Commodity Bundling: The Gaussian Case

by

Richard Schmalensee

WP#1235-81   July 1981

Commodity Bundling: The Gaussian Case*

Richard Schmalensee

ABSTRACT

In order to obtain comparative results for alternative
pricing strategies, the distribution of buyers' reservation
prices in the Adams-Yellen framework is assumed to be
bivariate normal. Pure bundling then operates by reducing
effective buyer diversity, thus facilitating capture of
consumers' surplus. It apparently always makes buyers
worse off than unbundled sales; it is more profitable if
average reservation prices are high enough. Mixed bundling
combines advantages of both pure bundling and unbundled
sales, and it is apparently generally more profitable than
either. Bundling policies, which treat both goods symmetrically,
seem most attractive under symmetric reservation price
distributions.

July 1981

I. Introduction

In an important and widely-cited essay, Adams and Yellen [1976] examine the use of package selling as a price discrimination device.[1] They consider a monopolist producing two goods with constant unit costs and facing buyers with diverse tastes. The marginal utility of a second unit of either good is assumed to be zero for all buyers. The two goods are independent in demand for all buyers, so that any buyer's reservation price for the first unit of either good is independent of the market price of the other. Thus the maximum amount any buyer would pay for a bundle consisting of one unit of each good is the sum of the two reservation prices, and buyers are completely described by the values of those two prices.[2] Resale markets are assumed away. Adams and Yellen consider three different sales strategies: unbundled sales (the two goods are priced and sold separately), pure bundling (only a bundle consisting of one unit of each good is sold), and mixed bundling (both the bundle and the two goods are offered).[3]

Mainly through the use of examples, Adams and Yellen [1976] examine the possible implications of switches among these strategies for seller profit and net welfare (profit plus consumers' surplus). Unfortunately, they do not derive general conditions under which bundling is either profit- or welfare-enhancing, nor do they suggest any general principles or insights that could develop the reader's understanding of such issues.[4] Thus they observe merely that "whether one [pricing strategy] generates more profits than another depends on the prevailing level of costs and on the distribution of customers in reservation price space."[5] Similarly, at the conclusion of their normative analysis, they note only that "prohibition of bundling without more might make society worse off" and that "the deadweight loss associated with bundling might also exceed the corresponding loss associated with simple

monopoly pricing."[6] It is not at all apparent, however, that one <u>can</u> say much more than this under the assumptions that Adams and Yellen make.

The present essay takes what seems to be a logical next step under these circumstances. The Adams-Yellen model is specialized by imposing restrictions on the admissible patterns of buyers' tastes or, equivalently, on the distribution of reservation price pairs in the population. This restriction to a class of examples enables us to say a good deal about the effects of bundling on seller profit, consumers' surplus, and net welfare. While our detailed findings are of course necessarily valid only for the class of examples considered, they should serve both to enhance one's intuition about bundling and its consequences and to suggest patterns that might hold more generally.

Specifically, this essay adds to the assumptions of Adams and Yellen [1976] outlined above the additional restriction that buyers' reservation price pairs follow a bivariate normal distribution.[7] The frequency with which normal distributions arise in the social sciences makes the Gaussian family a plausible choice to describe the distribution of tastes in a population of buyers. In addition, the bivariate normal has a small number of easily-interpreted parameters. A final attraction of the Gaussian case is that the distributions of reservation prices for each good separately and for the bundle (composed of one unit of each good) are all normal. This greatly facilitates comparison of unbundled sales and pure bundling.

There are, however, two difficulties with the assumption of normality. First, even under a policy of unbundled sales, profit-maximizing solutions do not exist in closed form. Though analytical methods can carry us a long way, full exploration of the Gaussian case seems to require a good deal of computer simulation. In the interests of clarity and brevity, assertions in

what follows that are supported only by computer output and not by general proofs are often indicated by the underscored adverb <u>apparently</u>. Second, it follows from the analysis of Adams and Yellen [1976, p. 483] that for all reservation price distributions that have density everywhere in the positive quadrant (as the non-degenerate bivariate normal does), mixed bundling is strictly more profitable than pure bundling. (It can obviously never be strictly less profitable than pure bundling for any distribution.) But in the Gaussian case it is quite difficult to obtain optimal mixed bundling policies numerically, and we have accordingly not performed a complete analysis of this strategy.

Section II analyzes unbundled sales under Gaussian demand. Some general results are obtained that may be of independent interest because Gaussian demand has not received much study. These results are used extensively in later Sections. Section III compares pure bundling and unbundled sales. Even though pure bundling cannot be profit maximizing in this model, as noted above, it may in fact be optimal when there are setup costs associated with offering additional product varieties or with maintaining more complex pricing arrangements. It may also be more difficult to prevent resale under mixed bundling than under pure bundling. Moreover, this comparison may provide insights useful in the analysis of other situations, involving non-Gaussian demands, in which pure bundling is optimal. Finally, since mixed bundling differs from unbundled sales by the addition of a bundle to the firm's offerings, an analysis of pure bundling may enhance understanding of the operation of mixed bundling policies. In Section IV, the profitability of mixed bundling is compared to that of unbundled sales. Section V summarizes the general results and implications of this analysis.

II. Unbundled Sales

Let $Q^1(P^1,P^2)$ and $Q^2(P^1,P^2)$ be the demand functions for the monopoly's

two products when both are priced and sold separately. The assumption of demand independence implies that the demand for either good under unbundled sales is independent of the price of the other, so that these demand functions may be written as $Q^1(P^1)$ and $Q^2(P^2)$. Because buyers are interested in at most one unit of either good, if we pass to a continuum model and drop superscripts to reduce clutter, either demand function may be written as

$$Q(P) = \int_P^\infty g(x)\, dx \, , \qquad (1)$$

where $g(x)$ gives the density of buyers at reservation price x. Since unit costs are constant, we can normalize by setting $Q(-\infty) = 1$ with no loss of generality. In the Gaussian case, $g(x)$ is then a univariate normal density function.

