Introduction
 Data & Measures
 Effect on inequality
 Mechanism
 Robustness
 Conclusion

 000000
 000
 0000000
 0000000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000

The heterogenous effects of employers' concentration on wages: better sorting or uneven rent extracting?

Axelle Arquié, Julia Bertin,

CEPII

EEA 2022

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★□▶ □□ ◇◇◇

Introduction	Data & Measures	Effect on inequality	Mechanism	Robustness	Conclusion
●00000	000	0000000	0000000	000	00

Data & Measures

Effect on inequality

Mechanism

Robustness

Conclusion

When is labor market concentration high?

- When:
 - $1. \ \mbox{there}$ are few employers,
 - 2. the employment share of some employers is high (large employers)
- When a large employer increases his share of employment, or when medium- or small- sized employers leaves the market, labor market concentration increases
- Labor market concentration \Rightarrow market structure on the employers' side
- Measured with Herfindahl-Hirschmann index (HHI), HHD
 - DoJ and European commission benchmarks = above resp.
 0.25 and 0.2, product markets considered as very concentrated

Introduction	Data & Measures	Effect on inequality	Mechanism 00000000	Robustness	Conclusion
Research	questions				

- 1. Beyond the average, how does labor market concentration affect the distribution of wages and hence wage inequality?
 - Hypothesis ⇒ A rise in labor market concentration increases inequality
- 2. How can labor market concentration affect inequality?
 - Two mechanisms investigated ⇒ Sorting versus bargaining sensitivity

Introduction Da	ta & Measures E	Effect on inequality	Mechanism	Robustness	Conclusion
000000 00	0 0	000000	00000000	000	00

Literature

- 1. Labor concentration and average wage
 - Empirics: Azar, Marinescu, Steinbaum, Taska (2020), Rinz (2020), Marinescu, Ouss, Pape (2021), Bassanini, Batut, Caroli (2020)
 - Theory: Jarosch, Nimczik and Sorkin (2021): in more concentrated market, higher probability of re-encountering twice the same employer

2. Labor concentration and inequality

- Empirics: Rinz (2020): few measures, no study of mechanism
- Theory: ?
- 3. Sorting
 - Empirics: Card, Heining, and Kline (2016), Song, Price, Guvenen, Bloom, and von Wachter (2019): most change in wage inequality attributed to change in between-firm inequality rather to within-firm inequality, i.e. sorting
 - Theory: *Eeckout* (2018) for a literature review
- 4. Monopsony: Robinson (1933) Modern Monopsony
 - Manning (2003), Berger, Herkenhoff, Mongey (2021), Lamadon, Mogstad, Setzler (2021): unobserved idiosyncratic preference over non-wage job features

 Introduction
 Data & Measures
 Effect on inequality
 Mechanism
 Robustness
 Conclusion

 000000
 000
 000000
 0000000
 0000000
 000
 000

We explore two mechanisms

1. "Better sorting"

- With more concentration, employers can be + demanding in the selection process ⇒ More efficient sorting ⇒ higher productivity workers gather in higher productivity firm (positive assortative matching)
- Inequality and productivity increases

2. "Bargaining sensitivity"

- Lower-paid jobs wage + sensitive to labor concentration: better-paid jobs wage depends relatively more on factors other than market structure
- Inequality increases but no productivity gain

Introduction ○○○○○●	Data & Measures	Effect on inequality	Mechanism	Robustness	Conclusion
Contribut	tion				

1. Using a combination of IV and fixed effects, we quantify the effect of labor market concentration along the wage distribution and on wage inequality between jobs in France

 \blacktriangleright Quantification

- 2. We investigate mechanisms at play
 - We find evidence that increase in inequality brought by labor market concentration is not linked to a better sorting, which could increase productivity, but to a higher sensitivity of the bargaining position of the least paid jobs to employers' concentration

Introduction	Data & Measures	Effect on inequality	Mechanism	Robustness	Conclusion
000000	•00	0000000	0000000	000	00

Data & Measures

Introduction 000000	Data & Measures ○●○	Effect on inequality	Mechanism 00000000	Robustness	Conclusion
Data over	rview				

- French administrative employee-employers data, DADS-Postes (INSEE) + FICUS-FARE (INSEE): balance-sheet information -Annual data
- Mainland France + Corsica over 2000-2019
- 178 sectors, 304 CZ
 - To cover the whole period, we construct one unique sector classification (2 revisions of NAF: 2003, 2008), exclude: agriculture, extraction, public sector, financial intermediation
 List
 - We use the 2010 CZ classification for all the period

Data & Measures

Effect on inequality

Mechanism 00000000 Robustness

Conclusion

Definition of local labor market

- Local labor market: a sector in a Commuting Zone (CZ):
 - Example: the jobs in the rubber industry of the CZ including Béthune and 102 other '*communes*' make a local labor market
- We use sectors instead of occupations in main specification:
 - 1. Conceptual reason: we analyse between- and within- firm inequality, which makes more sense at sectoral level
 - 2. Data limitation: longer period covered with sectors, usable since 2009 only for occupations
 - 3. Worker mobility: similar using sectors or occupations, between 2017 and 2018, 7% of workers changed sector, 6.8% changed 3-digit occupation and 7.8% 4-digit occupation (DADS-Panel, authors' calculations)
- However, we conduct the analysis for robustness using occupations (3-digit and 4-digit) and results are similar

