

# Multidimensional Heterogeneity and Product Design

E. Glen Weyl

joint work with André Veiga, Toulouse School of Economics (TSE)

University of Chicago and Toulouse School of Economics

Presentation Slides  
December 2011

# Core idea and motivation

Firms often design products to attract most valuable customers

- Insurers reduce coverage to drive away the sick
- “Soap” operas attract women who control purse
- Credit cards offer points, travel to attract big spenders

Salient, but theory literature not equipped to handle

- 1 Rothschild-Stiglitz (76), etc.: non-existence
  - Not very useful in applications...
- 2 Platforms literature largely ignores
- 3 Multidimensional screening opaque, special cases
  - Again hard to connect to applications
- 4 More recent literature enriches heterogeneity but...

We follow Einav and co-authors with rich heterogeneity

- But enrich instruments, allows to nest wide range of issues
- Each “effect” is intuitive, empirically measurable quantity

# Outline

- 1 Simple example develops core idea, key quantity
  - Cov ( preferences, contribution| marginal)
  - Insurance: marginal utility for coverage, cost of covering
  - In platforms, infinite series multiplier from sorting
- 2 General model and connection to literature
  - Formula classifying/quantifying effects, when they emerge
  - Taxonomy of several literatures using this
- 3 Series of examples illustrating applications, effects
  - 1 Competition in insurance and Rothschild-Stiglitz
  - 2 Broadcast media and soaps: non-transferable utility
  - 3 Credit cards and non-linear pricing
- 4 Technical issues and conclusion
  - Multiplicity, implementation and insulating tariffs
  - Conclusion and directions for future research

# A classic insurance example

Original Rotschild-Stiglitz context was insurance, so start there

- Monopoly (or planner) insurer chooses price  $P$ , coverage  $\rho$
- Key is to *add rich heterogeneity for smooth derivatives*
  - Potential users' types  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^T \sim f(\theta)$  smooth,  $T$  large
    - Income, sophistication, health, risk-preferences, etc.
  - Determines (quasi-linear) preferences  $u(\rho; \theta) - P$
  - But also *cost of coverage*  $c(\rho; \theta)$
- Participating users  $\Theta(P, \rho) \equiv \{\theta : u(\rho; \theta) \geq P\}$ 
  - Integrate number  $N \equiv \int_{\Theta} f$ , cost  $C \equiv \int_{\Theta} cf$ ,  $AC \equiv \frac{C}{N}$
- Marginal users  $\partial\Theta \equiv \{\theta : u(\rho; \theta) = P\}$ 
  - Integrate for # of marginals  $M \equiv \int_{\partial\Theta} f$ ,  $MC \equiv \frac{\int_{\partial\Theta} cf}{M} \equiv \tilde{c}$
- Also *average marginal utility*  $\bar{u}' \equiv \frac{\int_{\Theta} u' f}{N}$  and
  - *Average marginal utility among marginals*  $\tilde{u}' \equiv \frac{\int_{\partial\Theta} u' f}{M}$
  - Key because of Spence (1975) distinction

# Derivation

Useful to think of increasing  $\rho$  while holding  $N$  fixed

- By Leibnitz,  $\frac{\partial N}{\partial \rho} = M\tilde{u}'$ ,  $\frac{\partial N}{\partial P} = -M$ 
  - ⇒ To hold fixed  $N$ ,  $P$  must rise with  $\rho$  by  $\tilde{u}'$
- Then what is  $\left. \frac{\partial C}{\partial \rho} \right|_{N \text{ fixed}}$  ?
  - By Leibnitz, rises by  $N\bar{c}' + M\tilde{u}'c$ , but falls by  $M \cdot MC \cdot \tilde{u}'$
  - Total effect  $N\bar{c}'_{\rho} + M(\tilde{u}'c - MC \cdot \tilde{u}')$ ; but  $MC$  just  $\tilde{c}$ 
    - Recall that  $E[xy] - E[x]E[y] = Cov(x, y)$
  - ⇒  $\tilde{u}'c - \tilde{c} \cdot \tilde{u}' = Cov(u', c | \partial \Theta) \equiv \sigma$ , crucial quantity!
- Social welfare is  $\int_{\theta} u - C$ , optimal quantity just  $P = MC$ 
  - Derivative wrt  $\rho$  is  $N\bar{u}' - N\bar{c}' - M\sigma$
- Profits are  $NP - C$ , optimal quantity is  $MR = P - \frac{N}{M} = MC$ 
  - Cournot distortion  $\mu \equiv \frac{N}{M}; \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial \rho} = N\tilde{u}' - N\bar{c}' - M\sigma$

