

The background of the cover is a grayscale photograph of a modern university building with a large glass facade. In the foreground, there is a paved courtyard with several trees and concrete benches. The text is overlaid on this image.

KRANNERT GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana

A Model of Broker's Trading with Applications to
Order Flow Internalization

by

Sugato Chakravarty
Asani Sakar

Paper No. 1150
Date: August 2001

Institute for Research in the
Behavioral, Economic, and
Management Sciences

**A Model of Broker's Trading, With Applications to Order Flow
Internalization**

Sugato Chakravarty^{a,*}, Asani Sarkar^b

^a*Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, 47907-1262*

^b*Federal Reserve Bank of New York*

Previous version: June 2000 -- Current version: August 2001

JEL Classification number: G12

Keywords: dual trading, informed traders, internalization, piggybacking, adverse selection.

Abstract

Although brokers' trading is endemic in securities markets, the form of this trading differs between markets. Whereas in some securities markets, brokers may trade with their customers in the same transaction (simultaneous dual trading or SDT), in other markets, brokers are only allowed to trade *after* their customers in a separate transaction (consecutive dual trading or CDT). We show theoretically that, informed and noise traders are worse off and brokers are better off while market depth is lower in the SDT market. Thus, given a choice, traders prefer fewer brokers in the SDT market compared to the CDT market. With free entry, however, market depth may be higher in the SDT market provided its entry cost is sufficiently low relative to the CDT market. We study order flow internalization by broker-dealers, and show that, in the free entry equilibrium, internalization hurts retail customers and market quality.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors' and do not represent those of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York or the Federal Reserve System.

*Corresponding author. Tel.: 765-494-6427

E-mail address: sugato@purdue.edu

Dual trading occurs when a broker sometimes trades for customers as an agent, and at other times trades for his own account. Personal trading by brokers is pervasive throughout securities and futures markets in the U.S. and the world. There are two types of dual trading: *simultaneous* (where a broker trades for himself and a customer in the same transaction) and *consecutive* (where a broker trades for customers as an agent and for himself at other times, but not in the same transaction).

In futures exchanges, consecutive dual trading is permitted, but not simultaneous dual trading. However, both types of dual trading are allowed in securities markets, currency and interest rate swap markets, and the fixed income market. What are the relative advantages and disadvantages of the two forms of dual trading, and how do they relate to the structure of the securities markets? Our paper highlights the role of brokerage competition in determining the relative costs and benefits of the two types of dual trading. We show that consecutive dual trading markets are associated with many brokers, whereas simultaneous dual trading markets are only viable with few brokers. Therefore, consistent with institutional reality, our model predicts that in futures markets, where typically many dual traders are present in each contract, consecutive dual trading is more likely than simultaneous dual trading. In stock markets, by contrast, the number of dual traders in any stock is few, and simultaneous dual trading is the norm.¹

In our model, based on Kyle (1985), multiple informed traders and noise traders trade by dividing their orders equally among multiple brokers. The brokers, on receiving the orders, may dual trade consecutively or simultaneously. If brokers dual trade simultaneously, each broker

¹ In the NYSE, for example, the potential dual traders are--in addition to the specialist--national full-line firms and investment banks. In 1989, there were six national full-line firms, and ten investment banks

submits the net order (his personal trades plus his customers' trades) to the market maker for execution, and the game ends in a single period. If brokers trade consecutively, trading occurs over two periods. In period one, each broker submits the sum of informed and period-one noise trades to the market maker for execution. In period two, each broker submits his personal trade and period two noise trades to the market maker. In all cases, the market maker sets prices to make zero expected profits, conditional on observing the net order flow in the market.

We find that the simultaneous dual trading markets are not viable when there are many dual traders. The reason is that brokers mimic informed trades by trading with insiders in the same direction, causing insiders to trade less and at a higher price (in absolute value), and lowering informed profits.² In addition, brokers offset noise trades, thereby increasing noise trader losses. These effects are more adverse, the greater the number of brokers.

When both dual trading markets exist, informed traders have lower expected profits and noise traders have higher losses with simultaneous dual trading. These results appear to imply that, over time, simultaneous dual trading markets should cease to exist. To explain the coexistence of the two types of dual trading, we extend the model by endogenizing the number of brokers and informed traders in the market. In the free entry equilibrium, traders pay a fixed fee to enter the market and, upon entering, choose the number of brokers to trade with. We show that, provided the market entry fee is sufficiently low, enough informed traders enter the simultaneous dual trading market to make it viable. Further, traders choose many brokers in the consecutive dual trading market, and only one broker in the simultaneous dual trading market.

(Matthews,1994).

² As a practical example of how brokers' trading may hurt informed traders, large institutional customers in the stock markets have long been concerned that brokers may use knowledge of their orders to trade for their own accounts. See "Money Machine", *Business Week*, June 10, 1991, pages 81-84.

To test the applicability of our model, we study order flow internalization by brokers, which primarily affects uninformed retail order flow (Easley, Kiefer and O'Hara (1996), Battalio, Green and Jennings (1997), and the SEC (1997)). We show that, in the free entry equilibrium, internalization reduces market depth and price informativeness, and increases uninformed losses. Further, the number of internalizing brokers is negatively related to the market depth and the number of entering informed traders. Thus, our model predicts that internalization may be more prevalent in thin markets with few informed traders. If thin markets have high spreads, this result supports advocates of purchased order flow who argue that it primarily affects NYSE stocks with large spreads (Easley, Kiefer and O'Hara, 1996). However, contradicting these advocates, we show that market quality is affected adversely.

The existing literature on dual trading does not distinguish between the two types of dual trading. Also, it does not consider multiple informed traders and multiple brokers in the same model, nor does it endogenize the number of traders. Fishman and Longstaff (1992) study consecutive dual trading in a model with a single broker and a fixed order size. Roell (1990) and Chakravarty (1994) have multiple dual traders but a single informed trader. Sarkar (1995) studies simultaneous dual trading with multiple informed traders and a single broker.

Regarding internalization, Battalio and Holden (1996) show that, if brokers can distinguish between informed and uninformed orders (as in our model), they can profit from internalizing uninformed orders. However, unlike our model, they do not focus on the effect of internalization on market quality. Dutta and Madhavan (1997) find that a collusive equilibrium is easier to sustain with preferencing arrangements. In contrast to the theoretical results, the empirical studies of Battalio (1997), Battalio, Greene and Jennings (1997) and Lightfoot, Martin,

Peterson, and Sirri (1997) and the experimental study of Bloomfield and O'Hara (1996) find no adverse effect on market quality.³

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section I describes a trading model with multiple customers and many brokers, when the number of informed traders and brokers is fixed. Sections II and III solve the consecutive and simultaneous dual trading models. Section IV endogenizes the number of informed traders and brokers. Section V analyzes order flow internalization. Section VI concludes. All proofs are in the appendix.

I. A Model of Trading with Multiple Customers and Multiple Brokers.

We consider an asset market structured along the lines of Kyle (1985). There is a single risky asset with random value v , drawn from a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance Σ_v . There are n informed traders who receive a signal about the true asset value and submit market orders. For an informed trader i , $i=1, \dots, n$, the signal is $s^i = v + e^i$, where e^i is drawn from a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance Σ_e . A continuum of noise traders also submit aggregate market orders u , where u is normally distributed with mean zero and variance Σ_u . All random variables are independent of one another.

