

Lecture 21:

Strategic Interaction and Game Theory

**Office Hours This Friday: 11-12 only, not 10-11.
An additional hour will be added for Friday afternoon
and announced online.**

***Reminders: Graded Homework due Monday at 7pm. No
lectures, discussion sections or office hours next week.***

Strategic Interaction

- In perfectly competitive markets (like the market for corn), firms do not compete with other firms on an individual basis.
- If Farmer Jane grows corn, she couldn't care less about what Farmer Jones is doing.
- Farmer Jane looks up the price of corn in the newspaper or online,...
- and she bases her business strategy on the price.
- Farmer Jane does **NOT interact strategically** with her competitors.

- Monopolies, too, have no **strategic interaction** with competitors (unless there are potential entrants, they have no competitors 😊).
- But suppose two fancy hotels are located across the street from one another (a duopoly).
 - The owner of each hotel will be concerned about the **pricing** strategy of the other owner,...
 - and about the other's business strategy in general.
 - Each owner will base her own business strategy...
 - ...on her beliefs about the strategy of her competitor.
 - This is an example of **strategic interaction**.

- Strategic interaction is very important when a small number of people or firms engage in **bargaining**, **conflict** or **competition**.
 - Duopoly (two competing firms)
 - Oligopoly (several competing firms)
 - Contracts
 - Legal Disputes
 - Political campaigns

Clicker Question

Game Theory

- **Game Theory** refers to a set of mathematical tools used to analyze strategic interaction.
 - Game theory is often applied in economics, political science, and military science,...
 - but game theory is **not** commonly applied to ordinary games like chess or tennis.
- In game theory,
 - **players** (decision makers)...
 - adopt **strategies** (complete plans of action)...
 - and receive **payoffs** (rewards or punishments), which depend on the strategies of all of the players.
- There must be at least two players in a game, but games with any number of players can be analyzed.

Strategies

■ A **strategy** is a **complete plan** that describes the **action** a player will take **in every circumstance** that she can observe.

- Sometimes, a strategy will involve only one action:
(*"I'll ask my boss for a raise [salary increase]."*)

- But some strategies are complex plans that involve many possible actions (*e.g. military strategies*).

Coordination in Business

■ Sometimes firms can increase profits by coordinating their strategies.

- **Example:** If a men's clothing shop and a women's clothing shop locate in the same mall, both may attract more customers.

- There are many other examples where firms can increase profits by coordinating.

- One firm supplies inputs to another firm *precisely when they are needed*.
- All firms in a shopping center stay open during the *same hours*. [Why?]
- All car thieves steal cars on the *same day*, so that police are spread thin.

Battle of the Sexes

- The *Battle of the Sexes* is a game-theory model of coordination in business (or in personal relationships).
- To keep the game simple, only two players are modeled.
- Vanesa wants to go to a football match *F*, but Miguel wants to go to the opera *R*.
- If they both do *F*, then Vanesa gets payoff *2*, and Miguel gets *1*,
- and if they both do *R*, then Vanesa gets *1* and Miguel gets *2*.
- But if they do different things, then both get *0*.
- Each must buy his/her ticket without knowing what the other is doing. [*Miguel forgot to charge his cell phone.*]

		Miguel	
		F	R
Vanesa	F	2, 1	0, 0
	R	0, 0	1, 2

Game-Theory Terminology

■ Vanesa and Miguel are **players**.

■ **F** and **R** are **strategies**.

■ **{F, R}** is the **strategy space** (the set of allowable strategies).

■ **2, 1** and **0** are payoffs.

■ Each cell in the table corresponds to a **strategy profile** (one strategy for each player), and the contents of the cell are the payoffs corresponding to that profile.

- For example, the top-right cell represents the strategy profile $\langle F, R \rangle$ (Vanesa chooses **F**; Miguel chooses **R**).
- **0** for Vanesa and **0** for Miguel are the corresponding payoffs.

