

A comparison of first price multi-object auctions

Katerina Sherstyuk*
University of Hawaii at Manoa†

June 16, 2007

Abstract

We compare multi-object English-type ascending price auctions with first price sealed bid auctions in private values environments with multi-object demands. Special attention is paid to the effect of closing rules on ascending auctions' outcomes.

JEL classification code: C92, D44

Key words: multi-object auctions; experiments

*Financial support by the University of Hawaii Foundation New Economy Research Grant is gratefully acknowledged. The ascending auctions experimental software used in this study was developed by Anil Roopnarine and David Porter. I would also like to thank Jeremy Dulatre for an excellent research assistance, and Sumner La Croix, Charles Plott, the Editor and two anonymous referees for very helpful discussions.

†Department of Economics, University of Hawaii at Manoa, 2424 Maile Way, Honolulu, HI 96822. Fax: (808)-956-4347; phone: (808)-956-7851; email: katyas@hawaii.edu.

1 Introduction

Multi-object auctions have been generating increasing interest among experimentalist due to both theoretical developments in auction theory, and to the growing use of multi-unit or multi-object auction mechanisms in practice, such as in government procurement and privatization programs and internet auctions. A large number of recent experimental studies focus on several important issues in multi-object auction design: demand reduction incentives in multi-unit demand environments (e.g., Alsemgeest et al., 1998; Kagel and Levin, 2001), possibilities of bidder collusion in multi-object auctions (e.g., Kwasnica and Sherstyuk, 2007), or efficient auction design in the presence of interdependencies in bidder valuations across objects (e.g., Bykowsky et al., 2000; Banks et al., 2003).

This study pursues simpler but important objectives. One is to compare efficiencies and revenue-generating properties of simultaneous multi-object first price sealed bid auctions and ascending bid English-type auctions in competitive environments. The choice of auction format and auction rules has implications for bidder behavior, and, therefore, for resulting efficiency and revenue of the auction. While auction formats other than first price sealed bid and pay-your-bid ascending English-type auctions are used in practice (e.g., Roth and Ockenfels, 2002), the formats we study are used commonly, and are often considered as competing alternatives in multi-object auction design (Goeree et al., 2006). Multi-object simultaneous English-type auctions range from large scale government spectrum auctions (McAfee and McMillan, 1996; Jehiel and Moldovanu, 2003), to silent charity auctions (Isaac and Schneir, 2005), to small scale online jewelry auctions (e.g., Bidz.com). Examples of multi-object first price sealed-bid auctions include many public procurement auctions (Lundanders and Nilsson, 2004). We focus constrain our attention on first price sealed bid and ascending bid English-type multi-object formats. To ensure that bidder value structure does not give a priori advantages to one auction format over the other, we study independent private values environments with multi-object demands. Further, to ensure a competitive environment, we investigate auctions with a fairly large number of bidders per market (four).¹

For single-unit auctions, Coppinger et al. (1980) have shown that sealed bids lead to higher prices and generate more revenue than English auctions. We check whether

¹In the presence of complementarities in bidder valuations, a simultaneous ascending auction format has been argued to have an advantage over the sealed bid auction in achieving efficient aggregation of complementary objects; e.g., McAfee and McMillan (1996). Further, while non-competitive behavior is always of a concern in multi-object settings, it has not been reported in no communication auction experiments with more than two bidders, unless a very specific valuations structure is imposed; see Kwasnica and Sherstyuk (2007), and Li and Plott (2005).

these findings generalize to multi-object demand environments. Such test of robustness of relative performances of sealed bid and ascending price auctions is important since new phenomena may emerge in a multi-object environment due, for example, to the presence of transaction or complexity costs for bidders in dealing with multiple objects (e.g., Isaac and Schneur, 2005), or due to possible emergence of new equilibria under certain multi-object auction formats (e.g., Brusco and Lopomo, 2002). Lunanders and Nilsson (2004) compare bidding behavior for multiple identical contracts in first price simultaneous, first price sequential and first price combinatorial auctions, under non-linear cost structures. Unlike Lunanders and Nilsson, we consider auctions for multiple heterogeneous goods with independent valuations. Goeree et al. (2006) compare the performances of first price simultaneous, first price sequential, simultaneous descending and simultaneous ascending auctions in various bidding environments with single-unit demand. They find that simultaneous ascending auctions are the most efficient, but at the same time they yield lower and more variable revenues than other auction formats. Unlike Goeree et al., we consider environments with multi-object demands.

The second objective of our paper is to consider effects of closing rules on ascending bid English-type auctions' outcomes. We compare ascending bid auction with the fixed auction duration, or the "hard" closing rule (AAH), and ascending bid auction with an activity-based, or "soft," closing rule (AAS). While the soft closing rule guarantees that bidding according to one's true value is an equilibrium in an English-type ascending auction, the hard closing rule guarantees that the auction ends "on time." Thus, the two formats may offer a trade-off between efficiency and time-effectiveness that are worth considering. Experimentalists have been aware of closing rule effects and often opted for soft closing rules since early auction experiments (e.g., Smith, 1964).² An activity-based soft closing rule was used in recent Federal Communications Commission simultaneous multi-object ascending auctions for spectrum licenses (McAfee and McMillan, 1996). However, the differences in performances brought in by the variations in the closing rules have not been documented in detail. Roth and Ockenfels (2002) and Ockenfels and Roth (2006) bring fresh interest to the auction closing rules with their analysis of end-of-period bidding

²All non-computerized double auction experiments employed an activity-based closing rule; a typical instruction to subjects, in its relevant part, read: "This [bidding] process continues for a period of time. You will be warned in advance before the market closes and more bids will be called for before actually closing" (Plott and Smith, 1978, p. 150). Smith (1979) used a soft closing rule in a public good auction mechanism. Early computerized double auction software by Williams (1980) imposed a maximal auction duration, but the auction duration could be shortened though traders' unanimous vote to end trading period (1980, p. 241). Multiple Unit Double Auction software by Plott (1991) allowed a choice between a hard and a soft closing rule.

in second price internet auctions. They suggest that the hard closing rule creates strategic incentives for late bidding, and present evidence of significant differences in bidding patterns between eBay and Amazon auctions that use different ending rules. Ariely et al. (2005) support the above findings with laboratory data from second price single-object experimental auctions. Similarly to Ariely et al., we consider the effects of closing rules on experimental ascending auctions performances. However, there are two significant differences from Ariely et al. First, we focus on first price, or pay-your-bid, rather than second price, ascending auctions.³ Pay-your-bid ascending auctions have an advantage of being more strategically transparent to bidders than second price ascending auctions, and in some cases an auctioneer may prefer to use a pay-your-bid ascending auction for this reason. Second, we focus on multi-object, rather than single-object auctions. The strategic rationale of bidding late in the auctions with the hard closing rule to avoid price wars, studied in Ockenfels and Roth (2006), fully applies to the pay-your-bid AAH auctions (both single and multi-object). In fact, simple incremental bidding is not always a best response or an equilibrium strategy in the pay-your-bid ascending auctions under the hard closing rule.⁴ Thus we investigate whether late bidding is characteristic to these AAH auctions, and whether such late bidding leads to lower prices. Yet another possibility is that bidders in AAH auctions delay bidding till the last moment, and then submit bids close to those in the sealed bid auctions. If all bidders ignore the possibility of end-of-auction bids not going through, and are all risk-neutral, then each bidder's expected payoff under such

³In a first price pay-your-bid ascending auction, the current highest bid for an object is publicly displayed and becomes the current price for the object. In a second price ascending auction, the current highest bid is not publicly displayed, and the current price for the object equals to the minimum bid increment above the previous highest bid. Thus traditional English-type ascending auctions where bids are solicited "from the floor" are technically first price auctions, even though their single-object versions are theoretically equivalent to second price (Vickrey) auctions in terms of their outcomes. Second price ascending auctions have become popular relatively recently with the emergence of online auction platforms such as eBay; see Roth and Ockenfels (2002). To complicate things, some online auctions offer bidders a choice to either bid "live", as in a pay-your-bid ascending auction, or to use a proxy bidding system and submit their maximal bid, as in a second price ascending auction.

