Price Competition and Product Differentiation when Consumers Care for the Environment

Klaus Conrad
NOTA DI LAVORO 66.2003

Klaus Conrad, *University of Mannheim, Germany*

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

Price Competition and Product Differentiation when Consumers Care for the Environment

Summary

Increasing environmental awareness may affect the pleasure of consuming a good for which an environmental friendly substitute is available. When deciding to buy differentiated products, a compromise is sometimes made between preferred characteristics of the good and its environmental properties. In this paper we investigate the market implication of product differentiation when customers are concerned about environmental aspects of the good. We use the spatial duopoly model to determine how environmental concern affects prices, product characteristics and market shares of the competing firms. Our analysis is based on a two-stage game where at the first stage each firm chooses the characteristic of its product. At the second stage each firm chooses its price. The unique equilibrium prices and market shares are affected by consumer awareness of the environment and by the higher costs for producing those goods. As for the Nash equilibria in the characteristics we find three equilibria depending on the parameter constellation. In order to find out whether the market functions in an optimal way we determined the choice of environmental characteristics by a welfare maximizing authority. The result of this analysis is that characteristics differ under private decision making and social one. It can be shown, however, that it is possible to choose environmental policy instruments in order to stimulate private firms to produce the social optimal qualities.

Address for correspondence:

Klaus Conrad
University of Mannheim
Department of Economics L7
3-5, D-68131 Mannheim
Phone.: +49 621 181 1896
Fax: +49 621 181 1893
E-mail: kconrad@rumms.uni-mannheim.de

Price Competition and Product Differentiation when Consumers Care for the Environment

1.   Introduction*

Although nowadays ecologically relevant behavior is expected from a consumer, there are still consumers who buy canned beer or bottled juice under a no refund claim system instead of buying beverages under the deposit-refund system. Consumers also buy paper produced from trees instead of paper recovered from waste paper or normal food instead of eco- or bio-food. They buy cars with a big engine and a bad mileage per liter gasoline instead of a three-liter car. They prefer to use the airplane instead of the train although of a relatively short travel distance, they purchase conventional bulbs instead of electricity saving bulbs or they prefer energy-inefficient halogen light instead of neon tubes. Consumers' individual decisions are based on utility maximizing behavior, but there is a trade-off between utility derived from preferred characteristics of a product and between the moral behavior of buying "green", expected by part of the society. There is product differentiation with respect to environmental friendly characteristics with positive market shares for producers who care about these characteristics and for producers who don't. If a consumer buys a product which lacks any environmental friendly characteristics, he might have a bad conscience because environmental awareness is expected from him. His environmental attitude is influenced by friends, parents, partners, or by the media, but it is often not strong enough to push the market share of environmental incompatible products towards zero and that one of the environmentally friendly substitute towards one. One reason is that producers are aware of the conflict of consumers between preferred characteristics and their environmental incompatibility. They know that customers, getting their preferred characteristics from an environmental friendly product, welcome that coincidence but if environmental aspects are missing, they might anyhow buy the product.

Producers respond to consumer's utility from a product and his disutility from not being environmental friendly in various ways. In addition to offering different characteristics, producers can choose prices such as to prevent the loss of market shares.

———————————————

A price could be attractive to the consumer because characteristics of the product offered are similar. In that case, price competition is high. But consumers may also accept higher prices because environmental friendly products are costlier to produce, making these products more expensive. We will develop a standard model of price competition and product differentiation[1] incorporating the aforementioned environmental awareness of the consumers. The model is similar in spirit to a paper by Grilo, Shy and Thisse (2001) in which equilibrium prices are determined when consumer behavior is characterized by phenomena like conformity or vanity.[2] We will describe market equilibria in which firms choose the characteristics of their respective products as well as their prices. Our analysis is based on a two-stage non-cooperative game. In the first stage, each firm chooses the characteristic of its product (more or less environmental friendly). Then, having observed its rival's characteristics, in the second stage of the game each firm chooses its price. The set of players therefore consists of two firms and a continuum of potential customers represented by the unit interval. They choose from which firm to buy having observed prices and characteristics.

Our objective is to confront our results with those derived in the literature on price competition through product differentiation (e.g. Shaked and Sutton (1982)). In these models the two firms will choose distinct qualities and both will enjoy positive profits at equilibrium. The intuitive idea behind this result is that, as their qualities become close, price competition between the increasingly similar products reduces the profit of both firms. The open question is whether under environmental awareness the equilibrium will be still unique, whether product differentiation will be maximal, and whether profits will be still positive when the costs of production increase with quality, i.e. with environmental properties. The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we present the model of price and product differentiation and characterize the Nash equilibria. In section 3 we look for social welfare maximizing environmental characteristics and for policy instruments to affect firms' decisions on characteristics towards social ones. Section 4 concludes the paper.

---

[1] The standard model has been set out by D'Aspremont et al. (1979) by correcting Hotelling's (1929) "principle of minimum differentiation". They show that no equilibrium price solution exists when both sellers are not far enough from each other. They consider a slightly modified version of Hotelling's model for which there exists a price equilibrium solution everywhere. In this version there is a tendency for both sellers to maximize their differentiation.
[2] See also a model of social distance by Akerlof (1997) that is useful for understanding social decisions.

2.   The model

We consider an oligopolistic (duopolistic) market where the two firms compete not only in prices but also in quality. Quality here means that the product differs in terms of its environmental characteristics. When the firm decides on the degree of environmental friendliness of its product, it has to anticipate the strategic effects of its decision on price and attribute of its competitor's product. Our non-cooperative game considers two stages: In the first stage the firms simultaneously choose their respective characteristics. In the second stage they compete in prices. At this stage the characteristics are fixed and irreversible, so that price competition is influenced by the degree of product differentiation. Firms will take this into account when deciding on the characteristics. Our model differs from standard models of product differentiation because of the introduction of a consumption externality. The model is in spirit of models of social interaction in which individuals care about status (belonging to the group of environmentally concerned people) as well as "intrinsic utility" which refers to utility derived directly from consumption.[3] We consider two firms selling a heterogeneous product with characteristics $q_i \in [0,1]$, $i = 1, 2$, with $q_1 \leq q_2$. The products are labeled in increasing order of environmental friendliness, i.e. firm 1 is less concerned about not producing environmentally friendly goods. In our model of horizontal product differentiation each consumer buys one unit of the product. There is a continuum of consumers uniformly distributed over the interval [0, 1]. The willingness to pay of consumer $\theta \in [0,1]$ for a unit of the good of property q is defined by:

(1) $$v(q,\theta) = r - t(q-\theta)^2 - d(1-q)$$

in which r stands for the gross, intrinsic utility a consumer derives from consuming one unit of the product. In the tradition of spacial models of product differentiation, it is assumed that r is sufficiently large to ensure that all consumers prefer buying rather than dropping out of the market. The term $t(q-\theta)^2$ represents the costs a consumer, located at $\theta \in [0,1]$, bears if he does not get his preferred characteristic because he has to buy from firm i selling characteristic $q_i (i=1,2)$. With $d(1-q_i)$ we express the social status of the consumer. It is modeled by the bad conscious of not having purchased the environmentally most friendly product at the end of the characteristic's [0, 1] line. When environmental awareness is

---

[3] See Bernheim (1994).

sufficiently important relative to intrinsic utility, many individuals conform to a single homogeneous standard of behavior, despite heterogeneous underlying preferences. Social groups often penalize individuals who deviate from accepted norms, even when deviations are relatively minor.[4] We incorporate environmental concern directly into individual preferences. There are at least three separate justifications for doing this. First, the assumption that individuals care about the environment is consistent with evidence. Second, evolutionary pressures could well produce preferences of this form. Third, deviations from social environmental awareness are punished by loss of social "reputation" (not being "in").[5] The utility of consumer θ when buying from i is then defined by

$$(2) \qquad U(q_i, \theta) = r - t(q_i - \theta)^2 - d(1 - q_i) - p_i$$

where p_i is the price of firm i (i = 1, 2). The utility (2) captures different types of product differentiation together with a social externality.[6] The consumer feels he should consider to buy "green" but his preferences are different. Social pressure as an externality compels him to incorporate environmental aspects into his preferences.

