

# Flexibility and Information

Mark Whitmeyer\*

October 19, 2022

## Abstract

We study the effect of increased flexibility—increasing the number of actions available to an agent by one—on an agent’s value for information. Increased flexibility always makes information more valuable if and only if the new action is either weakly dominated or extremal, i.e., a (partial) substitute for at most one action. This condition is also necessary and sufficient for the agent to not acquire less information as flexibility increases when information is endogenously acquired by the agent.<sup>1</sup> We apply these findings to a monopolistic screening problem in which the good is information and to delegation with information acquisition.

**Keywords:** Power Diagrams, Expected Utility, Selling Information, Information Acquisition, Delegation

**JEL Classifications:** D81; D82; D83

---

\*Arizona State University. Email: [mark.whitmeyer@gmail.com](mailto:mark.whitmeyer@gmail.com). I am grateful to Simon Board, Gregorio Curello, Rosemary Hopcroft, Vasudha Jain, Ludvig Sinander, Can Urgan, Tong Wang, Joseph Whitmeyer, Tom Wiseman, Renkun Yang, Kun Zhang, and a seminar audience at Dongbei for their feedback.

<sup>1</sup>This double negative is inescapable: “not less information” is not the same as “more information.”

When action grows unprofitable, gather information;  
when information grows unprofitable, sleep.

---

Ursula Le Guin, *The Left Hand of Darkness*


## 1 Introduction

A (risk-neutral) woman is sitting at a roulette table. Initially, she has only two options: she can bet a dollar on *red* or on *black*, each of which returns the bet plus 50 cents if the ball lands on the predicted color. Let us give her a third option. We could give her the option to leave the table, dollar in hand, and not bet. Alternatively, we could instead allow her to bet two dollars on the number 10, which returns the bet plus 1 dollar (say) if the ball lands on that number. Which of these new bets, if any, guarantees that the value of information for the woman is higher?


As we discover in this paper, the answer is simple, only the latter of the two potential new bets leads to a higher value for information. Indeed, suppose that *red* and *black* are equally likely. With only the initial two bets to choose from, the woman would be willing to pay for any information about the ball's final resting place, provided its price is sufficiently low. If we gave the woman the option to leave the table, this would clearly no longer be true: any information that doesn't move her beliefs too much is now worthless to the woman, who strictly prefers to leave the table at those beliefs. In contrast, the additional option to bet on 10 makes information weakly more valuable.

The crucial difference between the two potential new actions is that there is a state of the world (namely, that in which the ball lands in the 10 slot) in which betting on 10 is uniquely optimal; and only the optimality of betting on *black* is affected at some beliefs—if betting *red* is optimal at some belief before the addition of 10 it remains optimal after the 10 bet's introduction. There is no state of the world in which leaving the table is optimal—regardless of what number the ball lands in, it must land in either *red* or *black*, in which the bets on the respective colors are uniquely optimal. Figure 1 illustrates this example.


The formal setting of this paper is simple. There is a compact set of actions  $\mathcal{A}$ . Our protagonist is a decision maker, an agent who initially possesses a finite set of actions



(a) Choosing between *red* and *black*



(b) Choosing between *red*, *black*, and 10



(c) Choosing between *red*, *black*, and leaving

Figure 1: The tiling of the 2-simplex (power diagram) corresponding to the motivating example. There are three states  $\{0, 1, 2\}$ , where 0 is the state *red*, 1 is the state  $black \wedge (-10)$  and 2 is the state  $black \wedge 10$ .  $x := \mathbb{P}(1)$  and  $y := \mathbb{P}(2)$ .

$A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . There is an unknown state of the world  $\theta$ , which is drawn according to some full-support prior  $\mu$  from some finite set of states  $\Theta$ . The agent has some bounded utility function  $u: \mathcal{A} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that is such that no action in  $A$  is weakly dominated: for each action in  $A$ , there exists some open set of beliefs at which that action is uniquely optimal. When the agent acquires information, she does so by observing the realization of an experiment, stochastic map  $\pi: \Theta \rightarrow \Delta(S)$ , where  $S$  is a compact set of signal realizations.

We pose two questions. In both, the state space  $\Theta$ , the initial set of actions  $A$ , the new set of actions  $\hat{A} := A \cup \{\hat{a}\}$  for some  $\hat{a} \in \mathcal{A} \setminus A$ , and the agent's utility function  $u(a, \theta)$  are known to the observer (us). In both, we say the agent **becomes more flexible** if her set of actions is enlarged from  $A$  to  $\hat{A}$ .

**1. Buying some experiment.** The agent is willing to pay some fixed cost  $\gamma \geq 0$  for an experiment. Suppose the agent becomes more flexible. When must the agent still be willing to buy the experiment?

The first question can be rephrased as follows. The agent has some known set of actions  $A$  and is willing to pay for some (unknown to the observer) experiment. When is it true that the agent must still be willing to pay for this experiment when her set of available actions is enlarged by one? What are the necessary and sufficient conditions on  $u(a, \theta)$  that guarantee the value of information has not decreased?

Our second question gives the agent greater control over information acquisition. Now, the experiment is not exogenous but instead an endogenous choice of the agent. She may choose to acquire any (Bayes-plausible)<sup>2</sup> distribution over posteriors  $\Phi \in \Delta(\Delta(\Theta))$  subject to a uniformly posterior-separable (UPS) cost<sup>3</sup>  $D: \Delta(\Delta(\Theta)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We would like to know what conditions on  $u(a, \theta)$  mean that adding an action to the agent's choice set will not result in the agent acquiring less information.

---

<sup>2</sup>We use  $\mathcal{F}(\mu)$  to denote the set of Bayes-plausible distributions when the prior is  $\mu$ . We will frequently omit the "Bayes-plausible" modifier.

