Düsseldorf Institute
for Competition Economics

DISCUSSION PAPER

No 271

Negative Consumer Value and Loss Leading

Stéphane Caprice,
Shiva Shekhar

October 2017

HEINRICH HEINE
UNIVERSITÄT DÜSSELDORF

d|u|p düsseldorf university press

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

ISSN 2190-9938 (online) – ISBN 978-3-86304-270-7

Negative Consumer Value and Loss Leading*

Stéphane Caprice† and Shiva Shekhar‡

October 2017

Abstract

Large retailers, competing with smaller stores that carry a narrower range, can exercise market power by pricing below cost some of their products. Below-cost pricing arises as an exploitative device rather than a predatory device (e.g., Chen and Rey, 2012). Unlike standard textbook models, we show that positive consumer value is not required in these frameworks. Large retailers can sell products offering consumers a negative value. We use our insight to revisit some classic issues in vertical relations.

JEL Classification: L13, L81.

Keywords: Multiproduct retailers, loss-leading, negative consumer value.

*We are grateful to Patrick Rey, Yassine Lefouilli and Markus Reisinger for their helpful discussions.

†Toulouse School of Economics, INRA, University of Toulouse Capitole, Toulouse, France; email: stephane.caprice@inra.fr.

‡DICE (University of Düsseldorf); email: shekhar@dice.hhu.de.

1 Introduction

A line of research in industrial organization examines the phenomenon of loss-leading when retailers are multiproduct firms (i.e., Chen and Rey, 2012; Chen and Rey, 2016 and Johnson, 2017). Large retailers, competing with smaller stores that carry a narrower range, can exercise market power by pricing below cost some products also offered by smaller rivals. Loss-leading does not appear for predatory reason, instead procompetitive justification are invoked. For example, in Chen and Rey (2012) below-cost pricing arises as an exploitative device to discriminate multistop shoppers from one-stop shoppers. The result is shown in a standard model where the goods offer consumers a positive value as in textbook models. In this article, we demonstrate that positive value is not required for the goods which are priced below-cost. Large retailers can sell products offering consumers negative values. Our result emerges from a recalculation of Chen and Rey's original model in allowing for a negative consumer value for the good which is priced below-cost.[1]

We organize the paper as follows. Section 2 presents Chen and Rey (2012)'s model, in which we show our result. In Section 3, we provide some applications of our result in vertical relations and we conclude in Section 4.

2 The model and results

In order to make our results as clear as possible and directly comparable, we first start in Subsection 2.1 with the simple example used by Chen and Rey (2012).[2] Then, we extend this setting in Subsection 2.2.

2.1 A simple example

Suppose two goods A and B, consumers value A at $u_A = 10$ and B at $u_B = 6$. There are two firms: L and S. While L is a multiproduct firm which can supply A and B, S only supplies B. L supplies A at no cost and supplies B at unit cost c_L. Let $v_L = u_B - c_L$ denote the consumer value of the good B at L. Chen and Rey assume in this example

[1] We also extend our results to Chen and Rey (2016) and Johnson (2017) in Appendices.

[2] See p. 3466.

that $c_L = 4$ which results in $v_L = u_B - c_L = 2$: the good B offers consumers a positive value at L. We do not restrict attention to $c_L = 4$; instead we say that the good B offers consumers a positive value if $v_L > 0$, that is, $c_L < u_B = 6$ and a negative value if $v_L \leq 0$, that is $c_L \geq u_B = 6$. B is also offered by S which is a competitive fringe, at a price $\widehat{p} = 2$. Let $v_S = u_B - \widehat{p}$ denote the consumer value of the good B at S; we obtain $v_S = 4$. We assume that $v_S > v_L$, which translates into $v_L < 4$, that is $c_L > 2$.

Consumers face a shopping cost s for visiting a store, reflecting the opportunity cost of the time spent in traffic, selecting products and so on.[3] We suppose further that half of the consumers face a high shopping cost $\overline{s} = 4$, whereas the others can shop at no cost, that is $\underline{s} = 0$.

If L were a monopolist, implying that S were not present in the market, it is easy to show that B would be sold only if $v_L > 0$. Towards this, if L were alone, it would supply A and B to all consumers at a total price $p^m_{AB} = u_A + u_B - \overline{s} = 12$, and would obtain a profit $\pi^m_{AB} = p^m_{AB} - c_L = 12 - c_L$.[4] It could also supply A only to all consumers at a price $p^m_A = u_A - \overline{s} = 6$, which results in a profit of $\pi^m_A = 6$.[5] L would supply A and B if $c_L < 6$ and would supply A only if $c_L \geq 6$ which corresponds to $u_B = 6$. L would thus supply A and B if $v_L > 0$ and A only if $v_L \leq 0$. The result is not surprising as firms only supply goods offering consumers values which are positive. This suggests the idea as in textbook models that "only goods which deliver consumers a positive value are sold by a multiproduct firm".

Suppose now, instead, that L is not a monopolist and good B is also offered by S, which offers consumers a value of $v_S = 4$. S cannot attract high-cost consumers, who would obtain $v_S - \overline{s} = 0$; L can therefore still charge them a total price p^m_{AB}. As showed by Chen and Rey (2012), due to the presence of S, L can now screen consumers according to their shopping costs, by selling B below cost (i.e., $p_B < c_L$): keeping the total price equal to $p^m_{AB} = 12$, it can lower the price for B down to $p_B = 2$, and increasing the price for A to $p_A = 10$. This does not affect the shopping behavior of high-cost consumers, who still face a total price of p^m_{AB}, but increases the margin earned

[3] It may also account for consumers' enjoyment or dislike for shopping.

[4] Selling to low-cost consumers only at a total price $p_{AB} = u_A + u_B = 16$ leads to a lower profit $\pi_{AB} = (16 - c_L)\frac{1}{2} = 8 - \frac{c_L}{2} < 12 - c_L$ for any $c_L < 8$, which is satisfied for $v_L > 0$.

[5] Selling A to low-cost consumers only at a price $p_A = u_A = 10$ leads to a lower profit $\pi_A = 10\frac{1}{2} = 5 < 6$.

on low-cost consumers, who now become multistop shoppers and buy B from S. This loss-leading strategy allows L to charge the monopoly price to one-stop shoppers and, here extracts the full value of A from multistop shoppers.

To make our point, we first start with the case $v_L = 0$, that is $u_B = c_L$. While in the monopoly case, L would be indifferent between supplying A and B and supplying A only, it is now better off in supplying A and B. Focusing on high-cost consumers, who are one-stop shoppers, L is indifferent between supplying A and B and supplying A only. The two strategies lead to the same monopoly margin from these consumers: $p^m_{AB} - c_L = p^m_A = 6$. However, in presence of S, L can now charge a higher price p_A to low-cost consumers who are multi-stop shoppers and buy B from S. By keeping the total price equal to p^m_{AB}, in selling B below cost, and in increasing the price for A, it can obtain to a higher margin on low-cost consumers. While the margin on these consumers were $p^m_{AB} - c_L = p^m_A = 6$ without S, the margin is now $p_A = 10$ which leads to a total profit of $\frac{1}{2}p_A + \frac{1}{2}(p^m_{AB} - c_L) = 8$ instead of $p^m_{AB} - c_L = 6$ without S. The presence of S thus allows L to screen consumers according to their shopping costs, which makes supplying null-valued good by L profitable.

