



University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

Wharton Research Scholars

Wharton Undergraduate Research

5-2020

Analyzing M&A: The Effects of Institutional Investor Cross Ownership

David Hua
University of Pennsylvania

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.upenn.edu/wharton_research_scholars

 Part of the [Business Commons](#)

Hua, David, "Analyzing M&A: The Effects of Institutional Investor Cross Ownership" (2020). *Wharton Research Scholars*. 202.
https://repository.upenn.edu/wharton_research_scholars/202

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. https://repository.upenn.edu/wharton_research_scholars/202
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Analyzing M&A: The Effects of Institutional Investor Cross Ownership

Abstract

This study provides new evidence on the role of institutional investors in corporate strategy, specifically in mergers and acquisitions and for three subsets of deals. For firms that are harder to value with greater information asymmetry, institutional investor cross-ownership between two firms increases transaction fees, reduces deal premiums, and lowers cash consideration in deals. Firms with greater analyst following and cross ownership as a percentage of total institutional ownership pay less fees, lower deal premiums, and less cash consideration in deals. Higher analyst following also contributes to lower completion probabilities while higher cross ownership as a percentage of total institutional ownership increases completion probability. While my results suggest that synergies are largely unaffected by cross ownership and the subsets listed above, my overall results suggest that institutional cross-ownership will continue to affect strategic decision-making processes moving forward.

Keywords

merger, acquisition, investor

Disciplines

Business

**ANALYZING M&A: THE EFFECTS OF INSTITUTIONAL INVESTOR CROSS
OWNERSHIP**

By

David Hua

huad@wharton.upenn.edu

An Undergraduate Research Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

WHARTON RESEARCH SCHOLARS

Faculty Advisor:

Matthew Cedergren

Assistant Professor, Accounting

THE WHARTON SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

MAY 2020

Abstract

This study provides new evidence on the role of institutional investors in corporate strategy, specifically in mergers and acquisitions and for three subsets of deals. For firms that are harder to value with greater information asymmetry, institutional investor cross-ownership between two firms increases transaction fees, reduces deal premiums, and lowers cash consideration in deals. Firms with greater analyst following and cross ownership as a percentage of total institutional ownership pay less fees, lower deal premiums, and less cash consideration in deals. Higher analyst following also contributes to lower completion probabilities while higher cross ownership as a percentage of total institutional ownership increases completion probability. While my results suggest that synergies are largely unaffected by cross ownership and the subsets listed above, my overall results suggest that institutional cross-ownership will continue to affect strategic decision-making processes moving forward.

1. Introduction

This study aims to improve our understanding of how cross-level institutional ownership affects outcomes in the mergers and acquisitions (M&A) process. Institutional investor cross-ownership occurs when an investor who owns shares of one firm in an M&A process also owns shares of the other firm in the same M&A process. In the financial services industry, in both the sell-side and buy-side realms, understanding the various drivers of M&A as well as how they result in certain outcomes is incredibly important. In the specific case of institutional investor

cross ownership, there is a great deal of research on how varying levels of this variable broadly affects outcomes in M&A.

Cross-level institutional ownership can play a major role in M&A outcomes. Brooks et al. (2008) has found that higher levels of cross-level institutional ownership not only increase the probability of two firms merging, but also affects outcomes of the transaction as well (e.g. reduced deal premiums, increased stock payment in transactions, and lowered completion probabilities of deals with negative acquirer announcement returns). They also found that deals with high institutional investor cross-ownership tend to have lower transaction costs and that the combined firm discloses more transparent financial statement information post-acquisition, with the ultimate effect of institutional investor cross-ownership on the total deal synergies and post-deal long-term performance being positive.

This paper extends the Brooks et al. (2018) analysis to investigate several open questions. First, while Brooks et al. (2018) examine cross-level institutional ownership using an OLS specification with time and industry fixed effects, I believe it would be interesting to see which industries and during which periods in time (i.e., merger waves, recessionary periods) does institutional cross-ownership matter more in M&A outcomes. An examination of the individual coefficients of industry and time effects did not reveal any insights.

Second, I will look into whether there is cross-sectional variation in the relationship between cross-level institutional ownership and the M&A outcome variables (as Brooks, Chen, and Zheng do not look at interaction variables or perform other cross-sectional analyses). For example, I plan to investigate whether the relationship between cross-level institutional ownership and the outcome variables is stronger (or weaker) among the following cross-sectional characteristics:

- Firms that have higher potential information asymmetry or are harder to value (such as high R&D, greater intangible assets, higher bid-ask spreads)
- Firms that have more or less analyst following
- The overall percentage of institutional ownership at the buyer and target that represents cross-ownership.

Understanding the role of institutions in post-merger outcomes is important for three main groups. The first group includes sell-side firms like investment banks, as they would have a better idea on where to source potential deals. With institutional shareholder information already publicly available, banks could use the results in this study to refine their search for potential new advising opportunities along various factors like industry, levels of institutional investor cross ownership, as well as other factors. In addition, after securing the advising opportunity, banks could structure transactions better based on the analysis with a better understanding of stock-based transactions, deal premiums, etc.

Another group that I believe will benefit from this research includes buy-side firms like hedge funds looking for new potential investment opportunities. With the same access to publicly available shareholder information as banks, asset managers and hedge funds would be able to better predict where successful potential M&A transactions are more likely to occur or better predict which publicly announced transactions may perform better than others.

The third group that will benefit is academics, because this paper will expand upon the current literature around M&A outcomes and institutional investor cross ownership. This paper will hopefully also help provoke thought around the importance of cross-sectional areas of

investigation concerning the relationship between institutional cross-ownership and M&A outcomes for a most recent subsets of firms.

2. Existing Literature

Several prior studies have examined the factors that helps facilitate successful M&A transactions. One variable in particular that has been studied is the level of institutional ownership of both target and acquirer firm (known as cross-ownership) and how it affects the outcomes of these deals. The level of common institutional investor ownership has been studied in the context of M&A, but also in contexts indirectly related, providing further avenues for research and exploration.

With regards to research around institutional investors, a large set of the recent literature focuses on institutional investors in the context of shareholder activism, and more specifically how these large institutional investors can effect changes in companies. Some of these changes in companies include forcing management to partake in certain merger and acquisition transactions. Becht, Polo, and Rossi (2016) look at how hedge fund activism — particularly by institutional investors — is a huge channel of influence for those investors. Specifically, they argue that institutional investors' ability to affect shareholder voting can specifically lower agency conflict and deter CEOs from making overconfident decisions, thereby resulting in more successful M&A transactions as value-destructive transactions do not make it past a shareholder vote. However, Becht et al. (2018) examined M&A transactions in the UK where rules require shareholder voting for transactions of a certain size (as opposed to the US where such voting is not mandatory).

Becht et al's (2018) research is extended by Li, Liu and Wu (2018) which looks at all-stock US deals where shareholder voting is required for deals in which the acquiring firm issues more than 20% of new shares to finance the transaction. Their findings are similar in that the shareholder vote serves as a sort of disciplinary device that forces acquirer management to choose target firms with potentially greater synergies and/or lower offer premiums than in cases without shareholder voting, thereby further highlighting the importance of institutional investors monitoring M&A transactions. While these two pieces of literature discuss institutional investor ownership from a sole owner basis (not in the context of cross-ownership), the findings as well as the methods of sampling and testing data prove useful towards understanding the topic as well as providing a basis for further research.

Building upon existing literature on institutional investor ownership, many studies have looked at how institutional level cross-ownership affects companies, deals and other attributes as well. Scholars have looked at institutional level cross-ownership in various different contexts outside of M&A, but with potential extensions and connections to M&A. These contexts include corporate innovation, competition between firms (generally speaking as well as in the airline industry more specifically), product market competition, market mechanisms, corporate governance, and disclosure practices. In the context of corporate innovation, Gao, Shen, Gao, and Chan (2019) looked at a sample of Chinese firms from 2003 through 2016 and measured whether institutional investor cross-ownership had an impact on a firm's ability to innovate. In the context of my proposed study, there seems to be potential to review the analysis on a newer data set and on US firms and whether or not the higher levels of corporate innovation lead to an increased or decreased desire for potential M&A (derived from a firm's ability or lack thereof to innovate organically to grow).

In terms of competition amongst firms, both Connely, Lee, Tihanyi, Certo, and Johnson (2019) as well as Azar, Schmalz, and Tecu (2018) looked at how institutional investor cross-ownership impacted competition. Both studies came to similar conclusions in that rival firms with similar ownership structures will engage in dissimilar competitive actions to avoid directly competing with one another. While Azar et al.'s (2018) analysis is limited to just the airline industry (using a sample of US publicly traded airlines up to 2016Q2), there is potential to explore the analysis in other industries and on newer data sets.

He and Huang (2017) found in their research that cross-held firms experienced significantly higher market share growth than non-cross-held firms and that institutional investor cross-ownership “facilitates explicit forms of product market collaboration (such as within-industry joint ventures, strategic alliances, or within-industry acquisitions) and improves innovation productivity and operating profitability.” Building upon that research, He, Huang and Zhao (2019) looked at how this cross-level ownership incentivizes institutional investors to be more active in their monitoring, illustrating the point that institutional cross-ownership serves “as a market-based mechanism to alleviate the inefficiency induced by governance externalities.” From a disclosure perspective, Jung (2013) investigates how an overlap in institutional investor ownership between two firms acts “as a mechanism by which a first-mover firm’s increase in disclosure prompts investors to seek a similar increase from a follower firm” and that ultimately, investor overlap works as a channel of communication and feedback mechanism.

Some scholars have looked at this cross-level ownership directly in the context of M&A. Brooks, Chen, and Zeng (2018) looked directly at how the role of institutional investors affects corporate strategy and more specifically how institutional level cross-ownership affects

outcomes in mergers and acquisitions. While their findings show that higher cross-level ownership leads to an increased probability of merging, reduced deal premiums, and increased stock payments among other results), their data set only resembles data from a 30-year window from 1984-2014. With the M&A market heating up over the last five years, there is potential to reinvestigate these findings on a new set of data as well as classify different time periods for analysis as well. In addition, this research is generally contradicted by Harford, Jenter and Li (2017) who argue that institutional investor cross-holdings are too small to matter in most M&A transactions. With a similarly less recent sample, there is opportunity to reinvestigate findings in this case as well, especially with the number of M&A deals worldwide increasing at a CAGR of 5.1% since 2014 up to 2018 (IMAA). In addition, there is an opportunity to reinvestigate Brooks et al.'s (2018) findings in a cross-sectional context as discussed in the introduction.

Ultimately, there are some gaps in the current research, especially with the outdated nature of some of the sample transactions used in the papers. In addition to potentially performing similar analyses as some above-discussed prior studies with newer data, our research could be classified by different industries or comparisons could be made between different time periods of M&A activity as well. In addition, with the research done on institutional level cross-ownership in fields not exactly M&A, there are many potential links between those fields and the success or failure of M&A transactions as well as other driving factors related to M&A deals.

3. Data and Methods

This study uses archival data to investigate the research questions. First, in order to collect the sample of mergers and acquisitions, I use the Thomson Reuters securities Data

Company Platinum Mergers and Acquisitions database (SDC Platinum). To further refine the sample, I start with all US domestic mergers and acquisitions announced between 1977 - 2018 (ten more years than the sample used by Brooks, Chen, and Zeng, 2018). Following the guidelines of Brooks et al., I require that both acquirers and targets be US publicly traded companies so that institutional cross-ownership can be calculated, excluding transactions labeled as minority stake purchases, acquisitions of remaining interest, privatizations, repurchases, exchange offers, self-tenders, recapitalizations or spin-offs. In addition, the percentage of the target's shares that are owned by the acquirer prior to and after the transaction must be less than 50% and at least 90%, respectively. I exclude deals that are less than \$1 million in transactions value. I also use the Compustat database for accounting data and the CRSP database for stock price data. Finally, the sample is limited to deals in which the acquirer and target have data from those two databases and all independent variables are winsorized at the 1% and 99% levels. To calculate institutional cross ownership, I link the M&A sample with the Thomson Financial CDA/Spectrum Institutional (13F) database. Table A2 presents a distribution of the sample of deals by year and by industry and suggests that the sample is representative of the general deal environment of its time period and is well diversified.

In terms of analyzing the data, I will also be taking a similar approach as Brooks, Chen and Zeng (2018) did with their multivariate analysis. The main empirical approach will be two ordinary least squares regressions. The first regression will investigate whether there is cross-sectional variation in the relationship between cross-level institutional ownership and the M&A outcome variables (as discussed above, Brooks, Chen, and Zheng do not look at interaction variables or perform other cross-sectional analyses). Specifically, the regression will look into

how the effects on the outcome variables change as acquirer cross ownership and target cross ownership change.

This first regression will be as follows with the variables discussed above, as in Brooks et al., controls for both year and industry fixed effects:

$$Y = \alpha_i + \beta_1 * ACO + \beta_2 * TCO + \beta_3 * (ACO * TCO) + Controls + Fixed Effects + \varepsilon$$

The second regression will also investigate whether there is cross-sectional variation in the relationship between cross-level institutional ownership and the M&A outcome variables. For example, is the relationship between cross-level institutional ownership and the outcome variables stronger (or weaker) among: 1) Firms that have higher potential information asymmetry or are harder to value (such as high R&D, greater intangible assets, higher bid-ask spreads) 2) Firms that have more/less analyst following 3) Firms that with higher/lower cross-ownership as a percentage of total institutional ownership?

