### **Dynamic Collusion**

#### Kong-Pin Chen

#### Research Center for Humanities and Social Sciences Academia Sinica

# **Collusion in Cournot Competition**

- In a one-shot Cournot game, the firms receive payoffs corresponding to the Cournot equilibrium.
- However, this equilibrium does not maximize joint profit.
- The firms can collude, essentially by reducing outputs, to produce a joint output that corresponds to monopolistic output, and obtain joint-monopolistic profit.
- This collusion is unattainable, as collusion does not constitute a NE.

- Two firms, 1 and 2; each produces an output  $q_i$ , i = 1, 2.
- production cost is 0.
- Linear market demand:

$$P = a - bQ;$$

where  $Q = q_1 + q_2$ , a, b > 0, and P is market price.

- Cournot outputs:  $q_1^c = q_2^c = a/3b$ .
- Price under Cournot equilibrium:  $P^c = a/3$ .

- Monopoly output, however, is  $Q^m = a/2b$ , and  $P^m = a/2$ .
- Therefore, if each firm produces a/4b, then profit of each firm is π<sup>\*</sup><sub>i</sub> = a<sup>2</sup>/8b > π<sup>c</sup><sub>i</sub>, i = 1, 2.
- This is a standard scenario for collusive pricing.
- However, in a one-shot setting, this scenario cannot work, as the firms face a prisoner's dilemma.

	collusive	non-cooperative
collusive	$\frac{a^2}{8b}, \frac{a^2}{8b}$	$\frac{3a^2}{32b}, \frac{9a^2}{64b}$
non-cooperative	$\frac{9a^2}{64b}, \frac{3a^2}{32b}$	$\frac{a^2}{9b}, \frac{a^2}{9b}$

- In an infinite-horizon setting, suppose the discount factor between periods is δ ∈ (0, 1).
- ► Trigger strategy: Firms start with porducing the collusive quantity q<sub>1</sub> = q<sub>1</sub><sup>\*</sup> and q<sub>2</sub> = q<sub>2</sub><sup>\*</sup>, and keep producing this quantity if the market price in the previous period is greater or equal to a/2. If the price in the previous period is smaller than a/2, they switch to q<sub>1</sub><sup>c</sup> and q<sub>2</sub><sup>c</sup> forever.

Trigger strategy is a SPE if the profit from collusion is greater than a one-shot deviation, i.e.,

$$\frac{a^2}{8b} \geq (1-\delta) \left[ \frac{9a^2}{64b} + \delta \frac{a^2}{9b^2} + \delta^2 \frac{a^2}{9b^2} ... \right]$$

- Inequality satisfied if  $\delta \ge 9/15$
- In reality, there is imperfect monotoring.
- In the example, price and total quantity has 1-1 correspondence. Therefore, observing price is enough to infer opponent's quantity.
- What, more realistically, if not?



$$\widetilde{P} = a - bQ + \widetilde{\varepsilon}$$

- There is a noise to market price.
- For simplicity, assume  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ .
- Can't infer the value of Q even if  $\tilde{P}$  is observed.

- Any strategy to sustain collusion?
- Key: market price and total quantity are negatively correlated.
- Since, under collusion, every firm has incentive to cheat by increasing self-quantity, price tends to be lower when a firm cheats.
- Price is then an imperfect signal of cheating.

A modified trigger strategy:
 Let P be the price threshold.

Firms start with porducing the collusive quantity  $q_1 = q_1^*$  and  $q_2 = q_2^*$ , and keep producing this quantity if the market price in the previous period is greater or equal to  $\overline{P}$ . If the price in the previous period is smaller than  $\overline{P}$ , they switch to  $q_1^c$  and  $q_2^c$  forever.

Let V<sup>\*</sup>(δ) be a firm's payoff if both firms follow the modified trigger strategy.

Then

$$V^*(\delta) = (1-\delta)\pi^* + \delta F(\overline{P} - \frac{a}{2})\pi^c + \delta(1 - F(\overline{P} - \frac{a}{2}))V^*(\delta).$$

$$\mathcal{V}^*(\delta) = rac{(1-\delta)\pi^* + \delta \mathit{F}(\overline{P}-rac{a}{2})\pi^c}{1-\delta(1-\mathit{F}(\overline{P}-rac{a}{2}))}.$$

- Note that V<sup>\*</sup>(δ) is a linear combination of π<sup>\*</sup> and π<sup>c</sup> and, since π<sup>\*</sup> > π<sup>c</sup>, it must be V<sup>\*</sup>(δ) > π<sup>c</sup>.
- Now we want to find the condition under which the modified trigger strategy is a SPE.
- Let V(q, δ) be a firm's life-time payoff when it switches to q for one period, then follows the modified trigger strategy (i.e., a one-shot deviation to q).

