# Discussion of Setzler, Tintelnot: "The Effects of Foreign Multinationals on Workers and Firms in the United States"

Emanuele Colonnelli (Chicago Booth)

July 2019

First part [foreign firm premium]:

- Emma (high quality) and Nick (low quality) move from GM to Toyota, same year same CZ
- Emma's wage goes from 100 at GM to 107 at Toyota, Nick gets the same 50

#### First part [foreign firm premium]:

- Emma (high quality) and Nick (low quality) move from GM to Toyota, same year same CZ
- Emma's wage goes from 100 at GM to 107 at Toyota, Nick gets the same 50

#### Second part [foreign spillovers]:

- Toyota's local operations grow in size relative to GM  $\to$  Large domestic firms benefit, and all Emmas earn more

#### First part [foreign firm premium]:

- Emma (high quality) and Nick (low quality) move from GM to Toyota, same year same CZ
- Emma's wage goes from 100 at GM to 107 at Toyota, Nick gets the same 50

#### Second part [foreign spillovers]:

- Toyota's local operations grow in size relative to GM  $\to$  Large domestic firms benefit, and all Emmas earn more
- NB: Toyota and GM are different
  - Toyota is foreign, GM is not
  - Toyota more productive than GM
  - Toyota: 8 Emma / 2 Nick ; GM: 6 Emma / 4 Nick

# Foreign Firms Have Higher TFP and Better Employees

- they pay more
- they generate positive local spillovers

### Should We Care?

# Should We Care?

### • Yes

- Huge debate (economic and political) on how to approach FDI, all even more relevant in current polarized world, trade wars, etc.
- Left Hand Size also very topical: jobs, earnings inequality, ...

# Should We Care?

### • Yes

- Huge debate (economic and political) on how to approach FDI, all even more relevant in current polarized world, trade wars, etc.
- Left Hand Size also very topical: jobs, earnings inequality, ...

Toyota's own estimates of the job multiplier are different:



### **Main Comments**

- 1. Empirics and Contribution
- 2. Foreign Wage Premium: Mechanisms
- 3. Foreign Spillovers: Mechanisms

Where contribution stands: [Best paper using micro-data to establish policy-relevant facts on foreign firms in US]

Where contribution stands: [Best paper using micro-data to establish policy-relevant facts on foreign firms in US]

Foreign Wage Premium:

- Lots of evidence from many countries, not controversial (Cameroon 20%, Denmark 75%, Finland 3%, France 13%, Germany 3%, Ghana 40-60%, Indonesia 20-60%, Kenya 24%, Malaysia 10%, Mexico 32%, Portugal -3-4%, Sweden, -2-6%, Uk 3-15%, USA 29%, Venezuela 31%, Zambia 37%, Zimbabwe 30%)
- Contribution is data: foreign ownership + matched employer-employee data
- To keep an eye on:
  - Assumption is job moves are exogenous (show more dynamics and trends around moves)
  - Can only observe parent-subsidiary linkages as snapshot in 2016 (measurement error may not be classical, show robustness to acquisitions)

Where contribution stands: [Best paper using micro-data to establish policy-relevant facts on foreign firms in US]

Foreign Wage Premium:

- Lots of evidence from many countries, not controversial (Cameroon 20%, Denmark 75%, Finland 3%, France 13%, Germany 3%, Ghana 40-60%, Indonesia 20-60%, Kenya 24%, Malaysia 10%, Mexico 32%, Portugal -3-4%, Sweden, -2-6%, Uk 3-15%, USA 29%, Venezuela 31%, Zambia 37%, Zimbabwe 30%)
- Contribution is data: foreign ownership + matched employer-employee data
- To keep an eye on:
  - Assumption is job moves are exogenous (show more dynamics and trends around moves)
  - Can only observe parent-subsidiary linkages as snapshot in 2016 (measurement error may not be classical, show robustness to acquisitions)

Foreign Spillovers:

- Top firms generate positive spillovers also not controversial (e.g. Greenstone, Hornbeck, Moretti 2010), especially in developed countries
- Contribution is use of shit-share design in new setting
- To keep an eye on:
  - Bartik-style assumptions, tests, inference (e.g., Goldsmith-Pinkham et al 2019, Adao et al 2019, Borusyak et al 2018)
  - Compositional changes?

Where contribution stands: [Best paper using micro-data to establish policy-relevant facts on foreign firms in US]

Foreign Wage Premium:

- Lots of evidence from many countries, not controversial (Cameroon 20%, Denmark 75%, Finland 3%, France 13%, Germany 3%, Ghana 40-60%, Indonesia 20-60%, Kenya 24%, Malaysia 10%, Mexico 32%, Portugal -3-4%, Sweden, -2-6%, Uk 3-15%, USA 29%, Venezuela 31%, Zambia 37%, Zimbabwe 30%)
- Contribution is data: foreign ownership + matched employer-employee data
- To keep an eye on:
  - Assumption is job moves are exogenous (show more dynamics and trends around moves)
  - Can only observe parent-subsidiary linkages as snapshot in 2016 (measurement error may not be classical, show robustness to acquisitions)

Foreign Spillovers:

- Top firms generate positive spillovers also not controversial (e.g. Greenstone, Hornbeck, Moretti 2010), especially in developed countries
- Contribution is use of shit-share design in new setting
- To keep an eye on:
  - Bartik-style assumptions, tests, inference (e.g., Goldsmith-Pinkham et al 2019, Adao et al 2019, Borusyak et al 2018)
  - Compositional changes?