<sup>3</sup>Roughly, uniformly posterior-separable cost functionals are those that are additively separable in the prior and posterior. This paper's definition is that of [Caplin et al. \(2022\)](#) (Definition 4), with the lone modification that we allow the convex function corresponding to the cost functional to be weakly convex. This modification is merely for convenience: it simplifies greatly the proof of Proposition 3.1.

**2. Acquiring some information.** An agent acquires some distribution over posteriors  $\Phi$ . Suppose the agent becomes more flexible. When will the agent not acquire less information?

In other words, we know that the agent would acquire distribution  $\Phi$  when her set of actions is  $A$ . We wish to discover what conditions on the agent’s utility ensure that there is an optimal  $\hat{\Phi}$  that is not a strict mean-preserving contraction of  $\Phi$  when her set of actions is  $\hat{A}$ .<sup>4</sup>

## 1.1 Some Preliminaries

Our first step is to back out the agent’s reduced-form payoff as a function of her posterior belief. When her set of actions is  $A$ , we define the value function

$$V(x) := \max_{a \in A} \mathbb{E}_{x(\theta)} u(a, \theta) ,$$

where  $x = x(\theta) \in \Delta(\theta)$  is the agent’s belief. Value function  $V$  is continuous, convex, and piecewise affine. The graph of the value function is a polyhedral surface in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $n$  is the number of states. Associated with any such value function is the projection of  $V$  onto  $\Delta(\Theta)$ , which yields a finite collection  $C$  of polytopes  $C_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, m$ , where  $|A| = m$ ). By construction, action  $a_i$  is optimal for any belief  $x \in C_i$  and uniquely optimal for any belief  $x \in \text{int } C_i$ .  $C$  is a mathematical object known as a **power diagram**.<sup>5</sup> Figure 2 illustrates two pairs of value functions and power diagrams when the agent has three actions. In Figure 2a there are two states and in Figure 2b there are three.

When the agent has access to a new action,  $\hat{a}$ , we can construct the analogous objects, value function  $\hat{V}$  and corresponding power diagram  $\hat{C}$ . We say that a power diagram  $P$  is “finer” than a power diagram  $P'$  if and only if the partition of  $\Delta(\Theta)$  corresponding to

---

<sup>4</sup>For distributions  $P$  and  $Q$  supported on a compact, convex subset,  $X$ , of a vector space—for this paper  $X$  is either  $\Delta(\Theta)$  ( $|\Theta| = n < \infty$ ) or  $[0, 1]^n$ — $P$  is a **mean-preserving contraction (MPC)** of  $Q$  if  $\int \phi dP \leq \int \phi dQ$  for all convex functions  $\phi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .  $P$  is a **strict mean-preserving contraction** of  $Q$  if  $P$  is an MPC of  $Q$  but  $Q$  is not an MPC of  $P$ .

<sup>5</sup>Kleiner, Moldovanu, Strack, and Whitmeyer (2022) study applications of power diagrams to economic settings, with a particular focus on information and mechanism design, and information acquisition.




Figure 2

$P$  is finer than that corresponding to  $P'$ . We write this  $P \geq P'$  (and  $>$  when the relation is strict).

It is easy to see that when we compare the power diagrams  $C$  and  $\hat{C}$  (corresponding to an agent's increase in flexibility) we can say nothing in general about their relationship in the "finer-than" partial order. For instance, suppose the new action  $\hat{a}$  strictly dominates all of the actions in set  $A$ . Accordingly,  $\hat{C}$  has a single element,  $\Delta(\Theta)$ , and so  $C > \hat{C}$ . On the other hand, suppose the set of states and actions (in  $A$ ) are both binary ( $\Theta = \{0, 1\}$ , and  $A = \{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}\}$ ), and that the agent's utility is  $-(a - \theta)^2$ . This yields the value function and power diagram

$$V(x) = \frac{1}{16} \max\{-8x - 1, 8x - 9\}, \quad \text{and} \quad C = \left\{ \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right], \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right] \right\}.$$

If  $\hat{a} = 1$ , the new power diagram is

$$\hat{C} = \left\{ \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right], \left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{7}{8}\right], \left[\frac{7}{8}, 1\right] \right\},$$

which reveals that  $\hat{C} > C$ . If instead  $\hat{a} = \frac{1}{2}$ ,

$$\hat{C} = \left\{ \left[0, \frac{3}{8}\right], \left[\frac{3}{8}, \frac{5}{8}\right], \left[\frac{5}{8}, 1\right] \right\},$$

and  $\hat{C}$  and  $C$  are incomparable. Summing things up,

**Remark 1.1.** Increased flexibility has an ambiguous effect on the relation between the agent’s power diagrams in the refinement order.

We say that the new action  $\hat{a}$  is **extremal** if and only if  $\hat{a}$  is not weakly dominated and  $\hat{C} \geq C$ . Clearly, a necessary condition for this status is that there exists at least one state  $\theta'$  such that  $u(\hat{a}, \theta') > \max_{a \in A} u(a, \theta')$ . However, this condition is obviously not sufficient: introducing a strictly dominant action will result in a coarser power diagram. Instead, an action being extremal means that it can replace at most one action in the agent’s initial set of actions,  $A$ .

Figure 3 illustrates the three kinds of new action  $\hat{a}$ . In Figure 3a, the power diagrams cannot be ranked in the refinement order. In Figure 3c, the new action is dominant, and so  $C \geq \hat{C}$ . In Figure 3b, the new action is extremal and so  $\hat{C} \geq C$ .

