

Transparency of Information and Coordination in Economies with Investment Complementarities

By GEORGE-MARIOS ANGELETOS AND ALESSANDRO PAVAN*

Economies with production externalities, demand spillovers, incomplete financial markets, and Keynesian frictions are only a few examples of those in which macroeconomic complementarities play a prominent role. Within this class of economies, how does the precision of publicly provided and privately collected information affect equilibrium allocations and social welfare? And what is the optimal transparency in the information conveyed, for example, by economic statistics, policy announcements, or news in the media? To answer these questions, we consider a simple real economy where the individual return to investment is increasing in the aggregate level of investment and where market participants have heterogeneous expectations about the underlying economic fundamentals (the exogenous productivity). We interpret an increase in the *transparency* of public information either as a reduction in the level of common uncertainty for a given level of idiosyncratic uncertainty (that is, an increase in the *absolute* precision of public information) or as a reduction in the heterogeneity of expectations across market participants for a given level of overall uncertainty (that is, an increase in the *relative* precision of public information).

We first consider an environment where complementarities are weak, so that the equilibrium is unique no matter the structure of information. As in Stephen Morris and Hyun Song Shin (2002), complementarities increase the sensitivity of equilibrium allocations with re-

spect to public information, which increases the volatility generated by common noise in market expectations. Moreover, when information is heterogeneous, an increase in the precision of public information may have the perverse effect of increasing aggregate volatility, by increasing the sensitivity of economic activity to common noise. On the contrary, an increase in the precision of private information necessarily reduces aggregate volatility. Nevertheless, we show that, as long as there is no value to lotteries, welfare unambiguously increases with an increase in either the relative or the absolute precision of public information. Hence, policies that either disseminate more precise information about economic fundamentals or reduce the heterogeneous interpretation of economic statistics and policy measures necessarily boost welfare. On the contrary, an increase in the precision of private information may reduce welfare by increasing the heterogeneity of expectations and thereby obstructing coordination in the market, in which case policies that discourage the private collection of private information may increase welfare.

Morris and Shin (2002) argued that, in environments with strategic complementarities and heterogeneous information, more precise public information can reduce social welfare, whereas more precise private information is always beneficial. We find rather the opposite. The difference in the results is due to an important distinction between the environments in the two models. Morris and Shin (2002) consider a kind of “beauty contest,” where the payoff of a player decreases with the distance between his own action and the action of others, but where this distance is irrelevant from a social perspective. It follows that the complementarity is present only at the private level, and hence the attempt of the agents to align their actions is socially wasteful. In this case, more transparent public information facilitates more effective

* Angeletos: Department of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 50 Memorial Drive, E52-251, Cambridge, MA 02142, and NBER (e-mail: angelet@mit.edu); Pavan: Department of Economics, Northwestern University, 2001 Sheridan Road, Andersen Hall Room 3239, Evanston, IL 60208-2600 (e-mail: alepavan@northwestern.edu). We are grateful to Narayana Kocherlakota for the invitation to prepare this paper. For useful comments, we thank Daron Acemoglu, Ricardo Caballero, Christian Hellwig, Bengt Holmstrom, and Ivan Werning.

coordination, which is valued by the market but not by society. In contrast, we consider environments where the complementarity is present at the social level so that effective market coordination is socially valuable, as is likely to be the case in economies with production and demand spillovers, network externalities, or incomplete financial markets. As shown in Angeletos and Pavan (2003), market participants use public information to align their investment choices, but not enough as compared to what is socially optimal, for they do not internalize the positive externality of their investment on the return to others. As a consequence, more transparent public information, by permitting more effective coordination in the market, necessarily increases welfare, despite the fact that it may lead to higher volatility.¹

In light of these results, we finally consider the possibility that complementarities are strong enough that multiple equilibria emerge for certain structures of information, in which case more effective coordination in the market need not always be socially beneficial. Indeed, there is a critical threshold for the transparency of public information above which multiple equilibrium levels of investment are possible. Above this threshold, the desirability of more effective market coordination and thus the welfare effect of more transparent public information depend critically on which equilibrium is selected. If the market coordinates on the socially desirable equilibrium, facilitating coordination is beneficial, and welfare tends to be maximized at high levels of transparency. If instead the market coordinates on the undesirable equilibrium, impeding coordination by introducing noise in public information can be welfare-enhancing.

This final result is related to Angeletos et al. (2003), where it is shown that, in coordination environments where a privately informed policymaker is interested in fashioning market outcomes, active policy intervention may lead to

policy traps, where the optimal policy and market outcomes are dictated largely by arbitrary self-fulfilling market expectations. In the present paper, we do not consider active policy intervention. Nevertheless, a similar trap emerges regarding the information disseminated by government agencies and central bankers: The optimal transparency depends on the aggressiveness or leniency of market expectations.

We conclude that, in the class of environments considered in this paper, noise in public information may be socially desirable only when there is a high risk that more transparency will introduce coordination failures.² Otherwise, the timely and frequent provision of public information seems warranted from a social perspective, even if that may lead to an increase in volatility.

