

I'm not a robot



square is an increasing monotone (or monotonic) transformation. This means that the ordinal preference induced by these functions is the same as if u (x) {\displaystyle u(x)^{2}} . In order to simplify calculations, various alternative assumptions have been made concerning details of human preferences, and these imply various alternative utility functions such as:CES (constant elasticity of substitution),isoelastic utility,Exponential utility,Quasi-linear utility,Homothetic preferences,Stone-Geary utility function,Gorman polar form,Greenwood-Horowitz-Huffman preferences,King-Plosser-Rebelo preferences,Hyperbolic absolute risk aversion,Most utility functions used for modeling or theory are well-behaved. They are usually monotonic and quasi-concave. However, it is possible for rational preferences not to be representable by a utility function. An example is lexicographic preferences which are not continuous and cannot be represented by a continuous utility function.[8]Economists distinguish between total utility and marginal utility. Total utility is the utility of an alternative, an entire consumption bundle or situation in life. The rate of change of utility from changing the quantity of one good consumed is termed the marginal utility of that good. Marginal utility therefore measures the slope of the utility function with respect to the changes of one good.[9] Marginal utility usually decreases with consumption of the good, the idea of "diminishing marginal utility". In calculus notation, the marginal utility of good X is

M

U

x

=

∂
U
X

∂
x

{\displaystyle MU_{x}={\frac {\partial U}{\partial X}}}

 . When a good's marginal utility is positive, additional consumption of it increases utility; if zero, the consumer is satiated and indifferent about consuming more; if negative, the consumer would pay to reduce his consumption.[10] Rational individuals only consume additional units of goods if it increases the marginal utility. However, the law of diminishing marginal utility means an additional unit consumed brings a lower marginal utility than that carried by the previous unit consumed. For example, drinking one bottle of water makes a thirsty person satisfied; as the consumption of water increases, he may feel begin to feel bad which causes the marginal utility to decrease to zero or even become negative. Furthermore, this is also used to analyze progressive taxes as the greater taxes can result in the loss of utility.Marginal rate of substitution is the absolute value of the slope of the indifference curve, which measures how much an individual is willing to switch from one good to another. Using a mathematic equation,

M

R

S

=

∂

x

2

∂

x

1

{\displaystyle MRS={\frac {\partial x_{2}}{\operatorname {d} }x_{1}}}

 keeping (x1,x2) constant. Thus, MRS is how much an individual is willing to pay for consuming a greater amount of x1. MRS is related to marginal utility. The relationship between marginal utility and MRS is:[9]

M

R

S

=

M

U

1

M

U

2

{\displaystyle MRS={\frac {MU_{1}}{MU_{2}}}}

 Main article: Expected utility hypothesisExpected utility theory deals with the analysis of choices among risky projects with multiple (possibly multidimensional) outcomes.The St. Petersburg paradox was first proposed by Nicholas Bernoulli in 1713 and solved by Daniel Bernoulli in 1738, although the Swiss mathematician Gabriel Cramer proposed taking the expectation of a square-root utility function of money in an 1728 letter to N. Bernoulli. D. Bernoulli argued that the paradox could be resolved if decision-makers displayed risk aversion and argued for a logarithmic cardinal utility function. (Analysis of international survey data during the 21st century has shown that insofar as utility represents happiness, as for utilitarianism, it is indeed proportional to log of income.)The first important use of the expected utility theory was that of John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern, who used the assumption of expected utility maximization in their formulation of game theory.In finding the probability-weighted average of the utility from each possible outcome:

E

U

=
P
r
(
z
)
u
(
V
a
l
u
e
(
z
)
)
+
P
r
(
y
)
u
(
V
a
l
u
e
(
y
)
)

{\displaystyle {\text{EU}}=Pr(z)\cdot u({\text{Value}}(z))+Pr(y)\cdot u({\text{Value}}(y))}

 Main article: Von NeumannMorgenstern utility theoremVon Neumann and Morgenstern addressed situations in which the outcomes of choices are not known with certainty, but have probabilities associated with them.A notation for a lottery is as follows: if options A and B have probability p and 1p in the lottery, we write it as a linear combination:

