



**Faculdade de Economia  
da Universidade de Coimbra**

Grupo de Estudos Monetários e Financeiros  
(GEMF)  
Av. Dias da Silva, 165 – 3004-512 COIMBRA,  
PORTUGAL

gemf@fe.uc.pt  
<http://gemf.fe.uc.pt>

HELDER M. C. V. SEBASTIÃO

**The partial adjustment factors of FTSE  
100 stock index and stock index futures:  
The informational impact of electronic  
trading systems**

---

ESTUDOS DO GEMF

N.º 7

2008

**PUBLICAÇÃO CO-FINANCIADA PELA  
FUNDAÇÃO PARA A CIÊNCIA E TECNOLOGIA**

Impresso na Secção de Textos da FEUC  
COIMBRA 2008

# The partial adjustment factors of FTSE 100 stock index and stock index futures: The informational impact of electronic trading systems

Helder M. C. V. Sebastião<sup>a</sup>

*Faculdade de Economia da Universidade de Coimbra*

June, 2008

## Resumo

O presente trabalho aplica o modelo de ajustamento parcial com ruído aos contratos de futuros FTSE 100 transaccionados na LIFFE e ao índice subjacente, cujas acções constituintes são transaccionadas na London Stock Exchange. O estudo debruça-se essencialmente sobre o impacto dos novos sistemas electrónicos de negociação, recentemente implementados naqueles mercados, sobre a eficiência *informacional* absoluta e relativa.

A análise empírica é efectuada utilizando preços de transacção com várias frequências, desde 1 até 30 minutos, para uma amostra que cobre o período desde 15 de Janeiro 1997 até 17 de Março de 2000. Os resultados indicam que o SETS, introduzido em Outubro de 1997 na London Stock Exchange, aumentou a eficiência absoluta mas diminuiu a eficiência relativa do índice, enquanto a migração dos Futuros FTSE 100 para o LIFFE CONNECT, em Maio de 1999, diminuiu quer a eficiência absoluta quer a eficiência relativa daquele contrato. O efeito negativo sobre a eficiência sugere um acréscimo de ruído *micro-estrutural* resultante das flutuações *bid-ask* e da inexistência de intermediação humana, a qual permitiria atenuar os desequilíbrios causados pelo fluxo aleatório de ordens de transacção.

## Abstract

This paper examines the partial adjustment factors of FTSE 100 stock index and stock index futures. Using high frequency data since January 15, 1997 until March 17, 2000, it aims to assess the informational impact of the new electronic trading systems recently implemented at London Stock Exchange and LIFFE. The results suggest that information runs mainly from the futures market to the spot market. We find that the introduction of SETS, in October 1997, has increased the FTSE 100 index absolute efficiency; however it reduced the informational feedback to the futures market. The implementation of LIFFE CONNECT at LIFFE, in May 1999, has reduced the absolute and relative efficiency of FTSE 100 futures. These findings seem to imply that during the period under scrutiny electronic trading has increased the level of microstructural noise, probably due to the bid-ask bounce and order flow imbalances.

*JEL classification:* G13; G14; G15

*Keywords:* Partial adjustments; Price discovery; High frequency data; FTSE 100; Stock index futures; Market microstructure; Electronic trading; LIFFE, London Stock Exchange.

---

<sup>a</sup> FEUC, Av. Dias da Silva, 165, 3004-512 Coimbra-Portugal.  
Tel: +351 239 790500, e-mail address: [helderse@fe.uc.pt](mailto:helderse@fe.uc.pt)

The present work is part of my PhD thesis in Financial Markets at the Management School – Lancaster University and was supported by the POCTI program of the “III Quadro Comunitário de Apoio” sponsored by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) and by the European Social Fund (ESF). Thanks are also due to Gary Xu, Nelson Areal, Michael Theobald, Pradeep Yadav and, most especially to my supervisor, Stephen Taylor. The usual disclaimer applies.

## **1. Introduction**

This paper aims to assess the impact of the new electronic trading systems, recently implemented at London Stock Exchange and LIFFE, on the absolute and relative efficiency of FTSE 100 index and futures contracts using partial adjustment factors.

The informational linkage between stock indices and stock index futures has been extensively analysed, both theoretically and empirically, in the finance literature (see, for example, Herbst et al., 1987; Kawaller et al., 1987; Stoll and Whaley, 1990; Chan, 1992; Kawaller et al., 1993; Abhyankar, 1995; Martikainen et al., 1995; Abhyankar, 1998; Pizzi et al., 1998; Booth et al., 1999; Fung and Jiang, 1999; Kim et al., 1999; Min and Najand, 1999; Frino et al., 2000; Chiang and Fong, 2001). However, few papers have attempted to characterize the adjustment process to new information in a high frequency framework.

There are several economic reasons to support that in highly liquid markets for individual assets, such as the futures market, it takes just a few minutes or even seconds for the complete adjustment of prices to new information. This claim is empirically sustained by event studies designed to examine the effect of firm-specific information disclosure, such as earnings, dividends, takeovers announcements, and, most particularly, by those designed to explore the effect of macroeconomic announcements on index futures contracts (Ederington and Lee, 1993, 1995).

The empirical evidence on stock indices is less conclusive. The literature has identified several microstructural factors that may produce significant autocorrelations even at lower frequencies, (e.g. daily). Among these factors stands out the nonsynchronous trading effects (Mech, 1993; Boudoukh et al., 1994; Ahn et al., 2002). At higher frequencies, well diversified indices experience normally higher autocorrelations than those of the corresponding futures contract. However, there is some empirical evidence that nonsynchronous data is not the only source of discrepancy between the two markets (Mackinlay and Ramaswamy, 1988).

In a high frequency framework, fundamental information interacts in a nontrivial manner with the trading mechanisms that originate prices. The analysis of how market structures influence the price adjustment until the hypothetical situation where all information is impounded and revealed by the price system is a research area in market microstructure by its own right. Using minute-by-minute data for more than three years, since January 15, 1997, until March 17, 2000, we are able to study the changes in the price discovery process due to the implementation SETS at the London Stock Exchange and LIFFE CONNECT at LIFFE.

Before October 1997, UK stocks were traded on the Stock Exchange Automated Quotation System (SEAQ). Essentially, this was a quote-driven market where multiple dual-capacity market makers were obliged, during the “mandatory quote period”, to continuously provide bid and ask prices for all individual domestic stocks, along with the maximum transaction size to which those prices were related. However, even those equities and volumes for which the market maker should provide binding quotes were to a great extent indicative, as it was common practice to improve upon the quoted prices via telephone negotiations. For each security, liquidity was only supplied by market makers without the competition of public limit orders.

Following the market reform undertaken by NASDAQ on January 20, 1997, LSE launched, on October 20, 1997, the Stock Exchange Trading System (SETS) for the 100 most liquid domestic shares. SETS provides a continuous, electronic, order-driven trading platform for domestic stocks with the largest capitalization. The automatic order-matching feature and the predominant role of limit orders in supplying liquidity are main differences in relation to SEAQ. With SETS, dealers are not obliged to provide firm quotes and its participation in the market became entirely voluntary and competes with the public limit orders in providing “immediacy. Any trade through the SETS central market is published instantaneously, irrespective of its size.

FTSE 100 stock index futures begin trading at LIFFE through the traditional open-outcry system. In the “pits”, traders, in close physical proximity, verbally and publicly announced or cancelled bids and offers. A trader could request a quote and then could accept the best one or refuse trading. When there were many bids or offers at the same quote, a “lottery” - the trader choice - was used as a tiebreak. When two traders agreed to a trade, each trader recorded the relevant information in a paper card. These cards were collected by the appropriate clearing firm at regular intervals. Transaction prices should be published immediately to the entire trading community. However, because quotes were recorded manually by “pit” observers, the displayed quotes might not cover the entire set of available quotes, leading to an overstatement of the average time between quote revisions and introducing a report delay that increased with the “crowd” activity. Liquidity was mainly supplied by a special category of exchange members, with limited capital compared to the institutional members, known as “scalpers”. These market participants were physically present on the floor, traded primarily for their own personal account and generally its typical trading strategy consisted in taking several small positions of several seconds or minutes, hoping to earn a profit by the end of the day.

The first migration to LIFFE CONNECT (Release 1.0 LCFF) occurred on November 30, 1998, for individual equity options. FTSE 100 index futures began trading on LIFFE CONNECT five months later, on May 10, 1999 (Release 2.0 LCFF). Trading on LIFFE

CONNECT is conducted in an automatic order-driven environment. Only exchange members, that can enjoy dual capacity, may access directly to the trading host through their trading applications and can provide indirect access to the order book through the integration of sub-systems. As in SETS, the system matches automatically buy and sell orders according to strict price and time priority rules. Liquidity in the central order book is primarily provided by public limit orders. Cumulatively, some exchange members, categorized as “market makers”, are only obligated to provide quotes on request. Market makers are released from their obligations to provide any two-way prices in the event of “fast markets”. The system provides complete market information, in that any changes to the order book, whether they result from new orders, order revisions, expiry of “good-until-cancel” orders, or the execution of trades, are communicated to any trader that has subscribed to the relevant market. In addition, for a given contract or strategy, traders are able to track full market depth by requesting information about all prices available plus aggregate volume at those prices. The system assures both pre-trade and post-trade anonymity, as traders are not aware of whose orders they are viewing or trading against.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains a review of the relevant literature on the effects of electronic trading on price discovery. Section 3 presents the partial adjustment with noise model from which the different partial factors estimators are derived and discusses its applicability in a high frequency framework. Section 4 describes the dataset and provides some descriptive statistics. Section 5 estimates the partial adjustment coefficients for the FTSE 100 index and futures contracts at different sampling frequencies. Main conclusions are stated in Section 6.

## **2. Literature review**

Market protocols, and most particularly the type of trading system, may influence the market liquidity structural features but also can have an impact on the price adjustment process to information. Several issues have been raised when relating electronic trading and price discovery; generally associated with different degrees of accessibility, transparency, anonymity, flexibility, resiliency and human intermediation.

Electronic trading may reduce the atomicity of liquidity (Massimbi and Phelps, 1994; Pirrong, 1996), and decrease the contribution of “locals” to price discovery (Fong and Zurbrugg, 2003; Frino et al., 2004; Kurov and Lasser, 2004). However, electronic trading mechanisms have the increased ability to offer remote cross-border membership and to create powerful network synergies (Franke and Hess, 2000), hence facilitating direct participation at lower cost by particular and institutional (Blume and Goldstein, 1997).

It is commonly argued that electronic trading increases pre-trade and post-trade transparency. The effect of pre-trade transparency on the price discovery is not decisive. For instance, Flood et al. (1999) argue that pre-trade opaqueness increases search costs, which induces more aggressive pricing strategies, meaning that price discovery is probably much faster in opaque markets; Pagano and Röell (1996) propose that pre-trade transparency reduces trading costs. Boehmer et al. (2004) show empirically that the introduction OpenBook service at NYSE, which provides limit-order book information to traders off the exchange floor, improved the informational efficiency of prices. Conceivably, the enhanced post-trade transparency of electronic trading systems implies that more endogenous information and public exogenous information is available to a greater number of potential investors, which, reduces the overall opportunity trading costs (Locke and Sarkar, 2001). Bloomfield and O'Hara (1999) present a laboratory experiment where, ultimately, post-trade transparency increases liquidity costs but it also increases informational efficiency.

Usually, in electronic systems, traders communicate anonymously via a screen and therefore adverse selection problems are allegedly weaker on the floor. Because a limited number of traders are physically concentrated in the "pit", traders can observe each others' behaviour and infer valuable information. The lower anonymity of quote-driven markets in conjunction with the ability to select a counterpart may reduce the overall trading costs but also can disincentive trading on information (Benveniste et al., 1992; Pirrong, 1996).

Martens (1998) and Massimb and Phelps (1994) argue that the disadvantage of the limit order book lies in the time delay between the withdrawal of old quotes and the submission of new orders. In outcry markets, a single hand signal is sufficient enough to change the price quotes. However, given the recent advances in telecommunications, computer technology and trading software, electronic trading can be quite flexible, with important savings in execution time and other trading costs. Moreover, the high pre and post-trade transparency of electronic systems surely imply that this system provides a more timely response to exogenous information. Against the superior resiliency of open outcry systems, Pirrong (1996) states that, during "fast market" situations, order flow on the floor may be fragmented and different prices may coexist in different areas of the "pit". Following this argument, in "fast markets" open outcry may introduce noise in the pricing process.

Probably the most obvious effect of electronic trading is that it disrupts the liquidity and stability services provided by human intermediation. Intermediaries in the trading process, such as market makers and other "locals", can anticipate future order imbalances and consequently their intervention can reduce transitory volatility. These services are

particularly valuable for less liquid stocks (Madhavan and Sofianos, 1998). In a similar perspective, it is argued that human intermediation provides market stability in the presence of severe asymmetric information problems (Glosten, 1989; Tse and Zobotina, 2004). Conversely, Bloomfield et al. (2003) argue that in electronic systems, informed traders can also provide liquidity to the order book through the submission of limit orders when the value of their information is low. According to these authors, this would explain why electronic markets can endogenously create liquidity even in the presence of information asymmetry.

It is worth noticing that stability and price discovery (i.e. dynamic price efficiency) may be conflicting market functionalities. If there is no human intermediation, the increase in information asymmetry may have a more pronounced negative impact on liquidity, the bid-ask spread widens and market depth declines. Informed trades will have a bigger price impact and market prices will incorporate more rapidly information (Easley and O'Hara, 1992). But, this market is less stable, in the sense that it exhibits large price volatility.

The ambiguity of the theoretical arguments about the impact of electronic trading on price discovery is also present in the empirical evidence, and it seems that the conflicting results are very sensitive to the intrinsic liquidity of the market under study.

Grünbichler et al. (1994) use data for the German stock index (DAX), whose component stocks are traded on the floor at the Frankfurt Stock Exchange, and for the DAX index futures that are screen-traded on the German Futures and Options Exchange (DTB) and conclude that screen trading accelerates the price discovery process. Martens (1998) focus on the relative price discovery during the two extreme events of "fast markets" and very quiet periods for the Bund futures traded simultaneously at the LIFFE, open outcry market, and DTB, automated exchange, and shows that there is a drop in the information share of LIFFE from 57.8% in high volatility periods to 33.8% in low periods. Franke and Hess (2000) find that the DTB's market share is inversely related to price volatility and trading volume. Theissen (2002) examines the mid-quotes of the 30 stocks, traded simultaneously during 3 hours each day at the floor of the Frankfurt Stock Exchange and on the electronic system IBIS, the results are favourable for the electronic market with an estimated Gonzalo-Granger common factor weight of 0.65.

Taylor et al. (2000) find that in the pre-SETS period, the adjustment in the FTSE 100 futures market is faster than adjustments in the spot market; however this asymmetry disappears in the electronic trading period. Tse and Zobotina (2001) examine the impact of LIFFE CONNECT and find that the variance of the pricing error is about 5 times more in the electronic period than in the open outcry period. Frino and McKenzie (2002) also study the impact of LIFFE CONNECT and conclude that the strengthening of the simultaneity of price discovery is probably the reflection that the cash market is also screen traded, which

enhances program trading and index arbitrage. Chng (2004) finds that electronic trades at LIFFE CONNECT are more than twice as informative as the previous floor trades and concludes that this is originated by the increase in the order flow visibility.

Hasbrouck (2003) examines the relative price discovery of exchange-traded funds, regular futures contracts, traded through open outcry at CME, and E-mini futures contracts, screen-traded at GLOBEX, on the S&P 500 and NASDAQ 100 indices and estimates information shares of around 85% for the E-mini contract. Kurov and Lasser (2004) revisit the work of Hasbrouck (2003) - excluding the exchange-traded funds - and report that almost all price discovery is attributed to the electronic market, with information shares of about 98% and 96% for the E-mini S&P 500 and NASDAQ 100 futures respectively. Ates and Wang (2005) also study the regular futures contracts and E-mini futures contracts on the S&P 500 and NASDAQ 100 indices, and find that after the learning period and when the electronic system achieves a sufficient level of liquidity, this market presents an increasing informational superiority, with information shares of 84.2% to 89.5% in the maturity period.

