Trader Anonymity, Price Formation and Liquidity[*]

Erik Theissen[**]

February 2000

please do not quote without permission

Abstract: The present paper analyses price formation and liquidity in a non-anonymous environment as it can be found on the floor of the NYSE or the Frankfurt Stock Exchange. Our main hypothesis is that the non-anonymity allows the specialist to assess the probability that a trader trades on the basis of private information. He uses this knowledge to price discriminate. This can be achieved by quoting a large spread and granting price improvement to traders deemed uninformed.

Two testable implications can be derived from this. First, price improvement reflects lower adverse selection costs but does not lead to a reduction in the specialist's profit. Second, transactions that occur at the quoted prices are more likely to be initiated by informed traders. Therefore, the quote adjustment following these transactions should be more pronounced than the quote adjustment after transactions at prices inside the spread. We test these hypotheses empirically using data from the Frankfurt Stock Exchange. The results are consistent with these hypotheses and thus support the notion that a non-anonymous environment allows the identification of informed traders and may thus alleviate the adverse selection problem. We discuss the implications of our results for the design of trading systems.

JEL classification: G10

Keywords: anonymity, specialists, bid-ask spreads

---

1 Introduction

Securities markets differ along a variety of dimensions. These comprise, but are not limited to, different degrees of market transparency, of the automation of the trading process and of the intermediation through market makers or specialists. The present paper focuses on the degree of trader anonymity and its impact on price formation and liquidity. We define the degree of anonymity to be the degree of information about the identity of a potential counterparty that is revealed before a transaction takes place.

The issue addressed in this paper is important for a number of reasons. First, the degree of anonymity is potentially related to the extent to which informed traders can exploit their informational advantages and may, therefore, be related to the adverse selection costs. Second, many electronic trading systems are anonymous. Gaining insights into the impact of anonymity on price formation and liquidity may enhance our understanding of the relative merits of these trading systems. Third, a situation where an anonymous and a non-anonymous market coexist is often encountered in reality. The upstairs market for block trades, the development of anonymous proprietary trading systems and NASDAQ's anonymous SOES system are cases in point. The key to understanding the reasons for this coexistence may well be in an in-depth analysis of the effect of anonymity on market outcomes.

It is widely believed that institutional investors prefer anonymous trading systems because they do not want to publicly disclose their trading needs (see the survey results in Economides / Schwartz 1995 and Schwartz / Steil 1996). On the other hand, however, anonymity allows informed traders to remain unidentified and may thus aggravate the adverse selection problem. Further, in an anonymous market it is difficult for uninformed traders to signal their uninformed trading motives, e.g. in the sense of sunshine trading (Admati / Pfleiderer 1991).

Given the importance of the issue, surprisingly little is known about the effects of anonymity on price formation and liquidity. In the dual trading models of Röell (1990) and Fishman / Longstaff (1992), a broker has information about the trading motives of his customers. The market itself, however, is assumed to be anonymous. In Forster / George (1992) and Madhavan (1996) strategic traders have information about either the direction or the magnitude of liquidity trading. This knowledge about the composition of the aggregate order flow is qualitatively different, however, from knowledge about identities and trading motives of individual traders. Seppi (1990) models the coexistence of an anonymous trading floor and a non-anonymous upstairs market for block transactions. He finds that the upstairs market attracts uninformed traders. Rhodes-Kropf (1998) examines the coexistence of an anonymous and a non-anonymous dealer market. Some customers in the non-anonymous market have market power vis-a-vis the market maker and can, therefore, negotiate execution at prices inside the quoted spread. This feature is absent in the anonymous market. Benveniste / Marcus / Wilhelm (1992) model the interaction between a specialist and brokers who have information about the trading motives of their customers. In their „active specialist" case the brokers share this information with the specialist in order to maintain a reputation as a fair trader. Chan / Weinstein (1993) develop a similar argument.

Empirical evidence on the effects of trader anonymity is scarce. Harris / Schultz (1997) find that market makers loose on trades with the „SOES bandits" which are executed in the anonymous SOES system. Madhavan / Cheng (1997) document that, consistent with the model of Seppi (1990), the upstairs market is used by traders who can credibly signal that they trade for liquidity reasons. Garfinkel / Nimalendran (1998) find that NYSE stocks exhibit larger increases in the bid-ask spread on insider trading days[1] than NASDAQ stocks. The

---

[1] An insider trading day is defined as a day on which officers or directors have traded in shares of their firm. Such trades have to be reported and are subsequently published by the SEC.

authors consider this to be evidence that the trading system of the NYSE is less anonymous. Consistent with this result, Heidle / Huang (1999) show that the probability of trading with an informed trader is higher on NASDAQ than on either the NYSE or the AMEX. De Jong / Nijman / Röell (1996) show that trades that are negotiated bilaterally (and thus non-anonymously) and are then executed through the Paris Bourse's CAC system have a much lower price impact than regular CAC trades.

The present paper adds to this literature. It builds on a theoretical framework similar to that developed in Benveniste / Marcus / Wilhelm (1992) in order to derive and test hypotheses on the price formation in a non-anonymous market. We assume that the non-anonymity of the environment allows the specialist to assess the probability that a trader trades on the basis of private information. The specialist uses this knowledge to price discriminate. This can be achieved by quoting a large spread and granting price improvement to traders deemed unin-formed. Two testable implications can be derived from this. First, price improvement reflects lower adverse selection costs but does not lead to a reduction in the specialist's profit. Second, transactions that occur at the quoted prices are more likely to be initiated by informed traders. Therefore, the quote adjustment following these transactions should be more pronounced than the quote adjustment after transactions at prices inside the spread. We test these hypotheses empirically using data from the Frankfurt Stock Exchange, a non-anonymous market that is organized in a way similar to the New York Stock Exchange. The results are consistent with both hypotheses and, therefore, support the notion that a non-anonymous environment allows the identification of informed traders and may thus alleviate the adverse selection problem.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we derive our hypotheses. In section 3 we describe the data set. The results of the empirical analysis are presented in sec-

tion 4. Section 5 offers a concluding discussion of the implications for the design of trading systems.

2 Hypotheses

Our hypotheses build on the assumption that the non-anonymous environment allows the specialist to draw inferences about the motives behind individual trades. This may be achieved in either of two ways. First, the specialist may be able to draw inferences from the observed behavior of a counterparty. Second, the specialist may base his judgement on past trading experience with the trader in question. In both cases the specialist must be able to price discriminate, i.e., to offer different prices to different traders. A simple way to achieve price differentiation is to quote a large spread that incorporates a sufficient adverse selection component and to execute transactions with traders deemed uninformed at a price inside the quoted spread.

It is important to note that for this mechanism to work it is not necessary that the specialist can infer the trading motive with certainty. It is sufficient if he is able to correctly assign a higher probability for information-motivated trading to some traders.

The argument outlined above is similar in spirit to the basic idea of the model of Benveniste / Marcus / Wilhelm (1992). In this model the specialist interacts with brokers who represent customer orders. A broker has some information about the trading motives of his customers that is not known to the specialist. Whenever she represents an order that is likely to be information-motivated she faces a trade-off. She may try to obtain best execution for this order. This may secure her future business with the customer in question but, at the same time,

4

erodes her reputation vis-a-vis the specialist.[2] Consequently, the specialist will offer her less favorable conditions in future transactions. This adversely affects the execution quality the broker can obtain for her uninformed customers. In order not to loose these customers the broker has an incentive not to search best execution for her informed customers in the first place. Note that this does not necessarily entail violating her fiduciary duties vis-a-vis these customers. Not to search best execution may simply mean accepting the quoted prices rather than trying to negotiate a price improvement. This results in self-selection on the side of the brokers. Orders that are likely to be motivated by private information are executed at the quoted prices, orders that are likely to be liquidity-motivated tend to be executed at prices inside the quoted spread.