⁴Following Ockenfels and Roth(2006), consider a two-bidder auction for one object in which bidder i follows an incremental bidding strategy: he starts with submitting the lowest possible bid m for the object; then does not bid as long as bidder i is the highest bidder; otherwise bids up by a minimal increment s if the object's price is below i 's value v_i . If bidder j uses the same incremental bidding strategy then j 's payoff is zero whenever $v_j \leq v_i$. If, instead, j does not bid till the very end of the auction and then bids $(m + s)$ when i does not have time to respond to j 's bid, then j 's expected payoff is $p(v_j - m - s) > 0$, where $p > 0$ is the probability of an end-of-period-bid going through. Hence, j 's best response may be not to bid until late. In general, if bidder values are i.i.d. drawn from a distribution $F(\cdot)$, and i 's value is unknown to j , then (assuming that i uses the above incremental bidding strategy) j 's expected payoff from incremental bidding is $F(v_j) \times (v_j - E(v_i | v_i \leq v_j))$, whereas j 's expected payoff from delaying the bid till the last moment is, as before, $p(v_j - m - s)$. Obviously, the lower is j 's value v_j and the higher is the probability p that the end-of-auction bid goes through, the more likely is j to benefit from end-of-period bidding.

strategy in AAH is equal to the payoff in the first price sealed bid auction, and therefore this strategy constitutes a (weak) equilibrium, supported by the threat of a price war if “early” out-of-equilibrium bids are observed. This gives us another reason to compare AAH ascending auctions with first price sealed bid (FPSB) auctions.

We find that, as in the single-object case, ascending bid English-type auction with the soft closing rule is more efficient but generates less revenue than first price sealed bid auction. Further, we observe significant differences in bidding dynamics and outcomes in ascending auctions with the hard and with the soft closing rules. The use of controlled laboratory environments allows us to investigate the effects of ending rules not only on timing of bids (as in Roth and Ockenfels, 2002, and Ockenfels and Roth, 2006), but also on resulting auction revenues and efficiencies. Ariely et al. (2005) report that revenues and efficiencies were somewhat lower in the second price auction with the hard closing rules. In our experiments, AAH result in significantly lower efficiency, and more volatile and somewhat lower prices than AAS. However, the AAH do take less time to run.

2 Description of institutions and research hypotheses

Three multi-object auction institutions are considered: first price sealed bid auctions (FPSB), simultaneous ascending auctions with the hard closing rule (AAH), and simultaneous ascending auctions with the soft closing rule (AAS). In all three institutions, several object are offered for sale simultaneously to a number of bidders. In FPSB, each bidder submits a sealed bids for each object that he or she may want to buy. Each object is then allocated to the highest bidder for that object, who pays own bid. In both variants of ascending auctions, each object is auctioned off via an ascending bid (English-type) auction in a separate market, with the markets run simultaneously for all object. In AAH, the auction duration is fixed; in AAS, the auction closes when no new bids are incoming for a given number of seconds. As in the FPSB, each object is then allocated to the highest bidder for that object, who pays own bid. All three institutions are tested in independent private values environments only.

We next state several competing hypotheses regarding comparative performance of the three institutions. The baseline hypothesis is based on the revenue equivalence theorem (Myerson, 1981; Riley and Samuelson, 1981). It ignores possible emergence of other-than-competitive equilibria due to the multi-object setting, as well as possible closing rule effects in AAH, and assumes risk neutral competitive (Bayesian and Perfect Bayesian for static and dynamic auctions, respectively) Nash equilibrium behavior of all bidders:

Hypothesis 0 (H0) *All three multi-object auction institutions, FPSB, AAH and AAS, yield the same price levels and efficiency.*

An alternative hypothesis focuses on possible differences between ascending and sealed bid auctions, and is based on earlier evidence from the single-object auctions:⁵

Hypothesis 1 (H1) *Multi-object FPSB yield higher prices and more revenue than either of the ascending auction institutions, AAH and AAS.*

Even if H0 does not hold due to differences between ascending and sealed bid auctions, we may expect equivalence between the two ascending auction institutions if the auction closing rule has no effect:

Hypothesis 2 (H2) *AAH and AAS auctions yield the same price levels and efficiency, which may be different from FPSB auctions.*

The remaining hypotheses focus on possible effects of auction closing rules on bidder behavior. First suppose that bidders in AAH try to delay price wars by bidding late, but then engage in sealed-bid-like price competition towards the end of the auction. If such bidders bid sufficiently late so that any feedback on competitors' bids is unavailable, but in time to get their bids in with certainty, then the outcomes in the AAH should be similar to the outcomes in FPSB auctions. In this case, AAH should not lead to suppressed prices in spite of the closing rule effect.

Hypothesis 3 (H3) *AAH yield the same price levels and revenues as FPSB auctions, which may be different from the AAS auction.*

An alternative hypothesis assumes an adverse effect of the hard auction closing rule on bidder competitive tendencies. Suppose some bidders strategically respond to incremental bidding by other bidders. Then under AAH, they may delay bidding till the last moment, and then bid near the end of the auction by some increment over the minimal (or the low outstanding) bid. Such bidding dynamics may result in suppressed prices and inefficient outcomes.

Hypothesis 4 (H4) *AAH yields lower prices and lower efficiency than AAS.*

⁵Explanations for the differences observed in the single-unit auctions include, for example, bidder risk aversion (e.g., Cox, et al., 1988), or bidder bounded rationality combined with the type of information feedback provided in FPSB auctions (Neugebauer and Selten, 2006).

The above hypotheses do not exhaust all possibilities, but they cover several cases of possible different rankings between the three institutions in terms of revenue and efficiency. The experimental design below allows to discriminate among these competing hypotheses.

3 Experimental design and procedures

Groups of four subjects participated in a series of simultaneous auctions for four objects, labeled A , B , C and D . Three treatments were considered in the experiment, which differed in the institutions used to allocate the objects: AAH, AAS and FPSB, as described in Section 2. The institution used and the group composition stayed the same throughout each session. The ascending auction sessions, AAH and AAS, involved an unpaid trial period followed by 15 paid periods. The sealed bid sessions FPSB involved 20 paid periods. The trial period in AAH and AAS and the first five periods in FPSB were used to familiarize the bidders with the institutions; the last 15 periods were used to compare actual performances of institutions.

The sealed bid sessions were semi-computerized, and the ascending auction sessions were fully computerized.⁶ In FPSB auctions, the sealed bids for each object were submitted by subjects manually and then entered into the computer program which returned resulting prices and allocations. The bidders were then informed about the auction outcomes in their group, and a new auction period started. In AAH and AAS, the bidders could bid on the computer on any or all four objects at any time once an auction opened for bidding; the bid was accepted provided that it was higher than the previous outstanding bid on that object. No minimal bid increment was imposed. All incoming bids were observable to all bidders in the market through the computer; the bidders could easily see whether they or someone else were the highest bidder on a given object. The bidding closed on all objects simultaneously. In AAH, each auction was open for bidding for four minutes (240 seconds). In AAS, the auction ended when no new bids had been placed on any of the four objects for 40 seconds. When the auction closed, each object was allocated to the bidder with the highest bid for that object. There was a one minute interval between auction periods.

