

DISCUSSION PAPER

No 126

Consumer Myopia, Competition and the Incentives to Unshroud Add-on Information

Tobias Wenzel

December 2013

IMPRINT

DICE DISCUSSION PAPER

Published by

düsseldorf university press (dup) on behalf of
Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, Faculty of Economics,
Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE), Universitätsstraße 1,
40225 Düsseldorf, Germany
www.dice.hhu.de

Editor:

Prof. Dr. Hans-Theo Normann
Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE)
Phone: +49(0) 211-81-15125, e-mail: normann@dice.hhu.de

DICE DISCUSSION PAPER

All rights reserved. Düsseldorf, Germany, 2013

ISSN 2190-9938 (online) – ISBN 978-3-86304-125-0

The working papers published in the Series constitute work in progress circulated to stimulate discussion and critical comments. Views expressed represent exclusively the authors' own opinions and do not necessarily reflect those of the editor.

Consumer Myopia, Competition and the Incentives to Unshroud Add-on Information*

Tobias Wenzel^{1,2,†}

¹Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE)

²Universität Düsseldorf

December 2013

Abstract

This paper studies unshrouding decisions in a framework similar to Gabaix and Laibson (2006), but considers an alternative unshrouding mechanism where the impact of advertising add-on information depends on the number of unshrouding firms. We show that shrouding becomes less prevalent as the number of competing firms increases. With unshrouding costs a non-monotonic relationship between the number of firms and unshrouding may arise.

Keywords: Bounded rationality; Add-on pricing; Shrouding

JEL-Classification: D40; D80; L10

*I would like to thank Hans-Theo Normann and Irina Suleymanova as well as two reviewers for very helpful suggestions and comments.

[†]Email: tobias.wenzel@dice.uni-duesseldorf.de; Address: Universität Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE), Universitätsstrasse 1, 40225 Düsseldorf, Germany.

1 Introduction

For the functioning of markets, information and transparency on the consumer side are essential. The degree of consumer information can be heavily influenced by firm strategy, often to the detriment of consumers. One popular business strategy in this respect is to hide information over add-ons with the aim to charge unaware consumers overpriced fees. Prominent examples for this strategy, for instance, include the pricing of printer and corresponding cartridges or the pricing of current accounts and overdraft fees as add-on.^{1,2}

In a recent paper, Gabaix and Laibson (2006), henceforth GL, analyze firms' incentives to shroud such add-on information in a competitive environment. They show that if the number of myopic consumers, who do not foresee high add-on prices or underestimate add-on consumption, are sufficiently high, an equilibrium with high add-on fees and shrouding of add-on information exists. Base good prices, however, are low as firms want to attract many consumers who buy the overpriced add-on. In this equilibrium, consumers who are aware of this pricing strategy (sophisticated consumers in the terminology of GL) substitute away from add-on consumption. In GL, the existence of such a shrouding equilibrium is independent of the number of firms competing in a market, leading to the conclusion that intensifying competition does not improve information on the consumer side.

In GL, unshrouding of add-on information has two effects. Firstly, sophisticated consumers can now observe the add-on price. Secondly, if at least one firm decides to unshroud a fraction of myopic consumers is educated and becomes aware of the add-on. In this paper, we propose an alternative unshrouding mechanism where the number of myopic consumers who become educated by unshrouding increases with the number of unshrouding firms. The reason for this modification is that it is more likely that a myopic consumer picks up that information and becomes aware of the add-on if more firms send out advertising messages.

¹In practice, consumers might often be informed about the (high) prices of printer cartridges, but might underestimate their importance and, hence, underestimate the total costs of buying a certain printer. In this context, an unshrouding strategy by a firm might include the disclosure of the total cost of printing, for example, by providing typical consumer examples.

²See Armstrong and Vickers (2012) for a discussion of such strategies in the retail banking industry.

We characterize the equilibrium of the shrouding game and provide two arguments why in markets with many competitors shrouding of information may be less prevalent. Firstly, unshrouding equilibria exist for a wider range of parameter values if the number of competing firms increases. The reason is that, in our setup, a strategic complementarity in unshrouding incentives arises (Bulow et al., 1985). The more firms unshroud add-on information, the larger are the incentives for other firms to unshroud as well as less myopic consumers, who can be fooled by high add-on prices, remain in the market. This result is in contrast to GL. Secondly, as in GL, under a wide range of parameters multiple equilibria exist (all firms shrouding and all firms unshrouding). Thus, equilibrium selection is an issue. As the number of firms increases, unshrouding equilibria become more favorable in terms of risk considerations making it more likely that firms coordinate on the unshrouding equilibrium. In particular, we show that the parameter range, where the unshrouding equilibrium is picked according to risk dominance (Harsanyi and Selten, 1988) and to global games (Carlsson and van Damme, 1993), becomes larger as competition intensifies. Given these two reasons, this paper therefore argues that shrouding of add-on information may be less likely to be observed in competitive markets, and fostering market entry may be an effective tool to raise market transparency and consumer information.

The paper is also related to recent work by Heidhues et al. (2012) who analyze a model with perfect substitutes where firms may shroud one price component (instead of an add-on). The authors demonstrate that shrouding does only take place in concentrated markets. However, with positive unshrouding costs an unshrouding equilibrium ceases to exist. We also show that intensified competition decreases incentives to shroud, however, in contrast, in our framework an unshrouding equilibrium can also exist in the presence of unshrouding costs.

More generally, the paper is related to the literature that analyzes competition in the presence of behaviorally biased consumers and on firm strategy how to exploit such imperfect behavior.³ For instance, Spiegel (2006) considers a model where complicated products have multiple price elements which all need to be evaluated to infer a product's total price, but consumers only

³A survey on the impact of competition in markets where consumers exhibit behavioral biases is provided by Huck and Zhou (2011) and a textbook treatment is provided by Spiegel (2011).

base their purchase decision on one single element. Piccione and Spiegler (2012) and Chioveanu and Zhou (2013) develop models where consumer can be confused by different price frames. Carlin (2009) and Gu and Wenzel (2013) study firm's incentives to use obfuscation strategies to impede consumers' ability to compare different offers.

2 The model

The model is based on Gabaix and Laibson (2006), but differs in the effect of unshrouding. In contrast to GL, the share of myopic consumers who becomes educated due to unshrouding depends on the number of unshrouding firms.

We consider an oligopoly market where $n \geq 2$ firms offer a base good and an add-on. Each consumer demands at most one unit of the base good and one unit of the add-on where the add-on can only be purchased from the firm where the base good has been bought. All firms produce the base good and the add-on at no costs.

Base good prices, p_i , are observable by all consumers. Add-on prices, \hat{p}_i , however, can only be observed if firms advertise them. There are two types of consumers: myopic and sophisticated consumers. Sophisticated consumers are aware of the add-on and form beliefs about add-on prices if they are shrouded. Myopic consumers are completely unaware of the add-on and, hence, base their purchase decision solely on base-good prices.⁴ Initially, the share of myopic (sophisticated) consumers is α ($1 - \alpha$), where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Firms can unshroud add-on information, that is, advertise their add-on fees. Unshrouding has two consequences. Firstly, if a firm decides to unshroud, sophisticated consumers learn the add-on price charged by this firm. Secondly, by unshrouding some myopic consumers become aware of the add-on and behave like sophisticated consumers. In contrast to GL, we assume that the fraction of consumers that becomes sophisticated depends on the number of unshrouding firms. Define $\mu(k)$ as the share of myopic consumers who remain myopic if k firms decide to unshroud. We assume that $\mu(k)$ is a decreasing

⁴Kosfeld and Schüwer (2011) analyze a variant of GL where firms can (imperfectly) discriminate between sophisticated and myopic consumer.

function of the number of unshrouding firms, $\frac{\partial \mu(k)}{\partial k} < 0$. Conversely, if k firms unshroud, a fraction $(1 - \mu(k))$ of myopic consumers becomes sophisticated.

