Preprints.org

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Industrial Organization in Flux: Challenges in Merger Analysis and the Need for Disciplinary Reinvention

Naresh Charan *

Posted Date: 4 October 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202410.0345.v1

Keywords: industrial organisation; merger analysis; antitrust policy; market dynamics

Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 4 October 2024 doi:10.20944/preprints202410.0345.v1

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

Industrial Organization in Flux: Challenges in Merger Analysis and the Need for Disciplinary Reinvention

Naresh Charan

Affiliation; drncsaxena@gmail.com

Abstract: This article examines the pressing challenges facing Industrial Organization (IO) in the contemporary economic landscape, with a particular focus on merger analysis. The rapid pace of technological advancement and emergence of novel business models have strained conventional analytical frameworks. We explore how the rise of digital platforms, data as a competitive asset, and multi-sided markets have exposed gaps in our understanding of market power and consumer welfare. Through an examination of empirical methodologies, including structural models and difference-in-differences approaches, we highlight the limitations of current techniques in accurately predicting merger outcomes. The paper argues for a disciplinary reinvention of IO, drawing upon insights from behavioural economics, network theory, and data science. We posit that an interdisciplinary approach is essential for developing more robust analytical tools capable of navigating the complexities of modern markets and informing effective antitrust policy in an increasingly interconnected global economy.

Keywords: industrial organisation; merger analysis; antitrust policy; market dynamics

Introduction

The field of Industrial Organization has long been a cornerstone of economic thought, providing crucial insights into market structures, firm behaviour, and competitive dynamics. However, in recent years, this venerable discipline has found itself at a crossroads, grappling with unprecedented challenges that threaten to upend traditional paradigms and analytical frameworks. The rapid pace of technological advancement, coupled with the emergence of novel business models and the increasing complexity of global supply chains, has created a landscape that defies easy categorisation or analysis. Perhaps nowhere is this flux more evident than in the realm of merger analysis, where regulators and economists alike struggle to apply time-honoured principles to transactions that blur the lines between industries and redefine the very nature of competition.

This research paper seeks to explore the myriad challenges facing Industrial Organization in the contemporary economic environment, with a particular focus on the difficulties encountered in merger analysis. We will examine how the rise of digital platforms, the growing importance of data as a competitive asset, and the increasing prevalence of multi-sided markets have strained the limits of conventional analytical tools. Moreover, we will delve into the ways in which these challenges have exposed gaps in our understanding of market power, consumer welfare, and the long-term effects of corporate consolidation. As we navigate this complex terrain, it will become clear that the discipline of Industrial Organization is in dire need of reinvention – not merely an incremental update, but a fundamental rethinking of its core tenets and methodologies.

In light of these pressing issues, this paper will argue for a disciplinary reinvention that draws upon insights from adjacent fields such as behavioural economics, network theory, and data science. By adopting a more interdisciplinary approach, we posit that Industrial Organization can evolve to meet the demands of our rapidly changing economic landscape, providing policymakers and practitioners with the tools they need to navigate an increasingly complex and interconnected world. Through a careful examination of recent case studies, emerging theoretical frameworks, and cutting-

© 2024 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 4 October 2024 doi:10.20944/preprints202410.0345.v1

edge empirical methods, we aim to chart a course towards a more robust and adaptable discipline – one that can continue to offer valuable insights into the nature of competition and market dynamics in the 21st century and beyond.

From Antitrust Policy to Empirical Methodologies

The field of Industrial Organisation has undergone a significant transformation, adopting a more technologically advanced approach. Regulatory bodies and competition authorities globally appear content with their endeavours. The US Antitrust Modernization Commission's latest findings, whilst advocating for increased retrospective analysis of governmental merger oversight, deem the current state of US antitrust legislation as robust. They posit that US antitrust enforcement has appropriately prioritised innovation fostering, competition and consumer welfare promotion, and stringent punishment of criminal cartel activities.

Regarding inter-industry distinctions, the Commission's 2007 report asserted the irrelevance of novel or divergent regulations for the "new economy". They maintained that existing antitrust laws continue to be pertinent in both current and future contexts, dismissing the necessity for industry-specific treatment.

Economists, however, express less confidence. Many perceive an inadequate emphasis on applied research utilising measurement-based data within a coherent economic framework in contemporary IO studies. Despite substantial resources allocated to pre-approval scrutiny of potential anticompetitive merger effects, there is a dearth of post-hoc evaluation regarding the competitive impact of sanctioned mergers. This information vacuum impedes comprehensive analysis of governmental policies. Scholarly debate persists, with Crandall and Winston arguing against the consumer benefits of antitrust policy, whilst Baker contends the opposite in the same *Journal of Economic Perspectives* issue.

