

CORRELATED CHOICE

CHRISTOPHER P. CHAMBERS, YUSUFCAN MASATLIOGLU,
CHRISTOPHER TURANSICK

ABSTRACT. As a means for testing whether a group of agents jointly maximize random utility, we introduce the correlated random utility model. The correlated random utility model asks that agents face correlated random draws of preferences which govern their decisions. We study joint random utility maximization through the lens of joint stochastic choice data (correlated choice rule), a novel type of data to the stochastic choice framework. Key is the property of *marginality*, which demands the independence of any given agent’s marginal choices from the budgets faced by the remaining agents. Marginality permits the construction of well-defined marginal stochastic choice functions. Marginality and non-negativity of an analogue of the Block-Marschak polynomials characterize joint random utility maximization for small environments. For larger environments, we offer an example of a correlated choice rule establishing that each of the marginal stochastic choice rule may be stochastically rational while the correlated choice rule is not.

Date: October 12, 2021.

We thank Tugce Cuhadaroglu, Federico Echenique, Jay Lu, Paola Manzini, John Rust, Francis Vella, and seminar participants at RUD 2021 for helpful comments and discussions. We are especially grateful to Peter Caradonna for pointing out an error in an earlier version.

Chambers: Department of Economics, Georgetown University, ICC 580 37th and O Streets NW, Washington DC 20057. E-mail: Christopher.Chambers@georgetown.edu. Masatlioglu: University of Maryland, 3147E Tydings Hall, 7343 Preinkert Dr., College Park, MD 20742. E-mail: yusufcan@umd.edu Turansick: Department of Economics, Georgetown University, ICC 580 37th and O Streets NW, Washington DC 20057. E-mail: cmt152@georgetown.edu

A prior version of this paper has been circulated under the name “Influence and Correlated Choice.”

1. INTRODUCTION

Utility maximization is a central behavioral assumption in economics. Consequently, testing for utility maximization has been of consistent interest in decision theory. However, the hypothesis of static utility maximization has been shown to fail, at least in part, due to the fact that choices are stochastic. While there are many explanations for stochastic choice, we draw attention to the random utility model (RUM) of Block et al. (1959) which supposes that decision makers face random draws of utility functions and maximize their drawn utility function.¹ The decision theoretic literature and the econometric literature have been successful in developing tests for random utility maximization.² However, each of these tests only consider a single agent or a single group of agents. We ask if there are further testable implications of random utility maximization when we consider multiple (groups of) agents.

To motivate this question, we turn to the following interpretation of the random utility model. In this interpretation there is an underlying state of the world which is observable to the decision maker but unobservable to the analyst. This state varies and causes the apparent randomness of utility. As an example, an analyst may not have access to weather data, but the weather is obviously instrumental in an agent's decision whether to carry an umbrella. Under this interpretation, testing for random utility maximization is equivalent to testing the hypothesis that an underlying state of the world drives preferences. By adding multiple agents to this interpretation, we can then test to see if the choices of multiple agents are plausibly induced by some common underlying state.

The above interpretation lends insight into the natural multi-agent extension of the classic random utility model. Notably, if each agent's preferences are derived from the same state of the world, then in general we should expect that preference draws

¹For other explanations of stochastic choice, see Machina (1985), Manzini and Mariotti (2014), Cerreia-Vioglio et al. (2019), and Allen et al. (2021).

²Falmagne (1978) and McFadden and Richter (1990) offer two different decision theoretic tests for random utility maximization. Kitamura and Stoye (2018) offer an implementable econometric test for random utility maximization.

are correlated. We consider such a model and term it the *correlated random utility model*, or CRUM for short. In our model, agents face correlated random draws of preferences over their own choice environments. Our aim is to test for joint random utility maximization by developing tests for CRUM.

In order to better understand the correlation between choices, we focus our analysis on the study of joint stochastic choice data. We assume that the analyst is able to observe the frequency with which a pair of agents choose a pair of alternatives from a pair of menus, or budgets.³ We refer to this object as a *correlated choice rule*. To the best of our knowledge, this type of data is novel to the stochastic choice model. However, this type of data is not novel to the field of econometrics and has seen much use there in applied work.⁴ Our contribution here is to study joint stochastic choice data from an axiomatic perspective.

We develop three axioms which can refute the hypothesis of joint random utility maximization. The first of these axioms is the *non-negativity* of the multi-agent analogue of the Block-Marschak polynomials of Block et al. (1959). The interpretation of these polynomials is much the same as in the single agent case and non-negativity of these polynomials can be thought of as a strong form of “monotonicity” of choice probabilities with respect to set inclusion. To understand the necessity of this type of monotonicity, consider Table 1 which gives an example of a correlated choice rule which does not satisfy non-negativity. The left hand side presents an environment where the row agent chooses from $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, whereas the column agent chooses from $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$. The right hand side presents the same choice set for the row agent, but the column agent’s choice set has shrunk to $\{y_1, y_2\}$. If the choices in Table 1 were consistent with joint utility maximization, then the left hand table would tell us that 40% of the time x_1 would be ranked best by the row agent and y_1 would be ranked

³The agents do not choose from a set of pairs of alternatives, but rather, each agent chooses an alternative from her own budget.

⁴Most commonly, joint choice data has been used in the study of peer effects (see Sacerdote (2001), Kremer and Levy (2008), and Card and Giuliano (2013)). In addition, this type of data has been used to study the return on education by studying twins (see Ashenfelter and Krueger (1994) and Miller et al. (1995)).

best by the column agent. However, the right hand table tells us that x_1 and y_1 are never both ranked best. This is an obvious contradiction to joint utility maximization and speaks to the necessity of non-negativity.

	y_1	y_2	y_3			y_1	y_2	
x_1	0.4	0	0	0.4	x_1	0	0.4	0.4
x_2	0	0.3	0	0.3	x_2	0.3	0	0.3
x_3	0	0	0.3	0.3	x_3	0.1	0.2	0.3
	0.4	0.3	0.3	1		0.4	0.6	1

TABLE 1. Correlated choice rule for $(\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \{y_1, y_2, y_3\})$ and $(\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \{y_1, y_2\})$. The correlated choice rule is not consistent with joint utility maximization as non-negativity fails to hold.

Our second axiom, *marginality*, posits that each agent's marginal choice probabilities are independent of the other agents' choice sets. To better understand this axiom, turn to Table 2 which gives an example of a correlated choice rule which does not satisfy marginality. Once again, if this correlated choice rule were consistent with joint utility maximization, then the left hand table tells us that the row agent prefers x_1 25% of the time. On the other hand, the right hand table tells us that the row agent prefers x_1 50% of the time. Since CRUM assumes correlated draws of independent preferences, an agent's preferences do not depend on the choices of the other agents. As such, it must be the case that the frequency with which x_1 is most preferred is fixed. This then shows that the correlated choice rule is not consistent with joint random utility maximization.

	y_1	y_2			y_1	
x_1	0	0.25	0.25	x_1	0.5	0.5
x_2	0.25	0.5	0.75	x_2	0.5	0.5
	0.25	0.75	1		1	1

TABLE 2. Correlated choice rule for $(\{x_1, x_2\}, \{y_1, y_2\})$ and $(\{x_1, x_2\}, \{y_1\})$. The correlated choice rule is not consistent with joint utility maximization as marginality fails to hold.

As a warm-up exercise for studying joint random utility maximization, we study joint *deterministic* utility maximization. We find that marginality and the multi-agent analogue of the standard deterministic axiom characterize joint utility maximization. Surprisingly, this pattern does not extend to the stochastic case. Our main results show that non-negativity and marginality characterize joint random utility maximization for small choice environments but fail to do so for large choice environments. Due to this, we introduce one further axiom which we call *full capacity*. Roughly speaking, conditional on non-negativity, the capacity of a correlated choice rule measures the proportion of choices which can be rationalized by joint random utility maximization. Full capacity simply asks that the capacity of a correlated choice rule be equal to one. We provide a thorough discussion of this axiom in the body at which point it should become clear that this axiom is not tautological.

One of the advantages of testing random utility maximization with multiple (groups of) agents is that it gives insight into new ways that random utility maximization may fail to hold. Notably, marginality is a condition that has no meaning in the standard single agent case. Here, marginality tells us that each agent's choices are independent at the marginal level. As such, a failure of marginality means that the choices of each agent depend on the other agents, at least through their choice sets. We take this to mean that there is evidence of influence or strategic consideration between the agents. As one application of our axioms, we use this prior logic to posit failures of marginality as a test for influence between agents.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. We conclude this section with a review of the related literature. Section 2 formally introduces and discusses the type of data we consider. Section 3 discusses and develops test for the hypothesis of joint utility maximization. Section 4 discusses joint random utility maximization and our main results. Section 5 discusses two applications of our model and axioms. Finally, we conclude in Section 6.

1.1. Related Literature. Our paper is most obviously related to the strand of literature studying the random utility model of Block et al. (1959). Falmagne (1978),

Barberá and Pattanaik (1986), and McFadden and Richter (1990) contribute to the literature by providing characterizations of RUM. We add to this literature by considering the multi-agent and multi-dimensional extensions of RUM and these axiomatizations. This strand of literature was revitalized with Gul and Pesendorfer (2006) which considers the extension of RUM to randomization over expected utility functions. More recently, Apestegua et al. (2017) adds the assumption of single-crossing to RUM in order to recover uniqueness and provide a simpler axiomatization. Frick et al. (2019) considers an extension of RUM to a setting with dynamic considerations.

Further, our paper is related to the strand of decision theory literature studying multi-agent choice. Much of this literature focuses on testing game theoretic models. Sprumont (2000) focuses on the testable implications of Nash equilibrium in normal form games, Ray and Zhou (2001) focuses on extensive form games, and Lee (2012) focuses on zero-sum games. Carvajal et al. (2013) takes a more focused approach and studies the testable implications of the Cournot model. More recently, the decision theoretic literature has begun to focus on testing models of social influence. Cuhadaroglu (2017) and Borah et al. (2018) consider deterministic models of social influence. Chambers et al. (2020) considers an extension of the model of Luce (1959) which allows for influence and, to our knowledge, is the first to study multi-agent choice using stochastic choice data.

Finally, our paper is also loosely related to the mathematical and information design literature on feasible joint priors. This literature studies when a posterior belief distribution is feasible for a group of agents who share a common prior. We study a decision theoretic analogue. We ask when a joint choice distribution can come from a single distribution over preference pairs. Similar to how we show that marginality is necessary but not sufficient for rationalizability, this literature shows that the standard “martingale condition” (law of iterated expectations of beliefs) is necessary but not sufficient for feasibility. The mathematical literature began with Dawid et al. (1995) which characterizes the set of feasible distributions for two agents with two states of the world. Arieli et al. (2021) introduces this result to the economic literature and extends

it to any number of agents. Mathevet et al. (2020) considers the question of feasibility through the lens of Bayesian persuasion and is able to offer an implicit characterization.

2. THE DATA

We take as given a pair of nonempty and finite sets of *alternatives* X and Y . Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} be the sets of all non-empty subsets of X and Y , respectively. In this paper, we consider a data set which is novel in the context of decision theory. In this world, (A, B) represents a decision problem where $A \in \mathcal{X}$ and $B \in \mathcal{Y}$. We assume that the outside observer has a technology for observing the probability of (x, y) being chosen from (A, B) , where $x \in A$ and $y \in B$. For each $(A, B) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $p(A, B)$ is a probability measure.⁵

Definition. A *correlated choice rule* is a map $p : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \bigcup_{(A, B) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \Delta(A \times B)$ for which for each $(A, B) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, we have $p(A, B) \in \Delta(A \times B)$.

We now offer a few interpretations of this data set, though there are many more. Our focus is on the first type of data mentioned here. The key is that data consist of observations of choices of two entities, whether these be cross-sectional data or time series data.

We interpret X as the global choice set from which agent 1 may choose and Y as the set from which agent 2 may choose. Correlated choice data represents the joint probability of agent 1's choices and agent 2's choices from two sets, respectively. A reasonable example here might be the choices of two peers, one of whom is older. There are many other obvious examples. Education level choices among twins, choice of major among roommates, gardening choices of two neighbors, food choices of wife and husband, and sport activity choices of two siblings are some examples of correlated choice data of two distinct agents. What is constant between these examples is our goal in testing these data. We want to test whether these two agents are random utility maximizers with independent utility functions.

⁵It should be understood that the notation $p(\cdot|A, B)$ does not refer to conditional probability.