Brailsford et al. (1999) examine the impact of automated trading, introduced on September 1990 at the Australian stock market, on the information transmission between the stock and the futures market, and find that automated trading provides a richer and timelier information set which accelerates the price discovery process. Fung et al. (2005) study the switching, on June 6, 2000, of the Hang Seng Index futures (Hong Kong) from floor trading to electronic trading, and show that the futures information share increases from 56.48% to 65.60%, while the futures common factor weight increases from 0.602 to 0.664.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **The “partial adjustment with noise” model**

The theoretical background for the derivation of several partial adjustment estimators is the “partial adjustment with noise” model of Amihud and Mendelson (1987). This model is easily adapted to a bivariate price process of fundamentally related assets (Theobald and Yallup, 1998).

Let us suppose that the futures (log) price process, denoted by  $f$ , and the underlying asset (log) price process, denoted by  $s$ , follow an adjustment process with noise:



$$\begin{aligned}
p_{s,t} &= p_{s,t-1} + \delta_s (m_t - p_{s,t-1}) + \eta_{s,t} \\
p_{f,t} &= p_{f,t-1} + \delta_f (m_t - p_{f,t-1}) + \eta_{f,t} \\
m_t &= m_{t-1} + u_t \\
u_t &\sim N(0, \sigma_u^2) \\
\boldsymbol{\eta}_t &= \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{s,t} \\ \eta_{f,t} \end{bmatrix} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta) \\
\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta &= \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{\eta_s}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_{\eta_f}^2 \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In this structural model, the price process  $\mathbf{p}_t = \begin{bmatrix} p_{s,t} & p_{f,t} \end{bmatrix}'$  depends on information, specified by the latent fundamental price,  $m_t$ , and on a bivariate process  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{s,t} & \eta_{f,t} \end{bmatrix}'$ , that we will, with a slight abuse of language, call noise. The existence of only one efficient price for the underlying asset and for the futures contract is not a restrictive assumption in a high frequency setup because the fundamental determinants of the futures basis do not accrue intraday (Miller et al., 1994).

The fundamental (log) price follows a random walk, and its innovations,  $u_t$ , have a permanent impact on both prices. The dynamics generated by information are completely described by the convergence rate  $\delta_i$ , with  $i = s, f$ . In the hypothetical situation where  $\delta_i = 1$ , prices are fully adjusted to information, in the sense that information is completely and immediately impounded into prices, but still not completely revealing due to the existence of noise. Accordingly the “life” of the adjustment process diminishes as  $\delta_i$  approaches 1. To guarantee a finite adjustment process it is assumed that  $0 < \delta_i < 2$ . If  $0 < \delta_i < 1$  then prices undershoot the efficient price, i.e., in the presence of a permanent impact, evaluation errors have always the same sign and the sequence of prices provides valuable information. If  $1 < \delta_i < 2$  there are overshooting effects as prices overestimate and underestimate alternatively the efficient price, most particularly there is contemporaneous overreaction.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the term “overreaction” has been normally associated with long horizon investments, where “short-run” refers to a period of weeks or even months (see for example Jegadeesh and Titman, 1995); several papers, among which stands out Ederington and Lee (1993, 1995), provide empirical evidence that high frequency returns may also overreact to news events. Accordingly the “intraday overreaction hypothesis” has been already empirically tested (see, for example, Fung and Lam, 2004, and Grant et al., 2005).

Since the work of Bondt and Thaler (1985), overshooting effects have been commonly explained by cognitive misperceptions of market participants. For example, overreaction can result from rational anticipation of positive feedback trading, characterized by buying (selling) pressure when prices rise (fall) (Long et al., 1990), or can be the observable result of investors' overconfidence about the precision of their information signal, specially in face of unreliable information pieces (Daniel et al., 1998; Odean, 1998; Gervais and Odean, 2001). Alternatively, Lehmann (1990) argues that observable returns overreaction can be originated by imbalances in the market short-run (weekly) liquidity.

The second source of uncertainty,  $\eta$ , is modelled as two idiosyncratic noise processes with zero mean and variance  $\sigma_{\eta_s}^2$  and  $\sigma_{\eta_f}^2$  for the stock index and futures contract respectively. The noise variances aim to capture indistinguishably all microstructural imperfections such as bid-ask bounce, inventory adjustments, short selling restrictions, taxes, price discreteness, etc, as well as temporary order imbalances caused by liquidity or noise trading.

In this model, there are information-induced price movements and there is “everything else”, i.e. the second source of uncertainty is left unspecified. This does not mean that all information-induced price movements are in fact information as they can be the result of overshooting effects and therefore are, in fact, noise.<sup>2</sup> There is no distinction between public and private information; all sources of information are condensed in the latent efficient price and markets are distinct in the way they adapt to the information arrival process. The reasoning reduces to consider that the efficient price is resolved in the information market and thus is exogenous to the order flow. Differences between markets due to asymmetric information, different strategic behaviour of informed traders, different number of informed traders, different expectations, opinions or interpretations of public news, all this is assumed to be expressed by measurable differences between convergence speeds. If a specific market experiences an adjustment coefficient closer to unity, that means that it incorporates new information more rapidly and, assuming that all the rest is the same, informationally dominates the other market. However it remains to know if this is due to differences in gathering and interpreting public information or private information.

---

<sup>2</sup> One theoretical example of noise associated with information is found in the noisy rational expectations model of Brown and Jennings (1990). Here, traders are endowed with some informative signal; however this signal also contains noise, which is carried out through trading to the return process.

Considering the instantaneous return process, (the first difference of the logarithmic price process), model (1) can be expressed as a moving average process in permanent and transitory shocks,

$$R_{i,t} = \delta_i \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1-\delta_i)^k (u_{t-k} - \eta_{i,t-k-1}) + \eta_{i,t}, \quad (2)$$

or, using the lag operator

$$[1 - (1-\delta_i)L]R_{i,t} = \delta_i u_t + (1-L)\eta_{i,t}, \text{ with } i = s, f. \quad (3)$$

The return process in each market, defined by (2) and (3), is therefore a function of two unrelated processes,  $\{u_t\}$  and  $\{\eta_{i,t}\}$ , but the permanent and transitory components of returns are contemporaneously correlated as long as  $\delta_i \neq 1$ , consequently transaction prices are not strong-form efficient. In other words, information is exogenously produced but some part of it, depending on the value of  $|1-\delta_i|$ , is endogenously revealed through the trading process itself.

Equation (3) basically states that the return process is “observationally” equivalent to an ARMA(1,1) process. Considering (a) that  $u_t$  is i.i.d. with mean zero and variance  $\sigma_u^2$  and (b) that the noise terms are i.i.d. with mean zero and variance  $\sigma_{\eta_i}^2$ , partial adjustment coefficients for each market can be estimated by  $\hat{\delta}_i = 1 - \hat{\phi}_{i,1}$ , where  $\hat{\phi}_{i,1}$  is the autoregressive parameter estimate obtained from the return series.

Additionally, let us assume that (c) information innovations and noise processes are contemporaneous and serially uncorrelated, i.e.  $Cov(u_t, \eta_{i,\tau}) = 0, \forall t, \tau, i, j$ . Then, from (2) the variance of the individual return process is defined as

$$Var(R_{i,t}) = \frac{\delta_i}{2-\delta_i} \sigma_u^2 + \frac{2}{2-\delta_i} \sigma_{\eta_i}^2. \quad (4)$$

Hence, the variance of returns depends both on noise and information, with the contribution of information-induced volatility being a function of the adjustment speed. One market can experience a higher volatility because it reacts faster or overreacts to new information, or simply because it is noisier.

The auto-covariances assume the following functional formula:

$$Cov(R_{i,t}, R_{i,t-k}) = \frac{\delta_i (1-\delta_i)^{k-1}}{2-\delta_i} [(1-\delta_i) \sigma_u^2 - \sigma_{\eta_i}^2], \text{ with } k = 1, 2, 3, \dots, \quad (5)$$

Therefore, a second type of partial adjustment coefficient estimator derives naturally from the autocovariance ratios:

$$\pi_i = (1 - \delta_i) = \left[ \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{i,t-2}) / \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{i,t-1}) \right]. \quad (6)$$

A third adjustment coefficient estimator can be obtained from the cross-covariances ratios. Considering that (d) the noise processes are contemporaneous and serially uncorrelated, i.e.  $\text{Cov}(\eta_{i,\tau}, \eta_{j,\tau}) = 0$ ,  $\forall t, \tau, i, j$ , the cross-covariances are given by

$$\text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t-k}) = \frac{\delta_i \delta_j (1 - \delta_i)^k}{(\delta_i + \delta_j) - \delta_i \delta_j} \sigma_u^2, \text{ with } k = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots \text{ and } i \neq j. \quad (7)$$

From the contemporaneous and first order cross-covariances

$$\pi_i = (1 - \delta_i) = \left[ \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t-1}) / \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t}) \right]. \quad (8)$$

In real markets, information and noise interact and prevent markets from being continuous and completely arbitrated away. In this simple partial adjustment model, markets are different to the extent in which noise is “local” to each market but also because they may have different dynamic reactions to information. If prices converge to the efficient price at different rates, the observed returns will exhibit asymmetrical lead-lag structures. From (7) the first order cross-covariances are given as

$$\text{Cov}(R_{s,t-1}, R_{f,t}) = \frac{\delta_s \delta_f (1 - \delta_f) \sigma_u^2}{(\delta_s + \delta_f) - \delta_s \delta_f}, \text{ and } \text{Cov}(R_{s,t}, R_{f,t-1}) = \frac{\delta_s \delta_f (1 - \delta_s) \sigma_u^2}{(\delta_s + \delta_f) - \delta_s \delta_f}.$$

Therefore if, for example,  $\delta_f > \delta_s$ , the ratio  $\frac{\text{Cov}(R_{s,t-1}, R_{f,t})}{\text{Cov}(R_{s,t}, R_{f,t-1})} = \frac{1 - \delta_f}{1 - \delta_s}$  is lower than unity; and the futures market exhibit a lead over the underlying stock market.

Another recurring issue in the study of partial adjustment coefficients is the behaviour of the estimators with the sampling frequency. Let us suppose that the sampling interval  $t$  is divided into  $n$  equal subintervals  $l$ , i.e.  $n = t/l$ . Theobald and Yallup (2004) show that the autocorrelation coefficient at sampling frequency  $t$ ,  $\text{Corr}\{R(t), R(t-1)\}$ , can be expressed in terms of autocovariances and variances at the differencing interval  $l$ . Denoting the autocovariance of order  $k$  at differencing interval  $l$  as  $\text{Cov}(k)$  (the variance is denoted as  $\text{Cov}(0)$ ) then

$$\text{Corr}\{R(t), R(t-1)\} = \frac{n^{-1}\text{Cov}(1) + \sum_{i=2}^n (i/n)\text{Cov}(i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{n-i}{n}\right)\text{Cov}(i+n)}{\text{Cov}(0) + 2\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{n-i}{n}\right)\text{Cov}(i)}. \quad (9)$$

Hence, the “intervalling” properties of the autocorrelations ratio estimator depend on  $n$  and on higher order autocovariances. If the higher order autocovariances (in the summations of (9)) are sufficiently small, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Corr}\{R(t), R(t-1)\} = \frac{n^{-1}\text{Cov}(1)}{\text{Cov}(0)} = 0. \quad (10)$$

So, as the differencing interval increases, the adjustment coefficient estimates tend to unity. If the higher order autocorrelations are non-zero, over and underreactions may occur at longer differencing intervals. Theobald and Yallup (1998) demonstrate that, if the returns processes are completely described by the partial adjustment model, then the adjustment factor for a differencing interval of  $n$  periods,  $\delta(n)$ , is related to the partial adjustment factor for a single differencing interval,  $\delta(1)$ , according to

$$\delta(n) = n\delta(1)[1 + (n-1)\delta(1)]^{-1}. \quad (11)$$

Therefore, when  $\delta(1)=1$ ,  $\delta(n)=1$ ; when  $\delta(1)<1$ ,  $\delta(1)<\delta(n)<1$  and when  $\delta(1)>1$ ,  $\delta(1)>\delta(n)>1$ .

### **Bid-ask bounce, order flow dependencies and nonsynchronous trading**

There are several economic factors that induce serial correlation in asset returns, with its effect varying according to the sampling frequency. Besides the lagged impact of information, which is integrally captured by the partial adjustment model, there are other microstructural factors that have been identified in the literature, such as the bid-ask bounce, temporal dependences in the order flow and nonsynchronous trading.

To account for the impact of the bid-ask bounce, Roll (1984) develops a simple model, where the occurrence of buy and sell orders have the same probability. Assuming that the only source of noise is the bid-ask spread defined by  $2s$ , so that the feasible values for the ask and bid quotes are  $s$  and  $-s$  with probability  $1/2$ ; then the noise variance in model (1) is  $\sigma_\eta^2 = s^2$ . If prices full adjust to information,  $\delta=1$ , and using the convention that  $\delta^0=1$  (Hasbrouck and Ho, 1987), then from equation (5)  $\text{Cov}(R_t, R_{t-1}) = -s^2$  and  $\text{Cov}(R_t, R_{t-k}) = 0$ , for  $k=2,3,\dots$ . Thus, if prices full adjust to information, the bid-ask

bounce increases the returns volatility and induces negative first order correlation. If prices undershoot the efficient price, the bid-ask bounce produces negative autocorrelation of order higher than one, while if there are overshooting effects the autocorrelations have alternated signs. Independently of the adjustment process, the bid-ask spread influences the autocovariances only via  $\sigma_\eta^2$ , and therefore its impact cancels out in the autocovariance estimator of  $\delta_i$ . On the other hand, because bid-ask bounce produces a fluctuation of transaction prices around the fundamental price, it is commonly modelled as a MA(1) (see, for example, Stoll and Whaley, 1990). Therefore, when estimating the partial adjustment coefficient using the ARMA procedure, the bid-ask bounce is isolated by the MA component. Furthermore, in the case of a well diversified stock index, bid-ask errors in component stocks tend to compensate each other and its overall effect is probably trivial.

Hasbrouck and Ho (1987) extend the Roll's model and allow the order flow to follow an autoregressive structure of order one. The authors assume that the mid-quote is subjected to a lagged adjustment process, and that the transaction price is equal to the mid-quote plus an error  $\varepsilon_t$ . This error defines the bid-ask process conditional on the previous occurrence, i.e.

$$\varepsilon_t = \begin{cases} +s & \text{with probability } pr(\varepsilon_{t-1}), \\ -s & \text{with probability } 1 - pr(\varepsilon_{t-1}), \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

with a probability function given as

$$pr(x) = \begin{cases} (1+\vartheta)/2 & \text{if } x = +s \\ (1-\vartheta)/2 & \text{if } x = -s \end{cases} \quad \text{with } 0 < \vartheta < 1. \quad (13)$$

Because of the bid-ask error structure, transaction prices are now “observationally” equivalent to an ARMA(2,2), with the autoregressive parameters being jointly defined by the partial adjustment coefficient  $\delta$ , and the probability determinant  $\vartheta$ . More precisely  $\phi_1 = (1-\delta) + \vartheta$  and  $\phi_2 = -(1-\delta)\vartheta$ . Hence, the first autoregressive parameter no longer provides an unequivocal estimate of the partial adjustment coefficient. Moreover, because the autocovariances of order  $k$  of the  $\{\varepsilon_t\}$  process are equal to  $\vartheta^k$ , the autocovariances ratios do not purge the order flow dependence, implying that they provide a biased estimator of the partial adjustment factors.