This second regression will be as follows with the variables discussed above, as in Brooks et al., controls for both year and industry fixed effects:

$$Y = \alpha_i + \beta_1 * ACO + \beta_2 * TCO + \beta_3 * (ACO * Var) + \beta_4 * (TCO * Var) + Controls + Fixed Effects + \varepsilon$$

3. Results

The main outcome variables that I examined are Total Transaction Fees paid (FTOT), Deal Premium (DealPrem), Cash Consideration used in deal (PCT_Cash), Synergies achieved (Synergies), and Completion Probability (Completed). I initially run regressions to determine the effects of acquirer cross ownership and target cross ownership on those outcome variables, following the controls laid out by Brooks et al. After those regressions, I proceeded with my cross-sectional analysis to see how those effects varied for firms with more or less information asymmetry, analyst following, and cross ownership as a percentage of total institutional ownership. In looking at the first cross section of analysis with regards to information asymmetry, I looked at three main indicators: Research and Development (R&D) expense scaled by total revenue, Intangible Assets scaled by total assets, Bid Ask spread 1 month before the deal announcement. For the second cross sectional analysis, I looked at unique analysts following from both the acquirer and target level. For the final cross section analysis, I looked at the ratio of cross ownership as a percentage of total institutional ownership.

3a. Total Transaction Fees

In looking at the effects of institutional investor cross ownership on the transaction fees of a M&A deal, similar to Brooks et al., I am essentially looking to see if institutional cross-owners have a governance role in reducing information asymmetry and facilitating bargaining between target and acquirer better than a deal between two entirely independent parties. In addition, similar to Brooks et al., I hypothesize that if firms connected by institutional cross-

owners have greater information and better knowledge about the long-term profitability of a deal, there may be a lower need to hire investment banks to provide professional advice and therefore result in lower M&A advisory fees for such deals (2018).

Panel A of Table 1 presents the results examining transactions fees. While Brooks et al. showed for an average deal that one more institutional top 10 cross-owner (unique number of owners) is associated with a \$0.9 million reduction in acquirer financial advisor fees and a \$1.0 million reduction in target financial advisor fees, I find largely opposite results. With the larger, more recent sample, I found that acquirer cross ownership and target cross ownership actually increased total transaction fees with each percentage increasing total fees for both all deals in the sample as well as for completed deals in the sample. A 10% increase in acquirer and target cross ownership results in about a \$.7 million and \$.3 million increase in transaction fees. This result differs from my initial hypothesis but may be due to the more recent sample size and difference in looking at all institutional owners from a collective level rather than on an incremental per investor level. In looking at the interactions between acquirer cross ownership and target cross ownership, while both cross ownerships resulted in lower transaction fees, the interaction signals that the increasing presence of the other cross ownership variable resulted in an increase in total fees paid.

Panel B of Table 1 examines the cross-sectional effects of information asymmetry. In Column 1, I found that while both higher levels of R&D from acquiring firms and target firms led to marginally higher transaction fees and that both acquirer and target cross ownership also increased total fees, consistent with my earlier results. In the presence of the interaction term in Column 2, the increased presence of R&D for acquiring firms led to lower total fees: a 10% increase in information asymmetry ultimately led to a \$.6 million decrease in total fees paid. In

Column 3, I find that high levels of intangible assets (scaled by total assets) also led to an increase in total fees paid with a 10% increase in intangibles resulting in a \$.4 million and \$.2 million increase in total fees for acquiring and target firms respectively. In the presence of the interaction in Column 4, those effects were strengthened as increased intangibles for both acquiring and target firms increased total fees paid greatly with a 10% increase in intangibles resulting in a \$.9 million increase in fees for both acquiring and target firms. Looking into Column 5, I find that target firms with higher 1-month bid ask spreads paid substantially higher transaction fees with a 10% increase resulting in an increase of \$2.9 million in fees. In the presence of the interaction in Column 6, I find that that effect was mitigated for both acquiring firms and target firms who had high 1-month bid ask spreads. Overall, these results indicate that firms that are harder to value generally pay more in transaction fees, but with higher market misalignment on value leading up to the deal, may pay lower fees.

Columns 1 and 2 of Panel C of Table 1 examines the cross-sectional influence of analyst following. I find higher analyst following from the acquiring firm resulted in lower total transaction fees with each additional unique analyst lowering transaction fees by \$.02 million and higher analyst following from target firms increased transaction fees by \$.04 million. In the presence of interaction terms in Column 2 however, I find that the effects from higher analyst following for acquiring firms are reversed for firms with acquiring firms with higher cross ownership. In addition, the increased cross ownership for target firms strengthens the effect of analyst following, boosting transaction fees by an additional \$1.0 million. From these results, it is clear that analyst following plays a minor role in reducing fees paid by firms in transactions as the effects from acquiring firms and target firms largely cancel one another out.

Finally, I examine whether target and acquiror cross-ownership differentially influence each other in terms of their relationship with transactions fees. In Columns 3 and 4 of Panel C of Table 1, I find that greater percentage of cross ownership represented of total institutional ownership for acquiring firms led to an increase in total fees by small increase in total fees of \$.09 million for an increase of 10%. For target firms, an increase of cross ownership as a percentage of total institutional ownership by 10% resulted in a decrease of transaction fees by \$.1 million. In the presence of the interaction terms in Column 5, I find that while it seems that both cross ownership and cross ownership as a percentage of total fees significantly reduces transaction fees, those effects are largely reversed in the presence of the interaction term. This is consistent with my earlier results that cross ownership generally increases transaction fees and the larger cross ownership as percentage of total institutional ownership, especially for firms with higher cross ownership already, the larger the total transaction fees that are paid.

3b. Deal Premiums

Table 2 looks at the effects of institutional investor cross ownership on the deal premium of M&A deals, Brooks et al. found that institutional cross ownership reduces deal premiums, thus leading to better value for acquirers (2018). In Panel A of Table 2, I find that acquirer cross ownership tends to do decrease deal premiums and target cross ownership increases deal premiums with a 10% increase in cross ownership representing a .08% decrease and .07% increase in the premiums respectively. In the presence of the interaction in Column 2, I find that higher levels of the opposing ownership tends to increase the deal premium with a 10% increase in cross ownership resulting in a .05% increase in deal premium on top of the effects of the

individual variables. These results are consistent across regressions run with and without fixed effects.

Panel B of Table 2 illustrates the effects of institutional cross ownership for firms with higher levels of information asymmetry on deal premiums. Columns 1 and 2 focus on R&D expenditures and acquiring and target firms with higher levels of R&D expense (scaled by total revenue) tend to result in lower deal premiums. Consistent with the earlier results, acquirer cross ownership significantly reduces deal premiums while target cross ownership tends to increase deal premiums as shown in Column 2. In looking at how deal premium was affected for firms with higher levels of information asymmetry, Column 3 shows that acquiring and target firms with higher R&D generally resulted in lower deal premiums paid as well; however, the effect on lowering deal premiums was reversed in the presence of the interaction. Column 4 shows that acquiring and target firms with higher levels of intangible assets resulted in higher deal premiums with a 10% increase in intangible assets scaled by total assets resulting in a .3% increase in deal premium. In the presence of the interaction in Column 4, with that effect was reversed for acquiring firms with high levels of intangible assets and increased for target firms with higher levels of intangible assets. Columns 5 and 6 show the effects of cross ownership and 1-month bid ask spreads on deal premiums. Column 5 shows that higher bid ask spreads on the 1-month level of acquiring firms generally led to lower deal premiums as well with target bid ask spreads leading to higher deal premiums with a 10% increase in the bid ask spread scaled by price reducing deal premiums by 3.4% and increasing premiums by 2.7% for acquiring and target firms respectively. These effects were increased for firms with acquiring and target firms with higher levels of cross ownership by 1.0% and 11.4% respectively.

Panel C of Table 2 examines the cross-sectional influence of analyst following on deal premiums. Column 1 is consistent with earlier results in coefficient and magnitude showing that increases in acquirer cross ownership reduces deal premiums and increases in target cross ownership tends to increase deal premiums. Column 2 indicates that while the effects of analyst following were not significant, they tend to be strengthened for increases in acquirer and target cross ownership, respectively. For acquiring firms, this effect was increased by .5% for firms with higher cross ownership and for target firms, this effect was decreased further by .3% for firms with high levels of cross ownership.

In looking at Columns 3 and 4 of Panel C of Table 2, I find that higher levels of cross ownership as a percentage of total ownership for both acquiring firms and target resulted in lower deal premiums by .08% and .003% respectively for acquiring and target firms for a 10% increase in the cross ownership/total institutional ownership ratio. Column 4 shows that while insignificant, these results are bolstered for acquiring firms with higher cross ownership and mitigated for target firms with higher levels of cross ownership.

3c. Cash Consideration

In looking at the form of payment in M&A transactions, Brooks et al. found that higher levels of institutional investor cross ownership resulted in higher levels of stock payment and lower levels of cash payment used in the transaction (2018). In Column 1 of Panel A of Table 3, I find that higher levels of acquiring firm cross ownership lowered the percentage of cash used as payment in a transaction by 1.5% for a 10% increase in acquirer cross ownership but that higher levels of target firm cross ownership increased the percentage of cash used by .5% for a 10%

increase in target cross ownership. Column 2 shows that the effects of lowering cash payment were strengthened for higher levels of target cross ownership and the opposite to be true from the perspective of acquiring cross ownership. These results were generally consistent with and without fixed effects.

Panel B of Table 3 look at the first cross section of information asymmetry. Column 1 illustrates that both acquiring and target firms with higher levels of R&D paid a lower percentage of cash consideration in deals by .6% and .02% for a 10% increase in acquirer and target cross ownership respectively. In looking at how the effects of cross ownership varied for firms with higher or lower R&D, Column 2 shows that the increased amount of R&D on the acquirer side and the target side increased the cash consideration used with the target increase significant at .5% for a 10% increase in R&D expense as a percentage of total revenue. Column 3 looks into how these effects vary for firms with higher and lower intangible assets. Specifically, higher levels of intangibles for both acquirer and target resulted in a lower percentage of cash consideration with the target decrease significant at .7% for a 10% increase in intangible assets as a percentage of total assets. These effects were mitigated for target firms with higher levels of cross ownership and increased for acquiring firms with higher levels of cross ownership. Column 5 shows that higher 1-month bid ask spreads for acquiring firms resulted in higher percentages of cash used in deals by 8.6% for a 10% increase in the spread but for target firms resulted in lower percentages of cash used in deals by 1.9% for a 10% increase in the spread. The interactions in Column 6 suggest that for acquiring and target firms with higher levels of information asymmetry tend to pay less in cash as that bid ask spread increases.

Panel C of Table 3 looks into the cross section of analyst following. Column 1 indicates that each additional analyst following for the acquiring and target firm reduces the cash

percentage used by .11% and .16% respectively. Column 2 indicates that these effects were mitigated for acquiring firms with higher levels of cross ownership and increased for target firms with higher levels of cross ownership by .22% and .14% respectively. Overall, analyst following generally contributes to a decrease in the cash percentage used in deal considerations.

The last 2 columns of Panel C of Table 3 look into the final cross section of cross ownership as a percentage of total institutional ownership. Column 5 indicates that higher levels of cross ownership as a percentage of total ownership resulted in lower percentages of cash consideration used for both acquiring and target firms by .17% and .44% respectively for an increase of the cross ownership to total institutional ownership ratio by 10%. This effect was magnified for acquiring firms with higher levels of cross ownership and mitigated for target firms with higher levels of cross ownership by an additional 3.5% for a 10% increase in the cross ownership as a percentage of total institutional ownership percentage for acquiring firms. Overall, these results indicate that cross ownership generally reduces the cash consideration percentage used in total deal consideration.

3d. Synergies

Brooks et al. found that deal synergies, measured by acquirer and target market value-weighted average announcement returns, tended to be higher in the presence of institutional cross-owners (2018). In our results, it was unclear how significant the increases in deal synergies as a result of cross ownership were. Based on Panel A of Table 4, none of the independent variables were significant, but it seems that cross ownership generally increases the synergies achieved in deals to a small extent.

Panel B of Table 4 looks at these effects from an information asymmetry perspective. Specifically, Columns 1 and 2 show that only target R&D expenditures are significant in affecting synergies, with a 10% increase in those expenditures as a percentage of revenue resulting in a 1.4% decrease in synergies achieved. In looking at the interactions in Column 2, those results were consistent as increases in target R&D expenditures as a percentage of total revenue decrease synergies achieved, but that increased levels of cross ownership mitigated that effect. Columns 3 and 4 show that it was unclear how intangible assets affected synergies, but that the coefficients indicate that acquirer intangible assets seemed to decrease synergies achieved and target intangible assets seemed to increase synergies achieved. With regards to 1-month bid ask spreads, Column 5 shows that only target bid ask spreads had any significant impact on deal synergies, increasing synergies by 7.8% a 10% increase in the bid ask spread for the target firm. Column 6 indicates that while the interaction terms were not significant, that this effect was mitigated for firms with higher levels of cross ownership.

Panel C of Table 4 investigates the cross sections of analyst following and cross ownership as a percentage of total institutional ownership. In the analyst following cross section and cross ownership cross section, there were no significant takeaways on the effects of both analyst following or cross ownership as a percentage of total ownership on deal synergies. However, based on the coefficients, it seems that both acquirer analyst following and acquirer and target cross ownership as a percentage of total institutional ownership reduced deal synergies and that target analyst following increased deal synergies marginally.

3e. Completion Probability

Brooks et al. found generally that the presence of institutional cross-ownership between two firms increases the probability of a merger pair formation and that the existence of institutional investor cross-ownership reduces the completion probability of deals with negative acquirer CAR, but has no effect on the completion probability of deals with positive acquirer CAR (2018). Panel A of Table 5 suggests generally that higher levels of acquiring and target firm cross ownership resulted in lower completion probability of the deal by 34% and 55% respectively. Column 2 shows the interaction of the two cross ownership variables and indicates that the greater the presence of the corresponding cross ownership, the lower the completion probability as well.