To effectively inform antitrust policy and practice, IO should prioritise investigating the price implications of historical corporate mergers. However, this appears not to be the case. In contrast to labour economics, where numerous empirical studies examine wage effects of unionisation and minimum wage legislation, IO boasts only a handful of empirical investigations directly assessing price effects of completed mergers. Research on the cumulative impact of merger policy is even more sparse.

The principal approach in econometric industry studies, termed 'new empirical industrial organisation' (NEIO), initially lacked methodological sophistication. Early studies assigned behavioural interpretations to 'conjectural variations' as a market power metric, imposed stringent demand function restrictions to circumvent estimation of multiple cross-elasticities, and neglected endogeneity of prices and quantities alongside other identification issues.

The late 1990s witnessed the emergence of superior techniques under the 'structural IO' banner. Demand systems are typically estimated using discrete choice models for differentiating its products. It has been possible to limit substitution effects between brands in various segments by creating nested demand structures. The focus of demand modelling has been balancing flexible substitution patterns with the limited variation in typical data that permits flexible identification of such patterns. Prices in alternative marketplaces are one example of instrumental variables that are used to identify demand elasticities. Subsequently, using the substitution matrix, a market conduct model is created that allows for both types of simulation. Whilst these methodological advancements have elevated the status of IO, their credibility remains a subject of debate.

Industrial Disorganisation

The ready-to-eat cereal industry serves as an exemplary case study for examining the impact of corporate mergers on consumer goods pricing. Given that cereal has been a staple breakfast item for over a century, consumed by millions of households, any changes in its market dynamics could have far-reaching consequences. The cereal market is particularly resilient to economic downturns, owing to its affordability and ease of preparation. This sector is characterised by prolific brand diversification, with products that are differentiated yet closely related. The degree of similarity

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 4 October 2024 doi:10.20944/preprints202410.0345.v1

between cereal brands varies significantly; for instance, Cheerios bears more resemblance to certain multigrain oat brands than to corn flake varieties. One analytical approach involves segmenting products and developing models that restrict substitution patterns across segments whilst allowing for flexibility within them.

Recent methodologies in New Empirical Industrial Organisation (NEIO) and structural Industrial Organisation (IO) employ a two-stage process. The initial 'front-end' estimation calculates demand functions and supply relations, whilst the subsequent 'back-end' analysis utilises these estimates to simulate post-merger equilibrium conditions. Aviv Nevo's doctoral dissertation and subsequent publications in esteemed journals such as the RAND Journal of Economics and Econometrica demonstrate a profound understanding of the industry, coupled with meticulous empirical research. However, certain assumptions in his work warrant scrutiny. The formulated demand system imposes restrictions on substitution patterns that may be deemed unconvincing. Furthermore, the challenge of identifying suitable instrumental variables persists; in this case, the use of prices from other markets as instruments may be arbitrary, predicated on the assumption of inter-market independence. The assumption that mergers influence prices solely through the reduction in competitor numbers is particularly contentious, as other factors such as cost reductions could also play a significant role. Similar challenges plague structural merger models.

Another approach gaining traction is the difference-in-difference (DD) method, which considers a counterfactual scenario where the merger did not occur. This approach attempts to identify a comparison group. Ashenfelter and Hosken employ this approach in their analysis of the cereal industry merger, noting a discrepancy between their estimates and Nevo's predictions. Justine Hastings applies the DD method to examine the price effects of acquisition of a petrol dealer Thrifty. Her equation is:

$$p_{it} = \mu + \alpha_i + \delta\gamma \bullet t + \theta z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \qquad (1)$$

Whilst Hastings' work has garnered praise from prominent econometricians like Angrist and Pischke, such endorsement may be premature. The estimated effect size of five cents per gallon, implying a 50% increase in retail margins, would be alarming for antitrust authorities. However, a subsequent study by Taylor, Kreisle and Zimmerman, using a similar dataset over a longer period, presents contrasting results. Their regression equation is:

$$p_{it} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta\ \mathrm{Conversion}_{it} + \Sigma_j \Sigma_k \delta^{jk} \gamma_i \tau_t + \varepsilon_{it} \qquad (2)$$

where variables have similar meanings to equation (1), with $Conversion_{it}$ being a dummy variable indicating competition with a Thrifty station prior to its conversion.

