

# Socially Responsible Divestment\*

Alex Edmans

Doron Levit

LBS, CEPR, and ECGI

University of Washington and ECGI

Jan Schneemeier

Indiana University

March 8, 2023

## Abstract

Blanket exclusion of “brown” stocks is seen as the best divestment strategy as it starves them of capital, reducing externalities. We show that a more effective strategy may be tilting – holding a brown firm if it has taken a corrective action, thereby inducing reform. If the action is not publicly observable, the investor might not tilt even if she can gather private information on it. The presence of an arbitrageur who buys underpriced stocks increases the relative effectiveness of tilting versus exclusion. A partially profit-motivated investor is more likely to tilt than one whose sole objective is minimizing externalities.

**KEYWORDS:** Socially responsible investing, sustainable investing, externalities, exclusion, divestment, tilting, exit, governance.

**JEL CLASSIFICATION:** D62, G11, G34

---

\*aedmans@london.edu, dlevit@uw.edu, jschnee@iu.edu. We thank Eduardo Dávila, Shaun Davies, Thomas Geelen, Tom Gosling, Oliver Hart, Evgeny Lyandres, Giorgia Piacentino, Alejandro Rivera, Lin Shen, Tracy Wang, Ed Van Wesep and seminar/conference participants at the AFA, Conference on Financial Economics and Accounting, ECGI conference on Corporate Purpose, Stakeholderism and ESG, Emory, Financial Management Association, Financial Reporting Council, Indiana University, the MIT Asia Conference in Accounting, NBER, RCFS Winter Conference, UNC, and the UN PRI Academic Network Week for valued input. Alex Edmans is a non-executive director of the Investor Forum, which promotes collective engagement. The views in this article need not represent the views of the Forum, which had no input into this research.

Responsible investing – the practice of incorporating environmental, social, and governance (“ESG”) factors into investment decisions – is becoming increasingly mainstream. In 2006, the United Nations established the Principles for Responsible Investment, which was signed by 63 investors managing a total of \$6.5 trillion. By the end of 2021, this had grown to 4,375 investors, representing \$121 trillion.

One goal of responsible investing is financial – to improve risk-adjusted returns, by incorporating ESG factors that are not fully priced by the market. However, critics argue that this is simply investing, not responsible investing (e.g. Edmans, 2023; Mackintosh, 2022). The more distinctive goal is social – to reduce a company’s externalities, which is a particular objective of environmental and social (“ES”) investing. Investors can affect externalities through two channels. The first is engagement, which is sometimes effective but often costly. For example, Engine No. 1 spent \$30 million placing three climate-friendly directors onto Exxon’s board, compared to its stake of \$40 million. While the campaign was successful, it still provided no roadmap for Exxon to reduce its carbon emissions (Sharfman, 2021). In addition, some investors’ expertise may be in stock selection rather than engagement. The second is divestment: selling “brown” companies that exert negative externalities, increasing their cost of capital and hindering their expansion. This paper focuses on the optimal divestment strategy to mitigate externalities.

Under the cost of capital channel, the most powerful divestment strategy is blanket exclusion of externality-producing industries. 1,500 institutions, collectively managing \$40 trillion, have publicly committed to divest from fossil fuels. Practitioners and the general public hold investors accountable for their holdings of brown firms. In 2020, Extinction Rebellion protesters dug up a lawn outside Trinity College, Cambridge in protest of its investment in fossil fuel companies, and many asset owners evaluate asset managers according to whether they manage a “net zero” portfolio. Beyond climate Hartzmark and Sussman (2019) find that fund flows are significantly influenced by the ESG ratings of the companies they own.<sup>1</sup> Academic studies of greenwashing by asset managers similarly analyze their portfolio holdings (e.g. Gibson et al. (2022), Kim and Yoon (2022), and Liang, Sun, and Teo (2022)). Gibson et al. (2022) define the goal of responsible investing as “to allocate capital towards companies that make the world more sustainable”; under this goal, the average ES rating of portfolio companies is indeed the

---

<sup>1</sup>While some rating providers industry-adjust their ratings, others do not, so the average rating of a “brown” industry is lower than of a “green” industry.

relevant measure.

However, this argument considers only one channel through which divestment can affect a company's real actions – the primary markets channel, whereby divestment affects new capital raising. As the survey of Bond, Edmans, and Goldstein (2012) points out, investors can also have real effects through a secondary markets channel. Specifically, trading leads to the stock price reflecting a manager's real actions, thus rewarding or punishing him for taking them. Even if a firm is in an irremediably brown sector, where externalities are always negative, the manager may be able to take corrective actions to mitigate these externalities. Blanket exclusion fails to reward such actions because the firm is divested no matter what. Thus, it may be optimal for a responsible investor to pursue a “tilting” strategy, where she tilts away from a brown industry but is willing to hold firms that take corrective actions.

We build a model in which responsible investment affects firm behavior through both above channels. There is a single brown firm that emits negative externalities. The firm's manager can take a non-contractible corrective action that reduces both externalities and also firm value. The corrective action can never fully eliminate the externalities: a fossil fuel company will still retain its fossil fuel assets even if it also develops clean energy, an alcohol company will still have negative health effects even if it introduces low-alcohol drinks, and a gambling company will still lead to addiction even if it promotes responsible gambling. Since externalities are always negative, it might seem that exclusion is optimal to hinder firm expansion, but we show that tilting may be a superior strategy. The firm also raises capital which it uses to fund an expansion, increasing both firm value and externalities. The firm's manager is concerned with both fundamental value and the stock price, although the results continue to hold if the manager is concerned with fundamental value alone.

The firm is owned by a continuum of risk-averse, profit-motivated, atomistic investors (“households”) and a risk-neutral responsible investor. The responsible investor is able to take large positions and have price impact, and so we refer to her as a blockholder. In the baseline model, her objective is to minimize the firm's externalities. To do so, she announces an investment strategy that depends on whether it takes a corrective action. Under exclusion, the blockholder never holds the firm; under tilting, she invests if and only if it takes the action. We initially assume that the blockholder can commit to her investment strategy. For example, some funds advertise themselves as boycotting certain industries; deviation will lead to client withdrawals and potentially regulatory action. Other funds state that they have a

tilting strategy which involves investing in leaders in controversial industries. Deviating and excluding entire industries may increase tracking error, reduce risk-adjusted returns, or lead to investors withdrawing to cheaper passive funds that pursue exclusion.

We show that the optimal divestment strategy balances two forces. On the one hand, since the brown firm continues to produce negative externalities even under the corrective action, the blockholder wishes to minimize its size. She does so through blanket exclusion – by holding none of the brown firm’s shares, they have to be held entirely by risk-averse households, who require a risk premium for doing so. This minimizes the stock price, similar to Heinkel, Kraus, and Zechner (2001), and thus the new funds the firm can raise. On the other hand, the investor wishes to incentivize the action. Exclusion provides no such incentives, since the firm is always divested. Tilting rewards the manager for taking the action – by buying shares, the blockholder reduces the number that must be held by households, thus increasing the stock price.

Intuitively, the blockholder’s strategy is analogous to an incentive contract. Exclusion corresponds to paying the manager a flat salary, which minimizes the cost to the firm but provides no incentives. Tilting incentivizes the action, but is costly – in a contracting setting, the cost is the monetary value of the incentive; in a responsible investment setting, the cost is financing the expansion of a brown firm. This analogy highlights how exclusion may be suboptimal, despite being widely advocated – it is tantamount to giving zero incentives.

The optimal divestment strategy involves tilting if the corrective action is effective at reducing the externality, if the action is less costly and if the manager’s stock price concerns are high, as then the blockholder does not need to offer large share purchases to incentivize the action; thus, the additional expansion and externalities created are low. These results suggest that exclusion may be optimal for industries such as controversial weapons, where it is difficult to reduce the harm produced. In contrast, tilting may be preferred for fossil fuels, where managers can take corrective actions such as developing clean energy<sup>2</sup>, and the net cost of these actions may not be high – while developing clean energy requires substantial investment, it also generates significant future cash flows.

One might also think that exclusion is optimal if the firm has significant external financing needs, because it is particularly important to stifle capital raising. This turns out to be not always the case due to an opposing force. The effect of the action is plausibly multiplicative

---

<sup>2</sup>Cohen, Gurun, and Nguyen (2021) show that the fossil fuel industry produces more green patents than nearly any other sector, suggesting that companies within this industry can take corrective actions.

in firm size – reducing the per-unit amount of pollution has a greater impact in a firm that produces more. If the firm is raising large amounts of new capital, it becomes even more important to induce the corrective action. Overall, the amount of capital raised has a hump-shaped effect on the relative effectiveness of exclusion; for similar reasons, the profitability of the investment opportunity has an ambiguous effect.

We extend the model to the case in which the corrective action is unobservable, so the investor cannot condition her investment on it; instead, she can only condition it on a noisy public signal of the action. The noise may result from imperfect ES ratings, attempts by the brown firm to greenwash, or low disclosure standards. The noisier the signal, the greater the reward the investor needs to offer the manager to induce the action, and the more likely she is to choose exclusion. This result highlights a new benefit of ES disclosure – it allows investors to induce corrective actions without having to promise large amounts of capital.

Importantly, even if the blockholder can gather perfect information about the manager’s action at an arbitrarily small cost, she may not do so. It may seem that such information will allow her to induce the action at lower cost, i.e. promise a lower investment – since the blockholder will always invest if the manager has taken the action, he will do so even if the promised investment is small. However, the blockholder may end up buying a company that has taken the action even though the public signal suggests that it has not, i.e. owning a stock with a low ES rating. If the blockholder suffers sufficiently large fund outflows from doing so (as in Hartzmark and Sussman (2019)), she will not base her purchases on her private information. This reduces her incentives to gather it in the first place, and may deter her from inducing the corrective action.

If the manager is able to increase the precision of the public signal through disclosure, he will do so if his stock price concerns are sufficiently high, as then he benefits from the blockholder’s purchases if he has taken the action. It might seem that he will disclose a perfect signal, so that he will be given full credit for his action. However, he actually discloses a noisy signal, so that the blockholder has to promise a large investment to induce the action. The more investors that adopt a tilting strategy, the greater managers’ incentives to disclose more information, reinforcing investors’ incentives to tilt.

A common criticism of divestment is that arbitrageurs can buy divested stocks, attenuating the price impact. We introduce an arbitrageur who is purely profit motivated, like households, but has price impact. He buys half the shares that are not purchased by the blockholder,

lessening the impact of her trading decisions. This makes tilting less effective (since the arbitrageur partially offsets the blockholder's trades, he needs to promise an even larger purchase to induce the corrective action), but also exclusion less effective (since she buys up underpriced stock and reduces the impact on the cost of capital). Since the arbitrageur buys half of the free float, his impact is greater on exclusion, where the blockholder's trade is zero and the free float is the total shares outstanding, than on tilting. Therefore, tilting is more likely to be the optimal divestment strategy in the presence of arbitrageurs.

In our final extension, the blockholder's objective function includes trading profits as well as externalities. Our core result on the relative effectiveness of tilting and exclusion continues to hold. Moreover, and surprisingly, there are conditions under which the blockholder will induce the action if she is partially profit-motivated but not if she is only concerned with externalities. In particular, if tilting leads to more externalities, a responsible investor will choose exclusion, but a profit-motivated blockholder may tilt as this involves buying shares from risk-averse households and thus earning a premium for risk-bearing. Thus, the blockholder may tilt even if exclusion minimizes externalities. We also consider the case in which the blockholder is unable to commit to a trading strategy. In the absence of commitment, a blockholder concerned only with externalities cannot induce the action. Once the action has been taken, she cannot change it and thus has no incentive to buy shares – doing so will help the firm expand. Thus, any promise to buy shares upon the corrective action is non-credible. However, a sufficiently profit-motivated investor will buy shares to earn trading profits. She is more willing to do so if the action has been taken, as the action minimizes the additional externalities created by her share purchases. Therefore, a profit motivation makes it credible for the blockholder to tilt (i.e. buy more shares if the action has been taken than if it has not), thus allowing her to induce the action. A policy implication is that ensuring that funds fulfill their fiduciary duty to generate financial returns is not inconsistent with social returns, and may actually support the latter by giving funds incentives to tilt if commitment is not possible.

This paper is related to the theoretical literature on responsible stock selection. As discussed earlier, Heinkel, Kraus, and Zechner (2001) show that divestment reduces the price of a brown stock. Davies and Van Wesep (2018) demonstrate that the resulting lower price raises the number of shares granted to the manager if his equity-based pay is fixed in dollar terms, paradoxically rewarding him. Pedersen, Fitzgibbons, and Pomorski (2021) focus on the asset pricing implications of responsible investing and solve for the ESG-efficient frontier. Goldstein

et al. (2022) show that responsible investors can increase the cost of capital, because their trades reflect ES rather than financial performance, thus making the stock price less informative about financials. The above papers do not involve new financing and investment, so the lower stock price from divestment has no real effects. Pastor, Stambaugh, and Taylor (2021) model how greater taste for green companies increases their valuation and reduces equilibrium expected returns. While firms make investment decisions, they are financed by internal cash flow and so there is no primary markets channel through which the stock price affects investment. The above papers do not model externalities or study different strategies pursued by responsible investors; instead, investors' demands are automatic given their tastes.

Two working papers also feature the idea that making capital contingent upon a corrective action induces the action. In Oehmke and Opp (2022), a responsible investor can induce a clean technology by proposing a green bond that stipulates this technology; the investor is willing to buy the bond at a loss and so the firm issues it despite the stipulation. In our paper, the blockholder always makes a profit from investing, and so tilting does not require investors willing to make losses.<sup>3</sup> Financial returns are potentially relevant since fiduciary duty may limit asset managers' ability to sacrifice profits to achieve social objectives (see, e.g., Gosling and MacNeil (2023)); indeed, BlackRock opposed many climate resolutions in 2022 because they did not "consider them to be consistent with our clients' long-term financial interests." In addition, in Oehmke and Opp, the responsible investor wishes to scale up the clean technology and so there is no trade-off associated with the green bond expanding firm size. In our paper, providing more capital to induce the corrective action expands the scale of the firm and thus its negative externalities, which is why exclusion is sometimes optimal. In Landier and Lovo (2020), a responsible investor sets a cap to externalities which comes at a cost to firm profits; it withholds financing from any firm that exceeds this cap. While they also feature mainstream investors who may also provide funds, there is a probability that the firm cannot find such investors (and is thus not financed) due to search frictions. As a result, the firm may limit externalities to safeguard financing, even though doing so also reduces output. Neither paper features exclusion: Oehmke and Opp (2022) intentionally shut off exclusion by considering risk-neutral investors and a perfectly elastic supply of capital from financial investors; in Landier and Lovo (2020) outflows of capital from responsible investors are offset by inflows of capital

---

<sup>3</sup>In a similar vein, in Chowdhry, Davies, and Waters (2018), the impact investor makes a donation in return for the entrepreneur committing to pursue social goals.

from mainstream investors, which are perfect substitutes because production is deterministic and investors are risk-neutral.<sup>4</sup>

While other papers feature a primary markets channel through which investors encourage corrective actions (making loans or buying bonds that stipulate a technology), our paper features a secondary markets channel – investor trading causes a manager’s actions to be reflected in the stock price. Thus, tilting can be effective even if a firm is not raising new capital. This channel is also featured in models of “governance through exit”, such as Admati and Pfleiderer (2009), Edmans (2009), and Edmans and Manso (2011). Those papers do not feature the primary markets mechanism through which exclusion may have real effects, nor externalities.