The result still holds in the case where $v_L < 0$, that is $u_B < c_L$ as long as the gains of screening (i.e., $p_A - p^m_A = 4$) are larger than the losses of supplying A and B (i.e., $(p^m_{AB} - c_L) - p^m_A$) instead of supplying A only. With half of consumers who face a high shopping cost whereas the others can shop at a lower cost, L makes losses on one-stop shoppers (high-cost consumers) by supplying A and B instead of B only, that are $\frac{1}{2}[(p^m_{AB} - c_L) - p^m_A] = \frac{1}{2}(6 - c_L)$. However, L makes gains on multistop shoppers (low-cost consumers), that are $\frac{1}{2}(p_A - p^m_A) = \frac{1}{2}4$. Comparing losses and gains, L supplies A and B instead of supplying A only if $c_L < 10$, that is $v_L > -4$. Thus, as shown by Chen and Rey (2012), the presence of small rivals allows L in screening consumers according to their shopping costs, but this strategy, in selling B below cost opens a door for more. Indeed, a new insight should be added: L can now supply goods, that are competitive goods, for which consumer values are negative; the good B, here is sold for any $v_L > -4$.

2.2 A more general setting

We now extend the previous setting in a simple way, and, in particular, we allow for any proportion of low and high shopping cost. Let α and $1 - \alpha$ denote the proportion

of low and high-cost consumers (i.e., $\underline{s} = 0$ and $\overline{s} = 4$) respectively.

We denote by v_A, v_L the consumer values offered by L and by v_S the consumer value offered by S ($v_A > v_S > v_L$). As previously, we assume $v_A - \overline{s} > 0$ and $v_S - \overline{s} \leq 0$ such that S cannot attract high-cost consumers. This leads that high-cost consumers either buy at L or do not buy at all. In the previous numerical example, $v_A = u_A - c_A = 10$, $v_S = u_B - \widehat{p} = 4$, and these assumptions were satisfied: $v_A - \overline{s} = 6 > 0$ and $v_S - \overline{s} = 0$. As we focus on negative consumer value offered by L on the competitive segment, we assume $v_L < 0$, that is $v_L = u_L - c_L < 0$.

We denote by $r = p_A - c_A + p_B - c_L$, $r_A = p_A - c_A$ and by $r_L = p_B - c_L$ L's total margin, margin for A and for B respectively, with $r = r_A + r_L$.

As we did above, we first assume that L is a monopolist, implying that S is not present in the market; it is easy to show that the good B is not sold when $v_L < 0$. Two cases should be distinguished but in any case, B is not sold; L can supply A either to all consumers (as above) or to low-cost consumers only. Let $\underline{r}_A = v_A - \overline{s} = v_A - 4$ denote L's margin for A in the former case and $\overline{r}_A = v_A - \underline{s} = v_A$ L's margin for A in the latter case. When it supplies the good A to all consumers, it obtains $\underline{r}_A = v_A - 4$ and when it supplies A to low-cost consumers only, it gets $\overline{r}_A \alpha = v_A \alpha$. Comparing the profits, the result is that it supplies A to all consumers if $\alpha < \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}} = \frac{v_A - 4}{v_A}$ and A to low-cost consumers only if $\alpha \geq \frac{v_A - 4}{v_A}$.[6] Then, it can also supply A and B, however, B is not sold (in any case) because $v_L < 0$.

Suppose now, instead, that L is not a monopolist and the good B is also offered by S. As previously, we assume that S is a competitive fringe; S offers consumers a value v_S. We show that, while in the monopoly case, L would be better off in supplying A only, either to all consumers or to low-cost consumers only, L is now better off in supplying A and B to all consumers for $v_L < 0$, whatever the proportion of high and low shopping costs are.

When the proportion of low-cost consumers is small, that is, $\alpha < \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}} = \frac{v_A - 4}{v_A}$, L supplies A only to all consumers at $\underline{r}_A$ if it were alone. The presence of the competitive fringe allows L to screen consumers according to their shopping cost; keeping the total margin unchanged on high-cost consumers such that $v_A + v_L - r - \overline{s} = v_A - \underline{r}_A - \overline{s} = 0$

[6] In above numerical example, with $v_A = 10$ and $v_L < 0$, the good A was sold to all consumers because $\alpha = \frac{1}{2} < \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A} = \frac{3}{5}$.

(i.e., $r = \underline{r}_A + v_L$), lowering the margin for B down to $r_L = -(\overline{s} - \underline{s}) + v_L$ (i.e., $r_L = -(\overline{r}_A - \underline{r}_A) + v_L = -(\overline{s} - \underline{s}) + v_L$ with $r_A + r_L = r$ and $r_A = \overline{r}_A$) and increasing the margin for A to $r_A = \overline{r}_A = v_A - \underline{s}$ does not affect the shopping behavior of high-cost consumers (who still face the same margin) but increases the margin earned on low-cost consumers (who now become multistop shoppers). L earns a total profit $\overline{r}_A\alpha + (\underline{r}_A + v_L)(1-\alpha) = (v_A - \underline{s})\alpha + (v_A - \overline{s} + v_L)(1-\alpha)$ with $r_A = \overline{r}_A$ and $r = \underline{r}_A + v_L$, which can be greater than $\underline{r}_A = v_A - \overline{s}$, that is the profit it would obtain in selling A only to all consumers. Comparing the gains and losses of screening, this is true as long as the gains on low-cost consumers, which are $(\overline{r}_A - \underline{r}_A)\alpha = (\overline{s} - \underline{s})\alpha$ are larger than the losses on high-cost consumers, that are $((\underline{r}_A + v_L) - \underline{r}_A)(1-\alpha) = v_L(1-\alpha)$. The result is that L earns a higher total profit if $\alpha(\overline{s} - \underline{s}) > -(1-\alpha)v_L$ with $v_L < 0$, that is $v_L > -\frac{\alpha(\overline{s}-\underline{s})}{(1-\alpha)}$ which gives $v_L > -\frac{4\alpha}{(1-\alpha)}$. This case corresponds to the situation we developed in the numerical example above.[7]

When the proportion of low-cost consumers is high (i.e., $\alpha \geq \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}} = \frac{v_A - 4}{v_A}$), the situation is different, but the same logic applies. If L were alone, it would supply A to low-cost consumers only at $\overline{r}_A = v_A - \underline{s}$. The presence of the competitive fringe allows L to screen consumers according to their shopping costs, by pricing below cost the good B. Without changing the margin for A, which is still equal to $r_A = \overline{r}_A$, L can now attract high-cost consumers by charging $r_L = -(\overline{s} - \underline{s}) + v_L$ on the good B. With L's total margin, which is equal to $r = \underline{r}_A + v_L = (v_A - \overline{s}) + v_L$, high-cost consumers buy A and B from L. Low-cost consumers still buy A only from L because they are multistop shoppers, and high-cost consumers now become shoppers because they are interested in buying the basket (i.e., the good A and the good B). L earns a total profit $\overline{r}_A\alpha + (\underline{r}_A + v_L)(1-\alpha) = (v_A - \underline{s})\alpha + (v_A - \overline{s} + v_L)(1-\alpha)$ with $r_A = \overline{r}_A$ and $r = \underline{r}_A + v_L$, which can be greater than $\overline{r}_A\alpha = (v_A - \underline{s})\alpha$, that is the profits it gets in selling A only to low-cost consumers. While profits on low-cost consumers are unchanged, L can now earn $(v_A - \overline{s} + v_L)(1-\alpha)$ on high-cost consumers, which were not possible without the competitive fringe. Assume $v_L = 0$, L benefits of the presence of S because this allows it to screen consumers according to their shopping costs: L charges $r_A = \overline{r}_A$ and $r_L = -(\overline{r}_A - \underline{r}_A)$ which leads to a total margin of $r = \underline{r}_A$ (high-cost consumers become shoppers instead of not buying at all and low-cost consumers are multistop shoppers and buy B from S instead of buying A only). The benefits for

[7] With $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, v_L should be larger than -4.