All customers, informed and uninformed, must trade through brokers. There are m brokers in the market, who submit customer orders to the market maker. m and n are common knowledge. We assume that orders are split equally among the m brokers. By observing informed orders, brokers can infer the informed traders' signals. By observing orders of noise

³ As Battalio, Greene and Jennings (1997) state, their result may imply that broker-dealers are not systematically skimming uninformed order flows or, alternatively, that internalizing brokers have a cost advantage in executing orders. Macey and O'Hara (1997) survey the literature on preferencing and internalization.

traders, they are aware of the size of uninformed trades. Consequently, brokers have an incentive to trade based on their customers' orders. However, brokers are not allowed to trade ahead of (i.e., front run) their customers.

Brokers may trade in two possible ways. They may execute their customers' orders first, and trade for their own accounts second in a separate transaction---i.e., engage in *consecutive* dual trading. Alternatively, they may trade with their customers in the same transaction--i.e., engage in *simultaneous* dual trading. The sequence of events is as follows: in stage one, informed trader i (for $i=1,\dots,n$) observes s^i and chooses a trading quantity x^i . In stage two, broker j (for $j=1,\dots,m$) trades consecutively or simultaneously, and places orders of an amount z^j . In subsequent sections, we describe in more detail how simultaneous and consecutive dual trading differ. Finally, all trades (including brokers' personal trades) are batched and submitted to a market maker, who sets a price that earns him zero expected profits conditional on the history of net order flows realized.

Initially, the number of informed traders and brokers is fixed. Later, we allow informed traders to choose the number of brokers to allocate their orders to, and study the free entry equilibrium where informed traders and brokers decide whether to enter the market, depending on a market entry cost and their expected profits upon entering.

II. Consecutive Dual Trading.

In this section, we solve for the equilibrium in a market with consecutive dual trading. We assume that brokers do not trade with their customers in the same transaction--i.e., simultaneous dual trading is not allowed, as in futures markets.

A. The Consecutive Dual Trading Model

Trading occurs in two periods. In period one, brokers receive market orders from n informed traders and the noise traders, which they then submit to the market maker. In period two, brokers trade for themselves, along with period two noise traders. Each period, a market maker observes the history of net order flow realized so far and sets a price to earn zero expected profits, conditional on the order flow history.

The sequence of events is as follows: in period one, informed trader i , $i=1, \dots, n$ observes s^i and chooses $x^{i,d}$, knowing that his order will be executed in the first period. Accordingly, informed trader i , $i=1, \dots, n$, chooses $x^{i,d}$ to maximize conditional expected profits $E[(v-p_1)x^{i,d} | s^i]$, where the period one price is $p_1 = \lambda_1 y_1$, the period one net order flow is $y_1 = x_d + u_1$, the aggregate informed trade is $x_d = \sum_i x^{i,d}$ and u_1 is the period one noise trade.

In period two, brokers choose their personal trading quantity after observing the n -vector of informed trades $\{x^{1,d}, \dots, x^{n,d}\}$, u_1 and p_1 . Thus, broker j , $j=1, \dots, m$, chooses z^j to maximize conditional expected profits $E[(v-p_2)z^j | \{x^{1,d}/m, \dots, x^{n,d}/m\}, u_1/m, p_1]$, where the conditioning is based on each broker observing his portion of the informed and uninformed orders received, plus the period one price.

The m brokers submit their personal trades to the market maker, who sets $p_2 = \lambda_2 y_2 + \mu_2 y_1$ where $y_2 = \sum_j z^j + u_2$, $\sum_j z^j$ is the aggregate trade of all brokers and u_2 is the noise trade in period two. Finally, the liquidation value v is publicly observed and both informed traders as well as brokers realize their respective profits (if any).

Define $t = \Sigma_v / \Sigma_s$, where t is the unconditional precision of s^i , $i=1, \dots, n$. Note that $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Further, define $Q = 1 + t(n-1)$, where $(Q-1)s^i$ represents informed trader i 's conjecture (conditional

on s^i) of the remaining $(n-1)$ informed traders' signals. Since informed traders have different information realizations, they also have different conjectures about the information of other informed traders. t also measures the correlation between insider signals. For example, if $t=1$ (perfect information), informed signals are perfectly correlated, $Q=n$, and informed trader i conjectures that other informed traders know $(n-1)s^i$ --i.e., the informed trader believes other informed traders have the same information as he.

Proposition 1 below solves for the unique linear equilibrium in this market.

Proposition 1: In the consecutive dual trading case, there is a unique linear equilibrium for $t > 0$. In period one, informed trader $i, i=1, \dots, n$, trades $x^i = A_d s^i$, and the price is $p_1 = \lambda_1 y_1$. In period two, each broker $j, j=1, \dots, m$ trades $z = B_1 x_d + B_2 u_1$, the price is $p_2 = \lambda_2 y_2 + \mu_2 y_1$, and a broker's expected trading revenue is W_d where:

$$(1) \lambda_1 = \frac{\sqrt{nt \Sigma_v}}{(1+Q)\sqrt{\Sigma_u}}$$

$$(2) A_d = \frac{t}{\lambda_1(1+Q)}$$

$$(3) B_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{mQ(1+Q)}}$$

$$(4) B_2 = \frac{-\sqrt{Q}}{\sqrt{m(1+Q)}}$$

$$(5) \lambda_2 = \frac{\sqrt{nt \Sigma_v} \sqrt{m}}{\sqrt{Q(1+Q)\Sigma_u} (1+m)}$$

$$(6) \mu_2 = \frac{\sqrt{nt \Sigma_v}}{(1+Q)\sqrt{\Sigma_u}}$$

$$(7) W_d = \frac{\sqrt{nt \Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{\sqrt{Q(1+Q)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m(1+m)}}$$

Discussion: Period one informed trades are not affected by dual trading in period two since informed traders trade only in period one. The informed trading intensity A_d is positively related to the market depth ($1/\lambda_1$) and to the precision of the signal. In period two, dual traders piggyback on period one informed trades ($B_1 > 0$) and offset noise trades ($B_2 < 0$). Competition between informed traders leads insiders to use their information less, making piggybacking less valuable. Higher values of t increases the correlation between insiders' signals, reducing (for $n > 1$) the value of observing multiple informed orders. Consequently, the extent of piggybacking B_1 decreases in the number of informed traders n and the information precision t . Broker revenues increase with noise trading, and decrease with the number of brokers.

III. Simultaneous Dual Trading.

A. The Simultaneous Dual Trading Model

Simultaneous dual trading is modeled in a single period Kyle (1985) framework. The notations are the same as in section II. All variables and parameters related to simultaneous dual trading are denoted either with superscript s or subscript s .

A group of n informed traders receive signals s^i about the unknown value v , and choose quantities $x^{i,s}$ knowing that his order will be executed along with the orders of brokers and noise traders in the same transaction. Accordingly, informed trader i , $i=1, \dots, n$, chooses $x^{i,s}$ to maximize conditional expected profits $E[(v-p_s)x^{i,s} | s^i]$, where the price is $p_s = \lambda_s y_s$, the net order flow is $y_s = x_s + mz + u$, the aggregate informed trade is $x_s = \sum_i x^{i,s}$, z is the amount each broker trades and u is the noise trade.

Upon receiving the orders of their informed and uninformed customers, brokers choose their personal trading quantity after observing the n -vector of informed trades $\{x^{1,s}, \dots, x^{n,s}\}$ and u . Thus, broker $j, j=1, \dots, m$, chooses $z^{j,s}$ to maximize expected profits $E[(v-p_s)z^{j,s} \mid \{x^{1,s}/m, \dots, x^{n,s}/m\}, u/m]$, where the conditioning is based on each broker observing his portion of the informed and uninformed orders.