I. Weak Complementarities

Preferences and Technologies.—The economy is populated by a (measure 1) continuum of agents, indexed by i and uniformly distributed over the $[0, 1]$ interval. Agents are risk-neutral with utility

$$(1) \quad u_i = Ak_i - \frac{1}{2}k_i^2.$$

We interpret $k_i \in \mathbb{R}$ as individual investment (or effort), A as the return to investment, and $k_i^2/2$ as the cost of investment. We let $K = \int_0^1 k_i \, di$ denote the aggregate level of investment.

Like John Bryant (1983), Russell Cooper and Andrew John (1988), Daron Acemoglu (1993), Jess Benhabib and Roger Farmer (1994), and others, we introduce a complementarity by assuming that the individual return to investment is increasing in the aggregate level of investment:

$$(2) \quad A = (1 - \alpha)\theta + \alpha K.$$

The random variable θ parameterizes the exog-

¹ In independent parallel work, Christian Hellwig (2003) and Guido Lorenzoni (2003), building on Michael Woodford (2003), examine monetary economies in which complementarities arise in pricing decisions. They also find that the Morris-Shin result about the social value of public information can be reversed. However, they do not show how the welfare effects of public information depend on whether market coordination is socially desirable.

² Matthew Canzoneri (1985), Alex Cukierman and Allan Meltzer (1986), Andrew Atkeson and Patrick Kehoe (2001), Nancy Stokey (2003), and others consider how the transparency of policy instruments relates to the ability of the market to detect policy deviations in Barro-Gordon environments where the government lacks commitment. Our approach is clearly orthogonal to that line of research.

enous return to investment (the underlying fundamentals of the economy) and the coefficient $\alpha \geq 0$ captures the degree of complementarity.

Finally, social welfare is given by a utilitarian aggregator, $w = \int_0^1 u_i di$. Using (1) and (2), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} w &= AK - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 k_i^2 di \\ &= (1 - \alpha)\theta K - (1 - 2\alpha) \frac{1}{2} K^2 - \frac{1}{2} \text{var} \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{var} = \int_0^1 (k_i - K)^2 di$ measures the cross-sectional heterogeneity in investment. Note that w is concave in K for $\alpha < 1/2$, whereas it is convex for $\alpha > 1/2$. In the latter case, lotteries would be welfare-increasing, and volatility in K would be desirable. Since we are interested in the canonical case where welfare is decreasing in both volatility and heterogeneity, we restrict $\alpha \in [0, 1/2)$. This also suffices for the equilibrium to be unique.³

Information and Transparency.—The fundamentals $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ are not known at the time investment decisions are made. Furthermore, agents have heterogeneous beliefs about θ . For simplicity, we let the common prior about θ be uniform over \mathbb{R} . We summarize the public information by a sufficient statistic z such that $z = \theta + \sigma_z \varepsilon$, where ε is standard normal, independent of θ and common across agents. Similarly, the private information of agent i is summarized by a sufficient statistic $x_i = \theta + \sigma_x \xi_i$, where ξ_i is standard normal, independent of θ and independent and identically distributed across agents; σ_z and σ_x parametrize the precision of public and private information, respectively.

Letting $\delta \equiv \sigma_z^{-2}/(\sigma_x^{-2} + \sigma_z^{-2})$ and $\sigma \equiv (\sigma_x^{-2} + \sigma_z^{-2})^{-1/2}$, the posterior belief of agent i about θ is normal with mean $\mathbb{E}_i[\theta] \equiv \mathbb{E}[\theta|x_i, z] = (1 - \delta)x_i + \delta z$ and variance $\text{Var}_i[\theta] \equiv \text{Var}[\theta|x_i, z] = \sigma^2$. Literally interpreted, the dependence of $\mathbb{E}_i[\theta]$ on x_i is the result of the observation of private signals about θ . More generally, how-

ever, x_i introduces idiosyncratic variation in market expectations about the fundamentals and may thus be read also as heterogeneity in the filtering and interpretation of commonly available information. In this sense, δ measures the level of conformity in market expectations, whereas σ measures the quality of available information.

In the following, we interpret an increase in the transparency of public information either as a reduction in σ_z for given σ_x (that is, an increase in the *absolute* precision of public information) or as an increase in δ for given σ (an increase in the *relative* precision of public information).⁴ What we have in mind is that the transparency of public announcements, policy measures, and news in the media may affect either the noise in publicly available information or the extent to which such information is interpreted differently across market participants. As will become clear, our results are not very sensitive to which of the two interpretations we adopt.

A. Equilibrium

Each agent chooses k_i so as to maximize $\mathbb{E}_i[u_i]$. It follows that the optimal investment is given by

$$(3) \quad k_i = \mathbb{E}_i[A] = (1 - \alpha)\mathbb{E}_i[\theta] + \alpha\mathbb{E}_i[K].$$

Individual investment is thus increasing in the expected level of the fundamentals and in the expected level of aggregate investment.