If the mean and the standard deviation of $g(x)$ are μ and σ, respectively, $(x - \mu)/\sigma$ follows the standard (mean = 0, standard deviation = 1) normal distribution. Let $f(t)$ be the standard normal density, $[(2\pi)^{-1/2}\exp(-t^2/2)]$, and define

$$F(x) = \int_x^\infty f(t)\, dt \, . \qquad (2)$$

The function F is one minus the standard normal distribution function; it is everywhere strictly decreasing. It follows from the discussion above that in the Gaussian case, demand for a single good under unbundled sales is given by

$$Q(P) = F[(P - \mu)/\sigma] \, . \qquad (3)$$

One can show that for this demand function, elasticity is increasing in P and decreasing in μ. Higher values of σ make demand less elastic if $P \geq \mu$ and (by continuity) for some values of $P < \mu$. The demand curve given

by (3) is strictly concave for $P < \mu$ and strictly convex for $P > \mu$. While curves of this shape are not commonly encountered in textbooks, the Gaussian distribution from which (3) follows seems much more plausible in this context than the uniform distribution, for instance, that one would need to posit in order to justify more familiar-looking linear demand curves. Note also that <u>any</u> reservation price distribution with a non-zero mode inplies a demand function that goes from concavity to convexity as price rises past the modal value.

A number of readily-derived properties of the functions f and F that hold for all values of x are employed in what follows:[8]

$$F_x(x) = - f(x) ,$$ (4a)

$$F_{xx}(x) = - f_x(x) = xf(x) ,$$ (4b)

$$\int_x^\infty t\, f(t)\, dt = f(x) ,$$ (4c)

$$f(x) > xF(x) .$$ (4d)

Here and in all that follows, subscripts indicate differentiation.

Let C be the constant unit cost of producing the good being considered, and define the following new variables:

$$z = (P - C)/\sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha = (\mu - C)/\sigma .$$ (5)

Under competition z would equal zero and, from (3), sales would equal $F(-\alpha)$. Thus α is a scaling variable, reflecting the strength of demand relative to cost. One can think of z as a normalized or standardized markup.

Using (3) and (5), profit from a single good under unbundled sales, Π,

can be written as follows:

$$\Pi = \sigma\{\pi\} = (P - C)F[(P - \mu)/\sigma] = \sigma\{zF(z - \alpha)\} . \qquad (6a)$$

Note that $\pi(z,\alpha)$ is equal to total profit divided by σ and that choosing z to maximize π serves to maximize Π as well. Proceeding similarly, consumers' surplus, S, and net welfare, W, are as follows:

$$S = \sigma\{s\} = \int_P^\infty (x - P)g(x)dx = \sigma f[(P - \mu)/\sigma] - (P - \mu)F[(P - \mu)/\sigma]$$

$$= \sigma\{f(z - \alpha) - (z - \alpha)F(z - \alpha)\} , \qquad (6b)$$

$$W = \sigma\{w\} = \sigma\{s + \pi\} = \sigma\{f(z - \alpha) + \alpha F(z - \alpha)\} . \qquad (6c)$$

Let asterisks indicate evaluation at the profit-maximizing point, so that $z^* = z^*(\alpha)$ is the profit-maximizing value of z for given α. I now want to show that there exists a unique z^* for every α. Differentiating (6a), the first-order condition for profit maximization is

$$F(z^* - \alpha) - z^*f(z^* - \alpha) = 0 , \qquad (7)$$

and the corresponding second-order condition is

$$z^*(z^* - \alpha) - 2 < 0 . \qquad (8)$$

For any α, condition (8) is satisfied only for z^* values in a single interval that includes the origin. (Thus the profit function is not globally concave in the single-good Gaussian case.) Since $\partial\pi/\partial\alpha$ is declining in this interval and only there, if there exists a solution to the first-order condition (7) satisfying (8), it is unique. To show existence, first note that the left-hand side of (7) is positive for any finite α if $z^* = 0$. Using (4d), this expression can be seen to be less than zero if $z^* = [\alpha + (\alpha^2 + 4)^{1/2}]2$. There is

thus a solution to (7) in this range at which, from (4d) and (7),

$$z^*(z^* - \alpha) - 1 < 0 . \tag{9}$$

But satisfaction of (9) implies satisfaction of (8), and we have shown both existence and uniqueness of $z^*(\alpha)$.

Differentiation of (7) and use of (8) and (9) establishes that z^* is an increasing function of α:

$$0 < z_\alpha^*(\alpha) = [z^*(z^* - \alpha) - 1]/[z^*(z^* - \alpha) - 2] < 1 . \tag{10}$$

A plot of $z^*(\alpha)$, obtained by solving (7) numerically, is given in Figure 1. It follows from (10) that $\tilde{\alpha}$, defined by $z^*(\tilde{\alpha}) = \tilde{\alpha}$, is unique, as Figure 1 suggests.[9]

Going back to (5), one can use (10) to show that the profit-maximizing price, P^*, increases with both C and μ, as one might expect. The derivative of P^* with respect to σ has the sign of $(z^* - \alpha z_\alpha^*)$. This expression is clearly positive for negative α and is <u>apparently</u> positive if and only if $\alpha < 3.69$.[10]

Let $\pi^*(\alpha) = \pi[z^*(\alpha), \alpha]$, and define $s^*(\alpha)$ and $w^*(\alpha)$ similarly. Then differentiation of (6) and use of (7) and (10) yield

$$0 < \pi_\alpha^*(\alpha) = F(z^* - \alpha) < 1 , \tag{11a}$$

$$0 < s_\alpha^*(\alpha) = F(z^* - \alpha)(1 - z_\alpha^*) < 1 , \tag{11b}$$

$$0 < w_\alpha^*(\alpha) = F(z^* - \alpha)(2 - z_\alpha^*) < 2 , \tag{11c}$$

Differentiation of (11a) establishes that $\pi_{\alpha\alpha}^*$ is everywhere positive, so that π^* is globally strictly convex. Differentiation and simulation show that w^* is <u>apparently</u> strictly convex if and only if $\alpha < 8.18$, while s^* is <u>apparently</u> strictly convex if and only if $\alpha < 1.54$.[11] Inequalities (11) can be used to

show directly that Π, S, and W are increasing functions of μ and decreasing functions of C, as one might suspect. The dependence of these quantities on σ is more complex and important in what follows.