Now let us introduce a couple of terms so that we can define this paper’s main research questions formally and do so, before finishing the section with a lemma. Recalling (Kamenica and Gentzkow (2011)) that a signal,  $\pi$ , corresponds exactly to a Bayes-plausible distribution over posteriors  $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}(\mu) \subseteq \Delta(\Delta(\Theta))$ , we say that **flexibility generates a greater value for information** if

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Phi} \hat{V}(x) - \hat{V}(\mu) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\Phi} V(x) - V(\mu),$$

for all  $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}(\mu)$  and  $\mu \in \text{int} \Delta(\Theta)$ . To put differently, suppose the observer knows that agent was (or would be) willing to pay a positive cost,  $\gamma \geq 0$ , to observe the realization of some signal  $\pi$  when her set of actions is  $A$ . Flexibility generates a greater value for information if and only if the agent would be willing to pay a (weakly) greater cost when her set of actions is  $\hat{A}$ . This is the first question specified in the introduction.

Now consider the agent’s flexible information acquisition problem

$$\max_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}(\mu)} \int_{\Delta(\Theta)} V(x) d\Phi(x) - \kappa D(\Phi),$$

where  $\kappa > 0$  is a scaling parameter, and  $D$  is a uniformly posterior-separable cost functional, i.e., that for which there exists a weakly convex, continuous, function  $c: \Delta(\Theta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$D(\Phi) = \int_{\Delta(\Theta)} c(x) d\Phi(x) - c(\mu).$$




Figure 3: The three possible kinds of new action. There are two states and (initially) three actions. The payoff to the new, fourth, action is depicted in purple. Only in 3b is the new action extremal.



The frequently used “expected reduction in Shannon entropy” cost functional is the leading example of such a cost.

We say that **flexibility does not generate less information acquisition** if for any prior  $\mu \in \text{int} \Delta(\Theta)$ , UPS cost functional  $D$  and parameter  $\kappa > 0$ , and optimal solution to the agent’s information acquisition problem when the action set is  $A$ ,  $\Phi_A^*$ , there exists an optimal solution to the agent’s information acquisition problem when the action set is  $\hat{A}$ ,  $\Phi_{\hat{A}}^*$ , that is not a strict mean-preserving contraction of  $\Phi_A^*$ .

**Lemma 1.2.** *Flexibility generates a greater value for information and does not generate less information acquisition only if  $\hat{C} \succeq C$ , i.e., only if the new action,  $\hat{a}$ , is weakly dominated or extremal.*

*Proof.* If  $\hat{a}$  is weakly dominated the result is trivial. Now let  $\hat{a}$  be neither weakly dominated nor extremal. Given this, there must be a point  $x^*$ , polytope  $\hat{C}_k \in \hat{C}$ , and at least two polytopes  $C_i, C_j \in C$  such that  $x^* \in C_i \cap C_j$  and  $x^* \in \text{int} \hat{C}_k$ .

Because  $A$  has finitely many actions, we can find a nondegenerate distribution over posteriors whose support points lie within an open ball around  $x^*$  of arbitrary small radius and do not lie in  $C_i \cap C_j$ . Moreover, for all such posteriors, action  $\hat{a}$  is uniquely optimal. Thus, setting the prior  $\mu = x^*$ , we conclude that flexibility does not generate a greater value for information, since such information is worthless when the set of actions is  $\hat{A}$  but of strictly positive value when the set of actions is  $A$ .

Moreover, for this prior, we can find a cost function and parameter for which any solution to the information acquisition problem is nondegenerate when the set of actions is  $A$  but the unique solution is degenerate when it is  $\hat{A}$ .<sup>6</sup> Thus, flexibility may generate less information acquisition when  $\hat{a}$  is neither weakly dominated nor extremal. ■

Figure 3 provides a stark illustration of this result. In particular, 3c reveals that a new action can render any information worthless; and 3a is another example in which the value of information may strictly decrease as the agent becomes more flexible.

---

<sup>6</sup>For instance, the reduction in (Shannon) entropy cost function would do for a sufficiently large  $\kappa$ .

## 2 When Flexibility Increases the Value of Information

Lemma 1.2 provides a necessary condition for flexibility to increase the value of information. It turns out that this condition is also sufficient. *Viz.*, we have

**Theorem 2.1.** *Flexibility generates a greater value for information and does not generate less information acquisition if and only if  $\hat{C} \geq C$ , i.e., if and only if the new action,  $\hat{a}$ , is weakly dominated or extremal.*

This theorem combines Lemma 1.2 with the following three lemmas:

**Lemma 2.2.**  *$\hat{V} - V$  is convex if and only if  $\hat{C} \geq C$ .*

Proof of this result, and all others omitted from the text, may be found in Appendix A.

Next, observe that functions defined on the simplex that are the maxima of finitely many affine functions correspond precisely to decision problems. That is, by construction, every decision problem with finitely many actions begets a value function  $V(x)$ , and for every such value function, there is a decision problem that induces it. Indeed, such a value function can be done by constructing the appropriate utility function action by action, state by state. Thus, we have a corollary of Lemma 2.2:

**Corollary 2.3.**  *$\hat{V} - V$  is the value function for some decision problem if and only if  $\hat{C} \geq C$ .*

Armed with this, we can prove the final lemmas needed in support of the theorem.