Figure 1: Results as in Proposition 1 for $v_A = 10$, $v_S = 4$, $\underline{s} = 0$ and $\overline{s} = 4$.

L are thus given by $\underline{r}_A (1-\alpha) = (v_A - \overline{s})(1-\alpha)$ for $v_L = 0$. At the end, this strategy is profitable for $v_L < 0$, as long as the benefits on high-cost consumers are positive, that is, $v_L > -\underline{r}_A = -(v_A - \overline{s})$.

We summarize our results in Proposition 1.

Proposition 1 *Suppose L faces a competitive fringe of small retailers, L supplies A and B to all consumers whatever the proportion of high and low shopping costs even if $v_L < 0$; in particular, L supplies A and B to all consumers if $v_L > -\frac{\alpha(\overline{s}-\underline{s})}{(1-\alpha)} = -\frac{4\alpha}{(1-\alpha)}$ for $\alpha < \frac{v_A-\overline{s}}{v_A-\underline{s}} = \frac{v_A-4}{v_A}$ and if $v_L > -(v_A - \overline{s}) = -(v_A - 4)$ for $\alpha \geq \frac{v_A-4}{v_A}$.*

Proof. See the text above. ■

Figure (1) summarizes results in Proposition 1 according to the proportion of low shopping costs. This insight which seems quite surprising is due to the presence of small retailers which allows the large retailer to screen consumers according to their shopping costs. While a multiproduct monopolist has no incentive to profitably introduce a good with a negative value, a multiproduct firm which competes with small retailers on some segments has an incentive to profitably introduce products on these segments even if its products offer consumers negative values. By selling below cost these products, the multiproduct firm can discriminate the low-cost consumers (who are multistop shoppers and buy some products from the multiproduct firm and these products from the small

retailers) from the high-cost consumers (who are one-stop shoppers and buy all goods, i.e., the basket of goods from the multiproduct firm). Our insight provides a rationale for why multiproduct firms are able to offer a larger product line at no benefit (i.e., $v_L = 0$) or at a loss (i.e., $v_L < 0$).[8]

While we demonstrate our results in a simple example, similar insights can be provided with Chen and Rey (2012)'s general model. Interesting, similar insights also apply in Chen and Rey (2016), in which multiproduct firms with different comparative advantages compete for consumers with heterogenous shopping patterns. In their setting, competition for one-stop shoppers drives total prices down to cost, but firms subsidize weak products with the profit made on their strong products. Negative consumer values for weak products thus arise because multiproduct firms price below cost these products.[9] Recently, Johnson (2017) considers a setting in which one-stop shoppers may underestimate their needs, and shows that below-cost pricing may emerge when consumers have different biases across products. In particular, loss-leader products tend to be products that consumers purchase regularly. Our insight, that is, negative consumer values for these loss-leader products is feasible, once again applies to these products.[10]

Using the simple example above, we now provide some applications of our insights on vertical relations in the following Section.

3 Applications in vertical relations

We provide two applications. First, we discuss the access to the retail market (using the large retailer) for a supplier for which the good offers a negative consumer value, providing an example in which below-cost pricing is good for the supplier. Second, we demonstrate that a large retailer which benefits from an alternative source of supply which provides a negative consumer value for this good may have buyer power vis-à-vis an efficientsupplier of this good. This latter application helps us to show that the assortment of a large retailer may interact with the buyer power of this retailer when it

[8]For example, assuming that L faces a fixed cost to introduce the product L, that is F; our analysis shows (for $v_L = 0$) that there exists a positive F such that L has incentive to introduce B whatever the proportion of low-cost and high-cost consumers are. Using calculations above, threshold values in F are given by $(\overline{s} - \underline{s})\,\alpha$ for $\alpha < \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}}$ and by $(v_A - \overline{s})\,(1 - \alpha)$ for $\alpha \geq \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}}$.

[9]We provide an example in Appendix A.

[10]See Appendix B for an example.

competes with smaller retailers.

3.1 Access to the retail market

L is a multiproduct retailer which provides two goods A and B. In this subsection, we consider a scenario where the good B at L is being supplied by a supplier. The supplier can produce B at a constant marginal cost $c \geq 0$ and offers a take-it-or-leave-it two-part tariff contract (w_L, F_L) where w_L and F_L, respectively are the wholesale price and the fixed fee which are paid to the supplier by the large retailer. The timing of the game is as follows: first, the supplier offers contracts to the large retailer, which decides whether to accept or reject the contract and then the large retailer sets retail prices.

For notational simplicity, we denote the market value of the good B as $v_L = u_B - c_L - c$ where c_L represents the retailing cost of the large retailer. Furthermore, we assume that the market value of good B is negative, that is, $v_L < 0$ (to focus on our point) Then, there is a competitive fringe S of small retailers that sells the good B at a price $\widehat{p}$, providing consumers a utility of $v_S = u_B - \widehat{p}$. As previously, we assume that consumers face shopping costs $\underline{s}$ and $\overline{s}$, and that $v_A > v_S$ and $v_S \leq \overline{s}$.

Using previous results, we can write the retail margins of the large retailer and its gross profits. We denote by $v_L(w_L) = u_B - c_L - w_L$ the consumer value of the good B at L for a wholesale price w_L. Retail margins are thus given by $r_A = \overline{r}_A$ and $r_L = -(\overline{s} - \underline{s}) + v_L(w_L)$ which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{AL} &= (v_A - \underline{s})\alpha + (v_A - \overline{s} + v_L(w_L))(1-\alpha) \\ &= \pi_A^m + [(\overline{s} - \underline{s})\alpha + v_L(w_L)((1-\alpha))] \qquad \text{for } \alpha < \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}} \end{aligned}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{AL} &= (v_A - \underline{s})\alpha + (v_A + v_L(w_L) - \overline{s})(1-\alpha) \\ &= \pi_A^m + (v_A + v_L(w_L) - \overline{s})(1-\alpha) \qquad \text{for } \alpha \geq \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}} \end{aligned}$$

as gross profits for the large retailer.[11]

[11] π_A^m which represents, here the outside option of the large retailer is given by: $\pi_A^m = (v_A - \overline{s})$ for $\alpha < \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}}$ and $\pi_A^m = (v_A - \underline{s})\alpha$ for $\alpha \geq \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}}$.

Then, the supplier sets its contract to maximize the following,

$$\max_{w_L, F_L} (w_L - c)(1-\alpha) + F_L$$
$$s.t. \qquad \pi_{AL} - F_L \geq \pi_A^m$$

and the fixed fee is set so as to just satisfy the participation constraint of the large retailer. Since the retailer is the residual claimant of the total profits, the supplier sets its wholesale price to maximize the multiproduct retailer's profit and hence $w_L = c$. The supplier's profits are thus given as

$$\begin{aligned} [(\overline{s} - \underline{s})\alpha + v_L((1-\alpha))] \text{ for } \alpha &< \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}}, \\ \text{and } (v_A + v_L - \overline{s})(1-\alpha) \text{ for } \alpha &\geq \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}}. \end{aligned}$$

The above implies that the supplier of good B can supply its good for $v_L < 0$, that is $v_L > -\frac{\alpha(\overline{s}-\underline{s})}{(1-\alpha)}$ for $\alpha < \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}}$ and $v_L > -(v_A - \overline{s})$ for $\alpha \geq \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}}$ (see our previous analysis).[12] The supplier is thus able to profitably supply the good B at L even if its good has a negative market value. Our application provides a clear example where below cost pricing is good for the supplier which echoes the findings as in von Schlippenbach (2015). However, we go further in this application and say that the supplier has incentive to introduce a good for which the market value is negative.