Bidder valuations for the objects were integers between 1 and 100. Valuations were independently pre-drawn from the discrete uniform distribution for each period. To ensure better comparison across institutions, we used the same bidder value draws for the last

⁶The sealed bid experiments were semi-computerized instead of fully computerized due to the experimental software constraints at the time the experiments were conducted. We are unaware of studies that report significant differences between computerized and non-computerized first price sealed bid auctions.

15 periods of all three treatments. Under all treatments, bidders were allowed to bid over their value and to submit non-integer bids.

A total of 15 independent four-person groups participated in the experiments, with five groups per each treatment. The subjects were all undergraduates students at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, mostly from the College of Social Sciences. One or two four-person groups were run independently at the same time.⁷ The ascending auction sessions AAH and AAS were run for the maximum of 2.5-3 hours; in all but one sessions all 15 periods were completed; session AAS-2 ran out of time after completing 10 periods. The sealed bid sessions FPSB took about 1.5 hours each; all 20 auction periods were completed in each session. The exchange rate was US \$0.07 per experimental dollar, and the average per subject earnings were US \$27.45, including \$5 show-up fee.

4 Results: auction prices and efficiencies

The data from the last 15 periods of the three experimental treatments are summarized in Table 1, which presents summary statistics on auction prices, efficiencies, and bidder payoffs per auction, pooled by treatment. Table A1 (in the Supplementary Material section) gives more detailed statistics for each session. We compare the actual data with both the ascending auction (AA) and the sealed bid (FPSB) competitive predictions.⁸ Market efficiency, reported in the tables, is measured both in terms of the percentage of maximal gains from trade captured, and the percentage of auctions in which efficient allocations were achieved. Auction prices and bidder payoffs are reported in experimental dollars. Bidder payoffs are given by the differences between the highest bidder’s value and the price they paid in a given auction. The last three rows of Table 1 list p -values for the null hypotheses that the corresponding characteristics for each pair of treatments (FPSB and AAH, FPSB and AAS and AAH and AAS) are drawn from the same distribution (Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney test, two-sided). Unless otherwise stated, all non-parametric tests reported here use per session averages as units of observation.

TABLE 1 AROUND HERE

⁷Since all groups were run independently from each other, we will refer to individual groups as “sessions” below.

⁸Theoretical predictions listed in the tables are based on the actual bidder values for the periods completed in each session. In session AAH-5, no allocation was made in the first period due to computer problems; in session AAS-2, only ten periods were completed; all other sessions had all 15 periods completed. For this reason prediction differ slightly across sessions and treatments.

Figure F1 (in the Supplementary Material section) shows the dynamics of price deviations from the corresponding competitive predictions (risk-neutral Bayes Nash equilibrium predictions for FPSB auctions, and competitive English auction predictions for ascending auctions), pooled by treatment. For presentation convenience, the auction for each object is represented as a separate period in the figures. For example, periods 1,2,3,4 in the figure correspond to auctions for objects A, B, C, D in period 1. The actual periods are separated by vertical lines.

We first compare price levels, which are directly indicative of the auctioneer’s revenues, across the three institutions. We also look at price volatility relative to the competitive predictions.

Result 1 *In terms of price levels and revenues, the three treatments can be ranked as follows: FPSB > AAS > AAH. FPSB prices were significantly above the risk neutral Nash equilibrium prediction, AAS were at the equilibrium prediction, while AAH prices were below the prediction. AAH prices were also much more volatile than AAS prices.*

Support: Table 1; see also Table A1 and Figure F1 (in Supplementary Materials). The average price in FPSB treatment was 68.19 experimental dollars, as compared to 52.45 in AAH treatment and 60.15 in AAS treatment. The differences between FPSB and AAH, and between FPSB and AAS, are both significant at 0.8% level; the difference between AAS and AAH is marginally significant at 5.56% level.⁹ The average per session price deviations from the risk neutral Bayes Nash equilibrium prediction in FPSB is 7.73 experimental dollars, which is significantly different from zero at 0.14% level (*t*-test, two sided). The price deviation from the competitive English auction prediction in AAS is 0.80 experimental dollars, which is not different from zero at 39.1% level. The average per session price deviation from the competitive prediction in AAH is -6.95 experimental dollars, which is different from zero at 4.93% confidence level. Further, the price deviations from the competitive prediction were much more variable in AAH than in AAS (Figure F1): the standard deviation of price differences between the competitive predictions and the actual prices was significantly higher in AAH than in AAS (*p*-value for the test of no differences between AAH and AAS is 0.0080). □

Hence we can reject hypothesis H0 in the part regarding the price and revenue equivalence between the institutions. We confirm that the property of sealed bid auctions to

⁹We can show that the differences in mean prices between AAH and AAS treatments are mostly due to the early periods of the experiment. Indeed, by breaking the data into early periods (periods 1 to 7) and late periods (periods 8 to 15) we obtain that mean prices were significantly lower in AAH than in AAS in the early periods (*p*-value is 0.8%), but not in the late periods (*p*-value is 21.03%); see also Figure F1.

result in higher prices than ascending bid auctions carries over from one-object to multi-object environments. The robustness of the finding of Coppinger et al. (1980) is therefore established for our setting, and hypothesis H1 may be accepted based on our evidence. The ascending auctions with the soft closing rule yield outcomes right at the competitive equilibrium predictions; however, this is not so for ascending auctions with the hard closing rule. We obtain evidence of marginally lower and significantly more volatile prices in AAH auctions, against hypotheses H2 and H3 and in support of hypothesis H4.

We next compare the institutions in terms of efficiency.

Result 2 *Among the three treatments, AAS yield the highest share, and AAH yeild the lowest share of efficient allocations. In terms of gains from trade captured, the treatments can be ranked as follows: $AAS \approx FPSB > AAH$. The differences between FPSB and AAH and between AAS and AAH are statistically significant.*

Support: Tables 1, A1. AAS resulted in 95.71% of efficient allocations, as compared to 87.0% in FPSB and 72.97% in AAH. The average per session gains from trade in AAS and FPSB treatments are 98.71% and 98.57%, correspondingly, and are not statistically different according to Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney test (p -value is 0.4206); they are both significantly above the AAH gains of 93.6% (p -values are 0.0318 for the test between FPSB and AAH, and 0.0158 for the test between AAS and AAH). \square

Interestingly, we note that lower prices in AAH as compared to AAS do not result in significantly higher bidder payoffs, due to efficiency distortions:

Result 3 *Both ascending auction formats resulted in higher bidder payoffs than the FPSB auction format. The difference in bidder payoffs between AAH and AAS auctions is not statistically significant.*

Support: Tables 1, A1. Overall, bidder payoffs were the highest in AAH (23.30 experimental dollars on average), second highest in AAS (19.32 experimental dollars), and the lowest in FPSB (11.3 experimental dollars). However, the difference between AAH and AAS treatments is not statistically significant (p -value is 0.1508);¹⁰ the differences between AAH and FPSB, and AAS and FPSB, are highly significant (p -values are 0.008 and 0.0158, respectively). \square

¹⁰In periods 1-7, the difference between bidder payoff in AAH and AAS is marginally significant (p -value is 0.0556); however, it disappears completely in periods 8-15 (p -value is 0.5000).

