

# Financial Anomalies

Krishna Neupane

2024-08-24

# Table of contents

Preface	3
1 Introduction	4
2 Summary	10
References	11

# Preface

The article is designed to study financial anomalies

# 1 Introduction

Fama and MacBeth (1973) show two-parameter regression model estimates average risk-return relationships based on efficient market portfolio ( $m$ ), that is, the market prices fully reflect the available information. The asset are constructed based on Equation 1 for an asset ( $i$ ) proposed by @Black (1972).

$$x_{im} \equiv \frac{\text{total market value of all units of assets } i}{\text{total market value of all assets}} \quad (1.1)$$

where asset( $i$ )in the portfolio( $m$ )

Excepted return of a security ( $i$ ) is  $E(\tilde{R}_0)$ , the expected return on a security that is riskless in the portfolio  $m$ , plus a risk premium that is  $\beta_i$  times the difference between expected return of the portfolio ( $E(\tilde{R}_m)$ ) and riskless portfolio ( $E(\tilde{R}_0)$ ). is calculated by Equation 1,  $\beta_i$  is the risk of the asset  $i$  of the portfolio  $m$ , measured relative to  $\sigma^2(\tilde{R}_m)$

$$E(\tilde{R}_i) = [E(\tilde{R}_m) - S_m \sum \tilde{R}_m] + S_m \sigma(\tilde{R}_m) \beta_i,$$

where,

$$\beta_i \equiv \frac{\text{cov}(\tilde{R}_i, \tilde{R}_m)}{\sigma^2(\tilde{R}_m)} = \frac{\sigma_{j=1}^N x_{jm} \sigma_{ij}}{\sigma^2(\tilde{R}_m)} = \frac{\text{cov}(\tilde{R}_i, \tilde{R}_m) / \sigma(\tilde{R}_m)}{\sigma(\tilde{R}_m)}$$

$$S_m = \frac{E(\tilde{R}_m) - E(\tilde{R}_0)}{\sigma(\tilde{R}_m)}$$

hence

$$E(\tilde{R}_i) = E(\tilde{R}_0) + [E(\tilde{R}_m) - E(\tilde{R}_0)] \beta_i \quad (1.2)$$

For each period of  $t$ , the cross sectional regression is given by

$$R_{pt} = \tilde{\gamma}_{0t} + \tilde{\gamma}_{1t} \tilde{\beta}_{p,t-1} + \tilde{\gamma}_{2t} \tilde{\beta}_{p,t-1}^2 + \tilde{\gamma}_{3t} \bar{s}_{p,t-1} \tilde{\epsilon}_i + \tilde{\eta}_{pt}, \quad (1.3)$$

$p = 1, 2, \dots, t$

Equation 1 the independent variable  $\tilde{\beta}_{p,t-1}$  is the average of the  $\tilde{\beta}_i$  for securities in portfolio  $p$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}_{p,t-1}^2$  is the average of the squared values of these  $\tilde{\beta}_i$ ,  $\bar{s}_{p,t-1}\tilde{\epsilon}_i$  is the average of  $s\tilde{\epsilon}_i$  for portfolio  $p_i$

Gupta and Ofer (1975) examines investors growth expectations reflected in the stock prices. A change in the expectation is reflected in the price movement. The study defines the earnings price ratio is a function of risk characteristics of the security and the expected growth in the earnings in Equation 1. The risk component are measured by: - the beta coefficient - the firm asset size (natural logarithm of total asset) - dividend payout ratio - leverage ratio of liabilities and preferred stocks to the common stock outstanding - earnings variability (standard deviation of earnings to price ratio calculated over period of seven years)

$$EP = f(RS, EG) \quad (1.4)$$

where:

$EP$  = earnings price ratio- ,

$RS$  = risk characteristics of the security

$EG$  = the expected growth rate in the earnings

$$(1.5)$$

$$\Delta P_i^t = \frac{P_{it} - P_{it-1}}{P_{it-1}} \times 100 \quad (1.6)$$

where:

$\Delta P_i^t$  is the percent change of the security  $i$  during the period  $t - 1$  to  $t$

The average yearly percentage of the prices change for portfolio  $j$  ( $\Delta P_j$ ) is given by

$$\Delta P_j = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{14} \frac{\sum_{r_t=10j-9}^{10j} \Delta P_{rt}^t}{14}}{14}, r_t = 1, \dots, 190$$

where:

$r_t$  = the relative ranking of a security at time  $t$  according to its prediction error at that year. (1.7)

$\Delta P_t^{r_t}$  = percentage price change during the period  $t - 1$  to  $t$  for a security that has the rank of  $r_t$  at time  $t$  (1.8)

Basu (1977): to determine empirically whether the investment performance of the common stocks is related to the  $P/E$  ratios.  $P/E$  is the ratio of market value of the common stock

(market price times the number of shares outstanding) as of December 31 to reporting annual earnings (before extraordinary items) available for common stockholders. According to the paper, due the exaggerated investor expectations,  $P/E$  ratio may be the indicator of future investment performance. The paper shows that  $P/E$  is not fully reflected in security prices in as rapid a manner as postulated by the semi-strong form of the efficient market hypothesis. Instead, it seems that disequilibrium persisted in the capital market during the period studied. The results suggests that market efficiency does not exist due to lags and frictions in the price adjustment process.

Litzenberger and Ramaswamy (1979):

$$\tilde{R} - r_{ft} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1\beta_{it} + \gamma_2(d_{it} - r_{ft}) + \tilde{\epsilon}_{it}, i = 1, 2, \dots, N, t = 1, 2, \dots, T \quad (1.9)$$

where :

$\tilde{R}_{it}$  Return of the security  $i$  in period  $t$ ,  $\beta_{it}$  and  $d_{it}$  are the systemic risk and the dividend yield of security  $i$  in period  $t$ ,  $\tilde{\epsilon}_{it}$ , a disturbance term is  $\tilde{R} - E(\tilde{R}_{it})$ , the deviation of the realized return from the expected value.  
coefficients  $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$  (1.10)

Banz (1981): studies “size effect” by using market indices - Market Index, CRSP value weighted, CRSP equal weighted indexes, US Bond Index, Corporate Bond Index to estimate the relationship between the return and market value based on Equation 1. The study suggests the CAPM is misspecified.

$$R_{it} = \gamma_{0t} + \gamma_{1t}\beta_{1t} + \gamma_{2t}[(\phi_{1t} - \phi_{mt})] + \epsilon_{it}, i = 1, \dots, N \quad (1.11)$$

where:

$R_i$  = return on security  $i$

$\gamma_0$  = return on a zero-beta portfolio

$\gamma_1$  = return on market risk premium

$\phi_i$  = market value security  $i$

$\phi_m$  = average market value

$\gamma_2$  constant measuring the contribution of  $\phi_i$  to the expected return of a security

(1.12)

Figlewski (1981) estimates “The test methodology we will use is a familiar one. We construct ten portfolios to which stocks are assigned according to their average short interest during the previous six months, and calculate the portfolio a’s or excess returns.”

Basu (1983): The empirical findings reported in this paper indicate that, at least during the 1963-80 time period, the returns on the common stock of NYSE firms appear to have been related to earnings' yield and firm size.

De Bondt and Thaler (1985): "This study of market efficiency investigates whether such behavior affects stock prices. The empirical evidence, based on CRSP monthly return data, is consistent with the overreaction hypothesis. Substantial weak form market inefficiencies are discovered. The results also shed new light on the January returns earned by prior "winners" and "losers." Portfolios of losers experience exceptionally large January returns as late as five years after portfolio formation. To repeat, our goal is to test whether the overreaction hypothesis is predictive. Specifically, two hypotheses are suggested: (1) Extreme movements in stock prices will be followed by subsequent price movements in the opposite direction. (2) The more extreme the initial price movement, the greater will be the subsequent adjustment. Both hypotheses imply a violation of weak-form market efficiency."

Bhandari (1988): "The expected returns on common stocks are positively related to the debt/equity ratio (DER), controlling for the beta and firm size, both including and excluding January. This relationship is not sensitive to variations in the market proxy, estimation technique, etc. The evidence suggests that the "premium" associated with the debt/equity ratio is not likely to be just some kind of "risk premium"

$$E(\tilde{r}_i) = E(\tilde{\gamma}_0) + E(\tilde{\gamma}_1)LTEQ_i + E(\tilde{\gamma}_2)BETA_i + E(\tilde{\gamma}_3) + DER_i, i = 1, \dots, N \quad (1.13)$$

where:

Natural Logarithm of Total Common Equity (LETQ) where total common equity  
is the number of shares outstanding times (month-end) price per share

$$\text{Debt to Equity Ratio (DER)} = \frac{\text{book value of total assets} - \text{book value of common equity}}{\text{market value of common equity}}$$

