

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY AL URBANA-CHAMPAIGN STACKS Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2011 with funding from University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

http://www.archive.org/details/differentialchan426reil

•

Faculty Working Papers

DIFFERENTIAL CHANGES IN EXTERNAL MARKET LIQUIDITY

Frank K. Reilly and James A. Gentry

#426

College of Commerce and Business Administration University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign



FACULTY WORKING PAPERS

College of Commerce and Business Administration

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

1.00

August 20, 1977

DIFFERENTIAL CHANGES IN EXTERNAL MARKET LIQUIDITY

Frank K. Reilly and James A. Gentry

Å.

#426

۰.

ан ал

ABSTRACT

DIFFERENTIAL CHANGES IN EXTERNAL

MARKET LIQUIDITY

External market liquidity refers to the ability to buy or sell an asset quickly with little price change. Using a market liquidity measure developed by Amivest Corporation, there is an analysis of aggregate market liquidity during the period 1969-1975. Subsequently, using two samples of 24 larger firms and 24 smaller firms, there is a comparison of the levels of liquidity and a comparison of changes in liquidity for the two samples during this period.

1 11

an water a state of the second se

DIFFERENTIAL CHANGES IN EXTERNAL

MARKET LIQUIDITY*

Frank K. Reilly James A. Gentry**

INTRODUCTION

External market liquidity refers to the ability to buy or sell an asset quickly with <u>little price change</u> assuming no new information. This characteristic is important to all investors because the lack of it can increase the cost of an asset to the purchaser or decrease the revenue to the seller of an asset. This attribute has become important to portfolio managers of large institutions concerned with the ability to buy or sell blocks of stock [4, 6, 7]. Because institutional investors are the dominant force in the secondary market, market liquidity becomes important for the financial manager considering new external equity capital. If a company's stock does not enjoy a liquid secondary market, it is unlikely the company can sell a new primary issue. In addition, a poor secondary market can add to the risk of the stock and increase the firm's required rate of return on equity.

The purpose of this paper is threefold. The first is to discuss a measure of external market liquidity that can be used to examine changes in liquidity for the aggregate stock market and for individual stocks. The second purpose is to examine this liquidity measure for the aggregate market

*The authors acknowledge the assistance of Milan Saric and Paul Skelton. **The authors are Professors of Finance, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

- 招加市场的 24.2.40 mm + 2.2.500 增新

CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR

s Alignes and Hatter Alignes and Alignes

Wetter of another flowing of a strike at a set of the first of the off off of the strike of the s

(it is a gate of this equal to this equal to the set of the set

et a 你我说我的你说,我就能知道我们的你的?" 这一回了吗?我说是我们的你的我就是你帮你

oord (boo uuden antis' worken oordinan geno (humano) yaad (ayyoy**) a**y<mark>ah yan ay</mark>ii. yaa-Afaroota yaa

over time and demonstrate how external market liquidity has varied. Finally, there is an anlysis of market liquidity for two samples of individual firms. The samples include 24 larger firms from the top of the <u>Fortune</u> 1000 list and a sample of 24 smaller firms from the bottom of the <u>Fortune</u> 1000 list. The liquidity measure for the two different samples is examined over time in order to provide answers to two questions of concern to portfolio managers and corporate financial managers. First, is there a significant difference in the average level of market liquidity for large and small firms? The general consensus is that larger firms enjoy a higher level of market liquidity. If so, it should be of interest to know how much higher. The second question is concorned with changes in the level of market liquidity for the two samples during the period 1959-1975. Some observors have speculated that since 1959 there has been a <u>differential</u> change in market liquidity for large versus small firms because of the emergence of a tiered market.

AGGREGATE STCCK MARKET LIQUIDITY

A Liquidity Measure

As noted, market liquidity is the ability to buy or sell an asset quickly with little price change. Given this definition, the important attributes that require measurement are the *time* involved in a trade and the *price change*. Generally, information regarding the time required to complete a trade is not available. Fortunately, the time variable is probably not a crucial requirement because most trades not involving large "blocks" of stock (10,000 shares or more) are completed rapidly--in less than an hour, and in most instances in less than 15 minutes. Therefore, the time dimension is relatively constant. Hence the *price change* becomes

-2-

A set of the set of the

and the second se

A MARTER ALL
 A MAR

the variable of importance, but it is <u>not</u> simply price change. Not all trades are of equal size in terms of the number of shares involved and/or the value of the trade. Clearly one should relate the price change to the amount of trading. Such a measure has been developed by the Amivest Corporation, a New York research firm. The specific measure is derived daily for all stocks on the NYSE and the ASE and an unweighted average for all stocks is computed. The average of the daily values for a month is used as the monthly figure. The computation for each stock is as follows [2]:

Amivest \$ Index = Dollar Volume of Trading Percent Price Change Without Sign

This measure indicates the value of trading for every 1 percent price change. The larger the value of the index, the more trading that is possible without a major price change. Such a series for the aggregate market was not available prior to 1973 so it was necessary to derive a proxy. Such a proxy series was developed as part of another study for the period 1964-1975 [9]. The proxy series was computed monthly as:

Amivest \$ Index = $\frac{\text{Dollar Value of Trading on the NYSE}}{\text{Sum of Daily Percent Price Changes w/o Sign}}$

In addition, because some portfolio managers might conceive of liquidity in terms of how many *shares* can be traded, a share index was computed that indicates the number of shares traded per 1 percent change in price. It was computed as follows:

> Amivest Share Index = Total Reported Shares Traded on NYSE Sum of Daily Percent Price Changes w/o Sign

-3-

ess variable of importance, but is is <u>not</u> simply brice change. Not all trades are solved size in terms of the medier of shares involved and/or the value of the trade. Clearly, and adoutd reight the project change to the amount of tradifier. Such a messure has how developed by the Amivest Comparation, a second field from the specific reasons is derived doily for all stocks are the Yest and the only value for a reactive reasons is derived doily for all stocks the wret's of the only values for a reactive of the area of the amount of the wret's of the only values for a reactive to be the area of the active.

