

INLONDON

Economics in the Real World for Pre-University Students

Abhinay Muthoo University of Warwick 21st May 2020

Session #2: Intertemporal Cooperation and Coordination

Repeated Interaction as an alternative to the State

- Repeated Interaction. No State present, like in International context.
- Main aim: Explore when and if players (*countries*) can cooperate for mutually benefit *across time intertemporal cooperation*.
- Central Idea: "Carrots and Sticks" Attempt to cooperate (the "carrot") with deviations (cheating) by others from that met with punishment (the "stick").
- Dealing with the problem of *short-run temptation to cheat*.

Repeated PD Game

- Key Feature: Each time they play the PD game, they know the history of past plays (except the first time they play as there is no history).
- Objective for each player UK and EU: To maximise the present discounted value of their payoffs.
- Let each player discount future payoffs at some rate, which we denote by δ, which is a number between 0 and 1. So £1 secured tomorrow is worth £δ today which is less than 1.
- The more a player cares about *future* payoffs the *higher* is the value of δ .

Repeated PD – Sustaining Cooperation The Grim-Trigger Strategy

• India adopts the *"grim-trigger"* strategy:

First time they play the PD game, UK chooses **C** (to cooperate).

Thereafter, UK plays as follows: Play *C* if both players (UK and USA) played *C* throughout the past. Otherwise, play *D*.

- USA also adopts the same grim-trigger strategy.
- Note therefore that the outcome each time they play will be that both of them will cooperate, choose *C*, and thus each obtains a payoff of 5 each time they play.

Repeated PD – Sustaining Cooperation Costs and Benefits of Cheating.

- Benefit from cheating "today" the temptation: Getting an 8 rather than a 5. *Hence the "short-run" benefit from cheating is: 8 - 5 = 3.*
- Cost from cheating "today" are the losses from "tomorrow" onwards of benefits from cooperation. *Hence the "long-run" cost from cheating is: loss of 5 - 1 = 4 each period from tomorrow onwards.*
- The *present discounted value* of these losses are:

$$4\delta + 4\delta^2 + 4\delta^3 + 4\delta^4 + 4\delta^5 + = \frac{4\delta}{1-\delta}$$

 Notice that when δ = 0, these losses are also zero. Indeed, when δ is small, these losses will be small and close to zero - and so well below 3, which is the temptation from cheating.

Repeated PD – Sustaining Cooperation Incentive-Compatibility Condition for Not Cheating: *The Future needs to matter sufficiently*

 Each player will *not* cheat provided the benefit from cheating is *less than or equal to* the cost from cheating. That is the following holds:

$\mathbf{3} \leq \frac{4\delta}{1-\delta}$

- This will not hold if the discount factor is sufficiently small. This means that when a player does not care much about future payoffs then s/he will cheat and thus cooperation will not be sustained.
- But if the discount factor is sufficiently large, them the above inequality will hold. This means that when both players care sufficiently about their respective future payoffs, then neither of them has as an incentive to cheat and thus cooperation is sustained.

Coordination Problems with Conflict of Interest *The Battle of Sexes game*



Nash Demand Game: coordination with conflict

- Two Players: A and B.
- Strategies: Each player chooses or *demands* how much of the £100 she wants so states a number between £0 and £100.
- Choices are made "simultaneously" no communication
- Payoffs: If the sum of the two demands exceeds £100, each player gets nothing. But if the sum of the demands is less than or equal to £100, then each gets what they respectively demanded.
- What demand will you choose?