**Lemma 2.4.** *If  $\hat{C} \geq C$ , flexibility generates a greater value for information.*

*Proof.* In fact, we prove a stronger result. We show that for any distributions over posteriors  $\Phi$  and  $\Upsilon$  where  $\Phi$  is a mean-preserving spread of  $\Upsilon$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Phi} \hat{V}(x) - \mathbb{E}_{\Upsilon} \hat{V}(x) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\Phi} V(x) - \mathbb{E}_{\Upsilon} V(x).$$

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Phi} \hat{V}(x) - \mathbb{E}_{\Upsilon} \hat{V}(x) < \mathbb{E}_{\Phi} V(x) - \mathbb{E}_{\Upsilon} V(x),$$

or

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Phi} [\hat{V}(x) - V(x)] < \mathbb{E}_{\Upsilon} [\hat{V}(x) - V(x)].$$

However, by Corollary 2.3,  $\hat{V} - V$  corresponds to a decision problem and  $\Phi$  is a MPS of  $\Upsilon$ , so this inequality violates Blackwell's theorem. ■

When information is endogenous, the proof is quite similar.

**Lemma 2.5.** *If  $\hat{C} \geq C$ , flexibility does not generate less information acquisition.*

*Proof.* Let  $\Phi$  be an arbitrary optimal distribution when the set of actions is  $A$ . Suppose for the sake of contradiction that when the set of actions is  $\hat{A}$ , every optimizer is a strict MPC of  $\Phi$ . Pick one,  $\hat{\Phi}$ . The agent's net payoff is therefore  $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\Phi}} \hat{V} - D(\hat{\Phi})$ . The agent's payoff from instead acquiring the previous optimal distribution,  $\Phi$ , despite having the new action  $\hat{a}$  is  $\mathbb{E}_{\Phi} \hat{V} - D(\Phi)$ . By the optimality of  $\hat{\Phi}$  and strict suboptimality of  $\Phi$ , we must have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\Phi}} \hat{V} - D(\hat{\Phi}) > \mathbb{E}_{\Phi} \hat{V} - D(\Phi).$$

Analogously, the optimality of  $\Phi$  when the agent's value function is  $V$  implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Phi} V - D(\Phi) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\Phi}} V - D(\hat{\Phi}).$$

Combining these two inequalities we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\Phi}} [\hat{V} - V] > \mathbb{E}_{\Phi} [\hat{V} - V].$$

Again by Corollary 2.3,  $\hat{V} - V$  corresponds to a decision problem, so this contradicts Blackwell's theorem. ■

Note that in Lemma 2.5 we make no use of the fact that the cost functional is posterior separable; indeed, we do not even make use of the fact that it is Blackwell-monotone. All that is required is that the agent's payoff is additively separable in her value from the decision problem and her cost of acquiring information. Posterior separability of the cost function, instead, disciplines the necessity portion of Theorem 2.1.

## 2.1 Two States and the Mean Problem

If there are just two states, we can say more:

**Proposition 2.6.** *If  $|\Theta| = 2$ , flexibility generates more information acquisition if and only if  $\hat{C} \geq C$ , i.e., the new action  $\hat{a}$  is either weakly dominated or extremal.*

That is, for any prior  $\mu \in \text{int} \Delta(\Theta)$ , UPS cost functional  $D$  and parameter  $\kappa > 0$ , and optimal solution to the agent's information acquisition problem when the action set is  $A$ ,  $\Phi_A^*$ , there exists a  $\Phi_A^*$  that is a mean-preserving spread of  $\Phi_A^*$ .

This result is a consequence of Proposition 1 in [Curello and Sinander \(2022\)](#). Furthermore, it is clear that when  $|\Theta| > 2$ , Theorem 2.1 is the best that we can do: increased flexibility, even if the new action is extremal, does not mean that the agent will acquire more information. This is because the new and old experiments may not be (Blackwell) comparable.

[Curello and Sinander's](#) paper also allows us to establish an analog of Theorem 2.1 when the state  $\Theta = [0, 1]$  and the value function and cost function are mean-measurable. That is, suppose

- (i)  $\Theta = [0, 1]$ ,
- (ii) The prior admits full-support density  $f$ ,
- (iii) The decision-maker's utility function  $u(a, \theta) = \lambda(a)\theta + \rho(a)$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , and
- (iv) The decision-maker's cost of information acquisition is also mean measurable: for any MPC of the prior  $F, G$ , the cost of acquiring  $G$  is  $D(G) = \int_0^1 c(x) dG(x) - c(\mu)$ , where  $c: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous and convex.

We call the situation in which the state space is  $[0, 1]$ , the agent's value function is mean-measurable, and the cost of acquiring information (if relevant) is mean-measurable, the **mean problem**. We have an immediate analog of Theorem 2.1:

**Proposition 2.7.** *In the mean problem, flexibility generates a greater value for information and does not generate less information acquisition if and only if  $\hat{C} \geq C$ , i.e., if and only if the new action,  $\hat{a}$ , is weakly dominated or extremal.*

*Proof.* Necessity for both statements is an exact analog of Lemma 1.2, as is sufficiency when information is exogenous. When information is acquired by the agent, sufficiency is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1 in [Curello and Sinander \(2022\)](#). ■




Figure 4:  $\hat{C} > C$  but  $\hat{V} - V$  is not convex.

### 3 Beyond Adding a Single Action

#### 3.1 Adding Multiple Actions

If the agent is endowed with multiple new actions, rather than just one, what can we say about how this increased flexibility affects her value for information? Now, we impose that the agent obtains an additional finite set of actions  $B$  and define her new set of actions to be  $\hat{A} := A \cup B$ . We also redefine the term “flexibility” in this section to mean the addition of the new *set* of actions  $B$ .

With multiple new actions, we lose the equivalence of the convexity of  $\hat{V} - V$  and  $\hat{C}$ 's dominance of  $C$  in the refinement order. In particular, it is obvious (copying the argument for Lemma 2.2) that  $\hat{V} - V$  being convex implies  $\hat{C} \geq C$  but the converse is false. Intuitively, the value function  $\hat{V}$  can correspond to a finer power diagram than  $V$  but be shallower. Figure 4 illustrates an example of this. Nevertheless, the convexity of  $\hat{V} - V$  is still intimately connected to a positive value of information:

**Proposition 3.1.** *Flexibility generates a greater value for information and does not generate less information acquisition if and only if  $\hat{V} - V$  is convex. If  $|\Theta| = 2$ , flexibility generates more*

information acquisition if and only if  $\hat{V} - V$  is convex.