From the point of view of the empiricist who only has access to price and quotation data, the two cases - specialist identification ability and broker self selection - are observationally equivalent because they yield the same testable implications.

The first hypothesis is based on the observation that, given the conjectured behavior of brokers and / or specialists, price improvement reflects lower adverse selection costs and should, therefore, not be associated with lower market making profits. We thus have:

H1   The specialist's profit on transactions with and without price improvement is equal.

In the model of Rhodes-Kropf (1998), price improvement is granted because investors have differing degrees of market power vis-a-vis the market maker. In this case, granting price improvement should reduce the market maker's profits. A test of hypothesis H1 may thus enable us to discriminate between information-related and non information-related explanations of

---

[2]   This assumes that the specialist is, in a probabilistic sense, able to identify information-motivated transactions after the fact. This is a realistic assumption, however, because the specialist observes the trade direction and

price improvement. It should be noted, however, that the two hypotheses are not mutually exclusive.

The second hypothesis makes use of the fact that, under the conjectured behavior, a transaction that is executed at the quoted price (rather than at a price inside the quotes) has a higher probability of being initiated by an informed trader. The specialist should make use of this knowledge when adjusting his quotes. We thus have:

H2   *The increase [decrease] in the quote midpoint after a buyer-initiated transaction [seller-initiated transaction] is stronger if the transaction took place at a price equal to the prevailing quote as compared to a transaction at a price inside the quotes.*

3 Data

We use data from the continuous trading sessions (called *variabler Handel*) on the floor of the Frankfurt Stock Exchange to test the hypotheses derived in the preceding section.[3] Trading at the Frankfurt Stock Exchange is organized in a way that is similar to the structure of the trading process on the NYSE. Trading is conducted through the *Amtlicher Kursmakler* (henceforth Makler). His position resembles that of the NYSE specialist. He has exclusive access to the information in the limit order book. The Makler may trade for his own account, but is not obliged to do so.

The Makler continuously quotes bid and ask prices. These are called *Pretrades*. The quotes posted by the Makler either represent limit orders in his book or his willingness to trade for

---

the subsequent price movement.

[3]   Besides the continuous trading session there are three call auctions each day; an opening auction, a closing auction and a third auction at noon. An electronic trading system (until November 1997 IBIS, since then XETRA) operates parallel to the floor. For an empirical comparison of floor and screen trading see Theissen (1999).

his own account. The quotes are entered into an electronic system (BOSS-CUBE). Two char-acteristics of the Pretrades are noteworthy. First, there is no explicit quoted depth. It appears, however, that the depth at the quotes is reasonable. The median transaction size for the sample stocks ranges from DM 89,000 ($ 50,857[4]) to DM 584,200 ($ 333,828) with the cross-sectional average being DM 277,238 ($ 158,421). Further, the percentage of transactions oc-curring at prices outside the quoted spread is low, averaging 0.9% in our sample. These facts lend support to our statement that quoted depth is reasonably high.

Second, the quotes are deleted automatically after each transaction. An undesirable conse-quence of this is that a quoted spread does not always exist and that, therefore, some transac-tions take place absent a valid quoted spread. On the other hand, the Makler is forced to enter new quotes shortly (usually a few seconds) after a transaction. These quotes should incorpo-rate the price impact of the preceding transaction, a feature that will prove to be useful in the empirical analysis. Further, quotes are less likely to become stale and the incentive for the Makler to quote a wide spread (but effectively trade inside that spread) in order to avoid fre-quent re-posting of quotes is reduced – re-posting is mandatory after each transaction.

Besides any profits he may earn on his market making activities, the Makler receives a com-mission called *Courtage*. Both the buyer and the seller have to pay 0.04% (for stocks included in the DAX index) or 0.08% (for other stocks).[5]

When deriving our hypotheses we implicitly assumed that the Makler is the sole, or at least the dominant, supplier of liquidity. Empirical results reported in Freihube / Kehr / Krahnen / Theissen (1999) document that this is indeed the case. The quoted spread is narrower than the

---

[4] Based on an exchange rate of 1.75 DM/$, which is representative for the middle of the sample period.
[5] This is the regular rate that is paid by retail investors. Floor brokers (*Freimakler*) pay a lower commission.

spread obtained from the orders in the limit order book in more than 55% of the cases.[6] In these cases the spread represents the willingness of the Makler to trade for his own account rather than on behalf of a customer. Further, more than 46% of the transactions occur at prices inside the quoted spread. In many of these cases the Makler is trading for his own account. In fact, Freihube / Kehr / Krahnen / Theissen (1999) find that the Makler participates in more than 80% of the transactions and accounts for more than 40% of the trading volume. These figures are higher than the comparable figures for the NYSE reported by Madhavan / Sofianos (1998). Applying a model that assumes that the Makler is the dominant supplier of liquidity thus appears to be justified.

The sample for the present study comprises the 30 stocks which constitute the DAX index and an additional 14 stocks which are part of the mid-cap index MDAX. The latter were selected by ordering all 70 MDAX stocks by trading volume and choosing every 5th. The four least liquid stocks had to be discarded from the data set because the number of observations was insufficient to reliably estimate the components of the spread. This leaves us with 40 stocks in the final data set.

The data set comprises time-stamped transaction prices, volume data and the quotes entered by the Makler. The sample period spans the 44 trading days in June and July 1997. Two days (July 21st and July 23rd) were removed from the sample. On both days heavy trading caused a breakdown of the exchange's computer facilities. Trading had to be suspended several times.

The data set was screened carefully to eliminate outliers. Most outliers detected by the filtering rules we employed were obviously due to typing errors (e.g., an ask price of 730 instead of 370). Such errors were usually corrected by the Makler after some seconds.

---

[6] Chung / Van Ness / Van Ness (1999) report a comparable figure for the NYSE. There, the quoted spread is narrower than the spread calculated from the best bid and offer in the limit order book in only 29.3% of the cases.

4 Empirical results

4.1 Price Improvement: Importance and Determinants

In this section we present descriptive statistics on the frequency and magnitude of price improvement (see Petersen / Fialkowski 1994 and Ross / Shapiro / Smith 1996 for comparable results for the NYSE). We further estimate a Tobit model to analyze the determinants of the price improvement.

Table 1 shows the percentage of transactions with price improvement separately for quartiles of stocks sorted by trading volume and for small and large transactions. A small [large] transaction is defined as a transaction that is smaller than [larger than] the median transaction size for the stock in question.

Insert Table 1 here

Small transactions receive price improvement in 56.8% of the cases. There does not appear to exist a relation between this percentage and the total trading volume of the stocks. In fact, the correlation between the improvement frequency and the trading volume is 0.03. Large transactions receive price improvement less than half as often as small transactions. The aggregated figures in the table suggest a tendency for large transactions in less liquid stocks to receive price improvement less frequently than large transactions in more liquid stocks. The correlation coefficient is, however, only 0.17 and is not significantly different from zero.

Table 1 also reports the fraction of trades that occur at the midquote. On average, the probability that a transaction takes place at the midquote is about half the probability that it will receive any price improvement at all. Further, the probability that a small transaction is executed at a price equal to the midquote is about twice as large as the corresponding probability for a large transaction. Transactions at the midquote are less likely for less liquid stocks. The

correlation coefficients between the frequency of midquote transactions and the total trading volume are 0.34 for small transactions and 0.38 for large transactions. Both coefficients are significantly different from zero at the 5% level.