BETA, the risk measure

Amihud and Mendelson (1989):

The percentage bid-ask spread (= dollar spread divided by the stock price)

$$R_{pm} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1\beta_{pn} + \gamma_2\sigma_{pn} + \gamma_3SZ_{pn} + \gamma_4S_{pn} + \sum_{n=1}^{19} d_n DY_n + \epsilon_{pn} \quad \text{where:}$$

$p$  is the portfolio

$\beta_{pn}$  portfolio beta

$\sigma_{pn}$  residual standard deviation

$S_{pn}$  the portfolio average spread

$SZ_{pn}$  average market value of the portfolio

(1.14)

Ou and Penman (1989): “Implements multivariate LOGIT analysis in financial statements. Fundamental analysis extracts value measures from financial statements and compares them to prices to identify mispriced stocks. The evidence here suggests that financial statements capture fundamentals that are not reflected in prices.”

Jegadeesh (1990): “This paper documents strong evidence of predictable behavior of security returns. The results here show that the monthly returns on individual stocks exhibit. significantly negative first-order serial correlation and significantly positive higher-order serial correlation. The pattern of serial correlation exhibits seasonality, with the pattern in January significantly different from that in the other months.”

Jegadeesh and Titman (1993):

Loughran and Ritter (1995) : “Investing in firms issuing stock is hazardous to your wealth. Firms issuing stock during 1970 to 1990, whether an IPO or an SEO, have been poor long-run investments for investors. s. The average annual return during the five years after issuing is only 5 percent for firms conducting IPOs, and only 7 percent for firms conducting SEOs. Investing an equal amount at the same time in a nonissuing firm with approximately the same market capitalization, and holding it for an identical period, would have produced an average compound return of 12 percent per year for IPOs and 15 percent for SEOs. The magnitude of the underperformance is large: it implies that 44 percent more money would need to be invested in the issuers than in the nonissuers to be left with the same wealth five years later.”

Michaely, Thaler, and Womack (1995): “Market reaction to the dividend initiations.”

La Porta (1996): ” Contrarian strategies that use analysts’ expectations to form portfolios yield high returns. Specifically, when stocks are sorted by the expected growth rate in earnings, low  $E\{g\}$  stocks beat high  $E\{g\}$  stocks by twenty percentage points.. Finally, event study evidence suggests that the market was overly pessimistic about the earnings of the low  $E\{g\}$  portfolio and excessively optimistic about the earnings of the high  $E\{g\}$  portfolio”



Lev and Sougiannis (1996): “To address these concerns, we estimate the R&D capital of a large sample of public companies and find these estimates to be statistically reliable and economically meaningful. We then adjust the reported earnings and book values of sample firms for the R&D capitalization and find that such adjustments are value-relevant to investors.”

Sloan (1996): “This paper investigates whether stock prices reflect information about future earnings contained in the accrual and cash flow components of current earnings. The persistence of earnings performance is shown to depend on the relative magnitudes of the cash and accrual components of earnings. However, stock prices act as if investors fail to identify correctly the different properties of these two components of earnings”

Womack (1996): ” An analysis of new buy and sell recommendations of stocks by security analysts at major U.S. brokerage firms shows significant, systematic discrepancies between prerecommendation prices and eventual values. The initial return at the time of the recommendations is large, even though few recommendations coincide with new public news or provide previously unavailable facts. However, these initial price reactions are incomplete. For buy recommendations, the mean postevent drift is modest (+2.4%) and short-lived, but for sell recommendations, the drift is larger (-9.1%) and extends for six months. Analysts appear to have market timing and stock picking abilities”

Brennan, Chordia, and Subrahmanyam (1998): “We examine the relation between stock returns, measures of risk, and several non-risk security characteristics, including the book-to-market ratio, firm size, the stock price, the dividend yield, and lagged returns. Our primary objective is to determine whether non-risk characteristics have marginal explanatory power relative to the arbitrage pricing theory benchmark, with factors determined using, in turn, the Connor and Korajczyk (CK; 1988) and the Fama and French (FF; 1993b) approaches. Fama—MacBeth-type regressions using risk adjusted returns provide evidence of return momentum, size, and book-to-market effects, together with a significant and negative relation between returns and trading volume, even after accounting for the CK factors. When the analysis is repeated using the FF factors, we find that the size and book-to-market effects are attenuated, while the momentum and trading volume effects persist. In addition, Nasdaq stocks show significant underperformance after adjusting for risk using either method”

Brennan, Chordia, and Subrahmanyam (1998): Regardless of the method used to risk-adjust returns, we find a strong negative relation between average returns and trading volume, which is consistent with a liquidity premium in asset prices. In addition, the size and book-to-market ratio effects are strong in the CK method of risk-adjustment, while the FF factors attenuate both the magnitude and significance of these effects.