Introduction	Data & Measures	Effect on inequality	Mechanism	Robustness	Conclusion
000000	000	000000	00000000	000	00

Effect on inequality

Introduction	Data & Measures	Effect on inequality ○●○○○○○	Mechanism	Robustness	Conclusion
Specificat	ion				

• Level of analysis: CZ/sector/year level (304 CZ, 178 sectors, 20 years)

 $log(Ineq_{c,j,t}) = \beta * log(HHI_{c,j,t}) + X_{c,j,t} + Z_{j,t} + \alpha_{c,t} + \omega_{c,j} + \epsilon_{c,j,t}$

- Ineq_{c,j,t} is the Inequality Measure (in log) in CZ c, in industry j, at time t.
- $HHI_{c,j,t}$ is the HHI in CZ c, in industry j, at time t.
- X_{c,j,t} is a vector of controls (CZ/sector/year)
- Z_{j,t} is a vector of controls (sector/year)
- Standard error are clustered at the CZ level

 Introduction
 Data & Measures
 Effect on inequality
 Mechanism
 Robustness
 Conclusion

 000000
 000
 0000000
 00000000
 00000000
 000000000

Concerns for identification

- Local decline in economic activity, job polarization and product market concentration can affect both labor market concentration and wage inequality
- To mitigate those concerns, our controls include:
 - 1. Controls at local labor market * year level
 - Average age of employees, average firm size, and average number of employees (size of the market)
 - Polarization
 - 2. Controls at the sector * year level
 - Labor productivity of the sector, each year
 - 3. Fixed effect at the CZ * year level

 Introduction
 Data & Measures
 Effect on inequality
 Mechanism
 Robustness
 Conclusion

 000000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000

Possible bias: local heterogenous productivity shock

- Local positive productivity shock benefiting only the larger firms (likely if larger firms are the most innovative ones):
 - Can increase concentration as already larger firms become even bigger and increase their share of employment + if smaller, lower-productivity, firms exit ⇒ concentration increases
 - Can decrease inequality if smaller, lower-productivity, firms exit
 : destruction of lower-paid jobs ⇒ inequality between remaining job decreases
- To deal with this omitted variable bias, we use an instrument

troduction	Data & Measures	Effect on inequality	Mechanism	Robustness	Conclusion
00000	000	0000000	0000000	000	00

Instrument

In

 Instrument = employment-weighted average HHI within the same industry across other commuting zones

 First Stage

$$HHI^{-c}_{j,t} = \frac{\sum_{z \neq c} (HHI_{z,j,t} * empl_{z,j,t})}{\sum_{z \neq c} empl_{z,j,t}}$$

- Instrument captures sectoral changes that can affect local HHI through:
 - 1. Change in production function (ex: fixed cost) \Rightarrow might require employers to concentrate more or less
 - 2. Financial factors affecting mergers and hence employers' concentration
- Eliminates local forces shaping concentration:
 - $1. \ \ {\rm Local \ heterogeneous \ productivity \ shock}$
 - 2. Change in economic dynamism of the local labor market

Data & Measures

Effect on inequality

Mechanism

Robustness

Conclusion

Labor market concentration decreases average wage

	Maari			
	(1)	ean (o)		
	(1)	(2)		
	OLS	IV		
HHI employment (log, mkt)	0.030***	-0.058***		
	(0.003)	(0.010)		
Lab. prod. (mean log, sect)	0.028***	0.023***		
	(0.002)	(0.002)		
HHI sales (log, sect)	0.002***	0.003***		
	(0.001)	(0.001)		
Average age (mkt)	0.013***	0.014***		
	(0.000)	(0.000)		
Market size (log, mkt), post	-0.061***	-0.064***		
	(0.005)	(0.005)		
Firm size (mean log, mkt), decl. eff	0.076***	0.029***		
· - /	(0.003)	(0.004)		
Polarization	0.012***	0.007***		
	(0.002)	(0.002)		
CZ year FE	Yes	Yes		
CZ sector FE	Yes	Yes		
Obs	210,551	210,551		
R squared	0.092	0.025		
Adjusted R-squared	0.091	0.024		
KP Stat		840.8		

Standard errors in parentheses

ntroduction	Data & Measures	Effect on inequality	Mechanism	Robustness	Conclusion
000000	000	000000	0000000	000	00

