

Haucap, Justus; Heimeshoff, Ulrich

Working Paper

Google, Facebook, Amazon, eBay: Is the internet driving competition or market monopolization?

DICE Discussion Paper, No. 83

Provided in Cooperation with:

Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE), Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf

Suggested Citation: Haucap, Justus; Heimeshoff, Ulrich (2013) : Google, Facebook, Amazon, eBay: Is the internet driving competition or market monopolization?, DICE Discussion Paper, No. 83, ISBN 978-3-86304-082-6, Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE), Düsseldorf

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/68229>

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.

DISCUSSION PAPER

No 83

Google, Facebook, Amazon, eBay: Is the Internet Driving Competition or Market Monopolization?

Justus Haucap,
Ulrich Heimeshoff

January 2013

IMPRINT

DICE DISCUSSION PAPER

Published by

Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, Department of Economics, Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE), Universitätsstraße 1, 40225 Düsseldorf, Germany

Editor:

Prof. Dr. Hans-Theo Normann

Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE)

Phone: +49(0) 211-81-15125, e-mail: normann@dice.hhu.de

DICE DISCUSSION PAPER

All rights reserved. Düsseldorf, Germany, 2013

ISSN 2190-9938 (online) – ISBN 978-3-86304-082-6

The working papers published in the Series constitute work in progress circulated to stimulate discussion and critical comments. Views expressed represent exclusively the authors' own opinions and do not necessarily reflect those of the editor.

Google, Facebook, Amazon, eBay: Is the Internet Driving Competition or Market Monopolization?¹

Justus Haucap and Ulrich Heimeshoff*

January 2013

Abstract: This paper discusses the general characteristics of online markets from a competition theory perspective and the implications for competition policy. Three important Internet markets are analyzed in more detail: search engines, online auction platforms, and social networks. Given the high level of market concentration and the development of competition over time, we use our theoretical insights to examine whether leading Internet platforms have non-temporary market power. Based on this analysis we answer the question whether any specific market regulation beyond general competition law rules is warranted in these three online markets.

JEL Codes: L12, L41, L81, L82, L86

Keywords: two-sided markets, online markets, digital economy, antitrust, e-commerce

¹ We thank Paul Welfens and the participants of the workshop on “Digital EU-Integration and Globalisation” in Wuppertal for their very helpful comments and discussions.

* Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics, Heinrich-Heine-University of Düsseldorf, Universitätsstr. 1, 40225 Düsseldorf, Germany, Mail: haucap@dice.hhu.de, heimeshoff@dice.hhu.de.

1. Introduction

Due to the ever increasing diffusion of (high-speed) Internet access, Internet access and Internet-based services are available to more people in the world than ever (see, e.g., Mueller and Lemstra, 2011). As key consequence of this diffusion process Internet applications have revolutionized transactions, both for businesses and for consumers. The Internet's effects on (lower) transaction costs and increased competition have been widely recognized. Innovative service providers such as *Amazon*, *eBay* or search engines such as *Google* and *Bing* have lowered search costs in many markets. And while Internet services have made entry into many markets easier, concerns have recently emerged about competition in these Internet service markets themselves. The European Commission as well as the US Federal Trade Commission have been investigating various business practices of *Google*, *eBay* and other well-known Internet firms, and consumers also appear to be increasingly skeptical about the market power of firms such as *Facebook*. As the firms' conduct is increasingly encountered with suspicion by competition authorities and consumer protection organizations alike, the obvious question has emerged whether current competition law instruments are sufficient to address the emerging competition concerns in digital platform markets.

To provide an answer to this question, the differences between online markets and conventional "brick-and-mortar" or offline markets should be first analyzed. On the one hand, it is rather obvious that many very successful Internet-based companies are nearly monopolists. *Google*, *Youtube*, *Facebook*, and *Skype* are typical examples for Internet firms who dominate their relevant markets and who leave only limited space for a relatively small competitive fringe. Furthermore, most of these providers do not generate content themselves, but "only" provide access to different content on the Internet. On the other hand, the crucial question from a competition policy perspective is not so much *whether* these firms have such a dominant position today, but rather *why* they have such a large market share and whether this is a temporary or non-temporary phenomenon. Do these Internet monopolies enjoy a dominant position because they are protected from competition through barriers to entry or do they just enjoy the profits of superior technology and innovation? Are we observing some sort of Schumpeterian competition where one temporary monopoly is followed by another, with innovation as the driving competitive force, or are we dealing with monopoly firms that mainly try to foreclose their markets through anticompetitive behavior? These are the key questions of this paper.

The remainder of the paper now proceeds as follows: In the next section, we discuss major features of online markets to lay the theoretical foundations to explain the high concentration levels often observed, using the by now well established theory of two-sided markets. Building on these insights, three particular online markets are analyzed, where competition and consumer protection concerns have recently been most acute, namely search engine services, online auctions, and social networks. These platforms are good examples for online markets that are characterized by dominant firms or almost monopolies, and the three markets can be ideally related to the theoretical discussion. Based on our discussion of these markets, the need for enhanced market regulation will be analyzed. The last section concludes.

2. What Drives Competition in Internet Markets?

2.1 Theoretical Background

In contrast to conventional markets, the degree of competition in Internet markets is often (but not always) determined by direct and indirect network effects and switching costs (Evans and Schmalensee, 2007). While network effects are typical for media and Internet markets, famous examples are credit card networks, (online) auction platforms or other (online) trading places. A market is typically called two-sided if indirect network effects are of major importance (Peitz, 2006; Vogelsang, 2010). Indirect network effects can be distinguished from so-called direct network effects, which are directly related to the size of a network. Put differently, direct network effects mean that the utility that a user receives from a particular service directly increases with an increasing number of other users (Rohlf, 1974; Katz and Shapiro, 1985). The classical example are telecommunications networks, as, for example, a service such as *Skype* is more attractive for users the larger the number of other *Skype* users, as the possibility to communicate is increasing in the number of users. Similarly, if a large customer base is already using a certain social network such as *Facebook*, *LinkedIn* or *XING* this attracts even more users to join, as a large customer base increases the probability to find valuable contacts.

