

Ewerhart, Christian

Working Paper

Mixed equilibria in Tullock contests

Working Paper, No. 143

Provided in Cooperation with:

Department of Economics, University of Zurich

Suggested Citation: Ewerhart, Christian (2014) : Mixed equilibria in Tullock contests, Working Paper, No. 143, University of Zurich, Department of Economics, Zurich, <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-93905>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/111200>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



**University of
Zurich** ^{UZH}

University of Zurich
Department of Economics

Working Paper Series

ISSN 1664-7041 (print)
ISSN 1664-705X (online)

Working Paper No. 143

Mixed equilibria in Tullock contests

Christian Ewerhart

March 2014

MIXED EQUILIBRIA IN TULLOCK CONTESTS

Christian Ewerhart*

This version: March 2, 2014

Abstract. Any symmetric mixed-strategy equilibrium in a Tullock contest with intermediate values of the decisiveness parameter ($2 < R < \infty$) has countably infinitely many mass points. All probability weight is concentrated on those mass points, which have the zero bid as their sole point of accumulation. With contestants randomizing over a non-convex set, there is a cost of being “halfhearted,” which is absent from both the lottery contest and the all-pay auction. Numerical bid distributions are generally negatively skewed, and exhibit, for some parameter values, a higher probability of ex-post overdissipation than the all-pay auction.

Keywords. Tullock contest, mixed-strategy Nash equilibrium, analytical functions.

JEL-Codes. C72 - Noncooperative Games; D72 - Political Processes: Rent-Seeking, Lobbying, Elections, Legislatures, and Voting Behavior; C16 - Specific Distributions.

*) University of Zurich, Department of Economics; postal address: Schönberggasse 1, 8001 Zurich, Switzerland; phone: 41-44-6343733; e-mail: christian.ewerhart@econ.uzh.ch.

1. Introduction

Even after several decades, the game-theoretic analysis of Tullock's (1980) model of a political contest is still incomplete. Indeed, Nash equilibria in either pure or mixed strategies have been described explicitly only for a range of lower values of the decisiveness parameter (Pérez-Castrillo and Verdier, 1992; Nti, 1999), and for the limit case of the all-pay auction (Hillman and Samet, 1987; Hillman and Riley, 1989; Baye et al., 1996), but not so for intermediate values. As has been widely acknowledged, this lack of a game-theoretic prediction is undesirable, in particular because the resulting constraints on the decisiveness parameter do not have a proper economic motivation (Che and Gale, 2000; Konrad and Kovenock, 2009; Schweinzer and Segev, 2012; Szymanski and Valetti, 2003).

For the case of intermediate values of the decisiveness parameter (" $2 < R < \infty$ "), in which a pure-strategy Nash equilibrium does not exist, Baye et al. (1994) proved the existence of a symmetric mixed-strategy Nash equilibrium with complete rent dissipation, and subsequently approximated the limit distribution by calculating equilibria of rent-seeking games with finite strategy spaces. Building on those results, Alcade and Dahm (2010) showed that many contests of intermediate decisiveness allow a mixed-strategy equilibrium that shares important statistics with the equilibrium of the corresponding all-pay auction.¹ However, a more structural understanding of the limit distribution remained elusive. For example, it was not known if the limit distribution is continuous like in the case of the all-pay auction, or a finite col-

¹These statistics include the probability of becoming active, the average level of expenditure, the ex-ante probability to win, as well as expected payoffs.

lection of mass points as in Che and Gale's (2000) analysis of difference-form contests, or something completely different. Moreover, numerical calculations based on contests with finite strategy spaces have tended to offer only rather low-resolution images of the limit distribution.²

The present paper addresses these issues by deriving new structural properties of mixed-strategy Nash equilibria in the rent-seeking game. Specifically, it is shown that any symmetric mixed-strategy equilibrium in the Tullock contest of intermediate decisiveness entails countably infinitely many mass points. Moreover, all probability weight is concentrated on these mass points. Finally, the mass points form a discrete set in the strategy space, and accumulate only at the zero bid, which itself is played with probability zero.

