

# Impact of Stock Market Structure on Intertrade Time and Price Dynamics

Ainslie Yuen<sup>1</sup> & Plamen Ch. Ivanov<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Signal Processing Laboratory, Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 1PZ, UK*

<sup>2</sup>*Center for Polymer Studies and Department of Physics, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215*

27 April, 2004

Recent developments on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) [1, 2], have raised the profile of the market operating mechanism, the “market structure”, employed by a stock market. The two major stock markets in the U.S., the NYSE and the National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotation System (NASDAQ) National Market have very different structures [3, 4], and there is continuing controversy over whether reported differences in stock price behaviour are due to differences in market structure or company characteristics [5]. As the influence of market structure on stock prices may be obscured by exogenous factors such as demand and supply [6, 7], we hypothesize that modulation of the flow of transactions due to market operations may carry a stronger imprint of the internal market mechanism. To this end, we analyse times between consecutive transactions for a diverse group of stocks registered on the NYSE and NASDAQ markets, and we relate the dynamical properties of the intertrade times with those of the corresponding price fluctuations. We report evidence of a robust scale-invariant temporal organisation in the transaction timing of stocks which is independent of individual company characteristics and industry sector, but which depends on market structure. Specifically, we find that stocks registered on the NASDAQ exhibit significantly stronger correlations in their transaction timing within a trading day, compared with NYSE stocks. Further, we find that companies that transfer from the NASDAQ to the NYSE show a reduction in the correlation strength of transaction timing within a trading day, after the move, suggesting influences of market structure. Surprisingly, we also observe that stronger power-law correlations in intertrade times are coupled with stronger power-law correlations in absolute price returns and higher price volatility, suggesting a strong link between the dynamical properties of intertrade times and the corresponding price fluctuations over a broad range of time scales. Comparing the

**NYSE and NASDAQ markets, we demonstrate that the higher correlations we find in inter-trade times for NASDAQ stocks are indeed matched by higher correlations in absolute price returns and by higher volatility, suggesting that market structure may affect price behaviour through information contained in transaction timing. These findings may have implications for the use of transaction timing in the prediction of prices and risk management on different stock markets.**

The impact of market structure and associated rules of operation on market efficiency and stock price formation have attracted considerable public attention in recent months [1]. This has also been of concern to those involved in stock market regulation, on behalf of investors [1, 8], since optimising market structure results in more effectively functioning markets [9] and increases a market's competitiveness for market share in listed stocks [10]. Recent comparative studies of the NYSE and NASDAQ markets have primarily focused on stock prices to provide evidence that market organisational structure affects the price formation process [9, 11, 12]. Specifically, it has been shown that stocks registered on the NASDAQ may be characterised by a larger bid-ask spread [13] and higher price volatility [9, 11, 12]. However, this is often attributed to the market capitalisation, growth rate or the nature of the companies listed on the NASDAQ [5]. Furthermore, empirical studies have emphasized the dominant role and impact of trading volume on prices [6, 7]; since traded volume is determined by investors it is difficult to isolate the effects of market structure on price formation.

To better understand the mechanism by which market structure may affect stock prices, we study the information contained in the times between consecutive stock transactions. As market-specific operations may modulate the flow of transactions, we hypothesize that dynamical features of transaction timing reflect the underlying market mechanism. Specifically, we ask if stocks of companies with diverse characteristics registered on a given market exhibit common features in their transaction timing, which may be associated with the particular market structure. Further, we investigate how the dynamical properties of transaction timing relate to dynamical features of price fluctuations over a range of time scales, and whether market structure affects the temporal organisation of price fluctuations.

To probe how market structure influences the trading of stocks, we consider the two major U.S. stock markets, the NYSE and the NASDAQ. All transactions on the NYSE of a given stock are centralised and are controlled by a *single* human operator called a “specialist”, whose primary role is to match together public buy and sell orders on the basis of price, in an auction-like setting [3].

The NYSE specialist is under obligation to maintain both price continuity and a “fair and orderly market” [3]. The specialist is also under obligation to intervene, using his own firm’s inventory of available stock, to provide liquidity in the event of an order imbalance, preventing sharp changes in the stock price [3]. The NYSE regulations allow for considerable flexibility within the specialist’s operations [2]. In contrast, trading on the NASDAQ is decentralised, with trading in a given stock managed by a *number* of dealers called “market makers”. Each market maker maintains his own inventory of stock in order to buy and sell to the public [4]. In comparison, the NYSE specialist rarely uses his own firm’s inventory: such transactions involve less than 15% of trading volume [14]. Although several regional exchanges may trade NYSE listed stocks, price formation has primarily been attributed to NYSE trading [15]. In contrast, the NASDAQ market relies on competition between multiple dealers for public orders to facilitate the price formation process [13]. Moreover, a substantial fraction of share volume on the NASDAQ is not handled by dealers, but is traded electronically via networks for small public orders and for institutional investors [4]. Such fragmentation of the NASDAQ stock market has been associated with higher price volatility [9].

Here we ask to what extent such structural and operational differences between the NYSE and NASDAQ markets affect the flow of transactions. It is difficult to answer whether differences in intertrade times are due to individual company characteristics because the majority of empirical studies have considered a single stock over a few months [16, 17]. Studies which considered the intertrade times of a larger group of stocks did not find common features in the intertrade times and did not compare between markets [18, 19]. The only comparative study considered a single NYSE and a single Paris stock, finding some differences in their intertrade times, but those may well be due to a different culture of trading [20]. To probe for evidence of the impact of market structure on the trading of stocks, we employ concepts and methods from statistical physics to investigate the correlation properties of transaction timing for diverse companies, over time scales ranging from seconds up to a year.