In contrast, indirect network effects arise only *indirectly* if the number of users on one side of the market attracts more users on the other market side. Hence, users on one side of the market *indirectly* benefit from an increase in the number of users on their market side, as this increase attracts more potential transaction partners on the other market side. While there is no direct benefit of an increase in users on the same market side, the network effect unfolds

indirectly through the opposite market side. Taking *eBay* as an illustration, more potential buyers attract more sellers to offer goods on *eBay* as (a) the likelihood to sell their goods increases with the number of potential buyers and (b) competition among buyers for the good will be more intense and, therefore, auction revenues are likely to be higher (Rochet and Tirole, 2003, 2006; Evans and Schmalensee, 2007). A higher number of sellers and an increased variety of goods offered, in turn, make the trading platform more attractive for more potential buyers. These indirect network effects are the key characteristic of two-sided-markets and different from most conventional markets. With positive network effects, the more participants are on the one side of the market, the higher the participants' utility on the other market side and vice versa.

From a competition policy point of view it is important to note that network effects often make large platform sizes indispensable in order to achieve an efficient utilization of the platform. Hence, high market concentration levels cannot simply be interpreted in the same manner as in conventional markets without network effects (see, e.g., Wright, 2004). From a business perspective, two-sided markets are also interesting as it is not sufficient for the platform operator to convince only users of one market side to join the platform, as there is an interrelationship between the user groups on both market sides. Neither the buyer side nor the seller side of the market can be attracted to join the platform if the other side of the market is not sufficiently large. This is a realization of the well known "Chicken-and-Egg-Problem", where both sides of the market determine each other and no side can emerge without the other (see Callaud and Jullien, 2003).

One should also briefly mention that high concentration levels that result from indirect network effects are not an entirely new phenomenon which has only emerged in Internet markets. The concentration of trade on one single marketplace is very well known from various exchanges and centralized market places. The existence of one large market place is often efficient from an economic perspective, as it helps to reduce search costs for consumers, which would be impossible when a large number of small marketplaces would exist. Note that even businesses such as car dealerships and antique dealers have traditionally often been located in the same neighborhood in order to decrease customers' search cost and also transport costs.

Another notable point is that usually one side of the market is "subsidized" by the other (Wright, 2004; Parker and Alstyne, 2005). Products such as the *Acrobat Reader*, *Microsoft's MediaPlayer* or the *RealPlayer* are available free of charge for consumers. They are

subsidized by the market side that is more price sensitive than the other. As a result, platform operators generate most of their profits on the market side which is characterized by the smaller price elasticity of demand.

2.2 Concentration Levels in Two-sided-Markets and its Determinants

As a consequence of these indirect network effects platform markets may be more concentrated than other markets levels. However, this does not imply that every digital platform market is automatically highly concentrated. Counter-examples are online real estate brokers, travel agents, and many online dating sites, where several competing platforms co-exist. Hence, the presence of indirect network effects is by no means sufficient for a monopoly or even high levels of market concentration to emerge. In addition, it is not even clear from a theoretical point of view whether competition between several platforms is necessarily welfare enhancing when compared to monopolistic market structures. While, generally speaking, competition between several firms is almost always beneficial in “traditional” markets (as long as the particular market under consideration is not characterized by natural monopoly conditions), this general wisdom does not always hold for two-sided markets. Even if multiple platforms are not associated with a duplication of fixed costs, the existence of multiple platforms may not be efficient due to the presence of indirect network effects. As Caillaud and Jullien (2003) and Jullien (2005) have shown, a monopoly platform can be efficient because network effects are maximized when all agents manage to coordinate over a single platform. Hence, strong network effects can easily lead to highly concentrated market structures, but strong network effects also tend to make these highly concentrated market structures efficient. In contrast, capacity constraints (and the associated the risk of platform overload), heterogeneous preferences (and the resulting potential for platform differentiation) and users’ so-called multi-homing possibilities (i.e., the possibility to participate in several platforms at the same time) tend to drive competition into digital markets. Therefore, it is not only unclear how market concentration and consumer welfare are related in these platform markets, but also whether the market is quasi naturally converging towards a monopoly structure. As Evans and Schmalensee (2008, pp. 679 ff) have now argued, there are five driving forces which determine the concentration process and level in two-sided-markets, as outlined in Table 1:

Table 1: Determinants of Concentration on Two-sided Markets

Driving force	Effect on Concentration
Strength of indirect network effects	+
Degree of economies of scale	+
Capacity constraints	–
Scope of platform differentiation	–
Multi-homing opportunities	–

Source: Evans and Schmalensee (2008).

It is relatively straightforward and immediately plausible that indirect network effects and economies of scale lead to increasing concentration. The strength of these indirect network effects will differ from platform to platform. In general, it can be observed that many two-sided markets are characterized by a cost structure with a relatively high proportion of fixed costs and relatively low variable costs (see, e.g., Jullien, 2006). For example, for *eBay*, *expedia*, *booking.com* etc. most of the costs arise from managing the respective databases, while additional transactions within the capacity of the databases usually cause hardly any additional cost. Increasing returns to scale are, therefore, not at all unusual, but rather typical for two-sided markets. While network effects and economies of scale both have a positive effect on market concentration levels, there are also three countervailing forces that facilitate market competition (Haucap and Wenzel, 2011).

One important countervailing force are capacity constraints. While in physical two-sided markets such as shopping centers, fairs, and nightclubs space is physically limited,² this does not necessarily hold for digital two-sided market. However, advertising space is often restricted since too much advertising is often perceived as a nuisance by users and, therefore, decreasing the platform's value in the recipients' eyes (Becker and Murphy, 1993; Bagwell, 2007). In electronic two-sided market like online auction platforms or dating sites capacity limits can also emerge as a result of negative externalities caused by additional users. If additional users make the group more heterogeneous, users' search costs may increase. In contrast, the more homogeneous the users are, the higher a given platform's value for the demand side. If, for example, only certain people visit a particular platform (as some platforms are, for example, mainly visited by women, golf players, academics or so), targeted advertising is much easier for advertisers. Also note that many dating sites advertise that they only represent a certain group of clients (for example, only academics). This reduces the search costs for all visitors involved. Additional users would make the user group more

² The capacity on one side of the market may be more limited than on the other. For example, the number of stands may be more limited on a trade show than the space for potential visitors.

heterogeneous and not necessarily add value, as increased heterogeneity also increases the search cost for other users.

Directly related to the platforms' heterogeneity is the degree of product differentiation between platforms. For dating sites, magazines and newspapers it is almost always evident that consumer preferences are heterogeneous so that some product differentiation emerges. Such differentiation can be vertical (e.g., for the advertising industry high-income users may be more interesting than a low-income audience) and horizontally (e.g. people interested in sailing versus people interested in golf).