Anivert Inder - Argeney Peters Change of Frailing

This seasone indivites be value of reading for every i percent order which, the larger the value of the least the vert timble timb is possible wither a spor prove datage. Such a cost of the the appropriate market was not aveilable prior to 1973 so 10 was not ever to devise a prozet. Such a proxy so be an developed as and so mother and to the posited 1964-1875 [9]. The proxy series to second datage work, was

Actvort 1 Lidox - But of Dilly Friding on the MYME

In addition, became save tart offers organ of the contained that is in addition, became save tart offers of the addition of

delydat Share Lawky 7 Ers of Sale wingers Highes Trided on 1758

. . .

These measures can also be used to measure the liquidity for individual securities over time. In fact, this is the major use made of the liquidity measure by the originators [2]. In a subsequent section these liquidity measures are used to examine the level of liquidity and changes in liquidity for a sample of larger firms and a sample of smaller firms.

Aggregate Liquidity Over Time

Exhibits 1 and 2 contain a monthly time series plot of the two Amivest liquidity measures for the period January, 1969-December, 1975. Exhibit 1 contains the dollar index and indicates *significant variation over time* from a low of .19 (\$190,000) during the latter half of 1974, to a high of almost 2.5 (\$2,500,000) during the first half of 1972. Not only is there a wide range of values, but there was substantial variability over time on a month-to-month basis. The point is, the plot indicates that *external market liquidity for the total stock market is clearly not constant over time*. Based upon a casual analysis it appears that a major factor influencing market liquidity is the general market and also declined steadily during 1973-74 when stock prices fell by over 40 percent. In fact, the series hit its trough during 1974. In contrast, market liquidity reached its high point during the bull market of 1972, and increased from its low point during the rising market of 1975.

The results for the Amivest Share Index (Exhibit 2) are quite similar. In this case the range was from about .08 (80,000 shares) in 1970 and 1974, to a high of over .60 (600,000 shares) during 1972. This similarity in wide ranges is not surprising since the monthly values for the two liquidity

-4-

Suggeressands are also be as to assure the lique by for individual encomities over time. In fact, this is the saint we made of the Highlity measure by the orthinarchy is a subsequent souther these signifies, trasures are used to examine the treat of timestry and chances in liquidity. For a subset of intract times only a step of timestry former.

will work of blupts or search

Anibits 1 and 2 routhin a worsty tive series net of the teo Anivest tiquidity easures for the teriod 1 are the freedown to the condition contains vie dolter units the indire a weat and the starf of more fill. For the to the (Standard) during the structure half of 1074, to the the of all of 2,800 and an ing the struct (If of 10.2), our only is structure with a second there are about that antichilde on a time on a such a second there are about that antichilde on a time on a such a second the structure (the point is) and all the second beneford to the second to the structure of the test of the second of the second test of the structure of the test of the second of the second test of the second of the second of the second of the structure of the second of the second of the second test of the second of the second of the second of the second test of the second of the second of the second of the second test of the second of the second of the second of the second test of the second of the second of the second of the second test of the second test of the second of the s

The restrict for the state of the file (Exhibite Construction) and the file of a large state of an large of the large state of a sta

.



TIME SERIES PLOT OF MONTHLY AMIVEST DOLLAR LIQUIDITY INDEX FOR NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE

January, 1969 - December, 1975



· •

-5-

TTEL CONTRACTOR - Employ Meanwood





EXHIBIT 2

January, 1969 - December, 1975



-6-



,÷

TO REPORT BOARD TO BE AND THE AND NO THERE ADARD TO THE ADARD TO BE ADARD TO B

S PERIO

. 7.

series are correlated about .90.

In summary, these graphs indicate that aggregate market liquidity varies widely over time and is quite volatile on a month-to-month basis.

INDIVIDUAL STOCK LIQUIDITY

Measures for Individual Stocks

As noted, the Amivest measures can be derived for individual stocks for a period of time. Obviously the computations are much more extensive because total dollar trading and share trading is not available for individual stocks. Therefore it is necessary to determine daily percent price changes for each stock relative to the volume of trading for each day. The share volume is straightforward; the dollar volume was computed as the number of shares traded times the mean of the high and low price for the day. Amenticity figure is computed as follows:

Amivest Share Index =
$$\sum_{i=1}^{N}$$
Shares Traded Day i
Percent Price Change w/o SignNAmivest Dollar Index = $\sum_{i=1}^{N}$ Shares Traded x (Hi+Lo/2)
Percent Price Change w/o SignNwhere N = the number of trading days in the month.

Because of the extensive computations required for each stock, it is not feasible to derive the index for each stock for every month during the time period. Because we wanted to analyze these series for individual stocks over time, it was decided to compute the measure for a specified month each year. Specifically, it was decided to compute the measure during the month of May for each year 1969-1975. The choice of May was

Philippe of Construction on approximation

 Rechard A and characterization of the second transformation with a second dimension with a stability of the second se

MALE MALE ALTERNAL

rearrant indiate a storage

(a) access the extent measures and to the left individual starks into a moded of these therically who an antitic more extensive because teach roller traving and the individual activity is not and with the more traving and the individual is not and with the for individtion starks. Therefore it is need as a more individually present price and the starks is actually the set of the individual of the musshort assume is actually the relation of the individual the short assume is actually the relation of the start of the individset of charge is actually the relation of the individual is an and day. The set of charge is actually the relation of the individual is an actual individual and the relation is a set of the relation of the relation of the individual and the relation is a set of the relation.

and the first of the second second

and a state of the state of the

Addition of the set of the state of the set of the

arbitrary on the basis that stock prices should not be affected by year-end factors that occur during November to February or influenced by the "summer" rally factors.