Easy to see

$$V(q,\delta) = (1-\delta) \left[ a - b\left(\frac{a}{4b} + q\right) \right] + \delta F(\overline{P} - \frac{3}{4}a + bq)\pi^{c} + \delta(1 - F(\overline{P} - \frac{3}{4}a + bq))V^{*}(\delta).$$

$$rac{\partial V(q,\delta)}{\partial q} = (1-\delta)(rac{3}{4}a-2bq) - \delta bf(\overline{P}-rac{3}{4}a+bq)(V^*(\delta)-\pi^c).$$

• If  $q_1^*$  and  $q_2^*$  constitute SPE, it must be that

$$\frac{\partial V(q,\delta)}{\partial q}|_{q=\frac{a}{4b}}=0,$$

11

i.e, FOC holds at  $q_i = q_i^*$ .

$$\frac{1}{4}(1-\delta)\mathbf{a} - \delta bf(\overline{P} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{a})(V^* - \pi^c) = 0.$$
(1)

- Assume  $f(0) > a(1-\delta)/4\delta b(V^* \pi^c)$ .
- LHS of (1) is positive when P→ -∞, and increases as P approaches a/2. By assumption, the LHS of (1) is negative when P = a/2.
- ▶ By mean-value theorem, there exists P<sup>\*</sup> ∈ (-∞, <sup>a</sup>/<sub>2</sub>) such that (1) holds.
- $\blacktriangleright \overline{P}^*$  is the value of the threshold price to be identified.

- Note that, under the modified trigger strategy, the firms eventually go into the non-cooperative stage with probability 1.
- The punishment does not have to be infinitely long. This improves efficiency.
- As a punishment, the firms can engage in a Cournot competition for *n* period, then go back to collusive state.
- Our previous calculation is for case when  $n = \infty$ .

- Easy to see that previous result goes through if n is large enough.
- Collusion á la Green-Porter will then be characterized by cycles of collusive phrase and competitive phrase.

- Suppose the production cost is c for both firms.
- In every period, firms observe the value of ε̃ before setting price.
- Bertrand competition.

• Bertrand equilibrium: 
$$p_1^B = p_2^B = c$$
.

q<sub>1</sub><sup>B</sup> = q<sub>2</sub><sup>B</sup> = <sup>a-c+ε<sub>t</sub></sup>/<sub>2</sub>; where ε<sub>t</sub> is the realization of ε̃ in period t.
 π<sub>1</sub><sup>B</sup> = π<sub>2</sub><sup>B</sup> = 0.

In any period t, monopolic price solves for

$$Max_P(P-c)\frac{-P+a+\varepsilon_t}{b}.$$

$$p_1^M = p_2^M = \frac{a+c+\varepsilon_t}{2}.$$

$$q_1^M = q_2^M = \frac{a-c+\varepsilon_t}{4b}.$$

$$\pi_1^M = \pi_2^M = \frac{(a-c+\varepsilon_t)^2}{8b}.$$

- Consider the following trigger strategy:
- In each period, each firm *i* sets the price p<sub>i</sub><sup>M</sup>. They keep this price as long as the other firm's price is higher or equal to p<sub>i</sub><sup>M</sup> in previous period. If in any period, the other firm's price is lower than p<sub>i</sub><sup>M</sup>, then switch to p<sub>i</sub><sup>B</sup> forever.
- Want to find the condition under which the strategy is SPE.

#### In every period t,

$$(1-\delta)\frac{(a-c+\varepsilon_t)^2}{8b} + \delta\frac{(a-c)^2 + V(\tilde{\varepsilon})}{8b} \ge (1-\delta)\frac{(a-c+\varepsilon_t)^2}{4b} + 0.$$
 That is,

$$\frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \frac{(a-c)^c + V(\tilde{\varepsilon})}{8b} \ge \frac{(a-c+\varepsilon_t)^2}{4b}.$$
 (2)

- As usual, the greater the value of  $\delta$ , the more likely (2) holds.
- However, the greater the value of \varepsilon\_t, the less likely (2) holds, implying a boom will more likely trigger the price war.

- This contrasts the result in Green-Porter.
- Green-Porter: Recession  $\rightarrow$  price war.
- Rotemberg-Saloner: Boom  $\rightarrow$  price war.
- The stark difference in conclusions does not come from one being Cournot and the other being Bertrand, but from the fact that ε is not observed before output decision is made in Green-Porter, but observable in Rotemberg-Saloner.