The market is modeled as a two-stage game, the solution of which is given by a subgame perfect Nash equilibrium in pure strategies. In the first stage, firms select their characteristics. In the second one, given any pair of characteristics, the firms choose their prices. By backwards induction we want to determine for a given pair of characteristics (q_1, q_2) all the price pairs for which both firms have a strictly positive demand. We therefore are interested in finding a consumer $\hat{\theta} \in (0,1)$ who is indifferent between the two suppliers, given their prices (p_1, p_2). For that, $\hat{\theta}$ must satisfy the following equation:

$$(3) \qquad U(q_1, \hat{\theta}) = U(q_2, \hat{\theta}).$$

Using (2) and solving (3) for $\hat{\theta}$ yields:

---

[4] See Bernheim (1994) for a model of social interaction in which individuals care about status as well as "intrinsic" utility.

[5] In the status model by Akerlof (1997), the individual chooses a status-producing variable x to maximize an utility function $U = u(x) - d \cdot (\tilde{x} - x)$ where the person loses utility in amount $d(\tilde{x} - x)$ insofar as she falls behind everyone else in her choice of x where $\tilde{x}$ is the choice of everyone else.

[6] See Grilo, Shy and Thisse (2001).

$$(4) \qquad \hat{\theta} = \frac{p_2 - p_1 + t(q_2 - q_1)\left[q_1 + q_2 - \overline{d}\right]}{2\,t(q_2 - q_1)}$$

where $\overline{d} = d/t$. Under horizontal product differentiation consumers split their purchase between the two firms when they offer their product at the same price. Setting $p_1 = p_2$ in (4) implies $0 < q_1 + q_2 - \overline{d} < 2$ as a condition for horizontal product differentiation. For consumers with $\theta < \hat{\theta}$, it is $v(q_1, \theta) - p_1 > v(q_2, \theta) - p_2$; i.e. they buy the product of firm 1. Consumers with $\theta > \hat{\theta}$ buy the product of firm 2 as for them $v(q_1, \theta) - p_1 < v(q_2, \theta) - p_2$. The firm specific demand functions are therefore

$$(5) \qquad D_1(p_1, p_2) = \hat{\theta} \quad , \qquad D_2(p_1, p_2) = 1 - \hat{\theta}$$

for firm 1 and firm 2, respectively.

In producing the two characteristics we assume that costs increase in q. Environmental friendly products incur higher costs to produce them. Profits are then defined as follows:

$$(6) \qquad \pi_1 = \left[p_1 - c\,q_1\right] D_1(p_1, p_2), \quad \pi_2 = \left[p_2 - c\,q_2\right] D_2(p_1, p_2)$$

where c in $C_i = c \cdot q_i \cdot D_i$ is a constant. From the FOCs for a profit-maximizing price strategy we obtain the following reaction functions:

$$(7) \qquad p_1 = p_1^R(p_2) = \frac{1}{2}\left\{p_2 + t(q_2 - q_1)\left[q_1 + q_2 - \overline{d}\right] + c\,q_1\right\}$$

$$(8) \qquad p_2 = p_2^R(p_1) = \frac{1}{2}\left\{p_1 + t(q_2 - q_1)\left[2 - q_1 - q_2 + \overline{d}\right] + c\,q_2\right\}.$$

Firm i's best response on the price of its competitor depends on the characteristics chosen by the firms at the first stage of the game. Solving the reaction functions for p_1 and p_2 yields the unique equilibrium prices:

(9)
$$p_1^* = \frac{1}{3}\left[t\left(q_2 - q_1\right)\left[2 + q_1 + q_2 - \overline{d}\right] + c\left(q_2 + 2\,q_1\right)\right]$$

(10)
$$p_2^* = \frac{1}{3}\left[t\left(q_2 - q_1\right)\left[4 - q_1 - q_2 + \overline{d}\right] + c\left(q_1 + 2\,q_2\right)\right].$$

Since for horizontal product differentiation $0 < q_1 + q_2 - \overline{d} < 2$, prices are positive. Evaluating the marginal consumer (4) at the price equilibrium, we have

(11)
$$\theta^* = d_1\left(q_1, q_2\right) = \frac{t\left[2 + q_1 + q_2 - \overline{d}\right] + c}{6\,t}$$

(12)
$$1 - \theta^* = d_2\left(q_1, q_2\right) = \frac{t\left[4 - q_1 - q_2 + \overline{d}\right] - c}{6\,t}.$$

Proposition

Consumer awareness of the environment, d, lowers the price p_1^* and raises the price p_2^*. The market share of firm 1 will decline and the one of firm 2 will increase, i.e.

$$\frac{\partial\,p_1^*}{\partial\,\overline{d}} < 0, \quad \frac{\partial\,p_2^*}{\partial\,\overline{d}} > 0, \quad \frac{\partial\,\theta^*}{\partial\,\overline{d}} < 0, \quad \frac{\partial\left(1 - \theta^*\right)}{\partial\,\overline{d}} > 0.$$

Second, higher costs of production, c, reduces the market share of the environmentally concerned firm 2. Both firms raise their prices but the price increase of firm 2 is higher than the one of firm 1. The spread of their prices increases and depends on the difference in product differentiation

$$\left(\frac{\partial\left(1 - \theta^*\right)}{\partial\,c} < 0, \quad \frac{\partial\,p_1^*}{\partial\,c} < \frac{\partial\,p_2^*}{\partial\,c}, \quad \frac{\partial\left(p_2^* - p_1^*\right)}{\partial\,c} = \frac{1}{3}\left(q_2 - q_1\right)\right).$$

These conclusions only hold if q_1 and q_2 are fixed. When choosing the characteristics at the first stage of the game, firms take into account the effect of their quality decisions on the

price, set at the second stage. Profit of firm i is $\pi_i(q_1, q_2) = \left[p_i^*(q_1, q_2) - c\, q_i \right] \cdot d_i(q_1, q_2)$ and depends on the characteristics (q_1, q_2). We consider first the case of an interior solution $0 \le q_i \le 1$ and solve the FOCs $\dfrac{\partial \pi_i}{\partial q_i} = 0$ in terms of two reaction functions. The result is

(13) $\qquad q_1 = q_1^R(q_2) = \dfrac{1}{3}\left[-2 + \overline{d} + q_2 - \overline{c} \right]$

(14) $\qquad q_2 = q_2^R(q_1) = \dfrac{1}{3}\left[4 + \overline{d} + q_1 - \overline{c} \right]$

where $\overline{d} = d/t$ and $\overline{c} = c/t$. It is well known that in the conventional case $(d = c = 0)$ there exists no interior solution. Both firms choose maximal product differentiation by producing $\tilde{q}_1 = 0$ and $\tilde{q}_2 = 1$. Solving the simultaneous system (13) and (14) yields

(15) $\qquad \tilde{q}_1 = -\dfrac{1}{4} + \dfrac{1}{2}\left(\overline{d} - \overline{c}\right)$

(16) $\qquad \tilde{q}_2 = \dfrac{5}{4} + \dfrac{1}{2}\left(\overline{d} - \overline{c}\right).$

An interior solution for $\tilde{q}_1 \ge 0$ would require $\overline{d} - \overline{c} \ge \dfrac{1}{2}$, and for $\tilde{q}_2 \le 1$ the inequality $\overline{d} - \overline{c} \le -\dfrac{1}{2}$. We conclude that there exists no interior Nash equilibrium in characteristics.

We next characterize three equilibria of (q_1, q_2), depending on the difference $\overline{d} - \overline{c}$.