An analysis of the liquidity indexes indicated that the liquidity values vary substantially among stocks, and also vary for individual stocks over time. One obvious reason for expecting the liquidity values for individual stocks to vary over time is that the aggregate market liquidity varies substantially. Therefore, it was decided to "normalize" the monthly liquidity value for individual stocks by the aggregate market value for that month. The result is a *relative* measure of liquidity over time as follows:

> Relative Amivest Dollar Index = <u>Co. Amivest Dollar Index (May)</u> Market Amivest Dollar Index (May)

As an example, the unadjusted dollar index for American Can during May, 1969, was \$958,497 and the comparable market index was \$1,706,557. Therefore, the *relative* dollar Amivest index for American Can was .562, indicating that American Can's dollar liquidity during May, 1969, was about 56 percent as large as the average stock on the NYSE. A comparable calculation with American Can's share index and the market share index shows a relative share value of .51 indicating that American Can's share liquidity was about one-half as large as the share liquidity for the average stock on the NYSE.

The relative liquidity measures for individual stocks are employed in the next section where there is a comparison of the market liquidity for a sample of larger firms to the liquidity for a sample of smaller firms.

-8-

 Fig t av should ge serve entry and ser entry and serve entry and

An usely as the liquid start tindicated for a specific value very sub- in standing start of the vary for start spectrum at the start of the vary for start spectrum at the start of the market of the spectrum at the spectrum at the spectrum of the spectrum at the spectrum

where we set Bo that the the the set of a first of the set of the

A construction of a media of a fee A construction of the SEC.
A construction of a construction of the A construction of the SEC.
A construction of a construction of the A construction.
A construction of the A construction of the A construction.

a de la compañía de l Ser la compañía de la Casa de la compañía d

-

LARGER FIRMS VERSUS SMALLER FIRMS

Sample Firms

The total sample was derived as part of a larger study that considered external <u>and</u> internal liquidity using quarterly financial statements. Therefore, the larger firm sample includes 24 firms that provided quarterly financial statements (balance sheet and income statements) for the seven years 1969-1975. The companies also had to be on Compustat and on the University of Chicago stock price tapes (CRSP tapes). Even with these constraints, the list includes the three largest industrial firms on the <u>Fortune</u> 1975 top 1000 industrial list (Exxon, General Motors, and Ford). There were only five companies that would not be in the top 100 (United Airlines was second on the transportation list but would have been about number 75 on the industrial list; Jewel Companies were 11th on the retailing list and would have been 80 on the industrial list). The smallest company in this sample was Amsted with a rank of 360. The sample of smaller firms was randomly selected from the 50 smallest firms on the <u>Fortune</u> 1000 list that likewise had data available on Compustat and CRSP.

Clearly the sample of larger firms is generally the largest available in our economy since they are near the top of the <u>Fortune</u> list. In contrast, the sample of "smaller" firms are <u>not</u> small in absolute terms since they are still part of the <u>Fortune</u> list, but are definitely smaller than the large group. As an example, the 1,000th company on the 1975 <u>Fortune</u> list was Seagrave. This company had sales of over \$91 million and assets of over \$57 million. In absolute terms this firm is not small, but it is small compared to Exxon (number 1 in 1975) that had sales of \$42 billion

-ğ-

Aspel - Har P

borebiance that there is a fine to be any appress of the state of the interpretation of the second of the second state of the second second second second second second second second en un l'elle ward data el fini el fili d'a server calle d'andre el part data, and l'andre and ' proved and generation rate on oper them prove any addressed attacked the left years 1969-1914 The company of the significant of any Constant and and search University of Chicogn Aleas whis Lagos (CRSP topps). For a shide these conarraints the itst includes for tools larger ladestand films on the "Jee" hmelgenotett terrorde incarab tert Life inderi 0001 got 2011 emitte" There were only "ive comparies then well in structure the top, 106 (Million 4.4.1.2.1 n en sinner and i blatter. Net motor Airian war second on the same workly A number 25 on the industrial state program and provide 1117 and the an ALC A CONTRACTOR text and would have been sto as " producing the second condition in the In this sumple was bracked of a grant of the discussion of an offer and a sumple was the discussion of the and independent of the second to character and independent one the consequent all of programs showing the straight of the straight of the line of the lin in an enginess they are near the trip of the services list, is a car stare the score of the second of the second of the second of the open of the second second second second second the are every for the former lift, and does we with a lift of the second state that rec i secretario da un esserio i obe 1.00011 company in tion 15. Perfitter its contraction while a shift of the bally had the Symmetry of the second the of association, the disclusion of the discussion of the three to be and the the second small opported to Exxon (1) ber J in 1975 opportand asles on a straight

and assets of \$31 billion. The point is, the smaller company sample is small compared to the larger firms, but still much larger than a number of other public firms which number close to 10,000. Therefore, they are smaller than the large firms, but larger than about 9,000 other firms.