L
=
p
A
+
(
1
−
p
)
B

{\displaystyle L=pA+(1-p)B}

 More generally, for a lottery with many possible options:

L
=

∑

i

p

i

A

i

,

{\displaystyle L=\sum _{i}p_{i}A_{i},}

 where

∑

i

p

i

=
1

{\displaystyle \sum _{i}p_{i}=1}

. By making some reasonable assumptions about the way choices behave, von Neumann and Morgenstern showed that if an agent can choose between the lotteries, then this agent has a utility function such that the desirability of an arbitrary lottery can be computed as a linear combination of the utilities of its parts, with the weights being their probabilities of occurring.This is termed the expected utility theorem. The required assumptions are four axioms about the properties of the agent's preference relation over 'simple lotteries', which are lotteries with just two options. Writing

B

≽

A

{\displaystyle B\succeq A}

 to mean 'A is weakly preferred to B' ('A is preferred at least as much as B'), the axioms are:completeness: For any two simple lotteries

L

{\displaystyle L}

 and

M

{\displaystyle M}

, either

L

≽

M

{\displaystyle L\succeq M}

 or

M

≽

L

{\displaystyle M\succeq L}

 (or both, in which case they are viewed as equally desirable).transitivity: for any three lotteries

L
,
M
,
N

{\displaystyle L,M,N}

, if

L

≽

M

{\displaystyle L\succeq M}

 and

M

≽

N

{\displaystyle M\succeq N}

, then

L

≽

N

{\displaystyle L\succeq N}

.convexity/continuity (Archimedean property): If

L
,
M
,
N

{\displaystyle L\succeq M\succeq N}

, then there is a

p

{\displaystyle p}

 between 0 and 1 such that the lottery

p
L
+
(
1
−
p
)
N

{\displaystyle pL+(1-p)N}

. Intuitively, if the lottery formed by the probabilistic combination of

L

{\displaystyle L}

 and

N

{\displaystyle N}

 is no more preferable than the lottery formed by the same probabilistic combination of

M

{\displaystyle M}

 and

N
,

{\displaystyle N,}

 then and only then

L

≽

M

{\displaystyle L\succeq M}

. Axioms 3 and 4 enable us to decide about the relative utilities of two assets or lotteries.In more formal language: A von NeumannMorgenstern utility function is a function from choices to the real numbers:

u
:

X

R

{\displaystyle u\colon X\to \mathbb {R} }

 which assigns a real number to every outcome in a way that represents the agent's preferences over simple lotteries. Using the four assumptions mentioned above, the agent will prefer a lottery

L

2

{\displaystyle L_{2}}

 to a lottery

L

1

{\displaystyle L_{1}}

 if and only if, for the utility function characterizing that agent, the expected utility of

L

2

{\displaystyle L_{2}}

 is greater than the expected utility of

L

1

{\displaystyle L_{1}}

:

L

1

≽

L

2

i
f
f
u
(

L

1

)
≥
u
(

L

2

)

{\displaystyle L_{1}\succeq L_{2}{\text{ iff }}u(L_{1})\geq u(L_{2})}

. Of all the axioms, independence is the most often discarded. A variety of generalized expected utility theories have arisen, most of which omit or relax the independence axiom.Main article: Indirect utilityAn indirect utility function gives the optimal attainable value of a given utility function, which depends on the prices of the goods and the income or wealth level that the individual possesses.One use of the indirect utility concept is the notion of the utility of money. The (indirect) utility function for money is a nonlinear function that is bounded and asymmetric about the origin. The utility function is concave in the positive region, representing the phenomenon of diminishing marginal utility. The boundedness represents the fact that beyond a certain amount money ceases being useful at all, as the size of any economy at that time is itself bounded. The asymmetry about the origin represents the fact that gaining and losing money can have radically different implications both for individuals and businesses. The non-linearity of the utility function for money has profound implications in decision-making processes: in situations where outcomes of choices influence utility by gains or losses of money, which are the norm for most business settings, the optimal choice for a given decision depends on the possible outcomes of all other decisions in the same time-period.[11]Individuals' consumptions are constrained by their budget allowance. The graph of budget line is a linear, downward-sloping line between X and Y axes. All the bundles of consumption under the budget line allow individuals to consume without using the whole budget as the total budget is greater than the total cost of bundles (Figure 2). If only considers prices and quantities of two goods in one bundle, a budget constraint could be formulated as

