

Economic Models of Consumer Protection Policies

Mark Armstrong
Oxford University

Stockholm: November 2011

- Historically, far more “economics” in antitrust policy than in consumer policy
 - typically, more money at stake in antitrust
 - much consumer policy presumes “non rational” consumer behavior
 - big exception is focus (mostly in 1980s) on search/information problems
- But changing now, in part as Behavioral Economics diffuses into the discipline
- Here I summarise some of my recent research on the topic (with John Vickers and Jidong Zhou)
 - mostly with “old” focus on search/information problems in markets with rational consumers

Consumer Protection and Moral Hazard I

- Armstrong, Vickers & Zhou (2009), “Consumer protection and the incentive to become informed”
- If consumers are over-protected in the market they may take less care in their choice
 - akin to car insurance: if drivers are fully compensated for theft, they take less care to lock their car
- Consider market with endogenous price dispersion where consumers choose to be either *less informed* or (by incurring a search cost) *better informed* about prices in the market
 - latter observe more prices, and so pay lower expected price
 - proportion who choose to be better informed depends on extent of price dispersion in market
 - average prices chosen by firms depend on proportion of consumers who are informed

Consumer Protection and Moral Hazard II

- Suppose policy imposes a cap on permitted prices
 - the policy has pros and cons:
 - for a *fixed* proportion of informed consumers, policy is pro-consumer
 - but cap reduces price dispersion, and so reduces proportion of informed consumers
- Theorem: if search cost is the same for all consumers and cap is not so tight that all price dispersion eradicated, policy *harms* all consumers [see also Knittel & Stango, *AER*, 2003]
 - moral hazard effect necessarily outweighs the direct price-reduction effect
 - this is protection which consumers don't need
 - similar “perverse” effects might be seen with “Do not call” lists and other policies which facilitate refusal of advertising
 - would be useful in future to extend analysis to focus on policy towards exploitation in the small print

Rushed Decision Making I

- Armstrong & Zhou (2011), “Exploding offers and buy-now discounts”
- Sellers sometimes make consumers decide on-the-spot
 - i.e., before consumers can discover alternative deals available
 - seller needs to distinguish new visitors from those who come back to buy later (fine for doorstep sellers, home improvements etc., but not supermarkets)
- Consider simplified setting with a single seller
 - surplus from buying firm’s product at price p is $u - p$
 - u is idiosyncratic match value: fraction of consumers with $u \geq p$ is $Q(p)$
 - if consumer does not buy seller’s product, her uncertain outside option is $v \geq 0$
 - v might represent the deals available from rival suppliers
 - u and v are independent

Rushed Decision Making II

- crucially, she does not know v when she first visits (or is visited by) the monopolist
- Free recall sales policy:
 - consumers always investigate outside option in case it's better
 - with price p , consumer buys if $u - p \geq v$
 - seller's expected demand is $\mathbb{E}_v[Q(p + v)]$
- Exploding offer sales policy:
 - with price p , consumer buys if $u - p \geq \mathbb{E}_v[v]$
 - seller's expected demand is $Q(p + \mathbb{E}_v[v])$
- Theorem: [from Jensen's Inequality]
 - firm makes exploding offers if demand curve Q is concave
 - firm allows free recall if demand curve Q is convex
- Result also holds without commitment if some consumers are "credulous", and mistakenly believe salesman's pattern

Rushed Decision Making III

- For given price p , use of exploding offers harms consumers
 - typically, use of an exploding offer also involves a higher price
 - then there is a double consumer harm: poor matching and higher price
- Less extreme sales tactic is to offer a “buy-now discount”
 - e.g., seller offers 10% discount on “regular price” if consumer agrees immediately
 - essentially this policy is *always* profitable (if feasible)
 - despite its being framed as a “discount”, this tactic can induce all prices to rise

Commission-Based Selling I

- Armstrong & Zhou (2011), “Paying for prominence”
- In markets with search frictions, a prominent product (e.g., one encountered first in a consumer’s search process) has advantage over rival products
- Sales intermediaries (e.g., financial advisors, magazine editors, stores) have much discretion over which products they choose to promote
 - product suppliers may reward intermediaries on the basis of sales to encourage unobserved marketing efforts
 - danger is that intermediary promotes product which comes with highest commission, not the best product for consumers

Commission-Based Selling II

- Consider model with a single intermediary (“salesman”) which consumers must consult
 - number of suppliers of homogeneous product
 - each supplier chooses retail price paid by consumers and the commission it pays to salesman
 - exogenous fraction of consumers are “savvy” and buy product with lowest price
 - remaining consumers are “credulous” and follow salesman’s recommendation
- Outcome is that salesman recommends product with highest commission
 - this is the product with highest retail price, so there is “mis-selling”
 - suppliers compete to offer high commission, which drives up their marginal costs and so also their retail prices

Commission-Based Selling III

- This is a poor outcome for consumers (and sometimes for suppliers too), relative to two natural benchmarks:
 - 1 No salesman is present at all, and “credulous” consumers buy their product randomly (this situation is just Varian’s (1980) model of sales)
 - 2 No commissions are paid from suppliers, and consumers pay salesman directly for advice
 - assuming fee for advice is no higher than previous commission revenue
 - UK current policy by *Financial Services Authority* essentially bans commission payments from suppliers to salesmen