3.2 Buyer power and alternative source of supply

There are a number of reasons explaining why large buyers obtain price discounts from sellers (e.g., Dobson and Waterson, 1999; Inderst and Mazzarotto, 2007). One of these is to assume that large buyers can turn to other sources of supply and can thus demand better terms from suppliers.[13] In these kinds of models, large retailers have access to other sources of supply and they can turn to these other sources if they dislike the efficient suppliers' terms. Price discounts thus emerge when large retailers have *positive*

[12] While we provide an analysis in assuming that the supplier offers two-part tariff contracts to the large retailer, our analysis still holds in linear-contracting for values of v_L defined in the main text; however, equilibrium contracts would be different.

[13] Integrating backward and producing the good themselves is an alternative solution which is also mentioned.

outside options, which corresponds to the "textbook" view.[14]

In our present setting, the large retailer is a multiproduct firm. While the previous view arises when the large retailer is a monopolist, that is, the large buyer has buyer power if it has a positive outside option, buyer power may also arise if the large retailer has a negative outside option when it competes with small retailers. It is the combination of both "access to an alternative supplier" and "seller power " (i.e., its ability to price below-costs these goods) which allows the large retailer to have discounts even if it has a negative outside option.

In this application, we assume that L is in relation with an efficient supplier for the good B. However, it has also access to an alternative supplier which is modeled as a competitive fringe. As previously, we assume that the efficient supplier makes take-it-or-leave-it offers to L in two-part tariffs. Let $v_L = u_B - c_L - c$ denote the consumer's value offered by the efficient supplier at L and $\widetilde{v}_L = v_L = u_B - c_L - \widetilde{c}$ the consumer's value offered by the alternative supplier at L with $v_L > \widetilde{v}_L$ (c and $\widetilde{c}$ denote respectively, the constant marginal cost of the efficient supplier and of the alternative supplier). We assume that $\widetilde{v}_L < 0$ to focus on a negative outside option. The retail market and consumer behavior are unchanged.

L is a multiproduct monopolist. There is no scope for L to exert buyer power vis-à-vis the efficient supplier of the good B because L has access to a negative outside option for this good (i.e., $\widetilde{v}_L < 0$). The profit of the large retailer is given by its monopoly profit on the good A, that is, π_A^m and the supplier extracts the monopoly profit for the good B. In this case, only a positive outside option for this good, that is, $\widetilde{v}_L > 0$ would allow L to obtain better terms for the efficient supplier.

L is in competition with S on the good B. The view changes drastically: while L had π_A^m as an outside option when it were monopolist, it now has $\widetilde{\pi}_{AL}$ as an outside option, which can be greater than π_A^m even if $\widetilde{v}_L < 0$. This insight comes from our previous analysis: a multiproduct firm which competes with small retailers on a specific segment has an incentive to profitably supply a product for which the consumer's value is negative on this segment. By selling below cost this product, the multiproduct firm can discriminate consumers according to their shopping costs, which allows

[14]See Katz (1987), and more recently Caprice (2006) and Caprice and Rey (2015) for applications with this modeling of buyer power.

products with negative consumer's value to be profitable. Using our previous simple example, we obtain $\widetilde{\pi}_{AL} = (v_A - \overline{s}) + [(\overline{s} - \underline{s})\,\alpha + \widetilde{v}_L\,((1-\alpha))]$ which corresponds to $\pi_A^m + [(\overline{s} - \underline{s})\,\alpha + \widetilde{v}_L\,((1-\alpha))]$ when $\alpha < \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}}$ and $\widetilde{\pi}_{AL} = (v_A - \underline{s})\,\alpha + (v_A + \widetilde{v}_L - \overline{s})\,(1-\alpha)$, that is, $\pi_A^m + (v_A + \widetilde{v}_L - \overline{s})\,(1-\alpha)$ for $\alpha \geq \frac{v_A - \overline{s}}{v_A - \underline{s}}$. While L would have no buyer power when it were a monopolist, it has buyer power now as it can extracts $\widetilde{\pi}_{AL} - \pi_A^m$ instead of π_A^m.

Figure 2 illustrates our insight, that is, $\widetilde{\pi}_{AL} - \pi_A^m$ for $\widetilde{v}_L = 0$ and numerical values used above ($v_A = 10$, $v_S = 4$, $\underline{s} = 0$ and $\overline{s} = 4$) according to the proportion of low shopping costs. Note that this buyer power arises whatever the proportion of high and low shopping costs are ($\widetilde{v}_L = 0$). In particular, starting from a situation where all consumers have the same shopping costs, introducing a arbitrarily small number of consumers with a different shopping cost suffices to give some buyer power to the large retailer, which were not the case for $\alpha = 0$ or $\alpha = 1$.



Figure 2: Difference in outside option profits in terms of proportion of low shopping cost consumers

Our result contrasts with the standard textbook view about buyer power, in which $\widetilde{v}_L$ should be positive. While in the analysis of market power of large retailers, buyer power and seller power are generally studied separately, our insight suggests that both can interact.[15] In particular, the large assortment of a big-box retailer can help it to

[15]Note as exception, Caprice and Shekhar (2017) which defines buyer power as here, but focus on

benefit from buyer power in product categories for which products are sold below-cost costs.

4 Conclusion

Chen and Rey's (2012) model captures one the key characteristics of the modern retail markets: consumers face shopping costs and large retailers offering large product line benefit from seller power. The recalculation of Chen and Rey's (2012) paper provides new insights. Contrary to the conventional wisdom, which requires positive consumer value for a multiproduct firm, we show that goods with negative consumer value can be provided by multiproduct retailers as long as below-cost pricing on these goods is optimal.[16]

We provide two applications of our result on vertical relationships. First, we demonstrate that a supplier facing a negative consumer value can access the retail market when it negotiates with a large retailer. The supplier of the loss-leader product benefits from the large product line of the large retailer. The latter prices below cost this product and the supplier has access to the market. It is an example, where a supplier can benefit from a large retailer's below-cost pricing strategy. Second, we demonstrate that a positive consumer value as demand-side substitution is not required for a large retailer to benefit from buyer power. When a large retailer prices below-cost some products, it does not need to have positive consumer values as demand-side substitution for these products. Its seller power (i.e., here its opportunity to price below-cost) helps it to benefit from buyer power even if it has a negative consumer value as a demand-side substitution.

While we focus on vertical relations, interesting insights of our results in product line competition can also be provided. However, we leave this task for further investigation.

the impact of the countervailing power on consumers and total welfare. In particular, they show that countervailing power is detrimental to consumers and total welfare when the market power of the large retailer is defined by both seller power and buyer power; however, they do not deal, as here with the introduction of negative market value products.

[16]We extend our insights to alternative modelings, that are, Chen and Rey (2016) and Johnson (2017).

5 References

Caprice, S. (2006), "The Welfare Effects of a Ban on Price Discrimination", *Review of Industrial Organization*, 28(1): 63-80.

Caprice, S., and P. Rey (2015), "Buyer power from joint listing decision," *Economic Journal*, 125: 1677-1704.

Caprice, S., and S. Shekhar (2017), "On the countervailing power of large retailers when shopping costs matter", TSE Working Paper 17-771.

Chen, Z., and P. Rey (2012), "Loss leading as an exploitative practice", *American Economic Review*, 102(7): 3462-3482.

Chen, Z., and P. Rey (2016), "Competitive Cross-Subsidization", TSE Working Paper 13-450, revised version.

Dobson, P., and M. Waterson (1999), "Retailer power: recent developments and policy implications", *Economic Policy*, 14(28), 133-156.

Inderst, R., and N. Mazzarotto (2008), "Buyer Power in Distribution", in W.D. Collins (Ed.), ABA Antitrust Section Handbook, Issues in Competition Law, 1611-1637; ABA Book Publishing, Chicago.

Johnson, J. P. (2017), "Unplanned Purchases and Retail Competition", *American Economic Review*, 107(3): 931-65.