Differentiation of (6a) and use of (11a) yields

$$\Pi^*_\sigma = \pi^* - \alpha\pi^*_\alpha = (z^* - \alpha)F(z^* - \alpha) . \tag{12a}$$

Thus for $\alpha < \tilde{\alpha}$ (implying $z^* > \alpha$), increases in σ increase total profit, while for larger values of α, profit is reduced when σ increases. Changes in σ affect both the level and elasticity of demand. If α is positive, so that $\mu > C$, increases in σ shift some buyers' reservation prices below C and thus lower the level of demand. On the other hand, increase in σ apparently lower demand elasticity at the profit-maximizing point (and thus raise P*) as long as $\alpha < 3.69$. Thus increases in σ must increase profit for $\alpha \leq 0$ and cannot increase profit for $\alpha \geq 3.69$. At $\alpha = \tilde{\alpha} = 1.253$, a small increase in σ has no effect on profit because the positive impact of the induced elasticity decline is exactly offset by the associated drop in the level of demand.

Differentiation of (6b) and use of (7) and (11b) does not yield an expression as simple as in (12a):

$$S^*_\sigma = \{-f(z^* - \alpha)/[z^* - \alpha)-2]\}\{[z^*(z^* - \alpha)-1]^2 + [1 - z^{*2}]\} . \tag{12b}$$

The first of the two right-hand terms is always positive by (8), while the second is positive as long as $z^{*2} \leq 1$. From (9), $z^*(0)^2 < 1$, and $z^*_\alpha > 0$, so that S^*_α is positive for all $\alpha \leq 0$. Simulation shows that S^*_α is apparently positive for all $\alpha > 0$ as well. As σ rises, buyers become more diverse, and it is more difficult for a monopolist not practicing price discrimination to convert consumers' surplus into profit.

Finally, differentiation of (6c) and use of (7) and (11c) yields

$$W^*_\sigma = \{-f(z^* - \alpha)/[z^*(z^* - \alpha)-2]\}\{2 - z^{*2}\} . \tag{12c}$$

Increases in σ raise net welfare as long as $z^* < \sqrt{2}$. Solving $z^*(\hat{\alpha}) = \sqrt{2}$ numerically, we find $\hat{\alpha} = 1.561$, so that W^*_σ is positive if and only if $\alpha < \hat{\alpha} = 1.561$. It should be clear that W^* must be positive for $\alpha < \tilde{\alpha}$, since both Π^*_σ and S^*_σ are (<u>apparently</u>) positive there.

III. Pure Bundling

Let us now use superscripts to identify goods, as before, so that c^1 is the unit cost of good 1, σ^2 is the demand standard deviation of good 2, and so on. Let ρ be the correlation coefficient of the joint reservation price distribution. Under bivariate normality, it is straightforward to show that the distribution of reservation prices for the bundle (consisting of one unit of each good) is normal with mean $\mu^B = (\mu^1 + \mu^2)$ and standard deviation $\sigma^B = \delta(\sigma^1 + \sigma^2)$, where δ is defined by

$$\delta = [1 - 2(1 - \rho)\theta(1 - \theta)]^{1/2}, \tag{13a}$$

$$\theta = \sigma^1/(\sigma^1 + \sigma^2) . \tag{13b}$$

The important function $\delta(\rho,\theta)$ satisfies $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$, $\delta(1,\theta) = 1$ for all θ, $\delta_\rho > 0$, and δ is minimized for any ρ by $\theta = 1/2$. The following definitions are also useful:

$$d = \alpha^1 - \alpha^2 , \tag{13c}$$

$$\bar{\alpha} = \theta\alpha^1 + (1 - \theta)\alpha^2 , \tag{13d}$$

$$\alpha^B = (\mu^B - c^B)/\sigma^B = \bar{\alpha}/\delta , \tag{13e}$$

where $c^B = (c^1 + c^2)$ is the unit cost of producing the bundle.

Total profits under optimal pure bundling are simply $[\sigma^B \pi*(\alpha^B)]$, while unbundled selling would yield $[\sigma^1 \pi*(\alpha^1) + \sigma^2 \pi*(\alpha^2)]$. Using definitions (13) to substitute for the α's and σ's, it is straightforward to show that pure bundling is more profitable than unbundled sales if and only if the following quantity is positive:

$$D\Pi = \delta\pi*[\bar{\alpha}/\delta] - \theta\pi*[\bar{\alpha} + (1 - \theta)d] - (1 - \theta)\pi*[\bar{\alpha} - \theta d] . \tag{14a}$$

Analogous reasoning produces the following test quantities for consumers' surplus and net welfare, respectively:

$$DS = \delta s*[\bar{\alpha}/\delta] - \theta s*[\bar{\alpha} + (1 - \theta)d] - (1 - \theta)s*[\bar{\alpha} - \theta d] , \tag{14b}$$

$$DW = \delta w*[\bar{\alpha}/\delta] - \theta w*[\bar{\alpha} + (1 - \theta)d] - (1 - \theta)w*[\bar{\alpha} - \theta d] . \tag{14c}$$

Pure bundling increases consumers' surplus (net welfare) if and only if DS (DW) is positive.