The higher the degree of heterogeneity among potential users and the easier it is for platforms to differentiate, the more diverse platforms will emerge and the lower will be the level of concentration. The finding that increasing returns to scale foster market concentration while product differentiation and heterogeneity of user preferences work into the other direction is not new, but well known from the economics literature (see, e.g., Dixit and Stiglitz, 1977; Krugman, 1980). On two-sided markets increasing concentration will be driven by indirect network effects, but capacity limits, product differentiation and the potential for multi-homing (i.e., the parallel usage of different platforms) will decrease concentration levels. How easy it is for consumers to multi-home depends, among other things, on (a) switching costs (if they exist) between platforms and (b) whether usage-based tariffs or positive flat rates are charged on the platform.

To illustrate this thought consider online travel agencies such as *Expedia*. Switching from one online travel agency to another is usually associated with relatively low switching costs. Multi-homing is also easy, as travelers can easily search for flights, hotels, etc. over more than one platform before actually booking, and airlines, hotels, etc. can easily be listed on more than one platform. With respect to search engines users can also easily, without major costs, switch away from *Google* to another general search engine such as *Bing* or even to specialized searches over *Amazon*, library catalogues, travel sites and so on if a switch appears to be attractive. In contrast, switching costs between social networks such as *Facebook* are generally much higher because of strong direct network effects and the effort needed to coordinate user groups. While for *Google* no significant direct network effects exist, i.e., it does not *directly* matter how many other people use *Google*, this is not true for social networks such as *Facebook* where the number of users is a very important factor for users' utility. Still entry into the search engine business is not easy due to the *indirect* network effects above described and the economies of scale that are (a) at least partly based on

learning effects, which depend on the cumulative number of searches made over the network in the past, and (b) on decreasing average costs, which are caused by substantial fixed costs of the technical infrastructure.

Another form of switching cost can be found on auction platforms such as *eBay* where, apart from indirect network effects, a user's reputation is also highly relevant. As a user's reputation is a function of the number of transactions already conducted over the platform, the reputation is typically platform specific (e.g., for *eBay*), so that changing platforms involves high switching costs, as it is difficult, if not impossible, to transfer one's reputation from one platform to another.

Having discussed the determinants of market concentration in two-sided market, let us now analyze the concentration processes for some typical online markets such as search engines, online auction platforms, and social networks.

3. Competition in Some Typical Online Markets

3.1 Search Engines

Back in the early 1990s search engines were hardly used on a large scale, while today search engines as *Google* or *Bing* are multi-billion dollar businesses. Internet search revenues in the US reached a value of \$5,7 billion for the first six months in 2010 (PWC, 2010, p. 13). At the same time, the market for online search is highly concentrated, as can be seen from Table 2:

Table 2: Market Shares for Online Search in Selected Countries in Q4/2010

Search Engine	USA	Germany	UK	France	Japan	China	Russia	Australia
Google	71.0%	97.0%	93.0%	96.0%	38.0%	24.6%	34.5%	92.8%
Yahoo	14.5%	1.0%	2.1%	1.3%	51.0%	-	-	2.3%
Bing	9.8%	1.2%	3.5%	2.1%	-	-	-	3.2%
Baidu	-	-	-	-	-	73.0%	-	-
Yandex						-	62.0%	-
other	4.7%	0.9%	1.5%	0.6%	11.0%	3.4%	3.5%	1.7%

Quelle: <http://www.greenlightdigital.com/assets/images/market-share-large.png>

As Table 2 clearly reveals, *Google* is the clear market leader in Western countries, while *Baidu* in China, *Yandex* in Russia and to a lesser degree *Yahoo* in Japan have dominant positions in these countries. In all of these markets, we see a highly concentrated structure with a monopoly or at best a duopoly emerging. The reasons for these high concentration

levels are economies of scale as well as network effects that characterize search engines. While it is easy to understand that large customer bases are attractive for advertising companies, it is less clear that size matters for search engine users. Moreover, switching costs between search engines are very modest for consumers, as the past has shown. When *Google* entered the market in 1998, *Altavista* was the leading search engine with *Yahoo!* closely following on the second place in the Western world. Still *Google* managed not only to enter the market, but also to offer superior quality so that *Google* even leapfrogged its competitors. Similarly, *Rambler* has been the leading Russian search engine in the late 1990s before it was surpassed by *Yandex*. Many commentators agree the *Google*'s success was also a result of its superior quality (see, e.g., Argenton and Prüfer, 2012).

What determines the quality of search engines though? Based on expert surveys the following attributes appear to be most important for users when choosing between search engines (see Argenton and Prüfer, 2012):

1. Overall accuracy of search results,
2. page load speed and
3. real time relevance

In all three categories *Google* is reported to lead the field in expert surveys. Overall, the quality of search engines can be approximated by “expected time a user needs to obtain a satisfactory result”. The time needed to find a satisfactory result depends on several factors (Argenton and Prüfer, 2012), including:

1. Search algorithm quality,
2. hardware quality,
3. data quality,

where data quality refers to both data freely available on the Internet and search engine specific data that has been collected during previous search processes. In principle, the availability of hardware and Internet data should not differ between competitors, especially given the substantial financial resources are available to firms such as *Microsoft*, *Google* and also *Facebook* for whom the access to sufficient financial resources should be taken as given. The main competition problem for those firms is rather the limited availability of high-quality search data, which is firm specific (Levy, 2009; Argenton and Prüfer, 2012). Due to its significant market share *Google* also has the best access to (also historical) search data. This is an important aspect for success in search engine markets, as search data is needed to refine the engines' search algorithms. The more search data an operator has, the better are the

refinements of its search algorithm. This process results in superior search engine quality and provides a competitive advantage for the market leader, i.e., *Google*. Is this advantage reason enough for competition authorities to step in though, or is it just a result of better management and innovation which should not be discouraged?

The existence of a superior search engine is, of course, not a policy concern for competition authorities in itself. However, there have been numerous complaints that *Google* is abusing its dominant position, especially to favor its own subsidiaries (such as *Google Map* or *Google Travel*) over competing platforms. The European Commission has already started to investigate these claims, and the Federal Trade Commission has also spent about 19 months to analyze *Google*'s behavior, but decided not initiate any prosecutions in the end. Without deeper insight knowledge of the facts it remains speculative at this point though whether these claims are well found or not.