Case (*i*): $\qquad \overline{d} - \overline{c} \ge \dfrac{1}{2}$

It is $\tilde{q}_1 \ge 0$ from (15) and $\tilde{q}_2 = 1$ as q_2 must not exceed one. According to (13), the best response of firm 1 on $\tilde{q}_2 = 1$ is $q_1^R(1) = \dfrac{1}{3}\left[-1 + \overline{d} - \overline{c} \right]$ which implies $q_1 \ge 0$ if $\overline{d} - \overline{c} \ge 1$. The

best response of firm 2 on $q_1^R(1)$ follows from (14). It is $q_2 = q_2^R \left(q_1^R(1) \right) = \dfrac{11}{9} + \dfrac{4}{9} \left(\overline{d} - \overline{c} \right) > 1$

that is, firm 2 sticks to $\tilde{q}_2 = 1$. We conclude:

Proposition 2:

If $\qquad \overline{d} - \overline{c} \ge 1 \qquad (i.e.\ d - c \ge t),\quad$ then

(17)
$$q_1^* = \frac{1}{3} \left[-1 + \overline{d} - \overline{c} \right] \ge 0$$
$$q_2^* = 1$$

is a Nash equilibrium in the characteristics q_1 and q_2.

Case (*ii*): $\qquad \overline{d} - \overline{c} \le -\dfrac{1}{2}$

It is $\tilde{q}_2 \le 1$ from (16) and $\tilde{q}_1 = 0$ as q_1 can not become negative. The best response (14) of firm 2 on $\tilde{q}_1 = 0$ is $q_2^R(0) = \dfrac{1}{3} \left[4 + \overline{d} - \overline{c} \right]$ with $q_2^R(0) \le 1$ if $\overline{d} - \overline{c} \le -1$. The best response of firm 1 on $q_2^R(0)$ is in turn $q_1^R \left(q_2^R(0) \right) = \dfrac{1}{9} \left[-2 + 4 \left(\overline{d} - \overline{c} \right) \right] < 0$ with $\overline{d} - \overline{c} \le -1$; that is $\tilde{q}_1 = 0$.

We conclude:

Proposition 3:

If $\qquad \overline{d} - \overline{c} \le -1 \qquad (i.e.\ d - c \le -t),\quad$ then

(18)
$$q_1^* = 0$$
$$q_2^* = \frac{1}{3} \left[4 + \overline{d} - \overline{c} \right] \le 1$$

is a Nash equilibrium in (q_1, q_2).

Case (*iii*): $\qquad -\dfrac{1}{2} \le \overline{d} - \overline{c} \le \dfrac{1}{2}$

It is $\tilde{q}_1 = 0$, $\tilde{q}_2 = 1$. The best response of firm 2 on $\tilde{q}_1 = 0$ is $q_2^R(0) = \frac{1}{3}\left[4 + \overline{d} - \overline{c}\right]$ with

$q_2^R(0) > 1$ if $\overline{d} - \overline{c} > -1$. In that case it is $q_2^R = 1$. The best response of firm 1 on $q_2^R = 1$ is

$q_1^R(1) = \frac{1}{3}\left[-1 + \overline{d} - \overline{c}\right]$ with $q_1^R(1) < 0$ if $\overline{d} - \overline{c} < 1$. We conclude:

Proposition 4:

If $\qquad -1 < \overline{d} - \overline{c} < 1 \quad \left(i.e. \quad -t < d - c < t\right)$, then

(19) $\qquad q_1^* = 0 \qquad\qquad q_2^* = 1$

is a Nash equilibrium in $\left(q_1, q_2\right)$.

The market shares in our three cases can be determined by inserting q_1^*, q_2^* in (11) and

(12):

$$
\begin{aligned}
&1) \qquad 4 \geq \overline{d} - \overline{c} \geq 1 \ : \ \theta^* = \frac{4}{9} - \frac{1}{9}\left(\overline{d} - \overline{c}\right), \qquad 1 - \theta^* = \frac{5}{9} + \frac{1}{9}\left(\overline{d} - \overline{c}\right)\\
(20) \quad &2) \ -4 \leq \overline{d} - \overline{c} \leq -1 \ : \ \theta^* = \frac{5}{9} - \frac{1}{9}\left(\overline{d} - \overline{c}\right), \qquad 1 - \theta^* = \frac{4}{9} + \frac{1}{9}\left(\overline{d} - \overline{c}\right)\\
&3) \qquad -1 < \overline{d} - \overline{c} < 1 \ : \ \theta^* = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6}\left(\overline{d} - \overline{c}\right), \qquad 1 - \theta^* = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6}\left(\overline{d} - \overline{c}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

As expected, environmental awareness reduces the market share of firm 1 and increases the market share of good 2. The same effect has a lower unit cost c. In Table 1 we present the characteristics, prices, market shares and profit for our three Nash-equilibria. As values for $\overline{d} - \overline{c}$ we choose an upper bound, a lower bound and an intermediate value (we set $t = 1$ for simplification).

Table 1: Market structure and performance in the three Nash equilibria (t = 1)

$d-c$	q_1^*	q_2^*	p_1^*	p_2^*	θ^*	π_1^*	π_2^*
1. Nash eq.				Strong environmental concern			
$d-c=4\,t$ $(d=c+4)$	1	1	c	c	0	0	0
$d-c=2\,t$ $(d=c+2)$	1/3	1	$c/3+0.29$	$c+1.03$	2/9	0.066	0.806
$d-c=t$ $(d=c+1)$	0	1	2/3	$c+4/3$	3/9	0.22	0.89
2. Nash eq.				Weak environmental concern			
$d-c=-t$ $(d=c-1)$	0	1	4/3	$c+2/3$	0.66	0.89	0.22
$d-c=-2\,t$ $(d=c-2)$	0	2/3	1.03	$2/3\,c+0.29$	0.78	0.806	0.066
$d-c=-4\,t$ $(d=c-4)$	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
3. Nash eq.				Balanced environmental/Cost situation			
$d-c=t/2$ $(d=c+1/2)$	0	1	0.83	$c+1.16$	5/12	0.35	0.632
$d-c=0$ $(d=c)$	0	1	1	$c+1$	1/2	1/2	1/2
$d-c=-t/2$ $(d=c-1/2)$	0	1	7/6	$c+5/6$	7/12	0.68	0.35

Under strong environmental concern (1. Nash eq. with $d-c=4$) there is Bertrand price competition on the homogenous goods market $\left(q_1^*=q_2^*=1\right)$. If environmental concern becomes somewhat weaker, firm 1 differentiates its product towards being less environmental friendly. It raises by this strategy its market share and profit. However, firm 2 benefits from the environmental concern by having a market share of at least $2/3$ as well as higher profits than firm 1. The 2. Nash eq. case we call weak environmental concern. The values in Table 1

start with a case where costs dominate environmental concern only weakly. Firm 1 chooses $q_1 = 0$ and has a market share of $2/3$. If the cost aspect becomes more dominant, firm 2 lowers q_2 from $q_2^* = 1$ to $q_2^* = 2/3$, but will loose market share and profits nevertheless. If costs are too high relative to environmental concern $(d - c = -4)$, there is again Bertrand competition on the homogenous goods market, but this time at $q_1^* = q_2^* = 0$. Finally, we call the 3. Nash eq. a balanced environmental / cost situation. If there is an exact balance $(d = c)$, firms share the market, the mark-up on marginal costs is 1 and profits are equal. If there is a slight tendency towards environmental concern $(d - c = 1/2)$, this favors firm 2 in terms of a higher market share and higher profits. The situation is symmetric if there is a slight tendency towards the cost aspect.

