



Provided by the author(s) and University College Dublin Library in accordance with publisher policies., Please cite the published version when available.

Title	Upper Bounds on Risk Aversion under Mean-variance Utility
Authors(s)	Denny, Kevin
Publication date	2019-02
Series	UCD Centre for Economic Research Working Paper Series; WP2019/02
Publisher	University College Dublin. School of Economics
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/9632

Downloaded 2019-04-20T14:37:04Z

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)



Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.



UCD CENTRE FOR ECONOMIC RESEARCH

WORKING PAPER SERIES

2019

Upper Bounds on Risk Aversion under Mean-variance Utility

Kevin Denny, University College, Dublin

WP19/02

February 2019

**UCD SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN
BELFIELD DUBLIN 4**

Upper bounds on risk aversion under mean-variance utility

Kevin J. Denny^{*}

School of Economics & Geary Institute for Public Policy

University College Dublin

7th February 2019

Abstract:

Based on a simple prior, this note derives upper bounds for the coefficient of absolute & relative risk aversion if utility can be written as depending linearly on the mean and variance of income.

Keywords: risk aversion, mean-variance utility, risk tolerance

JEL Classification: D80

^{*} Email : kevin.denny@ucd.ie The basic result here I figured out c.1986 but I'm not inclined to rush matters. My thanks to Sarah Parlane for comments.

1. Introduction

Given expected utility maximization, the utility of an individual is a linear function of the mean and variance of their income under certain conditions: quadratic utility and/or a normal distribution of income. The former is a fairly restrictive assumption with some undesirable properties: utility is decreasing in the argument at some points and exhibits increasing absolute risk aversion. The latter assumption, normality of income, is probably a better rationale although it implies negative incomes having a non-zero probability.

Nonetheless the mean-variance framework is intuitive and is widely used, particularly in finance (for example Funga & Hsieh 1999). If cognitive resources are limited, then an additional advantage to the mean-variance approach is that it is much simpler, requiring knowledge of only two parameters. D'Acromont & Bossaerts (2008) explore the behavioural foundations of the mean-variance approach and provide experimental evidence that it better characterizes agents' decisions in some circumstances i.e. as the number of possible states increase.

A feature of the model is that one can write an individual's certainty equivalent income as a linear function of the mean and variance. It does not appear to have been noticed that using a simple prior one can establish an upper bound to a standard measure of risk aversion. For the discrete case the certainty equivalent level of income is implicitly defined by:

$$U\left(\mu - \frac{1}{2}\gamma\sigma^2\right) = \sum_i \pi_i U(y_i) \quad 1 \geq \pi_i \geq 0 \quad \sum_i \pi_i = 1 \quad (1)$$

μ, σ^2 are the mean and variance respectively of income, $\gamma = -\frac{u''(y)}{u'(y)}$ is the coefficient of

absolute risk aversion (CARA) and $\frac{1}{2}\gamma\sigma^2 \equiv R$ is the risk premium, the amount individuals

would be willing to pay to eliminate uncertainty. $-\frac{u''(y) \cdot y}{u'(y)} = \theta$ is the coefficient of relative

risk aversion (CRRA)¹. In the finance literature, the reciprocal of θ is known as the coefficient of relative risk tolerance (CRRT).

¹ See J.Hirschliefer, J.G Riley (1992), section 2.3.1 for a discussion and derivation of the standard results. Nakamura (2015) considers more general nonlinear mean-variance utility models. Building on recent work in behavioural economics & psychology, O'Donoghue & Somerville (2018) consider modelling risk aversion in non-expected utility models.

2. Theory

Consider an individual who discards a fraction t of her income. While this reduces both the mean and variance of income, *a priori* one expects this to reduce certainty equivalent income. Given free disposability, in equilibrium an individual is no better off if she chooses to automatically discard a fraction of her income. One does not, in general, observe individuals disposing of income for the sole purpose of reducing the dispersion (although some people tithe a proportion of their income to religious organizations which might be considered a form of insurance).

From this it follows that:

$$\mu - \frac{1}{2}\gamma\sigma^2 \geq (1-t)\mu - \frac{1}{2}\gamma(1-t)^2\sigma^2 \quad (2)$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{2\mu}{\sigma^2} \frac{1}{2-t} \geq \gamma \quad (3)$$

The limit of the LHS of (3) as t goes to 0 provides an upper bound to γ :

$$\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \geq \gamma \quad (4)$$

Hence:

$$\frac{2R}{\sigma^2} = \gamma \leq \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \Rightarrow \frac{R}{\mu} \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (5)$$

(4) can be written in terms of the coefficient of relative risk aversion (CRRRA), evaluated at the mean:

$$\left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right)^2 \geq \theta(\mu) \quad (6)$$

Unlike (4), the LHS of (6) is unit free. So the results can be summarized as:

Lemma: The coefficient of absolute risk aversion, under mean-variance utility, is weakly bounded from above by the ratio of the mean to the variance.

Corollary 1: The risk premium, as a proportion of the mean, is weakly bounded from above by 0.5.

Corollary 2: The coefficient of relative risk aversion, evaluated at the mean, is weakly bounded from above by the reciprocal of the squared coefficient of variation.

Alternatively, Corollary 2 could be re-stated as saying that the coefficient of relative risk tolerance, evaluated at the mean μ , is weakly bounded from below by the coefficient of variation squared.

Such bounds could be used to test the appropriateness of the mean-variance model or, if taking the latter as given, to evaluate estimates of risk aversion. How informative these bounds are will depend on the data.