Table 2 reports the price improvement as a percentage of the quoted spread. A figure, e.g. 43.94% for the small transactions, has to be interpreted as follows. On average, the effective spread on a small transaction is 43.94% smaller than the spread quoted immediately prior to the transaction. The figure thus represents the unconditional expectation of the reduction in transaction costs due to price improvement.

Insert Table 2 here

The results are consistent with those presented in the previous tables. The average percentage price improvement for small transactions amounts to more than 40% of the quoted spread and is more than twice as large as the corresponding value for large transactions. The figures suggest a tendency for the average degree of price improvement to be smaller for less liquid stocks. However, the correlation coefficients are only 0.16 and 0.27 for small and large transactions, respectively, and are not significantly different from zero at the 5% level (the latter coefficient is marginally significant at the 10% level).

The results presented in this section document that a significant fraction of the transactions on the floor of the Frankfurt Stock Exchange receive price improvement. The fact that small transactions are more likely to benefit from price improvement is consistent with the notion that informed traders are more likely to trade larger quantities. The observed pattern is, however, also consistent with inventory management on the side of the Makler.

We use a regression analysis to separate any effect of inventory management on the price improvement. The dependent variable is the degree of price improvement in each transaction,

expressed as a percentage of the quoted spread immediately prior to the transaction.[7] We include independent variables that are related to the inventory risk and adverse selection risk faced by the Makler.

Standard models of the bid-ask spread assume a fixed transaction size (among the exceptions are Easley / O'Hara 1987 and Glosten 1989). In these models, price improvement does not occur because the quoted prices incorporate a compensation for the inventory and adverse selection risk tailored to the fixed transaction size. In reality, however, transaction sizes are not fixed and the equilibrium spread is likely to depend on the transaction size. Price improvement may, therefore, be granted on those transactions where the equilibrium spread is smaller than the quoted spread. The descriptive results presented in Table 1 and Table 2 are consistent with this conjecture. The relation between transaction size and equilibrium spread may well be nonlinear, e.g. because of fixed order processing costs. To allow for such non-linearities we include both the transaction size, measured as the number of shares traded, and the squared transaction size on the right-hand side.

The Makler may be more likely to grant price improvement on transactions that reduce his inventory. Since we do not observe his inventory directly, we include a proxy variable for the inventory position. We use the total number of shares bought or sold by all suppliers of liquidity on the specific trading day,[8] up to (but excluding) the transaction in question. Trade direction is inferred using the method proposed by Lee / Ready (1991). Given the empirical results on Makler participation discussed in section 3, this appears to be a reasonable proxy for the Makler's inventory. We sign the variable such that it carries a positive sign when the transaction in question reduces the inventory (i.e., the Makler has a long position and sells, or

---

[7] Note that the problem, encountered in NYSE data, that quotes may be recorded ahead of the transaction that triggered them does not arise in our data set.

he has a short position and buys) and a negative sign otherwise. To account for possible non-linearity we also include the square of the variable, signed according to the convention outlined above.

Increased return volatility increases the risks the Makler faces and may, therefore, affect his willingness to grant price improvement. To capture this effect we include the absolute change in the midquote between the transaction in question and the preceding transaction as an independent variable. The size of the bid-ask spread itself may also depend on the inventory and adverse selection risk perceived by the Makler. Further, the size of the spread may be related to the Makler's (possibly time-varying, cf Brock / Kleidon 1992) market power. We therefore include the spread in the regression. Finally, a series of transactions on the same side of the market may reveal insider trading activity. We therefore include a dummy variable taking on the value 1 whenever the transaction is on the same side of the market as the preceding transaction and taking on a value of zero otherwise. This leads to the following model

$$\frac{\left(s_t^q - s_t^e\right)}{s_t^q} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 q_t + \gamma_2 q_t^2 + \gamma_3 I_t + \gamma_4 sign\left(I_t\right) I_t^2 + \gamma_5 \left|mq_t - mq_{t-1}\right| + \gamma_6 s_t^q + \gamma_7 D_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (1)$$

where t is a (transaction) time index, s_t^q and s_t^e are the quoted and the effective spread, respectively, q_t is the transaction size, measured as the number of shares traded, I_t is the inventory, signed according to the convention outlined above, mq_t is the midquote in effect immediately prior to transaction t and D_t is a dummy variable taking on the value one whenever transaction t is a continuation, i.e., occurs on the same side of the market as the preceding transaction.

---

[8]   We follow Manaster / Mann (1996) in setting the inventory at the beginning of each trading day to zero. Because the Maklers are able to lay off inventory in the electronic trading system (which offers considerably

The dependent variable in (1) can only take on values between zero and 1.[9] A value of zero, corresponding to a transaction at the quoted bid or ask price, is by far the most frequent observation in the sample. OLS estimation, therefore, seems inappropriate.[10] Instead, we treat the dependent variable as being censored at zero. The censoring assumption is appropriate because there are cases in which the unobservable equilibrium spread is larger than the quoted spread (and, consequently, the price improvement should be negative) but the Makler has to trade at his quoted prices. This may occur because he did not update his quotes. Similarly, the quoted bid or ask may be determined by a stale limit order. In addition, the Makler may occasionally trade at unfavorable prices in order to preserve price continuity. To account for the censoring we estimate equation (1) as a Tobit model.[11]

Insert Table 3 here

The results are shown in Table 3. The first five lines show the means of the estimated marginal effects for all stocks and for quartiles of stocks sorted by total trading volume. The marginal effects are obtained by multiplying the estimated coefficients by the fraction of uncensored observations. The lower part of the Table shows the number of positive and negative coefficients. The independent variables have explanatory power for the degree of

---

longer trading hours than the floor), cumulating inventory over the trading days would be inappropriate.

[9] For transactions at a price outside the quoted spread, the dependent variable would be negative because the effective spread is larger than the quoted spread. In fact, some transactions (approximately 0.9%) occur at prices outside the spread. Most of these transactions, however, were the second (or a subsequent) transaction in a sequence of transactions *without* an intermediate quote publication. Since, as outlined in section 3, the quotes are deleted automatically after the first of the series of transactions, the subsequent transactions take, strictly speaking, place when there is no valid quoted spread. Therefore, the degree of price improvement is not defined. In the light of this we decided to exclude transactions at prices outside the last quoted spread from the analysis.

[10] Petersen / Fialkowski (1994), facing a similar problem, consider estimating a (multinomial) logit model because, in their data set, 97% of the observations for the dependent variable are 0, one eighth or two eighths. The variation in our data set is much greater because the minimum tick size is much lower. It amounts to DM 0.01 [0.05] for stocks trading at prices up to [above] DM 100.

[11] It is much less clear whether the dependent variable should also be treated as being right-censored at 1. Treating it as right-censored implicitly assumes that the unobservable equilibrium spread is occasionally negative. To account for this ambiguity we also estimated a version of the model that treats the price improvement variable as being left-censored at zero and right-censored at 1. The results were very similar. We therefore restrict the presentation to the left-censored model.

price improvement. A Likelihood Ratio Test rejects the null hypothesis of no explanatory power for all 40 stocks. The average McFadden-R^2 is 0.164.

Consistent with the results shown in Tables 1 and 2 and those reported by Petersen / Fialkowski (1994) and Ross / Shapiro / Smith (1996) for the NYSE, the degree of price improvement decreases with transaction volume. The volume coeffcient is negative for all 40 stocks and is significantly different from zero for 39. The relation between volume and price improvement appears to be nonlinear. In all but one case the coefficient on squared volume is positive, implying a concave relation between trade size and price improvement.[12]

Inventory does not seem to matter. The number of positive and negative coefficients are approximately equal and most coefficients are not significantly different from zero. There are three possible explanations for this finding. First, models of inventory management predict that the risk associated with the actual inventory is reflected in the quoted bid and ask prices. In this case, one would not expect inventory considerations to influence the degree of price improvement once the transaction size is taken into account. Second, it has been found that the impact of inventory management on the spread is weak at the transaction level (Hasbrouck / Sofianos 1993, Manaster / Mann 1996). Third, the results may simply indicate that the inventory variable is not an accurate proxy for the Makler's inventory. Given that the construction of the variable relies on the accuracy of the Lee / Ready (1991) algorithm and assumes that Makler participation is roughly constant across transactions, we cannot rule out this possibility.

