## Econ 8601

## Size Distribution of Plants

- Plants (establishments)
- Firms (groups of establishments under common ownership or control)
- Cities (groups of people)
- Common size measure: Count heads


## A Word About Data for U.S.

- Census Bureau Business Register
- Data collected at establishment level because easy to aggregate up by industry or location
- Linked together: Longitudinal Business Database (LBD): confidential. (But we now have a Census Data Research Center on campus!)
- Public Release of cell counts in County Business Patterns Program
* Detailed industry (but limits to how detailed one can make this): tradeoffs for Census in designing an industry classification system
* Detailed emloyment size categories ' 01 ' $=1-4, ~ ‘ 02$ ' $=5-$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 9 \text {, ‘03'=10-19, '04'=20-49, } 05 \text { ' }=50-99, ~ ‘ 06 ’=100-249 \text {, } \\
& \text { '07'=250-499, '08'=500-999, '09'=1,000-1,499, ' } 10 \text { ' }=1,500- \\
& 2,499, ~ ' 11 '=2,500-4,999, ~ ' 12 '=5,000+
\end{aligned}
$$

* Geography (county level)
* Can be viewed as public release of 7.5 million establishment of emp, location, industry
* But for other stuff have be confidentially restrictions. Employment size category no problem. But employment is (as is wages)
- Firms: Statistics of U.S. Businesses (Company Statistics)
- Micro data: have firm identifier
- Now have some public releases of plant dynamics data


## Cross Industry Size Differences

The Literature Goes this way....

- Viner: differences in minimum efficient scale (do U-shaped average costs thing)
- Literature trying to estimate economies of scale
- Tries Understand changes in size distribution from changes in technology
- e.g. Size of retail stores and the automobile


## Standard Theory of Within Industry Size Differences

- Lucas (1978) Size Distibution Paper
- Set of firms in industry, vary by productivity parameter $\theta \in[0, \bar{\theta}]$ Price is $p$, wages are $w$,
- Use Cobb-Douglas $h(n)=n^{\alpha}$
- Solve

$$
\max _{n} \theta h(n)-w n
$$

- FONC

$$
\begin{aligned}
\theta \alpha n^{\alpha-1}-w & =0 \\
n^{1-a} & =\frac{\alpha p \theta}{w} \\
\ln n & =\left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right)[\ln \alpha+\ln p-\ln w+\ln \theta]
\end{aligned}
$$

- Actually, Lucas made it general equilibrium, choose between management job and worker job, Productivity

$$
Q=\theta h(g(K, N))
$$

where $g$ constant returns to scale.

- Shape of distribution. We have

$$
\ln n=\left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right)[\ln \alpha+\ln p-\ln w+\ln \theta]
$$

- So if $\theta$ is $\log$ normal then the distribution of employment is log normal
- Plot histogram (actually not so log normal take Inemp, median $=.51$, mean $=1.51$, so skewed here. (corresponds to emp 1.66, and 4.52). So actually doesn't fit so well..... General claim out there that plant level data lognormal is OK. But at firm level data really bombs because of FAT TAIL (WalMart today, General Motors yesterday.) Pareto is a fat-tailed distribution that fits the data well.


Figure 1: 2006 CBP Inemp histogram

Hopenhayn added Dynamics to the Lucas Model

Partial equilibrium model of an industry

- $P(Q)$ inverse demand function
- Production function $q=\theta h(n), \theta \in[0,1]$ productivity parameter, $n$ employment. Assume $h^{\prime}>0, h^{\prime \prime}<0, \lim _{n \rightarrow 0} h^{\prime}(n)=$ $\infty$.
- $\theta$ follows a Markov process

$$
\theta_{t+1} \text { distributed } F\left(\cdot, \theta_{t}\right)
$$

where $\frac{\partial F}{\partial \theta}<0$

- Assume that for each $\varepsilon>0$ and $\theta_{t}$ there exists an $n$ such that $F^{n}\left(\varepsilon \mid \theta_{t}\right)>0$, where $F^{n}\left(\varepsilon \mid \theta_{t}\right)$ is what the distribution of $\theta_{t+n}$ would be if exit were infeasible.
- The exists a fixed cost $c_{f}>0$ to remain in the market
- There is a cost of entry $c_{e}>0$. Entrants draw from a distribution $G$.


## Timing

| Stage | Incumbent | Entrant |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | pays $c_{f}$ | pays $c_{e}$ |
| 2 | observes $\theta_{t}$ and sets $q$ to max profit | same as incumbent |
| 3 | decides whether to stay in next period or exit |  |

## Stationary Equilibrium

Set of objects:

- Price $p$
- $\mu$ measure of types $\theta$ of incumbents at the beginning of the period
- $M$ measure of new entrant to enter in the period

That satisfy

- Supply equals demand in the output market
- Firms maximize profits in output decisions and exit decisions
- Entry condition holds( return to entry is zero of $M>0$ and otherwise nonpositive).
- The exit and entry behavior implies the invariant measure $\mu$.