Labor concentration *increases* inequality between jobs

• Change of sign of estimate compared to OLS: confirms bias

	0	LS	ľ	V
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Gini	90/10	Gini	90/10
HHI employment (log, mkt)	-0.016***	-0.023***	0.025***	0.083***
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.010)
Lab. prod. (mean log, sect)	-0.025***	-0.054***	-0.022***	-0.049***
,	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.005)
HHI sales (log, sect)	0.002***	0.004***	0.002***	0.002**
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Average age (mkt)	-0.008***	-0.023***	-0.009***	-0.025***
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)
Market size (log. mkt), post	0.077***	0.085***	0.078***	0.088***
	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.005)
Firm size (mean log_mkt), decl. eff	-0.040***	-0.060***	-0.045***	-0.073***
	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.006)
Polarization	0.032***	0.043***	0.034***	0.049***
	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.004)
CZ year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CZ sector FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	210,551	210,551	210,551	210,551
R squared	0.046	0.029	0.030	0.009
Adjusted R-squared	0.045	0.028	0.029	0.008
KP Stat			840.8	840.8



Introduction	Data & Measures	Effect on inequality	Mechanism	Robustness	Conclusion
000000	000	0000000	•0000000	000	00

Mechanism

Data & Measures

Effect on inequality

Mechanism ○●○○○○○○ Robustness

Conclusion

Exploring two mechanisms

- 1. "Better sorting" mechanism
 - With better sorting, wage gap between different types of firm widens
 ⇒ between-firm inequality should increase (Dispersion of the

average wage of each firm of the market) • Def

- 2. "Bargaining position sensitivity" mechanism
 - Increase in employers concentration more damaging for the least-paid jobs (return of bargaining power from less concentration to wage concave or can afford to wait more)
 ⇒ within-firm inequality should increase (Dispersion of wages of jobs of a given firm) ● Def
 - Mechanically, the average wage of firms with more lower-paid jobs should decrease

 \Rightarrow between-firm inequality should increase

Data & Measures

Effect on inequality

Mechanism ○○●○○○○○ Robustness

Conclusion

IV: Effect on between- and within-firm inequality

	Wi	thin	Betv	ween
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Gini	90/10	Gini	90/10
HHI employment (log, mkt)	0.048***	0.089***	0.059***	0.090***
	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.009)
Lab. prod. (mean log, sect)	-0.008**	-0.026***	0.013**	0.015**
	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)
HHI sales (log, sect)	0.002*	0.003*	0.001	0.003**
,	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Average age (mkt)	-0.006***	-0.013***	-0.012***	-0.019***
0 0 0 0	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Market size (log. mkt), post	0.078***	0.060***	0.097***	0.066***
	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.005)
Firm size (mean log, mkt), decl. eff	-0.016***	-0.010**	-0.237***	-0.219***
	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Polarization	0.022***	0.026***	0.045***	0.044***
	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.004)
CZ year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CZ sector FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	210,551	210,551	210,551	210,551
R squared	0.011	-0.003	0.040	0.022
Adjusted R-squared	0.010	-0.004	0.040	0.021
KP Stat	840.8	840.8	840.8	840.8

Standard errors in parentheses

Data & Measures

Effect on inequality

Mechanism 000●0000 Robustness

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★□▶ □□ ◇◇◇

Conclusion

Further exploring relevance of the 2 mechanisms

- Effect on within- and between- firm inequality consistent with bargaining and sorting
- As between-firm estimate is consistent with both and within-firm only with the bargaining one, weak evidence that the bargaining hypothesis might be more important
- Let's examine the effect of labor concentration on the wage along the wage distribution

Data & Measures

Effect on inequality

Mechanism 0000●000 Robustness

Conclusion

Negative effect along the wage distribution of jobs

- Sorting mechanism: some jobs shoud benefit
- We find that no deciles of jobs benefit, the 99th percentile either



22/30

Data & Measures

Effect on inequality

Mechanism 00000●00 Robustness

Conclusion

∃ ► ∃ = < < <</p>

Effect of labor concentration on average wage of firms

- Sorting mechanism: some firms should benefit
- We find that no deciles of firms benefit



Data & Measures

Effect on inequality

Mechanism 000000●0 Robustness

Conclusion

ELE SOG

Effect on average wage of firms, for the richest markets

- Sorting: maybe only richest firms on richest markets (above median average wage) benefit?
- We find that this is not the case



24/30

Data & Measures

Effect on inequality

Mechanism 0000000● Robustness

Conclusion

ELE SOG

Effect on average wage of firms, for the largest markets

- Sorting: maybe only richest firms on largest markets (above median number of employees) benefit?
- We find that this is not the case



 Introduction
 Data & Measures
 Effect on inequality
 Mechanism
 Robustness
 Conclusion

 000000
 000
 0000000
 0000000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000
 000

Robustness

 Introduction
 Data & Measures
 Effect on inequality
 Mechanism
 Robustness
 Conclusion

 000000
 000
 0000000
 0000000
 000
 000
 000

Robustness checks

- $1. \ \mbox{Alternative definition of labor markets:}$
 - Occupation instead of sectors Table
 - 'Département' instead of commuting zones Table
- 2. Alternative instruments:
 - Number of firms
 - Normalized HHI
- 3. Alternative measures of concentration: Payroll-HHI instead of employment-HHI > Table 1 > Table 2