Given the linearity of (3) and the normality of posterior beliefs about θ , equilibrium investment decisions are linear, so that $k_i = \beta x_i + \gamma z$, where β and γ are constants determined in equilibrium. Then, $K = \beta\theta + \gamma z$, and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} k_i &= \mathbb{E}_i[A] \\ &= (1 - \alpha + \alpha\beta)[(1 - \delta)x_i + \delta z] + \alpha\gamma z. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\beta = (1 - \alpha)(1 - \delta)/[1 - \alpha(1 - \delta)]$ and $\gamma = \delta/[1 - \alpha(1 - \delta)]$. Clearly, this is the unique symmetric linear (rational-expectations)

³ The equilibrium is unique if and only if $\alpha < 1$. The case $\alpha \in [1/2, 1)$ is considered in Angeletos and Pavan (2003). In that case, introducing noise in public information can be desirable to the extent that this substitutes for the absence of socially valuable lotteries.

⁴ Note that δ is an increasing transformation of the relative precision of public information.

equilibrium. Furthermore, as proved in Morris and Shin (2002), when best responses are linear in $\mathbb{E}_i[\theta]$ and $\mathbb{E}_i[K]$, there do not exist equilibria other than this one.⁵

PROPOSITION 1: *The equilibrium exists, is unique, and is given by $k_i = \beta x_i + \gamma z$, where*

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta &= 1 - \delta - \rho \\ \gamma &= \delta + \rho \\ \rho &= \frac{\alpha \delta (1 - \delta)}{1 - \alpha (1 - \delta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\beta = 1 - \delta$ and $\gamma = \delta$ for $\alpha = 0$. The term ρ thus measures the excess sensitivity of equilibrium allocations to public information as compared to the case where there are no complementarities. Moreover, ρ is increasing in α . Stronger complementarities thus lead to a higher sensitivity of investment to public information. This is a direct implication of the fact that, in equilibrium, the public signal is a relatively better predictor of aggregate behavior than the private signal.

The equilibrium levels of volatility and heterogeneity are $\text{Var}(K|\theta) = (\gamma\sigma_z)^2$ and $\text{Var}(k_i|\theta, z) = (\beta\sigma_x)^2$, respectively, where β and γ are given by (4). This leads to the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 2: *(i) Volatility necessarily increases with an increase in δ for given σ , and increases with a reduction in σ_z for given σ_x if and only if $\sigma_z^2 > \sigma_x^2/(1 - \alpha)$. (ii) Heterogeneity falls with either an increase in δ or a reduction in σ_z .*

This result may suggest that transparency can be socially undesirable when it increases volatility. However, we will see that welfare necessarily increases with an increase in either the relative or the absolute precision of public information.

⁵ Note that, although the two models are different, the structure of the best responses is identical and so are the equilibrium strategies.

B. Welfare

We now consider social welfare evaluated at equilibrium. This is given by $w(\theta) = \frac{1}{2}\theta^2 - \frac{1}{2}\Omega$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &= (\beta\sigma_x)^2 + (1 - 2\alpha)(\gamma\sigma_z)^2 \\ &= \text{Var}(k_i|\theta, z) + (1 - 2\alpha)\text{Var}(K|\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Ω measures the welfare consequences of heterogeneity in individual investment and volatility in aggregate investment. Since $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$, welfare decreases with both heterogeneity and volatility. Furthermore, the relative weight on heterogeneity is increasing in α . This reflects the social value of coordination: The stronger the complementarity, the more important the alignment in individual investment decisions.

Using (4) and substituting $\sigma_x = \sigma/\sqrt{1 - \delta}$ and $\sigma_z = \sigma/\sqrt{\delta}$, we get

$$\Omega = \frac{(1 - 2\alpha) + \alpha^2(1 - \delta)}{[1 - \alpha(1 - \delta)]^2} \sigma^2.$$

It follows that $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ suffices for $\Omega > 0$ which leads to the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 3: *Welfare necessarily increases with either an increase in δ or a reduction in σ .*

That welfare decreases with σ for given δ follows directly from the fact that an increase in σ means an increase in both volatility and heterogeneity. On the other hand, as shown in Proposition 2, an increase in δ implies lower heterogeneity at the expense of higher volatility. To understand why the effect of lower heterogeneity dominates, note that social welfare under a utilitarian objective coincides with the expected utility of an agent. Suppose for a moment that there were no complementarity ($\alpha = 0$), in which case $\beta = 1 - \delta$ and $\gamma = \delta$. It follows that $\Omega = (\beta\sigma_x)^2 + (\gamma\sigma_z)^2 = (1 - \delta)\sigma^2 + \delta\sigma^2 = \sigma^2$, so that the expected utility of an agent depends only on σ , and not on δ . This result should be expected: An increase in δ given σ substitutes a higher precision in public information for a lower precision in private information, without altering the overall precision of information. When $\alpha = 0$, individual choices are not interdependent, and the decom-

position of information between private and public is irrelevant. When instead $\alpha > 0$, public information becomes more important than private information in predicting the return to investment, so that a substitution from private to public information raises the expected utility of an agent. In other words, an increase in δ raises welfare because it permits the agents to second-guess each others' actions better and therefore facilitates more coordination in the market.