There are several reasons why a larger number of unshrouding firms increases the number of sophisticated consumers. Firstly, if unshrouding firms send out advertising messages randomly to consumers it is more likely that a consumer receives an advertising message if more firms advertise. Secondly and alternatively, suppose that not all myopic consumers pay attention to add-on prices even if they receive disclosure information. For instance, this could be because some consumers do not understand that they will want to buy the add-on in the future. However, if consumers receive multiple warnings and repeatedly receive information on high add-on fees there might be a larger likelihood that they pick up this information eventually and behave accordingly. With both interpretations, we would argue that the number of consumers becoming informed increases in the number of unshrouding firms. In Section 4 we provide a simple microfoundation based on advertising that derives a function $\mu(k)$.

Firms can charge a maximal price of \bar{p} for the add-on. Sophisticated consumers can avoid buying the add-on by turning to an outside substitution at a cost e . As in GL, sophisticated consumers decide whether to avoid the add-on at the same stage where they decide on the base-good purchase.

To model competition in the base-good market we follow GL. Define x_i as the anticipated net surplus of buying the base good from firm i relative to the net surplus from buying the next best alternative. As we solve for symmetric equilibria, the next best alternative is the symmetric equilibrium price charged by all other firms. Equilibrium prices are denoted by an asterisk.

The anticipated net surplus for sophisticated consumers equals

$$x_i = [p^* + \min(e, E\hat{p}^*)] - [p_i + \min(e, E\hat{p}_i)], \quad (1)$$

where $E\hat{p}_i$ and $E\hat{p}^*$ are the expected add-on prices.

For myopic consumers, ignoring add-on purchases, the anticipated net surplus is

$$x_i = p^* - p_i. \quad (2)$$

The probability that a consumer chooses to buy the base good from firm i

is denoted by $D(x_i)$ which depends on the anticipated net surplus from this alternative. This demand function strictly increases with x_i and is bounded between zero and one.⁵

We study the following three-stage game:

- In stage 1, firms set prices for the base good, p_i , as well as for the add-on \hat{p}_i . In addition, each firm decides whether to unshroud add-on information.
- In stage 2, consumers decide from which firm to buy the base good. Sophisticated consumers (and myopic consumers who have become sophisticated) can also decide whether to substitute away from the add-on.
- In stage 3, myopic consumers buy the add-on. Sophisticated consumers buy the add-on only if they have not substituted away at stage 2.

3 Results

This section provides the equilibrium of the game. The following Proposition states equilibrium shrouding decisions:

Proposition 1. Let $\underline{\alpha} = \frac{e}{\bar{p}}$ and $\bar{\alpha} = \frac{e}{\bar{p}\mu(n-1)}$, where $\underline{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$.

i) If $\alpha \geq \underline{\alpha}$, there exists a shrouding equilibrium where all firms shroud add-on information. Firms choose an add-on price $\hat{p}^* = \bar{p}$ and all sophisticated consumers substitute away from add-on consumption.

ii) If $\alpha \leq \bar{\alpha}$, there exists an unshrouding equilibrium where all firms unshroud add-on information. Firms choose an add-on price $\hat{p}^* = e$ and all sophisticated consumers decide to purchase the add-on.

Proof: see the Appendix.

⁵Formally, such a demand function can be derived by a random-utility model (e.g., Anderson et al., 1992).

The firms' shrouding decisions depend on the number of myopic consumers in the market. A shrouding equilibrium exists if the share of myopic consumers is larger than some critical number, $\underline{\alpha}$. Conversely, an unshrouding equilibrium exists if the number of myopic consumers is sufficiently low, $\alpha \leq \bar{\alpha} = \frac{e}{\bar{p}\mu(n-1)}$. Note that, as in GL, for some parameters ranges, multiple equilibria exist. For $\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$, both a shrouding and an unshrouding equilibrium exist. Shrouding is the unique symmetric equilibrium if $\alpha > \bar{\alpha}$, and unshrouding is the unique symmetric equilibrium if $\alpha < \underline{\alpha}$.

In GL, the conditions for a shrouding or an unshrouding equilibrium to exist, are independent of the number of competitors (n). That is, according to GL, whether or not we should observe shrouding of add-on information is independent of the competitive pressure in an industry. This can best be seen by noting that in GL $\mu(k) = \mu$ is a constant and does not depend on the number of unshrouding firms.⁶ This is in contrast to our model.

In the following, we will argue that, in our setup, shrouding becomes less prevalent if competition becomes more intense. We provide two arguments for this claim. First, we will show that as the number of firms increases the parameter range for which an unshrouding equilibrium exists increases. Secondly, we show that the unshrouding equilibrium becomes more favorable in terms of risk consideration with a larger number of firms. This is relevant as the range where multiple equilibria exist becomes larger with more firms.

An unshrouding equilibrium exists if $\alpha < \bar{\alpha} = \frac{e}{\bar{p}\mu(n-1)}$. It can be easily seen that this parameter range increases with the number of firms in the market:

$$\frac{\partial \bar{\alpha}}{\partial n} = -\frac{e}{\bar{p}[\mu(n-1)]^2} \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial n} > 0. \quad (3)$$

Proposition 2. As the number of firms increases, the parameter range, for which an unshrouding equilibrium exists, increases.

Proposition 2 shows that the existence of an unshrouding equilibrium depends on the intensity of competition. The reason for this result is a strategic complementarity (in the sense of Bulow et al. (1985)) in unshrouding incen-

⁶In GL, the corresponding cut-off values are $\underline{\alpha} = \frac{e}{\bar{p}}$ and $\bar{\alpha} = \frac{e}{\bar{p}\mu}$. Both values are independent of the number of firms, n .

tives. For given (base good and add-on) prices, each unshrouding firm reduces the number of myopic consumers and, hence, increases the incentives to unshroud for other firms as well. This is simply because the number of myopic consumers who would buy the expensive (shrouded) add-on becomes smaller with more unshrouding competitors. In consequence, unshrouding is more likely to be an equilibrium if the number of competitors is large, even if the initial number of myopic consumers is high.

In Heidhues et al. (2012) a larger number of firms also makes unshrouding more likely. The mechanism underlying their result differs however. In their model with a potentially shrouded price component, an unshrouding firm can attract additional consumers from competitors by adopting a transparent price strategy, and such a strategy is only worthwhile if competition is sufficiently intense.

Note, however, that as the number of firms increases, the parameter range with multiple equilibria also becomes larger, that is, the interval $[\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ becomes larger.⁷ Hence, equilibrium selection is an issue. In our case, for any given base good price, unshrouding is a relatively safe strategy yielding a safe payoff of e for every attracted customer. There is risk associated with the shrouding strategy. The payoff for selling the add-on decreases in the number of unshrouding firms. If few firms unshroud a high payoff from add-on sales can be expected, however, the payoff is low if many firms decide to unshroud as the number of myopic consumers would be small in that case.

To select among equilibria, we use the notion of risk dominance by Harsanyi and Selten (1988) and the selection criterion based on a global games approach offered by Carlsson and van Damme (1993). Both criteria take risk considerations into account and deliver similar results.⁸ A good argument for selecting equilibria in terms of risk is also given in laboratory experiments. Among others, van Huyck et al. (1990) and Schmidt et al. (2003) show that in coordination games risk dominated equilibria are more likely to be chosen by actual players.

We find:

⁷As shown above the upper bound increases with n and the lower bound is independent of n .