Hasbrouck and Ho (1987) analysis puts into perspective the typical limitations in any attempt to estimate the partial adjustment coefficients. In general, if noise is a subordinated stochastic process, then the structure of this process is transferred into the returns autocovariances and it is impossible to isolate noise from fundamental information

innovations. In fact, any violation of assumptions (c) and (d) introduces an error in the estimation of  $\delta_i$ . For example, in the presence of contemporaneous correlation between the information innovations and the noise processes and between the noise processes, the multiplicative error of the cross-covariance estimator is given as (see Appendix A)

$$\xi_i = \frac{\sigma_u^2 + \frac{\delta_i}{\delta_j} \sigma_{u,\eta_i} - (1 - \delta_i)^{-1} \left( \sigma_{u,\eta_j} + \frac{\delta_i}{\delta_j} \sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j} \right)}{\sigma_u^2 + \frac{\delta_i}{\delta_j} \sigma_{u,\eta_j} + \frac{\delta_j}{\delta_i} \sigma_{u,\eta_i} + \frac{\delta_i + \delta_j}{\delta_i \delta_j} \sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j}}, \text{ with } i, j = s, f \text{ and } i \neq j \quad (14)$$

According to (14) the estimation error is a non-linear function of  $\delta_s$ ,  $\delta_f$ ,  $\sigma_u^2$ ,  $\sigma_{u,\eta_i}$  and  $\sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j}$ ; and the estimated parameter will be most probably biased upwards, given that the two assets are related not only via the information innovations but also via the noise processes in both markets.

In order to purge the contemporaneous correlation effect, instead of using the estimator (8), one could just increase the order of both cross-covariances, and the consistent estimator would now be given as

$$\pi_i = (1 - \delta_i) = \left[ \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t-2}) / \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t-1}) \right] \quad (15)$$

However there are no aprioristic reasons to believe that the fundamental processes are contemporaneous but not serially correlated, especially in a high frequency framework. In sum, estimator (15) reduces the contemporaneous correlation effects of noise, but increases the error produced by the serial correlations, while the opposite happens with estimator (8).

Probably, the most important issue when estimating the partial adjustment coefficients for stock indices is the presence of stale prices in the index computations. Stale prices decrease the variance of well diversified portfolios, induce serial autocorrelation, positive for well diversified portfolios and negative for individual securities such as futures contracts, decrease the contemporaneous cross-correlation between index and futures returns and increase the cross-correlation of lagged futures returns (Campbell et al., 1997, p. 85-98).

Theobald and Yallup (1998, 2004) argue that stale prices introduce a MA( $q$ ) component in the returns processes, where  $q$  is the maximum lagged “true” return to have an impact on the observed current return. Campbell et al. (1997, p. 92-94) show that, in the presence of nonsynchronous trading, observed portfolio returns follow a first order autoregressive process. Stoll and Whaley (1990) claim that stale prices should be

modelled as an ARMA(p,q) process. In sum, it appears that nonsynchronous trading tends to contaminate the ARMA estimator; and surely biases the autocovariance and cross-covariance estimators.

The basic procedure developed by Theobald and Yallup (1998, 2004) to adjust the covariance ratios estimators to nonsynchronous trading consists in lagging the covariances for  $q$  periods; i.e., the consistent autocovariance and cross-covariance estimators in the presence of stale prices up to  $q_i$  lags in market  $i$  are respectively

$$\pi_i = (1 - \delta_i) = \left[ \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{i,t-2-q_i}) / \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{i,t-1-q_i}) \right], \text{ and} \quad (16)$$

$$\pi_i = (1 - \delta_i) = \left[ \text{Cov}(R_{i,t-1}, R_{j,t-1-q_i}) / \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t-q_i}) \right]. \quad (17)$$

Although, these estimators remove the nonsynchronous trading effect, it is quite an *ad hoc* procedure because it simply implies that there is a priory knowledge on  $q_i$ . While there are economic reasons to believe that in a highly liquid futures market  $q_f \approx 0$  even at higher frequencies; for the underlying index,  $q_s$  is most probably different from zero and is a function of the type of variable used to compute the value of the index (mid-quotes or transaction prices) and the liquidity of each component stock. Not to mention the possibility of reporting lags due to the time needed to gather information for all the constituent stocks and to resolve the computation algorithm.

The previous discussion suggests a two-step procedure when computing the partial adjustment coefficients from bivariate return processes, i.e. when using the cross-covariances estimator. Firstly an ARMA(p,q) is fitted to the univariate time series and then the cross-covariance estimator is applied to the model residuals (see Theobald and Yallup, 1998, 2005). There is an important drawback in this procedure: the ARMA model not only mitigates the effect of noise-induced volatility and autocorrelation but it also tends to normalize the adjustment processes across markets. Hence, without additional information, one can not declare that generally the resulting estimates correspond to the partial adjustment coefficients to the common fundamental factor; they are in fact estimates of the relative adjustment process and accordingly they should be properly interpreted in relative terms.

To support the above statement, we generate 100,000 pseudo-observations from model (1) with parameters  $\{\sigma_u^2 = 4, \sigma_{\eta_s}^2 = \sigma_{\eta_f}^2 = 1, \delta_s = \delta_f = 0.5\}$ . The ARMA(1,1) estimates are  $\hat{\delta}_s = 0.5026$  and  $\hat{\delta}_f = 0.5044$ , the cross-covariance estimates obtained from unfiltered returns are  $\hat{\delta}_s = 0.4922$  and  $\hat{\delta}_f = 0.4969$ , the cross-covariance estimator



applied to the residuals of an ARMA(1,1) are  $\hat{\delta}_s = 0.6143$  and  $\hat{\delta}_f = 0.6175$ . So, even when data respects all the basic assumptions (a) through (b), the two-step procedure outlined previously only gives the correct adjustment coefficient estimates if  $\sigma_u^2 \approx 2\sigma_{\eta_i}^2$ , with  $i = s, f$ . In the above simulation, information-induced variance is higher than the noise-induced variance; consequently the estimates from the ARMA residuals are biased upwards, but correctly they assign a similar adjustment process to both markets.

The above discussion motivates the use of multiple adjustment factor estimators, in order to obtain a more reliable picture about the adjustment processes in both markets.

#### 4. Data and descriptive statistics

The empirical analysis is performed on the FTSE 100 index and FTSE 100 futures contracts for a sample of more than three years, since January 15, 1997.

The futures data was withdrawn from the LIFFEstyle CD-ROM. These files contain seven columns corresponding to date, time stamp to the nearest second, trade price indicator, delivery month, price, volume and trading platform. Besides the usual indicators for transaction and bid and ask prices, there are also special indicators for transactions embedded in declared spread and delta neutral strategies. However, the special indicators for wholesale transactions ("J" for basis trading and "K" for block trading) are not available during the period under scrutiny. Futures prices are expressed in index points multiplied by 10. The trading platform column indicates the price origin: "floor" or electronic platform, designated by "APT". The index data has three columns for dates, time stamps and index values. The index was computed at regular time intervals, at a reporting frequency of 1 minute before February 23, 1998, and 15 seconds afterwards.

The overall sample was partitioned into three sub-samples according to the existing trading mechanisms. The main concern when designing these sub-samples was to compare similar stages of maturation of the trading systems, most especially in what it refers to the one used to measure the effects of the introduction of SETS. This new electronic platform suffered some hostile reactions, particularly from large UK-based investors that were comfortable with the opaqueness of SEAQ and the existence of a network of intimate relationships with market makers. The abandonment of the computerized settlement system TAURUS on March 11, 1993, overwhelmingly mentioned in the specialized press, generated a lack of confidence in the ability of LSE to implement and manage electronic projects. Furthermore, the first months of trading, characterized by low liquidity and erratic pricing, raised a fierce criticism against the new trading system.

One year after the introduction of SETS, the system showed to be quite successful (Plexus Group, 1999; Naik and Yadav, 1999).

To discard the transition period of SETS, our study only considers for the second sub-sample (denoted hereafter as **P2**), when shares were traded on SETS and futures were traded on the floor, the data since July 20, 1998, until May 07, 1999.<sup>3</sup>

The other two sub-samples were obtained considering, after filtering and sampling, the most approximate number of observations to the one in P2 for an integer number of days. The first sub-sample corresponds to the period from January 15, 1997, until October 17, 1997; when UK shares were traded on SEAQ and FTSE 100 futures were traded on the floor (sub-sample named as **P1**). The third sub-sample corresponds to the period from June 10, 1999, until March 17, 2000; when SETS was in place at the LSE and the FTSE 100 futures were already traded on LIFFE CONNECT (denoted as **P3**).

In order to obtain synchronised time series for the FTSE 100 index and futures contract, we apply several filtering rules to the raw data: (i) only futures transaction prices, with the marker "Trd", i.e. not embedded in spread or delta trades, are considered; (ii) the rollover procedure for the futures contract was based on the trading activity measured by the number of trades per day; (iii) for each trading day, the time series include only those prices when the stock market and the futures markets are open; (iv) days missing completely or in part (with a gap of more than 30 minutes) for at least one series are removed from the sample;<sup>4</sup> (v) for each day, the first five minutes of common trading are discarded; and (vi) for the LIFFE CONNECT period all prices with a corresponding volume equal or superior to 750 contracts are removed from the series.<sup>5</sup>

Finally, the futures series was sampled minute-by-minute, using the last price before the sampling point. The final price series have a total of 87,043, 86,970 and 87,300 observations, which corresponds to 193, 195 and 180 trading days for the three periods

---

<sup>3</sup> There are some arguments that support the choice of July 20 for the beginning of this sub-sample: firstly, the minimum order size was removed from SETS and the maximum order size was increased from 10 NMS to 20 NMS one month before, secondly the futures tick value diminished from £12.5 to £5 after the contract of June 1998, and finally and more importantly, on July 20, 1998, SETS began to open half an hour later, at 9:00, in response to lack of liquidity and disturbed price formation at the opening.

<sup>4</sup> This rule imply not only the synchronization of the two time series, but also guarantees the continuity of the same trading mechanism for each trading day (exclusion of trading halts and related auctions) and exclude atypical days such as December 24 and December 31, when both markets are open only until 12:30.

<sup>5</sup> Undoubtedly, this is the most controversial filtering rule, but the economic reasons underlying the exclusion of big transactions during P3 are quite compelling. In this period the average volume per trade was only 3.74 contracts and 90% of all trades had a volume equal or inferior to 7 contracts therefore it is highly probable that trades with a volume of 750 contracts or more are originated outside the order book through the wholesale facilities. Because block prices can be quite different from the prevailing prices in the order book at the time when a big trade is reported, the recorded prices show a jump and immediately afterwards a reversion to the main stream of prices, inducing spurious volatility and especially higher kurtosis. During floor trading, the reported 259 transactions with a volume equal or higher than 750 contracts have no discernible impact in the returns series in transaction time, however in LIFFE CONNECT, the reported 310 big trades increases the kurtosis from 54.02 to 1,414.78, i.e., by a factor of 26!

respectively. The number of minute-by-minute prices considered in each trading day depends on the common normal trading hours in the two markets (excluding trading in the electronic facility APT when the central market at LIFFE was conducted on the floor). Therefore, excluding the first five common trading minutes, a particular day can have a total of 451, 446 or 506 minute-by-minute prices.

The statistical properties of FTSE 100 index and FTSE 100 futures minute-by-minute percentage logarithmic returns are reported in Table 1.

### **[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]**

For both markets the mean is almost equal to zero. The standard deviation of the futures market is higher than the standard deviation of the index returns, particularly for the first period, where the excess volatility is about 269%. The distributions of returns are leptokurtic, i.e. exhibit negative skewness and fat tails, especially for the index during P2. The excess kurtosis of the index in relation to the futures contract during P2 and P3 reflects most probably the persistence of some of the problems affecting the implementation of SETS.

The autocorrelations of the index returns are all positive and show a marked trend to decrease through the overall sample, implying that most probably the effect of nonsynchronous trading in the observed index returns has decreased through time, and particularly with the introduction of SETS. So, it seems that the actual transaction prices in SETS are revised more frequently than the market makers mid-quotes in SEAQ.<sup>6</sup>

Assuming that markets are completely efficient and that the FTSE 100 index measures a perfectly diversified stock portfolio, then the first order autocorrelation coefficient for the index returns provides a simple estimate of the nontrading probability (Campbell et al., 1997, p. 93). According to this simple procedure, during P1, the nontrading probability is 57.66%, i.e., on average, less than half of the index value is reviewed in each minute. For P2 and P3 the nontrading probabilities are just 12.42% and 7.52% respectively.

The autocorrelations of the FTSE 100 futures returns are clearly lower than those of the index, and arguably are economically insignificant. The number of zero futures returns, are about 40% in P1, 24% in P2 and 16% in P3. However, the percentage of minutes with no transactions are only 14.89%, 6.55% and 3.30% in the three periods respectively,

---

<sup>6</sup> The unusually high index autocorrelations during P1 are probably the result of the filtering and sampling procedures used when constructing the prices series. The exclusion of data when one market is closed, the removal of the first 5-minutes of each trading day, and the extraction of days with gaps over 30 minutes may have led to an overestimation of nontrading intervals for the individual stocks. For instance, when we include the overnight returns, the index presents a first order autocorrelation of only 0.0997, 0.1101 and 0.0636 for the three sub-samples respectively.

meaning that the existence of stale prices in the futures series is not a severe problem, specially in P2 and P3.

Finally, the autocorrelations and the Ljung-Box portmanteau tests indicate that both the index and the futures squared returns present high linear dependence which is typical in high frequency data (see, for example, Areal and Taylor, 2002).

## **5. Empirical results**

As a preliminary study on the FTSE 100 index and futures partial adjustment coefficients, Table 2 presents the estimates of these factors using the auto and cross-covariances ratios for 1-minute returns.

When no allowance is made for the existence of stale prices (Lag 0), the autocovariance ratio estimator assesses a factor of 0.2379 for the index during P1 and slightly higher factors during P2 and P3, these being 0.3582 and 0.3356 respectively. The estimated factors for the FTSE 100 futures contract have similar magnitude except for P3, where the point estimate of 1.3557 is significantly higher than one. Although the futures estimate in P1 is relatively small, the t-statistic is only 0.99, not rejecting the null hypothesis that this coefficient is different from 1.

### **[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]**

The cross-covariance ratios offer a completely different ordering of the partial adjustment coefficients. Although we have already suggested that the FTSE 100 index may have been largely computed with stale prices during the period when stock were traded on SEAQ, a negative cross-covariance estimate of -0.3175 is not a reasonable figure for the adjustment factor. In P2 the index cross-covariance factor increases to 0.0341 and in P3 increases to 0.2037. This provides some evidence that the implementation of SETS has reduced the effect of stale prices in the reported index. This decrease may be due to a higher operational or informational efficiency in the stock market or simply the result of new computing and/or reporting procedures. The cross-covariance factors for the futures contract are remarkably stable, with estimates of 0.6139, 0.6873 and 0.6711 for the three sub-samples respectively.

The index results seem quite unreliable. Conceivably, the existence of stale prices in the index is biasing the autocovariance estimator upwards and the cross-covariance estimator downwards. For the futures contract other microstructural processes might also be affecting non-trivially the autocovariance estimates, most specifically during P3. When we lag the autocovariances and cross-covariances ratios for the index an interesting pattern emerge in P1; the autocovariance estimates remain at around 0.13 and 0.14 until

lag 9, while the cross-covariance estimates presents a tendency to increase until lag 7. This suggests that during P1 the FTSE 100 index may have been computed with stock prices at least up to the previous 7 minutes. The same reasoning implies that during the other sub-samples the effect of stale prices is lower; with the index being computed with stock prices up to 3 minutes during P2 and up to 2 minutes during P3.

Theobald and Yallup (2004) present some evidence on the superiority of the ARMA estimator in relation to the autocovariance estimator. In order to obtain more precise insights on the partial adjustment coefficients, Panels A, B and C of Table 3 report the ARMA estimates and some diagnostic statistics for different sampling frequencies using the sampled returns without any previous filtering.