Despite apparent differences, equation (2) is fundamentally similar to equation (1). However, the estimates for *Conversion* differ significantly. Taylor and colleagues find the price increase to be economically insignificant - approximately one-fiftieth of Hastings' estimate. This finding raises doubts about whether ARCO's acquisition of Thrifty led to higher prices and challenges the underlying model of consumer preferences. As the DD methodology continues to evolve, it faces ongoing criticism for being atheoretical and highly sensitive to assumptions. This case study underscores the complexities and challenges inherent in analysing the effects of mergers in consumer goods industries.

Navigating Uncertainty and Multinational Complexities

In the realm of merger analysis, we find ourselves at an impasse, with both structurally derived estimates and direct difference-in-differences (DD) approaches facing considerable scrutiny. The trajectory of structural models suggests increasing sophistication, yet the question of whether they can be predicated on fewer, more plausible assumptions remains unresolved. Proponents of randomised controlled trials advocate for a comparative approach, wherein multiple structural models are evaluated against direct estimates to determine superiority. This methodology, as exemplified by research on brands of toilet paper by Hausman and Leonard, indicates that the Nash-Bertrand model — often used in merger impact analyses — yields indirect estimates that align reasonably well with direct estimates and outperform alternative models.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 4 October 2024 doi:10.20944/preprints202410.0345.v1

However, this approach begs a critical question: can direct estimates truly be considered the gold standard? The ARCO-Thrifty acquisition case study casts doubt on the reliability of DD estimates. Moreover, on theoretical grounds, eminent scholars, including Nobel laureate James Heckman, have critiqued the emphasis on experimental or quasi-experimental results, arguing that this statistical retreat abandons crucial aspects of economic choice theory. Heckman contends that this shift overlooks pivotal distinctions between ex ante and ex post outcomes, as well as subjective and objective evaluations—concepts central to structural econometrics.

A further consideration is the applicability of historical merger data to future cases. Einav and Levin pose a provocative question: would proponents of direct measurement genuinely advocate for the Department of Justice to base its assessment of a hypothetical Microsoft-Yahoo merger on price effects observed in mergers of airline or office supply companies in the past, or on subsets derived from chance CEO encounters or lunar eclipses?

The analysis of multinational mergers presents additional complexities. While quantitative factors such as stock prices and balance sheets can be readily incorporated, the cultural nuances prove far more elusive. For instance, significant disparities exist between the human resource management practices of Western multinationals and their Asian counterparts operating beyond their countries of origin. Furthermore, the decentralisation of state power — a consequence of globalisation, neoliberalism, and evolving legal theory — has exerted a disrupting effect on industrial organisation. In light of these challenges, the path forward in merger analysis remains uncertain, necessitating a nuanced approach that acknowledges the limitations of both structural and direct estimation methods while striving for more robust and context-sensitive evaluations.

Conclusion

The field of Industrial Organization finds itself at a critical juncture, grappling with unprecedented challenges that call into question long-held assumptions and methodologies. The rapid pace of technological advancement, coupled with the emergence of novel business models and increasingly complex global supply chains, has created a landscape that defies easy categorisation or analysis. This flux is particularly evident in the realm of merger analysis, where traditional tools and frameworks struggle to capture the nuanced realities of modern market dynamics.

The evolution of empirical methodologies in Industrial Organization, from the early days of the 'new empirical industrial organisation' (NEIO) to the more sophisticated 'structural IO' approaches, represents significant progress in our ability to model and analyse complex market interactions. However, as demonstrated by the conflicting results in studies of mergers in industries such as ready-to-eat cereals and retail petrol, even these advanced techniques are not without their limitations and controversies. The debate between structural models and direct difference-in-differences (DD) approaches highlights the ongoing challenge of balancing theoretical rigour with empirical validity.

The case of the ARCO-Thrifty acquisition serves as a stark reminder of the potential pitfalls in merger analysis. The dramatic difference in findings between Hastings' original study and the subsequent re-examination by Taylor et al. underscores the sensitivity of these analyses to methodological choices and data selection. This discrepancy raises important questions about the reliability of such studies in informing antitrust policy and practice.

Moreover, the increasing complexity of multinational mergers adds another layer of difficulty to the already challenging task of merger analysis. Cultural differences in management practices, the decentralisation of state power, and the evolving legal landscape all contribute to a more intricate and nuanced environment for corporate consolidation. These factors often elude quantitative analysis, highlighting the need for a more holistic approach that can account for both measurable economic impacts and less tangible cultural and institutional effects.

As we look to the future of Industrial Organization, it is clear that a disciplinary reinvention is not just desirable, but necessary. This reinvention must draw upon insights from adjacent fields such as behavioural economics, network theory, and data science to develop more robust and adaptable analytical frameworks. The goal should be to create tools and methodologies that can effectively

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 4 October 2024 doi:10.20944/preprints202410.0345.v1

navigate the complexities of modern markets while maintaining the rigour and credibility that have long been hallmarks of the discipline.