If *Google* should be found guilty of anticompetitive search discrimination, an interesting question concerns potential remedies. One suggestion has been to require *Google* to reveal its search algorithm, but such a measure would appear disproportionate, as has been argued elsewhere in the literature, as it concerns the heart of *Google*'s business and the main element of competitive rivalry (see, e.g., Bork and Sidak, 2012; Argenton and Prüfer, 2012). Instead Argenton and Prüfer (2012) have recently suggested that *Google* should be required to share its specific search engine data to foster competition in search engine markets. This suggestion is based on the observation that for competing search engines catching up or even overtaking *Google* is very difficult due to missing online search data to develop better search engine algorithms. Hence, access to (historical) search data may help enabling *Google*'s competitors in developing better search algorithms, thereby increasing competitive pressures in the market for search engines.

A third option, which is more light-handed, would be to mandate that *Google* colors the background of links to its own subsidiaries in a similar manner as sponsored links (see, e.g., Haucap, 2012). Once consumers realize that some search results point towards *Google* websites, they can better evaluate the quality of the results and, in case they are not satisfied, switch to some other search engine. Increased transparency should resolve most of the problems associated with any potential discriminatory bias in vertical search.³

³ A much more detailed analysis of a potential antitrust case against *Google* and the costs and benefits of various remedies can be found in Pollock (2010), Manne and Wright (2011) and Bork and Sidak (2012).

3.2 Online Trading Platforms

While *Google*'s behavior and position may currently receive most of the public attention, the behavior of dominant trading platforms such as *eBay* has also been subject to antitrust scrutiny. During the last 15 years online trading platforms have become increasingly popular. Depending on the precise market definition concentration levels in the online trading market are often rather high. Among online auction platforms, for example, *eBay* has enjoyed very high market shares almost from the early beginnings of electronic commerce.⁴ In 1998, *eBay*'s share in the market for online auctions in the US was 80%, culminating in a market share of almost 99% in 2008 (Lucking-Riley, 1998). The picture is very much the same in most other industrialized countries. A notable exception is Japan, where *Yahoo* is not only the market leader for Internet search (as can be seen from Table 1), but also for online auctions. This dominance in the online auction business is not only a result of competitive forces though. Instead the lack of competition is also partly due to a contract between *eBay* and *Yahoo*, dating back to 2002, when *eBay* agreed to exit the Japanese market while *Yahoo* shut down its online auction sites in Germany, the UK, France, Italy, Spain and Ireland. In exchange, *eBay* also agreed to significant side payments in forms of advertisement placed on the *Yahoo* web page. While this contract is almost certainly violating competition law, Ellison and Ellison (2005) also argue that indirect network effects are the main reason why *eBay* is able to hold its leading position over a very long time period in most countries, while *Yahoo* manages to do the same in Japan. Hence, an important question from a competition policy perspective is whether *eBay* has significant and not only temporary market power in the market for online auctions.

One important aspect for this analysis is the question how easy it is for sellers and buyers to engage in multi-homing, i.e. the parallel use of competing online trading platforms. For many sellers it is not as attractive to engage in multi-homing as it first seems for a number of reasons. First of all, multi-homing is difficult for small sellers because they often sell unique items and heavily benefit from a large group of customers to find buyers for their products. Additionally, it is difficult to build up reputation on several platforms, as reputation depends on the number of transactions a seller has already honestly completed on a given network. In fact, a good reputation on *eBay* translates into higher prices for sellers, as has been repeatedly documented (see, e.g., Melnik and Alm, 2002; Bajari and Hortaçsu, 2004; Dellarocas, 2006; Resnick et al., 2006). Transferring reputation from one platform to another is rather difficult

⁴ A detailed discussion of the market definition for online auctions and other electronic trading platforms can be found in Haucap and Wenzel (2009).

or often even impossible. Hence, investment into one's reputation is typically platform specific so that switching costs result. Furthermore, selling on smaller platforms bears the risk of selling the product at prices below its market value, as the price mechanism works best with a sufficiently large number of market participants on both sides of the market, i.e. with sufficient market liquidity or "thickness". Hence, multi-homing is reasonably difficult for sellers. The reputation mechanism also works for buyers to some degree even though it is less important than for sellers. The lock-in effect is, therefore, typically lower for consumers. However, as long as sellers do not switch to other trading platforms, there is only a very limited benefit for consumers in starting to visit and to search through other trading platforms. In addition, the design of online trading platforms, their market rules, the handling of the platforms etc. usually differ from platform to platform and, as a result, buyers also face some switching costs if they decide to use another platform than, say *eBay*, as they have to get used to the terms of transactions, the handling etc. on the new platform. In addition, *eBay* also tries to create endogenous switching costs in order to bind customers. For example, the so-called *eBay* university offers courses how to use *eBay* more efficiently. Overall, *eBay* clearly has significant market power on online auction platforms. Due to individuals' specific reputation, indirect network effects, and switching costs, *eBay*'s market shares are not likely to erode within any foreseeable time horizon. While the discussion in this section is based on *eBay*, many insights also apply to other dominant online trading platforms such as *Amazon*.

3.3 Social Networks

The third example that we want to discuss are social networks, which have become and are still becoming increasingly popular for billions of people all over the world in order to stay in contact with friends or to find potential business partners.⁵ Social network such as *Facebook* share many characteristics with other online platforms. In order to assess the potential for competition and potential barriers to entry, it is important to understand whether (a) switching costs play a major role or not and (b) how easy it is for consumers to engage in multi-homing. In principle, multi-homing is easily possible, as it only takes a some time to set up a profile. In this context, it is also interesting to note that well known social networks such as the family of VZ networks in Germany (*meinVZ*, *studivZ*, and *schülervZ*) or *myspace* in the US lost many active members over a very short time period, mostly due to the competition from *Facebook*. The market structure for social networks in Germany is given in Table 3.

⁵ See Benkler (2006) for an in depth analysis why people join networks and in which ways they benefit from networks.

Table 3: Visitors of Social Networks in Germany in 2011

Social Network	Number of Unique Visitors	Market Shares*
Facebook	130,000,000	67.1%
Wer kennt wen	15,000,000	7.7%
Stayfriends	11,000,000	5.7%
Jappy	6,900,000	3.6%
Xing	6,800,000	3.5%
Schüler VZ	5,700,000	2.9%
Mein VZ	5,600,000	2.9%
Ordnoklasniki	5,100,000	2.6%
LinkedIn	3,100,000	1.6%
Studi VZ	2,900,000	1.5%
others		0.9%

Source: <http://www.muenchnermedien.de/die-20-beliebtesten-sozialen-netzwerke-deutschlands-2011>

* Note that market shares are calculated without Twitter, Tumblr and Google+, as the first two are not considered social networks, while for Google+ not data was available.

