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Motivation and Approach

Strategic behavior, choice correlations important to outcomes in financial markets (Morris and Shin (1999))
How to identify and quantify such behavior?

- Importance of interactions between agents (complex systems)
  - strategic complementarity
  - know individual optimization problems
    ⇒ total outcome is probabilistic
    ⇒ chain reaction through information revelation about market liquidity
- Analysis by distribution
  - accumulation of risk captured by distribution parameters
  - economic interpretations

13F Filings with SEC

- Thompson Financial Spectrum database
- Institutional investment managers with over $100 million under management
- 16 quarters 2003:Q1 - 2008:Q1
- S&P 500 stocks
- Types: Banks and Trusts, Insurance Comp., Invest. Comp., Invest. Adv., All Other (Pension, Endowment Funds)
The Sellout Phase

Fraction $\alpha(j,k) = \frac{\# \text{ investors type 'j' selling } > 80\% \text{ of stock 'k'} \text{ in quarter 't'}}{\text{investors in the group}}$
Normality Test of $a(j, k)$ over the entire sample, 2003:Q1 - 2008:Q1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a(j, k)$</td>
<td>38,353</td>
<td>22.745</td>
<td>79.264</td>
<td>6.368</td>
<td>54.868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $\alpha(j, k)$ has large kurtosis, highly non-normal
- Inverse of slope provides good approximation of the mean – exponential distribution
  - LS regression in S&P 500 stocks $\hat{\beta} = -31.443$ (std. 0.055, $R^2$ 0.988)
Why Exponential?

- Normality is a good hypothesis: central limit theorem should hold if investors act independently.
- Not likely that exogenous aggregate shocks follow an exponential distribution.
- Exponential tail occurs in a domino effect.
- – an indication of herding?
Model

- $N$ informed traders indexed by $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$ endowed with one unit of risky asset
- $(g - r)p$ gains for staying invested in the bubbles
- $\beta p$ loss if the bubble bursts.
- trader $i$ can either sell ($a_i = 1$) or remain in the same position ($a_i = 0$)
- observed: aggregate number of informed selling traders $a \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i$, (corresponding fraction $\alpha = a/N$)
- unobserved: liquidity provided by noise traders $\theta$
- bubble bursts if $\alpha > \theta$
- private signal: $x_i = \theta + \epsilon_i$
- prior belief on $\theta$ and $\epsilon_i$ jointly follow a bivariate normal distribution with mean $(\theta_0, 0)$ and variance $(\sigma^2_\theta, \sigma^2_\epsilon)$
Optimal strategy

\[(g - r) \Pr(\theta \geq \alpha \mid x_i, a, a_i = 0) - \beta \Pr(\theta < \alpha \mid x_i, a, a_i = 0) = 0 \quad (1)\]

or, equivalently, sell out if:

\[\frac{g - r}{\beta} < \frac{\Pr(x_i, a, a_i = 0, \theta < \alpha)}{\Pr(x_i, a, a_i = 0, \theta \geq \alpha)} \quad (2)\]

Threshold rule: trader \(i\) sells if \(x_i \leq \bar{x}(a)\) and holds otherwise. \(\bar{x}(a)\) implicitly determined by (2).
Benchmark case: traders act independently

Then the optimal strategy is to sell if:

\[ x_i < \bar{x} \]

where \( \bar{x} \) is constant.
Then \( a \) follows a binomial distribution with probability \( Pr(\bar{x} > x_i) \)
and population \( N \). This asymptotes to normal when \( N \) is large.
Endogenous feedback:

Under the threshold rule, the joint probability has three parts:

1. Private information $x_i$

$$\frac{\Pr(x_i, \theta < \alpha)}{\Pr(x_i, \theta \geq \alpha)}$$

2. Information revealed by holding actions of $N - 1 - a$ informed traders

$$\left( \frac{\Pr(x_j > \bar{x}(a) \mid \theta < \alpha)}{\Pr(x_j > \bar{x}(a) \mid \theta \geq \alpha)} \right)^{N-1-a}$$

3. Information revealed by selling actions of $a$ informed traders

$$\left( \frac{\Pr(x_j \leq \bar{x}(a) \mid \theta < \alpha)}{\Pr(x_j \leq \bar{x}(a) \mid \theta \geq \alpha)} \right)^a$$
Equilibrium

- \((x_i, \alpha)\) pair such that each trader has no incentive to deviate from the threshold rule given that all the other traders obey the rule.
- Equilibrium thresholds show strategic complementarity:

\[
\begin{align*}
& N = 160, \; g = 0.1 \\
& r = 0.04, \; \beta = 0.82 \\
& \theta \text{ is } N(0.5, 0.3) \\
& \epsilon_i \text{ is } N(0, 1)
\end{align*}
\]
Herding

\[
\mu(a) = \frac{H'}{H} \frac{d\bar{x}(a)}{da} (N - a)
\]  

\[
H(\bar{x}) = \int_\bar{x} e^{-\frac{(x_j - \theta_1)^2}{2\sigma^2}} \frac{dx_j}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma e}
\]

- \(\frac{H'}{H}\): hazard rate for the traders who have remained holding the asset to sell upon observing \(a\)
- \(\frac{d\bar{x}(a)}{da}\) is of order \(1/N\)
- \(\mu(a)\) is Poisson mean of number of traders induced to sell by trader \(a\)
Let $\mu_1 \equiv \mu(0)$ denote the mean number of traders that would sell in response to shocks $x_i$ even when $a = 0$

