

**Summary:**

- Sig. (+) AR for target-buyer
- Sig (+) AR for target
- Mixed evidence for buyers
- ST wealth effects – on avg M&A → value
- LT post ann. Are mixed and op performance also mixed.

Large loss deals – financed with equity, hostile, within industry, acq firms has high M/B ratio, size, ↓ op C/F – thus linked to overvalued equity (make poor acq when they run out of good ones, consistent with high M/B ratio and (+) AR at ann.)

**Module 2: Drivers of M&A Waves and Cross-border M&A**

Wave	Drivers	Org Invention	Industries	Turning Point
<b>Wave 1</b> (1895-1904) - <b>monopolies, EOScale,</b> easy/fraudulent financing, stock market crash	- favourable eco, stock market conditions - rapid tech innovation	Horizontal trust	Manufacturing	Regulation against horizontal combinations
<b>Wave 2</b> (1925-1929) - <b>oligopoly,</b> enhance productivity as part of war/tech innovation	- SP boom, ↑reg against H-mergers - tech innovation	Vertical Integration	Public utilities, mining, banking	Stock Market Crash of 1929
<b>Wave 3</b> (1965-1970) - <b>diversification</b> principle applied to managing large mergers	- booming of economy, low IR, high SP	Conglomerate	Oil	1971 recession, antitrust movement against conglomerates
<b>Wave 4</b> (1981-1987) - <b>hostile mergers,</b> IB plays aggressive role	- ↑SP, ↓IR - ↑ capital market innovation/sophistication - deregulation	LBO, specialist PE firms	Broad-based hostile deals	1990 Recession
<b>Wave 5</b> (1992-2000) - <b>mega/strategic mergers</b> - equity based - oligopoly market structure - globalisation	- ↑SP, ↓IR - industry specific shocks (deregulation, tech innovation, demographic change)	VC's	Broad based, more friendly	Internet Bubble burst in March 2000
<b>Wave 6</b> (2003-2007)	- ↑SP, ↓IR – cash used due to abundant liquidity - more relaxed antitrust rules - innovation – credit derivatives	PE firms, <b>cross-border,</b> hostile deals, LBOs, European		GFC in 07/08
<b>Wave 7</b> (2014 - )	- hist. low IR due to CB liquidity injection - commodity and currency vol. → cross border M&A	Disruptive innovation (search for IP) – <b>buying future competitors</b>	Cross-border mergers	??? Brexit, Trump, China Economy, US vs NK

### Explanations for Merger Waves

Reason	Description	Explains	Managers Rational?	Markets Rational?
<b>1. Hubris (Roll)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On avg, buyers earn no sig. AR after merger ann.</li> <li>- Managers of buyers must believe they have superior abilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Why firms do bad deals, but not M&amp;A waves and industry clustering</li> </ul>	N	Y
<b>2. Market Manias</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- mass irrational behaviour → bubbles, crashes → deal frenzy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- M&amp;A waves but not industry clustering</li> </ul>	N	N
<b>3. Overvaluation of stock</b> - problem for acquirer S/H as manager cannot produce performance req. to justify SP → LR value destroying acq. to satisfy ST growth expectations – ST compensation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- asymmetric info</li> <li>- firms use overvalued stock as ‘acq currency’ – when assessment of firm value is lower than that of the market</li> <li>- realise gains from mispricing premium over LT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- M&amp;A waves and use of payment (equity)</li> <li>- bidders are on avg more overvalued than targets → ↑P(equity offer)</li> </ul>	Y – bidder is rational, and max S/H value	N – greater bidder overvaluation strongly associated with ↓ ann. AR
<b>4. Agency Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inefficiencies arising from conflicts of interest between agents and principals</li> <li>- takeover removes these costs and make the firm more efficient due to ↑ governance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- M&amp;A waves but not industry clustering</li> </ul>	Y	Y
<b>5. Monopoly, comp. position and rent seeking</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- M&amp;A has antitrust constraint</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- industry clustering but not waves</li> </ul>	Y	Y
<b>6. Product Market Cycle and Operating Synergy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- incentive to merge during periods of eco expansion → EOScale – market power consideration</li> <li>- procyclical and (+) related to product market demand</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- takeover waves and industry clustering of M&amp;A</li> </ul>	Y	Y
<b>7. Industry Shocks</b> e.g. globalisation, trade lib. Tax changes – <b>dispersion of Tobin’s Q is driver</b> - high TQ firms have better prod <sup>n</sup> tech, predicts that mergers with lower TQ firms being sold to higher TQ to create synergies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- eco disturbances/shocks (targets) → ↑ dispersion of Q values among firms</li> <li>- L-TQ firms tend to be dissolved/taken over, due to high FC and low marginal adjustment cost of M&amp;A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- industry clustering and M&amp;A waves</li> </ul>	Y	Y