

# Obstacles to Redistribution Through Markets and One Solution\*

Roy Allen

Department of Economics

University of Western Ontario

rallen46@uwo.ca

John Rehbeck

Department of Economics

The Ohio State University

rehbeck.7@osu.edu

November 22, 2021

## Abstract

Dworczak et al. (2021) study when certain market structures are optimal in the presence of heterogeneous preferences. A key assumption is that the social planner knows the joint distribution of the value of the good and marginal value of money. This paper studies whether relevant features of this distribution are identified from choice data. We show that the features of the distribution needed to characterize optimal market structure cannot be identified when demand is known for all prices. While this is a negative result, we show that the distribution of good value and marginal utility of money is fully identified when there is an observed measure of quality that varies. Thus, while Dworczak et al. (2021) abstract from quality, we show how including quality is crucial for potential applications.

*JEL Classification Numbers:* C00, D01, D11

*Keywords:* demand, identification, revealed preference.

---

\*We thank Piotr Dworczak, Bruno Salcedo, and Charles Zheng for helpful comments. Any remaining errors are our own.

# 1 Introduction

Dworczak et al. (2021) asks several important economic questions such as: When are price regulations in a market optimal? What is the structure of optimal price regulation? Can redistributive policies improve social welfare? Dworczak et al. (2021) elegantly provides answers to each question. The main primitives needed to characterize the optimal market structure are certain features of the joint distribution of the value of the good and marginal value of money. In their analysis, these are assumed known by the social planner *a priori*.<sup>1</sup> Thus, to apply these results in practice, it is crucial to know whether relevant features of the joint distribution on preferences can be identified. This paper studies identification of this joint distribution from choice data.

We present two results. First, even when demand is well-behaved and observed without error for all prices, this is not enough to recover the features needed to characterize optimal market structure. While this is a negative result, our second result shows that we can identify the entire joint distribution of preferences when there is an observed measure of the quality of the good. Thus, while Dworczak et al. (2021) abstract from the quality of goods present in real-world markets, we show that quality information is crucial for the planner to learn the distribution of preferences. Fortunately, such quality data is present for all markets mentioned in Dworczak et al. (2021). In the Iranian kidney market, the quality of kidneys can be measured by individual health histories. In the rental real estate market, apartments differ on various measures of quality such as location or square footage. Finally, in the labor market, jobs that have similar pay may have different company culture or benefits.

## 2 Model

We consider the framework of Dworczak et al. (2021) and examine when choice data can or cannot identify the joint distribution of good value and marginal value of money. Understanding this feature of the model is crucial to apply the results from Dworczak et al. (2021) since the conditions that characterize the optimal mechanism depend on features of this distribution. We briefly summarize the model for the

---

<sup>1</sup>In this paper, we focus only on identification of the demand side since the supply side has the same underlying structure in Dworczak et al. (2021).

non-owners of the good (demand side) from Dworczak et al. (2021).

Here there exists a unit mass of *non-owners* who have preferences for a good ( $K$ ) and money ( $M$ ). The demand side is assumed to have no units of the good  $K$  and have unit demand for the good. Each individual has a value for the good ( $v^K$ ) and a value for money ( $v^M$ ). Let  $(x^K, x^M) \in \{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{R}$  where  $x^K$  describes whether the individual purchases the good and  $x^M$  is the amount of money the person holds.

Each individual is assumed to receive utility

$$v^K x^K + v^M x^M.$$

The value vector  $(v^K, v^M)$  is assumed to be distributed according to a joint distribution  $F(v^K, v^M)$ . For simplicity, we suppose that the joint distribution has a probability density function given by  $f(v^K, v^M)$ . We also suppose that  $v^K$  and  $v^M$  have non-negative and bounded support. These are stronger assumptions than Dworczak et al. (2021), but seem reasonable for application. Moreover, since our first result is a non-identification result, we show that even under additional structure, we cannot recover relevant features of the distribution.

In the framework of Dworczak et al. (2021), the characterization of the optimal mechanism depends on the magnitude of certain moments of the distribution  $F(v^K, v^M)$ . In particular, Dworczak et al. (2021) shows that the optimal market structure depends on the values

$$\mathbb{E}[v^M] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[v^M \mid \underline{r}]$$

where  $\underline{r}$  is the minimum of  $\frac{v^K}{v^M}$  over its support. Similarly,  $\bar{r}$  is the maximum of  $\frac{v^K}{v^M}$  over its support. Many of the propositions depend on whether there is low or high inequality of valuations. Inequality on the demand side of the market is said to be low when  $\mathbb{E}[v^M \mid \underline{r}] \leq 2\mathbb{E}[v^M]$  and high when the opposite strict inequality holds.

### 3 Non-identification with Demand

We first focus on what can be identified with demand data. We show that even when the demand function is known ex-ante, we cannot recover the features of the

distribution needed to characterize the optimal mechanism. Let  $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$  be the price of the good.