We next consider the comparative statics of w with respect to σ_x and σ_z , which combine the effects of δ and σ . To this aim, we first rewrite Ω as

$$\Omega = \frac{\sigma_x^2 \sigma_z^2 [(1 - 2\alpha)\sigma_x^2 + (1 - \alpha)^2 \sigma_z^2]}{[\sigma_x^2 + (1 - \alpha)\sigma_z^2]^2}.$$

It follows that the next proposition holds.

PROPOSITION 4: (i) A reduction in σ_z necessarily increases welfare. (ii) A reduction in σ_x decreases welfare if and only if $\alpha > \frac{1}{3}$ and

$$\sigma_x^2 > \frac{(1 - \alpha)^2}{3\alpha - 1} \sigma_z^2.$$

Hence, more precise public information necessarily increases welfare. This is because a reduction in σ_z for given σ_x implies both better coordination (higher δ) and lower uncertainty (lower σ). On the contrary, more precise private information has an ambiguous effect on welfare. This is because a reduction in σ_x for given σ_z means lower uncertainty (lower σ) at the expense of lower coordination (lower δ). If the complementarity is sufficiently weak, so that there is little value to coordination, or if the relative precision of public information is very low, so that volatility is low compared to heterogeneity, the benefit of lower uncertainty outweighs the cost of lower coordination. Otherwise, a reduction in σ_x reduces welfare.

One can interpret σ_x as the amount of information collected privately by market participants. Given the precision of the information and the strategies of the other agents, an individual decision-maker always values more precise information. Hence, a lower σ_x is always beneficial from a private perspective. On the other hand, an agent may prefer other agents to have less precise private information, since this

would permit him to predict more accurately the aggregate level of investment. In other words, the private collection of information may create a negative externality, implying that a lower σ_x need not be beneficial from a social viewpoint. We can thus have a market failure in the amount of private information collected by individual agents, in which case government intervention that discourages the collection of private information may actually increase welfare.

Finally, our result that more transparency in public information increases welfare even though it may also increase volatility, contrasts with the result of Morris and Shin (2002). As we anticipated in the Introduction, the difference is due to the social value of coordination. In our model, the complementarity is equally present at the private and the social level.⁶ In Morris and Shin (2002), instead, there is an additional externality that perfectly offsets the complementarity at the social level. To see this, let $L = (\theta - A)K$ and suppose individual payoffs are $u_i = Ak_i - \frac{1}{2}k_i^2 + L$, in which case welfare reduces to $w = \int u_i di = \int (\theta k_i - \frac{1}{2}k_i^2) di$. This is the analogue of Morris and Shin (2002) in our setting. L is the externality that renders the social (gross) return to investment independent of K , thus removing the complementarity at the social level. It follows that the coordination motive is not warranted from a social perspective, in which case stronger complementarity or more transparent public information may decrease welfare by exacerbating this motive. If instead coordination is socially valuable, as is probably the case in economies with production or demand spillovers, network externalities, or incomplete financial markets, then more transparency is most likely to boost welfare.

II. Strong Complementarities

In this section, we consider environments in which the complementarity is sufficiently strong to induce multiple equilibria for some information structures. To capture this possibility, we now let

$$A = \theta + \mathbf{1}[K \geq r]$$

⁶ See also Angeletos and Pavan (2003) for further discussion.

where $\mathbf{1}[K \geq r]$ equals 1 if $K \geq r$ and 0 otherwise; $r \in (0, 1)$ represents the critical size of aggregate investment necessary for the complementarity to pay off. Without serious loss of generality, we let $r = 1/2$. For tractability, we also let the cost of investment be linear, so that

$$u_i = Ak_i - k_i$$

and constrain $k_i \in [0, 1]$.

Let $\theta \equiv 0$ and $\bar{\theta} \equiv 1$. If $\theta \in [\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta}]$ were common knowledge, both $k_i = 1$ and $k_i = 0$ for all i would be an equilibrium; the former coincides with the first best, whereas the latter represents a coordination failure. With heterogeneous information, the possibility of multiple equilibria depends on the transparency of public information, as we show next.

A. Equilibrium

An agent finds it optimal to invest $k_i = 1$ if $\mathbb{E}_i[A] \geq 1$, and $k_i = 0$ otherwise. We restrict attention to equilibria with monotonic strategies, in which case for every z there exists $x^*(z)$ such that $k_i = 1$ if $x_i > x^*(z)$ and $k_i = 0$ otherwise. Aggregate investment is thus increasing in θ and is given by $K(\theta, z) = \Phi([\theta - x^*(z)]/\sigma_x)$, where Φ is the standard normal cumulative distribution function. This implies that $K \geq r (=1/2)$ if and only if $\theta \geq \theta^*(z)$, where $\theta^*(z) = x^*(z)$, and therefore $\mathbb{E}[A|x_i, z] = \mathbb{E}[\theta|x_i, z] + \Pr(\theta \geq \theta^*|x_i, z)$, or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[A|x_i, z] &= (1 - \delta)x_i + \delta z \\ &+ \Phi\left(\frac{(1 - \delta)x_i + \delta z - \theta^*}{\sigma}\right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $k_i = 1$ if $x \geq x^*$, and $k_i = 0$ otherwise, where x^* solves $\mathbb{E}[A|x^*, z] = 1$. Combining this with $\theta^* = x^*$, we conclude that the equilibrium threshold x^* must solve