There is at least one other, perhaps useful, interpretation of the model. With this interpretation, stochastic choice data are the outcome of repeated choices by the *same agent* (intrapersonal). This single agent has preferences on $X \times Y$, which might depend on unobservable random factors. In addition to random utility maximization, we want to test whether the preferences over bundles in X and Y are *independent*, in the sense that consumption of a member of X does not influence the preferences over Y .⁶

Under this interpretation, $p(x, y|A, B)$ represents the probability of the agent choosing x and y from A and B , respectively, when offered a budget of the form $A \times B$. Conventional data identify which specific product each customer chose and its price but do not describe the other products and their prices at the time of purchase. On the other hand, scanner data of purchase histories allow researchers to match the choice and price of multiple products. The repeated purchasing decisions of a single agent can be recovered by matching purchases made with the same credit card or debit card. Digital platforms offer another avenue to recover the types of data that we consider. For many digital platforms, consumers are either required or suggested to make an account in order to make purchases. Tracking repeated purchasing decisions of a single agent then amounts to tracking the purchasing decisions of a single account. Correlated choice data could be i) two distinct products choices of the single agent over time, or ii) the same product purchased on two different specific times (for example, purchases on weekdays and on the weekend). For more on stochastic choice over time, see (Frick et al., 2019), (Lu and Saito, 2018), and (Duraj, 2018).⁷

Alternatively, we may think of this single individual instead randomly choosing contingent choices or contracts (random choice of acts, see *e.g.* Lu (2021)). X and Y now represent the available actions in two states of the world, state 1 and state 2, respectively. The fact that the individual chooses from $X \times Y$ means that there are no interstate constraints. The hypothesis we test in this environment is a very weak form of monotonicity across states, allowing for state dependence. That is, it is weaker than

⁶Formally, we want to test whether preferences over $X \times Y$ can be written with a utility representation of the form: $U(a, b) = H(f(a), g(b))$, where H is increasing in each coordinate.

⁷Dynamic stochastic choice has also been studied in the context of Luce's model or logit (Luce, 1959), see in particular Rust (1987), Fudenberg and Strzalecki (2015), or Pennesi (2021).

either Savage's P3 (Savage, 1972) or the notion of monotonicity of (Anscombe et al., 1963).

Our data allow us to study the correlation structure of stochastic choice across a pair of agents.⁸ Such a framework allows a richer language for discussing stochastic choice, and also allows for more restrictive testing. Table 3 illustrates our data for two decision problems. For each decision problem, we also provide marginal choice distributions. Here, the marginal distribution of $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ is the same across two choice problems: $(\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \{y_1, y_2, y_3\})$ and $(\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \{y_1, y_2\})$. This is not true in general.

	y_1	y_2	y_3			y_1	y_2	
x_1	0.2	0	0.3	0.5	x_1	0.3	0.2	0.5
x_2	0.1	0.3	0	0.4	x_2	0.1	0.3	0.4
x_3	0	0	0.1	0.1	x_3	0	0.1	0.1
	0.3	0.3	0.4	1		0.4	0.6	1

TABLE 3. Correlated choice rule for $(\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \{y_1, y_2, y_3\})$ and $(\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \{y_1, y_2\})$.

3. DETERMINISTIC CHOICE

In this section we study conditions under which a correlated choice rule can be generated by two agents each maximizing their own deterministic preference. In other words, we develop tests to see if the data support the hypothesis of joint utility maximization. However, as our ultimate goal is to study the hypothesis of joint random utility maximization, we present our axioms in terms of choice probabilities and functions thereof.

We first define the set of linear orders on any arbitrary set A by $\mathcal{L}(A)$.⁹ For any menu A and linear order \succ over non-empty $B \subseteq A$, denote by $M(B, \succ)$ the unique maximal element of B according to \succ . In terms of the story of joint utility maximization, obviously we want to hypothesize that each set, X and Y , belongs to a *different* agent,

⁸The theoretical framework can easily be generalized to accommodate any finite number of agents.

⁹A linear order is a binary relation which is complete, transitive, and antisymmetric.

and to test whether they have individual preferences that act independently of each other.¹⁰

Definition. A correlated choice rule p is consistent with joint utility maximization if there is a linear order pair $(\succ, \succ') \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)$ such that, for any $(A, B) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ and for every $(x, y) \in A \times B$, we have the following.

$$p(x, y|A, B) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (x, y) = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ')) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

As mentioned previously, in this section we present all of our axioms in terms of choice probabilities. To that end, we introduce an analogue of the Block-Marschak polynomials from Block et al. (1959). Define, for each $x \in A \subseteq X$ and $y \in B \subseteq Y$,

$$(1) \quad q(x, y|A, B) = \sum_{A': A \subseteq A'} \sum_{B': B \subseteq B'} (-1)^{|A' \setminus A| + |B' \setminus B|} p(x, y|A', B').$$

While this equation looks complicated, it is just a straightforward generalization of the classical single-agent concept. Put simply, $q(x, y|A, B)$ captures the new choice probability of (x, y) in $A \times B$ not explained by choice probabilities of (x, y) in the strict supersets of $A \times B$. There is another nice interpretation of these polynomials in terms of joint random utility maximization that we will discuss in future sections. Suffice to say, while the formula behind this expression is new (though it bears an obvious resemblance to the classical formula), the idea behind it is not novel. We now introduce our first axiom.

Axiom 1 (SARP). For each $x \in A \subseteq X$ and $y \in B \subseteq Y$, we have $q(x, y|A, B) \in \{0, 1\}$.

The first thing to note is that this axiom guarantees that choices are deterministic. Since each Block-Marschak polynomial is either zero or one, each choice probability will similarly be either zero or one. The second thing to note is our suggestive naming

¹⁰Of course we cannot rule out the possibility that the individuals “aggregate” their preferences in a Paretian fashion. The fact that there are no constraints across the individuals does not allow us to distinguish between individuals acting independently and agents using Paretian aggregation. They are observationally equivalent.

of this axiom. We call this axiom SARP as it reduces to the Strong Axiom of Revealed Preference of Houthakker (1950) in the single-agent case with a complete choice domain. In the single-agent case, SARP implies that if an agent chooses x over x' in one choice set then they will never choose x' when x is available. There is a similar interpretation in the two-agent case. SARP states that if the agents choose the pair (x, y) over (x', y') in some choice set then they will never choose (x', y') when (x, y) is available.

Unlike in the single-agent case, SARP is not sufficient for characterizing joint utility maximization. Suppose that the pair of agents choose (x, y) from $A \times B$. SARP allows for the first agent to change their choice when y is removed from B . This type of behavior would lead an observer to believe that the utility of the first agent depends on the choice of the second agent. If this were not the case, then the removal of y from B would not change the ranking of x in A . As such, we need an additional axiom in order to characterize the behavior consistent with joint utility maximization. We introduce it here.

Axiom 2 (Marginality). *For all $A \in \mathcal{X}$, $x \in A$, and all $B, B' \in \mathcal{Y}$, $\sum_{y \in B} p(x, y|A, B) = \sum_{y' \in B'} p(x, y'|A, B')$, with a similar statement for $y \in B$.*

Observe that any correlated choice rule satisfying marginality defines two classical stochastic choice functions, one over X and the other over Y , which can be termed *marginal choice rules*. For example, given a correlated choice rule p satisfying marginality, we can define the marginal $p_X : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \bigcup_{\emptyset \neq A \subseteq X} \Delta(A)$, where $p_X(A) \in \Delta(A)$, via:

$$p_X(x|A) = \sum_{y \in B} p(x, y|A, B).$$

By marginality, p_X is well-defined independently of B . We define p_Y similarly.

In essence, marginality is a separability axiom. It states that one agent's marginal choices do not depend on the choice set of the other agent. In the context of deterministic choice, marginality guarantees us that, regardless of the choice set of the second agent, the first agent will always choose the same element from a given choice set.

Since joint utility maximization posits that each agent maximizes a preference which is independent of the other agent, it is natural to ask that the choices of one agent be independent of the choice set of the other agent. These two axioms are all we need to characterize the behavioral content of joint utility maximization.

Theorem 1. *A correlated choice rule p is consistent with joint utility maximization if and only if p satisfies SARP and marginality.*

We leave all proofs to the appendix, but we discuss the intuition behind our results here. To begin, SARP guarantees us that choices are deterministic and marginality guarantees us that marginal choices of one agent do not depend on the choice set of the other agent. These two implications then allow us to construct classic single-agent deterministic choice functions for each agent. SARP then guarantees us that these single-agent choice functions are classically rationalizable. There are two main takeaways from this result. The first is that SARP, the multi-agent analogue of the standard axiom, is not sufficient for characterization; we need something more. The second is that the addition of marginality is sufficient for characterization. That is to say, having well defined marginal choices is all that is needed beyond the standard axioms for choices to be consistent with joint utility maximization.

4. STOCHASTIC CHOICE

In this section, we discuss conditions under which a correlated choice rule can be generated by two agents joint random utility maximizing. Note that there is a distinction between a correlated choice rule being consistent with random utility maximization and being consistent with joint random utility maximization. A correlated choice rule is rationalizable by RUM if there is a probability distribution $\pi \in \Delta(\mathcal{L}(X \times Y))$ such that for any $(A, B) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, and for every $(x, y) \in A \times B$, we have $p(x, y|A, B) = \pi\{\succ \in \mathcal{L}(X \times Y) : (x, y) = M(A \times B, \succ)\}$. This notion of RUM is the classical one. The only distinction is the form of the “budgets” on which the choice function operates: they must always take the form $A \times B$. Here, preferences can depend nontrivially on *pairs* of alternatives.

Definition. A correlated choice rule p is rationalizable by CRUM if there is a probability distribution $\pi \in \Delta(\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y))$ such that for any $(A, B) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, and for every $(x, y) \in A \times B$, we have

$$p(x, y|A, B) = \pi\{(\succ, \succ') \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y) : (x, y) = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ'))\}.$$

The probability distribution π above has multiple interpretations which further depend on our data interpretation. If we interpret our data as repeated choice by a pair of agents, this probability distribution can be thought of as modeling variation in a state which is observable to the agents but unobservable to the analyst. As an example, if we consider the decision of two agents whether or not to carry an umbrella, then the probability distribution π represents the distribution of rainy days. Now, if we interpret our data as aggregate choice data from a population of decision making pairs, then this probability distribution represents the distribution of types in the population. As an example, if we look at the voting behavior of different couples, then this probability distribution could measure the political beliefs of said couples. Regardless of interpretation, this probability distribution is the mechanism randomly determining tastes and the mechanism by which preferences are correlated.

Just as is the case with RUM, not all correlated choice rules are rationalizable by CRUM. We now present some axioms which can be used to test to see if a correlated choice rule is consistent with joint random utility maximization. Recall that in the discussion of deterministic choice we asked for each agent's preference to be independent of the other agent. We used this to motivate our marginality axiom. The intuition is much the same here. The agents share a distribution over preference pairs and we ask each preference in this pair be independent of the other agent. Just as earlier, marginality is a separability axiom which asks that each agent's marginal choice probabilities be independent of the other agent's choice set. Marginality will once again be one of the axioms we use to test for joint random utility maximization.

Recall the Block-Marschak polynomials introduced by equation (1). As mentioned earlier, we now give an interpretation of these polynomials in terms of CRUM. Notably, these polynomials are set up so that if the correlated choice rule p is rationalizable by CRUM, then $q(x, y|A, B)$ would be exactly the probability of realizing a pair $(\succ_1, \succ_2) \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)$ for which for all $x' \notin A$, $x' \succ_1 x$ and for all $x'' \in A$, $x \succ_1 x''$; with a similar statement for \succ_2 . This can be seen easily by the formula:

$$(2) \quad p(x, y|A, B) = \sum_{A': A \subseteq A'} \sum_{B': B \subseteq B'} q(x, y|A', B').$$

and applying a standard Mobius inversion formula, see *e.g.* Rota (1964). This interpretation is the natural extension of the interpretation that Falmagne (1978) gives for the single-agent Block-Marschak polynomials. This intuition drives our next axiom.

