



CEP Discussion Paper No 1476

April 2017

Concentrating on the Fall of the Labor Share

**David Autor, David Dorn
Lawrence F. Katz, Christina Patterson
John Van Reenen**

Abstract

In this paper, we discuss an explanation for the fall in share of labour in GDP based on the rise of “superstar firms.” If globalization or technological changes advantage the most productive firms in each industry, product market concentration will rise as industries become increasingly dominated by superstar firms with high profit margins and a low share of labor in firm value-added and sales. As the importance of superstar firms increases, the aggregate labour share will fall. This hypothesis suggests that sales will increasingly concentrate in a small number of firms and that industries where concentration rises most will have the largest declines in the labour share. We find support for these predictions aggregating up micro-data from the US Census 1982-2012.

Keywords: labour share, concentration, superstar firms

JEL codes: J3

This paper was produced as part of the Centre’s Growth Programme. The Centre for Economic Performance is financed by the Economic and Social Research Council.

Acknowledgements

We thank Daron Acemoglu and Jason Furman for helpful discussions. This research was funded by the National Science Foundation, the European Research Council, the Economic and Social Research Council, the MIT Initiative on the Digital Economy, and the Swiss National Science Foundation.

David Autor, Department of Economics, MIT. David Dorn, Department of Economics, University of Zurich. Lawrence F. Katz, Department of Economics, Harvard University. Christina Patterson, Department of Economics, MIT. John Van Reenen, Department of Economics, MIT and Sloan School and Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics.

Published by
Centre for Economic Performance
London School of Economics and Political Science
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing of the publisher nor be issued to the public or circulated in any form other than that in which it is published.

Requests for permission to reproduce any article or part of the Working Paper should be sent to the editor at the above address.

I. Introduction

There has been an upswing of interest in economics and the media over the decline in the share of GDP going to labor. The stability of the labor share of GDP was one of the famous Kaldor (1961) “stylized facts” of growth. The macro stability of labor’s share was always, as Keynes remarked, “something of a miracle” and disguised instability at the industry level (Elsby et al. 2013). Karabarbounis and Neiman (2013) emphasize that the decline in the labor share is not confined to the U.S. and occurs primarily within rather than between industries. Although there is controversy over the degree to which the fall in the labor share is due to measurement issues such as the treatment of housing (Rognlie 2015) and intangible capital (Koh et al. 2016), there is consensus that there has been a decline in the U.S. labor share since the 1980s particularly in the 2000s.

Nevertheless, little consensus exists on the causes of the decline in the labor share. Elsby et al. (2013) argue for the importance of international trade and find that the labor share declines the most in U.S. industries strongly affected by import shocks. However, labor shares have also declined in most non-traded sectors such as wholesale, retail and utilities, a pattern not readily explained by rising trade.

Karabarbounis and Neiman (2013) instead emphasize that the cost of capital has fallen relative to the cost of labor, driven especially by rapid declines in quality-adjusted equipment prices of information and communication technologies. A decline in the relative price of capital will lead to a decline in the labor share under CES production functions if the capital-labor elasticity of substitution is greater than unity. Although Karabarbounis and Neiman present evidence that the elasticity exceeds unity, the bulk of the empirical literature suggests a much lower elasticity (e.g. Lawrence 2015). Since changes in relative factor prices tend to be similar across firms, lower relative equipment prices should lead to greater capital adoption and falling labor shares in all firms. In Autor et al. (2017) we find the opposite: the unweighted mean labor share across firms has not increased much since 1982. Thus, the average firm shows little decline in its labor share. To explain the decline in the aggregate labor share, one must study the reallocation of activity among heterogeneous firms toward firms with low and declining labor shares.

In Autor et al. (2017) we propose a new “superstar firm” model that emphasizes the role of firm heterogeneity in the dynamics of the aggregate labor share. We hypothesize that industries are

increasingly characterized by a “winner take most” feature where one firm (or a small number of firms) can gain a very large share of the market. Large firms have lower labor shares if production requires a fixed amount of overhead labor in addition to a size-dependent variable labor input, or if markups in the product market correlate positively with firm size. Possible explanations for the growth of winner take most includes the diffusion of new competitive platforms (e.g. easier price/quality comparisons on the Internet), the proliferation of information-intensive goods that have high fixed and low-marginal costs (e.g., software platforms and online services), or increasing competition due to the rising international integration of product markets. New technologies may also have strengthened network effects and favored firms that are more adept at adopting and exploiting new modes of production.