With regards to information asymmetry, Panel B of Table 5 indicates that the level of R&D did not have any significant effect on the completion probability of deals. However, the coefficients of the variables in Columns 1 and 2 suggest that higher levels of R&D expenditures scaled by total assets tends to lead to higher completion probability. Column 3 shows that acquirer intangible assets do have a significant impact on completion probability of deals, lowering the probability by .06% for a 10% increase in intangibles as a percentage of total assets. Column 4 indicates that the significance of the acquiring firm interaction term that the effect of reducing completion probability is increased for firms with higher intangibles. Columns 5 shows that target bid ask spreads do not play a significant role in completion probabilities but generally reduce the chances at the deal closing. While the individual acquirer and target firm spreads did not predict any changes in completion probability, Column 6 indicates that firms with higher levels of bid ask spreads increased the completion probability.

Panel C of Table 5 looks at the analyst following cross section. Column 1 shows that more analysts following target firms resulted in a slight decrease in completion probabilities by 1% for each additional analyst. In the presence of the interaction in Column 2, the result was consistent and the interactions signal that the effect of the decrease in completion probability was magnified for deals with higher target cross ownership.

Finally, the last two columns of Panel C of Table 5 look at cross ownership as a percentage of total institutional ownership as a cross section. These independent variables did not significantly predict any changes to completion probability, but the coefficients signal that acquirer cross ownership may reduce completion probability while target cross ownership may improve completion probability. In Column 4, the significant interaction term for acquirer cross ownership shows that for acquiring firms with cross ownership, the higher that cross ownership is as a percent of total institutional ownership, the lower the completion probability of the deal.

4. Conclusion

While cross ownership led to generally higher transaction fees, the governance powers of institutional investors cross owning both target and acquiring firms can be seen in their ability to influence lower deal premiums, something that is more flexible compared to standard advisory fees for deals. With cash and stock often used as substitutes for one another in deals, my findings were aligned with Brooks et al. that deals with cross owners tend to use more stock and less cash for payment. Given the high unpredictability of market returns surrounding deals, it was hard to identify any significant takeaways with regards to synergies under these three cross sections. My

findings on completion probability build on Brooks et al findings in showing that higher levels of target cross ownership ultimately reduce completion probability of deals.

There were some limitations in the study, namely with some of the variables calculated based on market indices that were calculated without a value weighted market index to benchmark stock price changes. More broadly, there were some limitations in calculating a post-deal metric as the synergies variable was based on a cumulative abnormal return over a 3 day window, rather than assessing the value achieved over a longer time horizon. In addition, there are many other confounding variables that may have explained the variation in the outcome variables I used. At the end of the day, M&A deals are a complex process involving various measurable and immeasurable factors that may ultimately affect outcomes; however, institutional investor cross ownership may provide some detail as to how deal makers can better strategize these deals moving forward.

Appendix A

Table A1

Variable definitions. This table provides variable definitions and the corresponding data sources. CRSP refers to the Center for Research in Security Prices, SDC refers to the Thomson Reuters Securities Data Company, 13F refers to the Thomson Reuters 13F Database, and IBES refers to the Institutional Brokers' Estimate System

Variable	Definition	Source
<i>Dependent variables of interest</i>		
FTOT	Total Transaction fees paid by acquirer and target firms	SDC
DealPrem	Deal premium paid: (transaction value/market value of target) - 1	SDC/CRSP
PCT_Cash	Percentage of cash payment involved in the total value of the transaction	SDC
Synergies	(acquirer CAR3 * acquirer market value + target CAR3 * (1 - toehold) * market value) / (acquirer market value + (1 - toehold) * target market value)	SDC/CRSP
Completed	Indicator variable: one for deals that are completed, zero for withdrawn deals	SDC
<i>Acquirer and target firm characteristics</i>		
A(T)XrdRev	Research and Development (R&D) expense scaled by total revenue in last fiscal year ending before announcement	Compustat
A(T)IntanAt	Intangible assets scaled by total assets in last fiscal year ending before deal announcement	Compustat
A(T)Bidask1M	Mean bid-ask spread scaled by price during the 31 days prior to deal announcement	CRSP
A(T)Bidask3M	Mean bid-ask spread scaled by price during the 92 days prior to deal announcement	CRSP
A(T)AnalystFollow	Number of unique analysts who provided an EPS forecast for the acquirer in the 365 days prior to deal announcement	IBES
A(T)coIo	Cross owned shares divided by total shares owned by institutional investors at quarter end	13F
A(T)LogSize	The natural log of total assets at the end of the fiscal year before the announcement	Compustat
A(T)Lev	Book value of debt over total assets at the end of the fiscal year before the deal announcement	Compustat
A(T)CHE	Cash holdings, including cash and marketable securities	Compustat
A(T)CFtoE	Income before extraordinary items plus depreciation minus dividends on common and preferred stocks divided by firm market value at the end of the fiscal year before the deal announcement	Compustat
A(T)Ret205	Buy-and-hold stock return over the (-205, -6) window	CRSP
A(T)Std205	The standard deviation of the daily return over the (-205, -6) window	CRSP
GrossCollateral	The gross value of property, plant, and equipment over total assets at the end of the fiscal year before deal announcement	Compustat
NetCollateral	The net value of property, plant, and equipment over total assets at the end of the fiscal year before deal announcement	Compustat
TotalIO	Institutional ownership at the quarter end	13F
A(T)ROA	Operating cash flows over total assets	Compustat
A(T)Sales_Growth	Percentage change in sales from the previous year	Compustat
<i>Deal characteristics</i>		
HostileDeal	Indicator variable: one for hostile deals, zero otherwise.	SDC
CompDeal	Indicator variable: one if more than one firm is bidding for the target, zero otherwise	SDC
TenderDeal	Indicator variable: one for tender offers, zero otherwise	SDC
DiversDeal	Indicator variable: one if target and acquirer have different two-digit SIC Codes, zero otherwise	SDC
RelSize	The ratio of transaction value to acquirer market value at the end of the fiscal year before the deal announcement	SDC/Compustat
<i>Institutional cross-ownership variables</i>		
A(T)CrossOwnPct	Ownership by acquirer (target) institutions that own target (acquirer) shares	13F

Table A2

Sample breakdown by year

Year	# of Deals	Percent	Year	# of Deals	Percent
1977	1	0.01	1998	623	6.14
1978	14	0.14	1999	645	6.35
1979	10	0.10	2000	570	5.61
1980	16	0.16	2001	387	3.81
1981	93	0.92	2002	215	2.12
1982	93	0.92	2003	241	2.37
1983	134	1.32	2004	239	2.35
1984	196	1.93	2005	220	2.17
1985	234	2.30	2006	257	2.53
1986	241	2.37	2007	273	2.69
1987	282	2.78	2008	204	2.01
1988	329	3.24	2009	163	1.61
1989	294	2.90	2010	152	1.50
1990	196	1.93	2011	108	1.06
1991	238	2.34	2012	130	1.28
1992	204	2.01	2013	124	1.22
1993	294	2.90	2014	168	1.65
1994	409	4.03	2015	198	1.95
1995	479	4.72	2016	144	1.42
1996	499	4.91	2017	116	1.14
1997	592	5.83	2018	129	1.27
			Total	10,154	100

Table A3

Sample breakdown by industry code

# of Deals	2-digit SIC Code	Industry Description
1,214	67	Holding & Other Investment Offices
963	73	Business Services
746	28	Chemical & Allied Products
719	60	Depository Institutions
698	36	Electronic & Other Electric Equipment
580	48	Communications
469	35	Industrial Machinery & Equipment
388	38	Instruments & Related Products
383	13	Oil & Gas Extraction
320	49	Electric, Gas, & Sanitary Services
274	63	Insurance Carriers
207	37	Transportation Equipment
201	80	Health Services
183	62	Security & Commodity Brokers
180	20	Food & Kindred Products
166	10	Metal, Mining
142	61	Nondepository Institutions
128	27	Printing & Publishing
127	34	Fabricated Metal Products
117	33	Primary Metal Industries
114	50	Wholesale Trade – Durable Goods
109	87	Engineering & Management Services
1,726	Other	Other industries with < 102 deals in sample
<hr/> 10,154		

Table A4

Dependent and Independent variable breakdown

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std Dev</i>	<i>25th Pctl</i>	<i>50th Pctl</i>	<i>75th Pctl</i>
FTOT	9.008	16.345	1.000	3.058	9.451
DealPrem	1.380	1.515	0.997	1.306	1.618
PCT_CASH	81.883	28.989	63.470	100.000	100.000
Synergies	0.208	3.377	0.000	0.114	0.301
Completed	0.725	0.447	0.000	1.000	1.000
ACrossOwnPct	0.167	0.185	0.024	0.097	0.259
TCrossOwnPct	0.197	0.215	0.028	0.113	0.303
AXrdRevt	0.115	1.922	0.000	0.000	0.039
TXrdRevt	0.164	0.730	0.000	0.000	0.050
AIntanAt	0.106	0.167	0.000	0.021	0.144
TIntanAt	0.082	0.150	0.000	0.003	0.093
ABidask1M	0.011	0.018	0.000	0.004	0.013
ABidask3M	0.011	0.018	0.000	0.004	0.014
TBidask1M	0.023	0.035	0.001	0.012	0.030
TBidask3M	0.024	0.035	0.001	0.012	0.032
AAnalystFollow	14.540	13.500	3.000	11.000	23.000
TAnalystFollow	7.119	8.843	1.000	4.000	10.000
AcoIo	0.318	0.260	0.094	0.264	0.503
TcoIo	0.495	0.301	0.247	0.516	0.739
ALogSize	7.651	2.453	6.038	7.797	9.440
TLogSize	5.648	2.254	4.031	5.548	7.188
ALev	0.584	0.247	0.415	0.583	0.787
TLev	0.544	0.284	0.314	0.546	0.770
ache	1946.350	5743.640	26.661	148.546	893.805
tche	242.690	862.885	4.071	21.908	97.377
ACFtoE	0.053	0.093	-0.034	0.050	0.096
TCFtoE	-0.336	0.777	-0.230	0.034	0.100
ARet205	0.127	0.348	-0.071	0.084	0.265
TRet205	0.106	0.437	-0.150	0.072	0.301
AStd205	0.026	0.015	0.015	0.022	0.031
TStd205	0.037	0.024	0.021	0.031	0.046
GrossCollateral	0.494	0.365	0.203	0.406	0.721
NetCollateral	0.234	0.231	0.035	0.160	0.363
TotalIO	0.836	0.566	0.395	0.785	1.212
AROA	0.042	0.064	0.008	0.034	0.074
TROA	-0.083	0.316	-0.054	0.012	0.057
ASalesGrowth	-0.023	0.150	-0.085	-0.085	-0.026
TSalesGrowth	-0.150	0.398	-0.286	-0.111	-0.006
HostileDeal	0.035	0.184	0.000	0.000	0.000
CompDeal	0.065	0.246	0.000	0.000	0.000
TenderDeal	0.142	0.349	0.000	0.000	0.000
DiversDeal	0.525	0.499	0.000	1.000	1.000
RelSize	0.332	0.650	0.000	0.066	0.367

Table 1 – Panel A

Basic regression of total transaction fees against cross ownership.

	Dependent variable = Transactions fees			
Intercept	-16.3600 *** -10.41	-15.7661 *** -10.47	8.3946 1.23	8.5578 1.31
ACrossOwnPct	10.3748 *** 5.00	-18.8552 *** -6.85	7.4236 *** 3.58	-20.6072 *** -7.56
TCrossOwnPct	4.2170 ** 2.42	-21.0731 *** -8.97	3.2895 • 1.91	-21.6797 *** -9.25
ACrossOwnPct*TCrossOwnPct		82.2396 *** 15.33		80.4273 *** 14.99
ALogSize	0.6886 *** 3.80	0.9779 *** 5.60	0.4507 ** 2.39	0.7129 *** 3.93
TLogSize	2.2495 *** 9.51	2.5704 *** 11.29	2.1574 *** 8.87	2.4688 *** 10.56
ALev	0.2237 0.19	-0.5785 -0.52	0.4189 0.35	-0.4307 -0.38
TLev	1.1372 1.17	0.4709 0.51	1.8385 • 1.91	1.1362 1.23
ache	0.0000 0.29	0.0000 -0.61	0.0000 0.53	0.0000 -0.11
tche	0.0084 *** 16.98	0.0070 *** 14.55	0.0081 *** 16.51	0.0068 *** 14.30
ACFtoE	-9.4027 *** -3.05	-11.0847 *** -3.75	-4.4356 -1.37	-5.2777 • -1.70
TCFtoE	-0.2241 -0.39	0.1703 0.31	-0.3419 -0.60	0.0061 0.01
ARet205	-0.4802 -0.77	-0.3367 -0.56	-0.4276 -0.69	-0.4883 -0.82
TRet205	1.8444 *** 3.57	1.8622 *** 3.76	2.0158 *** 3.94	1.9719 *** 4.03
AStd205	23.6511 1.18	24.8747 1.30	40.3202 • 1.82	31.5153 1.49
TStd205	14.5369 1.05	9.9311 0.75	16.8586 1.20	5.2366 0.39
GrossCollateral	6.3297 *** 4.23	7.2188 *** 5.03	6.0779 *** 3.85	6.8213 *** 4.51
NetCollateral	-11.4405 *** -4.67	-12.7909 *** -5.45	-9.5228 *** -3.40	-10.3798 *** -3.86
TotalIO	-1.1862 ** -2.18	0.5075 0.95	-1.0173 • -1.83	0.6912 1.27
AROA	8.7505 ** 2.34	11.0682 *** 3.09	10.2378 *** 2.75	11.4812 *** 3.22
TROA	-2.2380 • -1.92	-2.4819 ** -2.22	-0.4752 -0.41	-0.8513 -0.77
ASalesGrowth	-2.9729 ** -1.96	-2.6032 • -1.79	-2.7876 • -1.83	-2.2584 -1.55
TSalesGrowth	-0.3447 -0.55	-0.4446 -0.75	-0.5181 -0.85	-0.4481 -0.76
TAnalystFollow	0.3635 *** 10.29	0.3559 *** 10.52	0.3992 *** 10.87	0.3898 *** 11.08
HostileDeal	0.5693 0.41	1.2691 0.96	1.7705 1.30	2.4635 • 1.89
CompDeal	0.2929 0.31	0.4421 0.49	0.7113 0.76	0.8263 0.92
TenderDeal	-0.9247 • -1.88	-0.6358 -1.35	-1.1617 ** -2.32	-0.8888 • -1.85
DiversDeal	-1.2116 *** -2.87	-1.1828 *** -2.93	-0.6896 -1.55	-0.6385 -1.50
RelSize	0.0025 *** 6.52	0.0025 *** 6.73	0.0025 *** 6.56	0.0025 *** 6.81
n	2624	2624	2624	2624
R-squared	0.554	0.591	0.609	0.642
Year + Industry fixed effects	No	No	Yes	Yes

Table 1 – Panel B

Regression of total transaction fees against cross-ownership under information asymmetry cross section. Detailed variables descriptions include in Appendix A.