Some empirical studies examine the effectiveness of blanket exclusion as a responsible investing strategy. Teoh, Welch, and Wazzan (1999) show that the South Africa exclusion campaign had a negligible effect on company valuations. The model and calibration of Berk and van Binsbergen (2021) show that ES-motivated exclusion has little effect on the cost of capital, because arbitrageurs can buy the underpriced stocks. In our model, the manager cares about the stock price for reasons other than the cost of capital, and the investor can tilt in addition to engaging in blanket exclusion. We also find that arbitrageurs attenuate the impact of exclusion; however, they increase the relative effectiveness of tilting. Pastor, Stambaugh, and Taylor (2022) document a significant return differential between German green bonds and otherwise-equivalent non-green twins, demonstrating that arbitrageurs cannot fully eliminate any price drop resulting from divestment. They study twin bonds where a perfect arbitrage exists; for equities, the effect of divestment may be higher. Berk and van Binsbergen’s empirical estimation studies the effect of being added to the FTSE USA 4 Good Select Index, i.e. the price impact of positive screening; in our model, exclusion involves negative screening. It is thus closer to the asset pricing model of Zerbib (2022) where some investors blanketly exclude certain stocks. He estimates that exclusion leads to a return premium of 2.79% per year. More broadly, Kojien and Yogo (2019) find a significant effect of institutional investor demand on asset prices, and the survey of Edmans and Holderness (2017) summarizes the evidence for

---

<sup>4</sup>While we consider the relative effectiveness of different divestment strategies, other papers compare divestment with other mechanisms to reduce externalities. Broccado, Hart, and Zingales (2022) and Gollier and Pouget (2022) show that engagement is more effective than divestment if investors have a binding vote on whether firms are green or brown. They provide the normative implication that such a vote may be useful; no such vote currently exists.



the effectiveness of “governance through exit”. In an ES context, Gantchev, Giannetti, and Li (2022) show that the threat of exit following negative environmental and social ES incidents disciplines managers to improve ES performance. Exit is only possible if the investor is willing to hold brown firms in the first place. Heath et al. (2023) show that ES funds select firms with good ES performance, but that their selection does not improve such performance. This may be the case because some funds engage in exclusion rather than tilting.

## 1 The Model

### 1.1 Players and Timing

We consider a single firm with a risk-neutral manager (“ $M$ ”). The firm is in a “brown” industry and thus emits negative externalities, to be specified later. The initial number of shares is normalized to one. The financial market consists of a continuum of risk-averse, profit-motivated, atomistic investors (“households”), indexed by  $i \in [0, 1]$ , and a risk-neutral responsible investor that aims to minimize the externalities produced by the firm. The responsible investor has the ability to take large positions and thus have price impact, and so we refer to it as a blockholder (“ $B$ ”). Since the blockholder is risk-neutral and households are risk-averse, non-investment by  $B$  reduces the stock price as it means that more shares are held by risk-averse households. The results would be qualitatively unchanged if  $B$  were also risk-averse, since non-investment by the blockholder would mean that each household has to hold more shares, leading to inefficient risk-sharing as in Heinkel, Kraus, and Zechner (2001).

There are four dates  $t \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ . At  $t = 0$ ,  $B$  announces an investment strategy  $x(a)$  that depends on a publicly-observable action  $a \in \{0, 1\}$  taken by the firm. We will sometimes refer to action  $a = 1$  as the “corrective action”, or simply the “action”, such as a fossil fuel company investing in clean energy, an alcohol company reducing the alcohol content of its drinks, or a gambling company promoting responsible gambling. The strategy  $x(0) = x(1) = 0$  represents “exclusion”, where  $B$  never holds the firm regardless of its action; the strategy  $\{x(0) = 0, x(1) > 0\}$  represents “tilting”, where  $B$  tilts away from the stock – she does not hold it if  $a = 0$ , but owns a strictly positive amount if  $a = 1$ .

Initially, we assume that  $B$  can commit to the investment strategy. For example, an asset manager can launch a fund with a stated investment strategy to exclude brown firms, such as

the Vanguard ESG FTSE Social Index fund. Deviating will lead to client withdrawals and may prompt regulatory action.<sup>5</sup> Alternatively, an asset manager can launch a fund with a tilting strategy, which generally avoids brown firms but is willing to hold them if they are sustainability leaders in their industry, such as the Royal London Sustainable World fund.<sup>6</sup> Such funds claim to add value through active management and analyzing individual companies within a sector. Failing to hold any firms in a controversial industry may also lead to client withdrawals as it would be cheaper to hold a passive fund that pursues an exclusionary strategy. In addition, avoiding entire industries will increase tracking error and may reduce risk-adjusted returns; Hong and Kacperczyk (2009) find that alcohol, tobacco, and gambling stocks significantly outperform their peers, and Baker, Hollifield, and Osambela (2022) show theoretically that ES-conscious funds should hold brown stocks to hedge against brown states. Practitioners sometimes refer to tilting as a “best-in-class” strategy. We build a parsimonious model with only one firm so the best-in-class concept does not apply literally, but if the model were extended to multiple firms, buying only those that take corrective actions involves investing in those that are best-in-class. In Section 5.1 we consider the case in which  $B$  is unable to commit to her investment strategy.

At  $t = 1$ ,  $M$  takes action  $a \in \{0, 1\}$ . Choosing the corrective action ( $a = 1$ ) reduces the firm’s externality and decreases firm value by  $c$ , net of any benefit. We have  $c > 0$ : the action reduces firm value, otherwise it would automatically be taken without the need for responsible investment. At  $t = 2$ , the firm issues  $q \in (0, 1)$  additional shares to finance an investment project and investors trade claims to the firm’s terminal value. At  $t = 3$ , the firm generates both a terminal cash flow and externalities.

The manager’s action is non-contractible. It is very difficult to specify ex ante what corrective actions a company can take, particularly because it depends on factors such as technological feasibility (e.g. the affordability of renewable energy or carbon capture). In addition, a company’s ES performance depends on very many dimensions, and it is difficult to measure all of them and put it into a compensation contract. Instead, responsible investors base their decision to invest in a company on a range of quantitative and qualitative factors.

---

<sup>5</sup>For example, the UK’s Financial Conduct Authority has forced funds to remove “sustainability” labels from their name due to not investing in accordance with their stated strategy

<sup>6</sup>Some passive funds engage in tilting, such as the Legal & General Future World Climate Change Equity Factors Index Fund, which tracks the FTSE Russell All-World ex CW Climate Balanced Factor Index.

## 1.2 Firm Value and Externalities

The firm's terminal value is specified as:

$$V = \theta + rI - ca, \tag{1}$$

where  $\theta \sim N(\mu, \sigma)$  represents the random return generated by the firm's assets in place. The cost of the corrective action is captured by  $ca$  and the gross return from the new investment is given by  $rI$  with  $r > 1$ . The firm finances the investment solely by issuing new shares so that  $I = pq$ . To focus on the main economic mechanism – the blockholder's trade-off between providing incentives for the action and less capital for brown investments – we take the firm's issuance decision  $q$  as given. For example,  $q$  may be limited by the amount of equity that can be raised without the agency costs of outside equity becoming too severe. With fixed  $q$ , lower demand for the firm's stock by the blockholder reduces the stock price  $p$  and thus the level of investment  $I = pq$ . This setting involves constant returns to scale – the firm can invest any amount  $I$ , with a constant gross return of  $r$ . An alternative assumption would be to have decreasing returns to scale and endogenous  $q$ , which would substantially complicate the model without qualitatively changing the results.<sup>7</sup> A decrease in the stock price  $p$  would reduce the optimal level of  $q$ , lowering investment as in the current setup.

The firm's operations generate a negative externality  $f$  to society:

$$f(\theta, rI, a) = \lambda(\theta + rI)(1 - \xi a). \tag{2}$$

The externality depends on the firm's assets in place  $\theta$ , the payoff from investment  $rI$ , and the action  $a$ .<sup>8</sup> The parameter  $\lambda > 0$  scales the externality and  $\xi \in (0, 1)$  determines the efficacy of the corrective action. Since the externality is increasing in the size of the firm and thus investment, there are two ways in which the blockholder's trading can reduce externalities. The first is by increasing the cost of capital and thus constraining the externality-producing investment that the manager undertakes. This is typically the stated rationale for divestment.

---

<sup>7</sup>The per-share value of the firm is given by  $v \equiv \frac{V}{1+q}$ , and so  $q$  affects both the numerator (through affecting investment and thus aggregate value) and denominator. Thus, if  $q$  were endogenous, it would not be solvable in closed form.

<sup>8</sup>We assume that the externality does not depend on the  $ca$  term. We implicitly assume that the firm has cash on hand to pay this cost and does not need to disinvest to do so.

The second is by directly rewarding the manager for taking the corrective action. The functional form for  $f$  implies that the action is expected to reduce the externality in a multiplicative way. For example, if the corrective action involves developing a less polluting technology, this is implemented firm-wide and thus has a larger effect on larger firms. In Appendix A we show that the model’s main results continue to hold if the action has an additive effect on the externality that is independent of firm size. This extension also captures the case in which the action has a multiplicative effect on the externality, as in (2), and the cost of the action is also multiplicative in firm size.

As mentioned in the introduction, other papers shut down the exclusion channel by featuring risk neutrality and externalities that do not scale with the firm. Our paper models exclusion by containing an externality that scales with firm size and risk-averse households so that divestment by the blockholder has a price impact. This captures the main argument for exclusion used in practice – to starve the firm of capital and hinder its expansion, and allows us to study the key trade-offs between different divestment strategies. The parameter  $q$  allows for variation on how much external capital firms require;  $q$  will be low in firms that finance their investments with retained earnings.

### 1.3 Manager’s Problem

The manager’s utility depends on the equilibrium stock price  $p$  and the per-share firm value  $v$ :

$$U_m = \omega p + (1 - \omega)v, \tag{3}$$

with  $\omega \in [0, 1]$ . The concern for the short-term stock price  $\omega$  is standard in the literature and can arise from a number of sources introduced by prior research, such as takeover threat (Stein, 1988), termination threat (Edmans, 2011), or reputational concerns (Narayanan, 1985; Scharfstein and Stein, 1990). All our results continue to hold if  $\omega = 0$ , because a manager fully aligned with fundamental value will still care about the stock price  $p$  as it will affect the terms at which he will raise equity; we feature a parameter for the manager’s short-term concerns as it affects the relative effectiveness of exclusion and tilting. In Heinkel, Kraus, and Zechner (2001), Pastor, Stambaugh, and Taylor (2021), and Broccado, Hart, and Zingales (2022),  $\omega = 1$ .

At  $t = 1$ , the manager solves:

$$\max_{a \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}[U_m], \quad (4)$$

where the expectation is taken over  $\theta$ . Importantly, the manager takes the blockholder's investment policy  $x(a)$  as given when choosing  $a$ .

## 1.4 Financial Market

The blockholder commits to a demand schedule  $x(a)$ . Households maximize a standard mean-variance objective with constant absolute risk aversion parameter  $\gamma > 0$ . When submitting their demands, households condition on the action  $a$  and the stock price  $p$ :

$$\max_{x_i} \mathbb{E}[x_i(v - p)|a, p] - \frac{\gamma}{2} \text{Var}(x_i(v - p)|a, p). \quad (5)$$

Their demand function is thus given by:

$$x_i = \frac{\mathbb{E}[v|a, p] - p}{\gamma \text{Var}(v|a, p)}. \quad (6)$$

Market clearing requires that total demand equals supply:

$$x(a) + \int_0^1 x_i di = 1 + q. \quad (7)$$

Solving for  $p$  yields:

$$p = \mathbb{E}[v|a, p] - \gamma \text{Var}(v|a, p) (1 + q - x(a)) \quad (8)$$

with  $\mathbb{E}[v|a, p] = \frac{\mu + rI - ca}{1 + q}$ ,  $\text{Var}(v|a, p) = \frac{\sigma^2}{(1 + q)^2}$ , and  $I = qp$ .

The stock price  $p$  is the certainty equivalent per-share value of the firm. The second term represents the risk discount, which is increasing in risk  $\text{Var}(\cdot)$ , household risk aversion  $\gamma$ , and the number of shares held by households  $1 + q - x(a)$ . An increase in the blockholder's demand raises the stock price by reducing the number of shares that risk-averse investors need to hold.

## 1.5 Blockholder's Problem

The blockholder chooses the investment strategy  $x(a)$  to minimize the expected externality:

$$\min_{x(a)} \mathbb{E}[f(\theta, rI, a)]. \quad (9)$$

In Section 5, we allow the blockholder's objective function to comprise both trading profits and externalities.

We assume that  $0 \leq x(a) \leq 1 + q$ . The assumption  $x(a) \geq 0$  results from short-sale constraints, which are standard in the blockholder exit literature (e.g. Admati and Pfleiderer, 2009; Edmans, 2009); without short-sales constraints, blockholders have no special role as any investor can exit, regardless of her initial stake. However, this assumption is not necessary for our results. If short-sales are possible, all the results continue to apply except that  $B$  need not be a blockholder – she can be any large investor that can commit to an investment strategy.<sup>9</sup> Similarly,  $x(a) \leq 1 + q$  means that the blockholder cannot buy more than the entire firm, i.e. households cannot short sell. If this assumption is relaxed, our results become stronger as the blockholder has a greater ability to reward the corrective action.

## 2 Optimal Investment Strategies

We solve the model by backwards induction. We first re-write the equilibrium stock price as a function of  $B$ 's strategy and the corrective action. We take the stock price in equation (8), plug in  $I = pq$  and solve for  $p$ :

$$p(a) = \frac{\mu - ca - \left(1 - \frac{x(a)}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2}{1 + q - rq}. \quad (10)$$

The intuition is as follows. In the absence of an investment decision, the stock price is the certainty equivalent firm value divided by the number of shares ( $1 + q$ ). One may think that investment should add an additional term to firm value in the numerator. However, since the value of the investment is  $rq p(a)$ , it effectively reduces the number of shares by  $rq$  in the

---

<sup>9</sup>We would only need a limit on the maximum possible short-sales to prevent the stock price in equation (8) from turning negative.

denominator.<sup>10</sup>

To ensure that  $p(a)$  is positive, we assume that  $\mu > \gamma\sigma^2 + c$  so that expected firm value is not outweighed by the risk premium and the cost of the action, and that  $1 + q - rq > 0$  so the effective number of shares does not turn negative. The second condition can be rewritten  $r < \frac{1+q}{q}$ . Intuitively, if  $r$  is sufficiently large, then households demand more shares when the price is higher, since their funds will be invested in a very profitable investment opportunity, leading to an upward-sloping demand curve.

We next solve for  $M$ 's optimal choice of  $a$ . He takes the action if  $\mathbb{E}[U_m|a = 1] \geq \mathbb{E}[U_m|a = 0]$ . Plugging in the earlier expressions for  $p(a)$  and  $\mathbb{E}[v]$  shows that this inequality is satisfied if and only if:

$$x(1) - x(0) \geq \frac{c(1+q)}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega + (1-\omega)z]} \equiv \bar{\Delta}_x \quad (11)$$

where

$$z \equiv \frac{rq}{1+q} \in (0, 1). \quad (12)$$

The action  $a = 1$  has two effects on  $M$ 's objective function. First, it incurs a cost  $c$  which reduces fundamental value and thus the stock price; the latter in turn lowers investment and further reduces fundamental value. Second, it increases the blockholder's demand from  $x(0)$  to  $x(1)$ , raising the stock price  $p(a)$  and thus investment and firm value. Thus,  $M$  takes the action if the second force is sufficiently strong, i.e.  $B$  pursues a tilting strategy where  $x(1) - x(0)$  is sufficiently high.