From worldwide perspective, *Facebook* is also by far the market leader, even though the leadership is not as dominant as Google's position in the search engine market in many countries or *eBay*'s position in the online auction market. Table 4 gives the worldwide market shares of different social networks from August 2011 to August 2012.

Table 4: Market Shares of Social Networks worldwide from August 2011 to August 2012

Social Network	Market Share in %
Facebook	64.27
StumbleUpon	16.07
YouTube*	7.39
Twitter*	5.07
reddit	3.00
Pinterest	2.67
Vkontakte	0.32
LinkedIn	0.31
Digg	0.20
NowPublic	0.16

Source: Statista⁶

As can be easily seen, the market concentration level is lower than in the market for online search and online auctions. One reason may be that social networks are in an earlier stage of their diffusion curve compared to other online markets. In fact, social network platforms still show strong fluctuations in their market shares and (unique) visitor numbers. Hence, no equilibrium may have been reached so far. However, there are at least two deeper reasons

⁶ Note that Youtube and Twitter are often defined as social media platforms, but typically not as social networks. <http://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/241601/umfrage/marktanteile-fuehrender-social-media-seiten-weltweit>

why the market for social networks shows lower concentration levels than other Internet markets. Firstly, user preferences are more heterogeneous, and, secondly, it is not very costly for users to be present on two social networks, i.e., to engage in multi-homing. For example, one network (such as *Facebook*) may be used for social contacts while a second network (e.g., *LinkedIn* or *Xing*) may be used for business-related contacts and exchange. Given this market segmentation, the degree of competition between various business-related networks and various social networks may possibly decline to some extent though, as direct network effects are rather strong for social networks. The main value of the network lies in the number of members subscribed to the network. However, as the dramatic decline of the VZ networks in Germany illustrates, new networks can still emerge, as multi-homing is rather easy and switching costs are not too substantial. An interesting development has been the market entry of *Google+* in 2011, which has attracted a significant number of unique visitors. The further development of *Google+* remains to be seen though.

4. Conclusion

Competition between platforms is characterized by direct and indirect network effects, switching costs, reputation effects, and economies of scale. While the strength of these effects differs heavily between markets and platforms, the effects are typically more important than in standard “physical” markets. It is not possible to generalize with respect to the degree of competition in online markets. While some markets tend to lean towards high concentration ratios, the strong market position of *Google* and *Facebook* do not necessarily need to be long-lasting. While in *Google*’s case, switching costs for consumers are low so that *Google* has to defend its position against continuous innovation and entry, the wealth of its historic search data gives *Google* still a major advantage for further improving its search algorithm, holding on to its competitive advantages. In the case of *Facebook*, multi-homing is not too costly so that there is scope for further competition. The entry of *Google+* in 2011 is an interesting development for competition, but the further development remains to be seen. In contrast, *eBay* has managed to hold on to its dominant position in the market for private online auctions which is difficult to contest, as sellers’ reputations are not transferable across platforms.

Form a competition policy perspective it is important to recognize the role of direct and indirect network effects. If direct and indirect network effects play an important role in a particular online market, it is not clear ex ante whether a monopoly or a dominant market position is actually good or bad from an efficiency perspective. While some authors such as

von Blanckenburg and Michaelis (2008a, 2008b) argue for a stronger market regulation of *eBay*, there are also good and valid counter-arguments, based on innovation incentives. In fact, many online markets have been characterized by a large degree of Schumpeterian competition where one dominant player follows the other. A notable exception has only been *eBay* which has managed to hold on to its dominant position for more than a decade now. Still, a more interventionist approach beyond the application of general competition law rules appears not to be warranted so far.

Literature

- Argenton, Cedric and Jens Prüfer (2012): Search Engine Competition with Network Externalities, *Journal of Competition Law and Economics* 8 (1), 73-105.
- Bagwell, Kyle (2007): The Economic Analysis of Advertising, in: Mark Armstrong and Robert Porter (Eds.): *Handbook of Industrial Organization*, Vol. 3, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 1701-1844.
- Bajari, Patrick and Ali Hortaçsu (2004): Economic Insights from Internet Auctions, *Journal of Economic Literature* 42, 457-486.
- Becker, Gary S. und Kevin M. Murphy (1993): A Simple Theory of Advertising as a Good or Bad, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 108, 941-964.
- Benkler, Yochai (2006): *The Wealth of Networks*, Yale University Press.
- Bork, Robert H. and J. Gregory Sidak (2012): What Does the Chicago School Teach About Internet Search and the Antitrust Treatment of Google?, *Journal of Competition Law and Economics* 8, 1-38.
- Caillaud, Bernard and Bruno Jullien (2003): Chicken & Egg: Competition among Intermediation Service Providers, *Rand Journal of Economics* 34, 309-328.
- Dellarocas, Chrysanthos (2006): Reputation Mechanisms, in: T. Hendershott (Ed.), *Handbook on Economics and Information Systems*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 629-660.
- Dixit, Avinash and Joseph Stiglitz (1977): Monopolistic Competition and Optimum Product Diversity, *American Economic Review* 67, 297-308.
- Ellison, Glenn and Sara Fisher Ellison (2005): Lessons about Markets from the Internet, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 19, 139-158.
- Evans, David and Richard Schmalensee (2007): The Industrial Organization of Markets with Two-sided Platforms, *Competition Policy International* 3, 151-179.
- Evans, David and Richard Schmalensee (2008): Markets with Two-sided Platforms, in: Issues in: *Competition Law and Policy* (ABA Section of Antitrust Law 2008), 667-693.
- Haucap, Justus (2012): Wie lange hält Googles Monopol?, *MedienWirtschaft* 9.
- Haucap, Justus and Tobias Wenzel (2009): Ist eBay unbestreitbar ein nicht-bestreitbares Monopol? Monopolisierungsgefahren bei Online-Marktplätzen. In Ralf Dewenter and Jörn Kruse (Eds.), *Wettbewerbsprobleme im Internet*, Nomos Verlag, Baden-Baden, pp. 7-34.

