

Index

- abuses, mutual fund industry, 2–3
- actively managed equity funds performance
 - comparisons, 147, 148, 183, 184–185, 186
- activity-based allocation of costs, 118–119
- advisory contracts market, 36, 193*n*15
- Allianz NFJ Dividend Value fund, 87, 88
- allocation of costs: activity-based, 118–119;
 - alternative based, 118; examples of, 117–118; measurement of, 117–119
- American Century Investments, 104–105
- analytical framework, 160
- anecdotal evidence, 152–153
- announced price, 6
- annual redemption rates, 91, 94
- appellate court decision, *Gartenberg*, 34–44;
 - on advisory contracts market, 36, 193*n*15;
 - arguments against, 36–37, 38–39, 41, 43–44, 46; on competition among funds, 35–37; competition rejection in, 24, 193*n*24; competitively insignificant fees and, 37–38, 193*n*19; conclusions about, 46–47; cost-based theory of value and, 43; on determining excessive fees, 39, 43, 46, 193*n*22; on fall-out benefits, 33, 41–42, 193*n*27; further economic issues raised by, 42–44, 194*n*28, 194*n*30; investment adviser replacement and, 38–39; on investor mobility, 37–38; monopoly pricing and, 42, 194*n*30; overview of, 34–35; subadvisers and, 193*n*17; subsequent court decisions regarding, 44–45, 194*n*38. *See also* district court decision, *Gartenberg*
- arm’s-length bargaining, 28
- asset distribution: causation regarding, 205*n*34;
 - price range and, 111–112, 205*n*n34–35
- asset values by rates of return/years investing, 19
- attributes: defined, 6; price competition and, 6–7, 153; Wal-Mart example regarding, 153
- auto industry market segments, 52–53

- back-end load fees, 151–152
- board of directors: conflict of interest, 130, 208*n*2; excessive fees and, 22–23, 154–155; regulation of, 154–155
- Bogle, John, 126, 136–137, 208*n*3
- bond funds: annual redemption rates, 91, 94;
 - vs. money market funds, 95; number of, 83
- Broad Street complex, 133
- Brown, Stuart B., 105–106, 199*n*1, 200*n*3, 202*n*18–19, 202*n*22, 203*n*24, 209*n*12

- Canada, price dispersion, 205*n*35
- cash balance plans, 14
- closed-end mutual funds, 188*n*9
- Collins, Sean, 106, 203*n*24

- collusion, 82
- commingled investment pool, 100, 200n2
- competition: absence of, 1; conventional indices of, 81–82; *Jones* case and, 195n39.
See also price competition
- complexes, fund: attributes, 6; changes in shares regarding, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92–93; competition between, 175; defined, 188n14; demand for, 161–163; discrete choice model regarding, 53–54; economies of scale, 119, 120, 121–122, 123, 124–125; entry of new, 84, 87, 88–89; equity fund concentration and, 82, 84, 86; goodwill, 163–164; model simulations of, 167–168; number of, 82, 83; selection factors, 53–54; share of industry assets, 84; single-nested model and, 160–161; survivor technique and, 120, 121–122, 123
- concentration, mutual fund industry, 82, 84, 84, 85–86
- conflict of interest: director by-offs and, 130, 208n2; governance structure and, 20–22, 130, 207n1; ideas for resolving, 130–131, 208n3–4; internal management and, 131–134; investment advisers and, 20–22, 190n8; not-for-profit and, 130, 131, 134–135, 208n3; performance comparisons and, 143–147; principal findings on, 153–154; TIAA-CREF and, 142–143; Vanguard and, 135–142; vertical integration and, 131, 208n4
- consumer choice, 48, 195m1
- cost function: defined, 164; economies of scale and, 164–166, 166; economies of scope and, 166–167; extreme value model and, 174–175
- cost-based theory of value, 43
- cross-price elasticity: calculation of, 163; competition studies flaws regarding, 52; defined, 196n9; statistical regression analysis and, 60, 61, 178–179
- deferred load charge, 58, 197m8
- defined benefit plan: vs. cash balance plans, 14; explained, 3–4, 188n13; government, 16–17; Pension Protection Act of 2006 and, 15; shift from, 13–14, 189n9
- defined contribution plan: explained, 4, 188n13; government and, 16–17; growth, 14–15, 189n9; Pension Protection Act of 2006 and, 15–16; shift to, 13–14, 189n9
- demand function: calculation, 161–163; parameters, 164, 173
- demand schedule, 56, 197m6
- descriptive statistics, in discrete choice model, 58, 59
- dimensions of differentiation, 53
- direct purchases, 93, 198n8
- disclosure, 29, 155, 211m1
- discount brokers, 93
- discrete choice model: demand measured via, 53, 196m1; descriptive statistics and, 58, 59; dimensions of differentiation in, 53; distribution channels and, 54–55, 58, 60; estimating demand/price elasticities using, 57–73; investment advisers' behavior and, 56–57; investor behavior and, 55–56; June 2004 example using, 60, 61, 62, 197m19–20; large complexes and, 53–54; outside goods and, 169; price elasticities and, 60, 61, 178–179; product differentiation and, 62; profit implication calculation in, 60, 62, 63–72, 197m19–20; simulation results of, 75–79; simulations of, 73–79, 167–168
- distribution channels: direct purchases, 93, 198n8; discrete choice model and, 54–55, 58, 60; financial advisers and, 93, 111, 205n32; front-end loads and, 93–94, 199n14; full-service brokerage houses, 92, 93; industry structure and, 91, 93–94; loads and, 93–94; price dispersion and, 110–111, 204n31, 205n32; principles of differentiation generalized extreme value model and, 174–175; retirement accounts and, 93; 12b-1 fees and, 93, 199m15
- district court decision, *Gartenberg*, 32–34.
See also appellate court decision, *Gartenberg*
- Dodge & Cox International Stock fund, 87, 88
- Dreyfus, 90, 91, 92
- economies of scale: assumptions about, 112–113, 206n38; calculating, 164–166, 166,

