

Resende, Marcelo

Working Paper

Concentration and market size: lower bound estimates for the Brazilian industry

CESifo Working Paper, No. 2441

Provided in Cooperation with:

Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

Suggested Citation: Resende, Marcelo (2008) : Concentration and market size: lower bound estimates for the Brazilian industry, CESifo Working Paper, No. 2441, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/26486>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Concentration and Market Size: Lower Bound Estimates for the Brazilian Industry

MARCELO RESENDE

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 2441
CATEGORY 9: INDUSTRIAL ORGANISATION
OCTOBER 2008

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- *from the SSRN website:* www.SSRN.com
- *from the RePEc website:* www.RePEc.org
- *from the CESifo website:* www.CESifo-group.org/wp

Concentration and Market Size: Lower Bound Estimates for the Brazilian Industry

Abstract

The paper estimates the lower bound for market concentration taking as reference the framework advanced by Sutton (1991). Quantile regression methods were considered in the context of the Brazilian manufacturing industry in 2005 and separate estimates were obtained for exogenous and endogenous sunk cost industries. The evidence favoured a convergence of the concentration lower bound towards zero in exogenous sunk costs industries in line with previous empirical evidence for developed countries. In contrast, the magnitude was similar in the case of endogenous sunk cost industries what might reflect the low technological effort in that emerging economy.

JEL Code: L11.

Keywords: concentration, market size.

*Marcelo Resende
Economic Institute
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro
Av. Pasteur 250, Urca
22290-240, Rio de Janeiro-RJ
Brazil
mresende@ie.ufrj.br*

The author acknowledges CNPq for financial support.

1. Introduction

The recent empirical literature on Industrial Organization-IO increasingly relies on game-theoretical foundations. This tendency motivates a movement towards industry-specific studies and further highlights the disenchantment with inter-industry studies [see e.g. Schmalensee (1989)]. In contrast, the bounds approach advanced by Sutton (1991, 1998) explores robust relationships that hold across different sectors in a game-theoretic setting where different types of sunk costs may prevail. The referred theoretical framework has induced a handful of empirical studies as given by Sutton (1991), Lyons and Mataves (1996), Robinson and Chiang (1996) and Giorgetti (2000, 2003). A salient prediction implied by Sutton (1991) refers to the differential behaviour of the asymptotic concentration as market size increases depending on the nature of sunk costs. An implication of his framework would be that the referred lower bound would remain above zero in the case of industries with endogenous sunk costs (related to advertising and R&D) whereas it would converge to zero in the case of industries with exogenous sunk costs.

The evidence, despite difference in magnitudes and sectors' definitions, appears to corroborate distinct patterns depending on the nature of sunk costs. Nevertheless, Giorgetti (2003) highlights the sensitivity of previous results to the presence of outliers and defend the use of robust methods of estimation. In the present paper, we undertake a similar approach by considering the estimation of concentration lower bounds for the Brazilian industry in 2005. The paper intends to contribute to the literature by considering a large developing country where traditional and dynamic industrial sectors co-exist and therefore provides further evidence on Sutton's models that extrapolates the previously considered context of

developed countries. That evidence can, in principle, be suggestive as the level of technological effort is typically low in the Brazilian economy¹ and therefore less discernible differences of the lower bound for concentration in accordance to the nature of sunk costs may emerge. Moreover, the paper focuses on a more accurate concentration measure similarly as Lyons and Matraves (1996) and in contrast with the remainder of the literature.

The paper is organized as follows. The second section briefly discusses the econometric approach and empirical implementation procedures. The third section discusses the data sources and detail variables' construction procedures. The fourth section brings some final comments.

2. Estimation of Lower Bounds for Concentration

Previous studies for estimating the lower bound for concentration mostly relied on a maximum likelihood estimator referring to a Weibull specification. The sensitivity of such model to the presence of outliers had motivated Giorgetti (2003) to consider quantile regression-QR methods that provide a robust alternative for traditional estimators when the error distribution departs from normality. Rather than considering a single central tendency that is assumed to be valid for the whole sample, QR allows for distinct effects of the explanatory variables depending on the portion of the conditional distribution of the dependent variable [see Buchinsky (1998) and Koenker (2005) for introductions on the topic]. The general econometric model takes the form that traces back to Sutton (1991):

¹ See e.g. Resende and Hasenclever (1998). A comprehensive discussion on the innovation survey used in this paper is considered by Kannebley Jr. et al (2005)

$$\ln\left(\frac{HH}{1-HH}\right) = a + b \frac{1}{\ln(S/\sigma)} + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