⁸In the case of two players, both criteria coincide, but deviate for a larger number of players. However, qualitatively similar results arise when applying either of these criteria (Kim, 1996).

Proposition 3. As the number of firms increases, the parameter range, where the unshrouding equilibrium is the selected equilibrium according to risk-dominance and according to global games, increases.

Proof: see the Appendix.

Propositions 2 and 3 provide two arguments why unshrouding of add-on information becomes more prevalent as the intensity of competition increases: Unshrouding becomes an equilibrium for a larger parameter range and, in case of multiple equilibria, the unshrouding equilibrium becomes more favorable in terms of risk. This is intuitively appealing as, with many firms, it is more likely that at least some firms unshroud making it more risky to shroud the add-on. In consequence, the riskless unshrouding option becomes more attractive. The policy implication we can draw from this is that fostering entry of more firms can have, besides the positive competitive effect on base good competition,⁹ the beneficial effect of promoting market transparency by increasing firms' incentives to educate consumers.

4 Example

The analysis so far has only assumed that $\mu(k)$ is decreasing in the number of unshrouding firms. This section considers a simple microfoundation based on advertising that derives such a function.

Example 1

Suppose that each unshrouding firm sends out an advertising message which is received and understood by a myopic consumer with probability $\lambda \in (0, 1)$.¹⁰ Assuming that messages are independent from each other, then if k firms decide to unshroud and send out an advertising message, a fraction $(1 - \lambda)^k$ of myopic consumers do not pick up that information and remains myopic while a fraction $1 - (1 - \lambda)^k$ receives and understands the disclosure information. Then, $\mu(k) = (1 - \lambda)^k$ and $\frac{\partial \mu(k)}{\partial k} = (1 - \lambda)^k \ln(1 - \lambda) < 0$.

⁹See GL, for a discussion on this issue.

¹⁰For costly advertising we refer to the discussion in Section 5.

As $\frac{\partial \mu(k)}{\partial k} < 0$ our results from Propositions 2 and 3 immediately apply and, as the number of firms is increased, the parameter range with an unshrouding equilibrium increases. Interestingly, in this example, it can also be shown that, if the number of firms becomes sufficiently large, $\bar{\alpha}$ eventually becomes larger than one, and unshrouding is an equilibrium for all $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. This critical number of competing firms can be calculated explicitly:

$$n > 1 + \frac{\ln\left[\frac{e}{p}\right]}{\ln[1 - \lambda]}. \quad (4)$$

Hence, if competition is sufficiently intense, unshrouding is always an equilibrium, independent of the initial level of consumer myopia (as measured by α).

Example 2

In example 1, it is assumed that the probability that a myopic consumer receives any given advertising message is independent of the number of firms in the market. As a consequence, if all firms in the market decide to unshroud, the number of consumers who become aware of add-ons is higher in larger markets. In this section, we consider an example where the probability that a consumer receives a given advertising message depends on the number of firms. In other words, the impact of advertising is related to a firm's market share.

Suppose that a myopic consumer receives an advertising message with a probability of $1 - (1 - \lambda)^{\frac{1}{n}}$. Hence, in large markets (high n) a given advertising message has a smaller effect. Then, the share of myopic consumers who do not receive any message if k firms choose to advertise add-on information is $\mu(k) = (1 - \lambda)^{\binom{k}{n}}$.¹¹ As $\frac{\partial \mu(k)}{\partial k} = \frac{1}{n}(1 - \lambda)^{\frac{k}{n}} \ln(1 - \lambda) < 0$, the results from Propositions 2 and 3 apply.

¹¹Note that, with this formulation, if all firms decide to unshroud the number of consumers who become aware of add-ons is independent of the number of competing firms. That is, $\mu(k = n) = (1 - \lambda)$.

5 Costly unshrouding

So far, unshrouding add-on information has been costless. Now suppose there is a (fixed) cost $c > 0$ associated with unshrouding. In general, incentives to unshroud will be lower with unshrouding costs.

Notice first that, with perfect competition (base products and add-ons are homogenous products), unshrouding equilibria cannot exist because the average profit level per consumer is competed down toward marginal cost (zero, in our case) and firms would earn negative profits if unshrouding would take place. This is the case analyzed in Heidhues et al. (2012). However, if firms have market power, unshrouding equilibria may still exist, though under more restrictive conditions than in the base case.

As the incentives to shroud/unshroud are difficult to analyze with general demand functions we now use the circular city approach to model differentiated base goods where the degree of product differentiation / market power is denoted by the transport cost parameter t (Salop, 1979).¹² An unshrouding equilibrium exists under the following conditions:

Proposition 4. Define $\hat{\alpha} = \frac{ne+2\sqrt{t(t-cn^2)}-2t}{n\bar{p}\mu(n-1)}$. Then, a symmetric unshrouding equilibrium exists if

- i) $\alpha \leq \hat{\alpha}$,
- ii) $\frac{t}{n^2} \geq c$.

Proof: see the Appendix.

The first condition states that for an unshrouding equilibrium to exist, the share of myopic consumers must not be too large. The second condition states unshrouding costs must not be too high to ensure non-negative profits in an unshrouding equilibrium. Note that, for $c = 0$, condition i) simplifies to $\hat{\alpha} = \frac{e}{\bar{p}\mu(n-1)} = \bar{\alpha}$, the condition from the base model without unshrouding costs (see Proposition 1). Condition 2 is always fulfilled with $c = 0$.

¹²Qualitatively similar results are obtained in the case of a random-utility model as in Anderson et al. (1992), however the analysis is less tractable.




Figure 1: Existence of unshrouding equilibrium

We now analyze the impact of the number of firms on the existence of an unshrouding equilibrium. Suppose unshrouding costs are not too high such that condition ii) is met. Then, increasing the number of firms has two effects. First, as in the base model without unshrouding costs, shrouding becomes a less attractive option if many other firms have unshrouded so that the number of remaining myopic consumers is small. This is because $\mu(k)$ decreases with k . Second, as with positive $c > 0$, unshrouding profits become rather low if there are many firms and the incentives to deviate from unshrouding to avoid paying c rises with the number of firms. This can be seen by noting that $\frac{\partial \hat{\alpha}}{\partial n} |_{\mu=const.} < 0$. The overall impact of the number of firms depends on the strength of those two effects and, in particular, on the level of the unshrouding cost. We illustrate this by using $\mu(k) = (1 - \lambda)^k$ from example 1 and using parameter values $\bar{p} = 1, e = 0.5, \lambda = 0.3, t = 1$ and two levels of unshrouding costs: low unshrouding cost ($c = 0.025$) and high unshrouding cost ($c = 0.05$).¹³ The results are displayed in Figure 1. The left panel shows that, with low unshrouding costs, the result from the base model is confirmed. The existence of an unshrouding equilibrium is more likely with more firms. With high unshrouding costs, the impact of competition is non-monotonic: If the number of firms is increased in a concentrated market the scope for an unshrouding equilibrium rises while increasing the number of firms in an already unconcentrated market leads to a smaller parameter range for which an unshrouding equilibrium exists.

To sum up, the incentives to unshroud are lower with unshrouding costs.

¹³We find qualitatively similar results for other parameter values.

However, unshrouding equilibria still exist and the impact of more intense competition can be positive provided that unshrouding costs are not too high. For high levels of unshrouding cost we observe a non-monotonic relationship where unshrouding is likely for an intermediate market concentration, but less prevalent for very competitive and very concentrated markets.

