

# **The Effects of Technological Change on the Quality and Variety of Information Products**

David Waterman  
Dept. of Telecommunications  
Indiana University  
1229 E. 7<sup>th</sup> st.  
Bloomington, IN 47405  
[waterman@indiana.edu](mailto:waterman@indiana.edu)  
812-855-6170

Revised July 21, 2006  
Forthcoming, *Economics of Innovation and Technological Change*

JEL Classifications: D24, O33, L82, L86

Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the 31<sup>st</sup> Annual TPRC Conference in Washington, D.C.. October, 2003; the 2004 International Industrial Organization Conference, Chicago, April 23-24, 2004; and the NBER All Universities Conference on the Economics of the Information Economy, Cambridge, MA, May 7-8, 2004. I am grateful to participants at these conferences and to Michael Baye, Thom Gillespie, Fabio Manenti, Steven Wildman, and anonymous reviewers for comments. I am especially indebted to Xiaofei Wang for excellent research assistance.

## **Abstract**

Anecdotal evidence suggests that producers of information products (TV programs, movies, computer software) may respond to potentially cost saving technological change by increasing, rather than reducing, their total production investments in the “first copy” of each product, possibly at the expense of product variety. Comparative statics show that under reasonable assumptions about consumer demand and production technology, competitive firms in a monopolistically competitive industry are in fact induced to increase first copy investments as a result of either what we define as “quality-enhancing” or “cost-reducing” types of technological advance, while product variety either falls or stays the same. Results suggest that contrary to often held expectations, potentially cost saving technological advances in information industries may result in greater market concentration.

## **I. Introduction and background**

In their classic treatise on the economics of the performing arts, Baumol & Bowen (1968) established that a lack of opportunities for increased productivity in presentation of theatre, symphony concerts, and the like, implied that the arts were destined to become more and more costly relative to other goods and services. That would lead to a decline in their availability, unless there were comparable increases in public or foundation subsidy. It is evident, however, that the production of some information goods, such as movies, television programs, and computer software, have been subject to major technological advance. As computer technology has developed over the past two or three decades, special effects have become a key part of Hollywood's movie and television output. Computer software, of course, has been made possible by computers themselves, and technological advances in games and other applications have obviously been dramatic.

How does technological change in the creation of such information goods affect the quality and variety of products that are made available? Several authors have addressed tradeoffs between product quality and variety in differentiated product industries (Shaked & Sutton, 1987; Sutton, 1991, 2001; Berry & Waldfogel, 2003). The effects of technological advance on these tradeoffs, however, does not appear to have been considered in the economic literature.

How production technology affects such tradeoffs has evident implications for market concentration in information industries. If technological advance tends to favor variety over quality, the result may be fragmentation of market shares. Conversely, incentives to increase product quality relative to variety imply a rise in industry concentration.

We address these issues using simple theoretical models. We do not attempt to develop general results for the effects of technological change on product quality, variety, or industry concentration. Rather, our purpose is to explain what seems to be a prevalent tendency for the result of technological change in information production to be a triumph of quality (or at least production budgets) over variety—even in cases where the technology is ostensibly cost-reducing. For example, major cost-reducing advances in movie animation made possible by CGI (Computer Generated Imagery) technology since

the mid 1990s have, paradoxically, been associated with relatively rapid increases in the production costs of animated compared to other features films. Although a given film is said to cost about 45% less to make using CGI technology (Eller, 2002), CGI movies released in recent years have on average cost about twice as much as 2-D movies.<sup>1</sup>

Often, in fact, observers seem to greet news of production cost-reducing advances in information industries with relief that smaller independent operators--such as desktop publishers, or independent filmmakers with PC animation programs, or cheap digital cameras and editing equipment--will finally have the means to challenge industry domination by highly capitalized, established firms. For example, a *Scientific American* article in 2000 declared an independent film production revolution in the making, remarking that "It is now possible for all of us to try to become desktop Scorceses" (Broderick, 2000, p. 68).

