



On Tuesday 1 July 2025, 04:00-21:00 GMT, we'll be making some site updates on Taylor & Francis Online. You'll still be able to search, browse and read our articles, where access rights already apply. Registration, purchasing, activation of tokens, eprints and other features of Your Account will be unavailable during this scheduled work.

Home ► All Journals ► Economics, Finance & Business ► Financial Analysts Journal ► List of Issues
► Volume 65, Issue 4 ► Liquidity and the Post-Earnings-Announce

Financial Analysts Journal >
Volume 65, 2009 - [Issue 4](#)

706 | 142 | 7
Views | CrossRef citations to date | 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 Tourism, Hospitality and Events journals, sign in here to start your FREE access for 14 days

📖 References ➕ Supplemental 🗨️ Citations 📊 Metrics 📄 Reprints & Permissions

Read the

We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 909 partners store and access personal data, like browsing data or unique identifiers, on your device. Selecting "I Accept" enables tracking technologies to support the purposes shown under "we and our partners process data to provide," whereas selecting "Reject All" or withdrawing your consent will disable them. If trackers are disabled, some content and ads you see may not be as relevant to you. You can resurface this menu to change your choices or withdraw consent at any time by clicking the ["privacy preferences"] link on the bottom of the webpage [or the floating icon on the bottom-left of the webpage, if applicable]. Your choices will have effect within our Website. For more details, refer to our Privacy Policy. [Here](#)

We and our partners process data to provide:

...

I Accept

Reject All

Show Purpose



Abstract

The post

market e

occurs n

surprise

weig

illiquid s

By using

70-100

earnings

One of t

efficienc

earnings momentum. This anomaly refers to the fact that companies reporting

icts with

ent drift

h-earnings-

value-

n the most

mpact costs.

count for

exploit the

form market

D), or

unexpectedly high earnings subsequently outperform companies reporting unexpectedly low earnings. More specifically, a company's standardized unexpected 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 (the absolute value of the daily price change divided by the daily trading volume). Returns on the long-short SUE strategy are 90 bps per month for the 1972–2005 period.

Because transaction costs are an important consideration in trading a PEAD strategy, we studied the impact of transaction costs on the profitability of the PEAD trading strategy. We used several different transaction cost assumptions to study the impact. We used a 0.5 percent transaction cost assumption, which is the average transaction cost of the PEAD trading strategy. We found that the PEAD trading strategy is unprofitable after adjusting for transaction costs. This finding is consistent with Rubinstein's definition of the PEAD anomaly.



Related research ⓘ

People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by
142

- 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 updates by email

