

COMPETITION IN THE COMPUTER INDUSTRY: ONLINE VERSUS RETAIL*

AUSTAN GOOLSBEE†

This paper estimates the price sensitivity of individuals' choice of whether to buy computers online versus in retail stores using a new data source on the computer purchases of more than 20,000 people. The paper first fits hedonic regressions for the retail price of computers in a local area and then examines how that price influences the probability of buying online. The results indicate that the decision is sensitive to the relative price of retail computers and it varies by type of customer and type of computer. Conditional on buying a computer, the elasticity of buying remotely with respect to retail store prices is about 1.5.

I. INTRODUCTION

ONE OF THE MOST important questions about Internet commerce is how much competition it provides with retail merchants. This is hard to answer, in practice, because most standard data sets do not include information about the Internet. In most sectors, online merchants make up only a small fraction of total sales (even for books, online sales account for less than 5% of the total market). Several recent papers have emphasized the large amount of price dispersion online in individual sectors such as books and music (see Brynjolfsson and Smith [2000]; Bailey [1998]; Clay *et al.* [2000]; or the review in Smith, *et al.* [1999]) and seemed to suggest that price competition online may not be particularly intense and that brand and other factors are quite important.

There has been little empirical work on direct competition between retail and Internet commerce (see Balasubramanian [1998]). One exception is Goolsbee [2000a] who finds that variations in retail prices caused by local sales tax rates seems to have a large impact on consumers' online buying patterns, suggesting that there is cross-channel competition. To understand the role of this cross-channel competition, though, more pre-

*I wish to thank Andrew Lee for excellent research assistance, David Genesove, Severin Borenstein, Judy Chevalier, Luis Garicano, Steve Levitt, an anonymous referee, workshop participants in the NBER E-Commerce group, and especially Scott Stern for helpful comments and the National Science Foundation and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation for financial assistance.

† Author's affiliation: Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago, 1101 East 58th Street, Chicago, IL 60637, USA.
email: goolsbee@gsb.uchicago.edu

cise estimates of the magnitude of cross-price sensitivity of demand across different venues are needed.

To do such estimation, however, requires data that is normally difficult to come by. First, one needs data on people's shopping patterns across retail and Internet channels for some type of good. Second, one needs data on the relative price across channels in many different local markets. Unfortunately, cross-market price data on individual goods is extremely rare.

Computers are the one type of good where the data are potentially sufficient to estimate such demand. Computer goods are the single largest category of retail goods sold online (Boston Consulting Group [1998]). In part this is an outgrowth of the well established mail-order trade in computers. Manufacturers such as Dell and Gateway have integrated their direct sales operations previously conducted through magazines and telephone into large online businesses.

The approach I take is to use a new micro data set on individual computer purchases and estimate the sensitivity of venue choice to variations in the relative price with a two-step procedure. First, I construct a price index for local retail computers in each of the 50 largest metro areas by fitting a hedonic regression on purchase price data by metropolitan area for computers that were bought in retail stores. I then estimate how much the individual pays for a computer as a function of the computer's characteristics, year dummies, and metro area dummies. Second, using the metro area dummies as a local retail price index for computers, I estimate a logit model for the discrete choice of where an individual bought a computer as a function of retail prices and of individual characteristics.

The results indicate that the variation in retail prices has a significant impact on the likelihood of buying directly from the manufacturer. Conditional on buying a computer, the elasticity of buying remotely with respect to the retail price is about 1.5.

The paper proceeds in four sections. Section II describes the role of the Internet in the computer industry and the data used in this paper. Section III presents the results from the hedonic regression and the creation of the local retail price index for computers in each market. Section IV explores the price sensitivity on online sales with respect to this price. Section V concludes.

II. DATA AND INDUSTRY BACKGROUND

II(i). *The Data*

The estimation relies on micro data on computer purchases from the December, 1998, proprietary mail survey of Forrester Research called *Technographics 99*. Forrester is a marketing research company specializing

in the information economy. The fieldwork for the survey was conducted by the NPD Group. NPD Group received survey data from about 90,000 American households on their ownership patterns for computers and other electronic goods. The sampling methodology is proprietary but is meant to ensure a nationally representative sample. More details on the Technographics program can be found in Bernhoff *et al.* [1998] or Goolsbee and Klenow [1999].