However, this reinvention must be approached with caution and humility. The ongoing debates between proponents of structural models and advocates of more direct measurement techniques serve as a reminder that no single approach is likely to provide a definitive solution to the challenges facing Industrial Organization. Instead, a pluralistic approach that combines multiple methodologies and perspectives may be necessary to gain a comprehensive understanding of market dynamics in the 21st century.

In conclusion, the field of Industrial Organization stands at a crossroads, facing challenges that demand innovative thinking and interdisciplinary collaboration. As we strive to develop more effective tools for merger analysis and market understanding, we must remain cognisant of the limitations of our models and the potential for unintended consequences in their application. Only through a continued commitment to rigorous empirical work, theoretical innovation, and critical self-reflection can Industrial Organization hope to maintain its relevance and value in an increasingly complex economic landscape. The path forward may be uncertain, but it is through embracing this uncertainty and complexity that the discipline can evolve to meet the demands of our rapidly changing world.

References

1. Morck, R., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1990). Do managerial objectives drive bad acquisitions? *The Journal of Finance*, *45*(1), 31-48.
2. Avery, C., Chevalier, J. A., & Schaefer, S. (1988). Why do managers undertake acquisitions? An analysis of internal and external rewards for acquisitiveness. Journal of Law, *Economics, and Organization*, *14*(1), 24-43.
3. Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (2003). Stock market driven acquisitions. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *70*(3), 295–311.
4. Fuchs, V. R. (1972). Policy issues and research opportunities in industrial organization. NBER.
5. Stigler, G. J. (1968). *The organization of industry*. Irwin.
6. Asthana, A. N. (2023). Wastewater Management through Circular Economy: A Pathway Towards Sustainable Business and Environmental Protection. *Advances in Water Science*, *34*(3), 87-98.
7. Asthana, A. N. (2022). Impact of mindfulness on irrigation water consumption. *Frontiers in Water*, *4*. https://doi.org/10.3389/frwa.2022.1062835
8. Asthana, A. N. (2014). Thirty years after the cataclysm: toxic risk management in the chemical industry. *Journal of Toxicological Sciences*, *6*(1), 01-08.
9. Williamson, O. E. (1996). *The mechanisms of governance*. Oxford University Press.
10. Antitrust Modernization Commission. (2007). *Report and recommendations*. AMC.
11. Ashenfelter, O., & Hosken, D. (2010). The effect of mergers on consumer prices: Evidence from five mergers on the enforcement margin. *Journal of Law and Economics*, *53*(3), 417-466.
12. Crandall, R. W., & Winston, C. (2003). Does antitrust policy improve consumer welfare? Assessing the evidence. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *17*(4), 3-26.
13. Baker, J. B. (2003). The case for antitrust enforcement. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *17*(4), 27-50.
14. Angrist, J. D., & Pischke, J. S. (2010). The credibility revolution in empirical economics: Asthana, A. N. (2012). Decentralisation, HRD and production efficiency of water utilities: evidence from India. *Water Policy*, *14*(1), 112-126.
15. Asthana, A. N. (1994). Demand analysis in a basic needs framework: The case of rural water supply in central India. Fordham University.
16. Asthana, A. N. (2023). Role of Mindfulness and Emotional Intelligence in Business Ethics Education. *Journal of Business Ethics Education*, *20*, 5-17.
17. How better research design is taking the con out of econometrics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *24*(2), 3-30.
18. Bresahan, T. F. (1989). Empirical studies of industries with market power. In R. Schmalensee & R. D. Willig (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial Organization* (Vol. 2, pp. 1011-1057). North-Holland.
19. Corts, K. S. (1999). Conduct parameters and the measurements of market power. *Journal of Econometrics*, *88*(2), 227-250.
20. Ackerberg, D., Benkard, L., Berry, S., & Pakes, A. (2007). Econometric tools for analyzing market outcomes. In J. J. Heckman & E. E. Leamer (Eds.), *Handbook of Econometrics* (Vol. 6, Part A, pp. 4171-4276). Elsevier.
21. Asthana, A. N. (2022). Increasing production efficiency of irrigation systems through stakeholder participation. *Water Policy*, *24*(6), 1061-1072.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 4 October 2024 doi:10.20944/preprints202410.0345.v1