We thus observe that ascending auctions with the soft closing rule (AAS) yield outcomes closest to the competitive equilibrium prediction both in terms of prices and efficiency. Sealed bid auctions (FPSB) result in inefficient allocations more often than AAS auctions, but interestingly we find that the efficiency losses are negligible. In contrast, we find that the use of the hard closing rule causes more volatile pricing which significantly reduces both the share of efficient allocations and the gains from trade. This gives additional evidence against hypotheses H0, H2 and H3, and in support of hypothesis H4.

In sum we can reject hypotheses H0, H2 and H3, and accept H1 and H4. Having obtained the evidence of adverse effects of the hard closing rule on the efficiency and revenue-generating properties in multi-object ascending auctions, we seek to uncover behavioral regularities behind these effects. Our next step is to analyze and compare the bidding dynamics in AAH and AAS auctions.

5 Bidding dynamics in ascending auctions

We consider the bidding dynamics under the two ascending auctions formats, AAH and AAS.¹¹ Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the bidding dynamics for one of the sessions for each treatment. Figure 1 displays bids in time in AAH-1 session, and figure 2 – bids in time in AAS-1 session. The horizontal axis shows time (in seconds), and the vertical axis shows bid values (in experimental dollars). Since bidding took place for multiple objects simultaneously, there may be multiple bids submitted at the same time.¹² Distinct time intervals with no bidding activity correspond to time breaks between periods.

FIGURES 1-2 AROUND HERE

Before turning to a formal analysis of the bidding dynamics, let us compare representative dynamics in AAH treatment (Figure 1) with AAS treatment (Figure 2) informally. Although both are characterized by overall bid increases in time within each auction period, there are several noticeable differences between AAH-1 and AAS-1 sessions. First, it appears that overall there were fewer bids submitted in AAH-1 than in AAS-1. Second, substantial amount of bids are concentrated towards the end of periods in AAH-1, while bids appear to be distributed more uniformly in time in AAS-1. Third, bids appear to increase slowly at the beginning of many periods in AAH-1, with bid increases accelerating

¹¹The bidding dynamics are pooled together across all four objects. Separating the analysis by object gives qualitatively similar results.

¹²There were also a number of instances where several bids for the same object came in at the same moment in time. In such cases all bids were accepted and recorded, and the highest bid became the outstanding bid.

towards the end of periods. In contrast, in AAS-1 most of the bid increases occur early in time, and bids increase slower towards the end. All three phenomena potentially indicate less intensive price competition in AAH as compared to AAS.

To see whether these preliminary observations have support in the data, consider the bidding dynamics, as well as auction duration, by session. Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of bidding dynamics by session and pooled by treatment. The last row of Table 2 lists p -values for the null hypothesis that the corresponding characteristics for AAH and AAS are drawn from the same distribution (Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney test, two-sided).

TABLE 2 AROUND HERE

Since AAH auctions had pre-set period durations, while AAS had a flexible period duration, we compare duration of bidding activity, rather than period duration itself, across treatments. For each auction period, the duration of bidding activity is defined as the time between the earliest and the latest bid in the period; this allows for a comparison between AAH and AAS treatments.

We first compare duration of bidding activity and overall bidding intensity, measured by the number and frequency of bids in time, in AAH and AAS auctions.

Result 4 *The AAS auctions took longer than AAH auctions. However, bidding competition was more intensive in AAS than in AAH auctions: there were more bids submitted per auction, and frequencies of bids in time were higher in AAS than in AAH auctions.*

Support: Table 2. The average duration of bidding activity in AAH was 207.66 seconds (about 3.5 minutes), as compared to 343.52 seconds (about 5.7 minutes) in AAS; the difference is significant at 3.18% level. The average number of bids per auction in AAH was only 25.03, as compared to 55.42 bids in AAS (significantly different at 0.8% level). The average time lag between any two bids in AAH auctions was 10.01 seconds, as compared to 6.5 seconds in AAS auctions (significantly different at 0.8% level). \square

Together with Result 1, this implies that the hard auction closing rule did have a detrimental effect on competitive tendencies in AAH. Of course one could suggest that prices lower than competitive occurred in AAH simply because naive incremental bidders raised their bids too slowly and did not have time to reach the competitive equilibrium levels within the allocated 240 seconds of bidding. However, this explanation can be rejected by observing that the frequency at which the bids were submitted was substantially lower in AAH than in AAS.

Next consider whether end-of-period bidding was in fact substantial in AAH auctions, as may be suggested by theoretical considerations and by Figure 1. Figure 3 shows bidding intensity within all auctions, for both treatments (left – AAH, right – AAS). For the purpose of better comparison, we normalized the duration of bidding activity to one for each treatment. The length of each bar on the figure is indicative of the total number of bids submitted within a certain time interval in the auctions.

FIGURE 3 AROUND HERE

Table 2 also displays the share of bids submitted in each quarter of bidding activity time, along with the share of bids submitted in the last 10% of the bidding activity time (which we call the end-of-period interval), and the average time lag between end-of-period bids.

As obvious from Figure 3 and Table 2, there was a drastic difference in the timing of bids between AAH and AAS auctions.

Result 5 *The timing of bids was significantly different between AAH and AAS treatments. There was a significant amount of end-of-period bidding in AAH auctions, but not in AAS auctions.*

Support: Figure 3 and Table 2. Figure 3 illustrates that in AAS, the bidding intensity was the highest at the beginning of the auctions and then decreased slowly but steadily as auctions progressed. In contrast, in AAH the bidding intensity was the highest at the beginning and at the end of the auctions, with relatively few bids submitted in between the beginning and the end. Figure 3 indicates at both the differences in the overall number of bids (more bids in AAS than in AAH) and in the timing of bids. To focus on the differences in the timing, we normalize overall bidding intensity in each auction to one, and then evaluate the distribution of bidding intensity within auction duration by treatment. For the data pooled by treatment, the hypothesis that the observed bidding intensities within auction duration in AAH and AAS are drawn from the same population is rejected at any significance level (p -value is zero for both Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Kruskal-Wallis tests).¹³ From Table 2, about 36% of bids were submitted in the first quartile of bidding time in both AAH and AAS auctions. For AAH, almost the same share of bids were

¹³These results are based on the bidding intensities pooled across all auctions of a given treatment. The pattern of bidding intensity was fairly homogeneous across AAH sessions: The hypothesis of no differences in distributions of bidding intensities among five sessions of AAH cannot be rejected according to Kruskal-Wallis test: p -value is 0.119. The individual sessions in AAS treatment were more heterogeneous (p -value is 0.000, for the same test); however, any sessions in AAS treatment exhibited less end-of-period bidding than any session in AAH bidding; see Table 2.

submitted in the last quartile (34.8%); in contrast, only 16.9% of bids were submitted in the last quartile in AAS auctions. 24.6% of all bids in AAH were submitted in the last 10% of the bidding activity time, as compared to only 7.4% for AAS; the differences are highly significant (p -value for the Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney test is 0.008). The average time interval between any two submitted bids decreased from 10.01 seconds to 2.89 seconds at the end of the auctions in AAH, whereas it increased from 6.50 seconds to 10.82 seconds in AAS.¹⁴ This indicates an increase in the bidding intensity at the end of the auctions in AAH, and a corresponding slow-down in bidding intensity at the end of the auctions in AAS. \square

We next compare the average size of bid increments in AAH and AAS treatments, and consider how it changed from the beginning to the end of an auction. Small bid increments throughout should provide evidence of incremental bidding; whereas large bid increments could indicate more aggressive or more erratic bidding, or, if exhibited towards the end of the auction, possible similarities with first-price-sealed-bid-auction-type strategies. Table 3 summarizes, by session and treatment, the average magnitude of the opening (first) bids in an auction, average bid increments within auction duration, and average end-of-period bid increments (submitted in the last ten percent of the bidding activity time). The table also gives the p -values for the null hypothesis of no difference between treatments (Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney rank-sum test), and for the hypotheses of no differences between the opening, average, and end-of-period bid increments (Wilcoxon signed rank test).

