Lecture 21

Markets, Mechanisms and Machines

David Evans and Denis Nekipelov

- Approach in Economics: study choices of individuals in "product space" or "space of commodities"
- Could treat information as commodity
 - Determine is value for consumers and producers
 - Construct demand and supply
 - Study market for information
- Characteristic feature of information: symmetric availability of information has significant effect on market outcomes



`Why' is what separates us from them, you from me. `Why' is the only real social power, without it you are powerless. And this is how you come to me, without `why,' without power.

- Information has both properties of "standard" commodities and has unique features
- Commodity properties
 - Can measure stock of information (accumulated knowledge; e.g. Wikipedia) and flow of information (incremental changes in the knowledge; e.g. edits to Wikipedia article)
- Unique properties
 - Information can be shared, but cannot be simply moved between parties (need a concept of "forgetting")
 - Information can be altered or deliberately misrepresented

- Information has both properties of "standard" commodities and has unique features
- Commodity properties
 - Can measure stock of information (accumulated knowledge; e.g. Wikipedia) and flow of information (incremental changes in the knowledge; e.g. edits to Wikipedia article)
- Unique properties
 - Information can be shared, but cannot be simply moved between parties (need a concept of "forgetting")
 - Information can be altered or deliberately misrepresented

- Information impacts quality of decisions under uncertainty
- Can measure its value by utility gains from better decisions
- Simple model: *S* states, s = 1, 2, ..., S with
- Probability distribution of state realization $P = \{p_s\}$
- Consumer can take actions $a \in A$
- Utility outcome is function of state and action:
 u(a,s) (ex post utility)
- Ex ante utility $EU(a, \mathbf{P}) = \Sigma_s p_s u(a,s)$

- Contrasts ex ante utility with ex post utility
- Ex post: choose $a_s = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in A} u(a,s)$
- Ex ante: choose $a^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in A} EU(a, \mathbf{P})$
- Given that $\Sigma_s p_s \max_{a \in A} u(a,s) \ge \max_{a \in A} \Sigma_s p_s u(a,s)$, ex post utility maximization always yields higher utility
- Difference is value of information service
 - Maximum willingness to pay to intermediary to eliminate uncertainty
- Similarly analyze value of improving information

- Can relate to financial risk hedging with options
 - Pay to postpone risky decisions until after realization of uncertainty
- Simple model: investment *I* in asset with return *R*(*s*), monotone in *s* with density of distribution of *s*, *f*(*s*) with support on [0,1]
- Assume that $R(0) \le I \le R(1)$, but $\int R(s) f(s) ds \ge I$
 - There is a risk to loose investment
 - However, for risk-neutral player it is optimal to invest

- Expected profit from investment is $\int [R(s) I]f(s)ds > ds$
- An option, is a contract that allows to buy asset only when return above a given threshold
- What is the value *V* of such contract?
 - There is threshold state s^* for exercising option
 - If investor's utility from "money" is *u* then expected utility from unhedged investment is $\int u(R(s) I)f(s)ds$
 - Expected utility from hedged investment is $\int u(R(s) - V)f(s)ds + u(I-V)F(s^*) = \int u(R(s) - I)f(s)ds$
 - s^* A risk-neutral investor hedges with $R(s^*)=I$

Types of "Information Environments"

- Verifiable information: can be demonstrated to outsiders according to an accepted standard of evidence or proof.
 - Recall: we can use cryptography to verify information
 - Contractable
- Observable information: can be seen by all parties of transaction but may not be provable to external observers
 - Can only rely on incentives to enforce actions based on this information
- Private information: known only to one party in transaction
 - Explicitly kept secret and requires formation of beliefs
 - Recall: auctions

Asymmetry of information

- Ex ante asymmetry vs asymmetry arising during transaction
- Adverse selection: ex ante asymmetry
 - Individuals have private types that "principal" (insurer, employer) does not observe
- Moral hazard: asymmetry during transaction
 - Individuals have private actions (e.g. effort) that principal does not observe
- Typically consider contract between principal and agent
 - Principal designs contract to optimize her objective
 - Agent chooses actions that optimize her utility subject to constraints of contract

- Unique property of information is difficulty to transfer it entirely from one individual to another (instead of sharing)
- Control over information sharing is linked with concept of privacy
 - Not sharing enough information prohibits optimal allocation and leads to welfare loss
 - Sharing "too much" information may allow price discrimination (or other worse forms of discrimination)
- Privacy protection trade-offs costs and benefits of information asymmetry

- Spence (1973): "The lemon market"
 - To avoid market collapse individuals may engage in costly "signaling" to reveal their type
- Gottlieb and Smetters (2011): 9 out of 15 top MBA programs in the US do not disclose student grades to employers
- Simple model: Ability of MBA student $\theta \in [0,1]$ produces grade g with effort cost g/θ
- When student graduates θ is her productivity at work
- With public grades, offered wage will depend on g
- When grades are not public, employers have to pay the same wage to all MBA graduates

• Utility of graduate

 $U(w, g, \theta) = w - g/\theta$

- Profit of the firm is θ w
- Assume that θ takes values on [0,1]
- This principal-agent setting of a sequential game:
 - 1. MBA graduate makes decision to exert effort by choosing g
 - 2. Firms make competitive offers *w*
 - 3. MBA graduate accepts or rejects it

- Find grade-dependent wage w(g)
 - MBA student chooses effort (expressed in grade g) to maximize utility $U(w(g), g, \theta)$ with respect to
 - FOC: $w'(g)=1/\theta$, which implicitly defines $g(\theta)$
 - Firms make competitive offers w(g)
 - Since firms know w(g), they know mapping $g(\theta)$
 - Thus firm can infer θ from observing grade g
 - Competitive offer is then $w=\theta$
 - This means that $w(g) = \theta = 1/w'(g)$
 - Solve differential equation to get

 $w(g) = (2g)^{1/2}$ (calibration w(0) = 0)

Ensure separating equilibria

- Students with different abilities choose different effort
- In this equilibrium $g^*(\theta) = \theta^2/2$ (students with higher ability earn higher grades)
- Equilibrium payment $w^*(g) = \theta$ and utility $U^*(\theta) = \theta/2$
- In "grade privacy" regime firms offer uniform wage $w_U = E[\theta]$
- Grade privacy is optimal if $U^*(\theta) \le E[\theta]$, i.e. $E[\theta] \ge 1/2$
 - MBA students have to be "selectively smart"