There seems little evidence, though, that such fragmentation actually occurs. The motion picture industry in general, as well as computer games and other applications software, are apparent examples. From 1975 to 2005, average production costs of MPAA-member produced theatrical features rose about 20-fold (from \$3.1 to \$60.0 million, but there was only a 38% increase in the number of movies that MPAA companies distributed annually in the U.S. (from 138 to 190) (MPAA, 2006; Waterman, 2005). In spite of dramatic technological advance occurring over this period, market shares of the dominant studios have remained stable or have increased.<sup>2</sup> Available data for Korean computer game production show that from 1999 to 2003, average development costs per game rose by 237% in Korean won (Korean Game Development and Promotion Institute, 2002, 2004).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For details of these data, see Waterman (2004; 2005). Briefly here, the first major CGI movie, *Toy Story*, was released in 1995. Available data show that from the 1992-94 period to the 1998-02 period, average animated movie production costs rose 178% compared to 84% for non-animated movies. The average actual budgets of CGI animated movies released in the U.S. from 1998-2002 were approximately twice as high as those of 2-D movies: \$89.8 vs. \$46.9 million, respectively.

<sup>2</sup> Throughout the 1975-2003 period, MPAA-distributed movies have accounted for 80 to 90% of the total box-office in the United States. Market shares of independents were 7.2% in the 2001-2003 period, down from a high of 19.0% in the 1986-90 period.); because the MPAA bases its average production cost data on a subset (of undisclosed size) of all MPAA releases, these trends in number of releases and average costs are not precisely comparable. See Waterman, 2005, reporting data based on *Variety* (various) and the Nielsen-EDI Summary Database.

Turning to the relevant economic literature, Lancaster (1975), Spence (1976), and Dixit and Stiglitz (1977) first studied tradeoffs between production setup costs and variety in differentiated product markets, with explicit modeling of the television case by Spence and Owen (1977). These authors generally assumed, however, that set up or first copy costs, and thus product quality, are exogenous.

Later authors developed endogenous quality models in which product quality can be varied by raising or lowering set up, or first copy costs. Shaked and Sutton (1987) develop such a model in which individual consumers differ in terms of their valuation of quality. They show that if marginal costs are constant or increase slowly enough, high quality firms can undercut low quality firms as market size increases, resulting in a lower bound on industry concentration. Larger markets, that is, do not necessarily result in greater product variety. Sutton (2001) builds upon that model and Sutton (1991) to investigate the effects of R&D intensity on industry concentration. As the basis for an extensive empirical study, his theoretical model shows that industry concentration depends positively on the elasticity of product quality with respect to R&D spending and on the substitutability of products at the consumer level.

It is evident that first copy investment is a central determinant of product quality in information industries, and that the level of investment is an important decision variable. Examples include investments in computer software product development, the production costs of movies or television programs, and the creation of newspaper or magazine content. Berry and Waldfogel (2003) develop an endogenous quality model based on Shaked & Sutton (1987) to empirically demonstrate that the average quality of daily newspapers increases with local market size, but that market fragmentation does not occur. That result contrasts with increasing fragmentation as market size grows in the case of restaurants, a product in which quality primarily depends upon variable costs.

Other frameworks have been used to investigate the tradeoffs between the quality and variety of differentiated products with endogenous setup costs and constant marginal costs of production and distribution. Economides (1989) considers the tradeoffs in a model that represents product space along a straight line. Waterman (1990) uses a modified version of Salop's (1979) circular model of monopolistic competition, with specific applications to media products, to show that increases in demand (or for the

television case, a conversion from advertiser to direct pay support), may induce producers to increase production investments and thus product quality, without necessarily increasing product variety. Economides (1993) shows similar tradeoffs between product quality and variety in a circular model framework, but without direct application to media products.

Turning to our attempt to explain these phenomena, it is useful to conceive of technological change as one of two types: “cost-reducing” or “quality enhancing.” In live action films, for example, computer technology now permits digitally generated movie extras to routinely take the place of live actors. To the extent that such technology results in essentially equivalent outcomes for the movie viewer—such as, perhaps, computer simulation of large crowd scenes--this technology is cost reducing. We are all familiar, however, with how computer technology has made possible the increasingly spectacular special effects in Hollywood blockbusters. Basically, these technologies can be thought of as quality enhancing. Of course, technological changes in movies and other media can be both cost reducing and quality enhancing. In other information product industries, like computer software, there has clearly been a dramatic march forward in development processes on both fronts. Ever faster and efficient computers have greatly shortened the time it takes to carry out a given programming task, and they also make possible far more useful (or fun) software creations.