"InfoAsym" →	Dependent variable = Transactions fees					
	R&D expenditures		Intangible assets		Bid-ask spread	
Intercept	8.3576 1.22	8.5981 1.26	6.8016 0.99	7.1547 1.05	7.5630 1.11	6.9710 1.02
ACrossOwnPct	7.3771 *** 3.56	7.9068 *** 3.78	7.5108 *** 3.63	5.5721 ** 2.34	7.6029 *** 3.67	9.4019 *** 4.16
TCrossOwnPct	3.2939 • 1.91	3.0349 • 1.75	3.0826 • 1.79	1.2982 0.67	3.2130 • 1.87	4.7018 *** 2.59
AInfoAsym	0.0957 0.32	0.2768 0.89	4.0262 *** 2.89	1.9173 0.98	-1.3491 -0.08	16.4617 0.84
TInfoAsym	0.3032 0.90	0.1532 0.32	2.5371 • 1.78	-0.3484 -0.17	29.9447 *** 3.22	45.9205 *** 4.47
ACrossOwnPct* AInfoAsym		-6.5394 • -1.94		9.0102 1.51		-287.0075 *** -2.75
TCrossOwnPct* TInfoAsym		0.9718 0.78		9.1278 • 1.76		-218.8342 *** -3.81
ALogSize	0.4529 ** 2.39	0.4323 ** 2.28	0.4298 ** 2.27	0.4296 ** 2.27	0.5180 *** 2.68	0.5772 *** 3.00
TLogSize	2.1546 *** 8.85	2.1526 *** 8.84	2.1201 *** 8.60	2.1513 *** 8.72	2.2174 *** 9.11	2.2642 *** 9.34
ALev	0.4212 0.36	0.4240 0.36	0.4343 0.37	0.5053 0.43	0.3832 0.32	0.3270 0.28
TLev	1.9960 ** 2.04	1.9789 ** 2.03	1.7166 • 1.78	1.6539 • 1.72	1.7080 • 1.77	1.6873 • 1.76
ache	0.0000 0.48	0.0000 0.44	0.0000 0.79	0.0000 0.67	0.0000 0.40	0.0000 0.01
tche	0.0081 *** 16.51	0.0081 *** 16.52	0.0082 *** 16.66	0.0082 *** 16.67	0.0080 *** 16.32	0.0078 *** 15.97
ACFtoE	-4.3313 -1.34	-4.5615 -1.41	-5.0725 -1.57	-5.4152 • -1.68	-5.3739 • -1.65	-6.0719 • -1.88
TCFtoE	-0.3925 -0.68	-0.4350 -0.76	-0.3764 -0.66	-0.3644 -0.64	-0.4123 -0.72	-0.3383 -0.60
ARet205	-0.4198 -0.68	-0.4509 -0.73	-0.3496 -0.57	-0.3500 -0.57	-0.4159 -0.66	-0.5907 -0.94
TRet205	2.0078 *** 3.92	2.0087 *** 3.92	2.0792 *** 4.08	2.0612 *** 4.04	2.3182 *** 4.47	2.1958 *** 4.25
AStd205	39.7048 • 1.79	38.5767 • 1.74	50.8678 ** 2.29	48.2329 ** 2.17	46.2329 ** 2.05	44.8162 ** 1.99
TStd205	16.2297 1.15	16.7925 1.19	18.5462 1.32	18.2566 1.30	-0.0490 0.00	-6.8757 -0.46
GrossCollateral	6.1115 *** 3.87	6.1682 *** 3.90	6.8000 *** 4.28	6.8756 *** 4.33	5.9257 *** 3.76	6.0832 *** 3.87
NetCollateral	-9.5478 *** -3.40	-9.7470 *** -3.47	-9.0120 *** -3.22	-9.0207 *** -3.22	-9.2480 *** -3.30	-9.2897 *** -3.33
TotalIO	-1.0309 • -1.86	-0.9837 • -1.77	-1.0100 • -1.82	-0.8937 -1.61	-0.8883 -1.59	-0.6916 -1.24
AROA	10.2506 *** 2.74	9.4885 ** 2.52	11.8139 *** 3.15	12.0870 *** 3.22	10.5937 *** 2.85	10.2006 *** 2.76
TROA	-0.1027 -0.08	-0.0947 -0.08	-0.5930 -0.51	-0.6092 -0.53	-0.5551 -0.48	-0.7531 -0.65
ASalesGrowth	-2.7975 • -1.84	-2.8159 • -1.85	-2.5099 • -1.65	-2.4095 -1.58	-3.0146 ** -1.98	-3.1857 ** -2.11
TSalesGrowth	-0.5395 -0.87	-0.5796 -0.94	-0.4225 -0.69	-0.4503 -0.73	-0.6784 -1.11	-0.7236 -1.19
TAnalystFollow	0.3993 *** 10.87	0.4011 *** 10.92	0.4027 *** 10.98	0.4127 *** 11.20	0.4065 *** 11.07	0.3880 *** 10.57
HostileDeal	1.7918 1.31	1.7884 1.31	1.7779 1.31	1.8114 1.33	1.7272 1.27	1.6645 1.23
CompDeal	0.7129 0.76	0.7051 0.75	0.7617 0.82	0.8083 0.87	0.8621 0.92	0.6712 0.72
TenderDeal	-1.1612 ** -2.32	-1.1977 ** -2.38	-1.1638 ** -2.33	-1.1477 ** -2.30	-1.1643 ** -2.33	-1.0713 ** -2.15
DiversDeal	-0.6920 -1.55	-0.7161 -1.60	-0.8048 • -1.80	-0.7899 • -1.77	-0.6911 -1.55	-0.6886 -1.56
RelSize	0.0025 *** 6.55	0.0025 *** 6.51	0.0024 *** 6.39	0.0024 *** 6.43	0.0025 *** 6.69	0.0026 *** 6.78
n	2624	2624	2624	2624	2624	2624
R-squared	0.609	0.610	0.611	0.613	0.611	0.615
Year + Industry fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 1 – Panel C

Regression of total transaction fees against cross-ownership under analyst following and cross-ownership as a percentage of total ownership cross sections. Detailed variables descriptions include in Appendix A.

"CrossSecVar" →	Dependent variable = Transactions fees			
	Analyst Following		CO / IO	
Intercept	7.7748 1.13	7.6948 1.14	22.8734 *** 2.90	27.4800 *** 3.73
ACrossOwnPct	7.3237 *** 3.53	3.4035 1.28	7.6833 *** 3.45	-41.9593 *** -11.33
TCrossOwnPct	3.3462 • 1.94	-8.9956 *** -4.21	4.0340 ** 2.15	-20.6355 *** -4.61
ACrossSecVar	-0.0239 -0.90	-0.0676 ** -1.97	0.9862 0.67	-6.9847 *** -4.75
TCrossSecVar	0.4104 *** 10.58	0.0094 0.17	-1.4319 -1.40	-1.9345 • -1.87
ACrossOwnPct* ACrossSecVar		0.1931 • 1.81		86.9164 *** 16.34
TCrossOwnPct* TCrossSecVar		1.0318 *** 8.49		24.2591 *** 4.69
ALogSize	0.5658 ** 2.49	0.7944 *** 3.50	0.4676 ** 2.40	0.5209 *** 2.86
TLogSize	2.1152 *** 8.54	2.5233 *** 10.24	2.2461 *** 9.01	2.5577 *** 10.96
ALev	0.2291 0.19	-0.1215 -0.10	0.0986 0.08	-0.0207 -0.02
TLev	1.8106 • 1.88	0.9818 1.03	2.0313 ** 2.11	0.8756 0.97
ache	0.0000 0.46	0.0000 -0.40	0.0000 0.79	0.0001 1.26
tche	0.0081 *** 16.52	0.0072 *** 14.77	0.0072 *** 14.72	0.0048 *** 10.29
ACFtoE	-4.8699 -1.49	-6.3143 ** -1.97	-4.4622 -1.39	-3.5606 -1.19
TCFtoE	-0.3335 -0.58	-0.0976 -0.17	-0.2528 -0.44	0.4404 0.82
ARet205	-0.4225 -0.68	-0.1915 -0.32	-0.3551 -0.58	-0.1962 -0.34
TRet205	2.0309 *** 3.97	1.9376 *** 3.86	1.9969 *** 3.92	1.6497 *** 3.47
AStd205	41.4219 • 1.87	45.0341 ** 2.07	48.0649 ** 2.15	42.9372 ** 2.05
TStd205	17.2533 1.23	12.0467 0.87	17.1170 1.20	3.2992 0.25
GrossCollateral	6.1498 *** 3.89	5.8872 *** 3.80	6.3949 *** 4.05	5.5251 *** 3.75
NetCollateral	-9.5225 *** -3.39	-9.2214 *** -3.35	-9.8500 *** -3.50	-9.1144 *** -3.47
TotalIO	-0.9653 • -1.73	-0.1228 -0.22	-0.7594 -1.27	1.8500 *** 3.16
AROA	10.7797 *** 2.86	12.2597 *** 3.31	11.7547 *** 3.17	10.8513 *** 3.13
TROA	-0.5029 -0.43	-0.7041 -0.62	-0.6506 -0.56	-1.0246 -0.94
ASalesGrowth	-2.8376 • -1.87	-2.8533 • -1.91	-2.5123 • -1.66	-2.2987 -1.63
TSalesGrowth	-0.5219 -0.85	-0.6043 -1.01	-0.4491 -0.73	-0.4606 -0.80
TAnalystFollow			0.3794 10.22	0.3100 8.90
HostileDeal	1.7356 1.27	1.4361 1.07	1.9239 1.43	1.9671 1.57
CompDeal	0.7105 0.76	0.9402 1.03	-0.1707 -0.18	-0.1796 -0.21
TenderDeal	-1.1866 ** -2.37	-1.1656 ** -2.37	-1.1209 ** -2.26	-0.6929 -1.49
DiversDeal	-0.7005 -1.57	-0.8839 ** -2.02	-0.6842 -1.54	-0.5037 -1.22
RelSize	0.0025 *** 6.53	0.0027 *** 7.10	0.0023 *** 5.87	0.0022 *** 5.95
n	2624	2624	2560	2560
R-squared	0.609	0.625	0.613	0.664
Year + Industry fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 2 – Panel A

Basic regression of deal premium against cross ownership.

	Dependent variable = Deal Premium			
Intercept	-0.2335 -1.45	-0.2330 -1.45	-0.1372 -0.16	-0.1374 -0.16
ACrossOwnPct	-0.8281 *** -3.65	-0.9863 *** -3.22	-1.0954 *** -4.69	-1.1009 *** -3.52
TCrossOwnPct	0.7030 *** 3.70	0.5645 ** 2.16	0.6222 *** 3.23	0.6172 ** 2.30
ACrossOwnPct*TCrossOwnPct		0.4722 0.77		0.0168 0.03
ALogSize	0.0681 *** 3.83	0.0696 *** 3.89	0.0537 *** 2.80	0.0538 *** 2.79
TLogSize	0.0052 0.23	0.0071 0.31	-0.0147 -0.60	-0.0146 -0.60
ALev	-0.0733 -0.60	-0.0749 -0.61	-0.0738 -0.58	-0.0739 -0.58
TLev	0.7477 *** 7.24	0.7448 *** 7.20	0.8166 *** 7.71	0.8165 *** 7.70
ache	0.0000 ** -2.42	0.0000 ** -2.47	0.0000 ** -2.10	0.0000 ** -2.10
tche	-0.0001 • -1.68	-0.0001 • -1.79	-0.0001 • -1.77	-0.0001 • -1.75
ACFtoE	-0.6169 ** -2.03	-0.6364 ** -2.09	-0.7706 ** -2.35	-0.7710 ** -2.35
TCFtoE	-0.0594 -1.09	-0.0575 -1.05	-0.0440 -0.79	-0.0440 -0.79
ARet205	0.0094 0.15	0.0106 0.16	0.0329 0.49	0.0329 0.49
TRet205	-0.3604 *** -6.84	-0.3606 *** -6.84	-0.3718 *** -6.92	-0.3718 *** -6.92
AStd205	-0.9139 -0.45	-0.9041 -0.45	-0.5733 -0.25	-0.5746 -0.25
TStd205	14.1860 *** 10.71	14.1616 *** 10.69	13.2449 *** 9.56	13.2430 *** 9.54
GrossCollateral	0.0031 0.02	0.0083 0.05	-0.0164 -0.09	-0.0162 -0.09
NetCollateral	0.1959 0.71	0.1882 0.68	0.3014 0.96	0.3012 0.96
TotallO	0.1834 *** 3.15	0.1918 *** 3.24	0.1265 ** 2.06	0.1268 ** 2.03
AROA	0.3590 0.92	0.3731 0.96	0.7047 • 1.75	0.7050 • 1.75
TROA	0.2494 ** 2.30	0.2467 ** 2.28	0.3509 *** 3.15	0.3508 *** 3.15
ASalesGrowth	-0.4257 *** -2.96	-0.4269 *** -2.97	-0.4131 *** -2.81	-0.4131 *** -2.81
TSalesGrowth	0.1230 ** 2.03	0.1227 ** 2.02	0.0976 1.58	0.0976 1.58
TAnalystFollow	-0.0122 *** -3.17	-0.0122 *** -3.17	-0.0052 -1.26	-0.0052 -1.26
HostileDeal	-0.2849 • -1.75	-0.2814 • -1.73	-0.2068 -1.26	-0.2067 -1.26
CompDeal	0.2998 *** 2.72	0.2998 *** 2.72	0.3199 *** 2.86	0.3198 *** 2.86
TenderDeal	0.3397 *** 5.88	0.3409 *** 5.90	0.3316 *** 5.58	0.3317 *** 5.58
DiversDeal	-0.1539 *** -3.36	-0.1538 *** -3.36	-0.1560 *** -3.15	-0.1559 *** -3.15
RelSize	0.0005 *** 11.81	0.0005 *** 11.78	0.0005 *** 10.94	0.0005 *** 10.93
n	4518	4518	4518	4518
R-squared	0.109	0.109	0.144	0.144
Year + Industry fixed effects	No	No	Yes	Yes

Table 2 – Panel B

Regression of deal premium against cross-ownership under information asymmetry cross section. Detailed variables descriptions include in Appendix A.