6 Conclusion

This paper has revisited shrouding of add-on information in the framework of Gabaix and Laibson (2006), but has modified the unshrouding mechanism. The main conclusion of the paper is that more intense competition may shift industry behavior toward unshrouding. We have provided two arguments in favor of this. Firstly, unshrouding becomes an equilibrium for a larger parameter range. Secondly, in the parameter range where multiple equilibria exist, unshrouding becomes more favorable in terms of risk. From this we conclude that fostering market entry may be an effective tool to increase market performance, even in situations where initial consumer information is poor.

Introducing unshrouding costs qualifies our results somewhat. For small level of unshrouding costs, unshrouding still becomes more prevalent if the number of firms is increased. However, for higher unshrouding costs a non-monotonic relationship between the number of firms and unshrouding may be observed.

A Appendix

Derivation of Proposition 1

The proof follows the one in Gabaix and Laibson (2006). The existence of symmetric equilibrium base-good prices is ensured by Caplin and Nalebuff (1991).

Consumers form the following beliefs: If a firm shrouds, sophisticated consumers rationally anticipate high add-on prices (\bar{p}) to arise which is the profit-maximizing

add-on price. Hence, a consumer chooses the outside option at cost e . If a firm unshrouds, a sophisticated consumer can observe the chosen add-on price. Myopic consumers do not form beliefs about add-on prices. Given these beliefs it is optimal for a firm to charge an add-on price of \bar{p} if it shrouds and choose price e if it unshrouds.

We now determine equilibrium shrouding decisions. Define $\underline{\alpha} = \frac{e}{\bar{p}}$ and $\bar{\alpha} = \frac{e}{\bar{p}\mu(n-1)}$.

i) Suppose that $\alpha \geq \underline{\alpha}$. We show that all firms shrouding add-on prices is an equilibrium.

Suppose that all firms except firm i shroud the add-on and set an add-on price $\hat{p} = \bar{p}$. If firm i also decides to shroud, it optimally sets an add-on price $\hat{p}_i = \bar{p}$, leading to profits of

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_s &= (1-\alpha)D(-p_i - e + p^* + e)[p_i] + \alpha D(-p_i + p^*)[p_i + \bar{p}] \\ &= D(-p_i + p^*)[p_i + \alpha\bar{p}].\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

The first term are profits from sophisticated consumers who only demand the base good and avoid paying for the add-on by incurring costly effort. Hence, firm i earns an amount p_i for each sophisticated consumer. The second term gives the income from myopic consumers who purchase both the base good as well as the add-on. From each of those consumers firm i receives $(p_i + \bar{p})$.

If instead firm i decides to unshroud the add-on, it optimally sets an add-on price of $\hat{p}_i = e$ so that sophisticated consumers also buy the add-on. For any price above e sophisticated consumers would prefer the outside option at cost e . Firm i 's profits are then

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_u &= [1 - \alpha\mu(1)]D(-p_i - e + p^* + e)[p_i + e] \\ &\quad + \alpha\mu(1)D(-p_i + p^*)[p_i + e] \\ &= D(-p_i + p^*)[p_i + e].\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

With unshrouding, both myopic and sophisticated consumers buy the add-on from firm i . Hence, firm i earns $(p_i + e)$ per consumer. As a consequence, the profits with unshrouding are independent of the shares of myopic and sophisticated consumers.

Comparing (5) and (6) reveals that shrouding leads to higher profits if $\Pi_s \geq \Pi_u \Leftrightarrow \alpha \geq \frac{e}{\bar{p}} = \underline{\alpha}$. Hence, if $\alpha \geq \underline{\alpha}$ no firm has an incentive to deviate from shrouding the add-on and a symmetric equilibrium wherein all firms shroud exists.

Finally, let us derive the base-good price in a shrouding equilibrium. The first-order condition with respect to the base-good price p_i is given by $(p_i + \alpha\bar{p})D'(-p_i + p^*) +$

$D(-p_i + p^*) = 0$. Solving for the symmetric equilibrium price yields $p^* = \frac{D(0)}{D'(0)} - \alpha\bar{p}$. Firms earn profits of $D(0)^2/D'(0)$.

ii) Next, suppose that $\alpha \leq \bar{\alpha}$. We show that in this case an equilibrium exists where all firms unshroud.

Suppose that all firms except firm i unshroud the add-on and set an add-on price $\hat{p}^* = e$. If firm i also decides to unshroud the add-on, it optimally sets an add-on price of $\hat{p}_i = e$. Firm i 's profits are then

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_u &= [1 - \alpha\mu(n)]D(-p_i - e + p^* + e)[p_i + e] \\ &+ \alpha\mu(n)D(-p_i + p^*)[p_i + e] \\ &= D(-p_i + p^*)[p_i + e].\end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

The first term are the profits from selling the base good and the add-on to sophisticated consumers and the second term from selling to the myopic consumers. Again, with unshrouding, overall profits are independent from the share of myopic and sophisticated consumers.

If instead firm i decides to shroud, it optimally sets an add-on price $\hat{p}_i = \bar{p}$ to take full advantage of myopic consumers. This leads to profits of

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_s &= [1 - \alpha\mu(n-1)]D(-p_i - e + p^* + e)[p_i] \\ &+ \alpha\mu(n-1)D(-p_i + p^*)[p_i + \bar{p}] \\ &= D(-p_i + p^*)[p_i + \bar{p}\alpha\mu(n-1)].\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

Note that with $n-1$ firms unshrouding and 1 firm shrouding, the number of myopic consumers is $\alpha\mu(n-1)$ and the share of sophisticated consumers is then $1 - \alpha\mu(n-1)$. The first term of (8) is the income from selling to sophisticated consumers who only buy the base good. The second term of (8) is the income from myopic consumers buying both the base good and the add-on. Note that the profits from shrouding decrease when there is a larger number of unshrouding firms in the market. This is because the number of myopic consumers who would buy the expensive add-on becomes smaller with more firms unshrouding, that is, $\alpha\mu(n-1)$ is decreasing in n and the incentive to deviate by shrouding become smaller.

Comparing (7) and (8) reveals that unshrouding leads to higher profits if $\alpha \leq \bar{\alpha} = \bar{\alpha}$. Hence, if $\alpha \leq \bar{\alpha}$ no firm has an incentive to deviate from unshrouding add-on information and a symmetric equilibrium wherein all firms unshroud exists.

The equilibrium base-good price with all firms unshrouding can be derived by inspecting the first-order condition $(p_i + e)D'(-p_i + p^*) + D(-p_i + p^*) = 0$. The symmetric equilibrium price is then $p^* = \frac{D(0)}{D'(0)} - e$ and profits amount to $D(0)^2/D'(0)$.

iii) Next, note that $\underline{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$ because $0 < \mu(n-1) < 1$. Hence, we can distinguish three equilibrium regions:

- $\alpha > \bar{\alpha}$: There is a unique symmetric equilibrium where all firms shroud add-on information.
- $\bar{\alpha} \geq \alpha \geq \underline{\alpha}$: Both, a symmetric shrouding and an unshrouding equilibrium exists.
- $\alpha < \underline{\alpha}$: There is a unique symmetric equilibrium where all firms unshroud add-on information.

iv) Note that asymmetric equilibria where some firms shroud and some firms unshroud cannot exist. We demonstrate this by contradiction. Suppose there is an equilibrium where $0 < k < n$ firms unshroud and $n - k > 0$ firms shroud. An unshrouding firm does not deviate to shrouding if $D(-p_i + p^*)[p_i + e] \geq D(-p_i + p^*)[p_i + \alpha\mu(k-1)\bar{p}] \Leftrightarrow e \geq \alpha\mu(k-1)\bar{p}$ and a shrouding firm does not deviate if $D(-p_i + p^*)[p_i + \alpha\mu(k)\bar{p}] \geq D(-p_i + p^*)[p_i + e] \Leftrightarrow \alpha\mu(k)\bar{p} \geq e$. Together, $\mu(k-1) \leq \frac{e}{\alpha\bar{p}} \leq \mu(k)$. As $\frac{\partial\mu}{\partial k} < 0$, this condition cannot be satisfied, hence a contradiction, and an asymmetric equilibrium does not exist.