---

[12]   The positive coefficient on squared volume does not, in general, cause the total effect of volume on the degree of price improvement to become positive. The „break-even volume" (the transaction size at which the negative linear and the positive quadratic effect cancel out) is, in all but one case, at least six times the average transaction size for the stock in question. Note, however, that the marginal effects reported in Table 3 measure the effect of a change in an independent variable on the degree of price improvement at the mean of the independent variables.

Similar to Petersen / Fialkowski (1994) and Ross / Shapiro / Smith (1996) we find that the degree of price improvement is positively related to the size of the spread for all 40 stocks. This is consistent with an adverse selection interpretation of the spread. When facing higher adverse selection risk, the Makler widens his spread. If he subsequently trades with a counterparty known to be uninformed, there is a higher potential for price improvement then in periods with smaller spreads. A related interpretation that takes the role of public limit orders into account can also be given.[13] The Makler's quote may represent limit orders in the book rather than his own willingness to trade. In this case, the adverse selection risk is passed on to the limit order traders. This is likely to happen when adverse selection risk, and consequently the spread, is high. Although the quotes represent limit orders in the book, the Makler may nevertheless participate in a trade. In this case, however, he has to improve on the price of the limit order in the book. Therefore, a strategy of partially withdrawing from the market and picking potentially profitable trades is also consistent with a positive relation between spreads and price improvement. The coefficient on the volatility proxy – the absolute midquote change since the last transaction – is negative in 32 cases and significant in 13. This implies that the degree of price improvement is negatively related to volatility once the size of the spread is taken into account.

Finally, the coefficient for the dummy variable indicating continuations is positive for the majority of the stocks. This is somewhat surprising because a sequence of transactions on the same side of the market is more likely when informed traders are present. It may, however, be the case that other variables, particularly the spread and the absolute quote change, already capture this effect.

---

[13] For a detailed analysis that relates NYSE specialist actions to the state of the limit order book, see Harris / Panchapagesan 1999.

Taken together, the results of the Tobit analysis provide support for an adverse selection-related interpretation of the price improvement. Evidence in favor of an inventory-related explanation is much weaker. We therefore interpret the results as supporting our basic argument that price improvement is related to the „management" of adverse selection risk in a non-anonymous environment.

4.2 Price improvement and market maker profits

Our hypothesis 1 states that price improvement reflects lower adverse selection costs. Therefore, the Makler's profits should be unaffected by the degree of price improvement. This hypothesis is testable. We estimate the Makler's profit for each transaction and relate the profit to the degree of price improvement granted.

We use the realized spread as our measure of the Makler's profits. The following procedure was used. First, transactions were classified as being buyer-initiated or seller-initiated following the method proposed by LEE / READY (1991). Each transaction was then matched with a subsequent transaction at the opposite side of the market, i.e., each buyer-initiated transaction was matched with a subsequent seller-initiated transaction and vice versa. The realized spread is then calculated as

$$s^R = \frac{p_t^a - p_{t+1}^b}{p_t^a}$$

if the initial transaction was at the ask and

$$s^R = \frac{p_{t+1}^a - p_t^b}{p_t^b}$$

if the initial transaction was at the bid. The „subsequent" transaction was taken to be the next transaction at the opposite side of the market (version 1) and the next transaction at the oppo-

16

site side of the market after at least five minutes (version 2).[14] Since the results are virtually identical we restrict the presentation to version 1.

We next categorize transactions according to the degree of price improvement. We differentiate between transactions at the quoted price, transactions at a price inside the quoted spread (excluding transactions at the midquote) and transactions at the midquote. Table 4 shows the current spread (defined as the quoted spread in the moment the transaction is initiated), the effective spread, the realized spread and the modified adverse selection component (to be defined below) for each of the three price improvement categories.

Insert Table 4 here

The current spread is higher for transactions at prices within the spread or at the spread midpoint than for transactions at a price equal to the bid or ask quotes.[15] The differences are significantly different from zero. This is consistent with the results of the Tobit model discussed in the previous section.

The effective spread is necessarily equal to the current spread if only transactions at the quoted prices are considered. Price improvement reduces the effective spread, the amount of the reduction being, on average, 57% of the quoted spread.[16] If only transactions at prices equal to the midquote are considered, the effective spread is zero by definition.

The realized spread averages 0.018%. The realized spreads for the three price improvement categories are 0.007% for transactions at the quotes, 0.056% for transactions at prices within the quotes and 0.012% for transactions at the midquote. The weighted average of the latter

---

[14] The results of HUANG / STOLL (1996), HARRIS / SCHULTZ (1998) and Lightfood / Martin / Peterson / Sirri (1999) suggest that no systematic price movements are to be expected after 5 minutes.

[15] It appears that the higher spread at least partially translates into Makler profits. As documented in the Table and discussed below, realized spreads on transactions where price improvement was granted are higher than the average realized spread.

two categories is 0.035%. The realized spread on transactions where price improvement is granted is thus *larger,* rather than smaller, than the realized spread on transactions without price improvement. This supports the hypothesis that granting price improvement does not reduce the Makler's profits.

The results are inconsistent with the predictions of the model of Rhodes-Kropf (1998). According to this model, the degree of price improvement reflects the bargaining power of the counterparty and should, therefore, be negatively related to the Makler's profits.[17]

Generally, a measure of the adverse selection component of the spread can be obtained by subtracting the realized spread from the effective spread (e.g. Huang / Stoll 1996).[18] This implicitly assumes that the Makler expects the same effective half-spread in the transaction in which he closes out his position than in the initial transaction. Put differently, he expects the same degree of price improvement in both transactions. This assumption is justified if one is only interested in an estimate of the average adverse selection component. When estimating the adverse selection component for different degrees of price improvement in the initial transaction, however, the procedure clearly results in biased estimates. To eliminate the bias we estimate the adverse selection component for the price improvement category i as

$$s_{a,i} = \left(0.5 s_{e,i} + 0.5 \bar{s}_e\right) - s_{r,i}$$

where $s_{e,i}$ denotes the average effective spread for price improvement category i. $\bar{s}_e$ is the average (over all price improvement categories) effective spread and $s_{r,i}$ is the average realized

---

[16] This figure is different from the corresponding figure in Table 2 because here the percentage price improvement is measured *conditional on price improvement being granted.*

[17] In fact, some of our results are consistent with market power on the side of the Makler. We documented that he earns a higher realized spread on transactions at prices within the spread. The adverse selection cost associated with these trades is smaller than it is for transactions at the quoted prices. It appears that only a fraction of this reduction is passed on to the traders, resulting in higher realized spreads for the Makler.

[18] If inventory management reduces the realized spread, these inventory holding costs would also be reflected in the estimate of the adverse selection component. However, as mentioned previously, empirical evidence for inventory management is hardly found in transaction-level data.

spread for category *i*. This definition of the adverse selection component assumes that the Makler expects an effective half spread in the offsetting transaction that is equal to the average effective half-spread or, put differently, he expects to close his position in a transaction where he grants the average degree of price improvement.