A corollary of this result is the necessity of  $\hat{C} \geq C$ :

**Corollary 3.2.** *Flexibility generates a greater value for information and does not generate less information acquisition only if  $\hat{C} \geq C$ .*

We can also still connect the value of flexibility in a precise way to this relationship and the extremality of the new actions. Let  $|B| = t \in \mathbb{N}$ . We say that a new set of actions is **sequentially extremal** if and only if there exists a finite sequence of power diagrams  $C^1, \dots, C^m$  with  $C^i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, t$ ) corresponding to action set  $A_i := A \cup_{j=1}^i \{a_j\}$ , where each  $a_j \in B$  is distinct, such that  $C^t \geq \dots \geq C^1 \geq C$ . Intuitively, given some finite set of actions,  $A$ , a finite set of actions,  $B$ , is sequentially extremal if and only if we can add the actions one-by-one to  $A$  in such a way that each new action is either extremal or weakly dominated.

**Lemma 3.3.**  *$\hat{V} - V$  is convex if  $B$  is sequentially extremal.*

*Proof.* Lemma 2.2 and straightforward induction yield the result. ■

The converse to Lemma 3.3 is false, however: Figure 5 illustrates an example of this. In it the agent gets access to two new actions, which increases her value of information. Note that the addition of these two actions leaves her power diagram unchanged, i.e.,  $\hat{C} = C$  but  $\hat{V} - V$  is convex. Moreover, the addition of just one of these actions would not increase her value for information (in the senses studied in this paper).<sup>7</sup>

Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.3 produce

**Corollary 3.4.** *Flexibility generates a greater value for information and does not generate less information acquisition if the set of additional actions is sequentially extremal.*

### 3.1.1 Another Notion of “More Valuable Information”

In this paper, our primary focus is on two specific ways of formalizing the phenomenon of information becoming more valuable (or no less valuable) as flexibility increases. Yet

---

<sup>7</sup>I am grateful to Gregorio Curello for suggesting this example.




Figure 5:  $\hat{C} = C$  and  $\hat{V} - V$  is convex. However,  $B$  is not sequentially extremal.

another way of doing so is as follows.<sup>8</sup> Let  $\Pi$  be the set of all experiments, and let  $\Pi_\mu^*$  be the set of experiments that have strictly positive value for an agent with action set  $A$  and prior  $\mu \in \text{int} \Delta(\Theta)$ . That is

$$\Pi_\mu^* := \left\{ \pi \in \Pi \mid \mathbb{E}_{\Phi_{\pi, \mu}} V(x) > V(\mu) \right\},$$

where  $\Phi_{\pi, \mu}$  is the distribution over posteriors corresponding to prior  $\mu$  and experiment  $\pi$ . Observe that this set is nonempty if and only if  $|A| \geq 2$  (maintaining the assumption that no action in  $A$  is weakly dominated), since the fully informative experiment is always an element of this set.

Continuing this section's interpretation of flexibility as meaning the addition of a new finite set of actions  $B$ , we say that **flexibility expands the set of valuable experiments** if for every  $\mu \in \text{int} \Delta(\Theta)$ ,  $\Pi_\mu^* \subseteq \hat{\Pi}_\mu^*$ . Then,

**Proposition 3.5.** *Flexibility expands the set of valuable experiments if and only if  $\hat{C} \geq C$ .*

*Proof.* First let  $\hat{C} \geq C$ , and suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exists some

---

<sup>8</sup>I am grateful to Renkun Yang for suggesting this interpretation.

$\mu \in \text{int } \Delta(\Theta)$  and some  $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}_\mu$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_\Phi V(x) > V(\mu), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_\Phi \hat{V}(x) = \hat{V}(\mu).$$

This implies that  $\text{supp } \Phi \subseteq \hat{C}_i$  for some  $\hat{C}_i \in \hat{C}$  and that there exists no  $C_j \in C$  such that  $\text{supp } \Phi \subseteq C_j$ . This contradicts  $\hat{C} \succeq C$ .

Now suppose for the sake of contraposition that  $\hat{C} \not\succeq C$ . Following the first part of the proof of Lemma 1.2 it is easy to see that we can find a  $\mu \in \text{int } \Delta(\Theta)$  and  $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}_\mu$  that is worthless to an agent with power diagram  $\hat{C}$  but of strictly positive value to an agent with power diagram  $C$ . Accordingly, there exists  $\mu \in \text{int } \Delta(\Theta)$  such that  $\Pi_\mu^* \not\subseteq \hat{\Pi}_\mu^*$ . ■

An essential feature of the power diagram representation of a utility function is that some data is lost. Information is valuable if and only if it affects an agent's decision making. A power diagram reveals whether information is valuable but does not indicate how valuable it is.

## 3.2 Transformations of the Utility Function

Importantly, Proposition 3.1 is merely a statement connecting the convexity of  $\hat{V} - V$  and the comparative value of information. The fact that  $\hat{V}$  is obtained from  $V$  by adding actions is inconsequential. Another way to obtain  $\hat{V}$  from  $V$  is by some transformation of the utility function. That is, suppose a decision maker's utility  $u$  is modified by some affine transformation, i.e., her new utility is  $\hat{u} := ku + s$ , where  $k \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$  and  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Such a transformation preserves the power diagram— $\hat{C} = C$ —but how does it affect  $\hat{V} - V$ ?

