

Contests with Rank-Order Spillovers

Michael R. Baye, FTC & Indiana University
Dan Kovenock, University of Iowa
Casper de Vries, Erasmus University

The views expressed here are those of the authors and may not reflect those of the Federal Trade Commission or any of the individual Commissioners.

Overview: Applications

- Results apply/extend a variety of models/results in IO, behavioral economics, and game theory
 - Cover all standard contests and auctions, war of attrition, & all-pay auction
 - More exotic auctions and contests
 - Innovation contests with spillovers
 - Pricing games
 - Price matching policies
 - Behavioral economics (inequality aversion, loss aversion, regret, reference pricing)
 - Evolutionary equilibria (ESS)

Proposition 1: Characterization of Symmetric Pure-Strategy Equilibria

- (i) ≥ 0
- (ii) ≤ 0

Proposition 2: Characterization of Symmetric Mixed-Strategy Equilibria

- (i) $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $0 < \beta < 1$;
- (ii) $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $0 < \beta < 1$;
- (iii) $0 < \alpha < 1$ and either $0 < \beta < 1$ or $0 < \beta < 1$.



Proposition 2: Characterization of Symmetric Mixed-Strategy Equilibria (Continued)

* , *

$$* \quad \left(\frac{0}{\dots} \right) \dots, \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{if } 0 \\ \text{if } 0 \end{array} \right. ,$$

$$* \quad \left(\frac{\dots}{\dots} \right) \dots \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{if } 0; \quad 0; \quad 0 \\ \text{if } 0; \quad 0; \quad / \quad ; \quad / \quad 0 \\ \text{if } \quad \quad 0; \quad / \quad 0 \\ \text{if } 0; \quad 0; \quad / \quad ; \quad 0 \\ \text{if } 0; \quad 0; \quad ; \quad 0 \\ \text{if otherwise} \end{array} \right.$$

Proposition 3: Summary Characterization

(a)

$$\begin{matrix} 0; & 0, & 0, & 0 & & 0, & \leq 0, \\ / 0 & & & & & 0, & \leq & 0, \end{matrix}$$

(b)

$$0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0$$

(c)

$$0, \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0$$

(d)

Example: Partnership Dissolution (Self-Auction)

- Two partners wish to dissolve a partnership. Each values at 0.
- Submit bids simultaneously; high bidder gets other partner her bid gain ownership:

— if

Example: An Innovation Contest with Spillovers

- Extend Dasgupta's (1986) all-pay auction innovation contest model
 - Each firm's expenditure on R&D has beneficial spillover on rival

$$v_i = \alpha x_i + \beta x_j, \quad \alpha > \beta > 0$$

- Greater benefit to winner than loser ($\alpha > \beta$)
- This is a contest with $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 0$, and $\alpha > \beta$.
- Since $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$, Propositions 2 and 3 imply that the unique symmetric equilibrium is

*

Example: Varian/Rosenthal Sales Models



Example: Inequality Aversion in a Job Tournament

- Two workers compete in a winner-take-all fashion for a promotion

Example: Inequality Aversion in a Job Tournament (Continued)

- Propositions 1, 2 and 3 imply that the unique symmetric equilibrium is in mixed strategies and given by

$$* \quad \frac{1 - \mu}{\exp\left(\frac{1 - \mu}{\mu}\right) - 1}$$

on $(0, \frac{\mu}{1 - \mu})$

Example: Loss Aversion in a Job Tournament



Example: Winner Regret in Auctions

- First price auction with regret (Engelbrecht-Wiggans (1989), Engelbrecht-Wiggans and Katok (2007), and Filiz-Ozbay and Ozbay (2007)):

$$u_1, u_2 = \begin{cases} b_1 - \mu & \text{if } b_1 > b_2 \\ 0 & \text{if } b_1 \leq b_2 \end{cases}$$

- b_i is player i 's bid, v the value of the item, and $\mu \geq 0$ a "regret" parameter
- Winner regret refers to the fact that the high bidder derives disutility from leaving money on the table (the difference between the winning and losing bid). The payoffs may be rewritten as

$$u_1, u_2 = \begin{cases} v - \mu & \text{if } b_1 > b_2 \\ 0 & \text{if } b_1 \leq b_2 \end{cases}$$

- $v \in [0, 1]$, $\mu \in [0, 1]$, and -1 .
- Propositions 1 and 3 imply the unique symmetric equilibrium is

*

Example: Auctions with Winner and Loser Regret

- Can show both effects arise in this case

$$1, 2 \quad - \frac{\mu}{1} \quad \frac{1}{\mu} \quad \text{if} \\ \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{if} \quad .$$

- This is a with 1 , 1 , 0 , 1 , μ , 0 , $-$, $-\mu$, and 0 .

- When $\mu > 1$, Propositions 2 and 3 imply the unique symmetric equilibrium is

$$* \quad \left(\frac{1}{-\mu} \right) \cup \left(1 - \exp \left(-\frac{-\mu}{1} \right) \right)$$

on $0, \frac{1-\mu}{-\mu} \ln \left(\frac{1}{1-\mu} \right)$

- When $\mu < 1$, Proposition 2 yields the standard all-pay auction form: $\frac{1}{2}$.

Example: Evolutionary Stationary Strategies (ESS) in the All-Pay Auction

- One can also use Proposition 2 to find the unique symmetric ESS equilibrium in the standard two-player all-pay auction
- Finite agent ESS equilibrium of Schaffer (1988) requires each player maximize difference in payoffs:

$$1, 2 \quad \begin{array}{ccc} - & - & - \\ - & - & - \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{if} \\ \text{if} \end{array}$$

- This is a 2×2 with payoffs

$$1, 2$$

Concluding Remarks