These findings are potentially important because they imply that the equilibrium prediction for intermediate values of the decisiveness parameter differs structurally (even though not necessarily statistically) from the tractable cases that have been studied more frequently in the literature. Indeed, contrasting both the lottery contest and the all-pay auction, the equilibrium bid distribution for intermediate values of the decisiveness parameter has a non-convex support, which is implied by a cost of bidding a strict convex combination of any two distinct positive optimal bids.³

²To address the problem, one may choose to modify the game (Dari-Mattiacci and Parisi, 2005; Amegashie, 2012). While those alternative approaches might prove useful, they do not necessarily solve the original problem (cf. Münster, 2007).

³Also the equilibria studied by Che and Gale (2000) feature a non-convex best response set. However, in their framework, any convex combination of two optimal *positive* bids is again optimal.




Figure 1. Equilibrium payoff functions in the two-player Tullock contest

The main tools for proving the results of this paper are taken from the realm of complex analysis. More specifically, one considers a contestant's *equilibrium payoff function*, i.e., the expected payoff of a contestant as a function of her own expenditure, assuming that the other contestants adhere to the equilibrium strategy. See Figure 1 for illustration. It is then shown that the equilibrium payoff function allows a complex-analytic extension to an open connected subset of \mathbb{C} that encompasses the real interval $(0, \infty)$.⁴ But any non-constant function that is analytic over an open connected subset of the complex numbers has a discrete set of zeros. Since all expenditure levels in the support of a mixed equilibrium strategy necessarily yield the same expected payoff, this allows deducing that all positive bids used in an equilibrium strategy must be isolated points of the support, which is the key

⁴Generally, a function is called analytic when it can be represented locally by a converging power series. See Section 2 for a formal definition.

ingredient of the equilibrium analysis.⁵

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. The necessary material from complex analysis is reviewed in Section 2. Section 3 states and proves the discreteness result. The equilibrium characterization can be found in Section 4. Section 5 offers numerical illustrations. Concluding remarks are collected in Section 6. Appendix A describes the numerical approach that has been used to calculate examples of bid distributions.

2. Background on analytic functions

This section recalls some concepts and results from complex analysis. For further details and proofs, the reader is referred to any textbook on the topic, such as Conway (1978).

Here is the definition of a complex-analytic function.

Definition 2.1. A complex-valued function f is *complex-analytic* in an open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ if, at any point $z_0 \in U$, there is a power series $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \alpha_m (z - z_0)^m$ in z around z_0 , with coefficients $\alpha_m \in \mathbb{C}$ for $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, that converges to $f(z)$ for all z in a neighborhood $V \subseteq U$ of z_0 .

A *zero* of a complex-valued function f is a point z in the domain of f such that $f(z) = 0$. The following result says that the zeros of a non-constant complex-analytic function on a connected open set necessarily form a discrete set.

⁵To obtain the discreteness result, it would in principle suffice to show that the equilibrium payoff function is real-analytic on $(0, \infty)$. However, I have not been able to prove this result without resorting to methods from complex analysis.

Lemma 2.2. *If f is a complex-analytic function on an open connected set $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ and if there is a sequence of distinct points z_1, z_2, \dots in U with $z_0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n \in U$ and such that $f(z_n) = 0$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots$, then $f(z) = 0$ for all $z \in U$.*

The following two standard results in complex analysis serve as the main technical tools to show that the equilibrium payoff function in the rent-seeking game allows an analytic extension to some complex domain that contains the interval $(0, \infty)$.

Lemma 2.3 (Cauchy's Theorem) *Let f be a complex-analytic function on the open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$\oint_{\xi} f(z) dz = 0 \tag{1}$$

for every closed rectifiable curve ξ that is homotopic to zero in U .