### **[INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]**

For the index during P1, at 1-minute frequency, the order chosen by AIC for the moving average is 7 and the estimated factor is only 0.1499, the R-squared is 36.13%, and the Ljung-Box portmanteau tests emphasize highly significant correlation structure in the ARMA innovations and squared innovations. All these results support once again our hypothesis of severe stale price effects in the index during P1. At a sampling frequency of 1 minute the other sub-samples exhibit ARMA factors not statistically different from unity, except the futures series during P3; in this sub-sample the estimated coefficient for the futures contract is only 0.2054.

As predicted by the theory, decreasing the sampling frequency has only trivial effects on the estimated factors when these factors are not statistically different from unity at higher frequencies. Although this is the general tendency for the futures returns during P1 and for the index and futures returns during P2 and P3, the estimates of the first order autoregressive parameter are somewhat instable. This instability reflects the existence of significant higher order autocorrelations (at 1-minute frequency) and the interaction between the first order moving average parameter and the first order autoregressive parameter. When the autoregressive estimates for each sampling frequency are averaged, part of this instability disappears, given more supportive evidence on the previous claims. Once again, results are different for the index during P1; where the average ARMA factor estimates increase almost monotonically towards unity with the differencing interval, providing some evidence that it takes at least 30 minutes for the index to completely adjust to new information.

If the order flow process is an important determinant of the returns autocorrelation structure as predicted by Hasbrouck and Ho (1987), one would expect a significant second order autoregressive parameter, as long as the adjustment coefficient is sufficiently

different from unity. Furthermore, the order flow effect would be more visible in the futures returns at higher frequencies, because the effects in the constituent stocks are probably diversified away in the FTSE 100 index. The results on the significance of the second order autoregressive parameter for the futures market are not conclusive; most probably due to the fact that adjustment coefficients are approximately equal to unity.

The significant autocorrelation in the residuals and most particularly in the square residuals of the ARMA(1,q) cast some doubts on the adequacy of this model. Table 4 reports the ARMA estimators applied to the returns previously filtered by the conditional volatility estimated by a GARCH(1,1). Although some significant autocorrelation structure still remains at higher frequencies, the two-step procedure is generally successful in removing most of the autocorrelation in the returns and squared returns. The index during P1 is once again the exception.

#### **[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]**

Results in Table 4, in conjunction with the previous remarks withdrawn from Tables 2 and 3, lead to the following conclusions:

(1) At 1-minute frequency, the absolute partial adjustment coefficient for the index market during P1 was relatively low, somewhere between 0.15 and 0.20. During P1 it took more than 30 minutes for the reported index to complete the adjustment process to new information. The introduction of SETS decreased the importance of stale prices in the index computation and strengthened the index adjustment process to new information. The increased absolute and relative efficiency of the FTSE 100 index is even more visible during P3.

(2) During the three sub-samples the relative partial adjustment coefficient of futures contract at a 1-minute frequency was around 0.60 to 0.70. This factor increased during P2 and decreased with the introduction of LIFFE CONNECT. During P3 it takes, on average, more 1 or 2 minutes for futures prices to be full adjusted to new information than in P1.

Arguably, in a high frequency framework, the autocorrelation ratio and the autoregressive parameter in the ARMA model are quite noisy estimators of the partial adjustment factor. Firstly, the difference between the ARMA point estimates and the ARMA averaged estimates and, secondly, the existence of estimates economically different from unity coupled with statistical inference in the opposite direction, suggest that the use of univariate series provides very poor results. Ultimately, this is probably due to the existence of several microstructural variables with some kind of structure, to the existence of stale prices in the index and to the fact that data is not regularly spaced.

Cross-covariance adjustment factors estimated, at different sampling frequencies, using unfiltered (sampled) returns (CCU), ARMA innovations (CCA) and ARMA-GARCH(1,1) innovations filtered for conditional volatility (CCG) are shown in Panels A, B and C of Table 5. The reported results are strikingly coherent and economically meaningful.

**[INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE]**

At 1-minute, the CCG estimates support the previous claim that the partial adjustment factor for the index during P1 was situated between 0.15 and 0.20. At a 30-minute frequency all index estimates are still significantly different from unity and there is some evidence that the “true” factor is proximately equal to 0.80.

On one hand, it appears that the implementation of SETS has introduced more noise into the index price formation process at 1-minute frequency but, on the other hand, it has also diminished the existence of stale prices in the index. This is discernible by the fact that during P2 the estimates for the index at 1-minute frequency are all positive; however the CCG estimate is lower than the corresponding figure in P1.

Index estimates from the three procedures present a tendency to be closer to each other, not only through the decrease in the sampling frequency for a given sub-sample, but also as time elapses. For P2, at a 5-minute frequency, the estimates are 0.4853 (CCU), 0.5946 (CCA) and 0.5703 (CCG); at half-hour frequency the index price formation is completely dominated by information and the estimators are around 0.87. In P3, even for higher frequency returns the three estimates are very close; at 1-minute the estimated factors for the index are 0.2037, 0.2668 and 0.2760. Hence, from P2 to P3, partial adjustment factors have increased on average about 0.20 at higher frequencies and approximately 0.05 at lower frequencies. The regularity of this increment highlights the existence of a pronounced learning and market maturation effects in SETS that continued even 2 years after the implementation of this electronic trading system.

The FTSE 100 futures market is more efficient than the underlying asset though all the sub-samples. On average, at 1-minute frequency, the futures factor is about 3 times higher than the corresponding index factors. Also at this frequency, the futures partial adjustment factors remain relatively stable through the overall sample; however there is a slight increase, from around 0.61 in P1 to 0.69 in P2 and a small decrease to 0.65 during P3. During P1, it takes at least 10 to 15 minutes for futures prices to be relatively full adjusted, during P2 this figure is only 7 minutes and in P3 it is 8 minutes.

At 30-minute sampling frequency, the difference between the index and futures factors for the unfiltered returns are about 0.41 in P1, 0.10 during P2 and 0.04 during P3. When filtering for nonsynchronous trading and heteroscedasticity (CCG), the differences remain

almost unchanged for P2 and P3, but suffer a pronounced decrease (about 46%) during P1. Hence, this provides some evidence that the differences in the estimated adjustment processes in the index and futures markets are not solely explained by nonsynchronous trading.

## **6. Conclusions**

The main empirical findings can be summarized as follows:

(1) In all sub-samples, the FTSE 100 futures markets reacts more intensively to information than the underlying index and accordingly converge more quickly to the full-information equilibrium.

(2) The implementation of SETS has reduced substantially the amount of nonsynchronous trading effects on the index. With the new electronic system the FTSE 100 index provides more reliable and timely information on the stock market movements.

(3) The introduction of SETS has enhanced the informational efficiency of UK stock market. This is discernible from (a) the increase of the number of ARMA estimates at different frequencies not statistically different from one, (b) from the augment of the rate according to which all cross-covariance estimates increase with the sampling interval.

(4) SETS has collaterally increased the level of noise, at least during P2. This is supported by (a) the reduction of cross-covariance estimate for the ARMA-GARCH adjusted innovations at 1-minute frequency and by (b) the increase of the futures cross-covariances estimates at higher frequencies than 15 minutes.

(5) There is some evidence that LIFFE CONNECT not only has slowed down the adjustment process but also has increased the relative level of noise in the futures price formation process. Several results point in this direction: (a) the number of ARMA estimates statistically different from unity increase in P3, (b) all estimates at a frequency of 1-minute (except the one resulting from the autocovariance ratio) have decreased substantially, and (c) the unfiltered, ARMA and ARMA-GARCH cross-covariance estimates decrease, on average, at all frequencies.



## Appendix A

### Cross-covariance partial adjustment estimator error in the presence of correlated processes

Suppose that the return process of the futures contract, denoted by  $f$ , and of the underlying asset, denoted by  $s$ , follow an adjustment process with noise, modelled as

$$R_{i,t} = \delta_i (m_t - p_{i,t}) + \eta_{i,t}, \text{ with } m_t = m_{t-1} + u_t, \text{ and } i = s, f; \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $R_{i,t}$  and  $p_{i,t}$  denotes the instantaneous return and the logarithmic price of asset  $i$  at time  $t$  respectively;  $u_t$  represents the common information innovation with zero mean and variance  $\sigma_u^2$ ;  $\eta_{i,t}$  represents the noise term in market  $i$ , with zero mean and variance  $\sigma_{\eta_i}^2$ ; and  $\delta_i$  is the price adjustment coefficient, assumed to be constant, with  $0 < \delta_i < 2$ . The process (5.A.1) has a structural moving average representation

$$R_{i,t} = \delta_i \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 - \delta_i)^k (u_{t-k} - \eta_{i,t-k-1}) + \eta_{i,t}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Now, suppose that one is interested in estimating  $\delta_i$  according to the cross-covariance ratio

$$\pi_i = (1 - \delta_i) = \frac{\text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t-1})}{\text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t})}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Assuming that the fundamental innovations and the noise processes are serially uncorrelated but  $\text{Cov}(u_t, \eta_{i,t}) = \sigma_{u,\eta_i} \neq 0$  and  $\text{Cov}(\eta_{i,t}, \eta_{j,t}) = \sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j} \neq 0$ ,  $\forall t, i, j$ ; then when defining the returns cross-covariances only the contemporaneous terms in (A.2) are non-zero. Let us consider firstly the information innovations,

$$\text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t} \mid \sigma_{u,\eta_i} = 0, \sigma_{u,\eta_j} = 0, \sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j} = 0) = \delta_i \delta_j \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 - \delta_i)^k (1 - \delta_j)^k \sigma_u^2, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j-1,t} \mid \sigma_{u,\eta_i} = 0, \sigma_{u,\eta_j} = 0, \sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j} = 0) = \delta_i \delta_j (1 - \delta_i) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 - \delta_i)^k (1 - \delta_j)^k \sigma_u^2. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Considering that

$$A = \delta_i \delta_j \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 - \delta_i)^k (1 - \delta_j)^k = \frac{\delta_i \delta_j}{\delta_i + \delta_j - \delta_i \delta_j}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

then

$$\text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t} \mid \sigma_{u,\eta_i} = 0, \sigma_{u,\eta_j} = 0, \sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j} = 0) = A\sigma_u^2 \text{ and} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j-1,t} \mid \sigma_{u,v_i} = 0, \sigma_{u,v_j} = 0, \sigma_{v_i,v_j} = 0) = (1 - \delta_i) A\sigma_u^2. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Therefore

$$\frac{\text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j-1,t} \mid \sigma_{u,\eta_i} = 0, \sigma_{u,\eta_j} = 0, \sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j} = 0)}{\text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t} \mid \sigma_{u,\eta_i} = 0, \sigma_{u,\eta_j} = 0, \sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j} = 0)} = (1 - \delta_i) \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Proceeding in the same way for  $\sigma_{u,\eta_i}$  and  $\sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j}$ , and rearranging the terms, the contemporaneous cross-covariances are given as

$$\text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t}) = A \left[ \sigma_u^2 + \frac{\delta_i}{\delta_j} \sigma_{u,\eta_j} + \frac{\delta_j}{\delta_i} \sigma_{u,\eta_i} + \frac{\delta_i + \delta_j}{\delta_i \delta_j} \sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j} \right], \text{ and} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$\text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t-1}) = A(1 - \delta_i) \left[ \sigma_u^2 + \frac{\delta_i}{\delta_j} \sigma_{u,\eta_j} - (1 - \delta_i)^{-1} \left( \sigma_{u,\eta_j} + \frac{\delta_i}{\delta_j} \sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j} \right) \right]. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Hence,  $\hat{\pi}_i = \pi_i \xi_i$ , where  $\xi_i$  is the multiplicative estimation error given as

$$\xi_i = \frac{\sigma_u^2 + \frac{\delta_i}{\delta_j} \sigma_{u,\eta_j} - (1 - \delta_i)^{-1} \left( \sigma_{u,\eta_j} + \frac{\delta_i}{\delta_j} \sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j} \right)}{\sigma_u^2 + \frac{\delta_i}{\delta_j} \sigma_{u,\eta_j} + \frac{\delta_j}{\delta_i} \sigma_{u,\eta_i} + \frac{\delta_i + \delta_j}{\delta_i \delta_j} \sigma_{\eta_i,\eta_j}}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

## References

- Abhyankar, A. H. (1995) "Return and Volatility Dynamics in the FT-SE 100 Stock Index and Stock Index Futures Markets", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 15, No. 4, 457-488.
- Abhyankar, A. H. (1998) "Linear and Nonlinear Granger Causality: Evidence from the UK Stock Index Futures Market", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 18, No. 5, 519-540.
- Ahn, D.-H.; Boudoukh, J.; Richardson, M., and Whitelaw, R. F. (2002) "Partial Adjustment or Stale Prices? Implications from Stock Index and Futures Returns Autocorrelations", *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 655-689.
- Amihud, Y. and Mendelson, H. (1987) "Trading Mechanisms and Stock Returns: An Empirical Investigation", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 42, No. 2, 533-553.
- Areal, N. M. P. C. and Taylor, S. J. (2002) "The Realized Volatility of FTSE-100 Futures Prices", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 22, No. 7, 627-648.
- Ates, A. and Wang, G. H. (2005) "Information Transmission in Electronic Versus Open-Outcry Systems: An Analysis of U.S. Equity Index Futures Markets", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 25, No. 7, 679-715.
- Benveniste, L. M.; Marcus, A. J., and Wilhelm, W. J. (1992) "What's Special about the Specialist?", *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 32, No. 1, 61-86.
- Boehmer, E.; Saar, G., and Yu, L. (2005) "Lifting the Veil: An Analysis of Pre-Trade Transparency at the NYSE", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 60, No. 2, 783-815.
- Bondt, W. F. M. de and Thaler, R. (1985) "Does the Stock Market Overreact", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 40, No. 3, 793-805.
- Booth, G. G.; So, R. W., and Tse, Y. (1999) "Price Discovery in the German Equity Index Derivatives Market", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 19, No. 6, 619-643.
- Boudoukh, J.; Richardson, M., and Whitelaw, R. F. (1995) "A Tale of Three Schools: Insights on Autocorrelations of Short-Horizon Stock Returns", *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 539-573.
- Bloomfield, R. J. and O'Hara, M. (1999) "Market Transparency: Who Wins and Who Loses", *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 5-35.
- Bloomfield, R. J.; O'Hara, M., and Saar, G. (2003) "The "Make or Take" Decision in an Electronic Market: Evidence on the Evolution of Liquidity", *NYU Stern School of Business Working Paper*, No. FIN-02-029, 13th Annual Utah Winter Finance Conference; AFA 2003 Washington, DC Meetings, September. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=336683>.
- Blume, M. E. and Goldstein, M. A. (1997) "Quotes, Order Flow, and Price Discovery", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 52, No. 1, 221-244.
- Brailsford, T.; Fino, Alex; H., Alan, and West, A. (1999) "Stock Market Automation and the Transmission of Information between Spot and Futures Markets", *Journal of Multinational Financial Management*, Vol. 9, No. 3-4, 247-264.
- Campbell, J. Y.; Lo, A. W., and MacKinlay, A. C. (1997) *The Econometrics of Financial Markets*, Princeton University Press, Chichester, UK.