This paper exposit and evaluates two core claims of the superstar firm explanation: (1) the concentration of sales among firms within an industry has risen across much of the U.S. private economy; and (2) industries with larger increases in concentration should experience a larger decline in labor’s share.

II. Model

To see the intuition for a link between the rise of superstar firms and a decline in the labor share, consider a production function $Y = AV^{\alpha_L}K^{1-\alpha_L}$ where Y is value-added, V is variable labor, K is capital and A is Hicks-neutral efficiency (“TFPQ”), which we assume is heterogeneous across firms. There is a fixed amount of overhead labor F needed for production, so total labor is $L = V + F$. We assume that factor markets are competitive with wage w and cost of capital r being equal to the input factors’ marginal revenue products, while there is imperfect competition in the product market. From the static first order condition for labor, we can write the share of labor costs (wL) in nominal value added (PY) as:

$$(1) \quad S_i = \left(\frac{wL}{PY}\right)_i = \frac{\alpha_L}{\mu_i} + \frac{wF}{(PY)_i}$$

where μ is the mark-up, the ratio of product price (P) to marginal cost (c), and F is fixed overhead labor costs. The firm subscripts i indicate that for given economy-wide values of (α_L, w, F) a firm will have a lower labor share if (i) its share of fixed costs in total revenues are lower or (ii) its mark-up is higher. Superstar firms (firms with high A_i) will be larger because they produce more

efficiently and capture a higher share of industry output. Superstar firms therefore will have a lower share of fixed costs in total revenues, and thus a lower labor share. In monopolistically competitive models, the mark-up is the same across firms in an industry: $\mu = \rho / (\rho - 1)$, where ρ is the price elasticity of demand. However, in other models of imperfect competition, firms with larger market shares will be able to set higher mark-ups (e.g. Cournot competition), also leading to a negative relationship between firm size and labor shares. In either case, when there is an exogenous change that allocates more market share to a small number of large superstar firms, the aggregate labor share will fall as the economy shifts towards these low labor share firms. Autor et al (2017) formalize this idea in a simple superstar firm model for a monopolistically competitive setting. Distinct from the prior literature, the superstar firm model emphasizes the heterogeneity of firms within industries as being critical for understanding the fall in the labor share. We next show that, in line with the model's mechanism, the concentration of sales across firms within industries has grown in most U.S. sectors.

III. Data and Empirical Findings

We use data from the U.S. Economic Census, conducted every five years to enumerate all establishments in select sectors on current economic activity. We focus on the Economic Census from 1982 to 2012 for six large sectors: manufacturing, retail trade, wholesale trade, services, finance, and utilities and transportation. The covered establishments in these six sectors account for four-fifths of total private sector employment.

For the six sectors, the Census reports each establishment's annual payroll, output, employment, and an identifier for the firm to which the establishment belongs. To measure the concentration of sales within an industry, we use an output measure capturing total sales by the establishment during the survey year. To measure sales at the firm level, we aggregate the sales of all establishments that belong to the same firm and the same industry. If a firm operates establishments in several industries, each combination of firm and industry is counted as a separate firm, capturing the firm's separate contributions to sales concentration in several industries.

To implement our industry-level analysis, we assign each establishment in a given year to a 1987 SIC-based time-consistent industry code as described in Autor et al. (2017). Our methodology yields 676 industries, 388 of which are in manufacturing. All of our measures use these time-

consistent industry definitions leading to measures of industry concentration that differ slightly from published statistics. The correlation between our calculated measures and those based on the published data is close to one, however, for periods without changes in industry definitions.

We measure the concentration of sales within an industry as either the fraction of total sales accruing to its four largest firms (denoted CR4) or the fraction of sales accruing to its twenty largest firms (denoted CR20). Figure 1 plots the average CR4 and CR20 across four-digit industries for our six sectors from 1982 to 2012. The level of sales concentration varies considerably across sectors. In each year, the top four firms in an average manufacturing industry capture more than a third of the industry's total sales, while the top four firms in the average service industry combine for less than a sixth of total sales.