- 175; cost function and, 164–166, 166; critics' arguments on, 112–113; equity funds, 119, 123, 124–125; expected results, 77–79, 78, 79; expense ratios/asset sizes measuring, 115–117; fund complexes, 119, 120, 121–122, 123, 124–125; *Gartenberg* case on, 113, 206n41; monopoly pricing and, 114–115, 206n44; multiproduct firms and, 117–119; no expected results, 75–77, 76, 77; operating cost increases and, 114, 206n45; price competition and, 112–125; prior studies on, 115–117, 206n49; regression models measuring, 117; SEC on, 206n38, 206n49; in short-/long-run, 114–115; survivor technique and, 119–125; Wharton report and, 113, 116–117
- economies of scope, 166–167, 174
- effective price, 6
- Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals *Gartenberg* case, 45
- empirical estimation: of nested logit demand model, 169, 170; of price elasticities, 169–171
- employer-based retirement plans, 93
- England, 205n35
- entry, ease of, 152
- equity funds: actively managed, 147, 148, 183, 184–185, 186; annual redemption rates, 91, 94; changes in shares regarding, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92–93; concentration by investment category, 82, 84, 85, 86; economies of scale, 119, 123, 124–125; entry of new, 84, 87, 88–89; expense ratios and, 127; vs. money market funds, 95; number of, 82, 83; performance comparisons, 144–146, 145, 147, 148, 183, 184–185, 186; principal findings regarding, 151–154; survivor technique and, 123, 124–125; switching, 151–152
- exchange traded funds (ETFs): entry of, 152; as product innovation, 95
- expense ratios: economies of scale and, 115–117; fund types and, 127; price competition and, 126–128; price dispersion and, 107–108, 109; principal findings regarding, 151; trends in, 126–127; 12b-1/load fees and, 126
- external management: assessing, 131–134, 209n11; history of, 132–133; vs. internal, 20, 131–134, 190n3, 208n4, 209n11; principle findings on, 153–154; SEC and, 133, 209n11; Wharton School of Finance and Commerce and, 209n11
- extreme value model. *See* principles of differentiation generalized extreme value model
- fall-out benefits, 31, 33, 41–42, 193n27
- fee breakpoints, 32
- fee disparities: dissimilar advisory products and, 101–102; estimates of retail/institutional management, 105–106; factors explaining, 100–101; identical/similar advisory products and, 102–105; market segment, 100–107, 200n3
- fee waivers, 6, 95–96, 97, 199n25
- fees, excessive: adviser/board of directors relationship and, 22–23, 154–155; critics view of, 20–24, 99–100, 199n1; disclosure regulating, 155, 211n1; *Gartenberg* case regarding, 32–44, 46, 193n22; governance structure/interest conflict and, 20–22, 130, 207n1; historical background, 18–29; hypothesis, 151; ideas for resolving, 130–131, 208n3–4; investor mobility and, 23, 190n11; investor sensitivity to, 23; 1950s/60s, 26–28; 1924–1940, 24–26; principal findings regarding, 151–154; private action cases regarding, 26, 191n27; regulation and, 28–29, 154–156; SEC report on, 26, 27–28; study observations regarding, 99–100; transfer of wealth via, 18, 19; Wharton School report on, 26, 27
- Fidelity: changes in shares in, 89, 90, 91, 92; low fee promotions, 95; price competition by, 152
- fiduciary duty: definitions of, 192n35; district vs. appellate court regarding, 32, 192n7; *Gartenberg* district court decision and, 32–34; Section 36(b) on, 28, 34, 191n34
- financial advisers: distribution channels and, 93, 111, 205n32; price dispersion and, 111, 205n32