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★□▶ □□ ◇◇◇

- 4. Weighted regressions **Table**
- 5. More inequality measures Table

Introduction	Data & Measures	Effect on inequality	Mechanism	Robustness	Conclusion
000000	000	0000000	0000000	000	00

Alternative instruments

- 1. Inverse of number of firms: 1/N
 - Captures the variation of HHI linked to the number of employers
 - Gini estimate (0.041)

 Table
- 2. Normalized HHI: $HHI_{norm} = \frac{HHI-1/N}{1-1/N}$
 - Captures the variation of HHI linked to the dispersion of employment shares, i.e. the weight of each employer's holding number of firms fixed
 - Gini estimate (0.015): indicates that effect does not come only from variation of number of employers but also from variation in their relative weights <a>Table

Introduction	Data & Measures	Effect on inequality	Mechanism	Robustness	Conclusion
000000	000	0000000	00000000	000	•0

Conclusion

ntroduction	Data & Measures	Effect on inequality	Mechanism	Robustness	Conclusion
00000	000	0000000	00000000	000	0●

Results overview

- Labor concentration decreases average wage and increases inequality between jobs in the same local labor market
- Labor concentration increases inequality between jobs in the same firm ("within-firm inequality") and between the average jobs in each firm ("between-firm inequality")
- Labor concentration decrease wages of jobs and average wage of all firms along the wage distribution, even on richest and largest markets
- ⇒ We conclude that relative bargaining argument is much more prevalent than sorting: labor concentration increase inequality by undercutting relatively more the bargaining power of the lowest earners

・ロト・4日・4日・4日・900

Hirschmann Herfindhal Index

Employment share of each firm in each sector/CZ

$$s_{j,c,f} = rac{emp_{j,c,f}}{\sum_{f} emp_{j,c,f}}$$

▶ Back

- We regroup all jobs in establishments of a given firm in same local labor market: common employer
- Employment HHI at the sector/CZ level:

$$HHI_{j,c} = \sum_{f} (s_{f,j,c,})^2 \text{ with } 0 \le HHI \le 1$$

• Robustness: payroll-HHI

First stages

	Em	nlowmont k		
	(1)	ipioyment-r	101	Payroli-HHI
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	HHI, log	HHI, log	HHI, log	HHI, log
Instrument : employment-HHI	0.779***			
	(0.027)			
	()			
Instrument : 1/Number of firms		0.595***		
,		(0.021)		
		(0.011)		
Instrument : normalized employment-HHI			0.486***	
·····			(0.017)	
			(0.011)	
Instrument : payroll-HHI				0.572***
				(0.026)
C7 year FE	Vec	Vac	Vec	Vec
	i ca	1C3	1C3	103
CZ sector FE	res	res	res	res
Obs	210,551	210,551	210,551	210,551
KP stat	840.82	808.18	819.15	481.88

Standard errors in parentheses

* p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Back

Alternative definition of market: sector*départment level

	(1)	(2)	(2)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Gini	90/10	99/10
HHI employment (log, mkt)	0.028***	0.107***	0.074***
	(0.006)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Lab. prod. (mean log, sect)	-0.012***	-0.019***	0.006
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.006)
HHI sales (log sect)	0.004***	0.004***	-0.001
This sales (log, seer)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
Average age (mkt)	-0.008***	-0.025***	-0.022***
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Market size (log. mkt), post	0.065***	0.081***	0.123***
	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.008)
Firm size (mean log mkt) decl. off	0.037***	0.060***	0.054***
Timi size (mean log, mkr), deci. en	(0.003)	(0.007)	(0.007)
	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Polarization	0.033***	0.063***	0.095***
	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.006)
DEP year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
CZ sector FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	144,055	144,055	144,055
R squared	0.014	-0.008	0.004
Adjusted R-squared	0.013	-0.009	0.003
KP Stat	1076.9	1076.9	1076.9

Standard errors in parentheses

* p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

3/23

Alternative definition of market: 3-digit occupation*commuting zone level

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Gini	90/10	Mean
HHI employment (log, mkt)	0.627***	0.233***	-0.084***
	(0.174)	(0.036)	(0.021)
Average age (mkt)	-0.017***	-0.028***	0.018***
	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Market size (log, mkt)	-0.147**	-0.102***	0.078***
	(0.059)	(0.015)	(0.008)
Firm size (mean log, mkt), decl. eff	0.013	-0.052***	0.026***
	(0.017)	(0.008)	(0.004)
CZ year	Yes	Yes	Yes
CZ occup FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	90,402	90,592	90,592
R squared	-0.078	-0.017	0.019
Adjusted R-squared	-0.080	-0.018	0.018
KP Stat	787.3	772.0	772.0