The m brokers submit their customer trades and personal trades to the market maker, who sets the price that earns him zero expected profits conditional on the net order flow realized. Finally, the liquidation value v is publicly observed and both informed traders as well as brokers realize their respective profits (if any). Proposition 2 below solves for the unique linear equilibrium in this market.

Proposition 2: In the simultaneous dual trading case, there is a unique linear equilibrium for $t > 0$ and $Q > m$. Informed trader $i, i=1, \dots, n$, trades $x^{i,s} = A_s s^i$, broker $j, j=1, \dots, m$ trades $z = B_{1,s} x_s + B_{2,s} u$, the price is $p_s = \lambda_s y_s$, W_s is the broker's expected revenue, where:

$$(8) \quad \lambda_s = (1+m) \frac{\sqrt{nt \Sigma_v}}{\sqrt{\Sigma_u (1+Q)}}$$

$$(9) \quad A_s = \frac{(Q-m)t}{\lambda_s Q(1+Q)}$$

$$(10) \quad B_{1,s} = \frac{1}{(Q-m)}$$

$$(11) \quad B_{2,s} = -\frac{1}{(1+m)}$$

$$(12) \quad W_s = \frac{\sqrt{nt \Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{Q(1+m)}$$

In contrast to Proposition 1, the informed trading intensity A_s depends on the number of brokers. The insider trades and equilibrium exists only if $Q > m$. Since $n > Q$, existence implies $n > m$: the number of informed traders must exceed the number of brokers. The intuition behind

this result is as follows. Suppose an insider buys. Dual traders also buy in the same transaction, piggybacking on the insider trade (i.e. $B_I > 0$), and increasing the price paid by the insider for his purchase. The order of an individual insider is exploited less as the number of insiders increases, and is exploited more as the number of brokers increases. If the number of brokers is too large relative to the number of insiders, the adverse price effect makes it too costly for insiders to trade.

B. Comparing Simultaneous And Consecutive Dual Trading

By combining results from propositions one and two, we can compare the equilibrium outcomes for the two kinds of dual trading, holding the number of informed traders and brokers fixed.

Corollary 1. Suppose m and n is fixed. Then:

- (1) If $Q \leq m$, only the consecutive dual trading equilibrium is viable.*
- (2) If $Q > m$, then both dual trading equilibria are viable. Relative to simultaneous dual trading, uninformed losses and brokers' profits are lower, while informed profits are higher with consecutive dual trading.*

As discussed in Proposition 2, the simultaneous dual trading equilibrium no longer exists when $Q \leq m$, i.e. when there are too many brokers who take advantage of the insider information. Since, with consecutive dual trading, informed trading is independent of the number of brokers, a market with consecutive dual trading continues to exist even with too many brokers. When the number of brokers is relatively few ($Q > m$), then both types of dual trading exists. Brokers would prefer simultaneous since their profits are higher. Since brokers' profits are at the expense of insiders, informed traders by contrast prefer consecutive dual trading. Aggregate profits of informed traders and dual traders are higher in the simultaneous dual trading market.

Since noise trader losses are the negative of these aggregate profits, noise trader losses are also higher with simultaneous dual trading.

IV. Free Entry by Informed Traders and Brokers

In this section, we study the two forms of dual trading, given that informed and uninformed traders optimally choose the number of brokers to give their orders to, and given that there is free entry into the asset market. The decision-making sequence of agents is as follows:

1) Informed traders and brokers simultaneously decide whether to enter the market; (2) Informed and noise traders choose the number of brokers to give the order to; (3) Informed and noise traders divide their orders equally among the chosen brokers. From then on, the game continues as before.

Informed traders choose the number of brokers to maximize expected profits. Uninformed noise traders choose the number of brokers to minimize their expected losses to informed traders and brokers. The following corollary describes traders' choice of the number of brokers to trade with.

Corollary 2. (1) When brokers trade consecutively, informed and noise traders choose all the brokers available.

(2) Suppose there are at least two informed traders, so that the simultaneous dual trading equilibrium exists. Then, with simultaneous dual trading, informed and noise traders give orders to only one broker.

With consecutive dual trading, informed traders' profits are independent of m but noise trader losses are decreasing in m . Thus, noise traders choose all available brokers while informed traders are indifferent to the choice of m . When brokers trade simultaneously, the

situation is reversed: informed profits are decreasing in m whereas uninformed losses are independent of m . Thus, informed traders choose one broker and noise traders are indifferent to the choice of m . For concreteness, we assume that informed and noise traders give orders to the same number of brokers.

Next, consider free entry by informed traders and brokers. Let k_i be the cost of entering market i , $i=d$ (consecutive dual trading), s (simultaneous dual trading). To obtain analytic solutions, we assume $t=1$. The free entry equilibrium satisfies two conditions. Traders enter a market until their expected profits, net of the entry cost, are zero. And the cost is low enough so that entry is profitable for the minimum number of traders necessary to sustain equilibrium. Proposition three solves for the free entry equilibrium in the two markets.

Proposition 3. (1) In the market with consecutive dual trading, n_d informed traders and m_d brokers enter the market, with $m_d < n_d$, and m_d and n_d given by:

$$(13) \sqrt{m_d}(1 + m_d) = \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{k_d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + n_d}}$$

$$(14) \sqrt{n_d}(1 + n_d) = \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{k_d}$$

At least *two* informed traders and at least *one* broker enter the market if:

$$(15) k_d \leq \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{3\sqrt{2}}$$

(2) In the market with simultaneous dual trading, n_s informed traders and *one* broker enter the market, where n_s is given by:

$$(16) \frac{n_s \sqrt{n_s}(1 + n_s)}{(n_s - 1)} = \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{2k_s}$$

At least *two* informed traders and *one* broker enter the market if:

$$(17) \quad k_s \leq \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{12\sqrt{2}}$$

Proposition three is intuitive: the number of informed traders and brokers entering a market is inversely related to the cost of entering the market, and positively related to the volatility of the asset value and the size of noise trades (i.e., the depth of the market). In the consecutive dual trading market, a broker expects to make less trading profits than an informed trader since he trades second. Thus, the equilibrium number of brokers is less than the equilibrium number of informed traders in this market.

An important observation is that the participation constraint (17) is more restrictive than the inequality (15), implying that the simultaneous dual trading equilibrium is viable only at lower market entry cost, relative to the consecutive dual trading equilibrium. In the following proposition, we compare the two types of dual trading markets given free entry by brokers and informed traders and the optimal choice of the number of brokers by informed traders.

Proposition 4. **In the free entry equilibrium of proposition three, suppose $k_d > 2k_s$. Then $n_d < n_s$. Market depth may be higher with simultaneous dual trading if n_s is large relative to n_d and m_d .**

The proposition says that, if entry costs are sufficiently low, the simultaneous dual trading market may have *more* informed traders and greater market depth in a free entry equilibrium. The reason is that informed traders protect themselves from excessive piggybacking by choosing only one broker, thus maximizing their expected profits in the simultaneous dual trading market. Consequently, if entry costs are low enough, many informed traders enter the simultaneous dual trading market and market depth is higher. Thus, the

proposition provides some intuition as to why we see markets with simultaneous dual trading exist in the real world.

