- 1. Prove all of the Lemmas and Corollaries for the screening model covered in class, starting from the slide "Analysis of Constraints."
- 2. Prove that in the screening model a profit maximizing firm never pools the two types of workers.
- 3. (MWG 14.C.7) Assume that there are two types of consumers for a firm's product,  $\theta_H$  and  $\theta_L$ . The proportion of type  $\theta_L$  consumers is  $\lambda$ . A type  $\theta$ 's utility when consuming amount x of the good and paying a total of T for it is  $u(x,T) = \theta v(x) T$ , where:

$$v(x) = \frac{1 - (1 - x)^2}{2}$$

The firm is the sole producer of this good, and its cost of production per unit is c > 0. (Note: Also, assume the monopolist must charge a linear price: T(x) = px.)

- (a) Consider a nondiscriminating monopolist. Derive his optimal pricing policy. Show that he serves both classes of consumers if either  $\theta_L$  or  $\lambda$  is "large enough."
- (b) Consider a monopolist who can distinguish the two types (by some characteristic) but can only charge a simple price  $p_i$  to each type  $\theta_i$ . Characterize his optimal prices.
- (c) Suppose the monopolist cannot distinguish the types. Derive the optimal two-part tariff (a pricing policy consisting of a lump-sum charge F plus a linear price per unit purchased of p) under the assumption that the monopolist serves both types. Interpret. When will the monopolist serve both types?
- (d) Compute the fully optimal nonlinear tariff. How do the quantities purchased by the two types compare with the levels in (a) to (c)?
- 4. What equilibria of the education signaling game in class can be ruled out by (iteratively) eliminating strongly or weakly dominated strategies?
- 5. In the education signaling game, show that when the prior probability of type  $\theta = H$  is close enough to 1, the (ex-ante or interim/Pareto) welfare-maximizing equilibrium is the pooling equilibrium with zero education.

Prof. Alexey Makarin

Due: 28/04/2020 16:45 CET