Standard errors in parentheses



Alternative instruments: Number of firms

	Ove	erall	Betv	ween	en Within		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
	Gini	90/10	Gini	90/10	Gini	90/10	
HHI employment (log, mkt)	0.041***	0.123***	0.020**	0.054***	0.086***	0.162***	
	(0.006)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.013)	
Lab. prod. (mean log, sect)	-0.022***	-0.047***	0.011**	0.013**	-0.006*	-0.023***	
	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.005)	
HHI sales (log, sect)	0.002***	0.002*	0.002*	0.003***	0.001	0.002	
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	
Average age (mkt)	-0.009***	-0.025***	-0.012***	-0.019***	-0.007***	-0.014***	
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	
Market size (log, mkt), post	0.079***	0.090***	0.096***	0.065***	0.080***	0.063***	
	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.007)	
Firm size (mean log, mkt), decl. eff	-0.046***	-0.078***	-0.232***	-0.215***	-0.020***	-0.019***	
	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.006)	
Polarization	0.035***	0.051***	0.042***	0.042***	0.025***	0.031***	
	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.006)	
CZ year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
CZ sector FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Obs	210,551	210,551	210,551	210,551	210,551	210,551	
R squared	0.015	-0.009	0.047	0.028	-0.004	-0.025	
Adjusted R-squared	0.014	-0.009	0.046	0.028	-0.005	-0.026	
KP Stat	808.2	808.2	808.2	808.2	808.2	808.2	

Standard errors in parentheses



Alternative instruments: normalized HHI

Standard errors in parentheses



Payroll-HHI: average wage and overall inequality

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Mean	Gini	90/10
Pavroll HHI (log. mkt)	-0.055***	0.002	0.044***
	(0.011)	(0.005)	(0.009)
Lab. prod. (mean log, sect)	0.025***	-0.024***	-0.052***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.005)
HHI sales (log_sect)	0.003***	0.002***	0.003**
Titti sales (log, seer)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
	()	()	()
Average age (mkt)	0.014***	-0.009***	-0.024***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)
Market size (log mkt) post	0.063***	0.077***	0.096***
Warker size (log, like), post	-0.005 (0.005)	(0.003)	(0.000)
	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.005)
Firm size (mean log, mkt), decl. eff	0.088***	-0.042***	-0.070***
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.006)
Delectronic	0.000***	0.022***	0.046***
Polarization	(0.002)	(0.000)	(0.004)
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.004)
CZ year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
CZ sector FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	210,551	210,551	210,551
R squared	-0.009	0.042	0.022
Adjusted R-squared	0.042	-0.009	0.021
KP Stat	481.9	481.9	481.9

Standard errors in parentheses



Payroll-HHI: within- and between-firm inequality

	Bet	ween	Wi	thin
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Gini	90/10	Gini	90/10
Payroll HHI (log, mkt)	0.079***	0.113***	0.029***	0.065***
	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.007)	(0.012)
Lab. prod. (mean log, sect)	0.011**	0.012*	-0.010***	-0.030***
	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.005)
HHI sales (log, sect)	0.000	0.001	0.002*	0.003*
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
Average age (mkt)	-0.012***	-0.019***	-0.006***	-0.012***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)
Market size (log, mkt), post	0.096***	0.065***	0.077***	0.059***
	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.006)
Firm size (mean log, mkt), decl. eff	-0.242***	-0.225***	-0.014***	-0.009*
	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.005)
Polarization	0.045***	0.044***	0.021***	0.024***
	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.006)
CZ year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CZ sector FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	210,551	210,551	210,551	210,551
R squared	0.037	0.020	0.016	0.002
Adjusted R-squared	0.036	0.020	0.016	0.001
KP Stat	481.9	481.9	481.9	481.9

Standard errors in parentheses



Weighted regressions

	Querall		Retween		Within	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Gini	90/10	Gini	90/10	Gini	90/10
HHI employment (log, mkt)	0.0162**	0.0515***	0.0724***	0.0771***	0.0391***	0.0756***
	(0.0067)	(0.0127)	(0.0141)	(0.0177)	(0.0094)	(0.0177)
Lab. prod. (mean log, sect)	-0.0353***	-0.0938***	0.0141*	-0.0021	-0.0312***	-0.0747***
	(0.0055)	(0.0111)	(0.0076)	(0.0113)	(0.0041)	(0.0092)
HHI sales (log, sect)	0.0021***	0.0064***	0.0067***	0.0101***	0.0006	0.0041***
	(0.0006)	(0.0011)	(0.0017)	(0.0020)	(0.0006)	(0.0015)
Average age (mkt)	-0.0090***	-0.0250***	-0.0116***	-0.0193***	-0.0070***	-0.0161***
	(0.0006)	(0.0011)	(0.0009)	(0.0010)	(0.0011)	(0.0020)
Market size (log, mkt), post	0.3136***	0.6983***	0.1112	0.1305	0.4006***	0.8011***
	(0.0851)	(0.2605)	(0.0732)	(0.1633)	(0.0866)	(0.1784)
Firm size (mean log, mkt), decl. eff	-0.0190***	-0.0276***	-0.1223***	-0.0900***	-0.0117***	-0.0026
	(0.0051)	(0.0090)	(0.0057)	(0.0072)	(0.0044)	(0.0095)
Polarization	0.2971***	0.7021**	0.0907	0.1461	0.3558***	0.7728***
	(0.0924)	(0.2753)	(0.0761)	(0.1646)	(0.0935)	(0.1903)
CZ year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CZ sector FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	208,463	208,463	208,463	208,463	208,463	208,463
R squared	0.0171	0.0244	0.0039	0.0054	0.0124	-0.0040
Adjusted R-squared	0.0163	0.0236	0.0031	0.0046	0.0116	-0.0048
KP Stat	55.6	55.6	55.6	55.6	55.6	55.6