Axiom 3 (Non-negativity). *For each $x \in A \subseteq X$ and $y \in B \subseteq Y$, we have $q(x, y|A, B) \geq 0$.*

Since these polynomials are equal to probability weights for rationalizable data, it must be the case that these polynomials are non-negative. For a concrete example that speaks to the necessity of non-negativity, we turn our attention to Table 4. Table 4 provides an example of a correlated choice rule that is not rationalizable by CRUM with each marginal choice rule being rationalizable by RUM.¹¹ To see this, note that choice from $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\} \times \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ tells us that order pairs that rank x_1 and y_1 as best are drawn with a probability of one-half. Now, choice from $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\} \times \{y_1, y_2\}$ tells us that order pairs that rank x_1 and y_1 as best are never drawn. Putting this observation in terms of Block-Marschak polynomials, it turns out that $q(x_1, y_1|\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \{y_1, y_2\}) = -0.5$, a direct violation of non-negativity. To rationalize each marginal choice rule, we

¹¹A marginal choice rule over X is rationalizable by the random utility model (RUM) if there is a probability distribution $\pi \in \Delta(\mathcal{L}(X))$ such that for any $A \in \mathcal{X}$, and for every $x \in A$, we have $p_X(x|A) = \pi\{\succ \in \mathcal{L}(X) : x = M(A, \succ)\}$.

consider the following two distributions over linear orders.

$$\pi_1(\succ) = \begin{cases} 0.5 & x_1 \succ x_2 \succ x_3 \\ 0.25 & x_2 \succ x_1 \succ x_3 \\ 0.25 & x_3 \succ x_2 \succ x_3 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \pi_2(\succ) = \begin{cases} 0.5 & y_1 \succ y_2 \succ y_3 \\ 0.25 & y_2 \succ y_1 \succ y_3 \\ 0.25 & y_3 \succ y_2 \succ y_3 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The distribution π_1 is a RUM representation of the marginal choice rule over different x . Similarly, the distribution π_2 is a RUM representation of the marginal choice rule over different y .

	y_1	y_2	y_3			y_1	y_2	
x_1	0.5	0	0	0.5	x_1	0	0.5	0.5
x_2	0	0.25	0	0.25	x_2	0.25	0	0.25
x_3	0	0	0.25	0.25	x_3	0.25	0	0.25
	0.5	0.25	0.25	1		0.5	0.5	1

TABLE 4. Correlated choice rule for $(\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \{y_1, y_2, y_3\})$ and $(\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \{y_1, y_2\})$. The correlated choice rule is not rationalizable by CRUM. The marginal choice rules are rationalizable by RUM.

Given that SARP and marginality characterize the behavioral content of joint utility maximization, it may be reasonable to think that non-negativity and marginality characterize the behavioral content of joint random utility maximization. However, that is not the case. Despite having the analogue of the standard axiom (non-negativity) along with a separability axiom (marginality), we need something stronger. The following observation formalizes this statement.

Observation 1. *Suppose that $|X| \geq 4$ and $|Y| \geq 4$. There are correlated choice rules which satisfy marginality and non-negativity but are not rationalizable by CRUM.*

In the appendix, we provide a thorough description of a correlated choice rule that satisfies marginality and non-negativity but fails to be rationalizable by CRUM. In this example, we need an environment where each agent has at least four alternatives. Further, we can extend the structure of this example to larger choice environments. With

this in mind, the natural question is what happens with smaller choice environments. It turns out that, for smaller choice environments, non-negativity and marginality are sufficient to characterize the behavior implications of joint random utility maximization.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that $|X| \leq 3$ or $|Y| \leq 3$. A correlated choice rule is rationalizable by CRUM if and only if it satisfies non-negativity and marginality.*

Our proof is constructive and provides an algorithm that takes in a correlated choice rule and returns a CRUM representation of the correlated choice rule if one exists. At an intuitive level, we use the small choice environment and non-negativity to uniquely pin down the marginal distribution of preferences of the agent with the small choice environment. From there, we use marginality and non-negativity to ensure that the behavior of the agent with the large choice environment is consistent with random utility maximization. We then condition on the preferences of the agent with the small choice environment and treat the other agent as if they were in the single agent case.

Interpretation wise, our Observation 1 and Theorem 2 provide a tight characterization of when checking non-negativity and marginality is sufficient for testing for CRUM rationalizability. Simply put, if at most one agent has four or more alternatives, then checking non-negativity and marginality is sufficient. However, if two or more agents each have four or more alternatives, then these two conditions cease to be sufficient.

4.1. Larger Choice Environments. As we have just seen, non-negativity and marginality are not sufficient for characterizing CRUM rationalizability. In this section we explore additional axioms with the aim of a full characterization. The next axiom we introduce requires several preliminary definitions. We state them here. For an order \succ and alternative x , we write the strict upper contour set of x as follows.¹²

$$U_{\succ}(x) = \{y \mid y \succ x\}$$

Definition. We call the tuple (x, y, A, B) a *choice tuple* if $x \in A \subseteq X$ and $y \in B \subseteq Y$.

¹²The strict upper contour set of a x is the set of all elements y satisfying $y \succ x$.

Definition. We say that the choice tuple (x, y, A, B) is *associated* with the preference pair (\succ_1, \succ_2) if $U_{\succ_1}(x) = X \setminus A$ and $U_{\succ_2}(y) = Y \setminus B$.

In order to build some intuition, consider the following. Let a correlated choice rule be generated by a degenerate distribution over the preference pair (\succ_1, \succ_2) . Then $q(x, y|A, B) = 1$ if (x, y, A, B) is associated with (\succ_1, \succ_2) and $q(x, y|A, B) = 0$ otherwise. In other words, a choice tuple (x, y, A, B) is associated with (\succ_1, \succ_2) if and only if strictly positive probability weight on (\succ_1, \succ_2) implies a strictly positive $q(x, y|A, B)$.

Definition. We say that a set Γ of choice tuples *spans* $\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)$ if for all $(\succ_1, \succ_2) \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)$, there exists some $(x, y, A, B) \in \Gamma$ associated with (\succ_1, \succ_2) .

A spanning Γ is a book keeping tool that is meant to take stock of each preference pair while only using data from the correlated choice rule. Since, in general, a choice tuple is associated with multiple preference pairs, a spanning Γ need not take stock of each preference pair separately. That is to say, a choice tuple of a spanning Γ will generally take stock of multiple preference pairs. Let Θ denote the collection of all sets Γ of choice tuples (x, y, A, B) which span $\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)$.

Definition. We define the *capacity* of a correlated choice rule as follows.

$$(3) \quad C(p) = \min_{\Gamma \in \Theta} \sum_{(x, y, A, B) \in \Gamma} q(x, y|A, B)$$

Conditional on non-negativity, the capacity of a correlated choice rule is meant to capture the portion of the correlated choice rule that can be generated by choice according to preference pairs. Intuitively, for a correlated choice rule to be CRUM rationalizable, it must be that the entire correlated choice rule can be generated by choice according to preference pairs. This motivates the following condition.

Axiom 4 (Full Capacity). *For a correlated choice rule p , $C(p) = 1$.*

To better formalize the intuition behind the necessity of full capacity, consider the following. First, note that the capacity of a correlated choice rule can never be more than one. To see this, recall that the $q(x, y|X, Y) = p(x, y|X, y)$. Since each preference

has a maximal element, there is some choice tuple (x, y, X, Y) associated with each preference pair. By taking $\{(x, y, X, Y)\}_{x \in X, y \in Y}$ as a spanning Γ , it follows immediately that there will always be some spanning Γ such that the sum in equation (3) is no more than one. To see why the capacity of a rationalizable correlated choice rule is no more than one, recall that a rationalizable correlated choice rule can be represented by a probability distribution π over preference pairs. Further, recall that $q(x, y|A, B)$ is equal to the probability weight put on order pairs that are associated with (x, y, A, B) . Since each spanning Γ takes stock of each preference pair at least once, the sum given in equation (3) can be no less than the probability weight put on each preference pair. These two pieces of intuition show that the capacity of a CRUM rationalizable correlated choice rule must be equal to one.

Alternatively, full capacity can be stated in terms of a set of linear inequalities. Since the capacity of a system is never greater than one, full capacity is equivalent to asking that for all $\Gamma \in \Theta$ we have the following.

$$\sum_{(x,y,A,B) \in \Gamma} q(x, y|A, B) \geq 1.$$

We are interested in developing a finite test for the CRUM rationalizability. With this alternate formulation of full capacity, checking for marginality, non-negativity, and full capacity amounts to checking that a finite set of linear inequalities hold. As we have discussed when we introduced each of these axioms, these axioms are all necessary for CRUM rationalizability.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that a correlated choice rule is rationalizable by CRUM. Then it satisfies marginality, non-negativity, and full capacity.*

Notably, our Theorem 3 only speaks to the necessity of our axioms and does not speak to the sufficiency of them. We are currently unable to speak to the sufficiency of these three axioms, but we do conjecture that these three axioms are sufficient for CRUM rationalizability.

Conjecture 4. *If a correlated choice rule satisfies non-negativity, marginality, and full capacity, then the correlated choice rule is rationalizable by CRUM.*

We leave the proof of this conjecture to future research. However, we provide intuition as to why we believe the addition of full capacity is sufficient for characterizing CRUM rationalizability. We also explain why we are unable to provide a proof of our conjecture.

Our problem is closely related to the max-flow min-cut theorem of graph theory (Ford and Fulkerson, 1956). This theorem starts by supposing that we have some directed graph. This graph has two special nodes, the source, the node from which all maximal paths start, and the sink, the node at which all maximal paths end. Each edge has associated with it a non-negative real number which is interpreted as the capacity constraint of that edge. A flow assignment is an assignment of real numbers to maximal paths such that, for each edge, summing over the flows assigned to paths that pass through that edge is no more than the capacity constraint of that edge. The max-flow min-cut theorem characterizes the maximum possible total flow for a given directed graph. As the name of the theorem suggests, the maximum flow for a given directed graph is equal to the minimum value of all cuts of that graph. A cut of a graph is a set of nodes of the graph containing the source and not containing the sink. The edges associated with a cut are the set of edges connecting a node in the cut and a node not in the cut. The value of a cut is equal to the sum of the capacity constraints of the edges associated with the cut.

Now we draw a parallel between the setup for the max-flow min-cut theorem and our full capacity condition. In the appendix, we present a graphical representation of our choice environment.¹³ In our representation, every preference pair (\succ_1, \succ_2) can be thought of as a path along the graph. Each choice tuple (x, y, A, B) can be thought of as an edge with corresponding capacity constraint $q(x, y|A, B)$. The edges of a cut are analogous to the choice tuples of a spanning Γ . Finally, the minimum value of a cut is analogous to the capacity of a correlated choice rule. In asking for the

¹³Here we consider the single graph representation of the marginal graph system.

capacity of a correlated choice rule to be one, our aim is to find a flow assignment that assigns a total flow of one to preference pairs. If such an assignment exists, it then also defines a CRUM representation of the correlated choice rule. However, in our graphical representation there are more paths than there are preference pairs. This is where the difficulty of our problem lies. The max-flow min-cut theorem ensures that there is a flow assignment to the entire set of paths that achieves a total flow equal to the minimum cut. In our case, we are considering a restricted set of paths on our graph.

To the best of our knowledge, this type of restricted max-flow min-cut result is an open or yet unasked question in graph theory. We also note that the standard techniques used to prove the max-flow min-cut theorem no longer work when applied to the restricted case.

4.2. The Axiom of Revealed Stochastic Preference. Given the nature of Conjecture 4, one may take this as an inability to characterize the behavioral content of joint random utility maximization. However, that is not the case. In this section we consider an extension of the Axiom of Revealed Stochastic Preference (ARSP) of McFadden and Richter (1990) in order to provide a full characterization. We restate ARSP here.

Definition. A stochastic choice rule p satisfies *ARSP* if for every finite sequence $\{(x_i, A_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ where, for each i , $x_i \in A_i$, we have the following.

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p(x_i|A_i) \leq \max_{\succ \in \mathcal{L}(X)} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{x_i = M(A_i, \succ)\}$$

While non-negativity of the Block-Marschak polynomials and ARSP are both used to characterize the behavioral content of RUM, ARSP has two advantages over the prior method. Recall that in order to define the Block-Marschak polynomials at set A , one must observe choice at all supersets of A . In practice, choice data are often incomplete. However, ARSP can be tested without observing choice on each non-empty subset of

X . Further, ARSP tells us that if we want to test if choice probabilities lie within the convex hull formed by classically rationalizable preferences then we can instead study the relationship between those choice probabilities and the cone formed by classically rationalizable preferences.

McFadden (2005) makes the observation that ARSP can be used to characterize the stochastic generalization of any set of finite choice rules. We record the straightforward observation that this extends to multi-agent and multi-dimensional choice rules. Consider the following restatement of ARSP in terms of correlated choice rules.

Definition. A correlated choice rule p satisfies ARSP if for every finite sequence $\{(x_i, y_i), A_i \times B_i\}_{i=1}^n$ where, for each i , $A_i \times B_i \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ and $(x_i, y_i) \in A_i \times B_i$, we have the following.

