly, for firms, we have:

DEFINITION: The Elasticity of Technical Substitution (a 2-input case for DEFINITION 3.2 on Jehle & Reny pp. 129)

For a production function $f(x_1, x_2)$, the elasticity of substitution of input 2 for input 1 at the point $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$ is defined as:

$$\sigma_{12}(x_1, x_2) \equiv \left(\frac{d \ln MRTS_{12}(\frac{x_2}{x_1})}{d \ln(\frac{x_2}{x_1})} \right)^{-1}$$

Note both the numerator and the denominator are functions of $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$. If we define $\frac{x_2}{x_1} = r$, $\sigma_{12}(x_1, x_2)$ can be rewritten as:

$$\sigma_{12}(x_1, x_2) \equiv \left(\frac{d \ln MRTS_{12}(r)}{d \ln r} \right)^{-1}$$

5 An example from exam 2019 Q1(a)

Deb and Frank have the following utility functions $U_D = x_D + 2y_D$ and $U_F = x_F^\alpha y_F^{1-\alpha}$, with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

b) [5%] What is the elasticity of substitution for Deb? What is the implication for the income and substitution effects?

Obviously, Deb has a "perfect substitution" preference exactly the same as Figure 4.

$$MRS_{xy} = \frac{\partial / \partial x}{\partial u / \partial y} = 0.5$$

$$\sigma_{xy} = \left[\frac{d \ln(MRS)}{d \ln(x/y)} \right]^{-1} = \left[\frac{0}{d \ln(x/y)} \right]^{-1} = [0]^{-1} = +\infty$$

In this case, Deb believes x and y are the same product but with different amount per package.

As for income and substitution effects, the solution online is incorrect. Let's use apple as an example to make it clear:

Day 1




Figure 6: A fair deal

- x : an apple , 5 kr per package.
- y : a 2-apple pack, 10 kr per package.

It's fair! Deb will not mind to substitute 2 x with 1 y . Her demands lie on the budget frontier.

Day 2

- x : an apple , 5 kr per package.
- y : a 2-apple pack, 5 kr per package. On Sale!.




Figure 7: y is on sale

Deb will spend all income on y because it's cheaper per apple.

If Deb chose $(x = 0, y = \frac{\$}{10kr})$ in Day 1, when "relative price" changes (dash line), her demand will not change \Rightarrow no substitution effects, and income effects only exist for y :

$$y = \frac{\$}{10kr} \Rightarrow y = \frac{\$}{5kr}$$

(Note in Day 1, indifference curve u is also on the budget frontier B)

Day 3

- x : an apple , 3 kr per package (also on sale but still more expensive).
- y : a 2-apple pack, 5 kr per package. Still on sale.




Figure 8: y is still cheaper

There is no substitution effect and income effect. Demands unchanged.

Day 4

- x : an apple , 2 kr per package (Cheaper!).
- y : a 2-apple pack, 5 kr per package. Still on sale.




Figure 9: x is cheaper

If the relative price changed (red dash line), with the same utility, Deb's demand will change:

$$x = 0 \rightarrow x^h$$

$$y = \frac{\$}{10kr} \rightarrow y = 0$$

This is due to substitution effect. In this case, the income effects only exist for x :

$$x^h \rightarrow x = \frac{\$}{2kr}$$

Answer: The elasticity of substitution for Deb is infinite due to perfect substitution. Assume there is a cheaper commodity, like y in Day 2.

- When the cheaper is still cheaper (y in Day 3), no substitution effect, no income effect, no price effect.
- When the cheaper becomes the more expensive (y in Day 4), income effect exists only for the cheaper (x in Day 4).

Tips: Allocate your time according to the point of the questions.

- This is a 5% point question, then just answer it briefly.
- Use graphs can save your time.
- Use "common sense" to avoid proving (unless the question asks you to **calculate**), e.g. "straight" indifference curve \Rightarrow perfect substitution $\Rightarrow \sigma = +\infty$

- Just skip it if you find it difficult. This small sub-question is really hard to answer.