The last step is to solve for  $B$ 's optimal policy  $x(a)$ . The previous assumptions  $\mathbb{E}[f(\theta, rI, 1)] > \mathbb{E}[f(\theta, rI, 0)]$  and  $\frac{\partial f(\theta, rI, a)}{\partial I} > 0$ , and the fact that  $p(0)$  increases with  $x(0)$ , imply that the blockholder optimally sets  $x(0) = 0$ . It immediately follows from equation (11) that the blockholder can implement  $a = 1$  by setting  $x(1) \geq \bar{\Delta}_x$  and  $a = 0$  by setting  $x(1) \in [0, \bar{\Delta}_x)$ . We assume that

$$c \leq \gamma\sigma^2[\omega + (1-\omega)z] \quad (13)$$

---

<sup>10</sup>To see this, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Market value of firm} &= \text{Certainty equivalent fundamental value of firm} \\ p(1+q) &= \text{Certainty equivalent assets in place} + rqp \\ p(1+q-rq) &= \text{Certainty equivalent of assets in place} \end{aligned}$$

so that the constraint  $x(1) \leq 1 + q$  does not bind.<sup>11</sup> Proposition 1 gives the blockholder's optimal strategy; all proofs are given in the Appendix.

**Proposition 1** (*Blockholder's strategy*): *The blockholder's optimal strategy is given as follows:*

- (i) *If  $\xi \geq \bar{\xi}$ , the optimal strategy is tilting, i.e.  $x(1) = \bar{\Delta}_x$  and  $x(0) = 0$ , and the manager chooses  $a = 1$ ;*
- (ii) *If  $\xi < \bar{\xi}$ , the optimal strategy is exclusion, i.e.  $x(1) = x(0) = 0$ , and the manager chooses  $a = 0$ .*

*The threshold  $\bar{\xi} \equiv \frac{(1-\omega)c}{(1-\omega)c + (\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2)(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z})}$  is increasing in  $(c, \gamma, \sigma)$  and decreasing in  $(\omega, \mu)$ . If  $\omega = 0$ , then  $\bar{\xi}$  is decreasing in  $(r, q)$ . If  $\omega \in (0, 1)$ , then  $\bar{\xi}$  is hump-shaped in  $(r, q)$ . The threshold  $\bar{\Delta}_x$  is defined in equation (11).*

The intuition is as follows. The blockholder's investment strategy  $x(a)$  is analogous to an incentive contract provided to a manager, except that incentives are not provided by cash, but through purchasing shares which raises the stock price.<sup>12</sup> A higher stock price increases the manager's payoff directly as the manager places weight  $\omega$  on the stock price, and indirectly by increasing the proceeds from capital raising and thus fundamental value (on which the manager places weight  $1 - \omega$ ). As in a compensation model, it is optimal to give the lowest possible reward upon  $a = 0$ . In a contracting setting with limited liability, this involves zero pay; in an investment setting with short-sales constraints, this involves zero demand. Whether to reward  $a = 1$  depends on whether the benefits of the action exceed the costs. In a contracting setting, the cost is the financial cost of pay. In our investment setting, the cost is that positive demand increases the stock price, raising investment and thus the externality. This analogy highlights the drawback of exclusion strategies, despite them being practiced by many investors – they are tantamount to giving the manager zero reward for desirable actions.

The blockholder chooses tilting if the effectiveness of the action  $\xi$  is sufficiently high. Then, the most effective way to reduce externalities is to incentivize the manager to take the action through tilting, rather than to starve the firm of funds through exclusion. The threshold  $\bar{\xi}$  is

---

<sup>11</sup>In the extensions, condition (13) will differ, and we will state the new required condition.

<sup>12</sup>A second difference is that an incentive contract is contingent upon output, whereas the blockholder's strategy is contingent upon the action  $a$ . We only require the action  $a$  to be publicly observable, but not contractible. Section 3 studies the case in which  $a$  is not publicly observable.



lower (i.e. tilting is more likely to be optimal) if the manager has greater stock price concerns ( $\omega$  is high<sup>13</sup>) and the action is less costly ( $c$  is low). This reduces the number of shares  $\bar{\Delta}_x$  that  $B$  needs to purchase to induce the corrective action, meaning that doing so is possible without raising investment by much.

Tilting is also preferred if the firm is large (high  $\mu$ ) and risk  $\sigma$  and risk aversion  $\gamma$  are small, because this increases the stock price and thus the amount of investment. In addition, high  $\mu$  increases assets in place. Both factors lead to greater firm value and thus higher externalities. Since the action  $a$  has a multiplicative effect on the externality, the greater the firm value, the greater the benefit from the action. Lower risk and risk aversion also mean that exclusion by the blockholder has a less negative effect on the stock price.

Finally, the capital raised by the firm ( $q$ ) and the profitability of the investment ( $r$ ) have non-monotonic effects on  $\bar{\xi}$ . One might think that they should have an unambiguous effect – the greater the capital raised, the more important the cost of capital channel, and thus the more valuable exclusion is to increase the cost of capital. However, there is a force in the opposite direction – the greater the capital raised, the more important the action is to reduce the externalities from the new investment. If  $q$  and  $r$  are sufficiently high, such a large amount of capital is raised that this second force dominates and further increases in  $q$  and  $r$  make tilting more effective.

In Appendix A, we consider the case in which the action has an additive effect on the externality that is independent of firm size, for example if the cost  $c$  involves donating money to charity which reduces the externality by  $\lambda\xi$ . This extension also captures the case in which the action has a multiplicative effect on the externality, as in (2), and the cost of the action is also multiplicative in expected firm size. In the core model, the action has a fixed cost  $c$ , such as the cost of developing a less polluting technology which, once invented, can be implemented costlessly across the firm. However, if the technology is already known (and thus does not require a fixed development cost) but its implementation involves a higher per-unit cost of production, then this cost will scale with firm size. The key result that tilting is preferred if and only if  $\xi$  exceeds a cutoff continues to hold, as do the comparative statics with respect to  $c$  and  $\omega$ . However, the effects of  $q$  and  $r$  now become monotonic (greater levels lead to exclusion

---

<sup>13</sup>One might think that there is a force in the opposite direction – higher  $\omega$  means a lower weight  $(1 - \omega)$  on fundamental value, and so the manager has less incentive to boost the stock price to increase the amount raised by the new investment. However, the cost of the investment  $c$  also affects fundamental value, so a lower weight on fundamental value makes the manager more willing to pay the cost.

being preferred), and  $\mu, \gamma, \sigma$  no longer affect the optimal strategy.

### 3 Unobservable Corrective Action

In this section, we consider the case in which the corrective action is not publicly observable. As a result,  $B$  cannot condition her holdings on  $a$ . Instead, there is a public signal  $s \in \{0, 1\}$  which is correlated with the action, such as an ES rating. The signal precision is given by

$$\tau \equiv \Pr[s = a | a] \in [0.5, 1). \quad (14)$$

This precision can be affected by many real-world factors. For example, superior disclosure standards, more trusted third-party verification of disclosures, or greater consensus between ES rating agencies (which Berg, Kölbl, and Rigobon (2022) show to disagree significantly) will increase precision. Alternatively, if  $M$  is able to greenwash, i.e. give the impression of taking the corrective action without actually doing so, then  $\tau$  is lower. The signal is publicly observed at  $t = 2$ , before trade in the secondary market takes place. The blockholder is able to condition her holdings on this signal,  $x(s) \geq 0$ . Households have rational expectations and correctly conjecture the manager's equilibrium action.

We proceed in two steps. First, we take the signal precision as given and analyze how  $\tau$  affects the optimal investment strategy. Second, we endogenize signal precision and allow the manager to choose  $\tau$  ex ante.

#### 3.1 Optimal Investment Strategies

Following the same steps as in the baseline model,  $M$  takes the action if and only if:

$$x(1) - x(0) \geq \frac{1}{2\tau - 1} \frac{(1 - \omega)c(1 + q)(1 - z)}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega + (1 - \omega)z]} \equiv \widehat{\Delta}_x(\tau). \quad (15)$$

As in the baseline model, the manager chooses the action if it leads to the blockholder buying a sufficiently large amount. The threshold  $\widehat{\Delta}_x$  is decreasing in signal precision  $\tau$ :  $\frac{\partial \widehat{\Delta}_x}{\partial \tau} < 0$ . Intuitively,  $B$  has to provide  $M$  stronger incentives to take the action when the public signal is less precise. If  $\tau = 1/2$ , the signal is uninformative about the action. Since the blockholder is unable to reward the action, the manager always chooses  $a = 0$ .

The blockholder optimally chooses tilting if the expected externality with  $a = 1$  and  $x(1) = \widehat{\Delta}_x$  is lower than that under  $a = 0$  and  $x(1) = 0$ , and  $\widehat{\Delta}_x(\tau) \leq 1 + q$ . The equivalent of condition (13), to ensure  $x(1) \leq 1 + q$ , is  $c \leq \frac{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z](2\tau-1)}{(1-\omega)(1-z)}$ . Under this assumption,  $B$ 's optimal strategy is given by Proposition 2:

**Proposition 2** (*Unobservable corrective action*): *The blockholder's optimal strategy is tilting and the manager chooses  $a = 1$  if and only if*

$$\xi \geq \bar{\xi}_{unob}(\tau) \equiv 1 - \frac{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2}{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2 + c\left(\frac{\tau}{2\tau-1} \frac{1-\omega}{\omega+\frac{z}{1-z}} - 1\right)}. \quad (16)$$

*Otherwise, it is exclusion and the manager chooses  $a = 0$ . The tilting strategy involves  $x(1) = \widehat{\Delta}_x(\tau)$ .  $\bar{\xi}_{unob}(\tau)$  is increasing in  $(c, \gamma, \sigma)$  and decreasing in  $(\omega, \mu, \tau)$ .*

As in the baseline model,  $B$  chooses tilting if the effectiveness of the action exceeds a threshold. This threshold is decreasing in signal precision  $\tau$ . A higher  $\tau$  means that it is less costly for  $B$  to implement the action, and so tilting is preferable to exclusion. Note that  $\bar{\xi}_{unob}(1/2) = 1$ : if the signal is pure noise, then  $B$  always chooses exclusion. In this sense, exclusion is more “robust” than tilting – it is a simple strategy for  $B$  to execute, that does not rely on her ability to observe the corrective action. However, this robustness comes at a cost of providing no incentives to restructure.

Proposition 2 thus highlights a new benefit of superior ES disclosure. Common arguments are that ES disclosure allows investors to allocate capital according to ES performance, and to hold managers to account. Both of these channels operate here, but there is an additional force – by allowing investors to allocate capital according to ES performance, they can induce corrective actions without having to commit to a significant investment in a brown firm.

### 3.2 Blockholder Private Information

We now allow the blockholder to gather private information on the manager's action  $a$ , after the action has been taken but before she trades. We assume the cost of information acquisition is arbitrarily small, and if  $B$  is indifferent between acquiring information and remaining uninformed, she prefers the latter. Other market participants remain uninformed about  $a$ , although they continue to observe the public signal  $s$ .

If the blockholder acquires private information on  $a$ , we assume that she can commit to an investment that conditions on  $a$ . Since both the manager and blockholder know when  $a = 1$ , the blockholder can commit to rewarding the manager by purchasing stock if  $a = 1$ .<sup>14</sup> If the blockholder does not acquire information, then she can only base her investment strategy on the public signal  $s$ . If the company has a low ES rating (i.e.,  $s = 0$ ), but  $B$  buys a stake in it (i.e.,  $x > 0$ ), she suffers a loss of  $g > 0$  from client outflows, consistent with the evidence of Hartzmark and Sussman (2019).<sup>15</sup>

The blockholder's objective function is to minimize the sum of the firm's externalities, her cost of information acquisition, and her reputational costs, i.e.

$$f + g(1 - s)\mathcal{I}_{\{x > 0\}}.$$

**Proposition 3** (*Blockholder private information*):

(i) If  $\tau \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1-\omega}{\frac{1+z}{1-z} + \omega}$ , the blockholder remains uninformed and chooses tilting if and only if  $\xi > \bar{\xi}_{unob}(\tau)$ , as in Proposition 2.

(ii) Suppose  $\frac{1}{2} < \tau < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1-\omega}{\frac{1+z}{1-z} + \omega}$  and let

$$\bar{\xi}_{in}(g) \equiv \frac{(1 - \omega) c + \frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda} \frac{1-z}{z} \left(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}\right)}{(1 - \omega) c + \left(\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2\right) \left(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}\right)}. \quad (17)$$

$$\bar{\xi}_{un}(g) \equiv 1 - \frac{\frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda} \frac{1-z}{z} \left(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}\right)}{c \left[\frac{\tau}{2\tau-1} (1 - \omega) - \frac{1}{1-z}\right]}. \quad (18)$$

---

<sup>14</sup>If the blockholder reneges on this commitment, and the action becomes publicly observable with a lag so it becomes known that she has reneged, then she will be unable to induce the action in any other firms going forwards. The same logic means that  $B$  is able to commit to acquiring information. If she reneges on this commitment, she will be uninformed about  $a$  and thus will not be able to reward the manager by purchasing stock if  $a = 1$ . Allowing for a divestment strategy that conditions both on  $a$  and  $s$  would not change the result since the action  $a$  is perfectly predictable in equilibrium.

<sup>15</sup>Such outflows arise because clients use portfolio ES ratings to assess how responsible an investor the blockholder is. With rational expectations, every client would understand  $B$ 's strategy and anticipate that  $M$  always chooses  $a = 1$ ; thus,  $s = 0$  provides no information about  $M$ 's action. However, some clients may be unaware that  $B$  is able to obtain private information, that she is following a tilting strategy, or that  $M$  is able to take a corrective action. A rational expectations microfoundation is that there are multiple blockholder types, and one blockholder type places no weight on externalities and thus will hold an unreformed brown company to earn the profits from risk-bearing. Thus,  $x > 0$  despite  $s = 0$  causes clients to downwardly revise their beliefs that the blockholder is a responsible investor.

Then, there exists  $g^* > 0$  that satisfies  $\bar{\xi}_{unob}(\tau) = \bar{\xi}_{in}(g^*)$  such that:

- (a) If  $g \geq g^*$ , the blockholder remains uninformed and chooses tilting if and only if  $\xi > \bar{\xi}_{unob}(\tau)$ .
- (b) If  $g < g^*$ , the blockholder chooses exclusion if  $\xi < \bar{\xi}_{in}(g)$ , informed tilting if  $\bar{\xi}_{in}(g) < \xi < \bar{\xi}_{un}(g)$ , and uninformed tilting if  $\xi > \bar{\xi}_{un}(g)$ . In this case  $\bar{\xi}_{in}(g) < \bar{\xi}_{unob}(\tau) < \bar{\xi}_{un}(g)$ , with  $\lim_{g \nearrow g^*} \bar{\xi}_{in}(g) = \bar{\xi}_{unob}(\tau) = \lim_{g \nearrow g^*} \bar{\xi}_{un}(g)$ .
- (c) The equilibrium expected externality is increasing in  $g$ .

Proposition 3 shows that  $B$  is less likely to acquire information when the cost from greenwashing accusations  $g$  is large. Absent reputational concerns, it is efficient for  $B$  to acquire private information as she does not need to promise as large a purchase to induce the action – since  $M$  knows that  $B$  will have observed that he has taken the action, he will be willing to do so even if the promised purchases are low. However, by committing to condition her strategy on  $a$ , the blockholder exposes herself to the risk that she ends up purchasing shares if  $a = 1$  even if  $s = 0$  – investing in a company that the public thinks has taken no corrective action. If the cost of greenwashing accusations is sufficiently large, the blockholder is less likely to acquire private information which, in turn, increases the cost of inducing the action and deters her from doing so in the first place.

In reality, many responsible investors claim to gather private information on firms' social performance. Indeed, one might think that doing so makes them more effective, since they can hold firms more accountable. However, contrary to their claims, they have no incentive to gather private information if they are unable to trade on it, due to being evaluated on how their investments vary with publicly observable signals.

