As you arrive:

- 1. Make yourself a namecard with your preferred name (materials up front). (Please keep this and bring it to every subsequent lecture.)
- 2. Answer question on PollEv.com/ECON7510. Please no Googling or discussing—I want to know what you think. (It's anonymous.)
- 3. If you haven't already done so, please take a look at the course syllabus (available on Canvas).

Lecture 1: Introduction

ECON 7510
Cornell University
Adam Harris

Slides draw upon lecture materials from Nikhil Agarwal (MIT).

Today's lecture

1. Introductions and course details

2. Industrial organization: Definition and history

3. Overview of theory of the firm

Introduction to ECON 7510

Getting to know me:

- Research: IO methods \rightarrow questions in transportation economics and the economics of AI
- Preferred name: Adam

Getting to know me:

- Research: IO methods \rightarrow questions in transportation economics and the economics of AI
- Preferred name: Adam

Getting to know you:

- 1. Your preferred name
- 2. Your program and year
- 3. Something about your research interests and why you wanted to take the course / what you hope to get out of the course

- √ Have you taken PhD-level microeconomics?
- √ Have you taken PhD-level econometrics?

- √ Have you taken PhD-level microeconomics?
- √ Have you taken PhD-level econometrics?
- Have you written code in python, julia, R, or Matlab?

- √ Have you taken PhD-level microeconomics?
- √ Have you taken PhD-level econometrics?
- Have you written code in python, julia, R, or Matlab?
- Have you solved optimization problems numerically?

- √ Have you taken PhD-level microeconomics?
- √ Have you taken PhD-level econometrics?
- Have you written code in python, julia, R, or Matlab?
- Have you solved optimization problems numerically?
- Have you solved dynamic programming problems numerically?

Course logistics

- Instructor office hours
 - Uris Hall 436.
 - By appointment. See syllabus for details and Calendly link.

Course logistics

- Instructor office hours
 - Uris Hall 436.
 - By appointment. See syllabus for details and Calendly link.

Requirements

- Assignments (30%):
 - » Five problem sets with empirical exercises and conceptual questions.
 - » Please turn in problem sets and code and output via Canvas.
 - » Coding in python, julia, or R strongly encouraged.
 - » You are encouraged to collaborate; groups can be as large as 3. Please list collaborators.
- End-of-term assignment (in-class presentation or written) (30%): Either a review of a recent IO/structural paper or a proposal for a research project.
- Class Participation (10%)
- Final exam (30%): In-class November 16 and November 18.

Two principles:

1. You get out of the course what you put into it.

- 1. You get out of the course what you put into it.
 - Choice of topics on final.

- 1. You get out of the course what you put into it.
 - Choice of topics on final.
 - See syllabus for generative AI rules.

- 1. You get out of the course what you put into it.
 - Choice of topics on final.
 - See syllabus for generative AI rules.
- 2. "Be curious, not judgmental."



Two principles:

- 1. You get out of the course what you put into it.
 - Choice of topics on final.
 - See syllabus for generative AI rules.
- 2. "Be curious, not judgmental."

Lectures—questions and discussion encouraged.



- 1. You get out of the course what you put into it.
 - Choice of topics on final.
 - See syllabus for generative AI rules.
- 2. "Be curious, not judgmental."
 - Lectures—questions and discussion encouraged.
 - We want to cultivate an environment where everyone can participate, ask questions, and learn
 - → Please don't hold yourself back from participating!



Overview of Topics

Theme: Fundamental tools of industrial organization

- Part 1: Fundamental IO theory
 - 1. Theory of the firm; producer theory
 - 2. Monopolies: Pricing; product quality/choice
 - 3. Price discrimination
 - 4. Competition: Static; dynamic
 - 5. Market entry
- Part 2: Computational building blocks
- Part 3: Estimating demand systems
- Part 4: Estimating single-agent dynamic discrete choice models

Industrial organization: Definition and history

Industrial organization

Question: What is industrial organization?