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p(x_i, y_i | A_i, B_i) \leq \max_{(\succ, \succ') \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{(x_i, y_i) = (M(A_i, \succ), M(B_i, \succ'))\}$$

As CRUM is the stochastic generalization of choice according to a preference pair, CRUM is also characterized by the above formulation of ARSP.

Theorem 5. *A correlated choice rule p is rationalizable by CRUM if and only if p satisfies ARSP.*

The proof of Theorem 5 is not particularly novel. In fact, we base our proof heavily off of the proof of the equivalence of ARSP to stochastic rationality in Border (2007); it is mostly a matter of simply replacing the notation. This multi-agent ARSP offers the same advantages as the standard version. Specifically, it can be tested regardless of the choice domain and it tells us that studying the cone formed by preference pairs will offer insight into CRUM rationalizability. Notably, we formalize the relationship between the convex hull and cone formed by preference pairs in one of our applications in the next section.

5. APPLICATIONS

In this section we consider two potential applications of our model and axioms. In our first application we make the connection that CRUM can be tested using the framework developed by Kitamura and Stoye (2018). Our second application posits failures of marginality as a test for influence.

5.1. Developing a Feasible Hypothesis. The goal of this section is to develop an alternate formulation of the hypothesis that a correlated choice rule is rationalizable by CRUM which is feasibly testable using known econometric tools. To that end, much of this section will mirror the treatment of RUM presented in Kitamura and Stoye (2018).

To begin, let D denote a matrix whose rows are indexed by the elements of $\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)$, columns are indexed by the set of choice tuples, and has typical element $d_{((\succ, \succ'), (a, b, A, B))}$. D is defined as follows.

$$d_{((\succ, \succ'), (a, b, A, B))} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (a, b) = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ')) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

While the indexing is arbitrary, we now take it to be fixed. Using the same fixed indexing, let ν denote a vector indexed by the set of choice tuples satisfying $\nu_{(a, b, A, B)} = p(a, b|A, B)$ for the correlated choice rule in question.¹⁴ Put simply, each row of the matrix D captures how the pair agents would choose if they chose according to a fixed preference pair. Similarly, ν captures the actual choice probabilities of the pair of agents. It follows directly from definitions that the correlated choice rule is rationalizable if and only if there exists some $\pi \in \Delta(\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y))$, which is the unit simplex of $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)|}$, such that $\nu = D\pi$. This means that the hypothesis of rationalizability is equivalent to the following hypothesis.

$$(\mathbf{H}_A) \text{ There exists } \pi \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)|} \text{ such that } \nu = D\pi.$$

¹⁴We note that D and ν can be constructed even with limited data. If a correlated choice rule does not offer data for a set $A \times B$, D and ν can be constructed by simply omitting the elements indexed by choice tuples of the form (\cdot, \cdot, A, B) . All the following analysis carries through in this case.

In order to simplify the above hypothesis, we present the following result which is the multi-agent analogue of Theorem 3.1 from Kitamura and Stoye (2018).

Theorem 6. *The following are equivalent.*

- (1) *The correlated choice rule is rationalizable by CRUM.*
- (2) $\nu = D\pi$ for some $\pi \in \Delta(\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y))$ which is the unit simplex of $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)|}$
- (3) $\nu = D\pi$ for some $\pi \geq 0$

The intuition for this result is much the same as it is in Kitamura and Stoye (2018). The equivalence of the first two points follows directly from definitions. The equivalence of the second and third points is a result of the fact that choice probabilities sum to one. If $\pi \geq 0$ satisfies $\nu = D\pi$, then $D\pi$ defines a probability distribution for each choice set $A \times B$. This immediately gives us that $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)|}$. As mentioned earlier, this result formalizes the relationship between the convex hull and the cone formed by preference pairs. Further, it tells us that (\mathbf{H}_A) is equivalent to the following hypothesis.

$$(\mathbf{H}_B) \text{ There exists } \pi \geq 0 \text{ such that } \nu = D\pi.$$

Define $\mathcal{C} = \{D\pi | \pi \geq 0\}$. It then follows that (\mathbf{H}_B) is equivalent to the following hypothesis.

$$(\mathbf{H}_C) \min_{\eta \in \mathcal{C}} [\nu - \eta]' \Omega [\nu - \eta] = 0$$

In the above equation, Ω is a positive definite matrix.¹⁵ For a discussion regarding the implementation of testing this hypothesis, we direct the reader to Kitamura and Stoye (2018) and Smeulders et al. (2021). Our contribution here is noting that CRUM can be tested using econometric tools which have already been developed and are well studied.

5.2. Testing for Influence. In this section, we propose failures of marginality as a nonparametric test for influence. Detecting influence and disentangling influence from

¹⁵Kitamura and Stoye (2018) further restrict Ω to be diagonal and note that the solution to (\mathbf{H}_C) is the projection of $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)|}$ onto \mathcal{C} under the weighted norm $\|x\|_\Omega = \sqrt{x' \Omega x}$.

correlation effects is a problem that is well known to be difficult. This problem is well described in Manski (1993) and is termed the *reflection problem*. This problem arises when researchers attempt to disentangle correlation effects (preference draws) from causal effects (social influence).¹⁶ Manski shows that the strength of these two effects are not identified in a wide array of models.

We consider a different but related question to that of Manski. We ask if there is some behavior which cannot arise without the presence of influence. In other words, we ask when influence is necessary to explain observed choice behavior. As CRUM is a model of pure correlation, one may think it reasonable to pose failures of our model as a test for influence; anything which cannot be explained by correlation must arise from influence. However, as we take a decision theoretic approach to this problem, we must be cognisant of the potential for irrationality. Further, since irrationality is a model relative concept, we must first pose a model free definition of influence if we hope to test for it. As such, we say that an agent is subject to *influence* if their choices or preferences depend on the choices or characteristics of another agent or group of agents.

With this definition in mind, consider our three axioms; marginality, non-negativity, and full capacity. As non-negativity is the natural extension of the axiom which characterizes standard RUM, failures of non-negativity may be attributed to failures of random utility maximization. Further, as the capacity of a correlated choice rule aims to measure what proportion of choice is captured by choice according to preference pairs, full capacity also captures some portion of random utility maximization. As such, we discard these two axioms in our testing process and turn to marginality, our separability axiom.

Recall that marginality supposes that each agent's marginal choice probabilities be independent of the other agent's choice set. A failure of marginality would then indicate

¹⁶We note that disentangling correlation from causal effects, such as influence, has been of recent discussion in decision theory papers such as Ellis and Thysen (2021). However, in Ellis and Thysen (2021), causal effects are modeled as a directed acyclic graph. In the context of influence, this would limit influence to be one directional; from one person to the other. That is a restrictive assumption as an agent can both influence and be influenced by another.

that at least one agent’s marginal choice probabilities depend on the other agent’s choice set. While the exact causal reason for this dependence remains a mystery, this dependence is exactly one agent’s choice depending on another agent’s choice (set). In this way, every failure of marginality captures the presence influence.

One of the desirable properties of this test is that marginality can be tested with just marginal choice data. That is to say, there may be times when an analyst has access to marginal choice probabilities but not to joint choice probabilities. In this case, so long as the analyst can “condition” these marginal choice probabilities on the choice sets of both agents, the analyst can check for failures of marginality. Further, in the case of marginal choice data, testing for CRUM boils down to testing for marginality, a separability axiom, and non-negativity of the single agent Block-Marschak polynomials, a random utility maximization axiom.¹⁷ This means that disentangling potential irrationality, failures of non-negativity, from influence, failures of marginality, becomes an even cleaner exercise.

Further, we note that testing for failures of marginality can be done with an incomplete data set. Specifically, we only need to observe choice on sets of the form $A \times B$ and $A \times B'$ to potentially falsify marginality.¹⁸ We take this observation to mean that marginality can be falsified, and thus influence can be tested for, given a reasonable data set.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper we develop a novel model of multi-agent choice and use it to test the hypothesis of joint random utility maximization. This model is the natural extension of the widely used random utility model. To our knowledge, our model is the first decision theoretic model to study joint stochastic choice data, a type of data commonly used in the study of peer effects. We propose three axioms which can be used to test our model. Two of these axioms characterize the model for small choice environments.

¹⁷We prove this claim in the appendix.

¹⁸This is similar to the result of Chambers et al. (2020) which shows that their influence parameter can be identified with a single suitably chosen source of choice set variation.

One obvious shortcoming remains in this work: we have not been able to provide a full characterization of joint random utility maximization in terms of a finite system of linear inequalities analogous to Falmagne (1978). Indeed, we only provide a finite list of linear inequalities (marginality, non-negativity, and full capacity) which are *necessary* for the representation to hold. That said, the duality theory teaches us that there must necessarily exist a finite list of such linear inequalities, and so understanding what these are remains an open question.

We see several avenues to extend the present work beyond that which has already been mentioned. Notably, CRUM assumes that the preferences of each agent are independent of the other agents. The natural question is what happens when we allow for influence and strategic considerations. This is of particular interest as the data we consider is often used in the study of peer effects. Similarly, under the intrapersonal interpretation of our data, CRUM assumes that products are neither complements nor substitutes. As such, it could be of interest to develop and test a model which allows for complements and substitutes. Ultimately, joint stochastic choice data is under studied from an axiomatic perspective and offers potential insight into many practical applications.

APPENDIX A. GRAPHICAL CONSTRUCTIONS

In this appendix, we present and discuss two graphical constructions used in the proofs of our main results.

A.1. Choice Multigraph. The proof of Theorem 2 is involved and relies on the notion of a particular directed weighted multigraph which is derived from a particular correlated choice rule. Formally, a multigraph is an object consisting of a collection of *nodes* and a set of *edges*, each of which connects two nodes. Each edge will have a real number associated as its capacity. We consider a multigraph instead of a standard graph as a multigraph allows for multiple edges to connect the same two nodes. We will name our constructed multigraph the *choice multigraph*.

The choice multigraph for the choice environment $X \times Y$ has nodes indexed by the elements of $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. We will use the index set to refer to a given node. There exists an edge between two nodes $A \times B$ and $A' \times B'$ if one of the following is true.

- (1) $A = A'$, $B' \subseteq B$ and $|B \setminus B'| = 1$
- (2) $B = B'$, $A' \subseteq A$ and $|A \setminus A'| = 1$

Now consider a pair of nodes of the form $A \times B$ and $A \times B'$ with $B' \subseteq B$ and $\{y\} = B \setminus B'$. There are $|A|$ edges connecting nodes $A \times B$ and $A \times B'$, one for each element $x \in A$. For each $x \in A$, assign $q(x, y|A, B)$ as the capacity of one edge connecting the nodes $A \times B$ and $A \times B'$. The symmetric construction holds switching the roles of A and B .

We are interested in preference pairs and their corresponding representation in the choice multigraph. Each preference pair will be associated with a subgraph of the choice multigraph. We will term each of these subgraphs a *face* of the choice multigraph.

We define $F(\succ_1, \succ_2)$ as follows. First, a node $A \times B$ is a part of $F(\succ_1, \succ_2)$ if and only if the following two conditions hold.

- (1) For all $x \in X \setminus A$, $x \succ_1 M(A, \succ_1)$.
- (2) For all $y \in Y \setminus B$, $y \succ_2 M(B, \succ_2)$.

Further, for two nodes $A \times B$ and $A \times (B \setminus \{y\})$ on $F(\succ_1, \succ_2)$, there is a single edge on $F(\succ_1, \succ_2)$ connecting these two nodes. The edge connecting $A \times B$ and $A \times (B \setminus \{y\})$ is the edge with capacity $q(M(A, \succ_1), y|A, B)$. The symmetric statement reversing the roles of A and B also holds. See Figure 1 for the face $F(a \succ_1 b \succ_1 c, d \succ_2 e \succ_2 f)$.

A.2. Marginal Graph System. In this section, we describe a graphical representation of a correlated choice rule which satisfies marginality. The representation is called the marginal graph system and will be of use when discussing Observation 1.

Before formally defining the graph, we first define two values which will be necessary for defining the marginal graph system. Since we have assumed marginality, we are able to define $p_X(x, A) = \sum_{y \in B} p(x, y|A, B)$ independently of $B \subseteq Y$. We can do the same for $y \in B$ in order to produce $p_Y(y, B)$. We can then use these marginal choice




FIGURE 1. The face corresponding to the order pair $(a \succ_1 b \succ_1 c, d \succ_2 e \succ_2 f)$ in the choice multigraph corresponding to the collection of sets $\{\{a, b, c\}, \{d, e, f\}\}$.

probabilities to define the single agent Block-Marschak polynomials for each agent.