TABLE 3 AROUND HERE

Result 6 *AAS auctions were characterized by aggressive opening bids, followed by bids rising in small increments; bid increments decreased toward the end of the auction. In AAH auctions, bids were increasing in larger increments than in the AAS auctions, and the bid increments increased towards the end of the auctions.*

Support: Table 3. Although the magnitude of the opening bids was not significantly different between AAH and AAS treatment (p -value is 0.1508), the average bid increments were significantly higher in AAH (8.24 experimental dollars on average) than in AAS (4.07 experimental dollars on average), at the significance level of 0.8%. During the last 10% of bidding activity time (end-of-period), the AAH bid increments increased to an average

¹⁴Both differences are significant at 6.26% level according to Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed rank test, using per session averages as units of observations. The reported p -value is the lowest that may be obtained with for this sample size (five pairs of matched observations).

of 12.97 experimental dollars; in contrast, in AAS they decreased to an average of 1.95 experimental dollars. For both treatments, the p -values for the tests of no differences between before-end and end-of-period bid increments are 0.0626, the lowest that may be obtained for this sample size (Wilcoxon signed rank test). \square

Finally, we consider the incidence of incremental bidding and late bidding using individual-level data. Tables 4 and A2 (the latter in the Supplementary materials) summarize bidding characteristics in AAH and AAS by individual subject. Along with reporting the average by subject number of bids and the share of end-of-period bids, Table 4 reports two other individual characteristics. One is the share of incremental bids. We consider a bid incremental if either (i) it is an opening bid for the object, or (ii) it is not submitted by the current highest bidder, and the bid increment is no higher than 5 experimental dollars.¹⁵ This characteristic allows us to explore whether individual subject behavior in AAH and AAS was consistent with simple incremental bidding, as discussed in Section 1 above. We report the share of incremental bids by subject both before the period end, and at the end of the period. We also report how often (in what share of periods among all periods) each subject bid exclusively at the end of the period (denoted as “Late only bidding”).¹⁶

TABLE 4 AROUND HERE

Based on the individual data, we conclude.

Result 7 *Individual behavior in AAS auctions was overwhelmingly characterized by incremental bidding both early in the auction and at the end of the auction; the share of end-of-period bidding was negligible. In AAH auctions, the individuals submitted incremental bids less often overall, and the share of incremental bids decreased dramatically towards the auction end for all subjects. In many instances, subjects in AAH bid exclusively at the end of the auction.*

Support: Tables 4, A2. In AAS auctions, the share of incremental bids increased from 82.2% before the end of period to 95.0% at the end of period. For 15 out of 20 subjects,

¹⁵Ariely et al. (2005) report the share of bids submitted by current highest bidder as an indicator of non-incremental bidding. In our experiments, over 99.5% of all bids in AAS, both before the end and at the end of the auctions, are not submitted by the current highest bidder. For AAH, these percentages are 94.5% and 83.1%, correspondingly. Thus, except for the end-of-period bids in AAH, bidders in our experiments rarely bid on the object for which they are current highest bidder. We therefore use a stricter definition of incremental bidding which takes into account both who bids, and how large the bid increment is. The maximal bid increment of 5 experimental dollars used to define incremental bidding is chosen rather arbitrary; using 4 or 6 dollars instead gives qualitatively similar results.

¹⁶Table A2 provides more details on individual bidding characteristics. Reported statistics may differ somewhat between Tables 2, 3 and Tables 4, A2, since the averages in Tables 4 and A2 are weighted by individual.

100% of end-of-period bids were incremental bids. With the exception of one subject in two periods, no one engaged in late-only bidding in AAS. In AAH auctions, the average share of incremental bids dropped from 72.1% before the end of the period to only 32.7% at the end of the period; moreover, the share of incremental bids decreased at the end of the period for every subject (Table A2). On average, in 22.6% of the periods a subject in AAH did not bid until the end of the period; 70% of subjects did not bid until late at least in one period, and 30% of subjects did not bid until late in 45% of periods or more. □

We confirm that individual behavior was characterized by incremental competitive bidding in AAS, but was subject to very strong end-of-period effects in AAH. We can also show that end-of-period bidding in AAH increased with subject experience; thus, the share of end-of-period bids among all bids increased to 43.7% in periods 8-15 as compared to 36.8% across all periods (Table A2).¹⁷ Such bidder behavior in AAH is best explained by bidders trying to suppress price competition or delay it till the end of the auction. However, these attempts appear to be not fully successful, as can be inferred from relatively large bid increments of about 8 experimental dollars taking place throughout the process of bidding. Being followed by hectic end-of-period bidding with average bid increments of over 12 experimental dollars, such bidding dynamics in AAH resulted in somewhat lower than competitive and much more volatile prices, and no significant gains to bidders, due to distortions in allocative efficiency.

It is instructive to compare our findings with Roth and Ockenfels (2002), Ockenfels and Roth (2006), and Ariely et al. (2005), who study last-minute bidding in second price internet auctions. They show that (i) there is significant amount of late bidding in auctions that use a hard closing rule (eBay), but not in auctions that use a soft closing rule (Amazon); (ii) Bid increments increase at the end of the period on eBay, but not in Amazon; and (iii) End-of-period bidding on eBay increases with experience. We obtain similar findings for pay-your-bid experimental ascending auctions. However, much of the analyses and results are different because of the differences between first price pay-your-

¹⁷The above findings are confirmed by parametric estimations of both percentages and probabilities of incremental bidding as functions of closing rule, subject experience (approximated by the period number), individual value for the object, and end-of-period time interval. We confirm that incremental bidding increases at the end of period in AAS, and it decreases at the end of period in AAH. Subject experience has a significant negative effect on incremental bidding in AAH, but has no effect on incremental bidding in AAS. Bidder value for object has a pronounced negative effect on incremental bidding in both AAH and AAS, but the magnitude of the effect is much smaller in AAS. The estimations also show that there is significant heterogeneity among subjects in both AAH and AAS auctions. These findings are robust to various model specifications.

bid and second price ascending auctions. For example, Ariely et al. report that in their auctions with the soft closing rule, the number of bids per bidder decreases with bidder experience, a feature that is due to the second price nature of the auctions they study; in contrast, we observe that intensive incremental bidding in our pay-your-bid auctions with the soft closing rule persists with experience, leading to competitive pricing and highly efficient outcomes.

6 Discussion

In comparing three simultaneous multi-object pay-your-bid (first price) auction formats, we observed that simultaneous ascending auctions with the soft closing rule were the most efficient among these formats. Ascending auctions with the hard closing rule generated the lowest revenue and efficiency, while the sealed bids led to the highest revenue. Thus the revenue rankings between FPSB and ascending auctions, established earlier for single-unit auctions by Coppinger et al. (1980) and the literature that followed, are confirmed for the multi-object settings.¹⁸ We also observed significant differences in dynamics of two variants of ascending auctions, the differences that are apparently due to the differences in the auction closing rules. While the soft closing rule yields outcomes right at the competitive predictions, the hard closing rule generates incentives for delayed bidding, distorting both auction revenue and efficiency.