Where in the present application we consider the Hirschman-Herfindahl concentration index ($HH = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i^2$) in contrast with the majority of the previous studies that considered concentration ratios despite the associated shortcomings. As usual s_i stands for the market share of i -th firm in the industry taking as reference sales data. A second crucial choice pertains the market size (S) normalized by a minimum efficient scale measure (σ). For the former the aggregate sales of the industry are considered whereas for the latter the feasible proxy was the median sales figure of the sector.²

In the particular context of the present application, QR estimators can be obtained as the solution of the following problem, where $0 < \theta < 1$ stands for the θ -th regression quantile:

$$\min_{a,b} \left[\sum_{i \in \{i: \ln(\frac{HH_i}{1-HH_i}) \geq a + \frac{b}{\ln(S_i/\sigma_i)}\}} \theta \left| \ln\left(\frac{HH_i}{1-HH_i}\right) - \left(a + \frac{b}{\ln(S_i/\sigma_i)}\right) \right| + \sum_{i \in \{i: \ln(\frac{HH_i}{1-HH_i}) < a + \frac{b}{\ln(S_i/\sigma_i)}\}} (1-\theta) \left| \ln\left(\frac{HH_i}{1-HH_i}\right) - \left(a + \frac{b}{\ln(S_i/\sigma_i)}\right) \right| \right] \quad (2)$$

The next essential aspect for empirical implementation of the analysis refers to the segmentation of the sample in terms of industries characterized by

² More sophisticated procedures were advanced in the literature as for example by Lyons (1980) that introduced a new measure minimum efficient scale-MES based on the firm's decision to set up a second plant, The new estimates were found to be in substantial agreement with those derived by the survivor technique. The adopted proxy for MES is inspired by Sutton (1991) and a similar procedure was implemented by Görg et al. (2000) and Görg and Strobl (2002).

exogenous or endogenous sunk costs. Previous works by Lyons and Matraves (1996), Robinson and Chiang (1996) and Giorgetti (2000) considered a single cut-off point defined in terms of the advertising intensity-IA (advertising expenses/sales) and R&D intensity-IRD (R&D expenses/sales). The criterion thus defined 4 types of industries: type 1 (if IA and IRD $\leq 1\%$), 2A (if IA $> 1\%$ and IRD $\leq 1\%$), 2R (if IA $\leq 1\%$ and IRD $> 1\%$) and 2AR (if IA $> 1\%$ and

IRD $> 1\%$). Giorgetti (2003) considered a simplified criterion based on RA = (R&D+Advertising expenses)/sales by which exogenous sunk costs industries would be defined by RA $\leq 1\%$ whereas endogenous sunk cost industries would require RA $\geq 4\%$. The elimination of the intermediate cases reflects the intention to avoid measurement errors. I adopt a similar procedure in the present paper as further discussed in the next section.

3. Empirical Analysis

3.1-Data Construction

The paper relies on special tabulations from two different surveys carried out by the Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística-IBGE for Brazil in 2005, namely the Pesquisa Industrial Annual (PIA) and the Pesquisa de Inovação Tecnológica (PINTEC). The tabulation for the PIA at the 4-digits level (CNAE4) for the manufacturing industry did not provide information on sectors with 1 or 2 firms due to confidentiality restrictions.

The information for the PINTEC was available at the 3-digits level. We adopt the following cut-off points; exogenous sunk costs industries (RA $\leq 1\%$), endogenous sunk costs industries (RA $\geq 3\%$). This criterion respectively led to

sub-samples with 114 and 37 industries. The basic variables upon which the transformed variables are the following:

- . HH: Hirschman-Herfindahl concentration index for industries at the 4-digits level upon data from the PIA-IBGE. Net operating revenues represented sales
- . S: market size as defined by total sales of the industry at the 4-digits level obtained from the PIA-IBGE
- . Minimum efficient scale: median sales figure for the industry at the 4-digits level obtained from the PIA-IBGE
- . R&D and advertising intensity as defined by (advertising plus R&D expenditures) divided by sales. The measure comprises both internal and external R&D and the firms from the PIA and PINTEC surveys were matched for the calculation of that measure and information was available at the 3-digits level. R&D data was obtained from the PINTEC survey whereas advertising and sales were obtained from the PIA survey.