When individuals have preferences from Section 2, each individual chooses to buy one unit of good  $K$  when  $\frac{v^K}{v^M} > p$ , regardless of their initial monetary holdings. Thus, demand is given by  $D(p) = 1 - \iint 1\left\{\frac{v^K}{v^M} \leq p\right\} f(v^K, v^M) dv^K dv^M$  where  $1\{\cdot\}$  is an indicator function.

We note that knowledge of  $F(v^K, v^M)$  is equivalent to knowing the joint distribution over  $r$  and  $v^M$  given by  $G(r, v^M)$  where  $r = \frac{v^K}{v^M}$ , since this gives a one-to-one transformation of random variables under the maintained assumption that  $v^M \neq 0$  almost surely. We denote the joint probability density function of  $G(r, v^M)$  by  $g(r, v^M)$ , which exists since our distribution is continuous and we have an almost everywhere non-zero Jacobian for the change of variables.

As in Dworczak et al. (2021), it will be useful to reference the marginal cumulative density function of  $r = \frac{v^K}{v^M}$ . Here, we abuse notation so that the cumulative distribution over  $r$  is given by  $G(r) = \iint 1\left\{\frac{v^K}{v^M} \leq r\right\} f(v^K, v^M) dv^K dv^M$ . Similarly, we denote the probability density function over  $r$  as  $g(r)$ . Thus, it follows that knowing the market demand for good  $K$  is equivalent to knowing the cumulative density distribution of  $r$  since

$$D(p) = 1 - G(p).$$

Since demand and the marginal distribution of  $r$  are directly related, knowledge of demand gives  $G(r)$ , which we record below.

**Lemma 1.** *If  $D(p)$  is known for all prices, then  $G(r)$  is known.*

Under the assumptions on the joint distribution  $F(v^K, v^M)$ , the demand function will satisfy several nice properties. For example, demand is monotone decreasing in price. Also, we know that  $D(p) = 1$  for all  $p \leq \underline{p}$  and  $D(p) = 0$  for all  $p \geq \bar{p}$  where  $\underline{p} = \underline{p}$  and  $\bar{p} = \bar{p}$ . Since  $G(p)$  has a probability density function, we know that  $D(p)$  is differentiable on  $(\underline{p}, \bar{p})$ .

We will show that when demand is known, one cannot identify whether same the demand side inequality is low or high. The reason for this is that demand only gives us information on the marginal distribution of  $G(r, v^M)$  with respect to  $r$  but does not restrict conditional moments of  $v^M$ . To see this, assuming that conditional

moments exist and using the law of iterated expectations, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[v^M] &= \int \int v^M g(r, v^M) dv^M dr \\ &= \int \mathbb{E}[v^M \mid r] g(r) dr.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, even though  $g(r)$  is identified from demand, there is limited information about the conditional expectation of  $v^M$  given  $r$ . We show in the proof of the following proposition that even when demand is known there can be low or high inequality on the demand side of the market.

**Proposition 1.** *Knowledge of the demand  $D(p)$  does not identify whether there is low or high same side inequality of demand.*

*Proof.* To see this, note there are no restrictions on the conditional demand. Therefore, we look for an arbitrary function  $h(r)$  that maps to finite non-negative numbers to get

$$\mathbb{E}[v^M \mid r] = \frac{h(r)}{g(r)}$$

where  $g(r)$  is the probability density distribution identified from demand. Note that this expectation can be generated by letting the distribution of  $v^M$  conditional on  $r$  be a truncated normal distribution with mean  $\frac{h(r)}{g(r)}$  and truncated at  $\frac{h(r)}{g(r)} - \varepsilon$  and  $\frac{h(r)}{g(r)} + \varepsilon$  where  $\varepsilon \in \left(0, \frac{h(r)}{g(r)}\right)$ , so the marginal value of money is non-negative.

Note that when the conditional mean satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[v^M \mid r] = \frac{h(r)}{g(r)}$$

it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[v^M] = \int_{\underline{r}}^{\bar{r}} h(r) dr$$

where we are essentially finding the expectation of  $h(r)$  over a uniform distribution. Thus, we see that the condition to determine market inequality reduces to

$$h(\underline{r}) \geq 2g(\underline{r}) \int_{\underline{r}}^{\bar{r}} h(r) dr \tag{1}$$

For example, inequality is low when the scaled area under  $h(r)$  exceeds  $h(\underline{r})$  as stated below

$$h(\underline{r}) \leq 2g(\underline{r}) \int_{\underline{r}}^{\bar{r}} h(r) dr. \quad (2)$$

We show one function that gives low market inequality. Let  $h(r) = r - \underline{r} + \delta$  where  $\delta > 0$  so that integrating Equation 2 gives

$$\delta \leq 2g(\underline{r}) \int_{\underline{r}}^{\bar{r}} (r - \underline{r}) dr + 2\delta g(\underline{r})(\bar{r} - \underline{r})$$

which is true when  $\delta \leq 2g(\underline{r}) \int_{\underline{r}}^{\bar{r}} (r - \underline{r}) dr$ .