# Privately and social optimal pricing

Simple/intuitive social optimality, distortions on coverage

$$\underbrace{N(\bar{u}' - \bar{c}')}_{\text{classic optimality}} = \underbrace{M\sigma}_{\text{optimal "cream-skimming" (Bundorf et al., Forthcoming)}}$$

Private optimum similar, but incorporates *Spence distortion*:

$$N\left(\underbrace{\tilde{u}'}_{\text{Spence distortion}} - \bar{c}'\right) = M\sigma$$

- Classic Spence: cater to marginal not average consumer
  - Can only extract willingness of marginal to pay
  - Can go either way
- Then you were a tourist...

# A platform example

*Platforms*: “users” value and generate characteristics:

- 1 Payments: credit, debit, PayPal, etc.
- 2 Advertising: newspapers, websites, TV, etc.
- 3 Operating systems: smart phones, video games, etc.

Most common context for this covariance to matter:

- Also generates some nice (slightly) different economics
- Key now: users combine role generating  $\rho$  and consuming
  - User utility  $u(K; \theta) - P$  where  $K$  comes from...
  - Each user generating  $k(\theta)$ ,  $K = \int_{\Theta} k f$
- Increasing  $N$  reduces price by  $-\frac{1}{M}$  but also raises by  $\frac{\partial P}{\partial K} \frac{dK}{dN}$
- From earlier,  $\frac{\partial P}{\partial K} = \tilde{u}'$  and  $\frac{dK}{dN} = \tilde{k} + M\sigma \frac{dK}{dN}$
- Infinite series: attracting sorts more in (out), compounds

$$\implies \frac{dK}{dN} = \frac{\tilde{k}}{1-M\sigma} \implies \frac{dP}{dN} = -\frac{1}{M} + \frac{\tilde{k}}{1-M\sigma}$$

# Pricing platforms

Combining with earlier yields simple rules:

1 Social:

$$S \equiv C' - P = \tilde{k} \frac{\overbrace{u'N}^{\text{direct externality}}}{\underbrace{1 - M\sigma}_{\text{infinite series formula}}}$$

2 Private:

$$D \equiv C' + \mu - P = \tilde{k} \frac{\tilde{u}'N}{1 - M\sigma}$$

- Spence distortion can be magnified or mitigated
- Uncorrelated collapses to simple model with average
- Key feature is not contribution heterogeneity alone...
  - Key is covariance! Sorting effect of characteristic

# General model

Paper shows this is crucial in far broader model allowing for

- 1 Any number of *instruments* (e.g. non-linear pricing)  $\rho$ 
  - Need not include price so “non-transferable utility”
  - Also arbitrarily many endogenous characteristics  $\mathbf{K}$   $f$
- 2 Third-degree price discrimination (many “sides” to market)
- 3 (Symmetrically differentiated Bertrand) Competition
  - Fairly easy to relax, but maintains continuity with monopoly

Nests most contract theory, platforms, matching, static IO

- 1 Platform  $j$  profits are integral  $\Pi = \int_{\Theta^j} \pi(\rho^j, \mathbf{K}^j) f$
- 2 User  $i$ 's utility on platform  $j$  is  $u^j(\rho^j, \mathbf{K}^j; \theta_i)$
- 3 *Characteristic  $l$*  generated by users  $K_l^j = \int_{\Theta^j} k_l(\theta, \rho^j, \mathbf{K}^j) f$
- 4  $f, \mathbf{u}, \theta$  symmetric in exchanging firms  
 $\implies$  Natural to look for a symmetric equilibrium in  $\rho^j$

## New quantities in general formula

Now many instruments, need not include price; new concepts

- *Focal* instrument  $\rho^*$ ; like price adjusts to hold  $N$  fixed
- “Non-transferable utility”  $\iff \rho^* \neq P, P \notin \rho$
- Then  $\tilde{u}_\rho$  not well-defined: like income effects
  - Need to hold fixed number using  $\rho^*$ :  $\phi_\rho = \frac{\tilde{u}_\rho}{u_{\rho^*}}$
- For  $\rho \neq \rho^*$ ,  $\sigma_{u_\rho - \phi_\rho u_{\rho^*}, X} \equiv \text{Cov}(u_\rho - \phi_\rho u_{\rho^*}, X | \partial\Theta) \equiv \sigma(\rho, X)$
- $h$  may be  $\pi$  (profits) or  $\pi + u$  (welfare): spatial economy
  - “Intensive elasticity” just case when  $\frac{\partial \pi}{\partial \rho} \neq 0$ , like  $u$
  - $\overline{X_{\rho|\rho^*}} \equiv \overline{X_\rho - \phi_\rho X_{\rho^*}}$
- Finally, shadow value of characteristic  $\lambda_k$ 
  - Also for instrument, but always 0 because can create freely
  - Key difference between instruments, characteristics
- *Exiting*  $X$ , *switching*  $S$ ;  $H = X$  for planner,  $X + S$  for eq.
- Bolded things indicate vector