- Chan, K. (1992) "A Further Analysis of the Lead-Lag Relationship between the Cash Market and Stock Index Futures Market", *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 123-152.
- Chng, M. T. (2004) "A Model of Price Discovery and Market Design: Theory and Empirical Evidence", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 24, No. 12, 1107-1146.
- Daniel, K.; Hirshleifer, D., and Subrahmanyam, A. (1998) "Investor Psychology and Security Market Under- and Overreactions", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 53, No. 6, 1839-1885.
- Easley, D. and O'Hara, M. (1992) "Adverse Selection and Large Trade Volume: The Implications for Market Efficiency", *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 185-208.
- Ederington, L. H. and Lee, J. H. (1993) "How Markets Process Information: News Releases and Volatility", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 48, No. 4, 1161-1191.
- Ederington, L. H. and Lee, J. H. (1995) "The Short-Run Dynamics of the Price Adjustment to New Information", *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 117-134.
- Flood, M. D.; Huisman, R.; Koedijk, K. G., and Mahieu, R. J. (1999) "Quote Disclosure and Price Discovery in Multiple-Dealer Financial Markets", *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 37-59.
- Fong, K. and Zurbrugg, R. (2003) "How Much Do Locals Contribute to the Price Discovery Process?", *Journal of Empirical Finance*, Vol. 10, No. 3, 305-320.
- Franke, G. and Hess, D. (2000) "Information Diffusion in Electronic and Floor Trading", *Journal of Empirical Finance*, Vol. 7, No. 5, 455-478.
- Frino, A.; Walter, T., and West, A. (2000) "The Lead-Lag Relationship between Equities and Stock Index Futures Markets around Information Releases", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 20, No. 5, 467-487.
- Frino, A.; Harris, F. H. deB.; McNish, T. H., and Tomas III, M. J. (2004) "Price Discovery in the PITS: The Role of Market Makers on the CBOT and the Sydney Futures Exchange", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 24, No. 8, 785-804.
- Frino, A. and McKenzie, M. D. (2002) "The Impact of Screen Trading on the Link between Stock Index and Stock Index Futures Prices: Evidence from UK Markets", *EFMA 2002 London Meetings*. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=314398>.
- Fung, A. K.-W. and Lam, K. (2004) "Overreaction of Index Futures in Hong Kong", *Journal of Empirical Finance*, Vol. 11, No. 3, 331-351.
- Fung, J. K. W. and Jiang, L. (1999) "Restrictions on Short-Selling and Spot-Futures Dynamics", *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, Vol. 26, No. 1-2, 227-248.
- Fung, J. K. W.; Lien, D.; Tse, Y., and Tse, Y. K. (2005) "Effects of Electronic Trading on the Hang Seng Index Futures Market", *International Review of Economics and Finance*, Vol. 14, No. 4, 415-425.
- Gervais, S. and Odean, T. (2001) "Learning to Be Overconfident", *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1-27.

- Glosten, L. R. (1989) "Insider Trading, Liquidity, and the Role of the Monopolistic Specialist", *Journal of Business*, Vol. 62, No. 2, 211-236.
- Grant, J. L.; Wolf, A., and Yu, S. (2005) "Intraday Price Reversals in the US Stock Index Futures Market: A 15-Year Study", *Journal of Banking & Finance*, Vol. 29, No. 5, 1311-1327.
- Grünbichler, A.; Longstaff, F. A., and Schwartz, E. E. (1994) "Electronic Screen Trading and the Transmission of Information: An Empirical Examination", *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 166-187.
- Hasbrouck, J. (2003) "Intraday Price Formation in U.S. Equity Index Markets", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 58, No. 6, 2375-2400.
- Hasbrouck, J. and Ho, T. S. Y. (1987) "Order Arrival, Quote Behavior, and the Return-Generating Process", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 42, No. 4, 1035-1048.
- Herbst, A. F.; McCormack, J. P., and West, E. N. (1987) "Investigation of a Lead-Lag Relationship between Spot Stock Indices and their Futures Contracts", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 7, No. 4, 373-382.
- Jegadeesh, N. and Titman, S. (1995) "Overreaction, Delayed Reaction, and Contrarian Profits", *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 4, 973-993.
- Kawaller, I. G.; Koch, P. D., and Koch, T. W. (1987) "The Temporal Price Relationship between S&P 500 Futures and the S&P 500 Index", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 42, No. 5, 1309-1329.
- Kawaller, I. G.; Koch, P. D., and Koch, T. W. (1993) "Intraday Market Behavior and the Extent of Feedback between S&P 500 Futures Prices and the S&P 500 Index", *Journal of Financial Research*, Vol. 16, No. 2, 107-121.
- Kurov, A. and Lasser, D. (2004) "Price Dynamics in the Regular and E-Mini Futures Markets", *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 39, No. 2, 365-384.
- Kim, M.; Szakmary, A. C., and Schwartz, T. (1999) "Trading Costs and Price Discovery across Stock Index Futures and Cash Markets", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 19, No. 4, 475-498.
- Lehmann, B. N. (1990) "Fads, Martingales, and Market Efficiency", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 105, No. 1, 1-28.
- Locke, P. R. and Sarkar, A. (2001) "Liquidity Supply and Volatility: Futures Market Evidence", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 1-17.
- Long, J. B.; Shleifer, A.; Summers, L. H., and Waldman, R. J. (1990) "Positive Feedback Investment Strategies and Destabilizing Rational Speculation", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 45, No. 2, 379-395.
- MacKinlay, A. C. and Ramaswamy, K. (1988) "Index-Futures Arbitrage and the Behavior of Stock Index Futures Prices", *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 137-158.
- Madhavan, A. and Sofianos, G. (1998) "An Empirical Analysis of NYSE Specialist Trading", *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 48, No. 2, 189-210.
- Martens, M. (1998) "Price Discovery in High and Low Volatility Periods: Open Outcry versus Electronic Trading", *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions & Money*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 243-260.

- Martikainen, T.; Perttunen, J., and Puttonen, V. (1995) "On the Dynamics of Stock Index Futures and Individual Stock Returns", *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, Vol. 22, No. 1, 87-100.
- Massimb, M. N. and Phelps, B. D. (1994) "Electronic Trading, Market Structure and Liquidity", *Financial Analysts Journal*, Vol. 50, No. 1, 39-50.
- Mech, T. S. (1993) "Portfolio Return Autocorrelation", *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 34, No. 3, 307-344.
- Miller, M. H.; Muthuswamy, J.; Whaley, R. E. (1994) "Mean Reversion of Standard & Poor's 500 Index Basis Changes: Arbitrage Induced or Statistical Illusion", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 49, No. 2, 479-513.
- Min, J. H. and Najand, M. (1999) "A Further Investigation of the Lead-Lag Relationship between the Spot Market and Stock Index Futures: Early Evidence from Korea", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 19, No. 2, 217.
- Naik, N. Y. and Yadav, P. K. (1999) "The Effects of Market Reform on Trading Costs of Public Investors: Evidence from the London Stock Exchange", *Institute of Finance & Accounting Working Paper*, No. 296, London Business School, EFA 0372, June. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=172328>.
- Odean, T. (1998) "Volume, Volatility, Price, and Profit when All Traders are Above Average", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 53, No. 6, 1887-1934.
- Pagano, M. and Röell (1996) "Transparency and Liquidity: A Comparison of Auction and Dealer Markets with Informed Trading", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 51, No. 2, 579-611.
- Pirrong, C. (1996) "Market Liquidity and Depth on Computerized and Open Outcry Trading Systems: A Comparison of DTB and LIFFE Bund Contracts", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 16, No. 5, 519-543.
- Pizzi, M. A.; Economopoulos, A. J., and O'Neil, H. M. (1998) "An Examination of the Relationship between Stock Index Cash and Futures Markets: A Cointegration Approach", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 18, No. 3, 297-305.
- Plexus Group (1999) "Execution of U.K. Equities: New Market Structures", *Commentary*, No. 58, May, Los Angeles, USA.
- Roll, R. (1984) "A Simple Implicit Measure of the Effective Bid-Ask Spread in an Efficient Market", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 39, No. 4, 1127-1139.
- Stoll, H. R. and Whaley, R. E. (1990) "The Dynamics of Stock Index and Stock Index Futures Returns", *Journal of Finance and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 25, No. 4, 441-468.
- Taylor, N.; Dijk, D.; Franses, P. H., and Lucas, A. (2000) "SETS, Arbitrage Activity, and Stock Price Dynamics", *Journal of Banking & Finance*, Vol. 24, No. 8, 1289-1306.
- Theissen, E. (2002) "Price Discovery in Floor and Screen Trading Systems", *Journal of Empirical Finance*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 455-474.
- Theobald, M. and Yallup, P. (1998) "Measuring Cash-Futures Temporal Effects in the UK Using Partial Adjustment Factors", *Journal of Banking & Finance*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 221-243.

Theobald, M. and Yallup, P. (2004) "Determining Security Speed of Adjustment Coefficients", *Journal of Financial Markets*, Vol. 7, 75-96.

Theobald, M. and Yallup, P. (2005) "Intraday Volatility and Adjustment", *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions & Money*, Vol. 15, N° 5, 407-424.

Tse, Y. K. and Zabolina, T. (2001) "Transaction Costs and Market Quality: Open Outcry versus Electronic Trading", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 21, No. 8, 713-735.

Tse, Y. K. and Zabolina, T. (2004) "Do Designated Market Makers Improve Liquidity in Open-Outcry Futures Markets", *Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 24, No. 5, 479-502.

**Table 1** Summary statistics for minute-by-minute returns

This table shows the summary statistics for the percentage logarithmic returns of the FTSE 100 stock index and futures contract. The futures prices of the nearest contract until the last trading day are sampled minute-by-minute, using the last transaction price before the sampling point. The sample P1 contains 193 days for a total of 86,850 observations from 15 January 1997 to 17 October 1997, P2 contains 195 days, 86,775 observations, from 20 July 1998 to 7 May 1999 and P3 includes 180 days, 87,120 observations, from 10 June 1999 to 17 May 2000. Ljung-Box portmanteau tests for up to the  $n$ th order serial correlation in returns and squared returns are denoted by  $Q(n)$  and  $Q^2(n)$  respectively. AIC and AIC<sup>2</sup> denotes the lag length selected by the Akaike information criterion for the returns and squared returns respectively. Asterisks indicate test statistics significance at the 1% level.

	<b>P1</b> ( <i>SEAQ/Floor</i> )		<b>P2</b> ( <i>SETS/Floor</i> )		<b>P3</b> ( <i>SETS/LIFFE CONNECT</i> )	
	Index	Futures	Index	Futures	Index	Futures
Number of zeros	4287 (4.94%)	34669 (39.92%)	1519 (1.75%)	20762 (23.93%)	77 (0.09%)	13926 (15.98%)
Number of minutes without transactions	--	12936 (14.89%)	--	5690 (6.55%)	--	2870 (3.30%)
Mean	0.000077	0.000116	-0.000095	-0.000159	-0.000209	-0.000145
Minimum	-0.1361	-1.2399	-1.8332	-0.5831	-1.0019	-0.9780
Percentile 10	-0.0094	-0.0421	-0.0353	-0.0673	-0.0389	-0.0542
Percentile 90	0.0096	0.0423	0.0346	0.0670	0.0378	0.0536
Maximum	0.1318	0.6539	1.2068	0.5949	1.0480	1.1162
Stand. deviation	0.0109	0.0402	0.0489	0.0571	0.0398	0.0484
Skewness	-0.3946	-0.4142	-1.6281	-0.0481	-0.2775	0.0032
Kurtosis	15.6955	29.9082	89.6554	6.6741	35.9723	15.7958
Autocorr. returns						
Lag 1	0.5766*	0.0047	0.1242*	0.0317*	0.0752*	-0.0476*
Lag 2	0.4394*	0.0033	0.0797*	0.0223*	0.0499*	0.0169*
Lag 3	0.3815*	0.0051	0.0485*	-0.0034	0.0334*	0.0029
Lag 4	0.3318*	0.0075	0.0344*	-0.0128*	0.0191*	-0.0063
Lag 5	0.2929*	0.0074	0.0157*	-0.0114*	0.0134*	0.0018
Q (5)	75301.4527*	14.8120	2217.3593*	157.2749*	855.8675*	227.8131*
Q (10)	92302.7084*	29.8341*	2272.1145*	161.3217*	883.3507*	233.3599*
Q (20)	97513.0963*	44.0417*	2288.4509*	178.0202*	901.6646*	242.8016*
AIC	7	0	4	5	8	2
Autocorr. squared returns						
Lag 1	0.4356*	0.1907*	0.0240*	0.2017*	0.0586*	0.3136*
Lag 2	0.2887*	0.0860*	0.0287*	0.1503*	0.1923*	0.0846*
Lag 3	0.2459*	0.0806*	0.0145*	0.1387*	0.0397*	0.0525*
Lag 4	0.1982*	0.0788*	0.0180*	0.1256*	0.0338*	0.0458*
Lag 5	0.1690*	0.0576*	0.0188*	0.1223*	0.0322*	0.0468*
Q <sup>2</sup> (5)	34863.2893*	5192.2679*	198.7041*	9829.1571*	3849.5295	9801.6072*
Q <sup>2</sup> (10)	42736.2313*	7424.5810*	320.2817*	14756.7194*	4008.7470	10800.2458*
Q <sup>2</sup> (20)	49578.3140*	9300.5494*	399.3742*	23800.3519*	4201.8821*	11968.1269*
AIC <sup>2</sup>	15	13	11	30	16	20



**Table 2** Autocovariance and cross-covariance factor estimates for 1-minute returns

This table presents the partial adjustment factors estimates obtained from 1-minute FTSE 100 index and futures logarithmic returns. The overall sample, from 03/06/1996 until 17/03/2000, is divided into three sub-samples according to the different trading systems in place at LSE and LIFFE. The sub-sample P1 contains 193 days with a total of 86,850 observations (15 January 1997 to 17 October 1997); P2 contains 195 days, 86,775 observations, from 20 July 1998 until 7 May 1999, and P3 includes 180 days, 87,120 observations, from 10 June 1999 until 17 May 2000. “Auto-cov.” and “Cross-cov.” designate the autocovariance and cross-covariance ratio estimators:

$$\delta_i = 1 - \left[ \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{i,t-2-q_i}) / \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{i,t-1-q_i}) \right],$$

$$\delta_i = 1 - \left[ \text{Cov}(R_{i,t-1}, R_{j,t-1-q_i}) / \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t-q_i}) \right],$$

for  $i = s, f$  and  $i \neq j$ . The rows “Lag q” represent the additional lag introduced in the covariances, i.e.  $q_i$ , to account for the stale price effect in the index. The t-statistics for  $\pi_i = 1 - \delta_i$  are presented in parentheses. For the autocovariance ratio estimator the t-statistic is computed as

$$t_i^* = T^{-1} \sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2 \text{Var}(R_{i,t}) \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{i,t-1-q_i})^{-2}.$$

Where  $\sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2$  is the estimated variance of the disturbance in the regression  $R_{i,t-2-q_i} = a + bR_{i,t-1-q_i} + \varepsilon_{i,t}$ .

For the cross-covariance ratio estimator the t-statistic is computed as

$$t_i^* = T^{-1} \sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2 \text{Var}(R_{i,t}) \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t-q_i})^{-2} \text{ for } i = s, f \text{ and } i \neq j.$$

Where  $\sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2$  is the estimated variance of the disturbance in the regression  $R_{j,t-1-q_i} = a + bR_{j,t-q_i} + \varepsilon_{j,t}$  (Theobald and Yallup, 1998, 2004).