### 3.3 Optimal Disclosure

In this section, we return to the case in which  $a$  is unobservable to all investors, and allow the manager to choose  $\tau$  ex ante by engaging in disclosure. We assume that if the manager is indifferent between different values of  $\tau$ , he chooses the lowest possible  $\tau$  of  $\frac{1}{2}$  as this would be strictly optimal if disclosure were costly. We also assume the choice of  $\tau$  is made public, so that  $B$  can condition her investment strategy on  $\tau$ .

The equivalent of condition (13), to ensure  $x(1) \leq 1 + q$ , is  $c \leq \frac{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}{1+\omega+(1-\omega)z}$ . Under this assumption, Proposition 4 gives  $M$ 's optimal disclosure policy and shows how it affects  $B$ 's optimal investment strategy.

**Proposition 4** (*Optimal disclosure policy*). *If and only if*

$$\xi \geq 1 - \frac{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2}{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2 + c \frac{1-\omega}{\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}}} \equiv \bar{\xi}_{disc}, \quad (19)$$

then the manager chooses  $\tau^* = \max\{\hat{\tau}(\xi), \tau^{min}\} \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  where  $\hat{\tau}(\xi)$  satisfies  $\xi = \bar{\xi}_{unob}(\tau)$  and  $\tau^{min}$  satisfies  $\hat{\Delta}_x(\tau^{min}) = 1 + q$ , the blockholder chooses tilting, and the manager chooses  $a = 1$ . Otherwise, the manager chooses  $\tau = \frac{1}{2}$ , the blockholder chooses exclusion, and the manager chooses  $a = 0$ . The threshold  $\bar{\xi}_{disc}$  decreases in  $(\mu, \omega)$ , it increases in  $(c, \gamma, \sigma)$ , and it is hump-shaped in  $(r, q)$ .

The manager discloses information (i.e. chooses  $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$ ), and the blockholder chooses tilting, if and only if the action is sufficiently effective. The threshold for  $\xi$  decreases in the manager's stock price concerns. This is because disclosure increases the stock price if the manager has taken the action. One might think that  $M$  should choose full disclosure ( $\tau = 1$ ) so that his action is always reflected in the public signal ( $s = 1$ ). In contrast, the manager deliberately discloses noisy signals, so that the blockholder has to promise a high investment  $x(1)$  upon the action in order to induce it. Indeed,  $\hat{\tau}(\xi)$  is the minimum disclosure that persuades the blockholder to implement the action.

The model considers a blockholder who chooses optimally between tilting and exclusion strategies. Stepping outside the model, if there was a probability that the blockholder only implements exclusion strategies (e.g. due to lack of sophistication, or its clients believing that exclusion is the best way to invest responsibly), then the greater this probability, the more likely it is for the manager to choose minimal disclosure ( $\tau = \frac{1}{2}$ ). Thus, if the economy contains more responsible investors that are open to adopting a tilting strategy, this would encourage firms to disclose more information about their ES activities, in turn reinforcing investors' incentives to adopt the tilting strategy. Relatedly, if the blockholder's investment strategy and the manager's disclosure choice were made simultaneously, rather than sequentially, then tilting and disclosure would be strategic complements – the manager will disclose more if he

expects that the blockholder will tilt. Thus, there would be multiple equilibria where tilting is self-fulfilling. As a result, regulation that encourages either disclosure or tilting (e.g. not punishing responsible firms for holding brown stocks) could help coordinate on the tilting, high-disclosure equilibrium.

## 4 Presence of Arbitrageur

A common criticism of divestment strategies is they allow arbitrageurs to buy brown firms at depressed prices, attenuating the impact of divestment on prices. This section extends the model to incorporating an arbitrageur,  $A$ , who is purely profit-motivated like households, and is risk-neutral and can take large stakes and have price impact like the blockholder. We return to the case in which the action  $a$  is publicly observable; this simplifies the analysis as it means that firm value (which is net of  $c$ , if  $a = 1$ ) is publicly observable.

With probability  $\eta \in (0, 1]$ ,  $A$  arrives after  $B$  has announced her investment strategy and  $M$  has taken action  $a$ . The presence of the arbitrageur is public information. He trades an amount  $y$  at  $t = 2$  to maximize  $\Pi_A(y) = y(v - p)$ . The equivalent of condition (13), to ensure  $x(1) \leq 1 + q$ , is  $c \leq \gamma\sigma^2[\omega + (1 - \omega)z] \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{2}\right)$ . Under this assumption, the solution is given in Proposition 5:

**Proposition 5** (*Arbitrageur*). *If the arbitrageur is present, his trading volume and profit are given by*

$$y^*(x) = \arg \max_y \Pi_A(y) = \frac{1 + q - x}{2} \quad (20)$$

$$\Pi_A(y^*(x)) = \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1 + q - x}{1 + q}\right)^2 \gamma\sigma^2 \quad (21)$$

and, conditional on  $x$ , the stock price is given by

$$p(x, a, y^*(x)) = \frac{\mu - ca - \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{x}{1+q}\right) \gamma\sigma^2}{1 + q - rq}. \quad (22)$$

The blockholder's optimal strategy is tilting and the manager chooses  $a = 1$  if and only if

$$\xi \geq \bar{\xi}_{arb} \equiv \frac{(1 - \omega) c}{(1 - \omega) c + \left(\frac{\mu}{z} - \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{2}\right) \gamma \sigma^2\right) \left(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}\right)}. \quad (23)$$

Otherwise, it is exclusion and the manager chooses  $a = 0$ . The tilting strategy involves

$$x(1) = \frac{(1 + q) c}{\left(1 - \frac{\eta}{2}\right) \gamma \sigma^2 [\omega + (1 - \omega) z]}. \quad (24)$$

As is standard,  $A$  buys half of the free float not acquired by  $B$ , as shown in equation (20). Comparing (22) with (10), there is an additional  $(1 - \frac{\eta}{2})$  term in the numerator, which multiplies the term containing  $x$  and means that the blockholder's trade has a lower effect on the stock price. Intuitively, if  $A$  is present, she buys half of the free float, so  $B$ 's impact is halved. As a consequence, equation (24) contains an additional  $(1 - \frac{\eta}{2})$  term in the denominator – since the blockholder has smaller price impact, she must promise a higher purchase to induce the action, which makes tilting more expensive to implement. Exclusion also becomes less effective because the arbitrageur partially reverses the impact of exclusion on the stock price and the cost of capital. Since the arbitrageur buys half of the free float, his impact is decreasing in the blockholder's trade. Thus, while the arbitrageur makes both exclusion and tilting less effective, the impact is greater on exclusion as the blockholder's trade is zero. As a result, the threshold in (23) is decreasing in  $\eta$  – the greater the probability of the arbitrageur appearing, the more likely the blockholder is to tilt.

## 5 Profit-Motivated Responsible Investor

This section extends the blockholder's objective function to comprise trading profits as well as externalities. She now maximizes

$$U_B = \varphi x (v - p) - (1 - \varphi) f(\theta, rI, a), \quad (25)$$

where  $\varphi \in [0, 1]$  parametrizes the blockholder's concern for profits. The baseline model is a special case where  $\varphi = 0$ . We consider two sub-cases: in the first,  $B$  cannot commit to an investment strategy; in the second, she can. We use “profit-motivated” to denote a blockholder



with  $\varphi > 0$  and “responsible” for  $\varphi = 0$ .

## 5.1 No Commitment

Suppose that  $B$  cannot commit to an investment strategy, i.e. she chooses her optimal trade at  $t = 2$  freely after the action  $a$  has become public at  $t = 1$ . In the baseline model where  $\varphi = 0$ , the blockholder will always choose  $x = 0$ . Her trading decision has no influence on the action since it has already been taken; her only objective is to minimize firm size which is achieved through  $x = 0$ . Thus, in equilibrium, the manager will choose  $a = 0$  and the expected externality is  $\lambda \frac{\mu - z\gamma\sigma^2}{1-z}$ .

If  $\varphi > 0$ , the blockholder’s objective function includes profit. Given action  $a$ , she maximizes her expected utility by choosing:

$$x^*(a) = \frac{1+q}{2} \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1-a\xi), 0 \right\}. \quad (26)$$

The profit-motivated blockholder buys shares, since there are gains from trade between the risk-neutral blockholder and the risk-averse households. Moreover,  $x^*(1) \geq x^*(0)$ : the blockholder buys more shares when the manager takes the action, even though it reduces firm value. The intuition is as follows. The action’s impact on firm value does not affect trading profits, because the action is public and thus fully reflected in the stock price. However, the action means that buying shares, and thus helping the company expand, has a less positive impact on externalities. Thus, buying shares has the same benefit (trading profits are unchanged) and a lower cost (externalities are smaller) and so the blockholder buys more shares if  $a = 1$ .

The manager has rational expectations about the blockholder trade  $x^*(a)$ . As in the baseline model, he takes the action if and only if

$$x^*(1) - x^*(0) \geq \bar{\Delta}_x, \quad (27)$$

where  $\bar{\Delta}_x$  is given by (11). The equilibrium is given by Proposition 6.

**Proposition 6** (*Profit-motivated blockholder, no commitment*): *Suppose the blockholder cannot commit to an investment strategy. In equilibrium:*

- (i) *If  $\xi \leq \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}$ , the blockholder buys  $x^*(0)$  shares and  $a^* = 0$ .*

(ii) If  $\xi > \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}$ , there exists  $0 < \underline{\varphi}(\xi) < \bar{\varphi}(\xi) < 1$  such that:

(a) If  $\varphi \in [\underline{\varphi}(\xi), \bar{\varphi}(\xi)]$ , the blockholder buys  $x^*(1)$  shares and  $a^* = 1$ .

(b) If  $\varphi \notin [\underline{\varphi}(\xi), \bar{\varphi}(\xi)]$ , the blockholder buys  $x^*(0)$  shares and  $a^* = 0$ .

(iii) Let  $f^*(\varphi)$  be the externalities where the blockholder's weight on profits is  $\varphi$ . Then, there exists  $\xi_{NC} \in (0, 1)$  and  $\varphi_{NC}(\xi) \leq \bar{\varphi}(\xi)$  such that:

(a) If  $\xi \leq \max\left\{\frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}, \xi_{NC}\right\}$  then  $f^*(\varphi) = f^*(0)$  if  $\varphi < \underline{\varphi}(\xi)$ , and  $f^*(\varphi) > f^*(0)$  if  $\varphi \geq \underline{\varphi}(\xi)$ .

(b) If  $\xi > \max\left\{\frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}, \xi_{NC}\right\}$  then  $f^*(\varphi) = f^*(0)$  if  $\varphi < \underline{\varphi}(\xi)$ ,  $f^*(\varphi) < f^*(0)$  if  $\varphi \in [\underline{\varphi}(\xi), \varphi_{NC}(\xi)]$ , and  $f^*(\varphi) > f^*(0)$  if  $\varphi \geq \varphi_{NC}(\xi)$ .

Part (i) states that, as in the baseline model, the blockholder cannot induce the action if it is sufficiently ineffective. Part (ii) demonstrates that, if the action is sufficiently effective, the blockholder can induce it if profit motives fall within an intermediate range. On the one hand, they need to be sufficiently high to induce the blockholder to buy shares: note that  $\varphi$  needs to be sufficiently greater than 0, rather than just strictly positive, since profit motives need to outweigh the increased externalities from buying shares. On the other hand, the blockholder's concern for externalities also has to be sufficiently high that she buys significantly more shares when  $a = 1$  than when  $a = 0$ .

Even if profit motives allow the blockholder to induce the action, this does not automatically mean that externalities fall, since profit motives also lead the blockholder to buy shares which helps the firm expand. Part (iii) shows that, for an intermediate range of profit motives and a sufficiently effective corrective action, the former effect outweighs the latter – i.e. the inducement of the action outweighs the financing of expansion and so externalities do fall.

The intuition is as follows. In the baseline model, the blockholder is able to commit to buying more shares when the action is taken. If the blockholder is unable to commit, and is only concerned with externalities, she will not buy shares, regardless of the manager's action, as doing so increases externalities. Profit motives substitute for the ability to commit – they make it individually rational for the blockholder to buy more shares when  $a = 1$ , effectively committing her to reward the corrective action.

## 5.2 Commitment

This sub-section allows the blockholder to commit to a trading strategy, as in the baseline model. The equilibrium is given by Proposition 7.

**Proposition 7** (*Profit-motivated blockholder, commitment*):

- (i) *The firm's externalities in equilibrium increase with  $\varphi$ .*
- (ii) *There exists  $\bar{\xi}_C > 0$  such that the profit-motivated blockholder induces the corrective action if and only if  $\xi \geq \bar{\xi}_C$ . Moreover,*
  - (a) *If  $\bar{\Delta}_x \leq \frac{1+q}{2}$  then  $\bar{\xi}_C < 1$ , and if  $\bar{\Delta}_x > \frac{1+q}{2}$  then there is  $\varphi^* > \frac{z\lambda}{1-z+z\lambda}$  such that  $\bar{\xi}_C < 1$  if and only if  $\varphi < \varphi^*$ .*
  - (b) *If  $\frac{1+q}{2} < \bar{\Delta}_x$  and  $\varphi < \frac{z\lambda}{1-z+z\lambda}$ , then  $\bar{\xi}_C < \bar{\xi}$ .*

Part (i) shows that, under commitment, a profit-motivated investor will always generate (weakly) more externalities than a responsible investor, who by definition minimizes externalities. The greater the weight the investor puts on trading profits, the larger are the expected externalities in equilibrium. Part (ii) shows that, as in the baseline model, a profit-motivated investor tilts if the action is sufficiently effective. Intuitively, large  $\xi$  makes tilting attractive since it reduces externalities (as in the baseline model), but also because it enables the profit-motivated investor to earn the gains from trade at a lower social cost. Part (iia) confirms that this condition is satisfied for a non-empty range of parameter values, i.e. profit-motivated investors continue to tilt in some cases. Part (iib) gives sufficient conditions for the threshold for  $\xi$  to be lower for a profit-motivated investor than a responsible one. If these conditions are satisfied, then when  $\xi \in (\bar{\xi}_C, \bar{\xi})$ , a responsible investor excludes but a profit-motivated investor tilts. Intuitively, even though tilting leads to more externalities, it also generates trading profits which the profit-motivated investor is concerned about but the responsible investor is not.

## 6 Conclusion

This paper has analyzed the optimal investment strategy of a responsible investor who aims to minimize the externalities emitted by a brown firm. While exclusion – never investing in

the firm – minimizes the stock price and thus the amount of externality-enhancing investment the firm can undertake, it provides no incentives for the firm to undertake a corrective action. Tilting provides incentives to take the action, at the cost of providing capital to a brown firm and allowing it to expand. The optimal strategy is for the investor to tilt if the action is effective at reducing externalities and comes at little cost to firm value, and also if the manager’s stock price concerns are high, as then the blockholder does not need to promise a large investment to persuade the manager to take the action. Surprisingly, greater capital needs may reduce the relative effectiveness of exclusion, even though it increases the cost of capital.

We extend the model to the case in which the corrective action is not observable, but a noisy signal is, and the investor can condition her holdings only on the signal. The noisier the signal, the greater the reward the investor needs to offer to induce the action, and the less likely she is to tilt. If the manager can choose signal precision, he will choose to disclose some information if his stock price concerns are sufficiently high, as the blockholder will buy if he has taken the corrective action, increasing the stock price. However, he will only disclose a noisy signal, so that the investor has to promise high investment upon the corrective action in order to induce it. Even if the blockholder has the option to acquire private information about the manager’s action at an arbitrarily small cost, she may refrain from doing so if she suffers a sufficiently large reputational loss from investing in a company that has taken a corrective action but the public is unaware of this fact. If there is an arbitrageur who buys underpriced stock, exclusion becomes relatively less effective compared to tilting as the arbitrageur offsets the negative effect of exclusion on the stock price.