- Haucap, Justus and Tobias Wenzel (2011): Wettbewerb im Internet: Was ist online anders als offline?, *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftspolitik* 60, 200-211.
- Jullien, Bruno (2005): Two-Sided Markets and Electronic Intermediaries, *CESifo Economic Studies* 51, 232-260.
- Jullien, Bruno (2006): Two-sided Markets and Electronic Intermediaries. In: Gerhard Illing and Martin Peitz (Eds.), *Industrial Organization and the Digital Economy*, MIT-Press, Cambridge, pp. 272-303.
- Katz, Michael and Carl Shapiro (1985): Network Externalities, Competition, and Compatibility, *American Economic Review* 75, 424-440.
- Krugman, Paul (1980): Scale Economies, Product Differentiation, and the Pattern of Trade, *American Economic Review* 70, 950-959.
- Levy, Steven (2009): Secret of Googlenomics: Data-Fueled Recipe Brews Profitability, in: *Wired Magazine*, 17.06.2009 Online available at: http://www.wired.com/culture/culturereviews/magazine/17-06/nep_googlenomics.
- Lucking-Reiley, David (1999), Using Field Experiments to Test Equivalence between Auction Formats: Magic on the Internet, *American Economic Review* 89, 1063-1080.
- Manne, Geoffrey A. and Joshua D. Wright (2011): Google and the Limits of Antitrust: The Case Against the Case Against Google, *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy* 34, 171-244.
- Melnik, Mikhail I. and James Alm (2002): Does a Seller's Ecommerce Reputation Matter? Evidence from Ebay Auctions, *Journal of Industrial Economics* 50, 337-349.
- Mueller, Milton and Wolter Lemstra (2011): Liberalization and the Internet, in: Matthias Finger and Rolf Künneke (Eds.): *International Handbook of Network Industries*, Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Parker, Geoffrey W. and Marshall van Alstyne (2005): Two-sided Network Effects: A Theory of Information Product Design, *Management Science* 51, 1494-1504.
- Peitz, Martin (2006): Marktplätze und indirekte Netzwerkeffekte, *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* 7, 317-333.
- Pollock, Rufus (2010): Is Google the Next Microsoft? Competition, Regulation in Internet Search, *Review of Network Economics* 9 (4).
- PWC (2010): IAB Internet Advertising Revenue Report, Available at: http://www.iab.net/media/file/IAB_report_1H_2010_Finaql.pdf.
- Resnick, Paul, Richard Zeckhauser, John Swanson and Kate Lockwood (2006): The Value of Reputation on eBay: A Controlled Experiment, *Experimental Economics* 9, 79-101.
- Rochet, Jean-Charles and Jean Tirole (2003): Platform Competition in Two-sided Markets, *Journal of the European Economic Association* 1, 990-1029.
- Rochet, Jean-Charles and Jean Tirole (2006): Two-Sided Markets: A Progress Report, *Rand Journal of Economics* 37, 645-667.
- Rohlf, Jeffrey (1974): A Theory of Interdependent Demand for a Communications Service, *Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science* 5, 16-37.
- Vogelsang, Michael (2010): Dynamics of Two-sided Internet Markets, *Information Economics and Economic Policy* 7, 129-145.

- von Blanckenburg, Korbinian and Michael Michaelis (2008a): dDay – eBay: Funktionsdefekte auf dem Markt für Online-Auktionshäuser, *Wettbewerb in Recht und Praxis* 4/2008, 463-470.
- von Blanckenburg, Korbinian and Michael Michaelis (2008b): Regulierungsmöglichkeiten auf dem Markt für Online-Auktionen, *Wirtschaftsdienst* 88, 415-420.
- Wright, Julian (2004): One-sided Logic in Two-sided Markets, *Review of Network Economics* 3, 42-63.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSION PAPERS

- 83 Haucap, Justus and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Google, Facebook, Amazon, eBay: Is the Internet Driving Competition or Market Monopolization?, January 2013.
- 82 Regner, Tobias and Riener, Gerhard, Voluntary Payments, Privacy and Social Pressure on the Internet: A Natural Field Experiment, December 2012.
- 81 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus and Wey, Christian, The Effects of Remedies on Merger Activity in Oligopoly, December 2012.
- 80 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Optimal Damages Multipliers in Oligopolistic Markets, December 2012.
- 79 Duso, Tomaso, Röller, Lars-Hendrik and Seldeslachts, Jo, Collusion through Joint R&D: An Empirical Assessment, December 2012.
Forthcoming in: The Review of Economics and Statistics.
- 78 Baumann, Florian and Heine, Klaus, Innovation, Tort Law, and Competition, December 2012.
- 77 Coenen, Michael and Jovanovic, Dragan, Investment Behavior in a Constrained Dictator Game, November 2012.
- 76 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Strategic Obfuscation and Consumer Protection Policy in Financial Markets: Theory and Experimental Evidence, November 2012.
- 75 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Jovanovic, Dragan, Competition in Germany's Minute Reserve Power Market: An Econometric Analysis, November 2012.
- 74 Normann, Hans-Theo, Rösch, Jürgen and Schultz, Luis Manuel, Do Buyer Groups Facilitate Collusion?, November 2012.
- 73 Riener, Gerhard and Wiederhold, Simon, Heterogeneous Treatment Effects in Groups, November 2012.
- 72 Berlemann, Michael and Haucap, Justus, Which Factors Drive the Decision to Boycott and Opt Out of Research Rankings? A Note, November 2012.
- 71 Muck, Johannes and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, First Mover Advantages in Mobile Telecommunications: Evidence from OECD Countries, October 2012.
- 70 Karaçuka, Mehmet, Çatik, A. Nazif and Haucap, Justus, Consumer Choice and Local Network Effects in Mobile Telecommunications in Turkey, October 2012.
Forthcoming in: Telecommunications Policy.
- 69 Clemens, Georg and Rau, Holger A., Rebels without a Clue? Experimental Evidence on Explicit Cartels, October 2012.
- 68 Regner, Tobias and Riener, Gerhard, Motivational Cherry Picking, September 2012.
- 67 Fonseca, Miguel A. and Normann, Hans-Theo, Excess Capacity and Pricing in Bertrand-Edgeworth Markets: Experimental Evidence, September 2012.
Forthcoming in: Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics.
- 66 Riener, Gerhard and Wiederhold, Simon, Team Building and Hidden Costs of Control, September 2012.

