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• Uncertainty is a fact of life so people’s attitudes towards risk enter every realm of economic decision-making.

• We *must* study individual behavior with respect to choice involving uncertainty.

• Models of decision making under uncertainty play a key role in every field of economics.
Preliminaries (PR 5.1)

First, we define some key concepts to which we refer throughout the lecture:

– Objective and subjective probability, and probability distribution.

– Risk (known probabilities) and ambiguity (unknown probabilities).

– Variability (expected value, standard deviation, and variance).
Probability is the likelihood that a given outcome will occur. Suppose there are two possible outcomes having payoffs $x_1$ and $x_2$ and that the probabilities of these outcomes are $p_1$ and $p_2$, then the expected value is

$$E(x) = p_1x_1 + p_2x_2$$

where $p_1 + p_2 = 1$ (a probability distribution). More generally, when there are $n$ outcomes the expected value is

$$E(x) = p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 + \cdots + p_nx_n.$$
When there are two outcomes $x_1$ and $x_2$ occurring with probabilities $p_1$ and $p_2$ the variance is given by

$$\sigma^2 = p_1[x_1 - E(x)]^2 + p_2[x_2 - E(x)]^2,$$

and when there are $n$ outcomes $x_1, x_2, ..., x_n$ occurring with probabilities $p_1, p_2, ... p_n$ the variance is given by

$$\sigma^2 = p_1[x_1 - E(x)]^2 + p_2[x_2 - E(x)]^2 + \cdots + p_n[x_n - E(x)]^2.$$

The standard deviation is the square root of the variance $\sigma$ and it is a standard measure of variability.
An example (PR Tables 5.1-5.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>$E(x)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p_1$</td>
<td>$x_1$</td>
<td>$p_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 2</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$x_1$</th>
<th>$[x_1 - E(x)]^2$</th>
<th>$x_2$</th>
<th>$[x_2 - E(x)]^2$</th>
<th>$\sigma^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job 1</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 2</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A modified example (PR Table 5.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>$E(x)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p_1$</td>
<td>$x_1$</td>
<td>$p_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 2</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outcome 1 $</th>
<th>[x_1 - E(x)]^2$</th>
<th>Outcome 2 $</th>
<th>[x_2 - E(x)]^2$</th>
<th>$\sigma^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job 1</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 2</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preferences toward risk (PR 5.2)

The standard model of decisions under risk (known probabilities) is based on von Neumann and Morgenstern Expected Utility Theory.

Let $X$ be a set of lotteries, or gambles, (outcomes and probabilities). A fundamental assumption about preferences toward risk is independence:

For any lotteries $x, y, z$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$

$$x \succ y \text{ implies } \alpha x + (1 - \alpha) r \succ \alpha y + (1 - \alpha) r.$$
Expected Utility Theory has some very convenient properties for analyzing choice under uncertainty.

To clarify, we will consider the *utility* that a consumer gets from her or his income.

More precisely, from the consumption bundle that the consumer’s income can buy.
Expected utility is the sum of utilities associated with all possible outcomes, weighted by the probability that each outcome will occur.

In the job example above the expected utility from job 1 is given by

\[ E(u) = .5u(2000) + .5u(1000), \]

and the expected utility from job 1 is given by

\[ E(u) = .5u(1510) + .5u(510). \]

– PR Figures 5.1-5.2 here –
Asset markets (PR 5.4)

An asset provides a flow of money (or services) to its owner. A risky asset provides a monetary flow that is at least in part random.

Suppose there are two assets – risk-free (treasury bill) with known return $R_f$ and risky asset (stock) with expected return $R_m > R_f$.

We can describe the risk-return tradeoff in terms of indifference curves and solve the investor’s choice problem.

– PR Figures 5.5-5.6 here –
Behavioral economics (PR 5.5)

Allais (1953) I

- Choose between the two gambles:

\begin{align*}
A &:= \frac{.33}{.66} \rightarrow 25,000 \\
B &:= \frac{1}{.01} \rightarrow 24,000 \\
\end{align*}
Allais (1953) II

– Choose between the two gambles:

\[ C := \frac{.33}{.067} \] \[ D := \frac{.34}{.066} \]
Ellsberg (1961)

An urn contains 300 marbles; 100 of the marbles are red, and 200 are some mixture of blue and green. We will reach into this urn and select a marble at random:

- You receive $25,000 if the marble selected is of a specified color. Would you rather the color be red or blue?

- You receive $25,000 if the marble selected is not of a specified color. Would you rather the color be red or blue?
Prospect Theory (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979)

Explains several key expected utility violations, including the classical paradox of Allais (1953).

Prospect theory has two ingredients:

- *Reference point* – the point from which the agent makes a decision.
- Loss aversion – the aggravation from losing is greater than the pleasure from gaining.

⇒ The *endowment effect* – the tendency to value an asset more when you own it...
Takeaways

• Consumers and managers frequently make decisions with uncertain consequences.

• Facing uncertain choices, Expected Utility consumers maximize the average expected utility associated with each outcome.

• Individual behavior is often contrary to the assumptions of Expected Utility Theory (an important frontier of choice theory).