Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis
Research Department Staff Report 402

Revised October 2008

Monopoly and the Incentive to Innovate When Adoption Involves Switchover Disruptions*

Thomas J. Holmes

University of Minnesota,
Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis,
and National Bureau of Economic Research

David K. Levine

Washington University in St. Louis

James A. Schmitz, Jr.

Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis

ABSTRACT _____

Arrow (1962) argued that since a monopoly restricts output relative to a competitive industry, it would be less willing to pay a fixed cost to adopt a new technology. Arrow's idea has been challenged and critiques have shown that under different assumptions, increases in competition lead to less innovation. We develop a new theory of why a monopolistic industry innovates less than a competitive industry. The key is that firms often face major problems in integrating new technologies. In some cases, upon adoption of technology, firms must temporarily reduce output. We call such problems *switchover disruptions*. If firms face switchover disruptions, then a cost of adoption is the forgone rents on the sales of lost or delayed production, and these opportunity costs are larger the higher the price on those lost units. In particular, with greater monopoly power, the greater the forgone rents. This idea has significant consequences since if we add switchover disruptions to standard models, then the critiques of Arrow lose their force: competition again leads to greater adoption. In addition, we show that our model helps explain the accumulating evidence that competition leads to greater adoption (whereas the standard models cannot).

_____

1   Introduction

Arrow (1962) postulated that a monopolistic industry would be less innovative than a competitive one. His idea was simple: Since a monopoly restricts output relative to a competitive industry, it would be less willing to pay a fixed cost to adopt a new technology (since there would be fewer units over which to "amortize" the fixed cost). In this paper, we present an alternative theory explaining why a monopolist would be less innovative. We start from the fact that firms often face major problems in integrating new technologies. In some cases, upon adoption of technology, firms must temporarily produce substantially below pre-adoption levels. We call such problems *switchover disruptions*. Our idea is also simple: If firms face switchover disruptions, then a cost of adoption is the forgone rents on the sales of those "lost" units, and these opportunity costs are larger the higher the price on those lost units. In particular, higher monopoly power means higher opportunity costs, so less incentive to innovate.

Arrow's idea has been challenged on *theoretical grounds*. A number of critiques have shown that under different (and, *a priori*, as reasonable) assumptions, increases in competition lead to less innovation. Our idea advances the literature since we show that if we add switchover disruptions to a standard (Arrow-type) model, then the critiques of Arrow lose their force: competition again leads to greater adoption. In addition, we show that our model helps explain the accumulating *evidence* that competition leads to greater adoption (whereas the standard Arrow model cannot).

Perhaps the most fundamental critique of Arrow's idea is that, as a matter of theory, when an industry faces increased competition (say through unilateral tariff reduction), its output may very well fall, and the Arrow logic then implies less innovation (see, e.g., Demsetz (1969) and Yi (1999)). Another famous critique is that of Gilbert and Newbery (1982). They switch some of Arrow's assumptions (about who can "bid" on new technology) and show a monopolist now has a greater incentive to adopt than an "outside" rival. Other critiques are discussed below. When we add switchover disruptions to a standard (Arrow-type) model, we show that increases in competition lead to increases in adoption even if output of the industry (and individual firms) falls, and even if we use the Gilbert and Newbery formulation.

Our model also explains the evidence that competition spurs adoption and productivity in a way the Arrow model cannot. In particular, many plant-level studies find that plant-TFP and adoption increase with competition even as plant-output falls significantly.[1] The

---

[1] Below we discuss studies of industries facing increased competition (e.g., Schmitz (2005) and Dunne,

Arrow model cannot explain rising adoption and TFP in the face of falling output, and in fact predicts the opposite. But our model provides an explanation. Since increased competition leads to lower prices, the opportunity cost of switchover disruption is reduced. Not only is the model consistent with the facts, but in the industry studies noted above it is clear that it was the reduction in the opportunity costs associated with switchover disruptions that *was* the mechanism by which adoption increased. All this evidence is discussed below.

When considering the incentive of a firm to adopt an innovation, Arrow, Gilbert and Newbery, and others, have assumed that new technology can instantaneously and seamlessly be introduced. Adoption does not work that way, and the assumption that it does is not innocuous. Firms often face major problems in integrating new technologies. We will present extensive evidence on such phenomena in the next section.

Following our discussion of switchover disruptions, we present our "baseline" model. The baseline model serves to illustrate the Arrow force for adoption (which we'll call the *Arrow Output Effect*) and the new force introduced with this paper, the *Switchover Disruption Effect* (again, lower prices mean lower opportunity costs of switchover disruptions). We then introduce extensions to this basic model to address the major critiques of the Arrow idea. These extensions will show that the critiques do eliminate the *Arrow Output Effect*, yet the *Switchover Disruption Effect* remains, and increases in competition can increase adoption.

In our model, there will be an incumbent firm that faces a group of rival firms. The incumbent firm will initially have a cost advantage over its rivals, indexed by the parameter τ. One interpretation is that the incumbent is a domestic firm and the rivals are foreign firms. Foreign firms must incur an additional cost of τ per unit (above and beyond production costs) to serve the local market, where τ could be a tariff or a transportation cost. A new technology will become available. If a firm adopts the technology, its costs may initially increase (if there is switchover disruption), and it may initially lose sales. We will consider how the incentives to adopt the technology vary as the market power or tariff parameter τ is changed.

This incumbent-versus-rivals structure is similar to the approach in Gilbert and Newbery and Reinganum (1983). The incentive-to-innovate literature has expanded to consider a wide range of oligopoly models. Recent papers that review this literature are Vives (forthcoming) and Schmutzler (2007). But all this literature, as far as we know, has assumed that firms

---

Klimek, and Schmitz (2008)) and studies of trade liberalization (an early study is Tybout and Westbrook (1995), and there has been an explosion of papers since, many discussed below).

can instantaneously and seamlessly introduce new technologies.[2] Switchover disruptions are not considered.

There is an old saying, "If you have a good thing going, don't rock the boat." Here, a firm with a lucrative monopoly may decide not to adopt a technology that, in the short-run, disturbs its lucrative position. There is another old saying, "If you have nothing to lose, swing for the fences." There are recent papers that have attempted to capture this idea in models where firm's R&D investment is a choice of variance in outcomes (see, e.g., Anderson and Cabral (2007)). The point is to show that firms that are far behind may decide to choose high variance R&D programs. Again, switchover disruptions are not considered.

Having switchover disruptions in economic models is by no means new. There is a large literature where switchover disruptions play an important role, for example, in Jovanovic and Nyarko (1996), Chari and Hopenhayn (1991), Klenow (1998), Parente (1994) and Schivardi and Schneider (2008). A major focus of these papers has been to see how switchover disruption influences investment. In that sense, they are close cousins to this paper. However, they have not considered how switchover disruptions in adopting technology might change the relationship between market power and the incentive to innovate.

2   Motivating Switchover Disruption

We use this section to motivate introducing switchover disruptions into the incentive-to-innovate literature. In particular, this section provides evidence that when firms adopt new technologies, they often experience an initial increase in costs (or decrease in productivity). In fact, of course, some new technologies never succeed.

One note before we begin. If new technologies can yield higher costs than old ones, firms would obviously run "pilot" projects to learn if new technologies were better or not. Firms obviously do this. But as argued and seen below, for many technologies testing can only reduce uncertainty a modest amount. Pilot projects can often test only one dimension of the technology in isolation from others. To know if a technology works can only be learned by turning on all the systems at once. And then the system must be run for substantial periods of time before the productivity of the technology is learned. In this paper, we do not delve

---

[2]In some papers there is uncertainty regarding how long it may take to develop an innovation. Similarly, there are models where there is uncertainty as to how much better an innovation will be. But once an innovation is developed, it can be seamlessly adopted.

into why technology has this feature but explore its consequences.[3]

Let us start by presenting evidence on switchover disruptions faced by three well-known firms. We then turn to more formal studies, looking at switchover costs in manufacturing, supply-chains, and in organizational innovation in general.

2.1   Switchover Costs in Specific Adoption Episodes

When discussing evidence, we think it's productive to begin with concrete examples of switchover disruptions. We will give three such cases, though a much larger list is easy to compile. The specific episodes are not meant to be a "test" of our model (i.e., one should not be asking whether the firms have lots of, or little, market power), but simply evidence that disruption is important. A more productive way to test the idea is to look at cases where firms faced large *changes* in market power, and ask how this *changed* their adoption decisions. (We will address this a bit below.)

Boeing. In building the 787 Dreamliner, Boeing chose a new technology, one that involved its suppliers assembling more of the parts off-site than usual, and then shipping to Boeing for final assembly. Such a process had been pursued successfully in other manufacturing industries. However, Boeing has faced major problems – switchover disruptions – in implementing the technology. Suppliers have been slow to send assembled parts, spurring Boeing to request suppliers to ship unassembled work to them. But "Boeing has ended up with a pile of parts and wires, and lots of questions about how they all fit together, not unlike a frustrating Christmas morning at home." With ever growing delays in promised delivery dates, Boeing may lose substantial business to Airbus. It's clear that it is taking Boeing a substantial period of time to learn whether the new system is better than the old.[4]

General Motors. In the 1980s, after suffering large losses in market share to Japanese producers, General Motors (GM) invested heavily in automation and robots in order to stem losses in market share. But when factories reopened with their new automation systems, there were major production problems. Robots often did not run. When they did, they "often began dismembering each other, smashing cars, spraying paint everywhere and even fitting the wrong equipment." GM found that "technologies that worked well in isolated pilot projects [weren't] easily coordinated in the real world of high-volume manufacturing." Many

---

[3]A related issue is why a firm does not immediately switch back to its old technology if costs initially increase with adoption. Again, it is not possible to do so in many (all?) cases as is also seen below.

[4]See coverage in the New York Times, January 16, 2008, "Boeing Is Expected to Disclose Further Delays," and January 17, 2008, "Supplier Woes Lead to New Delay of Boeing 787."

of the factories were able to produce only a small share of their rated capacity for months and months.[5]

United Airlines. When a new Denver airport was built in the mid 1990s, United Airlines and the city decided to install a highly automated baggage handling system. There were major switchover disruptions. The system "immediately became known for its ability to mangle and misplace a good portion of everything that wandered into its path." A year after opening, United sued the builder of the system claiming it "performed miserably." For the first decade of operation, United used only a stripped down version of the system. Finally, United decided to turn the system off in 2005.[6]

2.2   Switchover Costs in Manufacturing

U.S. Apparel Manufacturing. Dunlap and Weil (1996) studied the adoption of new technology, modular production systems, in U.S. apparel manufacturing. Of the firms they studied (accounting for about 30% of industry shipments), about 40% had adopted the technology at some point. Of those that adopted, about 50% abandoned the technology. The overwhelming reason given for dropping the innovation was that it lowered labor productivity.