These data provide information on the demographics of all respondents including gender, race, income, education, age, whether they use a computer at work, whether they run a business from home, and their state and broadly defined metropolitan area of residence (specifically, what television market). They also answer whether they have a personal computer at home.

I include all people with a computer. For those with a computer at the time of the survey (conducted in December 1998), the survey asks how many computers they currently have, how many they have ever had, when they bought their first computer, and how often they use their computer. For their most recent computer, respondents answer where they bought it, how much they paid for it, and give a variety of characteristics of the computer such as the speed of the chip, whether they have a modem, a laser printer, and so on.¹ Note that these are for home computers and do not include business purchases.

II(ii). *The Computer Industry*

In 1999, there were more than 36 million PCs sold in the United States (InfoTech Trends, 2000). Most of these were to businesses but given that more than half of U.S. households have a PC in their homes, residential sales are also quite important.² For computer manufacturers, there are two main methods of selling to residential customers. The first is to market computers through distribution networks such as computer stores like CompUSA, electronics stores like Circuit City, general retailers or catalog merchants. The alternative is direct selling from the manufacturer to the consumer, usually either through an Internet site or through direct ads in computer magazines. The best known of these merchants are Dell and Gateway, though there are several others. Recently, Gateway has also

¹ For the work here, I will classify the respondent as a remote buyer if they say he bought his computer either 'direct from the manufacturer' or 'online.' I do this because it is common for customers of the large direct sellers of computers such as Dell or Gateway to use the Internet to customize a computer and get a price quote and then call on the telephone to place the order. This might be reported by the customer in either category. All of the other choices are from some type of retail store such as an electronics store or a computer store.

² Excellent discussions of the computer industry can be found in the work of Bresnahan, Stern and Trajtenberg [1997] or Bresnahan and Greenstein [forthcoming].

TABLE I
LOCATION AND BRAND DISTRIBUTION OF HOME COMPUTERS

<i>Location of Last Purchase</i>	<i>Percent of Total</i>
Computer Store	23.9
Electronics Store	23.0
Discount Warehouse/Membership Club	4.6
Office Superstore	3.8
Other Type of Retail Store	4.7
Direct, Catalog or Internet	29.6
Gift	10.3
<i>Brand of Last Purchase</i>	<i>Percent of Total</i>
Compaq	10.8
Packard-Bell	10.5
IBM	10.2
Gateway	9.5
HP	6.7
Dell	4.8
Acer	3.1
NEC	1.8
Toshiba	1.6
Other Brands	35.1
Unknown	5.8

Notes: Author's calculations using data from Forrester on computers purchased from 1996–1998.

opened computer stores of their own (Gateway Country stores) but this took place largely after this sample.

Table I illustrates the point with data from Forrester on the location of the most recent purchase for members of the sample and brand of the most recent computer for members of the sample from 1996 through 1998. The data indicate that of computer owners in the top 50 metro areas, about 60 percent purchased their last computer from some kind of retail store, with computer and electronics stores dominating the category. About 30 percent of computer owners purchased their last machine from a catalog, direct from the manufacturer or over the Internet, and about 10 percent received the computer as a gift. The proportion buying from a retail store has been slowly falling over time. In 1995, about two-thirds had bought their last computer at a store. By 1998, it was about 57%. Typically, the direct sellers appeal to a more informed consumer than does the computer store. The average computer owner who bought his last computer in a store, for example, has owned 2.0 computers in his lifetime whereas the average remote buyer has owned about 2.2.

The brands represented are familiar. Compaq, Packard-Bell, and IBM make up the largest sellers. That Gateway is larger than Dell is a bit surprising since Dell's sales are larger but this may be due to the focus here being on home computers as opposed to business, government, and educational sales. More than a third of the sample bought a brand that was not in this group of well-known sellers.

III. HEDONIC REGRESSIONS AND A LOCAL PRICE INDEX

Typically, hedonic studies of the computer industry (see Berndt, Griliches, and Rappaport [1995] or Berndt, Dullberger and Rappaport [2000] for results and guides to the literature) are based on list prices and not transaction prices. The Forrester data have the advantage of being transaction prices. They have the disadvantage, however, that they lack the same level of detail for the characteristics of the machine. Rather than having the actual MHz of the CPU, for example, the Forrester data has only categories such as 386, 486, Pentium, Pentium II, and so on.