Similarly, high same side inequality of demand occurs when

$$h(\underline{r}) > 2g(\underline{r}) \int_{\underline{r}}^{\bar{r}} h(r) dr. \quad (3)$$

One function that gives high same-side inequality is  $h(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r - \underline{r} + \delta}}$ . Integrating Equation 3 gives

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} > 4g(\underline{r}) \left( \sqrt{\bar{r} - \underline{r} + \delta} - \sqrt{\delta} \right)$$

which is implied when

$$\delta^2 + (\bar{r} - \underline{r})\delta - \frac{1}{16g^2(\underline{r})} < 0. \quad (4)$$

Finding the roots of this, we find that Equation 4 holds when  $\delta < \frac{1}{2} \left( \sqrt{(\bar{r} - \underline{r})^2 + \frac{1}{4g^2(\underline{r})}} - (\bar{r} - \underline{r}) \right)$ .

This shows that information about  $\mathbb{E}[v^M]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[v^M \mid \underline{r}]$  needed to determine low or high inequality cannot be recovered from demand data.  $\square$

## 4 Identification with Quality

The previous section shows how demand data with only prices cannot identify the key features needed to characterize the optimal mechanism from Dworzak et al. (2021). This section shows that if the analyst also observes variation in *quality* of the

good, then the previous non-identification result is overturned.<sup>2</sup> To formalize this, we consider buyers with preferences over  $(x^K, x^Q, x^M) \in \{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{R}^2$ , where  $x^Q$  is a measure of quality. Here we imagine quality is constant within a sub-market, but varies exogenous across sub-markets. This is a common assumption in applied work.

Now, the utility of individuals on the demand side is given by

$$(v^K + v^Q x^Q)x^K + v^M x^M.$$

Here,  $v^Q$  is the value of quality. When quality is fixed in a market, this is exactly the setup of Dworczak et al. (2021) once we define  $\tilde{v}^K = v^K + v^Q x^Q$  as the value of the good. We will provide conditions under which the joint distribution of  $(v^K, v^Q, v^M)$  is identified. This in turn identifies the joint distribution of  $(\tilde{v}^K, v^M)$ . Thus, the analysis of Dworczak et al. (2021) can be used in markets where the quality  $x^Q$  is the same.

We assume that the distribution of  $(v^K, v^Q, v^M)$  admits a density of the form  $f(v^K, v^Q, v^M)$ . For this situation, the demand curve depends on quality  $x^Q$  and price  $p$ . We write demand with quality as

$$D_Q(x^Q, p) = \int \int \int 1\{v^K + v^Q x^Q - v^M p \geq 0\} f(v^K, v^Q, v^M) dv^K dv^Q dv^M.$$

This specification uses the fact that the individual pays price  $p$  for the good and thus faces the dis-utility of expenditure  $-v^M p$  regardless of monetary holdings. We give assumptions below that ensure identification of the distribution of values.

**Assumption 1.** *The quality-price demand function  $D_Q$  is known for all values  $x^Q \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $p \in B \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ , where  $B$  contains an open set.*

**Assumption 2.** *The value  $v^Q = 1$  almost surely, the distribution of  $(v^K, v^M)$  is determined by its moments, and all absolute moments of  $(v^K, v^M)$  exist and are finite.*

The assumption  $v^Q = 1$  sets the scale of the latent utility model. Some assumption on scale is necessary to identify the distribution of  $(v^K, v^M)$ . When  $v^Q > 0$  almost surely, the extra assumption  $v^Q = 1$  almost surely does not have any additional empirical restrictions, and is thus a normalization.

---

<sup>2</sup>The way we introduce quality differs from Akbarpour et al. (2020) who look at optimal allocation policies that depend on continuous good quality with transfers.

**Proposition 2.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the distribution of  $(v^K, v^M)$  is identified.*

*Proof.* With the assumption  $v^Q = 1$  almost surely, write

$$D_Q(x^Q, p) = \int \int \int 1\{v^K - v^M p \geq -x^Q\} f(v^K, v^Q, v^M) dv^K dv^Q dv^M.$$

We recognize that varying  $x^Q$  over all of  $\mathbb{R}$  recovers the distribution of  $v^K - v^M p$ . By varying  $p$  in an open ball contained in  $B$ , we recover the distribution of  $(v^K, v^M)$  from Masten (2018), Lemma 2.  $\square$

Fox (2021) presents a related identification result for discrete choice.

## References

- AKBARPOUR, M., P. DWORCZAK, AND S. D. KOMINERS (2020): “Redistributive allocation mechanisms,” *Available at SSRN 3609182*.
- DWORCZAK, P., S. D. KOMINERS, AND M. AKBARPOUR (2021): “Redistribution through markets,” *Econometrica*, 89, 1665–1698.
- FOX, J. T. (2021): “A note on nonparametric identification of distributions of random coefficients in multinomial choice models,” *Annals of Economics and Statistics*, 142, 305–310.
- MASTEN, M. A. (2018): “Random coefficients on endogenous variables in simultaneous equations models,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 85, 1193–1250.