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We examine the changes in reported trades on NASDAQ from 1993 through 2010. We find that while volume and the number of trades are increasing for NASDAQ-listed securities, the percentage of volume that executes on NASDAQ declines from almost $100 \%$ in the 1990's to less than $40 \%$ in 2010. We examine the entrants of new exchanges on NASDAQ and the merger of NASDAQ and several exchanges. We do not find that either entrants of new trading venues or the merging of trading venues leads to a change in total volume of securities executed. We also document a large increase in the number of cancelled orders for NASDAQ-listed securities, and this is increasing.

## INTRODUCTION

The structure of stock exchanges are continually evolving as is how they compete for order flow. The purpose of this study is to trace the evolution of the NASDAQ stock market from 1993 through 2010. NASDAQ experiences many changes during this time period, ranging from trading and quoting rule changes (such as the limit order rule, quote rule, and minimum tick size changes) to competition from other venues in trading NASDAQ-listed securities. NASDAQ has seen a dramatic decline in its market share of executions of NASDAQ-listed stocks, with volume executing on NASDAQ going from 100\% (1993) to $37 \%$ (2010) during our sample time period.

We look at market competition and fragmentation as we trace the evolution of the NASDAQ market from 1993 through 2010. Many studies examine specific events, perhaps a small point in time, a single event, or the effect of particular trading or quoting rules. However, we target the structural changes such as the entrance of another venue trading NASDAQ-listed securities and whether the change results in the consolidation of (exchange mergers) or fragmentation of trading.

This paper builds on the work of Arnold, Hersch, Hulherin, and Netter (1999), who examine the evolution of regional stock exchanges' trading in the United States from 1938 to 1995. Arnold, Hersch, Hulherin, and Netter document the consolidation of regional stock exchanges (mergers) during this time period, which leads to a consolidation of trading on the regional stock exchanges and to decreases in bidask spreads. Although our study time period (1993-2010) contains a few NASDAQ-venue mergers, our
study differs significantly from Arnold, Hersch, Hulherin, and Netter as a number of exchanges, as well as alternative trading systems, begin trading NASDAQ-listed securities, leading to an increase in fragmentation rather than consolidation. Like Arnold, Hersch, Hulherin, and Netter, we find a narrowing of spreads during our time period, but our period is one when NASDAQ trading is fragmenting, not consolidating.

The issue of whether markets are more efficient when trading is consolidated in one venue (see, for example, Mendleson, 1987, and Chowdry and Nanda, 1991) or if trading is fragmented across multiple venues (see for example Battalio, 1997; Boehmer and Boehmer, 2003; and Foucault and Menkveld, 2008) is pondered both theoretically and empirically. A recent paper by O'Hara and Ye (2011) uses a matched sample of NYSE and NASDAQ stocks from April through June of 2008 to determine how market fragmentation affects the quality of trading in US markets. They use the volume of trade reporting facilities (TRF) as a proxy for fragmentation and conclude that fragmentation does not appear to harm market quality. We add to this work by looking at NASDAQ over time (as opposed to a point in time) to see how changes in fragmentation and the number of venues that trade NASDAQ stocks impacts market quality measures.

Several microstructure studies examine trading and trading costs over time - but most of these studies use only the activity of the primary exchange, and do not consider the activity of exchanges other than the primary listing exchange. For example, Chordia, Roll and Subrahmanyam (2001) look at trading volume and spreads for NYSE listed stocks from 1988 through 1998; Jones (2002) examines trading and trading costs from 1990 through 2000 for the Dow Jones stocks; Chorida, Sarkar, and Subrahmanyam (2005) investigate spreads of NYSE listed stocks from 1991 through 1998; Chordia, Huh, and Subrahmanyam (2007) look at trading from July 1963 to December 2002 for NYSE/AMEX stocks, and NASDAQ stocks from 1983 through 2002; Hameed, Kang, and Viswanathan (2010) study spreads of NYSE listed stocks from 1988 through 2003; and Angel, Harris and Spatt document provide an overview of changes in trading and trading costs in the U.S. markets from a $8^{\text {th }}$ tick sizes to decimalization. Our study adds to this line of research, by showing the increase in participation of trading venues other than the primary exchange. We document where trades occur for NASDAQ stocks (different reporting venues), show that the number of reporting venues are increasing, and thereby, changing the NASDAQ marketplace, and examine changes in spreads and speeds of execution for these NASDAQ stocks (see Boehmer, 2005).

We verify that, from 1993 to 2010, the average volume and number of trades per stock for NASDAQlisted securities dramatically increases while the average trade size per stock declines. The number of stocks listed on NASDAQ increases from 1993 to 1997, and declines steadily thereafter. From 1993 through 2010, trading evolves, volume migrates to other venues, and fragmentation increases due to competition from other trading venues. During this time period, nine trading venues enter the market to trade NASDAQ-listed securities, and four exchanges that trade NASDAQ-listed securities participate in mergers.