Derivation of Proposition 3

i) The risk dominant equilibrium can be found by applying the tracing procedure by Harsanyi and Selten (1988).

Suppose that a player assigns a probability q to the event that all remaining players choose to shroud while the probability $1-q$ is assigned to the event that all remaining players choose to unshroud.

Let $\bar{q} = \frac{e - \alpha\bar{p}\mu(n-1)}{\alpha\bar{p}[1 - \mu(n-1)]}$ be the marginal belief such that a player with belief q is indifferent between shrouding and unshrouding. Hence, given a player's belief q , the best response is to shroud if $q > \bar{q}$ and to unshroud if $q < \bar{q}$. Note that $\frac{\partial\bar{q}}{\partial\alpha} < 0$ and $\frac{\partial\bar{q}}{\partial n} > 0$.

Harsanyi and Selten (1988) assume that prior beliefs q are uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$. Thus, a given firm chooses to shroud with probability $(1 - \bar{q})$ and to unshroud with probability \bar{q} . Given these priors, the expected benefit from shrouding is $\alpha\bar{p}E[\mu(\bar{q}(n-1) - 1)]$ and the expected benefit from unshrouding is e . Comparison reveals that unshrouding is the risk dominant equilibrium if $H = \alpha\bar{p}E[\mu(\bar{q}(n-1) - 1)] - e < 0$. As $\frac{\partial H}{\partial\alpha} > 0$, there exists a critical α^* such that shrouding is the risk dominant equilibrium if $\alpha > \alpha^*$ and unshrouding is the risk dominant equilibrium if $\alpha < \alpha^*$.

Finally, by the implicit function theorem, it can be shown that

$$\frac{d\alpha^*}{dn} = -\frac{\frac{\partial H}{\partial n}}{\frac{\partial H}{\partial \alpha}} > 0. \quad (9)$$

Hence, it follows that the range of α where unshrouding is the risk dominant equilibrium increases if n becomes larger.

ii) Kim (1996, p. 216) shows that an equilibrium H is selected by the global games approach if

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{n} [\pi_k^H - \pi_k^L] > 0, \quad (10)$$

where π_k^j denotes the payoff for a player choosing strategy H if the total number of players choosing that strategy is k . Applied to our game shrouding is the selected equilibrium strategy if

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{n} [\bar{p}\alpha\mu(n-k) - e] > 0, \quad (11)$$

which can be re-expressed as

$$\alpha > \frac{ne}{\bar{p}\sum_{k=1}^n \mu(n-k)} = \tilde{\alpha}(n). \quad (12)$$

Hence, if $\alpha < \tilde{\alpha}(n)$ unshrouding is the selected equilibrium. As $\tilde{\alpha}(n+1) > \tilde{\alpha}(n)$, it follows that the parameter space where unshrouding is the selected equilibrium increases with n .

Derivation of Proposition 4

Suppose that all firms unshroud the add-on and set an add-on price $\hat{p}^* = e$. Then, the equilibrium base-good price is equal to $p^* = \frac{t}{n} - e$ and all firms would earn profits of $\Pi = \frac{t}{n^2} - c$ which corresponds to the standard Salop profit less the fixed costs of unshrouding. We will show that is an equilibrium under the conditions provided in Proposition 4.

First, all firms unshrouding can only be an equilibrium if profits are nonnegative, that is, $\frac{t}{n^2} - c \geq 0$. Solving for c gives condition ii) in Proposition 4. Second, no firm may deviate to shrouding and increase its profits. Let $\hat{\alpha} = \frac{ne+2\sqrt{t(t-cn^2)}-2t}{n\bar{p}\mu(n-1)}$ and suppose firm i deviates. Then, this firm would sell the add-on only to myopic consumers and earn $(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{p^*-p_i}{t})(p_i + \alpha\mu(n-1)\bar{s})$. The optimal base-good price in case of shrouding would be $p = \frac{t}{n} \frac{1}{2}(e + \alpha\mu(n-1)\bar{s})$ leading to profits of $\frac{(2t\alpha\mu(n-1)\bar{s}-en)^2}{4tn^2}$. Firm i has no

incentive to deviate if $\frac{(2t\alpha\mu(n-1)\bar{s}-en)^2}{4tn^2} \leq \frac{t}{n^2} - c$ which is satisfied if $\alpha \leq \hat{\alpha}$. This gives condition i) in Proposition 4.

References

- Anderson, S., de Palma, A., and Thisse, J.-F. (1992). *Discrete Choice Theory of Product Differentiation*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Armstrong, M. and Vickers, J. (2012). Consumer protection and contingent charges. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 50(2):477–493.
- Bulow, J. I., Geanakoplos, J. D., and Klemperer, P. D. (1985). Multimarket oligopoly: Strategic substitutes and complements. *Journal of Political Economy*, 93(3):488–511.
- Caplin, A. and Nalebuff, B. (1991). Aggregation and imperfect competition: on the existence of equilibrium. *Econometrica*, 59(1):25–59.
- Carlin, B. (2009). Strategic price complexity in retail financial markets. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 91(3):278–287.
- Carlsson, H. and van Damme, E. (1993). Global games and equilibrium selection. *Econometrica*, 61:989–1018.
- Chioveanu, I. and Zhou, J. (2013). Price competition with consumer confusion. Forthcoming *Management Science*.
- Gabaix, X. and Laibson, D. (2006). Shrouded attributes, consumer myopia and information suppression in competitive markets. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121(2):505–540.
- Gu, Y. and Wenzel, T. (2013). Strategic obfuscation and consumer protection policy. Forthcoming *Journal of Industrial Economics*.
- Harsanyi, J. C. and Selten, R. (1988). *A General Theory of Equilibrium Selection in Games*. MIT Press.
- Heidhues, P., Köszegi, B., and Murooka, T. (2012). Inferior products and profitable deception. Unpublished working paper.

- Huck, S. and Zhou, J. (2011). Consumer behavioral biases in competition: A survey. Unpublished working paper.
- Kim, Y. (1996). Equilibrium selection in n-person coordination games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 15(2):203–227.
- Kosfeld, M. and Schüwer, U. (2011). Add-on pricing, naive consumers, and the hidden welfare costs of education. Unpublished working paper.
- Piccione, M. and Spiegler, R. (2012). Price competition under limited comparability. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(1):97–135.
- Salop, S. (1979). Monopolistic competition with outside goods. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 10(1):141–156.
- Schmidt, D., Shupp, R., Walker, J. M., and Ostrom, E. (2003). Playing safe in coordination games: The roles of risk dominance, payoff dominance, and history of play. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 42(2):281–299.
- Spiegler, R. (2006). Competition over agents with boundedly rational expectations. *Theoretical Economics*, 1(2):207–231.
- Spiegler, R. (2011). *Bounded Rationality and Industrial Organisation*. Oxford University Press.
- van Huyck, J. B., Battalio, R. C., and Beil, R. O. (1990). Tacit coordination games, strategic uncertainty, and coordination failure. *American Economic Review*, 80(1):234–248.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSION PAPERS