These results have several useful implications. First, the observed differences among multi-object formats may help auction designers to evaluate trade-offs between efficiency, revenue and time-effectiveness of these institutions in competitive environments with private values and no complementarities. Second, we document effects of auction closing rules on the dynamics and outcomes of ascending pay-your-bid auctions. Experimentalists have known for decades to avoid hard closing rules in their auction designs whenever possible. However, there are circumstances when one is tempted to use a hard closing rule. That could be, for example, to insure that auctions end “on time,” or to synchronize several auctions conducted in parallel. Further, hard closing rules are often used in practice; for example, silent charity auctions operate under hard closing rules.¹⁹ In other cases,

¹⁸Goeree et al. (2006) also find that first price sealed bid multi-object auctions yield higher revenue than ascending auctions, in bidding environments with single-unit demands.

¹⁹Isaac and Schneir (2005) point out that the multi-object simultaneous nature of non-computerized silent charity auctions together with a hard closing rule causes a certain revenue anomaly, due to a transaction cost to the bidders of following several objects at the same time. Bidders tend to stick around their favorite objects in the last few minutes of these auctions. A similar phenomenon may be present to some extent in computerized auctions. Isaac and Schneir also report that bid jumping, or bidding in large increments which is inconsistent with incremental bidding, is widespread in silent auctions.

auctions may operate under soft closing rules, but auctioneers themselves may not fully realize the connection between auction closing rules and incentives for late bidding.²⁰ We hope that this study will help to better understand the trade-offs between auction “speed”, revenue, efficiency, as well as incentives for late bidding induced by different closing rules.

References

- [1] Alsemgeest, P., C. Noussair, and M. Olson. 1998. Experimental Comparisons of Auctions Under Single- and Multi-Unit Demand. *Economic Inquiry* 36: 87-97.
- [2] Ariely, D., A. Ockenfels, and A. Roth. 2005. An experimental analysis of ending rules in Internet auctions. *Rand Journal of Economics* 36(4): 890-907.
- [3] Banks, J., M. Olson, D. Porter, S. Rassenti, and V. Smith. 2003. Theory, experiment and the Federal Communications Commission spectrum auctions. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 51(3): 303-350.
- [4] Brusco, S., and G. Lopomo. 2002. Collusion via signaling in simultaneous ascending bid auctions with heterogeneous objects, with and without and complementarities. *Review of Economic Studies* 69(2): 407-436.
- [5] Bykowsky, M., R. Cull, and J. Ledyard. 2000. Mutually destructive bidding: The FCC Auction Design Problem. *Journal of Regulatory Economics* 17(3): 205-228.
- [6] Coppinger, V. M., V. L. Smith and J. A. Titus. 1980. Incentives and behavior in English, Dutch, and Sealed-Bid auctions. *Economic Inquiry* 18: 1-22.
- [7] Cox, J., V. Smith, and J. Walker. 1988. Theory and Individual Behavior of First-Price Auctions. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 1: 61-99.
- [8] Goeree, J.K., T. Offerman and A. Schram. 2006. Using first-price auctions to sell heterogeneous licenses. *International Journal of Industrial Organization* 24(3): 555-581.

²⁰An online jewelry auction Bidz.com allows automatic extension for additional 15 seconds if a bid is placed in the last 15 seconds of an auction. Until recently, this auction operated as pay-your-bid auction, but has now introduced a proxy bidding system “AutoBid.” The explanation of how AutoBid works is as follows: “(1) Enter your Maximum Bid amount. (2) Enter the desired Bid Increment... AutoBid will bid for you to maintain you as the Winning Bidder... Autobid will begin outbidding others in the last 5 seconds of the auction.” An obvious consequence of such proxy bidding system is that most of the bidding activity starts at around 15 second before the originally scheduled auction closing time.

- [9] Isaac, R.M. and K. Schnier, 2005. Silent auctions in the field and in the laboratory. *Economic Inquiry* 43(3): 715-733.
- [10] Jehiel, P., and B. Moldovanu. 2003. An Economic perspective on auctions. *Economic Policy* April: 269-308.
- [11] Kagel, J. H., and D. Levin. 2001. Behavior in Multi-Unit Demand Auctions: Experiments with Uniform price and Dynamic Vickrey Auctions. *Econometrica* 69(2): 413-454.
- [12] Kwasnica, A. and K. Sherstyuk. 2007. Collusion and equilibrium selection in auctions. *The Economic Journal*, 117 (January): 120-145.
- [13] Li, J., and C. Plott. 2005. Tacit collusion in auctions and conditions for facilitation and prevention: Equilibrium selection in laboratory experimental markets. Caltech Social Science Working Paper No. 1223.
- [14] Lunanders, A. and J.E. Nilsson. 2004. Taking the lab to the field: Experimental tests of alternative mechanisms to procure multiple contracts. *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, 25(1), 39-58.
- [15] McAfee, R. Preston, and John McMillan. 1996. Analyzing the Airwaves Auction. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 10(1) (Winter): 159-175.
- [16] Myerson, Roger B. 1981. Optimal auction design. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 6: 58-73.
- [17] Neugebauer, Tibor, and Reinhard Selten. 2006. Individual behavior of first-price auctions: The importance of information feedback in computerized experimental markets. *Games and Economic Behavior* 54: 183-204.
- [18] Ockenfels, A., and A. Roth. 2006. Late and multiple bidding in second price Internet auctions: Theory and evidence concerning different rules for ending an auction. *Games and Economic Behavior* 55: 297-320.
- [19] Roth, A., and A. Ockenfels. 2002. Last-minute bidding and the rules for ending second-price auctions: Evidence from eBay and Amazon auctions on the internet. *American Economic Review* 92(4): 1093-1103.

- [20] Plott, Charles R. 1991. A computerized laboratory market system and research support systems for the multiple unit double auction. Caltech Social Science Working Paper No. 783.
- [21] Plott, Charles R., and Vernon L. Smith. 1978. An Experimental Examination of Two Exchange Institutions. *The Review of Economic Studies* 45(1) (February): 133-153.
- [22] Riley, J.G., and W.F. Samuelson. 1981. Optimal auctions. *American Economic Review* 71: 381-392.
- [23] Smith, Vernon L. 1964. Effect of Market Organization on Competitive Equilibrium. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 78(2) (May): 181-201.
- [24] Smith, Vernon L. 1979. Incentive Compatible Experimental Processes For the Provision of Public Goods. In: Smith Research, ed. *Experimental Economics*, Vol. 1. JAI Press Inc, Greenwich, Connecticut.
- [25] Williams, Arlington W. 1980. Computerized Double-Auction Markets: Some Initial Experimental Results. *The Journal of Business* 53(3), Part 1 (July): 235-258.