p

1

X

1

+

p

2

X

2

=
Y

{\displaystyle p_{1}X_{1}+p_{2}X_{2}=Y}

, where

p

1

{\displaystyle p_{1}}

 and

p

2

{\displaystyle p_{2}}

 are prices of the two goods,

X

1

{\displaystyle X_{1}}

 and

X

2

{\displaystyle X_{2}}

 are quantities of the two goods.Figure 2 slope =

P
(
x
)
P
(
y
)

{\displaystyle {\text{slope}}={\frac {P(x)}{P(y)}}}

 Rational consumers wish to maximise their utility. However, as they have budget constraints, a change of price would affect the quantity of demand. There are two factors could explain this situation:Purchasing power: Individuals obtain greater purchasing power when the price of a good decreases. The reduction of the price allows individuals to increase their savings so they could afford to buy other products.Substitution effect: If the price of good A decreases, then the good becomes relatively cheaper with respect to its substitutes. Thus, individuals would consume more of good A as the utility would increase by doing so.Cambridge economist Joan Robinson famously criticized utility for being a circular concept: "Utility is the quality in commodities that makes individuals want to buy them, and the fact that individuals want to buy commodities shows that they have utility"[12]:48 Robinson also stated that because the theory assumes that preferences are fixed this means that utility is not a testable assumption. This is so because if we observe changes of peoples' behavior in relation to a change in prices or a change in budget constraint we can never be sure to what extent the change in behavior was due to the change of price or budget constraint and how much was due to a change of preference.[13][unreliable source] This criticism is similar to that of the philosopher Hans Albert who argued that the ceteris paribus (all else equal) conditions on which the marginalist theory of demand rested rendered the theory itself a meaningless tautology, incapable of being tested experimentally.[14][unreliable source] In essence, a curve of demand and supply (a theoretical line of quantity of a product which would have been offered or requested for given price) is purely ontological and could never have been demonstrated empirically[dubious discuss].Other questions of what arguments ought to be included in a utility function are difficult to answer, yet seem necessary to understand utility. Whether people gain utility from coherence of wants, beliefs or a sense of duty is important to understanding their behavior in the utility organon.[15] Likewise, choosing between alternatives is itself a process of determining what to consider as alternatives, a question of choice within uncertainty.[16]An evolutionary psychology theory is that utility may be better considered as due to preferences that maximized evolutionary fitness in the ancestral environment but not necessarily in the current one.[17]There are many empirical works trying to estimate the form of utility functions of agents with respect to money.[18]Business and Economics portalHappiness economicsLaw of demandMarginal utilityUtility maximization problem - a problem faced by consumers in a market: how to maximize their utility given their budget.Utility assessment- processes for estimating the utility functions of human subjects. ^ Debreu, Gerard (1954), "Representation of a preference ordering by a numerical function", in Thrall, Robert M.; Coombs, Clyde H.; Raiffa, Howard (eds.), Decision processes, New York: Wiley, pp. 1591–67, OCLC 639321. ^ Jehle, Geoffrey; Reny, Philipp (2011). Advanced Microeconomic Theory. Prentice Hall, Financial Times, pp.1316. ISBN978-0-273-73191-7. ^ "nonsatiation". Oxford Reference. Retrieved 18 July 2024. ^ Marshall, Alfred (1920). Principles of Economics. An introductory volume (8thed.). London: Macmillan. ^ a b Dominick, Salvatore (2008). Principles Of Microeconomics. New Delhi: Oxford Higher Education/Oxford University Press. p.60. ISBN9780198062301. ^ Lin, Chung-Cheng; Peng, Shi-Shu (2019). "The role of diminishing marginal utility in the ordinal and cardinal utility theories". Australian Economic Papers. 