Lemma 2.4 (Morera's Theorem) *Let f be a continuous complex-valued function on the open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. Suppose that equation (1) holds for every triangular path ξ in U . Then f is complex-analytic in U .*

3. The support of mixed equilibria in the Tullock contest

In the sequel, I will discuss only the simple example of a two-player rent-seeking game.⁶ Each player $i = 1, 2$ chooses a level of expenditure $x_i \geq 0$. For a fixed value of the parameter $R \geq 0$, player i 's payoff in the rent-seeking game is given by

$$\Pi_i(x_i, x_j) = \frac{x_i^R}{x_i^R + x_j^R} - x_i, \tag{2}$$

⁶See Section 6 for a discussion of the scope of the results of this paper.

where $j \neq i$, and the ratio is interpreted as $\frac{1}{2}$ if the denominator vanishes.

Recall the following facts about the equilibrium set of this game. For $0 \leq R \leq 2$, there exists a symmetric pure-strategy Nash equilibrium in which each agent invests $\frac{R}{4}$. For $2 < R < \infty$, however, there does not exist a pure-strategy equilibrium. Instead, there exists a symmetric mixed-strategy equilibrium with complete rent dissipation.⁷

The following lemma collects those properties of Tullock’s “impact function” that are relevant for the discreteness result stated further below.

Lemma 3.1. *For any finite $R \geq 0$, the function $h(x_i) = x_i^R$ allows a complex-analytic extension \hat{h} to an open neighborhood H of $(0, \infty)$ in \mathbb{C} . Moreover, $h(x_i) > 0$ for any $x_i > 0$.*

Proof. Denoting by $\ln z_i$ the principal value of the complex logarithm, the mapping $\hat{h}(z_i) = \exp(R \cdot \ln z_i)$ is complex-analytic on the halfplane $H = \{z_i \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Re}(z_i) > 0\}$. Clearly, $\hat{h}(x_i) = h(x_i)$ for any $x_i > 0$. This proves the first claim. The second claim is obvious. \square

Fix now some parameter value R , and take some symmetric mixed-strategy equilibrium μ^* of the rent-seeking game with decisiveness R . The following result provides some information about the support S^* of μ^* .

Theorem 3.2. *$S^* \cap (0, \infty)$ is discrete, and allows only the zero bid as a potential accumulation point.*

⁷To define mixed-strategy equilibria, I follow the usual approach according to which mixed strategies correspond to probability distributions on the respective player’s space of pure strategies (Dasgupta and Maskin, 1986; Baye et al., 1994; Yang, 1994).

Proof. For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta > 0$ small, consider the rectangular domain

$$U(\varepsilon, \delta) = \{z_i \in \mathbb{C} : \varepsilon < \operatorname{Re} z_i < \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, |\operatorname{Im} z_i| < \delta\}, \quad (3)$$

that is illustrated in Figure 2.




Figure 2. Construction of the domain $U(\varepsilon, \delta)$

It is claimed first that, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there is some $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that the complex-valued function

$$\tilde{\Pi}_i(z_i, x_j) = \frac{\widehat{h}(z_i)}{\widehat{h}(z_i) + x_j^R} - z_i \quad (4)$$

is well-defined and bounded on $U(\varepsilon, \delta) \times \mathbb{R}_+$. To prove this claim, take some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. On the non-empty compact interval $I_\varepsilon = [\varepsilon, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}]$, the continuous function h assumes a minimum value $M > 0$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.1, h allows a complex-analytic extension \widehat{h} to an open neighborhood H of $(0, \infty)$ in \mathbb{C} . Since \widehat{h} is continuous, there exists, for any $x_i \in I_\varepsilon$, some $\delta_1(x_i) > 0$ such that $\operatorname{Re}(\widehat{h}(z_i)) > \frac{M}{2}$ for any $z_i \in H$ with $|z_i - x_i| < \delta_1(x_i)$. Exploiting the compactness of I_ε another time, there are finitely many $x_i^1, \dots, x_i^\nu \in I_\varepsilon$ such that for any $x_i \in I_\varepsilon$, there is some $\nu_0 \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ with $|x_i - x_i^{\nu_0}| < \delta_1(x_i^{\nu_0})$. Hence (see again Figure 2), there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\operatorname{Re}(\widehat{h}(z_i)) > \frac{M}{2}$