**Lemma 3.6.**  *$\hat{V} - V$  is convex if and only if  $k \geq 1$ .*

Combining this with Proposition 3.1 produces

**Proposition 3.7.** *A positive affine transformation  $u \mapsto ku + s$  of the agent's utility function,  $u$ , generates a greater value for information and does not generate less information acquisition if and only if  $k \geq 1$ .*

One might also wish to say something about how risk aversion shapes preferences for information, i.e., does information become more valuable as an agent becomes more risk



averse? Unfortunately, the issue with this question is that modifying the agent's utility function by some non-affine transformation may in general change the power diagram; and in particular, may result in a new power diagram that is incomparable to the previous one. That is, there are some experiments that a more risk-averse agent would value more than a less risk-averse agent, but also experiments for which the reverse holds.

## 4 Two Applications

### 4.1 Delegation

In a delegation setting, in which an agent acquires information before taking an action, Szalay (2005) studies how a principal prefers to constrain the agent's set of actions even though their interests are perfectly aligned *ex post*. In particular, Szalay shows that it is optimal for the principal to eliminate "intermediate" actions, which improves incentives for information acquisition. In that spirit, here we note that when the agent chooses whether to buy a fixed experiment, the principal always finds it optimal to increase the agent's flexibility by giving him additional extremal actions.

Suppose the principal and agent share the same utility function, a common prior, and that initially the set of actions available to the agent is the finite set  $A$  (in which no action is weakly dominated). The agent can acquire information by paying some cost  $\gamma > 0$  to see the realization of some signal. After acquiring information, the agent takes an action. The principal can give the agent access to an additional finite set of actions,  $B$ , before she acquires information.

**Remark 4.1.** The principal prefers to give the agent access to an additional set of actions,  $B$ , if it is sequentially extremal.

### 4.2 Selling Information

Proposition 3.1 suggests a natural analog of increasing differences in an informational setting in which an agent's private type is her endowment of actions. Assuming that the set of actions  $\mathcal{A}$  is such that no action is weakly dominated, we may specify that an agent's

type  $\theta_i$  indicates her set of available actions  $A_i \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . Given this, for any pair of types  $\theta_i$  and  $\theta_j$  say that type  $\theta_i > \theta_j$  if and only if  $V_i - V_j$  is convex.

Here we apply this to a monopolistic screening problem. There are two states and an agent has one of two types,  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ , with respective value functions  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ , where  $V_1 - V_2$  is convex. The principal and agent share a common prior  $\mu \in \text{int}\Delta(\Theta)$  and the principal can “produce” any distribution over posteriors  $\Phi$  subject to a UPS cost  $D(\Phi)$ . By the revelation principle, she offers a contract  $((t_1, \Phi_1), (t_2, \Phi_2))$ .

Naturally, in the first-best problem, the principal solves

$$\max_{\Phi_1 \in \mathcal{F}(\mu)} \left\{ \int_0^1 V_1(x) d\Phi_1(x) - \kappa D(\Phi_1) \right\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{\Phi_2 \in \mathcal{F}(\mu)} \left\{ \int_0^1 V_2(x) d\Phi_2(x) - \kappa D(\Phi_2) \right\},$$

and charges each type a price produced by that type’s binding participation constraint. Echoing the basic monopolistic screening model, Proposition 2.6 indicates that in the first-best solution type  $\theta_1$  is provided with “higher quality” than type  $\theta_2$ ; that is,  $\Phi_{1,FB}$  is an MPS of  $\Phi_{2,FB}$ . In addition Lemma 2.4 tells us that  $t_1 \geq t_2$ .

In the second-best problem, following standard logic,  $IR_2$  and  $IC_1$  bind, whereas  $IR_1$  and  $IC_2$  are slack. The principal’s objective is therefore (eliminating constants)

$$(1 - \rho) \left( \frac{1}{1 - \rho} \int_0^1 (V_2(x) - \rho V_1(x)) d\Phi_2(x) - \kappa D(\Phi_2) \right) + \rho \left( \int_0^1 V_1(x) d\Phi_1(x) - \kappa D(\Phi_1) \right),$$

where  $\rho := \mathbb{P}(\theta_1)$ . Since

$$V_2 - \frac{V_2 - \rho V_1}{1 - \rho} = \rho \frac{V_1 - V_2}{1 - \rho}$$

is convex, Proposition 2.6 tells us that  $\Phi_{2,SB}$  must be an MPC of  $\Phi_{2,FB}$ . Evidently,  $\Phi_{1,SB} = \Phi_{1,FB}$ . As we have argued, all of the standard insights go through:

**Remark 4.2.** In the “selling information” example of this section, in the second-best (screening) solution, there is no output (quality of information) distortion at the top and downward distortion for the “low” type relative to the first-best optimum.

## 5 Related Work & Discussion

As Section 2.1 indicates, this paper is related to [Curello and Sinander \(2022\)](#), who explore in a single-dimensional—either corresponding to a mean-measurable problem with an

continuum of states or a binary state—setting what changes to her indirect payoff lead to greater (or no less) information provision by a persuader. When there are just two states or in the mean problem, their first theorem and first proposition are useful for this work: we use them to establish Propositions 2.6 and 2.7. The questions they study, as well as those studied here, are fundamentally comparative statics questions, which connects this work to, e.g., [Milgrom and Shannon \(1994\)](#) and [Quah and Strulovici \(2009\)](#). The example of Section 4.2 is related to [Sinander \(2022\)](#), in which the author exploits his novel converse envelope theorem to show that in an information-sales setting, any Blackwell-increasing information allocation is implementable.