Formally, for each $x \in A \subseteq X$, we have the following.

$$q_X(x, A) = \sum_{A': A \subseteq A'} (-1)^{|A' \setminus A|} p_X(x, A')$$

We analogously define $q_Y(y, B)$.

We now begin with the construction of the marginal graph system. For two agents, there are two different marginal graph systems; one for each ordering of agents. We will focus on the construction where we take the first agent to be the primary agent. The construction for the second agent is analogous. The marginal graph system consists of a collection of graphs which roughly fit into two categories. The first category consists of a single graph which captures information about the marginal choices of the first agent. The second category consists of many graphs, each of which, roughly speaking, captures information about the choices of the second agent conditional on the choices of the first agent.

The construction of the graph corresponding to the first agent will follow closely with the construction of the graph considered in Fiorini (2004). We will call this graph the *marginal component* of the marginal graph system. To begin, the nodes of the marginal component are indexed by the elements of 2^X , the power set of X . We will refer to nodes by their indexed set. There exists an edge between nodes A and B if one of the following two conditions hold.

- (1) $A \subseteq B$ and $|B \setminus A| = 1$
- (2) $B \subseteq A$ and $|A \setminus B| = 1$

For an edge connecting sets A and $A \setminus \{x\}$, we assign $q_X(x, A)$ as the capacity.

We now consider the construction of the graphs corresponding with choices of the second agent. We will call this collection of graphs the *conditional component* of the marginal graph system. Further, we call a single graph of the conditional component a *conditional graph*. For each pair (x, A) with $x \in A \subseteq X$, we will construct a graph for the second agent. The constructions are analogous. Here we consider the construction for (x, A) . To begin, the nodes of a conditional graph are indexed by the elements of

2^Y , the power set of Y . We will refer to nodes by their indexed set. There exists an edge between nodes B and C if one of the following two conditions hold.

- (1) $C \subseteq B$ and $|B \setminus C| = 1$
- (2) $B \subseteq C$ and $|C \setminus B| = 1$

For an edge connecting sets B and $B \setminus \{y\}$, we assign $q(x, y|A, B)$ as the capacity.

As with the choice multigraph, we are interested in the representation of preference pairs in terms of the marginal graph system. Roughly speaking, a preference pair will be represented by a single path along the marginal component and a single common path along each conditional graph of the conditional component. We now consider the representation for (\succ_1, \succ_2) . The path on the marginal component corresponding to the preference \succ_1 has nodes satisfying the following.

- A such that for all $x \in X \setminus A$, $x \succ_1 M(A, \succ_1)$

The edges connecting these nodes will have capacities of form $q_X(M(A, \succ_1), A)$. The path on the conditional graphs corresponding to the preference \succ_2 has nodes satisfying the following.

- B such that for all $y \in Y \setminus B$, $y \succ_2 M(B, \succ_2)$

For a given (x, A) , the edges connecting these nodes will have capacities of form $q(x, M(B, \succ_2)|A, B)$.

We note that there is a way to represent the marginal graph system in terms of a single graph. Roughly speaking, we can replace the edge connecting A with $A \setminus \{x\}$ on the marginal component with the conditional graph for (x, A) . When replacing an edge that connects node A with node $A \setminus \{x\}$ with its associated conditional component, we replace the node Y of the conditional graph with the node A from the marginal component and the node \emptyset from the conditional graph with the node $A \setminus \{x\}$ from the marginal component. This representation is useful for understanding the intuition behind full capacity and we use this representation in our discussion of the Conjecture 4. We call this representation the *marginal graph*.

APPENDIX B. PROOFS

B.1. **Lemma 1.** We begin by proving a preliminary lemma that will be used in the proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. This lemma consists of showing that marginality is equivalent to this next definition.

Definition. We say that a correlated choice rule satisfies *recursivity* if for every $A \neq X$, every $B \subseteq Y$ and every $y \in B$, the following is satisfied (with a similar statement for sums across B).

$$\sum_{x \in A} q(x, y|A, B) = \sum_{z \in X \setminus A} q(z, y|A \cup \{z\}, B)$$

Lemma 1. *The correlated choice rule p satisfies marginality if and only if the corresponding Block-Marschak polynomials satisfy recursivity.*

Proof. First we show that marginality implies recursivity. Fix A, B and $y \in B$. Let us write the equations:

$$(4) \quad \sum_{x \in A} q(x, y|A, B) = \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{A \subseteq A'} \sum_{B \subseteq B'} (-1)^{|A' \setminus A| + |B' \setminus B|} p(x, y|A', B').$$

Likewise,

$$(5) \quad \sum_{z \in X \setminus A} q(z, y|A \cup \{z\}, B) = \sum_{z \in X \setminus A} \sum_{A \cup \{z\} \subseteq A'} \sum_{B \subseteq B'} (-1)^{|A' \setminus (A \cup \{z\})| + |B' \setminus B|} p(z, y|A' \cup \{z\}, B').$$

Let us subtract equation (5) from equation (4). We will do a simple counting argument. In particular, for every set A' , we will count the number of times it appears in the difference of the two equations. In equation (5), no term of the type $p(x, y|A, B')$ ever appears. Consequently, the difference of equation (4) and equation (5) has a term of $\sum_{x \in A} \sum_{B \subseteq B'} (-1)^{|B' \setminus B|} p(x, y|A, B')$.

Now consider any set A' for which $A \subseteq A'$ and $|A| < |A'|$. The total coefficient coming from equation (4) is obviously

$$\sum_{x \in A} \sum_{B \subseteq B'} (-1)^{|A' \setminus A| + |B' \setminus B|} p(x, y | A', B').$$

Likewise, the total coefficient coming from the negation of equation (5) is $(-1) \sum_{z \in A' \setminus A} \sum_{B \subseteq B'} (-1)^{|A' \setminus A| - 1 + |B' \setminus B|} p(z, y | A', B')$, or

$$\sum_{z \in A' \setminus A} \sum_{B \subseteq B'} (-1)^{|A' \setminus A| + |B' \setminus B|} p(z, y | A', B').$$

Overall, then, the difference of equation (4) and equation (5) is

$$\sum_{A \subseteq A'} \sum_{B \subseteq B'} (-1)^{|A' \setminus A| + |B' \setminus B|} \sum_{x \in A'} p(x, y | A', B').$$

Reverse the order of the sums according to A and B , and obtain:

$$\sum_{B \subseteq B'} \sum_{A \subseteq A'} (-1)^{|A' \setminus A| + |B' \setminus B|} \sum_{x \in A'} p(x, y | A', B').$$

Now, by marginality, $\sum_{x \in A'} p(x, y | A', B')$ is independent of A' . Since $y \in B$ is fixed, we can call this term $\iota(B')$. Therefore the expression becomes:

$$\sum_{B \subseteq B'} \sum_{A \subseteq A'} (-1)^{|A' \setminus A| + |B' \setminus B|} \iota(B').$$

One more rearrangement:

$$\sum_{B \subseteq B'} (-1)^{|B' \setminus B|} \iota(B') \sum_{A \subseteq A'} (-1)^{|A' \setminus A|}.$$

Obviously, though, since $A \neq X$, we know that $\sum_{A \subseteq A'} (-1)^{|A' \setminus A|} = 0$. This follows, as in the notation of Rota (1964), as what we have is $\sum_{A \subseteq A'} \mu(A, A') \zeta(A', X)$ (here μ is the Mobius function of set inclusion), so that the entire expression is $\delta(A, X)$, where again this is the ‘‘Kronecker delta’’ referred to in Rota (1964) as being the identity element of the incidence algebra. This identity element is 0 if $A \neq X$ (otherwise is 1). So we are done.

Now we show that recursivity implies marginality. We begin with a claim.

Claim 1. *Suppose q satisfies recursivity. Then for each $n \geq 0$, we get*

$$\sum_{x \in A} \sum_{A': A \subseteq A': |A'| \leq |A| + n} q(x, y | A', B) = \sum_{A': A \subseteq A': |A'| = |A| + n} \sum_{x \in A'} q(x, y | A', B).$$

Further,

$$\sum_{x \in A} \sum_{A': A \subseteq A'} q(x, y | A', B) = \sum_{z \in X} q(z, y | X, B).$$

Proof of Claim 1. The proof is by induction on n . For $n = 0$ it is trivial. Suppose it is true for n and we will show for $n + 1$. This gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{A': A \subseteq A': |A'| \leq |A| + n + 1} q(x, y | A', B) &= \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{A': A \subseteq A': |A'| \leq |A| + n} q(x, y | A', B) \\ &+ \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{A': A \subseteq A': |A'| = |A| + n + 1} q(x, y | A', B). \end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis, this gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{A': A \subseteq A': |A'| \leq |A| + n + 1} q(x, y | A', B) &= \sum_{A': A \subseteq A': |A'| = |A| + n} \sum_{x \in A'} q(x, y | A', B) \\ &+ \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{A': A \subseteq A': |A'| = |A| + n + 1} q(x, y | A', B) \end{aligned}$$

By applying recursivity to the first part of this sum, we know that

$$\sum_{x \in A'} q(x, y | A', B) = \sum_{z \in X \setminus A'} q(z, y | A' \cup \{z\}, B).$$

So

$$\sum_{A': A \subseteq A': |A'| = |A| + n} \sum_{x \in A'} q(x, y | A', B) = \sum_{A': A \subseteq A': |A'| = |A| + n} \sum_{z \in X \setminus A'} q(z, y | A' \cup \{z\}, B).$$

Now let us do a simple combinatorics argument.

Let us now consider a set A^* of cardinality $|A| + n + 1$, which contains A . This set appears in the form of $A' \cup \{z\}$ in the above summation exactly $n + 1$ times, one for each members $z \in A^* \setminus A$. And each time, it adds a value of $q(z, y | A^*, B)$. So, overall,

$$\sum_{A': A \subseteq A', |A'| = |A| + n} \sum_{z \in X \setminus A'} q(z, y | A' \cup \{z\}, B) = \sum_{A': A \subseteq A', |A'| = |A| + n + 1} \sum_{x \in A' \setminus A} q(x, y | A', B).$$

So the expression:

$$\sum_{A': A \subseteq A', |A'| = |A| + n} \sum_{x \in A'} q(x, y | A', B) + \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{A': A \subseteq A', |A'| = |A| + n + 1} q(x, y | A', B)$$

gives exactly

$$\sum_{A': A \subseteq A', |A'| = |A| + n + 1} q(x, y | A', B),$$

which is what we wanted to prove in regards to the first part of the lemma. The second part of the lemma follows from setting $n = |X| - |A|$. \square

Now observe that $\sum_{x \in A} p(x, y | A, B) = \sum_{B \subseteq B'} \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{A \subseteq A'} q(x, y | A, B)$, which by the above claim is the same as $\sum_{B \subseteq B'} \sum_{x \in X} q(x, y | X, B)$, which is independent of A . So we are done. \square

B.2. Lemma 2. We now state and prove another preliminary lemma which will be used in the proofs of Theorem 1, Theorem 2, and Theorem 3. The statement of the lemma requires some preliminary notation. Fix $A \times B \subseteq X \times Y$ with $(x, y) \in A \times B$. Let

$$M_{(x,y), A \times B} = \{(\succ_1, \succ_2) : \forall (a, a', b, b') \in A^c \times A \times B^c \times B, a \succ_1 x \succ_1 a' \text{ and } b \succ_2 y \succ_2 b'\}.$$

Then $M_{(x,b), y \times B}$ consists of the set of order pairs (\succ_1, \succ_2) for which:

- (1) Every member of A is \succ_1 ranked below every member outside of A , where x is at the top of A
- (2) Every member of B is \succ_2 ranked below every member outside of B , where y is at the top of B .

The following lemma and its proof are analogous to the classical single agent case, see *e.g.* Falmagne (1978).

Lemma 2. *The correlated choice rule p is rationalized by $\pi \in \Delta(\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y))$ if and only if $q(x, y|A, B) = \pi(M_{(x,y),A \times B})$ for all (x, y, A, B) .*

Proof. For all $A \subseteq X$, all $B \subseteq Y$, all $x \in A$, and all $y \in B$, π rationalizes the correlated choice rule if and only if $p(x, y|A, B)$ is the π -probability of realizing a pair (\succ_1, \succ_2) for which $A \subseteq \{z \in X : x \succ_1 z\}$ and $B \subseteq \{w \in Y : y \succ_2 w\}$. Namely, it is the π -probability of $\bigcup_{A \subseteq A'} \bigcup_{B \subseteq B'} M_{(x,y),A' \times B'}$. For a fixed (x, y) , the sets $M_{(x,y),A' \times B'}$ are disjoint as $A \subseteq A'$ and $B \subseteq B'$, conclude:

$$p(x, y|A, B) = \sum_{A': A \subseteq A'} \sum_{B': B \subseteq B'} \pi(M_{(x,y),A' \times B'}).$$

The result now follows from the Mobius inversion formula. \square

B.3. Theorem 1.