Japanese Steel Manufacturing. Nakamura and Ohashi (2005) examine the experience of Japanese steel manufacturers when they shifted from the open-hearth furnace (OHF) to the basic oxygen furnace (BOF) in the 1950s and 1960s. They found that plants adopting the new technology experienced significant declines in productivity (TFP) at the time of adoption. They estimated a 14% drop in productivity initially, and that it was three years before the BOF-productivity approached the level of the old OHF-productivity.

U.S. Steel Manufacturing. Ichniowski and Shaw (1995) studied the adoption of new technology in U.S. steel finishing lines. They looked at the adoption of management innovations, in particular, human resource management (HRM) innovations. They view "the adoption of an innovative HRM system as an investment decision analogous to a decision to invest in physical capital" (p. 20). We share this view. One of the costs of adoption that they emphasized was the uncertainty in how the technology would perform after adoption. A

---

[5]For coverage see "When GM's Robots Ran Amok," The Economist, 8/10/91, Vol. 320, Issue 7719, "Tricky Auto Makers Discover 'Factory of the Future' Is Headache Just Now," Wall Street Journal, May 13, 1986, "Detroit Stumbles on Its Way to the Future," BusinessWeek, June 16, 1986.

[6]United's lease (in 2002) requires it to pay the city $60 million a year for the automated system (for 25 years). Hence, United must swallow this loss. However, United will reduce its operating costs by returning to manual baggage handling, and expects to save $12 million a year on these costs. For coverage of this story, see "United Abandons Denver Baggage System," Associated Press, June 7, 2005, and "Denver Airport Saw the Future. It Didn't Work," New York Times, August 27, 2005.

large part of the uncertainty arose from the potential resistance to the new technology (by line workers, union officials, and managers).[7] We share this view that one possible source of switchover disruption is resistance to innovation.

General Manufacturing. Some researchers have looked at the productivity experience of manufacturing plants after they have undergone a major surge in investment. Using these surges as proxies for adoption of technology, they have found that productivity has initially fallen after adoption. Studies include Huggett and Ospina (2001) who looked at what happened to trend productivity growth after adoption, and Sakellaris (2004) who looked at the impact on levels of productivity.

2.3   Switchover Costs in Supply-Chain Management

Changes in supply-chain systems will almost certainly cause switchover disruptions. There is no way of knowing if a system is better without trying it. Boeing is now in the process of such learning. There is a thriving literature in operations research and management that has studied the consequences of supply chain disruptions, brought on by glitches in moving to new technology and other sources of disruption. The literature has found large losses in productivity and share value as a result of glitches (see, e.g., Hendricks and Singhal (2003, 2005) and references therein).

2.4   Switchover Costs in Organizational Changes

Organizational changes will almost certainly cause switchover disruptions. A new organizational structure might be better or worse, but there is really no way of knowing without the entire organization trying it. If it is worse, there is no way to switch back to the old organization overnight if at all. We will discuss a few areas in which firms attempt to improve their organizations (and lower their production costs).

Work Rule Changes. A subset of organizational innovation involves firms changing work rules of a union. Here it may be clear that a new set of work rules (e.g., more flexible ones) would lead to much lower costs. Yet introducing the changes might lead to a union strike and a considerable period of downtime. Indeed there are many episodes where firms were shut down for long periods before being able to change the work rules, and in some instances,

---

[7]According to Ichniowski and Shaw, "Our interviews highlighted many cases where attempts to introduce new [technology] were undermined by low levels of trust between labor and management" (p. 51).

were not able to change them at all.

A Potpourri of Workplace Changes. To finish this section, we'll simply list some examples of other switchover disruption discussed in the organization literature. Marketing departments have faced disruptions introducing sales force automation technology (see, e.g., Speier and Venkatesh (2002)). Human resource departments have faced disruptions in introducing new workplace compensation schemes (see, e.g., Beer and Cannon (2004)). And, of course, introducing new information technology systems often leads to significant disruptions (see, e.g., Ginzberg (1981)). Lastly, there are obviously switchover disruptions as CEOs are changed.

3   Baseline Model

Consider a homogenous products industry in which production takes place over a unit time interval $t \in [0, 1]$. There is one firm, the *incumbent*, that initially has a cost advantage over its *rivals*. Let c° denote the initial marginal cost of the incumbent. The rival firms (assume there are two or more of them) each have marginal cost equal to $c^\circ + \tau$, for $\tau \geq 0$. The parameter τ governs the degree of market power that the incumbent has over the rivals, and it will be the key element in our comparative statics analysis.

One interpretation of the τ parameter is that the incumbent is a domestic firm and the rivals are foreign firms. All firms have the same production cost c°, but the foreign firms must incur an additional cost of τ per unit which could be a tariff or a transportation cost.

We assume *Bertrand competition*, that is, that firms compete in price.

3.1   New Technology

At time $t = 0$, a *new technology* becomes available. If the new technology is adopted at time $t = 0$, then marginal cost at time t equals $c_t = f(t)$. We assume marginal cost falls over time in a continuous and strictly decreasing fashion, $f'(t) < 0$. Let $\bar{c} = f(0)$ be the high initial cost and $\underline{c} = f(1)$ be the low cost ultimately attained, $\underline{c} < \bar{c}$.

We assume that $\underline{c} < c^\circ$ so that ultimately the new technology is better than the original. The key innovation in our analysis is to allow for the possibility that $\bar{c} > c^\circ$. When that happens we say there is a *switchover disruption* at the initial point of adoption. Figure 1 illustrates an example. We can think of there being some prior period $t \in [-1, 0)$ over which

cost was constant at $c°$. When the new technology is adopted, marginal cost goes up initially, but eventually is lower.

3.2 Demand Structure

The quantity demanded (at each $t \in [0,1]$) in the industry at price p is $Q^D(p)$. We assume that demand is *weakly inelastic*, that is

$$Rev(p) = Q^D(p)p \text{ is weakly increasing in } p. \tag{1}$$

This assumption simplifies our calculations, because it implies that the incumbent will limit price at the rival's cost.

3.3 Who Can Adopt?

The final issue to be determined is: Who gets to adopt the new technology? Our baseline approach follows Arrow (1962). Here the incumbent alone has a choice to adopt. The incumbent can pay a fixed cost $F \geq 0$ to adopt the new technology or pay no fixed cost and use the original technology instead. If the incumbent does adopt, the rivals can be excluded and the rivals' fixed cost remains at $c° + \tau$. The essence of the Arrow setup is that the incumbent is choosing between having the new technology for itself and no one having it.[8]

4 Monopoly and the Incentive to Innovate

This section provides our baseline analysis of how the incentive to innovate depends upon the monopoly power parameter τ. The analysis highlights two forces for how a decrease in τ increases incentives to innovate. The first is the familiar Arrow Output Effect. The second is the new effect, the Switchover Disruption Effect, that we introduce with this paper.

In this baseline model, recall that only the incumbent has the option to adopt. Consider the incumbent's decision at $t = 0$ (if it does not adopt at $t = 0$, it would never adopt). If the incumbent does not innovate, the equilibrium price from Bertrand competition is the limit price $p° = c° + \tau$. This yields a profit margin of $p° - c° = \tau$ per unit sold. The incumbent's

---

[8]In many cases, this setup is clearly appropriate. When a firm decides whether to adopt a new supply system, a new human resource system, and so on, it is the only firm that has a say.

sales will be $Q^\circ = Q^D(c^\circ + \tau)$ at each instant along the unit time interval and the profit flow $\tau Q^D(c^\circ + \tau)$.

In calculating the present value of profits, it will be convenient in the analysis to integrate over the cost path $c(t)$ rather than over t. For the case where f is continuous and strictly decreasing, let $G(c)$ denote how much time remains when marginal cost equals c, for $c \in [\underline{c}, \bar{c}]$. That is, $G(c)$ is the value of x solving $f(1 - x) = c$. Thus $G(\bar{c}) = 1$ and $G(\underline{c}) = 0$, and $0 < G(c) < 1$ for $\underline{c} < c < \bar{c}$. The c.d.f. over marginal cost during the time interval is $1 - G(\cdot)$ and let $g(c) = -G'(c)$ be the density of marginal cost. Finally, letting ρ be the discount rate, define $h(c)$ as

$$h(c) \equiv e^{-\rho(1 - G(c))} g(c). \tag{2}$$

This will show up in the formulas below as the weight on profits when cost is c. The first term takes into account discounting, since the time is $t = 1 - G(c)$ when cost is c. The second term takes into account the density of c.[9]

The present value of the profit flow $\tau Q^D(c^\circ + \tau)$ then equals (as a function of τ)

$$v^\circ(\tau) = \tau Q^D(c^\circ + \tau) \int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} h(c) dc. \tag{3}$$

If the incumbent adopts, it obtains a cost path that starts with $\bar{c}$ and monotonically decreases to $\underline{c}$. If the initial cost $\bar{c}$ is above $c^\circ + \tau$, it drops out of the market until its cost falls to the limit price. Beyond this point, the incumbent's cost c is below $c^\circ + \tau$, and it sets the limit price $p = c^\circ + \tau$.[10] The present value to the incumbent from adoption, netting out the fixed cost of adoption F, then equals

$$v(\tau) = Q^D(c^\circ + \tau) \int_{\underline{c}}^{\min\{\bar{c}, c^\circ + \tau\}} h(c) \left[c^\circ + \tau - c\right] dc - F. \tag{4}$$

The net return to adoption is the difference between v and v°,

$$W(\tau) = Q^D(c^\circ + \tau) \left[\int_{\underline{c}}^{\min\{\bar{c}, c^\circ + \tau\}} h(c) \left[c^\circ + \tau - c\right] dc - \tau \int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} h(c) dc \right] - F. \tag{5}$$

---

[9] As a help to the reader regarding notation, consider the case if there was no discounting. Then since $h(c)$ is the "weight" at each c, the integral of $h(c)$ over costs equals one, that is, $\int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} h(c) dc = 1$. With discounting, we have that $\int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} h(c) dc = \int_0^1 e^{-\rho t} dt$.

[10] If the initial cost $\bar{c}$ is below $c^\circ + \tau$, the incumbent sets the limit price over the entire interval.