$$\begin{aligned} (5) \quad F(x^*; z, \delta, \sigma) &\equiv \delta(z - x^*) \\ &- \sigma\Phi^{-1}[1 - (1 - \delta)x^* - \delta z] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that the above always admits a solution. Let $\hat{\delta} \equiv \sqrt{2\pi\sigma}/(1 + \sqrt{2\pi\sigma})$ and let $\hat{\sigma}_z$ be the unique positive solution to $\sigma_z^2\sqrt{2\pi} = \sigma_x^2\sqrt{\sigma_x^{-2} + \sigma_z^{-2}}$. If $\delta < \hat{\delta}$, or equiv-

alently $\sigma_z > \hat{\sigma}_z$, then F is monotonic in x for all z , and thus the equilibrium threshold x^* is unique. F is instead nonmonotonic whenever $\delta > \hat{\delta}$, or equivalently $\sigma_z < \hat{\sigma}_z$. In this case, let $\bar{z}, \underline{z} = 1/2 \pm \{m - \Phi^{-1}(m)\sigma(1 - \delta)/\delta - 1/2\}$, where $m > 1/2$ solves $\Phi'(\Phi^{-1}(m)) = \sigma(1 - \delta)/\delta$, and note that $0 < \underline{z} < 1/2 < \bar{z} < 1$. For $z \notin (\underline{z}, \bar{z})$, (5) has a unique solution x^* . But for $z \in (\underline{z}, \bar{z})$, (5) admits three solutions, $x_{\text{low}}^* < x_{\text{medium}}^* < x_{\text{high}}^*$. The two extreme solutions represent stable equilibria; the intermediate one represents an unstable equilibrium, which we disregard.

PROPOSITION 5: (i) If $\delta < \hat{\delta}$ (equivalently, $\sigma_z > \hat{\sigma}_z$), or $z \notin (\underline{z}, \bar{z})$, there exists a unique threshold equilibrium: $k_i = 1$ if and only if $x_i \geq x^*(z)$, where $x^*(z)$ is the unique solution to $F(x^*; z, \delta, \sigma) = 0$. (ii) If instead $\delta > \hat{\delta}$ (equivalently, $\sigma_z < \hat{\sigma}_z$) and $z \in (\underline{z}, \bar{z})$, there exist exactly two stable threshold equilibria: In the first, $k_i = 1$ if and only if $x_i \geq x_{\text{low}}^*(z)$; in the second, $k_i = 1$ if and only if $x_i \geq x_{\text{high}}^*(z)$, where $x_{\text{low}}^*(z)$ and $x_{\text{high}}^*(z)$ are the lowest and highest solutions to $F(x^*; z, \delta, \sigma) = 0$.

A high level of transparency (high δ or low σ_z) may thus lead to multiple equilibria. When this is the case, the second equilibrium (x_{high}^*) is characterized by less aggregate investment than the first (x_{low}^*).

B. Welfare


The probability that a coordination failure is possible depends on the transparency of information. Indeed,

$$\Pr[z \in (\underline{z}, \bar{z})|\theta] = \Phi\left(\frac{\bar{z} - \theta}{\sigma_z}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{\underline{z} - \theta}{\sigma_z}\right)$$

increases with \bar{z} , decreases with \underline{z} , and decreases with σ_z for $\theta \in (\underline{z}, \bar{z})$. Moreover, $\partial \bar{z}/\partial \delta < 0 < \partial \underline{z}/\partial \delta$.

PROPOSITION 6: If $\delta > \hat{\delta}$ (equivalently, $\sigma_z < \hat{\sigma}_z$) and $\theta \in (\underline{z}, \bar{z})$, the probability of multiple equilibrium levels of investment increases with either a higher δ for given σ or a lower σ_z for given σ_x .

An increase in the level of transparency may thus decrease welfare by increasing the probability that the “bad” equilibrium is played.

FIGURE 1. THE EFFECT OF σ_z ON WELFARE

Unfortunately, it is impossible to characterize welfare analytically. We thus resort to numerical simulations.

The effect of σ_z on $w(\theta)$ is illustrated in Figure 1 for various values of θ . The solid lines represent welfare along the high-investment equilibrium, whereas the dashed lines represent

welfare along the low-investment equilibrium. In general, the welfare effects of transparency are neither monotonic nor homogeneous across θ . However, the effects tend to be small for sufficiently low or sufficiently high values of θ . We thus choose to concentrate on intermediate fundamentals.