We examine one hundred stocks listed on the NYSE, from eleven industry sectors: Technology-Hardware(5), Semiconductors(2), Pharmaceutical & Medical Equipment(10), Financial(8), Automotive(9), Defense/Aerospace(9), Mining, Metals & Steel Works(8), Chemicals & Plastics(7), Retail & Food(17), Petroleum, Gas & Heavy Machinery(10), Telephone Service Providers(7), Electric & Power Services(8). We study the time intervals between successive stock trades, over a period of four years - 4 Jan. 1993 to 31 Dec. 1996 - as recorded in the Trades and Quotes (TAQ)

database from the NYSE (Table I). We also analyse one hundred NASDAQ stocks from fourteen industry sectors: Technology-Hardware(28), Technology-Software(16), Semiconductors(7), Pharmaceutical, Biotechnology & Medical Equipment(12), Financial(5), Automotive(1), Steel Works(1), Chemicals(1), Retail & Food(16), Petroleum, Gas & Heavy Machinery (2), Telephone & Cable Television Service Providers(5), Services(2), Transportation(3), Electrical Apparatus(1). We study the time intervals between successive stock trades as recorded in the TAQ database, for twenty-nine companies over the period 4 Jan. 1993 - 31 Dec. 1996, and seventy one companies over the period 3 Jan. 1994 - 30 Nov. 1995 (marked with (\*) in Table II). For both markets, we select companies with average market capitalisations ranging over three decades, and varying levels of trading activity with average values of intertrade time between 11 and 640 seconds for NYSE stocks, and between 5 and 680 seconds for NASDAQ stocks. In parallel with the intertrade times, we analyse the prices for both sets of stocks over the same periods.

Like many financial time series the intertrade times (ITT) are inhomogeneous and nonstationary, with statistical properties changing with time, e.g. ITT data exhibit trends superposed on a pattern of daily activity. While ITT fluctuate in an irregular and complex manner on a trade-by-trade basis, empirical observations reveal that periods of inactive trading are often followed by periods of more active trading (Fig. 1). Such patterns can be seen at scales of observation ranging from minutes to months, suggesting that there may be a self-similar, fractal structure in the temporal organisation of intertrade times, independent of the average level of trading activity of a given stock.

To probe for scale-invariant features in the fluctuations of intertrade times, we apply the detrended fluctuation analysis (DFA) method, which has been shown to detect and accurately quantify long-range power-law correlations embedded in noisy non-stationary time series with polynomial trends [21]. We choose this method because traditional techniques such as power spectral, autocorrelation and Hurst analyses are not suited to nonstationary data [22]. The DFA method (DFA- $l$ ) quantifies the root-mean-square fluctuations  $F(n)$  of a signal at different time scales  $n$ , after accounting for nonstationarity in the data by subtracting underlying polynomial trends of order  $(l - 1)$ . A power-law functional form  $F(n) \sim n^\alpha$  indicates self-similarity and fractal scaling in the ITT time series. The scaling exponent  $\alpha$  quantifies the strength of correlations in the ITT fluctuations: if  $\alpha = 0.5$  there are no correlations, and the signal is uncorrelated random noise; if  $\alpha < 0.5$  the signal is anti-correlated, meaning that large values are more likely to be followed by small values; if  $\alpha > 0.5$  there are positive correlations and the signal exhibits persistent behaviour,

where large values are more likely to be followed by large values and small values by small values. The higher the value of  $\alpha$ , the stronger the correlations. The DFA method avoids the spurious detection of apparent long-range correlations that are an artifact of polynomial trends and other types of nonstationarities [22, 23, 24].

We find that the ITT series for all stocks on both markets exhibit long-range power-law correlations over a broad range of time scales, from several trades to hundreds of thousands of trades, characterised by a scaling exponent  $\alpha > 0.5$  (Fig. 2). For all stocks on both markets we observe a crossover in the scaling curve  $F(n)$  from a scaling regime with a lower exponent  $\alpha_1$  over time scales less than a trading day, to a scaling regime with an exponent  $\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$  (stronger positive correlations) over time scales from days to almost a year.

Further, we find that this crossover is systematically more pronounced for NYSE stocks compared with NASDAQ stocks. Characterising ITT fluctuations over time scales less than a day, we find that NASDAQ stocks exhibit systematically stronger correlations than NYSE stocks, with statistically significantly higher average value of the exponent  $\alpha_1^{ITT_{NASDAQ}} = 0.75 \pm 0.04$  (group mean  $\pm$  std. dev.) as compared with  $\alpha_1^{ITT_{NYSE}} = 0.62 \pm 0.03$  (Fig. 2). In contrast, over time horizons above a trading day, we find that the correlation properties of ITT on both markets are statistically similar with average scaling exponent  $\alpha_2^{ITT_{NASDAQ}} = 0.85 \pm 0.08$  comparable with  $\alpha_2^{ITT_{NYSE}} = 0.87 \pm 0.09$  (Fig. 2).

We next investigate how the correlation properties of ITT depend on the average level of trading activity, and if this dependence differs with market structure. Since both sets of a hundred stocks that we study on the NYSE and NASDAQ markets encompass a wide range of average trading activity, we split both sets into six subsets with matching average ITT ( $\overline{ITT}$ ) and approximately equal numbers of stocks (Fig. 2b,c). Within each market we find that over time scales less than a day, the correlation exponent characterising the trading dynamics is larger for stocks with higher trading activity (lower  $\overline{ITT}$ ) (Fig. 3a). Surprisingly, this dependence persists over much longer time scales, ranging from days to months (Fig. 3b). For NYSE stocks we find a logarithmic dependence of  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  and  $\alpha_2^{ITT}$  on  $\overline{ITT}$ . We then compare the scaling behaviour of ITT for each subset of NASDAQ stocks with the subset of NYSE stocks with matching  $\overline{ITT}$ . We find that the average correlation exponent  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  for the NASDAQ stocks is consistently higher compared with the NYSE stocks for each subset, and that the difference  $\alpha_1^{ITT_{NASDAQ}} - \alpha_1^{ITT_{NYSE}}$  is practically independent of  $\overline{ITT}$  (Fig. 3a). In contrast, there is no systematic difference in the values of the average  $\alpha_2^{ITT}$  for NASDAQ and NYSE stocks for subsets with matching  $\overline{ITT}$  (Fig. 3b). These

observations suggest that the difference in the correlation properties of intertrade times of NYSE and NASDAQ stocks is independent of the average level of trading activity.