In general, one needs values of 7 parameters to describe any particular case of this model fully: μ^1, σ^1, μ^2, σ^2, ρ, c^1, and c^2. Conditions (14) show that only 4 parameters need to be known to evaluate the desirability of a switch from unbundled selling to pure bundling: $\bar{\alpha}$, ρ, d, and θ. It turns out to be most instructive to consider first the symmetric case, in which d = 0 and θ = 1/2, and then to examine the effects of departures from symmetry. In the symmetric case, pure bundling acts by reducing the dispersion of the distribution of reservation prices in a sense to be made precise below. If symmetry does not hold, pure bundling is less likely to be profit- or welfare-enhancing than in the symmetric case.

A. The Symmetric Case

Because θ = 1/2, we have $\delta = \sqrt{(1 + \rho)/2}$, so that δ goes from zero to

one as ρ goes from -1 to +1. In the symmetric case, equations (14) reduce immediately to

$$DII \;=\; \delta\pi*(\bar{\alpha}/\delta) - \pi*(\bar{\alpha}) \;, \tag{15a}$$

$$DS \;=\; \delta s*(\bar{\alpha}/\delta) - s*(\bar{\alpha}) \;, \tag{15b}$$

$$DW \;=\; \delta w*(\bar{\alpha}/\delta) - w*(\bar{\alpha}) \;. \tag{15c}$$

If $\rho = +1$, then $\delta = +1$, and $DII = DS = DW = 0$. Pure bundling and unbundled sales are then publicly and privately equivalent, since every buyer consumes either both goods or neither one under both strategies. This provides a boundary condition on these three expressions for all values of $\bar{\alpha}$.

Let us first see when pure bundling is more profitable than unbundled sales. As ρ goes to -1 ($\delta \to 0$), σ^B goes to zero, since in the limit all buyers have reservation price μ^B for the bundle. If $\mu^B < c^B$, so that $\bar{\alpha} < 0$, the bundle clearly cannot be sold at a profit, even though unbundled sales will yield positive profits. If $\bar{\alpha}$ is positive, however, the bundle can be sold profitably to all buyers as long as it is priced between c^B and μ^B. Maximum profits under pure bundling are thus $(\mu^B - c^B) = (\mu^1 - c^1) + (\mu^2 - c^2) = 2\sigma\bar{\alpha}$, where $\sigma = \sigma^1 = \sigma^2$. Total profit under unbundled sales is just $2\sigma\pi*(\bar{\alpha})$, so that pure bundling is more profitable than unbundled sales when $\rho = -1$ if and only if $[\bar{\alpha} - \pi*(\bar{\alpha})]$ is positive. <u>Apparently</u> this quantity is positive for $\bar{\alpha} > \underline{\tilde{\alpha}} = .227$. (It follows from (11a) that there can be at most one solution to $\underline{\tilde{\alpha}} = \pi*(\tilde{\alpha})$.)

Differentiating (15a) and recalling (12a), we have

$$DII_\delta \;=\; \pi*(\bar{\alpha}/\delta) - (\bar{\alpha}/\delta)\pi*_\alpha(\bar{\alpha}/\delta) \;=\; \left.\dfrac{II*}{\sigma}\right|_{\alpha=\bar{\alpha}/\delta} \tag{16a}$$

Now consider Figure 2. From the discussion below (12a), it follows that

$D\Pi_\delta < 0$ for all δ if $\bar{\alpha} > \tilde{\alpha}$. Since $D\Pi = 0$ when $\delta = 1$, for any $\bar{\alpha}$, a curve like I must apply whenever $\bar{\alpha} > \tilde{\alpha}$. Pure bundling is then more profitable than unbundled sales for all $\rho < +1$. Using the strict convexity of π^*, one can show that $D\Pi$ is strictly convex in δ. Since if $\bar{\alpha} < \underline{\tilde{\alpha}}$, $D\Pi < 0$ for $\delta = 0$, a curve like III thus must apply in this range, and pure bundling is always less profitable than unbundled sales for $\bar{\alpha} < \underline{\tilde{\alpha}}$. If $\bar{\alpha}$ is between $\underline{\tilde{\alpha}}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}$, curve II must be the relevant one. (This function attains its minimum at $\delta = \bar{\alpha}/\tilde{\alpha}$, from (16a) and the discussion of (12a).) By strict convexity, there is a unique $\delta^\pi(\bar{\alpha})$ between zero and one for $\bar{\alpha}$ in this range, such that pure bundling is more profitable than unbundled sales if and only if $\delta < \delta^\pi(\bar{\alpha})$. (From the discussion above, $\delta^\pi(\underline{\tilde{\alpha}}) = 0$ and $\delta^\pi(\tilde{\alpha}) = 1$.) Solving for δ^π numerically and transforming back to ρ, we obtain the curve labeled $\rho^\pi(\bar{\alpha})$ in Figure 3.[12] Pure bundling is apparently more profitable than unbundled sales at all $(\bar{\alpha}, \rho)$ points below this curve.

The numerical examples in Stigler [1968] and in Adams and Yellen [1976] might suggest that the profitability of pure bundling requires a negative correlation in the population of buyers between reservation prices for the two goods.[13] This is clearly not the case, however: pure bundling is always more profitable than unbundled sales in the symmetric Gaussian case for any positive ρ if $\bar{\alpha}$ is large enough. A more useful interpretation of bundling is suggested by our use of (12a) in the analysis above. Pure bundling acts to reduce buyer diversity, in that as long as $\rho \neq +1$, the standard deviation of reservation prices for the bundle is always less than the sum of the standard deviations for the two goods of which it is composed. (Since σ is measured in dollars, it is the relevant index of dispersion or buyer heterogeneity in this context, as equations (6) indicate.) If the level of demand for the two goods, as measured by $\bar{\alpha}$, is high enough, a reduction in heterogeneity always

increases profits by permitting more efficient extraction of consumers' surplus. The correlation among reservation prices matters only because the lower is ρ, the greater the reduction in dispersion produced by bundling.