- 65 Fonseca, Miguel A. and Normann, Hans-Theo, Explicit vs. Tacit Collusion – The Impact of Communication in Oligopoly Experiments, August 2012.
Forthcoming in: European Economic Review.
- 64 Jovanovic, Dragan and Wey, Christian, An Equilibrium Analysis of Efficiency Gains from Mergers, July 2012.
- 63 Dewenter, Ralf, Jaschinski, Thomas and Kuchinke, Björn A., Hospital Market Concentration and Discrimination of Patients, July 2012.
- 62 Von Schlippenbach, Vanessa and Teichmann, Isabel, The Strategic Use of Private Quality Standards in Food Supply Chains, May 2012.
Forthcoming in: American Journal of Agricultural Economics.
- 61 Sapi, Geza, Bargaining, Vertical Mergers and Entry, July 2012.
- 60 Jentzsch, Nicola, Sapi, Geza and Suleymanova, Irina, Targeted Pricing and Customer Data Sharing Among Rivals, July 2012.
Forthcoming in: International Journal of Industrial Organization.
- 59 Lambarraa, Fatima and Riener, Gerhard, On the Norms of Charitable Giving in Islam: A Field Experiment, June 2012.
- 58 Duso, Tomaso, Gugler, Klaus and Szücs, Florian, An Empirical Assessment of the 2004 EU Merger Policy Reform, June 2012.
- 57 Dewenter, Ralf and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, More Ads, More Revs? Is there a Media Bias in the Likelihood to be Reviewed?, June 2012.
- 56 Böckers, Veit, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Müller Andrea, Pull-Forward Effects in the German Car Scrappage Scheme: A Time Series Approach, June 2012.
- 55 Kellner, Christian and Riener, Gerhard, The Effect of Ambiguity Aversion on Reward Scheme Choice, June 2012.
- 54 De Silva, Dakshina G., Kosmopoulou, Georgia, Pagel, Beatrice and Peeters, Ronald, The Impact of Timing on Bidding Behavior in Procurement Auctions of Contracts with Private Costs, June 2012.
Forthcoming in: Review of Industrial Organization.
- 53 Benndorf, Volker and Rau, Holger A., Competition in the Workplace: An Experimental Investigation, May 2012.
- 52 Haucap, Justus and Klein, Gordon J., How Regulation Affects Network and Service Quality in Related Markets, May 2012.
Published in: Economics Letters 117 (2012), pp. 521-524.
- 51 Dewenter, Ralf and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Less Pain at the Pump? The Effects of Regulatory Interventions in Retail Gasoline Markets, May 2012.
- 50 Böckers, Veit and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, The Extent of European Power Markets, April 2012.
- 49 Barth, Anne-Kathrin and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, How Large is the Magnitude of Fixed-Mobile Call Substitution? - Empirical Evidence from 16 European Countries, April 2012.
- 48 Herr, Annika and Suppliet, Moritz, Pharmaceutical Prices under Regulation: Tiered Co-payments and Reference Pricing in Germany, April 2012.

- 47 Haucap, Justus and Müller, Hans Christian, The Effects of Gasoline Price Regulations: Experimental Evidence, April 2012.
- 46 Stühmeier, Torben, Roaming and Investments in the Mobile Internet Market, March 2012.
Published in: Telecommunications Policy, 36 (2012), pp. 595-607.
- 45 Graf, Julia, The Effects of Rebate Contracts on the Health Care System, March 2012.
- 44 Pagel, Beatrice and Wey, Christian, Unionization Structures in International Oligopoly, February 2012.
Forthcoming in: LABOUR: Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations.
- 43 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Price-Dependent Demand in Spatial Models, January 2012.
Published in: B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 12 (2012), Article 6.
- 42 Barth, Anne-Kathrin and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Does the Growth of Mobile Markets Cause the Demise of Fixed Networks? – Evidence from the European Union, January 2012.
- 41 Stühmeier, Torben and Wenzel, Tobias, Regulating Advertising in the Presence of Public Service Broadcasting, January 2012.
Published in: Review of Network Economics, 11, 2 (2012), Article 1.
- 40 Müller, Hans Christian, Forecast Errors in Undisclosed Management Sales Forecasts: The Disappearance of the Overoptimism Bias, December 2011.
- 39 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Transparency, Entry, and Productivity, November 2011.
Published in: Economics Letters, 115 (2012), pp. 7-10.
- 38 Christin, Clémence, Entry Deterrence Through Cooperative R&D Over-Investment, November 2011.
Forthcoming in: Louvain Economic Review.
- 37 Haucap, Justus, Herr, Annika and Frank, Björn, In Vino Veritas: Theory and Evidence on Social Drinking, November 2011.
- 36 Barth, Anne-Kathrin and Graf, Julia, Irrationality Rings! – Experimental Evidence on Mobile Tariff Choices, November 2011.
- 35 Jeitschko, Thomas D. and Normann, Hans-Theo, Signaling in Deterministic and Stochastic Settings, November 2011.
Forthcoming in: Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization.
- 34 Christin, Cérence, Nicolai, Jean-Philippe and Pouyet, Jerome, The Role of Abatement Technologies for Allocating Free Allowances, October 2011.
- 33 Keser, Claudia, Suleymanova, Irina and Wey, Christian, Technology Adoption in Markets with Network Effects: Theory and Experimental Evidence, October 2011.
Published in: Information Economics and Policy, 24 (2012), pp. 262-276.
- 32 Çatik, A. Nazif and Karaçuka, Mehmet, The Bank Lending Channel in Turkey: Has it Changed after the Low Inflation Regime?, September 2011.
Published in: Applied Economics Letters, 19 (2012), pp. 1237-1242.
- 31 Hauck, Achim, Neyer, Ulrike and Vieten, Thomas, Reestablishing Stability and Avoiding a Credit Crunch: Comparing Different Bad Bank Schemes, August 2011.