22. Asthana, A. N. (2004). Corruption and decentralisation: evidence from India's water sector. Loughborough University.
23. Asthana, A. N. (2023). Prosocial behavior of MBA students: The role of yoga and mindfulness. *Journal of Education for Business*, *98*(7), 378-386.
24. Reiss, P. C., & Wolak, F. A. (2007). Structural econometric modelling: Rationales and examples from industrial organization. In J. J. Heckman & E. E. Leamer (Eds.), *Handbook of Econometrics* (Vol. 6, Part A, pp. 4227-4415). Elsevier.
25. Berry, S. T. (1994). Estimating discrete choice models of product differentiation. *RAND Journal of Economics*, *25*(2), 242-262.
26. Hausman, J. A. (1997). Valuation of new goods under perfect and imperfect competition. In T. F. Bresnahan & R. J. Gordon (Eds.), *The Economics of New Goods* (pp. 209-237). University of Chicago Press.
27. Baker, J., & Bresnahan, T. F. (1985). The gains from merger or collusion in product differentiated industries. *Journal of Industrial Economics*, *33*(4), 427-444.
28. Asthana, A. (1998). Intergovernmental fiscal relations, Ronald C. Fisher(ed.): Boston[u. a.], Kluwer, 1997. *Kyklos*, *51*(4), 595-596.
29. Berry, S. T., & Pakes, A. (1993). Some applications and limitations of recent advances in empirical industrial organization: Merger analysis. *American Economic Review*, *83*(2), 247-252.
30. Nevo, A. (1997). Demand for ready-to-eat cereal and its implications for price competition, merger analysis and valuation of new brands [Doctoral dissertation]. Harvard University.
31. Nevo, A. (2000). Mergers with differentiated products: The case of the ready-to-eat cereal industry. *RAND Journal of Economics*, *31*(3), 395-421.
32. Nevo, A. (2001). Measuring market power in the ready-to-eat cereal industry. *Econometrica*, *69*(2), 307-342.
33. Asthana, A. N. (1999). Ahmad, Ehtisham (ed.)(1997). Financing Decentralized Expenditures. An International Comparison of Grants. *Kyklos*, *52*(1), 103-104.
34. Asthana, A. N. Pines, David, Efraim Sadka and Itzhak Zilcha (eds.)(1998). Topics in Public Economics. *Kyklos*, *52*(1), 122-123.
35. Asthana, A. N. (1999). Lemmen, J. and Elgar, E. (eds.)(1999). Integrating financial markets in the European Union. *Kyklos*, *52*(3), 465-467
36. Peters, C. (2010). Evaluating the performance of merger simulation: Evidence from the US airline industry. *Journal of Law and Economics*, *53*(4), 627-49.
37. Hastings, J. S. (2004). Vertical relationships and competition in retail gasoline markets: Empirical evidence from contract changes in Southern California. *American Economic Review*, *94*(1), 317–28.
38. Taylor, C., Kreisle, N., & Zimmerman, P. (2010). Vertical relationships and competition in retail gasoline markets: Empirical evidence from contract changes in Southern California: Comment. *American Economic Review*, *100*(3), 1269–1276.
39. Hausman, J. A., & Leonard, G. K. (2002). The competitive effects of a new product introduction: A case study. *Journal of Industrial Economics*, *50*(3), 237–63.
40. Heckman, J. J., 2010. Building Bridges between Structural and Program Evaluation Approaches to Evaluating Policy. Journal of Economic Literature, 48(2): 356–398.
41. Asthana, A. N. (2024). The Mechanism of Stress-Reduction Benefits Of Yoga For Business Students. *The Seybold Report*, *19*, 198-208.
42. Asthana, A. N. (2023) Determinants of Cultural Intelligence of Operations Management Educators. *The Seybold Report*, *18*(6), 789-800.
43. Einav, L., & Levin, J. (2010). Empirical industrial organization: A progress report. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *24*(2), 145-162.
44. Shapiro, C. (2010). The 2010 horizontal merger guidelines: From hedgehog to fox in forty years. *Antitrust Law Journal*, *77*(1), 701-759.
45. White, L. J. (2010). The growing influence of economics and economists on antitrust: An extended discussion. *Economics, Management, and Financial Markets*, *5*(1), 26-63.
46. Schmalensee, R. (2012). On a level with dentists? Reflections on the evolution of industrial organization. *Review of Industrial Organizations*, *41*(3), 157-179.
47. Budzinski, O., & Ruhmer, J. (2010). Merger simulation in competition policy: A survey. Journal of Competition *Law and Economics*, *6*(2), 277-319.
48. Jaffe, S., & Weyl, E. G. (2013). The first-order approach to merger analysis. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, *5*(4), 188-218.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.