Standard errors in parentheses

* p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

🕩 Back

More inequality indices

	0 "					
	(1) (2) (4)					
	(1) Thail	(2)	(S) Disash	(4)		
(lan arla)	0.020***	Chtrop	0.010***	0.024***		
HHI employment (log, mkt)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.006)	(0.00F)		
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.000)	(0.005)		
Lab. prod. (mean log, sect)	-0.032***	-0.044***	-0.019***	-0.026***		
	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.002)		
HHI sales (log, sect)	0.002**	0.003***	0.002***	0.002***		
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)		
Average age (mkt)	-0.015***	-0.026***	-0.008***	-0.010***		
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)		
Market size (log. mkt), post	0.141***	0.104***	0.090***	0.065***		
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.003)		
	()	()	(,	()		
Firm size (mean log, mkt), decl. eff	-0.070***	-0.053***	-0.045***	-0.044***		
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.002)		
Polarization	0.063***	0.064***	0.040***	0.028***		
	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.002)		
CZ year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
CZ sector FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Obs	210,551	210,551	210,551	210,551		
R squared	0.031	0.020	0.032	0.024		
Adjusted R-squared	0.030	0.019	0.031	0.023		
KP Stat	840.8	840.8	840.8	840.8		

Standard errors in parentheses



More inequality ratios

			Overall		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	50/10	90/50	80/50	50/20	99/10
HHI employment (log, mkt)	0.090***	-0.007	0.019***	0.103***	0.054***
	(0.009)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.012)
Lab. prod. (mean log. sect)	-0.041***	-0.008***	-0.016***	-0.060***	-0.012**
	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.006)
HHI sales (log_sect)	-0.003***	0.006***	0.003***	0.001	-0.002*
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Average age (mkt)	-0.024***	-0.001***	-0.003***	-0.018***	-0.021***
)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)
Market size (log_mkt)_post	0.034***	0.055***	0.040***	0.059***	0.129***
······);	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.007)
Firm size (mean log, mkt), decl. eff	-0.050***	-0.023***	-0.024***	-0.076***	-0.061***
	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.006)
Polarization	0.026***	0.023***	0.012***	0.018***	0.089***
	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.005)
CZ year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CZ sector FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	210,551	210,551	210,551	210,551	210,551
R squared	0.003	0.017	0.008	-0.009	0.012
Adjusted R-squared	0.002	0.016	0.007	-0.009	0.011
KP Stat	840.8	840.8	840.8	840.8	840.8

Standard errors in parentheses

* p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Back

Labor and product market concentration

- The two concepts should be dinstinguished:
 - Labor market concentration is local
 - Product market concentration, for most goods and some services (tradable), is not local
- Correlation between weighted average labor HHI and sectoral product market HHI in our data is positive but moderate: 0.48 in 2018
- 1. We control for the product market concentration at the sector * year level
 - NB: No balance sheet at the establishment, i.e. local level
- 2. We find higher estimates for manufacture sector (where both concepts are even more likely to be dissociated)

▶ Back

Market power and concentration: ambiguous link

- Concentration is also an equilibrium outcome: cannot *a priori* equate concentration with employers' market power
- "Burdett Mortensen effect": decrease in market power of employers (i.e. more competitive labor market) can actually increase concentration
- In a labor market becoming more competitive, workers can more easily move to better-paying firms, which increase their market share and labor concentration (*if those better-paying firm already have a large share of the market*)