As hypothesized, the price improvement is reflected in the adverse selection component rather than in the realized spread. The modified adverse selection component is 0.155% on average. However, for transactions at a price equal to the bid or ask quotes, the adverse selection component is larger, amounting to 0.20%. It drops to 0.103% for transactions at prices within the quotes and to 0.075% for transactions at the midquote. This is consistent with our hypothesis that price improvement reflects lower adverse selection costs rather than lower market maker profits.

In Table 5 we report realized spreads for each price improvement category separately for small and large transactions (as defined previously) and for quartiles of stocks sorted by trading volume. Generally, realized spreads on large transactions are lower than realized spreads on small transactions. Most importantly, the result that realized spreads on transactions where price improvement was granted is not smaller than the realized spread on transactions occurring at the quoted prices continues to hold in most cases. An exception are small transactions at the midquote in liquid stocks.

Insert Table 5 here

The results presented thus far have been descriptive in nature. They do not rule out the possibility that a relation between price improvement and realized spreads is masked by the influence of other variables. We therefore regress the realized spread s_t^r on the degree of price improvement $Impr_t$ (measured as a percentage of the quoted spread) and include control variables that may also have impact on the realized spread. The results documented in Table 5

suggest that the transaction volume should be included as a control variable. We further include the inventory (as defined previously), the absolute midquote change since the last transaction as a measure of short-term price volatility, the magnitude of the quoted spread and a dummy variable which takes on the value 1 when the transaction is a continuation. We allow for non-linearity of the relation between the realized spread and both trade size and inventory by including quadratic terms on the right-hand side. The resulting model is

$$s_t^r = \gamma_0 + \gamma_i Impr_t + \gamma_2 q_t + \gamma_3 q_t^2 + \gamma_4 I_t + \gamma_5 sign(I_t) I_t^2 + \gamma_6 |mq_t - mq_{t-1}| + \gamma_7 s_t^q + \gamma_8 D_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (2)$$

Insert Table 6 here

We estimated this model separately for each stock. Results are presented in Table 6. A F test rejects the null hypothesis of no explanatory power for 37 of the 40 stocks at the 5% level. The independent variables thus do have explanatory power, although the average R^2 is only 0.07. Consistent with our previous results, the degree of price improvement does not appear to be systematically related to the realized spread. 21 coefficients are positive, 19 are negative. Although the number of significantly negative coefficient estimates is higher than the number of significantly positive estimates, a cross-sectional t-test does not reject the null hypothesis of a zero mean (t-value 0.72). Conforming the results in Table 5, the realized spread is negatively related to the transaction volume. The coefficients on the square of volume indicate that this relation is non-linear. The inventory is positively related to the realized spread and, again, the relation appears to be non-linear. Given the signing convention for the inventory variable, realized spreads tend to be higher on transactions that reduce the Makler's inventory. Though perplexing at first sight, this finding is consistent with the results reported by Manaster / Mann (1996). A possible explanation is that the Makler voluntarily acquires an inventory position. This behavior would be consistent with the results Madhavan / Smidt (1993) report for NYSE specialists.

Also consistent with our earlier results, the realized spread is positively related to the magnitude of the quoted spread. Increases in quoted spreads are, therefore, not entirely driven by adverse selection costs but may also contain a component related to the Makler's market power. The remaining control variables – the volatility measure and the dummy variable for continuations – are unrelated to the realized spread.

Taken together, both the descriptive results and the regression results lend strong support to the hypothesis that price improvement is related to the adverse selection costs rather than to the profits earned by the Makler. The non-anonymity of the environment allows the Makler to assess the probability of a trade initiated by a specific counterparty to be motivated by private information and to adjust the terms of trade accordingly.

It should be noted, however, that the analysis relies on the Lee / Ready (1991) algorithm to classify transactions as being buyer-initiated or seller-initiated. The validity of the results, therefore, depends on the accuracy of the Lee / Ready algorithm. Recent empirical research (e.g. Ellis / Michaely / O'Hara 1999, Odders-White 1999) suggests that the algorithm classifies 80 – 85% of the transactions correctly. Although far from 100%, these figures allow the conclusion that the results presented in this paper are not an artefact of inaccurate trade classification.

4.3 Price improvement and quote adjustment

Our second hypothesis states that the Makler's quote adjustment will be larger after a transaction at the quoted price than after a transaction at a price inside the spread because transactions at a price equal to the bid or ask quotes are more likely to be initiated by informed traders.

We test this hypothesis by comparing the last midquote published prior to the transaction to a subsequent midquote for the three price improvement categories introduced in the preceding section. The changes in midquotes are signed such that upward revisions after buyer-initiated transactions and downward revisions after seller-initiated transactions have a positive sign. This signing convention is consistent with the quote adjustment being related to adverse selection.

We calculated two versions of the quote adjustment measure. The first version relates the midquote immediately prior to the transaction to the next midquote after the transaction. Since quotes are deleted automatically from the system after each transaction and have to be re-entered manually, these new quotes should capture the conjectured price impact of the preceding transaction. To check the robustness of the results we also calculated a second version of the measure. It relates the initial midquote to the next midquote published at least five minutes after the transaction.

The results are shown in Table 7. The table reports the cross-sectional averages (weighted by the number of transactions) of the mean and median quote adjustment for each stock. Separate figures are given for small and large transactions and for quartiles of stocks sorted by trading volume. Panel A [B] reports the results obtained when using the first [second] version of the quote adjustment measure.

Insert Table 7 here

In each single case the quote adjustment after a transaction at the quoted price is larger than the adjustment after a transaction at a price within the quoted spread or at the midquote. Transactions at the quoted prices have a significant price impact, amounting to DM 0.48 on average. In most cases, the quote adjustment is more pronounced after larger transactions.

This is what one would expect given that informed traders prefer larger trade sizes and that the quote adjustment may also be related to inventory considerations.

The quote adjustment after transactions where price improvement was granted is much lower. The average quote adjustment is DM 0.09 for transactions at prices within the quotes and -0.02 for transactions at prices equal to the current midquote.[19] T-tests for individual stocks (results not shown) reveal that the differences between the quote adjustment after transactions at the quotes on the one hand and after transactions within the quotes and at the midquote on the other hand are highly significant.

Panel B shows the results obtained when using the second version of the quote adjustment measure, i.e., when measuring the quote adjustment between the time of the transaction and the next quote published after at least five minutes. This version of the measure yields very similar conclusions.

To check the robustness of the descriptive results we also regressed the quote adjustment on the degree of price improvement and a set of control variables. The dependent variable, $Ind_t \left(mq_{t+1} - mq_t \right)$ is the difference between the next midquote after the transaction and the midquote immediately prior to the transaction, multiplied by the trade indicator variable to conform to the signing convention outlined above. The control variables are the same as in equation (2). The model thus is

---

[19] The negative quote adjustment after transactions at the midquote is contrary to what one would expect. We therefore checked the results for the individual stocks. We found that the quote adjustment is negative for almost all stocks and significantly so for approximately half of the stocks. One possible explanation is inaccurate trade classification. The Lee / Ready (1991) method has been found to be rather unreliable for transactions at the midquote (see Ellis / Michaely / O'Hara 1999, Odders-White 1999). To check the robustness of our results we performed the following exercise. We calculated the average *absolute* quote adjustment after transactions at the midquote. This method clearly results in an upward bias of the estimated quote change. We find, however, that even this upward-biased measure, though (by definition) positive, is smaller than the quote adjustment after transactions at the quotes shown in Table 7. This is true for the average over all stocks and for each of the quartiles. We performed the same robustness check for the quote change after transactions at prices within the spread. Again, the conclusions remain unchanged.

$$Ind_t \left(mq_{t+1} - mq_t \right) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_i Impr_t + \gamma_2 q_t + \gamma_3 q_t^2 + \gamma_4 I_t + \gamma_5 sign\left(I_t \right) I_t^2$$
$$+ \gamma_6 \left| mq_t - mq_{t-1} \right| + \gamma_7 s_t^q + \gamma_8 D_t + \varepsilon_t \qquad (3)$$

We estimated equation (3) for each stock separately. The results are presented in Table 8. The independent variables explain a significant part of the quote adjustment as evidenced by an average R^2 of 0.33. The coefficient on the degree of price improvement has the predicted negative sign and is significantly different from zero at the 5% level for all 40 stocks. Consistent with the results in Table 7, the quote adjustment is larger after larger transactions. The relation between transaction volume and quote adjustment is, again, non-linear. [20] Inventory considerations to not appear to affect the quote setting behavior. This is consistent with findings by others (e.g. Hasbrouck / Sofianos 1993, Manaster / Mann 1996) that inventory effects are usually not found in transactions data. There is some evidence that the quote adjustment is positively related to the previous absolute quote change that serves as a proxy for volatility. Further, the quote change is strongly positively related to the size of the spread. This is consistent with the notion that transactions that occur when the spread is high convey more information.

