

Moral hazard with multiple agents

Tournaments:

- use ordinal information/rankings to determine payoffs

Lazear-Rosen (JPE '81)

- 2 agents

$$q_1 = a_1 + \varepsilon_1, \quad \varepsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2)$$

$$q_2 = a_2 + \varepsilon_2,$$

- Principal and agents are risk neutral

- contract: each agent gets t

- winner gets prize w

- i wins if $q_i > q_j$

- agent cost of effort is $\psi_i(a_i) = \psi(a_i)$

- agent i solves

$$\max_{a_i} \{t + \Pr[\text{win}] \cdot w - \psi(a_i)\}$$

$$= \max_{a_i} \{t + \Pr[q_i > q_j | a_i] \cdot w - \psi(a_i)\}$$

$$= \max_{a_i} \{t + \Pr[a_i + \varepsilon_i > a_j + \varepsilon_j | a_i] \cdot w - \psi(a_i)\}$$

$$= \max_{a_i} \{t + \Pr[\varepsilon_j - \varepsilon_i < a_i - a_j | a_i] \cdot w - \psi(a_i)\}$$

$$= \max_{a_i} \{t + G(a_i - a_j) \cdot w - \psi(a_i)\}$$

where G is cdf of $\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 \sim N(0, 2\sigma^2)$

FOCs: $(a_i): g(a_i - a_j)w - \Psi'(a_i) = 0$

$(a_j): g(a_j - a_i)w - \Psi'(a_j) = 0$

Consider only symmetric equilibria: $a_i = a_j = a$

$\Rightarrow g(0) \cdot w = \Psi'(a)$

What is first best? $\Psi'(a^{FB}) = 1$

First best is attainable if $w = \frac{1}{g(0)}$

You can get the first-best with an ordinal measure.

Under risk aversion:

- tournaments good when common shocks big.
- tournaments help filter out the noise

when $y = a_i + \varepsilon_i + \eta$

Tournaments throw away the cardinal information.

Green-Stokey (JPE '03)

- Tournament with n agents
- Schedule of prizes $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^n$

◦ $\Pi = \sum_{i=1}^n (q_i - w_i)$

◦ $q_j = e_j + \varepsilon_j + \eta$

◦ $u(w_j) - c(e_j)$

$u' \geq 0, u'' \leq 0$

$c' \geq 0, c'' \geq 0$

Focus on symmetric equilibrium: $e_i^* = e^* \forall i$

Then $E U = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [u(w_i) - c(e^*)]$ since if $e_i^* = e^*$,

then all prizes are equally likely.

Principal wants to:

$$\max_{e, \{w_i\}_{i=1}^n} E \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (q_i - w_i) \right]$$

$$\text{s.t. } \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u(w_i) - c(e^*) \geq \bar{u} \quad (\text{IR})$$

$$c'(e) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial e} \underbrace{\psi_i(e, e^*)}_{\text{order statistic}} u(w_i)$$

where $\psi_i(e, e^*) = \text{prob coming in in place } i$
when i exerts e and everyone else exerts e^* .

Results:

1] Fix $n < +\infty$. Then, a relative performance evaluation individual contract (CRPE) dominates the optimal tournament.

2] As $n \rightarrow +\infty$, the tournament's performance converges to the optimal RPE.

Tournaments help prevent the principal from cheating the agent.

- (*) Conjecture: The reason why there is a nonmonotonic relationship b/w σ^2 and payoff is asymmetric case is suboptimality
- Information is always available under optimal contracts

Elimination Tournament: Rosen '86

- Moldovani-Sela (AER, 2001) asks, "what is the optimal prize structure in tournaments."
- Biggest increase in prizes should occur in the final period: incentive is based on $w_k - w_{k-1}$.

(*) Repeated tournaments.

Moral Hazard with multiple tasks

- One agent, one principle.

Grossman-Hart was agnostic about action set A .

- A compact.

Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization

Holmstrom-Milgrom (JLEO, '91)

- Two tasks $i=1,2$

$$q_i = a_i + \varepsilon_i$$

$$[\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2] \sim N(0, \Sigma), \quad \Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & R \\ R & \sigma_2^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$u = -e^{-r(w - \Psi(a_1, a_2))}, \quad \Psi(a_1, a_2) = \frac{1}{2}(c_1 a_1^2 + c_2 a_2^2) + \delta a_1 a_2$$