"InfoAsym" →	Dependent variable = Deal Premium					
	R&D expenditures		Intangible assets		Bid-ask spread	
Intercept	-0.1498 -0.17	-0.1589 -0.18	-0.1668 -0.19	-0.1508 -0.18	-0.1753 -0.20	-0.1475 -0.17
ACrossOwnPct	-1.0866 *** -4.65	-1.1009 *** -4.67	-1.0994 *** -4.71	-1.1096 *** -4.19	-1.0673 *** -4.57	-1.0210 *** -3.99
TCrossOwnPct	0.6190 *** 3.22	0.6033 *** 3.11	0.6101 *** 3.17	0.4613 ** 2.15	0.6202 *** 3.22	0.4949 ** 2.40
AInfoAsym	-0.0001 -0.01	-0.0022 -0.14	0.0327 0.21	0.0427 0.20	-3.4605 * -1.90	-3.1257 -1.56
TInfoAsym	-0.0429 -1.27	-0.0655 -1.48	0.3069 * 1.86	0.0518 0.22	2.7014 *** 2.93	1.9643 * 1.95
ACrossOwnPct* AInfoAsym		0.1972 0.46		-0.0577 -0.08		-1.0471 -0.10
TCrossOwnPct* TInfoAsym		0.1056 0.72		0.9588 1.54		11.3818 * 1.87
ALogSize	0.0552 *** 2.87	0.0561 *** 2.92	0.0557 *** 2.89	0.0558 *** 2.90	0.0522 *** 2.66	0.0514 *** 2.61
TLogSize	-0.0149 -0.61	-0.0145 -0.60	-0.0215 -0.87	-0.0193 -0.78	-0.0089 -0.36	-0.0111 -0.45
ALev	-0.0748 -0.58	-0.0759 -0.59	-0.0772 -0.60	-0.0817 -0.64	-0.0666 -0.52	-0.0618 -0.48
TLev	0.7934 *** 7.38	0.7911 *** 7.36	0.8133 *** 7.68	0.8149 *** 7.69	0.8064 *** 7.62	0.8044 *** 7.60
ache	0.0000 ** -2.09	0.0000 ** -2.13	0.0000 ** -2.03	0.0000 ** -2.06	0.0000 ** -2.01	0.0000 * -1.91
tche	-0.0001 * -1.76	-0.0001 * -1.75	-0.0001 -1.56	-0.0001 -1.57	-0.0001 * -1.84	-0.0001 * -1.75
ACFtoE	-0.7833 ** -2.39	-0.7741 ** -2.36	-0.7963 ** -2.43	-0.8213 ** -2.50	-0.7937 ** -2.40	-0.7885 ** -2.39
TCFtoE	-0.0386 -0.69	-0.0381 -0.68	-0.0429 -0.77	-0.0418 -0.75	-0.0437 -0.79	-0.0464 -0.84
ARet205	0.0321 0.48	0.0323 0.49	0.0346 0.52	0.0366 0.55	0.0178 0.26	0.0213 0.32
TRet205	-0.3707 *** -6.90	-0.3723 *** -6.92	-0.3701 *** -6.89	-0.3710 *** -6.90	-0.3499 *** -6.44	-0.3444 *** -6.33
AStd205	-0.5290 -0.23	-0.5110 -0.22	-0.2058 -0.09	-0.2475 -0.11	0.8300 0.35	0.8248 0.35
TStd205	13.1951 *** 9.52	13.1464 *** 9.47	13.2423 *** 9.55	13.2401 *** 9.55	11.4498 *** 7.55	11.6570 *** 7.66
GrossCollateral	-0.0282 -0.16	-0.0206 -0.11	0.0052 0.03	0.0080 0.04	-0.0050 -0.03	-0.0141 -0.08
NetCollateral	0.3174 1.01	0.3111 0.99	0.3194 1.02	0.3197 1.02	0.2778 0.89	0.2882 0.92
TotalIO	0.1259 ** 2.05	0.1242 ** 2.02	0.1318 ** 2.14	0.1364 ** 2.21	0.1263 ** 2.04	0.1193 * 1.92
AROA	0.7299 * 1.81	0.7334 * 1.81	0.7174 * 1.77	0.7393 * 1.82	0.7367 * 1.83	0.7418 * 1.84
TROA	0.2934 ** 2.44	0.2852 ** 2.37	0.3457 *** 3.11	0.3510 *** 3.15	0.3231 *** 2.89	0.3336 *** 2.99
ASalesGrowth	-0.4122 *** -2.81	-0.4120 *** -2.80	-0.4119 *** -2.80	-0.4134 *** -2.81	-0.4138 *** -2.81	-0.4048 *** -2.75
TSalesGrowth	0.1008 1.63	0.0977 1.57	0.1060 * 1.71	0.1036 * 1.67	0.0820 1.32	0.0796 1.29
TAnalystFollow	-0.0053 -1.29	-0.0054 -1.30	-0.0050 -1.22	-0.0049 -1.17	-0.0048 -1.17	-0.0040 -0.97
HostileDeal	-0.2083 -1.27	-0.2062 -1.25	-0.2001 -1.22	-0.1929 -1.17	-0.2129 -1.30	-0.2079 -1.27
CompDeal	0.3177 *** 2.84	0.3203 *** 2.86	0.3243 *** 2.90	0.3254 *** 2.91	0.3322 *** 2.97	0.3361 *** 3.01
TenderDeal	0.3313 *** 5.58	0.3283 *** 5.51	0.3313 *** 5.58	0.3324 *** 5.60	0.3340 *** 5.63	0.3311 *** 5.58
DiversDeal	-0.1572 *** -3.18	-0.1556 *** -3.14	-0.1640 *** -3.30	-0.1636 *** -3.30	-0.1557 *** -3.15	-0.1538 *** -3.11
RelSize	0.0005 *** 10.95	0.0005 *** 10.97	0.0005 *** 10.91	0.0005 *** 10.89	0.0005 *** 11.05	0.0005 *** 11.05
n	4518	4518	4518	4518	4518	4518
R-squared	0.145	0.145	0.145	0.146	0.146	0.147
Year + Industry fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 2 – Panel C

Regression of deal premium against cross-ownership under analyst following and cross-ownership as a percentage of total ownership cross sections. Detailed variables descriptions include in Appendix A.

"CrossSecVar" →	Dependent variable = Deal Premium			
	Analyst Following		CO / IO	
Intercept	-0.0546 -0.06	-0.0509 -0.06	0.3346 0.36	0.3091 0.33
ACrossOwnPct	-1.0871 *** -4.66	-1.1685 *** -3.80	-0.5547 ** -2.22	-0.0613 -0.14
TCrossOwnPct	0.6112 *** 3.17	0.6384 *** 2.64	0.8736 *** 4.31	0.6231 1.19
ACrossSecVar	0.0037 1.32	0.0028 0.79	-0.8379 *** -5.37	-0.7606 *** -4.59
TCrossSecVar	-0.0067 -1.57	-0.0060 -0.97	-0.0392 -0.38	-0.0746 -0.67
ACrossOwnPct* ACrossSecVar		0.0049 0.41		-0.8711 -1.39
TCrossOwnPct* TCrossSecVar		-0.0034 -0.26		0.3718 0.61
ALogSize	0.0350 1.47	0.0365 1.50	0.0246 1.23	0.0234 1.17
TLogSize	-0.0082 -0.33	-0.0090 -0.35	0.0373 1.48	0.0357 1.42
ALev	-0.0446 -0.34	-0.0458 -0.35	-0.0171 -0.13	-0.0147 -0.11
TLev	0.8198 *** 7.74	0.8194 *** 7.71	0.7442 *** 7.06	0.7501 *** 7.11
ache	0.0000 ** -1.98	0.0000 ** -1.96	0.0000 -1.62	0.0000 • -1.70
tche	-0.0001 • -1.76	-0.0001 • -1.73	-0.0001 ** -2.02	-0.0001 • -1.72
ACFtoE	-0.7047 ** -2.13	-0.6998 ** -2.10	-0.7824 ** -2.41	-0.7715 ** -2.37
TCFtoE	-0.0429 -0.77	-0.0442 -0.79	-0.0144 -0.26	-0.0169 -0.30
ARet205	0.0297 0.45	0.0299 0.45	0.0436 0.66	0.0429 0.65
TRet205	-0.3734 *** -6.95	-0.3738 *** -6.95	-0.3646 *** -6.81	-0.3621 *** -6.76
AStd205	-0.8448 -0.36	-0.8663 -0.37	-0.3066 -0.13	-0.2953 -0.13
TStd205	13.1982 *** 9.52	13.2116 *** 9.53	14.3050 *** 10.22	14.3917 *** 10.27
GrossCollateral	-0.0243 -0.13	-0.0231 -0.13	0.0674 0.38	0.0696 0.39
NetCollateral	0.2883 0.92	0.2907 0.93	0.2331 0.74	0.2336 0.75
TotalIO	0.1193 • 1.93	0.1210 • 1.92	0.0712 1.09	0.0652 0.96
AROA	0.5957 1.45	0.5943 1.45	0.8477 ** 2.13	0.8402 ** 2.11
TROA	0.3567 *** 3.20	0.3566 *** 3.20	0.3355 *** 2.99	0.3418 *** 3.04
ASalesGrowth	-0.4071 *** -2.77	-0.4086 *** -2.78	-0.3757 ** -2.54	-0.3768 ** -2.55
TSalesGrowth	0.0975 1.58	0.0979 1.59	0.0844 1.36	0.0882 1.42
TAnalystFollow			-0.0037 -0.90	-0.0032 -0.78
HostileDeal	-0.2034 -1.24	-0.2028 -1.23	-0.1679 -1.03	-0.1699 -1.05
CompDeal	0.3192 *** 2.86	0.3189 *** 2.85	0.3168 *** 2.88	0.3199 *** 2.90
TenderDeal	0.3344 *** 5.63	0.3334 *** 5.61	0.3132 *** 5.37	0.3119 *** 5.34
DiversDeal	-0.1523 *** -3.07	-0.1525 *** -3.08	-0.1368 *** -2.79	-0.1376 *** -2.81
RelSize	0.0005 *** 10.94	0.0005 *** 10.93	0.0005 *** 11.13	0.0005 *** 11.19
n	4518	4518	4342	4342
R-squared	0.145	0.145	0.158	0.159
Year + Industry fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 3 – Panel A

Basic regression of cash consideration percentage against cross ownership.