- 126 Wenzel, Tobias, Consumer Myopia, Competition and the Incentives to Unshroud Add-on Information, December 2013.
Forthcoming in: Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization.
- 125 Schwarz, Christian and Suedekum, Jens, Global Sourcing of Complex Production Processes, December 2013.
- 124 Defever, Fabrice and Suedekum, Jens, Financial Liberalization and the Relationship-Specificity of Exports, December 2013.
- 123 Bauernschuster, Stefan, Falck, Oliver, Heblich, Stephan and Suedekum, Jens, Why Are Educated and Risk-Loving Persons More Mobile Across Regions?, December 2013.
- 122 Hottenrott, Hanna and Lopes-Bento, Cindy, Quantity or Quality? Knowledge Alliances and their Effects on Patenting, December 2013.
- 121 Hottenrott, Hanna and Lopes-Bento, Cindy, (International) R&D collaboration and SMEs: The effectiveness of targeted public R&D support schemes, December 2013.
- 120 Giesen, Kristian and Suedekum, Jens, City Age and City Size, November 2013.
- 119 Trax, Michaela, Brunow, Stephan and Suedekum, Jens, Cultural Diversity and Plant-Level Productivity, November 2013.
- 118 Manasakis, Constantine and Vlassis, Minas, Downstream Mode of Competition With Upstream Market Power, November 2013.
- 117 Sapi, Geza and Suleymanova, Irina, Consumer Flexibility, Data Quality and Targeted Pricing, November 2013.
- 116 Hinlopen, Jeroen, Müller, Wieland and Normann, Hans-Theo, Output Commitment Through Product Bundling: Experimental Evidence, November 2013.
Forthcoming in: European Economic Review.
- 115 Baumann, Florian, Denter, Philipp and Friehe Tim, Hide or Show? Endogenous Observability of Private Precautions Against Crime When Property Value is Private Information, November 2013.
- 114 Fan, Ying, Kühn, Kai-Uwe and Lafontaine, Francine, Financial Constraints and Moral Hazard: The Case of Franchising, November 2013.
- 113 Aguzzoni, Luca, Argentesi, Elena, Buccirossi, Paolo, Ciari, Lorenzo, Duso, Tomaso, Tognoni, Massimo and Vitale, Cristiana, They Played the Merger Game: A Retrospective Analysis in the UK Videogames Market, October 2013.
- 112 Myrseth, Kristian Ove R., Riener, Gerhard and Wollbrant, Conny, Tangible Temptation in the Social Dilemma: Cash, Cooperation, and Self-Control, October 2013.
- 111 Hasnas, Irina, Lambertini, Luca and Palestini, Arsen, Open Innovation in a Dynamic Cournot Duopoly, October 2013.

- 110 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Competitive Pressure and Corporate Crime, September 2013.
- 109 Böckers, Veit, Haucap, Justus and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Benefits of an Integrated European Electricity Market, September 2013.
- 108 Normann, Hans-Theo and Tan, Elaine S., Effects of Different Cartel Policies: Evidence from the German Power-Cable Industry, September 2013. Forthcoming in: Industrial and Corporate Change.
- 107 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Klein, Gordon J., Rickert, Dennis and Wey, Christian, Bargaining Power in Manufacturer-Retailer Relationships, September 2013.
- 106 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Design Standards and Technology Adoption: Welfare Effects of Increasing Environmental Fines when the Number of Firms is Endogenous, September 2013.
- 105 Jeitschko, Thomas D., NYSE Changing Hands: Antitrust and Attempted Acquisitions of an Erstwhile Monopoly, August 2013.
- 104 Böckers, Veit, Giessing, Leonie and Rösch, Jürgen, The Green Game Changer: An Empirical Assessment of the Effects of Wind and Solar Power on the Merit Order, August 2013.
- 103 Haucap, Justus and Muck, Johannes, What Drives the Relevance and Reputation of Economics Journals? An Update from a Survey among Economists, August 2013.
- 102 Jovanovic, Dragan and Wey, Christian, Passive Partial Ownership, Sneaky Takeovers, and Merger Control, August 2013.
- 101 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Klein, Gordon J., Rickert, Dennis and Wey, Christian, Inter-Format Competition Among Retailers – The Role of Private Label Products in Market Delineation, August 2013.
- 100 Normann, Hans-Theo, Requate, Till and Waichman, Israel, Do Short-Term Laboratory Experiments Provide Valid Descriptions of Long-Term Economic Interactions? A Study of Cournot Markets, July 2013. Forthcoming in: Experimental Economics.
- 99 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus, Haucap, Justus and Wey, Christian, Input Price Discrimination (Bans), Entry and Welfare, June 2013.
- 98 Aguzzoni, Luca, Argentesi, Elena, Ciari, Lorenzo, Duso, Tomaso and Tognoni, Massimo, Ex-post Merger Evaluation in the UK Retail Market for Books, June 2013.
- 97 Caprice, Stéphane and von Schlippenbach, Vanessa, One-Stop Shopping as a Cause of Slotting Fees: A Rent-Shifting Mechanism, May 2012. Published in: Journal of Economics and Management Strategy, 22 (2013), pp. 468-487.
- 96 Wenzel, Tobias, Independent Service Operators in ATM Markets, June 2013. Forthcoming in: Scottish Journal of Political Economy.
- 95 Coublucq, Daniel, Econometric Analysis of Productivity with Measurement Error: Empirical Application to the US Railroad Industry, June 2013.
- 94 Coublucq, Daniel, Demand Estimation with Selection Bias: A Dynamic Game Approach with an Application to the US Railroad Industry, June 2013.
- 93 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Status Concerns as a Motive for Crime?, April 2013.

- 92 Jeitschko, Thomas D. and Zhang, Nanyun, Adverse Effects of Patent Pooling on Product Development and Commercialization, April 2013.
- 91 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Private Protection Against Crime when Property Value is Private Information, April 2013.
Published in: *International Review of Law and Economics*, 35 (2013), pp. 73-79.
- 90 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Cheap Talk About the Detection Probability, April 2013.
Forthcoming in: *International Game Theory Review*.
- 89 Pagel, Beatrice and Wey, Christian, How to Counter Union Power? Equilibrium Mergers in International Oligopoly, April 2013.
- 88 Jovanovic, Dragan, Mergers, Managerial Incentives, and Efficiencies, April 2013.
- 87 Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Klein Gordon J., Bargaining Power and Local Heroes, March 2013.
- 86 Bertschek, Irene, Cerquera, Daniel and Klein, Gordon J., More Bits – More Bucks? Measuring the Impact of Broadband Internet on Firm Performance, February 2013.
Forthcoming in: *Information Economics and Policy*.
- 85 Rasch, Alexander and Wenzel, Tobias, Piracy in a Two-Sided Software Market, February 2013.
Published in: *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 88 (2013), pp. 78-89.
- 84 Bataille, Marc and Steinmetz, Alexander, Intermodal Competition on Some Routes in Transportation Networks: The Case of Inter Urban Buses and Railways, January 2013.
- 83 Haucap, Justus and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Google, Facebook, Amazon, eBay: Is the Internet Driving Competition or Market Monopolization?, January 2013.
Forthcoming in: *International Economics and Economic Policy*.
- 82 Regner, Tobias and Riener, Gerhard, Voluntary Payments, Privacy and Social Pressure on the Internet: A Natural Field Experiment, December 2012.
- 81 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus and Wey, Christian, The Effects of Remedies on Merger Activity in Oligopoly, December 2012.
- 80 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Optimal Damages Multipliers in Oligopolistic Markets, December 2012.
- 79 Duso, Tomaso, Röller, Lars-Hendrik and Seldeslachts, Jo, Collusion through Joint R&D: An Empirical Assessment, December 2012.
Forthcoming in: *The Review of Economics and Statistics*.
- 78 Baumann, Florian and Heine, Klaus, Innovation, Tort Law, and Competition, December 2012.
Forthcoming in: *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*.
- 77 Coenen, Michael and Jovanovic, Dragan, Investment Behavior in a Constrained Dictator Game, November 2012.
- 76 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Strategic Obfuscation and Consumer Protection Policy in Financial Markets: Theory and Experimental Evidence, November 2012.
Forthcoming in: *Journal of Industrial Economics* under the title "Strategic Obfuscation and Consumer Protection Policy".

