

Discussion on:

Private Equity and Pay Gaps Inside the Firms

Joacim Tåg

Research Institute of Industrial Economics (IFN)

www.joacimtag.se

Capri, June 2022

Remark #1: Mechanisms

- Why age, gender, and occupation?
 - estimate heterogeneous treatment effects with causal trees and forests
 - motivate heterogeneity through theory
- Theory
 - **Occupation:** flattening of the firm (Amess et al 2007, Caliendo et al 2015)
 - **Age:** breach of trust and skill obsolescence (Shleifer and Summers 1988, Olsson and Tåg 2017)
 - **Gender:** professionalization/standardization of pay?
- Other angles
 - Tournament theory
 - Production hierarchies
 - Family firms
- Literature needs a theory of internal reorganization of labor after M&As

Remark #2: External validity

- Are French LBOs special?
 - Compare French LBOs in observable characteristics to other countries (Capital IQ data)
 - Add institutional details on wage setting and seniority based dismissal laws
 - Add table comparing effects on men, managers and women to existing heterogeneity work
 - Replicate Davis et al (2014) growth and reallocation analyses

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics

	Sample					
	Final (1)	Weighted (2)	Sweden (3)	United States (4)	United Kingdom (5)	France (6)
A. Transaction types (nonexclusive):						
Going private (%)	2.5	9.5	2.0	4.8	4.2	1.1
Corporate divestiture (%)	30.5	41.8	35.4	29.7	29.8	16.9
Bankruptcy (%)	.8	.1	1.5	3.8	4.2	2.8
Management buyout (%)	20.1	10.6	21.9	22.4	57.1	34.3
Family succession (%)	5.9	3.8	4.4	4.2	4.4	8.3
Cross border (%)	28.5	43.2	27.8	5.8	11.2	17.0
Platform (%)	2.5	10.3	3.2	8.8	2.3	2.4

Table 9
Comparison to Table 4 in Davis et al. (2014)

	Sample			
	Sweden All Firms (1)	United States All Firms (2)	Sweden Low-Productive Firms (3)	Sweden High-Productive Firms (4)
Employment growth $t = 0$ to $t = 2$	3.49*** (.13)	-.88*** (.18)	-3.41*** (.29)	5.33*** (.17)
By adjustment margins:				
Continuers	2.78*** (.12)	-1.57*** (.12)	-1.63*** (.29)	4.41*** (.16)
Deaths	-1.69*** (.05)	4.12*** (.09)	2.44*** (.05)	-2.76*** (.07)
Births	-1.47*** (.06)	1.80*** (.05)	-.17 (.12)	-1.71*** (.08)
Acquisitions	.20*** (.04)	5.62*** (.05)	-3.50*** (.11)	.43*** (.03)
Divestitures	.29*** (.03)	2.77*** (.05)	-4.32*** (.10)	.55*** (.02)

Remark #3: Implications

- Are PE buyouts affecting aggregate inequality?
 - PE firms reduce wage inequality within firms, but GPs and management team make out like bandits
 - Stayers' wages almost unchanged, effects come from reallocation
 - Back-of-the-envelope calculation

Table 11
Job Polarization in Sweden, 2001–11

	Percentage Point Change, 2001–11			Percentage Change (Col. 3 to Col. 1)
	All Workers	PE Workers	Non-PE Workers	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Low-wage occupations	–.65	2.99	–.75	–15.38
Middle-wage occupations	–3.64	–6.89	–3.56	2.20
High-wage occupations	4.29	3.90	4.21	–1.86
	Polarization Index			
$\Delta(E^{\text{low}}/E^{\text{middle}})$	10.03	35.70	9.38	–6.48
$\Delta(E^{\text{high}}/E^{\text{middle}})$	25.29	38.11	25.05	–.95

Minor remarks

- Keep in mind that the wage effects are relative
 - wages may increase, but less than at controls
 - control firms may use different incentive schemes (these are growing firms)
 - PE firms may be standardizing hiring
 - Are the managers and older workers that leave friends or family of founders (family firms in France)?
- Data and econometrics
 - Why no triple-difference regressions in the heterogeneity part (Olden and Moen, 2022)?
 - You should match on dimensions of heterogeneity
 - Are the clusters at the buyout target firm or at worker's current firm?
 - Are firms/workers allowed to be controls for multiple years? If so, how do you deal with the standard errors?
 - Should you not weight the regressions given that you have more controls than treated?
 - Direct comparison to Boucly et al (2011) in table would be valuable
 - Absolute numbers of churn in small firms (below 80 empl., 20% churn)?
 - Are the old, the men, and the managers the same people?