3. Social welfare maximizing characteristics

The next step is to check for market failure in the sense that the private choice of the characteristics might differ from the social optimal one preferred by an environmental authority. For that purpose we define social welfare as a function of q_1 and q_2. It is equal to the aggregate willingness to pay minus cost of production. Therefore

$$(21) \quad W(q_1, q_2) = \int_0^{\breve{\theta}} \left[r - t(q_1 - \theta)^2 - d(1 - q_1) - cq_1 \right] d\theta + \int_{\breve{\theta}}^1 \left[r - t(q_2 - \theta)^2 - d(1 - q_2) - cq_2 \right] d\theta$$

The market share $\breve{\theta}$ separates the consumers with higher welfare from q_1 from those with higher welfare from q_2. It is determined by the consumer being indifferent between welfare from q_1 and welfare from q_2:

$$r - t(q_1 - \breve{\theta})^2 - d(1 - q_1) - cq_1 = r - t(q_2 - \breve{\theta})^2 - d(1 - q_2) - cq_2$$

This condition yields

$$\breve{\theta} = \frac{1}{2}(q_1 + q_2 - \bar{d} + \bar{c})$$

For maximizing welfare in (21) with respect to q_1 and q_2, we first integrate W with respect to θ, and then we set the partial derivatives $\dfrac{\partial W}{\partial q_1}$ and $\dfrac{\partial W}{\partial q_2}$ equal to zero. Solving the two FOCs for q_1 and q_2 yields the characteristics which maximize social welfare[7]:

$$(22) \qquad \hat{q}_1 = \frac{\bar{d} - \bar{c}}{2} + \frac{1}{4}, \qquad \hat{q}_2 = \frac{\bar{d} - \bar{c}}{2} + \frac{3}{4}.$$

Inserting these values in $\breve{\theta}$, given above, yields $\breve{\theta} = \dfrac{1}{2}$. In the conventional case $(d = c = 0)$, it is $\hat{q}_1 = \dfrac{1}{4}$, $\hat{q}_2 = \dfrac{3}{4}$ and $\theta = \dfrac{1}{2}$. Each firm should produce the optimal quality of that consumer who is located in the middle of the corresponding market segment of the firm[8]. Compared with the private choice in that case, i.e. $q_1^* = 0$, $q_2^* = 1$, private competition leads to an extreme product differentiation relative to the social optimum. In our case $(d > 0,\ c > 0)$, we have to compare the three Nash equilibria (q_1^*, q_2^*) with the corresponding social pair $(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2)$ to find out whether private and social characteristics differ.

Let us consider the first Nash equilibrium in (17). Since $\bar{d} - \bar{c} \geq 1$, it is $q_2^* = \hat{q}_2 = 1$, but $q_1^* \neq \hat{q}_1$. In order to achieve that q_1^* is equal to $\hat{q}_1$, we have to introduce a policy parameter as an incentive for firm 1 to produce $\hat{q}_1$. One possibility is to set $c = c_0 - s$ where s could be a subsidy $(s > 0)$ or a tax $(s < 0)$ on the unit cost of production. Private calculations are now based on $c = c_0 - s$, social welfare calculations on $c = c_0$. We are interested in finding a value of s such that $q_1^*(s) = \hat{q}_1$, i.e.

$$(23) \qquad q_1^*(s) = \frac{1}{3}\left[-1 + \bar{d} - \frac{c_0 - s}{t} \right] = \frac{\bar{d} - \bar{c}_0}{2} + \frac{1}{4} = \hat{q}_1.$$

This condition is satisfied for

$$(24) \qquad s = \frac{7}{4}t + \frac{d - c_0}{2}.$$

---

[7] See the Appendix for mathematical details.
[8] See Bester, p. 116 for the conventional case.

In order to check whether *s* is a subsidy or a tax, we substitute *s* from (24) into the parameter condition for case (i), i.e. into $4 \geq \dfrac{d-(c_0-s)}{t} \geq 1$ and obtain $\dfrac{3}{2}t \geq d - c_0 \geq -\dfrac{t}{2}$. Therefore *s* is positive and a subsidy on the cost of production. Since $q_1^* < \hat{q}_1$ without a subsidy, $s > 0$ is an incentive for firm 1 to raise the environmental characteristics of its product. Firm 2 benefits from this policy because it gets also the subsidy but produces already the highest environmental characteristic $q_2^* = 1 (= \hat{q}_1)$.

An alternative policy to raise q_1^* could be to launch a campaign to raise environmental awareness (d) of the consumers by δ (advertising, TV spots, etc.). The equivalent condition to (23) is

$$q_1^*(\delta) = \frac{1}{3}\left[-1 + \frac{d+\delta-c}{t}\right] = \frac{\overline{d}-\overline{c}}{2} + \frac{1}{4} = \hat{q}_1 .$$

The required impact on environmental awareness is then

$$\delta = \frac{7}{4}t + \frac{\overline{d}-\overline{c}}{2} > 0$$

which is positive since $\overline{d} - \overline{c} \geq 1$.

Let us next consider the second Nash equilibrium in (18). Since $\overline{d} - \overline{c} \leq -1$, it is $q_1^* = \hat{q}_1$ but $q_2^* \neq \hat{q}_2$. Similarly as before we have to find a *s* such that

(25) $\qquad q_2^*(s) = \dfrac{1}{3}\left[4 + \overline{d} - \dfrac{c_0-s}{t}\right] = \dfrac{\overline{d}-\overline{c}_0}{2} + \dfrac{3}{4} = \hat{q}_2 .$

Since without an incentive *s*, $q_2^* > \hat{q}_2$, we expect a tax $(s < 0)$. Solving (25) for s yields

(26) $\qquad \overline{s} = \dfrac{\overline{d}-\overline{c}_0}{2} - \dfrac{7}{4}$

where $\overline{s} = s/t$. If we substitute $\overline{s}$ into the parameter conditions for case (*iii*), i.e.

$-4 \leq \bar{d} - (\bar{c}_0 - \bar{s}) \leq -1$, we obtain $-\frac{3}{2} \leq \bar{d} - \bar{c}_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, that is, $\bar{s} < 0$, a tax on production. As an example we could think of two firms, one produces milk in glass bottles and the other one milk in tetra-packs. From the social point of view there might be too many glass bottles on the market. On the one hand side glass bottles are environment friendly because they can be recycled many times. On the other hand, costs of recycling are high because return technologies have to be installed, transportation and cleaning costs are costly, and transportation and cleaning burden the environment. With these costs in mind, the social optimum could call for less bottled milk than under a private market outcome and a tax on the production of bottled milk would correct this outcome. Since the producer of milk in tetra packs (firm 1) produces $q_1^* = 0$, it has no costs $\left((c_0 - s) \cdot q_1^* = 0 \right)$ and is therefore not affected by the tax.

We could also think of affecting d by $d + \delta$. If we replace d in (25) by $d + \delta$ and solve for δ, we obtain a negative δ [9]. The government announces that global warming is not caused by carbon dioxide emissions (coal-fired power plants) and that there is no reason to disfigure the landscape by economic inefficient wind mills.

Finally, if the third Nash equilibrium occurs $(q_1^* = 0, q_2^* = 1)$, there is no way to influence the firms to produce the social optimal environmental qualities $\hat{q}_1$ and $\hat{q}_2$ in (22). The only possibility is to affect d or c in the corresponding interval $-1 < \bar{d} - \bar{c} < 1$ such that the private outcome is one of the other two Nash equilibria. Since one policy parameter is needed to end up in another equilibrium and another policy parameter to adjust private environmental qualities to the social ones, a campaign has to be launched as well as a tax or subsidy to be paid to achieve the social outcome.

4. Summary and conclusion

Increasing environmental awareness may affect the pleasure of consuming a good for which an environmental friendly substitute is available. When deciding to buy differentiated products, a compromise is sometimes made between preferred characteristics of the good and its environmental properties. In this paper we have investigated the market implication of product differentiation when customers are concerned about environmental aspects of the

---

[9] It is $\delta = \frac{\bar{d} - \bar{c}}{2} - \frac{7}{4}$ and negative because of $\bar{d} - \bar{c} \leq -1$.

good. We have used the spacial duopoly model to determine how environmental concern affects prices, product characteristics and market shares of the competing firms.