Since $\sigma_z = 0$ restores common knowledge for any given $\sigma_x > 0$, and since the “good” equilibrium under common knowledge coincides with the first best, it is trivial that welfare is maximized at $\sigma_z = 0$. Therefore, provided that there is little risk of a coordination failure, full transparency is desirable. If instead the “bad” equilibrium is played whenever multiple equilibria are possible, welfare tends to decrease with a reduction in σ_z beyond $\hat{\sigma}_z$, in which case welfare is maximized at an intermediate level of transparency.

The patterns revealed by the examples of Figure 1 appear to be robust across a large number of simulations. Also, simulations of the welfare effect of δ give similar results and are omitted due to space limitations. We thus conclude that the following must hold.

PROPOSITION 7: *If the socially preferable equilibrium is selected with high probability whenever multiple equilibria are possible, welfare is robustly maximal at $\delta = 1$ for given σ , and necessarily maximal at $\sigma_z = 0$ for given σ_x . If instead the worse equilibrium is selected with high probability, welfare is robustly maximized at $\delta \leq \hat{\delta}$, or $\sigma_z \geq \hat{\sigma}_z$.*

III. Concluding Remarks

This paper has examined the welfare effects of public and private information in an economy with investment complementarities. If the complementarity is weak so that multiple equilibria are never possible, more transparency in public information increases welfare, despite the fact that it also increases volatility. This is because more transparency facilitates more effective coordination in the market, which is socially valuable given that the complementarity is present at the aggregate level. On the other hand, if the complementarity is strong so that multiple equilibria are possible for high levels of transparency, more precise public information facilitates more effective market coordination on either equilibrium. In that case,

“constructive ambiguity” becomes optimal when there is a high risk that the undesirable equilibrium is selected.

In Angeletos and Pavan (2003), we examine in more detail the properties of equilibrium and optimal allocations for economies with investment complementarities. We expect our insights to turn useful also in the analysis of other settings in which aggregate complementarities play an important role, such as economies with incomplete financial markets, Keynesian frictions, or network externalities.

REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, Daron.** “Learning About Others’ Actions and the Investment Accelerator.” *Economic Journal*, March 1993, 103(417), pp. 318–28.
- Angeletos, George-Marios; Hellwig, Christian and Pavan, Alessandro.** “Coordination and Policy Traps.” Mimeo, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2003.
- Angeletos, George-Marios and Pavan, Alessandro.** “The Value of Information and Coordination in Economies with Investment Complementarities.” Mimeo, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2003.
- Atkeson, Andrew and Kehoe, Patrick.** “The Advantage of Transparent Instruments of Monetary Policy.” National Bureau of Economic Research (Cambridge, MA) Working Paper No. 8681, 2001.
- Benhabib, Jess and Farmer, Roger.** “Indeterminacy and Increasing Returns.” *Journal of Economic Theory*, June 1994, 63(1), pp. 19–41.
- Bryant, John.** “A Simple Rational Expectations Keynes-Type Model.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, August 1983, 98(3), pp. 525–28.
- Canzoneri, Matthew.** “Monetary Policy Games and the Role of Private Information.” *American Economic Review*, December 1985, 75(5), pp. 1056–70.
- Cooper, Russell and John, Andrew.** “Coordinating Coordination Failures in Keynesian Models.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, August 1988, 103(3), pp. 441–63.
- Cukierman, Alex, and Meltzer, Allan.** “A Theory of Ambiguity, Credibility, and Inflation under Discretion and Asymmetric Information.” *Econometrica*, September 1986, 54(5), pp. 1099–1128.
- Hellwig, Christian.** “On the Aggregate Effects of Information Heterogeneity.” Mimeo, University of California–Los Angeles, 2003.
- Lorenzoni, Guido.** “Imperfect Information and Aggregate Demand.” Mimeo, Princeton University, 2003.
- Morris, Stephen and Shin, Hyun Song.** “The Social Value of Public Information.” *American Economic Review*, December 2002, 92(5), pp. 1521–34.
- Stokey, Nancy.** “Rules versus Discretion after Twenty-Five Years,” in Mark Gertler and Kenneth Rogoff, eds. *NBER macroeconomics annual 2002*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003.
- Woodford, Michael.** “Imperfect Common Knowledge and the Effects of Monetary Policy,” in P. Aghion, R. Frydman, J. Stiglitz, and M. Woodford, eds., *Knowledge, information and expectations in modern macroeconomics: In honor of Edmund S. Phelps*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.

This article has been cited by:

1. J.C. Elnaboulsi, W. Daher, Y. Sağlam. 2018. On the social value of publicly disclosed information and environmental regulation. *Resource and Energy Economics* **54**, 1-22. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Itay Goldstein, Liyan Yang. 2018. Good disclosure, bad disclosure. *Journal of Financial Economics* . [[Crossref](#)]
3. David P. Myatt, Chris Wallace. 2018. Information Use and Acquisition In Price-Setting Oligopolies. *The Economic Journal* **128**:609, 845-886. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Alessandro Gobbi, Jakob Grazzini. 2017. A basic New Keynesian DSGE model with dispersed information: An agent-based approach. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* . [[Crossref](#)]
5. Tetsuya Kasahara. 2017. Strategic Uncertainty in the Guessing Game and the Role and Effects of a Public Common Noise Player. *International Journal of Applied Behavioral Economics* **6**:2, 23-36. [[Crossref](#)]
6. QI CHEN, TRACY R. LEWIS, KATHERINE SCHIPPER, YUN ZHANG. 2017. Uniform Versus Discretionary Regimes in Reporting Information with Unverifiable Precision and a Coordination Role. *Journal of Accounting Research* **55**:1, 153-196. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Kohei Kawamura, Vasileios Vlaseros. 2017. Expert information and majority decisions. *Journal of Public Economics* **147**, 77-88. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Antonio Jimenez-Martinez. 2017. On Information Aggregation and Interim Efficiency in Networks. *Games* **8**:1, 15. [[Crossref](#)]
9. BERNARDO GUIMARAES, CAIO MACHADO, MARCEL RIBEIRO. 2016. A Model of the Confidence Channel of Fiscal Policy. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* **48**:7, 1363-1395. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Bahman Gharesifard, Behrouz Touri, Tamer Basar, Jeff Shamma. 2016. On the Convergence of Piecewise Linear Strategic Interaction Dynamics on Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **61**:6, 1682-1687. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Anil Arya, Brian Mittendorf. 2016. On the synergy between disclosure and investment beauty contests. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **61**:2-3, 255-273. [[Crossref](#)]
12. DIEGO MORENO, TUOMAS TAKALO. 2016. Optimal Bank Transparency. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* **48**:1, 203-231. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Romain Baeriswyl, Camille Cornand. 2016. The Predominant Role of Signal Precision in Experimental Beauty Contests. *The B.E. Journal of Theoretical Economics* **16**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
14. G.-M. Angeletos, C. Lian. Incomplete Information in Macroeconomics 1065-1240. [[Crossref](#)]
15. José Jorge, Joana Rocha. 2015. A PRIMER ON GLOBAL GAMES APPLIED TO MACROECONOMICS AND FINANCE. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **29**:5, 869-886. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Paul A. Groot, Sébastien Mittraille, Silvia Sonderegger. 2015. The costs and benefits of coordinating with a different group. *Journal of Economic Theory* **160**, 517-535. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Michal Szkup, Isabel Trevino. 2015. Information acquisition in global games of regime change. *Journal of Economic Theory* . [[Crossref](#)]
18. Andrew Williams. 2015. A global index of information transparency and accountability. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **43**:3, 804-824. [[Crossref](#)]
19. Taneli Mäkinen, Björn Ohl. 2015. Information acquisition and learning from prices over the business cycle. *Journal of Economic Theory* . [[Crossref](#)]
20. Achim Hecker, Tobias Kretschmer. 2015. Public R&D as a Standard-Setting Device. *Industry and Innovation* 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]

21. Takashi Ui, Yasunori Yoshizawa. 2015. Characterizing social value of information. *Journal of Economic Theory* . [[Crossref](#)]
22. Takashi Ui. 2014. The social value of public information with convex costs of information acquisition. *Economics Letters* **125**:2, 249-252. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Romain Baeriswyl, Camille Cornand. 2014. REDUCING OVERREACTION TO CENTRAL BANKS' DISCLOSURES: THEORY AND EXPERIMENT. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **12**:4, 1087-1126. [[Crossref](#)]
24. Ryan Chahrour. 2014. Public Communication and Information Acquisition. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* **6**:3, 73-101. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
25. David P. Myatt, Chris Wallace. 2014. Cournot competition and the social value of information. *Journal of Economic Theory* . [[Crossref](#)]
26. Antonio Jiménez-Martínez. 2014. Information acquisition interactions in two-player quadratic games. *International Journal of Game Theory* **43**:2, 455-485. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Andrew Williams. 2014. The effect of transparency on output volatility. *Economics of Governance* **15**:2, 101-129. [[Crossref](#)]
28. David P. Myatt, Chris Wallace. 2014. Central bank communication design in a Lucas-Phelps economy. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **63**, 64-79. [[Crossref](#)]
29. Camille Cornand, Frank Heinemann. 2014. Measuring agents' reaction to private and public information in games with strategic complementarities. *Experimental Economics* **17**:1, 61-77. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Felipe S. Iachan, Plamen T. Nenov. 2014. Information quality and crises in regime-change games. *Journal of Economic Theory* . [[Crossref](#)]
31. Luca Colombo, Gianluca Femminis. 2014. Optimal policy intervention, constrained obfuscation and the social value of public information. *Economics Letters* . [[Crossref](#)]
32. Xiaotong Li, Robert J. Kauffman, Feifei Yu, Ying Zhang. 2013. Externalities, incentives and strategic complementarities: understanding herd behavior in IT adoption. *Information Systems and e-Business Management* . [[Crossref](#)]
33. Gabriel Desgranges, Stéphane Gauthier. 2013. Asymmetric information and rationalizability. *Economic Theory* **54**:3, 789-804. [[Crossref](#)]
34. HONG QU. 2013. How Do Market Prices and Cheap Talk Affect Coordination?. *Journal of Accounting Research* n/a-n/a. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Hiroki Arato, Tomoya Nakamura. 2013. Endogenous Alleviation of Overreaction Problem by Aggregate Information Announcement. *Japanese Economic Review* n/a-n/a. [[Crossref](#)]
36. Torun Dewan, David P Myatt. 2012. On the rhetorical strategies of leaders: Speaking clearly, standing back, and stepping down. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* **24**:4, 431-460. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Marie Hoerova, Cyril Monnet, Ted Temzelides. 2012. Money talks. *Economics Letters* **116**:3, 617-621. [[Crossref](#)]
38. JONATHAN G. JAMES, PHILLIP LAWLER. 2012. Strategic Complementarity, Stabilization Policy, and the Optimal Degree of Publicity. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* **44**:4, 551-572. [[Crossref](#)]
39. D. P. Myatt, C. Wallace. 2012. Endogenous Information Acquisition in Coordination Games. *The Review of Economic Studies* **79**:1, 340-374. [[Crossref](#)]
40. ANDREW HERTZBERG, JOSÉ MARÍA LIBERTI, DANIEL PARAVISINI. 2011. Public Information and Coordination: Evidence from a Credit Registry Expansion. *The Journal of Finance* **66**:2, 379-412. [[Crossref](#)]

