

## Hicksian aggregation season 2

Felipe Del Canto, 2 de Septiembre de 2019

### 1. Where have I seen this before?

Recall that in this problem, given  $u : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , one wishes to find  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $U : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{p}, q, y) &:= \arg \max_{\mathbf{x}, z} u(\mathbf{x}, z) \\ \text{s.a. } &\mathbf{p}\mathbf{x} + qz = y. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} X(f(\mathbf{p}), q, y) &:= \arg \max_{X, z} U(X, z) \\ \text{s.a. } &PX + qz = y \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

satisfy

$$X(f(\mathbf{p}), q, y) = g(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{p}, q, y)).$$

Typically, these functions do not exist except in very restrictive cases. Thus, in the general case the equality will not hold and consequently the approximation error could be directly measured by

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{p}, q, y) := \left| X(f(\mathbf{p}), q, y) - g(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{p}, q, y)) \right|$$

For general functions  $u$  and  $U$  there is no algebraic expression of the demands  $X$  and  $\mathbf{x}$ . Hence, in our last meeting we discussed a method to compute this difference based on a Taylor approximation of both demand functions. In order to obtain the derivatives one could implicitly differentiate the lagrangians of problems (1) and (2). To put in practice this plan in a particular example one wishes to choose some “nice” utility functions  $u$  and  $U$  and aggregators  $f$  and  $g$  to see how these calculations work out. Sadly, the common Cobb-Douglas utility function is of no interest in this setting. Indeed, if  $\alpha \in (0, 1)^n$  with  $|\alpha|_1 < 1$ , then

$$\hat{u}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, z) = \underbrace{\left( \prod_{j=1}^n x_j^{\alpha_j} \right)}_{:=v(\mathbf{x})} z^{1-|\alpha|_1},$$

and thus

$$\hat{u}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, z) = \tilde{u}(v(\mathbf{x}), z),$$

with

$$\tilde{u}(v, z) = vz^{1-|\alpha|_1}.$$

Since  $v : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is also an homothetic function, then functional separability holds and good aggregation is possible by choosing the proper aggregators  $f$  and  $g$ . Consequently, in order to find an interesting example we must choose some function  $u$  that does not allow  $z$  to be “independent” of the goos in  $x$ . A simple tweak of the function  $u_\alpha$  does this trick and gives some interesting results. Let  $\alpha$  be as above and define

$$u_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, z) = \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^{\alpha_j} z^{1-\alpha_j}. \quad (3)$$

Observe that if all  $\alpha_j$  are different, then it is not possible to factor  $z$  in the above expression, solving the problem. Indeed, as [Varian \(1992\)](#) points out, functional separability is present only if the preference relation  $\succ_u$  represented by the utility function satisfies:

$$(\mathbf{x}, z) \succ (\mathbf{x}', z) \iff (\mathbf{x}, z') \succ (\mathbf{x}', z') \quad \forall z, z', \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \quad (4)$$

It is straightforward to see that for the preference relation represented by the function  $u_\alpha$  defined in (3), property (4) does not hold unless all  $\alpha_j$  are equal.

Observe that when  $\alpha_j = \alpha_0$  for every  $j$ , then

$$u_{\alpha_0}(\mathbf{x}, z) = \left( \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^{\alpha_0} \right) z^{1-\alpha_0}.$$

The parenthesis in this last expression suggest a particular form of aggregation

$$g(\mathbf{x}) := \left( \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^{\alpha_0} \right)^{1/\alpha_0}.$$

This function  $g$  is also present in the context of international trade. In [Helpman et al. \(2008\)](#) the authors develop a model where  $g$  is precisely the utility function of a country. They also suggest a certain price index that could also be useful in this setting but I have not investigated

it yet. Given this function  $g$ , the aggregate function  $U$  should be defined as follows:

$$U_{\alpha_0}(X, z) = X^{\alpha_0} z^{1-\alpha_0},$$

which is the usual Cobb-Douglas utility function. In the general case, when the  $\alpha_j$  are not equal, we could define  $U$  as follows:

$$U_{\alpha}(X, z) = X^{\bar{\alpha}} z^{1-\bar{\alpha}},$$

where  $\bar{\alpha} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j$ . This definition has the property that if  $\alpha_j = \alpha_0$  for every  $j$ , then  $\bar{\alpha} = \alpha_0$ .

The only problem with the function  $u_{\alpha}$  is the following. The first order conditions of problem (1) are

$$\alpha_j x_j^{\alpha_j} z^{1-\alpha_j} = \lambda_d p_j x_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n x_j^{\alpha_j} z^{1-\alpha_j} - \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j x_j^{\alpha_j} z^{1-\alpha_j} = \lambda_d q z \quad (6)$$

Summing (5) over  $j$  and replacing in (6) we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^n x_j^{\alpha_j} z^{1-\alpha_j} - \lambda_d \sum_{j=1}^n p_j x_j = \lambda_d q z,$$

and thus

$$\lambda_d = \frac{u(x, z)}{y}.$$

This means we do not have an analytic expression for the demand  $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{p}, q, y)$  but computing the derivatives should be possible by implicit differentiation of the lagrangian. The derivatives of  $X$  can be easily computed since

$$X(f(\mathbf{p}), q, y) = \bar{\alpha} \frac{y}{f(\mathbf{p})}$$

## References

E. Helpman, M. Melitz, and Y. Rubinstein. Estimating Trade Flows: Trading Partners and Trading Volumes\*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(2):441–487, 05 2008. ISSN 0033-5533. doi: 10.1162/qjec.2008.123.2.441. [2](#)

H. Varian. *Microeconomic Analysis*. Norton International edition. Norton, 1992. ISBN 9780393960266. [2](#)