	Dependent variable = Cash Consideration			
Intercept	105.9365 *** 30.37	105.9533 *** 30.37	102.8772 *** 8.04	102.9040 *** 8.05
ACrossOwnPct	-15.8936 *** -3.76	-11.8293 ** -2.10	-10.5187 ** -2.43	-7.4838 -1.31
TCrossOwnPct	5.4363 1.55	9.2443 • 1.87	3.3432 0.95	6.2372 1.25
ACrossOwnPct*TCrossOwnPct		-13.0401 -1.09		-9.9116 -0.81
ALogSize	0.8505 ** 2.30	0.8173 ** 2.21	1.7334 *** 4.35	1.7081 *** 4.27
TLogSize	-2.3560 *** -5.01	-2.4193 *** -5.11	-1.2597 *** -2.59	-1.3131 *** -2.67
ALev	1.2262 0.48	1.2138 0.47	-0.9655 -0.35	-0.9685 -0.36
TLev	-8.4009 *** -4.00	-8.2978 *** -3.94	-10.6032 *** -4.94	-10.5087 *** -4.89
ache	0.0003 *** 3.13	0.0004 *** 3.18	0.0003 *** 2.84	0.0003 *** 2.89
tche	-0.0005 -0.48	-0.0004 -0.31	0.0001 0.09	0.0002 0.21
ACFtoE	20.9298 *** 3.29	21.3860 *** 3.35	16.2647 ** 2.43	16.6085 ** 2.48
TCFtoE	-2.4787 ** -2.08	-2.5427 ** -2.13	-2.5713 ** -2.15	-2.6193 ** -2.18
ARet205	-5.1838 *** -3.45	-5.1416 *** -3.42	-4.1194 *** -2.69	-4.0684 *** -2.65
TRet205	0.3148 0.28	0.3036 0.27	0.6248 0.55	0.6093 0.54
AStd205	-233.0748 *** -5.01	-232.8591 *** -5.00	-158.7422 *** -3.01	-157.0767 *** -2.98
TStd205	-78.6329 *** -2.75	-78.1626 *** -2.73	-17.1552 -0.58	-16.4750 -0.56
GrossCollateral	2.8327 0.82	2.7194 0.79	4.6713 1.27	4.6054 1.25
NetCollateral	-17.5880 *** -3.06	-17.5031 *** -3.05	-18.1836 *** -2.74	-18.1599 *** -2.74
TotalIO	-2.9609 ** -2.47	-3.1394 *** -2.60	-1.2285 -0.98	-1.3663 -1.08
AROA	14.9384 • 1.82	14.7418 • 1.79	14.4886 • 1.71	14.3335 • 1.69
TROA	4.5276 • 1.79	4.6741 • 1.85	1.7935 0.70	1.9363 0.75
ASalesGrowth	4.0898 1.30	4.0075 1.28	5.7309 • 1.80	5.6913 • 1.79
TSalesGrowth	0.7913 0.56	0.8207 0.58	0.1040 0.07	0.1213 0.09
TAnalystFollow	0.0390 0.53	0.0416 0.56	-0.1928 ** -2.44	-0.1902 ** -2.41
HostileDeal	9.4137 *** 3.20	9.2677 *** 3.15	8.0885 *** 2.71	7.9725 *** 2.67
CompDeal	-0.6844 -0.36	-0.6835 -0.36	-1.4134 -0.74	-1.3983 -0.73
TenderDeal	10.0245 *** 10.08	9.9645 *** 10.01	10.5037 *** 10.21	10.4560 *** 10.15
DiversDeal	2.7498 *** 2.94	2.7159 *** 2.90	1.9279 • 1.89	1.9021 • 1.86
RelSize	-0.0090 *** -10.00	-0.0089 *** -9.91	-0.0090 *** -9.89	-0.0089 *** -9.85
n	2773	2773	2773	2773
R-squared	0.214	0.215	0.278	0.278
Year + Industry fixed effects	No	No	Yes	Yes

Table 3 – Panel B

Regression of cash consideration percentage against cross-ownership under information asymmetry cross section. Detailed variables descriptions include in Appendix A.

"InfoAsym" →	Dependent variable = Cash Consideration					
	R&D expenditures		Intangible assets		Bid-ask spread	
Intercept	104.7022 *** 8.19	104.2314 *** 8.16	103.9263 *** 8.11	104.2515 *** 8.13	101.8217 *** 7.95	101.2911 *** 7.90
ACrossOwnPct	-10.2845 ** -2.38	-11.4213 *** -2.62	-10.4624 ** -2.42	-11.9939 ** -2.38	-10.9513 ** -2.53	-10.5170 ** -2.19
TCrossOwnPct	3.3081 0.94	2.3882 0.67	3.8122 1.08	1.0689 0.27	3.2681 0.93	4.0975 1.08
AInfoAsym	-6.2133 *** -3.33	-8.8773 *** -3.40	-2.6577 -0.80	-4.3070 -0.96	86.1421 ** 2.25	92.1471 ** 2.18
TInfoAsym	-0.2265 -0.30	-1.5669 -1.53	-7.8373 ** -2.45	-12.2978 *** -2.69	-19.6731 -0.99	-12.1947 -0.56
ACrossOwnPct* AInfoAsym		19.4689 1.64		7.2783 0.51		-102.9434 -0.46
TCrossOwnPct* TInfoAsym		4.9307 * 1.80		15.2478 1.30		-112.2534 -0.93
ALogSize	1.6893 *** 4.24	1.8015 *** 4.49	1.7044 *** 4.26	1.6953 *** 4.24	1.8963 *** 4.65	1.9183 *** 4.68
TLogSize	-1.2523 *** -2.58	-1.2526 *** -2.58	-1.1223 ** -2.27	-1.0488 ** -2.11	-1.2624 *** -2.58	-1.2071 ** -2.45
ALev	-1.1551 -0.42	-1.4572 -0.54	-0.9484 -0.35	-0.8746 -0.32	-1.0682 -0.39	-1.1204 -0.41
TLev	-11.1189 *** -5.12	-11.1793 *** -5.16	-10.2983 *** -4.80	-10.3193 *** -4.80	-10.6604 *** -4.97	-10.7073 *** -4.99
ache	0.0003 *** 2.92	0.0003 *** 2.73	0.0003 *** 2.60	0.0003 *** 2.58	0.0003 *** 2.58	0.0003 ** 2.51
tche	0.0001 0.08	0.0001 0.09	-0.0003 -0.23	-0.0003 -0.22	0.0001 0.09	0.0000 0.03
ACFtoE	15.4073 ** 2.31	15.6965 ** 2.35	17.3125 *** 2.58	17.0050 ** 2.54	14.9396 ** 2.22	14.7499 ** 2.19
TCFtoE	-2.6593 ** -2.22	-2.6576 ** -2.22	-2.6442 ** -2.21	-2.6170 ** -2.18	-2.6453 ** -2.21	-2.6145 ** -2.18
ARet205	-4.2782 *** -2.79	-4.1564 *** -2.72	-4.1684 *** -2.72	-4.2419 *** -2.77	-3.6498 ** -2.36	-3.6819 ** -2.38
TRet205	0.6490 0.57	0.4901 0.43	0.5273 0.46	0.5046 0.44	0.5598 0.49	0.5278 0.46
AStd205	-150.8874 *** -2.86	-145.1984 *** -2.75	-171.8487 *** -3.24	-172.8976 *** -3.26	-182.9742 *** -3.41	-183.0821 *** -3.41
TStd205	-16.8901 -0.57	-22.1706 -0.75	-16.2752 -0.55	-15.0235 -0.51	-4.4145 -0.14	-6.4463 -0.20
GrossCollateral	4.5856 1.24	4.7494 1.29	3.7594 1.01	3.7807 1.02	4.5047 1.22	4.6426 1.26
NetCollateral	-18.4776 *** -2.79	-18.3331 *** -2.77	-18.9853 *** -2.86	-18.9738 *** -2.86	-17.8222 *** -2.69	-17.9829 *** -2.71
TotalIO	-1.1383 -0.91	-1.2504 -1.00	-1.4012 -1.12	-1.3431 -1.07	-1.0161 -0.81	-0.9632 -0.76
AROA	12.0605 1.42	12.7021 1.49	13.7836 1.62	14.3934 * 1.69	15.4176 * 1.82	15.2207 * 1.79
TROA	0.5956 0.22	0.2904 0.11	2.3147 0.90	2.3624 0.91	1.7553 0.68	1.5729 0.61
ASalesGrowth	6.1281 * 1.93	6.4941 ** 2.04	5.6398 * 1.77	5.7389 * 1.80	5.4828 * 1.72	5.3810 * 1.69
TSalesGrowth	0.1291 0.09	0.0138 0.01	-0.1229 -0.09	-0.1694 -0.12	0.2513 0.18	0.1916 0.13
TAnalystFollow	-0.1846 -2.34	-0.1910 -2.42	-0.1829 -2.32	-0.1819 -2.30	-0.1981 -2.51	-0.2094 -2.63
HostileDeal	8.1053 *** 2.73	8.1739 *** 2.75	7.9193 *** 2.66	8.0989 *** 2.72	8.2219 *** 2.76	8.2183 *** 2.76
CompDeal	-1.6051 -0.84	-1.4581 -0.77	-1.5470 -0.81	-1.4849 -0.78	-1.5020 -0.79	-1.5492 -0.81
TenderDeal	10.4892 *** 10.22	10.3480 *** 10.06	10.4969 *** 10.22	10.5348 *** 10.25	10.4649 *** 10.17	10.5401 *** 10.22
DiversDeal	1.8142 * 1.78	1.8946 * 1.86	2.2458 ** 2.18	2.2887 ** 2.23	1.9004 * 1.86	1.8682 * 1.83
RelSize	-9.0553 *** -10.01	-8.9611 *** -9.91	-8.9235 *** -9.86	-8.9302 *** -9.87	-9.0115 *** -9.96	-9.0118 *** -9.95
n	2773	2773	2773	2773	2773	2773
R-squared	0.281	0.283	0.280	0.281	0.279	0.280
Year + Industry fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 3 – Panel C

Regression of cash consideration percentage against cross-ownership under analyst following and cross-ownership as a percentage of total ownership cross sections. Detailed variables descriptions include in Appendix A.

"CrossSecVar" →	Dependent variable = Cash Consideration			
	Analyst Following		CO / IO	
Intercept	100.5240 *** 7.83	100.7006 *** 7.84	101.6271 *** 7.29	100.2834 *** 7.20
ACrossOwnPet	-11.2036 *** -2.59	-14.0846 *** -2.58	-9.1615 • -1.84	11.3568 1.25
TCrossOwnPet	3.8617 1.09	4.6492 1.04	5.9863 1.49	6.3898 0.61
ACrossSecVar	-0.1052 ** -2.04	-0.1427 ** -2.11	-1.6945 -0.51	1.7764 0.50
TCrossSecVar	-0.1603 ** -1.99	-0.1261 -1.05	-4.4139 ** -2.00	-5.1158 ** -2.14
ACrossOwnPet* ACrossSecVar		0.2200 0.88		-35.5539 *** -2.71
TCrossOwnPet* TCrossSecVar		-0.1444 -0.56		1.2530 0.10
ALogSize	2.1962 *** 4.79	2.2486 *** 4.83	2.0051 *** 4.77	1.9895 *** 4.74
TLogSize	-1.4270 *** -2.89	-1.4671 *** -2.91	-1.1920 ** -2.31	-1.3335 ** -2.57
ALev	-2.0178 -0.73	-2.0547 -0.74	-0.3674 -0.13	-0.2469 -0.09
TLev	-10.6466 *** -4.96	-10.6163 *** -4.94	-10.6030 *** -4.77	-10.2185 *** -4.59
ache	0.0003 *** 2.68	0.0003 *** 2.67	0.0003 ** 2.42	0.0003 ** 2.32
tche	0.0001 0.11	0.0001 0.12	0.0002 0.18	0.0009 0.69
ACFtoE	14.7775 ** 2.20	14.8785 ** 2.20	12.6540 • 1.85	12.8968 • 1.89
TCFtoE	-2.5678 ** -2.15	-2.6154 ** -2.18	-2.4576 ** -1.96	-2.6147 ** -2.09
ARet205	-4.0127 *** -2.62	-4.0128 *** -2.62	-3.6968 ** -2.37	-3.5200 ** -2.25
TRet205	0.7147 0.63	0.7062 0.62	0.1776 0.15	0.2606 0.22
AStd205	-149.3362 *** -2.82	-150.1339 *** -2.84	-189.0376 *** -3.47	-182.7052 *** -3.35
TStd205	-16.1672 -0.55	-15.2373 -0.51	-8.2972 -0.27	-2.8475 -0.09
GrossCollateral	4.7633 1.29	4.7275 1.28	4.1634 1.10	4.1778 1.10
NetCollateral	-17.7620 *** -2.68	-17.5208 *** -2.64	-17.2445 ** -2.52	-17.1182 ** -2.50
TotallO	-0.6424 -0.50	-0.6349 -0.49	-1.6750 -1.24	-2.3065 -1.64
AROA	17.3951 ** 2.03	17.2927 ** 2.02	17.8410 ** 2.04	18.3228 ** 2.10
TROA	1.4711 0.57	1.4641 0.57	0.7871 0.30	1.2293 0.46
ASalesGrowth	5.3264 • 1.67	5.2572 • 1.65	5.4753 • 1.68	5.4196 • 1.66
TSalesGrowth	0.0320 0.02	0.0586 0.04	0.0474 0.03	0.2272 0.15
TAnalystFollow			-0.1825 -2.21	-0.1626 -1.96
HostileDeal	8.1119 *** 2.72	8.1519 *** 2.74	7.4684 ** 2.46	7.3407 ** 2.42
CompDeal	-1.4253 -0.75	-1.4425 -0.76	-1.0223 -0.53	-0.8938 -0.46
TenderDeal	10.3758 *** 10.08	10.3531 *** 10.04	10.6571 *** 10.18	10.5466 *** 10.06
DiversDeal	1.8506 • 1.81	1.8568 • 1.82	1.7229 • 1.65	1.6404 1.57
RelSize	-8.9399 *** -9.88	-8.9245 *** -9.85	-8.8613 *** -9.49	-8.7728 *** -9.40
n	2773	2773	2647	2647
R-squared	0.279	0.279	0.287	0.289
Year + Industry fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 4 – Panel A

Basic regression of synergies against cross ownership.

