

ECON 337901

FINANCIAL ECONOMICS

Peter Ireland

Boston College

April 1, 2021

These lecture notes by Peter Ireland are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>.

Measuring Risk Aversion

We've already seen that within the von Neumann-Morgenstern expected utility framework, risk aversion enters through the concavity of the Bernoulli utility function.


Measuring Risk Aversion

We've also seen previously that concavity of the utility function is related to convexity of indifference curves.

In standard microeconomic theory, this feature of preferences represents a “taste for diversity.”

Under uncertainty, it represents a desire to smooth consumption across future states of the world.

Expected Utility Functions



A risk averse consumer prefers $c_A = (c_G + c_B)/2$ in both states to c_G in one state and c_B in the other.

Measuring Risk Aversion

Mathematically, $u'(p) > 0$ means that an investor prefers higher payoffs to lower payoffs, and $u''(p) < 0$ means that the investor is risk averse.

But is there a way of quantifying an investor's degree of risk aversion?

And is there a criterion according to which we might judge one investor to be more risk averse than another?

Measuring Risk Aversion

Since $u''(p) < 0$ makes an investor risk averse, one conjecture would be to say that an investor with Bernoulli utility function $v(p)$ is more risk averse than another investor with Bernoulli utility function $u(p)$ if $v''(p) < u''(p)$ for all payoffs p .

But does a “more concave” Bernoulli utility function **always** correspond to greater risk aversion?

Unfortunately, no.

Measuring Risk Aversion

Recall that the preference ordering of an investor with vN-M utility function

$$U(x, y, \pi) = \pi u(x) + (1 - \pi)u(y)$$

is also represented by the vN-M utility function

$$V(x, y, \pi) = \alpha U(x, y, \pi)$$

for **any** value of $\alpha > 0$.

Measuring Risk Aversion

But with

$$\begin{aligned}V(x, y, \pi) &= \alpha U(x, y, \pi) \\ &= \alpha \pi u(x) + \alpha(1 - \pi)u(y) \\ &= \pi \alpha u(x) + (1 - \pi)\alpha u(y) \\ &= \pi v(x) + (1 - \pi)v(y)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$v(p) = \alpha u(p)$$

for any payoff p .

Measuring Risk Aversion

Now

$$v(p) = \alpha u(p),$$

implies

$$v'(p) = \alpha u'(p)$$

and

$$v''(p) = \alpha u''(p),$$

By making α larger or smaller, the Bernoulli utility function can be made “more” or “less” concave without changing the underlying preference ordering.

Measuring Risk Aversion

In the mid-1960s, Kenneth Arrow and John Pratt proposed two alternative measures of risk aversion that are immune to this problem:

$$R_A(Y) = -\frac{u''(Y)}{u'(Y)} = \text{coefficient of absolute risk aversion}$$

$$R_R(Y) = -\frac{Y u''(Y)}{u'(Y)} = \text{coefficient of relative risk aversion}$$

where Y measures the investor's income level.

Measuring Risk Aversion

$$R_A(Y) = -\frac{u''(Y)}{u'(Y)} = \text{coefficient of absolute risk aversion}$$

$$R_R(Y) = -\frac{Y u''(Y)}{u'(Y)} = \text{coefficient of relative risk aversion}$$

Absolute risk aversion applies to bets over absolute dollar amounts: $\pm \$1000$.

Relative risk aversion applies to bets expressed relative to (as a fraction of) income: ± 1 percent of Y .

Measuring Risk Aversion

$$R_A(Y) = -\frac{u''(Y)}{u'(Y)} = \text{coefficient of absolute risk aversion}$$

$$R_R(Y) = -\frac{Yu''(Y)}{u'(Y)} = \text{coefficient of relative risk aversion}$$

Since $v(p) = \alpha u(p)$ implies $v'(p) = \alpha u'(p)$ and $v''(p) = \alpha u''(p)$, these measures are invariant to arbitrary re-scalings of the Bernoulli utility function.

Measuring Risk Aversion

Two alternative measures of risk aversion are

$$R_A(Y) = -\frac{u''(Y)}{u'(Y)} = \text{coefficient of absolute risk aversion}$$

$$R_R(Y) = -\frac{Y u''(Y)}{u'(Y)} = \text{coefficient of relative risk aversion}$$

where Y measures the investor's income level.

And since both measures have a minus sign out in front, both are positive and increase when risk aversion rises.

Measuring Risk Aversion

$$R_A(Y) = -\frac{u''(Y)}{u'(Y)} = \text{coefficient of absolute risk aversion}$$

$$R_R(Y) = -\frac{Y u''(Y)}{u'(Y)} = \text{coefficient of relative risk aversion}$$

The notation $R_A(Y)$ and $R_R(Y)$ emphasizes that both measures of risk aversion can depend on the investor's income Y . A given bet can seem more or less risky, depending on the investor's income.

