state $\rightarrow$	<i>S</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>s</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>S</i> <sub>3</sub>	Dominance:
act ↓				
$a_1$	4	3	1	
a2	6	2	2	
$a_3$	5	3	2	
$a_4$	6	1	0	
<i>a</i> <sub>5</sub>	3	2	5	

So we can simplify

state 
$$\rightarrow$$
  $s_1$   $s_2$   $s_3$   
act  $\downarrow$   
 $a_2$   $6$   $2$   $2$   
 $a_3$   $5$   $3$   $2$   
 $a_5$   $3$   $2$   $5$ 

What then?

First a different example:

state  $\rightarrow s_1 \quad s_2 \quad s_3$ act  $\downarrow$   $a_1 \quad 4 \quad 3 \quad 1$   $a_2 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 2$   $a_3 \quad 5 \quad 3 \quad 2$   $a_4 \quad 6 \quad 1 \quad 0$   $a_5 \quad 3 \quad 3 \quad 4$ 

One criterion that can be used is the **MaxiMin** criterion.

state 
$$\rightarrow$$
  $s_1$   $s_2$   $s_3$   
act  $\downarrow$   
 $a_2$   $6$   $2$   $2$   
 $a_3$   $5$   $3$   $2$   
 $a_5$   $3$   $2$   $5$ 

Now back to the previous problem:

MaxiMin =

## A refinement is the **LexiMin**

state  $\rightarrow s_1 \quad s_2 \quad s_3$ act  $\downarrow$  $a \quad 6 \quad 2 \quad 2$ 

### Here the LexiMin picks

### One more example:

state $\rightarrow$	<i>s</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>s</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>S</i> <sub>3</sub>	<i>S</i> <sub>4</sub>	
act ↓					MaxiMin =
$a_1$	2	3	1	5	
$a_2$	6	2	2	3	
<i>a</i> <sub>3</sub>	5	3	2	4	Lexiiviin =
$a_4$	6	1	0	7	
$a_5$	3	2	5	1	

# Special case: outcomes are sums of money

state  $\rightarrow s_1 \quad s_2 \quad s_3 \quad s_4$ act  $\downarrow$  $a_1 \quad \$12 \quad \$30 \quad \$0 \quad \$18$  $a_2 \quad \$36 \quad \$6 \quad \$24 \quad \$12$ 

 $a_3$  \$6 \$42 \$12 \$0

Suppose that we are able to assign probabilities to the states:

state $\rightarrow$	<i>S</i> <sub>1</sub>	$S_2$	<i>S</i> <sub>3</sub>	$S_4$
	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{5}{12}$	$\frac{1}{12}$

- $a_1$  is the lottery
- $a_2$  is the lottery
- $a_3$  is the lottery

The expected values are:

#### Definition of attitude to risk ....

Given a money lottery L, imagine giving the individual a choice between L and the expected value of L for sure, that is, the choice

between 
$$\binom{\mathbb{E}[L]}{1}$$
 and L or, written more simply, between  $\mathbb{E}[L]$  and L

If she says that

- $\mathbb{E}[L] \succ L$  we say that she is **risk** relative to L
- $\mathbb{E}[L] \sim L$  we say that she is **risk** relative to L
- $L \succ \mathbb{E}[L]$  we say that she is **risk** relative to L

So in the above example, if we assume that the agent is risk neutral relative to every lottery and her preferences are transitive, then, since

 $\mathbb{E}[a_1] = 10.5$  $\mathbb{E}[a_2] = 24$  $\mathbb{E}[a_3] = 14$  Can we infer risk attitudes from choices?

Let  $L = \begin{pmatrix} \$40 & \$60 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}$  Then  $\mathbb{E}[L] =$ 

Suppose Ann's preferences are transitive, she prefers more money to less and she says that she prefers \$49 to *L*.

Suppose Bob's preferences are transitive, he prefers more money to less and he says that he prefers 51 to *L*.