for any $z_i \in U(\varepsilon, \delta)$. For this value of δ , the function $\tilde{\Pi}_i$ is indeed well-defined and bounded on $U(\varepsilon, \delta) \times \mathbb{R}_+$. To prove the theorem, consider now the complex-valued equilibrium payoff function

$$\bar{\Pi}_i(z_i) = \int \tilde{\Pi}_i(z_i, x_j) d\mu^*(x_j). \quad (5)$$

Because the integrand is bounded on $U(\varepsilon, \delta) \times \mathbb{R}_+$ as well as continuous in z_i over $U(\varepsilon, \delta)$ for any $x_j \geq 0$, and because μ^* has a compact support, Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem implies that $\bar{\Pi}_i$ is continuous on $U(\varepsilon, \delta)$. To show that $\bar{\Pi}_i$ is even complex-analytic in $U(\varepsilon, \delta)$, consider an arbitrary triangular path ξ in $U(\varepsilon, \delta)$. Then, for any $x_j \geq 0$, since $U(\varepsilon, \delta)$ is contractible and $\tilde{\Pi}_i(\cdot, x_j)$ is complex analytic in $U(\varepsilon, \delta)$, Cauchy's Theorem implies that

$$\oint_{\xi} \tilde{\Pi}_i(z_i, x_j) dz_i = 0. \quad (6)$$

Integrating over μ^* yields

$$\int \left(\oint_{\xi} \tilde{\Pi}_i(z_i, x_j) dz_i \right) d\mu^*(x_j) = 0. \quad (7)$$

Since μ^* has a compact support, and $\tilde{\Pi}_i$ is bounded on $U(\varepsilon, \delta) \times \mathbb{R}_+$, one may exchange the order of integration in equation (7), so that

$$\oint_{\xi} \left(\int \tilde{\Pi}_i(z_i, x_j) d\mu^*(x_j) \right) dz_i = 0. \quad (8)$$

But ξ was arbitrary, so that Morera's Theorem implies that $\bar{\Pi}_i$ is indeed analytic in the complex domain $U(\varepsilon, \delta)$. On the other hand, $\bar{\Pi}_i$ is non-constant in $U(\varepsilon, \delta)$ for ε sufficiently small because $\bar{\Pi}_i(x_i) \leq 1 - x_i$ for any $x_i \geq 0$. Fix now any $x_i^* \in S^*$ such that $x_i^* > 0$. For ε sufficiently small, x_i^* is an interior point of I_ε . Since x_i^* is a best response to μ^* , one has $\bar{\Pi}_i(x_i^*) - \Pi^* = 0$,

where Π^* denotes the expected equilibrium payoff. By Lemma 2.2, there is an open neighborhood \widehat{V} of x_i^* in $U(\varepsilon, \delta)$ such that x_i^* is the only zero of $\overline{\Pi}_i - \Pi^*$ in \widehat{V} . But then, $\widetilde{V} = \widehat{V} \cap \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is an open neighborhood of x_i^* in the strategy set \mathbb{R}_+ such that x_i^* is the only best response to μ^* in \widetilde{V} . \square

4. Equilibrium characterization

By Theorem 3.2, any symmetric Nash equilibrium μ^* of the rent-seeking game has the property that the intersection of its support S^* with $(0, \infty)$ is discrete and allows only the zero bid as a potential accumulation point. Thus, either S^* is finite, or the zero bid is an accumulation point of S^* . For $R > 2$, however, it will be shown below that the origin necessarily is an accumulation point of S^* .⁸ It is also shown that for $R \leq 2$, there are no symmetric mixed-strategy equilibria in addition to the well-known pure-strategy equilibrium.