Question: What is the implication of Leontief preference's ES for the income and substitution effects?

Since you are here...

6 exam 2019 Q1(a) c)- d) - Choice with uncertainty

6.1 exam 2019 Q1(a) c) [5%]

Deb and Frank have the following utility functions $U_D = x_D + 2y_D$ and $U_F = x_F^\alpha y_F^{1-\alpha}$, with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

c) Suppose that x and y measure the same commodity in two different states of the world, say states X and Y .

- Rewrite the utility functions as expected utility functions.
- For which α do the utility functions for D and F have the same MRS at the 45 degree line?
- What does this mean?

The question wants us to **rewrite** utility functions when there are 2 possible states.

We know:

- The summation of the possibilities of the two states must be 1.
- Any monotonic transformation ($f(u)$ is a strictly increasing function of u , e.g. $f(u) = 0.5u$, $f(u) = \ln(u)$, $f(u) = u^2$) of utility functions will not change preference.

1. Rewrite:

$$E(U_D) = \frac{1}{3}x_D + \frac{2}{3}y_D$$

$$E(U_F) = \alpha \ln x_F + (1 - \alpha) \ln y_F$$

- Deb's utility function is actually $U_D(w) = w$, where $w = x, y$
- Frank's utility function is $U_F(w) = \ln w$, where $w = x, y$

2. α and MRS:

$$MRS_{D12} = 0.5$$

$$MRS_{F12} = \frac{\alpha/x}{(1-\alpha)/y} = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \frac{y}{x} = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \Big|_{x=y}$$

When $MRS_{D12} = 0.5 = MRS_{F12} \Big|_{x=y} = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}$, we have $\alpha = \frac{1}{3}$

3. Meaning

When $\alpha = \frac{1}{3}$, $E(U_F) = \frac{1}{3} \ln x_F + \frac{2}{3} \ln y_F$,

Deb and Frank believe the possibilities of the two states are the same.

6.2 exam 2019 Q1(a) d) [5%]

- Compute Deb's certainty equivalent at her endowment.
- Compute the Arrow-Pratt index of absolute risk aversion for Frank.




Figure 10: Concave utility functions have positive risk premium $P \equiv E(g) - CE$

1. Deb's certainty equivalent

Since Deb's utility function $u = w$, where $w = x, y$ is a straight (45 degree) line, $u[E(g)] = E(u)$, $CE = E(g) = 1$

2. Absolute risk aversion for Frank

DEFINITION 2.6 The Arrow-Pratt Measure of Absolute Risk Aversion (pp.113)

$$R_a(w) \equiv -\frac{u''(w)}{u'(w)}$$

The utility function of Frank with no uncertainty is $u = \ln w$, where $w = x, y$, thus

$$R_a(w) = -\frac{-\frac{1}{w^2}}{\frac{1}{w}} = \frac{1}{w}$$

7 exam 2017 Part 1. Q5 - Certainty Equivalent

Emilia's vN-M utility function is $u(c_1, c_2, \pi_1, \pi_2) = \pi_1 \sqrt{c_1} + \pi_2 \sqrt{c_2}$, where c_1 and c_2 are monetary payoffs in states 1 and 2 and π_1 and π_2 are the probabilities associated to such states. Emilia is offered the possibility to take a gamble that pays either 36 or 64 with equal probability. What is Emilia's reservation price for this gamble? What is her risk premium? Consider now a gamble that pays 4 times as much in each state (i.e., 4×36 and 4×64). Would Emilia be willing to pay 4 times as much for such a gamble?

Parse the question in plain language:

- Emilia's utility with no uncertainty is $u(c) = \sqrt{c}$, c is money.
- Now there are uncertainty: 2 states with the same possibility, i.e. $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$
- Money in the two states: $c_1 = 36$, $c_2 = 64$

"Reservation price" is the price you want to pay to play the gamble, which is the same as "certainty equivalent".