Interpreting the Measures of Risk Aversion

To interpret the two measures of risk aversion, it is helpful to recall from calculus the theorem stated by Brook Taylor (England, 1685-1731), regarding the approximation of a function f using its derivatives: the “first-order” approximation


$$f(x + a) \approx f(x) + f'(x)a$$

and the “second-order” approximation

$$f(x + a) \approx f(x) + f'(x)a + \frac{1}{2}f''(x)a^2.$$


The second-order approximation is more accurate than the first, and both become more accurate as a becomes smaller.

Interpreting the Measures of Risk Aversion



The first-order (linear) approximation $u(x + a) \approx u(x) + u'(x)a$ overstates $u(x + a)$ when u is concave.

Interpreting the Measures of Risk Aversion



Since $u''(x) < 0$, the second-order (quadratic) approximation $u(x+a) \approx u(x) + u'(x)a + (1/2)u''(x)a^2$ will be more accurate.

Interpreting the Measures of Risk Aversion

Focusing first on the measure of absolute risk aversion, consider an investor with initial income Y who is offered a bet: win h with probability π and lose h with probability $1 - \pi$.

A risk-averse investor with vN-M expected utility would never accept this bet if $\pi = 1/2$.

The question is: how much higher than $1/2$ does π have to be to get the investor to accept the bet?

Interpreting the Measures of Risk Aversion

Let π^* be the probability that is just high enough to get the investor to accept the bet.

Then π^* must satisfy

$$u(Y) = \pi^* u(Y + h) + (1 - \pi^*) u(Y - h).$$

Interpreting the Measures of Risk Aversion

Take second-order Taylor approximations to $u(Y + h)$ and $u(Y - h)$:

$$u(Y + h) \approx u(Y) + u'(Y)h + \frac{1}{2}u''(Y)h^2$$

$$u(Y - h) \approx u(Y) - u'(Y)h + \frac{1}{2}u''(Y)h^2$$

Interpreting the Measures of Risk Aversion

$$u(Y) = \pi^* u(Y + h) + (1 - \pi^*) u(Y - h)$$

$$u(Y + h) \approx u(Y) + u'(Y)h + \frac{1}{2}u''(Y)h^2$$

$$u(Y - h) \approx u(Y) - u'(Y)h + \frac{1}{2}u''(Y)h^2$$

imply

$$\begin{aligned} u(Y) &\approx \pi^* \left[u(Y) + u'(Y)h + \frac{1}{2}u''(Y)h^2 \right] \\ &\quad + (1 - \pi^*) \left[u(Y) - u'(Y)h + \frac{1}{2}u''(Y)h^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Interpreting the Measures of Risk Aversion

$$u(Y) \approx \pi^* \left[u(Y) + u'(Y)h + \frac{1}{2}u''(Y)h^2 \right] \\ + (1 - \pi^*) \left[u(Y) - u'(Y)h + \frac{1}{2}u''(Y)h^2 \right]$$

implies

$$u(Y) \approx u(Y) + (2\pi^* - 1)u'(Y)h + \frac{1}{2}u''(Y)h^2$$

Interpreting the Measures of Risk Aversion

$$u(Y) \approx u(Y) + (2\pi^* - 1)u'(Y)h + \frac{1}{2}u''(Y)h^2$$

$$0 \approx (2\pi^* - 1)u'(Y)h + \frac{1}{2}u''(Y)h^2$$

$$0 \approx (2\pi^* - 1)u'(Y) + \frac{1}{2}u''(Y)h$$

$$2\pi^* u'(Y) \approx u'(Y) - \frac{1}{2}u''(Y)h$$

$$\pi^* \approx \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \left[-\frac{u''(Y)}{u'(Y)} \right] h$$

Interpreting the Measures of Risk Aversion

Since

$$R_A(Y) = -\frac{u''(Y)}{u'(Y)} = \text{coefficient of absolute risk aversion,}$$

it follows from these calculations that

$$\pi^* \approx \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \left[-\frac{u''(Y)}{u'(Y)} \right] h = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} h R_A(Y) > \frac{1}{2}.$$

The boost in π above $1/2$ required for an investor with income Y to accept a bet of plus or minus h relates directly to the coefficient of absolute risk aversion.

Interpreting the Measures of Risk Aversion

As an example, suppose that we ask an investor: What value of π^* would you need to accept a bet of plus-or-minus $h = \$1000$?

And the investor says: I'll take it if $\pi^* = 0.75$.

Interpreting the Measures of Risk Aversion

With $h = \$1000$ and $\pi^* = 0.75$,

$$\pi^* \approx \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}hR_A(Y)$$

implies

$$0.75 \approx 0.50 + \frac{1000}{4}R_A(Y)$$

$$0.25 \approx 250R_A(Y)$$

$$R_A(Y) \approx \frac{0.25}{250} = 0.001.$$

Interpreting the Measures of Risk Aversion

Realistically, a bet over \$1000 is probably going to seem more risky to someone who starts out with less income.

In general, $R_A(Y)$ can depend on Y . More specifically, it seems likely that $R_A(Y)$ decreases when Y goes up, so that

$$R'_A(Y) < 0.$$