Insert Table 8 here

The regression results are thus consistent with the hypothesis that the non-anonymous environment allows the Makler to identify informationless trades. These trades tend to be executed at prices inside the prevailing spread and, due to their informationless nature, do not trigger a quote revision.

---

[20] This is consistent with the results reported by Kempf / Korn (1999). In a slightly different context, they (1999) show, using data on the DAX futures contract, that the midquote change subsequent to a transaction is a nonlinear function of the transaction size.

5 Discussion

The present paper analyses price formation and liquidity in a non-anonymous environment as it can be found on the floor of the NYSE or the Frankfurt Stock Exchange. Our main hypothesis is that the non-anonymity allows the Makler to assess the probability that a given counterparty trades on the basis of private information. The Makler uses this knowledge to price discriminate. This is achieved by quoting a large spread and granting price improvement to traders deemed uninformed.

The conjectured behavior yields predictions about the relation between price improvement and market maker profits and the relation between price improvement and quote adjustment. We use data from the Frankfurt Stock Exchange to test these hypotheses empirically. Our results lend strong support to both hypotheses. Granting price improvement does not reduce the Makler's profits as measured by the realized spread. Rather, the degree of price improvement is negatively related to the adverse selection component of the spread. This is consistent with the hypothesis that price improvement is granted to those traders that are less likely to trade on the basis of private information. We further document that the quote adjustment is significantly larger after transactions at the quoted price than after transactions at a price inside the spread or after transactions at the midquote. Taken together, our results support the hypothesis that the Makler makes use of the information conveyed by trader identities. The empirical findings suggest that this is associated with lower adverse selection costs.

The results presented in this paper have important implications for the design of trading systems. Anonymity, albeit preferred by many institutional investors, is not obtained without cost. The advantages of a non-anonymous trading system are likely to be more pronounced the more severe the adverse selection problem for the stock in question is. This suggests that less liquid stocks, because of their higher adverse selection costs, should be traded in a non-

anonymous environment. This view is supported by the experience in Germany. Here, non-anonymous floor trading and anonymous electronic trading for the same stocks co-exist. The floor has retained a large market share in less liquid stocks whereas the electronic trading system is the dominant market for blue chips. Consistent with the results of this paper, it has been found that the adverse selection component of the spread is larger in the electronic trading system (Theissen 1999).

The results of this paper suggest directions for future research. First, it will be interesting to see whether the results obtained for the Frankfurt Stock Exchange extend to other markets, e.g. the NYSE. Second, the results of the present paper predict that adverse selection costs for orders executed in NASDAQ's anonymous SOES system are higher than those for orders executed in the regular NASDAQ dealer market. This is also an issue that can be addressed empirically.

References

Admati, Anat R. / Pfleiderer, Paul (1991): Sunshine Trading and Financial Market Equilibrium. Review of Financial Studies 4, 443-481.

Benveniste, L. / Marcus, A. / Wilhelm, W. (1992): What's special about the specialist? In: Journal of Financial Economics 32, 61-86.

Brock, William A. / Kleidon, Allan W. (1992): Periodic Market Closure and Trading Volume. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control 16, S. 451-489.

Chan, Yuk-Shee / Weinstein, Mark (1993): Reputation, Bid-Ask Spread and Market Structure. Financial Analysts Journal, July/August, 57-62.

Chung, Kee H. / Van Ness, Bonnie F. / Van Ness, Robert A. (1999): Limit Orders and the Bid-Ask Spread. Journal of Financial Economics 53 (1999), 255-287.

de Jong, Frank / Nijman, Theo / Röell, Ailsa (1996): Price Effects of Trading and Components of the Bid-Ask Spread on the Paris Bourse. Journal of Empirical Finance 3, 193-213.

Economides, Nicholas / Schwartz, Robert A. (1995): Equity Trading Practices and Market Structure: Assessing Asset Managers' Demand for Immediacy. New York University Stern School of Business Working Paper EC-95-08, New York, August.

Easley, David / O'Hara, Maureen (1987): Price, Trade Size, and Information in Securities Markets. Journal of Financial Economics 19, S. 69-90.

Ellis, Katrina / Michaely, Roni / O'Hara, Maureen (1999): The Accuracy of Trade Classification Rules: Evidence from NASDAQ. Working Paper, Cornell University, December.

Fishman, Michael J. / Longstaff, Francis A. (1992): Dual Trading in Futures Markets. Journal of Finance 47, 673-694.

Forster, Margaret M. / George, Thomas J. (1992): Anonymity in Securities Markets. Journal of Financial Intermediation 2, 168-206.

Freihube, Thorsten / Kehr, Carl-Heinrich / Krahnen, Jan P. / Theissen, Erik (1999): Was leisten die Kursmakler? Eine empirische Untersuchung am Beispiel der Frankfurter Wertpapierbörse. Kredit und Kapital, forthcoming.

Garfinkel, J. / Nimalendram, M. (1998): Market Structure and Trader Anonymity: An Analysis of Insider Trading. Working Paper, Loyola University of Chicago and University of Florida, September.

Glosten, Lawrence R. (1989): Insider Trading, Liquidity, and the Role of the Monopolist Specialist. Journal of Business 62, 211-235.

Harris, Jeffrey H. / Schultz, Paul H. (1997): The Importance of Firm Quotes and Rapid Executions: Evidence from the January 1994 SOES Rule Change. Journal of Financial Economics 45, 135-166.

Harris, Jeffrey H. / Schultz, Paul H. (1998): The Trading Profits of SOES Bandits. Journal of Financial Economics 50, 39-62.

Harris, Lawrence E. / Panchapagesan, Venkatesh (1999): The Information-Content of the Limit-Order Book: Evidence from NYSE Specialist Actions. Working Paper, University of Southern California and Washington University, October.

Hasbrouck, Joel / Sofianos, George (1993): The Trades of Market Makers: An Empirical Analysis of NYSE Specialists. Journal of Finance 48, 1565-1593.

Heidle, Hans G. / Huang, Roger D. (1999): Information-Based Trading in Dealer and Auction Markets: An Analysis of Exchange Listings. Working Paper, Vanderbilt University, December.

Huang, Roger D. / Stoll, Hans R. (1996): Dealer versus Auction Markets: A Paired Comparison of Execution Costs on NASDAQ and the NYSE. Journal of Financial Economics 41, 313-357.

Kempf, Alexander / Korn, Olaf (1999): Market Depth and Order Size. Journal of Financial Markets 2, S. 29-48.

Lee, Charles M. / Ready, Mark A. (1991): Inferring Trade Direction from Intraday Data. Journal of Finance 46, 733-746.

