

When WARP guarantees rationality

Bloody Micro! by Impatient Researcher

December 28, 2020

Question

Show that if observations of what an agent chooses satisfy WARP, and the budget set \mathcal{B} includes all subsets of X up to 3 elements, then WARP guarantees rationality¹.

¹ It should be noted that rationality guarantees WARP but WARP **may not** imply rationality.

Refresher

Before diving into the formal definition, the idea is actually extremely simple. We want to see if the choice an individual makes is the same as what an individual with rational preferences would make.

Rationality: Given a choice structure $(\mathcal{B}, C(\cdot))$, if $C(B) = C^*(B, \succsim)$, $\forall B \in \mathcal{B}$, then the preference relation \succsim rationalises $C(\cdot)$ relative to \mathcal{B} .

Answer

1. Define the preference relation \succsim as this²:

$$x \in C(x, y) \iff x \succsim y$$

² This is simply specifying the preference relation \succsim (unobserved) with something we do observe $C(\cdot)$. We do not assume \succsim to be rational here.

2. WLOG³, suppose $x \succ y \succ z$

³ This is quite standard and it is innocuous in the sense that x, y, z are simply placeholders and are not assigned to any specific choice.

3. Then we know:

(a) $x \in C(x, y) \because x \succ y$

(b) $y \in C(y, z) \because y \succ z$

4. Given WARP, is our \succsim defined in this fashion rational?

(a) Completeness: yes because $C(\cdot)$ is a choice function and by definition, it's never empty (you have got to choose something) and therefore \succsim is complete.

(b) Transitivity? Need more work to show.

5. To show transitivity, suppose $z \in C(x, y, z)$. Then \because WARP⁴:

⁴ WARP \iff Condition α and β

(a) $y \in C(y, z)$ and $z \in C(x, y, z) \implies y \in C(x, y, z) \because$ Condition β

(b) $x \in C(x, y)$ and $y \in C(x, y, z) \implies x \in C(x, y, z) \because$ Condition β

(c) $x \in C(x, y, z) \implies x \in C(x, z) \because$ Condition α

6. Then we have shown transitivity as:

$$x \succ y \text{ and } y \succ z \implies x \succ z$$

7. We then need to show that $C(\cdot) = C^*(\cdot, \succ)$. To prove equivalence, we have to prove both ways:

$$(a) \ x \in C(B, \succ) \implies x \in C(B) \ \forall B \in \mathcal{B}$$

- i. For a given $B \in \mathcal{B}$
- ii. By the definition of $x \in C(B, \succ)$, we know $x \succ y, \forall y \in B$
- iii. As $C(\cdot)$ is never empty⁵, WLOG let y^* be some item such that $y^* \in C(B)$. And of course $y^* \in B$.
- iv. As $x \succ y, \forall y \in B$, then we know that $x \succ y^* \implies x \in C(\{x, y^*\})$
- v. By Condition β , we have $x \in C(\{x, y^*\})$ and $y^* \in C(B) \implies x \in C(B)$. We have come a full circle. \square

⁵ Again it is a choice function, you have to got to choose something. It can be more than one item though.

$$(b) \ x \in C(B) \implies x \in C(B, \succ) \ \forall B \in \mathcal{B}$$

- i. For a given $B \in \mathcal{B}$
- ii. $x \in C(B) \implies x \in C(x, z), \forall z \in B, \because$ Condition α
- iii. Given how our \succ is defined, then $x \in C(x, z), \forall z \in B \implies x \succ z, \forall z \in B$
- iv. Which then of course implies that $x \in C(B, \succ) \ \forall B \in \mathcal{B}$. \square