Since for both NYSE and NASDAQ stocks we have chosen a range of market capitalisations, industry sectors and average levels of trading activity, our findings of a crossover in the scaling behaviour of ITT and stronger correlations over intraday time scales for NASDAQ stocks, support our hypothesis that market structure affects the dynamics of transaction timing. However, more established companies listed on the NYSE may be subject to different trading patterns when compared with the younger and more rapidly growing companies on the NASDAQ. To verify that the stronger correlations in ITT over time scales less than a day for NASDAQ stocks are indeed due to market structure, we ask if the scaling properties of ITT systematically change for companies that transfer from the NASDAQ to the NYSE. In particular, we investigate the trading dynamics of ten companies that moved from the NASDAQ to the NYSE around the end of 1994 and the beginning of 1995 (Table III). For each company, we analyse the ITT time series while the company was on the NASDAQ and then repeat the analysis when the company was on the NYSE.

For all ten companies we find a significant change in the scaling properties of intertrade times: a marked decrease in the strength of the power-law correlations within a trading day (lower  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$ ) associated with the transfer from the NASDAQ to the NYSE (Fig. 4). There is however, no corresponding systematic change in the correlations over time scales above a trading day, consistent with our findings of statistically similar values of scaling exponent  $\alpha_2^{ITT}$  for the two groups of one hundred stocks registered on the NYSE and NASDAQ (Fig. 2). Thus, our results indicate that market structure impacts not only trading dynamics on a trade-by-trade basis [19], but also the fractal temporal organisation of trades over time scales up to a day. The presence of stronger intraday correlations in transaction timing for NASDAQ stocks may be attributed to the multiplicity of dealers (ranging from 2 to 50 per stock during 1994 [13]) and electronic methods of trading (Electronic Communication Networks and the Small Order Execution System [4]), allowing the NASDAQ to efficiently absorb fluctuations in trading activity in almost real time [10]. In contrast, for each stock on the NYSE, while there is the electronic SuperDOT routing system, each order has to be exposed to and compared with outstanding orders, as the single NYSE specialist finds the best bid to match an offer with [3]. This may lead to interruptions in the execution of a rapid succession of trades on the NYSE, resulting in weaker correlations in intertrade times within a trading day.

On the other hand, our finding of stronger power-law correlations for both markets over time



horizons from a trading day to several months ( $\alpha_2^{ITT} > \alpha_1^{ITT}$ ) suggests that investors' behaviour is more coherent over longer time scales, as information driving trading activity takes time to disseminate. Moreover, this can account for the similar values of  $\alpha_2^{ITT}$  for subsets of NYSE and NASDAQ stocks with matched  $\overline{ITT}$ , since news and information driving trading activity are exogenous to market structure.

Finally, we investigate if the market-mediated differences in long-range power-law correlations in ITT translate into differences in the scaling behaviour of price fluctuations of stocks registered on the NASDAQ and NYSE markets. To this end, in parallel with ITT we analyse the absolute price returns for each company in our database for both markets. For all stocks we observe a crossover at a trading day in the scaling function  $F(n)$  of price fluctuations [25], from weaker to stronger correlations, corresponding to the crossover we observe for intertrade times. In addition we find that over time scales less than a day, stocks with stronger correlations in ITT exhibit stronger correlations in absolute price returns. In particular, we find that the stronger correlations in ITT associated with the NASDAQ market structure ( $\alpha_1^{ITT_{NASDAQ}} > \alpha_1^{ITT_{NYSE}}$ ), are accompanied by stronger correlations in price fluctuations ( $\alpha_1^{|RET|_{NASDAQ}} > \alpha_1^{|RET|_{NYSE}}$ ) over time scales within a trading day (Fig. 5a). We also find evidence of a positive relationship between correlations in ITT and correlations in price fluctuations over time scales larger than a trading day for NASDAQ stocks. In contrast, there is no corresponding positive relationship for NYSE stocks, suggesting a weaker coupling between trading dynamics and price formation under the NYSE market structure, over time horizons above a trading day. While previous work has suggested that bursts of trading activity have an instantaneous impact on stock prices [19, 26], our results show that the interaction between trading times and price formation may be more complex, where fractal temporal patterns in ITT are linked with scaling features of price fluctuations over a broad range of time scales.

We then test whether long-range correlations in ITT may be linked with stock price volatility. Previous studies have reported higher price volatility for NASDAQ stocks compared with NYSE stocks [9, 11, 12]. We find a positive relationship, with stronger correlations in ITT over time scales less than a day related to higher daily volatility  $\sigma^{RET}$ , and that the NASDAQ stocks have higher  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  and correspondingly higher  $\sigma^{RET}$  compared with NYSE stocks (Fig. 5b). This relationship may appear to follow from our observation that  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  depends on  $\overline{ITT}$  (Fig. 3a), and previous studies which connect price volatility with periods of high transaction rates [16]. However, for the stocks in our database (Tables I & II), we find no clear dependence between  $\sigma^{RET}$

and average level of trading activity as measured by  $\overline{ITT}$  (Fig. 5c). Thus the relationship between  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  and  $\sigma^{RET}$  suggests that information contained in the microscopic temporal structure of ITT is carried over a range of scales to impact daily price volatility.