Overall Individual Stock Results

An examination of the liquidity values for the two samples in Exhibits 3 and 4 indicates three relevant observations. First, the relative values vary widely between individual firms within a group (larger firms or smaller firms) even though the firms in a sample are quite comparable in terms of company size as shown in the <u>Fortune</u> list. As an example, during 1969 the relative dollar indexes for the large firm sample ranged from .07 for Amsted to 7.14 for Atlantic Richfield. If one ignores Amsted as being too small, the low value becomes .35 and the high to low ratio is over 20 times.

The second observation is that the liquidity values for individual stocks vary substantially over time. This is impressive considering that these are *relative* measures and as such should not be affected by market changes. As an example, the Eastman Kodak relative dollar index ranged from 1.94 in 1969 to 30.92 in 1973--a factor of over 15. Finally, it is apparent that the relative dollar indexes and relative share indexes for individual companies during specific years are generally quite similar. Put another way, the alternative liquidity measures for individual stocks clearly move together over time.

Comparisons

The purpose of the subsequent comparisons is twofold. The first intent

-10-

W billion The Down is the small.

the larger fits and think till much large art in a which nonbraids e prit Mar

WAR BUT THE PARTY OF THE PARTY

. 199

A HIG ODI TO AD OBART THE SEC. or 13 - (300, 03 -) rollem or calls -

net an strange den

Sec. 18

. F.

attration to make own with the court schiuming ...

e entre la la destruit della arabier. Anter entre della d · events · This offer a groups (surpress of surpress of states ···· E····· rd :

The sum of the sum of the sum of the sum of the - tinl tomore as an example

in obter of dama mails and a second s 201 6961 Spec and an antipation of the terreture support and the state of the state

patent

the complete state of the contract of the second of the and first a surface and that is inpractice of a ring that

na series and a series of the series of the

 Mathematical COM (Mathematical Company) at a giant fill and a second second

a service and the service of a service service and the service of the start weather the second

ere ca encone comparts est a de de first intent

771

EXHIBIT 3

RELATIVE MEASURES OF EXTERNAL MARKET LIQUIDITY FOR 24 LARGE FIRMS (DOLLAR AND SHARES)

	196	9	197	o	197		197	2	197:		1974		1975	
COMPANY	69	Shrs	64	Shrs	69	Shrs	68	Shrs	\$3	Shrs	69	Shrs		Shrs
American Can	.56	,51	1.31	1.14	.64	. 70	.71	. 84	1.50	1.46	.44	.43	.64	.53
American Hospital & Supply Co.	. 37	.53	1.53	1.50	.68	.91	1.09	.95	2.61	2.32	1.25	1.07	.82	.67
Amsted Industries	.07	.08	.29	.29	60°	.10	.10	.10	.15	.13	. 29	.22	.92	.44
Atlantic Richfield Co.	7.14	2.87	9.36	4.30	2.79	1.60	9.15	5.60	7.92	3.51	8.27	2.47	8.13	2.62
Caterpillar Tractor	1.12	1.06	2.09	1.86	.53	.4.5	1.54	1.11	5.38	3.19	5.21	2.65	6.98	3.14
Chrysler Corp.	1.10	1.08	4.18	63 '5	1.43	2.00	1.57	1.79	A.45	5.58	.90	1.05	. 81	1.22
John Drere	.87	56°	2.16	1.01	.92	-5-	1.05	.65	2.13	1.91	1.58	1.51	3.45	2.28
Eastman Kodak	1.94	1.27	12.50	6.21	5.55	3.00	7.24	2.37	30.92	8.58 52	18.33	5.37	1.59	3.22
Exxon Corp.	4.46	2.74	16.34	0.96	6.19	3.50	6.62	3.50	32.50	2.45	10.45	4,15	7.71	2.77
Ford Motor Co.	2.14	2.12	7.79	6:06	1.03	1.34	3.89	2.23	9.49	57. 70	6.17	3.70	3.91	3.10
General Motors Corp.	5.20	5.23	15.46	7.84	6.41	3.75	9.47	. 73	20.50	0.74	10.24	6.41	7.38	4.60
Cenzgia Pacific	1.20	.65	5.61	4.14	1.71	1.42	53	-53	1.70	3.62	2.54	1.72	1.71	1.02
International Harvester	05.	.90	1.72	2.20	.5.3	- 22	.65	. 75	144 144 144	1.75	.64	.74	1.35	1.35
International Paper	1.51	1.71	2.13	2.25	1.11	1.22	1.32	1.25	2.73	2.06	2.28	55. [2.37	1.37
Jewel Companies	. 35	. 54	1.23	86.	.42	.32	.47	.33	512	.33	.46	.33	.34	.31
Monsanto	1.14	1.17	2.98	2.74	1.64	1.57	1.58	1.10	3.12	2.30	13.02	6.11	6.27	2.78
Motorola	.74	.31	3.25	1.31		сэ Сл	2.21	.82	3.08	1.11	3.57	1.87	3.88	2.25
Proctor and Gamble	1.48	.83	3.87	1.53	2.33	1.69	2.17	.91	2.38	3.06	7.40	2.35	5.61	1.75
Quaker Oats	.35	.30	.70	.58	.51	.53	<i>iv</i>	.27	.58	.52	.36	.42	.33	.54
A. E. Staley	.23	.26	.53	.41	.07	.07	.11	.11	.21	.15	.17	.13	.40	.17
Standard Oil Co. (CAL)	2.90	2.04	10.28	7.13	1.83	1.33	2.59	1.63	5.51	2.58	3.83	2.98	1.74	1.88
Standard Oil Co. (IND)	2.78	2.09	4.22	2.69	1.55	1.10	2.10	1.27	15.80	6.53	6.45	2.39	2.87	1.82
Union Oil Co.	1.91	1.67	2.51	2.35	.83	.75	1.01	.94	1.90	1.60	1.28	.93	1.79	1.24
United Airlines	.71	.95	1.90	1.79	.57	67	1.02	.81	.73	1.18	1.36	1.49	.81	1.05