Partial adjustment estimators	P1 (SEAQ/Floor)		P2 (SETS/Floor)		P3 (SETS/LIFFE CONNECT)	
	Index	Futures	Index	Futures	Index	Futures
Auto-cov.						
Lag 0	0.2379(158.51)	0.2907 (0.99)	0.3582 (23.66)	0.2949 (6.59)	0.3356 (14.79)	1.3557 (-5.01)
Lag 1	0.1318(137.62)	--	0.3919 (14.39)	--	0.3309 (9.90)	--
Lag 2	0.1301(119.71)	--	0.2909 (10.20)	--	0.4280 (5.66)	--
Lag 3	0.1171(105.69)	--	0.5425 (4.67)	--	0.2946 (3.99)	--
Lag 4	0.1289 (92.06)	--	-0.3713 (6.40)	--	0.3585 (2.56)	--
Lag 5	0.1468 (78.55)	--	0.5124 (3.12)	--	-0.0190 (2.61)	--
Lag 6	0.1380 (67.71)	--	0.5273 (1.48)	--	-0.1038 (2.88)	--
Lag 7	0.1200 (59.59)	--	1.4107 (-0.61)	--	0.3670 (1.82)	--
Lag 8	0.1268 (52.03)	--	3.5374 (-1.54)	--	0.1044 (1.63)	--
Lag 9	0.1361 (44.95)	--	1.5860 (-0.90)	--	0.8928 (0.18)	--
Cross-cov.						
Lag 0	-0.3175(70.26)	0.6139 (25.20)	0.0341 (72.73)	0.6865 (23.78)	0.2037 (70.80)	0.6711 (29.29)
Lag 1	0.0701 (65.33)	--	0.3437 (47.74)	--	0.4387 (39.74)	--
Lag 2	0.0943 (59.17)	--	0.2643 (35.12)	--	0.4038 (23.70)	--
Lag 3	0.0735 (54.82)	--	0.3871 (21.52)	--	0.3984 (14.26)	--
Lag 4	0.1030 (49.17)	--	0.1852 (17.54)	--	0.3750 (8.91)	--
Lag 5	0.1106 (43.74)	--	0.3413 (11.55)	--	0.2815 (6.40)	--
Lag 6	0.1027 (39.24)	--	0.1809 (9.46)	--	0.2097 (5.06)	--
Lag 7	0.1401 (33.75)	--	0.2934 (6.69)	--	0.0413 (4.85)	--
Lag 8	0.1389 (29.06)	--	0.2376 (5.10)	--	0.5080 (2.39)	--
Lag 9	0.0525 (27.53)	--	0.2902 (3.62)	--	-0.4407 (3.44)	--

**Table 3** ARMA factors at different frequencies for sampled returns

This table reports the ARMA partial adjustment coefficients estimates for the FTSE 100 stock index and futures contract. Estimates for each sub-sample, characterized by different trading systems in place at LSE and LIFFE are present in panels A, B and C.

Partial adjustment coefficients are estimated for different sampling frequencies, which are shown in the first column (in minutes). The number of observations for each regression is displayed in the second column. The estimating procedure is the following: firstly, the autoregressive component is fixed at order one, and the moving average order is chosen according to the Akaike information criterion among different competing models, ranging from order 0 to order 7; then the autoregressive coefficient is used to compute  $1-\phi_1$  and to test  $H_0: \phi_1 = 0$ , which is equivalent to a t-test on  $\delta = 1$ . For each estimation, the table also shows the moving average order,  $q$ , the R-squared,  $R^2$ , (negative values are rounded to zero), the Ljung-Box portmanteau tests for up to the 10th order serial correlation in return innovations and up to the 5th order serial correlation in the squared return innovations, denoted by  $Q(10)$  and  $Q^2(5)$  respectively. The significance of the second order autoregressive parameter (column  $\phi_2$ ) is tested using the t-statistic on an ARMA(2,q). The last column,  $(1-\bar{\phi}_1)$ , is the average of the adjustment coefficients estimated from ARMA(1,q) models, for every possible time series using different sampling points. For example, for a sampling frequency of 3 minutes, we estimate 3 ARMA models, the first one is estimated using the returns computed from prices (observations) 1, 4, 7,..., the second is estimated using prices 2, 5, 8,..., and so on; then the estimates are averaged. Asterisks (\*\*) and (\*) mark statistics significant at the 1% and 5% levels.

**Panel A: P1 (SEAQ/Floor)**

Index								
Min	Nobs	q	$\phi_2$	$R^2$	Q(10)	$Q^2(5)$	$1-\phi_1$	$1-\bar{\phi}_1$
1	86850	7	0.6828**	0.3613	220.0940**	7451.7610**	0.1499** (102.08)	0.1499
2	43329	1	-0.0467*	0.3448	36.7730**	4240.7557**	0.2654** (135.23)	0.2627
3	28822	1	-0.0257	0.3272	18.7244*	2715.6919**	0.3402** (85.97)	0.3402
4	21568	0	0.0109	0.3067	13.1220	2376.4424**	0.4462** (97.68)	0.4498
5	17216	2	0.0251	0.2777	23.0084*	2791.4141**	0.4821** (19.91)	0.4801
6	14315	1	0.1504	0.2449	21.0779*	2491.3537**	0.5556** (28.79)	0.5473
7	12242	1	0.0554	0.2082	15.3000	1843.5945**	0.6159** (20.63)	0.6356
8	10688	1	-0.0229	0.1857	21.5412*	1308.4779**	0.6446** (16.71)	0.7016
9	9479	6	-0.1662	0.1613	13.8947	1354.0275**	0.4919 (1.23)	0.6634
10	8512	1	-0.0365	0.1480	14.9540	1050.9456**	0.7588** (8.51)	0.6333
15	5610	0	-0.0152	0.0700	13.1480	882.7240**	0.7351** (20.57)	0.8462
20	4160	1	-0.0592	0.0550	11.7058	419.9563**	0.8879 (1.64)	0.8888
30	2709	3	-0.2342	0.0332	6.2086	118.2187**	1.0491 (-0.13)	0.7613
Futures								
Min	Nobs	q	$\phi_2$	$R^2$	Q(10)	$Q^2(5)$	$1-\phi_1$	$1-\bar{\phi}_1$
1	86850	0	0.0033	0.0000	27.7325**	5254.4589**	0.9953 (1.39)	0.9953
2	43329	0	0.0112*	0.0000	23.9769**	3614.2465**	0.9930 (1.45)	0.9929
3	28822	0	0.0013	0.0000	6.4662	2843.1795**	0.9983 (0.28)	1.0705
4	21568	1	-0.0088	0.0005	7.9706	2540.7811**	1.7390** (-6.03)	1.2722
5	17216	1	0.0001	0.0000	7.9885	1597.1103**	0.9996 (0.05)	1.0532
6	14315	0	-0.0069	0.0000	5.9092	1596.1683**	1.0002 (-0.03)	1.1142
7	12242	0	-0.0067	0.0000	5.2879	1507.3805**	1.0070 (-0.78)	1.0085
8	10688	0	0.0016	0.0001	11.5159	1563.3886**	1.0108 (-1.11)	1.1861
9	9479	0	-0.0021	0.0000	6.3619	1367.0441**	0.9951 (0.48)	1.3005
10	8512	0	-0.0080	0.0003	18.2237*	1116.4064**	1.0191 (-1.76)	1.1732
15	5610	1	0.0263	0.0000	12.5500	912.8628**	1.5950* (-1.97)	1.0722
20	4160	0	0.0254	0.0008	10.5554	291.8809**	1.0298 (-1.92)	0.9369
30	2709	0	-0.0074	0.0000	11.1293	127.6602**	0.9889 (0.58)	0.9894

**Panel B: P2 (SETS/Floor)**

Index									
Min	Nobs	q	$\phi_2$	$R^2$	Q(10)	$Q^2(5)$	$1-\phi_1$	$1-\bar{\phi}_1$	
1	86775	6	-0.1668	0.0198	136.8389**	226.1285**	1.1211 (-0.26)	1.1211	
2	43290	3	-0.1674	0.0216	50.6127**	187.0973**	1.2796 (-0.86)	1.0625	
3	28795	0	0.0231**	0.0198	26.6181**	220.9910**	0.8592** (24.14)	0.8584	
4	21548	0	-0.0002	0.0169	30.7300**	212.2649**	0.8698** (19.28)	0.8721	
5	17199	0	0.0015	0.0119	18.7190**	226.0925**	0.8906** (14.43)	0.8750	
6	14300	0	-0.0192*	0.0099	11.0942	195.6771**	0.9005** (11.96)	1.2198	
7	12230	1	-0.0306	0.0052	6.0138	226.5149**	1.1384 (-1.11)	1.1759	
8	10677	1	-0.0369*	0.0051	4.8182	384.9524**	1.2917* (-2.23)	1.2883	
9	9469	1	-0.0129	0.0026	4.0588	242.0323**	1.3855* (-2.16)	1.2551	
10	8502	1	-0.0254	0.0023	2.8144	295.3644**	0.8422 (0.67)	1.1032	
15	5603	1	0.0234	0.0010	3.3498	753.8565**	1.0981 (-0.20)	1.0744	
20	4154	0	-0.0220	0.0014	6.9290	293.0712**	0.9618* (2.46)	1.2674	
30	2704	1	-0.0315	0.0013	9.1007	84.3087**	1.7806** (-4.83)	1.1283	
Futures									
Min	Nobs	q	$\phi_2$	$R^2$	Q(10)	$Q^2(5)$	$1-\phi_1$	$1-\bar{\phi}_1$	
1	86775	6	0.2432	0.0017	8.3662	9818.8713**	1.4365 (-0.51)	1.4365	
2	43290	3	-0.2954*	0.0016	6.2763	5217.6319**	1.5113 (-1.32)	1.1115	
3	28795	4	-0.4229	0.0002	8.3968	2741.5319**	0.6887 (1.15)	0.8536	
4	21548	1	-0.0264**	0.0002	7.0728	2601.4592**	0.7580 (0.96)	0.9272	
5	17199	0	-0.0036	0.0005	10.3005	2340.6001**	1.0102 (-1.34)	1.1954	
6	14300	0	-0.0027	0.0000	6.4373	2157.5943**	1.0041 (-0.49)	1.2343	
7	12230	7	-0.3687	0.0021	3.5909	1807.0570**	1.0864 (-0.21)	1.2695	
8	10677	0	0.0068	0.0000	10.6299	1620.4068**	1.0241* (-2.49)	0.9374	
9	9469	3	0.3733	0.0012	7.8880	1432.2826**	1.6451* (-2.47)	1.2415	
10	8502	0	-0.0003	0.0000	2.4157	781.5140**	1.0150 (-1.38)	0.9737	
15	5603	5	-0.0796	0.0026	1.6292	498.0648**	1.7104** (-5.05)	1.3420	
20	4154	2	0.2896	0.0010	11.5849	340.5903**	1.8733** (-9.81)	1.4462	
30	2704	1	-0.0352	0.0015	11.8687	108.7610**	1.2439 (-0.54)	1.1704	

**Panel C: P3 (SETS/LIFFE CONNECT)**

Index								
Min	Nobs	q	$\phi_2$	$R^2$	Q(10)	$Q^2(5)$	$1-\phi_1$	$1-\bar{\phi}_1$
1	87120	8	0.0999	0.0081	35.5658**	4100.8175**	1.0768 (-0.13)	1.0768
2	43470	4	-0.2250	0.0095	19.5242*	2990.6822**	1.0424 (-0.09)	0.7144
3	28920	1	-0.0056	0.0084	19.2908*	2152.7081**	0.7067** (4.47)	0.9681
4	21645	2	-0.2167	0.0086	15.1713	1193.0019**	1.3079 (-1.69)	1.0137
5	17280	7	-0.6988**	0.0066	4.6227	618.1459**	0.1745** (10.67)	0.7489
6	14370	3	0.9190**	0.0074	13.8635	604.5743**	1.7984** (-4.39)	1.0687
7	12292	1	0.0396*	0.0029	11.3719	499.7415**	0.8082 (1.22)	1.0076
8	10733	1	0.0122	0.0036	12.5350	415.0765**	0.9395** (6.27)	1.0530
9	9520	0	0.0077	0.0025	6.5247	338.9618**	0.9498** (4.90)	0.9407
10	8550	0	0.0073	0.0036	12.6485	283.2741**	0.9397** (5.59)	1.0397
15	5640	0	0.0076	0.0018	10.1931	179.2144**	0.9563** (3.29)	1.0488
20	4185	5	-0.2168	0.0042	1.3055	74.5502**	1.0808 (-0.33)	0.8695
30	2730	4	0.0404	0.0034	3.6361	27.9699**	1.1016 (-0.18)	1.0143
Futures								
Min	Nobs	q	$\phi_2$	$R^2$	Q(10)	$Q^2(5)$	$1-\phi_1$	$1-\bar{\phi}_1$
1	87120	5	-0.0571	0.0026	2.5065	9188.1888**	0.2054** (3.35)	0.2054
2	43470	0	-0.0096*	0.0000	7.8573	3209.3543**	0.9983 (0.36)	1.0051
3	28920	0	0.0142	0.0002	19.0026*	1198.5341**	1.0142* (-2.42)	0.9189
4	21645	0	0.0112	0.0000	14.7906	1269.5083**	0.9982 (0.26)	1.0119
5	17280	0	0.0058	0.0000	10.8126	855.6977**	1.0049 (-0.65)	0.9956
6	14370	0	0.0022	0.0000	19.4901*	418.9056**	0.9900 (1.20)	0.9917
7	12292	0	0.0065	0.0000	9.4982	724.1508**	0.9942 (0.64)	1.1871
8	10733	0	-0.0019	0.0000	14.3714	324.1292**	0.9841 (1.65)	1.0832
9	9520	0	0.0085	0.0000	12.2652	238.3635**	0.9997 (0.03)	1.2220
10	8550	1	0.0184	0.0001	16.2886	246.4774**	1.5606 (-1.93)	1.3719
15	5640	0	0.0180	0.0000	9.4917	157.8394**	0.9982 (0.13)	0.6808
20	4185	5	-0.2705	0.0026	5.3712	54.1447**	1.0403 (-0.14)	1.0605
30	2730	3	0.3413	0.0021	1.5620	27.0682**	1.5074 (-1.47)	1.0843

**Table 4** ARMA factors at different frequencies for heteroscedasticity filtered returns

This table shows the ARMA partial adjustment coefficients estimates for the FTSE 100 stock index and futures contract returns after adjusting for heteroscedasticity. The overall sample, from 03/06/1996 until 17/03/2000, is divided into three sub-samples according to the different trading systems in place at LSE and LIFFE. Estimates for each sub-sample are present in panels A, B and C.

The basic difference in relation to Table 5.2 is that, before the estimation of the ARMA models, returns are filtered for the conditional volatility estimated by a GARCH(1,1). Tests are conducted on  $\tilde{R}_{i,t} = R_{i,t} / \sqrt{h_{i,t}}$ , where  $R_{i,t}$  are the sampled returns and  $h_{i,t}$  is the conditional variance of asset  $i$ , estimated by

$$R_{i,t} = \mu + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad \varepsilon_{i,t} = v_{i,t} \sqrt{h_{i,t}}, \quad v_{i,t} \sim N(0,1), \quad h_{i,t} = \kappa + \alpha \varepsilon_{i,t-1}^2 + \beta h_{i,t-1}.$$

Partial adjustment coefficients are estimated for different sampling frequencies, present in the first column (in minutes). See Table 5.2 for the construction of other columns. Asterisks (\*\*) and (\*) indicate test statistics significant at the 1% and 5% levels.