As before, I will restrict attention to the simplest of all cases, and leave any discussion to Section 6.

Theorem 4.1. *In any symmetric equilibrium of the two-player rent-seeking game with $2 < R < \infty$, the support of the distribution of expenditure levels has the zero bid as an accumulation point. Thus, the equilibrium is characterized by a sequence of mass points*

$$y_1 > y_2 > \dots > 0, \tag{9}$$

chosen with respective positive probabilities q_1, q_2, \dots , so that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_k = 0$

⁸This specific argument is applied more generally in a companion paper (2012).

and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} q_k = 1$. Moreover,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{q_k y_K^R}{y_K^R + y_k^R} - y_K = 0, \quad (10)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{q_k R y_K^{R-1} y_k^R}{(y_K^R + y_k^R)^2} - 1 = 0, \quad (11)$$

for any integer $K \geq 1$. Finally, there are no non-degenerate mixed-strategy equilibria for $R \leq 2$.

Proof. Suppose that the zero bid is not an accumulation point of S^* . Then, using Theorem 3.2, S^* is discrete and compact, hence finite. Let $y_1 > y_2 > \dots > y_L$ be the mass points of the equilibrium bid distribution, used with respective probabilities q_1, \dots, q_L , where $\sum_{k=1}^L q_k = 1$. From the first-order condition at y_L ,

$$\sum_{k=1}^L \frac{q_k R y_L^{R-1} y_k^R}{(y_L^R + y_k^R)^2} = 1, \quad (12)$$

one obtains

$$\sum_{k=1}^L \frac{2y_k^R}{y_L^R + y_k^R} \frac{q_k y_L^R}{y_L^R + y_k^R} - y_L = \frac{2-R}{R} y_L. \quad (13)$$

But since $y_k \geq y_L$ for $k = 1, \dots, L$, it follows that

$$\sum_{k=1}^L \frac{q_k y_L^R}{y_L^R + y_k^R} - y_L \leq \frac{2-R}{R} y_L. \quad (14)$$

Thus, for $R > 2$, bidding y_L yields a negative expected payoff in equilibrium, which is impossible. The contradiction shows that the origin is necessarily an accumulation point of S^* . To prove equation (10), one notes that

$$\Pi^* = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{q_k y_K^R}{y_K^R + y_k^R} - y_K, \quad (15)$$

for any index $K \geq 1$, where Π^* is the expected equilibrium payoff, as before. Taking the limit $K \rightarrow \infty$, and subsequently exchanging the sum and

the limit via Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem implies then that $\Pi^* = 0$. Finally, it is shown that there are no non-degenerate mixed-strategy equilibria for $R < 2$. Indeed, by Theorem 3.2, any symmetric equilibrium bid distribution consists of discretely located mass points $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^L$ that are chosen with probabilities $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^L$, where $L \leq \infty$. Consider now the first-order condition at y_1 , i.e.,

$$\sum_{k=1}^L \frac{q_k R y_1^{R-1} y_k^R}{(y_1^R + y_k^R)^2} - 1 = 0. \quad (16)$$

Arguing as above, this implies

$$\sum_{k=1}^L \frac{q_k y_1^R}{y_1^R + y_k^R} - y_1 \geq \frac{2-R}{R} y_1, \quad (17)$$

where the inequality is strict if $L > 1$. Hence, for $R \leq 2$, rent dissipation would be imperfect in any non-degenerate mixed-strategy equilibrium. As pointed out above, however, $\Pi^* > 0$ is feasible only if the zero bid is not an accumulation point of S^* . Thus, L is finite. Comparing now (17) with (14) shows that, indeed, $L = 1$. Thus, any symmetric equilibrium in the two-player Tullock contest with $R \leq 2$ is necessarily in pure strategies. \square