Where I hope extra contributions can be made: [Open black box of "foreign-ness"]

### Larger Effects if MNEs of Developed Countries?



(a) Firm Premiums

### **Replicating Findings in Brazil 1/4**



# **Replicating Findings in Brazil 2/4**

USA

#### Brazil

Outcome: S	shorter-term Wage Growth $log(w_t) - log(w_{t-1})$	$\begin{array}{l} \text{Longer-term Wage Growtl} \\ \log(w_{t+1}) - \log(w_{t-2}) \end{array}$	Outcome:	Shorter-term Wage Growth $log(w_t) - log(w_{t-1})$	Longer-term Wage Growti $log(w_{t+1}) - log(w_{t-2})$
Domestic to Foreign Move	s: 0.045*** (0.002)	0.073*** (0.003)	Domestic to Foreign Movers	0.011*** (0.004)	0.025*** (0.005)
Foreign to Domestic Move	s: -0.042*** (0.002)	-0.035*** (0.002)	Foreign to Domestic Moves	V -0.173*** (0.003)	-0.118*** (0.004)
Domestic to Domestic Moves:	0.005*** (0.001)	0.012*** (0.001)	Domestic to Domestic Moves X	-0.033*** (0.001)	-0.038*** (0.002)
Foreign to Foreign Moves:	0.014*** (0.004)	0.031*** (0.003)	Foreign to Foreign Moves X	-0.061*** (0.005)	-0.012 (0.008)
Stayers at Foreign Firms:	-0.001 (0.001)	0.000 (0.001)	Stayers at Foreign Firms: X	0.013*** (0.001)	0.005*** (0.002)

### **Replicating Findings in Brazil 3/4**



# **Replicating Findings in Brazil 4/4**

#### USA

VX

#### Brazil

	Full Sample	By Firm Size			
		Size 1-9	Size 10-99	Size 100+	
	Outo	ome: Log	Full-time W	orkers	
2SLS Indirect Effect	0.45*** (0.12)	0.08 (0.06)	0.39*** (0.14)	1.23*** (0.43)	
First Stage Coefficient	0.60*** {0.03)	0.63*** (0.03)	0.58*** (0.03)	0.53*** (0.04)	
First Stage F-statistic	297	434	292	151	
Firm Observations (Millions)	45.9	38.3	7.0	0.5	

	c	utcome: Lo	Log Wage Bill	
2SLS Indirect Effect	0.47*** (0.14)	0.03 (0.09)	0.37** (0.16)	1.15*** (0.42)
Pirst Stage Coefficient	0.60*** (0.03)	0.63*** (0.03)	0.58*** (0.03)	0.53*** (0.04)
First Stage F-statistic	297	434	292	151
Firm Observations (Millions)	45.9	38.3	7.0	0.5

	Full Sample	By Firm size		
		Size 1-9	Size 10-99	Size 100+
Panel A.				
	Outcome: g	rowth in La	og Number o	of Workers
2SLS Spillover Estimate	1.235* (0.733)	0.518* (0.268)	0.793** (0.327)	0.109 (1.131)
Observations	34,978,038	25,583,059	8,703,636	690,704
Panel B.	Outcome: growth in Log Total Wage			
2SLS Spillover Estimate	0.554 (0.768)	-0.342 (0.399)	0.074 (0.413)	-0.261 (1.189)
Observations	34,973,668	25,578,791	8,703,539	690,699

- Selection
- Rent sharing by more productive firms

- Selection
- Rent sharing by more productive firms
- Job risk
- Compensating differentials (extra hours and amenities)

- Selection
- Rent sharing by more productive firms
- Job risk
- Compensating differentials (extra hours and amenities)
- Efficiency wages due to monitoring and communication problems
- Job-specific skills
- Protecting foreign-specific firm assets

- Selection
- Rent sharing by more productive firms
- Job risk
- Compensating differentials (extra hours and amenities)
- Efficiency wages due to monitoring and communication problems
- Job-specific skills
- Protecting foreign-specific firm assets
- Aversion to foreign firms and co-workers
- Cultural differences by country of ownership

- Selection
- Rent sharing by more productive firms
- Job risk
- Compensating differentials (extra hours and amenities)
- Efficiency wages due to monitoring and communication problems
- Job-specific skills
- Protecting foreign-specific firm assets
- Aversion to foreign firms and co-workers
- Cultural differences by country of ownership
- Cannot disentangle everything, but maybe:
  - Heterogeneity across sectors and firm types × Rule out unlikely channels × Make estimate as tight as possible (e.g., within 6-digit NAICS \* zipcode \* year)
     × Residual is "foreign-ness" (economic, cultural, behavioral, ...?)

• Technology and knowledge spillovers

- Technology and knowledge spillovers
- Local demand

- Technology and knowledge spillovers
- Local demand
- Input-Output linkages
- Competitive pressure

#### • Technology and knowledge spillovers

- Local demand
- Input-Output linkages
- Competitive pressure
- Management practices

#### • Technology and knowledge spillovers

- Local demand
- Input-Output linkages
- Competitive pressure
- Management practices
- Here I think you can do a lot more:
  - Heterogeneity across sectors can go a long way [customer-suppliers networks, product market competition, labor market networks, knowledge/innovation complementarities, ...]
  - Do effects vary by geographic distance?
  - Extensive vs intensive margin
  - Employees' movements across foreign and domestic firms
  - Change in firm's input and output (investment mix, innovation type)?
  - Lots of other interesting outcomes!

### My Takeaways

- Fantastic paper, huge policy implications
- Just some extra empirical checks
- More on mechanisms and "foreign-ness"
- Many many followups

Thank you