

o. SETUP

Depending on the outcome of today's activity, you will receive one of the following snacks:

Bar (b)	Cheese (c)	Jerky (j)	Snickers (s)
---------	------------	-----------	--------------

1. PERSONAL PREFERENCE GROUNDING

Individual task 1.1: In the chart below, for each outcome row, either list at least one feature that makes you prefer that outcome (over some other) or at least one feature that makes you disprefer that outcome.

	Prefer	Disprefer
<i>b</i>		
<i>c</i>		
<i>j</i>		
<i>s</i>		

2. PERSONAL ORDINAL RANK & UTILITY

Individual task 2.1: In the first column below, assign your own (strict) ordinal ranking from 1-4 (most preferred to least) over $\{b, c, j, s\}$. If you're indifferent between two or more options, choose at random.

Individual task 2.2: Now insert your personal utility function over those outcomes.

Rules for $u(x)$:

- $0 \leq u(x) \leq 1$, and must sum to 1
- If indifferent between x and y , $u(x) = u(y)$
- Roughly consistent with obvious lotteries

	Ordinal Rank	Utility: $u(x)$
<i>b</i>		
<i>c</i>		
<i>j</i>		
<i>s</i>		

Don't discuss the utility values you wrote down with your group until instructed to!

4. GROUP VOTE

Your group will be voting on one type of snack to receive at the end of the session based on your individual rankings. All members of your group will receive the type of snack selected through your voting procedure, and **no trading with, or donating to, others** is allowed.

- Put each voter's first names in the empty cells on the top row (in alphabetical order).
- Place each individual's voting score for that agent on that option below their name.
- Your group will use PLURALITY, so put a box around all 1s, then tally all 1s in the votes column.
- Circle the winner in the Votes Column. Instructions for ties below.

	1:	2:	3:	4:	Votes
<i>b</i>					
<i>c</i>					
<i>j</i>					
<i>s</i>					

Tie Instructions: in alphabetical order

2-way: 1-5 = x , 6-10 = y

3-way: 1-3 = x, 4-6 = y, 7-9 = z, 10 = reroll

4-way: 1-2 = x, 3-4 = y, 5-6 = z, 8-10 = reroll

5. INFORMAL SOCIAL WELFARE ANALYSIS

Group task 5.1: Without looking at individual utilities, work through each possible outcome in order, and each member should share whether they would be happy with that being the outcome of the vote. Keep track of any particularly weighty considerations in the table below.

	Weighty Reason to Prefer	Weighty Reason to Disprefer
<i>b</i>		
<i>c</i>		
<i>j</i>		
<i>s</i>		

Group task 5.2: Consider the outcome of the vote, and decide whether you think that was the best for the social welfare of the group overall.

6. EXTENDED (EMPATHETIC) UTILITIES

Group Task 6.1: Without looking at individual utilities, as a group, try to come to a consensus over the extended preference ranking of each member's most preferred item as assigned during the individual preference ranking. (In cases of genuine indifference, use the tie breaking convention below.)

	#1: Person / Item	#2: Person / Item	#3: Person / Item	#4: Person / Item
Extended Ranking				

Genuine Indifference Tie Breaking Instructions: 2-way: 1-5 = x , 6-10 = y
 3-way: 1-3 = x, 4-6 = y, 7-9 = z, 10 = reroll
 4-way: 1-2 = x, 3-4 = y, 5-6 = z, 8-10 = reroll

Group Task 6.2: On slide.

REFERENCES & FURTHER READING

Anshelevich, Elliot, et al. 2021. "Distortion in Social Choice Problems: The First 15 Years and Beyond." arXiv:2103.00911. Preprint, arXiv, March 1. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2103.00911>.

Arrow, Kenneth J. 1977. "Extended Sympathy and the Possibility of Social Choice." *The American Economic Review* 67 (1): 219–25.

Binmore, Ken. 2009. "Interpersonal Comparison of Utility." (Unpublished Manuscript, available at <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/14435/1/14435.pdf>)

Greaves, Hilary, and Harvey Lederman. 2017. "Aggregating Extended Preferences." *Philosophical Studies* 174 (5): 1163–90.

Harsanyi, John C. 1953. "Cardinal Utility in Welfare Economics and in the Theory of Risk-Taking." *Journal of Political Economy* 61 (5): 434–35.

Harsanyi, John C. 1955. "Cardinal Welfare, Individualistic Ethics, and Interpersonal Comparisons of Utility." *Journal of Political Economy* 63 (4): 309–21.

Harsanyi, John C. 2008. "Interpersonal Utility Comparisons." In *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Lemieux, Pierre. 2022. "Interpersonal Comparisons of Utility." *Econlib*, February 1. <https://www.econlib.org/interpersonal-comparisons-of-utility/>.