In summary, our results indicate that market structure influences the correlation properties of transaction timing, with stocks registered on the NASDAQ showing systematically stronger long-range, power-law correlations within a trading day compared with stocks listed on the NYSE. Moreover, stocks characterised by stronger correlations in their intertrade times exhibit stronger correlations in their price fluctuations and higher daily price volatility. Further, stocks registered on the NASDAQ are characterised not only by higher volatility compared with NYSE stocks, but also by stronger correlations in price fluctuations over time scales less than a day, suggesting an influence of market structure on the process of price formation over a range of time scales. Understanding the scale-invariant properties of intertrade times is crucial to the development of more realistic models of the price formation process [16, 18, 27, 28, 29] and its dependence on market structure. Furthermore, these results are of interest in the context of the continuing process of optimising market structure to maintain the efficiency and competitiveness of U. S. stock markets.

- 
- [1] Solomon, D. & Kelly, K. Wide SEC review may revamp structure of U.S. stock markets. *Wall St. Journal* ([www.wsj.com](http://www.wsj.com)), 19 September 2003 (2003).
  - [2] Bogle, J. C. SpecialistMan. *Wall St. Journal* ([www.wsj.com](http://www.wsj.com)), 19 September 2003 (2003).
  - [3] Hasbrouck, J. & Sofianos, G. The trades of market makers: an empirical analysis of NYSE specialists. *Journal of Finance* **48**, 1565–1593 (1993).
  - [4] Smith, J. W., Selway, J. P. & McCormick, T. The Nasdaq stock market: historical background and current operation. *NASD Working Paper* **98-01** (1998).
  - [5] Peterson, S. Nasdaq Comments on SEC Report on Execution Quality. *NASDAQ Press Release* ([www.nasdaqnews.com](http://www.nasdaqnews.com)), 8 January 2001 (2001).
  - [6] Gallant, A. R., Rossi, P. E. & Tauchen, G. E. Stock prices and volume. *The Review of Financial Studies* **5**, 199–242 (1992).
  - [7] Lillo, F., Farmer, J. D. & Mantegna, R. N. Master curve for price-impact function. *Nature* **421**, 129–130 (2003).



- [8] SEC Announces Agenda for Public Hearing on Proposed Regulation National Market System. *U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission Press Release* (<http://www.sec.gov/news/press/2004-52.htm>), 15 April 2004 (2004).
- [9] Bennett, P. & Wei, L. Market structure, fragmentation and market quality. *Working Paper (New York Stock Exchange)* **2003-04** (2003).
- [10] Masulis, R. W. & Shivakumar, L. Does market structure affect the immediacy of stock price responses to news? *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* **37**, 617–648 (2002).
- [11] Bessembinder, H. & Kaufman, H. A comparison of trade execution cost for NYSE and Nasdaq-listed stocks. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* **32**, 287–311 (1997).
- [12] Weaver, D. G. Intraday volatility on the NYSE and NASDAQ. *Working Paper (New York Stock Exchange)* **2002-03** (2002).
- [13] Christie, W. & Schultz, P. Why do NASDAQ market makers avoid odd-eighth quotes? *Journal of Finance* **49**, 1813–1840 (1994).
- [14] Hechinger, J. Fidelity urges NYSE to revamp trading operation. *Wall St. Journal* ([www.wsj.com](http://www.wsj.com)), 17 October 2003 (2003).
- [15] Hasbrouck, J. One security, many markets: determining the contributions to price discovery. *Journal of Finance* **50**, 1175–1199 (1995).
- [16] Engle, R. & Russell, J. Autoregressive conditional duration: a new model for irregularly spaced transaction data. *Econometrica* **66**, 1127–1162 (1998).
- [17] Raberto, M., Scalas, E. & Mainardi, F. Waiting times and returns in high-frequency financial data: an empirical study. *Physica A* **314**, 749–755 (2002).
- [18] Hausman, J., Lo, A. & Mackinlay, C. An ordered probit analysis of transaction stock prices. *Journal of Financial Economics* **31**, 319–379 (1992).
- [19] Dufour, A. & Engle, R. Time and the price impact of a trade. *Journal of Finance* **55**, 2467–2498 (2000).
- [20] Jasiak, J. Persistence in intertrade durations. *Working paper (York University)* (1999).
- [21] Peng, C.-K. *et al.* Mosaic organization of DNA nucleotides. *Phys. Rev. E* **49**, 1685–1689 (1994).
- [22] Taqqu, M. S., Teverovsky, V. & Willinger, W. Estimators for long-range dependence: an empirical study. *Fractals* **3**, 785–798 (1995).
- [23] Hu, K., Ivanov, P. C., Chen, Z., Carpena, P. & Stanley, H. E. Effect of trends on detrended fluctuation analysis. *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 011114 (2001).

- [24] Kantelhardt, J. W., Koscielny-Bunde, E., Rego, H. H. A., Havlin, S. & Bunde, A. Detecting long-range correlations with detrended fluctuation analysis. *Physica A* **295**, 441–454 (2001).
- [25] Liu, Y. *et al.* Statistical properties of the volatility of price fluctuations. *Phys. Rev. E.* **60**, 1390–1400 (1999).
- [26] Jones, C., Kaul, G. & Lipson, M. Transactions, volume and volatility. *Review of Financial Studies* **7**, 631–651 (1994).
- [27] Ghysels, E., Gouriéroux, C. & Jasiak, J. Market time and asset price movements theory and estimation. *Working Paper 95s-32, Centre for Interuniversity Research and Analysis on Organizations* (1995).
- [28] Mandelbrot, B. B., Fisher, A. & Calvet, L. A multifractal model of asset returns. *Cowles Foundation Discussion Paper 1164, Yale University* (1997).
- [29] Masoliver, J., Montero, M. & Weiss, G. H. Continuous-time random-walk model for financial distributions. *Phys. Rev. E.* **67**, 021112 (2003).
- [30] Plerou, V., Gopikrishnan, P., Amaral, L. A. N., Gabaix, X. & Stanley, H. E. Economic fluctuations and anomalous diffusion. *Phys. Rev. E.* **62**, 3023–3026 (2000).
- [31] Bonanno, G., Lillo, F. & Mantegna, R. Dynamics of the number of trades of financial securities. *Physica A* **280**, 136–141 (2000).