## THE EVOLUTION OF TRADING ON NASDAQ

The primary objective of our paper is to show how the landscape of NASDAQ has changed over time. While there are many events that have shaped NASDAQ as we know it today. NASDAQ has seen regulatory changes during this time period (such as the minimum tick size change from eights to sixteenths, the tick size change from sixteenths to decimals, and the inclusion of inter-market sweep orders). The number of venues trading in NASDAQ stocks (such as Archipelago, the ISE, BATS) has increased. Also, some venues that trade NASDAQ-listed stocks have consolidated (such as the merger of Instinet and Island and NASDAQ and BRUT; the NASDAQ purchase of the Philadelphia stock exchange and the NASDAQ purchase of the Boston Stock Exchange).

The effects of many of these events are documented in the finance literature. See Barclay, Christie, Harris, Kandel, and Schultz (1999) and Bessembinder (1999) for tick size changes and order handling rule changes and O'Hara and Ye (2011) for the effects of fragmentation. These papers typically study the market over a short time period revolving around the event.

We use data from CRSP, TAQ, and SEC Rule 605 to investigate, not just at one point in time, but rather the evolution of trading on NASDAQ from 1993 through 2010. We match trade data, obtained from the NYSE trade and Quote (TAQ) data set, to stocks with NASDAQ as their primary listing exchange in the CRSP data set. Order-flow statistics such as the percentage of volume, percentage of dollar volume, and percentage of trade executions are computed for the various exchanges that make markets in NASDAQ securities. Figure 1 shows that volume and number of trades for NASDAQ-listed securities from 1993 through 2010 is steadily increasing.

Although volume and number of trades are increasing for NASDAQ- listed stocks, the number of NASDAQ-listed stocks fluctuates over time (see table 1). The number of NASDAQ listings increases from 1993 to 1997, and subsequently declines. As trading activity increases, the percentage of volume of NASDAQ-listed stocks executing on NASDAQ changes dramatically. Volume on NASDAQ goes from $100 \%$ in 1993 to $37 \%$ in 2010 (table 2 panel a). The loss in volume goes predominantly to NASD $\mathrm{ADF} / \mathrm{TRF}$ and Arca. Although volume is increasing over the time period, trading is fragmenting. Table 2 panel b shows that not all venues that trade NASDAQ stocks trade all NASDAQ-listed stocks. For example, in 1993 the Chicago Stock Exchange is the only venue, other than NASDAQ, that trades NASDAQ-listed stocks and it trades only 97 NASDAQ-listed securities (and execute only a few trades in 1993 for these stocks), while in 2010 Archipelago (now part of the NYSE) executes trades all NASDAQlisted securities.

## CHANGING OF VENUES ON NASDAQ

For the majority of NASDAQ's history, only NASDAQ, via its members, traded NASDAQ-listed stocks. NASDAQ-only trading changed in May of 1987 when the Chicago Stock Exchange began trading a small number NASDAQ-listed securities. Beginning in 2002, trading in NASDAQ-listed securities began fragmenting as several exchanges and ECNs began making markets in NASDAQ stocks. The number of venues that trade NASDAQ-listed securities changes as well as the percentage of volume reported on these exchanges. There are new entrants as well as several mergers that occur on NASDAQ over our time period. Table 3 lists the dates of the first trades when various exchanges begin trading NASDAQ-listed securities (panel A) and dates that NASDAQ merges with other exchanges and trading platforms (panel B).

## New Entrants

Prior to 2002 NASDAQ stocks were primarily traded on NASDAQ by its members with a small fraction of trading occurring on the Chicago stock Exchange. Between 2002 and 2008, eight additional trading venues began trading NASDAQ-listed stocks -the National Stock Exchange and Amex in 2002, ARCHA/Pacific and the Boston Stock Exchanges in 2003, the International Stock Exchange and the Philadelphia Stock Exchange in 2006, the Chicago Board Options Exchange in 2007, BATS in 2008, and Direct Edge in 2010 (the exact dates of when these venues began trading is shown in panel A of table 3). While there are a number of new entrants in the market for NASDAQ stocks, there were also several mergers, which will be discussed and analyzed later in the paper. NASDAQ underwent mergers with BRUT in 2004, Instinet in 2005, the Philadelphia Stock Exchange and Boston Stock Exchange in 2008. Panel B of table 3 shows the exact dates of mergers between NASDAQ and other trading venues/platforms.

Table 4 shows the changes in the NASDAQ marketplace surrounding an exchange entrance. When the National Stock Exchange, Archa/Pacific, the Boston Stock Exchange, BATS and Direct Edge begin trading NASDAQ-listed stocks, theses venues trade a large number of NASDAQ-listed securities and execute between $3.56 \%$ (BATS) to $11.98 \%$ (Direct Edge) of volume in those securities. The exchanges/venues that make a market in the most securities execute large volumes. When AMEX, ISE, the Philadelphia Stock Exchange and the CBOE start trading NASDAQ-listed stocks, they trade only a few stocks (less than 400 in each case) and do not execute many trades. Total volume tends to drop when an exchange enters (change in volume and the percentage volume of entrant in table 4), with the
exceptions of the entrance of ARCH/Pacific and the Boston Stock Exchange. We test if these differences are statistically different from zero. We do not find that new entrants increase (or decrease) the total volume of trading in securities on NASDAQ.