Back

US labor market concentration

Figure: HHI by CZ, average over SOC



Figure: Source: Marinescu et al. 2018



SEC	TOP
151	7 Manufacture of ment and fich
154	a manufacture of mean and animal aile and fate
156	Manufacture of registrative and annual one and storeh anducte.
150	Manufacture of grant mill products, automa and autori products
160	Manufacture of telesce modules
172	Tierzen Wenning of Textiler
174	Manufacturing of textile acticles
176	Manufacturing of texture articles
101	Manufacture of knicked radrics
102	Manufacture of naticles of fur
192	Manufacture of Jurgage handhaes saddlery and harness
201	Saumilling planing and impregnation of wood
202	Manufacture of other huilder' connector and joiners
205	Manufacture of ounderse of wood, code, strow and elaiting materials
212	Manufacture of articles of energy and exercised
222	Printing and service activities related to mining
241	Manufacture of basis chamicale
242	Manufacture of painte upweicher and cimilar costiner
245	Manufacture of paints, variations and antifumer propagations
247	Manufacture of actificial or swithetic fibres
252	Manufacture of elastics endusts
262	Manufacture of other norrelain and ceramic modurts
264	Manufacture of bricks, tiles and construction products, in baked clay
256	Manufacture of articles of concrete, cement and plaster
268	Manufacture of non-metallic mineral moducts
272	Manufacture of tubes
274	Manufacture of basic precious and other non-ferrous metals
281	Manufacture of structural metal products
283	Boiler making
285	Treatment and coating of metals: machining
287	Manufacture of other fabricated metal products
292	Manufacture of general-purpose machinery
294	Manufacture of machine tools
296	Manufacture of weapons and ammunition
300	Manufacture of office machinery and computer equipment
312	Manufacture of electricity distribution and control apparatus
314	Manufacture of batteries and accumulators
316	Manufacture of other electrical equipment
322	Manufacture of transmitting and receiving apparatus
331	Manufacture of medical, surgical and orthopaedic equipment
333	Manufacture of industrial process control equipment
335	Watches and clocks
342	Manufacture of bodies (coachwork) for motor vehicles: manufacture of trailers and semi-trailers
351	Building of ships and boats
353	Manufacture of air and spacecraft and related machinery
355	Manufacture of transport equipment n.e.c.
362	Manufacture of iewellery, bijouterie and related articles
364	Manufacture of sports goods

- 401 Electric power generation and distribution
- 403 Steam and air conditioning supply
- 451 Site preparation
- 453 Installation works
- 455 Renting of construction equipment with operator
- 502 Maintenance and repair of motor vehicles
- 504 Sale, maintenance and repair of motorcycles and related parts and accessories 511 Wholesale on a fee or contract basis

- 513 Wholesale of food
- 515 Wholesale of non-agricultural intermediate products
- 519 Other wholesale
- 522 Retail sale of food, beverages and tobacco in specialised stores
- 524 Retail sale of other goods in specialised stores
- 526 Retail trade not in stores 551 Hotels and similar accommodation
- 553 Restaurants
- 555 Event catering and other food service activities
- 602 Urban and Road transport
- 611 Sea and coastal passenger water transport
- 62 Passenger air transport and Freight air transport
- 631 Warehousing and Cargo handling
- 633 Travel agency activities
- 671 Activities auxiliary to financial services
- 701 Buying and selling of own real estate
- 703 Real estate activities on a fee or contract basis
- 712 Renting and leasing of transport equipment
- 714 Renting and leasing of personal and household goods
- 722 Computer programming and related activities
- 724 Database activities
- 731 Research and experimental development on natural sciences and engineering 741 Legal and accounting activities Management consultancy activities
- 743 Control activities and technical analysis
- 745 Selection and supply of personnel
- 747 Cleaning activities
 - 852 Veterinary activities
- 924 Press Agencies 930b Hairdressing
- 930d Funeral and related activities
 - 930f Other personal service activities

153 Manufacture of fruit and vegetables 155 Manufacture of dairy products 157 Manufacture of prepared animal feeds 159 Manufacture of beverages 171 Preparation and spinning of textile fibres 173 Finishing of textiles 175 Manufacture of other textiles 177 Manufacture of knitted and crocheted apparel 182 Manufacture of textile clothing 191 Tanning and dressing of leather 193 Manufacture of footwear 202 Manufacture of veneer sheets and wood-based panels 204 Manufacture of wooden containers 211 Manufacture of pulp, paper and paperboard 221 Publishing 223 Reproduction of recorded media 242 Manufacture of pesticides and other agrochemical products 244 Pharmaceutical industry 246 Manufacture of other chemical products 251 Manufacture of rubber products 261 Manufacture of glass and glass products 263 Manufacture of ceramic tiles and flags 265 Manufacture of cement, lime and plaste 267 Cutting, shaping and finishing of stone 271 Steel industry 273 Manufacture of other products of first processing of steel 275 Casting of metals 282 Manufacture of tanks, reservoirs and containers of metal 284 Forging, pressing, stamping and roll-forming of metal; powder metallurgy 285 Manufacture of cutlery, tools and general hardware 291 Manufacture of mechanical equipment 293 Manufacture of agricultural machinery 295 Manufacture of other special purpose ma 297 Manufacture of household appliance 311 Manufacture of electric motors, generators, transformers 313 Manufacture of wiring and wiring devices 315 Manufacture of electric lighting equipment 321 Manufacture of electronic components and boards 323 Manufacture of sound and video reception, recording and reproduction apparatus 332 Manufacture of measuring and checking instruments 334 Manufacture of optical instruments and photographic equipment 341 Manufacture of motor vehicles 343 Manufacture of parts and accessories for motor vehicles 352 Manufacture of railway locomotives and rolling stock 354 Manufacture of motorcycles and bicycles 361 Manufacture of furniture 363 Manufacture of musical instru 365 Manufacture of games and toys 37 Recovery of recyclable and non-recyclable metal materials 402 Manufacture of gas; distribution of gaseous fuels through mains 410 Water collection, treatment and supply 452 Construction of residential and non-residential buildings or civil engineering 454 Building completion and finishing 501 Sale of motor vehicles 503 Sale of motor vehicle parts and accessories 505 Retail sale of automotive fuel 512 Wholesale of agricultural raw materials 514 Wholesale of household goods 518 Wholesale of other machinery, equipment and supplies 521 Retail sale in non-specialised stores 523 Dispensing chemist in specialised stores 525 Retail of second-hand goods 527 Repair of personal and household goods 552 Other short-stay accommodation 554 Beverage serving activities 601 Rail transport 603 Transport via pipeline 612 Water transport 673 Snace transport 632 Management of transport infr 634 Organization of freight transport 660 locurance 672 Activities auxiliary to insurance 702 Renting of real estate 711 Renting and leasing of motor vehicles 713 Renting and leasing of other machinery, equipment 721 Consultancy 723 Data processing 725 Maintenance and repair of office machines and computer equipment 732 Research and experimental development on social sciences and humanities 742 Architectural and engineering activities and related technical consultancy 744 Advertising 746 Security and investigation activities 748 Other services provided mainly to businesses