We first have solved the second stage of the game, that is, price competition when differences in quality exists. The unique equilibrium prices and market shares are affected by consumer awareness of the environment and by the higher costs for producing those goods. We next determined the characteristics at the first stage of the game when firms take into account the effect of their quality decisions on profit, price and hence on market shares. We found no interior Nash equilibrium $\tilde{q}_1 > 0$, $\tilde{q}_2 < 1$ but three Nash equilibria of the type $\left(q_1^* > 0, q_2^* = 1 \right)$, $\left(q_1^* = 0, q_2^* < 1 \right)$ and $\left(q_1^* = 0, q_2^* = 1 \right)$, depending on the parameter constellations. The market share of the environmental good increases in each type with environmental concern and it declines if costs are higher to produce those goods.

In order to find out whether the market functions in an optimal way we have to compare the private decisions on quality with the choice of quality by a welfare maximizing authority. We found that the social welfare maximizing characteristics are not the same as the quality distribution by private firms in the three Nash equilibria. It is, however, possible to choose environmental policy instruments to stimulate private firms to produce the social optimal quality distribution. Depending on the type of the Nash equilibrium, the government can either choose a subsidy on costs or can launch a campaign in favor of environmental awareness, or it can raise the cost of a product by a tax or can announce its environmental irrelevance if producers care more for the environment than is socially justified.

References

Akerlof, G., 1997, Social distance and social decision. *Econometrica* 65, 1005-1027.

Bernheim, B.D., 1994, A theory or conformity. *Journal of Political Economy* 102, 841-877.

Bester, H., Theorie der Industieökonomik, Springer Verlag, 2000.

D'Aspremont, C. Grabszewicz, J.J. and J.F. Thisse, 1979, On Hotelling's "stability in competition". *Econometrica* 47, 1145-1149.

Grilo, I., Shy. O. and J.F. Thisse, 2001, Price competition when consumer behavior is characterized by conformity or vanity. *Journal of Public Economics* 80, 385-408.

Hotelling, H., 1929, Stability in competition. *Economic Journal* 39, 41-57.

Shaked, A. and J. Sutton, 1982, Relaxing price competition through product differentiation. *The Review of Economic Studies* 49, 3-13.

Appendix

Proof of (22):

$$\frac{W}{t} = \int_0^{\breve{\theta}} \left(\bar{r} - (q_1 - \theta)^2 - \bar{d}(1 - q_1) \right) d\theta$$

$$-\bar{c}\, q_1 \int_0^{\breve{\theta}} d\theta + \int_0^1 \left(\bar{r} - (q_2 - \theta)^2 - \bar{d}(1 - q_2) \right) d\theta - \bar{c}\, q_2 \int_{\breve{\theta}}^1 d\theta$$

where $\quad \bar{r} = \dfrac{r}{t}, \quad \bar{d} = \dfrac{d}{t}, \quad \bar{c} = \dfrac{c}{t}.$

Integrated:

$$\bar{W} = \left[\bar{r}\,\theta + \frac{1}{3}(q_1 - \theta)^3 - \bar{d}(1 - q_1)\,\theta - \bar{c}\, q_1\,\theta \right]_0^{\breve{\theta}}$$

$$+ \left[\bar{r}\,\theta + \frac{1}{3}(q_2 - \theta)^3 - \bar{d}(1 - q_2)\,\theta - \bar{c}\, q_2\,\theta \right]_{\breve{\theta}}^1$$

$$\Rightarrow \bar{W} = \bar{r}\,\breve{\theta} + \frac{1}{3}(q_1 - \theta)^3 - \bar{d}(1 - q_1)\,\breve{\theta} - \bar{c}\, q_1\,\breve{\theta} - \frac{1}{3}q_1^3$$

$$+ \bar{r} + \frac{1}{3}(q_2 - 1)^3 - \bar{d}(1 - q_2) - \bar{c}\, q_2 - \bar{r}\,\breve{\theta} - \frac{1}{3}(q_2 - \breve{\theta})^3 + \bar{d}(1 - q_2)\,\breve{\theta} + \bar{c}\, q_2\,\breve{\theta}.$$

FOC with respect to q_1:

$$\frac{\partial \bar{W}}{\partial q_1} = (q_1 - \breve{\theta})^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \right) + \bar{d}\,\breve{\theta} - \bar{d}(1 - q_1)\frac{1}{2} - \bar{c}\,\breve{\theta}$$

$$- \bar{c}\, q_1 \frac{1}{2} - q_1^2 - (q_2 - \breve{\theta})^2 \left(-\frac{1}{2} \right) + \bar{d}(1 - q_2)\frac{1}{2} + \bar{c}\, q_2 \frac{1}{2} = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \left(\frac{q_1 - q_2 + \bar{d} - \bar{c}}{2}\right)^2 \frac{1}{2} + \bar{d}\,\breve{\theta} - \frac{\bar{d}}{2}(1 - q_2) - \bar{c}\,\breve{\theta}$$

$$-\frac{\bar{c}}{2}(q_1 - q_2) - q_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{q_2 - q_1 + \bar{d} - \bar{c}}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{\bar{d}}{2}(1 - q_2) = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{4}\left(q_1 - q_2 + \bar{d} - \bar{c}\right)\left(q_1 - q_2 + \bar{d} - \bar{c}\right) + 2\,\bar{d}\,\breve{\theta} + d\,q_1$$

$$-2\,\bar{c}\,\breve{\theta} - \bar{c}(q_1 - q_2) - 2\,q_1^2 + \frac{1}{4}\left(q_2 - q_1 + \bar{d} - \bar{c}\right)\left(q_2 - q_1 + \bar{d} - \bar{c}\right) - \bar{d}\,q_2 = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{4}\Big[q_1^2 - q_1\,q_2 + \bar{d}q_1 - \bar{c}\,q_1 - q_1\,q_2 + q_2^2 - \bar{d}q_2 + \bar{c}q_2 + \bar{d}q_1 - \bar{d}\,q_2 + \bar{d}^2 - d\,\bar{c} - \bar{c}\,q_1$$

$$+\bar{c}\,q_2 - \bar{d}\,\bar{c} + \bar{c}^2\Big] + \bar{d}q_1 + \bar{d}\,q_2 - \bar{d}^2 + \bar{d}\,\bar{c} + \bar{d}\,q_1 - \bar{c}\,q_1 - \bar{c}q_2 + \bar{c}\,\bar{d} - \bar{c}^2 - \bar{c}\,q_1$$

$$+\bar{c}\,q_2 - 2\,q_1^2 + \frac{1}{4}\Big[q_2^2 - q_1\,q_2 + \bar{d}q_2 - \bar{c}\,q_2 - q_1\,q_2 + q_1^2 - \bar{d}\,q_1 + \bar{c}\,q_1 + \bar{d}q_2 - \bar{d}\,q_1$$

$$+\bar{d}^2 - \bar{c}\,\bar{d} - q_2\,\bar{c} + q_1\,\bar{c} - \bar{d}\,\bar{c} + \bar{c}^2\Big] - \bar{d}\,q_2 = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{4}\Big[2\,q_1^2 - 4\,q_1\,q_2 + 2\,q_2^2 + 2\,\bar{d}^2 - 4\,\bar{d}\,\bar{c} + 2\,\bar{c}^2\Big]$$

$$+2\,\bar{d}\,q_1 - \bar{d}^2 + 2\,\bar{d}\,\bar{c} - 2\,\bar{c}\,q_1 - \bar{c}^2 - 2\,q_1^2 = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{2}\,q_1^2 - q_1\,q_2 + \frac{1}{2}\,q_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\,\bar{d}^2 - \bar{d}\,\bar{c} + \frac{1}{2}\,\bar{c}^2 + 2\,\bar{d}\,q_1$$

$$-\bar{d}^2 + 2\,\bar{d}\,\bar{c} - 2\,\bar{c}\,q_1 - \bar{c}^2 - 2\,q_1^2 = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \boxed{-\frac{3}{2}\,q_1^2 - q_1\,q_2 + \frac{q_2^2}{2} - \frac{\bar{d}^2}{2} + \bar{d}\,\bar{c} - \frac{\bar{c}^2}{2} + 2\,\bar{d}\,q_1 - 2\,\bar{c}\,q_1 = 0 \qquad (A)}$$