When trading fragments, it likely results in an increase in price volatility (Madhaven, 1995). We examine the effect of each new entrant in the trading of NASDAQ-listed securities on price volatility and find that price volatility is not significantly lower for most entrants (see Table 5). The decrease is significant for the National Stock Exchange and AMEX, which is in contrast to the theoretical prediction of Madhaven.

## Mergers

There are four mergers that involve NASDAQ from 2004 through 2008 (mergers of NASDAQ with BRUT, Instinet, the Philadelphia Stock Exchange and the Boston Stock Exchange). Table 6 shows that the NASDAQ-BRUT merger results in an increase in the number of trades (panel a) and volume (panel B) on NASDAQ (that is, NASDAQ and the merged exchange). All other mergers result in NASDAQ losing market share. We test for changes in the overall volume when exchanges merge (in panel D of table 6), but we do not find any significant changes in overall volume (we also examine dollar volume of trading and find the same results).

We expect a merger to result in a decrease in volatility as trades are concentrated in one trading venue (and, as Madhaven (1995) theorizes that fragmentation leads to an increase in volatility, it seems that consolidation if trading should lead to a decrease in volatility). Table 7 shows the results of our mergervolatility investigation. We find mixed evidence regarding changes in the volatility of prices when trading exchanges/venues merge. The merger of NASDAQ and Brut results in a decline in price volatility, but the NASDAQ and Boston merger results in an increase in price volatility.

## TRADING COSTS AND SPEED OF EXECUTION ON NASDAQ

We use the SEC Rule 605 data to examine trading costs and speed of execution for NASDAQ-listed securities from 2002 through 2010 (the trends can be seen in figure 2). Rule 605 data begins in 2001, but we begin our analysis in 2002 as not all exchanges report in the early part of 2001. We show, in table 8 , effective spread and speed of execution statistics for the three largest venues that report trades in NASDAQ securities - NASDAQ, NASD, and ARCA-for 2002 through 2010. Effective spread, for the most part, declines from 2002 through 2010. The time of execution (speed) also generally declines. We now examine the relation between fragmented trading, trading costs, and speed of execution.

## Trading Costs Regressions

Trading on NASDAQ is fragmenting. Not only are more trading venues trading NASDAQ-listed securities, but a larger proportion of trades are executing on these exchanges. We seek to determine whether it is the number of venues on which trades execute or the percentage of trades that executes off NASDAQ that affects trading costs. We control for the determinants of spread: price, volume, trade size, volatility and firm size in the regression (see McInish and Wood, 1992). The results of this regression are in table 9 .

We find that as trading fragments for NASDAQ-listed stocks, that is, the percentage of volume executing off NASDAQ, spreads decline. We find a positive relation between the number of reporting venues and spread indicating that more reporting venues leads to an increase in spreads. We conclude that it is fragmentation of trading that reduces trading costs and not the number of venues that trade NASDAQ stocks.

## Speed of Execution Regressions

The time for execution is declining (speed is increasing) on NASDAQ during the 2002 to 2010 time period. As there is a relation between speed and trading costs (Boehmer, 2005), we use the same control variables in our speed regressions that we use for our spread regressions. We find that, as trading
fragments on NASDAQ, speed of execution declines. This indicates that as there is now more fragmentation, the speed of execution increases. Also, the speed of execution and the number of reporting venues are positively related, indicating that speed of execution is increasing with more trading venues.

## Characteristics of Stocks That Have Greater Fragmentation

We also examine the characteristics of stocks that relate to fragmentation (table 10). Firm size is negatively related to fragmentation, but this relation is not significant. Price and trade size are significantly negatively related to the amount of fragmentation, indicating that as prices increase the amount of fragmentation decreases (higher priced stocks trade more on NASDAQ) and larger trades execute on NASDAQ. We see a positive relation with execution speed and fragmentation indicating that as execution speed increases there is more trading off-NASDAQ.

## ORDER CANCELLATION RATES

The number (as well as the percentage) of cancelled orders is increasing during our time period. In an orderly competitive market, we do not expect to find a large number of cancelled orders. It appears, from the statistics in table 11, that cancelling orders is a practice that is becoming more and more common for NASDAQ-listed securities (panel A shows the number of cancelled orders and panel B shows the percentage of cancelled orders). We see that order cancellations are increasing through time. Some of the venues reporting cancelled trades report an alarming percentage of cancelled orders. In 2010 NASD reports $82.8 \%$ of orders cancelled, ARCA reports $92.1 \%$ of orders cancelled, AMEX cancels $52.8 \%$ of orders, the International Stock Exchange (ISE) cancels $97 \%$ of its orders and BATS cancels $40.8 \%$ of its orders. We believe the number of cancelled orders is an important characteristic of today's NASDAQ market, which affects underlying market quality. We also feel that false liquidity (orders which are posted and subsequently cancelled) is an important issue to point out, and while orders are cancelling at such high rates is outside of the scope of this paper, we hope that this points researchers to an issue with the NASDAQ stock market that researchers should explore.