# General formula and effects

With all this (a bit daunting) very simple formula; focal:

$$\underbrace{\tilde{\pi}^H}_{\text{Akerlof-Einav-Finkelstein selection}} = \underbrace{\frac{N \overline{h_{\rho^*}} + \mathbf{k}_{\rho^*}^\top \lambda}{M^H - \tilde{u}_{\rho^*}}}_{\text{Cournot}/\mu} + \underbrace{M^H \frac{\sigma_{\rho^*, \pi + \mathbf{k}^\top \lambda}}{-\tilde{u}_{\rho^*}}}_{\text{if } \rho^* \neq P}$$

Thus all standard quantities show up generally

$$\underbrace{\lambda}_{\text{Recursive platform}} = \underbrace{M^H}_{\text{RS}} \overbrace{\sigma(\rho, \pi + \mathbf{k}^\top \lambda)}^{\text{sorting}} + N \underbrace{h_{\rho|\rho^*} + \mathbf{k}_{\rho|\rho^*}^\top \lambda}_{\text{Spence}} \overbrace{\quad}^{\text{Intensive}}$$

There is a lot here in full generality, but organizes many things

- Illustrate by accounting, connecting to literature, examples
- Some also have 3rd-degree discrimination (multiple sides)

# Table of effects

	Hetero. prefs.	Hetero. contrib.	Platform	$\rho \neq P$	$P \notin \rho$	2nd <sup>o</sup> disc.	Market power	Comp.
$\mu$							X	
Spence	X		O	O		O	X	
Death spiral		X					–	X
Smooth selection	X	X						X
$\sigma$	X	X1	X1O	X1O		X2	X	
RS blow-up		X	O	O			–	X
Finite cream-skimming	X	X1	X1O	X1O		X2	X	X
$\phi$					X			
Recursive			X				X	
Intensive effect						X	X	

# Related literatures

Two key contributions of paper are:

- 1 Novel  $\sigma$ , quantifies general sorting effect
  - Natural question: why didn't this show up before?
  - Different answers for different literature strands
    - 1 Platforms (empirics + theory), most IO ignored, thought hard
    - 2 Contract theory focused on one dimension, so bang-bang
    - 3 Recent (Einav, Levin...) empirical/computational
    - 4 Multi-D screening only examples, derivatives hard
- 2 General framework uniting literatures with price theory
  - Key idea: add *more* realistic heterogeneity to smooth
  - Makes possible to take derivatives, get  $\sigma$
  - But also easy to add in all other effects price theoretically

To illustrate, series of examples showing all effects

- Table shows previous literature, what examples will develop

# Table of literatures

$A$  = analytical,  $B$  = bang-bang extreme,  $C$  = closed-form examples,  $E$  = computational/empirical

	Eivan+ related	Empirical IO/platforms	Platform theory	Classical contract theory	Multi-D screen	Insurance	Broadcast	Credit cards
$\mu$		$A$	$A$	$A$	$C$	$A$	$A$	$A$
Spence		$E$	$A$	$A$	$C$	$A$	$A$	$A$
Death spiral	$A$	$B$				$A$		
Smooth selection	$A$	$E$			$C$	$A$		
$\sigma$	$E$			$B$	$C$	$A$	$A$	$A$
RS blow-up				$B$		$A$		
Finite cream- skimming					$C$	$A$		
$\phi$							$A$	
Recursive		$E$	$A$				$A$	
Intensive effect	$E$			$A$	$C$			$A$