Katz, M. L. (1987), "The welfare effects of third-degree price discrimination in intermediate good markets," *American Economic Review*, 77(1):154-167.

von Schlippenbach, V. (2015), "Sales at a loss: who benefits", *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, 42(2): 269-286.

Appendices

A Illustration from Chen and Rey (2016)'s paper

We focus on the simple example (page 6) and we transform it a little to make our point clearer in their setting.

Consumers wish to buy two goods, A and B, which both can be supplied by two firms, 1 and 2. Let v_1^A and v_1^B denote consumers values for A and B from firm 1, and v_2^A and v_2^B consumers values for A and B from firm 2. We assume that firms are symmetric such that $v_1^A + v_1^B = v_2^A + v_2^B$; however, firm 1 enjoys a larger consumer value for A ($v_1^A > v_2^A$) whereas firm 2 enjoys a larger consumer value for B ($v_2^B > v_1^B$): $v_1^A = v_2^B > v_2^A = v_1^B$.

Consumers face a shopping cost, reflecting the opportunity cost of the time spent in traffic, selecting products and so on. Some consumers face a "low" shopping cost, that is $\underline{s}$, such that they will adopt a multistop shopping behavior, purchasing each product at the lowest available price. Let α denote the proportion of these consumers. While some consumers incur a low shopping cost, other consumers face a "high" shopping cost, that is $\overline{s}$ and $(1-\alpha)$ denote the proportion of these consumers.

Let r_1^A, r_1^B and r_1 denote firm 1's margins for A and B, and total margin, such that $r_1 = r_1^A + r_1^B$ and r_2^A, r_2^B and r_2 firm 2's margins for A and B, and total margin, that is $r_2 = r_2^A + r_2^B$.

Suppose first as Chen and Rey (2016), consumers face a high shopping cost (smaller than $v_1^A + v_1^B = v_2^A + v_2^B$). In equilibrium, consumers behave as one-stop shoppers, that is, they buy both products from the same firm, and thus only the total margin, r_1 and r_2 matter. As the firms deliver the same consumer value, Bertrand-like competition drives the basket margin down to zero: $r_1 = r_2 = 0$.

Suppose instead that all consumers face a low shopping cost such that, in equilibrium, consumers behave as multistop shoppers and purchase each product at the lowest available price. Asymmetric Bertrand competition then leads firms to sell weak products at zero margin, and strong products at a margin equal (or just below) the consumer value gain minus consumers' shopping costs: $r_1^A = v_1^A - v_2^A - \underline{s} = r_2^B = v_2^B - v_1^B - \underline{s}$ (i.e., $v_1^A - r_1^A - \underline{s} = v_2^A$ and $v_2^B - r_2^B - \underline{s} = v_1^B$). Note that $r_1^A = v_1^A - \underline{s}$ and $r_2^B = v_2^B - \underline{s}$ if

$v_1^B = v_2^A < 0$.

Next, suppose that a fraction of consumers face a high shopping cost, that is, $\overline{s}$, whereas the others have a low shopping cost, that is, $\underline{s}$. As showed by Chen and Rey (2016), cross-subsidization naturally arises. As before, fierce price competition dissipates profits from one-stop shoppers, and drives basket margins down to zero: $r_1^A + r_1^B = r_2^A + r_2^B = 0$. Then, keeping the total margin constant for one-stop shoppers, it suffices to undercut the rival's weak product by the amount of $\underline{s}$ to attract multistop shoppers. It follows that equilibrium margins are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} v_1^A - r_1^A - \underline{s} &= v_2^A - r_2^A, \\ v_2^B - r_2^B - \underline{s} &= v_1^B - r_1^B. \end{aligned}$$

Replacing r_1^B and r_2^A by $-r_1^A$ and $-r_2^B$ (as $r_1^A + r_1^B = 0$ and $r_2^A + r_2^B = 0$), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} v_1^A - r_1^A - \underline{s} &= v_2^A + r_2^B, \\ v_2^B - r_2^B - \underline{s} &= v_1^B + r_1^A. \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, $r_1^A = r_2^B$ and $r_1^A = \frac{v_1^A - v_2^A - \underline{s}}{2} = r_2^B = \frac{v_2^B - v_1^B - \underline{s}}{2}$, the result is $r_1^B = -\frac{v_1^A - v_2^A - \underline{s}}{2} = r_2^A = -\frac{v_2^B - v_1^B - \underline{s}}{2}$. This pricing strategy does not affect the shopping behavior of high-cost consumers (who still face a zero margin), but generates a positive profit from multistop shoppers, who buy A from firm 1 and B from firm 2, giving each firm a positive margin of $\frac{v_1^A - v_2^A - \underline{s}}{2} = \frac{v_2^B - v_1^B - \underline{s}}{2}$ on these consumers.

We now focus on our point and assume that $v_1^A = v_2^B > \overline{s}$ and $v_1^B = v_2^A < 0$.

Suppose first, that firm 1 were alone (by symmetry, the same analysis applies for firm 2 by replacing good A by good B and good B by good A), as $v_1^B < 0$, firm 1 would only supply good A. Two cases should be distinguished depending all consumers are served or low-cost consumers only, but in any case firm 1 would only supply good A. We can define a threshold in α such that, for low α, firm 1 provides the good A to all consumers and, for high α, firm 1 provides the good A to low-cost consumers.

Next, we suppose both firms compete, previous analysis applies and we can show that firm 1 supplies A and B and firm 2 supplies A and B even if $v_1^B = v_2^A < 0$.

Numerical example: $v_1^A = v_2^B = 26 > \overline{s} = 20$ and $v_1^B = v_2^A = -2 < 0$. We can define consumer utilities and costs as follows: $u_1^A = u_2^B = 36$, $u_1^B = u_2^A = 28$ and $c_1^A = c_2^B = 10$,

and $c_1^B = c_2^A = 30$. We also assume for the numerical example that $\underline{s} = 2$.

When firms are monopolists, the threshold in α is given by $\alpha = \frac{1}{4}$, but in any case, each firm only provides its strong product as $v_1^B = v_2^A = -2$.

When the firms compete, firms supply both goods, which generates a profit of $\frac{v_1^A - v_2^A - \underline{s}}{2}\alpha = \frac{v_2^B - v_1^B - \underline{s}}{2}\alpha = 13\alpha$ for each firm, even if $v_1^B = v_2^A = -2$. Q.E.D.

B Illustration from Johnson (2017)'s paper

Following Johnson (2017)'s paper, we assume asymmetric competition, in which a large retailer L with a full product line competes against a small firm S with a limited product line.[17] We focus on the pricing behavior of the large retailer and we assume that the small firm is not a strategic player: the expected "in-store" utility of shopping at retailer S will be given by $\widehat{U}_S$.

L carries m products. For simplicity, we assume that $m = 3$. Let c_1, c_2 and c_3 denote the retailing costs of the large retailer for these products. Prices are perfectly observed by consumers, who then decide whether to go shopping.

A consumer who visits retailer L purchases quantities x_1, x_2 and x_3 to maximize:

$$\sum_i \zeta_i \left[u_i\left(x_i\right) - p_i x_i\right], \qquad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

where $\zeta_i \in (0, 1)$ is a binary random variable after the consumer chooses the large retailer but before final in-store purchasing decisions are made. Hence, for any i that is carried by L, a consumer has zero demand for it (so that $\zeta_i = 0$) and so buys zero units, or instead has positive demand for it (so that $\zeta_i = 1$) and so buys quantity x_i to maximize $u_i\left(x_i\right) - p_i x_i$. Let $v_i\left(p_i\right)$ denote the indirect utility associated with product i: $v_i\left(p_i\right) = \max_{x_i} u_i\left(x_i\right) - p_i x_i$; we obtain $\frac{dv_i(p_i)}{dp_i} = -x_i$. The values $\{\zeta_i\}$ are realized independently of each other, and independently and identically across consumers. The true probability that a consumer has positive demand for i is given by θ_i. That is, for any given consumer, $\Pr\left[\zeta_i = 1\right] = \theta_i > 0$. While the true probability is θ_i, each consumer believes that he will have positive demand for product i with some probability $\widehat{\theta}_i$ with

[17] We use the version (2017), forthcoming in *AER*.