FOC with respect to q_2:

$$\frac{\partial \bar{W}}{\partial q_2} = -\left(q_1 - \breve{\theta}\right)^2 \frac{1}{2} - \bar{d}\left(1 - q_2\right)\frac{1}{2} - \bar{c}\, q_1 \frac{1}{2} + \left(q_2 - 1\right)^2 + \bar{d} - \bar{c}$$

$$-\left(q_2 - \breve{\theta}\right)^2 \frac{1}{2} - \bar{d}\,\breve{\theta} + \bar{d}\left(1 - q_2\right)\frac{1}{2} + \bar{c}\,\breve{\theta} + \frac{\bar{c}q_2}{2} = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow -\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{q_1 - q_2 + \bar{d} - \bar{c}}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{\bar{d}\,q_1}{2} - \frac{\bar{c}\,q_1}{2} + q_2^2 - 2\,q_2 + 1 + \bar{d}$$

$$-\bar{c} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{q_2 - q_1 + \bar{d} - \bar{c}}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{\bar{d}\,q_1}{2} - \frac{\bar{d}\,q_2}{2} + \frac{\bar{d}^2}{2} - \frac{\bar{d}\,\bar{c}}{2}$$

$$-\frac{\bar{d}\,q_2}{2} + \frac{\bar{c}\,q_1}{2} + \frac{\bar{c}\,q_2}{2} - \frac{\bar{c}\,\bar{d}}{2} + \frac{\bar{c}^2}{2} + \frac{\bar{c}\,q_2}{2} = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow -\frac{1}{4}\left(q_1 - q_2 + \bar{d} - \bar{c}\right)^2 + 2\,q_2^2 - 4\,q_2 + 2 + 2\,\bar{d} - 2\,\bar{c}$$

$$-\frac{1}{4}\left(q_2 - q_1 + \bar{d} - \bar{c}\right)\left(q_2 - q_1 + \bar{d} - \bar{c}\right) - 2\,\bar{d}\,q_2 + \bar{d}^2 - 2\,\bar{d}\,\bar{c} + 2\,\bar{c}\,q_2 + \bar{c}^2 = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow -\frac{1}{4}\left[2\,q_1^2 - 4\,q_1\,q_2 + 2\,q_2^2 + 2\,\bar{d}^2 - 4\,\bar{d}\,\bar{c} + 2\,\bar{c}^2\right] + 2\,q_2^2 - 4\,q_2 + 2\left(1 + \bar{d} - \bar{c}\right)$$

$$-2\,\bar{d}\,q_2 + \bar{d}^2 - 2\,\bar{d}\,\bar{c} + 2\,\bar{c}\,q_2 + \bar{c}^2 = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \boxed{\begin{array}{l} -\dfrac{q_1^2}{2}+q_1\,q_2+\dfrac{3}{2}\,q_2^2+\dfrac{\overline{d}^{\,2}}{2}-\overline{d}\,\overline{c}+\dfrac{\overline{c}^{\,2}}{2}-4\,q_2 \\[4mm] +2\left(1+\overline{d}-\overline{c}\right)-2\,\overline{d}\,q_2+2\,\overline{c}\,q_2=0 \qquad\qquad (B) \end{array}}$$

Next we add (A) + (B):

$$q_1^2-q_1(\overline{d}-\overline{c})-\left[q_2^2-2q_2+(1-\overline{d}-\overline{c})-\overline{d}\,q_2+\overline{c}\,q_2\right]=0$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad q_1=\dfrac{\overline{d}-\overline{c}}{2}\pm\sqrt{\dfrac{(\overline{d}-\overline{c})^2}{4}+\left[q_2^2-2q_2+(1+\overline{d}-\overline{c})-\overline{d}\,q_2+\overline{c}\,q_2\right]}$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad q_1=\dfrac{\overline{d}-\overline{c}}{2}\pm\left(\dfrac{\overline{d}}{2}-q_2+1-\dfrac{\overline{c}}{2}\right)$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad (C) \quad \boxed{q_1^1=\overline{d}-\overline{c}-q_2+1} \qquad\qquad q_1^2=-1+q_2\le 0$$

q_1^1 inserted into (A) yields:

$$-\dfrac{3}{2}\left[\overline{d}-\overline{c}\,q_2+1\right]^2-\left[\overline{d}-\overline{c}-q_2+1\right]q_2+\dfrac{q_2^2}{2}-\dfrac{\overline{d}^{\,2}}{2}+\overline{d}\,\overline{c}-\dfrac{\overline{c}^{\,2}}{2}+$$

$$2\overline{d}\,(\overline{d}-\overline{c}-q_2+1)-2\overline{c}(\overline{d}-\overline{c}-q_2+1)=0$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad q_2=\dfrac{\overline{d}-\overline{c}}{2}+\dfrac{3}{4}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}(C)\\\Rightarrow\end{array}\quad q_1=\dfrac{\overline{d}-\overline{c}}{2}+\dfrac{1}{4}$$

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series
Our working papers are available on the Internet at the following addresses:
http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.html
http://papers.ssrn.com

SUST	1.2002	*K. TANO, M.D. FAMINOW, M. KAMUANGA and B. SWALLOW*: Using Conjoint Analysis to Estimate Farmers' Preferences for Cattle Traits in West Africa
ETA	2.2002	*Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Paolo SURICO*: What Does Monetary Policy Reveal about Central Bank's Preferences?
WAT	3.2002	*Duncan KNOWLER and Edward BARBIER*: The Economics of a "Mixed Blessing" Effect: A Case Study of the Black Sea
CLIM	4.2002	*Andreas LÖSCHEL*: Technological Change in Economic Models of Environmental Policy: A Survey
VOL	5.2002	*Carlo CARRARO and Carmen MARCHIORI*: Stable Coalitions
CLIM	6.2002	*Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA*: Rockets and Feathers Revisited: An International Comparison on European Gasoline Markets
ETA	7.2002	*Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Eftichios S. SARTZETAKIS*: Stable International Environmental Agreements: An Analytical Approach
KNOW	8.2002	*Alain DESDOIGTS*: Neoclassical Convergence Versus Technological Catch-up: A Contribution for Reaching a Consensus
NRM	9.2002	*Giuseppe DI VITA*: Renewable Resources and Waste Recycling
KNOW	10.2002	*Giorgio BRUNELLO*: Is Training More Frequent when Wage Compression is Higher? Evidence from 11 European Countries
ETA	11.2002	*Mordecai KURZ, Hehui JIN and Maurizio MOTOLESE*: Endogenous Fluctuations and the Role of Monetary Policy
KNOW	12.2002	*Reyer GERLAGH and Marjan W. HOFKES:* Escaping Lock-in: The Scope for a Transition towards Sustainable Growth?
NRM	13.2002	*Michele MORETTO and Paolo ROSATO*: The Use of Common Property Resources: A Dynamic Model
CLIM	14.2002	*Philippe QUIRION*: Macroeconomic Effects of an Energy Saving Policy in the Public Sector
CLIM	15.2002	*Roberto ROSON*: Dynamic and Distributional Effects of Environmental Revenue Recycling Schemes: Simulations with a General Equilibrium Model of the Italian Economy
CLIM	16.2002	*Francesco RICCI* (l): Environmental Policy Growth when Inputs are Differentiated in Pollution Intensity
ETA	17.2002	*Alberto PETRUCCI*: Devaluation (Levels versus Rates) and Balance of Payments in a Cash-in-Advance Economy
Coalition Theory Network	18.2002	*László Á. KÓCZY* (liv*):* The Core in the Presence of Externalities
Coalition Theory Network	19.2002	*Steven J. BRAMS, Michael A. JONES and D. Marc KILGOUR* (liv): Single-Peakedness and Disconnected Coalitions
Coalition Theory Network	20.2002	*Guillaume HAERINGER* (liv): On the Stability of Cooperation Structures
NRM	21.2002	*Fausto CAVALLARO and Luigi CIRAOLO:* Economic and Environmental Sustainability: A Dynamic Approach in Insular Systems
CLIM	22.2002	*Barbara BUCHNER, Carlo CARRARO, Igor CERSOSIMO and Carmen MARCHIORI*: Back to Kyoto? US Participation and the Linkage between R&D and Climate Cooperation
CLIM	23.2002	*Andreas LÖSCHEL and ZhongXIANG ZHANG:* The Economic and Environmental Implications of the US Repudiation of the Kyoto Protocol and the Subsequent Deals in Bonn and Marrakech
ETA	24.2002	*Marzio GALEOTTI, Louis J. MACCINI and Fabio SCHIANTARELLI*: Inventories, Employment and Hours
CLIM	25.2002	*Hannes EGLI:* Are Cross-Country Studies of the Environmental Kuznets Curve Misleading? New Evidence from Time Series Data for Germany
ETA	26.2002	*Adam B. JAFFE, Richard G. NEWELL and Robert N. STAVINS*: Environmental Policy and Technological Change
SUST	27.2002	*Joseph C. COOPER and Giovanni SIGNORELLO*: Farmer Premiums for the Voluntary Adoption of Conservation Plans
SUST	28.2002	*The ANSEA Network*: Towards An Analytical Strategic Environmental Assessment
KNOW	29.2002	*Paolo SURICO*: Geographic Concentration and Increasing Returns: a Survey of Evidence
ETA	30.2002	*Robert N. STAVINS:* Lessons from the American Experiment with Market-Based Environmental Policies