	Dependent variable = Synergies			
Intercept	0.1046 0.28	0.1052 0.28	0.4774 0.29	0.5004 0.31
ACrossOwnPct	0.4203 0.88	0.6753 1.05	0.3563 0.72	0.6954 1.05
TCrossOwnPct	0.1393 0.34	0.3704 0.66	0.1698 0.41	0.4813 0.83
ACrossOwnPct*TCrossOwnPct		-0.8141 -0.60		-1.0965 -0.78
ALogSize	-0.0370 -0.93	-0.0395 -0.98	-0.0645 -1.47	-0.0679 -1.54
TLogSize	0.0105 0.21	0.0071 0.14	-0.0318 -0.59	-0.0370 -0.68
ALev	0.2921 1.03	0.2942 1.04	0.2347 0.78	0.2394 0.79
TLev	0.3506 1.48	0.3539 1.50	0.3434 1.39	0.3498 1.42
ache	0.0000 -1.18	0.0000 -1.14	0.0000 -1.19	0.0000 -1.14
tche	-0.0001 -0.44	0.0000 -0.35	0.0000 -0.26	0.0000 -0.15
ACFtoE	0.0733 0.10	0.1052 0.15	0.5564 0.73	0.5872 0.77
TCFtoE	-0.1198 -0.97	-0.1233 -1.00	-0.0975 -0.77	-0.1015 -0.80
ARet205	-0.0764 -0.50	-0.0785 -0.51	-0.1160 -0.73	-0.1169 -0.74
TRet205	-0.1915 -1.55	-0.1904 -1.54	-0.1895 -1.50	-0.1883 -1.49
AStd205	-9.4505 ** -2.02	-9.4927 ** -2.03	-9.1008 * -1.67	-9.0445 * -1.66
TStd205	6.8077 ** 2.24	6.8540 ** 2.26	7.5796 ** 2.36	7.7016 ** 2.39
GrossCollateral	0.0369 0.10	0.0301 0.08	0.0864 0.21	0.0785 0.19
NetCollateral	-0.2162 -0.36	-0.2058 -0.34	-0.6821 -0.97	-0.6714 -0.95
TotalIO	-0.0926 -0.72	-0.1030 -0.79	-0.0694 -0.51	-0.0837 -0.61
AROA	1.2237 1.35	1.2001 1.32	1.4527 1.54	1.4325 1.52
TROA	-0.2302 -0.89	-0.2267 -0.88	-0.2428 -0.90	-0.2360 -0.88
ASalesGrowth	-0.3177 -0.94	-0.3150 -0.93	-0.2986 -0.86	-0.2965 -0.85
TSalesGrowth	-0.0103 -0.07	-0.0084 -0.06	0.0107 0.07	0.0120 0.08
TAnalystFollow	0.0033 0.39	0.0034 0.40	0.0093 1.03	0.0096 1.06
HostileDeal	0.0682 0.17	0.0607 0.16	0.1272 0.32	0.1182 0.30
CompDeal	-0.0630 -0.24	-0.0621 -0.24	-0.0117 -0.04	-0.0089 -0.03
TenderDeal	-0.0095 -0.07	-0.0125 -0.09	-0.0124 -0.09	-0.0174 -0.13
DiversDeal	-0.0519 -0.49	-0.0519 -0.49	-0.0774 -0.66	-0.0779 -0.67
RelSize	0.0000 -0.09	0.0000 -0.06	0.0000 -0.47	0.0000 -0.45
n	5388	5388	5388	5388
R-squared	0.006	0.006	0.020	0.020
Year + Industry fixed effects	No	No	Yes	Yes

Table 4 – Panel B

Regression of synergies against cross-ownership under information asymmetry cross section. Detailed variables descriptions include in Appendix A.

"InfoAsym" →	Dependent variable = Synergies					
	R&D expenditures		Intangible assets		Bid-ask spread	
Intercept	0.4658 0.28	0.4603 0.28	0.5132 0.31	0.5043 0.31	0.2636 0.16	0.2565 0.16
ACrossOwnPct	0.3663 0.74	0.3438 0.69	0.3572 0.72	0.4150 0.73	0.3930 0.79	0.1546 0.28
TCrossOwnPct	0.1613 0.39	0.0841 0.20	0.1697 0.41	0.3808 0.82	0.1365 0.33	0.2484 0.55
AInfoAsym	0.0054 0.20	0.0056 0.19	-0.1397 -0.37	-0.0964 -0.19	-2.0874 -0.50	-3.8000 -0.85
TInfoAsym	-0.1360 • -1.65	-0.2378 •• -2.21	0.0257 0.07	0.3906 0.73	7.8127 ••• 3.61	8.2635 ••• 3.53
ACrossOwnPct* AInfoAsym		0.2637 0.24		-0.2241 -0.14		20.7726 0.95
TCrossOwnPct* TInfoAsym		0.5210 1.43		-1.3898 -0.96		-5.6221 -0.40
ALogSize	-0.0602 -1.37	-0.0583 -1.33	-0.0632 -1.44	-0.0636 -1.45	-0.0531 -1.18	-0.0549 -1.22
TLogSize	-0.0327 -0.61	-0.0310 -0.58	-0.0334 -0.62	-0.0374 -0.69	-0.0108 -0.20	-0.0116 -0.21
ALev	0.2277 0.75	0.2221 0.74	0.2324 0.77	0.2368 0.78	0.2197 0.73	0.2186 0.72
TLev	0.2772 1.11	0.2704 1.08	0.3462 1.40	0.3456 1.40	0.3174 1.29	0.3154 1.28
ache	0.0000 -1.17	0.0000 -1.23	0.0000 -1.22	0.0000 -1.21	0.0000 -1.20	0.0000 -1.16
tche	0.0000 -0.26	0.0000 -0.24	0.0000 -0.26	0.0000 -0.24	-0.0001 -0.43	0.0000 -0.38
ACFtoE	0.5132 0.67	0.5267 0.69	0.5684 0.74	0.5995 0.78	0.3831 0.50	0.3910 0.51
TCFtoE	-0.0847 -0.67	-0.0843 -0.67	-0.0960 -0.76	-0.0980 -0.77	-0.1042 -0.82	-0.1039 -0.82
ARet205	-0.1179 -0.75	-0.1167 -0.74	-0.1178 -0.74	-0.1183 -0.75	-0.1178 -0.74	-0.1169 -0.73
TRet205	-0.1907 -1.51	-0.1976 -1.56	-0.1894 -1.49	-0.1864 -1.47	-0.1214 -0.95	-0.1229 -0.96
AStd205	-8.9649 • -1.65	-8.8778 -1.63	-9.2559 • -1.69	-9.2270 • -1.68	-6.8921 -1.24	-6.6373 -1.19
TStd205	7.4302 •• 2.31	7.2532 •• 2.26	7.5230 •• 2.34	7.5025 •• 2.33	2.6419 0.76	2.6467 0.76
GrossCollateral	0.0575 0.14	0.0791 0.20	0.0738 0.18	0.0690 0.17	0.0833 0.21	0.0921 0.23
NetCollateral	-0.6451 -0.91	-0.6636 -0.94	-0.6987 -0.99	-0.7008 -0.99	-0.6983 -0.99	-0.7068 -1.00
TotalO	-0.0670 -0.49	-0.0702 -0.51	-0.0692 -0.51	-0.0745 -0.55	-0.0348 -0.25	-0.0248 -0.18
AROA	1.5232 1.61	1.4889 1.57	1.4061 1.48	1.3714 1.44	1.5588 • 1.65	1.5679 • 1.66
TROA	-0.4004 -1.40	-0.4299 -1.50	-0.2388 -0.89	-0.2442 -0.91	-0.3122 -1.16	-0.3129 -1.16
ASalesGrowth	-0.2978 -0.86	-0.2959 -0.85	-0.3083 -0.89	-0.3076 -0.88	-0.3377 -0.97	-0.3290 -0.94
TSalesGrowth	0.0230 0.16	0.0109 0.08	0.0124 0.09	0.0164 0.11	-0.0387 -0.27	-0.0384 -0.27
TAnalystFollow	0.0092 1.01	0.0090 0.99	0.0094 1.03	0.0092 1.01	0.0113 1.24	0.0115 1.25
HostileDeal	0.1235 0.31	0.1327 0.33	0.1295 0.32	0.1159 0.29	0.1254 0.31	0.1229 0.31
CompDeal	-0.0186 -0.07	-0.0094 -0.04	-0.0110 -0.04	-0.0086 -0.03	0.0220 0.08	0.0236 0.09
TenderDeal	-0.0133 -0.10	-0.0272 -0.20	-0.0118 -0.08	-0.0133 -0.10	-0.0135 -0.10	-0.0155 -0.11
DiversDeal	-0.0821 -0.70	-0.0799 -0.68	-0.0769 -0.65	-0.0791 -0.67	-0.0731 -0.62	-0.0725 -0.62
RelSize	-0.0456 -0.44	-0.0434 -0.42	-0.0473 -0.46	-0.0470 -0.45	-0.0447 -0.43	-0.0445 -0.43
n	5388	5388	5388	5388	5388	5388
R-squared	0.021	0.021	0.020	0.020	0.023	0.023
Year + Industry fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 4 – Panel C

Regression of synergies against cross-ownership under analyst following and cross-ownership as a percentage of total ownership cross sections. Detailed variables descriptions include in Appendix A.

"CrossSecVar" →	Dependent variable = Synergies			
	Analyst Following		CO / IO	
Intercept	0.3993 0.24	0.3892 0.24	0.6526 0.35	0.6405 0.34
ACrossOwnPct	0.3287 0.66	-0.2953 -0.46	0.7131 1.27	1.1236 1.12
TCrossOwnPct	0.1996 0.48	0.3635 0.69	0.4039 0.87	0.0940 0.08
ACrossSecVar	-0.0040 -0.66	-0.0112 -1.46	-0.3950 -1.09	-0.3279 -0.85
TCrossSecVar	0.0108 1.15	0.0158 1.17	-0.1470 -0.61	-0.1854 -0.71
ACrossOwnPct* ACrossSecVar		0.0426 1.57		-0.7248 -0.49
TCrossOwnPct* TCrossSecVar		-0.0263 -0.86		0.4298 0.30
ALogSize	-0.0466 -0.91	-0.0351 -0.67	-0.0664 -1.40	-0.0672 -1.42
TLogSize	-0.0394 -0.72	-0.0442 -0.79	-0.0397 -0.69	-0.0409 -0.71
ALev	0.2008 0.66	0.1835 0.60	0.1843 0.58	0.1877 0.59
TLev	0.3433 1.39	0.3456 1.40	0.3809 1.48	0.3852 1.49
ache	0.0000 -1.25	0.0000 -1.24	0.0000 -1.25	0.0000 -1.28
tche	0.0000 -0.26	0.0000 -0.21	0.0000 -0.13	0.0000 -0.06
ACFtoE	0.4865 0.63	0.5024 0.65	0.3803 0.48	0.3844 0.48
TCFtoE	-0.0996 -0.79	-0.1098 -0.87	-0.1122 -0.85	-0.1137 -0.86
ARet205	-0.1143 -0.72	-0.1128 -0.71	-0.0872 -0.53	-0.0881 -0.53
TRet205	-0.1878 -1.48	-0.1894 -1.49	-0.1935 -1.47	-0.1912 -1.45
AStd205	-8.8682 -1.62	-9.0138 • -1.65	-9.2191 -1.61	-9.2226 -1.61
TStd205	7.6465 ** 2.38	7.7402 ** 2.41	7.8163 ** 2.31	7.8734 ** 2.32
GrossCollateral	0.0928 0.23	0.1030 0.25	0.1823 0.43	0.1829 0.43
NetCollateral	-0.6696 -0.95	-0.6555 -0.93	-0.8208 -1.11	-0.8188 -1.10
TotalIO	-0.0519 -0.37	-0.0429 -0.31	-0.1803 -1.23	-0.1809 -1.20
AROA	1.5542 1.63	1.5525 1.62	1.6803 • 1.71	1.6721 • 1.70
TROA	-0.2454 -0.91	-0.2411 -0.90	-0.2634 -0.93	-0.2580 -0.92
ASalesGrowth	-0.3048 -0.88	-0.3196 -0.92	-0.3110 -0.85	-0.3116 -0.86
TSalesGrowth	0.0118 0.08	0.0187 0.13	0.0091 0.06	0.0123 0.08
TAnalystFollow			0.0119 1.25	0.0124 1.28
HostileDeal	0.1255 0.31	0.1343 0.34	0.1219 0.30	0.1199 0.29
CompDeal	-0.0105 -0.04	-0.0090 -0.03	0.0058 0.02	0.0094 0.03
TenderDeal	-0.0168 -0.12	-0.0208 -0.15	-0.0400 -0.28	-0.0403 -0.28
DiversDeal	-0.0809 -0.69	-0.0826 -0.70	-0.0785 -0.65	-0.0780 -0.64
RelSize	-0.0470 -0.46	-0.0389 -0.38	-0.0357 -0.33	-0.0327 -0.30
n	5388	5388	5143	5143
R-squared	0.020	0.021	0.021	0.021
Year + Industry fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 5 – Panel A

Basic regression of completion variable against cross ownership.

	Dependent Variable = Completion Probability	
Intercept	0.7052 *** 14.83	0.7188 *** 15.39
ACrossOwnPct	-0.3411 ** 2.17	0.1475 0.22
TCrossOwnPct	-0.5531 *** 7.56	-0.1254 0.21
ACrossOwnPct*TCrossOwnPct		-1.4775 *** 5.16
ALogSize	0.1554 *** 60.70	0.1498 *** 55.68
TLogSize	-0.1377 *** 31.09	-0.1444 *** 33.75
ALev	-0.4996 *** 12.63	-0.4971 *** 12.50
TLev	0.0490 0.17	0.0598 0.25
ache	0.0000 *** 6.32	0.0000 *** 5.60
tche	-0.0002 *** 25.80	-0.0002 *** 22.28
ACFtoE	-0.9025 *** 7.42	-0.8544 *** 6.62
TCFtoE	0.0151 0.06	0.0119 0.04
ARet205	0.1943 *** 6.29	0.1916 *** 6.12
TRet205	-0.0013 0.00	-0.0023 0.00
AStd205	1.8210 0.64	1.6932 0.55
TStd205	-1.2600 0.71	-1.2361 0.69
GrossCollateral	0.2481 * 1.78	0.2337 1.58
NetCollateral	-0.2455 0.67	-0.2310 0.59
TotalIO	0.4627 *** 45.84	0.4425 *** 41.18
AROA	0.5206 1.31	0.4774 1.10
TROA	0.3563 *** 7.72	0.3611 *** 7.92
ASalesGrowth	-0.0605 0.14	-0.0536 0.11
TSalesGrowth	0.0764 1.26	0.0784 1.33
TAnalystFollow	-0.0137 *** 13.10	-0.0135 *** 12.59
HostileDeal	-2.3384 *** 221.22	-2.3471 *** 222.58
CompDeal	-1.4359 *** 184.95	-1.4377 *** 184.97
TenderDeal	1.8252 *** 258.39	1.8209 *** 257.04
DiversDeal	-0.0617 1.28	-0.0609 1.25
RelSize	0.0910 *** 4.21	0.0946 *** 4.54
n	7992	7992
R-squared	0.128	0.129
Year + Industry fixed effects	Yes	Yes

Table 5 – Panel B

Regression of completed variable against cross-ownership under information asymmetry cross section. Detailed variables descriptions include in Appendix A.