We develop below a circular model of monopolistic competition with free entry (Salop, 1979). While such “address” models have limitations (Eaton & Lipsey, 1989), this model allows a useful framework for studying the effects of technological advance on market outcomes and consumer welfare. We nevertheless point out at the outset that we do not attempt to arrive at generalizations about the effects of technological change on product quality, variety, and welfare. Rather, the model is mainly intended to demonstrate that with plausibly defined demand and production conditions, the effect of either cost-reducing or quality-enhancing technological change in information industries can simply be increased production (setup) investments, along with reduced, or at least not necessarily greater, product variety.

After setting out the model and its equilibrium results, welfare comparisons are made, followed by discussion and conclusions.

## II. The Model

In the circular framework, product space is represented by the circumference of the circle, its length normalized to 1. Consumers are uniformly positioned along the circumference, with density also equal to 1. The location of each consumer is indicated by  $X_i$ . There are a total of  $n$  differentiated products, whose locations are indicated by  $X_j$ ,  $j = 1 \dots n$ . Each individual is assumed to consume only one product (eg, a differentiated movie, a TV or software program), and each firm produces only one product. Firms are also uniformly distributed along the circumference.

The utility of consumer  $i$  from consuming product  $j$  is defined to be dependent on two factors: (1)  $x_{ij}$ , which is defined as the distance in product space between that consumer's location and  $X_j$ , and (2) a vertical dimension indicating product quality. Just for color, we can think of movies as the information products in question and assume that they consist only of a series of filmed explosions, the number of which is represented by  $E_j$ ; product quality depends only on this factor. Specifically, I define:

$$(1) U_{ij} = (1 - \lambda x_{ij}) E_j^\beta$$

The parameter,  $\lambda$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ , measures how rapidly demand falls off with respect to the product's content, while  $\beta$  is the elasticity of demand w.r.t. production investment, where  $0 < \beta < 1$  and  $U'_\beta > 0$ ,  $U''_\beta < 0$ .

Essentially, this utility function acts as a movie production function in which explosions are the inputs and audience the output. Such a function could take a variety of different forms. While there is a very large literature on production functions, little of it seems to be characteristic of information products, and that which is seems to offer relatively little guidance.<sup>3</sup> As specified, the utility (ie, audience production) function has

---

<sup>3</sup> Some related research involves team sports. A recent empirical study of English Football by Carmichael, Thomas, & Ward (2000) reviews this literature, beginning with Scully (1974). These studies generally develop linear empirical models to estimate the marginal contributions of vectors of playing skills, or of individual players, to team win-loss records. A number of empirical studies have attempted to estimate the marginal effects of particular actors, Academy Awards, etc. on movie boxoffice results, using linear regression models (eg, Smith and Smith, 1986, Ravid, 1999; DeVany & Walls, 1999). Other authors have

appealing characteristics. The first derivative of demand with respect to the number of explosions is positive, and the second derivative negative. That is, more explosions always help, but there are diminishing returns to audience interest as more and more of them are used. The multiplicative form of the function means that the marginal effect of increasing production investments is to proportionately shift the demand line with respect to content outward.

Without loss of generality, we drop the subscript  $i$ , set  $j = 1$  and consider only the competition for consumers within the product space between products 1 and 2.

At the point of indifference for the marginal consumer:

$$(2) (1 - \lambda x_{12})E_1^\beta - P_1 = (1 - \lambda/n + \lambda x_{12})E_2^\beta - P_2.$$

Profits for firm 1 are defined as:

$$(3) \Pi_1 = 2P_1 x_{12} - C_E E_1$$

where  $C_E$  is a constant cost per explosion, so that total production investment,  $K_1 = C_E E_1$ . We assume that the producer faces no other costs than those of producing the film negative (or first copy) itself.

We further assume that all firms make entry, pricing and investment decisions simultaneously.<sup>4</sup> Solving (2) for  $x_{12}$  and substituting into (3), then differentiating (3) w.r.t.  $P_1$  and  $E_1$ , applying symmetry assumptions and adding the zero profit condition, yields three equations in three unknowns,  $E$ ,  $P$ , and  $n$ . After dropping subscripts, the results, plus the expression for total investment,  $K$ , are as follows:

---

investigated the production of computer software by estimating how well alternative functional relationships between output (as measured, for example, by lines of code) and hours of labor input (Hu, 1997). Overall, the economic literature on production appears to offer little guidance.