- $\delta > 0 \Rightarrow a_1, a_2$ are technological substitutes

- $\delta < 0 \Rightarrow a_1, a_2$ are technological complements

Assume a linear contract is optimal:

$$W = t + v_1 q_1 + v_2 q_2$$

$$\text{Find } (E: \hat{w}(a_1, a_2) = E[W(a_1, a_2)] - \frac{r}{2} \text{Var}(W(a_1, a_2)) - \psi(a_1, a_2)$$

$$= E[t + v_1(a_1 + \epsilon_1) + v_2(a_2 + \epsilon_2)]$$

$$- \frac{r}{2} \text{Var}(t + v_1(a_1 + \epsilon_1) + v_2(a_2 + \epsilon_2))$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} (c_1 a_1^2 + c_2 a_2^2) - \delta a_1 a_2$$

$$= t + v_1 a_1 + v_2 a_2 - \frac{r}{2} (v_1^2 \sigma_1^2 + v_2^2 \sigma_2^2 + 2v_1 v_2 R)$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} (c_1 a_1^2 + c_2 a_2^2) - \delta a_1 a_2$$

Assume $R = 0$.

$$\text{Agent: } \max_{a_1, a_2} t + v_1 a_1 + v_2 a_2 - \frac{r}{2} (v_1^2 \sigma_1^2 + v_2^2 \sigma_2^2) - \frac{1}{2} (c_1 a_1^2 + c_2 a_2^2) - \delta a_1 a_2$$

$$(a_1): v_1 - c_1 a_1 - \delta a_2 = 0 \Rightarrow v_1 = c_1 a_1 + \delta a_2$$

$$(a_2): v_2 - c_2 a_2 - \delta a_1 = 0 \Rightarrow v_2 = c_2 a_2 + \delta a_1$$

$$\text{Principal: } \max_{v_1, v_2, a_1, a_2} \{ a_1 + a_2 - t - v_1 a_1 - v_2 a_2 \}$$

$$\text{s.t. } \hat{w}(a_1, a_2) = t + v_1 a_1 + v_2 a_2 - \frac{r}{2} (v_1^2 \sigma_1^2 + v_2^2 \sigma_2^2) \geq \bar{w} \quad \text{IC}$$

$$v_1 = c_1 a_1 + \delta a_2$$

$$v_2 = c_2 a_2 + \delta a_1$$

IC

$$\max_{v_1, v_2, a_1, a_2} \left\{ a_1 + a_2 - \frac{r}{2} (v_1^2 \sigma_1^2 + v_2^2 \sigma_2^2) - \frac{1}{2} (c_1 a_1^2 + c_2 a_2^2) - \delta a_1 a_2 \right\}$$

s.t. - (IC)

$$\text{FOCs: } 1 - r\sigma_1^2 v_1 c_1 - r\sigma_2^2 v_2 \delta - v_1 = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow v_1 = \frac{1 - r\sigma_2^2 v_2 \delta}{1 + r\sigma_1^2 v_1 c_1}$$

$$v_2 = \frac{1 - r\sigma_1^2 v_1 \delta}{1 + r\sigma_2^2 v_2 c_2}$$

$$\Rightarrow v_1 = \frac{1 + r\sigma_2^2 (c_2 - \delta)}{1 + r\sigma_1^2 c_1 + r\sigma_2^2 c_2 + r^2 \sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2 (c_1 c_2 - \delta^2)}$$

$$v_2 = \frac{1 + r\sigma_1^2 (c_1 - \delta)}{1 + r\sigma_2^2 c_2 + r\sigma_1^2 c_1 + r^2 \sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2 (c_1 c_2 - \delta^2)}$$

1] If $\delta = 0$, we get the usual $v_1 = \frac{1}{1 + r c_1 \sigma_1^2}$, $v_2 = \frac{1}{1 + r c_2 \sigma_2^2}$

ie a_1, a_2 technologically independent.

2] Go from $\delta = 1$ to $\delta = -1$ (ie tech substitutes to tech complements) $\Rightarrow v_1 \uparrow, v_2 \uparrow$

3] As $\sigma_2^2 \rightarrow +\infty$, $v_2 \rightarrow 0$

$$v_1 \rightarrow \frac{r(c_2 - \delta)}{r c_2 + r^2 \sigma_1^2 (c_1 c_2 - \delta^2)}$$

□ What if $B(e_1, e_2) \neq e_1 + e_2$ (or $B(q_1, q_2) \neq q_1 + q_2$).

ie $B(e_1, e_2) = \min\{e_1, e_2\}$

What if there is intrinsic motivation?

3 things:

(a) $v_2^2 \rightarrow +\infty$

(b) $B(\cdot)$ extremely complementary

(c) intrinsic motivation (ie $v_1 = v_2 = 0$ and $e_1^* = I_1$
 $e_2^* = I_2$)

(d) $\delta = 1$

Then $v_1 \rightarrow 0$ and $v_2 \rightarrow 0$.

° principal gets $\min\{I_1, I_2\} > 0$

° can explain low-powered incentives.