Finally, if the blockholder is partially profit-motivated, this gives her greater incentives to tilt, since doing so involves buying shares from risk-averse households and thus earning trading profits for risk-bearing. In particular, if the blockholder is unable to commit to an investment strategy, one whose sole objective is to minimize externalities will never tilt, since she has no incentives to buy shares after the action has been taken, and thus cannot implement the action. A profit motivation effectively commits the blockholder to buy more shares if the corrective action is taken – i.e., to tilt – thus allowing her to induce the action.

Our paper considers secondary market trading, and demonstrates that tilting can be effective even if non-investment by the blockholder does not directly starve the firm of capital because the shares are bought by households. The mechanisms will continue to hold if the blockholder is providing primary capital – for example, providing a new loan, or providing

primary equity financing to a start-up. It may seem that withholding primary financing from firms that exert externalities, whatever actions they take, is the most responsible investing strategy as it hinders such firms from expanding. However, being willing to provide primary capital to brown firms if they are best-in-class will encourage such companies to reduce their externalities. Changing the blockholder to a primary capital provider will not change the comparison of exclusion versus tilting, but will increase the effectiveness of both divestment strategies relative to voice, as the firm will be more concerned with obtaining investment by the blockholder.

Our results have a number of potential implications for policymakers. Most obviously, it highlights that regulators should not automatically punish sustainable funds that hold brown stocks, or use the average holding of green stocks as a measure of an investor's sustainability. Under the EU's Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation, Article 9 funds are viewed as the most sustainable, and funds that classify themselves as Article 9 will likely attract greatest investment from socially-minded clients. However, Article 9 funds are prevented from holding any stocks that are viewed as unsustainable – even if they are best-in-class. Similarly, the EU's Non-Financial Reporting Directive requires institutional investors, such as banks and asset managers, to report the percentage of its portfolio that is environmentally sustainable, as defined by their alignment with the EU Taxonomy. This also encourages investors to exclude rather than tilt. In contrast, regulators should potentially police the opposite behavior – sustainable funds that claim to be actively managed and conduct their own research, but blanketly exclude certain sectors even though the fund's policy document does not do so. Just as regulators are scrutinizing actively-managed mainstream funds that act like closet indexers, they could also scrutinize actively-managed sustainable funds that engage in blanket exclusion. Doing so would help investors commit to tilting strategies.

Various standard-setting bodies (e.g. the Value Reporting Framework and the World Economic Forum) are developing common metrics for ES company performance. A frequently-stated advantage of such standards is that they allow policymakers and savers to evaluate which funds are greenwashing by studying the average metrics of their portfolio companies. However, such behavior will deter investors from gathering their own private information and using it to tilt in a less costly way, in turn deterring tilting in the first place. A quite separate implication is that ensuring that funds fulfill their fiduciary duty to generate financial returns for their clients is not inconsistent with achieving social returns, and may actually support it

by giving funds incentives to tilt if commitment is not possible.

While our analysis has focused on brown industries, a similar result likely applies for green industries.<sup>16</sup> Some sustainable funds will automatically hold all stocks within a green industry, or be significantly more likely to own a company if it is in such a sector. However, such a blanket policy provides few incentives for companies within this sector to increase their positive externalities, since they will automatically be held. A tilting policy, which overweights green industries but avoids “worst-in-class” companies within such sectors, may be more effective than blanket inclusion. An investment strategy that tilts away from brown sectors and towards green sectors will require similar amounts of capital to one that automatically excludes the former and includes the latter. While a tilting strategy requires capital to hold best-in-class brown firms, it also saves capital by avoiding worst-in-class green firms.

The model suggests potential avenues for future research. One extension is to multiple firms. In addition to demonstrating that the optimal divestment strategy might involve buying firms that are literally “best-in-class”, featuring these firms as competing with each other in the same industry would have interesting implications for how the investor’s divestment strategy affects product market interactions. A second extension is to multiple responsible investors. They may increase the power of tilting if multiple investors are able to reward the manager for a corrective action. In contrast, if they compete for client flows, and some clients are unsophisticated and view funds that blanketly exclude as being more sustainable, such competition may discourage tilting. A third is to the design of optimal incentive contracts in the presence of responsible investors. Most research suggests that long-term contracts (i.e. minimizing  $\omega$ ) are preferred to encourage long-term behavior, and this might seem to be especially the case in the presence of social objectives. However, short-term contracts allow investors to reward corrective actions by reflecting them in the short-term stock price. A third is to a dynamic setting, where past corrective actions may affect the effectiveness of future ones – for example, if there are diminishing returns to corrective actions, the blockholder may start off tilting but later switch to exclusion. Note that changes to parameters such as the effectiveness of the action can already be studied by our comparative statics, but new results may emerge that are unique to

---

<sup>16</sup>Note that many investors do not net off positive externalities from green industries against negative externalities from brown industries. For example, the negative externalities from alcohol, gambling, and defence cannot be neutralized by positive externalities from green industries. If so, such investors will be primarily concerned with negative externality reduction in brown industries, not positive externality creation in green industries.

a dynamic setting such as increased ability for the blockholder to commit to her strategy.

## References

- [1] Admati, Anat R. and Paul Pfleiderer (2009): “The “Wall Street Walk” and Shareholder Activism: Exit as a Form of Voice.” *Review of Financial Studies* 22, 2645–2685.
- [2] Baker, Steven D., Burton Hollifield, and Emilio Osambela (2022): “Asset Prices and Portfolios with Externalities.” *Review of Finance* 26, 1433–1468.
- [3] Berk, Jonathan and Jules H. van Binsbergen (2021): “The Impact of Impact Investing.” Working Paper, Stanford University.
- [4] Berg, Florian, Julian F. Kölbl, and Roberto Rigobon (2022): “Aggregate Confusion: The Divergence of ESG Ratings.” *Review of Finance* 26, 1315–1344.
- [5] Bond, Philip, Alex Edmans, and Itay Goldstein (2012): “The Real Effects of Financial Markets.” *Annual Review of Financial Economics* 4, 339–360.
- [6] Broccado, Eleonora, Oliver Hart, and Luigi Zingales (2022): “Exit versus Voice.” *Journal of Political Economy* 130, 3101–3145.
- [7] Chowdhry, Bhagwan, Shawn William Davies, and Brian Waters (2018): “Investing for Impact.” *Review of Financial Studies* 32, 864–904.
- [8] Cohen, Lauren, Umit G. Gurun, and Quoc Nguyen (2021): “The ESG-Innovation Disconnect: Evidence from Green Patenting.” Working Paper, Harvard University.
- [9] Davies, Shaun William and Edward Dickersin Van Wesep (2018): “The Unintended Consequences of Divestment.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 128, 558–575.
- [10] Edmans, Alex (2009): “Blockholder Trading, Market Efficiency, and Managerial Myopia.” *Journal of Finance* 64, 2481–2513.
- [11] Edmans, Alex (2011): “Short-Term Termination Without Deterring Long-Term Investment: A Theory of Debt and Buyouts.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 102, 81–101.
- [12] Edmans, Alex (2022): “The End of ESG.” *Financial Management* 52, 3–17.



- [13] Edmans, Alex and Clifford G. Holderness (2017): “Blockholders: A Survey of Theory and Evidence.” *Handbook of the Economics of Corporate Governance*, eds. Benjamin E. Hermalin and Michael S. Weisbach. Elsevier: North-Holland.
- [14] Edmans, Alex and Gustavo Manso (2011): “Governance Through Trading and Intervention: A Theory of Multiple Blockholders.” *Review of Financial Studies* 24, 2395–2428.
- [15] Gantchev, Nickolay, Mariassunta Giannetti, and Rachel Li (2022): “Does Money Talk? Divestitures and Corporate Environmental and Social Policies.” *Review of Finance* 26, 1469–1508.
- [16] Gibson, Rajna, Simon Glossner, Philipp Krueger, Pedro Matos, and Tom Steffen (2022): “Do Responsible Investors Invest Responsibly?” *Review of Finance* 26, 1389–1432.
- [17] Goldstein, Itay, Alexandr Kopytov, Lin Shen, and Haotian Xiang (2022): “On ESG Investing: Heterogeneous Preferences, Information, and Asset Prices.” Working Paper, University of Pennsylvania.
- [18] Gollier, Christian and Sébastien Pouget (2022): “Investment Strategies and Corporate Behaviour with Socially Responsible Investors: A Theory of Active Ownership.” *Economica* 89, 997–1023.
- [19] Gosling, Tom and Iain MacNeil (2023): “Can Investors Save the Planet? NZAMI and Fiduciary Duty.” *Capital Markets Law Journal*, forthcoming.
- [20] Hartzmark, Samuel M. and Abigail B. Sussman (2019): “Do Investors Value Sustainability? A Natural Experiment Examining Ranking and Fund Flows.” *Journal of Finance* 74, 2789–2837.
- [21] Heath, Davidson, Daniele Macciocchi, Roni Michaely, and Matthew C. Ringgenberg (2023): “Does Socially Responsible Investing Change Firm Behavior?” *Review of Finance*, forthcoming.
- [22] Heinkel, Robert, Alan Kraus and Josef Zechner (2001): “The Effect of Green Investment on Corporate Behavior.” *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 36, 431–449.

- [23] Hong, Harrison and Marcin Kacperczyk (2009): “The Price of Sin: The Effects of Social Norms on Markets.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 93, 15–36.
- [24] Kim, Soohun and Aaron Yoon (2022): “Assessing Active Managers’ Commitment to ESG Evidence from United Nations Principles for Responsible Investment.” *Management Science*, forthcoming.
- [25] Koiijen, Ralph S.J. and Motohiro Yogo (2019): “A Demand System Approach to Asset Pricing.” *Journal of Political Economy*, forthcoming.
- [26] Landier, Augustin and Stefano Lovo (2020): “ESG Investing: How to Optimize Impact?” Working Paper, HEC Paris.
- [27] Liang, Hao, Lin Sun, and Melvyn Teo (2022): “Responsible Hedge Funds.” *Review of Finance* 26, 1585–1633.
- [28] Mackintosh, James (2022): “ESG Investing Can Do Good or Do Well, but Don’t Expect Both.” *Wall Street Journal*, January 24, 2022.
- [29] Narayanan, M. P. (1985): “Managerial Incentives for Short-term Results.” *Journal of Finance* 40, 1469–1484.
- [30] Oehmke, Martin and Marcus Opp (2022): “A Theory of Socially Responsible Investment.” Working Paper, London School of Economics.
- [31] Pastor, Lubos, Robert F. Stambaugh, and Lucian A. Taylor (2021): “Sustainable Investing in Equilibrium.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 142, 550–571.
- [32] Pastor, Lubos, Robert F. Stambaugh, and Lucian A. Taylor (2022): “Dissecting Green Returns.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 146, 403–424.
- [33] Pedersen, Lasse Heje, Shaun Fitzgibbons, and Lukas Pomorski (2021): “Responsible Investing: The ESG-Efficient Frontier.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 142, 572–597.
- [34] Scharfstein, David and Jeremy Stein (1990): “Herd Behavior and Investment.” *American Economic Review* 80, 465–479.

- [35] Sharfman, Bernard S. (2021): “The Illusion of Success: A Critique of Engine No. 1’s Proxy Fight at ExxonMobil.” *Harvard Business Law Review Online* 12, 3.
- [36] Stein, Jeremy C. (1988): “Takeover Threats and Managerial Myopia.” *Journal of Political Economy* 46, 61–80.
- [37] Stein, Jeremy C. (1989): “Efficient Capital Markets, Inefficient Firms: A Model of Myopic Corporate Behavior.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 104, 655–669.
- [38] Yeoh, Siew Hong, Ivo Welch, and C. Paul Wazzan (1999): “The Effect of Socially Activist Investment Policies on the Financial Markets: Evidence from the South African Boycott.” *Journal of Business* 72, 35–89.
- [39] Zerbib, Olivier David (2022): “A Sustainable Capital Asset Pricing Model (S-CAPM): Evidence from Environmental Integration and Sin Stock Exclusion.” *Review of Finance* 26, 1345–1388.

## A Additive Externality

This Appendix considers the case in which the action  $a$  has an additive effect on the externality, i.e.  $f(\tilde{A}, rI, a) = \lambda \left( \tilde{A} + rI - \xi a \right)$ . Proceeding as in Section 2 leads to Proposition 8.

**Proposition 8** (*Blockholder's strategy, additive externality*): *The blockholder's optimal strategy is tilting if*

$$\xi \geq \bar{\xi}_{add} \equiv \frac{c}{\frac{1}{z} \frac{\omega}{1-\omega} + 1}. \quad (28)$$

*Otherwise, it is exclusion. The tilting strategy involves  $x(1) = \bar{\Delta}_x$ .  $\bar{\xi}_{add}$  is increasing in  $(c, r, q)$ , decreasing in  $\omega$ , and independent of  $(\mu, \gamma, \sigma)$ .*

**Proof of Proposition 8.** The expected externality given  $a \in \{0, 1\}$  is given by:

$$\mathbb{E}[f|a = 1] = \lambda \left( \mu + \frac{z}{1-z} \left( \mu - \gamma\sigma^2 - c + \frac{\gamma\sigma^2}{1+q} \bar{\Delta}_x \right) - \xi \right) \quad (29)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[f|a = 0] = \lambda \left( \mu + \frac{z}{1-z} (\mu - \gamma\sigma^2) \right). \quad (30)$$

It follows that  $\mathbb{E}[f|a = 1] \leq \mathbb{E}[f|a = 0]$  is equivalent to

$$\xi \geq \frac{z}{1-z} \left( \frac{\gamma\sigma^2}{1+q} \bar{\Delta}_x - c \right) \equiv \bar{\xi}_{add} \quad (31)$$

where  $\bar{\Delta}_x = \frac{c(1+q)}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}$ . Plugging in this expression leads to

$$\bar{\xi}_{add} = \frac{cz}{(1-z)} \left( \frac{1}{\omega + (1-\omega)z} - 1 \right) = \frac{c}{\frac{1}{z} \frac{\omega}{(1-\omega)} + 1}. \quad (32)$$

It immediately follows that  $\bar{\xi}_{add}$  increases in  $c$ ,  $r$ , and  $q$  and that it decreases in  $\omega$ . ■

We discuss only the comparative statics that differ from the multiplicative case. Now, exclusion is unambiguously more preferred if the capital raised by the firm ( $q$ ) and the profitability of the investment ( $r$ ) are sufficiently high. When the firm is raising more capital, it is particularly important to stifle capital raising. Since the effect of the additive action is independent of the amount of capital raised, there is no opposing force. In contrast,  $\mu$ ,  $\gamma$ , and

$\sigma$  no longer have an effect on the optimal strategy, since the effect of the additive action is independent of the amount of new investment and thus the stock price.

The analysis is identical for the case in which the action has multiplicative effect on the externality, as in (2), and the cost of the action is also multiplicative in expected firm size so that firm value is given by  $V = \theta + rI - ca(\mu + rI)$  rather than  $V = \theta + rI - ca$  as in the core model. Since firm size affects both the benefits and costs of the action, it drops out and reduces to the additive model.