<sup>4</sup> Alternatively, firms could sequentially make entry, quality, and price decisions in a game format. The large number of players in the monopolistically competitive framework, as well as a lack of theoretical guidance as to the appropriate sequence of firm decisions leads us to choose simultaneous solution. Economides (1993) derives results using the circular framework for two alternative game structures: a three stage game in which entry takes place in the first stage, location in the second, and price/quality choice in the third. The four-stage game separates out the quality and price choices into 2 stages. Results differ somewhat, but are qualitatively the same with respect to quality and variety tradeoffs.

$$(4) E^* = P^*/n^* = [4\beta^2/(\lambda(2+\beta)^2)]^{1/(1-\beta)} C_E^{-1/(1-\beta)}$$

$$(5) K^* = C_E E^* = [4\beta^2/(\lambda(2+\beta)^2)]^{1/(1-\beta)} C_E^{-\beta/(1-\beta)}$$

$$(6) P^* = C_E E^* n^* = [4\beta^2/(\lambda(2+\beta)^2)]^{1/(1-\beta)} C_E^{-\beta/(1-\beta)} (2\lambda+\beta\lambda)/2\beta$$

$$(7) n^* = C_E E^* \beta / P^* = (2\lambda+\beta\lambda)/2\beta$$

The effects of cost reducing and quality enhancing technologies can be separately considered in these equilibrium conditions. Cost-reducing technology simply works through the parameter  $C_E$ . That is, a lower  $C_E$  means that an explosion with the same audience appeal is cheaper. Quality enhancing technology works through the parameter  $\beta$ . In this case, the utility function shifts upward as  $\beta$  rises. To understand equilibrium effects of technological change, we are thus interested in the total derivatives,  $dE^*/dC_E$ ,  $dK^*/dC_E$ , and  $dn^*/dC_E$ , and comparably for the effects of parameters  $\beta$  on  $E^*$ ,  $K^*$  and  $n^*$ .

It is evident from (4) that  $dE^*/dC_E$  is unambiguously negative. As would be expected, that is, a lower cost of producing explosions induces firms to increase the number of them that are used. Of more interest, however, (5) shows that  $dK^*/dC_E$ , total spending on explosions (which in this case represents total movie production costs) also rises with a fall in the cost of the inputs. As (6) shows, the first order condition for  $n^*$  is independent of  $C_E$ ; product variety thus remains unchanged in response to a fall in input costs. Finally, differentiation of (6) also shows that  $P^*$  rises with a fall in  $C_E$ .

Differentiation of (4) and (5) show that  $dE^*/d\beta$  and  $dK^*/d\beta$  are both positive if  $E^*$ , the number of explosions is at least one.<sup>5</sup> Under this condition, that is, a higher audience responsiveness to product quality induces firms to increase the number of explosions used and total investments per product.  $P^*$  also rises with  $\beta$  if  $E^* > 1$ . As (7) shows straightforwardly, that product variety,  $n^*$ , is decreasing in  $\beta$ . Quality enhancing technologies thus increase production investments at the expense of variety.

---

<sup>5</sup> The exact condition for  $dE^*/d\beta$  to be positive is  $1/C_E \lambda > 2.25$ . This condition may hold if  $E^*$  is less than one depending on these parameter values, but  $E^* > 1$  is a sufficient condition. To see how an increase in  $\beta$  could lead to production of a lower number of explosions when  $E^* < 1$ , note that  $Q_\beta' = (J - \alpha P)E^\beta \ln e < 0$ . In that case, a quality enhancing technology change actually reduces consumers' marginal valuations and quantity demanded at every price, an intuitively perverse result.

As we would expect, (7) confirms that variety is increasing in  $\lambda$ ; as audience responsiveness to content increases--or in effect as the demand for variety rises--variety increases. Conditions (4) and (5) also show straightforwardly that product quality, along with total investments, is decreasing in  $\lambda$ . From (6), prices also fall unambiguously with an increase in  $\lambda$ .

In summary, cost-reducing technological change unambiguously result in increased production investments in the environment of our monopolistically competitive model. As (4) and (5) imply, this happens because the lower costs induce the use of additional explosions at a faster rate than their prices fall. In this model, variety remains unchanged; prices rise with the resulting increase in product investments, but at exactly the same rate as the rise in investments, neutralizing the effects on entry.

Product investments also rise, under reasonable assumptions, as a result of quality enhancing technology--in these cases at the expense of product variety. The balance of quality and variety is a tradeoff that depends on the elasticity of demand with respect to product quality vs. product variety. Other things equal, an increased responsiveness to quality via an increase in  $\beta$  shifts the balance toward higher investment in fewer products since broader audience products can take better advantage of economies of scale in increasing those investments. Note finally that an outward shift in the utility function via a fall in  $\lambda$  works to increase the marginal impact of increased investments on each consumer within the relevant product space—also moving the quality vs. variety tradeoff in favor of the former.