TABLE I:

Company Name	Ticker Symbol	Industry	Number of Trades	$\overline{TTT}$ (sec)	Company Name	Ticker Symbol	Industry	Number of Trades	$\overline{TTT}$ (sec)
Meredith	MDP	Food & Retail	35267	636	Medtronics	MDT	Medical Apparatus	308049	75
Transco	E	Natural Gas	47045	405	Southern	SO	Electric Services	329464	71
Avery Dennison	AVY	Paper Products	62927	365	Schlumberger	SLB	Oil & Gas	330830	70
Johnson Controls	JCI	Automatic Controls	68490	334	Amoco	AN	Petroleum	339996	69
Northrop Grumman	NOC	Aerospace/Defense	69739	330	PG & E	PCG	Electric Services	355190	66
Allergan	AGN	Pharmaceutical	71419	322	Sprint PCS	FON	Telephone Comms.	362851	64
Jefferson Pilot	JP	Financial	79013	292	Homestake Mining	HM	Mining	370132	63
Nalco Chemical	NLC	Chemicals	81731	283	Union Carbide	UK	Chemicals	387273	60
Lockheed Martin	LK	Aerospace/Defense	44897	282	Nynex	NYN	Telephone Comms.	386703	60
Northern States Pow.	NSP	Electric Services	85724	269	Morgan J.P. & Co.	JPM	Financial	401213	58
Dana	DCN	Automotive	89700	257	Dow Chemical	DOW	Chemicals	411258	57
Inland Steel Ind.	IAD	Steelworks	91137	253	Mobil	MOB	Petroleum Refining	430401	54
Ashland Inc.	ASH	Petroleum Refining	94396	245	Schering Plough	SGP	Pharmaceutical	431388	54
General Dynamics	GD	Aerospace/Defense	97594	237	Chase Manhattan	CMB	Financial	448801	52
Eaton	ETN	Automotive	98796	234	BellSouth	BLS	Telephone Comms.	450144	52
Ethyl	EY	Chemicals	100663	229	3M	MMM	Paper Products	449462	52
TRW Inc.	TRW	Automotive	111506	208	Texaco	TX	Petroleum	457081	51
Alcan Aluminium	AL	Metals	112193	207	Arch. Dan. Midl.	ADM	Food	468148	50
Unilever	UN	Food & Retail	113736	203	Bell Atlantic	BEL	Telephone Comms.	499768	47
Union Electric	UEP	Electric Services	119737	193	Pacific Telesis	PAC	Telephone Comms.	508091	46
Hercules	HPC	Chemicals	123618	187	Lilly Eli & Co.	LLY	Pharmaceutical	514899	45
Air Prod. & Chem.	APD	Chemicals	123416	187	Sara Lee	SLE	Food & Retail	527814	44
Textron	TXT	Aerospace/Defense	123879	187	Dupont	DD	Chemicals	543724	43
Carolina Power&Light	CPL	Electric Services	131352	177	American Express	AXP	Financial	581840	40
Nortel Networks	NT	Telephone Apparatus	132384	176	Fed. Nat. Mort.	FNM	Financial	627313	37
Baltimore Gas & Elec.	BGE	Electric Services	142973	163	Adv. Micro Dev.	AMD	Semiconductors	644865	36
Hershey Foods	HSY	Food & Retail	144982	160	Citicorp	CCI	Financial	677484	34
Honeywell Int.	HON	Aerospace/Defense	156376	149	Abbott Labs.	ABT	Pharmaceutical	691877	34
Navistar Int.	NAV	Automotive	168951	138	Pfizer	PFE	Pharmaceutical	689705	34
Campbell Soup	CPB	Food & Retail	175869	132	Texas Instruments	TXN	Semiconductors	708329	33
Raytheon	RTN	Aerospace/Defense	176148	132	Boeing Aerospace	BA	Aerospace/Defense	728779	32
United Tech.	UTX	Aerospace/Defense	190049	122	Exxon	XON	Petroleum Refining	750298	31
Nucor	NUE	Steelworks	194532	119	Johnson & Johnson	JNJ	Pharmaceutical	1001549	23
Barnett Banks	BBI	Financial	202774	115	Hewlett-Packard	HWP	Hardware	1094829	21
Phelps Dodge	PD	Metal Refining	203834	114	Home Depot	HD	Retail	1103037	21
McDonnell Douglas	MD	Aerospace/Defense	203845	114	Brist. Myers Squibb	BMY	Pharmaceutical	1121714	21
Fluor	FLR	Construction	205913	113	General Motors	GM	Automotive	1130452	21
General Mills	GIS	Food & Retail	227318	103	Compaq Computer	CPQ	Hardware	1184985	20
Newmont Mining	NEM	Mining	232391	100	Chrysler	C	Automotive	1231979	19
Anheuser Busch	BUD	Food & Retail	251972	93	Coca Cola	KO	Food & Retail	1244660	19
USX-US Steel Grp.	X	SteelWorks	252435	92	Ford	F	Automotive	1260730	19
Alza	AZA	Pharmaceutical	257116	91	GTE	GTE	Telephone Comms.	1268523	18
Alcoa	AA	Metal Refining	260980	89	Pepsico	PEP	Food & Retail	1321427	18
Bank Boston	BKB	Financial	262506	89	General Electric	GE	Food & Retail	1374682	17
Colgate Palmolive	CL	Food & Retail	262896	88	Philip Morris	MO	Food & Retail	1527659	15
Goodyear Tire & Rub.	GT	Automotive	272025	85	IBM	IBM	Hardware	1677319	14
Niagara Mohawk Pow.	NMK	Electric Services	276284	84	AT&T	T	Telephone Comms.	1689767	14
Atlantic Richfield	ARC	Petroleum	286580	81	Wal Mart	WMT	Retail	1794160	13
FPL Group	FPL	Electric Services	303364	77	Merck & Co.	MRK	Pharmaceutical	2055443	11
Royal Dutch Petrol.	RD	Petroleum	304505	76	Motorola	MOT	Hardware	2204059	11

Table I: Characteristics of one hundred NYSE stocks studied over the period 4 Jan. 1993 - 31 Dec. 1996. Companies range in average market capitalisation from  $\$0.8 \times 10^9$  to  $\$102 \times 10^9$  over the period, and are ranked in order of decreasing average value of ITT ( $\overline{ITT}$ ). We include all trades occurring during NYSE trading hours (9.30am-4pm EST), excluding public holidays and weekends.