Proof. We begin by showing joint utility maximization implies SARP and marginality. Joint utility maximization implies that agents choose according to some (\succ_1, \succ_2) . In other words, the agents choose according to a degenerate distribution over (\succ_1, \succ_2) . By Lemma 2, this immediately implies that $q(x, y|A, B) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all such (x, y, A, B) . We now note that the choice probability of a pair can be written as the following.

$$p(x, y|A, B) = \mathbf{1}\{x = M(A, \succ_1)\} \mathbf{1}\{y = M(B, \succ_2)\}$$

Observe the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{y \in B} p(x, y|A, B) &= \sum_{y \in B} \mathbf{1}\{x = M(A, \succ_1)\} \mathbf{1}\{y = M(B, \succ_2)\} \\
&= \mathbf{1}\{x = M(A, \succ_1)\} \sum_{y \in B} \mathbf{1}\{y = M(B, \succ_2)\} \\
&= \mathbf{1}\{x = M(A, \succ_1)\} \sum_{y \in B'} \mathbf{1}\{y = M(B', \succ_2)\} \\
&= \sum_{y \in B'} p(x, y|A, B)
\end{aligned}$$

This is exactly the statement of marginality, and so we are done.

Now we prove that SARP and marginality imply joint utility maximization. To begin, we know from a basic application of Mobius inversion that the following holds.

$$p(x, y|A, B) = \sum_{A': A \subseteq A'} \sum_{B': B \subseteq B'} q(x, y|A', B')$$

Since choice probabilities are between zero and one and because ARSP holds, it is immediate that $p(x, y|A, B) \in \{0, 1\}$. In other words, choices are deterministic. Further, marginality holds. This means that one agent's choices are independent of the other agent's choice set. Define the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
q(x, A) &= \sum_{y \in Y} q(x, y|A, Y) \\
q(y, B) &= \sum_{x \in X} q(x, y|X, B)
\end{aligned}$$

SARP once again gives us $q(x, A), q(y, B) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all such (x, A) and (y, B) . By Falmagne (1978), since these single agent Block-Marschak polynomials are non-negative, the random choice rule induced by these single agent Block-Marschak polynomials is rationalizable by RUM. It then follows from Theorem 5-(i) in Falmagne (1978) that the rationalizing distribution puts a probability weight equal to one on orders that satisfy the following.

- $x_1 \succ X \setminus \{x_1\}$
- $x_1 \succ x_2 \succ X \setminus \{x_1, x_2\}$

- $\{x_1, x_2\} \succ x_3 \succ X \setminus \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$
- And so on.

Above x_n is just used as a stylized naming of the elements of X . Further, the observation above gives us that $x_1 \succ_1 x_2 \succ_1 \cdots \succ_1 x_n$ rationalizes the marginal choices of the first agent. With a similar argument, we can say that $y_1 \succ_2 y_2 \succ_2 \cdots \succ_2 y_m$ rationalizes the marginal choices of the second agent. Since marginality holds and since choices are deterministic, the choices of one agent do not depend on the choice set of the other agent. Thus the joint choice of the two agents is determined by the preferences (\succ_1, \succ_2) . Thus SARP and marginality imply joint utility maximization. \square

B.4. Observation 1. During this example, let $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$ and $Y = \{w, x, y, z\}$. The table below shows the non-zero BM-polynomials of the correlated choice rule. All the non-zero BM-polynomials are equal to 0.5.

Set	$\{w, x, y, z\}$	$\{x, y, z\}$	$\{w, y, z\}$	$\{y, z\}$	$\{y\}$	$\{z\}$
$\{a, b, c, d\}$	$q(d, w)$ $q(c, x)$	$q(d, x)$	$q(c, w)$	$q(c, z)$ $q(d, y)$	$q(c, y)$	$q(d, z)$
$\{a, b, c\}$	$q(c, w)$	$q(c, x)$	-	$q(c, y)$	-	$q(c, z)$
$\{a, b, d\}$	$q(d, x)$	-	$q(d, w)$	$q(d, z)$	$q(d, y)$	-
$\{a, b\}$	$q(a, x)$ $q(b, w)$	$q(b, x)$	$q(a, w)$	$q(a, y)$ $q(b, z)$	$q(b, y)$	$q(a, z)$
$\{a\}$	$q(a, w)$	$q(a, x)$	-	$q(a, z)$	$q(a, y)$	-
$\{b\}$	$q(b, x)$	-	$q(b, w)$	$q(b, y)$	-	$q(b, z)$

TABLE 5. Block-Marschak polynomial values for the 4 by 4 counterexample. The corresponding sets for the first agent are given by the set column and the corresponding sets for the second agent are given by the set row. Each cell indicates the non-zero BM-polynomials of the correlated choice rule. All the non-zero BM-polynomials are equal to 0.5


Figure 2 shows the marginal component of the X-Marginal graph system and the marginal component of the Y-Marginal graph system. Now we will go about describing the conditional components of each of these graph systems. The conditional component of the X-Marginal graph system can be described as follows.

- (1) For the edge connecting $\{a, b, c, d\}$ to $\{a, b, c\}$ and the edge connecting $\{a, b, c\}$ to $\{a, b\}$, only the path corresponding to $w \succ x \succ y \succ z$ has positive flow along the conditional component. That flow is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$.
- (2) For the edge connecting $\{a, b, c, d\}$ to $\{a, b, d\}$ and the edge connecting $\{a, b, d\}$ to $\{a, b\}$, only the path corresponding to $x \succ w \succ z \succ y$ has positive flow along the conditional component. That flow is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$.
- (3) For the edge connecting $\{a, b\}$ to $\{a\}$ and the edge connecting $\{a\}$ to \emptyset , only the path corresponding to $w \succ x \succ z \succ y$ has positive flow along the conditional component. That flow is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$.
- (4) For the edge connecting $\{a, b\}$ to $\{b\}$ and the edge connecting $\{b\}$ to \emptyset , only the path corresponding to $x \succ w \succ y \succ z$ has positive flow along the conditional component. That flow is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$.

The conditional component of the Y-Marginal graph system is symmetric to the conditional component of the X-Marginal graph system. For clarity, we describe it as follows.

- (1) For the edge connecting $\{w, x, y, z\}$ to $\{x, y, z\}$ and the edge connecting $\{x, y, z\}$ to $\{y, z\}$, only the path corresponding to $d \succ c \succ b \succ a$ has positive flow along the conditional component. That flow is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$.
- (2) For the edge connecting $\{w, x, y, z\}$ to $\{w, y, z\}$ and the edge connecting $\{w, y, z\}$ to $\{y, z\}$, only the path corresponding to $c \succ d \succ a \succ b$ has positive flow along the conditional component. That flow is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$.
- (3) For the edge connecting $\{y, z\}$ to $\{y\}$ and the edge connecting $\{y\}$ to \emptyset , only the path corresponding to $c \succ d \succ b \succ a$ has positive flow along the conditional component. That flow is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$.
- (4) For the edge connecting $\{y, z\}$ to $\{z\}$ and the edge connecting $\{z\}$ to \emptyset , only the path corresponding to $d \succ c \succ a \succ b$ has positive flow along the conditional component. That flow is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$.

The structure of this counterexample can be found in the marginal graph system of correlated choice rules in larger choice environments. Whenever the marginal graph



(A) Marginal component of the X-Marginal graph system. (B) Marginal component of the Y-Marginal graph system.

FIGURE 2. Above are the marginal components for the two marginal graph systems from the four by four counterexample. All edges with zero flow are left out of the diagram.

system of a correlated choice rule contains the above structure, the correlated choice rule fails to have a CRUM representation.

B.5. Theorem 2.

Proof. We begin by showing that CRUM rationalizability implies non-negativity and marginality. By Lemma 2, for rationalizable data, each $q(x, y|A, B)$ is equal to a

probability weight. This immediately gives us non-negativity. As for marginality, observe the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y \in B} p(x, y|A, B) &= \sum_{y \in B} \pi(\{(\succ_1, \succ_2) | (x, y) = (M(A, \succ_1), M(B, \succ_2))\}) \\ &= \pi(\{\succ_1 | x = M(A, \succ_1)\}) \end{aligned}$$

The above immediately gives us that the marginal choice probability of x from A is independent of the choice set of the second agent. Thus marginality holds.

We now show that a correlated choice rule p with $|X| \leq 3$ or $|Y| \leq 3$ satisfying non-negativity and marginality implies that the correlated choice rule is CRUM rationalizable. Our proof describes an algorithm which takes in the choice multigraph of p (see Appendix A.1) and returns a rationalizing π for p . The algorithm is as follows.

- (1) Initialize $i = 0$ (a counter variable) and associate with each preference pair a $P_{(\succ_1, \succ_2)} = 0$. Define $q_0(x, y|A, B) = q(x, y|A, B)$.
- (2) Consider the set of faces with strictly positive $q_i(\cdot)$ on each edge. Call this set F_i . If $F_i = \emptyset$, terminate the algorithm. Otherwise, consider the set of edges, e_i , associated with each face in F_i . Call this set E_i . Consider the set of $(q_i(\cdot), e_i)$ that are associated with edges in E_i . Call this set Q_i . Choose a $(q_i(\cdot), e_i)$ such that $q_i(\cdot)$ is minimal among $q \in Q_i$. Call this value q_i^* . By definition of F_i , $q_i^* > 0$. Choose some face in F_i such that (q_i^*, e_i) is associated with an edge of that face. Call this face f_i^* . Consider the set of $(q_i(\cdot), e_i)$ associated with f_i^* . Call this set Q_i^* . For all $(q_i(\cdot), e_i) \in Q_i^*$, let $(q_{i+1}(\cdot), e_{i+1}) = (q_i(\cdot) - q_i^*, e_i)$. For all $(q_i(\cdot), e_i) \notin Q_i^*$, let $(q_{i+1}(\cdot), e_{i+1}) = (q_i(\cdot), e_i)$. Let (\succ_i^1, \succ_i^2) denote the preference pair that is associated with f_i^* . Let $P_{(\succ_i^1, \succ_i^2)} = q_i^*$.
- (3) Let $i = i + 1$ and return to step 2.

The algorithm can terminate in two cases. The first case is that there is zero flow along the choice multigraph at termination and the second case is that there is positive flow along some edge in the choice multigraph. Suppose that we are in the first case. In this case, let $\pi((\succ_1, \succ_2)) = P_{(\succ_1, \succ_2)}$. Recall that Lemma 2 states that the correlated choice rule p is rationalized by $\pi \in \Delta(\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y))$ if and only if $q(x, y|A, B) =$

$\pi(M_{(x,y),A \times B})$ for all (x, y, A, B) . In the case that the algorithm terminates with zero flow along the choice multigraph, exactly $q(x, y|A, B)$ amount of probability has been assigned to preference pairs that rank x exactly at the top of A and y exactly at the top of B . This means that the probability distribution constructed by the algorithm satisfies $q(x, y|A, B) = \pi(M_{(x,y),A \times B})$ for all (x, y, A, B) . Thus in the case where the algorithm terminates with zero flow on the choice multigraph, the correlated choice rule is rationalizable.

Now we show that non-negativity, marginality, and termination of the algorithm with positive flow somewhere on the choice multigraph leads to a contradiction. The contradiction will establish the existence of a face on the choice multigraph having strictly positive flow along each of its edges. The existence of such a face contradicts the termination of the algorithm. To begin we need the following lemma.

Claim 2. *If $q_i(\cdot)$ satisfy recursivity, then $q_{i+1}(\cdot)$ satisfy recursivity.*

Proof. Suppose $q_i(\cdot)$ satisfy recursivity. This means that $\sum_{x \in A} q_i(x, y|A, B) = \sum_{z \in X \setminus A} q_i(z, y|A \cup \{z\}, B)$. There are two cases to consider.

- (1) There exists $z \in X \setminus A$ such that $(X \setminus (A \cup \{z\})) \succeq_i^1 z \succ_i^1 A$ and $(Y \setminus B \succ_i^2 y \succeq_i^2 B)$.