How do outcomes of the competitive models compare with those of the welfare optimum?

Total welfare is the sum of consumers' surplus over all consumers in the market, less the aggregate cost of producing all  $n$  products:

$$(8) W = 2n \int_0^{1/2n} E^\beta (1-\lambda \bar{x}) dx - n C_E E$$

Maximization w.r.t.  $E$  and  $n$  yields:

$$(9) E_w^* = [4\beta^2/\lambda C_E (1+\beta)^2]^{1/(1-\beta)}$$

$$(10) n_w^* = (\lambda + \beta\lambda)/4\beta$$

From (4) and (7), respectively:

$$(11) E_{\Pi}^* < E_w^*$$

$$(12) n_{\Pi}^* = 2n_w^* + \lambda/2\beta$$

where  $\Pi$  indicates the maximum profit outcome. Comparable to the results of Salop (1979), Waterman (1990), and Economides (1993) for other models based in the circular framework of monopolistic competition, variety tends to be overproduced, and individual firms underinvest in quality. Moreover, it is easily shown that  $E_{\Pi}^* n_{\Pi}^* < E_w^* n_w^*$ . That is, aggregate industry investment is also below the welfare optimum.

It is well-known that welfare results in differentiated product models are subject to the particular form of the demand function, and this model is no exception. Nevertheless, welfare results seem to give us little cause for concern that higher investments in themselves, even at the expense of variety, reduce welfare.<sup>6</sup>

Both the equilibrium and welfare results of the above model can be extended to a multiple input case with qualitatively similar findings.<sup>7</sup>

### III. Conclusions

Under plausible demand and cost conditions, either cost-reducing or quality-enhancing technological change may induce producers of information products to increase first copy (sunk cost) investments. In a competitive market, product variety may fall as a result of quality-enhancing technology, and may at least not increase as a result of cost-reducing technology. The implication of these results--that technological advance in information production may result in higher market concentration rather than market

---

<sup>6</sup> A caveat to this observation is the extent to which higher movie budgets reflect higher rents paid to talent. It is not clear, however, whether a similar phenomenon would accompany a shift toward higher variety for a given level of total production investments.

<sup>7</sup> See Waterman (2004).

fragmentation, parallels the finding of Berry and Waldfogel (2003) that larger market size fails to result in fragmentation in the case of daily newspapers because incumbent firms can undercut rivals by expanding product quality.

The novel feature of the models in the present analysis is simply that inputs (in the presented case, a single input) appear in both the firm's demand and cost functions. That is, inputs are potentially quality enhancing. Under those conditions, even a straightforward cut in the wholesale price of an input in the production process, for example, induces the firm to increase total outlays on that input. This occurs because it is not only cheaper to use, but higher use of the input is quality enhancing, in turn increasing demand.

Our basic findings apply to any product having setup costs and constant marginal costs of production in which quality is embodied in setup rather than incremental costs. We have not, however, dealt with a number of other typical characteristics of the primary object of our analysis--information products-- which can also affect market structure and welfare outcomes. In information industries such as computer software, for example, powerful network effects can enhance a tendency toward monopoly, and thus high cost products, at the expense of variety. Copying and piracy of information products are also factors. Other things equal, piracy and copying tend to reduce production incentives, reducing both quality and variety, although it is reasonable to suppose that these activities disproportionately affect relatively expensive, broad appeal products.

It is also evident that even apart from the welfare findings, our results are not necessarily robust to alternative specifications of the production (ie, demand) function. The basic relationship between production inputs and demand in our models, however, is straightforward and plausible, and thus suggest insights into whether certain developing technological changes--such as the cheaper digital cameras for independent filmmakers-- are likely to result in a need to make lower investments, resulting in higher variety, or *vice versa*. If cheap digital cameras simply reduce movie production costs, but offer few opportunities to increase production quality, their dominant result is likely to just be lower total production costs. If the dominant effect of such digital equipment is to create new opportunities to producers and directors to improve production values, the result

may in fact be higher quality with no fragmentation and possibly, increased concentration.

### References

- Baumol, W., and W. Bowen, *Performing Arts, the Economic Dilemma*, MIT Press, 1968.
- Berry, S. and J. Waldfogel, *Product Quality and Market Size*, Working paper 9675, NBER, May, 2003.
- Broderick, P. (2000), *Moviemaking in Transition*, *Scientific American*, November, p. 61-69.
- Carmichael, F., D. Thomas, and R. Ward (2000), *Team Performance: The Case of English Premiership Football*, *Management Decision Economics*, 21, 31-45.
- DeVany, A., & Walls, W. (1999). *Uncertainty in the Movie Industry: Does Star Power Reduce the Terror of the Box Office?* *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 23( 4), 285-318.
- Dixit, A., and J. Stiglitz (1977), *Monopolistic competition and optimum product diversity*, *American Economic Review* 67, p. 297-308.
- Eaton, B. C., and R. G. Lipsey, "Product Differentiation," in R. Schmalensee and R. Willig (eds), *Handbook of Industrial Organization* (Amsterdam: North-Holland), pp. 723-770.
- Economides, N. (1989), *Quality variations and maximal variety*, *Urban Economics and Regional Science*, 19, p. 21-29.
- Economides, N. (1993), *Quality variations in the circular model of variety-differentiated products*, *Urban Economics and Regional Science*, 23, 235-57.
- Eller, Claudia (2002), *Sony to Launch Feature Animation Unit*, *Los Angeles Times*, May 9, B3, p. 1
- Faulkner, R. and A. Anderson (1987), *Short-term projects and emergent careers: Evidence from Hollywood*, *American Journal of Sociology*, Vo. 92, No. 4, 879-909.
- Gubernick, Lisa (2003), *The Animation Revolution*, *Wall Street Journal*, June 27, p. W5.
- Hu, Q. (1997), *Evaluating Alternative Software Production Functions*, *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 23 (6), June, 379-387.

Korean Game Development and Promotion Institute (2003), *2003 Game Development Trend Analysis & Guide* (in Korean).

Korean Game Development and Promotion Institute (2002), *2002 Korean Game White Paper* (in Korean).

Kremer, M. (1993), The O-Ring Theory of Economic Development, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 108, August, 551-575.

Lancaster, K (1975), Socially Optimal product differentiation *American Economic Review* 65, Sept., 567-585.

Motion Picture Association of America (2006), U.S. Entertainment Industry: 2005 MPA Market Statistics.

Owen, B., and S.Wildman (1992), *Video Economics* (Harvard U. Press)

Kagan Research, *Motion Picture Investor* (monthly).

Ravid, S. (1999). Information, Blockbusters and Stars: A Study of the Film Industry. *Journal of Business*, 72(4), 463-492.

Salop, S. (1979), Monopolistic competition with outside goods, *Bell Journal of Economics*, 10, Spring, pp. 141-156.

Screen Digest, *Interactive Leisure Software, Global Market Assessment and Forecast to 2006*; March, 2002.

Scully, G.W. (1974), Pay and performance in major league baseball, *American Economic Review*, 6, 915-930

Shaked, A., and J. Sutton, Product Differentiation and Industrial Structure, *Journal of Industrial Economics*, Vol. 36, No. 2, December, 1987., p. 131-146.

Smith, S. P. & Smith, K. (1986). Successful Movies: A Preliminary Empirical Analysis. *Applied Economics*, 18 (5), 501-507.

Spectrum Strategy Consultants, *From Exuberant Youth to Sustainable Maturity: Competitiveness analysis of the UK games software sector*, Main Report, 2002.

Spence, A. M. (1976), Product selection, fixed costs and monopolistic competition, *Review of Economic Studies* 43, 217-235.

Spence, A.M., and B. Owen (1977), Television programming, monopolistic competition, and welfare, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 91, 103-126.

Sutton, J. (1991) *Sunk Cost and Market Structure*, Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Sutton, J. (2001), *Technology and Market Structure: Theory and History*, Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Varian, H. R. (1989), "Price Discrimination,"

Waterman, D. (1990), Diversity and quality of information products in a monopolistically competitive industry, *Information Economics and Policy*, 4, pp. 291-303.

Waterman, D. (2004), *The Effects of Technological Change on the Quality and Variety of Information Products*, paper presented at the NBER Conference on Economics of the Information Economy, May 7-8, 2004; Cambridge, MA).

Waterman, D. (2005) *Hollywood's Road to Riches* (Cambridge, MA:Harvard University Press)