The equilibrium description provided by Theorem 4.1 contrasts with both the unique (pure-strategy) Nash equilibrium in the lottery contest and the unique (mixed-strategy) equilibrium in the all-pay auction. As already explained in the Introduction, the peculiar nature of the mixed-strategy equilibria in the Tullock contest is caused by the nonconvexity of the relevant best-response set, which is illustrated by Figure 1. Intuitively, the suboptimality of bids placed, e.g., strictly between bids y_1 and y_2 , captures a cost of being “halfhearted” in the sense that such positive bids are too low to be

effective against a decisive action by the opponent, but at the same time too high as a measured defense against speculative underbidding.

5. Numerical illustrations

5.1 Solving the infinite system

While Theorem 4.1 clarifies the structure of the mixed-strategy equilibrium in the Tullock contest, it is also desirable to learn more about the specific values of the parameters y_k and q_k . Since an explicit solution of equations (10-11) is not readily available, I truncated the infinite system and solved the resulting finite system numerically.⁹ Parameter values obtained along these lines, rounded to the fourth digit, are shown in Table I. As can be seen, for R kept fixed, the probability weight q_k is generally declining in k . Moreover, an increase in R pushes the mass points more tightly together and to higher levels, at the same time lowering q_1 . In sum, this may be seen as refining somewhat an earlier description given by Baye et al. (1994).¹⁰

⁹The numerical procedure is described in more detail in Appendix A.

¹⁰Baye et al. (1994, p. 372) write: “For $R = 3$ and $Q > 4$, one generally finds that all probability mass is loaded on the first few probabilities p_y , with most mass loaded on the higher p_y ’s” In this statement, the parameter Q denotes the value of the prize, which is in their setting also the number of grid points.

| | k | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Residual q |
|---------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------------|
| $R=2.5$ | y_k | 0.5559 | 0.0715 | 0.0140 | 0.0034 | 0.0010 | 0.0003 | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | |
| | q_k | 0.8872 | 0.0926 | 0.0156 | 0.0034 | 0.0009 | 0.0003 | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| $R=3$ | y_k | 0.6011 | 0.1435 | 0.0470 | 0.0182 | 0.0079 | 0.0037 | 0.0018 | 0.0009 | 0.0005 | 0.0002 | |
| | q_k | 0.7938 | 0.1440 | 0.0394 | 0.0133 | 0.0052 | 0.0022 | 0.0010 | 0.0005 | 0.0003 | 0.0002 | 0.0001 |
| $R=4$ | y_k | 0.6697 | 0.2665 | 0.1316 | 0.0726 | 0.0430 | 0.0267 | 0.0171 | 0.0109 | 0.0066 | 0.0037 | |
| | q_k | 0.6513 | 0.1874 | 0.0758 | 0.0363 | 0.0192 | 0.0110 | 0.0068 | 0.0046 | 0.0031 | 0.0024 | 0.0021 |
| $R=5$ | y_k | 0.7186 | 0.3621 | 0.2150 | 0.1388 | 0.0942 | 0.0655 | 0.0450 | 0.0303 | 0.0198 | 0.0120 | |
| | q_k | 0.5499 | 0.1964 | 0.0950 | 0.0530 | 0.0326 | 0.0223 | 0.0162 | 0.0116 | 0.0082 | 0.0067 | 0.0079 |
| $R=6$ | y_k | 0.7551 | 0.4371 | 0.2888 | 0.2039 | 0.1495 | 0.1105 | 0.0804 | 0.0574 | 0.0401 | 0.0262 | |
| | q_k | 0.4751 | 0.1928 | 0.1034 | 0.0632 | 0.0430 | 0.0325 | 0.0251 | 0.0189 | 0.0144 | 0.0128 | 0.0186 |
| $R=10$ | y_k | 0.8392 | 0.6178 | 0.4798 | 0.3704 | 0.2818 | 0.2121 | 0.1585 | 0.1178 | 0.0870 | 0.0635 | |
| | q_k | 0.3064 | 0.1610 | 0.1189 | 0.0971 | 0.0773 | 0.0600 | 0.0458 | 0.0346 | 0.0260 | 0.0210 | 0.0518 |

