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This note considers the question of which indifference curves in mean standard deviation space can be derived from expected utility preferences. It is shown that the well known requirement that the slope of indifference curves be zero when standard deviation is zero is not the only restriction: many families of curves satisfying this requirement which are also nicely behaved and convex downwards can be ruled out because they imply behavior inconsistent with expected utility preferences. It is therefore not possible to draw arbitrary indifference curves and assume there exist underlying expected utility preferences which correspond to these.

1. Introduction

If expected utility is a quadratic function of wealth then it is well known that mean standard deviation \((\mu - \sigma)\) indifference curves can be used to investigate choices among uncertain prospects no matter how these prospects are distributed. Alternatively for prospects which have uniquely defined two parameter distributions it is possible to utilize mean standard deviation analysis no matter what the utility function is. In portfolio theory attention is usually confined to two parameter symmetric stable distributions of which the normal is a special case since these distributions replicate themselves under weighted addition; portfolios thus have the same types of distributions as the assets which they consist of.

* I am grateful to A. Postlewaite for helpful discussions and encouragement.
In this note the opposite transformation is considered: namely, which mean standard deviation indifference curves can be derived from expected utility preferences.

Provided the opportunity set is linear it is well known that starting from the case where only riskless assets are held a small increase in risk accompanied by an increase in expected return always results in higher expected utility. It follows from this that the slope of \( \mu - \sigma \) indifference curves must be zero when \( \sigma = 0 \). This result is briefly recounted in section 2.

In section 3 it is demonstrated by counterexample that this is not the only restriction that can be placed on \( \mu - \sigma \) indifference curves. The counterexample is concerned with changes in investment strategies over time. In a multiperiod world, where the returns at the end of one period are simply reinvested at the beginning of the next, outcomes are multiplicative. Prospects with simple two parameter distributions which replicate themselves under multiplication are therefore considered. It is first shown that for prospects whose outcomes are independent over time preferences derived from an expected utility approach must be such that the initial investment strategy is carried through. However, it can then be shown that there exist nicely behaved, convex downwards, \( \mu - \sigma \) indifference curves satisfying the zero slope at \( \sigma = 0 \) restriction which imply that a person will switch strategies and which therefore cannot be derived from preferences over expected utility.

Finally section 4 contains some concluding remarks.

2. The slope of \( \mu - \sigma \) indifference curves at \( \sigma = 0 \)

Consider a person whose utility \( U \) depends on his wealth at the end of the period \( W_i \), who invests a proportion \( \pi \) of his current wealth \( W_0 (> 0) \) in a risky asset and the rest in a safe asset. The return on each dollar invested in the risky asset is represented by the random variable \( \tilde{X} \) and, on the safe asset it is \( R \). The person's expected utility is given by

\[
EU[W_i] = EU[(\pi \tilde{X} + (1-\pi)R)W_0].
\]  

(1)

It follows that

\[
\frac{dEU}{d\pi} \bigg|_{\pi=0} = (E\tilde{X} - R)W_0U'(RW_0).
\]  

(2)

Provided the person has \( E\tilde{X} > R \) then expected utility increases. A small amount of the risky asset is therefore preferred to the safe asset.

It follows from this that the slope of indifference curves at \( \sigma = 0 \) is zero. Suppose this were not the case. Suppose that \( \tilde{X} \) is distributed with expected return \( R_0 \) and standard deviation \( \sigma_1 \). Then, it would be possible to construct a portfolio with expected return \( R_1 \) and standard deviation \( \sigma_1 \) which would be preferred to the safe asset. The indifference curve could not be described by (1), but it would appear to contradict expected utility since it would be possible to construct a portfolio with expected return which does not satisfy equation (2).
Provided the person has a positive marginal utility of wealth and $E\hat{X} > R$ then expected utility is always increased by holding a sufficiently small amount of the risky asset in the portfolio rather than just holding the safe asset.

It follows from this that the slope of a $\mu - \sigma$ indifference curve at $\sigma = 0$ is zero. Suppose this were not the case as illustrated in fig. 1. Then it would be possible to construct a portfolio consisting of a safe asset with expected return $R_0$ and a risky asset with a higher expected return $R_1$ and standard deviation $\sigma_1$ which, no matter how small the proportion in the risky asset, would not allow the person to attain a higher indifference curve. This would contradict the result above so that the indifference curve could not be derived from an expected utility function. Hence only indifference curves with slope zero at $\sigma = 0$ can correspond to expected utility preferences.

It is important to stress that this result does not imply that a person will always be made better off by a small increase in risk which is accompanied by an increase in expected return. The result requires that the opportunity set be linear. If it is non-linear which could for example occur with certain types of non-linear income tax then it is possible for there to be increases in standard deviation accompanied by increases in expected return which do not make the person better off as illustrated in fig. 2.
3. Other restrictions: The counterexample

Consider a security with two possible payoffs for each dollar invested: \(X\) with probability \(\alpha\) and 0 with probability \(1 - \alpha\). This is a two parameter distribution \((X, \alpha)\) and knowledge of \(\mu\) and \(\sigma\) is sufficient to deduce \(X\) and \(\alpha\). Provided all the prospects considered have this same type of distribution it is therefore possible to represent expected utility preferences in \(\mu - \sigma\) space. It can be seen that the distribution has the property that it replicates under multiplication so that if \(B\) and \(C\) have independent \((X, \alpha)\) distributions then so also does \(BC\) have an \((X, \alpha)\) distribution.