There is a remarkably consistent upward trend in concentration in each sector. In manufacturing, the sales concentration ratio among the top 4 increases from 38% to 43%; in finance, it rises from 24% to 35%; in services from 11% to 15%; in utilities from 29% to 37%; in retail trade from 15% to 30% and in wholesale trade from 22% to 28%. Over the same period, there were similar or larger increases in CR20 for sales.

To further characterize the emergence of superstar firms, Figure 1 also plots CR4 and CR20 concentration measures based on firm employment rather than sales. Again, we observe a rising concentration in all six sectors for 1982 to 2012, although employment concentration has grown notably more slowly than sales concentration in finance, services, and especially in manufacturing. The pattern suggests that firms may attain large market shares with a relatively small workforce, as exemplified by Facebook and Google.




FIGURE 1. AVERAGE TOP-4 INDUSTRY CONCENTRATION BY MAJOR INDUSTRY GROUP

This figure plots the average concentration ratio in six major sectors of the U.S. economy. Industry concentration is calculated for each time-consistent 4-digit industry code as described in Autor et al. (2017), and then averaged across all industries within each of the six sectors. The solid blue line (circles), plotted on the left axis, shows the average fraction of total industry sales that is accounted for by the largest 4 firms in that industry, and the solid red line (triangles), also plotted on the left axis, shows the average fraction of industry employment utilized in the 4 largest firms in the industry. Similarly, the dashed green line (circles), plotted on the right axis, shows the average fraction of total industry sales that is accounted for by the largest 20 firms in that industry, and the dashed orange line (triangles), also plotted on the right axis, shows the average fraction of industry employment utilized in the 20 largest firms in the industry.

In Autor et al. (2017) we show that the two main qualitative findings of Figure 1 are robust to the use of an industry’s Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI). Sales have become more concentrated in each of the six broad sectors of the U.S. economy.

A measurement challenge for our conclusion of rising concentration for broad U.S. sectors is that our concentration measures are calculated exclusively using U.S. based establishments. Thus, our measures include production by foreign multinationals operating in the U.S., but they exclude imports. A measure only for the market shares of U.S. producers may mischaracterize concentration trends given rising import shares, particularly for manufacturing.

We assess the importance of trade in the competitive structure of manufacturing by calculating import-adjusted concentration ratios that treat imports from major country groups as if they belong to a single firm. Figure 2 plots the import-adjusted CR4 and CR20 measures along with the original measures only for U.S.-based establishments. The series with and without trade adjustment track each other closely, reaffirming our main finding of rising sales concentration. The slightly higher level of the adjusted concentration ratios implies that foreign producers (such as China) account for a sizable fraction of sales in some manufacturing industries. Imports in such industries likely originate from a small number of major foreign firms, but our data do not permit a firm-level breakdown of imports.




FIGURE 2. INDUSTRY CONCENTRATION ADDING IMPORTS

This figure plots the average sales concentration in U.S. 4-digit manufacturing industries from 1992 to 2012. The red line (triangles) plots the average fraction of total sales by domestic firms that is accounted for by an industry’s 4 largest firms (corresponding to the CR-4 Sales data series in the top left panel of Figure 1). The green line (squares) plots the fraction of the total U.S. market, defined as sales by domestic firms plus industry imports, which is produced by an industry’s 4 largest “firms”, where each group of exporting countries is counted as an individual firm. Imports are based on UN Comtrade data as described in Autor et al. (2017), and the 6 country groups are: Canada, Mexico/CAFTA, China, low income countries except China, 8 developed countries (Australia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Japan, New Zealand, Spain, and Switzerland), and rest of the world. On average, 0.94 country groups are among the top 4 “firms” in the left panel, and 2.7 country groups are among the top 20 “firms” in the right panel of the figure.

A further implication of our superstar firm model is that the labor share should fall differentially in industries that are experiencing larger increases in concentration. Intuitively, the causal force in our model is the shift in competitive conditions (fall in ρ), which reallocates market share to larger and more productive firms. Indeed, Autor et al. (2017) document a strong negative relationship in the cross section between a firm’s market share and its labor share. Thus, rising concentration and falling labor shares should move in tandem, both in aggregate and between industries.