Differentiating (15b) and recalling (12b), we have as above

$$DS_\delta = \left. S^*_\sigma \right|_{\alpha = \bar{\alpha}/\delta} \tag{16b}$$

Since we found above that S^*_σ is <u>apparently</u> everywhere positive, it follows that pure bundling <u>apparently</u> always lowers consumers' surplus as long as $\rho \neq +1$. (If one re-drew Figure 2 to show DS, $DS_\delta > 0$ everywhere means that a curve like III applies for all $\bar{\alpha}$.) It is thus <u>apparently</u> the case that the reduction in effective buyer heterogeneity induced by pure bundling leaves buyers in aggregate worse off, even if seller profit is not increased, because it is easier for the seller to convert surplus into profit.

Finally, let us consider DW, the change in net welfare brought about by a shift from unbundled sales to pure bundling. When $\rho = -1$ ($\delta = 0$), pure bundling extracts all consumers' surplus so that $W = \Pi$. Reasoning as above, pure bundling produces a larger value of W when $\rho = -1$ if and only if $[\bar{\alpha} - w^*(\bar{\alpha})]$ is positive. <u>Apparently</u> this quantity is positive for $\bar{\alpha} > \underline{\alpha} = .575$.[14] Differentiation of (15c) yields, as above,

$$DW_\delta = \left. W^*_\sigma \right|_{\alpha = \bar{\alpha}/\delta} \tag{16c}$$

Since $W^*_\sigma < 0$ for $\alpha > \hat{\alpha}$, it follows exactly as in the discussion below (16a) that pure bundling leads to higher net welfare when $\rho \neq +1$ and $\bar{\alpha} > \hat{\alpha}$.[15] Exploring the interval $[\tilde{\alpha}, \hat{\alpha}]$ numerically, we obtain the curve labeled $\rho^w(\bar{\alpha})$ in Figure 3. Pure bundling is <u>apparently</u> more efficient than unbundled sales, in the sense of producing a higher value of W, at all $(\bar{\alpha}, \rho)$ points below this

curve. If a move from unbundled to sales is welfare-enhancing, it is
apparently also profit-enhancing, but the converse is apparently not correct.[16]
If $\bar{\alpha}$ is not especially large, the drop in S apparently always caused by a
move to pure bundling can outweigh the associated increase in Π.

B. Departures from Symmetry

Pure bundling treats the two goods symmetrically, while unbundled sales
does not involve this constraint. It is thus not surprising that the symmetric
case is the one most favorable to pure bundling, in terms of both profit and
net welfare.

Let us first assume that d = 0 but $\theta \neq 1/2$. Then equations (14) reduce
to equations (15) exactly as above, but the δ corresponding to any given ρ is
larger by the discussion below (13a). This means that pure bundling produces
a smaller reduction in diversity. It then follows from the analysis above
that DS is still apparently negative everywhere but that DΠ and DW are positive
only for a subset of the set of $(\bar{\alpha}, \rho)$ values for which they were positive in
the symmetric case. Since $\delta = 1$ when $\rho = +1$ for any θ, pure bundling is more
profitable (efficient) than unbundled sales if $\bar{\alpha} > \tilde{\alpha}$ ($\bar{\alpha} > \hat{\alpha}$) for any θ as
long as d = 0. For smaller values of $\bar{\alpha}$, however, lower values of ρ are
generally required for pure bundling to increase profits (or net welfare)
when $\theta \neq 1/2$ than in the symmetric case.

If d $\neq$ 0, then for any θ not equal to zero or one, strict convexity of
π^* implies[17]

$$\theta\pi^*[\bar{\alpha} + (1 - \theta)d] + (1 - \theta)\pi^*[\bar{\alpha} - \theta d] > \pi^*\{\theta[\bar{\alpha} + (1 - \theta)d] + (1 - \theta)[\bar{\alpha} - \theta d]\}$$

$$= \pi^*(\bar{\alpha}) . \tag{17}$$

Comparing (14a) and (15a), this means that for any values of the other param-
eters, DΠ is larger when d = 0 than when the goods' α's are unequal. In

particular, when $d \neq 0$, pure bundling always lowers profits when $\rho = +1$. Non-zero values of d thus tend to reduce the set of values of the other parameters for which pure bundling is more profitable than unbundled sales. As long as α^1 and α^2 are less than 8.18, w^* is apparently strictly convex over the relevant range, and all the results of this paragraph thus apply to net welfare as well as to profit.

Numerical analysis of nonsymmetric cases is quite straightforward. The procedures employed in the preceding subsection need only slight modification to be used for any values of d and θ. In particular, Figure 2 remains valid except that the boundary value at $\delta = 1$ is generally negative.[18] This sort of computation did not seem likely to yield any new insights, however, so none was performed.

IV. Mixed Bundling

Under a policy of mixed bundling, goods one and two are offered for sale at prices P^1 and P^2, respectively, and a bundle of one unit of each is sold for $P^B = P^1 + P^2 - 2\phi$, where $\phi > 0$. (If $\phi \leq 0$, nobody would ever buy the bundle, and this strategy would reduce to unbundled sales.) Let $g(R^1, R^2)$ be the (bivariate normal) density function of reservation price pairs in the population of buyers. Then, referring to Figure 4, total profit under mixed bundling is given by[19]

$$\Pi(P^1, P^2, \phi) = (P^1 + P^2 - 2\phi - c^1 - c^2)(\underline{M} + \underline{N}^1 + \underline{N}^2)$$

$$+ (P^1 - c^1)\underline{O}^1 + (P^2 - c^2)\underline{O}^2 , \qquad (18)$$

where the areas appearing in this equation and in Figure 4 are defined as follows:

$$\underline{M} = {}_{P^1}\!\int_{-\phi}^{\infty} {}_{P^2}\!\int_{-\phi}^{\infty} g(x,y) \, dx \, dy \, , \tag{19a}$$

$$\underline{N}^1 = {}_{P^2}\!\int_{-2\phi}^{P^2-\phi} {}_{P^1+P^2}\!\int_{-2\phi-y}^{\infty} g(x,y) \, dx \, dy \, , \quad \underline{N}^2 = {}_{P^1}\!\int_{-2\phi}^{P^1-\phi} {}_{P^1+P^2}\!\int_{-2\phi-x}^{\infty} g(x,y) \, dy \, dx \, , \tag{19b}$$

$$\underline{O}^1 = \int_{-\infty}^{P^2-2\phi} \int_{P^1}^{\infty} g(x,y) \, dx \, dy \, , \quad \underline{O}^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{P^1-2\phi} \int_{P^2}^{\infty} g(x,y) \, dy \, dx \, . \tag{19c}$$

Iterative solution of the three first-order conditions for maximization of Π would involve several numerical integrations at each step. We do not attempt computation or characterization of such solutions here. Instead, we develop and apply a sufficient condition for mixed bundling to be more profitable than unbundled sales.