3.2- Econometric Evidence

The estimation of the models were carried out with Stata SE 10.0 and the results are displayed in table 1. Given the focus on lower bounds, the analysis considered lower quantiles (5 % and 10% in the present application)

Table 1

Concentration lower bounds estimates-quantile regression

Industries with exogenous sunk costs (N = 114)	quantile 5%	quantile 10%
a parameter	-5.130 (0.000)	-4.932 (0.000)
b parameter	9.657 (0.000)	9.264 (0.000)
Asymptotic HH	0.006 (0.076)	0.007 (0.029)
Industries with endogenous sunk costs (N = 37)		
a parameter	-4.642 (0.000)	-4.203 (0.000)
b parameter	6.994 (0.004)	6.082 (0.044)
Asymptotic HH	0.010 (0.077)	0.015 (0.079)

Note: standard errors were obtained by bootstrap resampling procedures with 1000 replications and the corresponding p-values are displayed in parentheses. For the asymptotic concentration, we considered the delta method to generate the standard errors

The evidence mostly corroborates the predictions advanced by Sutton (1991). Direct comparisons with previous empirical studies are not straightforward given different sector definitions and a different measure of concentration. Nevertheless, previous evidence pinpointed asymptotic concentration levels for exogenous sunk costs industries that were close to zero as predicted, whereas larger values prevailed in endogenous sunk costs industries. In the present

application, even if one considers a significance level higher than 5 % it appears to indicate a stronger convergence towards zero in the case of exogenous sunk costs industries. Interestingly, however, though one observes higher (asymptotic) concentration levels for endogenous sunk costs the differences are very small in the present case. The result is suggestive since the indicator for RAI reviews small magnitudes. In fact, if one considers the sub-sample of endogenous sunk costs industries a mean value of 0.047 and a coefficient of variation of 0.320 prevail. It appears that stronger contrasts between the two types of industries are more likely to prevail in countries where technological effort is more widespread across different industries.

4. Final Comments

The paper aimed at investigating the most salient prediction accruing from Sutton (1991) in the context of an emerging developing economy. Specifically, ideally one would expect an approximate convergence of the asymptotic concentration towards zero only in the case of exogenous sunk costs industries. In the present case, however, the difference between concentration bounds across the two types of industries are very small what might reflect the reduced magnitude of technological effort in that emerging economy.

Avenues for future research require improved data sets. In particular, it would be interesting to consider other types of endogenous sunk costs that were not emphasized by Sutton. In fact, modern organizational practices like total quality management, just-in-time systems among others may constitute relevant sources of endogenous sunk costs beyond advertising and R&S expenses.

References

- Buchinsky, M. (1998), Recent advances in quantile regression models: a practical guideline for empirical research, *Journal of Human Resources*, 33, 88-126.
- Giorgetti, M.L. (2000), La verifica del modello di Sutton per i settori manifatturieri italiani, *L'Industria*, 21, 543-564
- Giorgetti, M.L. (2003), Lower bound estimation-quantile regression and simplex method. An application to Italian manufacturing sectors, *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 51, 113-120
- Görg, H. and Strobl, E. (2002), Multinational companies and entrant start-up size: evidence from quantile regressions, *Review of Industrial Organization*, 20, 15–31.
- Görg, H., Strobl, E. and Ruane, F. (2000), Determinants of firm start-up size: an application of quantile regression for Ireland, *Small Business Economics*, 14, 211–22.
- Kannebley Jr., S., Porto, G.S., Pazello, E.T. (2005), Characteristics of Brazilian innovative firms: an empirical analysis based on PINTEC-industrial research on technological innovation, *Research Policy*, 34, 872-893
- Koenker, R. (2005), *Quantile Regression*, New York: Cambridge University Press
- Lyons, N. (1980), A new measure of minimum efficient plant size in UK manufacturing industry, *Economica*, 19-34

- Lyons, B., Mataves, C. (1996), Industrial concentration, In S. Davies and B. Lyons (eds.), *Industrial Organization in the European Union: Structure, Strategy and the Competitive Mechanism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Resende, M., Hasenclever, L. (1998), Intensidade em pesquisa e desenvolvimento e tamanho da firma: uma análise exploratória do caso brasileiro, *Estudos Econômicos*, 28, 601-618.
- Robinson, W.T., Chiang, J. (1996), Are Sutton's predictions robust? Empirical insights into advertising, R&D, and concentration, *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 64, 389-408.
- Schmalensee, R. (1989), Inter-industry studies of structure and performance, In R. Schmalensee and R.D. Willig (eds.), *Handbook of Industrial Organization*, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 951-1009
- Sutton, J. (1991), *Sunk Costs and Market Structure*, Cambridge-MA: MIT Press.
- Sutton, J. (1998), *Technology and Market Structure*, Cambridge-MA: MIT Press