I estimate the hedonic price indices by looking at buyers in the 50 highest population markets (chosen because they had sufficient observations to estimate the city fixed effects more precisely). The hedonic regression explains log prices for computers bought in retail stores as a function of dummies for the speed of the chip, dummies for the fourteen manufacturers, year dummies, and dummies for whether the computer was bought with a modem (and the type of modem), a printer, a scanner, extra memory, an expanded hard drive, and metropolitan area dummies.

Following the results of Berndt, Dullberger and Rappaport [2000] on the non-constancy of the parameters over time for certain characteristics of computers (and because some of the characteristics in the Forrester depend on the year—buying a scanner in 1994 means something quite different than buying one in 1998), I will also run a specification that includes interactions of the scanner, chip speed, modem, laptop, memory, and printer dummies with the year dummies. In doing these specifications and taking the metropolitan area dummies as a measure of the local price index, I am implicitly assuming that price differences across markets are constant across the sample and scale up the price of an identical computer in a multiplicative way. I will restrict the sample to computers bought in the period from 1996 through 1998 to reduce measurement error from recollection problems and so that the technologies remain roughly comparable across the sample.

Most of the coefficients on each characteristic have intuitive signs and plausible magnitudes. They are reported in column 1 of Table II. Faster chip speeds, the presence of a scanner, a modem, or a laser printer are associated with higher prices, for example. The year dummies suggest that the quality adjusted prices fell almost 15% per year in the period. This is smaller than the 25%–30% declines found in the list-price based hedonic regressions of the early 1990s (see Berndt *et al.* [2000]) but still sizable. In column 2, I add the year dummy interactions with the computer characteristics. Doing this effectively eliminates the year dummies on their own but the overall trend in prices remains large and negative. Though not listed to save space, the results indicate that the price premium for each type of chip falls over time, as does the laptop premium, and so on.

TABLE II
HEDONIC LOG PRICE REGRESSIONS

	(1) No Interactions	(2) Interactions	(3) Demographics	(4) Remote Sales
386 or less	-0.065 (0.027)	-0.109 (0.053)	-0.115 (0.053)	-0.187 (0.086)
486	-0.072 (0.019)	-0.063 (0.041)	-0.076 (0.041)	-0.110 (0.058)
Pentium	0.049 (0.021)	-0.050 (0.028)	-0.058 (0.028)	-0.149 (0.043)
Pentium II	0.138 (0.016)	0.119 (0.027)	0.104 (0.027)	0.049 (0.041)
Macintosh	-0.044 (0.059)	-0.039 (0.071)	-0.045 (0.070)	0.003 (0.073)
Modem	0.071 (0.029)	0.008 (0.050)	0.004 (0.049)	0.240 (0.054)
Scanner	0.031 (0.008)	0.028 (0.014)	0.023 (0.014)	0.030 (0.018)
Laser Printer	0.114 (0.030)	0.073 (0.039)	0.058 (0.038)	0.050 (0.045)
Laptop	0.156 (0.020)	0.173 (0.028)	0.152 (0.028)	0.312 (0.035)
Sales Tax	0.403 (0.452)	0.394 (0.451)	0.273 (0.451)	0.533 (0.671)
Extra Memory	-0.014 (0.009)	0.001 (0.015)	-0.005 (0.015)	0.001 (0.021)
Year 1995	0.271 (0.013)	0.022 (0.094)	-0.006 (0.093)	0.154 (0.106)
Year 1996	0.211 (0.011)	-0.035 (0.086)	-0.058 (0.085)	0.190 (0.100)
Year 1997	0.134 (0.010)	-0.098 (0.073)	-0.008 (0.079)	0.015 (0.084)
Education			0.004 (0.002)	
Income(/100)			0.129 (0.013)	
Age(/100)			0.104 (0.032)	
Other Dummies:	8 other hardware 13 manufacturers Gift Metro Area	8 other hardware 13 manufacturers scanner × year chip × year modem × year memory × year laptop × year printer × year Gift Metro Area	Race 8 other hardware 13 manufacturers scanner × year chip × year modem × year memory × year laptop × year printer × year Gift Metro Area	8 other hardware 13 manufacturers scanner × year chip × year modem × year memory × year laptop × year printer × year Gift Metro Area
<i>n</i>	9,391	9,391	9,327	9,391
<i>R</i> ²	0.13	0.14	0.16	0.14

Notes: The dependent variable in each of these regressions is the log of the price paid for the computer. The variables are defined in the text. The standard errors are in parentheses. The omitted chip category in the columns is 'don't know.'