- 900 Remediation activities and other waste management services
- 930a Laundry
- 930c Other beauty treatment
- 930e Physical well-being activities

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □□ のへの

Départements instead of CZ

- Local labor markets are defined as the intersection of a sector and a 'département'
- 304 CZ versus 99 'départements': larger labor markets
- Estimates slightly higher: 0.028 for Gini (versus 0.025 using CZ), 0.107 for 90/10 (versus 0.083 using CZ)

► Table

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □□ のへの

Occupations instead of sectors

- Local labor markets are defined as the intersection of an occupation and a 'département'
- 99 3-digit occupations (versus 178 sectors)
- Estimates are higher: 0.627 for Gini (versus 0.025 using sectors), 0.233 for 90/10 (versus 0.083 using CZ)



Payroll-HHI instead of employment-HHI

- Berger *et al.*, 2021: When there is a positive relationship between wages and employment, the payroll-HHI is strictly larger than the employment-HHI
- In our data, the payroll-HHI = 0.48 versus 0.46 for the employment-HHI
- A firm with a wage bill share of 20% might effectively be a larger employer, i.e. have a higher weight on the labor market, than a firm with an employment share of 20%, as wage and size are strongly correlated.

$$s_{j,c,f,t}^{w} = rac{wage_{j,c,f,t}}{\sum_{f} wage_{j,c,f,t}}$$
; $HHI_{j,c,t}^{w} = \sum_{f} (s_{f,j,c,t}^{w})^2$

• All estimates significant and of the same sign as with employment-HHI, except Gini overall

Weighted regressions

- NB: regression conducted on our restricted sample of already large markets
- Regression weighted by size of the market in terms of numbers of jobs
- Estimate for Gini is 0.0162 versus 0.025 for non-weighted regression



・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

More inequality measures

- More inequality ratios
 - Higher estimate for 90/10 and 99/10 ratios than 50/10, 90/50, 80/50 and 50/20
 - Labor concentration has an effect on inequality through its impact on the tails of the distribution Table
- More inequality measures
 - Theil index, Entropy index, Piesch index, Mehran index
 - Find similar results, higher estimates

 Table

"Within-firm" inequality

- Inequality within the same firm: "Within-firm" = Dispersion of wages of jobs of a given firm f
- Example for Gini:
 - 1. Calculate the inequality measure at the firm level

$$Gini_f = \frac{\sum_i \sum_j |w_i - w_j|}{\sum_i \sum_j w_i} \text{ for wages of all jobs } i \text{ and } j \text{ in firm } f$$

2. Compute weighted average at the local labor market level using employment shares as weights

$$\textit{Gini}_{j,c,t}^{\textit{With}} = \frac{\sum_{f} (\textit{Gini}_{f,c,j,t} * \textit{empl}_{f,c,j,t})}{\sum_{f} \textit{empl}_{f,c,j,t}}$$



"Between-firms" inequality

- Inequality between average wage in each firm:
 "Between-firms" = Dispersion of the average wage of each firm of the market
- Example for Gini:
 - 1. Calculate the average wage of each firm f, \overline{w}_f
 - 2. Calculate the inequality measures between those average wages

$$Gini_{j,c,t}^{Btw} = \frac{\sum_{f} \sum_{g} |\overline{w}_{f} - \overline{w}_{g}|}{\sum_{f} \sum_{g} \overline{w}_{f}}$$

for average wages of all firms f and g in local labor market

▶ Back

Quantification of the effect of employers' concentration

- 1. **Distribution**: Comparing labor market with average level of concentration in manufacturing (0.6) and a labor market with average level in services (0.3): wages of the 1st decile would be 6.7% lower, 5.5% for the 3rd decile, and 2.2% for the 9th decile
- 2. Inequality:
 - Wedge between 1st and 9th decile higher by almost 5% at average level in manufacture compared to average in services
 - A 10% increase in labor concentration is associated with a rise in the Gini index of 0.3% and a rise in the 90/10 earnings ratio of 0.8%