If P^1 and P^2 are chosen to maximize profits from unbundled sales, these values maximize $\Pi(P^1, P^2, \phi)$ when $\phi = 0$. If at such a point $\Pi_\phi > 0$, it follows that _some_ mixed bundling policy is _strictly_ more profitable than unbundled sales. (If Π were globally concave in these prices, this would also be a necessary condition, but we found in Section II that profit functions do not exhibit global concavity in the Gaussian case.) Differentiating (19) and evaluating the derivatives at $\phi = 0$, one obtains after considerable algebra

$$t = (1/2)\Pi_\phi(P^1, P^2, 0) = (P^1 - c^1)\int_{P^2}^{\infty} g(P^1, y) \, dy + (P^2 - c^2)\int_{P^1}^{\infty} g(x, P^2) \, dx$$

$$- \int_{P^1}^{\infty} \int_{P^2}^{\infty} g(x,y) \, dx \, dy \, . \tag{20}$$

The right-hand side of (20) has the form of most monopoly first-order conditions: the revenue loss on infra-marginal sales is subtracted from the profit gain on marginal sales. Setting the partial derivatives of Π with respect

to its first two arguments equal to zero at $\phi = 0$, one obtains condition (7) for each good. If $t > 0$ when these two conditions are satisfied, mixed bundling is more profitable than unbundled sales.

In order to take (20) into more useable form, let $f(u,v)$ be the bivariate normal density function of two standard normal deviates with correlation coefficient ρ, let $f(u)$ be the standard normal (marginal) density, as before, and let $f(u|v)$ be the corresponding conditional density. (Recall that $f(u|v)$ is normal with mean ρv and variance $(1 - \rho^2)$.) Let $r^i(\alpha^i) = z^{i}*(\alpha^i) - \alpha^i$, for $i = 1,2$. Then standard manipulations and condition (7) yield

$$(P^1 - C^1) \int_{P^2}^{\infty} g(P^1,y) \, dy = z^1 \int_{r^2}^{\infty} f(r^1,v) \, dv = z^1 f(r^1) \int_{r^2}^{\infty} f(v|r^1) \, dv$$

$$z^1 f(r^1) F[(r^2 - \rho r^1)/(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}] = F(r^1) F[(r^2 - \rho r^1)/(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}] . \qquad (21a)$$

Similarly, the second and third terms on the right of (20) can be re-written as follows:

$$(P^2 - C^2) \int_{P^1}^{\infty} g(x,P^2) \, dx = F(r^2) F[(r^1 - \rho r^2)/(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}] , \qquad (21b)$$

$$\int_{P^1}^{\infty} \int_{P^2}^{\infty} g(x,y) \, dx \, dy = \int_{r^1}^{\infty} \int_{r^2}^{\infty} f(u,v) \, du \, dv . \qquad (21c)$$

Let us define the following:

$$\bar{r} = (r^1 + r^2)/2 , \qquad (22a)$$

$$s = (r^1 - r^2)/2 , \qquad (22b)$$

$$\omega = \sqrt{(1 - \rho)/(1 + \rho)} . \qquad (22c)$$

Using (21) and (22), equation (20) can be re-written as follows:

$$t = F[\bar{r} + s]F[\omega\bar{r} - s/\omega] + F[\bar{r} - s]F[\omega\bar{r} + s/\omega] - \int_{\bar{r}+s}^{\infty} \int_{\bar{r}-s}^{\infty} f(u,v) \, du \, dv \, . \qquad (23)$$

A. The Symmetric Case

In the symmetric case, s = 0, so that equation (23) simplifies to

$$t = 2F(\bar{r})F(\omega\bar{r}) - I(\bar{r}) \, , \qquad (23a)$$

where we define

$$I(\bar{r}) = \int_{\bar{r}}^{\infty} \int_{\bar{r}}^{\infty} f(u,v) \, du \, dv \, , \qquad (23b)$$

(Note that we do not need to impose any second condition analagous to $\theta = 1/2$ in order to obtain symmetry here.) When $\rho = +1$, $I(\bar{r}) = F(\bar{r})$ and $\omega = 0$, so that t = 0 as one would expect. Mixed bundling can have no more effect in the case of perfect positive correlation among reservation prices than pure bundling.

If $\rho \neq \pm 1$, we can easily show that t is positive for $\bar{\alpha} \geq \tilde{\alpha}$. Clearly $I(\bar{r}) < F(\bar{r})$ when $\rho \neq +1$, so that

$$t > F(\bar{r})[2F(\omega\bar{r}) - 1] \, .$$

The quantity in brackets is non-negative if and only if $\bar{r} \leq 0$, and this is equivalent to the condition $\bar{\alpha} \geq \tilde{\alpha}$. Thus t is positive when this last condition is satisfied, as asserted above. This is hardly a surprise, of course. Adams and Yellen [1976, p. 483] showed that mixed bundling is more profitable than pure bundling in this model for all distributions that, like the normal, have probability density everywhere in the positive quadrant. But we established in Section III that pure bundling is always at least as profitable as

unbundled sales when $\bar{\alpha} \geq \tilde{\alpha}$ if $\rho \neq +1$.