58 (3): 233246. doi:10.1111/1467-8454.12151. S2CID159308055 via Wiley Online Library. ^ Moscati, Ivan (2013). "How Cardinal Utility Entered Economic Analysis, 1909-1944". SSRN Electronic Journal. doi:10.2139/ssrn.2296881. hdl:10419/149700. ISSN1556-5068. S2CID55651414. ^ Ingersoll, Jonathan E. Jr. (1987). Theory of Financial Decision Making. Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield. p.21. ISBN0-8476-7359-6. ^ a b Castro, Luiz Carvalho; Araujo, Antnio Souza (2019). "Marginal Utility & its Diminishing Methods" (PDF). International Journal of Tax Economics and Management: 3647. eISSN2618-1118. ^ Bloomenthal, Andrew. "Marginal Utility". Investopedia. Retrieved 25 April 2021. ^ Berger, J. O. (1985). "Utility and Loss". Statistical Decision Theory and Bayesian Analysis (2nded.). Berlin: Springer-Verlag. ISBN3-540-96098-8. ^ Robinson, Joan (1962). Economic Philosophy. Harmondsworth, Middle-sex, UK: Penguin Books. ^ Pilkington, Philip (17 February 2014). "Joan Robinson's Critique of Marginal Utility Theory". Fixing the Economists. Archived from the original on 13 July 2015. ^ Pilkington, Philip (27 February 2014). "utility Hans Albert Expands Robinson's Critique of Marginal Utility Theory to the Law of Demand". Fixing the Economists. Archived (PDF) from the original on 19 July 2015. ^ Klein, Daniel (May 2014). "Professor" (PDF). Econ Journal Watch. 11 (2): 97105. Archived (PDF) from the original on 5 October 2014. Retrieved 15 November 2014. ^ Burke, Kenneth (1932). Towards a Better Life. Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press. ^ Capra, C. Monica; Rubin, Paul H. (2011). "The Evolutionary Psychology of Economics". Applied Evolutionary Psychology. Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190586073.003.0002. ISBN9780191731358. ^ Kirby, Kris N. (2011). "An empirical assessment of the form of utility functions". psynet.apa.org. Retrieved 31 October 2023.Anand, Paul (1993). Foundations of Rational Choice Under Risk. Oxford University Press. ISBN0-19-823303-5.Fishburn, Peter C. (1970). Utility Theory for Decision Making. Huntington, NY: Robert E. Krieger. ISBN0-88275-736-9.Georgescu-Roegen, Nicholas (August 1936). "The Pure Theory of Consumer's Behavior". Quarterly Journal of Economics. 50 (4): 545593. doi:10.2307/1891094. JSTOR1891094.Gilboa, Itzhak (2009). Theory of Decision under Uncertainty. Cambridge University Press. ISBN978-0-521-74123-1.Kreps, David M. (1988). Notes on the Theory of Choice. Boulder, CO: West-view Press. ISBN0-8133-7553-3.Nash, John F. (1950). "The Bargaining Problem". Econometrica. 18 (2): 155162. doi:10.2307/1907266. JSTOR1907266. S2CID153422092.Neumann, John von & Morgenstern, Oskar (1944). Theory of Games and Economic Behavior. Princeton University Press.Nicholson, Walter (1978). Micro-economic Theory (Seconded.). Hinsdale: Dryden Press. pp.5387. ISBN0-03-020831-9.Plous, S. (1993). The Psychology of Judgement and Decision Making. McGraw-Hill. ISBN0-07-050477-6.Viner, Jacob (1925). "The Utility Concept in Value Theory and Its Critics". Journal of Political Economy. 33 (4): 369387.Viner, Jacob (1925). "The Utility Concept in Value Theory and Its Critics". Journal of Political Economy. 33 (6): 638659.Wikimedia Commons has media related to Utility (decision theory).Definition of Utility by InvestopediaAnatomy of Cobb-Douglas Type Utility Functions in 3DAnatomy of CES Type Utility Functions in 3DSimpler Definition with example from InvestopediaMaximization of Originality - redefinition of classic utilityUtility Model of Marketing - Form, Place Archived 12 November 2015 at the Wayback Machine, TimeArchived 30 October 2015 at the Wayback Machine, Possession and perhaps also TaskRetrieved from " types of utility in economics. What is utility in economics. Explain utility in economics. What are the different types of utility.