3. Conclusion

The non-parametric approach used here has the advantage that it relies only on invoking a weak prior and data on the mean and variance of income². A disadvantage is that the mean-variance model itself requires other assumptions, as discussed above, in addition to providing an upper-bound only. However other parametric methods of estimating risk preferences (e.g. Barsky *et al* 1997, Chetty 2006, Chiappori & Paiella 2011) require modelling labour supply responses, portfolio choices or hypothetical choices which depend on numerous other assumptions which may or may not be testable and are more demanding in terms of data.

² The idea of using simple priors to establish bounds on parameters has been extensively developed by Charles Manski and others e.g. Manski (1990).

4. References

Barsky, R. B., Juster, F. T., Kimball M. S. & M. D. Shapiro (1997) Preference parameters and behavioral heterogeneity: an experimental approach in the Health and Retirement Study. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(2): 537-579.

<https://doi.org/10.1162/003355397555280>

Chetty, R. (2006) A new method of estimating risk aversion. *American Economic Review*, 96(5): 1821-1834.

<https://DOI: 10.1257/aer.96.5.1821>

Chiappori, P.A & M. Paiella (2011) Relative risk aversion is constant: evidence from panel data. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 9(6): 1021-1052.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1542-4774.2011.01046.x>

D'Acremont, M. & P. Bossaerts (2008) Neurobiological studies of risk assessment: a comparison of expected utility and mean-variance approaches. *Cognitive, Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 8(4): 363-374.

<https://doi.org/10.3758/CABN.8.4.363>

Funga, W. & D.A. Hsiehb (1999) Is mean-variance analysis applicable to hedge funds? *Economics Letters*, 62(1): 53-58.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1765\(98\)00140-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1765(98)00140-2)

Hirschliefer, J. & J.G Riley (1992) *The Analytics of Uncertainty and Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK).

Manski, C. (1990) Nonparametric bounds on treatment effects. *American Economic Review, AEA Papers & Proceedings*, 80(2) 319-323.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2006592>

O'Donoghue, T. & J. Somerville (2018) Modelling risk aversion in economics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 32(2) 91-114.

<https://DOI: 10.1257/jep.32.2.91>

Nakamura, Y. (2015) Mean-variance utility. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 160: 536-556.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2015.10.001>

UCD CENTRE FOR ECONOMIC RESEARCH – RECENT WORKING PAPERS

- [WP18/02](#) David Madden: 'Changes in BMI in a Cohort of Irish Children: Some Decompositions and Counterfactuals' January 2018
- [WP18/03](#) Guido Alfani and Cormac Ó Gráda: 'Famine and Disease in Economic History: A Summary Introduction' February 2018
- [WP18/04](#) Cormac Ó Gráda: 'Notes on Guilds on the Eve of the French Revolution' February 2018
- [WP18/05](#) Martina Lawless and Zuzanna Studnicka: 'Old Firms and New Products: Does Experience Increase Survival?' February 2018
- [WP18/06](#) John Cullinan, Kevin Denny and Darragh Flannery: 'A Distributional Analysis of Upper Secondary School Performance' April 2018
- [WP18/07](#) Ronald B Davies and Rodolphe Desbordes: 'Export Processing Zones and the Composition of Greenfield FDI' April 2018
- [WP18/08](#) Costanza Biavaschi, Michał Burzynski, Benjamin Elsner, Joël Machado: 'Taking the Skill Bias out of Global Migration' May 2018
- [WP18/09](#) Florian Buhlmann, Benjamin Elsner and Andreas Peichl: 'Tax Refunds and Income Manipulation - Evidence from the EITC' June 2018
- [WP18/10](#) Morgan Kelly and Cormac Ó Gráda: 'Gravity and Migration before Railways: Evidence from Parisian Prostitutes and Revolutionaries' June 2018
- [WP18/11](#) Kevin Denny: 'Basic Stata Graphics for Economics Students' July 2018
- [WP18/12](#) Ronald B Davies and Joseph Francois: 'Irexit: Making the Worst of a Bad Situation' July 2018
- [WP18/13](#) Ronald B Davies: 'From China with Love: The Role of FDI from Third Countries on EU Competition and R&D Activities' July 2018
- [WP18/14](#) Arnaud Chevalier, Benjamin Elsner, Andreas Lichter and Nico Pestel: 'Immigrant Voters, Taxation and the Size of the Welfare State' August 2018
- [WP18/15](#) Michael Spagat and Stijn van Weezel: 'On the Decline of War' August 2018
- [WP18/16](#) Stijn van Weezel: 'Apocalypse Now? - Climate Change and War in Africa' August 2018
- [WP18/17](#) FM Kiernan: 'The Great Recession and Mental Health: the Effect of Income Loss on the Psychological Health of Young Mothers' October 2018
- [WP18/18](#) Ronald B. Davies and Neill Killeen: 'The Effect of Tax Treaties on Market Based Finance: Evidence using Firm-Level Data' October 2018
- [WP18/19](#) George Sorg-Langhans, Clemens Struck, and Adnan Velic: Solving Leontief's Paradox with Endogenous Growth Theory
- [WP18/20](#) Alan Fernihough, Cormac Ó Gráda: Population and Poverty in Ireland on the Eve of the Great Famine
- [WP18/21](#) Cormac Ó Gráda: The Next World and the New World: Relief, Migration, and the Great Irish Famine
- [WP18/22](#) Lisa Ryan, Sarah La Monaca, Linda Mastrandrea and Petr Spodniak: 'Harnessing Electricity Retail Tariffs to Support Climate Change Policy' December 2018
- [WP18/23](#) Ciarán Mac Domhnaill and Lisa Ryan: 'Towards Renewable Electricity in Europe: An Empirical Analysis of the Determinants of Renewable Electricity Development in the European Union' December 2018
- [WP19/01](#) Ellen Ryan and Karl Whelan: 'Quantitative Easing and the Hot Potato Effect: Evidence from Euro Area Banks' January 2019