41. Achim Hecker. 2011. Specialization, implicit coordination and organizational performance: trading off common and idiosyncratic knowledge. *Review of Managerial Science* 5:1, 19-47. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Parimal Kanti Bag, Nona Pepito. 2011. Double-edged transparency in teams. *Journal of Public Economics* . [[Crossref](#)]
43. SILVIA SONDEREGGER. 2010. CENTRALIZED OR DECENTRALIZED INFORMATION: WHICH IS BETTER FOR PROVIDING INCENTIVES?. *Economic Inquiry* 48:2, 290-305. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Moez Bennouri, C. Robert Clark, Jacques Robert. 2010. Information provision in financial markets. *Annals of Finance* 6:2, 255-286. [[Crossref](#)]
45. N. Gregory Mankiw, Ricardo Reis. Imperfect Information and Aggregate Supply 183-229. [[Crossref](#)]
46. Christian Hellwig. Monetary Business Cycles (Imperfect Information) 181-188. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Mauro Roca. 2010. Transparency and Monetary Policy with Imperfect Common Knowledge. *IMF Working Papers* 10:91, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
48. George-Marios Angeletos, Jennifer La'O. 2010. Noisy Business Cycles. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual* 24:1, 319-378. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Christian Hellwig. 2010. Comment. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual* 24:1, 379-394. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Lorenzoni Guido. 2009. A Theory of Demand Shocks. *American Economic Review* 99:5, 2050-2084. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
51. Bei Lu, Yi Tan. The Economic Effects of Central Bank Communication 1-5. [[Crossref](#)]
52. TORUN DEWAN, DAVID P. MYATT. 2008. The Qualities of Leadership: Direction, Communication, and Obfuscation. *American Political Science Review* 102:03, 351-368. [[Crossref](#)]
53. Camille Cornand, Frank Heinemann. 2008. Optimal Degree of Public Information Dissemination. *The Economic Journal* 118:528, 718-742. [[Crossref](#)]
54. Christian Hellwig. Monetary Business Cycles (Imperfect Information) 1-7. [[Crossref](#)]
55. TORUN DEWAN, DAVID P. MYATT. 2007. Leading the Party: Coordination, Direction, and Communication. *American Political Science Review* 101:04, 827-845. [[Crossref](#)]
56. George-Marios Angeletos, Alessandro Pavan. 2007. Efficient Use of Information and Social Value of Information. *Econometrica* 75:4, 1103-1142. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Maria Demertzis, Marco Hoeberichts. 2007. The Costs of Increasing Transparency. *Open Economies Review* 18:3, 263-280. [[Crossref](#)]
58. George-Marios Angeletos, Alessandro Pavan. 2007. Socially Optimal Coordination: Characterization and Policy Implications. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 5:2-3, 585-593. [[Crossref](#)]
59. Stephen Morris, Hyun Song Shin. 2007. Optimal Communication. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 5:2-3, 594-602. [[Crossref](#)]
60. Laura Veldkamp. 2006. Uncertainty, policy ineffectiveness and long stagnation of the macroeconomy. *Japan and the World Economy* 18:3, 273-277. [[Crossref](#)]
61. LAURA L. VELDKAMP. 2006. Information Markets and the Comovement of Asset Prices. *Review of Economic Studies* 73:3, 823-845. [[Crossref](#)]
62. Lars E. O. Svensson. 2006. Social Value of Public Information: Comment: Morris and Shin (2002) Is Actually Pro-Transparency, Not Con. *American Economic Review* 96:1, 448-452. [[Citation](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
63. Stephen Morris, Hyun Song Shin, Hui Tong. 2006. Social Value of Public Information: Morris and Shin (2002) Is Actually Pro-Transparency, Not Con: Reply. *American Economic Review* 96:1, 453-455. [[Citation](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]