Beyond this, economists (and biologists) have been interested in the value of information for decision makers since [Ramsey \(1990\)](#). This early foray was subsequently followed by the works of Blackwell ([Blackwell \(1951, 1953\)](#)) and [Athey and Levin \(2018\)](#). The list of other related papers studying the value of information includes [Donaldson-Matasci, Bergstrom, and Lachmann \(2010\)](#), who explore the “fitness value of information” from an evolutionary perspective; [De Lara and Gossner \(2020\)](#) who study the value of information using tools from convex analysis; [Radner and Stiglitz \(1984\)](#), [De Lara and Gilotte \(2007\)](#), and [Chade and Schlee \(2002\)](#) who study the marginal valuation of information; and [Azrieli and Lehrer \(2008\)](#), who study preference orders over information structures induced by decision problems.

Naturally, this paper is also related to the rational inattention literature pioneered by [Sims \(2003\)](#) and furthered by, e.g., [Caplin et al. \(2022\)](#), [Pomatto et al. \(2020\)](#), [Denti et al. \(2022\)](#), and [Denti \(2018\)](#). [Caplin and Martin \(2021\)](#) is especially similar in spirit to this paper. There, they formulate a (binary) relation between joint distributions over actions and states: one such joint distribution dominates another if for every utility function, every experiment consistent with the former is more valuable than every experiment consistent with the latter. In this paper, we construct a binary relation between value functions—one dominates another if information is more valuable for the former. In this spirit, our paper suggests an easy test for Bayesian rationality: give an experimental participant with some initial endowment of bets an additional extremal bet; they should be willing to pay more for information as a result.

## References

- Susan Athey and Jonathan Levin. The value of information in monotone decision problems. *Research in Economics*, 72(1):101–116, 2018.
- Yaron Azrieli and Ehud Lehrer. The value of a stochastic information structure. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 63(2):679–693, 2008.
- David Blackwell. Comparison of experiments. In *Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, pages 93–102, Berkeley, Calif., 1951. University of California Press.
- David Blackwell. Equivalent comparisons of experiments. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 24(2):265–272, 1953.
- Andrew Caplin and Daniel Martin. Comparison of decisions under unknown experiments. *Journal of Political Economy*, 129(11):3185–3205, 2021.
- Andrew Caplin, Mark Dean, and John Leahy. Rationally inattentive behavior: Characterizing and generalizing shannon entropy. *Journal of Political Economy*, 130(6):1676–1715, 2022.
- Hector Chade and Edward Schlee. Another look at the radner–stiglitz nonconcavity in the value of information. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 107(2):421–452, 2002.
- Gregorio Curello and Ludvig Sinander. The comparative statics of persuasion. *Mimeo*, 2022.
- Michel De Lara and Laurent Gilotte. A tight sufficient condition for radner–stiglitz nonconcavity in the value of information. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 137(1):696–708, 2007.
- Michel De Lara and Olivier Gossner. Payoffs-beliefs duality and the value of information. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 30(1):464–489, 2020.

- Tommaso Denti. Posterior separable cost of information. *Forthcoming, American Economic Review*, 2018.
- Tommaso Denti, Massimo Marinacci, and Aldo Rustichini. Experimental cost of information. *American Economic Review*, 112(9):3106–23, September 2022.
- Matina C. Donaldson-Matasci, Carl T. Bergstrom, and Michael Lachmann. The fitness value of information. *Oikos*, 119(2):219–230, 2010.
- Emir Kamenica and Matthew Gentzkow. Bayesian persuasion. *The American Economic Review*, 101(6):2590–2615, 2011.
- Andreas Kleiner, Benny Moldovanu, Philipp Strack, and Mark Whitmeyer. Applications of power diagrams to mechanism and information design. *Mimeo*, 2022.
- Paul Milgrom and Chris Shannon. Monotone comparative statics. *Econometrica*, 62(1):157–180, 1994.
- Luciano Pomatto, Philipp Strack, and Omer Tamuz. The cost of information. *Mimeo*, 2020.
- John K.-H. Quah and Bruno Strulovici. Comparative statics, informativeness, and the interval dominance order. *Econometrica*, 77(6):1949–1992, 2009.
- Roy Radner and Joseph Stiglitz. A nonconcavity in the value of information. In *M. Boyer, R. Kihlstrom (Eds.), Bayesian Models of Economic Theory*, pages 33–52. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1984.
- F. P. Ramsey. Weight or the value of knowledge. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 41(1):1–4, 1990.
- Christopher A Sims. Implications of rational inattention. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 50(3):665–690, 2003.
- Ludvig Sinander. The converse envelope theorem. *Forthcoming, Econometrica*, 2022.

Dezső Szalay. The economics of clear advice and extreme options. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 72(4):1173–1198, 10 2005.

Mark Whitmeyer and Kun Zhang. Buying opinions. *Mimeo*, 2022.

## A Omitted Proofs

### A.1 Lemma 2.2 Proof

*Proof.* Suppose first that  $\hat{C} \geq C$ . If  $\hat{C} = C$ , the value functions are the same so let  $\hat{C} > C$ , and let  $C_{s+1}$  be the element of the power diagram  $\hat{C}$  generated by the new action  $\hat{a}$ . Since  $\hat{C}$  is finer than  $C$ , there exists an element  $C_s$  of the power diagram  $C$  such that  $C_{s+1} \subset C_s$ . By definition of  $V$  and  $\hat{V}$ , for all  $x \in \Delta(\Theta) \setminus C_{s+1}$ ,  $V(x) = \hat{V}(x)$ ; and for all  $x \in C_{s+1}$ ,  $V(x) \leq \hat{V}(x)$ . Define  $T(x) := \hat{V}(x) - V(x)$ , and observe that on  $\Delta(\Theta) \setminus C_{s+1}$ ,  $T(x) = 0$  and on  $C_{s+1}$  it is some affine function  $a \cdot x + b$  ( $a \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ ). Note that  $a \cdot x + b \geq 0$  for all  $x \in C_{s+1}$  and  $a \cdot x + b \leq 0$  for all  $x \in \Delta(\Theta) \setminus C_{s+1}$ . Pick any pair  $x' \in \Delta(\Theta) \setminus C_{s+1}$  and  $x'' \in C_{s+1}$  and any  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . Then,

$$\lambda T(x') + (1 - \lambda)T(x'') = (1 - \lambda)(a \cdot x'' + b) \geq \max\{0, \lambda(a \cdot x' + b) + (1 - \lambda)(a \cdot x'' + b)\},$$

so we conclude that  $T$  is convex.