- Freeman, John P., 105–106, 199*m*1, 200*n*3, 202*mm*18–19, 202*n*22, 203*n*24, 209*n*12
- front-end loads: distribution channels and, 93–94, 199*m*14; switching and, 151–152
- full-service brokerage houses, 92, 93
- fund age, 58
- fund capitalization classifications, 58
- fund family. *See* complexes, fund
- fund supermarkets, 93
- Gallus* case, 45
- Gartenberg* case: appellate court decision in, 34–44; assumptions underlying, 81; background of, 31–32; conclusions about, 46–47; district court decision in, 32–34; economies of scale and, 113, 206*n*41; excessive fees and, 32–44, 43, 46, 193*n*22; factors leading to, 30–31; fund industry since, 81–98; retail vs. institutional fees and, 201*n*8; subsequent court decisions regarding, 44–45, 194*n*38
- goodwill law of motion, 163–164, 174
- governance structure: adviser replacement and, 22, 190*n*8; competition and, 21–22; conflict of interest and, 20–22, 130, 207*m*1; internal vs. external, 20, 131–134, 190*n*3, 208*n*4; SEC regulation of, 20–21, 154–155; Vanguard Group, 137, 141–142, 210*n*26
- Government Accountability Office (GAO): expense ratios and, 127; fee disclosure and, 29
- government pension plans, 16–17
- growth: defined contribution plan, 14–15, 189*n*9; government pension plans, 16–17; Individual Retirement Account plans, 14–15; market share vs. new money, 51–52; money market funds, 30–31; mutual fund industry, 11, 12, 13–17, 26, 82; in retirement plans, 11, 13–17
- Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI), 84, 198*n*5
- horizontal mergers, 84, 198*n*5
- hybrid funds: annual redemption rates, 91, 94; number of, 83
- hypothesis, excessive fees, 151
- Individual Retirement Account (IRA) plans: creation of, 13, 189*n*7; growth, 14–15; Pension Protection Act of 2006 and, 15–16; types of, 13
- institutional investors: adviser replacement and, 100, 201*n*5; dissimilar advisory products and, 101–102, 201*nn*7–8; fee difference estimates regarding, 105–106, 202*mm*18–19, 202*n*22, 203*n*24; fee disparities and, 100–107, 200*n*3; identical/similar advisory products and, 102–105
- institutional management fees, 105–106, 201*n*8, 202*mm*18–19, 202*n*22, 203*n*24
- interests, alignment of, 155–156
- internal management: assessing, 131–134, 209*m*1; vs. external, 20, 131–134, 190*n*3, 208*n*4, 209*m*1; history of, 132–133; principle findings on, 153–154; SEC and, 133, 209*m*1; TIAA-CREF, 142–143; Vanguard, 137, 141–142; Wharton School of Finance and Commerce and, 209*m*1
- investment advisers: asset size regarding, 56, 197*m*15; behavior, 56–57; board of directors and, 22–23, 154–155; collusion, 82; conflict of interest and, 20–22, 190*n*8; demand schedule regarding, 56, 197*m*16; interest alignment and, 155–156; marginal investors and, 56–57; monopoly profits and, 199*m*1; principal findings regarding, 151; profit motive and, 153; replacement of, 22–23, 38–39, 100, 190*n*9, 201*n*5; self-interest, 56; share ownership by, 156
- Investment Advisers Act (IAA), 3
- Investment Company Act (ICA), 2–3; amendment of, 28; board of directors and, 154–155; expense ratios and, 127; management malfeasance and, 25–26; Section 36(b) of, 28, 191*n*34
- Investment Company Institute (ICI), 96
- investor: behavior, 55–56; fee sensitivity, 23, 96, 151; fund selection, 161; interest alignment, 155–156; marginal, 56–57; mobility, 23, 37–38, 55–56, 91, 190*m*11
- Jones* case: *Gartenberg* case and, 45, 194*n*38; on market competition, 195*n*79