Suppose that $\mu(a)$ is constant at $\mu$ for $a > 0$

Then $a$ follows a distribution with exponential tail:

$$
\Pr(a) = \mu_1 e^{-(\mu a + \mu_1)} (\mu a + \mu_1)^{a-1} / a!
$$

$$
\sim (\mu e^{1-\mu} a)^{a-1.5}
$$

Slope of the exponential tail is determined by $\mu$
Numerical Simulations

- $\mu(a)$ is not assumed to be constant

- $a$ is distributed similarly to an exponential distribution for $0 < a < 50$. There is no incident of $a > 50$ except for the 691 “explosive” incidents in which case basically all the traders decide to sell.
Numerical Simulations

- *Left* blowups of the histogram for $0 < a < 160$. *Right* semi-log plot.
Evidence from institutional transactions

- *Left* histogram of empirical \(a(j, k)_t\). *Right* semi-log probability plot of empirical \(a(j, k)_t\).
- Fitted distribution with ML parameter estimates

\[
Pr(a) = \mu_1 e^{-(\mu a + \mu_1)}(\mu a + \mu_1)^{a-1}/a!
\]

\[
Pr(a) = (\mu e^{1-\mu})^a a^{-1.5}
\]
Evidence from institutional transactions

Table: Distribution parameter estimates for $a(j, k)$ for the 2005:Q2 - 2006:Q1 subsample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Distribution of $a(j, k)$</th>
<th>Benchmark Distributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borel-Tanner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trunc. Normal Gamma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_1$</td>
<td>2.058</td>
<td>$-97.461$ $\alpha$ 1.103 $\beta$ 4.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(7.152) (0.021) (0.072)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>$20.000$ $\beta$ 4.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.665) (0.103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Likelihood</td>
<td>11148.789</td>
<td>10040.186 10925.596 10938.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuong’s statistic</td>
<td>$H_1$</td>
<td>30.393 21.785 28.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>4,265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The probability density for the hypothesized distribution is $Pr(a) = \mu_1 e^{-(\mu a + \mu_1)}(\mu a + \mu_1)^{a-1}/a!$
Evidence from institutional transactions

Parameter interpretation:

- $\mu_1 = 2.058$: 2 managers within each group would have sold the stock even if no one else was selling
- $\mu = 0.570$: 57\% chance that a fund manager would have chosen to follow the actions of another fund manager
- Fit $e^{-\beta a(j,k)} \equiv \mu e^{(1-\mu) a(j,k)}$ with an exponential distribution: $\beta = 0.19$
- $\hat{\beta}$ is 0.209
Exponential Decay and the Rise of $\mu$ Over Time

Figure: Semilog probability plot of $a(j, k)$ and comparison to data simulated using the model and the two alternatives, Normal and Poisson.
Exponential Decay and the Rise of $\mu$ Over Time

Figure: Herding – quarterly estimates of distribution parameter $\mu$, which measures the probability of a “chain reaction” in response to a random liquidation by an investment manager. Initial independent liquidations occur with Poisson arrival rate of $\mu_1$. The probability density of the aggregate action is then given by $\Pr(a) = \mu_1 e^{-(\mu a + \mu_1)}(\mu a + \mu_1)^{a-1}/a!$
Figure: Left: $\mu$ as a function of $a$ in Equation 17 for different realizations of liquidity $\theta$. Right: simulated histograms of $a$ for high and low realizations of $\theta$. 

$e_1 = 0.7$ 
$e_1 = 0.3$
Illiquidity

$1/\theta_1$: Amihud (2002) proxy for a stock’s realized illiquidity

$$\Pr(\alpha(j, k)) = \mu_1 e^{-(\mu_{j,k}\alpha(j,k) + \mu_1)}(\mu_{j,k}\alpha(j, k) + \mu_1)^{\alpha(j,k)-1}/\alpha(j, k)!$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

and

$$\mu_{j,k} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 1/\theta_1(j) + \epsilon_{j,k}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

We pick trivial hyper-parameters for the priors:

$$\gamma_i \sim N(0, 1), \; i = 0, 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

$$\mu_1 \sim N(0, 1)$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

$$\tau_\epsilon \sim \Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon, \beta_\epsilon)$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)
### Table: Illiquidity and the Empirical Proxy for Herding, $\mu$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>node</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>2.50%</th>
<th>5.00%</th>
<th>95.00%</th>
<th>97.50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-6.833</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>-7.661</td>
<td>-7.526</td>
<td>-6.208</td>
<td>-6.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1/\theta_1(j)$</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_1$</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_\epsilon$</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>2.732</td>
<td>3.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>12,236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Results of Bayesian MCMC estimation of hierarchical model in Equation (6). $\Pr(a) = \mu_1 e^{-(\mu a + \mu_1)}(\mu a + \mu_1)^{a-1}/a!$ with restriction $\mu = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 1/\theta_1 + \epsilon$. Higher $\mu$ indicates higher intensity of the branching process generating the Borel Tanner distribution. Results based on 89,000 samples after discarding the first 11,000 iterations as “burn-in”. Confidence bounds computed under the normality assumption for the simulated parameter values. 2003:Q1 through 2006:Q1 time sample.
Conclusion

- The *fraction* of dumping institutions follows an exponential distribution before the regime change.
- Micro-founded model of herding in exit decisions generates exponential tail.
- Simulations show reasonable correspondence to institutional ownership data.
- The *number* of dumping institutions follows a distribution consistent with the model.
- In line with “market-timing” data generating mechanism, the distribution parameter measuring the degree of herding is increasing in a stock’s illiquidity as well as rises sharply prior the sell-out phase.