Table 1. Auction outcomes by treatment

mean (stddv)	Prices, experimental \$			Efficiency, %			Bidder Payoff, experimental \$		
	ACTUAL	AA PREDIC- TION	FPSB PREDIC- TION	% gains from trade captured	% efficient allocations	PREDIC- TION	ACTUAL	AA PREDIC- TION	FPSB PREDIC- TION
FPSB --all	68.19 (14.42)	59.12 (20.64)	60.46 (12.39)	98.57 (5.43)	87.00	100 (0.00)	11.30 (7.77)	21.50 (15.67)	20.15 (4.13)
AAH -- all	52.45 (16.69)	59.40 (20.60)	60.55 (12.40)	93.60 (14.76)	72.97	100 (0.00)	23.30 (15.67)	21.33 (15.65)	20.18 (4.13)
AAS -- all	60.15 (20.49)	59.35 (20.52)	60.48 (12.36)	98.71 (9.02)	95.71	100 (0.00)	19.32 (18.89)	21.29 (15.45)	20.16 (4.12)
p-value:* FPSB=AAH	0.0080			0.0318	0.0952	0.0080			
p-value:* FPSB=AAS	0.0080			0.4206	0.0952	0.0158			
p-value:* AAH=AAS	0.0556			0.0158	0.0080	0.1508			

* Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney test, two-sided

Table 2. Timing of bids

treatment	auction duration, secs	number of bids, count	mean lag, secs	end of period* lag, secs	Share of bids in time				
					Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	end of period*
AAH-all	207.66	25.03	10.01	2.89	0.363	0.154	0.136	0.348	0.246
AAH-1	212.87	26.40	8.80	2.95	0.349	0.152	0.132	0.367	0.248
AAH-2	206.53	24.07	10.96	2.57	0.452	0.142	0.104	0.303	0.254
AAH-3	210.40	26.20	10.06	3.77	0.310	0.126	0.143	0.421	0.258
AAH-4	204.23	20.08	11.33	2.39	0.356	0.151	0.131	0.362	0.245
AAH-5	204.29	28.43	8.87	2.76	0.346	0.198	0.171	0.285	0.226
AAS-all	343.52	55.42	6.50	10.82	0.369	0.259	0.203	0.169	0.074
AAS-1	210.13	36.33	6.05	9.67	0.416	0.242	0.180	0.162	0.077
AAS-2	600.40	106.90	5.72	9.17	0.305	0.280	0.241	0.174	0.064
AAS-3	334.13	48.20	7.11	12.28	0.354	0.262	0.210	0.174	0.072
AAS-4	289.87	47.33	6.33	12.60	0.385	0.272	0.201	0.143	0.065
AAS-5	283.07	38.33	7.32	10.37	0.387	0.238	0.182	0.193	0.091
p-value** for H0: AAH=AAS	0.0318	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.6904	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008

* end of period is defined as during the last ten percent of bidding activity time

** Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney test, two-sided

Table 3: Mean opening bids and bid increments, in experimental dollars

treatment	first bid	bid increment			p-value* for H0:	
		average within period	before end of period	end of period	firs bid= bid increment	before end bid incr = end bid incr
AAH-all	10.17	8.24	6.53	12.97	0.625	0.0626
AAH-1	16.68	7.81	7.18	9.42		
AAH-2	12.30	7.48	6.01	11.62		
AAH-3	1.75	7.83	5.52	14.65		
AAH-4	9.94	11.02	8.18	17.92		
AAH-5	10.20	7.05	5.74	11.22		
AAS-all	14.35	4.07	4.25	1.95	0.0626	0.0626
AAS-1	16.68	5.30	5.63	1.59		
AAS-2	2.95	2.20	2.26	1.35		
AAS-3	18.53	3.81	3.98	1.71		
AAS-4	13.13	4.20	4.37	2.03		
AAS-5	20.47	4.84	5.02	3.06		
p-value** for H0: AAH=AAS	0.1508	0.008	0.0158	0.008		

* Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed ranks test, two-sided

** Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney test, two-sided

Table 4: Individual bidding summary

mean stddv	No of subjects	Number of bids per period	End bids, share	Incremental bids*, share		Late only** bidding, share	% of subject who bid late only		
				before end of period	end of period		at least in one period	in 25% more	in 45% periods or more
AAH	20	6.72	0.368	0.721	0.327	0.226	70.00	40.00	30.00
		3.15	0.228	0.170	0.189	0.253			
AAS	20	14.09	0.067	0.822	0.950	0.005	5.00	0.00	0.00
		6.98	0.028	0.136	0.107	0.020			

* a bid is considered incremental if either (i) it is an opening bid for the object, or (ii) it is not submitted by the current highest bidder, and the bid increment is no higher than 5 experimental dollars

** late only bidding is defined as bidding exclusively at the end of period, that is, in the last ten percent of bidding activity time

Table A1. Auction outcomes by session

mean (stddv)	Prices, experimental \$			Efficiency, %			Bidder Payoff, experimental \$		
	ACTUAL	AA PREDIC- TION	FPSB PREDIC- TION	% gains from trade captured	% efficient allocations	PREDIC- TION	ACTUAL	AA PREDIC- TION	FPSB PREDIC- TION
FPSB -- all	68.19 (14.42)	59.12 (20.64)	60.46 (12.39)	98.57 (5.43)	87.00	100 (0.00)	11.30 (7.77)	21.50 (15.67)	20.15 (4.13)
FPSB-1	66.87 (16.36)	59.12 (20.78)	60.46 (12.47)	97.12 (6.46)	75.00	100 (0.00)	11.42 (7.84)	21.50 (15.77)	20.15 (4.16)
FPSB-2	68.80 (16.09)	59.12 (20.78)	60.46 (12.47)	98.31 (8.41)	86.67	100 (0.00)	10.40 (8.06)	21.50 (15.77)	20.15 (4.16)
FPSB-3	69.63 (12.15)	59.12 (20.78)	60.46 (12.47)	99.88 (0.93)	98.33	100 (0.00)	10.88 (7.14)	21.50 (15.77)	20.15 (4.16)
FPSB-4	65.08 (11.75)	59.12 (20.78)	60.46 (12.47)	99.20 (2.73)	90.00	100 (0.00)	14.85 (7.25)	21.50 (15.77)	20.15 (4.16)
FPSB-5	70.58 (14.86)	59.12 (20.78)	60.46 (12.47)	98.33 (4.90)	85.00	100 (0.00)	8.95 (7.52)	21.50 (15.77)	20.15 (4.16)
AAH -- all	52.45 (16.69)	59.40 (20.60)	60.55 (12.40)	93.60 (14.76)	72.97	100 (0.00)	23.30 (15.67)	21.33 (15.65)	20.18 (4.13)
AAH-1	60.43 (15.44)	59.12 (20.78)	60.46 (12.47)	98.31 (5.79)	90.00	100 (0.00)	18.78 (11.99)	21.50 (15.77)	20.15 (4.16)
AAH-2	49.75 (15.29)	59.12 (20.78)	60.46 (12.47)	94.07 (15.1)	75.00	100 (0.00)	26.82 (17.96)	21.50 (15.77)	20.15 (4.16)
AAH-3	45.18 (15.01)	59.12 (20.78)	60.46 (12.47)	90.36 (18.53)	61.67	100 (0.00)	27.52 (15.59)	21.50 (15.77)	20.15 (4.16)
AAH-4	53.22 (16.46)	59.12 (20.78)	60.46 (12.47)	91.99 (17.15)	70.00	100 (0.00)	21.23 (15.53)	21.50 (15.77)	20.15 (4.16)
AAH-5	53.77 (17.83)	60.63 (20.53)	60.92 (12.55)	93.25 (12.86)	67.86	100 (0.00)	22.05 (15.35)	20.61 (15.69)	20.31 (4.18)
AAS -- all	60.15 (20.49)	59.35 (20.52)	60.48 (12.36)	98.71 (9.02)	95.71	100 (0.00)	19.32 (18.89)	21.29 (15.45)	20.16 (4.12)
AAS-1	59.55 (20.16)	59.12 (20.78)	60.46 (12.47)	99.08 (4.44)	93.33	100 (0.00)	20.33 (16.06)	21.50 (15.77)	20.15 (4.16)
AAS-2	59.75 (19.94)	60.78 (19.90)	60.62 (12.32)	99.97 (0.20)	97.50	100 (0.00)	21.05 (14.85)	20.05 (14.13)	20.21 (4.11)
AAS-3	60.62 (19.64)	59.12 (20.78)	60.46 (12.47)	100 (0.00)	100.00	100 (0.00)	20.00 (14.38)	21.50 (15.77)	20.15 (4.16)
AAS-4	58.67 (20.72)	59.12 (20.78)	60.46 (12.47)	99.82 (1.22)	96.67	100 (0.00)	21.78 (16.49)	21.50 (15.77)	20.15 (4.16)
AAS-5	62.05 (22.23)	59.12 (20.78)	60.46 (12.47)	95.09 (18.6)	91.67	100 (0.00)	14.00 (27.70)	21.50 (15.77)	20.15 (4.16)