The dummy variables for each metro area in these regressions are then used as an indicator of the price level in each location. Since they are in log terms, I take the exponent and then norm the price levels to be 1 in the 50th largest market (Providence, RI). The prices of the Internet/catalog computers are assumed to be the same across markets, so the local price effect is a measure of the relative price. The prices vary from 0.98 to 1.12 as listed in Table III. The correlation of the retail price index from this regression with the one from the regression shown in column (1) is 0.99. It is true that cities with low costs of living, such as Lancaster and Greensboro, tend to have low retail prices for computers but the index is also relatively low for cities with higher costs of living but a more

TABLE III
ESTIMATED RETAIL PRICE INDEX FOR COMPUTERS BY MARKET

Metro Area	Retail Computer Price Index	Metro Area	Retail Computer Price Index
Pittsburgh	1.118	Tampa	1.057
Norfolk	1.106	Memphis	1.056
New Orleans	1.103	Greenville	1.052
Grand Rapids	1.102	San Antonio	1.051
Orlando	1.101	NYC	1.048
Seattle	1.098	Sacramento	1.043
Detroit	1.097	Houston	1.040
Cincinnati	1.092	Indianapolis	1.040
Philadelphia	1.088	San Francisco	1.037
Milwaukee	1.080	Portland	1.037
Denver	1.079	Dallas	1.032
Birmingham	1.073	Atlanta	1.031
Miami	1.073	Nashville	1.026
Minneapolis	1.071	Boston	1.025
St. Louis	1.069	Columbus	1.022
Cleveland	1.069	Louisville	1.022
Baltimore	1.068	Kansas City	1.021
Albuquerque	1.067	Oklahoma City	1.019
Hartford	1.065	Charlotte	1.010
Chicago	1.065	Buffalo	1.006
San Diego	1.063	Phoenix	1.000
Washington DC	1.063	Providence	1.000
Salt Lake City	1.060	Lancaster	0.999
West Palm Beach	1.059	Raleigh	0.980
Los Angeles	1.058	Greensboro	0.976

Notes: These are the price indices computed from the results in Table 2 as described in the text.

information technology savvy populace such as Raleigh/Durham, Boston, and San Francisco, though Seattle is a notable exception. I will use this price index, derived from the more general model in specification (2), in the estimates below.

As this retail price index will form the core of the estimation, it is important to check that variations in it actually represent variations in local prices and not spurious factors that might also be correlated with the probability of buying online. The main fear in such regressions is that unobserved characteristics of a person's computer that tend to increase the price will show up as higher prices when they, in fact, represent higher quality. In markets where a large fraction of people buy machines with higher MHz, conditional on the type of chip, for example, or some other measure of quality that is unobservable in the Forrester data, the price index will appear higher, conditional on the observables but for the wrong reasons. If the types of places where people buy higher MHz machines, conditional on observables, are also the places where people tend to buy online and through catalogs (i.e., more sophisticated places), this will bias the results.

I take two different approaches to dealing with this potential problem. First, I add individual level demographic information including age, income, education, and race dummies to the pricing regressions in column 3. These variables should not have a direct impact on prices paid for identical machines (unless there is discrimination) but may be correlated with the taste for unobserved quality in the computers. Indeed, as shown in the table, these variables are significantly correlated with price. Better educated and higher income people tend to have higher prices, conditional on the same observable computer characteristics (although older people do, as well). The impact of these factors on the local retail computer price index, however, is very small. The correlation of the retail price index from this regression with that in the general model is 0.96.