Table I. Numerical bid distributions

5.2 Higher moments of the bid distributions

Figure 3 exhibits the first four moments of the numerical bid distribution. As the right-upper panel illustrates, the skewness of the bid distribution is generally negative for $R > 2$, in contrast to the corresponding case of the all-pay auction. Moreover, with variance increasing and skewness vanishing for higher R , a higher degree of decisiveness seems to foster speculative underbidding.




Figure 3: Moments of the numerical bid distributions

5.3 Overdissipation

Figure 4 shows the probability of ex-post overdissipation, $\Delta(R)$, as a function of R . Somewhat unexpectedly, $\Delta(R)$ exceeds, for some values of R , the probability of ex-post overdissipation in the all-pay auction, which is 0.5 (Baye et al., 1999). In fact, $\Delta(R)$ approaches unity for R close to 2. These possibilities are obviously related to the discreteness of the equilibrium bid distribution.




Figure 4. The probability of ex-post overdissipation

6. Concluding remarks

While Theorem 3.2 has been stated and proved only for symmetric equilibria in the two-player Tullock contest, it reflects a more general fact. Indeed, it is not hard to see that the proof extends to settings with more than two players, heterogeneous valuations, and alternative impact functions.¹¹

Similarly, variants of Theorem 4.1 can be derived for other classes of contests. In particular, the arguments made above extend to the case of

¹¹For example, it suffices to assume that the impact function $h(x_i)$ is real-analytic on the interval $(0, \infty)$, which is the case for many functional forms considered in the literature.

symmetric equilibria in Tullock contests with $N \geq 2$ players, where then non-degenerate mixed-strategy equilibria exist if and only if $R > N/(N - 1)$.

Starting from Theorem 4.1, one may also obtain an explicit characterization of all-pay auction equilibria constructed by Alcade and Dahm (2010) in contests with heterogeneous valuations. For example, if $N \geq 2$ contestants possess respective valuations v_1, \dots, v_N , where $v_1 \geq v_2 \geq \dots \geq v_N > 0$, then player 1 randomizes over infinitely many positive mass points $\{y_k v_2\}_{k=1}^\infty$ with probabilities $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, player 2 randomizes over $\{0\} \cup \{y_k v_2\}_{k=1}^\infty$ with probabilities $1 - v_2/v_1$ and $\{q_k v_2/v_1\}_{k=1}^\infty$, while players $3, \dots, N$ remain inactive. The characterization of the symmetric two-player equilibrium thereby sheds light also on the structure of equilibria in more general contests.

Acknowledgements

For useful discussions and comments, I would like to thank Ayre Hillman, Kai Konrad, Dan Kovenock, Wolfgang Leininger, Paul Schweinzer, Larry Samuelson, and Casper de Vries.

Appendix A. Numerical approach

Numerical bid distributions in the symmetric two-player Tullock contest have been calculated by focusing on conditions (10-11) for indices $K \leq K^{\max}$, where $K^{\max} = 14$, and by stipulating that $y_k = 0$ for $k > K^{\max}$. This approach led to a system of equations

$$q_K = 2\left(1 - \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} q_k - y_K + \alpha_K(y_K) - \beta_K(y_K)\right) \quad (18)$$

$$= \frac{4y_K}{R}(1 - \alpha'_K(y_K) + \beta'_K(y_K)), \quad (19)$$

for $K = 1, \dots, K^{\max}$, with “error terms”

$$\alpha_K(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \frac{q_k x^R}{x^R + y_k^R}, \quad (20)$$

$$\beta_K(x) = \sum_{k=K+1}^{K^{\max}} \frac{q_k y_k^R}{x^R + y_k^R}. \quad (21)$$