Table 12 reports the differences in the percentage of orders cancelled by trading venues with the most cancelled orders. Arca is cancelling a significantly higher proportion of orders than NASD (and larger than NASDAQ, not tabulated). NASD is cancelling a larger proportion of orders than is NASDAQ. BATS has a high order cancellation rate, but not relative to the NASD. Initially, we believe the increasing number of cancelled orders may be related to the increase in high frequency trading. However, we leave this phenomenon to future researchers.

## CONCLUSION

Arnold, Hersch, Hulherin, and Netter (1999) show that as regional stock exchanges merge and trades are consolidated that trading costs decline. We examine NASDAQ listed securities from 1993 through 2010, a time period in which trading of NASDAQ listed securities becomes very fragment. We find that even in times of increased fragmentation that trading costs are declining and speeds of execution are increasing. We find that fragmentation of trades and not the number of exchanges/venues reduces trading costs and increases the speed of trading. We also document a large increase in the number of orders in NASDAQ-listed securities being cancelled.
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## TABLE 1 TRADING STATISTICS

Mean trading statistics reported by year and tick size regime. \# of stocks is the number NASDAQ-listed of stocks. Volume is the average daily volume of a sample stock. \# of trades is the average daily trades for a sample stock. Trade Size is the average number of shares per trades for a stock in the sample. Data source is the NYSE TAQ database.

| Panel A: by year |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | \# of stocks | Volume | \# of trades | Trade Size |
| 1993 | 3571 | 55053 | 30 | 1839 |
| 1994 | 4038 | 57934 | 32 | 1841 |
| 1995 | 4123 | 79939 | 49 | 1813 |
| 1996 | 4339 | 106355 | 68 | 1709 |
| 1997 | 4824 | 116883 | 81 | 1617 |
| 1998 | 4658 | 149434 | 123 | 1404 |
| 1999 | 4357 | 208189 | 253 | 1088 |
| 2000 | 4329 | 357422 | 540 | 878 |
| 2001 | 4327 | 414543 | 562 | 871 |
| 2002 | 3793 | 433425 | 622 | 744 |
| 2003 | 3324 | 470704 | 844 | 555 |
| 2004 | 2977 | 549951 | 1217 | 392 |
| 2005 | 2929 | 569786 | 1403 | 373 |
| 2006 | 2850 | 633516 | 1741 | 318 |
| 2007 | 2841 | 712784 | 2240 | 296 |
| 2008 | 2834 | 758178 | 2998 | 321 |
| 2009 | 2765 | 777261 | 2859 | 369 |
| 2010 | 2639 | 819388 | 2905 | 294 |
| Panel B: by tick size |  |  |  |  |
| Year | \# of stocks | Volume | \# of trades | Trade Size |
| 8ths | 4179 | 83233 | 52 | 1763 |
| 16ths | 4418 | 238348 | 305 | 1124 |
| Decimals | 2994 | 613954 | 1739 | 453 |

TABLE 2 (a)
SUMMARY STATISTICS BY VENUE - PERCENTAGE OF VOLUME BY EXCHANGE

| Year | NASDAQ | AMEX | Boston | National | NASD ADF, TRF | Chicago | ARCA | CBOE | ISE | Philadelphia | BATS | Direct Edge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1993 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 1994 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 1995 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 1996 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 1997 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 1998 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 1999 | 99.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 2000 | 99.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 2001 | 99.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 2002 | 94.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 2003 | 76.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 11.7\% | 3.2\% | 0.1\% | 8.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 2004 | 56.8\% | 0.0\% | 5.9\% | 19.0\% | 0.6\% | 0.1\% | 17.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 2005 | 63.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 20.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 16.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 2006 | 71.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.5\% | 6.7\% | 0.1\% | 19.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 2007 | 51.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 31.0\% | 0.1\% | 16.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 2008 | 46.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 3.0\% | 33.6\% | 0.1\% | 15.2\% | 0.3\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% |
| 2009 | 39.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 37.9\% | 0.3\% | 12.7\% | 0.3\% | 3.4\% | 0.0\% | 5.3\% | 0.0\% |
| 2010 | 37.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.9\% | 1.0\% | 35.3\% | 0.3\% | 16.7\% | 0.2\% | 1.7\% | 0.0\% | 6.7\% | 4.6\% |