A second, more direct test is to repeat the hedonic regressions but use the prices paid for computers bought direct from the manufacturer to get a local price index for remote computers. I do this in column 4. Since these prices are national prices, there should not be any local variation in the price of remote computers (save, perhaps for the tax term). To the extent that there are, these may be a measure of the unobservable quality premium in each city (i.e., a city with a higher index means that people buying remotely tend to buy higher quality machines with the same observables). Later I include this alternative remote computer price index as a control in the decision estimates to test for the presence of spurious correlation. A finding that higher local remote prices (which can only come about because of variations in the unobservables across cities rather than actual variation in prices in those cities) are correlated with the probability of buying remotely would be rather important evidence of a flawed approach. An interesting thing to note about the remote price index, now, however, is that it is uncorrelated with the retail price index (a correlation of -0.04).

IV. PROBABILITY OF BUYING REMOTELY VERSUS RETAIL

With this price index of local computer prices, I then use information on the individuals to examine their choices about whether to buy a computer remotely as a function of their observables and of relative prices in their area. Table IV lists the results from a logit regression of the $\{1,0\}$ decision of computer owners of whether they bought their computer remotely as a function of how many computers the individual has ever owned, when the person bought their first computer, how long they have had online access, whether this purchase was a laptop, whether the respondent has ever bought a non-computer product online, the number of cars and trucks in the household (which reduces the cost of retail shopping), race, age, education, income, whether they use a computer at work, year dummies,

TABLE IV
LOGIT MODELS OF THE DECISION TO BUY REMOTELY VERSUS RETAIL

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Retail Computer Prices	2.129 (0.548)	2.281 (0.562)	2.265 (0.565)	1.859 (0.548)
General Cost of Living		0.350 (0.112)	0.368 (0.122)	
Remote Computer Prices			-0.141 (0.401)	
Age	-0.010 (0.001)	-0.010 (0.001)	-0.010 (0.001)	-0.010 (0.001)
Education	0.077 (0.007)	0.079 (0.008)	0.079 (0.008)	0.079 (0.007)
Number of Automobiles	-0.082 (0.016)	-0.077 (0.016)	-0.077 (0.016)	-0.085 (0.016)
% MSA online				-2.966 (0.735)
% MSA own computer				1.981 (0.899)
<i>n</i>	20,724	20,326	20,326	20,724
Log Likelihood	-12433.3	-12164.8	-12164.7	-12412.7
Elasticity	1.55 (0.40)	1.66 (0.41)	1.65 (0.41)	1.37 (0.40)

Notes: The dependent variable in each column is a {0,1} indicating whether a computer owner's last purchase was made from a remote vendor. Each specification is estimated using a Logit model. The standard errors are in parentheses. The variables are defined in the text. Also included in each of the regressions are dummy variables for the year, the number of computers the individual has ever owned, the year they bought their first computer, the number of years they have been online, whether they have ever bought anything online, whether this computer was a laptop, as well as dummies for race, income, and gender. The elasticity is calculated at the mean of the covariates.

and the price index in the city. These controls are meant to account for individual technological sophistication.

Not surprisingly, people having bought computers in the past, having previously bought online, having higher income, and so on, are significantly more likely to buy directly from the manufacturer.

More importantly, however, prices are indeed positively and significantly correlated with the likelihood of a computer owner's having bought online or direct from the manufacturer. The marginal effect for a person with covariates at the mean levels gives an elasticity of 1.55 with standard error of 0.40 (i.e., conditional on buying a computer, an increase in retail prices of 1 percent raises the overall likelihood of buying remotely by 1.55 percent).

Next, to deal with the issue of whether the computer price index is merely picking up differences in the local housing or other costs of living, in column (2) I add the *Money* magazine 'Cost of Living Index' for the largest city in the metro area. This is a number equal to 1 in Columbus,

Ohio.³ The results indicate that higher local prices do make people more likely to buy computers online, separately from local computer prices, but that the effect of higher computer prices itself is still large and significant. The likelihood ratio test does reject the basic specification in (1) but the conditional cross-price elasticity here of 1.66 is still very close to the one calculated there of 1.55.

In column 3, as the test of whether this results from the spurious correlation between technological sophistication, unobservable computer quality in an area, and likelihood of buying remotely, I also include the local price index for remote purchased computers, as described above. The likelihood ratio test between the basic specification of column 1 rejects at the 5 percent level (but not at the one percent level) but only because of the cost of living measure. The coefficient on the remote price index is small, insignificant and of the wrong sign while the retail price index remains almost exactly the same size (the conditional cross-price elasticity is again 1.65) and the LR test did not reject when I included the remote price without the *Money* magazine cost of living.