"InfoAsym" →	Dependent variable = Deal Premium					
	R&D expenditures		Intangible assets		Bid-ask spread	
Intercept	0.7340 *** 15.84	0.7370 *** 15.95	0.8068 *** 18.91	0.8068 *** 18.91	0.7088 *** 14.55	0.7934 *** 17.96
ACrossOwnPct	-0.3394 ** 2.15	-0.3219 * 1.92	-0.2829 1.48	-0.0929 0.12	-0.3405 ** 2.16	-0.6197 *** 5.72
TCrossOwnPct	-0.5533 *** 7.56	-0.5216 *** 6.60	-0.5375 *** 7.11	-0.4649 *** 4.16	-0.5526 *** 7.54	-0.6269 *** 8.15
AInfoAsym	-0.0100 0.79	-0.0062 0.26	-0.5957 *** 11.61	-0.3910 *** 2.80	-0.1647 0.01	-2.9530 ** 2.31
TInfoAsym	-0.0367 0.96	0.0027 0.00	-0.1567 0.71	-0.0526 0.04	-0.0355 0.00	-0.8145 0.57
ACrossOwnPct* AInfoAsym		-0.1986 0.53		-0.9942 * 1.79		46.2186 *** 10.94
TCrossOwnPct* TInfoAsym		-0.2175 1.62		-0.3365 0.24		16.3309 *** 4.43
ALogSize	0.1558 *** 60.62	0.1552 *** 60.04	0.1667 *** 67.65	0.1652 *** 66.22	0.1549 *** 58.12	0.1476 *** 52.19
TLogSize	-0.1381 *** 31.22	-0.1389 *** 31.55	-0.1366 *** 29.69	-0.1405 *** 31.15	-0.1378 *** 30.85	-0.1424 *** 32.71
ALev	-0.5063 *** 12.94	-0.5106 *** 13.14	-0.5196 *** 13.62	-0.5220 *** 13.71	-0.4982 *** 12.47	-0.4941 *** 12.24
TLev	0.0250 0.04	0.0285 0.05	0.0528 0.19	0.0600 0.25	0.0493 0.17	0.0353 0.09
ache	0.0000 *** 6.19	0.0000 *** 5.77	0.0000 *** 8.95	0.0000 *** 9.12	0.0000 *** 6.26	0.0000 *** 4.21
tche	-0.0002 *** 25.70	-0.0002 *** 25.99	-0.0002 *** 25.25	-0.0002 *** 24.23	-0.0002 *** 25.75	-0.0002 *** 21.56
ACFtoE	-0.9227 *** 7.75	-0.9258 *** 7.80	-0.9164 *** 7.62	-0.8863 *** 7.11	-0.9022 *** 7.42	-0.8884 *** 7.17
TCFtoE	0.0190 0.10	0.0196 0.10	0.0214 0.12	0.0204 0.11	0.0153 0.06	0.0122 0.04
ARet205	0.1907 *** 6.05	0.1883 *** 5.89	0.1901 *** 6.00	0.1889 *** 5.93	0.1932 *** 6.09	0.1909 *** 5.93
TRet205	0.0017 0.00	0.0054 0.01	-0.0038 0.00	-0.0007 0.00	-0.0018 0.00	0.0045 0.00
AStd205	1.7199 0.57	1.7178 0.57	1.3499 0.35	1.2224 0.29	1.8588 0.62	1.8488 0.61
TStd205	-1.2541 0.71	-1.2339 0.68	-1.4057 0.89	-1.4781 0.98	-1.2227 0.55	-1.1817 0.51
GrossCollateral	0.2445 * 1.72	0.2352 1.59	0.2144 1.32	0.2043 1.20	0.2487 * 1.78	0.2594 * 1.94
NetCollateral	-0.2464 0.67	-0.2401 0.64	-0.3987 * 1.74	-0.3889 * 1.65	-0.2456 0.67	-0.2709 0.81
TotalO	0.4623 *** 45.77	0.4660 *** 46.38	0.4707 *** 47.31	0.4625 *** 45.38	0.4618 *** 45.24	0.4666 *** 45.30
AROA	0.5191 1.29	0.5211 1.30	0.3008 0.43	0.2935 0.41	0.5193 1.30	0.5338 1.37
TROA	0.3029 *** 4.84	0.3103 *** 5.07	0.3524 *** 7.51	0.3578 *** 7.73	0.3571 *** 7.70	0.3505 *** 7.37
ASalesGrowth	-0.0538 0.11	-0.0406 0.06	-0.0944 0.33	-0.0917 0.31	-0.0595 0.13	-0.0136 0.01
TSalesGrowth	0.0810 1.42	0.0846 1.54	0.0802 1.38	0.0798 1.37	0.0766 1.26	0.0786 1.32
TAnalystFollow	-0.0137 13.14	-0.0137 13.05	-0.0145 14.53	-0.0148 15.01	-0.0137 13.09	-0.0122 10.15
HostileDeal	-2.3406 *** 221.42	-2.3434 *** 221.81	-2.3549 *** 223.28	-2.3565 *** 223.72	-2.3384 *** 221.17	-2.3497 *** 223.34
CompDeal	-1.4368 *** 185.03	-1.4391 *** 185.49	-1.4362 *** 184.52	-1.4378 *** 184.83	-1.4361 *** 184.71	-1.4387 *** 184.59
TenderDeal	1.8267 *** 258.61	1.8308 *** 259.62	1.8235 *** 258.32	1.8230 *** 258.13	1.8251 *** 258.32	1.8184 *** 255.62
DiversDeal	-0.0642 1.39	-0.0674 1.53	-0.0774 ** 2.01	-0.0771 ** 1.99	-0.0616 1.28	-0.0587 1.16
RelSize	0.0921 *** 4.31	0.0914 *** 4.25	0.0995 *** 5.00	0.0998 *** 5.03	0.0909 *** 4.20	0.0902 *** 4.12
n	7992	7992	7992	7992	7992	7992
R-squared	0.128	0.129	0.130	0.130	0.128	0.131
Year + Industry fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 5 – Panel C

Regression of completed variable against cross-ownership under analyst following and cross-ownership as a percentage of total ownership cross sections. Detailed variables descriptions include in Appendix A.

"CrossSecVar" →	Dependent variable = Deal Premium			
	Analyst Following		CO / IO	
Intercept	0.6999 *** 14.52	0.6959 *** 14.34	0.9324 *** 21.64	0.9073 *** 20.30
ACrossOwnPct	-0.3530 ** 2.28	-0.1134 0.15	-0.1930 0.56	1.0067 *** 3.99
TCrossOwnPct	-0.5436 *** 7.19	-0.4383 *** 2.85	-0.4511 *** 4.09	-0.9823 *** 3.16
ACrossSecVar	-0.0011 0.14	0.0020 0.29	-0.1004 0.40	0.0782 0.21
TCrossSecVar	-0.0132 *** 10.57	-0.0106 *** 3.36	0.0401 0.12	-0.0391 0.09
ACrossOwnPct* ACrossSecVar		-0.0159 1.56		-1.9520 *** 7.89
TCrossOwnPct* TCrossSecVar		-0.0041 0.09		0.7609 1.39
ALogSize	0.1592 *** 50.30	0.1530 *** 45.04	0.1325 *** 36.52	0.1302 *** 35.22
TLogSize	-0.1403 *** 29.85	-0.1440 *** 30.11	-0.1576 *** 34.61	-0.1619 *** 36.08
ALev	-0.5075 *** 12.74	-0.4981 *** 12.26	-0.3793 *** 6.40	-0.3660 *** 5.95
TLev	0.0503 0.18	0.0568 0.22	0.0364 0.08	0.0521 0.17
ache	0.0000 *** 6.43	0.0000 *** 5.81	0.0000 *** 3.03	0.0000 *** 3.75
tche	-0.0002 *** 25.61	-0.0002 *** 24.31	-0.0002 *** 23.59	-0.0002 *** 18.61
ACFtoE	-0.9166 *** 7.56	-0.8868 *** 7.02	-0.9266 *** 7.13	-0.9187 *** 7.00
TCFtoE	0.0144 0.05	0.0133 0.05	0.0118 0.03	0.0096 0.02
ARet205	0.1950 *** 6.33	0.1921 *** 6.14	0.1739 *** 4.48	0.1734 *** 4.47
TRet205	-0.0011 0.00	0.0020 0.00	-0.0028 0.00	0.0000 0.00
AStd205	1.8597 0.66	1.9086 0.70	0.8014 0.11	0.7608 0.10
TStd205	-1.2532 0.71	-1.2019 0.65	-0.8340 0.26	-0.7274 0.20
GrossCollateral	0.2500 • 1.80	0.2473 • 1.77	0.2247 1.35	0.2196 1.29
NetCollateral	-0.2422 0.65	-0.2400 0.64	-0.1971 0.40	-0.1759 0.31
TotalIO	0.4667 *** 45.46	0.4542 *** 42.30	0.4093 *** 31.47	0.3931 *** 26.99
AROA	0.5496 1.42	0.5278 1.30	0.3262 0.47	0.3103 0.43
TROA	0.3563 *** 7.72	0.3597 *** 7.85	0.4197 *** 9.43	0.4291 *** 9.85
ASalesGrowth	-0.0629 0.15	-0.0559 0.12	-0.0890 0.27	-0.0850 0.24
TSalesGrowth	0.0763 1.26	0.0757 1.24	0.0468 0.42	0.0535 0.54
TAnalystFollow			-0.0108 7.42	-0.0099 6.10
HostileDeal	-2.3391 *** 221.36	-2.3384 *** 221.24	-2.3825 *** 216.12	-2.3824 *** 215.83
CompDeal	-1.4357 *** 184.87	-1.4378 *** 185.18	-1.4685 *** 183.55	-1.4666 *** 182.38
TenderDeal	1.8252 *** 258.29	1.8247 *** 258.23	1.8820 *** 253.20	1.8762 *** 251.64
DiversDeal	-0.0626 1.32	-0.0592 1.18	-0.0573 1.03	-0.0558 0.97
RelSize	0.0910 *** 4.21	0.0892 *** 4.05	0.1166 *** 6.06	0.1209 *** 6.49
n	7992	7992	7529	7529
R-squared	0.128	0.129	0.131	0.132
Year + Industry fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

References

- Azar, José, Martin C. Schmalz, and Isabel Tecu. “Anticompetitive Effects of Common Ownership.” *The Journal of Finance* 73, no. 4 (2018): 1513–65.
- Becht, Marco, Andrea Polo, and Stefano Rossi. “Does Mandatory Shareholder Voting Prevent Bad Acquisitions?” *Review of Financial Studies* 29, no. 11 (January 2016): 3035–67.
- Brooks, Chris, Zhong Chen, and Yeqin Zeng. “Institutional Cross-Ownership and Corporate Strategy: The Case of Mergers and Acquisitions.” *Journal of Corporate Finance* 48 (2018): 187–216.
- Connelly, Brian L., Kang Bok Lee, Laszlo Tihanyi, S. Trevis Certo, and Jonathan L. Johnson. “Something in Common: Competitive Dissimilarity and Performance of Rivals with Common Shareholders.” *Academy of Management Journal* 62, no. 1 (2019): 1–21.
- Gao, Kaijuan, Hanxiao Shen, Xi Gao, and Kam C. Chan. “The Power of Sharing: Evidence from Institutional Investor Cross-Ownership and Corporate Innovation.” *International Review of Economics & Finance* 63 (2019): 284–96.
- Harford, Jarrad, Dirk Jenter, and Kai Li. “Institutional Cross-Holdings and Their Effect on Acquisition Decisions.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 99, no. 1 (2011): 27–39.
- He, Jie (Jack), and Jiekun Huang. “Product Market Competition in a World of Cross-Ownership: Evidence from Institutional Blockholdings.” *The Review of Financial Studies* 30, no. 8 (March 2017): 2674–2718.
- He, Jie (Jack), Jiekun Huang, and Shan Zhao. “Internalizing Governance Externalities: The Role of Institutional Cross-Ownership.” *Journal of Financial Economics*, 2019.
- Jung, Michael J. “Investor Overlap and Diffusion of Disclosure Practices.” *Review of Accounting Studies* 18, no. 1 (2012): 167–206.
- Li, Kai, Tingting Liu, and Juan (Julie) Wu. “Vote Avoidance and Shareholder Voting in Mergers and Acquisitions.” *The Review of Financial Studies* 31, no. 8 (August 2018): 3176–3211.
- Matvos, G, and M Ostrovsky. “Cross-Ownership, Returns, and Voting in Mergers.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 89, no. 3 (2008): 391–403.