CESifo Working Paper Series

for full list see www.cesifo-group.org/wp

(address: Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany, office@cesifo.de)

- 2381 Sebastian Buhai, Miguel Portela, Coen Teulings and Aico van Vuuren, Returns to Tenure or Seniority?, August 2008
- 2382 Erkki Koskela and Jan König, Flexible Outsourcing, Profit Sharing and Equilibrium Unemployment, August 2008
- 2383 Torberg Falch and Justina AV Fischer, Does a Generous Welfare State Crowd out Student Achievement? Panel Data Evidence from International Student Tests, September 2008
- 2384 Pedro Gomes and François Pouget, Corporate Tax Competition and the Decline of Public Investment, September 2008
- 2385 Marko Koethenbuerger, How Do Local Governments Decide on Public Policy in Fiscal Federalism? Tax vs. Expenditure Optimization, September 2008
- 2386 Ronald McKinnon and Gunther Schnabl, China's Exchange Rate Impasse and the Weak U.S. Dollar, September 2008
- 2387 Yan-Leung Cheung, Yin-Wong Cheung and Alan T.K. Wan, A High-Low Model of Daily Stock Price Ranges, September 2008
- 2388 Louis Eeckhoudt and Harris Schlesinger, Changes in Risk and the Demand for Saving, September 2008
- 2389 Carsten Hefeker and Blandine Zimmer, Uncertainty and Fiscal Policy in an Asymmetric Monetary Union, September 2008
- 2390 Jay Pil Choi and Byung-Cheol Kim, Net Neutrality and Investment Incentives, September 2008
- 2391 Marcel Gérard, Financing Bologna, the Internationally Mobile Students in European Higher Education, September 2008
- 2392 Annette Alstadsæter and Knut Reidar Wangen, Corporations' Choice of Tax Regime when Transition Costs are Small and Income Shifting Potential is Large, September 2008
- 2393 António Afonso and Christophe Rault, 3-Step Analysis of Public Finances Sustainability: the Case of the European Union, September 2008
- 2394 Betsey Stevenson and Justin Wolfers, Economic Growth and Subjective Well-Being: Reassessing the Easterlin Paradox, September 2008

- 2395 Bernhard Eckwert and Itzhak Zilcha, Private Investment in Higher Education: Comparing Alternative Funding Schemes, September 2008
- 2396 Øystein Foros, Hans Jarle Kind and Jan Yngve Sand, Slotting Allowances and Manufacturers' Retail Sales Effort, September 2008
- 2397 Mohammad Reza Farzanegan, Illegal Trade in the Iranian Economy: Evidence from a Structural Model, September 2008
- 2398 Olivier Bos, Charity Auctions for the Happy Few, September 2008
- 2399 Robert S. Chirinko and Debdulal Mallick, The Marginal Product of Capital: A Persistent International Puzzle, September 2008
- 2400 Ben D'Exelle and Arno Riedl, Elite Capture, Political Voice and Exclusion from Aid: An Experimental Study, September 2008
- 2401 Torben M. Andersen and Joydeep Bhattacharya, On Myopia as Rationale for Social Security, September 2008
- 2402 Fabienne Llense, French CEO Compensations: What is the Cost of a Mandatory Upper Limit?, September 2008
- 2403 Valentina Bosetti, Carlo Carraro, Alessandra Sgobbi and Massimo Tavoni, Delayed Action and Uncertain Targets. How Much Will Climate Policy Cost?, September 2008
- 2404 Robert G. Chambers, Rolf Färe, Shawna Grosskopf and Michael Vardanyan, Generalized Quadratic Revenue Functions, September 2008
- 2405 Leonidas Enrique de la Rosa, Overconfidence in a Career-Concerns Setting, September 2008
- 2406 Marcus Drometer and Johannes Rincke, The Design of Political Institutions: Electoral Competition and the Choice of Ballot Access Restrictions in the United States, September 2008
- 2407 Markku Lanne and Helmut Lütkepohl, Stock Prices and Economic Fluctuations: A Markov Switching Structural Vector Autoregressive Analysis, September 2008
- 2408 Thomas L. Brewer, International Energy Technology Transfers for Climate Change Mitigations, September 2008
- 2409 Alexander Kemnitz, Native Welfare Losses from High Skilled Immigration, September 2008
- 2410 Xavier Vives, Strategic Supply Function Competition with Private Information, September 2008