1. Certainty equivalent

$$E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{36} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{64} = 7$$
$$u(CE) = \sqrt{CE}$$

Let $u(CE) = E(u)$, we have

$$\sqrt{CE} = 7 \Rightarrow CE = 49$$

Emilia can pay as much as 49 to play the gamble.

2. Risk Premium

Risk Premium = $E(c) - CE$

$$E(c) = \frac{1}{2} \times 36 + \frac{1}{2} \times 64 = 50$$
$$P = 50 - 49 = 1$$

3. 4 times as much

$$E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{4 \times 36} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{4 \times 64} = 2 \times 7$$

$$\sqrt{CE} = 2 \times 7 \Rightarrow CE = 4 \times 49$$

Yes, Emilia is willing to pay 4 times as much for such a gamble.

8 Jehle & Reny 3.10

A Leontief production function has the form

$$y = \min\{\alpha x_1, \beta x_2\}$$

for $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$. Carefully sketch the isoquant map for this technology and verify that the elasticity of substitution $\sigma = 0$, where defined.

$$\begin{cases} \text{If } \alpha x_1 > \beta x_2, \text{ i.e. } \frac{\alpha}{\beta} x_1 > x_2, y = \beta x_2 \\ \text{If } \alpha x_1 = \beta x_2, \text{ i.e. } \frac{\alpha}{\beta} x_1 = x_2, y = \alpha x_1 = \beta x_2 \\ \text{If } \alpha x_1 < \beta x_2, \text{ i.e. } \frac{\alpha}{\beta} x_1 < x_2, y = \alpha x_1 \end{cases}$$

Similar to Jehle & Reny 1.27 in seminar 1, the indifference curves are separated by a line. Here the line is $\frac{\alpha}{\beta} x_1 = x_2$. Since $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$, $\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \in (0, +\infty)$




Figure 11: A possible $\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$

We can then draw the indifference curves:




Figure 12: A map of the indifference sets for Q.3.10

Like Figure 5, when $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$ changes some angle γ , MRS changes from $+\infty$ to 0.

$$MRTS = \left[\frac{d \ln(MRTS)}{d \ln(x_2/x_1)} \right]^{-1} = \left[\frac{+\infty}{\text{some finite number}} \right]^{-1} = 0$$

A formal proof: from CES to Leontief (read if you're interested)

Since Leontief indifference curve is not differentiable(at the kink point), it's easier to start from a CES utility function. Suppose we have a CES utility function:

$$u(x_1, x_2) = [(\alpha x_1)^\rho + (\beta x_2)^\rho]^{\frac{1}{\rho}}$$

Where $\rho < 1$, and $\rho \neq 0$. The Elasticity of Substitution of the CES utility function is $\sigma = \frac{1}{1-\rho}$ (Jehle & Reny pp.130).

For simplicity, let's denote αx_1 as m and βx_2 as n . A log transformation will simplify our proof too:

$$\ln u(m, n) = \frac{\ln(m^\rho + n^\rho)}{\rho}$$

Then:

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \ln u(m, n) = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\ln(m^\rho + n^\rho)}{\rho} \rightarrow \frac{\ln(0) \text{ or } \ln(+\infty)}{-\infty} = \frac{\infty}{\infty}$$

Which is a **Indeterminate Form**. We can thus apply **L'Hôpital's rule**:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \ln u(m, n) &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\ln(m^\rho + n^\rho)}{\rho} \\ L'Hôpital's rule: &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{d \ln(m^\rho + n^\rho) / d \rho}{d \rho / d \rho} \\ &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{m^\rho \ln m + n^\rho \ln n}{m^\rho + n^\rho} \end{aligned}$$

(Note here we treat ρ as the only variable, therefore $\frac{dx^\rho}{d\rho} = x^\rho \ln x$)
Denote $c = \min\{m, n\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \ln u(m, n) &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\frac{1}{c^\rho}}{\frac{1}{c^\rho}} \ln u(m, n) \\ &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{(m/c)^\rho \ln m + (n/c)^\rho \ln n}{(m/c)^\rho + (n/c)^\rho} \end{aligned}$$