Lightfood, Lois E. / Martin, Peter G. / Peterson, Mark A. / Sirri, Erik R. (1999): Order Preferencing and Market Quality on United States Equity Exchanges. Working Paper, Securities and Exchange Commission, February.

Madhavan, Ananth (1996): Security Prices and Market Transparency. Journal of Financial Intermediation 5, 255-283.

Madhavan, Ananth / Cheng, Minder (1997): In Search of Liquidity: Block Trades in the Upstairs and Downstairs Market. Review of Financial Studies 10, 175-203.

Madhavan, Ananth / Smidt, Seymour (1993): An Analysis of Daily Changes in Specialist Inventories and Quotations. Journal of Finance 48, 1595-1628.

Madhavan, Ananth / Sofianos, George (1998). An Empirical Analysis of NYSE Specialist Trading. Journal of Financial Economics 48, 189-210.

Manaster, Steven / Mann, Steven C. (1999): Life in the Pits: Competitive Market Making and Inventory Control. Review of Financial Studies 9, 953-975.

Odders-White, Elizabeth (1999): On the Occurrence and Consequences of Inaccurate Trade Classification. Working Paper, University of Wisconsin-Madison, May.

Petersen, Mitchell / Fialkowski, David (1994): Posted versus Effective Spreads: Good Prices or Bad Quotes? Journal of Financial Economics 35, 269-292.

Rhodes-Kropf, Matthew (1998): Price Improvement in Dealership Markets. Working Paper, Columbia University, October.

Röell, Ailsa (1990): Dual-Capacity Trading and the Quality of the Market. Journal of Financial Intermediation 1, 105-124.

Ross, Katharine D. / Shapiro, Lames E. / Smith, Katherine A. (1996) Price Improvement of SuperDot Market Orders on the NYSE. NYSE Working Paper 96-02, March.

Schwartz, Robert A. / Steil, Benn (1996): Equity Trading III: Institutional Investor Trading Practices and Preferences. in. Steil, Benn et al.: The European Equity Markets. London.

Seppi, Duane J. (1990): Equilibrium Block Trading and Asymmetric Information. Journal of Finance 45, 73-94.

Theissen, Erik (1999). Floor versus Screen Trading: Evidence from the German Stock Market. Working Paper, University of Frankfurt and Groupe HEC, November.

Table 1: Frequency of price improvement in percent

	Frequency of price improvement (%)		Transactions at the midquote (%)	
	small transactions	large transactions	small transactions	large transactions
all stocks	56.80	25.95	26.98	13.16
largest quartile	53.95	25.79	28.31	13.81
2nd	64.27	28.00	27.62	13.76
3rd	53.98	23.99	24.55	11.82
smallest quartile	52.59	21.81	19.37	8.19

The table shows the frequency of transactions occurring at prices inside the quoted spread (columns 2 and 3) and of transactions occurring at a price equal to the midquote (columns 4 and 5). Separate figures are given for small and large transactions. A small [large] transaction is defined as a transaction of a size up to [equal to or larger than] the median transaction size of the stock in question. The last four lines report results for quartiles of stocks sorted by total trading volume.

Table 2: Price improvement as a percentage of the quoted spread

	small transactions	large transactions
all stocks	43.94	20.44
largest quartile	43.10	20.73
2nd	47.40	21.51
3rd	41.75	18.65
smallest quartile	39.05	16.50

The figures in the table report the price improvement as a percentage of the quoted spread in effect immediately prior to the transaction. The figures are *not* conditioned on price improvement being granted. Results are reported for small and large transactions separately. A small [large] transaction is defined as a transaction of a size up to [equal to or larger than] the median transaction size of the stock in question. The last four lines report results for quartiles of stocks sorted by total trading volume in the sample period.

Table 3: Determinants of price improvement

	constant	q_t	q_t^2	I_t	$sign(I_t)I_t^2$	$\|mq_t - mq_{t-1}\|$	s_t^q	D_t
largest	-0.0688	-8.29E-5	9.33E-9	-4.77E-7	2.74E-11	-0.2278	0.5989	0.0913
2nd	0.0390	-3.86E-4	1.97E-7	1.87E-6	2.17E-10	-0.1331	0.3975	0.0528
3rd	-0.01856	-2.98E-4	6.23E-8	3.77E-6	-9.55E-10	-0.0831	0.3982	0.0292
smallest	0.0040	-1.99E-4	7.95E-8	6.19E-6	-2.05E-9	-0.0718	0.1478	0.0151
all	-0.0111	-2.41E-4	8.70E-8	2.84E-6	-6.91E-10	-0.1290	0.3856	0.0471
# pos.	17	0	39	18	18	8	40	33
sign. 5%	10	0	36	2	2	1	39	18
# neg.	23	40	1	22	22	32	0	7
sign. 5%	13	39	0	4	1	13	0	1

The table presents the results of the Tobit model

$$\frac{\left(s_t^q - s_t^e\right)}{s_t^q} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 q_t + \gamma_2 q_t^2 + \gamma_3 I_t + \gamma_4 sign\left(I_t\right) I_t^2 + \gamma_5 \left|mq_t - mq_{t-1}\right| + \gamma_6 s_t^q + \gamma_7 D_t + \varepsilon_t .$$

where t is a (transaction) time index, s_t^q and s_t^e are the quoted and the effective spread, respectively, q_t is the transaction size, measured as the number of shares traded, I_t is the inventory, signed such that it carries a positive sign when the transaction in question reduces the inventory and a negative sign otherwise, mq_t is the mid-quote in effect immediately prior to transaction t and D_t is a dummy variable taking on the value one whenever transaction t is a continuation, i.e., occurs on the same side of the market as the preceding transaction. The model was estimated for each stock separately as a Tobit model with left-censoring at zero. The upper part of the Table reports mean values of the estimated marginal effects (defined as the estimated coefficient multiplied by the fraction of uncensored observations) for all stocks and for quartiles of stocks sorted by total trading volume. The lower part reports the number of positive and negative coefficients.

Table 4: Price improvement and the components of the spread

	all transactions n = 67485	at quotes n = 40174	within quotes n = 14093	at midquote n = 13272
quoted spread (%) („current")	0.263	0.240	0.337	0.256
effective spread (%)	0.173	0.240	0.145	0
realized spread (%)	0.018	0.007	0.056	0.012
modified adverse selection component	0.155	0.200	0.103	0.075

The table reports various spread measures for all transactions and for subsets of transactions that differ with respect to the degree of price improvement granted. The spread measures are the quoted spread in effect immediately prior to the transaction, the effective spread, the realized spread and the modified adverse selection component. The realized spread was obtained by relating each transaction price to the price of the next transaction at the opposite side of the market. The modified adverse selection component is defined in the text.

Table 5: Price improvement and realized spread: breakdown by trade size and stock liquidity

	at quotes		within quotes		at midquote	
	small trans-actions	large trans-actions	small trans-actions	large trans-actions	small trans-actions	large trans-actions
all stocks	0.045	-0.013	0.061	0.045	0.013	0.010
largest	0.044	-0.002	0.041	0.029	0.010	0.009
2	0.073	-0.010	0.080	0.059	0.012	0.009
3	0.002	-0.041	0.068	0.053	0.012	0.001
smallest	0.049	-0.069	0.080	0.091	0.063	0.077

The table reports the realized spread (obtained by relating each transaction price to the price of the next transaction at the opposite side of the market) for all transactions and for subsets of transactions that differ with respect to the degree of price improvement granted. Results are reported for small and large transactions separately. A small [large] transaction is defined as a transaction of a size up to [equal to or larger than] the median transaction size of the stock in question. The last four lines report results for quartiles of stocks sorted by total trading volume in the sample period.