$\widehat{\theta}_i \neq \theta_i$. Consumers make unplanned purchases such that $\theta_i \geq \widehat{\theta}_i$. Let $\alpha_i = \frac{\widehat{\theta}_i}{\theta_i}$ denote the accuracy ratio with $\alpha_i \leq 1$.

Because consumers believe that they will have positive demand for i with probability $\widehat{\theta}_i$, each consumer forecasts his expected "in-store" utility of shopping at retailer L to be:

$$\widehat{U}_L = \sum_i \widehat{\theta}_i v_i (p_i).$$

As noticed previously, the expected "in-store" utility of shopping at retailer S is given by $\widehat{U}_S$

Consumers choose whether to shop at retailer L or at retailer S by considering the values $\left\{\widehat{U}_L, \widehat{U}_S\right\}$. The number of consumers shopping at L is given by $Q\left(\widehat{U}_L, \widehat{U}_S\right)$. Let Q_1 denote the derivative with respect to the first argument; $Q_1 > 0$ so that Q is increasing in $\widehat{U}_L$. Properties of $Q\left(\widehat{U}_L, \widehat{U}_S\right)$ can be found in Johnson (2017, page 6).

The large retailer know the true probabilities $\{\theta_i\}$ but also know that consumers forecast their utility values $\left\{\widehat{U}_L, \widehat{U}_S\right\}$ based on the values $\left\{\widehat{\theta}_i\right\}$. The result is L sets prices to maximize:

$$Q\left(\widehat{U}_L, \widehat{U}_S\right) \pi_L$$

where $\pi_L = \sum_i \theta_i (p_i - c_i) x_i (p_i)$.

Define $L_i (p_i) = \frac{p_i - c_i}{p_i} \epsilon_i (p_i)$, where $\epsilon_i (p_i) = \frac{p_i x_i'(p_i)}{x_i(p_i)}$; $L_i (p_i)$ is the Lerner index of good i multiplied by its elasticity, so that if L were simply maximizing $(p_i - c_i) x_i (p_i)$, it would choose a price $\overline{p}_i$ such that $L_i (\overline{p}_i) = -1$ (by using the first-order condition: $(p_i - c_i) x_i' (p_i) + x_i (p_i) = 0$).

We assume in the following, to make our point that $x_i (p_i) = a - p_i$. Then, we assume that $c_1 = c_2 = c < a$; however we put no restriction on c_3. We will say that good 3 offers consumers a positive value if $c_3 < a$ and offers consumers a negative value if $c_3 \geq a$. So that, if L were simply maximizing $(p_3 - c_3) x_3 (p_3)$, it would choose a price $\overline{p}_3$ such that $L_3 (\overline{p}_3) = -1$ if the consumer value of the good 3 were positive and it would not sell the good in case of negative value, that were $c_3 \geq a$.

From the maximization problem of L which is given by $\max_{p_1, p_2, p_3} Q\left(\widehat{U}_L, \widehat{U}_S\right) \pi_L$, we derive first-order conditions ($i = 1, 2, 3$):

$$\frac{\partial \Pi_L}{\partial p_i} = Q\theta_i \left[x_i (p_i) + (p_i - c) x_i' (p_i)\right] + Q_1 \left[\widehat{\theta}_i \frac{dv_i (p_i)}{dp_i}\right] \pi_L = 0.$$

Using $\frac{dv_i(p_i)}{dp_i} = -x_i(p_i)$ and $L_i(p_i) = \frac{p_i - c}{p_i}\epsilon_i(p_i)$ leads to:

$$\frac{\partial \Pi_L}{\partial p_i} = \frac{x_i(p_i)}{\widehat{\theta}_i}\left[Q\theta_i\left[1 + L_i(p_i)\right] - Q_1\pi_L\right] = 0.$$

Then, with $\alpha_i = \frac{\widehat{\theta}_i}{\theta_i}$, we obtain:

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_i}\left[1 + L_i(p_i)\right] = \frac{Q_1}{Q}\pi_L$$

as it is derived in Johnson (2017)'s paper at page 9.

We assume that $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \alpha_3$ and that $p_2 = c$ at equilibrium. We know from Proposition 1 (at page 9) that the good 3 is priced below-cost because $\alpha_2 < \alpha_3$. The result is that, assuming $c_3 = a$, the good 3 is sold because it is priced below-cost at the equilibrium: $p_3 < a$. By continuity, there exists a threshold in $c_3 > a$ such that the good 3 is sold even if it provides consumers a negative value (i.e., $c_3 > a$). The result is obtained because the good 3 generates traffic to the large retailer. As claimed by Johnson (2017), goods with few unplanned purchases behave like this (we can thing about bread, milk, and so on). While these goods may provide consumers negative values at L, they can be sold by L, which corresponds to the point we demonstrate in the present paper. Q.E.D.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSION PAPERS

271 Caprice, Stéphane and Shekhar, Shiva, Negative Consumer Value and Loss Leading, October 2017.

270 Emch, Eric, Jeitschko, Thomas D. and Zhou, Arthur, What Past U.S. Agency Actions Say About Complexity in Merger Remedies, With an Application to Generic Drug Divestitures, October 2017.

269 Goeddeke, Anna, Haucap, Justus, Herr, Annika and Wey, Christian, Flexibility in Wage Setting Under the Threat of Relocation, September 2017.
Forthcoming in: Labour: Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations.

268 Haucap, Justus, Merger Effects on Innovation: A Rationale for Stricter Merger Control?, September 2017.
Forthcoming in: Concurrences: Competition Law Review.

267 Brunner, Daniel, Heiss, Florian, Romahn, André and Weiser, Constantin, Reliable Estimation of Random Coefficient Logit Demand Models, September 2017.

266 Kosse, Fabian, Deckers, Thomas, Schildberg-Hörisch, Hannah and Falk, Armin, The Formation of Prosociality: Causal Evidence on the Role of Social Environment, July 2017.

265 Friehe, Tim and Schildberg-Hörisch, Hannah, Predicting Norm Enforcement: The Individual and Joint Predictive Power of Economic Preferences, Personality, and Self-Control, July 2017.

264 Friehe, Tim and Schildberg-Hörisch, Hannah, Self-Control and Crime Revisited: Disentangling the Effect of Self-Control on Risk Taking and Antisocial Behavior, July 2017.

263 Golsteyn, Bart and Schildberg-Hörisch, Hannah, Challenges in Research on Preferences and Personality Traits: Measurement, Stability, and Inference, July 2017.

262 Lange, Mirjam R.J., Tariff Diversity and Competition Policy – Drivers for Broadband Adoption in the European Union, July 2017.

261 Reisinger, Markus and Thomes, Tim Paul, Manufacturer Collusion: Strategic Implications of the Channel Structure, July 2017.

260 Shekhar, Shiva and Wey, Christian, Uncertain Merger Synergies, Passive Partial Ownership, and Merger Control, July 2017.

259 Link, Thomas and Neyer, Ulrike, Friction-Induced Interbank Rate Volatility under Alternative Interest Corridor Systems, July 2017.

258 Diermeier, Matthias, Goecke, Henry, Niehues, Judith and Thomas, Tobias, Impact of Inequality-Related Media Coverage on the Concerns of the Citizens, July 2017.

