

2014 年大沼研究会ミクロ経済学試験問題

1. プレーヤー1 と 2 が、じゃんけんを行う。これを標準型ゲームで表し、ナッシュ均衡について言及しなさい。

2. 2 財 X,Y の消費量を x,y で表す。効用関数が、 $U(x,y)=2\log x+3\log y$ と表されるとする。
 - (1) $x=8, y=9$ における、Y の X に対する限界代替率を求めなさい。
 - (2) 消費者の予算が 40, それぞれの価格 $P_x=2, P_y=6$ とする。このとき、X,Y の消費量を求めなさい。
 - (3) (2)で求めた消費量における、Y の需要の価格弾力性を求めなさい。

3. ある財の供給量を x とする。この財の市場の逆需要関数は、 $30-2x$ であらわされる。また、独占的に行動する生産者の費用関数は、 $x^2/2$ と表される。このとき、以下の間に答えなさい。
 - (1) 限界収入関数を求めなさい。
 - (2) 独占市場の均衡点を求めなさい。
 - (3) 市場が独占市場であることによる死荷重を求めなさい。

2014 年度 大沼研究会入ゼミ英語試験問題

以下の文章は、New York Times に掲載された、ノーベル賞受賞経済学者スティグリッツの論説である。これを読んで以下の問に日本語で答えなさい。

1. 著者が最も強調している主張を、簡潔に述べなさい。
2. その理由を説明しなさい。
3. 下線部を訳しなさい。

The re-election of President Obama was like a Rorschach test, subject to many interpretations. In this election, each side debated issues that deeply worry me: the long malaise into which the economy seems to be settling, and the growing divide between the 1 percent and the rest — an inequality not only of outcomes but also of opportunity. To me, these problems are two sides of the same coin: with inequality at its highest level since before the Depression, a robust recovery will be difficult in the short term, and the American dream — a good life in exchange for hard work — is slowly dying.

Politicians typically talk about rising inequality and the sluggish recovery as separate phenomena, when they are in fact intertwined. Inequality stifles, restrains and holds back our growth. When even the free-market-oriented magazine *The Economist* argues — as it did in a special feature in October — that the magnitude and nature of the country's inequality represent a serious threat to America, we should know that something has gone horribly wrong. And yet, after four decades of widening inequality and the greatest economic downturn since the Depression, we haven't done anything about it.

There are four major reasons inequality is squelching our recovery. The most immediate is that our middle class is too weak to support the consumer spending that has historically driven our economic growth. While the top 1 percent of income earners took home 93 percent of the growth in incomes in 2010, the households in the middle — who are most likely to spend their incomes rather than save them and who are, in a sense, the true job creators — have lower household incomes, adjusted for inflation, than they did in 1996. The growth in the decade before the crisis was unsustainable — it was reliant on the bottom 80 percent consuming about 110 percent of their income.

Second, the hollowing out of the middle class since the 1970s, a phenomenon interrupted only briefly in the 1990s, means that they are unable to invest in their future, by educating themselves and their children and by starting or improving businesses.

Third, the weakness of the middle class is holding back tax receipts, especially because those at the top are so adroit in avoiding taxes and in getting Washington to give them tax breaks. The recent modest agreement to restore Clinton-level marginal income-tax rates for individuals making more than \$400,000 and households making more than \$450,000 did nothing to change this. Returns from Wall Street speculation are taxed at a far lower rate than other forms of income. Low tax receipts mean that the government cannot make the vital investments in infrastructure, education, research and health that are crucial for restoring long-term economic strength.

Fourth, inequality is associated with more frequent and more severe boom-and-bust cycles that make our economy more volatile and vulnerable. Though inequality did not directly cause the crisis, it is no coincidence that the 1920s — the last time inequality of income and wealth in the United States was so high — ended with the Great Crash and the Depression. The International Monetary Fund has noted the systematic relationship between economic instability and economic inequality, but American leaders haven't absorbed the lesson.

Our skyrocketing inequality — so contrary to our meritocratic ideal of America as a place where anyone with hard work and talent can “make it” — means that those who are born to parents of limited means are likely never to live up to their potential. Children in other rich countries like Canada, France, Germany and Sweden have a better chance of doing better than their parents did than American kids have. More than a fifth of our children live in poverty — the second worst of all the advanced economies, putting us behind countries like Bulgaria, Latvia and Greece.

(Inequality Is Holding Back the Recovery, By Joseph E. Stiglitz, January 19, 2013, New York Times)