Now let us establish that for any $\bar{\alpha}$, $t > 0$ if $\rho \leq 0$. If $\rho = 0$, $I(\bar{r}) = F(\bar{r})^2$, and $\omega = 1$, so that $t = F(\bar{r})^2 > 0$. This shows immediately how much more powerful mixed bundling is than pure bundling. For pure bundling to dominate unbundled sales when $\rho = 0$, Figure 3 indicates that $\bar{\alpha}$ must be at least 1.05. To deal with $\rho < 0$, re-write $I(\bar{r})$ as follows:

$$I(\bar{r}) = \int_{\bar{r}}^{\infty} \{\int_{\bar{r}}^{\infty} f(u|v) \, du\} f(v) \, dv = \int_{\bar{r}}^{\infty} F[(\bar{r} - \rho v)/(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}] f(v) \, dv . \qquad (24)$$

If $\rho < 0$ and $v > \bar{r}$, $F[(\bar{r} - \rho v)/(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}] < F[\omega \bar{r}]$, since F is strictly decreasing. Then from (23) and (24), $I(\bar{r}) < F(\bar{r})F(\omega \bar{r})$, so that for $\rho < 0$, $t > F(\bar{r})F(\omega \bar{r}) > 0$.

We have shown that if $\rho \neq +1$, mixed bundling is more profitable than unbundled sales if either $\bar{\alpha} \geq \tilde{\alpha}$ or $\rho \leq 0$. It is **apparently** the case that t is positive for all $\rho < +1$ as long as $\bar{\alpha} > -2.8$, and it may be positive for all values of $\bar{\alpha}$.[20] It is thus **apparently** true that if $\rho \neq +1$, mixed bundling is more profitable than unbundled sales in the symmetric case if either $\bar{\rho} > -2.8$ or $\rho \leq 0$. Mixed bundling is clearly a very powerful price discrimination device in the Gaussian symmetric case. The advantage of pure bundling is its ability to reduce effective buyer heterogeneity, while the advantage of unbundled sales is its ability to collect a high price for each good from some buyers who care very little for the other. Mixed bundling can make use of both these advantages by selling the bundle to a group of buyers with accordingly reduced effective heterogeneity, while charging high markups to those on the fringes of the taste distribution that are mainly interested in only one of the two goods. (See Figure 4.)

B. Departures from Symmetry

Mixed bundling differs from unbundled sales only in that a bundle of

one unit of each good is offered for sale under the former policy but not under the latter. Since the two goods are treated symmetrically in the bundle, it is perhaps not surprising that mixed bundling seems to perform best relative to unbundled sales in the symmetric case. Differentiation of (23) shows that $t_s = 0$ at $s = 0$. Differentiating again, one obtains

$$t_{ss}\Big|_{s=0} = [4f(\bar{r})/\omega][(\omega\bar{r})F(\omega\bar{r}) - f(\omega\bar{r})]$$

$$+ [2f(\omega\bar{r})/\omega][\bar{r}F(\bar{r}) - f(\bar{r})] < 0 \ ,$$

using (4d). Thus t attains a local maximum at $s = 0$ for all values of $\bar{r}$ and ω.[21] Of course, since $t > 0$ is only sufficient for the superiority of mixed bundling, and no special importance attaches to the magnitude of t, this result merely suggests that the symmetric case is most favorable to mixed bundling, it does not prove it.

V. Conclusions

By requiring the distribution of reservation price pairs in the Adams-Yellen [1976] model to be bivariate normal, we have been able to obtain a number of interesting and suggestive results about the comparative properties of commodity bundling and unbundled sales.

A number of basic implications of monopoly pricing under constant costs and Gaussian demand for a single good are derived in Section II. Those results are used in Section III to compare pure bundling with unbundled sales. In the symmetric case,[22] it is shown that pure bundling acts to reduce the effective dispersion in buyers' tastes. This happens because as long as $\rho \neq +1$, the standard deviation of reservation prices for the bundle is less than the sum of the standard deviations for the two goods of which it is

composed. The greater is the average willingness to pay, as measured by $\bar{\alpha}$, the more likely it is that such a reduction in diversity will enhance profits by enabling more efficient capture of consumers' surplus. On the other hand, pure bundling _apparently_ always makes buyers worse off in the symmetric case for the same reason. If $\bar{\alpha}$ is large enough, the increase in profit caused by pure bundling is _apparently_ larger than the fall in consumers' surplus, so that pure bundling increases net welfare. Since pure bundling requires symmetric treatment of the two goods while unbundled sales does not, it is not surprising that we find that pure bundling is most likely to be profit- or welfare-enhancing in the symmetric case for any values of ρ and $\bar{\alpha}$.

Because mixed bundling is a much more complex strategy than either un-bundled sales or pure bundling, the analysis of mixed bundling in Section IV yields fewer results than are obtained for pure bundling. In the symmetric case,[23] mixed bundling is always more profitable than unbundled sales if $\rho \leq 0$ or if $\bar{\alpha}$ is large enough, and it is _apparently_ more profitable for positive $\rho \neq 1$ at least as long as $\bar{\alpha} > -2.8$. Mixed bundling permits the seller to reduce effective buyer heterogeneity for one set of buyers, while selling at a high markup to those buyers with unusually low reservation prices for either good. This seems to make mixed bundling a very powerful price discrimination device indeed. It appears that mixed bundling, like pure bundling, is most profitable in the symmetric case, all else equal, but we do not have a rigorous proof of this.

References

Adams, W. J., and J. L. Yellen, "Commodity Bundling and the Burden of Monopoly," _Quarterly Journal of Economics_, 90 (August 1976), 475-98.

_____, and _____, "What Makes Advertising Profitable?" _Economic Journal_, 87 (September 1977), 427-49.

Paroush, J., and Y. C. Peles, "A Combined Monopoly and Optimal Packaging," _European Economic Review_, 15 (March 1981), 373-83.

