## 2006 Mid-term Question $7^{1}$

I can think of two ways to approach this question. One is by starting from the profit maximization problem using the cost function, the other is with the supply function. I will do both.

## 1) Solution based on the cost function:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi=p y-c(\mathbf{w}, y) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The FOC for profit max. is:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{\partial \pi}{\partial y}=p-\frac{\partial}{\partial y} c(\mathbf{w}, y)=0  \tag{2}\\
\text { or } \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial y} c(\mathbf{w}, y)=p \text { (a constant }\right) \tag{3}
\end{gather*}
$$

QUESTION: What are the necessary SOC for this solution to hold? Would a CRS technology be admissible here?

Relation 2 gives us an implicit relation between $w_{1}, w_{2}$ and $y$. As far as we are concerned here, it says that if $w_{1}$ and $w_{2}$ both increase, the firm will adjust $y$ in order to keep $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} c(\mathbf{w}, y)$ constant and equal to $p$. Hence the following:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial}{\partial w_{1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} c(\mathbf{w}, y) d w_{1}+\frac{\partial}{\partial w_{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} c(\mathbf{w}, y) d w_{2}+\frac{\partial^{2}}{(\partial y)^{2}} c(\mathbf{w}, y) d y=0 . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using Shephard's Lemma and rearranging, we get:

$$
\begin{equation*}
d y=-\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left[x_{1}(\mathbf{w}, y) d w_{1}+x_{2}(\mathbf{w}, y) d w_{2}\right]}{\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial y)^{2}} c(\mathbf{w}, y)} . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the SOC, the denominator is positive. Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
d y>0 \text { iff } \frac{\partial}{\partial y} x_{1}(\mathbf{w}, y) d w_{1}+\frac{\partial}{\partial y} x_{2}(\mathbf{w}, y) d w_{2}<0 \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

This implies that one of the two input types must be an inferior factor. It means that in order to produce more output, the firm actually chooses to use less of that input. We have shown that this leads to the paradoxical possibility that the output increases even though

[^0]the price of both inputs has increased.
QUESTION: Doesn't this result contradict the fact that own-price effects are nonpositive? Explain.

QUESTION: Provide a graphical example of an inferior factor.
QUESTION: Can both factors be inferior?

## 2) Solution based on supply function:

Take the supply function $y(\mathbf{w}, p)$. Since $w_{1}$ and $w_{2}$ both increase, we have, by definition,

$$
\begin{equation*}
d y=\frac{\partial y(\mathbf{w}, p)}{\partial w_{1}} d w_{1}+\frac{\partial y(\mathbf{w}, p)}{\partial w_{2}} d w_{2} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

By symmetry of the substitution matrix, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
d y=-\frac{\partial x_{1}(\mathbf{w}, p)}{\partial p} d w_{1}-\frac{\partial x_{2}(\mathbf{w}, p)}{\partial p} d w_{2} . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $x_{i}(\mathbf{w}, p)=x_{i}(\mathbf{w}, y(\mathbf{w}, p))$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
d y=-\frac{\partial x_{1}(\mathbf{w}, y)}{\partial y} \frac{\partial y(\mathbf{w}, p)}{\partial p} d w_{1}-\frac{\partial x_{2}(\mathbf{w}, y)}{\partial y} \frac{\partial y(\mathbf{w}, p)}{\partial p} d w_{2} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, we obtain the same conclusion as in (6).


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ NB This question was virtually identical to assigned exercise no 5.10.