Ignoring all error terms generated useful initial values for approximate solution vectors $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^{K^{\max}}$ and $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^{K^{\max}}$. In explicit terms, these initial values were $y_K = \frac{R(R-2)^{K-1}}{(R+2)^K}$ and $q_K = \frac{4(R-2)^{K-1}}{(R+2)^K}$, for $K = 1, \dots, K^{\max}$. Approximate solutions could then be improved locally at the K -th mass point, for any $K = 1, \dots, K^{\max}$, by solving (18-19) numerically for “updated” values \tilde{y}_K and \tilde{q}_K of y_K and q_K . To ensure a cumulative probability of one, any updated probability vector $(q_1, \dots, q_{K-1}, \tilde{q}_K, q_{K+1}, \dots, q_{K^{\max}}, 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{K^{\max}} q_k)$ was multiplied through with $1/(1 - q_K + \tilde{q}_K)$. A Visual Basic macro executed about 40 round-robin iterations of such updating. For any considered value of $R > 2$, the procedure always converged to the same distribution, regardless of changes made to initial conditions.

References

- Alcade, J., Dahm, M. (2010), Rent seeking and rent dissipation: A neutrality result, *Journal of Public Economics* 94, 1-7.
- Amegashie, J. A. (2012), A nested contest: Tullock meets the all-pay auction, unpublished manuscript.
- Baye, M., Kovenock, D., de Vries, C. (1994), The solution to the Tullock rent-seeking game when $R > 2$: Mixed-strategy equilibria and mean dissipation rates, *Public Choice* 81, 363-380.
- Baye, M., Kovenock, D., de Vries, C. (1996), The all-pay auction with complete information, *Economic Theory* 8, 291-305.
- Che, Y.-K., Gale, I. (2000), Difference-form contests and the robustness of all-pay auctions, *Games and Economic Behavior* 30, 22-43.
- Conway, J. (1978), *Functions of one complex variable*, Springer, Berlin.
- Dari-Mattiacci, G., Parisi, F. (2005), Rents, dissipation and lost treasures: Rethinking Tullock's paradox, *Public Choice* 124, 411-422.
- Dasgupta, P., Maskin, E. (1986), The existence of equilibrium in discontinuous games, I: Theory, *Review of Economic Studies* 53, 1-26.
- Ewerhart, C. (2012), Elastic contests and the robustness of the all-pay auction, under review.
- Hillman, A., Riley, J. (1989), Politically contestable rents and transfers, *Economics and Politics* 1, 17-39.

- Hillman, A., Samet, D. (1987), Dissipation of contestable rents by small numbers of contenders, *Public Choice* 54, 63-82.
- Konrad, K., Kovenock, D. (2009), Multi-battle contests, *Games and Economic Behavior* 66, 256-274.
- Münster, J. (2007), Rents, dissipation and lost treasures: Comment, *Public Choice* 130, 329-335.
- Nti, K.O. (1999), Rent-seeking with asymmetric valuations, *Public Choice* 98, 415-430.
- Pérez-Castrillo, D., Verdier, T. (1992), A general analysis of rent-seeking games, *Public Choice* 73, 335-350.
- Schweinzer, P., Segev, E. (2012), The optimal prize structure of symmetric Tullock contests, *Public Choice* 153, 69-82.
- Szymanski, S., Valetti, T. (2003), Incentive effects of second prizes, *European Journal of Political Economy* 21, 467-481.
- Tullock, G. (1980), Efficient rent-seeking, in Buchanan, J., Tollison, R., Tullock, G. (eds.), *Toward a theory of the rent-seeking society*, Texas A&M University Press, College Station, pp. 97-112.
- Yang, C.-L. (1994), A simple extension of the Dasgupta-Maskin existence theorem for discontinuous games with an application to the theory of rent-seeking, *Economics Letters* 45, 181-183.