Differentiating the net return to adoption with respect to the cost advantage τ yields

$$\frac{dW(\tau)}{d\tau} = \frac{dQ^D}{dp}\left[\int_{\underline{c}}^{\min\{\bar{c},c^\circ+\tau\}} h(c)\left[c^\circ + \tau - c\right]dc - \tau\int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} h(c)dc\right] \qquad (6)$$
$$-Q^D\int_{\min\{\bar{c},c^\circ+\tau\}}^{\bar{c}} h(c)dc.$$

The slope is the sum of two terms. The first is the *Arrow Output Effect*. The second is the *Switchover Disruption Effect*. We next state Proposition 1 which provides sufficient conditions under which falls in the tariff increase innovation.

Proposition 1. At any τ where the return to adoption is positive, $W(\tau) > 0$, the slope is weakly negative, $W'(\tau) \leq 0$, and is strictly negative if either (i) $D'(c^\circ + \tau) < 0$ (strict downward sloping demand) or (ii) $\bar{c} > c^\circ + \tau$ (significant switchover disruption).

Proof. If $W(\tau) > 0$, since $F \geq 0$, it must be the case that

$$\left[\int_{\underline{c}}^{\min\{\bar{c},c^\circ+\tau\}} h(c)\left[c^\circ + \tau - c\right]dc - \tau\int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} h(c)dc\right] > 0. \qquad (7)$$

This says that, on average, profitability per sale increases. Plugging (7) into the slope formula (6) immediately implies $W'(\tau) \leq 0$ and the claims about the strict inequality follow as well.

Proposition 1 says that if the new technology is worth adopting ($W(\tau) > 0$), then an increase in τ decreases the return to adoption ($W'(\tau) < 0$).[11] This implies that the return to adoption takes the form of a cutoff rule $\hat{\tau}$ where the incumbent adopts if $\tau < \hat{\tau}$ and does not adopt if $\tau > \hat{\tau}$. (Let $\hat{\tau} = 0$ in cases where it never adopts and $\hat{\tau} = \infty$ in cases where it always adopts.) If we think of F as a random variable with some distribution, then the cutoff $\hat{\tau}$ will decrease in F. Hence adoption is more likely the lower is τ.

To get a clearer picture of the first term of $\frac{dW}{d\tau}$ in (6), the Arrow Output Effect, it is helpful to rewrite this term when $\bar{c} \leq c^\circ + \tau$. In this case, it reduces to

$$\text{\textit{Arrow Output Effect:}} \quad \frac{dQ^D}{dp}\int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} h(c)\left[c^\circ - c\right]dc, \text{ if } \bar{c} \leq c^\circ + \tau.$$

It equals the average (marginal) cost reduction from the new technology times the change in

---

[11]We note that we can extend Proposition 1 to the case of elastic demand for the special case where the cost path takes on two values, $f(t) = \bar{c}$ for $t < \hat{t}$ and $f(t) = \underline{c}$.

market quantity from higher market power. The big idea is that there exist scale economies from adoption. There is one fixed cost and cost savings per unit are applied to multiple production units. The greater the market power through τ, the lower the production volume, and the fewer units over which to average the expense of the fixed cost. In short, an incumbent with high market power does not sell many units and so is less inclined to pay a given fixed cost to lower marginal coat. This well-known idea from Arrow is also called the *replacement effect* (see, e.g., Tirole (1988) on this terminology).

To get a clearer picture of the second term of $\frac{dW}{d\tau}$ in (6), it is helpful to rewrite this term when $\bar{c} > c^\circ + \tau$. In this case the term reduces to

$$\text{Switchover Disruption Effect:} \ -Q^D \int_{c^\circ+\tau}^{\bar{c}} h(c)dc, \text{ if } \bar{c} > c^\circ + \tau \tag{8}$$

This equals (minus) the present-value-weighted total time of the switchover disruption period times the volume of lost sales. If the monopoly power index τ increases by one dollar, this is the additional profit forgone during the switchover disruption.

This effect can be seen in Figure 2. For this figure, we assume that demand in perfectly inelastic. In the figure, there are two identical panels, except that the switchover disruption in the left hand panel is "small" (that is, $c^\circ + \tau > \bar{c}$) and is "large" in the right hand panel. The dark shaded area in both panels represents the total profits that are lost as a result of the disruption, and the light shaded area are the profits that are gained when costs fall below original costs. In the left hand panel, when an incumbent adopts, it does not lose any sales, and the Switchover Disruption terms drops to zero. Increases in τ in this case do not increase the size of the dark shaded area and have no effect on adoption decisions. In the right hand panel, when an incumbent adopts it loses sales. Now, increases in τ increase the size of the dark shaded area. The opportunity cost of the forgone sales during the disruption period is greater, decreasing the incentive to innovate. This is the term (8).

5   First Extension: Declining Output

Arrow's view that competition leads to greater innovation has been challenged on *theoretical grounds*. Perhaps the most fundamental critique is that, as a matter of theory, when an industry faces increased competition (say through unilateral tariff reduction), its output may very well fall, and the Arrow logic then implies less innovation. In this section we show

11

that if the baseline model above is extended to allow for decreasing output, then competition still leads to increased innovation (under some conditions, of course).

To begin addressing this issue, consider what happens if demand $Q^D(p)$ is perfectly inelastic so that $dQ^D/dp = 0$. The Arrow output term in the slope (6) reduces to zero. If there is no significant switchover disruption ($\bar{c} \leq c^\circ + \tau$), the second term is zero as well, so a change in market power τ has no impact on the incentive to innovate. However, if there is significant switchover disruption, $\bar{c} > c^\circ + \tau$, the second term is strictly negative, and our result that the incentives to innovate decline with τ goes through.[12]

A decrease in the monopoly index τ might *decrease* the incumbent's output. For example, suppose the industry here is an intermediate good industry in the manufacturing sector. Suppose it sells its output to other domestic manufacturing firms. Now imagine that there is a unilateral tariff reduction across *all* manufacturing industries. The tariff reduction will lead to a price reduction in the intermediate good industry, but some of its local market may simply disappear. Some of its upstream industries (or firms) may be eliminated by imports. Then, even as the intermediate industry's price falls, industry output falls. This was the case in the U.S. iron ore industry in the 1980s. Foreign competition led the domestic industry to significantly reduce its price, yet the sales of the industry also fell significantly (since U.S. steel producers lost sales to foreign steel producers).

We could extend the baseline model along the lines suggested in the paragraph above (distinguishing intermediate manufactures, etc.) But to keep things simple, we'll assume a reduced form relationship between industry demand and the tariff rate, that is, we'll assume demand is $Q^D(p, \tau)$. Holding p fixed, quantity demanded falls in τ. Again, one interpretation is that τ is a manufacturing-wide tariff, and its reduction means a smaller market for this intermediate industry.

In terms of the analysis above, in equation (5), we replace $Q^D(c^\circ + \tau)$ with $Q^D(c^\circ + \tau, \tau)$. To look at the impact of an increase in τ on the incentive to innovate, we need only replace dQ^D/dp in first term of the slope (6) with $dQ^D/d\tau$, where of course this latter derivative is a "total derivative." If the total derivative $dQ^D/d\tau < 0$, everything is qualitatively the same. But if $dQ^D/d\tau > 0$, then the sign of the first term in (6) (the Arrow Output effect) flips. In particular, if there is no significant switchover disruption so that $\bar{c} \leq c^\circ + \tau$, the incentive to innovate $W(\tau)$ *strictly increases* with the market power parameter τ, as opposed to decreasing. This is the "declining-output" critique. However, if there is significant switchover disruption, there are two offsetting effects. If the output effect from $dQ^D/d\tau$ is

---

[12]The reader will notice that this situation was covered by Proposition 1.

not too big, the Switchover Disruption effect will dominate, and an increase in τ will decrease incentives to innovate.

Notice that switchover disruptions are needed to explain how increased competition can lead to increased innovation in the face of output declines. This is a feature of empirical studies, that is, increased adoption in the face of falling output, that has remained a puzzle until now.

The evidence comes primarily from two sources, studies of specific industries that have undergone a dramatic increase in competition, and from unilateral trade liberalizations. The industry studies, and trade liberalization studies, uniformly show that as competition increases, productivity (e.g., TFP) at the establishment level increases.[13]

What happened to the size of the industry and individual establishments as competition increased (and spurred productivity)? Here, too, the studies speak with one voice: competition reduced industry and establishment size.

Consider first the study of specific industries. When competition hit the U.S. iron ore industry, its output fell in half. It was only after more than a decade that industry output returned to a level close to its pre-competition level. The same was true at the establishment (i.e., mine) level (Schmitz (2005)). In cement, foreign competition reduced industry output by 30 percent in the early 1980s and output did not reach its pre-competition level until the mid 1990s. In U.S. transportation, rail competition greatly reduced water shipments.

In the studies of (unilateral) trade liberalization's impact on productivity mentioned above, not all studies looked at the consequences of liberalization on industry (and establishment) size. But among those that did, establishment size falls. Hay (2001) shows that following unilateral trade liberalization in Brazil, its large manufacturing firms lost significant market share to foreign firms, had their profits fall sharply, yet increased their efficiency dramatically. Trefler (2004) finds that reductions in Canadian tariffs against the United States led to reductions in gross output per plant in Canada.[14] Bloom, Draca, and Van Reenen (2008) show that (European) plants facing the greatest increase in imports from China had the greatest increase in technology adoption (and had the greatest reduction in size measured

---

[13]Studies looking at specific industries, in addition to those discussed below, include Bridgman, Gomes and Teixiera (2008). Studies of trade liberalization's impact on plant productivity have grown significantly in the last decade. The studies, which uniformly find a positive impact on plant productivity, include Amiti and Konings (2007) (Indonesia), Bernard, Jensen, and Schott (2006) (U.S.), Bloom, Draca, and Van Reenen (2008) (OECD), De Loecker (2007), Hay (2001) (Brazil), Fernandes (2007) (Columbia), Muendler (2004) (Brazil), Pavcnik (2002) (Chile), Topalova (2004) (India), Trefler (2004) (Canada), and Tybout and Westbrook (1995) (Mexico).

[14]Trefler's Table 5 shows the negative impact of tariff reductions on size.

by employment).[15]

It is hard to understand these findings in Arrow-type models, the findings that as a plant shrinks from foreign competition its TFP (and technology adoption) increases. Our theory here provides an interpretation of these findings. As competition lowered price in these industries, it reduced the opportunity costs of lost sales if adopters ran into switchover disruptions. Not only is the argument consistent with the facts, but in the industry studies noted above it's clear this *was* the mechanism by which adoption increased.