- 75 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Jovanovic, Dragan, Competition in Germany's Minute Reserve Power Market: An Econometric Analysis, November 2012.
Forthcoming in: The Energy Journal.
- 74 Normann, Hans-Theo, Rösch, Jürgen and Schultz, Luis Manuel, Do Buyer Groups Facilitate Collusion?, November 2012.
- 73 Riener, Gerhard and Wiederhold, Simon, Heterogeneous Treatment Effects in Groups, November 2012.
- 72 Berlemann, Michael and Haucap, Justus, Which Factors Drive the Decision to Boycott and Opt Out of Research Rankings? A Note, November 2012.
- 71 Muck, Johannes and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, First Mover Advantages in Mobile Telecommunications: Evidence from OECD Countries, October 2012.
- 70 Karaçuka, Mehmet, Çatik, A. Nazif and Haucap, Justus, Consumer Choice and Local Network Effects in Mobile Telecommunications in Turkey, October 2012.
Published in: Telecommunications Policy, 37 (2013), pp. 334-344.
- 69 Clemens, Georg and Rau, Holger A., Rebels without a Clue? Experimental Evidence on Partial Cartels, April 2013 (First Version October 2012).
- 68 Regner, Tobias and Riener, Gerhard, Motivational Cherry Picking, September 2012.
- 67 Fonseca, Miguel A. and Normann, Hans-Theo, Excess Capacity and Pricing in Bertrand-Edgeworth Markets: Experimental Evidence, September 2012.
Published in: Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics, 169 (2013), pp. 199-228.
- 66 Riener, Gerhard and Wiederhold, Simon, Team Building and Hidden Costs of Control, September 2012.
- 65 Fonseca, Miguel A. and Normann, Hans-Theo, Explicit vs. Tacit Collusion – The Impact of Communication in Oligopoly Experiments, August 2012.
Published in: European Economic Review, 56 (2012), pp. 1759-1772.
- 64 Jovanovic, Dragan and Wey, Christian, An Equilibrium Analysis of Efficiency Gains from Mergers, July 2012.
- 63 Dewenter, Ralf, Jaschinski, Thomas and Kuchinke, Björn A., Hospital Market Concentration and Discrimination of Patients, July 2012.
- 62 Von Schlippenbach, Vanessa and Teichmann, Isabel, The Strategic Use of Private Quality Standards in Food Supply Chains, May 2012.
Published in: American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 94 (2012), pp. 1189-1201.
- 61 Sapi, Geza, Bargaining, Vertical Mergers and Entry, July 2012.
- 60 Jentzsch, Nicola, Sapi, Geza and Suleymanova, Irina, Targeted Pricing and Customer Data Sharing Among Rivals, July 2012.
Published in: International Journal of Industrial Organization, 31 (2013), pp. 131-144.
- 59 Lambarraa, Fatima and Riener, Gerhard, On the Norms of Charitable Giving in Islam: A Field Experiment, June 2012.
- 58 Duso, Tomaso, Gugler, Klaus and Szücs, Florian, An Empirical Assessment of the 2004 EU Merger Policy Reform, June 2012.
Published in: Economic Journal, 123 (2013), F596-F619.

- 57 Dewenter, Ralf and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, More Ads, More Revs? Is there a Media Bias in the Likelihood to be Reviewed?, June 2012.
- 56 Böckers, Veit, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Müller Andrea, Pull-Forward Effects in the German Car Scrappage Scheme: A Time Series Approach, June 2012.
- 55 Kellner, Christian and Riener, Gerhard, The Effect of Ambiguity Aversion on Reward Scheme Choice, June 2012.
- 54 De Silva, Dakshina G., Kosmopoulou, Georgia, Pagel, Beatrice and Peeters, Ronald, The Impact of Timing on Bidding Behavior in Procurement Auctions of Contracts with Private Costs, June 2012.
Published in: Review of Industrial Organization, 41 (2013), pp.321-343.
- 53 Benndorf, Volker and Rau, Holger A., Competition in the Workplace: An Experimental Investigation, May 2012.
- 52 Haucap, Justus and Klein, Gordon J., How Regulation Affects Network and Service Quality in Related Markets, May 2012.
Published in: Economics Letters, 117 (2012), pp. 521-524.
- 51 Dewenter, Ralf and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Less Pain at the Pump? The Effects of Regulatory Interventions in Retail Gasoline Markets, May 2012.
- 50 Böckers, Veit and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, The Extent of European Power Markets, April 2012.
- 49 Barth, Anne-Kathrin and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, How Large is the Magnitude of Fixed-Mobile Call Substitution? - Empirical Evidence from 16 European Countries, April 2012.
- 48 Herr, Annika and Suppliet, Moritz, Pharmaceutical Prices under Regulation: Tiered Co-payments and Reference Pricing in Germany, April 2012.
- 47 Haucap, Justus and Müller, Hans Christian, The Effects of Gasoline Price Regulations: Experimental Evidence, April 2012.
- 46 Stühmeier, Torben, Roaming and Investments in the Mobile Internet Market, March 2012.
Published in: Telecommunications Policy, 36 (2012), pp. 595-607.
- 45 Graf, Julia, The Effects of Rebate Contracts on the Health Care System, March 2012, Forthcoming in: The European Journal of Health Economics.
- 44 Pagel, Beatrice and Wey, Christian, Unionization Structures in International Oligopoly, February 2012.
Published in: Labour: Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations, 27 (2013), pp. 1-17.
- 43 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Price-Dependent Demand in Spatial Models, January 2012.
Published in: B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 12 (2012), Article 6.
- 42 Barth, Anne-Kathrin and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Does the Growth of Mobile Markets Cause the Demise of Fixed Networks? – Evidence from the European Union, January 2012.
- 41 Stühmeier, Torben and Wenzel, Tobias, Regulating Advertising in the Presence of Public Service Broadcasting, January 2012.
Published in: Review of Network Economics, 11/2 (2012), Article 1.