V. Internalization of order flow by broker-dealers

Internalization is the direction of order flow by a broker-dealer to an affiliated specialist or order flow executed by that broker-dealer as market maker. Broker-dealers can internalize order flow in several ways. For example, large broker-dealer firms, particularly NYSE member firms, purchase specialist units on regional exchanges and direct small retail customer orders to them. In off-exchange internalizations, NYSE firms execute orders of their retail customers against their own account, with the transaction taking place in the so-called third market or over-the-counter market. Such transactions, also called 19c-3 trading, have become a major source of profits for broker-dealers.⁴

We use our simultaneous dual trading model to analyze order flow internalization. Since internalizing brokers typically handle order flows of small retail investors, we assume that there are m_1 internalizing brokers who handle all of the noise trades, and m_2 piggybacking brokers who handle all the informed traders, with $m_1 + m_2 = m$. As before, the market maker sees the pooled order and, further, cannot distinguish between internalizing brokers and informed-order brokers.

Let z_1 be the trade of an internalizing broker and let z_2 be the trade of informed-order brokers. From (10) and (11):

$$(18) \quad z_1 = -\frac{u}{(1 + m_1)}$$

⁴ Rule 19c-3 allows NYSE stocks listed after April 26, 1979 to be traded off-exchange. Broker-dealers may have earned over \$500 million in 1994 from 19c-3 trading. See "Report on the practice of preferencing", the SEC, April 1997, and "In-House trades can be costly for small investors", the *Wall Street Journal*, December 20, 1994.

$$(19) z_2 = \frac{x_s}{(Q - m_2)}$$

We compare uninformed losses and the market quality between the internalization model and a model with no brokers' trading. For simplicity, we assume $t=1$. The following proposition shows the effect of order flow internalization on noise trader losses and the market, assuming free entry of informed traders and brokers.

Proposition 5. Suppose market entry is free. Then, with internalization of order flow, (i) one piggybacking broker, n_o informed traders and m_o internalizing brokers enter the market. m_o is less than the competitive number of brokers since internalizing brokers make positive expected profits in the free-entry equilibrium. (ii) Relative to a market with no order flow internalization, market depth, price informativeness, expected informed profits and the number of informed traders are lower, while uninformed losses are higher.

Since piggybacking hurts informed profits, traders choose just one piggybacking broker. Aggregate profits of internalizing brokers are greater than the aggregate profits of informed traders. Since entry costs must be low enough to allow informed traders to enter the market at zero expected profits, it follows that expected profits of internalizing brokers must be positive at these costs. The results on market quality and informed profits follow from our earlier result that market quality in the simultaneous dual trading market is worse than in the consecutive dual trading market and in a market without dual trading.

VI. Conclusion.

In this article, we study a wide variety of issues related to brokers' trading. Multiple informed traders and noise traders trade through multiple brokers, who either trade in the same transaction as their customers (simultaneous dual trading) or in a separate transaction (consecutive dual trading).

While the consecutive dual trading equilibrium always exists, the simultaneous dual trading equilibrium fails when the number of brokers is greater than the number of informed traders. The reason is that brokers trade with informed traders in the same direction, thus worsening informed traders' terms of trade. This effect is magnified with many brokers, leading informed traders to stop trading. When both equilibria exist, informed profits and market depth are lower, while uninformed losses and brokers' profits are higher with simultaneous dual trading, relative to consecutive dual trading. Thus, only brokers prefer simultaneous dual trading.

We allow informed and noise traders to choose the number of brokers, and endogenize the number of brokers and informed traders in the market. In the simultaneous dual trading market, informed and noise traders choose only one broker whereas, with consecutive dual trading, informed and noise traders choose all available brokers. If the market entry cost is sufficiently low, more informed traders enter the simultaneous dual trading market, and market depth may be lower, relative to the consecutive dual trading market. Thus, the adverse effects of simultaneous dual trading on customers and the market are mitigated in the free entry equilibrium. If the market entry cost is high, consecutive dual trading is better.

In the simultaneous dual trading model, we allow some brokers to internalize the uninformed order flow, by selling to noise traders as dealers, out of inventory. In the free entry

equilibrium, we find that market depth and price informativeness are lower, and uninformed losses are higher. In addition, the number of internalizing brokers is negatively related to market depth and the number of informed traders.

Appendix

Proof of Proposition 1:

Consecutive dual trading equilibrium.

In period one, the insider's problem is identical to the single period model in Kyle (1985), but with multiple informed traders. The solution to this equilibrium is in Lemma 1 of Admati and Pfleiderer (1988). This gives A_d and λ_1 .

The j-th dual trader's problem:

Let $x^{m,d}$ denote the n-tuple $\{x^{1,d}/m, x^{2,d}/m, \dots, x^{n,d}/m\}$. In period two, dual trader j observes $x^{m,d}$, p_1 and u_1/m and trades z^j . The dual trader's problem is to maximize with respect to z^j his expected profits $E[(v-p_2)z^j | x^{m,d}, u_1/m, p_1]$. Let $z^{-j} = \sum_{i \neq j} z^i$ for all $i \neq j$. Also, define $s = \sum_{i=1}^n s^i$. The first order

condition for the dual trader's problem is:

$$(1.1) \quad E\langle v | x^{m,d} \rangle - 2\lambda_2 z^j - \lambda_2 z^{-j} - \mu_2 A_d s - \mu_2 u_1 = 0$$

Using linear projection, $E[v | x^{m,d}] = ts/Q$, where Q is defined in the text. The second order condition is $-\lambda_1 < 0$, which is satisfied for $\lambda_1 > 0$.

Given that brokers are symmetric, $z = z^j$ for every j . Then, solving for z from (1.1),

$$(1.2) \quad z = \frac{ts}{\lambda_1 Q(1+Q)} \frac{T_\mu}{\lambda_2(1+m)} - \frac{\mu_2}{\lambda_2(1+m)} u_1 \text{ where}$$

$$(1.3) \quad T_\mu = \lambda_1(1+Q) - \mu_2 Q$$

Now, $y_2 = \sum_j z^j + u_2 = mz + u_2$. Substituting for z from (1.2), we have:

$$(1.4) \quad y_2 = \frac{ts}{\lambda_1 Q(1+Q)} T_\mu T_\lambda - T_\lambda \mu_2 u_1 + u_2 \text{ where}$$

$$(1.5) T_\lambda = \frac{m}{\lambda_2(1+m)}$$

Since the period one net order flow $y_1 = A_d s + u_1$, we can substitute for A_d from the text and rewrite as:

$$(1.6) y_1 = \frac{ts}{\lambda_1(1+Q)} + u_1$$

Let $\Sigma_{01} = \text{Cov}(v, y_1)$, $\Sigma_{02} = \text{Cov}(v, y_2)$, $\Sigma_{12} = \text{Cov}(y_1, y_2)$, $\Sigma_{11} = \text{Var}(y_1)$, and $\Sigma_{22} = \text{Var}(y_2)$. From linear projection, λ_1 , μ_2 and λ_2 are given by the following formulas:

$$(1.7) \lambda_1 = \frac{\Sigma_{01}}{\Sigma_{11}}$$

$$(1.8) \lambda_2 = \frac{\Sigma_{02}\Sigma_{11} - \Sigma_{01}\Sigma_{12}}{D}$$

$$(1.9) \mu_2 = \frac{\Sigma_{01}\Sigma_{22} - \Sigma_{02}\Sigma_{12}}{D}$$

$$(1.10) D = \Sigma_{11}\Sigma_{22} - (\Sigma_{12})^2$$

The results of the Proposition can be obtained after working out the expressions for Σ_{ij} , $i, j=1, 2$ and substituting in (1.7)-(1.10). A less computation-intensive alternative is to assume $\Sigma_{12}=0$, which implies (from 1.7 and 1.9) $\mu_2 = \Sigma_{01}/\Sigma_{11} = \lambda_1$. From (1.8), $\lambda_2 = \Sigma_{02}/\Sigma_{22}$ which gives the expression in the text. To complete the proof, we check that if μ_2 and λ_2 are as given in the proposition, $\Sigma_{12}=0$.

