Discussion: Product Differentiation and Oligopoly: a Network Approach

By Bruno Pellegrino

Discussant: Jane Olmstead-Rumsey, Minneapolis Fed/LSE

WFA, June 17, 2021

Overview

Question: What are the welfare costs of the oligopoly power of U.S. public firms?

Overview

Question: What are the welfare costs of the oligopoly power of U.S. public firms?

Contribution: propose and calibrate a new GE model of hedonic demand; divorced from standard industry classifications used in macro (*)

Overview

Question: What are the welfare costs of the oligopoly power of U.S. public firms?

Contribution: propose and calibrate a new GE model of hedonic demand; divorced from standard industry classifications used in macro (*)

Findings:

- 1. Costs of oligopoly power increased from 8.5% to 11% from 1997-2017
- 2. Firms capture greater share of total surplus in 2017 compared to 1997
- 3. Declining IPO rate contributes significantly to declining consumer surplus (*)

Utility Function: Generalized Hedonic-Linear Demand

$$U(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{q},H) = \alpha \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left(b_j^{\mathsf{x}} x_j - \frac{1}{2} x_j^2 \right) + (1-\alpha) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(b_i^{\mathsf{q}} q_i - \frac{1}{2} q_i^2 \right) - H$$

where:

- $ightharpoonup q_i$ is output consumed from firm i
- $ightharpoonup x_j$ is total consumption of characteristic j (that is, $x_j = \sum_i a_{ji} q_i$)
- $ightharpoonup \alpha$ is horizontal differentiation
- \triangleright b_i^{x} and b_i^{q} are characteristic- and firm-specific taste parameters
- ► *H* is labor supply

Model

- ▶ Oligopolists $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ characterized by $(\vec{a}_i, b_i, c_i, \delta_i)$
- Cournot competition among these firms
- ▶ Weighted network game methodology to solve for equilibrium output **q**

Model

- ▶ Oligopolists $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ characterized by $(\vec{a}_i, b_i, c_i, \delta_i)$
- Cournot competition among these firms
- ▶ Weighted network game methodology to solve for equilibrium output **q**

Theoretical results:

- 1. Markups increase in a firm's "uniqueness" in product space and in firm size
- 2. Consumer surplus is separable
- 3. Can add an additional representative firm to capture private and foreign firms

Model

- ▶ Oligopolists $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ characterized by $(\vec{a}_i, b_i, c_i, \delta_i)$
- Cournot competition among these firms
- ▶ Weighted network game methodology to solve for equilibrium output **q**

Theoretical results:

- 1. Markups increase in a firm's "uniqueness" in product space and in firm size
- 2. Consumer surplus is separable
- 3. Can add an additional representative firm to capture private and foreign firms

Benefits of this approach: highly tractable, rich heterogeneity, tight mapping to observables, only need to calibrate a few parameters (α, Δ)

In closed form:

1. Cournot baseline

- 1. Cournot baseline
- 2. First-best

- 1. Cournot baseline
- 2. First-best
- 3. Second-best

- 1. Cournot baseline
- 2. First-best
- 3. Second-best
- 4. "Resource efficient"

- 1. Cournot baseline
- 2. First-best
- 3. Second-best
- 4. "Resource efficient"
- 5. Monopoly: same product offerings, single decision-maker picks \mathbf{q} to max $\mathbf{\Pi}(\mathbf{q})$
 - Merger/common ownership: coordinated supply decisions among subset of firms

In closed form:

- 1. Cournot baseline
- 2. First-best
- 3. Second-best
- 4. "Resource efficient"
- 5. Monopoly: same product offerings, single decision-maker picks \mathbf{q} to max $\mathbf{\Pi}(\mathbf{q})$
 - Merger/common ownership: coordinated supply decisions among subset of firms

Additional exercise:

6. Role of declining IPOs: add extra firms identical to new entrants to keep rate of startup IPOs to acquisitions fixed at 1997 level

Comment 1: Sources of Time Trends in Oligopoly Power

Can we decompose the rise in the deadweight losses into:

- 1. Extensive: Entry and exit
- 2. Intensive: Changes in product differentiation among incumbents
 - Perhaps summarize trends in 2-dimensional space
- 3. Intensive: Changes in tastes (b_j^x, b_i^q) and costs (c_i)

Comment 1: Sources of Time Trends in Oligopoly Power

Can we decompose the rise in the deadweight losses into:

- 1. Extensive: Entry and exit
- 2. Intensive: Changes in product differentiation among incumbents
 - Perhaps summarize trends in 2-dimensional space
- 3. Intensive: Changes in tastes (b_i^x, b_i^q) and costs (c_i)

The paper focuses mainly on the contribution of declining entry. But what is it about IPO that gives a firm pricing power? And how important is exit?

Comment 2: A Measure of Our (Macro) Ignorance

- ▶ Departs from standard macro in two ways:
 - 1. Demand system (GHL vs. CES/nested CES)
 - 2. Richer product market rivalries (cosine similarities vs. NAICS/SIC)

Comment 2: A Measure of Our (Macro) Ignorance

- Departs from standard macro in two ways:
 - 1. Demand system (GHL vs. CES/nested CES)
 - 2. Richer product market rivalries (cosine similarities vs. NAICS/SIC)
- ► Suggested counterfactual: Implement a version of the model with **A** given by *k* binary NAICS/SIC industry characteristics

Comment 2: A Measure of Our (Macro) Ignorance

- Departs from standard macro in two ways:
 - 1. Demand system (GHL vs. CES/nested CES)
 - 2. Richer product market rivalries (cosine similarities vs. NAICS/SIC)
- ► Suggested counterfactual: Implement a version of the model with **A** given by *k* binary NAICS/SIC industry characteristics
- Compare deadweight losses with standard industry classifications to full network specification

Final Thoughts

► Really, really excellent and novel paper

Final Thoughts

- ► Really, really excellent and novel paper
- ▶ Many interesting and *tractable* extensions: common ownership, labor market power, multi-product firms, dynamics of product space itself

Final Thoughts

- ► Really, really excellent and novel paper
- ▶ Many interesting and *tractable* extensions: common ownership, labor market power, multi-product firms, dynamics of product space itself
- Quite elusive: root cause of rising oligopoly power
 - Paper points to rising entry costs/declining IPOs
 - I hope it can go even further