

Financial Analysts Journal >
Volume 65, 2009 - Issue 4

562 Views | 16 CrossRef citations to date | 7 Altmetric

Equity Investments

Liquidity and the Post-Earnings-Announcement Drift

Tarun Chordia, Amit Goyal, Gil Sadka, Ronnie Sadka & Lakshmanan Shivakumar

Pages 18-32 | Published online: 31 Dec 2018

Cite this article <https://doi.org/10.2469/faj.v65.n4.3>

Sample our
Economics, Finance,
Business & Industry Journals
>> [Sign in here](#) to start your access
to the latest two volumes for 14 days

[References](#) [Supplemental](#) [Citations](#) [Metrics](#) [Reprints & Permissions](#)[Read this article](#)

Abstract

The post-earnings-announcement drift is a longstanding anomaly that conflicts with market efficiency. This study documents that the post-earnings-announcement drift occurs mainly in highly illiquid stocks. A trading strategy that goes long high-earnings-surprise stocks and short low-earnings-surprise stocks provides a monthly value-weighted return of 0.04 percent in the most liquid stocks and 2.43 percent in the most illiquid stocks. The illiquid stocks have high trading costs and high market impact costs.

By using 70–100 percent of the earnings announcement, we find that the post-earnings-announcement drift is significantly larger in illiquid stocks than in liquid stocks. One possible explanation is that illiquid stocks have higher trading costs and market impact costs, which may lead to unexpected low earnings. More specifically, a company's standardized unexpected

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

earnings (SUE) is defined as the difference between the last available quarterly earnings and the earnings during that same quarter in the previous year, scaled by the standard deviation of this difference over the previous eight quarters. A trading strategy that each month goes long the stocks in the top decile of SUE and short the stocks in the bottom decile of SUE earns, on average, 90 bps per month (10 percent annually) over the 1972–2005 period.

The goal of this article is to demonstrate that stock liquidity is an important consideration for understanding the persistence of the PEAD anomaly over the years. Previous studies have not taken trading costs into account in the calculation of abnormal returns. We studied the impact of illiquidity on the profitability of the PEAD trading strategy and show that this strategy is likely to be unprofitable after adjusting for transaction costs.

First, we studied the relationship between the PEAD and illiquidity by using double-sorted portfolios. Our findings suggest that the PEAD is prevalent mainly in illiquid stocks. We examined the profitability of the long-short SUE strategy after sorting stocks into decile portfolios on the basis of their illiquidity. For this analysis, we used the Amihud measure of stock illiquidity, which is the average of the daily price impacts of the order flow (i.e., the daily absolute price change per dollar of daily trading volume). Returns to the long-short SUE strategy increased monotonically from 0.04 percent per month for the most liquid stocks to 2.43 percent for the most illiquid stocks.

Because we found that the PEAD is more prevalent in illiquid stocks, following a PEAD trading strategy will generate high transaction costs and a substantial price impact. We used several transaction-cost estimates to calculate the net returns to PEAD trading strategies. Our results show that transaction costs consume 70–100 percent of the potential profits. This lack of profitability can thus explain the persistence of the PEAD anomaly. This finding is consistent with the market microstructure framework of Ross, Rubinstein’s definition of illiquidity, and the illiquidity bias hypothesis of Shleifer and Vishny.

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings



Information for

[Authors](#)[R&D professionals](#)[Editors](#)[Librarians](#)[Societies](#)

Opportunities

[Reprints and e-prints](#)[Advertising solutions](#)[Accelerated publication](#)[Corporate access solutions](#)

Open access

[Overview](#)[Open journals](#)[Open Select](#)[Dove Medical Press](#)[F1000Research](#)

Help and information

[Help and contact](#)[Newsroom](#)[All journals](#)[Books](#)

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

[Sign me up](#)

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

[Accept All](#)[Essential Only](#)[Settings](#)