|  |  |  |  |  | $T$ | $\text { BLE } 2 \text { (b) }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { This t } \\ & \text { TAQ } \end{aligned}$ | reports the base. | mber of | ASDAQ- | ted firms th | trade on | an exchang | during | year. O | flow | is compiled | m the |  |
| Year | NASDAQ | AMEX | Boston | National | NASD ADF, TRF | Chicago | ARCA | CBOE | ISE | Philadelphia | BATS | Direct Edge |
| 1993 | 3571 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1994 | 4038 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1995 | 4123 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1996 | 4339 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1997 | 4824 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1998 | 4658 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 369 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1999 | 4357 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 636 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2000 | 4329 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 932 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2001 | 4327 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 777 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2002 | 3793 | 130 | 0 | 3659 | 0 | 472 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2003 | 3324 | 138 | 2184 | 3323 | 3238 | 247 | 3217 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2004 | 2977 | 140 | 2954 | 2977 | 2868 | 321 | 2977 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2005 | 2929 | 135 | 138 | 2929 | 1504 | 715 | 2929 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2006 | 2850 | 130 | 1663 | 2843 | 2829 | 1177 | 2850 | 0 | 194 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| 2007 | 2841 | 119 | 2343 | 2819 | 2841 | 1919 | 2841 | 1079 | 2534 | 623 | 0 | 0 |
| 2008 | 2834 | 28 | 0 | 2834 | 2834 | 2371 | 2834 | 2440 | 2793 | 466 | 2577 | 0 |
| 2009 | 2765 | 0 | 2585 | 2699 | 2765 | 2649 | 2764 | 2552 | 2762 | 0 | 2764 | 0 |
| 2010 | 2639 | 768 | 2589 | 2629 | 2639 | 2556 | 2639 | 2593 | 2638 | 1569 | 2639 | 2506 |

TABLE 3
INCEPTION DATE OF EXCHANGES TRADING NASDAQ STOCKS AND EXCHANGE MERGER DATES

This table reports the first date when an exchange trades NASDAQ-listed stocks and the dates of NASDAQ and various exchange and ECN mergers.

| Panel A: Date of $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Trade in NASDAQ-listed Stocks |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Exchange | Date |
| National Stock Exchange(NSX) | March 18, 2002 |
| AMEX | August 27, 2002 |
| ARCA/Pacific | February 14, 2003 |
| Boston Stock Exchange | December 23, 2003 |
| International Stock Exchange (ISE) | November 11, 2006 |
| Philadelphia Stock Exchange | November 16, 2006 |
| Chicago Board Options Exchange (CBOE) | April 4, 2007 |
| BATS | October 24, 2008 |
| Direct Edge | July 21, 2010 |
| Panel B: Dates of Mergers |  |
| Exchange | Date |
| NASDAQ-BRUT | September 7, 2004 |
| NASDAQ-Instinet | December, 8 2005 |
| NASDAQ-Philadelphia | July 24, 2008 |
| NASDAQ-Boston | August 29, 2008 |

## TABLE 4 <br> CHANGES AROUND EXCHANGE ENTRANCE

This table reports NASDAQ-listed stock order-flow when an entering exchange begins trading NASDAQ stocks. \# of Firms that trade on NASDAQ is the number of NASDAQ-listed firms traded during the 60 -day window surrounding an exchange entrance. \# of firms trading on entering exchange is the number of stocks the entering exchange makes a market in during its first 30 days of trading NASDAQ securities. Avg. Volume of the previous 30 days is the average daily volume for the 30 days prior to the entering exchange making a market in those securities. Avg. 30 days after entrance is the average daily volume for the 30 days after the entering exchange begins making a market in NASDAQ securities. Change in volume is the average change in volume for a stock (volume from all exchanges), which the entering exchange trades, from the 30 days prior to the exchange entering to the 30 days after the exchange begins trading NASDAQ stocks (volume from all exchanges). Percentage Volume of Entrant is the average daily percentage of orderflow (per stock) the entering exchange captures in the first 30 days of trading. Order-Flow data is obtained from the NYSE TAQ database.

| Exchange | Date | \# of Firms <br> that trade on <br> NASDAQ | \# of firms <br> trading on <br> entering <br> exchange | Avg. Volume <br> the previous <br> 30 days | Avg. Volume <br> 30 days after <br> entrance | Change in <br> volume | Percentage <br> Volume of <br> Entrant |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| National (NSX) | March 18, 2002 | 2,705 | 2,662 | 610,296 | 565,703 | $-44,593$ | $5.59 \%$ |
| AMEX | August 27, 2002 | 3,420 | 50 | $4,218,900$ | $3,657,907$ | $-560,992$ | $0.98 \%$ |
| ARCA/Pacific | February 14, 2003 | 2,249 | 2,992 | 396,171 | 451,534 | 56,162 | $5.04 \%$ |
| Boston | December 23, 2003 | 2,323 | 2,831 | 532,111 | 635,521 | 85,911 | $7.21 \%$ |
| ISE | November 11, 2006 | 2,626 | 215 | $4,869,141$ | $4,306,876$ | $-650,394$ | $0.02 \%$ |
| Philadelphia | November 16, 2006 | 2,626 | 100 | $6,183,555$ | $5,583,201$ | $-600,355$ | $0.21 \%$ |
| CBOE | April 4, 2007 | 2,789 | 384 | $2,849,074$ | $2,782,719$ | $-66,355$ | $0.02 \%$ |
| BATS | October 24, 2008 | 2,604 | 2,536 | 992,776 | 824,717 | $-168,060$ | $3.56 \%$ |
| Direct Edge | July 21, 2010 | 2,502 | 2,500 | 787,435 | 70,0396 | $-87,038$ | $11.98 \%$ |
| *Sta |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Statistically significant at the $10 \%$ level
**Statistically significant at the $5 \%$ level
***Statistically significant at the $1 \%$ level
TABLE 5