Autor et al. (2017) test this implication by estimating bivariate regressions of five-year changes in the payroll share of value-added on the contemporaneous change in concentration for the 388 manufacturing industries for the years 1987 – 2012. Figure 3, sourced from Autor et al. (2017), summarizes these regressions. In the *initial* five years of our sample, we detect no significant cross-industry relationship between rising concentration and falling labor share. But the cross-industry relationship between rising concentration and falling labor share becomes negative and significant in the next five-year interval, and grows in absolute magnitude across each subsequent interval. In the final period from 2007 to 2012, we estimate that each percentage point rise in an industry’s CR20 concentration index predicts a 0.4 percentage point fall in its labor share. We also observe a similar negative relationship between changes in the share of labor in sales and concentration in all six sectors.




FIGURE 3. CORRELATION BETWEEN CHANGES IN LABOR SHARE AND CHANGES IN INDUSTRY CONCENTRATION IN THE U.S. MANUFACTURING SECTOR AT FIVE-YEAR INTERVALS, 1982/87 – 2007/12

This figure plots point estimates and 95% confidence intervals from Autor et al. (2017) for OLS bivariate regressions of the change in the payroll to value-added share on the change in the CR20 index and a constant, estimated at the level of 4-digit U.S. manufacturing industries and separately for each of the indicated five-year intervals. Regressions are weighted by industries’ shares of value-added in 1982.

Why has industry sales concentration increased? One set of explanations involves a technological change that has made markets increasingly “winner take most” so that superstar firms with higher productivity increasingly capture a larger slice of the market. Or if incumbents are more likely to innovate and the persistence of incumbent’s innovative advantage has risen (Acemoglu and Hildebrand 2017), the incumbent advantage would increase and so would incumbents’ market shares.

An alternative set of explanations posits that higher concentration could arise from anti-competitive forces whereby dominant firms are increasingly able to prevent actual and potential rivals from entering and expanding (Barkai 2016). For instance, firms may lobby for regulatory barriers that complicate market entry/expansion for new and small firms. Higher entry barriers would enable incumbents to have higher monopolistic rents and therefore lower the labor share.

In the first set of explanations, the industries becoming increasingly concentrated will tend to be more dynamic with higher productivity and technical change. By contrast in the second set of explanations, the concentrating industries are likely to be dominated by less productive and less dynamic incumbents.

To shed light on these alternatives, we explored the relationship between changes in concentration and changes in other industry characteristics. Data limitations restrict this analysis to manufacturing. We find that the industries that became more concentrated over our sample period were also the industries in which productivity—measured by either output per worker, value-added per worker, TFP, or patents per worker—increased the most. Interestingly, there is no strong relationship between the change in concentration and the change in average wages. The findings suggest that a positive productivity-concentration relationship will most likely feature in any plausible explanation of rising industry concentration.

IV. Conclusions

We have considered a “superstar firm” explanation for the much-discussed fall in labor share of GDP. Our hypothesis is that technology or market conditions—or their interaction—have evolved to increasingly concentrate sales among firms with superior products or higher productivity thereby enabling the most successful firms to control a larger market share. Because these superstar

firms are more profitable, they will have a smaller share of their labor in total sales or value added. Consequently, the aggregate share of labor falls as the weight of superstar firms in the economy grows. The model yields many predictions that are elaborated and tested in Autor et al. (2017). A key underpinning of the superstar firm explanation for declining labor share is that sales should become increasingly concentrated in a small number of firms across a wide range of industries. Consistent with the model, we find that the concentration of sales (and of employment) has indeed risen from 1982 to 2012 in each of the six major sectors covered by U.S. Economic Census. In Autor et al. (2017), we further show that those industries where concentration rises the most have the sharpest falls in the labor share, and that the fall in the labor share is mainly due to a reallocation of labor towards firms with lower (and declining) labor shares, rather than due to declining labor shares within most firms.

REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, Daron and Nikolaus Hildebrand. 2017. "Increasing Concentration and Persistence of Innovation: Facts and Theory." Working Paper, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Autor, David, David Dorn, Lawrence F. Katz, Christina Patterson, and John Van Reenen. 2017. "The Fall of the Labor Share and the Rise of Superstar Firms." Working Paper, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Barkai, Simcha. 2016. "Declining Labor and Capital Shares." Working Paper, University of Chicago.
- Elsby, Mike., Bart Hobijn, and Aysegul Sahin. 2013. "The Decline of the U.S. Labor Share." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1-42
- Kaldor, Nicholas. 1961. "Capital Accumulation and Economic Growth" in *The Theory of Capital*, ed. F. A. Lutz and D. C. Hague, New York: St. Martin's Press: 177-222.
- Karabarbounis, Loukas and Brent Neiman. 2013. "The Global Decline of the Labor Share." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129(1), 61-103.
- Koh, Dongya, Raul Santaeulalia-Lopis, and Yu Zheng. 2016. "Labor Share Decline and the Capitalization of Intellectual Property Products." Barcelona Graduate School of Economics Working Papers No. 927.
- Lawrence, Robert. 2015. "Recent Declines in Labor's Share in Us Income: A Preliminary Neoclassical Account" NBER Working Paper No. 21296.
- Rognlie, Matthew. 2015. "Deciphering the Fall and Rise in the Net Capital Share: Accumulation or Scarcity?" *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1-69.

CENTRE FOR ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE
Recent Discussion Papers

1475	Ruben Durante Paolo Pinotti Andrea Tesei	The Political Legacy of Entertainment TV
1474	Jan-Emmanuel De Neve George Ward	Happiness at Work
1473	Diego Battiston Jordi Blanes i Vidal Tom Kirchmaier	Is Distance Dead? Face-to-Face Communication and Productivity in Teams
1472	Sarah Flèche	Teacher Quality, Test Scores and Non- Cognitive Skills: Evidence from Primary School Teachers in the UK
1471	Ester Faia Gianmarco Ottaviano	Global Banking: Risk Taking and Competition
1470	Nicholas Bloom Erik Brynjolfsson Lucia Foster Ron Jarmin Megha Patnaik Itay Saporta-Eksten John Van Reenen	What Drives Differences in Management?
1469	Kalina Manova Zhihong Yu	Multi-Product Firms and Product Quality
1468	Jo Blanden Kirstine Hansen Sandra McNally	Quality in Early Years Settings and Children's School Achievement
1467	Joan Costa-Font Sarah Flèche	Parental Sleep and Employment: Evidence from a British Cohort Study
1466	Jo Blanden Stephen Machin	Home Ownership and Social Mobility
1465	Decio Coviello Stefano Gagliarducci	Tenure in Office and Public Procurement

- | | | |
|------|---|--|
| 1464 | Claudia Olivetti
Barbara Petrongolo | The Economic Consequences of Family Policies: Lessons from a Century of Legislation in High-Income Countries |
| 1463 | Claudia Hupkau
Marion Leturcq | Fertility and Mothers' Labor Supply: New Evidence Using Time-to-Conception |
| 1462 | Clement Bellet | The Paradox of the Joneses: Superstar Houses and Mortgage Frenzy in Suburban America |
| 1461 | Georg Graetz
Guy Michaels | Is Modern Technology Responsible for Jobless Recoveries? |
| 1460 | Thomas Breda
Alan Manning | Diversity and Social Capital within the Workplace: Evidence from Britain |
| 1459 | Monica Langella
Alan Manning | Diversity and Neighbourhood Satisfaction |
| 1458 | Giordano Mion
Luca David Opromolla
Alessandro Sforza | The Diffusion of Knowledge via Managers' Mobility |
| 1457 | Kristian Behrens
Giordano Mion
Yasusada Murata
Jens Suedekum | Distorted Monopolistic Competition |
| 1456 | Tony Beaton
Michael P. Kidd
Stephen Machin
Dipa Sarkar | Larrikin Youth: New Evidence on Crime and Schooling |
| 1455 | Andrew Eyles
Stephen Machin
Sandra McNally | Unexpected School Reform: Academisation of Primary Schools in England |

The Centre for Economic Performance Publications Unit
Tel 020 7955 7673 Fax 020 7404 0612
Email info@cep.lse.ac.uk Web site <http://cep.lse.ac.uk>