**Panel A: P1 (SEAQ/Floor)**

Index							
Min	Nobs	q	$\phi_2$	R <sup>2</sup>	Q(10)	Q <sup>2</sup> (5)	1 - $\phi_1$
1	86850	2	0.0293	0.1500	138.0975**	64.3158**	0.1043** (240.64)
2	43329	2	0.5181**	0.1437	32.1612**	92.9543**	0.2018** (88.25)
3	28822	2	0.2405	0.1345	5.6776	35.7322**	0.2864** (46.71)
4	21568	1	-0.0258	0.1294	12.5077	35.8887**	0.3979** (40.87)
5	17216	2	0.2309	0.1301	6.8601	33.6854**	0.4514** (15.62)
6	14315	1	-0.0414	0.1173	7.4874	19.2032**	0.5592** (19.76)
7	12242	1	-0.0694	0.1142	9.6416	30.3225**	0.6119** (15.61)
8	10688	1	-0.0226	0.0979	14.7829	23.6867**	0.6630** (11.34)
9	9479	0	0.0112	0.0950	9.3844	42.7579**	0.6914** (31.58)
10	8512	1	-0.1534	0.0878	2.8238	13.2907*	0.6780** (9.28)
15	5610	1	-0.0460	0.0590	6.0350	7.0106	0.8129** (3.43)
20	4160	1	0.0362	0.0384	9.0278	1.9437	0.8387* (2.07)
30	2709	1	-0.0967	0.0274	6.5479	8.1440	0.9952 (0.04)

  

Futures							
Min	Nobs	q	$\phi_2$	R <sup>2</sup>	Q(10)	Q <sup>2</sup> (5)	1 - $\phi_1$
1	86850	2	-0.9034**	0.0001	5.3624	54.3542**	0.6735** (0.21)
2	43329	0	0.0060	0.0000	12.4826	6.4692	0.9984 (0.33)
3	28822	0	0.0052	0.0000	5.3027	16.5044**	1.0016 (-0.27)
4	21568	1	-0.0125	0.0001	6.3688	3.6130	1.4174 (-0.45)
5	17216	0	-0.0000	0.0000	7.7928	4.3257	1.0018 (-0.24)
6	14315	1	-0.0051	0.0000	4.5337	3.2785	0.6535 (0.15)
7	12242	0	-0.0023	0.0000	4.8637	0.7380	1.0045 (-0.49)
8	10688	0	-0.0062	0.0000	8.5481	3.3709	1.0031 (-0.32)
9	9479	0	-0.0010	0.0000	4.4314	7.5668	1.0069 (-0.67)
10	8512	0	-0.0032	0.0000	6.3833	0.5678	0.9997 (0.03)
15	5610	1	0.0309	0.0008	5.5237	1.9812	1.7382** (-3.29)
20	4160	0	0.0298	0.0002	6.8492	2.6405	1.0162 (-1.04)
30	2709	0	0.0019	0.0010	7.1375	5.8074	0.9664 (1.75)

**Panel B: P2 (SETS/Floor)**

Index							
Min	Nobs	q	$\phi_2$	$R^2$	Q(10)	$Q^2(5)$	$1 - \phi_1$
1	86775	4	0.1407	0.0180	127.6255**	22.0813**	0.4853** (5.73)
2	43290	2	0.0716	0.0177	66.4335**	13.0139*	0.7199* (2.13)
3	28795	0	0.0316**	0.0143	38.2074	10.4897	0.8801** (20.49)
4	21548	0	0.0133	0.0133	22.4762*	9.3234	0.8846** (17.05)
5	17199	0	0.0083	0.0096	15.5828	3.2581	0.9020** (12.91)
6	14300	0	-0.0034	0.0092	9.7693	4.1394	0.9040** (11.54)
7	12230	0	-0.0034	0.0060	8.4924	4.9408	0.9225** (8.59)
8	10677	3	-0.5704	0.0057	3.6371	2.1554	0.8261 (0.49)
9	9469	3	-0.4311	0.0038	2.5630	6.0239	1.0825 (-0.19)
10	8502	1	-0.0039	0.0029	2.9125	7.8290	0.5787* (2.17)
15	5603	1	0.0375*	0.0027	2.7338	6.0633	0.7068 (1.13)
20	4154	0	-0.0123	0.0023	4.8605	2.9153	0.9520** (3.10)
30	2704	1	-0.0245	0.0008	5.9393	17.3788	1.8305** (-4.69)
Futures							
Min	Nobs	q	$\phi_2$	$R^2$	Q(10)	$Q^2(5)$	$1 - \phi_1$
1	86775	9	0.7399	0.0009	3.6832	87.2444**	1.5580 (-0.83)
2	43290	3	-0.2192	0.0008	7.3393	20.0549**	1.5824 (-1.40)
3	28795	2	-0.0111	0.0001	10.519	2.8596	0.8722 (0.59)
4	21548	0	0.0017	0.0000	8.4079	2.1910	1.0082 (-1.21)
5	17199	0	0.0061	0.0000	10.1585	3.9224	1.0017 (-0.23)
6	14300	0	0.0094	0.0000	9.4503	6.4432	0.9996 (0.05)
7	12230	0	0.0037	0.0000	12.1392	9.4194	1.0030 (-0.33)
8	10677	0	0.0128	0.0000	7.5120	5.2503	1.0018 (-0.18)
9	9469	0	0.0103	0.0000	5.7019	6.7986	1.0032 (-0.31)
10	8502	0	0.0151	0.0000	4.4918	11.6559*	0.9961 (0.36)
15	5603	0	0.0261	0.0000	10.4378	4.0667	0.9826 (1.30)
20	4154	0	0.0007	0.0000	7.4866	2.4474	0.9851 (0.96)
30	2704	0	-0.0196	0.0014	6.9436	5.4458	0.9530* (2.44)

**Panel C: P3 (SETS/LIFFE CONNECT)**

Index							
Min	Nobs	q	$\phi_2$	R <sup>2</sup>	Q(10)	Q <sup>2</sup> (5)	1- $\phi_1$
1	87120	5	0.3375	0.0067	54.8550**	6.0250	0.3441 (1.52)
2	43470	4	0.4959	0.0080	36.4420**	21.4196**	0.8795 (0.27)
3	28920	1	-0.0207	0.0082	15.9994	19.9679**	0.6000** (6.65)
4	21645	1	0.0307	0.0073	15.5587	9.3826	0.5525** (7.42)
5	17280	2	-0.2245	0.0060	10.7719	7.0330	0.3116** (4.17)
6	14370	2	0.1708	0.0073	7.8613	2.9264	0.3386** (3.51)
7	12292	1	0.0298	0.0042	6.2951	2.3454	0.5788** (3.40)
8	10733	0	0.0208*	0.0042	10.5921	2.6042	0.9353** (6.71)
9	9520	1	0.0041	0.0036	7.6216	4.1371	0.7715 (1.26)
10	8550	0	0.0141	0.0046	11.1936	3.4714	0.9322** (6.28)
15	5640	0	0.0125	0.0028	8.7843	3.2128	0.9464** (4.03)
20	4185	5	-0.1818	0.0044	0.7435	4.1942	1.0822 (-0.31)
30	2730	3	0.3222	0.0028	3.7505	0.6436	1.2878 (-0.82)
Futures							
Min	Nobs	q	$\phi_2$	R <sup>2</sup>	Q(10)	Q <sup>2</sup> (5)	1- $\phi_1$
1	87120	5	-0.0283	0.0018	0.9069	33.3820**	0.1555** (11.62)
2	43470	0	-0.0037	0.0000	10.7614	20.7830**	0.9996 (0.09)
3	28920	2	0.2639	0.0003	14.0772	5.8895	0.5049** (2.58)
4	21645	1	0.0135	0.0001	14.3241	6.1028	0.3901* (2.27)
5	17280	1	-0.0001	0.0001	11.3773	2.2753	0.4526* (2.00)
6	14370	0	0.0114	0.0000	17.3646	1.3618	0.9868 (1.58)
7	12292	0	0.0194	0.0000	12.3900	1.3066	0.9901 (1.10)
8	10733	0	0.0108	0.0001	13.3640	1.7637	0.9810* (1.97)
9	9520	0	0.0187	0.0000	13.9836	1.6158	0.9946 (0.53)
10	8550	0	0.0235	0.0000	15.3831	2.2875	0.9829 (1.58)
15	5640	0	0.0173	0.0000	7.3137	1.5412	0.9857 (1.07)
20	4185	5	-0.2759	0.0029	4.0561	0.7324	1.0384 (-0.3)
30	2730	2	-0.0405	0.0013	3.8790	1.8511	1.3097 (-1.11)

**Table 5** Cross-covariance factors at different sampling frequencies

This table reports the cross-covariance partial adjustment coefficients estimates for the FTSE 100 stock index and futures contract. The overall sample, from 03/06/1996 until 17/03/2000, is divided into three sub-samples according to the different trading systems in place at LSE and LIFFE. Estimates for each sub-sample are present in panels A, B and C.

Partial adjustment coefficients are estimated for different sampling frequencies, shown in the first column (in minutes). These coefficients are computed using the cross-covariances from unfiltered returns (column “CCU”), the cross-covariances from ARMA innovations (column “CCA”) and the cross-covariances from innovations adjusted for the conditional volatility using ARMA-GARCH(1,1) (column CCG). The moving average order for the ARMA process is chosen according to the AIC criterion.

The t-statistics, reported in parentheses, are computed as

$$t_i^* = T^{-1} \sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2 \text{Var}(R_{i,t}) \text{Cov}(R_{i,t}, R_{j,t-q_i})^{-2} \text{ with } i = s, f \text{ and } i \neq j.$$

Where  $\sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2$  is the estimated variance of the disturbance in the regression  $R_{j,t-1-q_i} = a + bR_{j,t-q_i} + \varepsilon_{j,t}$  (Theobald and Yallup, 1998, 2004). Asterisks (\*\*) and (\*) mark estimates significantly different from unity at the 1% and 5% levels.

**Panel A: P1 (SEAQ/Floor)**

Min	Index			Futures		
	CCU	CCA	CCG	CCU	CCA	CCG
1	-0.3175**(70.26)	-0.0418**(55.99)	0.1750**(43.45)	0.6139**(25.20)	0.6294**(19.93)	0.5787**(22.19)
2	-0.3037**(72.40)	0.0902** (54.95)	0.2393** (43.98)	0.7878** (14.41)	0.8274**(10.43)	0.8133**(10.80)
3	-0.2692**(71.08)	0.1826** (51.09)	0.2906** (42.01)	0.8472** (10.91)	0.8756** (7.78)	0.8708** (7.65)
4	-0.2438**(68.12)	0.2501** (45.31)	0.3251** (38.77)	0.8693** (8.60)	0.8864** (6.86)	0.8608** (7.99)
5	-0.1904**(64.66)	0.2910** (42.65)	0.4031** (34.19)	0.8880** (7.15)	0.8782** (7.33)	0.8670** (7.62)
6	-0.1190**(59.98)	0.3446** (38.63)	0.4263** (31.96)	0.9086** (5.63)	0.9118** (5.20)	0.9021** (5.45)
7	-0.0193**(54.69)	0.4186** (33.82)	0.4776** (29.07)	0.9149** (5.13)	0.8998** (5.83)	0.9051** (5.28)
8	0.0584** (49.93)	0.4958** (29.45)	0.4927** (27.40)	0.9722* (1.63)	0.9661* (1.98)	0.9360** (3.46)
9	0.1277** (45.72)	0.5249** (26.43)	0.5448** (23.84)	0.9427** (3.27)	0.9304** (3.87)	0.9084** (4.79)
10	0.1518** (43.21)	0.5333** (25.83)	0.5786** (22.27)	0.9867 (0.73)	0.9569* (2.39)	0.9518* (2.55)
15	0.3746** (30.22)	0.6430** (18.08)	0.6549** (16.75)	1.0026 (-0.13)	0.9806 (0.98)	0.9579* (2.04)
20	0.4743** (23.03)	0.7078** (13.39)	0.7251** (12.19)	1.0369 (-1.66)	1.0046 (-0.21)	0.9822 (0.79)
30	0.6121** (15.38)	0.7868** (8.52)	0.8019** (7.94)	1.0203 (0.39)	0.9939 (0.24)	1.0022 (-0.09)



**Panel B: P2 (SETS/Floor)**

Min	Index			Futures		
	CCU	CCA	CCG	CCU	CCA	CCG
1	0.0341** (72.74)	0.1087** (63.81)	0.0830** (62.41)	0.6865** (23.78)	0.7081** (20.90)	0.6882** (21.22)
2	0.1656** (67.15)	0.2711** (57.40)	0.2529** (56.40)	0.8481** (12.35)	0.8531** (11.57)	0.8551** (10.94)
3	0.2828** (57.86)	0.4195** (47.00)	0.4106** (46.08)	0.9470** (4.32)	0.9425** (4.66)	0.9373** (4.90)
4	0.4101** (46.98)	0.5416** (37.07)	0.5185** (37.42)	0.9721* (2.24)	0.9471** (4.28)	0.9533** (3.63)
5	0.4853** (39.99)	0.5946** (31.73)	0.5703** (32.46)	0.9758 (1.89)	0.9636** (2.85)	0.9578** (3.19)
6	0.5207** (35.52)	0.6196** (28.29)	0.6092** (28.33)	0.9696* (2.26)	0.9614** (2.87)	0.9602** (2.88)
7	0.6123** (28.10)	0.6807** (23.36)	0.6673** (23.68)	0.9879 (0.88)	0.9620** (2.78)	0.9807 (1.37)
8	0.6601** (24.29)	0.7249** (19.85)	0.7064** (20.75)	1.0144 (-1.03)	0.9893 (0.77)	0.9925 (0.53)
9	0.7020** (20.45)	0.7482** (17.41)	0.7322** (18.09)	1.0148 (-1.01)	0.9911 (0.61)	0.9945 (0.37)
10	0.7123** (19.30)	0.7592** (16.25)	0.7471** (16.69)	1.0242 (-1.63)	1.0095 (-0.64)	1.0009 (-0.06)
15	0.7805** (12.89)	0.8133** (11.00)	0.7957** (11.81)	1.0030 (-0.17)	0.9852 (0.87)	0.9835 (0.95)
20	0.8275** (9.22)	0.8648** (7.24)	0.8551** (7.69)	0.9969 (0.17)	0.9782 (1.17)	0.9876 (0.66)
30	0.8631** (6.17)	0.8827** (5.27)	0.8781** (5.48)	0.9666 (1.51)	0.9904 (0.43)	1.0099 (-0.45)

**Panel C: P3 (SETS/LIFFE CONNECT)**

Min	Index			Futures		
	CCU	CCA	CCG	CCU	CCA	CCG
1	0.2037** (70.80)	0.2668** (65.80)	0.2760** (61.06)	0.6711** (29.29)	0.6448** (31.89)	0.6157** (32.41)
2	0.3780** (61.16)	0.4574** (52.86)	0.4673** (50.36)	0.8495** (14.86)	0.8513** (14.48)	0.8364** (15.47)
3	0.5128** (46.93)	0.5928** (39.32)	0.5923** (38.29)	0.9098** (8.72)	0.8974** (9.91)	0.8865** (10.66)
4	0.5625** (39.67)	0.6523** (31.38)	0.6463** (31.37)	0.9128** (7.94)	0.9151** (7.67)	0.9198** (7.11)
5	0.6630** (30.08)	0.7347** (23.66)	0.7261** (23.99)	0.9471** (4.74)	0.9417** (5.20)	0.9421** (5.07)
6	0.6988** (25.61)	0.7794** (18.67)	0.7760** (18.61)	0.9445** (4.74)	0.9522** (4.05)	0.9485** (4.28)
7	0.7236** (22.32)	0.7758** (18.07)	0.7656** (18.65)	0.9666** (2.70)	0.9732* (2.16)	0.9729* (2.16)
8	0.7293** (21.07)	0.7888** (16.37)	0.7885** (16.18)	0.9601** (3.11)	0.9757 (1.88)	0.9666* (2.55)
9	0.7674** (17.50)	0.8174** (13.74)	0.8120** (13.99)	0.9863 (1.03)	0.9869 (0.99)	0.9843 (1.17)
10	0.7835** (15.83)	0.8433** (11.47)	0.8395** (11.57)	0.9769 (1.69)	0.9734 (1.94)	0.9755 (1.77)
15	0.8354** (10.38)	0.8790** (7.63)	0.8803** (7.51)	0.9781 (1.38)	0.9811 (1.19)	0.9803 (1.24)
20	0.8717** (7.21)	0.8932** (6.01)	0.8994** (5.64)	0.9762 (1.34)	0.9671* (1.85)	0.9706 (1.65)
30	0.9217** (3.72)	0.9385** (2.91)	0.9364** (3.01)	0.9638 (1.72)	0.9935 (0.31)	0.9973 (0.13)

## ESTUDOS DO G.E.M.F.

(Available on-line at <http://gemf.fe.uc.pt>)