## B For Online Publication: Proofs

**Proof of Proposition 1.**  $B$ 's objective function is given by  $\mathbb{E}[f(\theta, rI, a)]$  with  $I = qp(a)$ . The equilibrium stock price, as a function of  $a$ , is given by:

$$p(a) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mu - \gamma\sigma^2 + \frac{x(1)}{1+q}\gamma\sigma^2 - c}{1+q-rq} & \text{if } a = 1 \\ \frac{\mu - \gamma\sigma^2}{1+q-rq} & \text{if } a = 0. \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

If  $a = 1$ , then the realized, and thus the expected, externality increases in  $x(1)$  through its impact on  $p(1)$ . As a result,  $B$ 's objective given  $a = 1$  is minimized at the smallest possible value that implements  $a = 1$ ,  $x(1) = \bar{\Delta}_x$ . It follows that  $B$  implements  $a = 1$  by choosing  $x(1) = \bar{\Delta}_x$  if and only if:

$$x(1) = \bar{\Delta}_x \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{E}[f(\theta, rqp(0), 0)] \geq \mathbb{E}[f(\theta, rqp(1; x(1) = \bar{\Delta}_x), 1)]. \quad (34)$$

Otherwise,  $B$  is better off implementing  $a = 0$  and sets  $x(1) = x(0) = 0$ . Evaluating  $\mathbb{E}[f]$  at  $a \in \{0, 1\}$  leads to the following condition for tilting:

$$x(1) = \bar{\Delta}_x \Leftrightarrow \xi \geq \frac{rq(p(1) - p(0))}{\mu + rqp(1)}. \quad (35)$$

Evaluating  $p(a)$  at  $a \in \{0, 1\}$  and using  $x(1) = \bar{\Delta}_x$  leads to:

$$\bar{\xi} = \frac{\frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q}\gamma\sigma^2 - c}{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2 + \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q}\gamma\sigma^2 - c} = \frac{c(1 - \omega)}{\left(\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2\right)\left(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}\right) + c(1 - \omega)} \quad (36)$$

where we have used  $\bar{\Delta}_x = \frac{c(1+q)}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}$ .

It immediately follows from the expression for  $\bar{\xi}$  that  $\frac{\partial \bar{\xi}}{\partial \mu} < 0$ ,  $\frac{\partial \bar{\xi}}{\partial \gamma} > 0$ , and  $\frac{\partial \bar{\xi}}{\partial \sigma} > 0$ . For the effect of  $c$ , we can divide the expression above by  $c$  to see that  $\frac{\partial \bar{\xi}}{\partial c} > 0$ . For the comparative statics with respect to  $\omega$ , we re-write the expression as:

$$\bar{\xi} = \frac{c}{\left(\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2\right) g_1(\omega) + c} \quad (37)$$

with  $g_1(\omega) \equiv \left(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}\right) \frac{1}{1-\omega}$  and  $g'_1(z) = \frac{1}{(1-\omega)^2(1-z)} > 0$  because  $z \in (0, 1)$ . It follows that  $\frac{\partial \bar{\xi}}{\partial \omega} < 0$  if  $\omega \in [0, 1)$ . If  $\omega = 1$ , then  $\bar{\xi} = 0$ .

For the comparative statics with respect to  $z$ , and thus  $(r, q)$ , we re-write the expression above as:

$$\bar{\xi} = \frac{(1-\omega)c}{g_2(z) + (1-\omega)c} \quad (38)$$

with  $g_2(z) = \left(\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2\right) \left(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}\right)$ . If  $\omega = 1$ , then  $\bar{\xi}$  does not depend on  $z$ . If  $\omega < 1$ , then the sign of  $\frac{\partial \bar{\xi}}{\partial z}$  is the opposite of  $g'_2(z)$ , which is equal to:

$$g'_2(z) = \frac{\mu - \gamma\sigma^2}{(1-z)^2} - \frac{\omega\mu}{z^2}. \quad (39)$$

Also note that  $g''_2(z) > 0$ ,  $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} g'(z) = -\infty$  if  $\omega > 0$  and  $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} g'(z) > 0$  if  $\omega = 0$ , and that  $\lim_{z \rightarrow 1} g'(z) = \infty$ . It follows that  $g_2(z)$  is U-shaped in  $z$  if  $\omega > 0$  and that it is increasing in  $z$  if  $\omega = 0$ . As a result,  $\bar{\xi}$  is hump-shaped in  $(r, q)$  if  $\omega > 0$  and decreasing in  $(r, q)$  if  $\omega = 0$ . ■

**Proof of Equation (15).** The equilibrium stock price given public signal  $s$  is given by:

$$p(\hat{a}, s) = \frac{\mu - c\hat{a} - \left(1 - \frac{x(s)}{1+q}\right) \gamma\sigma^2}{1+q - rq}, \quad (40)$$

where  $\hat{a}$  denotes the action conjectured by households.

If  $M$  chooses  $a = 1$ , his expected utility is given by:

$$\mathbb{E}[U_m | a = 1] = \omega [\tau p(\hat{a}, 1) + (1-\tau)p(\hat{a}, 0)] + (1-\omega) \frac{\mu + rq [\tau p(\hat{a}, 1) + (1-\tau)p(\hat{a}, 0)] - c}{1+q}.$$

If he chooses  $a = 0$ , his expected utility is given by:

$$\mathbb{E}[U_m|a = 0] = \omega [\tau p(\hat{a}, 0) + (1 - \tau)p(\hat{a}, 1)] + (1 - \omega) \frac{\mu + rq [\tau p(\hat{a}, 0) + (1 - \tau)p(\hat{a}, 1)]}{1 + q}.$$

Conditional on tilting,  $M$  chooses  $a = 1$  if and only if  $\mathbb{E}[U_m|a = 1] \geq \mathbb{E}[U_m|a = 0]$ , which is equivalent to the condition in equation (15). ■

**Proof of Proposition 2.** For  $\tau \in (1/2, 1)$ ,  $B$  chooses tilting,  $(x(1) = \hat{\Delta}_x, x(0) = 0)$  if (i) the expected externality with  $a = 1$  and  $x(1) = \hat{\Delta}_x$  is lower than that under  $a = 0$  and  $x(1) = 0$ , and (ii)  $x(1) \leq 1 + q$ . It follows from the expression for  $\hat{\Delta}_x(\tau)$  that condition (ii) is equivalent to  $c \leq \frac{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z](2\tau-1)}{(1-\omega)(1-z)}$ . Otherwise, she chooses exclusion and sets  $x(1) = x(0) = 0$ . Suppose  $c \leq \frac{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z](2\tau-1)}{(1-\omega)(1-z)}$ , then  $B$  chooses tilting if:

$$\begin{aligned} [\mu + rq(\tau p(1, 1) + (1 - \tau)p(1, 0))] (1 - \xi) &\leq \mu + rqp(0, 0) \Leftrightarrow \\ 1 - \xi &\leq \frac{\mu + rqp(0, 0)}{\mu + rq(\tau p(1, 1) + (1 - \tau)p(1, 0))} \Leftrightarrow \\ 1 - \xi &\leq \frac{\mu + \frac{z}{1-z}(\mu - \gamma\sigma^2)}{\mu + \frac{z}{1-z}\left(\mu - c - \left(1 - \frac{\tau\hat{\Delta}_x}{1+q}\right)\gamma\sigma^2\right)} \Leftrightarrow \\ \xi &\geq 1 - \frac{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2}{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2 - c + \gamma\sigma^2\frac{\tau\hat{\Delta}_x}{1+q}} \Leftrightarrow \\ \xi &\geq 1 - \frac{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2}{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2 + c\left(\frac{\tau}{2\tau-1}\frac{1-\omega}{\omega+\frac{z}{1-z}} - 1\right)} \equiv \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

It immediately follows that  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau)$  increases in  $(c, \gamma, \sigma)$  and decreases in  $(\mu, \tau)$ . Moreover, it decreases in  $\omega$  because  $\frac{1-\omega}{\omega+\frac{z}{1-z}}$  decreases in  $\omega$ . For  $\tau = 1/2$ ,  $B$  always chooses exclusion. ■

**Proof of Proposition 3.** We start by calculating  $B$ 's payoff in different scenarios, assuming that  $c \leq \frac{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z](2\tau-1)}{(1-\omega)(1-z)}$  so that she can implement tilting, which is shown in Proposition 2. If  $c > \frac{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z](2\tau-1)}{(1-\omega)(1-z)}$ , then  $B$  always chooses exclusion. First, if  $B$  chooses exclusion, then  $M$  chooses  $a = 0$ , and  $B$ 's payoff is independent of her private information and given by

$$\Pi_{\text{exclusion}} = -\lambda [\mu + rqp(0)].$$

In particular,  $B$  never acquires information if she intends to use exclusion.

Second, if  $B$  is uninformed about  $a$  and chooses tilting, she must be conditioning her trade on the public signal  $s$ . Therefore, she never suffers reputational costs and her payoff from tilting is

$$\Pi_{tilting}^{un} = -\lambda [\mu + rq(\tau p(1, 1) + (1 - \tau)p(1, 0))] (1 - \xi).$$

Third, if  $B$  is informed about  $a$  and chooses tilting, she has two options. First, if she chooses to condition her trade on  $a$ , her expected payoff is

$$\Pi_{tilting}^{in} = -\lambda (\mu + rqp(1)) (1 - \xi) - (1 - \tau) g.$$

Second, if despite being informed she conditions her trade on  $s$ , her expected payoff is  $\Pi_{tilting}^{un}$ . Therefore,  $B$  has no incentives to acquire information if it is not being used.

Overall, if  $B$  prefers uninformed tilting over exclusion if and only if  $\Pi_{tilting}^{un} > \Pi_{exclusion} \Leftrightarrow \xi > \bar{\xi}(\tau)$ . She prefers informed tilting over exclusion if and only if  $\Pi_{tilting}^{in} > \Pi_{exclusion} \Leftrightarrow$

$$\begin{aligned} -\lambda (\mu + rqp(1)) (1 - \xi) - (1 - \tau) g &\geq -\lambda [\mu + rqp(0)] \Leftrightarrow \\ \xi &\geq \frac{rq [p(1) - p(0)] + \frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda}}{\mu + rqp(1)} \Leftrightarrow \\ \xi &\geq \frac{\frac{z}{1-z} \left[ -c + \frac{x(1)}{1+q} \gamma \sigma^2 \right] + \frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda}}{\mu + \frac{z}{1-z} \left[ \mu - c - \left( 1 - \frac{x(1)}{1+q} \right) \gamma \sigma^2 \right]} \Leftrightarrow \\ \xi &\geq \frac{-c + \frac{x(1)}{1+q} \gamma \sigma^2 + \frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda} \frac{1-z}{z}}{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma \sigma^2 - c + \frac{x(1)}{1+q} \gamma \sigma^2} \Leftrightarrow \\ \xi &\geq \bar{\xi}_{in}(g) \equiv \frac{(1 - \omega) c + \frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda} \frac{1-z}{z} \left( \omega + \frac{z}{1-z} \right)}{(1 - \omega) c + \left( \frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma \sigma^2 \right) \left( \omega + \frac{z}{1-z} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$



Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) > \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g) \Leftrightarrow \\
& 1 - \frac{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2}{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2 + c\left(\frac{\tau}{2\tau-1} \frac{1-\omega}{\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}} - 1\right)} > \frac{(1-\omega)c + \frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda} \frac{1-z}{z} \left(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}\right)}{(1-\omega)c + \left(\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2\right) \left(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}\right)} \Leftrightarrow \\
& \frac{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2}{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2 + c\left(\frac{\tau}{2\tau-1} \frac{1-\omega}{\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}} - 1\right)} c \left[ \frac{\tau}{2\tau-1} (1-\omega) - \frac{1}{1-z} \right] > \frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda} \frac{1-z}{z} \left(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}\right) \Leftrightarrow \\
& (1 - \bar{\xi}(\tau)) c \left[ \frac{\tau}{2\tau-1} (1-\omega) - \frac{1}{1-z} \right] > \frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda} \frac{1-z}{z} \left(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have that  $\frac{\tau}{2\tau-1} (1-\omega) - \frac{1}{1-z} > 0 \Leftrightarrow \tau < \frac{1}{2-(1-z)(1-\omega)}$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) > \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g) \Leftrightarrow \\
& \tau < \frac{1}{2 - (1-z)(1-\omega)} \text{ and } \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) < \bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(g)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(g) \equiv 1 - \frac{\frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda} \frac{1-z}{z} \left(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}\right)}{c \left[ \frac{\tau}{2\tau-1} (1-\omega) - \frac{1}{1-z} \right]}.$$

$B$  prefers informed tilting over uninformed tilting if and only if  $\Pi_{\text{tilting}}^{\text{in}} > \Pi_{\text{tilting}}^{\text{un}} \Leftrightarrow$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\lambda(\mu + rqp(1))(1-\xi) - (1-\tau)g > -\lambda[\mu + rq(\tau p(1,1) + (1-\tau)p(1,0))](1-\xi) \Leftrightarrow \\
& p(1) + \frac{1}{rq} \frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda} \frac{1}{1-\xi} < \tau p(1,1) + (1-\tau)p(1,0) \Leftrightarrow \\
& \frac{\mu - c - \left(1 - \frac{x(a=1)}{1+q}\right) \gamma\sigma^2}{1+q-rq} + \frac{1}{rq} \frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda(1-\xi)} < \tau \frac{\mu - c - \left(1 - \frac{x(s=1)}{1+q}\right) \gamma\sigma^2}{1+q-rq} + (1-\tau) \frac{\mu - c - \gamma\sigma^2}{1+q-rq} \Leftrightarrow \\
& \frac{x(a=1)}{1+q} \gamma\sigma^2 + \frac{1+q-rq}{rq} \frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda(1-\xi)} < \tau \frac{x(s=1)}{1+q} \gamma\sigma^2 \Leftrightarrow \\
& \frac{\frac{c(1+q)}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}}{1+q} \gamma\sigma^2 + \frac{1-z}{z} \frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda(1-\xi)} < \tau \frac{\frac{1}{2\tau-1} \frac{(1-\omega)c(1+q)(1-z)}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}}{1+q} \gamma\sigma^2 \Leftrightarrow \\
& \frac{c}{\omega + (1-\omega)z} + \frac{1-z}{z} \frac{(1-\tau)g}{\lambda(1-\xi)} < \frac{\tau}{2\tau-1} (1-\omega)(1-z) \frac{c}{\omega + (1-\omega)z}
\end{aligned}$$

That is,  $\Pi_{\text{tilting}}^{\text{in}} > \Pi_{\text{tilting}}^{\text{un}} \Leftrightarrow$

$$\tau < \frac{1}{2 - (1-z)(1-\omega)} \text{ and } \xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(g).$$

We consider two cases:

1. Suppose  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) < \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g)$ . There are three sub cases:
  - (a) If  $\xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau)$  then  $B$  prefers exclusion over both informed and uninformed tilting and hence she never becomes informed and always chooses exclusion.
  - (b) If  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) < \xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g)$  then  $B$  prefers uninformed tilting over exclusion, and exclusion over informed tilting. Therefore,  $B$  never becomes informed and she choose tilting.
  - (c) If  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g) < \xi$ , then exclusion is an inferior strategy. Recall  $\bar{\xi}(\tau) < \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g)$  implies either  $\tau \geq \frac{1}{2 - (1-z)(1-\omega)}$ , in which case we have  $\Pi_{\text{tilting}}^{\text{in}} < \Pi_{\text{tilting}}^{\text{un}}$ , or  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(g) < \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau)$ , which given  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) < \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g) < \xi$ , implies  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(g) < \xi$ , i.e.,  $\Pi_{\text{tilting}}^{\text{in}} < \Pi_{\text{tilting}}^{\text{un}}$ . Either way,  $B$  remains uninformed.