This means that $q_i(z, y|A \cup \{z\}, B)$ is a part of f_i^* . This implies that $q_{i+1}(z, y|A \cup \{z\}, B) = q_i(z, y|A \cup \{z\}, B) - q_i^*$. Without loss of generality, let x be such that $X \setminus A \succ_i^1 x \succeq_i^1 A$. This means that $q(x, y|A, B)$ is a part of f_i^* . Further this means that for all $x' \in A$ with $x' \neq x$, $q(x', y|A, B)$ is not a part of f_i^* . These two facts together mean that $q_{i+1}(x, y|A, B) = q_i(x, y|A, B) - q_i^*$ and $q_{i+1}(x', y|A, B) = q_i(x', y|A, B)$. Further, for all $z' \in X \setminus A$ with $z' \neq z$, either $z' \succ_i^1 z$ or $x \succ_i^1 z'$. Both of these cases mean that $A \cup \{z'\}$ is not a part of f_i^* . This means that $q_{i+1}(z', y|A \cup \{z'\}, B) = q_i(z', y|A \cup \{z'\}, B)$. Putting all these

pieces together gets us the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{x \in A} q_{i+1}(x, y|A, B) &= \sum_{x \in A} q_i(x, y|A, B) - q_i^* \\
&= \sum_{z \in X \setminus A} q_i(z, y|A \cup \{z\}, B) - q_i^* \\
&= \sum_{z \in X \setminus A} q_{i+1}(z, y|A \cup \{z\}, B)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, in this case, recursivity holds.

- (2) There does not exist $z \in X \setminus A$ such that $(X \setminus (A \cup \{z\})) \succeq_i^1 z \succ_i^1 A$ or it is not the case that $(Y \setminus B \succ_i^2 y \succeq_i^2 B)$.

This means that, for all $x \in A$ and $z \in X \setminus A$, neither $q_i(x, y|A, B)$ or $q_i(z, y|A \cup \{z\}, B)$ are a part of f_i^* . This means that $q_{i+1}(x, y|A, B) = q_i(x, y|A, B)$ and $q_{i+1}(z, y|A \cup \{z\}, B) = q_i(z, y|A \cup \{z\}, B)$. Putting this all together gets us the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{x \in A} q_{i+1}(x, y|A, B) &= \sum_{x \in A} q_i(x, y|A, B) \\
&= \sum_{z \in X \setminus A} q_i(z, y|A \cup \{z\}, B) \\
&= \sum_{z \in X \setminus A} q_{i+1}(z, y|A \cup \{z\}, B)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the claim holds. □

Recall that we assume that the correlated choice rule satisfies marginality. This along with Lemma 1 and the above claim implies that the choice multigraph satisfies recursivity at every step of the algorithm, including when the algorithm terminates. Without loss of generality, let $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ and $Y = \{a, b, c\}$. We are in the case where there is positive flow along some edge in the choice multigraph. Without loss, let it be that $q_i(x, y|A, B) > 0$. Suppose $B \neq Y$. Then there exists some $y' \in B^c$ such that $q_i(x, y'|A, B \cup \{y'\}) > 0$. This follows from recursivity and positivity of $q_i(x, y|A, B) > 0$. Apply this logic once more to get that there exists y'' such that $q_i(x, y''|A, Y) > 0$. We can apply this logic, with more iterations, to X as well. This

means that without loss, $q_i(x_1, a|X, Y) > 0$. Now we will begin construction of the face with strictly positive entries.

- (1) Let $X = X_1$. Without loss of generality, there exists $x_1 \in X_1$ such that $q_i(x_1, a|X_1, Y) > 0$. This follows from the previous logic.
- (2) By recursivity, without loss of generality, $q_i(x_1, b|X_1, \{b, c\}) > 0$.
- (3) Let $X \setminus \{x_1\} = X_2$. By recursivity, there exists $x_2 \in X_2$ such that $q_i(x_2, b|X_2, \{b, c\}) > 0$.
- (4) Let $X_j = X \setminus \{x_k | k \in \mathbb{N}, k < j\}$. Let $j = 3$.
- (5) By recursivity, there exists $x_j \in X_j$ such that $q_i(x_j, b|X_j, \{b, c\}) > 0$.
- (6) If $j = N$, proceed to step 7. If $j < N$, let $j = j + 1$ and return to step 5.
- (7) Note that for all $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $q_i(x_k, b|X_k, \{b, c\}) > 0$. This means that for all $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $q_i(x_k, c|X_k, \{c\}) > 0$. This follows from recursivity.
- (8) Note that $q_i(x_k, b|X_k, \{b, c\}) > 0$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ further implies that for all $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $q_i(x_k, a|X_k, Y) > 0$. This too follows from recursivity.

The above steps have shown that the face corresponding to $(x_1 \succ_1 \dots \succ_1 x_N, a \succ_2 b \succ_2 c)$ has strictly positive flow along all of its edges. This contradicts the the algorithm terminating. This means that the algorithm must only terminate in case one, which we have shown leads to a rationalization of the system of choice probabilities. So we are done.

□

B.6. Theorem 3.

Proof. In the proof of Theorem 2, we have already shown that non-negativity and marginality are necessary for CRUM rationalizability. All that is left is to show that full capacity is necessary for CRUM rationalizability. To begin, consider the set of preference pairs with which the choice tuple (x, y, A, B) is associated. This set is exactly $M_{(x,y), A \times B}$. We know that $q(x, y|A, B) = \pi(M_{(x,y), A \times B})$. Now we can decompose

$M_{(x,y),A \times B}$ into its elements. This gives us the following.

$$q(x, y|A, B) = \pi(M_{(x,y),A \times B}) = \sum_{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in M_{(x,y),A \times B}} \pi((\gamma_1, \gamma_2))$$

Consider some $\Gamma \in \Theta$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(x,y,A,B) \in \Gamma} q(x, y|A, B) &= \sum_{(x,y,A,B) \in \Gamma} \sum_{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in M_{(x,y),A \times B}} \pi((\gamma_1, \gamma_2)) \\ &\geq \sum_{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)} \pi((\gamma_1, \gamma_2)) \\ &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

The first line follows from the logic explained prior. The second line follows from the fact that Γ spans $\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)$ and thus considers each order pair at least once. The last line follows from the fact that π is a probability distribution. By this logic, whenever a correlated choice rule has a CRUM representation, each spanning Γ must have value of at least one. This means that the capacity of the correlated choice rule can be no less than one.

Now recall that every finite linear order has a maximal element. This means that the set $\{(x, y, X, Y)\}_{x \in X, y \in Y}$ spans $\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)$. From the definition of the Block-Marschak polynomials we know the following.

$$\sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in Y} q(x, y|X, Y) = 1$$

This means that for each correlated choice rule, there is some spanning Γ which has a value of one. This, combined with the prior logic, gives us the following.

$$1 \leq C \leq 1$$

This gives us that $C = 1$. Thus rationalizability implies full capacity. This gives us that rationalizability implies marginality, non-negativity, and full capacity. \square

B.7. Theorem 5. Consider two agents with corresponding sets X and Y . Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ be the choice domain with corresponding correlated choice rule p .

Proof. We begin by proving that having a CRUM representation implies ARSP. Suppose that the correlated choice rule has a CRUM representation. This implies that there exists some $\pi \in \Delta(\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y))$ such that for all $A \times B \in \Sigma$, for all $(x, y) \in A \times B$, $p(x, y|A, B) = \pi(\{(\succ, \succ')|(x, y) = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ'))\})$. This further means that for all finite sequences of $\{(x_i, y_i), A_i, B_i\}_{i=1}^n$ with $(x_i, y_i) \in A_i \times B_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{i=1}^n p(x_i, y_i|A_i, B_i) &= \Sigma_{i=1}^n \pi(\{(\succ, \succ')|(x_i, y_i) = (M(A_i, \succ), M(B_i, \succ'))\}) \\ &\leq \max_{\pi' \in \Delta(\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y))} \Sigma_{i=1}^n \pi'(\{(\succ, \succ')|(x_i, y_i) = (M(A_i, \succ), M(B_i, \succ'))\}) \end{aligned}$$

The right hand side of the above equation is a maximization problem of a linear function on a compact and convex domain. This means that the maximizer is an extreme point. Formally, this means that

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{i=1}^n p(x_i, y_i|A_i, B_i) &\leq \max_{\pi' \in \Delta(\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y))} \Sigma_{i=1}^n \pi'(\{(\succ, \succ')|(x_i, y_i) = (M(A_i, \succ), M(B_i, \succ'))\}) \\ &= \max_{(\succ, \succ') \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)} \Sigma_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{(x_i, y_i) = (M(A_i, \succ), M(B_i, \succ'))\} \end{aligned}$$

Thus having a CRUM representation implies ARSP.

We will now show that ARSP holding implies that the correlated choice rule has a CRUM representation. We proceed by contraposition. Consider a matrix M with columns indexed by $(\succ, \succ') \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)$, the rows indexed by $((x, y), A \times B)$ for $A \times B \in \Sigma$ and $(x, y) \in A \times B$, and entry $((x, y), A \times B), (\succ, \succ')$ given by $\mathbf{1}\{(x_i, y_i) = (M(A_i, \succ), M(B_i, \succ'))\}$. Let $W = \begin{bmatrix} M \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$. Consider a column vector Q indexed by

$((x, y), A \times B)$ with entry $((x, y), A \times B)$ given by $p(x, y|A, B)$. Call $P = \begin{bmatrix} Q \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$. If the correlated choice rule does not have a CRUM representation, that means there does not exist $\pi \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)|}$ such that $W \cdot \pi = P$. By Farkas' Lemma, this means that there exists $j \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)|}$ such that $j \cdot W \leq 0$ and $j \cdot P > 0$. Writing out each line of the above equation gives us

$$\Sigma_{((x,y), A \times B)} j((x, y), A \times B) \mathbf{1}\{(x, y) = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ'))\} + j|P| \leq 0$$

and

$$\Sigma_{((x,y),A \times B)} j((x,y), A \times B) p(x,y|A,B) + j_{|P|} > 0$$

for all $(\succ, \succ') \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)$. Combining the above two equations gives us the following.

$$\begin{aligned} & \Sigma_{((x,y),A \times B)} j((x,y), A \times B) p(x,y|A,B) + j_{|P|} > \\ & \Sigma_{((x,y),A \times B)} j((a,b), A \times B) \mathbf{1}\{(x,y) = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ'))\} + j_{|P|} \end{aligned}$$

Let $J^+ = \{((x,y), A \times B) | j((x,y), A \times B) \geq 0\}$. Similarly, let $J^- = \{((x,y), A \times B) | j((x,y), A \times B) < 0\}$. Using this notation to write the prior equation gives us

$$\begin{aligned} & \Sigma_{((x,y),A \times B) \in J^+} j((x,y), A \times B) p(x,y|A,B) - \\ & \Sigma_{((x,y),A \times B) \in J^-} |j((x,y), A \times B)| p(x,y|A,B) > \\ & \Sigma_{((x,y),A \times B) \in J^+} j((x,y), A \times B) \mathbf{1}\{(x,y) = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ'))\} - \\ & \Sigma_{((x,y),A \times B) \in J^-} |j((x,y), A \times B)| \mathbf{1}\{(x,y) = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ'))\} \end{aligned}$$

Recall that

$$p(x,y|A,B) = 1 - \Sigma_{(x',y') \in (A \times B) \setminus \{(x,y)\}} p(x',y'|A,B)$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1}\{(x,y) = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ'))\} = \\ & 1 - \Sigma_{(x',y') \in (A \times B) \setminus \{(x,y)\}} \mathbf{1}\{(x',y') = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ'))\}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Sigma_{((x,y),A \times B) \in J^+} j((x,y), A \times B) p(x,y|A,B) + \\ & \Sigma_{((x,y),A \times B) \in J^-} \Sigma_{(x',y') \in (A \times B) \setminus \{(x,y)\}} |j((x',y'), A \times B)| p(x',y'|A,B) > \\ & \Sigma_{((x,y),A \times B) \in J^+} j((x,y), A \times B) \mathbf{1}\{(x,y) = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ'))\} + \\ & \Sigma_{((x,y),A \times B) \in J^-} \Sigma_{(x',y') \in (A \times B) \setminus \{(x,y)\}} |j((x',y'), A \times B)| \mathbf{1}\{(x',y') = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ'))\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since this is a finite system of strict linear inequalities, if there is a solution j , then there is a solution j where each component is rational. Let CD_j be the common denominator of this rational j . Let K be defined as follows.

$$K((x, y), A \times B) = \begin{cases} CD_j j((x, y), A \times B) & \text{if } ((x, y), A \times B) \in J^+ \\ CD_j |j((x, y), A \times B)| & \text{if } ((x, y), A \times B) \in J^- \end{cases}$$

Using this new notation, the we can rewrite the last inequality as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \Sigma_{((x,y), A \times B) \in J^+} K((x, y), A \times B) p(x, y | A, B) + \\ & \quad \Sigma_{((x,y), A \times B) \in J^-} \Sigma_{(x', y') \in (A \times B) \setminus \{(x, y)\}} K((x', y'), A \times B) p(x', y' | A, B) > \\ & \quad \Sigma_{((x,y), A \times B) \in J^+} K((x, y), A \times B) \mathbf{1}\{(x, y) = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ'))\} + \\ & \Sigma_{((x,y), A \times B) \in J^-} \Sigma_{(x', y') \in (A \times B) \setminus \{(x, y)\}} K((x', y'), A \times B) \mathbf{1}\{(x', y') = (M(A, \succ), M(B, \succ'))\}. \end{aligned}$$

These $K((x, y), A \times B)$ correspond to a new finite sequence of $\{(x_i, y_i), A_i \times B_i\}_{i=1}^n$. This along with the above inequality implies

$$\Sigma_{i=1}^n p(x_i, y_i | A_i, B_i) > \Sigma_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{(x_i, y_i) = (M(A_i, \succ), M(B_i, \succ'))\}.$$

The above inequality holds for all $(\succ, \succ') \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)$. This means that there exists some $\{(x_i, y_i), A_i \times B_i\}_{i=1}^n$ such that

$$\Sigma_{i=1}^n p(x_i, y_i | A_i, B_i) > \max_{(\succ, \succ') \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)} \Sigma_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{(x_i, y_i) = (M(A_i, \succ), M(B_i, \succ'))\}.$$

This is the negation of the inequality shown in ARSP. Thus by contraposition, ARSP holding implies that the correlated choice rule has a CRUM representation. Thus Theorem 5 holds.