TABLE II:

Company	Ticker	Industry	Number	$\overline{TTT}$	Company	Ticker	Industry	Number	$\overline{TTT}$
Name	Symbol		of Trades	(sec)	Name	Symbol		of Trades	(sec)
Oshkosh B Gosh	GOSHA	Retail & Food	31986	683	US Robotics	USRX*	Hardware	143912	78
Sanmina-SCI	SANM*	Hardware	22648	438	Symantec	SYMC*	Software	143405	77
MedImmune	MEDI*	Biotech.	24618	414	Autodesk	ACAD	Software	261716	74
ICOS	ICOS*	Pharmaceutical	32460	339	Oxf. Health Plans	OXHP*	Financial	150501	74
Gilead Sciences	GILD*	Biotech.	32187	332	Komag	KMAG*	Hardware	175953	63
Molex	MOLX*	Hardware	34104	321	Biomet	BMET	Med. Apparatus	379342	62
Coors Adolph	ACCOB	Food & Retail	78393	295	Novellus Systems	NVLS*	Hardware	182185	61
Whole Foods Mar.	WFMI*	Food & Retail	38018	290	Mobile Tel. Tech.	MTEL*	Telephone Comms.	184469	61
Ross Stores	ROST*	Food & Retail	42772	256	KLA-Tencor	KLAC*	Hardware	187614	60
XOMA	XOMA*	Pharmaceutical	43073	256	St. Jude Medical	STJM	Med. Apparatus	388393	59
Paccar	PCAR	Automotive	94496	245	AST Research	ASTA*	Hardware	191683	58
General Nutr. Cos.	GNCI*	Food & Retail	48222	226	Parametric Tech.	PMTC*	Software	197637	57
Ryans Fam. Steak.	RYAN	Food & Retail	108243	215	Starbucks	SBUX*	Food & Retail	201225	56
Caliber System	ROAD	Transportation	106570	209	Read-Rite	RDRT*	Hardware	205021	54
Giddings & Lewis	GIDL	Heavy Machinery	57081	204	Borland Software	BORL*	Software	207697	54
Huntington Banc.	HBAN*	Financial	55885	199	Gateway 2000	GATE*	Hardware	217267	52
Worthington Ind.	WTHG	Steelworks	119751	194	LM Ericsson Tel.	ERICY*	Hardware	228287	49
Phycor	PHYC*	Office Services	59431	183	StrataCom	STRM*	Hardware	235537	48
Intergraph	INGR	Hardware/Software	131780	176	Xilinx	XLNX*	Semiconductors	239423	47
Shared Medical Sys.	SMED	Hardware/Software	132579	175	Biogen	BGEN*	Biotech.	241886	46
Glenayre Tech.	GEMS*	Hardware	63152	174	Adaptec	ADPT*	Hardware	253082	44
PETsMART	PETM*	Food & Retail	67047	165	Acclaim Ent.	AKLM*	Software	282481	40
Tyson Foods	TYNSA*	Food & Retail	70711	158	Chiron	CHIR*	Pharmaceutical	292353	38
MFS Comms.	MFST*	Telephone Comms.	70776	157	Tellabs	TLAB*	Hardware	299490	38
Brunos	BRNO	Food & Retail	99211	155	Adobe Systems	ADBE*	Software	307959	36
Sigma-Aldrich	SIAL*	Chemicals	72843	153	America Online	AMER*	Services	314541	36
Atlantic S.E. Air.	ASAI*	Transportation	75031	148	Electronic Arts	ERTS*	Software	329541	34
Cephalon	CEPH*	Pharmaceutical	71733	148	Qualcomm	QCOM*	Hardware	335494	34
Safeco	SAFC	Financial	157461	148	Informix	IFMX*	Software	350185	32
Comcast	CMCSA	Cable TV	161408	144	Altera	ALTR*	Semiconductors	349925	32
Stew. & Stev. Svcs	SSSS*	Heavy Machinery	79177	141	Tele Comms.	TCOMA	Cable TV	765301	31
American Greetings	AGREA	Food & Retail	169265	138	Amer. Pow. Conv.	APCC*	Electrical Apparatus	395510	28
Northwest Airlines	NWAC*	Transportation	77658	127	Lotus Devel.	LOTS	Software	582256	25
ADC TeleComms.	ADCT*	Hardware	90573	123	Integr. Dev. Tech.	IDTI*	Semiconductors	471169	24
Charming Shoppes	CHRS	Food & Retail	196473	119	Cirrus Logic	CRUS*	Semiconductors	500710	22
HBO & Co.	HBOC*	Hardware/Software	95662	116	US HealthCare	USHC*	Financial	505215	22
Microchip Tech.	MCHP*	Semiconductors	102625	109	MCI Comms.	MCIC	Telephone Comms.	1096316	21
Andrew	ANDW	Hardware	215063	109	DELL	DELL*	Hardware	557195	20
Legent	LGNT*	Software	90705	108	DSC Comms.	DIGI	Hardware	1209063	19
Stryker	STRY*	Medical Apparatus	107678	104	Applied Materials	AMAT*	Hardware	584276	19
PeopleSoft	PSFT*	Software	108433	102	Sybase	SYBS*	Software	631753	18
Outback Steak.	OSSI*	Food & Retail	112607	99	Amgen	AMGN	Biotech.	1392229	17
Boatmens Banc.	BOAT	Financial	236139	99	3Com	COMS*	Hardware	699889	16
Intelligent Elec.	INEL*	Hardware	113666	98	Apple Computer	AAPL	Hardware	1646925	14
Genzyme General	GENZ*	Biotech.	116223	96	Novell	NOVL	Software	1803407	13
Bed Bath & Beyond	BBBY*	Food & Retail	120723	92	Oracle	ORCL	Software	1817365	13
Intuit	INTU*	Software	122051	91	Sun Microsystems	SUNW	Hardware/Software	2029156	12
Boston Chicken	BOST*	Food & Retail	128376	87	Cisco Systems	CSCO*	Hardware	1093386	10
Staples	SPLS*	Food & Retail	132041	85	Microsoft	MSFT*	Software	1505531	7
Linear Tech.	LLTC*	Semiconductors	139953	80	Intel	INTC	Semiconductors	4807756	5