Having obtained μ_2 and λ_2 , we substitute in (1.2). In the resulting expression, the coefficient of x_d is B_1 and the coefficient of u_1 is B_2 . This gives (3) and (4) in the text.

Finally, the expected profits of the j -th broker is $W_d = E[(v - p_2)z]$. After substituting for p_2 :

$$(1.11) W_d = E[(v - \lambda_2(mz + u_2) - \mu_2(x_d + u_1))z]$$

After appropriate simplifications, we get (7) in the text.

Proof of Proposition 2:

Simultaneous dual trading equilibrium.

Denote $x_s = \sum_{i=1}^n x^{i,s}$. There is only one period in this case, with net order flow:

$$(2.1) \quad y_s = \sum_{j=1}^m z^j + x_s + u$$

Let $x^{m,s}$ denote the n -tuple $\{x^{1,s}/m, x^{2,s}/m, \dots, x^{n,s}/m\}$. Dual trader j observes $x^{m,s}$, and u and trades z^j . The dual trader's problem is to maximize with respect to z^j his expected profits $E[(v - p_s)z^j \mid x^{m,s}, u/m]$. The first order condition for the dual trader's problem is:

$$(2.2) \quad E\langle v \mid x^{s,d} \rangle - 2\lambda_s z^j - \lambda_s z^{-j} - \lambda_s x_s - \lambda_s u = 0$$

Using linear projection, $E[v \mid x^{s,d}] = (tx_s/QA_s)$. The second order condition is $-\lambda_s < 0$, which is satisfied for $\lambda_s > 0$.

Given that brokers are symmetric, $z = z^j$ for every j . Then, solving for z from (2.2),

$$(2.3) \quad z = \frac{x_s}{\lambda_s(1+m)} \left[\frac{t}{QA_s} - \lambda_s \right] - \frac{u}{(1+m)}$$

Informed trader i observes s^i and trades $x^{i,s}$. The informed trader's problem is to maximize with respect to $x^{i,s}$ his expected profits $E[(v-p) x^{i,s} \mid s^i]$. Let $x^{-i,s} = \sum_k x^{k,s}$ for all $k \neq i$. Also, note from linear projection that $E[v \mid s^i] = ts^i$ and $E(x^{-i,s} \mid s^i) = (n-1)A_s ts^i$. The first order condition for the informed trader's problem is:

$$(2.4) \quad -2x^{i,s} \left[\frac{\lambda_s}{1+m} + \frac{m}{1+m} \frac{t}{QA_s} \right] + \frac{ts^i}{Q(1+m)} [Q + m - \lambda_s A_s (n-1)Q] = 0$$

The second order condition is $\lambda_s + (mt/QA_s) > 0$. Given $\lambda_s > 0$, this requires $A_s > 0$.

We solve for $x^{i,s}$ from (2.4). In the resulting expression, A_s is the coefficient of s^i and this gives us (9) in the proposition.

We substitute for A_s in (2.3). In the resulting expression, $B_{1,s}$ is the coefficient of x_s and $B_{2,s}$ is the coefficient of u . This gives (10) and (11) in the proposition. λ_s is obtained from the formula $\lambda_s = \text{Cov}(v, y_s) / \text{Var}(y_s)$. Finally, the expected profits of the j -th broker is obtained from the expression $W_s = E[(v - p_s)z]$.

Proof of Corollary 1:

(1) When $Q \leq m$, then $A_s \leq 0$ and so the simultaneous dual trading equilibrium does not exist.

However, the consecutive dual trading equilibrium is viable so long as $m \geq 1$.

(2) Suppose $Q > m$. In the consecutive dual trading equilibrium, profits for informed trader i are

$I_{i,d} = E[(v - p_i)x^{i,d}]$. Aggregate informed profits are $I_d = nI_{i,d}$. Using the results from Proposition

1 and substituting:

$$(c1.1) \quad I_d = \frac{\sqrt{nt\Sigma_u\Sigma_v}}{(1+Q)}$$

In the simultaneous dual trading equilibrium, profits for insider i are $I_{i,s} = E[(v - p_s)x^{i,s}]$. Aggregate informed profits are $I_s = nI_{i,s}$. Using the results from Proposition 2 and substituting:

$$(c1.2) \quad I_s = \frac{\sqrt{nt\Sigma_u\Sigma_v}}{Q(1+Q)} \frac{Q-m}{1+m}$$

Since $(Q-m)/Q < 1$ and $1/(1+m) < 1$, $I_s < I_d$.

Noise trader losses in the consecutive dual trading equilibrium U_d is the sum of aggregate informed and dual trading profits (since the market maker makes zero expected profits by assumption). Thus $U_d = I_d + mW_d$. Substituting for I_d from (c1.1) and for W_d from the text,

$$(c1.3) U_d = \frac{\sqrt{nt\Sigma_u\Sigma_v}}{1+Q} \left[1 + \frac{\sqrt{1+Q}}{\sqrt{Q}} \frac{\sqrt{m}}{1+m} \right]$$

Noise trader losses in the simultaneous dual trading equilibrium $U_s = I_s + mW_s$. Substituting for I_s from (c1.2) and for W_s from the text,

$$(c1.4) U_s = \frac{\sqrt{nt\Sigma_u\Sigma_v}}{1+Q}$$

Clearly, $U_d > U_s$. The result for broker profits follows from direct comparison of (7) and (12) in the text.

Proof of Corollary 2:

- (1) From (c1.1) in Corollary 1, I_d is independent of m . From (c1.3) in Corollary 1, U_d is decreasing in m . Thus noise traders choose the highest possible number of brokers and we assume informed traders do the same.
- (2) From (c1.2) in Corollary 1, I_s is decreasing in m and, from (c1.4) in Corollary 1, U_s is independent of m . Thus, informed traders choose $m=1$ and we assume noise traders do the same.

Proof of Proposition 3:

- 1) Since we assume $t=1$, $Q=n$. Since I_d is decreasing in n , the equilibrium number of informed traders n_d satisfies $I_d = nk_d$. Using (c1.1) in Corollary 1, we have:

$$(3.1) \sqrt{n_d} (1 + n_d) = \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{k_d}$$

Similarly, the equilibrium number of brokers m_d satisfies $W_d = k_d$ and, using (7) in the text, we have:

$$(3.2) \quad \sqrt{m_d}(1+m_d) = \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{k_d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+n_d}}$$

From (3.1) and (3.2), $m_d < n_d$.

If $m_d=1$ and $n_d=2$ is to be an equilibrium, then $I_d \geq nk_d$ and $W_d \geq k_d$ at these values, so that from

(3.1) and (3.2) we have:

$$(3.3) \quad k_d \leq \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{3\sqrt{2}}$$

$$(3.4) \quad k_d \leq \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{2\sqrt{3}}$$

Clearly, if (3.3) is satisfied, so is (3.4).

2) In the simultaneous dual trading equilibrium, $m_s=1$. Given $m_s=1$, the condition $I_s = nk_s$ implies,

from (c1.2) in Corollary 1, that:

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{2n_s \sqrt{n_s}(1+n_s)}{n_s - 1} = \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{k_s}$$

If $m_s=1$ and $n_s=2$ is to be an equilibrium, then $I_s \geq nk_s$ and $W_s \geq k_s$ at these values, so that from (3.5)

above and (12) in the text:

$$(3.6) \quad k_s \leq \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{12\sqrt{2}}$$

$$(3.7) \quad k_s \leq \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{2\sqrt{2}}$$

Clearly, if (3.6) is satisfied, so is (3.7).