「市家は高い」

大田市市にいる 金田市の「大田」 かみ おんにおくと

、金沙な NOB NOB 1.91 1.91 1.91

and the second s A The second second

22344

10.11

EXHIBIT 4

4

RELATIVE MEASURES OF EXTERNAL MARKET LIQUIDITY FOR 24 SMALLER COMPANIES (DOLLAR & SHARES)

CONDANY	19	69	19	70	19)71	19	72	61	73	19	74	19	75
CUNEAN	÷	Shrs	63	Shrs	43	Shrs	69	Shrs	\$	Shrs	s	Shrs	\$	Shrs
American Shipbuilding	.02	.04	.05	.09	,03	.04	. 05	.05	. 05	, 10	.07	. 18	.03	.07
Bates Mfg. Co.	.01	.02	.02	.06	.01	.04	.01	.03	.01	.03	.01	.03	:24	.29
Belding Hemingway	.02	.04	.05	.08	.03	,04	.04	.03	.02	.05	.04	80.	.01	.02
Carter Wallace	.07	.18	.27	.50	.66	.17	.16	.30	.06	.14	.06	.13	.07	.15
Cleveland Cliffs	.02	.02	.09	.07	.08	.05	.08	.05	.18	.11	.27	.11	.54	.16
Cox Broadcasting	.09	.09	.07	.13:	.07	.11	.33	.32	.11	.12	.07	.03	.08	.10
Dentsply Inc.	.13	.12	.25	.20	.44	.44	.25	.21	.]]	.13	.19	.19	.32	.27
Dr. Pepper Co.	.07	.06	.24	.46	.09	.14	.29	.23	.52	. 80	.27	.47	.29	.57
Fansteel Inc.	.04	.09	.06	.16	°01	.04	. 08	.18	.03	.07	. 76	.09	.04	.06
Hayes-Albion	.01	.02	.04	30.	.02	.04	.03	.05	:02	.05	.02	.03	.02	.03
Holly Sugar Corp.	, 01	.02	.04	.08	× 0 ~	60°	.01	.03	.03	.05	.12	.20		.15
Keller Industrials Inc.	. 64	.07	.03	.12	.03	.04	.07	.11	- 25	.12	.05	.07	.61	.63
Krochler Manufacturing Co.	.02	.02	.05	.10	.02	.02	.03	. 63	.02	.04	.03	-04	1.	.01
Lehigh Valley	.03	.31	. 1.1	.42	.03	.13	.06	.19	.10	23	.14	(-) 	.09	.22
Lessona Corp.	.14	.14	.06	.13	.04	. 05	:02	50%	60.	. 10	.05	.07	. 07	.07
MacAndrews-Forbe	.03	.07	.07	.14	.03	.05	.02	.04	5.	.06	.03	.64	.62	.03
Marquette Cement	.03	£0.	:03	.17	:05	.12	.02	.07	.06	.16	.05	-02	50.	.07
Munsingwear Inc.	°04	.06	.02	.09	09	•03	.0.3	.0.5	3	.05	50.	. 33	.05	56
Fitt Forgings	.01	£9.	.07	.14	.01	.03	.01	3	0.	.06	.04	.07	.01	.02
Skil Corp.	.02	.02	.05	.05	.03	.05	.65	.10	.10		.02	•G 5	.01	.02
Suanray Corp.	.07	.13	.10	.18	.04	30.	.05	69	.03	.09	.10	.12	.05	-03
Storer Broadcasting	.14	.17	.24	.31	.09	.12	.57	, (,२ (,१	• • • • •	.43	.12	.14	.12	.15
Texas Industries Inc.	.05	.03	.15	.17	.03	.04	.08	.10	£0 °	. 31	.05	-05	.04	.05
Thomas and Betts	.05	.05	.24	.21	.17	.15	,12	.07	.48	.20	55	.33	.14	01.

A PARTY AND TAP IN A PURCHESS OF STRUCT

		•	•					The second
			1					10 / 61 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 /
••		ء يا مر مع مر مع	 				ی ۱۹۹۹ می بر ۱۹۹۹ - ۱۹۹۹ ۱۹۹۹ - ۱۹۹۹ - ۱۹۹۹	
				•				
• • •								
· · · ·	1		- 10 vil.					HILLS HAVE A CARD
*** * * * * *				e de a time de a se time de			:	
		•	- - -	•	-1		с. 	
				•				
			۱ •	•	* * * * *	در ال الروبية الروبية الروبية	• . 	
,							:	
-		*****			- - - - - - - - - - - -	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
	#1.4 *1	£	1 19.00011 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8			۰ ۱۹۹۹ ۱۹۹۹ ۱۹۹۹	•	
	•	•			•	• •		
	:	- 	•					
1					, , ,			and the second se
•	-	•			Р -			
					•		1	
						4		
2 = '= 2	4 4 1011				6			 The second s
				•				
	•	1 1 1 1 1	•* • • •	•				and the second
	•	1	1		····		1000 - 10000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1	
	•	•		•				

is to determine if there are any differences in the level of market liquidity for small versus large firms. The second purpose is to determine if there -has been any difference in the *trends* of liquidity over time. Specifically, have the liquidity values for large and smaller firms moved in parallel over time or has there been a change in the performance of one group relative to the other?