Industrial organization: Traditional definition

Industrial organization is the study of imperfectly competitive markets.

— How do firms behave, and what are the consequences for welfare?

(What determines the incentives of the firm?)

- Demand conditions
- Cost conditions Production
- Competition

Industrial organization: Traditional definition

Industrial organization is the study of imperfectly competitive markets.

— How do firms behave, and what are the consequences for welfare?

(What determines the incentives of the firm?)

- Demand conditions
- Cost conditions Production
- Competition
- What determines demand, costs and competition conditions?
 - Investment, innovation
 - Market structure (entry, mergers, acquisitions)

Industrial organization: Traditional definition

Industrial organization is the study of imperfectly competitive markets.

— How do firms behave, and what are the consequences for welfare?

(What determines the incentives of the firm?)

- Demand conditions
- Cost conditions Production
- Competition
- What determines demand, costs and competition conditions?
 - Investment, innovation
 - Market structure (entry, mergers, acquisitions)
- Which policies, market rules should we adopt?
 - Antitrust policies
 - Regulation of concentrated industries
 - Market Design
 - Intellectual property

History of the field

- 1. Prior to 1980s: Structure-conduct-performance (SCP) empirical research
- 2. 1980s: Developments in theoretical IO
- 3. 1990s-present: New Empirical IO (NEIO)

Historical Perspective: Pre 1980

Schmalensee (1986): critical overview in Handbook of IO

- SCP: Structure Conduct Performance (Bain 1951, 1956)
- Structure: Inherent characteristics of the industry
 - Product type (demand)
 - Production technology (supply)
 - Number of firms (competitive environment)
 - Concentration (market power)
 - Entry barriers (fixed costs)
- Conduct: Firm behavior
 - Investment, innovation, pricing, advertising ...
- Performance: Positive or normative outcomes
 - Profits, welfare, entry, exit, R&D

SCP Paradigm

Cross-industry regression

- Study how structure \implies conduct \implies performance
- ✓ Difficult to observe conduct: focus on structure ⇒ performance
- Cross-industry regression analysis:

$$r_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 H_i + \beta_2 B E_i + \beta_3 (H_i \times B E_i) + \epsilon_i$$
 where i is industry (4 digit SIC) $r_i = \text{ROR on capital (closely related to profits)}$ $H_i = \sum_j s_{ij}^2$ is HHI (a measure of concentration) $BE_i = \text{Entry barriers such as fixed costs, min efficient scale}$

Assume markets in long-run equilibrium

SCP Paradigm

Cross-industry regression

- Study how structure ⇒ conduct ⇒ performance
- ✓ Difficult to observe conduct: focus on structure ⇒ performance
- Cross-industry regression analysis:

$$r_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 H_i + \beta_2 B E_i + \beta_3 (H_i \times B E_i) + \epsilon_i$$
 where i is industry (4 digit SIC) $r_i = \text{ROR on capital (closely related to profits)}$ $H_i = \sum_j s_{ij}^2$ is HHI (a measure of concentration) $BE_i = \text{Entry barriers such as fixed costs, min efficient scale}$

- Assume markets in long-run equilibrium
- → Do you have any concerns about this regression?

Issues with SCP

Issues with SCP

Practical issues

- Poor data
 - Accounting profits and costs are not economic profits/costs
 - Cross-industry analysis ⇒ use data common to all industries (worst data)
- 2. Is 4-digit SIC the correct level of aggregation?
 - SIC code 2024 is ice cream and frozen desserts
 - SIC Code 7372 is prepackaged software

Policy relevance?

- 3. How do we measure consumer welfare?
 - Typical objective of antitrust authorities
- 4. Little to say about mechanisms (conduct)
 - Cannot guide public policy

Econometric issues

- 5. Endogeneity and reverse causality
 - Conduct may affect structure
 - Omitted variables

Example

Concentrated industries have few firms and high profits

- Two equally plausible explanations
 - 1. Market power has led to high prices
 - 2. Efficient firms may have driven away inefficient firms
- → Matters for public policy

Example

Concentrated industries have few firms and high profits

- Two equally plausible explanations
 - 1. Market power has led to high prices
 - 2. Efficient firms may have driven away inefficient firms
- → Matters for public policy
- Nevertheless, SCP literature was useful in establishing empirical regularities that spurred the theoretical literature to follow.

Theoretical IO: 1980s

(Part 1 of the course)

Approach and broad lessons (see Tirole's book)

- Game theoretic models of firm behavior
- ightarrow Rich set of results explaining a wide range of phenomenon

Theoretical IO: 1980s

(Part 1 of the course)

Approach and broad lessons (see Tirole's book)

- Game theoretic models of firm behavior
- → Rich set of results explaining a wide range of phenomenon
- → A key takeaway: Details of the specific market matter
 - ✓ Classic example: Investment could accommodate or deter entry depending on strategic effects (Fudenberg and Tirole, 1984)
 - Conundrum for public policy
- Tirole's Nobel lecture consequently calls for policies that pays attention to "specificities of particular industries"
 - ✓ Underlying theme: Heterogeneity across industries

New Empirical IO: 1990s - Present

(Parts 3-4 of the course)

Tirole's Nobel citation: "theoretical advances fundamentally affected the empirical IO literature"

- Theoretical literature offered:
 - Several explanations for similar observations
 - A basis for building empirical models
 - An understanding of important mechanisms
- Empirical Revolution
 - Focus on narrowly defined industries (heterogeneous effects)
 - Close attention to theory
 - 1. Deriving testable hypotheses
 - 2. Interpreting the data (structural modeling)
 - Greater emphasis on
 - Strategies (conduct)
 - 2. Quantifying welfare, economic costs, profits (performance)
 - 3. Counterfactual simulations (policy)

New Empirical IO Approach

- Phrase a question in terms of a counterfactual
 - ✓ What will happen if Union Pacific and Norfolk Southern merge?
 - Only data available is from a world where these are separate entities
- Approach: build the primitives of the model
 - Demand and Supply
 - Interaction between insurers and pharmacies
- Estimate a model: attention to data limitations and institutional details, e.g.
 - Prices negotiated between railroads and their customers might only be selectively observed.
- Simulate a counterfactual world and analyze outcomes of interest
 - Factual world: Competitive price setting and negotiations
 - Counterfactual: Joint price setting, considerations about pricing to competitors
 - ✓ Consumer welfare, profits, bargaining with upstream firms etc.

Example: Use NEIO approach to study what would happen if Ford and GM merged.

 \rightarrow This is a counterfactual; only data available is from a world where these are separate entities

- → This is a *counterfactual*; only data available is from a world where these are separate entities
- 1. **Demand side**: Estimate model of demand for cars: $D(\mathbf{p})$.

- ightarrow This is a counterfactual; only data available is from a world where these are separate entities
- 1. **Demand side**: Estimate model of demand for cars: $D(\mathbf{p})$.
- 2. **Supply side**: Use profit-maximization to figure out what marginal costs rationalize observed prices.

- → This is a counterfactual; only data available is from a world where these are separate entities
- 1. **Demand side**: Estimate model of demand for cars: $D(\mathbf{p})$.
- 2. **Supply side**: Use profit-maximization to figure out what marginal costs rationalize observed prices.
- 3. **Counterfactual**: Merger changes profit-maximization problem. What prices does profit-maximizing firm set post-merger? This enables us to determine effects of merger on key short-run outcomes:
 - Consumer surplus
 - Producer surplus

Example: Use NEIO approach to study what would happen if Ford and GM merged.

- → This is a counterfactual; only data available is from a world where these are separate entities
- 1. **Demand side**: Estimate model of demand for cars: $D(\mathbf{p})$.
- 2. **Supply side**: Use profit-maximization to figure out what marginal costs rationalize observed prices.
- 3. **Counterfactual**: Merger changes profit-maximization problem. What prices does profit-maximizing firm set post-merger? This enables us to determine effects of merger on key short-run outcomes:
 - Consumer surplus
 - Producer surplus

With further extensions to the model, we can also analyze longer-run effects:

- Investment, innovation (of both merged firm and other firms)
- Entry of new firms

New Empirical IO

Question: Am I an IO economist?

New Empirical IO \rightarrow Structural empirical research

Question: Am I an IO economist?

Insight: The NEIO approach was developed to answer questions about imperfect competition, but it's actually much more widely applicable.

New Empirical IO \rightarrow Structural empirical research

Question: Am I an IO economist?

Insight: The NEIO approach was developed to answer questions about imperfect competition, but it's actually much more widely applicable.

Examples (all recent job market papers):

- How do out-of-district campaign contributions distort the positions of Congressional candidates? (Waldfogel 2025)
- $-\,$ What would be the effects of reforming the structure of real estate agent commissions? (Kim 2025)
- Why do developing economies feature so many small firms? (Ramos and Sverdlin-Lisker 2022)
- How can policymakers effectively incentivize the development of combination therapies for treating cancer (Dix and Lensman 2025)
- How can policymakers design mechanisms to incentivize conservation in a cost-effective way?
 (Aspelund and Russo 2025)

A Broader Definition?

- "Industrial Organization" may be too narrow to describe the modern IO field
- Perhaps "Market Organization" is better?
 - Analysis of market rules and structure
 - Behavior, incentives and payoffs of agents
 - Effects of policies and government interventions
- But even that might be too narrow. The field has become closely linked to a set of tools that are useful
 even in non-market contexts.
- Imperfect competition, antitrust, and regulation = "core IO"

Overview of Topics

Theme: Fundamental tools of industrial organization

- Part 1: Fundamental IO theory (Core IO)
 - (a.) Theory of the firm; producer theory
 - (b.) Monopolies: Pricing; product quality/choice
 - (c.) Price discrimination
 - (d.) Competition: Static; dynamic
- Parts 2-4: Fundamental tools of structural estimation (Broadly applicable empirical tools)
 - 2. Computational building blocks
 - 3. Estimating demand systems
 - 4. Estimating models of single-agent dynamics

What does "structural" mean?

Reduced-form approach

Reduced form: Model relationships among observables.

- Example: Suppose Y is (log) hourly earnings, X is years of education. Model relationship as

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 X^2 + W'\gamma + \epsilon$$

Possible identifying assumptions:

- $-\mathbb{E}\left[\varepsilon\mid X,W\right]=0$, or
- $-\mathbb{E}\left[\varepsilon\mid Z,W\right]=0$ and $Cov(Z,X\mid W)\neq0$

Reduced-form approach

Reduced form: Model relationships among observables.

- Example: Suppose Y is (log) hourly earnings, X is years of education. Model relationship as

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 X^2 + W' \gamma + \epsilon$$

Possible identifying assumptions:

- $-\mathbb{E}\left[\varepsilon\mid X,W\right]=0$, or
- $-\mathbb{E}\left[\varepsilon\mid Z,W\right]=0$ and $\mathsf{Cov}(Z,X\mid W)\neq 0$
- Suppose one of these sets of assumptions is satisfied and so we can estimate β , γ . What counterfactual questions can we answer?

Structural approach

What we might want but can't achieve using reduced-form alone

- Counterfactual analysis
- Welfare estimates
- $-\,\,$ Estimate treatment effect when good instruments/time stagger not available

Theory of the firm: A brief overview

The Neoclassical view

MWG: A black box.

- − Defined by some technology $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^L$.
- Chooses $y \in Y$ so as to maximize profit.

The Neoclassical view

MWG: A black box.

- − Defined by some technology $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^L$.
- Chooses $y \in Y$ so as to maximize profit.

Question: This is a useful description, but what key questions does it sidestep?

The Neoclassical view

MWG: A black box.

- − Defined by some technology $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^L$.
- Chooses $y \in Y$ so as to maximize profit.

Question: This is a useful description, but what key questions does it sidestep?

- Wait, but actually, what is a firm?
- Why does the firm exist?
- What determines Y?
- What determines the firm's boundaries?

Tirole's perspective

NB: This is question that is more often tackled by organizational economics rather than IO.

Tirole's perspective

NB: This is question that is more often tackled by organizational economics rather than IO.

Tirole: "a cost-minimizing device" for production.

 \rightarrow i.e., the firm exists because producing within the firm is cheaper than producing without.

Tirole's perspective

NB: This is question that is more often tackled by organizational economics rather than IO.

Tirole: "a cost-minimizing device" for production.

 \rightarrow i.e., the firm exists because producing within the firm is cheaper than producing without.

Three perspectives:

- 1. Technological view: Static synergy
- 2. Contractual view: A long-term relationship
- 3. Regulatory arbitrage view: e.g., firm is loophole for the exercise of monopoly power

Technological view

- If there are increasing returns to scale, having production concentrated in a smaller number of firms may be more efficient.
- "Economies of scale encourage the gathering of activities."
- When output is higher:
 - Workers can be more specialized.
 - More machines \rightarrow lower proportional variance in output due to breakdowns.
 - Avoid duplication of fixed costs.

Contractual view

- Key ideas: Idiosyncratic investment and asset specificity.
- → Want ex ante assurance that future gains from trade will be exploited and shared.
- Example: Specific human capital. More efficient to work on the same task / with the same team every day.
- Example: Site specificity. Mine-mouth power plant.

Regulatory arbitrage

— What happens in the market is often publicly observable; what happens within the firm is usually not.

Regulatory arbitrage

- What happens in the market is often publicly observable; what happens within the firm is usually not.
- Example: Monopoly pricing.
 - Exercise of monopoly power can be disciplined both by regulators and by other firms.

Regulatory arbitrage

- What happens in the market is often publicly observable; what happens within the firm is usually not.
- Example: Monopoly pricing.
 - Exercise of monopoly power can be disciplined both by regulators and by other firms.
 - Collusive price-setting is illegal; being a monopolist is not.

Regulatory arbitrage

- What happens in the market is often publicly observable; what happens within the firm is usually not.
- Example: Monopoly pricing.
 - Exercise of monopoly power can be disciplined both by regulators and by other firms.
 - Collusive price-setting is illegal; being a monopolist is not.
- Example: Price of intermediate good set by government

Profit-maximization hypothesis

If shareholders ran the firm directly, it would be profit-maximizing.

Profit-maximization hypothesis

- If shareholders ran the firm directly, it would be profit-maximizing.
- But, in practice, the firm is run by a manager, who may have different incentives:

Profit-maximization hypothesis

- If shareholders ran the firm directly, it would be profit-maximizing.
- But, in practice, the firm is run by a manager, who may have different incentives:
 - Monetary incentives, e.g., distorting short-term vs long-term tradeoff
 - Growth for its own sake (prestige, ego, power, etc)
 - Mislead about technology to take pressure off

Profit-maximization hypothesis

- If shareholders ran the firm directly, it would be profit-maximizing.
- But, in practice, the firm is run by a manager, who may have different incentives:
 - Monetary incentives, e.g., distorting short-term vs long-term tradeoff
 - Growth for its own sake (prestige, ego, power, etc)
 - Mislead about technology to take pressure off
- To combat this, shareholders may try to monitor manager performance or put limits on managerial discretion. But all of these approaches are imperfect.
- These are important issues. But are they ones that we as IO economists have to grapple with? Or is assuming profit maximization "good enough"?

Is the assumption of profit-maximization "good enough"?

1. Yes, if internal organization issues and product-market/input-market choices are approximately "separable".

Example: Manager chooses q, e.

$$\Pi = P(q)q - c(e, \epsilon)q$$

where e, ϵ are not observed by shareholders.

Is the assumption of profit-maximization "good enough"?

1. Yes, if internal organization issues and product-market/input-market choices are approximately "separable".

Example: Manager chooses q, e.

$$\Pi = P(q)q - c(e, \epsilon)q$$

where e, ϵ are not observed by shareholders. Would expect inefficiently low effort and inefficiently high cost (moral hazard)

$$e < e^* \Rightarrow \underbrace{c(e, \epsilon)}_{\tilde{c}} > \underbrace{c(e^*, \epsilon)}_{c^*}$$

Is the assumption of profit-maximization "good enough"?

 Yes, if internal organization issues and product-market/input-market choices are approximately "separable".

Example: Manager chooses q, e.

$$\Pi = P(q)q - c(e, \epsilon)q$$

where e, ϵ are not observed by shareholders. Would expect inefficiently low effort and inefficiently high cost (moral hazard)

$$e < e^* \Rightarrow \underbrace{c(e, \epsilon)}_{\tilde{c}} > \underbrace{c(e^*, \epsilon)}_{c^*}$$

Then the quantity-choice problem is $\max_q P(q)q - \tilde{c}q$. The manager might as well choose the quantity that is profit-maximizing given marginal cost \tilde{c} .

Is the assumption of profit-maximization "good enough"?

1. Yes, if internal organization issues and product-market/input-market choices are approximately "separable".

Example: Manager chooses q, e.

$$\Pi = P(q)q - c(e, \epsilon)q$$

where e, ϵ are not observed by shareholders. Would expect inefficiently low effort and inefficiently high cost (moral hazard)

$$e < e^* \Rightarrow \underbrace{c(e, \epsilon)}_{\tilde{c}} > \underbrace{c(e^*, \epsilon)}_{c^*}$$

Then the quantity-choice problem is $\max_q P(q)q - \tilde{c}q$. The manager might as well choose the quantity that is profit-maximizing given marginal cost \tilde{c} .

So firm's choice of quantity is observational equivalent to that of a profit-maximizing firm.

Is the assumption of profit-maximization "good enough"?

1. Yes, if internal organization issues and product-market/input-market choices are approximately "separable".

Example: Manager chooses q, e.

$$\Pi = P(q)q - c(e, \epsilon)q$$

where e, ϵ are not observed by shareholders. Would expect inefficiently low effort and inefficiently high cost (moral hazard)

$$e < e^* \Rightarrow \underbrace{c(e, \epsilon)}_{\tilde{c}} > \underbrace{c(e^*, \epsilon)}_{c^*}$$

Then the quantity-choice problem is $\max_q P(q)q - \tilde{c}q$. The manager might as well choose the quantity that is profit-maximizing given marginal cost \tilde{c} .

So firm's choice of quantity is observational equivalent to that of a profit-maximizing firm. The fact that $\tilde{c}>c^*$ is sometimes referred to as X-inefficiency.

Is the assumption of profit-maximization "good enough"?

- 2. Regardless, it is a necessary assumption.
 - As with any modeling choice, there's a realism-versus-tractability tradeoff.
 - If we want to make progress/derive theoretical predictions about important IO questions—e.g., antitrust policy, innovation, regulation, etc.—we can't also tackle the intra-firm incentives.
 - → Let's leave the internal principal-agent issues to the organizational economists.

Is the assumption of profit-maximization "good enough"?

- 2. Regardless, it is a necessary assumption.
 - As with any modeling choice, there's a realism-versus-tractability tradeoff.
 - If we want to make progress/derive theoretical predictions about important IO questions—e.g., antitrust policy, innovation, regulation, etc.—we can't also tackle the intra-firm incentives.
 - ightarrow Let's leave the internal principal-agent issues to the organizational economists.

MWG (p.127): "The firm is viewed merely as a "black box", able to transform inputs into outputs."

Next time

- 1. Review of producer theory from ECON 6090
- 2. Monopoly pricing