- 30 Suleymanova, Irina and Wey, Christian, Bertrand Competition in Markets with Network Effects and Switching Costs, August 2011.
Published in: B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 11 (2011), Article 56.
- 29 Stühmeier, Torben, Access Regulation with Asymmetric Termination Costs, July 2011.
Published in: Journal of Regulatory Economics, 43 (2013), pp. 60-89.
- 28 Dewenter, Ralf, Haucap, Justus and Wenzel, Tobias, On File Sharing with Indirect Network Effects Between Concert Ticket Sales and Music Recordings, July 2011.
Published in: Journal of Media Economics, 25 (2012), pp. 168-178.
- 27 Von Schlippenbach, Vanessa and Wey, Christian, One-Stop Shopping Behavior, Buyer Power, and Upstream Merger Incentives, June 2011.
- 26 Balsmeier, Benjamin, Buchwald, Achim and Peters, Heiko, Outside Board Memberships of CEOs: Expertise or Entrenchment?, June 2011.
- 25 Clougherty, Joseph A. and Duso, Tomaso, Using Rival Effects to Identify Synergies and Improve Merger Typologies, June 2011.
Published in: Strategic Organization, 9 (2011), pp. 310-335.
- 24 Heinz, Matthias, Juranek, Steffen and Rau, Holger A., Do Women Behave More Reciprocally than Men? Gender Differences in Real Effort Dictator Games, June 2011.
Published in: Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 83 (2012), pp. 105-110.
- 23 Sapi, Geza and Suleymanova, Irina, Technology Licensing by Advertising Supported Media Platforms: An Application to Internet Search Engines, June 2011.
Published in: B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 11 (2011), Article 37.
- 22 Buccirosi, Paolo, Ciari, Lorenzo, Duso, Tomaso, Spagnolo Giancarlo and Vitale, Cristiana, Competition Policy and Productivity Growth: An Empirical Assessment, May 2011.
Forthcoming in: The Review of Economics and Statistics.
- 21 Karaçuka, Mehmet and Çatik, A. Nazif, A Spatial Approach to Measure Productivity Spillovers of Foreign Affiliated Firms in Turkish Manufacturing Industries, May 2011.
Published in: The Journal of Developing Areas, 46 (2012), pp. 65-83.
- 20 Çatik, A. Nazif and Karaçuka, Mehmet, A Comparative Analysis of Alternative Univariate Time Series Models in Forecasting Turkish Inflation, May 2011.
Published in: Journal of Business Economics and Management, 13 (2012), pp. 275-293.
- 19 Normann, Hans-Theo and Wallace, Brian, The Impact of the Termination Rule on Cooperation in a Prisoner's Dilemma Experiment, May 2011.
Published in: International Journal of Game Theory, 41 (2012), pp. 707-718.
- 18 Baake, Pio and von Schlippenbach, Vanessa, Distortions in Vertical Relations, April 2011.
Published in: Journal of Economics, 103 (2011), pp. 149-169.
- 17 Haucap, Justus and Schwalbe, Ulrich, Economic Principles of State Aid Control, April 2011.
Forthcoming in: F. Montag & F. J. Säcker (eds.), European State Aid Law: Article by Article Commentary, Beck: München 2012.
- 16 Haucap, Justus and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Consumer Behavior towards On-net/Off-net Price Differentiation, January 2011.
Published in: Telecommunication Policy, 35 (2011), pp. 325-332.

- 15 Duso, Tomaso, Gugler, Klaus and Yurtoglu, Burcin B., How Effective is European Merger Control? January 2011.
Published in: *European Economic Review*, 55 (2011), pp. 980-1006.
- 14 Haigner, Stefan D., Jenewein, Stefan, Müller, Hans Christian and Wakolbinger, Florian, The First shall be Last: Serial Position Effects in the Case Contestants evaluate Each Other, December 2010.
Published in: *Economics Bulletin*, 30 (2010), pp. 3170-3176.
- 13 Suleymanova, Irina and Wey, Christian, On the Role of Consumer Expectations in Markets with Network Effects, November 2010.
Published in: *Journal of Economics*, 105 (2012), pp. 101-127.
- 12 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Karaçuka, Mehmet, Competition in the Turkish Mobile Telecommunications Market: Price Elasticities and Network Substitution, November 2010.
Published in: *Telecommunications Policy*, 35 (2011), pp. 202-210.
- 11 Dewenter, Ralf, Haucap, Justus and Wenzel, Tobias, Semi-Collusion in Media Markets, November 2010.
Published in: *International Review of Law and Economics*, 31 (2011), pp. 92-98.
- 10 Dewenter, Ralf and Kruse, Jörn, Calling Party Pays or Receiving Party Pays? The Diffusion of Mobile Telephony with Endogenous Regulation, October 2010.
Published in: *Information Economics and Policy*, 23 (2011), pp. 107-117.
- 09 Hauck, Achim and Neyer, Ulrike, The Euro Area Interbank Market and the Liquidity Management of the Eurosystem in the Financial Crisis, September 2010.
- 08 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Luis Manuel Schultz, Legal and Illegal Cartels in Germany between 1958 and 2004, September 2010.
Published in: H. J. Ramser & M. Stadler (eds.), *Marktmacht. Wirtschaftswissenschaftliches Seminar Ottobeuren*, Volume 39, Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2010, pp. 71-94.
- 07 Herr, Annika, Quality and Welfare in a Mixed Duopoly with Regulated Prices: The Case of a Public and a Private Hospital, September 2010.
Published in: *German Economic Review*, 12 (2011), pp. 422-437.
- 06 Blanco, Mariana, Engelmann, Dirk and Normann, Hans-Theo, A Within-Subject Analysis of Other-Regarding Preferences, September 2010.
Published in: *Games and Economic Behavior*, 72 (2011), pp. 321-338.
- 05 Normann, Hans-Theo, Vertical Mergers, Foreclosure and Raising Rivals' Costs – Experimental Evidence, September 2010.
Published in: *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, 59 (2011), pp. 506-527.
- 04 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Transparency, Price-Dependent Demand and Product Variety, September 2010.
Published in: *Economics Letters*, 110 (2011), pp. 216-219.
- 03 Wenzel, Tobias, Deregulation of Shopping Hours: The Impact on Independent Retailers and Chain Stores, September 2010.
Published in: *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 113 (2011), pp. 145-166.
- 02 Stühmeier, Torben and Wenzel, Tobias, Getting Beer During Commercials: Adverse Effects of Ad-Avoidance, September 2010.
Published in: *Information Economics and Policy*, 23 (2011), pp. 98-106.

- 01 Inderst, Roman and Wey, Christian, Countervailing Power and Dynamic Efficiency,
September 2010.
Published in: Journal of the European Economic Association, 9 (2011), pp. 702-720.

Heinrich-Heine-University of Düsseldorf

**Düsseldorf Institute for
Competition Economics (DICE)**

Universitätsstraße 1 _ 40225 Düsseldorf
www.dice.hhu.de

ISSN 2190-9938 (online)
ISBN 978-3-86304-082-6