Now, suppose for the sake of contraposition that  $\hat{C} \not\geq C$ . Then, we can find two points  $x', x'' \in \Delta(\Theta)$  with  $x' \neq x''$  and some  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$V(\lambda x' + (1 - \lambda)x'') < \lambda V(x') + (1 - \lambda)V(x''),$$

but

$$\hat{V}(\lambda x' + (1 - \lambda)x'') = \lambda \hat{V}(x') + (1 - \lambda)\hat{V}(x'').$$

Thus

$$T(\lambda x' + (1 - \lambda)x'') > \lambda T(x') + (1 - \lambda)T(x''),$$

so we conclude that  $T \equiv \hat{V} - V$  is not convex. ■

## A.2 Proposition 3.1 Proof

*Proof.* The sufficiency proof mirrors those for Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5.

Now suppose for the sake of contraposition that  $\hat{V} - V$  is not convex. If  $\hat{C} \not\geq C$  then Lemma 1.2 yields the result, so let  $\hat{C} \geq C$ . We abuse notation and set  $\hat{C} = C$ , understanding that  $V$  may not have a kink at some of the boundaries between elements of the power diagram. Because  $\hat{V} - V$  is not convex, we can always find two sets  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  that are elements of both power diagrams, that share a border (i.e., such that  $C_1 \cap C_2 \neq \emptyset$ ) and such that (using  $T(x) := \hat{V}(x) - V(x)$ )

$$T(\lambda x' + (1 - \lambda)x'') > \lambda T(x') + (1 - \lambda)T(x''), \quad (\star)$$

for all  $x' \in \text{int } C_1$ ,  $x'' \in \text{int } C_2$  and  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ .

**Exogenous information:** Inequality  $\star$  is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E}_\Phi \hat{V}(x) - \hat{V}(\mu) < \mathbb{E}_\Phi V(x) - V(\mu),$$

where  $\Phi$  is the binary experiment with support  $\{x', x''\}$  and mean  $\mu = \lambda x' + (1 - \lambda)x''$ .

**Endogenous information:** From Theorem 4.3 in [Whitmeyer and Zhang \(2022\)](#) (see also Lemma 2(2) in [Caplin et al. \(2022\)](#)), we may normalize  $V(x)$  and  $\hat{V}(x)$  to be such that  $V(x) = \hat{V}(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in C_1$ . Pick  $x_1 \in \text{int } C_1$ ,  $x_2 \in \text{int } C_2$  and  $\mu \in C_1 \cap C_2$  such that  $\mu$  lies on the line segment connecting  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . Denote this line segment  $\ell(x_1, x_2)$ ; formally,

$$\ell(x_1, x_2) := \{z \in \Delta(\Theta) \mid \exists \lambda \in [0, 1]: z = \lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2\}.$$

We also impose that  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are such that  $\ell(x_1, x_2) \subseteq C_1 \cap C_2$ .

Let  $c$  be a convex function that equals  $V(x)$  for all  $x \in \ell(x_1, x_2)$  and satisfies  $c(x) > \max\{V(x), \hat{V}(x)\}$  for all  $x \notin \ell(x_1, x_2)$ . Observe that  $c$  satisfies all of our requirements for a cost function.

By construction,  $V(x) - c(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in \ell(x_1, x_2)$  and  $V(x) - c(x) < 0$  for all  $x \notin \ell(x_1, x_2)$ . On the other hand,  $\hat{V}(x) - c(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in \ell(x_1, x_2) \cap C_1$  but  $\hat{V}(x) - c(x) < 0$  for all  $x \notin \ell(x_1, x_2) \cap C_1$ .

Evidently,  $\delta_\mu$  is the uniquely optimal distribution when the value function is  $\hat{V}$ , which is a strict MPC of the binary distribution with support  $\{x_1, x_2\}$ , which is an optimal distribution when the value function is  $V$ .

The  $n = 2$  result is implied by Proposition 1 in [Curello and Sinander \(2022\)](#). ■

### A.3 Proposition 3.6 Proof

*Proof.* If  $k = 1$ , the result is immediate, so let  $k \neq 1$ . For any pair of points  $x_1 \neq x_2 \in \Delta(\Theta)$  with corresponding optimal actions  $a_1 \neq a_2$ ,  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , and optimal action at  $x^\dagger := \lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2$ ,  $a^\dagger$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda T(x_1) + (1 - \lambda)T(x_2) > T(x^\dagger) &\Leftrightarrow \\ (k - 1)\left[\lambda \mathbb{E}_{x_1} u(a_1, \theta) + (1 - \lambda)\mathbb{E}_{x_2} u(a_2, \theta)\right] > (k - 1)\mathbb{E}_{x^\dagger} u(a^\dagger, \theta) &\Leftrightarrow \\ k > 1, \end{aligned}$$

recalling that  $T(x) := \hat{V}(x) - V(x)$ . ■