

# Monopoly

# Monopoly

## Overview

Definition: A firm is a monopoly if it is the **only** supplier of a product in a market. A monopolist's demand curve slopes down because firm demand equals industry demand.

Five cases:

- 1 Base Case (One price, perishable good, non-IRS Costs).
- 2 Natural Monopoly
- 3 Price Discrimination
- 4 **Bundling**
- 5 Durable Goods

# Price Discrimination

## Bundling

Good A and B are sold in fixed proportions, in a "package"

### Examples

- Movie distributors force theaters to acquire "bad" movies if they want to show good ones
- Photocopier manufacturers offer several goods: the copier, maintenance, and a package of both together

Why is this a profitable strategy?

# Price Discrimination

## Bundling

Example 1:

- Two types of consumers, unit demand, no complementarity between products:
- $WTP_{AB} = WTP_A + WTP_B$
- Assume  $MC = 0$

	Type 1 WTP	Type 2 WTP
A	9000	10000
B	3000	2000
AB	12000	12000

# Price Discrimination

## Bundling

- If sell separately,  $p_A = 9000$ ,  $p_B = 2000$ .  
 $\pi_A + \pi_B = 2(9000) + 2(2000) = 22000$
- If sell  $AB$ ,  $p_{AB} = 12000$ ,  $\pi_{AB} = 24000$

	Type 1 WTP	Type 2 WTP
A	9000	10000
B	3000	2000
AB	12000	12000

# Price Discrimination

## Bundling

Example 2:

	Type 1 WTP	Type 2 WTP
A	9000	10000
B	500	2000
AB	9500	12000

- If sell separately,  $p_A = 9000$ ,  $p_B = 2000$ .  
 $\pi_A + \pi_B = 2(9000) + 2000 = 20000$
- If sell  $AB$ ,  $p_{AB} = 9500$ .  $\pi_{AB} = 19000$ .

# Price Discrimination

## Bundling

What's different?

- In the first example, type 1 has higher demand for  $B$ , type 2 has higher demand for  $A$ .
- In the second example, type 2 has higher demand for both goods
- Intuition: bundling works when there is heterogeneity in preferences *across* goods.

# Price Discrimination

## Bundling

Example 3:

	Type 1 WTP	Type 2 WTP	Type 3 WTP
A	4000	3000	0
B	0	3000	4000
AB	4000	6000	4000

- If sell separately,  $p_A = 3000$ ,  $p_B = 3000$ .  $\pi_A + \pi_B = 3000 \times 4 = 12000$ .
- If sell  $AB$ ,  $p_{AB} = 4000$ .  $\pi_{AB} = 12000$ .
- If sell  $A$  and  $B$  and  $AB$ ,  $p_A = 4000$ ,  $p_B = 4000$ ,  $p_{AB} = 6000$ ,  $\pi_{mixed} = 14000$ .



# Price Discrimination

## Bundling

What's different?

- In this example, consumer type 2 has a fairly low valuation for the 2 products separately but a much higher valuation for the 2 together.
- In contrast, consumers 1 and 3 only value one of the two products.
- Firm can extract all surplus from all consumers through mixed bundling (offering both the bundle and its components).

# Price Discrimination

## Bundling: A rough description of the research literature

When does bundling increase profits? (Schmalensee (1984))

- Reservation prices for goods  $A$  and  $B$ , distributed according to  $F(v_A; v_B)$  across population (continuum of consumers),  $v_A, v_B \geq 0$ .
- Constant marginal costs,  $c_A, c_B$
- Allow *mixed* bundling, ie. provide menu with  $\{P_A, P_B, P_{AB}\}$  instead of just offering  $P_{AB}$  (pure bundling). Since one can set  $P_A$  and  $P_B$  to infinity, pure bundling is a special case of "mixed bundling" strategy.
- With Bivariate normal demand specification,  
 $f(v_A; v_B) \sim Normal([\mu_A, \mu_B], \Sigma)$

# Price Discrimination

## Bundling: A rough description of the research literature

- 1 Pure bundling vs. unbundled sales: with symmetric distribution, pure bundling is more profitable the lower the correlation of reservation values.
- 2 However, for any correlation pattern, pure bundling is still profitable if average willingness to pay is large enough compared to marginal cost.
- 3 For both conditions, can generally do better through mixed bundling.
- 4 In fact mixed bundling is always the most profitable alternative if reservation values are negatively correlated ( $\rho \leq 0$ ).