Consider for example the U.S. iron ore industry. For nearly a century, until the early 1980s, the U.S. and Canadian iron ore industries were the exclusive suppliers to steel plants in the Midwest manufacturing belt (e.g., Chicago and Cleveland). At that time they faced a significant increase in competition in these markets. In response, they adopted a technology that led to a surge in productivity. The technology was a change in organization, in particular, a change in work rules (see, for example, Galdon-Sanchez and Schmitz (2002) and Schmitz (2005)). The firms could have instituted these changes prior to the reduction in market power, but there would have been a switchover disruption, namely, a likely protracted strike by the union. With significant market power, and high iron ore prices, the opportunity costs of lost sales were too high. With the surge in competition, prices and rents fell dramatically. The opportunity costs of a protracted strike were now much lower, and the firms decided to pursue new work rules.[16] Similar developments occurred in the U.S. cement industry (Dunne, Klimek and Schmitz (2008)) and U.S. transportation industries (Holmes and Schmitz (2001)).[17]

To close this section, let's return to another *theoretical* critique of the Arrow model, one that is related to the *declining-output* issue: What happens if the new technology reduces fixed costs, leaving marginal cost alone? Suppose there is a flow fixed cost ϕ that must be paid each instant when output is positive, but not paid at zero output. Suppose initially, the cost is ϕ°, but if the new technology is adopted the fixed cost goes from $\bar{\phi}$ at the beginning to $\underline{\phi} < \bar{\phi}$ in the end. If $\bar{\phi}$ is high enough, the incumbent will shut down initially to avoid paying

---

[15]There is another literature that looks at the impact of trade liberalization on average firm and plant size (but does not focus on productivity). An important paper in this literature is Head and Ries (1999). Summarizing this literature, Tybout (2006) says, "The finding that foreign competition is associated with smaller firms in import competing industries seems robust."

[16]It's also quite possible that the firms thought the possibility of a strike, and its duration if it did happen, had fallen as well. But our model predicts this, too, is a force for technology adoption.

[17]The studies above looked at how changes in competition led to changes in technology adoption. Other studies have looked cross-sectionally, for example, Syverson (2004). Other proxies for changes in competition include regulatory restructuring (e.g., see Fabrizio, Rose and Wolfram (2007)) and changes in cartel laws (see, e.g., Symeonidis (2008)).

it. It is straightforward to see how we could redo the analysis of the previous section with this setup. The Arrow Output effect would of course disappear because it depends upon production volume which is irrelevant with a fixed cost. However, the Switchover Disruption term remains, and competition again leads to adoption (if the switchover costs are large enough).

6 The Second Extension: Gilbert and Newbery

A famous critique of Arrow is Gilbert and Newbery's (1982). They change the model setup and allow the rivals to also bid for the new technology. They show the monopolist has the greatest willingness to pay and that it increases in τ. In this section we show that if the baseline model above is extended to allow for the rivals to bid, then competition still leads to increased innovation (under some conditions, of course).

Formally, we assume an outside researcher can sell exclusive rights to use the technology to the incumbent or one of the rivals. If a rival uses the new technology, it still needs to pay the friction τ, in addition to the marginal production cost. Assume that the outside researcher can commit to an auction technology that extracts the full surplus from the bidder with the highest willingness to pay. In the analysis, we need to determine: Who has the highest willingness to pay, the incumbent or a rival, and how much is the high bidder willing to pay? We examine how the answers to these questions depend upon τ.

We proceed by first working things out when there is no switchover disruption. We then determine how things change when we put switchover disruption into the model. To highlight the role of switchover disruption, we zero out the Arrow Output effect by assuming demand is *perfectly inelastic* at unit demand, i.e., $Q^D(p) = 1$ for all p.

We begin with some additional notation. As in the previous section, let v denote the present value to the incumbent when it acquires the new technology. Now let u denote the present value to the *incumbent* when a *rival* obtains the new technology. Finally, let r be the present value to a *rival* when it acquires the new technology.

6.1 Adoption with no switchover disruption

Suppose there is no switchover disruption, $\bar{c} \leq c^\circ$. Define value v^{No_SD} to be the value to the *incumbent* of acquiring the rights to the new technology. This is just the formula (4) in the previous subsection with $Q^D(c^\circ + \tau) = 1$ and $\min\{\bar{c}, c^\circ + \tau\} = \bar{c}$. The value u^{No_SD} to

15

the incumbent if the rights are acquired by a rival firm is

$$u^{No\_SD} = \int_{\max\{c^\circ - \tau, \underline{c}\}}^{\max\{\bar{c}, c^\circ - \tau\}} h(c) \left[c + \tau - c^\circ\right] dc. \tag{9}$$

By using the max operator in (9) above, we subsume different cases. If $\max\{\bar{c}, c^\circ - \tau\} = c^\circ - \tau$ (equivalently $c^\circ \geq \bar{c} + \tau$), the incumbent is immediately undercut at the point of adoption by a rival and the integral above is 0 (limits of integration are $c^\circ - \tau$ and $c^\circ - \tau$). If alternatively $c^\circ < \bar{c} + \tau$, the incumbent is at least initially the low cost producer, taking into account the friction τ, but it will have to set the price to $c + \tau$ to match the adopting rival.

Finally, the value to a *rival* if the rival acquires the new technology rights is

$$r^{No\_SD} = \int_{\min\{\underline{c}, c^\circ - \tau\}}^{\min\{\bar{c}, c^\circ - \tau\}} h(c) \left[c^\circ - \tau - c\right] dc,$$

where, again, by using the min operator above we subsume different cases.

The maximum willingness to pay for the rights to the new innovation is

$$
\begin{aligned}
W^{No\_SD} &= \max\left\{v^{No\_SD} - u^{No\_SD}, r^{No\_SD}\right\} \\
&= \max\left\{
\begin{array}{c}
\int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} h(c) \left[c^\circ + \tau - c\right] dc - \int_{\max\{c^\circ - \tau, \underline{c}\}}^{\max\{\bar{c}, c^\circ - \tau\}} h(c) \left[c + \tau - c^\circ\right] dc, \\
\int_{\min\{\underline{c}, c^\circ - \tau\}}^{\min\{\bar{c}, c^\circ - \tau\}} h(c) \left[c^\circ - \tau - c\right] dc
\end{array}
\right\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

The first term in the maximization is the willingness to pay by the incumbent, the difference in return between having the production rights and a rival having them. The second term is the return to a rival owning the rights (a rival without rights gets profit equal to zero.)

Observe that at $\tau = 0$, the willingness to pay by the incumbent and a rival is the same and equal to

$$W^{No\_SD} = \int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} h(c) \left[c^\circ - c\right] dc, \text{ when } \tau = 0,$$

the present value of the cost reduction. This expression follows from the fact that, with no switchover disruption, $\max\{\bar{c}, c^\circ - \tau\} = \max\{c^\circ - \tau, \underline{c}\} = c^\circ$ (when $\tau = 0$), and $\min\{\bar{c}, c^\circ - \tau\} = \bar{c}$ and $\min\{\underline{c}, c^\circ - \tau\} = \underline{c}$. Next observe that the willingness to pay r^{No_SD} of the rival strictly

16

decreases in τ. Finally, we differentiate $v^{No\_SD} - u^{No\_SD}$. Let us first note that

$$\frac{dv^{No\_SD}}{d\tau} = \int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} h(c)dc.$$

The derivative $du^{No\_SD}/d\tau$ is the sum of the following three terms,

$$-\frac{d\max\{c^\circ - \tau, \underline{c}\}}{d\tau} h(\max\{c^\circ - \tau, \underline{c}\})[\max\{c^\circ - \tau, \underline{c}\} + \tau - c^\circ],$$

and

$$\frac{d\max\{\bar{c}, c^\circ - \tau\}}{d\tau} h(\max\{\bar{c}, c^\circ - \tau\})[\max\{\bar{c}, c^\circ - \tau\} + \tau - c^\circ],$$

and finally

$$\int_{\max\{c^\circ - \tau, \underline{c}\}}^{\max\{\bar{c}, c^\circ - \tau\}} h(c)dc.$$

The first two terms are zero (in each term, either the derivatives are zero, or if not, the rest of the expression is zero). Hence,

$$\frac{du^{No\_SD}}{d\tau} = \int_{\max\{c^\circ - \tau, \underline{c}\}}^{\max\{\bar{c}, c^\circ - \tau\}} h(c)dc$$

and hence

$$\frac{dv^{No\_SD}}{d\tau} - \frac{du^{No\_SD}}{d\tau} = \int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} h(c)dc - \int_{\max\{c^\circ - \tau, \underline{c}\}}^{\max\{\bar{c}, c^\circ - \tau\}} h(c)dc.$$

This last derivative is strictly positive if $\tau < c^\circ - \underline{c}$ and zero for $\tau \geq c^\circ - \underline{c}$. Hence for $\tau > 0$, the willingness to pay by the incumbent strictly exceeds that of the rival, and the willingness strictly increases in τ up to the threshold. In summary, we have proved:

Proposition 2. Assume the Gilbert and Newbery setup applies, that demand is perfectly inelastic, and that there is no switchover disruption ($\bar{c} \leq c^\circ$).

(i) If $\tau > 0$, the incumbent has a higher willingness to pay for the new innovation and so will outbid the rival so $W^{No\_SD} = v^{No\_SD} - u^{No\_SD}$.

(ii) $W^{No\_SD}(\tau)$ strictly increases in τ for $\tau < c^\circ - \underline{c}$ and is constant above this point.

Part (i) of the proposition is a variant of Gilbert and Newbery's famous result that innovation is worth more to the incumbent than to a new entrant and so the incumbent will preemptively patent before a rival. The incumbent will take into account that if it does not

17

preemptively innovate and the entrant adopts instead, the incumbent will lose its monopoly rent. In contrast, the rivals have no rent to forgo if they don't innovate.

Part (ii) of the result is really an elaboration on part (i). The larger is τ the larger is the incentive of the incumbent to hold onto its monopoly rents and so the more the incumbent is willing pay for the innovation. This remains true until $\tau > c^\circ - \underline{c}$. When the friction is bigger than this threshold, a rival cannot displace the incumbent even when its costs have fallen to $\underline{c}$. So the incumbent will enjoy the full value of the friction τ whether or not the incumbent or a rival have the new technology, meaning changes in τ don't impact willingness to pay. Part (ii) of Proposition flips the Arrow result because if there is a given underlying cost F to create the innovation, the higher is the monopoly index τ, the more likely it is that the underlying willingness to pay exceeds the innovation's cost.

6.2 Adoption with switchover disruption

The intuition embodied in Proposition 2 for how monopoly can raise the incentive to pay for innovation is well understood. The key point we want to make here is that this result depends heavily on the assumption that there are no switchover disruptions. We will show that the presence of switchover disruptions can overturn the results in Proposition 2. Note that in introducing switchover disruption, we must now allow the possibility that the incumbent might buy the technology and leave it idle. (With no switchover disruption, $\bar{c} \leq c^\circ$, the incumbent would always use the new technology it it owned the rights.)