		Miguel	
		F	R
Vanesa	F	2, 1	0, 0
	R	0, 0	1, 2

■ The Battle of the Sexes is modeled as a **normal-form game**.

- Each row represents a strategy for one player (Vanesa),...
- Each column represents a strategy for the other player (Miguel).
- The row player chooses up or down;
- the column player chooses left or right.

■ In textbooks, the game is usually illustrated in black and white,...

		Miguel	
		F	R
Vanesa	F	2, 1	0, 0
	R	0, 0	1, 2

		Miguel	
		F	R
Vanesa	F	2, 1	0, 0
	R	0, 0	1, 2

- with the first number inside each cell representing the payoff to the row player,
- and the second to the column player.

Applying Game Theory

- Can we use game theory to predict the outcomes of strategic interaction?
- What strategies should we expect Vanesa and Miguel to adopt in their “battle of the sexes”?
- Unfortunately, game theory has a number of different “**solution concepts**” that sometimes predict different outcomes.
- The most commonly used solution concept is the **Nash equilibrium**, named after the mathematician *John Nash* [Nobel Prize, 1994].
 - Sometimes we call it simply “an equilibrium.”

Nash Equilibrium

- A [**Nash**] **equilibrium** is a strategy profile in which each player has chosen the strategy that is a **best response** to the strategies of the other players.
- Equivalently, in a Nash equilibrium, if all players found out what the others were going to do,...
- ...**no** player would want to **deviate** [change] from her chosen strategy.
- Does the word “equilibrium” make sense for this situation? Why?

Equilibrium in the Battle of the Sexes

- Suppose both Vanesa and Miguel decide to go to the football match.

		<i>Miguel</i>	
		<i>F</i>	<i>R</i>
<i>Vanesa</i>	<i>F</i>	2, 1	0, 0
	<i>R</i>	0, 0	1, 2

- Is that an equilibrium?
- Given that Miguel has chosen *F*, what happens to Vanesa if she deviates from *F* to *R*?
 - ◆ Answer: she would get 0 instead of 2.
 - ◆ So *F* is Vanesa's best response to Miguel's *F*.
- Given that Vanesa has chosen *F*, what happens to Miguel if he deviates from *F* to *R*?
 - ◆ Answer: he would get 0 instead of 1.
 - ◆ So *F* is Miguel's best response to Vanesa's *F*.
- Result: the strategy profile $\langle F, F \rangle$ IS an equilibrium!
- Likewise, $\langle R, R \rangle$ is an equilibrium.

- Suppose Vanesa goes to football and Miguel goes to the opera $\langle F, R \rangle$.

		<i>Miguel</i>	
		<i>F</i>	<i>R</i>
<i>Vanesa</i>	<i>F</i>	2, 1	0, 0
	<i>R</i>	0, 0	1, 2

- Is $\langle F, R \rangle$ an equilibrium?
- Given that Miguel has chosen *R*, what happens to Vanesa if she deviates from *F* to *R*?
 - ◆ Answer: she would get 1 instead of 0, so she **would** deviate.
 - ◆ *F* is **not** Vanesa's best response to Miguel's *R*.
- Therefore $\langle F, R \rangle$ is not an equilibrium!
- We do not have to ask if Miguel would also deviate.
- Likewise, $\langle R, F \rangle$ is not an equilibrium.

- In the “Battle of the Sexes” coordination failure is not an equilibrium!
- Miguel would have to do what Vanesa wants, or *vice versa*.
- Both of these equilibria are called ***pure-strategy*** equilibria, because neither player chooses his strategy randomly.
- There is a ***mixed-strategy*** equilibrium also:
Vanesa goes to football with probability **2/3** and to the opera with probability **1/3**. Miguel does the opposite. *[You are not required to know this.]*
 - Extra credit: prove that this is an equilibrium !

Clicker Question

The Fiat-Money Game

■ Acceptance of fiat money is also a coordination game.

■ If **Ma** and **Huang** both accept dollars (**A**) in exchange for goods, then both benefit from voluntary exchange.