- 2411 Fabio Padovano and Roberto Ricciuti, The Political Competition-Economic Performance Puzzle: Evidence from the OECD Countries and the Italian Regions, September 2008
- 2412 Joan Costa-Font and Mireia Jofre-Bonet, Body Image and Food Disorders: Evidence from a Sample of European Women, September 2008
- 2413 Thorsten Upmann, Labour Unions – To Unite or to Separate?, October 2008
- 2414 Sascha O. Becker and Ludger Woessmann, Luther and the Girls: Religious Denomination and the Female Education Gap in 19th Century Prussia, October 2008
- 2415 Florian Englmaier and Stephen Leider, Contractual and Organizational Structure with Reciprocal Agents, October 2008
- 2416 Vittorio Daniele and Ugo Marani, Organized Crime and Foreign Direct Investment: The Italian Case, October 2008
- 2417 Valentina Bosetti, Carlo Carraro, Alessandra Sgobbi and Massimo Tavoni, Modelling Economic Impacts of Alternative International Climate Policy Architectures. A Quantitative and Comparative Assessment of Architectures for Agreement, October 2008
- 2418 Paul De Grauwe, Animal Spirits and Monetary Policy, October 2008
- 2419 Guglielmo Maria Caporale, Christophe Rault, Robert Sova and Anamaria Sova, On the Bilateral Trade Effects of Free Trade Agreements between the EU-15 and the CEEC-4 Countries, October 2008
- 2420 Yin-Wong Cheung and Daniel Friedman, Speculative Attacks: A Laboratory Study in Continuous Time, October 2008
- 2421 Kamila Fialová and Ondřej Schneider, Labour Market Institutions and their Effect on Labour Market Performance in the New EU Member Countries, October 2008
- 2422 Alexander Ludwig and Michael Reiter, Sharing Demographic Risk – Who is Afraid of the Baby Bust?, October 2008
- 2423 Doina Maria Radulescu and Michael Stimmelmayer, The Welfare Loss from Differential Taxation of Sectors in Germany, October 2008
- 2424 Nikolaus Wolf, Was Germany ever United? Evidence from Intra- and International Trade 1885 – 1933, October 2008
- 2425 Bruno S. Frey, David A. Savage and Benno Torgler, Noblesse Oblige? Determinants of Survival in a Life and Death Situation, October 2008
- 2426 Giovanni Facchini, Peri Silva and Gerald Willmann, The Customs Union Issue: Why do we Observe so few of them?, October 2008

- 2427 Wido Geis, Silke Uebelmesser and Martin Werding, Why go to France or Germany, if you could as well go to the UK or the US? Selective Features of Immigration to four major OECD Countries, October 2008
- 2428 Geeta Kingdon and Francis Teal, Teacher Unions, Teacher Pay and Student Performance in India: A Pupil Fixed Effects Approach, October 2008
- 2429 Andreas Haufler and Marco Runkel, Firms' Financial Choices and Thin Capitalization Rules under Corporate Tax Competition, October 2008
- 2430 Matz Dahlberg, Heléne Lundqvist and Eva Mörk, Intergovernmental Grants and Bureaucratic Power, October 2008
- 2431 Alfons J. Weichenrieder and Tina Klautke, Taxes and the Efficiency Costs of Capital Distortions, October 2008
- 2432 Andreas Knabe and Ronnie Schöb, Minimum Wage Incidence: The Case for Germany, October 2008
- 2433 Kurt R. Brekke and Odd Rune Straume, Pharmaceutical Patents: Incentives for R&D or Marketing?, October 2008
- 2434 Scott Alan Carson, Geography, Insolation, and Institutional Change in 19th Century African-American and White Stature in Southern States, October 2008
- 2435 Emilia Del Bono and Daniela Vuri, Job Mobility and the Gender Wage Gap in Italy, October 2008
- 2436 Marco Angrisani, Antonio Guarino, Steffen Huck and Nathan Larson, No-Trade in the Laboratory, October 2008
- 2437 Josse Delfgaauw and Robert Dur, Managerial Talent, Motivation, and Self-Selection into Public Management, October 2008
- 2438 Christian Bauer and Wolfgang Buchholz, How Changing Prudence and Risk Aversion Affect Optimal Saving, October 2008
- 2439 Erich Battistin, Clara Graziano and Bruno Parigi, Connections and Performance in Bankers' Turnover: Better Wed over the Mixen than over the Moor, October 2008
- 2440 Erkki Koskela and Panu Poutvaara, Flexible Outsourcing and the Impacts of Labour Taxation in European Welfare States, October 2008
- 2441 Marcelo Resende, Concentration and Market Size: Lower Bound Estimates for the Brazilian Industry, October 2008