The statement of our result will require two additional pieces of notation. Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
H^{disrupt} &\equiv \int_{c^\circ}^{\bar{c}} h(c)dc \\
H^{beyond} &\equiv \int_{\underline{c}}^{c^\circ} h(c)dc.
\end{aligned}
$$

Here $H^{disrupt}$ is the (weighted) duration of the switchover disruption, where the weight depends upon the cost density and the discount factor, and H^{beyond} is the (weighted) duration "beyond the disruption," when cost is lower than its initial value c°.

We start by determining what happens when the degree of market power τ is small.
Proposition 3. Assume the Gilbert and Newbery setup applies, that demand is perfectly inelastic, and that there is a period of switchover disruption ($\bar{c} > c^\circ$). Suppose that τ is small.

(i) If $H^{disrupt} < H^{beyond}$, then the incumbent obtains the innovation and W^{SD} strictly increases in τ.

(ii) If $H^{disrupt} \in (H^{beyond}, 2H^{beyond})$, then the incumbent still obtains the innovation, but W^{SD} strictly decreases in τ.

(iii) If $H^{disrupt} > 2H^{beyond}$, then a rival obtains the innovation and W^{SD} strictly decreases in τ.

Proof. Suppose $\bar{c} > c^\circ$ and $\tau \in (0, c^\circ - \underline{c})$. To do the analysis, we need to derive four different returns.

First Return: v^{SD}

This is the return to the incumbent from adopting the technology,

$$v^{SD} = \int_{\underline{c}}^{\min\{c^\circ + \tau, \bar{c}\}} h(c) \left[c^\circ + \tau - c\right] dc \tag{10}$$

where if $\min\{c^\circ + \tau, \bar{c}\} = \bar{c}$, the incumbent is always the low cost producer.

Second Return: i^{SD}

This is the return if the incumbent acquires the rights to the new technology but leaves it idle. Hence no rival adopts. We ignored this possibility in the non-disruption case because it was irrelevant there. But it can be relevant here. The return is

$$i^{SD} = \int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} h(c) \tau dc$$

since the markup is τ, and demand is unity.

Third Return: u^{SD}

This is the return to the incumbent of not acquiring the technology (so that it ends up in the hands of a rival),

$$u^{SD} = \int_{c^\circ}^{\bar{c}} h(c) \tau dc + \int_{c^\circ - \tau}^{c^\circ} h(c) \left[c + \tau - c^\circ\right] dc. \tag{11}$$

The first term is the return over the disruption interval, that is, the time before the adopting rival's cost (not including the friction τ) has fallen to c°, that is, the interval $[c^\circ, \bar{c}]$. The adopting rival begins with total cost $\bar{c} + \tau$ (which satisfies $\bar{c} + \tau > c^\circ + \tau > c^\circ$), but since there are other rivals (we assumed multiple rivals) with cost $c^\circ + \tau$, the incumbent's limit price is $c^\circ + \tau$, and its markup τ. The second term is the return after the disruption interval.

19

In this period, the adopting rival has a cost $c + \tau < c^\circ + \tau$. For the first part of this period, the incumbent's cost c° remains lower than $c + \tau$, during which period the equilibrium price is $c + \tau$. Eventually, since $\underline{c} < c^\circ$ and since $\tau < c^\circ - \underline{c}$ by assumption (since τ is assumed "small"), a point is reached (i.e., $c + \tau = c^\circ$) where the rival that adopts is the lowest cost producer (including the friction τ) and the incumbent's profit is zero from that point on.

Fourth Return: r^{SD}

The return to a rival of adopting the technology is

$$r^{SD} = \int_{\underline{c}}^{c^\circ - \tau} h(c) \left[c^\circ - \tau - c \right] dc,$$

since its limit price is c°, and its marginal cost is $c + \tau$.

Willingness to pay in the switchover disruption case is given by

$$W_{GN}^{SD} = \max \left\{ v^{SD} - u^{SD}, i^{SD} - u^{SD}, r^{SD} \right\}.$$

We begin by noting that for τ close to zero, it is immediate that $v^{SD} > i^{SD}$, so we can ignore the idling possibility for the rest of this proof. So we compare $v^{SD} - u^{SD}$ and r^{SD}. Note at $\tau = 0$ they are equal. Let us differentiate the difference, $v^{SD} - u^{SD}$, with respect to τ. First, we have that

$$\frac{dv^{SD}}{d\tau} = \frac{d \min \left\{ c^\circ + \tau, \bar{c} \right\}}{d\tau} h(\min \left\{ c^\circ + \tau, \bar{c} \right\})[c^\circ + \tau - \min \left\{ c^\circ + \tau, \bar{c} \right\}] + \int_{\underline{c}}^{\min \left\{ c^\circ + \tau, \bar{c} \right\}} h(c) dc,$$

where note that the first term is zero. Hence, we have that

$$\frac{dv^{SD}}{d\tau} - \frac{du^{SD}}{d\tau} = \int_{\underline{c}}^{\min \left\{ c^\circ + \tau, \bar{c} \right\}} h(c) dc - \int_{c^\circ - \tau}^{\bar{c}} h(c) dc, \tag{12}$$

and note that, at $\tau = 0$, $dv^{SD}/d\tau - du^{SD}/d\tau = H^{beyond} - H^{disrupt}$. Next, we have

$$\frac{dr^{SD}}{d\tau} = -\int_{\underline{c}}^{c^\circ - \tau} h(c) dc \tag{13}$$

and note that, at $\tau = 0$, $dr^{SD}/d\tau = -H^{beyond}$.

If $H^{beyond} > H^{disrupt}$, then for $\tau = 0$, (12) is positive and greater than (13). This implies that the incumbent has the highest willingness to pay for small τ. Thus $W_{GN}^{SD} = v^{SD} - u^{SD}$,

20

and this is strictly increasing for small τ, proving (i).

If $H^{disrupt} \in (H^{beyond}, 2H^{beyond})$, then (12) is strictly negative but still greater than (13). Thus $W^{SD} = v^{SD} - u^{SD}$ and is strictly decreasing for small τ, proving (ii).

If $H^{disrupt} > 2H^{beyond}$, then (12) is strictly less than (13). So a rival has the highest willingness to pay. So $W^{SD} = r^{SD}$ which is strictly decreasing, proving (iii). *Q.E.D.*

The above is a local result, holding around $\tau = 0$. The next result (Proposition 4) generalizes the two ways that big switchover costs overturn Gilbert and Newbery (which are parts (ii) and (iii) of Proposition 3) to a wider range of τ. Before stating Proposition 4, we need to deal with the complication that for certain parameters, it may be the case that the incumbent obtains the rights to the innovation but then leaves it idle. The following lemma shows that if this ever happens for any τ, it happens for all higher τ.

Lemma 1. Fix all the parameters of the model except for τ. If there exists any τ where the incumbent obtains the new innovation rights but then idles it (and has a strict preference to do so), there is a $\hat{\tau} > 0$ such that for all $\tau < \hat{\tau}$, the incumbent does not obtain and idle the new innovation but if $\tau > \hat{\tau}$ the incumbent does obtain the rights and idles it.

Proof. See appendix.

Define $\hat{\tau} = \infty$ in the event that there is no idling for any τ. Proposition 4 requires an additional assumption.

Assumption 1: Assume that $f'(t)e^{\rho t}$ increases in t.

A few remarks about assumption 1. We earlier assumed that $f'(t) < 0$. Now if the discount rate were $\rho = 0$, this assumption would be simply be that $f'' > 0$, i.e. that f is convex such as in the example in figure 1. This would be a standard assumption in any kind of learning over time setup where the initial advances come in at a faster rate than later advances. If $\rho > 0$, we need more than convexity since the $e^{\rho t}$ term works against the assumption (note $f'(t) < 0$). We need f to be convex *enough*. For example, if $f(t) = ke^{-\gamma t}$, then we need $\gamma > \rho$ for the assumption to hold. Assumption 1 directly implies that $h(c)$ decreases in c.[18]

With this setup, we can now generalize the two ways that big switchover costs overturn Gilbert and Newbery (which are parts (ii) and (iii) of Proposition 3) to a wider range of τ.

Proposition 4. As in Proposition 3, assume the Gilbert and Newbery setup applies, that demand is perfectly inelastic and that there is a period of switchover disturbance ($\bar{c} > c^\circ$). Assume further that Assumption 1 holds.

---

[18] Recall that $h(c) \equiv e^{-\rho(1-G(c))}g(c) = -e^{-\rho t}f(t)^{-1}$, for t solving $c = f(t)$.

(i) If $H^{disrupt} > H^{beyond}$, W^{SD} strictly decreases in τ for $\tau < \min\{c^\circ - \underline{c}, \hat{\tau}\}$.

(ii) If $H^{disrupt} > 2H^{beyond}$, a rival obtains the innovation for all $\tau < \min\{c^\circ - \underline{c}, \hat{\tau}\}$.