Table A2. Bidding dynamics summary by subject

Session	Subject ID	No. of bids per period		End bids, share		Late only bidding, share		Bid increment, exp \$		Bidding time lag, secs		Incremental bids*, share	
		all periods	8-15	all periods	8-15	all periods	8-15	before end	end of period	before end	end of period	before end	end of period
AAH-1	1	3.77	2.33	0.61	0.93	0.46	0.83	6.89	10.70	9.20	3.23	0.78	0.48
AAH-1	2	4.07	3.13	0.64	0.78	0.50	0.75	6.04	10.48	7.53	3.22	0.72	0.44
AAH-1	3	5.40	4.25	0.32	0.35	0.07	0.13	11.90	9.64	7.99	4.01	0.42	0.36
AAH-1	4	14.00	16.75	0.14	0.11	0.00	0.00	5.93	7.85	12.70	2.64	0.49	0.40
AAH-2	1	6.93	5.13	0.20	0.29	0.07	0.13	2.29	9.96	9.19	2.72	0.98	0.35
AAH-2	2	4.43	5.13	0.58	0.49	0.29	0.25	4.93	10.33	32.75	1.77	0.92	0.35
AAH-2	3	9.00	8.75	0.12	0.09	0.00	0.00	10.47	15.69	11.94	3.31	0.58	0.23
AAH-2	4	4.62	2.14	0.58	0.93	0.46	0.86	4.03	8.96	7.18	2.55	0.90	0.53
AAH-3	1	3.50	2.50	0.70	1.00	0.70	1.00	9.25	20.27	71.00	0.83	0.79	0.07
AAH-3	2	10.54	8.86	0.13	0.12	0.00	0.00	4.92	6.53	9.46	4.45	0.76	0.52
AAH-3	3	4.73	4.38	0.50	0.59	0.27	0.38	9.45	20.74	14.82	3.23	0.54	0.19
AAH-3	4	10.71	7.00	0.19	0.26	0.07	0.14	4.22	5.85	7.09	3.44	0.82	0.70
AAH-4	1	1.90	2.17	0.80	1.00	0.80	1.00	5.00	16.66	30.90	3.04	1.00	0.44
AAH-4	2	4.62	4.50	0.26	0.05	0.15	0.00	6.81	23.38	14.03	0.86	0.77	0.00
AAH-4	3	10.15	10.75	0.17	0.17	0.00	0.00	8.91	12.44	12.44	3.05	0.55	0.03
AAH-4	4	4.55	6.00	0.14	0.18	0.00	0.00	8.10	17.29	13.20	3.00	0.45	0.14
AAH-5	1	8.08	7.50	0.28	0.37	0.15	0.25	8.26	6.98	6.22	3.43	0.64	0.38
AAH-5	2	9.69	9.00	0.19	0.22	0.00	0.00	6.25	16.41	11.39	2.80	0.80	0.11
AAH-5	3	5.64	6.29	0.59	0.53	0.45	0.43	3.42	10.80	11.12	1.22	0.80	0.32
AAH-5	4	8.08	7.86	0.22	0.31	0.08	0.14	5.87	7.29	10.43	2.37	0.70	0.50
AAH mean		6.72	6.22	0.368	0.437	0.226	0.314	6.65	12.41	15.53	2.76	0.721	0.327
stddev		3.15	3.57	0.228	0.326	0.253	0.366	2.51	5.20	14.83	0.96	0.170	0.189
AAS-1	1	11.50	14.00	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.00	2.67	1.72	7.23	9.67	0.99	1.00
AAS-1	2	8.13	9.50	0.07	0.05	0.00	0.00	10.27	1.19	6.81	9.80	0.77	1.00
AAS-1	3	10.80	13.63	0.10	0.06	0.00	0.00	3.90	2.00	5.09	9.14	0.84	1.00
AAS-1	4	6.67	10.13	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	19.71	1.75	2.91	9.75	0.48	1.00
AAS-2	1	22.89	23.00	0.06	0.03	0.00	0.00	1.61	1.05	5.18	8.99	0.98	1.00
AAS-2	2	29.82	27.00	0.15	0.32	0.09	0.25	2.10	1.00	6.26	8.03	0.94	1.00
AAS-2	3	24.00	21.33	0.05	0.02	0.00	0.00	3.13	1.82	5.47	9.75	0.87	1.00
AAS-2	4	29.90	34.00	0.05	0.07	0.00	0.00	2.29	1.50	4.63	8.55	0.97	1.00
AAS-3	1	12.40	11.63	0.07	0.10	0.00	0.00	3.97	1.72	7.24	11.17	0.88	1.00
AAS-3	2	12.86	9.29	0.05	0.03	0.00	0.00	3.36	1.92	6.62	12.93	0.92	1.00
AAS-3	3	14.47	9.50	0.08	0.08	0.00	0.00	3.73	1.40	6.46	9.44	0.91	1.00
AAS-3	4	9.33	9.38	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.00	5.68	2.17	6.36	15.25	0.73	1.00
AAS-4	1	12.47	14.25	0.06	0.07	0.00	0.00	4.14	2.01	5.67	10.33	0.85	0.95
AAS-4	2	13.93	12.13	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.00	4.46	2.80	5.98	10.80	0.86	0.80
AAS-4	3	14.33	13.13	0.08	0.08	0.00	0.00	2.94	0.93	7.12	12.25	0.90	1.00
AAS-4	4	8.69	11.00	0.06	0.04	0.00	0.00	6.56	2.40	4.81	14.40	0.63	1.00
AAS-5	1	11.60	15.00	0.08	0.11	0.00	0.00	4.35	2.22	6.97	8.96	0.85	1.00
AAS-5	2	11.57	15.29	0.09	0.09	0.00	0.00	8.61	2.91	7.15	10.61	0.73	0.78
AAS-5	3	9.47	9.63	0.07	0.06	0.00	0.00	5.32	4.19	7.03	11.80	0.75	0.88
AAS-5	4	6.93	10.29	0.08	0.03	0.00	0.00	6.47	3.80	6.19	10.67	0.60	0.60
AAS mean		14.09	14.65	0.067	0.068	0.005	0.013	5.26	2.02	6.06	10.61	0.822	0.950
stddev		6.98	6.68	0.028	0.064	0.020	0.056	4.03	0.87	1.12	1.90	0.136	0.107

* a bid is considered incremental either (i) if it is an opening bid for the object, or (ii) if it is not submitted by the current highest bidder, and the bid increment is no higher than 5 experimental dollars

Figure F1: Price deviations from competitive predictions by treatment




Figure 1: bidding dynamics in AAH-1 session






Figure 2: bidding dynamics in AAS-1 session






Figure 3: Bidding intensity within auction duration, by treatment (AAH -- left, AAS -- right)