Proof of Proposition 4:

Assume (3.6) above in Proposition 3 is satisfied. Then, with free entry, both consecutive and

simultaneous dual trading equilibria exist. From (3.1) and (3.5) in Proposition 3:

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{\sqrt{n_s}}{\sqrt{n_d}} \frac{1+n_s}{1+n_d} = \frac{n_s-1}{2n_s} \frac{k_d}{k_s}$$

If $k_s \leq k_d/2$, then (4.1) implies that $n_s \geq n_d$.

From (5) and (8) in the text,

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda_2} = 2\sqrt{1+m_d} \frac{\sqrt{1+m_d}}{\sqrt{m_d}} \frac{\sqrt{n_s}}{\sqrt{1+n_s}} \frac{\sqrt{1+n_d}}{\sqrt{1+n_s}}$$

If m_d and n_s are both large, then $(1+m_d)/m_d$ and $n_s/(1+n_s)$ are approximately 1, and (4.2) is approximately:

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda_2} \approx 2\sqrt{1+m_d} \frac{\sqrt{1+n_d}}{\sqrt{1+n_s}}$$

From (4.3), $\lambda_s < \lambda_2$ if n_s is large relative to n_d and m_d .

Proof of Proposition 5:

(i) We use the subscript “o” to refer to outcomes in the order flow internalization model. Let A_o be the informed trading intensity, λ_o be the (inverse of) market depth, I_o be aggregate expected informed profits, $m_1 W_o$ be the aggregate expected profits of the internalizing brokers and U_o be uninformed losses. Analogous to Proposition 2, we can show that:

$$(5.1) \quad A_o = \frac{Q - m_2}{Q(1 + m_1)} \frac{\sqrt{t\Sigma_u}}{n\Sigma_v}$$

$$(5.2) \quad \lambda_o = \frac{1 + m_1 \sqrt{nt\Sigma_v}}{(1 + Q)\Sigma_u}$$

$$(5.3) \quad I_o = \frac{Q - m_2}{Q} \frac{\sqrt{nt\Sigma_u\Sigma_v}}{(1 + Q)(1 + m_1)}$$

$$(5.4) \quad m_1 W_o = m_1 \frac{\sqrt{nt \Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{(1+Q)(1+m_1)}$$

$$(5.5) \quad U_o = \frac{\sqrt{nt \Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{(1+Q)}$$

We know from Proposition 3 that the number of piggybacking brokers $m_2=1$ in equilibrium. Further, equilibrium requires $n > m_2$, so that $n \geq 2$. The number of internalizing brokers m_1 is determined in equilibrium. Let m_o be the equilibrium number of internalizing brokers. Let k_o be the entry cost in the market. Finally, let $t=1$ so that $Q=n$. Thus, the equilibrium number of informed traders n_o satisfies $I_o = nk_o$ and (5.3) implies:

$$(5.6) \quad k_o = \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{n_o \sqrt{n_o}} \frac{n_o - 1}{n_o + 1} \frac{1}{1 + m_o}$$

Given n_o and $m_2=1$, m_o satisfies $W_o \geq k_o$ and (5.4) implies:

$$(5.7) \quad k_o \leq \sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v} \frac{\sqrt{n_o}}{n_o + 1} \frac{1}{1 + m_o}$$

Inspection of (5.6) and (5.7) shows that both expressions cannot hold as equalities. So (5.7) must hold as an inequality, implying $W_o > k_o$. In other words, the brokerage market is not competitive, since brokers make positive expected profits even with free entry.

(ii) In the market without internalization, and with free entry, $m_2=1$ and $m_1=0$. The equilibrium number of informed traders n_w satisfies $I_w = nk_o$ where I_w is I_o evaluated at $m_2=1$ and $m_1=0$.

$$(5.8) \quad k_o = \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_u \Sigma_v}}{n_w \sqrt{n_w}} \frac{n_w - 1}{n_w + 1}$$

Comparing (5.6) and (5.8), $n_o < n_w$.

Let λ_w be the (inverse of) market depth in the market without internalization. λ_w is simply λ_o evaluated at $m_1=0$. Using (5.2), we have:

$$(5.8) \frac{\lambda_o}{\lambda_2} = n_o - 1 \frac{n_w(1+n_w)}{n_o(1+n_o)} \frac{n_w+1}{n_w-1}$$

$\lambda_o > \lambda_w$ since $n_w > n_o \geq 2$.

Price informativeness with internalization, PI_o , is defined as $\Sigma_v - \text{Var}(v | p_o)$, where $p_o = \lambda_o y_o$ and y_o is the net order flow with internalization. It can be shown that $PI = n\Sigma_v/(1+n)$. Therefore, $n_w > n_o$

implies that $PI_o = n_o\Sigma_v/(1+n_o) < n_w\Sigma_v/(1+n_w) = PI_w$ (price informativeness without internalization).

Expected informed profits without internalization I_w is I_o evaluated at $m_1=0$. From (5.3), $I_o < I_w$.

From (5.5), uninformed losses with internalization are proportional to $\frac{\sqrt{n_o}}{1+n_o}$ whereas

uninformed losses U_w without internalization are proportional to $\frac{\sqrt{n_w}}{1+n_w}$. Hence, $U_o > U_w$.

References

- Admati, A. & Pfleiderer, P. (1988). A theory of intraday patterns: Volume and price variability. *Review of Financial Studies*, 1, 3-40.
- Battalio, R. & Holden, C. W. (1996). Why doesn't decimal trading eliminate payment for order flow and internalization? Working Paper, Indiana University.
- Battalio, R. (1997). Third market broker-dealers: Cost competitors or cream skimmers? *Journal of Finance*, 52, 341-352.
- Battalio, R., Greene, J. & Jennings, R. (1997). Do competing specialists and preferencing dealers affect market quality? *Review of Financial Studies*, 10, 969-993.
- Bloomfield, R. & O'Hara, M. (1996). Does order preferencing matter? Working Paper, Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University.
- Chakravarty, S. (1994). Should actively traded futures contracts come under the dual trading ban? *Journal of Futures Markets*, 14, 661-684.
- Dutta, P. & Madhavan, A. (1997). Competition and collusion in dealer markets. *Journal of Finance*, 52, 245-276.
- Easley, D., Kiefer, N. M. & O'Hara, M. (1996). Cream-skimming or profit-sharing? The curious role of purchased order flow. *Journal of Finance*, 51, 3, 811.
- Fishman, M. & Longstaff, F. A. (1992). Dual trading in futures markets. *Journal of Finance*, 47, 643-672.
- Grossman, S.J. (1989). An economic analysis of dual trading. Working paper, University of Pennsylvania.
- Kyle, A.S. (1985). Continuous auctions and insider trading. *Econometrica*, 53, 1315-1335.

- Lightfoot, L.E., Martin, P. G., Peterson, M. A., & Sirri, B. (1997). Preferencing and market quality on U.S. equity exchanges. Working Paper, The Securities and Exchange Commission.
- Macey, J. R. & O'Hara, M. (1997). The law and economics of best execution. Forthcoming, *Journal of Financial Intermediation*.
- Matthews, J. O. (1994). *Struggle And Survival On Wall Street*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- "Report on the practice of preferencing", the Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington DC, April 1997.
- Roell, A. (1990). Dual-capacity trading and the quality of the market. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 1, 105-124.
- Sarkar, A. (1995). Dual trading: winners, losers and market impact. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 4, 77-93.

**ADDITIONAL INSTITUTE PAPERS AVAILABLE FROM THE KRANNERT
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT**

-1995-

- 1069 Sugato Chakravarty and John J. McConnell, AN ANALYSIS OF PRICES, BID/ASK SPREADS, AND BID AND ASK DEPTH SURROUNDING IVAN BOESKY'S ILLEGAL TRADING IN CARNATION'S STOCK.
- 1070 John J. McConnell and Henri Servaes, EQUITY OWNERSHIP AND THE TWO FACES OF DEBT.
- 1071 Kenneth J. Matheny, REAL EFFECTS OF MONETARY POLICY IN A 'NEOCLASSICAL' MODEL: THE CASE OF INTEREST RATE TARGETING.
- 1072 Julie Hunsaker and Dan Kovenock, THE PATTERN OF EXIT FROM DECLINING INDUSTRIES.
- 1073 Kessan Joseph, Manohar U. Kalwani, THE IMPACT OF ENVIRONMENTAL UNCERTAINTY ON THE DESIGN OF SALESFORCE COMPENSATION PLANS.
- 1074 K. Tomak, A NOTE ON THE GOLDFELD QUANDT TEST
- 1075 Alok R. Chaturvedi, SIMDS: A SIMULATION ENVIRONMENT FOR THE DESIGN OF DISTRIBUTED DATABASE SYSTEMS
- 1076 Dan Kovenock and Suddhasatwa Roy, FREE RIDING IN NON-COOPERATIVE ENTRY DETERRENCE WITH DIFFERENTIATED PRODUCTS
- 1077 Kenneth Matheny, THE MACROECONOMICS OF SELF-FULFILLING PROPHECIES
- 1078 Paul Alsemgeest, Charles Noussair and Mark Olson, EXPERIMENTAL COMPARISONS OF AUCTIONS UNDER SINGLE-AND MULTI-UNIT DEMAND
- 1079 Dan Kovenock, Casper D de Vries, FIAT EXCHANGE IN FINITE ECONOMIES
- 1080 Dan Kovenock, Suddhasatwa Roy, DYNAMIC CAPACITY CHOICE IN A BERTRAND-EDGEWORTH FRAMEWORK
- 1081 Burak Kazaz, Canan Sepil, PROJECT SCHEDULING WITH DISCOUNTED CASH FLOWS AND PROGRESS PAYMENTS

-1996-

- 1082 Murat Koksalan, Oya Rizi, A VISUAL INTRACTIVE APPROACH FOR MULTIPLE CRITERIA DECISION MAKING WITH MONOTONE UTILITY FUNCTIONS
- 1083 Janet S. Netz, John D. Haveman, ALL IN THE FAMILY: FAMILY, INCOME, AND LABOR FORCE ATTACHMENT

- 1084 Keith V. Smith, ASSET ALLOCATION AND INVESTMENT HORIZON
- 1085 Arnold C. Cooper and Catherine M. Daily, ENTREPRENEURIAL TEAMS
- 1086 Alok R. Chaturvedi and Samir Gupta, SCHEDULING OF TRANSACTIONS IN A REAL-TIME DISTRIBUTED TRANSACTION PROCESSING SYSTEMS: SCALEABILITY AND NETWORKING ISSUES
- 1087 Gordon P. Wright, N. Dan Worobetz, Myong Kang, Radha V. Mookerjee and Radha Chandrasekharan, OR/SM: A PROTOTYPE INTEGRATED MODELING ENVIRONMENT BASED ON STRUCTURED MODELING
- 1088 Myong Kang, Gordon P. Wright, Radha Chandrasekharan, Radha Mookerjee and N. Dan Worobetz, THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF OR/SM: A PROTOTYPE INTEGRATED MODELING ENVIRONMENT
- 1089 Thomas H. Brush and Philip Bromiley, WHAT DOES A SMALL CORPORATE EFFECT MEAN? A VARIANCE COMPONENTS SIMULATION OF CORPORATE AND BUSINESS EFFECTS
- 1090 Kenneth J. Matheny, NON-NEUTRAL RESPONSES TO MONEY SUPPLY SHOCKS WHEN CONSUMPTION AND LEISURE ARE PARETO SUBSTITUTES
- 1091 Kenneth J. Matheny, MONEY, HUMAN CAPITAL, AND BUSINESS CYCLES: A MODERN PHILLIPS CURVE-STYLE TRADEOFF
- 1092 Kenneth J. Matheny, OUTPUT TARGETING AND AN ARGUMENT FOR STABILIZATION POLICIES
- 1093 Kenneth J. Matheny, THE RELEVANCE OF OPEN MARKET OPERATIONS AS A MONETARY POLICY TOOL
- 1997-
- 1094 James C. Moore, William Novshek and Peter Lee U, ON THE VOLUNTARY PROVISION OF PUBLIC GOODS
- 1095 Michael R. Baye, Dan Kovenock and Casper G. deVries, THE INCIDENCE OF OVERDISSIPATION IN RENT-SEEKING CONTESTS
- 1096 William Novshek and Lynda Thoman, CAPACITY CHOICE AND DUOPOLY INCENTIVES FOR INFORMATION SHARING
- 1097 Vidyanand Choudhary, Kerem Tomak and Alok Chaturvedi, ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF RENTING SOFTWARE
- 1098 Jeongwen Chiang and William T. Robinson, DO MARKET PIONEERS MAINTAIN THEIR INNOVATIVE SPARK OVER TIME?

- 1099 Glenn Hueckel, LABOR COMMAND IN *THE WEALTH OF NATIONS*: A SEARCH FOR "SYSTEM"
- 1100 Glenn Hueckel, SMITH'S UNIFORM "TOIL AND TROUBLE": A "VAIN SUBTLETY"?
- 1101 Thomas H. Brush and Philip Bromiley, WHAT DOES A SMALL CORPORATE EFFECT MEAN? A VARIANCE COMPONENTS SIMULATION OF CORPORATE AND BUSINESS EFFECTS
- 1102 Thomas Brush, Catherine Maritan and Aneel Karnani, MANAGING A NETWORK OF PLANTS WITHIN MULTINATIONAL FIRMS
- 1103 Sam Hariharan and Thomas H. Brush, RESOURCES AND THE SCALE OF ENTRY CHOICE: THE COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE OF ESTABLISHED FIRMS?
- 1104 Thomas H. Brush, Philip Bromiley and Margaretha Hendrickx, THE RELATIVE INFLUENCE OF INDUSTRY AND CORPORATION ON BUSINESS SEGMENT PERFORMANCE: AN ALTERNATIVE ESTIMATE
- 1105 Thomas Brush, Catherine Maritan and Aneel Karnani, PLANT ROLES IN THE MANAGEMENT OF MULTINATIONAL MANUFACTURING FIRMS
- 1106 Thomas H. Brush, Catherine Maritan and Aneel Karnani, THE PLANT LOCATION DECISION IN MULTINATIONAL MANUFACTURING FIRMS: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS AND MANUFACTURING STRATEGY PERSPECTIVES
- 1107 Piyush Kumar, Manohar U. Kalwani and Maqbool Dada, THE IMPACT OF WAITING TIME GUARANTEES ON CUSTOMERS' WAITING EXPERIENCES
- 1108 Thomas H. Brush, Philip Bromiley and Margaretha Hendrickx, THE FREE CASH FLOW HYPOTHESIS FOR SALES GROWTH AND FIRM PERFORMANCE
- 1109 Keith V. Smith, PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS OF BROKERAGE FIRM RECOMMENDATIONS
- 1998 -
- 1110 Charles Noussair, Kenneth Matheny, and Mark Olson, AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF DECISIONS IN DYNAMIC OPTIMIZATION PROBLEMS
- 1111 Jerry G. Thursby and Sukanya Kemp, AN ANALYSIS OF PRODUCTIVE EFFICIENCY OF UNIVERSITY COMMERCIALIZATION ACTIVITIES
- 1112 John J. McConnell and Sunil Wahal, DO INSTITUTIONAL INVESTORS EXACERBATE MANAGERIAL MYOPIA?