This table reports percentage changes in price volatility from the 30-day period before an exchange entrance to the 30-day period after. Overall Change is the percentage change in volatility for all NASDAQ securities over the period. Percentage Change is the change in volatility for the stocks in which the entering exchange makes a market. All Other is the change in volatility in stocks which were not traded by the entering exchange. N is the number of stocks that the entering exchange trades in the first 30 days. Net change is the difference between Percentage Change and All Other. Data source: NYSE TAQ | Panel A: Changes in Price Volatility |
| :--- |
| Exchange Date |

| Exchange | Date | Overall Change | Percentage Change | All Other | N | Net Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| National (NSX) | March 18, 2002 | 12.2\% | 0.9\% | 41.3\% | 2,662 | -40.3\%** |
| AMEX | August 27, 2002 | -12.4\% | -23.7\% | -12.3\% | 50 | -11.4\%*** |
| ARCA/Pacific | February 14, 2003 | 14.3\% | 14.1\% | 16.5\% | 2,992 | -2.4\% |
| Boston | December 23, 2003 | 9.7\% | 9.8\% | 5.9\% | 2,831 | 3.9\% |
| ISE | November 11, 2006 | -2.0\% | -3.3\% | -1.9\% | 215 | -1.4\% |
| Philadelphia | November 16, 2006 | -3.7\% | -7.6\% | -3.6\% | 100 | -4.0\% |
| CBOE | April 4, 2007 | -1.5\% | -2.8\% | -1.3\% | 384 | -1.6\% |
| BATS | October 24, 2008 | -13.3\% | -13.5\% | -8.6\% | 2,536 | -4.9\% |
| Direct Edge | July 21, 2010 | -3.1\% | -3.1\% | -32.6\% | 2,500 | 29.4\% |

***Statistically significant at the $1 \%$ level
TABLE 6
CHANGES IN TRADING AROUND EXCHANGE MERGERS
This table reports the change in volume, dollar volume, and number of trades (average per stock) in NASDAQ-listed stocks surrounding an exchange or ECN merger. Change for merging is the change in order-flow for the merging exchange 30 days before to 30 days after the completion of the merger. Change for others is the change in order-flow for the non-merging exchanges 30 days before to 30 days after. Difference in merging and other is the difference between Change for Merging and Change for others. Data source: NYSE TAQ.
Exchange/Venue Date \# of firms that Change for merging Change for others Difference in merging merging venues Trade
Panel A: Changes in Number of Trades around exchange Merger

| Panel A: Changes in Number of Trades around exchange Merger |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NASDAQ-BRUT | September 7, 2004 | 2,787 | 55\% | 4\% | 50.5\%*** |
| NASDAQ-Instinet | December, 82005 | 2,640 | 42\% | 51\% | -8.9\%**** |
| NASDAQ-Philadelphia | July 24, 2008 | 2,681 | -2\% | 8\% | -9.9\%*** |
| NASDAQ-Boston | August 29, 2008 | 2,648 | 15\% | 23\% | -7.8\%*** |
| Panel B: Changes in Volume around exchange Merger |  |  |  |  |  |
| NASDAQ-BRUT | September 7, 2004 | 2,787 | 60\% | 23\% | 37.6\%*** |
| NASDAQ-Instinet | December, 82005 | 2,640 | 60\% | 79\% | -18.8\%** |
| NASDAQ-Philadelphia | July 24, 2008 | 2,681 | 6\% | 19\% | -13.7\%*** |
| NASDAQ-Boston | August 29, 2008 | 2,648 | 34\% | 44\% | -9.7\%*** |
| Panel C: Changes in Dollar Trading Volume around exchange Merger |  |  |  |  |  |
| NASDAQ-BRUT | September 7, 2004 | 2,787 | 78\% | 40\% | 37.0\%*** |
| NASDAQ-Instinet | December, 82005 | 2,640 | 84\% | 133\% | -49.3\% |
| NASDAQ-Philadelphia | July 24, 2008 | 2,681 | 6\% | 21\% | -14.9\%*** |
| NASDAQ-Boston | August 29, 2008 | 2,648 | 19\% | 27\% | -7.8\%*** |