257 Stiebale, Joel and Wößner, Nicole, M&As, Investment and Financing Constraints, July 2017.

256 Wellmann, Nicolas, OTT-Messaging and Mobile Telecommunication: A Joint Market? – An Empirical Approach, July 2017.

255 Ciani, Andrea and Imbruno, Michele, Microeconomic Mechanisms Behind Export Spillovers from FDI: Evidence from Bulgaria, June 2017.
Forthcoming in: Review of World Economics.

254 Hunold, Matthias and Muthers, Johannes, Capacity Constraints, Price Discrimination, Inefficient Competition and Subcontracting, June 2017.

253 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus and Köster, Mats, Salient Compromises in the Newsvendor Game, June 2017.
Published in: Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 141 (2017), pp. 301-315.

252 Siekmann, Manuel, Characteristics, Causes, and Price Effects: Empirical Evidence of Intraday Edgeworth Cycles, May, 2017.

251 Benndorf, Volker, Moellers, Claudia and Normann, Hans-Theo, Experienced vs. Inexperienced Participants in the Lab: Do they Behave Differently?, May 2017.
Forthcoming in: Journal of the Economic Science Association.

250 Hunold, Matthias, Backward Ownership, Uniform Pricing and Entry Deterrence, May 2017.

249 Kreickemeier, Udo and Wrona, Jens, Industrialisation and the Big Push in a Global Economy, May 2017.

248 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus and Köster, Mats, Local Thinking and Skewness Preferences, April 2017.

247 Shekhar, Shiva, Homing Choice and Platform Pricing Strategy, March 2017.

246 Manasakis, Constantine, Mitrokostas, Evangelos and Petrakis, Emmanuel, Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility by a Multinational Firm, March 2017.

245 Ciani, Andrea, Income Inequality and the Quality of Imports, March 2017.

244 Bonnet, Céline and Schain, Jan Philip, An Empirical Analysis of Mergers: Efficiency Gains and Impact on Consumer Prices, February 2017.

243 Benndorf, Volker and Martinez-Martinez, Ismael, Perturbed Best Response Dynamics in a Hawk-Dove Game, January 2017.
Published in: Economics Letters, 153 (2017), pp. 61-64.

242 Dauth, Wolfgang, Findeisen, Sebastian and Suedekum, Jens, Trade and Manufacturing Jobs in Germany, January 2017.
Forthcoming in: American Economic Review, Papers & Proceedings.

241 Borrs, Linda and Knauth, Florian, The Impact of Trade and Technology on Wage Components, December 2016.

240 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Siekmann, Manuel, Selling Gasoline as a By-Product: The Impact of Market Structure on Local Prices, December 2016.

239 Herr, Annika and Normann, Hans-Theo, How Much Priority Bonus Should be Given to Registered Organ Donors? An Experimental Analysis, November 2016.

238 Steffen, Nico, Optimal Tariffs and Firm Technology Choice: An Environmental Approach, November 2016.

237 Behrens, Kristian, Mion, Giordano, Murata, Yasusada and Suedekum, Jens, Distorted Monopolistic Competition, November 2016.

236 Beckmann, Klaus, Dewenter, Ralf and Thomas, Tobias, Can News Draw Blood? The Impact of Media Coverage on the Number and Severity of Terror Attacks, November 2016.
Forthcoming in: Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy.

235 Dewenter, Ralf, Dulleck, Uwe and Thomas, Tobias, Does the 4th Estate Deliver? Towars a More Direct Measure of Political Media Bias, November 2016.

234 Egger, Hartmut, Kreickemeier, Udo, Moser, Christoph and Wrona, Jens, Offshoring and Job Polarisation Between Firms, November 2016.

233 Moellers, Claudia, Stühmeier, Torben and Wenzel, Tobias, Search Costs in Concentrated Markets – An Experimental Analysis, October 2016.

232 Moellers, Claudia, Reputation and Foreclosure with Vertical Integration – Experimental Evidence, October 2016.

231 Alipranti, Maria, Mitrokostas, Evangelos and Petrakis, Emmanuel, Non-comparative and Comparative Advertising in Oligopolistic Markets, October 2016.
Forthcoming in: The Manchester School.

230 Jeitschko, Thomas D., Liu, Ting and Wang, Tao, Information Acquisition, Signaling and Learning in Duopoly, October 2016.

229 Stiebale, Joel and Vencappa, Dev, Acquisitions, Markups, Efficiency, and Product Quality: Evidende from India, October 2016.

228 Dewenter, Ralf and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Predicting Advertising Volumes: A Structural Time Series Approach, October 2016.
Published in: Economics Bulletin, 37 (2017), Volume 3.

227 Wagner, Valentin, Seeking Risk or Answering Smart? Framing in Elementary Schools, October 2016.

226 Moellers, Claudia, Normann, Hans-Theo and Snyder, Christopher M., Communication in Vertical Markets: Experimental Evidence, July 2016.
Published in: International Journal of Industrial Organization, 50 (2017), pp. 214-258.

225 Argentesi, Elena, Buccirossi, Paolo, Cervone, Roberto, Duso, Tomaso and Marrazzo, Alessia, The Effect of Retail Mergers on Prices and Variety: An Ex-post Evaluation, June 2016.

224 Aghadadashli, Hamid, Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus and Wey, Christian, The Nash Bargaining Solution in Vertical Relations With Linear Input Prices, June 2016.
Published in: Economics Letters, 145 (2016), pp. 291-294.

223 Fan, Ying, Kühn, Kai-Uwe and Lafontaine, Francine, Financial Constraints and Moral Hazard: The Case of Franchising, June 2016.
Forthcoming in: Journal of Political Economy.

222 Benndorf, Volker, Martinez-Martinez, Ismael and Normann, Hans-Theo, Equilibrium Selection with Coupled Populations in Hawk-Dove Games: Theory and Experiment in Continuous Time, June 2016.
Published in: Journal of Economic Theory, 165 (2016), pp. 472-486.

221 Lange, Mirjam R. J. and Saric, Amela, Substitution between Fixed, Mobile, and Voice over IP Telephony – Evidence from the European Union, May 2016.
Published in: Telecommunications Policy, 40 (2016), pp. 1007-1019.

220 Dewenter, Ralf, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Lüth, Hendrik, The Impact of the Market Transparency Unit for Fuels on Gasoline Prices in Germany, May 2016.
Published in: Applied Economics Letters, 24 (2017), pp. 302-305.

219 Schain, Jan Philip and Stiebale, Joel, Innovation, Institutional Ownership, and Financial Constraints, April 2016.

218 Haucap, Justus and Stiebale, Joel, How Mergers Affect Innovation: Theory and Evidence from the Pharmaceutical Industry, April 2016.

217 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus and Wey, Christian, Evidence Production in Merger Control: The Role of Remedies, March 2016.

216 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus, Köhler, Katrin, Lange, Mirjam R. J. and Wenzel, Tobias, Demand Shifts Due to Salience Effects: Experimental Evidence, March 2016.
Published in: Journal of the European Economic Association, 15 (2017), pp. 626-653.

215 Dewenter, Ralf, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Thomas, Tobias, Media Coverage and Car Manufacturers' Sales, March 2016.
Published in: Economics Bulletin, 36 (2016), pp. 976-982.

214 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus and Riener, Gerhard, A First Test of Focusing Theory, February 2016.

213 Heinz, Matthias, Normann, Hans-Theo and Rau, Holger A., How Competitiveness May Cause a Gender Wage Gap: Experimental Evidence, February 2016.
Forthcoming in: European Economic Review, 90 (2016), pp. 336-349.

212 Fudickar, Roman, Hottenrott, Hanna and Lawson, Cornelia, What's the Price of Consulting? Effects of Public and Private Sector Consulting on Academic Research, February 2016.