Proof. For $\tau < \min\{c^\circ - \underline{c}, \hat{\tau}\}$, by the definition of $\hat{\tau}$, the incumbent is not idling the technology. Hence, the formula (12) is valid for τ in this range. Differentiating again yields

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d^2 v^{SD}}{d\tau^2} - \frac{d^2 u^{SD}}{d\tau^2} &= h(c^\circ + \tau) - h(c^\circ - \tau), \text{ if } c^\circ + \tau < \bar{c}, \\ &= -h(c^\circ - \tau), \text{ if } c^\circ + \tau > \bar{c}\end{aligned}$$

Assumption 1 implies $h' < 0$, so the above is strictly negative. Since $H^{disrupt} > H^{beyond}$, $v^{SD} - u^{SD}$ is strictly decreasing for small τ. Since the function is strictly concave, it is then strictly decreasing for all $\tau \in (0, c^\circ - \underline{c})$. Next note from (13) that r^{SD} is strictly decreasing. Now $W^{SD} \equiv \max\{v^{SD} - u^{SD}, r^{SD}\}$ where $v^{SD} - u^{SD}$ and r^{SD} are both decreasing functions of τ. The maximum of decreasing functions is a decreasing function, proving (i). Next observe from differentiating (13) with respect to τ that r^{SD} is (weakly) convex. If $H^{disrupt} > 2H^{beyond}$, the slope of r^{SD} at $\tau = 0$ is strictly greater than the slope of $v^{SD} - u^{SD}$. Since r^{SD} is convex and $v^{SD} - u^{SD}$ is concave and since $v^{SD} - u^{SD} = r^{SD}$ at $\tau = 0$, $r^{SD} > v^{SD} - u^{SD}$ for $\tau \in (0, \min\{c^\circ - \underline{c}, \hat{\tau}\})$ as claimed. *Q.E.D.*

The intuition of the results for the Gilbert and Newbery structure can be gleaned from a simple example. Ignore discounting by setting $\rho = 0$. Suppose that during the disruption period, marginal cost is infinite, that is, $\bar{c} = \infty$, so that no production can take place. Once the disruption period is over, then marginal cost is $\underline{c} < (c^\circ - \tau)$. If the incumbent adopts the technology, it enjoys a profit only after the disruption interval has passed. Hence,

$$v^{SD} = H^{beyond}(c^\circ + \tau - \underline{c}).$$

If the incumbent doesn't adopt so that the rival gets it, it makes a profit only as long as the adopting rival is still in the disruption phase, that is,

$$u^{SD} = H^{disrupt}\tau.$$

The willingness of the incumbent to pay for the innovation is

$$W_{GN}^{SD} = v^{SD} - u^{SD} = H^{beyond}(c^\circ + \tau - \underline{c}) - H^{disrupt}\tau. \tag{14}$$

22

We can easily see here that if the $H^{disrupt}$ period is longer than the H^{beyond} period, an increase in τ will lower the incumbent's willingness to pay for the innovation. Obviously, the disruption period has to be quite big here, half of the entire period. But note that if we add discounting, the disruption period need not be so long for the result to go through since the disruption is bourne up front. So adding discounting magnifies the effect.[19]

7   The Third Extension: Learning by Doing

The previous two sections considered critiques of Arrow's logic that competition increased adoption. In this section we consider whether our logic about switchover disruption's impact on adoption holds under different assumptions about how costs fall after adoption.

In the baseline model, if a firm adopts, then the path of its costs depends *only* on time. In particular, its costs do not depend on output, as they would if there was learning-by-doing (LBD). Since costs only depend on time, if the incumbent adopts and there is a large switchover disruption, that is, $\bar{c} > c^\circ + \tau$, then it is *always* best for the incumbent to drop out of the market until $\bar{c} = c^\circ + \tau$. So, the incumbent *always* loses sales.

If there is LBD, then a firm's production rate influences its costs. In this case, perhaps the firm will choose to produce when $\bar{c} > c^\circ + \tau$. If it produces, there is a current loss (since marginal cost exceeds price), but costs also come down faster. So, if there is LBD, perhaps an incumbent does not choose to reduce sales after adoption. If it did not reduce sales, then the effect we have introduced disappears.

In this section, we address this issue with a simple version of our model with learning by doing. We show that under general conditions our effect does not disappear.

Suppose for simplicity that demand is perfectly inelastic at $Q^D = 1$ and that there is no discounting. Suppose there are two cost levels after adoption, $\bar{c} > \underline{c}$, and that cost remains at the high level $\bar{c}$ until the firm attains a critical knowledge K^*. In general, knowledge comes from both raw time and production experience. Specifically, conditioned upon adopting the new innovation at time $t = 0$, knowledge at time t evolves according to

$$K(t) = \int_0^t \left[\lambda + \beta q(t)^\alpha \right] dt, \tag{15}$$

---

[19]Note that there are other forces that act like discounting that will also magnify the impact of switchover disruptions. One example is if there is a small probability each "period" that the market disappears (for example, because of the development of a substitute product).

where $q(t)$ is the incumbent's production at time t. Assume $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Specification (15) nests the pure time model that we formulated in Section 3. To see this, if $\beta = 0$ and $\lambda > 0$, then at time t^* defined by

$$K^* \equiv \lambda t^*,$$

the critical level of knowledge is obtained and cost drops from $\bar{c}$ to $\underline{c}$. This is the pure time model.

For the rest of this section, to stack things against us, we assume that time has no impact on learning, that is, $\lambda = 0$. We also assume that $\bar{c} > c^\circ + \tau$. So if the incumbent does adopt, if it ever wants to lower costs to $\underline{c}$, it will have to initially produce at a loss. We normalize $\beta = 1$ in (15). Finally, we assume

$$K^* < 1,$$

so that if the incumbent does produce the unit demand through the time interval, it obtains the required knowledge level before $t = 1$.

Suppose that the firm adopts and attains the critical knowledge at time $\hat{t}$. Assuming the curvature parameter $\alpha < 1$, and given no discounting, it is immediate that the firm should be smoothing production at a constant q solving

$$K^* = \hat{t}q^\alpha.$$

(Where again we have normalized $\beta = 1$.) Alternatively, if the firm chooses a constant production rate q, it achieves K^* by $\hat{t}(q)$, where

$$\hat{t}(q) = \min\left\{K^* q^{-\alpha}, 1\right\}$$

and the bound at one covers the case where accumulated knowledge is insufficient by $t = 1$. The incumbent chooses a learning-period production level $\bar{q}$ to solve

$$v = \max_{\bar{q} \leq 1} -\hat{t}(\bar{q})\bar{q}\left(\bar{c} - c^\circ - \tau\right) + \left(1 - \hat{t}(\bar{q})\right)\left(c^\circ + \tau - \underline{c}\right). \tag{16}$$

During the learning period, the incumbent sells $\bar{q} \leq 1$ units at a loss $(\bar{c} - c^\circ - \tau)$, and the balance of the unit market demand is met by the rivals. After the low cost $\underline{c}$ is attained, the incumbent takes the entire unit demand and begins to enjoy profit $c^\circ + \tau - \underline{c}$.

Our next result shows that if learning is "concave enough" ($\alpha < .703$ is sufficient), then there exists a range of $\bar{c}$ under which it is optimal for the incumbent to set an output level $\bar{q}$ during the learning phase that is positive but strictly less than one, i.e., it only partially meets the market demand during this phase. To set up the result, we need to introduce two functions of α that come up in the analysis.

$$M_1(\alpha) \equiv \left(\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\right)^{\alpha} \tag{17}$$

$$M_2(\alpha) \equiv \left(\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\right)^{1-\alpha} + \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\right)^{\alpha}.$$

For a fixed $K^* < 1$, define $\hat{\alpha}$ by $M_1(\hat{\alpha}) \equiv M_2(\hat{\alpha})/K^*$. In the appendix where we prove Proposition 5, we show there is a unique $\hat{\alpha} \in (.703, 1)$ satisfying this condition. Our result is:

Proposition 5. Fix $\alpha < \hat{\alpha}$ and define cutoffs $\bar{c}_1$ and $\bar{c}_2$ by

$$\frac{\bar{c}_1 - c^{\circ} - \tau}{c^{\circ} + \tau - \underline{c}} \equiv M_1\left(\alpha\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \tag{18}$$

$$\frac{\bar{c}_2 - c^{\circ} - \tau}{c^{\circ} + \tau - \underline{c}} \equiv M_2(\alpha)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(K^*\right)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

The cutoffs satisfy $\bar{c}_2 > \bar{c}_1$ and $\bar{c}_1 > c^{\circ} + \tau$. In the solution to problem (16), if $\bar{c} \in (\bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2)$, then output during the learning period is strictly positive but less than one,

$$\bar{q} = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\frac{c^{\circ} + \tau - \underline{c}}{\bar{c} - c^{\circ} - \tau} < 1. \tag{19}$$

If instead $\bar{c} < \bar{c}_1$, then $\bar{q} = 1$ during the learning period. If $\bar{c} > \bar{c}_2$, then if the firm were to adopt, $\bar{q} = 0$ for all t and knowledge K^* is never attained.

Proof. See appendix.

As before, define $W(\tau) = v(\tau) - v^{\circ}(\tau) - F$ to be the net value of adopting the new technology. Our result is

Proposition 6. Assume $\alpha < \hat{\alpha}$. If $\bar{c} < \bar{c}_1$, then $W'(\tau) = 0$. If $\bar{c} > \bar{c}_1$, then $W'(\tau) < 0$.

25

Proof. The slope equals

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dW}{d\tau} &= \frac{dv}{d\tau} - \frac{dv^{\circ}}{d\tau} \\
&= \left[\hat{t}(\bar{q})\bar{q} + \left(1 - \hat{t}(\bar{q})\right)\right] - 1.
\end{aligned}$$

The bracketed term is the slope of v obtained from (16) using the envelope theorem. The impact of a change in τ is simply the average output. If $\bar{c} > \bar{c}_1$, then from Proposition 5, $\bar{q} < 1$, and average output under adoption is strictly less than one, implying $W'(\tau) < 0$. If $\bar{c} < \bar{c}_1$, average output under adoption is one, and $W'(\tau) = 0$. *Q.E.D.*

Proposition 6 shows that our basic insight continues to hold if we cast the disruption period as learning by doing. If $\bar{c}$ is large enough so that losses during the learning period are big enough, an incumbent that is adopting will contract its sales below the full market level of one unit. The bigger is τ, the more costly these lost sales, and the less the return to adoption.[20]

8   More Extensions

In this section, we briefly discuss some straightforward extensions of the model. These extensions show how the model can be interpreted more broadly, and how the effects we talk about can be magnified.

8.1   Incumbent faces rivals in many markets (i.e., variation in τ)

In the analysis above where there is a large switchover disruption, the incumbent loses its entire market for a period of time. But in more general models, the incumbent need not lose its entire market in order for the effect we are talking about to go through.[21] We illustrate

---

[20]One important thing to note is that in the extreme case where $\alpha = 1$ so there are no diminishing returns to learning, the incumbent goes to the corner upon adopting and either sets $\bar{q} = 1$ or $\bar{q} = 0$. Now it will never choose to adopt and set $\bar{q} = 0$. So if the turn to adoption is positive, then the return does not vary with τ, because the incumbent does not lose sales if it adopts. It is crucial for our result that there be diminishing returns in learning, so that the incumbent smooths out its learning and loses some sales. Another thing worth noting is even though an incumbent with higher τ is less likely to adopt, given that it does adopt we can see from (19)) that it will operate at a higher output $\bar{q}$ during the learning period and hence attain the required knowledge K^* faster.

[21]Another extension (besides the one we consider below) would be for the incumbent, upon adoption, to be able to produce only a certain fraction y of its pre-adoption output for a period of time. We could assume during this period it produced at marginal cost $\bar{c}$ (or $\underline{c}$), and that once the period is over, it produced at $\underline{c}$.

this here by allowing the incumbent's advantage over rivals to be big in some markets, and small in others. In this setup, even during the switchover disruption when the incumbent has high costs it will nonetheless continue to sell to consumers over whom it has high monopoly power. The incumbent will lose mobile consumers during the disruption and on account of these mobile consumers our results will go through.