Panel D: Changes in overall Volume around exchange Merger
Avg. Volume the
$\begin{array}{cc}\text { previous } 30 \text { days } & \text { days after merge } \\ 463,458 & 513,108\end{array}$
463,458
602,633
그귿
Date
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { NASDAQ-BRUT } & \text { September 7, 2004 } \\ \text { NASDAQ-Instinet } & \text { December } 82005\end{array}$
NASDAQ-Instinet December, 82005
NASDAQ-Philadelphia July 24, 2008
NASDAQ-Boston August 29, 2008
*Statistically significant at the $10 \%$ level
**Statistically significant at the $5 \%$ level
***Statistically significant at the $1 \%$ level
TABLE 7
CHANGES IN VOLATILITY AROUN


## TABLE 8

 EFFECTIVE SPREAD AND SPEED OF EXECUTION BY EXCHANGEThis table reports the average Effective Spread and Speed of execution for NASDAQ-listed stocks for 2002 through 2010. Data source: DASH 5

|  | NASDAQ |  | NASD |  | ARCA |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eff Sprd | Speed | Eff Sprd | Speed | Eff Sprd | Speed |
| 2002 | - | - | 0.14 | 59.60 | - | - |
| 2003 | - | - | 0.10 | 57.55 | 0.102 | 16.86 |
| 2004 | - | - | 0.09 | 47.61 | 0.021 | 4.39 |
| 2005 | - | - | 0.07 | 41.31 | 0.005 | 1.41 |
| 2006 | 0.05 | 10.18 | 0.06 | 46.28 | 0.003 | 0.66 |
| 2007 | 0.05 | 6.74 | 0.05 | 64.61 | 0.002 | 0.60 |
| 2008 | 0.07 | 3.99 | 0.04 | 44.99 | 0.003 | 1.39 |
| 2009 | 0.07 | 2.74 | 0.04 | 53.46 | 0.004 | 1.53 |
| 2010 | 0.05 | 4.48 | 0.02 | 48.26 | 0.002 | 0.72 |

TABLE 9
REGRESSIONS OF TRADING COSTS

| The dependent variable is Effective Spread. The sample is made up of annual firm observations for NASDAQ listed stocks. Size is firm value at the end of the year. Price is average stock price for the year. Volatility is average daily price volatility for the year. Volume is the daily number of shares. Trade size is the average number of shares per trade. Fragmentation is the percent of volume that is executed NASDAQ. \# of reporting venues is the average number of market center that trade a stock per month. Data sources are NYSE TAQ, and DA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Effective Spread | Effective Spread | Effective Spread | Execution Speed | Execution Speed | Execution Speed |
| Intercept | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.17 * * \\ & (2.481) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.16^{* *} \\ & (2.309) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.16 * * \\ & (2.377) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 147.95^{* * *} \\ & (9.747) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 149.94^{* * *} \\ & (9.875) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 148.40^{* * *} \\ & (9.776) \end{aligned}$ |
| Ln (size) | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01^{*} \\ & (-1.777) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (-1.621) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (-1.636) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25 \\ & (0.349) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.19 \\ & (0.261) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.20 \\ & (0.280) \end{aligned}$ |
| Log(price) | $\begin{aligned} & 0.04 * * * \\ & (3.246) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.04 * * * \\ & (3.268) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.04 * * * \\ & (3.246) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -12.08^{* * *} \\ & (-10.077) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -12.21^{* * *} \\ & (-10.142) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -12.09^{* * *} \\ & (-10.081) \end{aligned}$ |
| Log (volume) | $\begin{aligned} & -0.03 * * * \\ & (-8.924) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 * * * \\ & (-4.433) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 * * * \\ & (-4.342) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -13.46^{* * *} \\ & (-23.864) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -13.95^{* * *} \\ & (-19.666) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -14.05^{* * *} \\ & (-19.880) \end{aligned}$ |
| Log (trade size) | $\begin{aligned} & 0.04 * * * \\ & (3.344) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.03 * * * \\ & (3.027) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.03 * * * \\ & (2.976) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.24 * * * \\ & (5.844) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.65^{* * *} \\ & (5.979) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.81^{* * *} \\ & (6.066) \end{aligned}$ |
| Volatility | $\begin{aligned} & 0.13 \\ & (1.101) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.13 \\ & (1.104) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.13 \\ & (1.102) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.09 \\ & (0.101) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.20 \\ & (-0.195) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.07 \\ & (0.076) \end{aligned}$ |
| Fragmentation | $\begin{aligned} & -0.06 * * * \\ & (-2.782) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.06 * * * \\ & (-2.761) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.56 * * * \\ & (3.952) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 19.50^{* * *} \\ & (3.935) \end{aligned}$ |
| \# of reporting venues |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.00^{*} \\ & (-1.664) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.00^{*} \\ & (-1.652) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.18 * \\ & (1.775) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.17 * \\ & (1.729) \end{aligned}$ |
| N | 26,952 | 26,952 | 26,952 | 26,952 | 26,952 | 26,952 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.68 |
| F-value | 77.96 | 79.40 | 74.23 | 114.2 | 112.7 | 106.8 |