We conclude, if  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) < \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g)$  then  $B$  remains uninformed. She chooses exclusion if and only if  $\xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau)$ . Notice that if  $\tau < \frac{1}{2 - (1-z)(1-\omega)}$  then  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) > \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(0)$ , and hence, there is  $g^* > 0$  that satisfies  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) = \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g^*)$ , such that  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) < \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g) \Leftrightarrow g > g^*$ . Notice that if  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) = \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g^*)$  and  $\tau < \frac{1}{2 - (1-z)(1-\omega)}$ , then it must be  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) = \bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(g^*)$

2. Suppose  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) > \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g)$ . There are three sub cases:
  - (a) If  $\xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g)$  then  $B$  prefers exclusion over both informed and uninformed tilting and hence she never becomes informed and always chooses exclusion.
  - (b) If  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g) < \xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau)$  then  $B$  prefers informed tilting over exclusion, and exclusion over uninformed tilting. Therefore,  $B$  becomes informed and chooses tilting.
  - (c) If  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) < \xi$ , then exclusion is an inferior strategy. Recall  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) > \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g)$  implies  $\tau < \frac{1}{2 - (1-z)(1-\omega)}$  and  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(g) > \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau)$ . Therefore, in this case,  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g) < \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) < \bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(g)$ .  $B$  chooses informed tilting if  $\xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(g)$ , and uninformed tilting if  $\xi > \bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(g)$ .

We conclude that if  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) > \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g)$  then  $B$  chooses exclusion if  $\xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g)$ , informed tilting if  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(g) < \xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(g)$ , and uninformed tilting if  $\xi > \bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(g)$ .

Finally, suppose  $\xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau)$ . Notice that the amount of externalities under exclusion is lower than under informed tilting if and only if  $\xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(0)$ . Therefore, if  $\xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(0)$  then  $g$  has no impact on the externalities in equilibrium. If  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{in}}(0) < \xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau)$  then larger  $g$  increases the externalities in equilibrium by increasing the likelihood of exclusion in a region where informed tilting generates lower externalities.

Second, suppose  $\xi > \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau)$ . Notice that the amount of externalities under informed tilting is lower than under uninformed tilting if and only if  $\xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(0)$ . Therefore, if  $\xi > \bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(0)$  then  $g$  has no impact on the externalities in equilibrium. If  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) < \xi < \bar{\xi}_{\text{un}}(0)$  then larger  $g$  increases the externalities in equilibrium by increasing the likelihood of uninformed tilting in a region where informed tilting generates lower externalities. ■

**Proof of Proposition 4.** We have shown before that  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau)$  is a decreasing function of  $\tau$ . Moreover,  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 1} \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) < 1$ . If  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 1} \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) > \xi$  then  $B$  chooses exclusion regardless of  $\tau$ . In this case,  $M$  chooses  $\tau = \frac{1}{2}$ . Suppose  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 1} \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) \leq \xi$ , there exists  $\hat{\tau}(\xi) \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  such that,  $\xi \geq \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau) \Leftrightarrow \tau \geq \hat{\tau}(\xi)$ . Moreover, suppose that  $\hat{\Delta}_x(\tau) \leq 1 + q$ . We can write the expected payoff and stock price as functions of  $\tau$  as follows

$$\mathbb{E}[p(\tau)] = \frac{\mu - \gamma\sigma^2 + \left(\frac{\tau\hat{\Delta}_x(\tau)}{1+q}\gamma\sigma^2 - c\right) \mathbf{1}_{\tau \geq \hat{\tau}(\xi)}}{1 + q - rq} \quad (41)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[v(\tau)] = \frac{\mu + rq\mathbb{E}[p(\tau)] - c\mathbf{1}_{\tau \geq \hat{\tau}(\xi)}}{1 + q}. \quad (42)$$

$M$ 's expected utility can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[U_m(\tau)] &= \omega \mathbb{E}[p(\tau)] + (1 - \omega) \mathbb{E}[v(\tau)] \\
&= [\omega + (1 - \omega)z] \mathbb{E}[p(\tau)] + (1 - \omega) \frac{\mu - c \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\tau \geq \hat{\tau}(\xi)}}{1 + q} \\
&= [\omega + (1 - \omega)z] \left( \frac{\mu - \gamma\sigma^2}{1 + q - rq} + \frac{\frac{\tau \hat{\Delta}_x(\tau)}{1+q} \gamma\sigma^2 - c}{1 + q - rq} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\tau \geq \hat{\tau}(\xi)} \right) + (1 - \omega) \frac{\mu - c \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\tau \geq \hat{\tau}(\xi)}}{1 + q} \\
&= [\omega + (1 - \omega)z] \frac{\mu - \gamma\sigma^2}{1 + q - rq} + (1 - \omega) \frac{\mu}{1 + q} \\
&\quad + \left( [\omega + (1 - \omega)z] \frac{\frac{\tau \hat{\Delta}_x(\tau)}{1+q} \gamma\sigma^2 - c}{1 + q - rq} - (1 - \omega) \frac{c}{1 + q} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\tau \geq \hat{\tau}(\xi)} \\
&= [\omega + (1 - \omega)z] \frac{\mu - \gamma\sigma^2}{1 + q - rq} + (1 - \omega) \frac{\mu}{1 + q} \\
&\quad + \frac{c}{1 + q} \left( \frac{\tau}{2\tau - 1} (1 - \omega) - \frac{1}{1 - z} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\tau \geq \hat{\tau}(\xi)}
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that  $\frac{\tau}{2\tau - 1}$  decreases in  $\tau$ . Thus,  $M$  chooses  $\tau = \hat{\tau}(\xi)$  if  $\frac{\hat{\tau}(\xi)}{2\hat{\tau}(\xi) - 1} (1 - \omega) - \frac{1}{1 - z} > 0$ , and  $\tau = \frac{1}{2}$  otherwise. Notice that

$$\frac{\tau}{2\tau - 1} (1 - \omega) - \frac{1}{1 - z} > 0 \Leftrightarrow \tau < \frac{1}{1 + \omega + (1 - \omega)z}$$

Thus,  $M$  chooses  $\tau = \hat{\tau}(\xi)$  if  $\hat{\tau}(\xi) < \frac{1}{1 + \omega + (1 - \omega)z}$ , and  $\tau = \frac{1}{2}$  otherwise.

Next, we plug in  $\tau = \frac{1}{1 + \omega + (1 - \omega)z}$  into  $\hat{\Delta}_x(\tau)$  to check whether  $B$ 's position is less than  $1 + q$ . It follows that  $\hat{\Delta}_x\left(\frac{1}{1 + \omega + (1 - \omega)z}\right) \leq 1 + q$  is equivalent to  $c \leq \frac{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega + (1 - \omega)z]}{1 + \omega + (1 - \omega)z}$ . In this case,  $B$  can afford to implement tilting at  $\tau = \frac{1}{1 + \omega + (1 - \omega)z}$ . If instead  $c > \frac{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega + (1 - \omega)z]}{1 + \omega + (1 - \omega)z}$ , then  $B$  cannot implement tilting for any  $\tau < \frac{1}{1 + \omega + (1 - \omega)z}$  because  $\hat{\Delta}_x(\tau)$  is decreasing in  $\tau$ . Hence,  $M$  chooses  $\tau = \frac{1}{2}$ .

Suppose  $c \leq \frac{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega + (1 - \omega)z]}{1 + \omega + (1 - \omega)z}$  and recall that  $\hat{\tau}(\xi)$  satisfies  $\xi = \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau)$ , and since  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}(\tau)$  is

a decreasing function,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\tau}(\xi) &< \frac{1}{1 + \omega + (1 - \omega)z} \Leftrightarrow \\ \xi &> \bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \omega + (1 - \omega)z} \right)\end{aligned}$$

Next, we use the expression for  $\bar{\xi}_{\text{unob}}$  to re-write the condition above as:

$$\xi > 1 - \frac{z^{-1}\mu - \gamma\sigma^2}{z^{-1}\mu - \gamma\sigma^2 + c \frac{(1-z)(1-\omega)}{z+\omega-z\omega}} \equiv \bar{\xi}_{\text{disc}}.$$

The right-hand side of this condition increases in  $c, \gamma, \sigma$  and it decreases in  $\mu, \omega$ . It is hump-shaped in  $z$ , and thus in  $r, q$ .

Finally, we solve for the lowest value of  $\tau \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{1+\omega+(1-\omega)z}\right)$  that satisfies  $\widehat{\Delta}_x(\tau^{\min}) = 1 + q$ . This leads to  $\tau^{\min} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{c(1-\omega-(1-\omega)z)}{\gamma\sigma^2(\omega+(1-\omega)z)}\right)$ . For any  $\xi \geq \bar{\xi}(\tau^{\min})$ ,  $M$  sets  $\tau^* = \tau^{\min}$  because any  $\tau < \tau^{\min}$  would lead to exclusion. ■

**Proof of Proposition 5.** Given  $x, a$ , and  $y$ , the stock price is given by:

$$p(x, a, y) = \frac{\mu - ca - \left(1 - \frac{x+y}{1+q}\right) \gamma\sigma^2}{1 + q - rq}. \quad (43)$$

Thus,  $A$ 's profit is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_A(y) &= y(v(x, a, y) - p(x, a, y)) \\ &= y \left( \frac{\mu + rqp(x, a, y) - ac}{1 + q} - p(x, a, y) \right) \\ &= y \left( \frac{\mu - (1 - q - rq)p(x, a, y) - ac}{1 + q} \right) \\ &= y \left( \frac{\mu - \left[ \mu - ca - \left(1 - \frac{x+y}{1+q}\right) \gamma\sigma^2 \right] - ac}{1 + q} \right) \\ &= y \frac{\left(1 - \frac{x+y}{1+q}\right) \gamma\sigma^2}{1 + q}\end{aligned}$$

and so his trade is given by:

$$y^*(x) = \arg \max_y \Pi_A(y) = \frac{1+q-x}{2}$$

which yields a profit of

$$\Pi_A(y^*(x)) = \left( \frac{1}{2} \frac{1+q-x}{1+q} \right)^2 \gamma \sigma^2.$$

Thus,  $B$  expects the stock price to be

$$\begin{aligned} p(x, a, y^*(x)) &= (1-\eta) \frac{\mu - ca - \left(1 - \frac{x}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2}{1+q-rq} + \eta \frac{\mu - ca - \left(1 - \frac{x+y^*(x)}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2}{1+q-rq} \\ &= \frac{\mu - ca - \left(1 - \frac{x}{1+q} - \eta \frac{y^*(x)}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2}{1+q-rq} \\ &= \frac{\mu - ca - \left(1 - \frac{x}{1+q} - \eta \frac{\frac{1+q-x}{2}}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2}{1+q-rq} \\ &= \frac{\mu - ca - \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{x}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2}{1+q-rq} \end{aligned}$$

$M$  chooses  $a = 1$  if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \omega p(x(1), 1) + (1-\omega) \frac{\mu + rqp(x(1), 1) - c}{1+q} &> \omega p(x(0), 0) + (1-\omega) \frac{\mu + rqp(x(0), 0)}{1+q} \\ [\omega + (1-\omega)z] [p(x(1), 1) - p(x(0), 0)] &> (1-\omega) \frac{c}{1+q} \\ x(1) - x(0) &> \frac{(1+q)c}{\left(1 - \frac{\eta}{2}\right) \gamma \sigma^2 [\omega + (1-\omega)z]} \end{aligned}$$

$B$  chooses tilting if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi &\geq \frac{rq(p(1) - p(0))}{\mu + rqp(1)} \\
&= rq \frac{-c + (1 - \frac{\eta}{2}) \left(\frac{\Delta x}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2}{1+q-rq} \\
&= rq \frac{\mu - c - (1 - \frac{\eta}{2}) \left(1 - \frac{\Delta x}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2}{1+q-rq} \\
&= \frac{-c + (1 - \frac{\eta}{2}) \left(\frac{\Delta x}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2}{\frac{\mu}{z} - c - (1 - \frac{\eta}{2}) \left(1 - \frac{\Delta x}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2} \\
&= \frac{(1 - \omega) c}{(1 - \omega) c + \left(\frac{\mu}{z} - (1 - \frac{\eta}{2}) \gamma \sigma^2\right) \left(\omega + \frac{z}{1-z}\right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The condition  $x(1) \leq (1 + q)$  is equivalent to  $c \leq \gamma \sigma^2 [\omega + (1 - \omega)z] \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{2}\right)$ . If  $c > \gamma \sigma^2 [\omega + (1 - \omega)z] \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{2}\right)$ , then  $B$  cannot implement tilting and chooses  $x(1) = x(0) = 0$ . ■

**Proof of Proposition 6.** We define

$$E[U(a, x)] = \varphi x (v(x, a) - p(x, a)) - (1 - \varphi) \lambda (\mu + qrp(x, a)) (1 - a\xi)$$

where  $p(x, a) = \frac{\mu - ca - (1 - \frac{x}{1+q}) \gamma \sigma^2}{1+q-rq}$  and  $v = \frac{\mu + rqp(x, a) - ca}{1+q}$ . Observe that  $\varphi x (v(x, a) - p(x, a)) = \varphi \frac{x}{1+q} (1 - \frac{x}{1+q}) \gamma \sigma^2$ . Thus

$$x^*(a) = \arg \max_{x \geq 0} E[U(a, x)] = \frac{1+q}{2} \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1 - a\xi), 0 \right\}$$

and

$$E[U(a, x^*(a))] = \begin{cases} \varphi \frac{1 - \left[\frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1 - a\xi)\right]^2}{4} \gamma \sigma^2 - \\ (1 - \varphi) \lambda \left( \mu + z \frac{\mu - ca - \frac{1 + \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1 - a\xi)}{2} \gamma \sigma^2}{1-z} \right) (1 - a\xi) & \text{if } 1 \geq \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1 - a\xi) \\ - (1 - \varphi) \lambda \left( \mu + z \frac{\mu - ca - \gamma \sigma^2}{1-z} \right) (1 - a\xi) & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (44)$$

Consider parts (i) and (ii). Notice that

$$x^*(1) - x^*(0) = \frac{1+q}{2} \times \begin{cases} \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda \xi & \text{if } \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda \leq 1 \\ 1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1-\xi) & \text{if } 1 < \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda < \frac{1}{1-\xi} \\ 0 & \text{if } \frac{1}{1-\xi} \leq \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

Thus,  $x^*(1) - x^*(0) > \bar{\Delta}_x$  if and only if  $\frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda \leq 1$  and  $\frac{1+q}{2} \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda \xi > \frac{c(1+q)}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}$ , or

$1 < \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda < \frac{1}{1-\xi}$  and  $\frac{1+q}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1-\xi)\right) > \frac{c(1+q)}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}$ . These conditions can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\xi} \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]} < \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda \leq 1 \text{ or} \\ 1 < \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda < \frac{1}{1-\xi} \left(1 - \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice

$$\frac{1}{\xi} \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]} < \frac{1}{1-\xi} \left(1 - \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}\right) \Leftrightarrow \xi > \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}.$$

Thus, if  $\xi \leq \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}$  then the condition is empty. That is,  $x^*(1) - x^*(0) \leq \bar{\Delta}_x$ ,  $a = 0$ , and  $B$  buys  $x^*(0)$  shares. If  $\xi > \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}$  then the condition above is reduced to

$$\frac{1}{\xi} \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]} < \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda < \frac{1}{1-\xi} \left(1 - \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}\right) \Leftrightarrow \varphi \in (\underline{\varphi}(\xi), \bar{\varphi}(\xi))$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\varphi}(\xi) &\equiv \frac{\frac{z}{1-z} \lambda}{\frac{z}{1-z} \lambda + \frac{1}{\xi} \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}} \\ \underline{\varphi}(\xi) &\equiv \frac{\frac{z}{1-z} \lambda}{\frac{z}{1-z} \lambda + \frac{1}{1-\xi} \left(1 - \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if  $\varphi \in (\underline{\varphi}(\xi), \bar{\varphi}(\xi))$  then  $x^*(1) - x^*(0) > \bar{\Delta}_x$ ,  $a = 1$ , and  $B$  buys  $x^*(1)$  shares. If  $\varphi \notin (\underline{\varphi}(\xi), \bar{\varphi}(\xi))$  then  $x^*(1) - x^*(0) \leq \bar{\Delta}_x$ ,  $a = 0$ , and  $B$  buys  $x^*(0)$  shares.