Case 1. if $m < n$: $c = m, \frac{n}{c} = \frac{n}{m} > 1$

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \ln u(m, n) &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{1^\rho \ln m + (n/m)^\rho \ln n}{1^\rho + (n/m)^\rho} \\ (\frac{n}{m} > 1) &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\ln m + 0}{1 + 0} \\ &= \ln m\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \ln u(x_1, x_2) = \ln m = \ln(\alpha x_1) \Rightarrow \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} u(x_1, x_2) = \alpha x_1$

Case 2. if $m > n$: $c = n, \frac{m}{c} = \frac{m}{n} > 1$

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \ln u(m, n) &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{(m/n)^\rho \ln m + 1^\rho \ln n}{(m/n)^\rho + 1^\rho} \\ (\frac{m}{n} > 1) &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{0 + \ln n}{0 + 1} \\ &= \ln n\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \ln u(x_1, x_2) = \ln n = \ln(\beta x_2) \Rightarrow \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} u(x_1, x_2) = \beta x_2$

To sum up,

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} u(x_1, x_2) = \min\{\alpha x_1, \beta x_2\}$$

In addition,

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \sigma = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{1}{1 - \rho} = 0$$

We can conclude: when $\rho \rightarrow -\infty$, the CES utility function shows Leontief preference, and $\sigma = 0$.

9 Jehle & Reny 3.11

Calculate σ for the Cobb-Douglas production function $y = Ax_1^\alpha x_2^\beta$, where $A > 0$, $\alpha > 0$, and $\beta > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{12}(x_1, x_2) &\equiv \left(\frac{d \ln MRTS_{12}(r)}{d \ln r} \right)^{-1} \\ MRTS &= \frac{\partial f(x_1, x_2) / \partial x_1}{\partial f(x_1, x_2) / \partial x_2}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
MRTS &= \frac{\partial A x_1^\alpha x_2^\beta / \partial x_1}{\partial A x_1^\alpha x_2^\beta / \partial x_2} \\
&= \frac{A \alpha x_1^{\alpha-1} x_2^\beta}{A x_1^\alpha \beta x_2^{\beta-1}} \\
&= \frac{\alpha x_2}{\beta x_1}
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$ as r , then $MRTS = \frac{\alpha}{\beta} r$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{12} &= \left(\frac{d \ln(\frac{\alpha}{\beta} r)}{d \ln r} \right)^{-1} \\
&= \left(\frac{d[\ln(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}) + \ln(r)]}{d \ln r} \right)^{-1} \\
&= \left(\frac{d \ln(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}) + d \ln(r)}{d \ln r} \right)^{-1} \\
&= \left(\frac{0 + d \ln(r)}{d \ln r} \right)^{-1} \\
&= 1
\end{aligned}$$

10 Jehle & Reny 3.14

Calculate the elasticity of substitution for the production function in Example 3.2.

EXAMPLE 3.2 (Jehle & Reny pp.134) A production function with variable returns to scale:

$$y = k(1 + x_1^{-\alpha} x_2^{-\beta})^{-1}$$

where $\alpha > 0, \beta > 0$, and k is an upper bound on the level of output, so that $0 \leq y < k$.

$$\begin{aligned}
MRTS &= \frac{\partial k(1 + x_1^{-\alpha} x_2^{-\beta})^{-1} / \partial x_1}{\partial k(1 + x_1^{-\alpha} x_2^{-\beta})^{-1} / \partial x_2} \\
&= \frac{-k(1 + x_1^{-\alpha} x_2^{-\beta})^{-2} (-\alpha) x_1^{-\alpha-1} x_2^{-\beta}}{-k(1 + x_1^{-\alpha} x_2^{-\beta})^{-2} x_1^{-\alpha} (-\beta) x_2^{-\beta-1}} \\
&= \frac{\alpha x_2}{\beta x_1}
\end{aligned}$$

The same as Jehle & Reny 3.11, $\sigma_{12} = 1$