[^0]***Statistically significant at the $1 \%$ level
TABLE 10
REGRESSIONS OF WHO IS TRADING ON/OFF NASDAQ
This table reports marginal effects regression results based on tobit regression models for dependent variables that are constrained (twoway). The dependent variable is the percent of volume that is executed off of NASDAQ (Fragmentation). The sample is made up of annual firm observations for NASDAQ listed stocks. Size is firm market value at the end of the year. Price is average stock price for the year. Volatility is average daily price volatility for the year. Volume is the average daily number of shares. Trade size is the average number of shares per trade. Execution speed is the average number of second from order receipt to execution. Data sources are NYSE

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intercept | 1.833*** | 1.833*** | 1.767*** | 1.766*** |
|  | (70.83) | (70.80) | (67.52) | (67.47) |
| Ln (size) | -0.00134 | -0.00132 | -0.0017 | -0.00166 |
|  | (-0.738) | (-0.725) | (-0.935) | (-0.920) |
| Log(price) | -0.0932*** | -0.0935*** | -0.086*** | -0.0863*** |
|  | (-30.67) | (-30.32) | (-27.88) | (-27.57) |
| Log (volume) | 0.0324*** | 0.0327*** | 0.0365*** | 0.0368*** |
|  | (30.09) | (29.47) | (32.40) | (31.56) |
| Log (trade size) | -0.276*** | -0.276*** | -0.277*** | -0.278*** |
|  | (-79.88) | (-79.35) | (-81.68) | (-80.98) |
| Volatility | -0.00212 | -0.00450 | -0.0033 | -0.00627 |
|  | (-0.190) | (-0.408) | (-0.300) | (-0.569) |
| Effective Spread |  | 0.00781 |  | 0.0098 |
|  |  | (0.973) |  | (1.138) |
| Execution Speed |  |  | $0.000351^{* * *}$ | 0.000352*** |
|  |  |  | (9.965) | (9.984) |
| N | 26,952 | 26,952 | 26,952 | 26,952 |
| F -value | 2270 | 1896 | 1919 | 1649 |

*Statistically significant at the $10 \%$ level
***Statistically significant at the $1 \%$ level

TABLE 11

## CANCELED ORDERS

Panel A reports the average number of canceled orders per stock by exchange. Panel B reports the average percentage of orders canceled per stock by exchange. Data is compiled from the DASH 5 reports.

| Percentage of Orders Canceled |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | NASD | NASDAQ | ARCA | AMEX | ISE | BATS |
| 2002 | $20.2 \%$ | - | - | $55.7 \%$ | - |  |
| 2003 | $32.5 \%$ | - | $4.1 \%$ | $65.8 \%$ | - | - |
| 2004 | $40.2 \%$ | - | $62.5 \%$ | $74.2 \%$ | - | - |
| 2005 | $41.5 \%$ | - | $53.4 \%$ | $64.8 \%$ | - | - |
| 2006 | $35.0 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ | $56.6 \%$ | $63.4 \%$ | -40 | - |
| 2007 | $36.6 \%$ | $18.7 \%$ | $67.2 \%$ | $80.8 \%$ | $85.9 \%$ | - |
| 2008 | $65.4 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ | $75.8 \%$ | $77.5 \%$ | $96.2 \%$ | $33.2 \%$ |
| 2009 | $62.8 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ | $79.1 \%$ | - | $96.5 \%$ | $38.3 \%$ |
| 2010 | $82.8 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ | $92.1 \%$ | $52.8 \%$ | $97.0 \%$ | $40.8 \%$ |

## TABLE 12

## DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCENTAGE OF ORDERS CANCELED

Table reports the difference in percentage of orders canceled between exchanges. Difference is reported only if both exchanges trade NASDAQ stocks for the entire year. Data is compiled from the DASH 5

| reports. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | NASD - ARCA | NASD-NASDAQ | NASD-BATS |
| 2002 | - | - | - |
| 2003 | $-22.3 \% \%^{* * *}$ | - | - |
| 2004 | $-11.9 \%^{* * *}$ | - | - |
| 2005 | $-21.6 \% 0^{* * *}$ | - | - |
| 2006 | $-30.6 \% 0^{* * *}$ | $19.7 \%^{* * *}$ | - |
| 2007 | $-10.40^{* * *}$ | $17.90^{* * *}$ | - |
| 2008 | $-16.2 \%^{* * *}$ | $47.70^{* * *}$ | $24.6 \%^{* * *}$ |
| 2009 | $-9.31 \%^{* * *}$ | $46.5 \%^{* * *}$ | $42.1 \%^{* * *}$ |

*Statistically significant at the $10 \%$ level
**Statistically significant at the $5 \%$ level
***Statistically significant at the $1 \%$ level
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[^0]:    * Statistically significant at the $10 \%$ level