Phillips, O. R., "Product Bundles, Price Discrimination and a Two-Product Firm," _Quarterly Journal of Economics_, forthcoming (1981).

Schmalensee, R., "Commodity Bundling by Single-Product Monopolies," unpublished, MIT, 1981.

Stigler, G. J., "A Note on Block Booking," in _The Organization of Industry_ (Homewood, Ill.: R. D. Irwin, 1968), 165-70.

Footnotes

*Professor of Applied Economics, Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts
Institute of Technology. The author is indebted to Severin Borenstein for
superb research assistance, to the Ford Motor Company for research support
through a grant to MIT, and to the Harvard Economics Department for housing
him as a Visiting Scholar while most of this research was performed. Of
course only the author can be held responsible for this essay's shortcomings.

1. The first discussion of this possibility seems to have been that of
   Stigler [1968].

2. Paroush and Peles [1981] have recently relaxed the assumption that
   consumers purchase at most one unit of each good, but they consider
   only two types of buyers, both with linear demand functions. (They
   retain the assumption that demands are independent for all buyers.)
   Phillips [1981] uses a rather different framework to analyze bundling
   policies. For applications of the basic Adams-Yellen framework
   employed here, see Adams and Yellen [1977] and Schmalensee [1981].

3. Adams and Yellen [1976] refer to unbundled sales as "a pure components
   strategy."

4. Adams and Yellen [1976] do develop a general relation between profits
   under pure bundling and under mixed bundling. This relation is dis-
   cussed below. In addition, the Adams-Yellen analysis of the difficulties
   of using standard tools to measure the social cost of a bundling monopoly
   does lead to some general conclusions.

5. Adams and Yellen [1976, p. 488].

6. Adams and Yellen [1976, p. 495], emphasis added.

7. Adams and Yellen [1976, p. 488, note 15] indicate that they performed
   some simulations for this case. However they report only that "for

every characterization of tastes we studied, bundling in <u>some</u> form was preferred to pure components pricing for <u>some</u> cost conditions." (Emphasis added.)

8. Equation (4c) directly implies (4d) and is obtained by integration by parts.

9. Figure 1 also suggests that $z^*_{\alpha\alpha}$ is positive. This quantity has the sign of $[z^*(z^* - \alpha)^2 + \alpha]$, which is clearly positive for $\alpha \geq 0$ and is <u>apparently</u> positive at least for $\alpha \geq -3$.

10. Assertions of this sort, which make global statements about all values of α, are supported by numerical function evaluations for an array of α values whose upper and lower bounds are set by the inability of our routines to handle normal variables above 18 in absolute value. Thus even if some of these assertions are not true for some values outside this range, it is unlikely that such values would ever be encountered.

11. $w^*_{\alpha\alpha}$ can be shown to have the sign of $[6 + 4\alpha z^* - 5z^{*2}]$, while $s^*_{\alpha\alpha}$ has the sign of $[2 - z^{*4} + 2\alpha z^{*3} - \alpha^2 z^{*2} - z^{*2}]$.

12. One can show analytically that $\rho^{\pi}(\bar{\alpha})$ is a strictly increasing function over the relevant range.

13. See also Schmalensee [1981].

14. Since $w^*(\bar{\alpha}) > \pi^*(\bar{\alpha})$ for all $\bar{\alpha}$ and both functions are increasing, it must be that $\underline{\alpha} > \tilde{\alpha}$. As we show below, if $\rho \neq 1$ pure bundling always raises W if $\bar{\alpha} > \underline{\alpha}$. Thus any solutions to $\underline{\alpha} = w(\underline{\alpha})$ must lie in the open interval $(\tilde{\alpha}, \underline{\alpha})$, and the solution given in the text is <u>apparently</u> the only one there.

15. In particular, this result does not depend on whether or not w^* is convex. As long as DW is everywhere decreasing in δ and equals zero when $\delta = 1$, it must be everywhere positive; see curve I in Figure 2.

16. When $\rho = \rho^W$, $DW = D\Pi + DS = 0$. Since DS is _apparently_ everywhere negative, $D\Pi$ must be positive along the ρ^W locus, and the latter therefore _apparently_ cannot intersect the ρ^π locus. Using the convexity of π^*, one can show that $D\Pi$ is increasing in $\bar{\alpha}$ for $\rho \neq +1$, so that the ρ^W locus must lie everywhere to the right of the ρ^π locus if they don't intersect. This is confirmed by the computations underlying Figure 3.

17. In the uninteresting cases $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = 1$, the distribution of reservation prices is degenerate; we shall not consider these cases further.

18. From this and $\delta_\rho > 0$ it follows that if pure bundling is more profitable than unbundled sales for $\rho = \rho_0$, then regardless of the values of the other parameters, it is also more profitable for all $\rho < \rho_0$. Intuitively this is because smaller ρ's _always_ enable bundling to achieve greater reduction in effective buyer diversity.

19. For a detailed discussion, see Adams and Yellen [1976, p. 480].

20. A few negative values of t were encountered for $\bar{\alpha} < -2.8$, but the routine used to evaluate $I(\bar{r})$ yields errors in this region that are of the same order of magnitude as the computed values of t. It is thus quite possible that t is everywhere positive, but I do not now see a straightforward way of pursuing this point further.

21. It is perhaps also worth noting that for any s, as $\rho \to +1$ (so that $\omega \to 0$), $t \to 0$ for all values of $\bar{r}$. Let $s > 0$ without loss of generality. Then as $\omega \to 0$, the first term on the right of (24) approaches $F[\bar{r} + s]$, the second term goes to zero, and the third approaches $-F[\bar{r} + s]$.

22. Note that the two goods need not have identical costs in the symmetric case. Symmetry here requires only that $\sigma^1 = \sigma^2$ and $(\mu^1 - c^1) = (\mu^2 - c^2)$.

23. Recall that the relevant symmetry condition for mixed bundling is simply $\alpha^1 = \alpha^2$.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4