Suppose there are two assets which have this distribution: \(A_1\) is a safe asset with parameters \((X_1, 1)\) and \(A_2\) is a risky asset with parameters \((X_2, \alpha_2)\). There are two periods and people's utility depends on their wealth at the end of the second period. The proceeds of investment in the first period are simply reinvested in the second period. The outcomes of the risky asset in the two periods are taken to be independent.

For simplicity consider a person who initially has wealth of $1. One possible course of action he could take is to invest this in the risky asset in both periods. The resulting prospect at the end of the second period will be denoted \(P_{21}^0\). It consists of an uncertain payoff with a distribution of the above type with parameter \((X_2^*, \alpha_2^*)\). Similarly another possibility which will be denoted \(P_{21}^1\) is to invest in the risky asset in the first period and the safe asset in the second period with parameters \((X_2, \alpha_2)\).

Suppose \(P_{21}^0\) is preferred to \(P_{22}^0\):

\[\alpha_2 U(X_2 X_1) + (1 - \alpha_2) U(0)\]

Dividing through by \(\alpha_2\) and

\[U(X_2 X_1) > \alpha_2 U(X_2^*) + (1 - \alpha_2) U(0)\]

If the person undertakes choice \(P_{21}^1\) then he is assured to obtain a return of \(\alpha\) at the end of the first period. Suppose he is uncertain of the returns of the safe asset in the second period. He has a pay off with distribution \(P_{22}^1\) and has a payoff \(U(X_2^*) + (1 - \alpha_2) U(0)\). If this is preferred to the original strategy of switching to the safe asset in the first period and risky asset in the second period then he will have an original strategy to switching to the risky asset in the first period.

To summarize expected utility

\[P_{21}^0\] is preferred to \(P_{22}^0\).

The four prospects \(P_{21}^0, P_{22}^0, P_{21}^1, P_{22}^1\) have a parameter \((X, \alpha)\) distribution choice between them in \(\mu - \sigma\).

Consider the family of indifference curves

\[\mu = \sigma^2/8 + c.\]

where \(c\) is a constant representing an indifference curve.

These indifference curves are the level curves that satisfy the requirement that the expected utility of the risky asset in the second period is greater than the expected utility of the safe asset in the first period and the risky asset in the second period.

With the parameter values for the two prospects and the value of \(c\) for
and the safe asset in the second period. In this case the payoff has a distribution with parameters \((X_2, X_1, \alpha_2)\).

Suppose \(P_{21}^0\) is preferred to \(P_{22}^0\), it follows that

\[
\alpha_2 U(X_2, X_1) + (1 - \alpha_2) U(0) > \alpha_2 U(X_2^2) + (1 - \alpha_2) U(0).
\]

Dividing through by \(\alpha_2\) and rearranging this implies

\[
U(X_2, X_1) > \alpha_2 U(X_2^2) + (1 - \alpha_2) U(0).
\]

If the person undertakes \(P_{21}^0\) and the return to the risky asset at the end of the first period is 0 then no further decision is possible and he will inevitably obtain 0 at the end of the second period. However, if the return is \(X_2\) then two possibilities confronting the person are to invest in the safe asset in the second period as originally preferred or to switch and invest in the risky asset. The prospect in the former case is denoted \(P_{21}^1\) and has a payoff with distribution \((X_2, X_1, 1)\) and in the latter case it is denoted \(P_{22}^1\) and has a payoff with distribution \((X_2^2, \alpha_2)\). Eq. (4) shows that given (3), \(P_{21}^1\) is preferred to \(P_{22}^1\): the person will always prefer his original strategy to switching and investing in the risky asset.

To summarize expected utility preferences must be such that

\[
P_{21}^0 \text{ is preferred to } P_{22}^0 \text{ if } P_{21}^1 \text{ is preferred to } P_{22}^1.
\]

The four prospects \(P_{21}^0\), \(P_{22}^0\), \(P_{21}^1\) and \(P_{22}^1\) all have the same two parameter \((\mu, \sigma)\) distribution. It is therefore possible to consider the choice between them in \(\mu - \sigma\) space.

Consider the family of indifference curves with the form

\[
\mu = \sigma^2/8 + c,
\]

where \(c\) is a constant representing the utility level of the indifference curve.

These indifference curves are nicely behaved, convex downwards and satisfy the requirement that the slope at \(\sigma = 0\) is zero. However if \(X_1 = 1\), \(X_2 = 4\), and \(\alpha_2 = 3/4\) it can be shown that (5) is contradicted so that the curves cannot be derived from any expected utility preferences.

With the parameter values given, the means and variances of the prospects and the value of \(c\) for the indifference curve passing through
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \mu^2 )</th>
<th>( \sigma^2 )</th>
<th>( c )</th>
<th>( P^0_{21} )</th>
<th>( P^0_{22} )</th>
<th>( P^1_{21} )</th>
<th>( P^1_{22} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 3/8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1 1/8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These prospects and the indifference curves passing through them are illustrated in fig. 3.

It can be seen that the indifference curves corresponding to (6) imply that

\( P^0_{21} \) is preferred to \( P^0_{22} \) but \( P^1_{22} \) is preferred to \( P^1_{21} \)

so that (5) is violated and the indifference curves are not admissible.

This is only one example but clearly many other families of indifference curves could be ruled out because they imply switching in contradiction to (5).
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