Table II: Characteristics of one hundred NASDAQ stocks studied; data covers twenty nine companies over the period 4 Jan. 1993 - 31 Dec. 1996, and seventy one companies (marked with \* ) over the period 3 Jan. 1994 - 30 Nov. 1995. Companies range in average market capitalisation from  $\$0.2 \times 10^9$  to  $\$40 \times 10^9$ , and are ranked in order of decreasing average value of ITT ( $\overline{ITT}$ ). We include all trades occurring during regular NASDAQ trading hours (9.30am-4pm EST), excluding public holidays and weekends.



TABLE III: Characteristics of ten stocks that moved from the NASDAQ to the NYSE during the period 3 Jan. 1994 - 30 Nov. 1995. Companies are ranked in order of decreasing average value of ITT when on the NYSE. We include all trades occurring during NYSE trading hours (9.30am-4pm EST) excluding public holidays and weekends.

Company	Industry	NASDAQ				NYSE			
		Ticker Symbol	Number of Days	Number of Trades	$\overline{ITT}$ (sec)	Ticker Symbol	Number of Days	Number of Trades	$\overline{ITT}$ (sec)
Input Output	Measuring Devices	IPOP	219	25211	198	IO	265	10944	540
Consolidated Papers	Paper Mills	CPER	154	8902	389	CDP	330	15180	488
Cardinal Health	Wholesale Drugs	CDIC	171	11510	333	CAH	313	14819	475
AK Steel Holding Corp.	Steelworks	AKST	256	14575	383	AKS	167	10397	364
Sports & Recreation	Retail	SPRC	177	17721	222	WON	307	19907	345
State Street Boston	Financial	STBK	282	43829	148	STT	202	16916	273
Dollar General	Retail	DOLR	273	34873	180	DG	211	19817	241
Mid-Atlantic Medical Services	Financial	MAMS	187	90598	48	MME	297	50245	136
Seagate	Hardware	SGAT	238	119544	46	SEG	246	85100	67
Newbridge Networks	Hardware	NNCXF	176	208771	20	NN	308	148637	28

## Figure Captions

**Figure 1:** Relationship between stock price and trading activity. Representative example of time series derived from the Trades and Quotes (TAQ) database for transactions of stock in Compaq Computer Corp. (CPQ) registered on the NYSE. (a) Price of CPQ stock over a three week period from 20 Feb.- 8 Mar. 1996 (42606 trades). On 1 Mar. 1996 Compaq reported that it would cut product prices in order to meet sales targets, leading to a drop in the stock price. (b) Intertrade times (ITT) of CPQ stock over the same period. Data exhibit complex fluctuations, a daily pattern of trading activity (with short ITT at the open and close of a trading day and longer ITT in between), and highly heterogeneous structure, as seen in the flurry of trades following the price drop. The relaxation time of the ITT response following the price drop extends over several days, suggesting that information may be contained in the temporal structure of trading activity. Data include transactions occurring between 9.30am and 4pm EST, excluding weekends and holidays.

**Figure 2:** Different correlation properties in intertrade times for stocks registered on the NYSE and NASDAQ markets. (a) Root-mean-square fluctuation function  $F(n)$  obtained using DFA-2 analysis, for the intertrade times (ITT) of stock in NASDAQ company Sun Microsystems (SUNW) and NYSE company Compaq Computer Corp. (CPQ). Here  $n$  indicates the time scale in number of trades. We normalize the time scale  $n$  by the daily average number of trades for each stock, so that a unit normalized scale indicates one trading day (marked by a dashed line). The scaling curves are vertically offset for clarity. While both companies have similar market capitalisations, industry sectors and average levels of trading activity (average ITT) and exhibit long-range power-law correlations over a broad range of scales, the scaling behaviour of the intertrade times for the two stocks is quite different. For CPQ we find a pronounced crossover from weaker correlations over time scales smaller than a day, to stronger correlations over time scales larger than a trading day ( $\alpha_2^{ITT_{CPQ}} > \alpha_1^{ITT_{CPQ}}$ ). In contrast, the scaling function  $F(n)$  for SUNW does not exhibit such a crossover, and we find much stronger correlations over time scales smaller than a trading day compared with CPQ ( $\alpha_1^{ITT_{SUNW}} > \alpha_1^{ITT_{CPQ}}$ ). Correlation exponents  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  characterising the temporal structure in ITT for (b) one hundred NYSE stocks and (c) one hundred NASDAQ stocks, of companies with a broad range of market capitalisations and