Regarding the differential level of liquidity it was expected that on avorage the large firms would have a higher level of liquidity than the smaller firms because they have more shares outstanding, they are betterknown, and generally experience more trading activity. The expectation for the analysis of differential trols is related to the notion of a tiered market. It has been observed during the past ten years that because of the growth of institutions and the increase in their trading turnover, they have come to dominate trading in the secondary equity market [1, 3]. Further, institutions profer large firms because of their liquidity [8]. Honce, a "tiered market" has evolved with large firms in the upper tier and the great bulk of smaller firms comprising the lower tier [5, 10]. The result of the tiered market in terms of liquidity is that the rich get richer and the peor get poerer. Specifically, one would expect in a tiered market that the large firms that are of interest to the institutions that deminate trading would become more liquid, while the smaller firms in the lower ther would either experience no change in liquidity or might even show a decline in their market liquidity over time. Therefore, it was hypothesized that there would be a divergence in the liquidity for the two groups over time.

-13-

Ja to deter i e e the construction of the detail of the detailoo detailoo detail of the detailoo detail of the detail o

y Min (Press 1) second eld protest to the second seco

and the star leg for the star star star in a set of the star star in the star star star in the star star star s

The second second

sa a

Differences in the Level of Liquidity

The analysis considered the average liquidity for the two samples of stocks over time. The results reported in Exhibit 5 clearly support the belief that there is a major difference in the relative liquidity for the large firms compared to the smaller firms. In fact, the differences were substantially larger than expected. In terms of the relative dollar liquidity measures, the large firms are over <u>30 times</u> more liquid than the smaller firms. In terms of the relative share liquidity measures the large firms are over <u>15 times</u> more liquid.

The difference in comparison for the two measures is interesting. This difference occurs because the dollar index for the larger firms is generally twice as large as the share index for these firms. In contrast, for the smaller firms the share index is larger than the dollar index. This seeming paradex can be explained by the differential price of the shares for the two sets of firms. The average share price for the large firms is in excess of \$50, while the average share price for the smaller firms is about \$25. Therefore, the large firms have greater share liquidity, i.e., they can sell about 15 times more shares for a given percent change in price than the smaller firms. Then, considering the price of the small firms, the dollar values indicate an investor in a large firm can buy or sell 30 times as many dollars of stock for a given percent change in price as an investor in a smaller firm.

Because of the possible price bias connected with the share index, most observers would probably agree that the dollar index is preferable for comparing two groups of stocks. The point is, *irrespective of which* <u>etformersions</u> (and the second s

and the end of the second state of the second s nauf neueres view off an effort entry several solutions in a site of a severit and the state of the second ener scorenza (F. 1831, zbel) - training F. Start (F. Start) - steres transfer and K. Harris All malfore exclusion of the second en en la plinne en la Pontencia de la continua demanda qui ap and the second synthetic and the second s and the second sec en state e verte de l'home son de la barre de la definition de la barre de la tradition de and the second and the first state of the second 가 한 한 12 N 12 N and the second second and an and a star of the and the second the second s man and the second state of or due to the second second HERE ALL AND A REPORT OF A and the second supply and provide the second sec the state of the second st inin j and the second (c) S. M. A. L. C. LEWERT STREET, N. S. M. B. LEWERT, MARKET MARKET, MA KARKET, MARKET, MAR solve i to dina dia m and the second $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}$ en effective and the second second

er a ser a

<u>با</u> م

EXHIBIT 5

AVERAGE RELATIVE LIQUIDITY VALUES FOR LARGE AND SMALLER FIRM SAMPLES

	Do	llar Inde	×	Sha	re Indez	ς
	Large	Small	Ratio L/S	Large	Small	Ratio L/S
1969	1.705	.050	34.1	1.236	.081	15.3
1970	4.715	.107	44.1	3.256	.173	18.8
1971	1.709	.061	28.0	1.259	.089	14.1
1972	2.455	.097	25.3	1.454	.116	12.5
1973	6.796	.105	64.7	3.359	.144	23.3
1974	4.463	.101	44.2	2.175	.127	17.1
1975	3.409	.103	33.1	1.756	.116	15.1

S SIMINA

VERAGE RELATE BERGMMENT ALURS

a to the second	las an h	2.		Sha	chai or	
13 Ter see 1	E Canto	nidoa XI			LIBRO .	84191 - 841 -
$ \mathcal{F} _{\mathcal{M}} \geq$	· · · ·		+	are c	1241	15.3
e 2° . ;	F 19- 2	1. 4 4	,	$\partial x^{(1)} g x^{(1)}$	C.E.	2.81
ter"	1977 - 41 			1 1	1. E-3.	1.67
474. <u>6</u>	1-4 -			ter a presentation de la companya de	r <u>t</u>	
and the second second	00# .		4 7 0		info f	-
Alt p		1.1		11 <u>7</u> -	707.	ير ميو و الأمو و
Q03				E to an	-;jr	

liquidity series is used, the results support the expectation that the external market liquidity for larger firms is *significantly greater* than the market liquidity for smaller firms. Relating these results to the selection of the sample, it should be noted that the results would probably be more divergent if the larger firm sample had been confined to the top 50 firms. As it is, the sample only contains three of the top 13 stocks in terms of liquidity (General Motors, Eastman Kodak, and Exxon); but it is missing such notable institutional favorites as IBM (the <u>most</u> liquid stock) and AT&T.