- Kuhnen, Camelia M., 208n2
- law of motion, 163–164, 174
- law of one price, 99, 108, 110
- Litan, Robert E., 111, 205n35
- load charge, deferred, 58, 197m18
- load fees, 126
- load funds: distribution channels and, 93–94; expense ratios and, 127
- long-term fund annual redemption rates, 91, 94
- management costs, portfolio: comparing, 103–105; duties regarding, 103–104, 201m11; measurement challenges in, 104–105, 202m17; subadvisory fees and, 104, 106, 201m13, 202n22
- management fees, retail vs. institutional, 105–106, 201n8, 202m18–19, 202n22, 203n24
- management malfeasance: closed/open-end funds and, 24–25; early regulation of, 25–26; net asset value reporting and, 24, 191m18; 1924–1940, 24–26
- marginal investors, 56–57
- market segmentation parameters, 176
- market segments: auto industry examples of, 52–53; dissimilar advisory products and, 101–102; fee difference estimates between, 105–106; fee disparities between, 100–107, 200n3; identical/similar advisory products and, 102–105
- Marwick, Peat, 193n27
- Massachusetts Investors Growth Stock Fund (MIGSF), 132
- Massachusetts Investors Trust (MIT), 24, 132, 190n3
- McFadden, Daniel, 160
- Merrill Lynch: appellate court decision concerning, 34–44; district court decision regarding, 32–34; fee breakpoints, 32; *Gartenberg* case background, 31–32
- mobility, investor, 23, 37–38, 55–56, 91, 190m11
- model simulations. *See* simulations, model
- models: analytical framework of, 160; overview of, 159–160. *See also specific model*
- money market funds: vs. equity/bond funds, 95; fee breakpoints, 32; growth of, 30–31; number of, 82, 83
- monopoly pricing: economies of scale and, 114–115, 206n44; fair/unfair, 42, 194n30
- monopoly profits, 199m1
- “Mutual Fund Advisory Fees: New Evidence and A Fair Fiduciary Duty Test” (Freeman, Brown, & Pomerantz, 199m1)
- mutual fund industry: abuses, 2–3; annual redemption rates, 91, 94; changes in fund/complex shares, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92–93, 198n7; concentration, 82, 84, 84, 85–86; defined, 187n2; disclosure of information, 155, 211m1; distribution channels, 91, 93–94; economies of scale, 112–125; entry of new funds/complexes, 84, 87, 88–89; fee waivers, 6, 95–96, 97, 199n25; *Gartenberg*, since, 81–98; growth, 11, 12, 13–17, 26, 82; investor fee sensitivity, 23, 96, 151; low fees promotion, 95, 96; number of fund/fund complexes, 82, 83; Pension Protection Act of 2006, 15–16; pricing, 4–7; principal findings regarding, 151–154; product innovations, 95; retirement assets, 3–4; SEC report, 26, 27–28; structure, 81–91; Wharton School of Finance and Commerce report, 26, 27
- nested logit demand model: empirical estimation in, 169; variables, 170
- net asset value (NAV), 24, 191m18
- net price calculation, 163
- New Covenant Trust fund, 87, 89
- no-load funds: shift to, 93; switching, 151–152
- not-for-profit structure, 29; as conflict of interest solution, 130, 131, 134–135, 208n3; examples of, 131; principal findings on, 153–154; profit maximization in, 134–135; TIAA-CREF, 142–143; Vanguard, 137, 141–142, 210n26
- number of mutual funds, by investment categories, 82, 83
- open-end mutual funds, 3, 188n9
- outside goods, 169
- outside goods variable, 58, 59

