

Discriminatory Information Disclosure

Hao Li Xianwen Shi

Aer 2017

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

2 Model

3 Result

4 Conclusion

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

2 Model

3 Result

4 Conclusion

Releasing different amounts of additional information to different buyer types dominates full disclosure in terms of seller revenue.

Discriminatory information disclosure

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

2 Model

3 Result

4 Conclusion

Settings and Notation

- Consumer(buyer) Valuation: $\omega \in \Omega \equiv [\underline{\omega}, \bar{\omega}]$
- Consumer ex ante type: $\theta \in \Theta \equiv [\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta}]$
- $F(\cdot | \theta)$ be the conditional distribution function over Ω

Assumption:

We say that θ is "higher" than $\tilde{\theta}$ if $F(\omega | \theta) \leq F(\omega | \tilde{\theta})$ for all $\omega \in [\underline{\omega}, \bar{\omega}]$, with strict inequality for a positive measure of ω . (first-order stochastic dominance)

- Seller commits a disclosure policy together with a selling mechanism.
- Buyer decides whether to participate; if he does, the buyer reports his ex ante type to the seller.
- Buyer privately receives new information about his valuation
- The seller's mechanism is then implemented, which concludes the game.

$\langle S, \rho \rangle$ is a signal space S and a mapping $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow \Delta S$

Full disclosure: $S = \Omega$,

$$\rho(s | \omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s = \omega \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Binary Partition:

$$\rho(s | \omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s = s_- \text{ and } \omega < \kappa \\ 1 & \text{if } s = s_+ \text{ and } \omega \geq \kappa \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

2 Model

3 Result

4 Conclusion

Discrete Type

$\Theta = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n\}$, with $i > j$ implying that θ_i is higher than θ_j ,
 ϕ_i denote the probability of the type being θ_i , and let $\Phi_i = \sum_{j=1}^i \phi_j$

For full disclosure, any mechanism can be represented as a menu of (a_i, p_i) , where a_i is the nonrefundable advance payment in period 1 and p_i is the strike price in period 2.

$$\begin{aligned}(\text{IR}_i) \quad & -a_i + \int_{p_i}^{\bar{\omega}} (\omega - p_i) dF(\omega \mid \theta_i) \geq 0, \quad \forall i \\(\text{IC}_{ij}) \quad & -a_i + \int_{p_i}^{\bar{\omega}} (\omega - p_i) dF(\omega \mid \theta_i) \geq -a_j + \int_{p_j}^{\bar{\omega}} (\omega - p_j) dF(\omega \mid \theta_i), \quad \forall i, j\end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Proposition 1

For any contracts satisfy IC and IR under full disclosure. And satisfy $p_1 < \bar{\omega}$ and $F(p_1 | \theta_2) < F(p_1 | \theta_1)$. there exists an alternative menu with partial and discriminatory disclosure that yields a strictly greater revenue.

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{p}_1 &= p_1 + \delta, & \hat{a}_1 &= a_1 - \delta (1 - F(p_1 | \theta_1)) \\ \hat{p}_i &= p_i, & \hat{a}_i &= a_i + \delta (F(p_1 | \theta_1) - F(p_1 | \theta_2)), \quad \forall i \geq 2\end{aligned}$$

where δ satisfies

$$0 < \delta \leq \min_j \int_{p_1}^{\bar{\omega}} \frac{\omega dF(\omega | \theta_j)}{1 - F(\omega | \theta_j)} - p_1.$$

Proposition 2

Suppose that ex ante types are ordered in hazard rate dominance. If a menu of option contracts $(a(\theta), p(\theta))_{\theta \in \Theta}$ with differentiable $p(\theta)$ is incentive compatible and individually rational under full disclosure, the set $\{\theta : \partial F(p(\theta) \mid \theta) / \partial \theta < 0\}$ has a positive measure and $p(\theta) < \bar{\omega}$ for all θ , then there exists a binary-partition direct disclosure policy that strictly increases the seller's revenue.

$$\hat{p}(\theta) = p(\theta) + \delta$$

$$\hat{a}(\theta) = \int_{p(\theta)}^{\bar{\omega}} (1 - F(\omega \mid \theta)) d\omega - (1 - F(p(\theta) \mid \theta))\delta$$

$$- U(\underline{\theta}) - \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\theta} \left(\int_{p(t)}^{\bar{\omega}} \left(-\frac{\partial F(\omega \mid t)}{\partial t} \right) d\omega + \frac{\partial F(p(t) \mid t)}{\partial t} \delta \right) dt$$

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

2 Model

3 Result

4 Conclusion

$$\frac{d\hat{U}(\theta)}{d\theta} = \frac{dU(\theta)}{d\theta} + \frac{\partial F(p(\theta) \mid \theta)}{\partial \theta} \delta < \frac{dU(\theta)}{d\theta} \quad (4)$$

The total surplus remain unchanged and the "information rent" decrease strictly.

- [1] Dong Wei, Brett Green: Reverse Price Discrimination with Information Design

Thank you!