Changes in Liquidity Over Time

The data in Exhibit 5 indicate what happened to the average liquidity for the two groups of individual sample firms over time. It was hypothesized that the relative liquidity for the larger firms would probably <u>increase</u> over time because of the increased trading by institutions and their desire to acquire larger firms. In contrast, it was expected that the liquidity for smaller firms would generally remain constant or possibly decline because the dominant institutions would generally not have an interest in these firms. Therefore, one would expect that a <u>ratio</u> of the average liquidity values would <u>increase</u> over time assuming the ratio was the relative liquidity value for the large firms divided by the average relative liquidity value for the smaller firms.

Averages Over Time

The figures in Exhibit 5 indicate that the average liquidity values for both samples and measures generally *increased over time*. Specifically,

-16-

(devicing series is used the construction of expectation that the external surbet is utility for theory which is algorithered and the the market limitation doe south of fines. Someting these contrares the relection of the costor of should be broad that the contrare wild probusby be as a divergent of the target of a second between the real to and the second (which is a second of the contrares) of the contrares of every of firms. As it is all should be any sources as the term of the real fixed): store the terms of the costor of the contrares as the fit of the real best to the terms of the costor of the contrares as the fit of the real tiqued start) and of the terms of the real function of the real fit of tiqued start) and the costor of the real fit of the

Changes in black of the opened

(a) Anto in Exh.(A) is interested to the heave no the average liquidity for the reaction of view (interest to be in section). It as hyperbeister has to the rive (interfacy for the insection and) reductions and interesting over all breaks of the increased conting by inclinations and there itself or the action firms. It conterest, is an expected that the figuration for an even of and associated control or an expected that the figuration for an even of and associated constant or mostbly but figurates for the action of the insection and the anti-insected that interesting the action of and associated constant or mostbly but figurates for the action of the diam sector constant or mostbly interest in where the action of the insected constant or mostbly of the event for the action of the action of the constant or mostbly into event the where the action of the action of the constant or mostbly as the diameter of the action of the action of the constant of the action as the figurate for the figuration of the sector for the action of the event figuration of the sector of the action of the sector of the figuration of the sector of the sector of the sector of the action of the figuration of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector.

AVerticed in Algurative

The environ har residing findicate that the average liquidity values for both supplies and seasures generally bucksones aver value. Specific 119.

31 ×

the average dollar index for large firms went from 1.705 in 1969 to a high of 6.796 in 1973 and ended in 1975 at 3.409--double the 1969 value. Similarly, the average dollar index for the small firms went from .05 in 1969 to about .10 in 1975. Notably, the relative measures for both samples were high during 1973 and 1974 which were periods of declining stock prices and generally low market liquidity as shown earlier. The <u>relative</u> measures for these two samples increased because the liquidity for both groups of firms likewise declined, but the decline was <u>not as severe</u> as for the aggregate market. Notably, the relative performance by the larger firms during this period of declining stock prices was superior to the performance by smaller firms.

Ratio Over Time

The performance of the large to small liquidity ratio over time was not consistent with expectations based upon the development of a tiered market. The time series plot shown in Exhibit 6 indicates that the ratio of the average relative liquidity measures varied over time and ended the period slightly <u>lower</u> than at the beginning of the period. Notably, this ratio declined during 1971 and 1972, and increased during 1973 and 1974. This would indicate that the differential between large and smaller firms varied by market period. Specifically, during rising markets such as 1971 and 1972 the relative liquidity for the smaller firms increased more than for the larger firms. In contrast, during declining markets, the market liquidity for smaller firms declines much more than that for larger firms.

Although the average relative liquidity data do not support the

-17-

The average dation index for any time "in from 1.705 in 1995 to 1995 t

11 1.533³

The perious of the factor to small thruiding with webs and a correct on the interval the indectable one of the definition of a correct nerved for the ends of the constraint of the termination of a correct of an exclust where end of constraint for the termination of the versathe adjustic one of the constraint of the termination of the termination of an interval one of the constraint of the termination of the termination of the termination of the constraint of the termination of the termination of the termination of the constraint of the termination is the termination of the termination of the termination of the termination is the termination of the termination of the termination of the termination is the termination of termination of the termination of the termination of the termination of the termination of termination of the termination of the termination of termination of

Although the sveries sensive field is data to not support the

.



. ...

-18-

EXHIBIT 6



expectations, a more detailed analysis of the results for the individual firms provides some support for the hypothesis. Referring to Exhibits 3 and 4, one can determine what happened to individual firms over time, i.e., how many of the firms experienced changes? An analysis of only the first and last years (1969 and 1975) indicates that within the large firm sample (Exhibit 3) 15 of the firms clearly experienced increases in both measures of liquidity; only 3 experienced definite declines, and 6 had mixed results where one liquidity measure increased and the other declined. In contrast to these consistent increases within the large firm sample, the individual results for the smaller firm sample (Exhibit 4) indicated that only 8 firms experienced clear increases, 9 experienced definite declines, and 7 had mixed results. Notably four of the smaller companies that experienced increases had <u>very large</u> increases. Clearly, the results within the smaller firm sample are not as consistent as the results for the larger firms.

In summary, an analysis of the relative market liquidity for a sample of large firms and small firms indicates a wide difference in the level of liquidity--the average large firm had about 30 times more market liquidity than the average small firm on the basis of the dollar liquidity index. An analysis of changes in liquidity over time indicated that both samples of stocks experienced increases in liquidity for the overall period. In fact, the ratio of liquidity for the large versus the small indicated that the small firms increased slightly more from the first year to the last year. These results were inconsistent with expectations. Two points are worthy of note. First, the ratio of liquidity measures declined during rising markets and increased sharply during declining markets. This

-19-

indicates that the small firms gain in terms of relative liquidity during good markets, but suffer declines in relative liquidity during declining markets. Second, the individual firm results differed. The individual results for the large firms indicated that almost all of the large firms experienced an increase from 1969 to 1975. In contrast, only one-third of the small firms experienced an increase--apparently the average results for the smaller firm sample were carried by several very large increases.