- passively managed funds, 146, 146–147, 183, 184–185, 186
- pension plans, government, 16–17
- Pension Protection Act (PPA) of 2006, 15–16
- perfect competition model, 108, 110, 204n28
- performance contract, 5
- Pomerantz, Steve, 106, 199n1, 202m19, 203n24, 209m12
- pooling, 187n2
- portfolio management costs: comparing, 103–105; duties regarding, 103–104, 201m11; measurement challenges in, 104–105, 202m17; subadvisory fees and, 104, 106, 201m13, 202n22
- price competition: abuses, 3; ambiguity, 4; anecdotal evidence of, 152–153; appellate court decision, *Gartenberg*, on, 24, 35–37, 193n24; attributes and, 6–7, 153; changes in fund/complex shares revealing, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92–93; between complexes, 175; concentration and, 82, 84, 84, 85–86; controversy, 1–2; defined, 187n3; demand studies, 49, 50–51, 51–52; disclosure of information and, 155, 211m1; discrete choice models and, 53, 196m11; distribution channels and, 91, 93–94; economies of scale and, 112–125; entry of new funds/complexes supporting, 84, 87, 88–89; expense ratios and, 126–128; fee disparities and, 100–107; fee waivers and, 95–96, 97, 199n25; governance structure and, 21–22; indirect tests, 49, 195n2; industry abuses and, 3; key test of, 57; law of one price and, 99; market segments and, 52–53, 100–107; model simulations calculating, 73–79, 167–168; new entry/new products and, 152; outdated/ambiguous studies of, 8; perfect competition model and, 108, 110, 204n28; pillars, 48, 195m1; price dispersion and, 107–112; principal findings regarding, 151–154; prior studies, 49–52; product innovations and, 95; regulatory proposals for strengthening, 28–29; retirement accounts and, 2; statistical regression analysis testing, 57–73; study flaws, 51–52, 196n7; supply/demand model and, 7–8; switching promoting, 151–152; Wharton School report and, 27
- price dispersion: asset distribution/price range and, 111–112, 205m34–35; competition and, 107–112; evidence on, 110–111; financial advisers and, 111, 205n32; perfect competition and, 108, 110, 204n28; range of expense ratios, 107–108, 109; reasons for, 110–111, 204n31, 205n32; SEC study and, 108; S&P 500 index funds and, 108, 109, 204n26; U.S. vs. other countries, 111–112, 205n35; Wharton study and, 108, 204n27
- price elasticity: calculation of, 162–163; defined, 195n6; demand studies on, 49, 50–51, 51–52; empirical estimation of, 169–171; estimating, 57–73; market share vs. new money growth and, 51–52; statistical regression analysis and, 60, 61, 178–179. *See also* cross-price elasticity
- price range: asset distribution and, 111–112, 205m34–35; causation regarding, 205n34
- price sensitivity: consumer choice and, 48, 195m1; defined, 48; investor, 23, 96, 151
- pricing: attributes and, 6–7; complexity of, 4–5; fee waivers, 6; initial, 5; mutual fund, 4–7; performance contract and, 5
- Prime Reserve Fund, 118
- Primecap Fund, 140, 210n27
- principal findings, 151–154
- principles of differentiation generalized extreme value model, 160; competition between complexes and, 175; cost function/goodwill in, 174–175; demand for funds in, 171–173; estimation of, 176; solving extreme value equation in, 180–190; theoretical aspects of, 176–177, 180; two-nested model and, 171
- private action cases, 26, 191n27
- product innovations, 95
- products, advisory: dissimilar, 101–102; entry of, 152; identical/similar, 102–105
- Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, 25
- reasonableness standard, 32, 192n7
- regression demand equation, 197m17
- regression models, measuring economies of scale, 117