So now assume that there are multiple markets that differ by τ, in particular, let $\tau \in [0, \bar{\tau}]$. To keep things simple, assume demand is perfectly inelastic in each market and that the level of demand in each market differs by a scaler weight $a(\tau)$. Furthermore, assume that firms can perfectly discriminate between the markets, being able to offer a distinct price $p(\tau)$ to each market τ. This simplifies things considerably, as we can determine the Bertrand Equilibrium in each market separately.

This structure can be given several interpretations. In terms of the tariff example mentioned earlier, it may simply be the case that different consumers face different tariffs. Or we can interpret this as heterogeneity in transport costs in a spatial context with a Hotelling-like structure. We can put the incumbent in the center of a country. Buyers located in the center of the country have high τ because in addition to paying any tariff they have to incur transportation costs to ship imports inland. Buyers located on the coast have lower τ.

Let $W_{many\text{-}markets}$ be the net return to innovation in this new *many-markets* model. Given that the equilibrium can be determined in each τ market separately, we can use equation (5) of Section 3 to determine the return to innovation $W(\tau)$ in each τ market and then integrate over τ to obtain the net return over all markets,

$$W_{many\text{-}markets} = \int_0^{\bar{\tau}} a(\tau) W(\tau) d\tau. \tag{20}$$

Since we have assumed perfectly inelastic demand here, the first term in the slope of $W(\tau)$ in equation (6) (the Arrow Output effect) is zero. It is immediate then that $W'(\tau) \leq 0$ and that the inequality is strict for those τ markets where $\bar{c} > c^\circ + \tau$, i.e. where the incumbent is initially out of the market just after adoption. It is then clear that an upward shift in the distribution of τ (in the sense of first-order stochastic dominance) strictly decreases willingness to pay and our result goes through. We also see that in the very high τ markets (where $\bar{c} < c^\circ + \tau$), the incumbent retains its sales just after adoption, so the incumbent's aggregate output never goes all the way to zero.

8.2 Consumer Dynamics

Our consumer model features no dynamics. Fixing the prices of the incumbent and all rivals, quantity sold by the incumbent is independent of history. There is a large literature that emphasizes the importance of dynamics on the consumer side. Consumers may bear "switching costs" when they shift from one provider to a second provider. If the consumer goes ahead and makes such a switch, the first provider might have a difficult time getting the consumer back. See Klemperer (1995) for a survey of this literature.

If we introduce these kinds of dynamics on the consumer side, the effects we are isolating here are magnified. We make our point with a stylized example but our point is more general. Suppose that when consumers purchase from a rival, there is some probability they never will come back to the incumbent. Specifically, demand available to the incumbent decays at rate δ when demand is met by a rival firm. In this case we can rewrite the incumbent's willingness to pay (14) for the innovation in the example at the close of Section 6 as

$$W^{SD} = e^{-\delta H^{disrupt}} H^{beyond} \left(c^\circ + \tau - \underline{c}\right) - H^{disrupt}\tau.$$

This is the same as (14), except the first term now includes a decay factor for consumers lost over the course of the disruption interval (which has length $H^{disrupt}$). In the original analysis, $\delta = 0$ is implicitly assumed. The comparative static that W^{SD} decreases in τ now holds if

$$e^{-\delta H^{disrupt}} H^{beyond} < H^{disrupt}.$$

For any positive disruption interval $H^{disrupt}$, the above condition will hold for large enough consumer decay δ.

8.3 Uncertainty

The model is set up with a deterministic cost structure. Often there is a great deal of uncertainty in the adoption of a new technology and this reinforces our point. It may be that a new technology is worse than the existing one, even in the long run, but the only way to find out is to try it. Moreover, once a firm tries it, it may be stuck with it, at least for a substantial period of time. For example, the adoption of a new baggage handling system in the Denver airport turned out to be a mistake, but it took ten years before they abandoned it.

We can capture this with a simple relabeling. Suppose that the model is a static one, in which there is uncertainty about the realization c of a new technology. Assume that if the cost draw ends up $c > c^\circ$, the adopting firm is stuck with it—that is, the cost of reverting to the previous technology is prohibitively high. If we simply let $h(c)$ be the density of the cost draw c for the new technology, the model is formally identical to the model studied, and all of our results go through.

9   Conclusion

Overall, while the Arrow theory provides a possible explanation of why monopolies are observed to be sluggish innovators, it does not seem to fit the evidence particularly well. Indeed, monopolists tend to be conservative in a great many ways. And indeed, this makes sense: if you have a good thing going you do not want to rock the boat. The one thing a monopolist fears most is the loss of monopoly. This is exactly the driving force that explains why switchover disruptions can be so important: a competitor has little to fear from a disruption as they are earning little to begin with. A firm with a lucrative monopoly is well advised not to jeopardize it by adopting a technology that may in the short-run at least, threaten its lucrative position.

Appendix

Proof of Lemma 1

Following the notation and formulas found in the proof of Proposition 3, we have

$$\frac{dv^{SD}}{d\tau} - \frac{du^{SD}}{d\tau} = \int_{\underline{c}}^{\min\{c^\circ + \tau, \bar{c}\}} h(c)dc - \int_{\max\{c^\circ - \tau, \underline{c}\}}^{\bar{c}} h(c)dc$$

$$\frac{di^{SD}}{d\tau} - \frac{du^{SD}}{d\tau} = \int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} h(c)dc - \int_{\max\{c^\circ - \tau, \underline{c}\}}^{\bar{c}} h(c)dc$$

$$\frac{dr^{SD}}{d\tau} = -\int_{\underline{c}}^{\max\{c^\circ - \tau, \underline{c}\}} h(c)dc.$$

Note that at $\tau = 0, i^{SD} - u^{SD} = 0$, while $v^{SD} - u^{SD} = r^{SD} > 0$. Next note for $\tau \in (0, \underline{c} - c^\circ)$, that $i^{SD} - u^{SD}$ is strictly increasing while r^{SD} is strictly decreasing. For $\tau > \underline{c} - c^\circ$, $i^{SD} - u^{SD}$ is weakly increasing, while r^{SD} is flat. Hence if there is ever a point τ where $i^{SD} - u^{SD} > r^{SD}$, there is a unique cutoff τ' where $i^{SD} - u^{SD} = r^{SD}$, and $i^{SD} - u^{SD} < r^{SD}$ if and only if $\tau < \tau'$.

If $c^\circ + \tau < \bar{c}$, then the slope of $i^{SD} - u^{SD}$ is strictly greater than the slope of $v^{SD} - u^{SD}$ and otherwise the slope is equal. Hence if there is ever a point τ where $i^{SD} - u^{SD} > v^{SD} - u^{SD}$, there is a unique cutoff τ'' where $i^{SD} - u^{SD} = v^{SD} - u^{SD}$, and $i^{SD} - u^{SD} < v^{SD} - u^{SD}$ if and only if $\tau < \tau''$.

If the points τ' and τ'' don't exist, then for no τ is there a strict preference to idle. If both exist, then let $\hat{\tau} \equiv \max\{\tau', \tau''\}$. *Q.E.D.*

Figure 1: Appendix Figure 1

Proof of Proposition 5

We begin by plotting the functions $M_1(\alpha)$ and $M_2(\alpha)$ in Appendix Figure 1. It is immediate that $M_1(\alpha) \leq 1$ for $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, that $M_1(\alpha) > 1$, $M_1'(\alpha) > 0$ for $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, and that $\lim_{\alpha \to 1} M_1(\alpha) = \infty$. It is immediate that $M_2(\alpha) > 1$ for $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. In the figure it is readily apparent that $M_2'(\alpha) < 0$, for $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\lim_{\alpha \to 1} M(\alpha) = 1$. Note that the M_1 and M_2 functions intersect at a point slightly above $\alpha = .703$. Given these facts, it follows that for $K^* < 1$, there exists a unique $\hat{\alpha} \in (.703, 1)$ solving

$$M_1(\hat{\alpha}) = \frac{1}{K^*} M_2(\hat{\alpha}),$$

so that for $\alpha < \hat{\alpha}$, $M_1(\alpha) < \frac{1}{K^*} M_2(\alpha)$. Given the definitions (18) of the cutoffs $\bar{c}_1$ and $\bar{c}_2$, it follows that $\bar{c}_2 > \bar{c}_1$ and $\bar{c}_1 > c^\circ + \tau$.

Recall from the text that

$$\hat{t}(q) = \min \left\{ K^* q^{-\alpha}, 1 \right\}$$

and the incumbent chooses a learning-period production level q to solve

$$v = \max_{q \leq 1} -\hat{t}(q) q \left(\bar{c} - c^\circ - \tau \right) + \left(1 - \hat{t}(q) \right) \left(c^\circ + \tau - \underline{c} \right). \tag{21}$$

Let $\tilde{v}(q)$ be value at a given q. The slope equals

$$\tilde{v}'(q) = - \left(1 - \alpha \right) K^* q^{-\alpha} \left(\bar{c} - c^\circ - \tau \right) + \alpha K^* q^{-\alpha - 1} \left(c^\circ + \tau - \underline{c} \right)$$

This formula applies when q is in the interval $q \in [K^*, 1]$. For $q < K^*$, the firm never learns so the second term of (21) drops out. Let $\tilde{q}(\bar{c})$ solve $\tilde{v}'(q) = 0$,

$$\tilde{q}(\bar{c}) = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \frac{c^{\circ} + \tau - \underline{c}}{\bar{c} - c^{\circ} - \tau}.$$

It is straightforward to prove that for $q \in [K^*, 1]$, $\tilde{v}'(q) \geq 0$ implies $\tilde{v}''(q) < 0$. Hence, if $\tilde{q}(\bar{c}) \in [K^*, 1]$, $\tilde{q}(\bar{c})$ must be the unique maximizer of $\tilde{v}(q)$ for q in the interval $[K^*, 1]$.

