

Second-degree Price Discrimination Example

This is a summary of the example from class.

Consumer Information

1. All consumers have utility functions of the form $u(q, p, \theta) = \theta\sqrt{q} - p$. Different customers may have different values of the preference parameter, θ .
2. The preference parameter θ can take on two different values, 1 or 2. The probability that a customer has preferences defined by $\theta=1$ is denoted by λ . The probability that a customer has preferences defined by $\theta=2$ is then $1-\lambda$.

Firm Information

3. With two types of potential customers, second-degree price discrimination means the monopolist needs to choose two combinations of prices and quantities: (q_L, p_L) for customers with $\theta=1$ and (q_H, p_H) for customers with $\theta=2$.
4. The firm's objective to maximize its expected profit,

$$E\pi = \lambda(p_L - cq_L) + (1-\lambda)(p_H - cq_H).$$

5. The firm's marginal cost of production equals

Incentive Constraints

Because the monopolist cannot observe any customer's type, the best it can do is let each customer choose either (q_L, p_L) or (q_H, p_H) . To ensure that $\theta=1$ types choose (q_L, p_L) and that $\theta=2$ types choose (q_H, p_H) , the quantities and prices the monopolist chooses must satisfy several incentive constraints.

1. Incentive compatibility. Each customer must get at least as much utility from the quantity-price combination the monopolist would like a customer with his or her type to choose than he or she gets from any other quantity-price combination the monopolist offers.

$$(IC-H) \quad Hv(q_H) - p_H \geq Hv(q_L) - p_L$$

$$(IC-L) \quad Lv(q_L) - p_L \geq Lv(q_H) - p_H$$

2. Individual rationality or participation. Each customer must get at least as much utility from the quantity-price combination the monopolist would like a customer of his or her type to choose than the customer would get from making no purchase.

$$(IR-H) \quad Hv(q_H) - p_H \geq 0$$

$$(IR-L) \quad Lv(q_L) - p_L \geq 0.$$

From the analysis we did in class, the binding constraints will be (IC-H) and (IR-L). (Make sure you can explain why?)

Thus, using (IR-L) the monopolist will charge $\theta=1$ customers the price, $p_L = Lv(q_L) = \sqrt{q_L}$ and using (IC-H) the monopolist will charge the $\theta=2$ customers the price,

$$p_H = Hv(q_H) - Hv(q_L) + Lv(q_L) = Hv(q_H) - (H - L)v(q_L) = 2\sqrt{q_H} - \sqrt{q_L}.$$

Expected profit-maximizing quantities

Using the prices we just calculated, expected profit for the monopolist can now be written as

$$E\pi = \lambda(Lv(q_L) - cq_L) + (1 - \lambda)(Hv(q_H) - (H - L)v(q_L) - cq_H).$$

To calculate the optimal quantities, we need to set the partial derivative of expected profits with respect to each quantity equal to zero and solve the resulting equations. Doing so yields

$$\begin{aligned} \partial E\pi / \partial q_L &= \lambda(Lv'(q_L) - c) - (1 - \lambda)(H - L)v'(q_L) \\ &= (2\lambda - 1)v'(q_L) - \lambda c = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

and

$$\partial E\pi / \partial q_H = (1 - \lambda)(Hv'(q_H) - c) = (1 - \lambda)(2v'(q_H) - c) = 0. \tag{2}$$

Equation (1) implies $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{q_L}} = \frac{\lambda c}{2\lambda - 1}$ and equation (2) implies $\frac{1}{\sqrt{q_H}} = c$. Thus, $q_H = 1/c^2$ (which

is the quantity at which the $\theta=2$ customer's marginal utility equals the monopolist's marginal

cost) and $q_L = \frac{(2\lambda - 1)^2}{4\lambda^2 c^2}$.

If $\lambda=1/2$ and $c=1$, then the monopolist would sell 1 unit to high-type customers at a price of 2 and it would not sell anything to low-type customers ($q_L=0$). Low-types would not be willing pay \$2 for one unit.

If $\lambda=3/4$ and $c=1$, then the monopolist would sell 1 unit to high-type customers and $1/9$ units to low-type customers. The price for one unit would be $2 - 1/3$ or $5/3$. The price for buying $1/9$ units would be $1/3$.