## Setting up competition in the insurance model

Classic result is Rothschild-Stiglitz: no equilibrium

- This is because of *perfect* competition
- If we go to symmetrically differentiated, can quantify
- Start with two insurers; symmetry here means:
  - Cost of covering same on both plans given  $\rho$
  - Distribution of utilities symmetric
  - Sym. eq. in  $P, \rho$ : sufficient differentiation
- Two margins: *switching*  $S$  between, each *expansion*  $X$ 
  - By symmetry, same for each, size  $M^S$  and  $M^X$
- By symmetry, social optimum just change uniformly:

$$P = \tilde{c}^X$$
$$N(\bar{u}' - \bar{c}') = M^X \sigma^X$$

# Competition and its distortions

Competition just applies profit maximization to both margins

$$P = \tilde{c}^X + \overbrace{\frac{N}{M^S + M^X}}^{\text{Cournot distortion}} + \overbrace{\frac{M^S (\tilde{c}^S - \tilde{c}^X)}{M^S + M^X}}^{\text{Akerlof-Einav-Finkelstein (adverse) selection distortion}}$$

$$N \begin{pmatrix} \underbrace{\tilde{u}^{X+S}}_{\text{Spence distortion}} & -\bar{c}' \end{pmatrix} = M^X \sigma^X + \underbrace{M^S \sigma^S}_{\text{Rothschild-Stiglitz cream-skimming}}$$

We can read many classic and new results off:

- 1 As perfect competition, ( $M^S \rightarrow \infty$ ), no eq. as  $RScs \rightarrow \infty$
- 2 Comp. improves Cournot and  $\approx$  Spence ( $S$  like average)
- 3 Comp worsens selection and  $RScs$  (later infinitely)
  - Net on price likely good, bad on coverage with adverse
  - Price must be above  $AC$  with monopoly, blow up on coverage

# Broadcast media and the lack of transfers

In broadcast media, no price to viewers

- This lack of “transferable utility” adds two wrinkles as above
- Let’s model soap operas to illustrate:  $m \equiv$  melodrama
- Two *sides* to market: viewer and advertisers
- Viewers’ utility  $u^V(m; \theta^V)$ , advertisers  $\theta^A S - P^A$
- $S$  is total spending power of readers  $s(\theta^V)$
- Cost  $C(m, N^A, N^V)$ ; two changes w/o transfers:
  - 1 Marginal utility holding fixed number by  $m$ :  $\phi_A^V = \frac{\tilde{u}_A^V}{u_m^V}$
  - 2 *Relative covar.*:  $\sigma^V(A, s) \equiv \text{Cov}[u_A^V - \phi_A^V u_m^V, s \mid u^V = 0]$

$$\lambda^A = \underbrace{\phi_A C_m}_{\text{direct externality}} + \underbrace{M^V \frac{N^A P^A}{S} \sigma^V(A, s)}_{\text{boomerang sorting externality to advertisers}}$$

# Platform pricing without transfers

Profit-maximizing pricing/content provision then simple:

$$P^A = \mu^A + C_{N^A} - \tilde{a}\lambda^A$$

$$\underbrace{0}_{\text{Price}} = \underbrace{\frac{C_m}{MU_m^y}}_{\text{Cournot distortion}} + \underbrace{C_{N^y}}_{\text{marginal cost}} -$$

$$\underbrace{\frac{P^A N^A}{S}}_{\text{per-income price for ads}} \left( \underbrace{\sigma_{U_m, S}^y}_{\text{why soap operas}} + \underbrace{\tilde{s}}_{\text{standard externality}} \right)$$

Can also derive socially optimal prices...

- But requires stand on interpersonal comparisons
- No transfers assumption to rely on
- How to measure? Important in many literatures

## Fitting in non-linear pricing

Two-part tariff credit cards combine classic platform, multi-D

- Enrich, combine Rochet-Stole (02) and Rochet-Tirole (03)
  - Can extend to more general non-linear pricing
- Two sides: consumers  $\mathcal{C}$  and merchants  $\mathcal{M}$
- Fixed and linear prices  $P^C, p^C$ , linear to merchant  $p^M$ 
  - Consumers and merchants randomly matched
  - Merchants only choose to accept; consumers also intensive
- Merchant net value  $\theta^M$  from accepting
  - Accept iff  $\theta^M \geq p^M$ ; fraction  $N^M$  join
- Consumers choose  $q(p; \theta^C)$  conditional card purchases
  - Envelope:  $S^C(p^C; \theta^C) = \int_{p^C}^{\infty} q(\tilde{p}; \theta^C) d\tilde{p} - p^C q(p; \theta^C)$
  - Carry card if  $S^C N^M \geq P^C$ ; total fraction of purchases  $Q$
- Cost  $cQN^M$ , number of consumer  $N^C$

# Magnitudes and intuitions with non-linear pricing

$p^C, p^M$  fairly boring; socially optimal linear  $p^C = c - \overline{\theta^M}$