NRM	31.2002	*Carlo GIUPPONI and Paolo ROSATO:* Multi-Criteria Analysis and Decision-Support for Water Management at the Catchment Scale: An Application to Diffuse Pollution Control in the Venice Lagoon
NRM	32.2002	*Robert N. STAVINS*: National Environmental Policy During the Clinton Years
KNOW	33.2002	*A. SOUBEYRAN and H. STAHN* : Do Investments in Specialized Knowledge Lead to Composite Good Industries?
KNOW	34.2002	*G. BRUNELLO, M.L. PARISI and Daniela SONEDDA:* Labor Taxes, Wage Setting and the Relative Wage Effect
CLIM	35.2002	*C. BOEMARE and P. QUIRION* (lv): Implementing Greenhouse Gas Trading in Europe: Lessons from Economic Theory and International Experiences
CLIM	36.2002	*T.TIETENBERG* (lv): The Tradable Permits Approach to Protecting the Commons: What Have We Learned?
CLIM	37.2002	*K. REHDANZ and R.J.S. TOL* (lv): On National and International Trade in Greenhouse Gas Emission Permits
CLIM	38.2002	*C. FISCHER* (lv): Multinational Taxation and International Emissions Trading
SUST	39.2002	*G. SIGNORELLO and G. PAPPALARDO:* Farm Animal Biodiversity Conservation Activities in Europe under the Framework of Agenda 2000
NRM	40.2002	*S .M. CAVANAGH, W. M. HANEMANN and R. N. STAVINS:* Muffled Price Signals: Household Water Demand under Increasing-Block Prices
NRM	41.2002	*A. J. PLANTINGA, R. N. LUBOWSKI and R. N. STAVINS:* The Effects of Potential Land Development on Agricultural Land Prices
CLIM	42.2002	*C. OHL* (lvi): Inducing Environmental Co-operation by the Design of Emission Permits
CLIM	43.2002	*J. EYCKMANS, D. VAN REGEMORTER and V. VAN STEENBERGHE* (lvi): Is Kyoto Fatally Flawed? An Analysis with MacGEM
CLIM	44.2002	*A. ANTOCI and S. BORGHESI* (lvi): Working Too Much in a Polluted World: A North-South Evolutionary Model
ETA	45.2002	*P. G. FREDRIKSSON, Johan A. LIST and Daniel MILLIMET* (lvi): Chasing the Smokestack: Strategic Policymaking with Multiple Instruments
ETA	46.2002	*Z. YU* (lvi): A Theory of Strategic Vertical DFI and the Missing Pollution-Haven Effect
SUST	47.2002	*Y. H. FARZIN*: Can an Exhaustible Resource Economy Be Sustainable?
SUST	48.2002	*Y. H. FARZIN*: Sustainability and Hamiltonian Value
KNOW	49.2002	*C. PIGA and M. VIVARELLI*: Cooperation in R&D and Sample Selection
Coalition Theory Network	50.2002	*M. SERTEL and A. SLINKO* (liv): Ranking Committees, Words or Multisets
Coalition Theory Network	51.2002	*Sergio CURRARINI* (liv): Stable Organizations with Externalities
ETA	52.2002	*Robert N. STAVINS*: Experience with Market-Based Policy Instruments
ETA	53.2002	*C.C. JAEGER, M. LEIMBACH, C. CARRARO, K. HASSELMANN, J.C. HOURCADE, A. KEELER and R. KLEIN* (liii): Integrated Assessment Modeling: Modules for Cooperation
CLIM	54.2002	*Scott BARRETT* (liii)*:* Towards a Better Climate Treaty
ETA	55.2002	*Richard G. NEWELL and Robert N. STAVINS*: Cost Heterogeneity and the Potential Savings from Market-Based Policies
SUST	56.2002	*Paolo ROSATO and Edi DEFRANCESCO*: Individual Travel Cost Method and Flow Fixed Costs
SUST	57.2002	*Vladimir KOTOV and Elena NIKITINA* (lvii): Reorganisation of Environmental Policy in Russia: The Decade of Success and Failures in Implementation of Perspective Quests
SUST	58.2002	*Vladimir KOTOV* (lvii): Policy in Transition: New Framework for Russia's Climate Policy
SUST	59.2002	*Fanny MISSFELDT and Arturo VILLAVICENCO* (lvii): How Can Economies in Transition Pursue Emissions Trading or Joint Implementation?
VOL	60.2002	*Giovanni DI BARTOLOMEO, Jacob ENGWERDA, Joseph PLASMANS and Bas VAN AARLE:* Staying Together or Breaking Apart: Policy-Makers' Endogenous Coalitions Formation in the European Economic and Monetary Union
ETA	61.2002	*Robert N. STAVINS, Alexander F.WAGNER and Gernot WAGNER*: Interpreting Sustainability in Economic Terms: Dynamic Efficiency Plus Intergenerational Equity
PRIV	62.2002	*Carlo CAPUANO*: Demand Growth, Entry and Collusion Sustainability
PRIV	63.2002	*Federico MUNARI and Raffaele ORIANI*: Privatization and R&D Performance: An Empirical Analysis Based on Tobin's Q
PRIV	64.2002	*Federico MUNARI and Maurizio SOBRERO*: The Effects of Privatization on R&D Investments and Patent Productivity
SUST	65.2002	*Orley ASHENFELTER and Michael GREENSTONE*: Using Mandated Speed Limits to Measure the Value of a Statistical Life
ETA	66.2002	*Paolo SURICO*: US Monetary Policy Rules: the Case for Asymmetric Preferences
PRIV	67.2002	*Rinaldo BRAU and Massimo FLORIO*: Privatisations as Price Reforms: Evaluating Consumers' Welfare Changes in the U.K.
CLIM	68.2002	*Barbara K. BUCHNER and Roberto ROSON*: Conflicting Perspectives in Trade and Environmental Negotiations
CLIM	69.2002	*Philippe QUIRION*: Complying with the Kyoto Protocol under Uncertainty: Taxes or Tradable Permits?
SUST	70.2002	*Anna ALBERINI, Patrizia RIGANTI and Alberto LONGO*: Can People Value the Aesthetic and Use Services of Urban Sites? Evidence from a Survey of Belfast Residents
SUST	71.2002	*Marco PERCOCO*: Discounting Environmental Effects in Project Appraisal