■ But if **Ma** accepts dollars (**A**) and **Huang** rejects them (**R**), then **Ma** loses.

- He sells his goods, but he cannot buy anything with the money he receives.

■ If both **Ma** and **Huang** reject the dollar, then neither benefits from voluntary exchange, but neither loses anything either.

		Huang	
		A	R
Ma	A	1, 1	0, -1
	R	0, -1	0, 0

Clicker Question

Cooperation versus Competition

- Sometimes cooperation is more profitable or productive than competition.
- But cooperation can be hard to maintain.
- If all other firms (or players) are cooperating, it may be profitable for an individual firm to “defect” or cheat.

- **Example:** Coke and Pepsi could each earn more if they could both spend less on advertising.
- **Example:** The U.S. and Russia would both be better off if they could commit to keeping fewer nuclear weapons.
- The game-theory model of cooperation vs. competition is called the “**Prisoners’ Dilemma**”

Prisoners' Dilemma

- Thelma and Louise have been caught by the police.

- Police have evidence to put them behind bars for 5 years each,...
- but with a confession, the police could get 20-year sentences.

- So the police offer them the following terms:

- ◆ If only one person confesses, she will get only 2 years in prison, but the other gets 20 years,
- ◆ ...but if both confess, each gets 15 year in prison.

- Thelma and Louise each has two possible strategies:

- Silence (S) *[Try to cooperate with the other player.]*
- Confession (C) *[Follow narrow self-interest.]*

- Each has to make her choice without knowing what the other will do.

		<i>Louise</i>	
		<i>S</i>	<i>C</i>
<i>Thelma</i>	<i>S</i>	-5 -2	-5 -20
	<i>C</i>	-20 -15	-2 -15

Equilibrium in the Prisoners' Dilemma

- Suppose both Thelma and Louise decide to stay silent (S).

- Is that an equilibrium?
- Given that Louise has chosen S, what happens to Thelma if she deviates from S to C?

- Therefore, (S, S) IS NOT an equilibrium!

- Is (C, S) an equilibrium?

- Louise would get -15 instead of -20 if she deviated to C, so it is NOT.
- Similarly, (S, C) is NOT an equilibrium.

		<i>Louise</i>	
		<i>S</i>	<i>C</i>
<i>Thelma</i>	<i>S</i>	-5 -2	-5 -20
	<i>C</i>	-20 -15	-2 -15

■ Is $\langle C, C \rangle$ an equilibrium?

- Given that Louise has chosen **C**, will Thelma prefer to play **C** too?
 - ◆ Yes, she will lose more from deviating to **S**
 - ◆ So **C** is Thelma's best response to Louise's **C**
- Given that Thelma has chosen to play **C**, Louise's best response is to play **C** as well.

		Louise	
		S	C
Thelma	S	-5 -5	-2 -20
	C	-20 -2	-15 -15

- $\langle C, C \rangle$ is an equilibrium—the **only** equilibrium, even though both would be better off **if they could commit** to silence **S**!
- For each player, confession **C** is a **strictly dominant strategy**—i.e. it is better to play C, no matter what the other person does.
- For each player, **S** is a **strictly dominated strategy**—i.e. another strategy is better than **S** no matter what the other person may do.

Cooperation and the Prisoners' Dilemma

- The prisoners dilemma illustrates how difficult it is for competing firms to cooperate with each other, even when cooperating is Pareto efficient.
- Whatever they have agreed to, each player can do better by cheating (following narrow self-interest).
- That is why OPEC countries cheat and overproduce.
- That is why firms and political candidates employ negative advertising.
- Too bad (for them) that they cannot make a binding commitment.

Clicker Question

■ Example: Prisoners Dilemma--OPEC

- OPEC is an organization of petroleum-producing countries that promise to cooperate.
- OPEC sets production limits for each member country, which pushes up the petroleum price.
- But a number of countries cheat and produce more petroleum than OPEC rules allow.
- Some analysts believe that OPEC is completely ineffective...
- and the price of petroleum ends up at the competitive price.

End of File