- Privately optimal follows straight from logic:

$$\underbrace{(p^M + p^C - c)}_{\text{Rochet-Tirole mark-up}} \left( \underbrace{M^C \text{Cov} \left[ \widetilde{S_{p^C}^C}, q \right]}_{\sigma} + \underbrace{N^C \frac{dq}{dp^C}}_{\text{intensive}} \right) = \underbrace{N^C (\bar{q} - \tilde{q})}_{\text{Spence}}$$

- $p^M$  replaces  $\overline{\theta^M}$  by Spence
- $S_{p^C}^C = q$  by envelope so  $\sigma = \widetilde{\text{Var}}[q]$
- To connect with literature, rearrange, define elasticities
  - $\widetilde{\epsilon}_X^C \equiv \frac{\tilde{q} M^C p}{Q}$ , average quantity-weighted *extensive elasticity*
  - $\overline{\epsilon}_I^C \equiv -\frac{E[\epsilon q]}{E[q]}$ , average quantity-weighted *intensive elasticity*

# Linear component under non-linear pricing

$$\underbrace{\frac{p^c - (c - p^M)}{p^c}}_{\text{Lerner's mark-up}} = \frac{\overbrace{1 - \frac{\tilde{q}}{\bar{q}}}^{\text{Spence}}}{\underbrace{\frac{\overline{\epsilon_X^c} \widetilde{\text{Var}}[q]}{\tilde{q}}}_{\text{Rochet-Stole sorting discipline}}} + \underbrace{\overline{\epsilon_I^c}}_{\text{Mussa-Rosen-Wilson}}$$

- Nests several classic papers:
  - ① If exiters average ( $\tilde{q} = \bar{q}$ ) no distortion
    - Bedre-Defolie and Calvano (2010) use for credit cards
    - Assume no ex-ante knowledge, so marginals same
  - ② If no platform, exit from bottom ( $p^M = \tilde{q} = \widetilde{\text{Var}}[q] = 0$ )...
    - Mussa-Rosen; Wilson formula  $\frac{p-c}{p} = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$
- Suggests RS, selection effect with competition

# Multiplicity, implementation and insulation

Problem with above analysis: ec's determined by users

- Given instruments, may be coordination problem
- Simple example: two sides  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  with  $u^S (N^{-S}; \theta^S)$
- Platform choose prices to each side, users coordinate
- Multiple  $\mathbf{N}$  given  $\mathbf{P}$ , but unique  $\mathbf{P}$  given  $\mathbf{N}$
- $N^{\mathcal{B}} \implies$  distribution of values  $\implies \frac{\partial P^{\mathcal{A}}}{\partial N^{\mathcal{A}}} < 0$
- If platform *could* choose quantities, easy
- But how can it *implement* more robustly to coordination?
- Condition prices on people on other side  $P^S (N^{-S})!$ 
  - 1 Choose target quantities  $(\widetilde{N}^{\mathcal{A}}, \widetilde{N}^{\mathcal{B}})$
  - 2 Charge *insulating tariff*  $P^S (N^{-S}) \equiv P^S (\widetilde{N}^S, N^{-S})$
- Armstrong, Rochet-Tirole solutions special cases
  - Armstrong homogeneous utility, guarantee utility level
  - RT2003 proportional, price proportional

## General conditions for insulation

What does this represent? White and Weyl (2011):

- Most internet companies had low initial prices
- ⇒ Reduced-form for dynamic strategy (Cabral 2011)

Things are a bit more complicated in this paper

- 1 Many ec's, not just quantities
- 2 Need not have price instrument

Nonetheless natural analogy *insulating platform design*:

- Allow *all instruments* to condition on ec's
  - Reduced for dynamic adjustment of platform characteristics
- Technical question: when is this possible?
  - Intuitively: “enough” instruments to fix characteristics
  - Formally,  $\left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{K}}{\partial \rho}\right]^{-1} \frac{\partial \mathbf{K}}{\partial \mathbf{K}}$  has bounded eigenvalues
  - Uniqueness: can't have too many  $\rho$ : also bound from below

## Directions for future research

Paper aims to make three contributions:

- 1 General-purpose IO/contract model
- 2 Use rich heterogeneity to smooth, price theory approach
- 3 “Intuitive” labeling/categorizing of “effects”

Take away: don't be intimidated by multi-D screening, platforms

- Quite naturally amenable to simple empirical work
- Applied theory and empirical applications in progress:
  - 1 Gale-Shapley matching and college admissions
  - 2 Cream-skimming and women's' work-life balance
- Crucial to combine with competition
  - Heterogeneity endogenous through multihoming
  - Work with Alex White extends *AER* paper to competition
  - Uses insulation; combine with insulating platform design
- Working with Fabinger on general richness of Weyl-Tirole