Suppose first that $\bar{c} = \bar{c}_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{q}(\bar{c}_2) &= \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \frac{c^{\circ} + \tau - \underline{c}}{\bar{c}_2 - c^{\circ} - \tau} \\
&= \frac{M_1^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{M_2(\alpha)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} (K^*)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}} < 1
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the definitions of $\bar{c}_2$ and $M_1(\alpha)$ and $M_1(\alpha)$ and that $M_1(\alpha) < \frac{1}{K^*} M_2(\alpha)$, for $\alpha < \hat{\alpha}$. We can rewrite this as

$$\tilde{q}(\bar{c}_2)^{\alpha} = \frac{M_1}{M_2} K^*$$

Since $\alpha < \hat{\alpha}$, $M_1 > M_2$. Since $\alpha < 1$ and since $K^* < 1$, it follows that $\tilde{q}(\bar{c}_2) > K^*$. Hence $\tilde{q}(\bar{c}_2) \in (K^*, 1)$ and so it is the unique maximizer of $\tilde{v}(q)$ over the interval $[K^*, 1]$. The maximized value equals

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{v}(\tilde{q}) &= -K^* \tilde{q}^{-\alpha} \tilde{q} (\bar{c} - c^{\circ} - \tau) + \left(1 - K^* \tilde{q}^{-\alpha}\right) (c^{\circ} + \tau - \underline{c}) \\
&= -K^* \left[\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \frac{c^{\circ} + \tau - \underline{c}}{\bar{c} - c^{\circ} - \tau}\right]^{1-\alpha} (\bar{c} - c^{\circ} - \tau) \\
&\quad + \left(1 - K^* \left[\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \frac{c^{\circ} + \tau - \underline{c}}{\bar{c} - c^{\circ} - \tau}\right]^{-\alpha}\right) (c^{\circ} + \tau - \underline{c}),
\end{aligned}$$

so

$$\frac{\tilde{v}(\tilde{q})}{(c^\circ + \tau - \underline{c})} = -K^* \left(\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\right)^{1-\alpha} \left(\frac{c^\circ + \tau - \underline{c}}{\bar{c} - c^\circ - \tau}\right)^{-\alpha}$$
$$+ 1 - K^* \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\right)^{\alpha} \left(\frac{c^\circ + \tau - \underline{c}}{\bar{c} - c^\circ - \tau}\right)^{-\alpha}$$
$$= 1 - K^* M_2(\alpha) \left(\frac{c^\circ + \tau - \underline{c}}{\bar{c} - c^\circ - \tau}\right)^{-\alpha} = 0, \text{ at } \bar{c} = \bar{c}_2.$$

The last line follows from the definition of $\bar{c}_2$. At this point it is convenient to write $\tilde{v}(q, \bar{c})$ as an explicit function of $\bar{c}$. We have shown that at $\bar{c} = \bar{c}_2$, $\tilde{v}(\tilde{q}(\bar{c}_2), \bar{c}_2) = 0$. Since $\tilde{v}(q, \bar{c})$ strictly decreases in $\bar{c}$, for $q > 0$, it is immediate that $\tilde{v}(\tilde{q}(\bar{c}), \bar{c}) < 0$, for $\bar{c} > \bar{c}_2$. Hence the optimal policy (given adoption) for $\bar{c} > \bar{c}_2$ is to set $\bar{q} = 0$ and sustain no losses during the learning period and never learn. For $\bar{c} < \bar{c}_2$, it is immediate that the optimal policy is to set $\bar{q}(\bar{c}) = \min\{\tilde{q}(\bar{c}), 1\}$. Now $\tilde{q}(\bar{c})$ monotonocially decreases in $\bar{c}$. By the definition of $\bar{c}_1$, $\tilde{q}(\bar{c}_1) = 1$. So for $\bar{c} \in (\bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2)$, $0 < \bar{q}(\bar{c}) < 1$ as claimed. *Q.E.D.*

References

Amiti, Mary and Konings, Jozef, "Trade Liberalization, Intermediate Inputs, and Productivity: Evidence from Indonesia," *American Economic Review*, 2007.

Anderson, Axel, and Cabral, Luis, "Go for Broke or Play it Safe? Dynamic Competition with Choice of Variance," *RAND Journal of Economics* 38 (Autumn 2007), pp. 593–609.

Arrow, K., "Economic Welfare and the Allocation of Resources for Inventions," In *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity,* ed. R. Nelson, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Beer, Michael and Cannon, Mark, "Promise and Peril in Implementing Pay-for-Performance," *Human Resources Management*, Spring, 2004.

Bernard, Andrew B., Jensen, J. Bradford, and Schott, Peter K., "Trade Costs, Firms and Productivity," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, July 2006.

Bloom, Nicholas, Draca, Mirko, and Van Reenen, John, "Trade Induced Technical Change? The Impact of Chinese Imports on IT and Innovation," Working Paper, 2008.

Bridgman, Benjamin, Gomes, Victor and Teixeira, Arilton, "The Threat of Competition Enhances Productivity," Working Paper, 2008.

Chari, V.V. and Hopenhayn, Hugo, "Vintage Human Capital, Growth and the Diffusion of New Technology," *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 99, pp 1142-65, 1991.

De Loecker, Jan, "Product Differentiation, Multi-product Firms and Estimating the Impact of Trade Liberalization on Productivity," Working Paper, 2007.

Demsetz, Harold, "Information and Efficiency: Another Viewpoint," *Journal of Law and Economics*, 1969.

Dunlap, John and Weil, David, "Diffusion and Performance of Modular Production in the U.S. Apparel Industry," *Industrial Relations*, 1996.

Dunne, Timothy, Klimek, Shawn, and Schmitz, James, A. Jr., "Does Competition Spur Productivity? Evidence From Post WWII U.S. Cement Manufacturing," working paper, 2008.

Fabrizio, Kira, Rose, Nancy, and Wolfram, Catherine, "Do Markets Reduce Costs? Assessing the Impact of Regulatory Restructuring on U.S. Electric Generation Efficiency," *American Economic Review*, September, 2007.

Fernandes, Ana, "Trade Policy, Trade Volumes and Plant-Level Productivity in Columbian Manufacturing Plants," *Journal of International Economics*, 2007.

Galdon-Sanchez, Jose Enrique and Schmitz, James, A. Jr. "Competitive Pressure and Labor Productivity: World Iron Ore Markets in the 1980s," *American Economic Review* 2002.

Gilbert, Richard J. and David M. G. Newbery, "Preemptive Patenting and the Persistence of Monopoly," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 72, No. 3 (Jun., 1982), pp. 514-526.

Ginzberg, Michael, "Early Diagnosis of MIS Implementation Failure: Promising Results and Unanswered Questions," *Management Science*, Volume 27, Number 4 (April 1981), pp. 459-478.

Hay, Donald, "The Post-1990 Brazilian Trade Liberalisation and the Performance of Large Manufacturing Firms: Productivity, Market Share and Profits," *Economic Journal*, July, 2001.

Head, Kieth and Ries, John "Rationalization Effects of Tariff Reductions," *Journal of International Economics*, 1999.

Hendricks, Kevin, and Singhal, Vinod, "The Effect of Supply Chain Glitches on Shareholder Wealth," *Journal of Operations Management*, pp 501-22, 2003.

Hendricks, Kevin, and Singhal, Vinod, "Association between Supply Chain Glitches and Operating Performance," *Management Science*, May, 2005.

Holmes, Thomas J. and Schmitz, James, A. Jr., "Competition at Work: Railroads vs. Monopoly in the U.S. Shipping Industry," *Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis Quarterly Review*, Spring, 2001.

Huggett, Mark, and Ospina, Sandra "Does Productivity Growth Fall after the Adoption of New Technology?" *Journal of Monetary Economics,* pp 173-95, 2001.

Ichniowski, Casey and Shaw, Kathryn, "Old Dogs and New Tricks: Determinants of the Adoption of Productivity-Enhancing Work Practices," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1995.

Jovanovic, Boyan and Nyarko, Yaw, "Learning by Doing and the Choice of Technology," *Econometrica*, November, 1996.

Klemperer, Paul (1995),"Competition When Consumers Have Switching Costs: An Overview with Applications to Industrial Organization, Macroeconomics, and International Trade," *Review of Economic Studies* 62, 515-539.

Klenow, Peter, "Learning Curves and the Cyclical Behavior of Manufacturing Industries," *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 1998.

Muendler, Marc-Andreas, "Trade, Technology, and Productivity: A Study of Brazilian Manufacturers, 1986-1998," Working Paper, 2004.

Nakamura, Tsuyoshi and Ohashi, Hiroshi , "Technology Adoption, Learning by Doing, and Productivity: A Study of Steel Refining Furnaces," Working Paper, 2005.

Parente, Stephen, "Technology Adoption, Learning-by-doing, and Economic Growth," *Journal of Economic Theory,* 1994.

Pavcnik, Nina, "Trade Liberalization, Exit, and Productivity Improvements: Evidence from Chilean Plants," *Review of Economic Studies*, 2002.

Reinganum, Jennifer, "Uncertain Innovation and the Persistence of Monopoly," *American Economic Review*, September, 1983.

Sakellaris, Plutarchos "Patterns of Plant Adjustment,*" Journal of Monetary Economics,* pp 425-50, 2004.

Schivardi, Fabiano and Schneider, Martin, "Strategic Experimentation and Disruptive Technological Change,*" Review of Economic Dynamics*, 2008.

Schmitz, James, A. Jr., "What Determines Productivity? Lessons from the Dramatic Recovery of the U.S. and Canadian Iron Ore Industries Following Their Early 1980s Crisis,*" Journal of Political Economy*, June, 2005.

Schmutzler, Armin, "The Relation between Competition and Innovation — Why Is It Such a Mess?" University of Zurich, mimeo, November, 2007.

Speier, Cheri and Venkatesh, Viswanath, "The Hidden Minefields in the Adoption of Sales Force Automation Technologies," *Journal of Marketing*, July, 2002.

Symeonidis, George, "The Effect of Competition on Wages and Productivity: Evidence from the UK," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, vol. 90 (2008), pp. 134-146.

Syverson, Chad. "Market Structure and Productivity: A Concrete Example," *Journal of Political Economy*, 2004.

Tirole, Jean, (1988) *The Theory of Industrial Organization,* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Topalova, Petia, "Trade Liberalization and Firm Productivity: The Case of India," Working Paper, 2004.

Trefler, Daniel, "The Long and Short of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement," *American Economic Review,* September, 2004.

Tybout, James, "Plant- and Firm-Level Evidence on 'New Trade' Theories," in *Global Integration and Technology Transfer*, Hoekman, Bernard and Javorcik, Beata, editors, Palgrave, 2006.

Tybout, James and Westbrook, Daniel, "Trade Liberalization and the Dimensions of Efficiency Change in Mexican Manufacturing Industries," *Journal of International Economics*, 1995.

Vives, Xavier, "Innovation and Competitive Pressure," *Journal of Industrial Economics* (forthcoming).

Yi, Sang-Seung, "Market Structure and Incentives to Innovate: The Case of Cournot Oligopoly," *Economic Letters*, 1999.

Figure 1
An Example of a Cost Structure with Switchover Disruption

.

Figure 2
The Incentives to Adopt with Small and Large Switchover Disruption

(a) Small Switchover Disruption

(b) Large Switchover Disruption