Consider part (iii). Notice that  $x^*(a)$  weakly increases in  $\varphi$ . If  $M$  chooses  $a^* = 0$  in



equilibrium, then the externalities increase with  $\varphi$  if  $x^*(0) > 0 \Leftrightarrow \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda < 1 \Leftrightarrow \frac{\frac{z}{1-z} \lambda}{1 + \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda} < \varphi$ , and are invariant to  $\varphi$  otherwise. Notice that  $\xi > \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}$  implies  $\frac{1}{\xi} \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]} < 1 < \frac{1}{1-\xi} \left(1 - \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}\right)$  and hence  $\frac{\frac{z}{1-z} \lambda}{1 + \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda} \in (\underline{\varphi}(\xi), \bar{\varphi}(\xi))$ . That is, if  $\varphi < \underline{\varphi}(\xi)$  then  $\varphi < \frac{\frac{z}{1-z} \lambda}{1 + \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda}$ , and hence,  $x^*(0) = 0$ .

Suppose  $M$  chooses  $a^* = 1$  in equilibrium. Then, it must be  $\varphi \in [\underline{\varphi}(\xi), \bar{\varphi}(\xi)]$ , and the externalities are given by

$$\lambda \left( \mu + z \frac{\mu - c - \frac{1 + \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1-\xi)}{2} \gamma \sigma^2}{1-z} \right) (1-\xi),$$

which is increasing in  $\varphi$ . Notice

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \left( \mu + z \frac{\mu - c - \frac{1 + \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1-\xi)}{2} \gamma \sigma^2}{1-z} \right) (1-\xi) &< \lambda \frac{\mu - z \gamma \sigma^2}{1-z} \Leftrightarrow \\ \frac{(\frac{\mu}{z} - c - \frac{1}{2} \gamma \sigma^2) (1-\xi) - (\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma \sigma^2)}{\frac{1}{2} (1-\xi)^2 \gamma \sigma^2} &< \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda \Leftrightarrow \\ \varphi < \varphi_{NC}(\xi) &\equiv \frac{\frac{z}{1-z} \lambda}{\frac{z}{1-z} \lambda + \frac{(\frac{\mu}{z} - c - \frac{1}{2} \gamma \sigma^2) (1-\xi) - (\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma \sigma^2)}{\frac{1}{2} (1-\xi)^2 \gamma \sigma^2}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\frac{\mu}{z} - c - \frac{1}{2} \gamma \sigma^2) (1-\xi) - (\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma \sigma^2)}{\frac{1}{2} (1-\xi)^2 \gamma \sigma^2} &< \frac{1}{1-\xi} \left(1 - \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}\right) \Leftrightarrow \\ \xi > \xi_{NC} &\equiv \frac{\frac{4c}{\omega+(1-\omega)z} - c}{\frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma\sigma^2 + \frac{4c}{\omega+(1-\omega)z} - c}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if  $\xi \leq \max \left\{ \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}, \xi_{NC} \right\}$  then  $\varphi_{NC}(\xi) \leq \underline{\varphi}(\xi)$  and  $f^*(\varphi) \geq f^*(0)$  for all  $\varphi > 0$ , with the inequality being strict if and only if  $\varphi > \underline{\varphi}(\xi)$ . If  $\xi > \max \left\{ \frac{2c}{\gamma\sigma^2[\omega+(1-\omega)z]}, \xi_{NC} \right\}$  then  $\varphi_{NC}(\xi) > \underline{\varphi}(\xi)$ . Thus, if  $\varphi \in (0, \underline{\varphi}(\xi)]$  then  $f^*(\varphi) = f^*(0)$ , if  $\varphi \in (\underline{\varphi}(\xi), \varphi_{NC}(\xi))$  then  $f^*(\varphi) < f^*(0)$ , and if  $\varphi \in (\varphi_{NC}(\xi), 1)$  then  $f^*(\varphi) > f^*(0)$ . ■

**Proof of Proposition 7.** To see part (i), let  $x^*(a, \varphi)$  be the optimal trade of  $B$  if her type

is  $\varphi$  and  $M$  takes action  $a$ . We let  $f(\varphi)$  and  $\pi(\varphi)$  be the externalities and trading profits in equilibrium that are induced by strategies  $x^*(a, \varphi)$ , respectively. The equilibrium utility of type  $\varphi$  is  $\varphi\pi(\varphi) - (1 - \varphi)f(\varphi)$ . Suppose to the contrary there are  $\varphi' < \varphi''$  such that  $f(\varphi') > f(\varphi'')$ , that is, a blockholder with a greater profits motive induces less externalities in equilibrium. This implies either  $x^*(0, \varphi') \neq x^*(0, \varphi'')$  or  $x^*(1, \varphi') \neq x^*(1, \varphi'')$ . Notice  $f(\varphi') > f^*(\varphi'')$  implies  $\pi(\varphi') > \pi(\varphi'')$ . Otherwise,

$$\varphi'\pi(\varphi') - (1 - \varphi')f(\varphi') < \varphi'\pi(\varphi'') - (1 - \varphi')f(\varphi'')$$

and type  $\varphi'$  has a profitable deviation from  $x^*(a, \varphi')$  to  $x^*(a, \varphi'')$ , a contradiction. Suppose  $f(\varphi') > f^*(\varphi'')$  and  $\pi(\varphi') > \pi(\varphi'')$ . By revealed preferences of types  $\varphi'$  and  $\varphi''$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi'\pi(\varphi') - (1 - \varphi')f(\varphi') > \varphi'\pi(\varphi'') - (1 - \varphi')f(\varphi'') &\Leftrightarrow \varphi' > \frac{\frac{f(\varphi') - f(\varphi'')}{\pi(\varphi') - \pi(\varphi'')}}{1 + \frac{f(\varphi') - f(\varphi'')}{\pi(\varphi') - \pi(\varphi'')}} \\ \varphi''\pi(\varphi'') - (1 - \varphi'')f(\varphi'') > \varphi''\pi(\varphi') - (1 - \varphi'')f(\varphi') &\Leftrightarrow \varphi'' < \frac{\frac{f(\varphi') - f(\varphi'')}{\pi(\varphi') - \pi(\varphi'')}}{1 + \frac{f(\varphi') - f(\varphi'')}{\pi(\varphi') - \pi(\varphi'')}} \end{aligned}$$

But since  $\varphi'' > \varphi'$ , we get a contradiction.

Consider part (ii). Suppose  $B$  wants to induce  $a = 0$  in equilibrium. Given  $a = 0$ , the optimal strategy is  $x_C(0) = \frac{1+q}{2} \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda, 0 \right\}$  and  $x(1)$  such that  $x(1) - x_C(0) \leq \bar{\Delta}_x$  (e.g.,  $x(1) = x_C(0)$ ). This will generate  $B$  an expected payoff of

$$U_C(0) = \varphi \frac{x_C(0)}{1+q} \left( 1 - \frac{x_C(0)}{1+q} \right) \gamma \sigma^2 - (1 - \varphi) \lambda \left( \frac{\mu}{1-z} - \frac{z}{1-z} \gamma \sigma^2 \left( 1 - \frac{x_C(0)}{1+q} \right) \right).$$

Notice that this term does not depend on  $\xi$ . If  $B$  wants to induce  $a = 1$  in equilibrium, she will choose  $x(0) = 0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} x_C(1) &= \max \left\{ \frac{1+q}{2} \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1 - \xi), 0 \right\}, \bar{\Delta}_x \right\} \\ &= \frac{1+q}{2} \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1 - \xi), \frac{2c}{\gamma \sigma^2 [\omega + (1 - \omega)z]} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

This will generate  $B$  an expected payoff of

$$U_C(1) = \varphi \frac{x_C(1)}{1+q} \left(1 - \frac{x_C(1)}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2 - (1-\varphi) \lambda \left( \frac{\mu - zc}{1-z} - \frac{z}{1-z} \gamma \sigma^2 \left(1 - \frac{x_C(1)}{1+q}\right) \right) (1-\xi).$$

We consider two cases:

1. If  $\bar{\Delta}_x > \frac{1+q}{2} \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1-\xi), 0 \right\}$  then  $x_C(1) = \bar{\Delta}_x$  and it does not depend on  $\xi$ . In this case,

$$\frac{dU_C(1)}{d\xi} = (1-\varphi) \lambda \left( \frac{\mu - zc}{1-z} - \frac{z}{1-z} \gamma \sigma^2 \left(1 - \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q}\right) \right).$$

Notice

$$\frac{dU_C(1)}{d\xi} > 0 \Leftrightarrow \mu/z - c - \gamma \sigma^2 > -\gamma \sigma^2 \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q},$$

which always holds given that  $\bar{\Delta}_x > 0$ ,  $z \in (0, 1)$ , and the assumption  $\mu - c - \gamma \sigma^2 > 0$ .

2. If  $\bar{\Delta}_x \leq \frac{1+q}{2} \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1-\xi), 0 \right\}$  then  $x_C(1) = \frac{1+q}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1-\xi)\right) > 0$ , which is the optimal trade of  $B$ . Therefore,

$$\frac{dU_C(1)}{d\xi} = \frac{\partial U_C(1)}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial U_C(1)}{\partial x} \Big|_{x=x_C(1)} \times \frac{\partial x_C(1)}{\partial \xi}.$$

By the envelope theorem,  $\frac{\partial U_C(1)}{\partial x} \Big|_{x=x_C(1)} = 0$ . Also,

$$\frac{\partial U_C(1)}{\partial \xi} = (1-\varphi) \lambda \left( \frac{\mu - zc}{1-z} - \frac{z}{1-z} \gamma \sigma^2 \frac{1 + \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1-\xi)}{2} \right)$$

where

$$\frac{\partial U_C(1)}{\partial \xi} > 0 \Leftrightarrow \mu/z - c - \gamma \sigma^2 > -\gamma \sigma^2 \frac{1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1-\xi)}{2}$$

which always holds given that  $1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1-\xi) > 0$ ,  $z \in (0, 1)$ , and the assumption  $\mu - c - \gamma \sigma^2 > 0$ .

Since  $U_C(1)$  increases in  $\xi$  and  $U(0)$  is invariant to  $\xi$ , there exists  $\bar{\xi}_C > 0$  such that  $U_C(1) > U_C(0)$  if and only if  $\xi \geq \bar{\xi}_C$ , as required.

Consider part (2.a). We prove  $\bar{\xi}_C < 1$ . Indeed, if  $\xi = 1$  then inducing  $a = 1$  implies no externalities and

$$U_C(1) = \varphi \frac{x_C(1)}{1+q} \left(1 - \frac{x_C(1)}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2.$$

If  $\frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{c}{\gamma \sigma^2 [\omega + (1-\omega)z]}$  then  $x_C(1) = \frac{1+q}{2}$  which is the quantity that maximizes the unconstrained gains from trade, and therefore it must be  $U_C(1) > U_C(0)$ . Suppose  $\frac{1}{2} < \frac{c}{\gamma \sigma^2 [\omega + (1-\omega)z]}$ . In this case,  $x_C(1) = \frac{(1+q)c}{\gamma \sigma^2 [\omega + (1-\omega)z]}$  and

$$U_C(1) = \varphi \frac{c}{\gamma \sigma^2 [\omega + (1-\omega)z]} \left(1 - \frac{c}{\gamma \sigma^2 [\omega + (1-\omega)z]}\right) \gamma \sigma^2$$

Assumption (13),  $\frac{c}{\gamma \sigma^2 [\omega + (1-\omega)z]} \leq 1$ , guarantees  $U_C(1) \geq 0$ . If  $1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda \leq 0$  then  $x_C(0) = 0$  and

$$U_C(0) = -(1-\varphi) \lambda \left( \frac{\mu}{1-z} - \frac{z}{1-z} \gamma \sigma^2 \right) < 0$$

and thus,  $U_C(1) > U_C(0)$ , that is,  $\bar{\xi}_C < 1$ . Suppose  $1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda > 0$ . Then,  $x_C(0) = \frac{1+q}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda\right)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} U_C(0) &= \varphi \frac{x_C(0)}{1+q} \left(1 - \frac{x_C(0)}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2 - (1-\varphi) \lambda \left( \frac{\mu}{1-z} - \frac{z}{1-z} \gamma \sigma^2 \left(1 - \frac{x_C(0)}{1+q}\right) \right) \\ &= \varphi \left[ \frac{1}{4} \gamma \sigma^2 \left(1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda\right)^2 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda \left( \frac{\mu}{z} - \gamma \sigma^2 \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Notice  $U_C(0)$  increases in  $\varphi$ . Moreover, if  $\varphi = 1$  then  $U_C(0) > U_C(1)$  and if  $\varphi = \frac{\frac{z}{1-z} \lambda}{1 + \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda}$  then  $U_C(0) < U_C(1)$ . Therefore, if  $\frac{1}{2} < \frac{c}{\gamma \sigma^2 [\omega + (1-\omega)z]}$  then there is  $\varphi^* \in (\frac{z\lambda}{1-z+z\lambda}, 1)$  such that if  $\varphi < \varphi^*$  then  $\bar{\xi}_C < 1$ , and otherwise,  $\bar{\xi}_C = 1$ .

Finally, we prove part (2.b). Recall that in the baseline model, when  $\varphi = 0$ , then  $B$  induces  $a = 1$  if and only if  $\xi \geq \frac{\gamma \sigma^2 \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q} - c}{\mu/z - \gamma \sigma^2 + \gamma \sigma^2 \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q} - c}$ . Suppose  $\varphi > 0$  but  $\frac{1+q}{2} \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda (1-\xi), 0 \right\} < \bar{\Delta}_x$  and  $1 - \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda < 0$ . Then,  $x_C(1) = \bar{\Delta}_x$  and  $x_C(0) = 0$ . That is, although  $\varphi > 0$ ,  $B$ 's optimal trade that induces action  $a$  is the same as in the baseline model when  $\varphi = 0$ . Notice

that  $U_C(1) > U_C(0)$  if and only if

$$\frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2 > \frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \lambda \left[ \left( \frac{\mu - zc}{1-z} - \frac{z}{1-z} \gamma \sigma^2 \left(1 - \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q}\right) \right) (1-\xi) - \left( \frac{\mu}{1-z} - \frac{z}{1-z} \gamma \sigma^2 \right) \right]$$

$$\xi > \frac{\gamma \sigma^2 \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q} - c - \frac{\frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2}{\frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda}}{\mu/z - \gamma \sigma^2 + \gamma \sigma^2 \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q} - c} = \bar{\xi}_C$$

Thus, if  $\frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q} < 1$  and  $\frac{\gamma \sigma^2 \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q} - c - \frac{\frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q}\right) \gamma \sigma^2}{\frac{1-\varphi}{\varphi} \frac{z}{1-z} \lambda}}{\mu/z - \gamma \sigma^2 + \gamma \sigma^2 \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q} - c} < \xi < \frac{\gamma \sigma^2 \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q} - c}{\mu/z - \gamma \sigma^2 + \gamma \sigma^2 \frac{\bar{\Delta}_x}{1+q} - c}$  then  $B$  chooses  $a = 0$  if  $\varphi = 0$  but  $a = 1$  if  $\varphi > 0$ . Notice that sufficient conditions that satisfies these conditions are  $\frac{1+q}{2} < \bar{\Delta}_x$  and  $\varphi < \frac{z\lambda}{1-z+zc}$ . ■