- regression results for two-nested model, 178–179
- regulation: adviser share ownership, 156; board of directors, 154–155; excessive fees and, 28–29, 154–156; harm done by, 150; information disclosure, 155, 211*m*; price lowering, 6; price raising, 5; 36(b) and, 156
- relative market share, 77, 79
- retail fund investors: adviser replacement and, 100; dissimilar advisory products and, 101–102, 201*m*7–8; fee difference estimates regarding, 105–106, 202*m*18–19, 202*n*22, 203*n*24; fee disparities and, 100–107, 200*n*3; identical/similar advisory products and, 102–105
- retail management fees, 105–106, 201*n*8, 202*m*18–19, 202*n*22, 203*n*24
- retirement accounts: distribution channels and, 93; growth of, 11, 13–17; price competition and, 2. *See also* Individual Retirement Account plans
- retirement assets, 3–4
- San Diego government pension plan, 16
- Schuyt* case, 24, 193*n*24
- Section 36(b): costs/benefits of, 156; economies of scale and, 113, 206*n*41; on fiduciary duty, 28, 34, 191*n*34; of Investment Company Act, 28, 191*n*34
- Securities Act of 1933, 25
- Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC): board of directors and, 154–155; economies of scale and, 206*n*38, 206*n*49; fee disparities and, 100, 200*n*3; fund industry report by, 26, 27–28; governance structure/conflict of interest and, 20–21, 154–155; industry abuses investigated by, 2–3; internal/external management and, 133, 209*m*11; Investment Company Act amendment and, 28; price dispersion and, 108; regulation by, 150
- Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 25
- segmentation parameters, 176
- self-interest: investment advisers and, 56; investor behavior and, 55–56; studies, 196*m*13
- Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, 45, 194*n*38
- simulations, model: changes in relative costs/fees/goodwill, 76, 78; changes in relative market share, 77, 79; expected economies of scale results, 77–79, 78, 79; homogeneous product results in, 75; no expected economies of scale results, 75–77, 76, 77; parameters, 73–75; questions addressed, 73; results, 75–79; scenarios used, 73, 74–75; simplifying assumptions, 73–74, 197*m*21; between two complexes, 167–168
- single-nested model: complex goodwill in, 163–164; cost function, 164–167; demand for complexes/funds, 161–163; purpose of using, 160–161
- S&P 500 index funds: price dispersion and, 108, 109, 204*n*26; price range/asset distribution and, 111
- statistical regression analysis: descriptive statistics used in, 58, 59; distribution channels used in, 58, 60; June 2004 example using, 60, 61, 62, 197*m*19–20; other results from, 73; price competition tested via, 57–73; price elasticities and, 60, 61, 178–179; product differentiation and, 62; profit implication calculated in, 60, 62, 63–72, 197*m*19–20; regression demand equation and, 197*m*17
- stock turnover ratio, 58
- subadvisers: *Gartenberg* regarding, 193*m*17; portfolio management costs and, 104, 106, 201*m*13, 202*n*22; Vanguard Group and, 106, 136, 137, 139–140, 202*n*22, 209*m*13, 209*m*15, 210*n*27
- supply/demand model, 7–8
- Supreme Court, U.S., 45, 194*n*38
- survivor technique: assumptions of, 119–120; economies of scale estimated via, 119–125; equity funds and, 123, 124–125; fund complexes and, 120, 121–122, 123
- Swensen, David, 130
- switching, 151–152
- T. Rowe Price Prime Reserve Fund, 118
- Teachers Advisors. *See* TIAA-CREF
- TIAA-CREF: actively managed equity fund comparisons, 147, 148, 183, 184–185, 186;

- TIAA-CREF (*continued*)
 conflict of interest and, 142–143; equity fund comparisons, 144, 145, 146; fee increases, 143; history, 142; ideal structure of, 29; low fee promotions, 95; overview of, 131; passively managed fund comparisons, 146, 146–147, 183, 184–185, 186; performance comparisons, 143–149; principle findings on, 153–154
- 12b-1 fees: distribution channels and, 93, 199n15; expense ratios and, 126; management costs and, 202n17
- two-nested model, 171; regression results for, 178–179
- United States (U.S.), price dispersion, 111–112, 205n35
- utility maximization, random, 160
- Vanguard Group: actively managed equity fund comparisons, 147, 148, 183, 184–185, 186; changes in shares in, 89, 90, 91, 93; conflict of interest and, 135–142; critics arguments for, 135–136, 209m12; equity mutual funds, 138–140; governance structure, 137, 141–142, 210n26; history, 136–137; ideal structure of, 29; indexed fund, 137; internal management, 137, 141–142; low fee promotions, 95; overview of, 131; passively managed fund comparisons, 146, 146–147, 183, 184–185, 186; performance comparisons, 143–149, 211n36; price competition by, 152–153; principle findings on, 152–154; profits, 137, 141–142, 210n28; subadviser fees, 106, 136, 137, 202n22, 209m13, 210n27; subadvisers, 136, 137, 139–140, 209m15
- Vantage Point Advisors fund, 87, 89
- vertical integration: as conflict of interest solution, 131, 208n4; examples of, 131; vs. nonvertical, 132
- waivers, fee, 6, 95–96, 97, 199n25
- Wallison, Peter J., 111, 205n35
- Wal-Mart example, 153
- Walsh, Lori, 196n7
- Wellington Management Company, 136–137
- Wharton School of Finance and Commerce: economies of scale and, 113, 116–117; fee disparities and, 100, 200n3; fund industry report by, 26, 27; internal/external management and, 209m11; price dispersion and, 108, 204n27
- Zhang, Andrew, 196n7