211 Stühmeier, Torben, Competition and Corporate Control in Partial Ownership Acquisitions, February 2016.
Published in: Journal of Industry, Competition and Trade, 16 (2016), pp. 297-308.

210 Muck, Johannes, Tariff-Mediated Network Effects with Incompletely Informed Consumers, January 2016.

209 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus and Wey, Christian, Structural Remedies as a Signalling Device, January 2016.
Published in: Information Economics and Policy, 35 (2016), pp. 1-6.

208 Herr, Annika and Hottenrott, Hanna, Higher Prices, Higher Quality? Evidence From German Nursing Homes, January 2016.
Published in: Health Policy, 120 (2016), pp. 179-189.

207 Gaudin, Germain and Mantzari, Despoina, Margin Squeeze: An Above-Cost Predatory Pricing Approach, January 2016.
Published in: Journal of Competition Law & Economics, 12 (2016), pp. 151-179.

206 Hottenrott, Hanna, Rexhäuser, Sascha and Veugelers, Reinhilde, Organisational Change and the Productivity Effects of Green Technology Adoption, January 2016.
Published in: Energy and Ressource Economics, 43 (2016), pp. 172–194.

205 Dauth, Wolfgang, Findeisen, Sebastian and Suedekum, Jens, Adjusting to Globalization – Evidence from Worker-Establishment Matches in Germany, January 2016.

204 Banerjee, Debosree, Ibañez, Marcela, Riener, Gerhard and Wollni, Meike, Volunteering to Take on Power: Experimental Evidence from Matrilineal and Patriarchal Societies in India, November 2015.

203 Wagner, Valentin and Riener, Gerhard, Peers or Parents? On Non-Monetary Incentives in Schools, November 2015.

202 Gaudin, Germain, Pass-Through, Vertical Contracts, and Bargains, November 2015.
Published in: Economics Letters, 139 (2016), pp. 1-4.

201 Demeulemeester, Sarah and Hottenrott, Hanna, R&D Subsidies and Firms' Cost of Debt, November 2015.

200 Kreickemeier, Udo and Wrona, Jens, Two-Way Migration Between Similar Countries, October 2015.
Forthcoming in: World Economy.

199 Haucap, Justus and Stühmeier, Torben, Competition and Antitrust in Internet Markets, October 2015.
Published in: Bauer, J. and M. Latzer (Eds.), Handbook on the Economics of the Internet, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham 2016, pp. 183-210.

198 Alipranti, Maria, Milliou, Chrysovalantou and Petrakis, Emmanuel, On Vertical Relations and the Timing of Technology, October 2015.
Published in: Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 120 (2015), pp. 117-129.

197 Kellner, Christian, Reinstein, David and Riener, Gerhard, Stochastic Income and Conditional Generosity, October 2015.

196 Chlaß, Nadine and Riener, Gerhard, Lying, Spying, Sabotaging: Procedures and Consequences, September 2015.

195 Gaudin, Germain, Vertical Bargaining and Retail Competition: What Drives Countervailing Power?, May 2017 (First Version September 2015).
Forthcoming in: The Economic Journal.

194 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Learning-by-Doing in Torts: Liability and Information About Accident Technology, September 2015.

193 Defever, Fabrice, Fischer, Christian and Suedekum, Jens, Relational Contracts and Supplier Turnover in the Global Economy, August 2015.
Published in: Journal of International Economics, 103 (2016), pp. 147-165.

192 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Putting on a Tight Leash and Levelling Playing Field: An Experiment in Strategic Obfuscation and Consumer Protection, July 2015.
Published in: International Journal of Industrial Organization, 42 (2015), pp. 120-128.

191 Ciani, Andrea and Bartoli, Francesca, Export Quality Upgrading under Credit Constraints, July 2015.

190 Hasnas, Irina and Wey, Christian, Full Versus Partial Collusion among Brands and Private Label Producers, July 2015.

189 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus and Köster, Mats, Violations of First-Order Stochastic Dominance as Salience Effects, June 2015.
Published in: Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics, 59 (2015), pp. 42-46.

188 Kholodilin, Konstantin, Kolmer, Christian, Thomas, Tobias and Ulbricht, Dirk, Asymmetric Perceptions of the Economy: Media, Firms, Consumers, and Experts, June 2015.

187 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus and Wey, Christian, Merger Remedies in Oligopoly under a Consumer Welfare Standard, June 2015.
Published in: Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization, 32 (2016), pp. 150-179.

186 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus, Salience and Health Campaigns, May 2015.
Published in: Forum for Health Economics & Policy, 19 (2016), pp. 1-22.

185 Wrona, Jens, Border Effects without Borders: What Divides Japan's Internal Trade? May 2015.

184 Amess, Kevin, Stiebale, Joel and Wright, Mike, The Impact of Private Equity on Firms' Innovation Activity, April 2015.
Published in: European Economic Review, 86 (2016), pp. 147-160.

183 Ibañez, Marcela, Rai, Ashok and Riener, Gerhard, Sorting Through Affirmative Action: Three Field Experiments in Colombia, April 2015.

182 Baumann, Florian, Friehe, Tim and Rasch, Alexander, The Influence of Product Liability on Vertical Product Differentiation, April 2015.
Published in: Economics Letters, 147 (2016), pp. 55-58 under the title "Why Product Liability May Lower Product Safety".

181 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Proof beyond a Reasonable Doubt: Laboratory Evidence, March 2015.

180 Rasch, Alexander and Waibel, Christian, What Drives Fraud in a Credence Goods Market? – Evidence from a Field Study, March 2015.

179 Jeitschko, Thomas D., Incongruities of Real and Intellectual Property: Economic Concerns in Patent Policy and Practice, February 2015.
Forthcoming in: Michigan State Law Review.

178 Buchwald, Achim and Hottenrott, Hanna, Women on the Board and Executive Duration – Evidence for European Listed Firms, February 2015.

177 Heblich, Stephan, Lameli, Alfred and Riener, Gerhard, Regional Accents on Individual Economic Behavior: A Lab Experiment on Linguistic Performance, Cognitive Ratings and Economic Decisions, February 2015.
Published in: PLoS ONE, 10 (2015), e0113475.

176 Herr, Annika, Nguyen, Thu-Van and Schmitz, Hendrik, Does Quality Disclosure Improve Quality? Responses to the Introduction of Nursing Home Report Cards in Germany, February 2015.
Published in: Health Policy, 120 (2016), pp.1162-1170.

175 Herr, Annika and Normann, Hans-Theo, Organ Donation in the Lab: Preferences and Votes on the Priority Rule, February 2015.
Published in: Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 131 Part B (2016), pp. 139-149.

174 Buchwald, Achim, Competition, Outside Directors and Executive Turnover: Implications for Corporate Governance in the EU, February 2015.

173 Buchwald, Achim and Thorwarth, Susanne, Outside Directors on the Board, Competition and Innovation, February 2015.

172 Dewenter, Ralf and Giessing, Leonie, The Effects of Elite Sports Participation on Later Job Success, February 2015.

171 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Siekmann, Manuel, Price Dispersion and Station Heterogeneity on German Retail Gasoline Markets, January 2015.
Forthcoming in: The Energy Journal.

170 Schweinberger, Albert G. and Suedekum, Jens, De-Industrialisation and Entrepreneurship under Monopolistic Competition, January 2015.
Published in: Oxford Economic Papers, 67 (2015), pp. 1174-1185.

Older discussion papers can be found online at:
http://ideas.repec.org/s/zbw/dicedp.html

Heinrich-Heine-University of Düsseldorf

Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE)

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

ISSN 2190-9938 (online)
ISBN 978-3-86304-270-7