□

B.8. Theorem 6.

Proof. The equivalence of (1) and (2) follows directly from definitions. The definition of $\Delta(\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y))$ directly implies that (2) implies (3). All that is left is to show that

(3) implies (2). Let there exist $\pi \geq 0$ such that $\nu = D\pi$. By the definition of p , we know the following for each non-empty $A \subseteq X$ and $B \subseteq Y$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} \nu_{(x, y, A, B)} &= 1 \\ \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} d_{((\succ, \succ'), (x, y, A, B))} &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

This gives us the following.

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} \nu_{(x, y, A, B)} \\ &= \sum_{(\succ, \succ') \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)} \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} \pi_{(\succ, \succ')} d_{((\succ, \succ'), (x, y, A, B))} \\ &= \sum_{(\succ, \succ') \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)} \pi_{(\succ, \succ')} \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} d_{((\succ, \succ'), (x, y, A, B))} \\ &= \sum_{(\succ, \succ') \in \mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y)} \pi_{(\succ, \succ')} \end{aligned}$$

The above equation gives us that $\pi \in \Delta(\mathcal{L}(X) \times \mathcal{L}(Y))$. Thus (3) implies (2). □

B.9. Statement in Section 5.2. In the body of the paper we make the claim that non-negativity and marginality are sufficient for CRUM rationalizability with marginal choice data. We formalize and prove that claim here. To begin, by marginal data, we formally mean that for all $A \times B \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, we observe the probability the first agent chooses x from $A \times B$, call it $p_1(x|A \times B)$, and the probability the second agent chooses y from $A \times B$, call it $p_2(y|A \times B)$. We'll call data of this type a *marginal choice rule*. In this context, marginality has the following meaning.

Axiom 5 (Marginality). *For all $x \in A \subseteq X$ and all $B, B' \subseteq Y$, we have that $p_1(x|A \times B) = p_1(x|A \times B')$. Further, the analogous statement holds reversing the roles of the two agents.*

Further, when marginality holds, we are able to define choice probabilities for one agent independently of the second agent. As such, we define $p_1(x|A) = p_1(x|A \times B)$ and $p_2(y|B) = p_2(y|A \times B)$ for data which satisfies marginality. We can then define the single agent Block-Marschak polynomials as follows.

$$q_1(x|A) = \sum_{A': A \subseteq A'} (-1)^{|A' \setminus A|} p_1(x|A')$$

Let $q_2(y|B)$ be defined analogously. It then follows that non-negativity is stated as follows.

Axiom 6 (Non-negativity). *For all $x \in A \subseteq X$ and for all $y \in B \subseteq Y$, we have that $q_1(x|A) \geq 0$ and $q_2(y|B) \geq 0$.*

Theorem 7. *A marginal choice rule p is rationalizable by CRUM if and only if p satisfies marginality and non-negativity.*

Proof. We begin by showing that CRUM rationalizability implies marginality and non-negativity. Observe the following.

$$\begin{aligned} p_1(x|A \times B) &= \pi(\{(\succ_1, \succ_2) | x = M(A, \succ_1)\}) \\ &= \pi(\{\succ_1 | x = M(A, \succ_1)\}) \end{aligned}$$

The above statement is independent of the second agent. The analogous statement holds swapping the roles of the two agents. Thus, marginality holds. Since marginality holds, we can now define $p_1(x|A)$, $p_2(y|B)$, $q_1(x|A)$, and $q_2(y|B)$ as above. Since these choice probabilities ($p_1(x|A)$ and $p_2(y|B)$) arise from a distribution over linear orders, we know from Falmagne (1978) that each $q_1(x|A)$ and $q_2(y|B)$ must be non-negative. Thus, non-negativity holds.

We now show that marginality and non-negativity imply CRUM rationalizability. To begin, marginality implies that $p_1(x|A)$, $p_2(y|B)$, $q_1(x|A)$, and $q_2(y|B)$ are well defined as above. From Falmagne (1978) and non-negativity, we know that there are $\pi_1 \in \Delta\mathcal{L}(X)$ and $\pi_2 \in \Delta\mathcal{L}(Y)$ such that π_1 RUM rationalizes p_1 and π_2 RUM rationalizes p_2 . Since $p_1(x|A) = p_1(x|A \times B)$ and $p_2(y|A) = p_2(y|A \times B)$ for all such

A and B , the independent mixture of π_1 and π_2 CRUM rationalizes p . And so we are done.

□

REFERENCES

- ALLEN, R., P. DZIEWULSKI, AND J. REHBECK (2021): “Revealed Statistical Consumer Theory,” Unpublished.
- ANSCOMBE, F. J., R. J. AUMANN, ET AL. (1963): “A Definition of Subjective Probability,” *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 34, 199–205.
- APESTEGUIA, J., M. A. BALLESTER, AND J. LU (2017): “Single-Crossing Random Utility Models,” *Econometrica*, 85, 661–674.
- ARIELI, I., Y. BABICHENKO, F. SANDOMIRSKIY, AND O. TAMUZ (2021): “Feasible Joint Posterior Beliefs,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 129, 000–000.
- ASHENFELTER, O. AND A. KRUEGER (1994): “Estimates of the Economic Return to Schooling from a New Sample of Twins,” *The American Economic Review*, 1157–1173.
- BARBERÁ, S. AND P. K. PATTANAIK (1986): “Falmagne and the Rationalizability of Stochastic Choices in Terms of Random Orderings,” *Econometrica*, 54, 707–715.
- BLOCK, H. D., J. MARSCHAK, ET AL. (1959): “Random Orderings and Stochastic Theories of Response,” Tech. rep., Cowles Foundation for Research in Economics, Yale University.
- BORAH, A., C. KOPS, ET AL. (2018): “Choice via Social Influence,” Unpublished.
- BORDER, K. (2007): “Introductory notes on stochastic rationality,” California Institute of Technology.
- CARD, D. AND L. GIULIANO (2013): “Peer Effects and Multiple Equilibria in the Risky Behavior of Friends,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95, 1130–1149.
- CARVAJAL, A., R. DEB, J. FENSKE, AND J. K.-H. QUAH (2013): “Revealed Preference Tests of the Cournot Model,” *Econometrica*, 81, 2351–2379.
- CERREIA-VIOGLIO, S., D. DILLENBERGER, P. ORTOLEVA, AND G. RIELLA (2019): “Deliberately Stochastic,” *American Economic Review*, 109, 2425–45.

- CHAMBERS, C. P., T. CUHADAROGLU, AND Y. MASATLIOGLU (2020): “Behavioral Influence,” Unpublished.
- CUHADAROGLU, T. (2017): “Choosing on Influence,” *Theoretical Economics*, 12, 477–492.
- DAWID, A., M. DEGROOT, J. MORTERA, R. COOKE, S. FRENCH, C. GENEST, M. SCHERVISH, D. LINDLEY, K. MCCONWAY, AND R. WINKLER (1995): “Coherent Combination of Experts’ Opinions,” *Test*, 4, 263–313.
- DURAJ, J. (2018): “Dynamic Random Subjective Expected Utility,” Unpublished.
- ELLIS, A. AND H. C. THYSEN (2021): “Subjective Causality in Choice,” Unpublished.
- FALMAGNE, J.-C. (1978): “A Representation Theorem for Finite Random Scale Systems,” *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 18, 52–72.
- FIORINI, S. (2004): “A Short Proof of a Theorem of Falmagne,” *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 48, 80–82.
- FORD, L. R. AND D. R. FULKERSON (1956): “Maximal Flow Through a Network,” *Canadian journal of Mathematics*, 8, 399–404.
- FRICK, M., R. IJIMA, AND T. STRZALECKI (2019): “Dynamic Random Utility,” *Econometrica*, 87, 1941–2002.
- FUDENBERG, D. AND T. STRZALECKI (2015): “Dynamic Logit with Choice Aversion,” *Econometrica*, 83, 651–691.
- GUL, F. AND W. PESENDORFER (2006): “Random expected utility,” *Econometrica*, 74, 121–146.
- HOUTHAKKER, H. S. (1950): “Revealed Preference and the Utility Function,” *Economica*, 17, 159–174.
- KITAMURA, Y. AND J. STOYE (2018): “Nonparametric Analysis of Random Utility Models,” *Econometrica*, 86, 1883–1909.
- KREMER, M. AND D. LEVY (2008): “Peer Effects and Alcohol Use among College Students,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 22, 189–206.
- LEE, S. (2012): “The Testable Implications of Zero-sum Games,” *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 48, 39–46.
- LU, J. (2021): “Random ambiguity,” *Theoretical Economics*, 16, 539–570.

- LU, J. AND K. SAITO (2018): “Random Intertemporal Choice,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 177, 780–815.
- LUCE, R. D. (1959): *Individual Choice Behavior*, John Wiley.
- MACHINA, M. J. (1985): “Stochastic Choice Functions Generated From Deterministic Preferences Over Lotteries,” *The Economic Journal*, 95, 575–594.
- MANSKI, C. F. (1993): “Identification of Endogenous Social Effects: The Reflection Problem,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 60, 531–542.
- MANZINI, P. AND M. MARIOTTI (2014): “Stochastic Choice and Consideration Sets,” *Econometrica*, 82, 1153–1176.
- MATHEVET, L., J. PEREGO, AND I. TANEVA (2020): “On Information Design in Games,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 128, 1370–1404.
- MCFADDEN, D. AND M. K. RICHTER (1990): “Stochastic Rationality and Revealed Stochastic Preference,” *Preferences, Uncertainty, and Optimality, Essays in Honor of Leo Hurwicz*, Westview Press: Boulder, CO, 161–186.
- MCFADDEN, D. L. (2005): “Revealed Stochastic Preference: A Synthesis,” *Economic Theory*, 26, 245–264.
- MILLER, P., C. MULVEY, AND N. MARTIN (1995): “What Do Twins Studies Reveal About the Economic Returns to Education? A Comparison of Australian and US Findings,” *The American Economic Review*, 85, 586–599.
- PENNESI, D. (2021): “Intertemporal Discrete Choice,” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 186, 690–706.
- RAY, I. AND L. ZHOU (2001): “Game Theory via Revealed Preferences,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, 37, 415–424.
- ROTA, G.-C. (1964): “On the Foundations of Combinatorial Theory I. Theory of Möbius Functions,” *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 2, 340–368.
- RUST, J. (1987): “Optimal Replacement of GMC Bus Engines: An Empirical Model of Harold Zurcher,” *Econometrica*, 57, 999–1033.
- SACERDOTE, B. (2001): “Peer Effects with Random Assignment: Results for Dartmouth Roommates,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116, 681–704.

SAVAGE, L. J. (1972): *The Foundations of Statistics*, Dover.

SMEULDERS, B., L. CHERCHYE, AND B. DE ROCK (2021): “Nonparametric Analysis of Random Utility Models: Computational Tools for Statistical Testing,” *Econometrica*, 89, 437–455.

SPRUMONT, Y. (2000): “On the Testable Implications of Collective Choice Theories,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 93, 205–232.