CONCLUSIONS

The ability to buy or sell stock quickly without major price changes is obviously of importance to portfolio managers and investors because of its effect on the variability of returns. It is also of importance to corporate managers because it affects the company's ability to acquire new external equity capital and can influence the required return on the firm's equity.

The results reported here indicate several generalizations:

- 1) Aggregate market liquidity is very volatile over time.
- 2) The market liquidity for individual securities differs depending upon whether it is measured as dollar liquidity or share liquidity, but the two measures move in parallel over time.
- 3) The liquidity measures for individual securities vary substantially over time--even when adjusted for changes in market liquidity (i.e., relative liquidity varies).
- There is a <u>substantial</u> difference in the level of liquidity for a sample of larger firms compared to a sample of smaller firms.
- 5) Apparently the liquidity for both samples has increased over time,

indicated that the sould diens call in normal direction leginity design and not work that a stabler redifier an entrie is indicated during and intermatical decord on individual fire mouth and made like indicional could area of three area indicated that also and the indicions apprication of the court of the table of the of the indicions apprication of the court of the table of the contract of the societies the and firms of decord on formase expandedly in average maticatication and the average of the contract of the contract of the the and firms of decord on formase expanded by a version of the societies.

S PREMO

No allows to be an and ended definition with price changes is advised; of importance constraint an approximation of its effect as the variability of a council of its can of ispart and to correcte a three to be a set of exclusive set in the company souther new externed optics and the last of both the company southed returned to fire the set of the set of the last of set of a control to the the fire the set of the set of the last of the control returned to the set of the

readination and Israna and Israna Arranger (Hecus ad)

- configuration of function of the state of the state of the state of the
- By the content of the divident second for doffers encoding approximation is interested in a dorige fluctuation that the interest of a second decimation of the second s
- (j) the first the new of the individual accurate to work solutions are after a week of the section characteristic states and the states (i.e. relation for the states).
 - (i) there is a gravitation for a limit to the level of fight for for a second of they. If a submarket to a sample of another almast.
 - 5) Converte the table of the book angles have normaled over time,

but the larger company results are more consistent and the larger firms tend to gain during declining markets when market liquidity is of greatest importance. but the inter county meaning an wore convertent and the carges direction read to gain. And to der to the television wethin a liquidity to dimensional law figured.

REFERENCES

- "Are the Institutions Wrecking Wall Street?" <u>Business Week</u> (June 2, 1973).
- [2] Hirsch, Michael D., "Liquidity Filters: Tools for Better Performance," Journal of Portfolio Management, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Fall, 1975), pp. 46-50.
- [3] Klemkosky, Robert C., "Institutional Dominance of the NYSE," <u>Financial</u> <u>Executive</u>, Vol. 41, No. 11 (November, 1973), pp. 14-20.
- [4] Laing, Jonathon R., "Fiduciary Grants: Huge Sums Managed by Bank Trust Units Stirs Up Controversy," Wall Street Journal (January 7, 1975).
- [5] Loomis, Carol J., "How the Terrible Two-Tier Market Came to Wall Street," Fortune (July, 1973).
- [6] Lyons, John F., "What Happens When Liquidity Disappears?" <u>Institutional</u> <u>Investor</u>, Vol. 3, No. 11 (November, 1969), pp. 29-36, 98.
- [7] McClintick, David, "Illiquid Stocks--Lack of Ready Buyers and Sellers Imperils the Stock Market," Wall Street Journal (December 10, 1971).
- [8] Reilly, Frank K., "A Three Tier Stock Market and Corporate Financing," Financial Management, Vol. 4, No. 3 (Autumn, 1975), pp. 7-15.
- [9] Reilly, Frank K. and Wright, David, "An Analysis of Aggregate Stock Market Liquidity," Paper presented at the Eastern Finance Association Meeting, Boston, Mass. (April, 1977).
- [10] Wood, C. V., Jr., "Why It's Hard to Raise Capital Today," <u>Financial</u> <u>Executive</u>, Vol. 41, No. 11 (November, 1973), pp. 21-28.

17 a. a. b.

一合有的 建树脂 机构

- (1) "Are the Institution. Brecking will street " burg synkled: (July 7) 287-1
- [3] Hirth Michael C. Giquatric Mitters: Folly for Dester Scribmanue. Journal of Portfolic Janaser of Sci. 2. Active (Part, 1976) [p. 16-5].
- (*) Contesti "Priser: "Institution "Contantic of the "With a light Execution * 1 The No. 11 (* 18) - 19781; pp. 14-29
- [3] Dulley Annielton S., "Plauders (Emity) Sugarian innum Strate United (the Object Sofese end) Style Sofemult (Deviation) 7: 1779).
- namente la directo en enert stituite de la constituite de la facto de la seconda de la facto de la facto de la
 - i void la fin in in part in figure in the figure i the present in the figure in the figure in the sector in the se
 - [7] Folliness moveds "liftings Stocks 1 of of B mbr Supers and Willers 1948 115 Due 1665 A visit "all Street Louinels ("scombby 10, 1977).
 - int whitig think is included in a similar and capable villarcian Managed management (See Comment 1978) (1: 2-15.
 - [1] Sulli, Errar, S. and Estate Forvio. Estimate of anti-estabolicas dation in the mean presented. Science Hindle Association feeting 36²¹ and Capter 101.
 - (1) Stad; C. S. S. Start T. S. Sard T. Sard T.