Table 6: Price improvement and realized spread: regression results

	const.	*impr.*	q_t	q_t^2	I_t	$sign(I_t)I_t^2$	$\lvert mq_t - mq_{t-1} \rvert$	s_t^q	D_t
largest	0.011	-0.005	-1.51E-5	2.82E-9	4.77E-7	-3.68E-11	-0.030	0.198	-0.007
2nd	0.007	-0.027	-4.78E-5	3.40E-8	4.52E-6	-5.38E-10	-0.030	0.209	-0.007
3rd	-0.056	0.038	-4.77E-5	1.67E-9	-2.12E-6	2.03E-9	0.021	0.201	-0.016
smallest	-0.009	0.042	-1.24E-4	1.09E-7	8.37E-6	-9.49E-10	-0.018	0.160	0.008
all	-0.012	0.012	-5.86E-5	3.68E-8	2.81E-6	1.26E-10	-0.014	0.192	-0.006
# pos.	18	21	8	29	31	11	18	35	17
sign. 5%	5	5	0	14	8	0	3	27	1
# neg.	22	19	32	11	9	29	22	5	23
sign. 5%	7	10	19	0	0	9	3	0	2

The table presents the results of the regression model

$$s_t^r = \gamma_0 + \gamma_i Impr_t + \gamma_2 q_t + \gamma_3 q_t^2 + \gamma_4 I_t + \gamma_5 sign(I_t)I_t^2 + \gamma_6 \lvert mq_t - mq_{t-1} \rvert + \gamma_7 s_t^q + \gamma_8 D_t + \varepsilon_t.$$

where t is a (transaction) time index, $Impr_t$ is the price improvement, measured as a percentage of the quoted spread, s_t^r is the realized spread, q_t is the transaction size, measured as the number of shares traded, I_t is the inventory, signed such that it carries a positive sign when the transaction in question reduces the inventory and a negative sign otherwise, mq_t is the midquote in effect immediately prior to transaction t, s_t^q is the quoted spread and D_t is a dummy variable taking on the value one whenever transaction t is a continuation, i.e., occurs on the same side of the market as the preceding transaction. The model was estimated for each stock separately. The upper part of the Table reports mean values of the estimated coefficients for all stocks and for quartiles of stocks sorted by total trading volume. The lower part reports the number of positive and negative coefficients. Standard errors are based on the Newey-West covariance estimator.

Table 7: Price improvement and quote adjustment

Panel A: Next quotes published

		all	at quotes			within quotes			at midquote		
			small	large	all	small	large	all	small	large	all
all	mean	0,302	0,398	0,519	0,478	0,063	0,133	0,085	-0,011	-0,031	-0,018
	median	0,241	0,331	0,379	0,364	0,003	0,053	0,003	0	-0,010	0
largest	mean	0,109	0,113	0,199	0,168	0,028	0,065	0,040	-0,004	-0,005	-0,004
	median	0,081	0,096	0,185	0,171	0	0	0	0	0	0
second	mean	0,523	0,739	0,951	0,889	0,084	0,21	0,123	-0,010	-0,038	-0,021
	median	0,409	0,636	0,613	0,604	0	0,151	0	0	0	0
third	mean	0,436	0,642	0,685	0,669	0,105	0,165	0,123	-0,064	-0,049	-0,059
	median	0,360	0,549	0,518	0,510	0,018	0,024	0,020	0	0	0
smallest	mean	0,529	0,926	0,698	0,780	0,092	0,163	0,114	0,045	-0,323	-0,073
	median	0,492	0,652	0,518	0,562	0	0,001	0	0	-0,306	0

Panel B: Next quotes published after at least 5 minutes

		all	at quotes			within quotes			at midquote		
			small	large	all	small	large	all	small	large	all
all	mean	0,392	0,472	0,674	0,604	0,108	0,262	0,157	-0,035	0,003	-0,022
	median	0,272	0,380	0,488	0,455	0,048	0,149	0,063	-0,021	-0,004	0,000
largest	mean	0,141	0,133	0,263	0,215	0,012	0,100	0,042	0,003	0,022	0,009
	median	0,092	0,099	0,188	0,174	0,000	0,010	0	0	0	0
second	mean	0,683	0,918	1,232	1,137	0,187	0,453	0,269	-0,117	-0,053	-0,094
	median	0,442	0,748	0,844	0,794	0,128	0,330	0,148	-0,072	0,007	0
third	mean	0,579	0,720	0,918	0,847	0,127	0,458	0,227	-0,023	0,052	0,003
	median	0,472	0,608	0,738	0,677	-0,008	0,223	0,051	-0,002	-0,034	-0,002
smallest	mean	0,677	1,091	0,870	0,950	0,267	0,108	0,218	0,008	0,040	0,018
	median	0,519	0,860	0,688	0,789	0,060	0,105	0,071	0,015	-0,067	0,013

The figures in the table report the mean and median quote adjustment after a transaction. In Panel A [B] the adjustment is measured as the difference between the midquote immediately prior to the transaction and the next midquote published after the transaction [at least five minutes after the transaction]. It is signed such that an upward [downward] revision after a buyer- [seller-] initiated trade carries a positive sign. Separate figures are reported for transactions with differing degrees of price improvement, for small and large transactions, and for quartiles of stocks sorted by total trading volume.

Table 8: Price improvement and quote adjustment: regression results

	const.	*impr.*	q_t	q_t^2	I_t	$sign(I_t)I_t^2$	$\|mq_t - mq_{t-1}\|$	s_t^q	D_t
largest	0.006	-0.197	9.10E-5	-1.97E-8	-1.09E-6	1.60E-10	0.031	0.648	0.010
2nd	0.188	-1.64	0.003	-2.59E-6	-1.11E-4	3.04E-8	0.041	2.354	0.063
3rd	0.279	-0.925	2.07E-4	-1.29E-7	1.34E-5	-2.32E-10	0.040	0.984	0.002
smallest	0.427	-0.946	5.38E-5	2.93E-8	-2.95E-5	1.45E-8	0.043	0.419	-0.081
all	0.225	-0.927	7.23E-4	-6.76E-7	-3.20E-5	1.12E-8	0.039	1.10	-0.002
# pos.	34	0	35	9	22	20	32	40	18
sign. 5%	20	0	21	1	1	2	6	40	4
# neg.	6	40	5	31	18	20	8	0	22
sign. 5%	1	40	0	16	1	2	1	0	5

The table presents the results of the regression model

$$Ind_t\left(mq_{t+1} - mq_t\right) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_i Impr_t + \gamma_2 q_t + \gamma_3 q_t^2 + \gamma_4 I_t + \gamma_5 sign\left(I_t\right)I_t^2 + \gamma_6 \left|mq_t - mq_{t-1}\right| + \gamma_7 s_t^q + \gamma_8 D_t + \varepsilon_t.$$

where t is a (transaction) time index, Ind_t is the trade indicator variable (1 for a buyer-initiated transaction, -1 for a seller-initiated transaction), $Impr_t$ is the price improvement, measured as a percentage of the quoted spread, q_t is the transaction size, measured as the number of shares traded, I_t is the inventory, signed such that it carries a positive sign when the transaction in question reduces the inventory and a negative sign otherwise, mq_t is the midquote in effect immediately prior to transaction t, s_t^q is the quoted spread and D_t is a dummy variable taking on the value one whenever transaction t is a continuation, i.e., occurs on the same side of the market as the preceding transaction. The model was estimated for each stock separately. The upper part of the Table reports mean values of the estimated coefficients for all stocks and for quartiles of stocks sorted by total trading volume. The lower part reports the number of positive and negative coefficients. Standard errors are based on the Newey-West covariance estimator.