LARGE FIRMS AND M&A

JAN EECKHOUT



UPF Barcelona

IFC Conference on Competition and Productivity

23-24 January, 2023

Any opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not represent the views of the U.S. Census Bureau. All results have been reviewed to ensure that no confidential information is disclosed. Data Management System (DMS) number: P-7083300, Subproject number: 7508369. Disclosure Review Board number: CBDRB-FY22-CED006-0027.

Large Firms: Size Distribution



Large Firms: Size Distribution



Which Size?



Which Size? Percentiles



Economic Profits



Economic Profits: Percentiles



Why Superstar Firms?

- 1. Mergers and Acquisitions
- 2. Technological Change
- **3**. Firm Strategies

M&A and the decomposition of markups



Trading off the Good and the Bad

Firm dispersion:

- + Reallocation towards more productive firms
 - Cost $\searrow \searrow$
 - Price \searrow
- Incomplete Passthrough: firms do not pass on all the efficiency gains to customers
 - Markup = Price/Cost \nearrow
 - Fewer competitors
 - Higher dispersion in technology
 - Deadweight loss

Technology and Intangible Capital

Rise in Overhead (SG&A): +40%



Widening Productivity Distribution – US Census Data



High investment, high profits (high productivity)



Firms manipulate market structure and size

What do firms do to affect market structure:

- 1. M&A: little evidence of synergies/complementarities $% \mathcal{A}$
- 2. Killer Acquisitions \rightarrow Florian

Kill competition; dry up talent; deny access to technology (Kiva and Amazon)

- 3. 'Create' stronger network effects: self-preferencing,...
- 4. Predatory Innovation: make technology not interoperable

5. Over-invest in innovation to manipulate market structure (Sutton 1991, 2001)

Innovation and Large Firms

1. Leaders over-invest in innovation when oligopolistic competition

- Deter entry
- Reduce innovation by followers
- 2. Followers under-invest or don't invest at all
- 3. Falling # competitors; sharp rise in dominant firms in 2000s

Innovation and Large Firms



Innovation and Large Firms

- 1. Leaders in markets over-invest in innovation
 - Deter entry
 - Reduce innovation by followers
- 2. Followers under-invest or don't invest at all
- 3. Falling # competitors; sharp rise in dominant firms in 2000s
- \Rightarrow Net effect:
 - 1. Superstar firms and increased firm dispersion
 - 2. Net investment in innovation is down: large welfare cost of 15% of GDP

Monopsony



Monopsony



Consequences of Market Power and Large Firms

The rise of dominant firms have an economy-wide impact (role of GE)

- Declining labor share
- Declining business dynamism
 - Labor reallocation
 - Startup rate
- Rising Wage Inequality

Labor Share



Business Dynamism: Job Reallocation



Business Dynamism: Startups



Wage Inequality: Superstar Pay



Wage Inequality: Superstar Pay



Wage Inequality: Superstar Pay



Policy: Large Welfare Effects (8% of GDP)

- 1. Split up firms?
- 2. Taxing profits: no effect on efficiency, except if strategic investm. affects mkt structure
 - Progressive profit taxation...
- 3. Only reducing economy-wide market power will reduce GE effects and inefficiencies:
 - M&A: panel discussion!
 - antitrust has limited tools to deal with externalities from economy-wide market power
- 4. Ex ante regulation (e.g. DMA): interoperability, regulate as utilities?

Policy: Large Welfare Effects (8% of GDP)

- 1. Split up firms?
- 2. Taxing profits: no effect on efficiency, except if strategic investm. affects mkt structure
 - Progressive profit taxation...
- 3. Only reducing economy-wide market power will reduce GE effects and inefficiencies:
 - M&A: panel discussion!
 - antitrust has limited tools to deal with externalities from economy-wide market power
- 4. Ex ante regulation (e.g. DMA): interoperability, regulate as utilities?
- $\rightarrow\,$ Antitrust policy as redistribution

LARGE FIRMS AND M&A

JAN EECKHOUT



UPF Barcelona

IFC Conference on Competition and Productivity

23-24 January, 2023

Any opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not represent the views of the U.S. Census Bureau. All results have been reviewed to ensure that no confidential information is disclosed. Data Management System (DMS) number: P-7083300, Subproject number: 7508369. Disclosure Review Board number: CBDRB-FY22-CED006-0027.