- 1113 John J. McConnell, Mehmet Ozbilgin and Sunil Wahal, SPINOFFS, EX ANTE
- 1114 Sugato Chakravarty and John J. McConnell, DOES INSIDER TRADING REALLY MOVE STOCK PRICES?
- 1115 William T. Robinson and Sungwook Min, IS THE FIRST TO MARKET THE FIRST TO FAIL?: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FOR MANUFACTURING BUSINESSES
- 1116 Margaretha Hendrickx, WHAT CAN MANAGEMENT RESEARCHERS LEARN FROM DONALD CAMPBELL, THE PHILOSOPHER? AN EXERCISE IN PHILOSOPHICAL HERMENEUTICS
- 1117 Thomas H. Brush, Philip Bromiley and Margaretha Hendrickx, THE FREE CASH FLOW HYPOTHESIS FOR SALES GROWTH AND FIRM PERFORMANCE
- 1118 Thomas H. Brush, Constance R. James and Philip Bromiley, COMPARING ALTERNATIVE METHODS TO ESTIMATE CORPORATE AND INDUSTRY EFFECTS
- 1119 Charles Noussair, Stéphane Robin and Bernard Ruffieux, BUBBLES AND ANTI-CRASHES IN LABORATORY ASSET MARKETS WITH CONSTANT FUNDAMENTAL VALUES
- 1120 Vivian Lei, Charles N. Noussair and Charles R. Plott, NON-SPECULATIVE BUBBLES IN EXPERIMENTAL ASSET MARKETS: LACK OF COMMON KNOWLEDGE OF RATIONALITY VS. ACTUAL IRRATIONALITY
- 1999-
- 1121 Kent D. Miller and Timothy B. Folta, ENTRY TIMING AND OPTION VALUE
- 1122 Glenn Hueckel, THE LABOR “EMBODIED” IN SMITH’S LABOR-COMMANDED MEASURE: A “RATIONALLY RECONSTRUCTED” LEGEND
- 1123 Timothy B. Folta and David A. Foote, TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES AS REAL OPTIONS
- 1124 Gabriele Camera, DIRTY MONEY
- 1125 Wilfred Amaldoss, Robert J. Meyer, Jagmohan S. Raju, and Amnon Rapoport, COLLABORATING TO COMPETE: A GAME-THEORETIC MODEL AND EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF PROFIT-SHARING ARRANGEMENT AND TYPE OF ALLIANCE ON RESOURCE-COMMITMENT DECISIONS

1126 Wilfred Amaldoss, Robert J. Meyer, Jagmohan S. Raju, and Amnon Rapoport, APPENDICES FOR COLLABORATING TO COMPETE: A GAME-THEORETIC MODEL AND EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF PROFIT-SHARING ARRANGEMENT AND TYPE OF ALLIANCE ON RESOURCE-COMMITMENT DECISIONS

-2000-

1127 Sugato Chakravarty and Kai Li, AN ANALYSIS OF OWN ACCOUNT TRADING BY DUAL TRADERS IN FUTURES MARKETS: A BAYESIAN APPROACH

1128 Sugato Chakravarty, STEALTH TRADING: THE NEXT GENERATION

1129 S.G. Badrinath and Sugato Chakravarty, ARE ANALYST RECOMMENDATIONS INFORMATIVE?

1130 Sugato Chakravarty and Asani Sarkar, THE DETERMINANTS OF LIQUIDITY IN U.S. CORPORATE, MUNICIPAL AND TREASURY BOND MARKETS

1131 Vivian Lei and Charles Noussair, AN EXPERIMENTAL TEST OF AN OPTIMAL GROWTH MODEL

1132 Paul Healy and Charles Noussair, BIDDING BEHAVIOR IN THE PRICE IS RIGHT GAME: AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

1133 Kent D. Miller and Zur Shapira, BEHAVIORAL OPTION THEORY: FOUNDATIONS AND EVIDENCE

1134 Kent D. Miller, KNOWLEDGE INVENTORIES AND MANAGERIAL MYOPIA

1135 Gabriele Camera, Charles Noussair, and Steven Tucker, RATE-OF-RETURN DOMINANCE AND EFFICIENCY IN AN EXPERIMENTAL ECONOMY

1136 Timothy B. Folta, Jay J. Janney, SIGNALING FOR RESOURCE ACQUISITION: PRIVATE EQUITY PLACEMENTS BY TECHNOLOGY FIRMS

1137 Michael R. Baye, Dan Kovenock, Casper G. de Vries, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LITIGATION SYSTEMS: AN AUCTION-THEORETIC APPROACH

1138 Sugato Chakravarty, Asani Sarkar, DO DIFFERENCES IN TRANSPARENCY AFFECT TRADING COSTS? EVIDENCE FROM U.S. CORPORATE, MUNICIPAL AND TREASURY BOND MARKETS

-2001-

- 1139 Charles Noussair, Stephane Robin, Bernard Ruffieux, GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS IN THE FOOD SUPPLY: PUBLIC OPINION VS CONSUMER BEHAVIOR
- 1140 Gabriele Camera, SEARCH, DEALERS, AND THE TERMS OF TRADE
- 1141 David Masclet, Charles Noussair, Steven Tucker, Marie-Claire Villeval, MONETARY AND NON-MONETARY PUNISHMENT IN THE VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS MECHANISM
- 1142 Charles Noussair, Stephane Robin, Bernard Ruffieux, DO CONSUMERS NOT CARE ABOUT BIOTECH FOODS OR DO THEY JUST NOT READ THE LABELS
- 1143 Timothy B. Folta, Douglas R. Johnson, Jonathan O'Brien, UNCERTAINTY AND THE LIKELIHOOD OF ENTRY: AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE MODERATING ROLE OF IRREVERSIBILITY
- 1144 Alok Chaturvedi, Mukul Gupta, Sameer Gupta, ISSUES IN SERVER FARM DESIGN FOR REAL TIME E-COMMERCE TRANSACTIONS
- 1145 William Blankenau, Gabriele Camera, PRODUCTIVE EDUCATION OR A MARKETABLE DEGREE?
- 1146 Murat Köksalan, Selcen Pamuk, AN EVOLUTIONARY METAHEURISTIC FOR APPROXIMATING PREFERENCE-NONDOMINATED SOLUTIONS
- 1147 Gabriele Camera, Alain Delacroix, BARGAINING OR PRICE POSTING?
- 1148 Sugato Chakravarty, Asani Sarkar, A COMPARISON OF TRADING COSTS IN THE U.S. CORPORATE, MUNICIPAL AND TREASURY BOND MARKETS
- 1149 Sugato Chakravarty, Frederick H. deB. Harris, Robert A. Wood, DO BID-ASK SPREADS OR BID AND ASK DEPTHS CONVEY NEW INFORMATION FIRST?