- 40 Müller, Hans Christian, Forecast Errors in Undisclosed Management Sales Forecasts: The Disappearance of the Overoptimism Bias, December 2011.
- 39 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Transparency, Entry, and Productivity, November 2011.
Published in: *Economics Letters*, 115 (2012), pp. 7-10.
- 38 Christin, Clémence, Entry Deterrence Through Cooperative R&D Over-Investment, November 2011.
Published in: *Louvain Economic Review*, 79/2 (2013), pp. 5-26.
- 37 Haucap, Justus, Herr, Annika and Frank, Björn, In Vino Veritas: Theory and Evidence on Social Drinking, November 2011.
The theoretical part of this paper is forthcoming as: Haucap/Herr, „A Note on Social Drinking: In Vino Veritas”, *European Journal of Law and Economics*, and the empirical part is forthcoming as: Frank/Haucap/Herr, “Social Drinking Versus Administering Alcohol”, *Economic Inquiry*.
- 36 Barth, Anne-Kathrin and Graf, Julia, Irrationality Rings! – Experimental Evidence on Mobile Tariff Choices, November 2011.
- 35 Jeitschko, Thomas D. and Normann, Hans-Theo, Signaling in Deterministic and Stochastic Settings, November 2011.
Published in: *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 82 (2012), pp.39-55.
- 34 Christin, Cémence, Nicolai, Jean-Philippe and Pouyet, Jerome, The Role of Abatement Technologies for Allocating Free Allowances, October 2011.
- 33 Keser, Claudia, Suleymanova, Irina and Wey, Christian, Technology Adoption in Markets with Network Effects: Theory and Experimental Evidence, October 2011.
Published in: *Information Economics and Policy*, 24 (2012), pp. 262-276.
- 32 Çatik, A. Nazif and Karaçuka, Mehmet, The Bank Lending Channel in Turkey: Has it Changed after the Low Inflation Regime?, September 2011.
Published in: *Applied Economics Letters*, 19 (2012), pp. 1237-1242.
- 31 Hauck, Achim, Neyer, Ulrike and Vieten, Thomas, Reestablishing Stability and Avoiding a Credit Crunch: Comparing Different Bad Bank Schemes, August 2011.
- 30 Suleymanova, Irina and Wey, Christian, Bertrand Competition in Markets with Network Effects and Switching Costs, August 2011.
Published in: *B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 11 (2011), Article 56.
- 29 Stühmeier, Torben, Access Regulation with Asymmetric Termination Costs, July 2011.
Published in: *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, 43 (2013), pp. 60-89.
- 28 Dewenter, Ralf, Haucap, Justus and Wenzel, Tobias, On File Sharing with Indirect Network Effects Between Concert Ticket Sales and Music Recordings, July 2011.
Published in: *Journal of Media Economics*, 25 (2012), pp. 168-178.
- 27 Von Schlippenbach, Vanessa and Wey, Christian, One-Stop Shopping Behavior, Buyer Power, and Upstream Merger Incentives, June 2011.
- 26 Balsmeier, Benjamin, Buchwald, Achim and Peters, Heiko, Outside Board Memberships of CEOs: Expertise or Entrenchment?, June 2011.
- 25 Clougherty, Joseph A. and Duso, Tomaso, Using Rival Effects to Identify Synergies and Improve Merger Typologies, June 2011.
Published in: *Strategic Organization*, 9 (2011), pp. 310-335.

- 24 Heinz, Matthias, Juranek, Steffen and Rau, Holger A., Do Women Behave More Reciprocally than Men? Gender Differences in Real Effort Dictator Games, June 2011.
Published in: Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 83 (2012), pp. 105-110.
- 23 Sapi, Geza and Suleymanova, Irina, Technology Licensing by Advertising Supported Media Platforms: An Application to Internet Search Engines, June 2011.
Published in: B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 11 (2011), Article 37.
- 22 Buccirosi, Paolo, Ciari, Lorenzo, Duso, Tomaso, Spagnolo Giancarlo and Vitale, Cristiana, Competition Policy and Productivity Growth: An Empirical Assessment, May 2011.
Published in: The Review of Economics and Statistics, 95 (2013), pp. 1324-1336.
- 21 Karaçuka, Mehmet and Çatik, A. Nazif, A Spatial Approach to Measure Productivity Spillovers of Foreign Affiliated Firms in Turkish Manufacturing Industries, May 2011.
Published in: The Journal of Developing Areas, 46 (2012), pp. 65-83.
- 20 Çatik, A. Nazif and Karaçuka, Mehmet, A Comparative Analysis of Alternative Univariate Time Series Models in Forecasting Turkish Inflation, May 2011.
Published in: Journal of Business Economics and Management, 13 (2012), pp. 275-293.
- 19 Normann, Hans-Theo and Wallace, Brian, The Impact of the Termination Rule on Cooperation in a Prisoner's Dilemma Experiment, May 2011.
Published in: International Journal of Game Theory, 41 (2012), pp. 707-718.
- 18 Baake, Pio and von Schlippenbach, Vanessa, Distortions in Vertical Relations, April 2011.
Published in: Journal of Economics, 103 (2011), pp. 149-169.
- 17 Haucap, Justus and Schwalbe, Ulrich, Economic Principles of State Aid Control, April 2011.
Forthcoming in: F. Montag & F. J. Säcker (eds.), European State Aid Law: Article by Article Commentary, Beck: München 2012.
- 16 Haucap, Justus and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Consumer Behavior towards On-net/Off-net Price Differentiation, January 2011.
Published in: Telecommunication Policy, 35 (2011), pp. 325-332.
- 15 Duso, Tomaso, Gugler, Klaus and Yurtoglu, Burcin B., How Effective is European Merger Control? January 2011.
Published in: European Economic Review, 55 (2011), pp. 980-1006.
- 14 Haigner, Stefan D., Jenewein, Stefan, Müller, Hans Christian and Wakolbinger, Florian, The First shall be Last: Serial Position Effects in the Case Contestants evaluate Each Other, December 2010.
Published in: Economics Bulletin, 30 (2010), pp. 3170-3176.
- 13 Suleymanova, Irina and Wey, Christian, On the Role of Consumer Expectations in Markets with Network Effects, November 2010.
Published in: Journal of Economics, 105 (2012), pp. 101-127.
- 12 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Karaçuka, Mehmet, Competition in the Turkish Mobile Telecommunications Market: Price Elasticities and Network Substitution, November 2010.
Published in: Telecommunications Policy, 35 (2011), pp. 202-210.
- 11 Dewenter, Ralf, Haucap, Justus and Wenzel, Tobias, Semi-Collusion in Media Markets, November 2010.
Published in: International Review of Law and Economics, 31 (2011), pp. 92-98.

- 10 Dewenter, Ralf and Kruse, Jörn, Calling Party Pays or Receiving Party Pays? The Diffusion of Mobile Telephony with Endogenous Regulation, October 2010.
Published in: Information Economics and Policy, 23 (2011), pp. 107-117.
- 09 Hauck, Achim and Neyer, Ulrike, The Euro Area Interbank Market and the Liquidity Management of the Eurosystem in the Financial Crisis, September 2010.
- 08 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Schultz, Luis Manuel, Legal and Illegal Cartels in Germany between 1958 and 2004, September 2010.
Published in: H. J. Ramser & M. Stadler (eds.), Marktmacht. Wirtschaftswissenschaftliches Seminar Ottobeuren, Volume 39, Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2010, pp. 71-94.
- 07 Herr, Annika, Quality and Welfare in a Mixed Duopoly with Regulated Prices: The Case of a Public and a Private Hospital, September 2010.
Published in: German Economic Review, 12 (2011), pp. 422-437.
- 06 Blanco, Mariana, Engelmann, Dirk and Normann, Hans-Theo, A Within-Subject Analysis of Other-Regarding Preferences, September 2010.
Published in: Games and Economic Behavior, 72 (2011), pp. 321-338.
- 05 Normann, Hans-Theo, Vertical Mergers, Foreclosure and Raising Rivals' Costs – Experimental Evidence, September 2010.
Published in: The Journal of Industrial Economics, 59 (2011), pp. 506-527.
- 04 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Transparency, Price-Dependent Demand and Product Variety, September 2010.
Published in: Economics Letters, 110 (2011), pp. 216-219.
- 03 Wenzel, Tobias, Deregulation of Shopping Hours: The Impact on Independent Retailers and Chain Stores, September 2010.
Published in: Scandinavian Journal of Economics, 113 (2011), pp. 145-166.
- 02 Stühmeier, Torben and Wenzel, Tobias, Getting Beer During Commercials: Adverse Effects of Ad-Avoidance, September 2010.
Published in: Information Economics and Policy, 23 (2011), pp. 98-106.
- 01 Inderst, Roman and Wey, Christian, Countervailing Power and Dynamic Efficiency, September 2010.
Published in: Journal of the European Economic Association, 9 (2011), pp. 702-720.

Heinrich-Heine-University of Düsseldorf

**Düsseldorf Institute for
Competition Economics (DICE)**

Universitätsstraße 1_ 40225 Düsseldorf
www.dice.hhu.de