industry sectors. Stocks are ranked in order of decreasing average value of ITT ( $\overline{ITT}$ ) (as in Tables I & II), and are split into subsets (marked by vertical dashed lines) with matching  $\overline{ITT}$  and approximately equal numbers of stocks. We estimate  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  over scales from 8 trades to half of the daily average number of trades (for stocks with fewer than  $1.5 \times 10^5$  trades/year), and to a third of the daily average number of trades (for stocks with more than  $1.5 \times 10^5$  trades/year). We estimate  $\alpha_2^{ITT}$  over scales from 3 to 100 times the daily average number of trades. Group averages and standard deviations of  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  and  $\alpha_2^{ITT}$  are shown to the right of the panel for each market. Systematically higher values of  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  for the NASDAQ stocks (statistically significant difference with p-value  $p < 10^{-7}$  by the Student's t-test) suggest an underlying influence of market structure on the temporal organisation of intertrade times over scales within a trading day. In contrast, no systematic differences between the two markets are observed in the values of  $\alpha_2^{ITT}$ , characterising correlation properties of intertrade times over scales above a trading day ( $p = 0.03$  by the Student's t-test). We find similar results when we analyse trading activity at high resolution in terms of the number of trades per minute: a crossover at one trading day and stronger correlations for NASDAQ stocks compared with NYSE stocks over time scales less than a day (features which were not observed in previous studies [30, 31]). We further observe an increasing trend in the values of  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  and  $\alpha_2^{ITT}$  with decreasing  $\overline{ITT}$  for both markets.

**Figure 3:** Comparing long-range correlations in ITT for groups of stocks with varying average levels of trading activity on the NYSE and the NASDAQ. (a) Dependence of exponent  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$ , characterising the strength of correlations in ITT over scales from seconds up to a trading day, on the average level of trading activity. Each datapoint represents the group average over a subset of stocks, with a matching range of average intertrade times  $\overline{ITT}$  for the two markets. Stocks are grouped into subsets as indicated by vertical dashed lines in Fig. 2b,c. The consistent difference in the scaling exponent  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  between NYSE and NASDAQ stocks suggests that independent of company characteristics such as market capitalisation and industry sector, the temporal organisation of ITT within a trading day carries an imprint of market structure. (b) Dependence of exponent  $\alpha_2^{ITT}$  characterising correlations in ITT over time scales from a trading day to several months, on the average level of trading activity. On both markets we observe similar behaviour with no systematic difference in the values of  $\alpha_2^{ITT}$  between NYSE and NASDAQ subsets of stocks with matching ranges of  $\overline{ITT}$ . These results suggest that over time horizons longer than

a trading day, the impact of market structure on trading dynamics is less pronounced as more information is available to investors over longer time scales, driving their trading activity. The resulting more coherent behaviour of investors is reflected in stronger correlations ( $\alpha_2^{ITT} > \alpha_1^{ITT}$ ) over longer time scales.

**Figure 4:** Correlation properties of intertrade times of companies that moved from the NASDAQ to the NYSE during 1994-1995. (a) Fluctuation function  $F(n)$ , obtained using DFA-2 analysis on ITT of stock in the company Mid-Atlantic Medical Services Inc. while it was on the NASDAQ (3 January 1994 - 29 September 1994) and then after it moved to the NYSE (30 September 1994 - 30 November 1995). Here  $n$  indicates the scale in number of trades and the vertical dashed lines indicate the average daily number of trades while on the NYSE or the NASDAQ. The two scaling curves are vertically offset for clarity. After the move to the NYSE there is a decrease in the correlation exponent at time scales within a trading day and a pronounced crossover to stronger correlations with a higher exponent at larger time scales. (b) Correlation exponent  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  characterising fluctuations over time scales less than a trading day in ITT of stock in ten companies that moved from the NASDAQ to the NYSE. Companies are ranked in order of decreasing  $\overline{ITT}$  while on the NYSE (as in Table III) and the scaling range for  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  is the same as for the hundred NYSE and NASDAQ stocks (Fig. 2b,c). For all companies there is a decrease in  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  after the move to the NYSE, indicating that the transition to weaker correlations in ITT over time scales less than a day is due to the NYSE market structure and not to company-specific characteristics.

**Figure 5:** Relation between correlations in intertrade times and stock price dynamics (a) Dependence of exponent  $\alpha_1^{|RET|}$  characterising power-law correlations in absolute logarithmic price return fluctuations, on correlation exponent  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  characterising intertrade times within a trading day. Data represent one hundred NYSE (Table I) and one hundred NASDAQ (Table II) stocks. We calculate price returns over 1-minute intervals and  $\alpha_1^{|RET|}$  over time scales from 8 to 180 minutes ( $\approx$  half a trading day, which is 390 minutes). The positive relationship between  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  and  $\alpha_1^{|RET|}$  indicates that stronger correlations in ITT are coupled with stronger correlations in price fluctuations. This finding suggests that price fluctuations are not merely a response to short-term

bursts of trading activity [16, 26]: rather the fractal organisation of price fluctuations over a broad range of time scales is linked to the observed underlying scaling features in the series of intertrade times. Dependence of stock price volatility  $\sigma^{RET}$  on (b) the correlation exponent  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$  and (c) the average value of ITT for the same stocks as in (a). We calculate  $\sigma^{RET}$  as the standard deviation of daily logarithmic price returns over six-month periods, averaging over all six-month periods throughout the entire record of each stock. Our results show no strong dependence between stock price volatility  $\sigma^{RET}$  and average level of trading activity, rather the volatility appears sensitive to the strength of the temporal correlations in ITT. These findings suggest that scale-invariant features in transaction times may play an important role in price formation. Furthermore, both dynamic and static properties of stock prices appear to be influenced by market-specific features in transaction timing: stronger power-law correlations in ITT (higher values of  $\alpha_1^{ITT}$ ) for NASDAQ stocks are matched by stronger power-law correlations in price fluctuations (higher values of  $\alpha_1^{|RET|}$ ) and higher volatility ( $\sigma^{RET}$ ), compared with NYSE stocks.




FIG. 1:








FIG. 2:




FIG. 3:




FIG. 4:




FIG. 5: