Grantity MONOPOLISTIC Efficiency MONOPOLY PERECT COMPETITION OLIGOPOLY (D) identical products COMPENTION Productive MC=AC few firms in a market - sole seller -25% + share Allocative () Slight product differentiation @ many buyers & sellers MC = AR Causes of collusion: game theory e.g. prisoner's no barners to entry/exit (2) 1) imperfect into B Dynamic perfect information Supernormal profit in LR dilemma teaches us that communication no barress to entry (D) product differentiation leads to better outcomes O price takens (clashic Af curre) (3) high barriers to entry person 2 market P,) price makers confess dery price /costs/revenue indess (**5**, 5) (0,20) AC person (deny (1, 1)(20, 0) Collusion ourcome: firms act like a monopoly & С, 2, set high prices & low output. (OPEC) In the SP, same diagram as Draw a monopoly diagram AC monopoly. AR more elastic as > CMA quantity Here are weak subshitules. Causes of competitive objectives competition policy SHORT-Then, new firms enter as and laws preventing mergers etc. and four firms. Prafit maximisation: MC=MR High price, low quantity there are no barness to competing on NON-PRICE. prie entry so ther each firm's outcome: kinked demand cume SHORT-RUN US LONG-RUN AR shifts left firms can't rouse prices because P. () In the SR, firms can make supernormal profils they would lave most rales. AC by lowening costs. firms can't lower prices as ananhh (\mathcal{V}) As there is perfect information, and no barnens to entry, other firms would also reduce prices/ (= P. and supernormal pripts, new firms ENTER underaut AR (3) If new films enser, market supply increases and each If prices are rigid, non-price competition! (1) dynamic efficiency firms' demand (AR) decreases. - customer service 9 No supernormal profils in the LR. no supernormal profits in the LR. - task lack of p.e., n.e - quality - brand loyally () contestability 1) a.e. p.e (i) lack of p.e., a.e., d.e. (1) local monopolies! () no de 1) (1) depends on if competitive or allusire tootingtutors.co.uk