To further test for the importance of local sophistication, in column 4 I include DMA-wide measures in addition to the individual control variables. They are the share of the (survey) population in the metropolitan area that owns a computer and the share that has access to the Internet.⁴ The results indicate that these do matter for the likelihood of the individual's buying remotely (interestingly, more Internet users increases the probability but, conditional on that, having more computer users in the area reduces it). Again, the likelihood ratio test rejects the basic specification but the estimated price sensitivity remains very close. The elasticity fell from 1.55 in the original specification to 1.37 here.

Next, in Table V, I address some other issues in the estimation and look at some extensions of the results. Once the buyers who use the Internet are taken out of the retail demand, the segmenting of customers could lead the price offline to change (in either direction). Brown and Goolsbee [2001] and Scott Morton *et al.* [2001] examine markets where changes to online search costs affect prices offline. This could lead to bias in the estimated elasticities here. I test this directly in columns 1 and 2 where I instrument for the retail price of computers using the local retail sales tax rate in the area calculated in Goolsbee [2000a]. To simplify this IV strategy, I do this in the context of a linear probability model. I repeat the basic specification in the first column (including the DMA propensities to own a computer and use the Internet as in column 4 of the previous table).

³ The sample size shrinks slightly because the *Money* magazine index was not available for all markets.

⁴ These are computed using the full Forrester sample. See Goolsbee and Klenow [1999] for evidence on the importance of local spillovers for the diffusion of computer technology.

TABLE V
LOGIT MODELS OF THE DECISION TO BUY REMOTELY VERSUS RETAIL

	(1) Linear Prob.	(2) I.V.	(3) Over Time	(4) Experience Level	(5) Computer Type
Retail Computer Prices	0.379 (0.112)	2.398 (1.225)	1.816 (0.692)	3.355 (0.858)	2.000 (0.562)
Retail Price [Year = 1998]			0.112 (1.108)		
Retail P [Inexp. User]				-2.501 (1.100)	
Retail P [Laptop]					-2.620 (2.431)
Other Variables	Age, Education, Number of Cars	Age, Education, Number of Cars	Age, Education, Number of Cars	Age, Education, Number of Cars	Age, Education, Number of Cars
<i>n</i>	20,724	20,724	20,724	20,724	20,724
<i>R</i> ² or Log Likelihood	0.054	-	-12412.6	-12410.1	-12412.1
Elasticity	1.24 (0.37)	7.84 (4.01)	1.32 (0.50)	2.43 (0.62)	1.45 (0.41)

Notes: The dependent variable in each column is a {0,1} indicating whether a computer owner's last purchase was made from a remote vendor. The first column is estimated using OLS. The second column is estimated using linear IV. The other specifications use a Logit model. The standard errors are in parentheses. The variables are defined in the text. Also included in each of the regressions are the DMA mean Internet usage and computer ownership as well as dummy variables for the year, the number of computers the individual has ever owned, the year they bought their first computer, the number of years they have been online, whether they have ever bought anything online, whether this computer was a laptop, as well as dummies for race, income, and gender. The elasticity in (3) is during 1996-97. The elasticity in (4) is calculated at the mean of the covariates but assuming the buyer is an experienced user. The elasticity in (5) is at the mean of the covariates but assuming it is a desktop buyer.

The elasticity at the mean here is 1.24 with a standard error of 0.37. I then instrument in the second column. The results indicate that the price sensitivity is much greater when instrumented, suggesting that retail prices do indeed tend to be notably higher when the remote prices are lower, perhaps documenting the segmentation effect.