NRM	72.2002	*Philippe BONTEMS and Pascal FAVARD*: Input Use and Capacity Constraint under Uncertainty: The Case of Irrigation
PRIV	73.2002	*Mohammed OMRAN:* The Performance of State-Owned Enterprises and Newly Privatized Firms: Empirical Evidence from Egypt
PRIV	74.2002	*Mike BURKART, Fausto PANUNZI and Andrei SHLEIFER:* Family Firms
PRIV	75.2002	*Emmanuelle AURIOL, Pierre M. PICARD:* Privatizations in Developing Countries and the Government Budget Constraint
PRIV	76.2002	*Nichole M. CASTATER***:** Privatization as a Means to Societal Transformation: An Empirical Study of Privatization in Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union
PRIV	77.2002	*Christoph LÜLSFESMANN*: Benevolent Government, Managerial Incentives, and the Virtues of Privatization
PRIV	78.2002	*Kate BISHOP, Igor FILATOTCHEV and Tomasz MICKIEWICZ*: Endogenous Ownership Structure: Factors Affecting the Post-Privatisation Equity in Largest Hungarian Firms
PRIV	79.2002	*Theodora WELCH and Rick MOLZ*: How Does Trade Sale Privatization Work? Evidence from the Fixed-Line Telecommunications Sector in Developing Economies
PRIV	80.2002	*Alberto R. PETRUCCI*: Government Debt, Agent Heterogeneity and Wealth Displacement in a Small Open Economy
CLIM	81.2002	*Timothy SWANSON and Robin MASON* (lvi): The Impact of International Environmental Agreements: The Case of the Montreal Protocol
PRIV	82.2002	*George R.G. CLARKE and Lixin Colin XU:* Privatization, Competition and Corruption: How Characteristics of Bribe Takers and Payers Affect Bribe Payments to Utilities
PRIV	83.2002	*Massimo FLORIO and Katiuscia MANZONI*: The Abnormal Returns of UK Privatisations: From Underpricing to Outperformance
NRM	84.2002	*Nelson LOURENÇO, Carlos RUSSO MACHADO, Maria do ROSÁRIO JORGE and Luís RODRIGUES*: An Integrated Approach to Understand Territory Dynamics. The Coastal Alentejo (Portugal)
CLIM	85.2002	*Peter ZAPFEL and Matti VAINIO* (lv): Pathways to European Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading History and Misconceptions
CLIM	86.2002	*Pierre COURTOIS*: Influence Processes in Climate Change Negotiations: Modelling the Rounds
ETA	87.2002	*Vito FRAGNELLI and Maria Erminia MARINA* (lviii): Environmental Pollution Risk and Insurance
ETA	88.2002	*Laurent FRANCKX* (lviii): Environmental Enforcement with Endogenous Ambient Monitoring
ETA	89.2002	*Timo GOESCHL and Timothy M. SWANSON* (lviii): Lost Horizons. The noncooperative management of an evolutionary biological system.
ETA	90.2002	*Hans KEIDING* (lviii): Environmental Effects of Consumption: An Approach Using DEA and Cost Sharing
ETA	91.2002	*Wietze LISE* (lviii): A Game Model of People's Participation in Forest Management in Northern India
CLIM	92.2002	*Jens HORBACH*: Structural Change and Environmental Kuznets Curves
ETA	93.2002	*Martin P. GROSSKOPF:* Towards a More Appropriate Method for Determining the Optimal Scale of Production Units
VOL	94.2002	*Scott BARRETT and Robert STAVINS*: Increasing Participation and Compliance in International Climate Change Agreements
CLIM	95.2002	*Banu BAYRAMOGLU LISE and Wietze LISE:* Climate Change, Environmental NGOs and Public Awareness in the Netherlands: Perceptions and Reality
CLIM	96.2002	*Matthieu GLACHANT*: The Political Economy of Emission Tax Design in Environmental Policy
KNOW	97.2002	*Kenn ARIGA and Giorgio BRUNELLO*: Are the More Educated Receiving More Training? Evidence from Thailand
ETA	98.2002	*Gianfranco FORTE and Matteo MANERA*: Forecasting Volatility in European Stock Markets with Non-linear GARCH Models
ETA	99.2002	*Geoffrey HEAL*: Bundling Biodiversity
ETA	100.2002	*Geoffrey HEAL, Brian WALKER, Simon LEVIN, Kenneth ARROW, Partha DASGUPTA, Gretchen DAILY, Paul EHRLICH, Karl-Goran MALER, Nils KAUTSKY, Jane LUBCHENCO, Steve SCHNEIDER and David STARRETT*: Genetic Diversity and Interdependent Crop Choices in Agriculture
ETA	101.2002	*Geoffrey HEAL:* Biodiversity and Globalization
VOL	102.2002	*Andreas LANGE*: Heterogeneous International Agreements – If per capita emission levels matter
ETA	103.2002	*Pierre-André JOUVET and Walid OUESLATI*: Tax Reform and Public Spending Trade-offs in an Endogenous Growth Model with Environmental Externality
ETA	104.2002	*Anna BOTTASSO and Alessandro SEMBENELLI*: Does Ownership Affect Firms' Efficiency? Panel Data Evidence on Italy
PRIV	105.2002	*Bernardo BORTOLOTTI, Frank DE JONG, Giovanna NICODANO and Ibolya SCHINDELE*: Privatization and Stock Market Liquidity
ETA	106.2002	*Haruo IMAI and Mayumi HORIE* (lviii): Pre-Negotiation for an International Emission Reduction Game
PRIV	107.2002	*Sudeshna GHOSH BANERJEE and Michael C. MUNGER*: Move to Markets? An Empirical Analysis of Privatisation in Developing Countries
PRIV	108.2002	*Guillaume GIRMENS and Michel GUILLARD*: Privatization and Investment: Crowding-Out Effect vs Financial Diversification
PRIV	109.2002	*Alberto CHONG and Florencio LÓPEZ-DE-SILANES*: Privatization and Labor Force Restructuring Around the World
PRIV	110.2002	*Nandini GUPTA*: Partial Privatization and Firm Performance
PRIV	111.2002	*François DEGEORGE, Dirk JENTER, Alberto MOEL and Peter TUFANO*: Selling Company Shares to Reluctant Employees: France Telecom's Experience

(l) This paper was presented at the Workshop "Growth, Environmental Policies and Sustainability" organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, June 1, 2001

(li) This paper was presented at the Fourth Toulouse Conference on Environment and Resource Economics on "Property Rights, Institutions and Management of Environmental and Natural Resources", organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, IDEI and INRA and sponsored by MATE, Toulouse, May 3-4, 2001

(lii) This paper was presented at the International Conference on "Economic Valuation of Environmental Goods", organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei in cooperation with CORILA, Venice, May 11, 2001

(liii) This paper was circulated at the International Conference on "Climate Policy – Do We Need a New Approach?", jointly organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Stanford University and Venice International University, Isola di San Servolo, Venice, September 6-8, 2001

(liv) This paper was presented at the Seventh Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and the CORE, Université Catholique de Louvain, Venice, Italy, January 11-12, 2002

(lv) This paper was presented at the First Workshop of the Concerted Action on Tradable Emission Permits (CATEP) organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, Italy, December 3-4, 2001

(lvi) This paper was presented at the ESF EURESCO Conference on Environmental Policy in a Global Economy "The International Dimension of Environmental Policy", organised with the collaboration of the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei , Acquafredda di Maratea, October 6-11, 2001

(lvii) This paper was presented at the First Workshop of "CFEWE – Carbon Flows between Eastern and Western Europe", organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Zentrum fur Europaische Integrationsforschung (ZEI), Milan, July 5-6, 2001

(lviii) This paper was presented at the Workshop on "Game Practice and the Environment", jointly organised by Università del Piemonte Orientale and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Alessandria, April 12-13, 2002

(lix) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on "Mapping Diversity", Leuven, May 16-17, 2002

(lx) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on "Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications", organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, September 26-28, 2002

(lxi) This paper was presented at the Eighth Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the GREQAM, Aix-en-Provence, France, January 24-25, 2003