- 
- 2008-07 *The partial adjustment factors of FTSE 100 stock index and stock index futures: The informational impact of electronic trading systems*  
- Helder M. C. V. Sebastião
- 2008-06 *Water Losses and Hydrographical Regions Influence on the Cost Structure of the Portuguese Water Industry*  
- Rita Martins, Fernando Coelho & Adelino Fortunato
- 2008-05 *The Shadow of Death: Analysing the Pre-Exit Productivity of Portuguese Manufacturing Firms*  
- Carlos Carreira & Paulino Teixeira
- 2008-04 *A Note on the Determinants and Consequences of Outsourcing Using German Data*  
- John T. Addison, Lutz Bellmann, André Pahnke & Paulino Teixeira
- 2008-03 *Exchange Rate and Interest Rate Volatility in a Target Zone: The Portuguese Case*  
- António Portugal Duarte, João Sousa Andrade & Adelaide Duarte
- 2008-02 *Taylor-type rules versus optimal policy in a Markov-switching economy*  
- Fernando Alexandre, Pedro Bação & Vasco Gabriel
- 2008-01 *Entry and exit as a source of aggregate productivity growth in two alternative technological regimes*  
- Carlos Carreira & Paulino Teixeira
- 2007-09 *Optimal monetary policy with a regime-switching exchange rate in a forward-looking model*  
- Fernando Alexandre, Pedro Bação & John Driffill
- 2007-08 *Estrutura económica, intensidade energética e emissões de CO<sub>2</sub>: Uma abordagem Input-Output*  
- Luís Cruz & Eduardo Barata
- 2007-07 *The Stability and Growth Pact, Fiscal Policy Institutions, and Stabilization in Europe*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 2007-06 *The Consumption-Wealth Ratio Under Asymmetric Adjustment*  
- Vasco J. Gabriel, Fernando Alexandre & Pedro Bação
- 2007-05 *European Integration and External Sustainability of the European Union An application of the thesis of Feldstein-Horioka*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 2007-04 *Uma Aplicação da Lei de Okun em Portugal*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 2007-03 *Education and growth: an industry-level analysis of the Portuguese manufacturing sector*  
- Marta Simões & Adelaide Duarte
- 2007-02 *Levels of education, growth and policy complementarities*  
- Marta Simões & Adelaide Duarte
- 2007-01 *Internal and External Restructuring over the Cycle: A Firm-Based Analysis of Gross Flows and Productivity Growth in Portugal*  
- Carlos Carreira & Paulino Teixeira
- 2006-09 *Cost Structure of the Portuguese Water Industry: a Cubic Cost Function Application*  
- Rita Martins, Adelino Fortunato & Fernando Coelho
- 2006-08 *The Impact of Works Councils on Wages*  
- John T. Addison, Paulino Teixeira & Thomas Zwick
- 2006-07 *Ricardian Equivalence, Twin Deficits, and the Feldstein-Horioka puzzle in Egypt*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 2006-06 *L'intégration des marchés financiers*  
- José Soares da Fonseca

- 2006-05 *The Integration of European Stock Markets and Market Timing*  
- José Soares da Fonseca
- 2006-04 *Mobilidade do Capital e Sustentabilidade Externa – uma aplicação da tese de F-H a Portugal (1910-2004)*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 2006-03 *Works Councils, Labor Productivity and Plant Heterogeneity: First Evidence from Quantile Regressions*  
- Joachim Wagner, Thorsten Schank, Claus Schnabel & John T. Addison
- 2006-02 *Does the Quality of Industrial Relations Matter for the Macroeconomy? A Cross-Country Analysis Using Strikes Data*  
- John T. Addison & Paulino Teixeira
- 2006-01 *Monte Carlo Estimation of Project Volatility for Real Options Analysis*  
- Pedro Manuel Cortesão Godinho
- 2005-17 *On the Stability of the Wealth Effect*  
- Fernando Alexandre, Pedro Bação & Vasco J. Gabriel
- 2005-16 *Building Blocks in the Economics of Mandates*  
- John T. Addison, C. R. Barrett & W. S. Siebert
- 2005-15 *Horizontal Differentiation and the survival of Train and Coach modes in medium range passenger transport, a welfare analysis comprising economies of scope and scale*  
- Adelino Fortunato & Daniel Murta
- 2005-14 *'Atypical Work' and Compensation*  
- John T. Addison & Christopher J. Surfield
- 2005-13 *The Demand for Labor: An Analysis Using Matched Employer-Employee Data from the German LIAB. Will the High Unskilled Worker Own-Wage Elasticity Please Stand Up?*  
- John T. Addison, Lutz Bellmann, Thorsten Schank & Paulino Teixeira
- 2005-12 *Works Councils in the Production Process*  
- John T. Addison, Thorsten Schank, Claus Schnabel & Joachim Wagner
- 2005-11 *Second Order Filter Distribution Approximations for Financial Time Series with Extreme Outliers*  
- J. Q. Smith & António A. F. Santos
- 2005-10 *Firm Growth and Persistence of Chance: Evidence from Portuguese Microdata*  
- Blandina Oliveira & Adelino Fortunato
- 2005-09 *Residential water demand under block rates – a Portuguese case study*  
- Rita Martins & Adelino Fortunato
- 2005-08 *Politico-Economic Causes of Labor Regulation in the United States: Alliances and Raising Rivals' Costs (and Sometimes Lowering One's Own)*  
- John T. Addison
- 2005-07 *Firm Growth and Liquidity Constraints: A Dynamic Analysis*  
- Blandina Oliveira & Adelino Fortunato
- 2005-06 *The Effect of Works Councils on Employment Change*  
- John T. Addison & Paulino Teixeira
- 2005-05 *Le Rôle de la Consommation Publique dans la Croissance: le cas de l'Union Européenne*  
- João Sousa Andrade, Maria Adelaide Silva Duarte & Claude Berthomieu
- 2005-04 *The Dynamics of the Growth of Firms: Evidence from the Services Sector*  
- Blandina Oliveira & Adelino Fortunato
- 2005-03 *The Determinants of Firm Performance: Unions, Works Councils, and Employee Involvement/High Performance Work Practices*  
- John T. Addison

- 2005-02 *Has the Stability and Growth Pact stabilised? Evidence from a panel of 12 European countries and some implications for the reform of the Pact*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 2005-01 *Sustainability of Portuguese Fiscal Policy in Historical Perspective*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 2004-03 *Human capital, mechanisms of technological diffusion and the role of technological shocks in the speed of diffusion. Evidence from a panel of Mediterranean countries*  
- Maria Adelaide Duarte & Marta Simões
- 2004-02 *What Have We Learned About The Employment Effects of Severance Pay? Further Iterations of Lazear et al.*  
- John T. Addison & Paulino Teixeira
- 2004-01 *How the Gold Standard Functioned in Portugal: an analysis of some macroeconomic aspects*  
- António Portugal Duarte & João Sousa Andrade
- 2003-07 *Testing Gibrat's Law: Empirical Evidence from a Panel of Portuguese Manufacturing Firms*  
- Blandina Oliveira & Adelino Fortunato
- 2003-06 *Régimes Monétaires et Théorie Quantitative du Produit Nominal au Portugal (1854-1998)*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 2003-05 *Causas do Atraso na Estabilização da Inflação: Abordagem Teórica e Empírica*  
- Vítor Castro
- 2003-04 *The Effects of Households' and Firms' Borrowing Constraints on Economic Growth*  
- Maria da Conceição Costa Pereira
- 2003-03 *Second Order Filter Distribution Approximations for Financial Time Series with Extreme Outliers*  
- J. Q. Smith & António A. F. Santos
- 2003-02 *Output Smoothing in EMU and OECD: Can We Forego Government Contribution? A risk sharing approach*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 2003-01 *Um modelo VAR para uma Avaliação Macroeconómica de Efeitos da Integração Europeia da Economia Portuguesa*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 2002-08 *Discrimination des facteurs potentiels de croissance et type de convergence de l'économie portugaise dans l'UE à travers la spécification de la fonction de production macro-économique. Une étude appliquée de données de panel et de séries temporelles*  
- Marta Simões & Maria Adelaide Duarte
- 2002-07 *Privatisation in Portugal: employee owners or just happy employees?*  
- Luís Moura Ramos & Rita Martins
- 2002-06 *The Portuguese Money Market: An analysis of the daily session*  
- Fátima Teresa Sol Murta
- 2002-05 *As teorias de ciclo políticos e o caso português*  
- Rodrigo Martins
- 2002-04 *Fundos de acções internacionais: uma avaliação de desempenho*  
- Nuno M. Silva
- 2002-03 *The consistency of optimal policy rules in stochastic rational expectations models*  
- David Backus & John Driffill

- 2002-02 *The term structure of the spreads between Portuguese and German interest rates during stage II of EMU*  
- José Soares da Fonseca
- 2002-01 *O processo desinflacionista português: análise de alguns custos e benefícios*  
- António Portugal Duarte
- 2001-14 *Equity prices and monetary policy: an overview with an exploratory model*  
- Fernando Alexandre & Pedro Bação
- 2001-13 *A convergência das taxas de juro portuguesas para os níveis europeus durante a segunda metade da década de noventa*  
- José Soares da Fonseca
- 2001-12 *Le rôle de l'investissement dans l'éducation sur la croissance selon différentes spécifications du capital humain.*  
- Adelaide Duarte & Marta Simões
- 2001-11 *Ricardian Equivalence: An Empirical Application to the Portuguese Economy*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 2001-10 *A Especificação da Função de Produção Macro-Económica em Estudos de Crescimento Económico.*  
- Maria Adelaide Duarte e Marta Simões
- 2001-09 *Eficácia da Análise Técnica no Mercado Accionista Português*  
- Nuno Silva
- 2001-08 *The Risk Premiums in the Portuguese Treasury Bills Interest Rates: Estimation by a cointegration method*  
- José Soares da Fonseca
- 2001-07 *Principais factores de crescimento da economia portuguesa no espaço europeu*  
- Maria Adelaide Duarte e Marta Simões
- 2001-06 *Inflation Targeting and Exchange Rate Co-ordination*  
- Fernando Alexandre, John Driffill e Fabio Spagnolo
- 2001-05 *Labour Market Transition in Portugal, Spain, and Poland: A Comparative Perspective*  
- Paulino Teixeira
- 2001-04 *Paridade do Poder de Compra e das Taxas de Juro: Um estudo aplicado a três países da UEM*  
- António Portugal Duarte
- 2001-03 *Technology, Employment and Wages*  
- John T. Addison & Paulino Teixeira
- 2001-02 *Human capital investment through education and economic growth. A panel data analysis based on a group of Latin American countries*  
- Maria Adelaide Duarte & Marta Simões
- 2001-01 *Risk Premiums in the Portuguese Treasury Bills Interest Rates from 1990 to 1998. An ARCH-M Approach*  
- José Soares da Fonseca
- 2000-08 *Identificação de Vectores de Cointegração: Análise de Alguns Exemplos*  
- Pedro Miguel Avelino Bação
- 2000-07 *Imunização e M-quadrado: Que relação?*  
- Jorge Cunha

- 2000-06 *Eficiência Informacional nos Futuros Lisbor 3M*  
- Nuno M. Silva
- 2000-05 *Estimation of Default Probabilities Using Incomplete Contracts Data*  
- J. Santos Silva & J. Murteira
- 2000-04 *Un Essaie d'Application de la Théorie Quantitative de la Monnaie à l'économie portugaise, 1854-1998*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 2000-03 *Le Taux de Chômage Naturel comme un Indicateur de Politique Economique? Une application à l'économie portugaise*  
- Adelaide Duarte & João Sousa Andrade
- 2000-02 *La Convergence Réelle Selon la Théorie de la Croissance: Quelles Explications pour l'Union Européenne?*  
- Marta Cristina Nunes Simões
- 2000-01 *Política de Estabilização e Independência dos Bancos Centrais*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1999-09 *Nota sobre a Estimação de Vectores de Cointegração com os Programas CATS in RATS, PCFIML e EVIEWS*  
- Pedro Miguel Avelino Bação
- 1999-08 *A Abertura do Mercado de Telecomunicações Celulares ao Terceiro Operador: Uma Decisão Racional?*  
- Carlos Carreira
- 1999-07 *Is Portugal Really so Arteriosclerotic? Results from a Cross-Country Analysis of Labour Adjustment*  
- John T. Addison & Paulino Teixeira
- 1999-06 *The Effect of Dismissals Protection on Employment: More on a Vexed Theme*  
- John T. Addison, Paulino Teixeira e Jean-Luc Grosse
- 1999-05 *A Cobertura Estática e Dinâmica através do Contrato de Futuros PSI-20. Estimação das Rácios e Eficácia Ex Post e Ex Ante*  
- Helder Miguel C. V. Sebastião
- 1999-04 *Mobilização de Poupança, Financiamento e Internacionalização de Carteiras*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1999-03 *Natural Resources and Environment*  
- Adelaide Duarte
- 1999-02 *L'Analyse Positive de la Politique Monétaire*  
- Chistian Aubin
- 1999-01 *Economias de Escala e de Gama nos Hospitais Públicos Portugueses: Uma Aplicação da Função de Custo Variável Translog*  
- Carlos Carreira
- 1998-11 *Equilíbrio Monetário no Longo e Curto Prazos - Uma Aplicação à Economia Portuguesa*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1998-10 *Algumas Observações Sobre o Método da Economia*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1998-09 *Mudança Tecnológica na Indústria Transformadora: Que Tipo de Viés Afinal?*  
- Paulino Teixeira

- 1998-08 *Portfolio Insurance and Bond Management in a Vasicek's Term Structure of Interest Rates*  
- José Alberto Soares da Fonseca
- 1998-07 *Financial Innovation and Money Demand in Portugal: A Preliminary Study*  
- Pedro Miguel Avelino Bação
- 1998-06 *The Stability Pact and Portuguese Fiscal Policy: the Application of a VAR Model*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 1998-05 *A Moeda Única e o Processo de Difusão da Base Monetária*  
- José Alberto Soares da Fonseca
- 1998-04 *La Structure par Termes et la Volatilité des Taux d'intérêt LISBOR*  
- José Alberto Soares da Fonseca
- 1998-03 *Regras de Comportamento e Reformas Monetárias no Novo SMI*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1998-02 *Um Estudo da Flexibilidade dos Salários: o Caso Espanhol e Português*  
- Adelaide Duarte e João Sousa Andrade
- 1998-01 *Moeda Única e Internacionalização: Apresentação do Tema*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 
- 1997-09 *Inovação e Aplicações Financeiras em Portugal*  
- Pedro Miguel Avelino Bação
- 1997-08 *Estudo do Efeito Liquidez Aplicado à Economia Portuguesa*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1997-07 *An Introduction to Conditional Expectations and Stationarity*  
- Rui Manuel de Almeida
- 1997-06 *Definição de Moeda e Efeito Berlusconi*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1997-05 *A Estimação do Risco na Escolha dos Portafólios: Uma Visão Selectiva*  
- António Alberto Ferreira dos Santos
- 1997-04 *A Previsão Não Paramétrica de Taxas de Rentabilidade*  
- Pedro Manuel Cortesão Godinho
- 1997-03 *Propriedades Assintóticas de Densidades*  
- Rui Manuel de Almeida
- 1997-02 *Co-Integration and VAR Analysis of the Term Structure of Interest Rates: an empirical study of the Portuguese money and bond markets*  
- João Sousa Andrade & José Soares da Fonseca
- 1997-01 *Repartição e Capitalização. Duas Modalidades Complementares de Financiamento das Reformas*  
- Maria Clara Murteira
- 
- 1996-08 *A Crise e o Ressurgimento do Sistema Monetário Europeu*  
- Luis Manuel de Aguiar Dias
- 1996-07 *Housing Shortage and Housing Investment in Portugal a Preliminary View*  
- Vítor Neves
- 1996-06 *Housing, Mortgage Finance and the British Economy*  
- Kenneth Gibb & Nile Istephan

- 1996-05 *The Social Policy of The European Community, Reporting Information to Employees, a U.K. perspective: Historical Analysis and Prognosis*  
- Ken Shackleton
- 1996-04 *O Teorema da Equivalência Ricardiana: aplicação à economia portuguesa*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinho
- 1996-03 *O Teorema da Equivalência Ricardiana: discussão teórica*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinho
- 1996-02 *As taxas de juro no MMI e a Restrição das Reservas Obrigatórias dos Bancos*  
- Fátima Assunção Sol e José Alberto Soares da Fonseca
- 1996-01 *Uma Análise de Curto Prazo do Consumo, do Produto e dos Salários*  
- João Sousa Andrade