In columns 3–5, I examine differences in the elasticity across time, across groups, and across computer types. In column 3, I allow the price sensitivity to differ in 1998 from the sensitivity in 1997 and 1996 to determine if price sensitivity is rising over time. The results do not indicate any change in price sensitivity in the later period. Column 4 examines the sensitivity of people buying their first or second computer versus people buying their third or greater computer. The results in Goolsbee [2000b] indicate that novice computer users are likely to be less price sensitive than experienced users. The results confirm that the probability of buying remotely is significantly more sensitive to retail price for experienced buyers. The elasticity at the mean of the covariates but assuming this was one of the first computers for the buyer would reduce the stated elasticity from 2.4 to 0.8. Similarly in column 5, the sensitivity of desktop buyers is much greater than laptop buyers. Indeed laptop buyers' relative price sensitivity is not significantly different from zero with a point estimate that is slightly negative. Each of these narrows the type of competition that exists between online and offline merchants and suggests that future work, where more data may be available, could explore the various segments in more detail.

V. CONCLUSION

This paper has used micro data on individual computer purchases to estimate local retail price indices for computer equipment and to use these price data to estimate the price sensitivity of computer purchases across different channels. The results are some of the first estimates of direct competition between online and conventional retailers and they suggest that there is significant competition in the case of computer equipment, especially for sales to experienced computer users and desktop buyers. The conditional cross-price elasticity, overall, of buying remotely versus buying in a store with respect to the retail price is in excess of one and suggests that online and offline sales of computers are unlikely to be truly separate markets.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, J., 1998, 'Intermediaries and Electronic Markets: Aggregation and Pricing in Internet Commerce', Ph.D. dissertation, Management and Policy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Balasubramanian, S., 1998, 'Mail versus Mall: A Strategic Analysis of Competition between Direct Marketers and Conventional Retailers', *Marketing Science*, 17(3), pp. 181–195.
- Berndt, E., Dullenberger, E. and Rapaport, N., 2000, 'Price and Quality of Desktop and Mobile Personal Computers: A Quarter Century of History', mimeo, MIT Sloan School of Management.
- Berndt, E., Griliches, Z. and Rappaport, N., 1995, 'Econometric Estimates of Price Indexes for Personal Computers in the 1990's', *Journal of Econometrics*, 68(1), pp. 243–268.
- Bernhoff, J., Morrisette, S. and Clemmer, K., 1998, 'Technographics Service Explained', *Forrester Report*, I, Issue 0.
- Boston Consulting Group, 1998, *The State of Internet Retailing*, Mimeo, BCG/Shop.org, November.
- Bresnahan, T. and Greenstein, S., forthcoming, 'Technological Competition and the Structure of the Computer Industry', *Journal of Industrial Economics*.
- Bresnahan, T., Stern, S. and Trajtenberg, M., 1997, 'Market Segmentation and the Sources of Rents from Innovation: Personal Computers in the Late 1980's', 28, 0, S17–S44.
- Brown, J. and Goolsbee, A., 2001, 'Does the Internet Make Markets More Competitive? Evidence from the Life Insurance Industry', *Journal of Political Economy*.
- Brynjolfsson, E. and Smith, M., 2000, 'Frictionless Commerce? A Comparison of Internet and Conventional Retailers', *Management Science*, 46(4), April.
- Clay, K., Krishnan, R. and Wolff, E., 2000, 'Pricing Strategies on the Web: Evidence from the Online Book Industry', mimeo, Carnegie-Mellon University.
- Goolsbee, A., 2000a, 'In a World Without Borders: The Impact of Taxes on Internet Commerce', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(2), pp. 561–576.
- Goolsbee, A., 2000b, 'Tax Sensitivity, Internet Commerce, and the Generation Gap', in Poterba, J. (ed.), *Tax Policy and the Economy*, Volume 14 (2000), pp. 45–66, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Goolsbee, A. and Klenow, P., 1999, 'Evidence on Learning and Network Externalities in the Diffusion of Home Computers', NBER Working Paper Number 7329.
- InfoTech Trends, 2000, '<http://www.infotechrends.com/cgi-bin/cif/sub_read.pl?ux=00&quar=99Q2&99239070.htm=on> accessed November, 15, 2000.
- Scott Morton, F., Zettelmeyer, F. and Rosso, S., 2001, 'Internet Car Retailing', NBER Working Paper Number 7961.
- Smith, M., Bailey, J. and Brynjolfsson, E., 1999, 'Understanding Digital Markets: Review and Assessment', in Brynjolfsson, E. and Kahin, B. (eds), *Understanding The Digital Economy*, MIT Press (Cambridge, MA).