## Individual Behavior

(1) Production decision:

$$
\max _{n} p \theta h(n)-w n-c_{f}
$$

The FONC is

$$
p \theta h^{\prime}(n)-w=0
$$

Let $n(\theta, p)$ solve this problem. Let $q(\theta, n)=p \theta h(n(\theta, n))$ be the optimal quanity and let $\pi(\theta, p)$ be the maximized profit.
(2) Exit decision

$$
v(\theta, p)=\pi(\theta, p)+\max \left\{0, \beta \int_{0}^{1} v\left(\theta^{\prime}, p\right) f\left(\theta^{\prime} \mid \theta\right) d \theta^{\prime}\right\}
$$

Let $E(\theta, p)$ be the expected return to staying,

$$
E(\theta, p)=\beta \int_{0}^{1} v\left(\theta^{\prime}, p\right) f\left(\theta^{\prime} \mid \theta\right) d \theta^{\prime}
$$

Suppose that $E(1, p)>0$ and $E(0, p)<0$. Then let $x(p)$ be the unique point in $(0,1)$ satisfying

$$
E(x(p), p)=0
$$

(3) Entry Decision. The return to entry is

$$
\int_{0}^{1} v(\theta, p) g(\theta) d \theta-c_{e}
$$

Plot the first term on the whiteboard. Let $p^{*}$ be the unique price where the above is zero.

## The Stationary Distribution

Focus on case where $x^{*}=x\left(p^{*}\right)>0$.What is the stationary distribution of firms?

- Let $\mu_{t}$ be the distribution of types at time $t$.
- $\gamma$ the distribution of entrants given a unit measure of entry.
- $M \gamma$ distribution of entrant given a mass $M$ of entry.
- $\hat{P}_{x}$ mapping that first truncates all $\theta<x$ and then runs it through $F$

The equilibrium distribution of firms must satisty the stationary condition:

$$
\mu^{*}=\hat{P}_{x^{*}} \mu^{*}+M^{*} \gamma
$$

Or, rewriting, it solves:

$$
\left[\hat{P}_{x^{*}}-I\right] \mu^{*}=M^{*} \gamma
$$

or

$$
\mu^{*}=\left[\hat{P}_{x^{*}}-I\right]^{-1} M^{*} \gamma
$$

It also must satisfy the product market equilibrium condition

$$
p^{e}\left(\mu^{*}\right)=p^{*}
$$

where $p^{e}(\mu)$ is defined as the price solving

$$
\int_{0}^{1} q(p, \theta) \mu(\theta) d \theta=D(p)
$$

In summary, to solve for the equilibrium do the following:

1. Take $p^{*}$ as the price solving the free-entry condition.
2. Then find the flow of entrants $M^{*}$ so that the following holds:

$$
p^{e}\left(M^{*}\left[\hat{P}_{x^{*}}-I\right]^{-1} \gamma\right)=p^{*}
$$

## Example

Suppose two types $\theta_{1}=0, \theta_{2}=1$. Suppose the distribution function satisfies

$$
\left(\begin{array}{ll}
f_{11} & f_{12} \\
f_{21} & f_{22}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 1-f_{22} \\
0 & f_{22}
\end{array}\right)
$$

(type 1 always exits)

$$
v_{1}(p)=\pi_{1}(p)=-c_{f}
$$

$$
v_{2}=\pi_{2}+\beta\left(1-f_{22}\right) v_{1}+\beta f_{22} v_{2}
$$

Or

$$
v_{2}=\frac{1}{1-\beta f_{22}} \pi_{2}+\frac{\beta\left(1-f_{22}\right)}{1-\beta f_{22}}\left(-c_{f}\right)
$$

For this special case, $\hat{P}_{x^{*}}$ mapping is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{P}_{x^{*}} & =\left(\begin{array}{ll}
f_{11} & f_{12} \\
f_{21} & f_{22}
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right) \\
& =\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 1-f_{22} \\
0 & f_{22}
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 1-f_{22} \\
0 & f_{22}
\end{array}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Applications of the Model

Firm Dynamics

Fact: Examine a cohort of entering firms and follow survivors. The average size of the survivors increases. The probability of discontinuance decreases.

Model: Look at special case.

| Period | Measure in state |  | Prob survive |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\theta_{1}$ | $\theta_{2}$ |  |
| 1 | $M \gamma_{1}$ | $M \gamma_{2}$ | $\gamma_{2}$ |
| 2 | $\left(1-f_{22}\right) M \gamma_{2}$ | $f_{22} M \gamma_{2}$ | $f_{22}$ |

To be consistent with the empirical literature need $f_{22}>\gamma_{2}$. This also implies average size increases.

In the general model analogous mechanical conditions are needed. The distribution of new entrants can't be too good compared with the transition function $F$.