## 2 Summary

In summary, this book has no content whatsoever.

# References

- Amihud, Yakov, and Haim Mendelson. 1989. "The Effects of Beta, Bid-Ask Spread, Residual Risk, and Size on Stock Returns." *The Journal of Finance* 44 (2): 479–86.
- Banz, Rolf W. 1981. "The Relationship Between Return and Market Value of Common Stocks." *Journal of Financial Economics* 9 (1): 3–18.
- Basu, Sanjoy. 1977. "Investment Performance of Common Stocks in Relation to Their Price-Earnings Ratios: A Test of the Efficient Market Hypothesis." *The Journal of Finance* 32 (3): 663–82.
- . 1983. "The Relationship Between Earnings' Yield, Market Value and Return for NYSE Common Stocks: Further Evidence." *Journal of Financial Economics* 12 (1): 129–56.
- Bhandari, Laxmi Chand. 1988. "Debt/Equity Ratio and Expected Common Stock Returns: Empirical Evidence." *The Journal of Finance* 43 (2): 507–28.
- Black, Fischer. 1972. "Capital Market Equilibrium with Restricted Borrowing." *The Journal of Business* 45 (3): 444–55.
- Brennan, Michael J, Tarun Chordia, and Avanidhar Subrahmanyam. 1998. "Alternative Factor Specifications, Security Characteristics, and the Cross-Section of Expected Stock Returns." *Journal of Financial Economics* 49 (3): 345–73.
- De Bondt, Werner FM, and Richard Thaler. 1985. "Does the Stock Market Overreact?" *The Journal of Finance* 40 (3): 793–805.
- Fama, Eugene F, and James D MacBeth. 1973. "Risk, Return, and Equilibrium: Empirical Tests." *Journal of Political Economy* 81 (3): 607–36.
- Figlewski, Stephen. 1981. "The Informational Effects of Restrictions on Short Sales: Some Empirical Evidence." *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 16 (4): 463–76.
- Gupta, Manak C, and Aharon R Ofer. 1975. "INVESTORS' EXPECTATIONS OF EARNINGS GROWTH, THEIR ACCURACY AND EFFECTS ON THE STRUCTURE OF REALIZED RATES OF RETURN." *The Journal of Finance* 30 (2): 509–23.
- Jegadeesh, Narasimhan. 1990. "Evidence of Predictable Behavior of Security Returns." *The Journal of Finance* 45 (3): 881–98.
- Jegadeesh, Narasimhan, and Sheridan Titman. 1993. "Returns to Buying Winners and Selling Losers: Implications for Stock Market Efficiency." *The Journal of Finance* 48 (1): 65–91.
- La Porta, Rafael. 1996. "Expectations and the Cross-Section of Stock Returns." *The Journal of Finance* 51 (5): 1715–42.
- Lev, Baruch, and Theodore Sougiannis. 1996. "The Capitalization, Amortization, and Value-Relevance of r&d." *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 21 (1): 107–38.
- Litzenberger, Robert H, and Krishna Ramaswamy. 1979. "The Effect of Personal Taxes and Dividends on Capital Asset Prices: Theory and Empirical Evidence." *Journal of Financial*

- Economics* 7 (2): 163–95.
- Loughran, Tim, and Jay R Ritter. 1995. “The New Issues Puzzle.” *The Journal of Finance* 50 (1): 23–51.
- Michaeli, Roni, Richard H Thaler, and Kent L Womack. 1995. “Price Reactions to Dividend Initiations and Omissions: Overreaction or Drift?” *The Journal of Finance* 50 (2): 573–608.
- Ou, Jane A, and Stephen H Penman. 1989. “Financial Statement Analysis and the Prediction of Stock Returns.” *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 11 (4): 295–329.
- Sloan, Richard G. 1996. “Do Stock Prices Fully Reflect Information in Accruals and Cash Flows about Future Earnings?” *Accounting Review*, 289–315.
- Womack, Kent L. 1996. “Do Brokerage Analysts’ Recommendations Have Investment Value?” *The Journal of Finance* 51 (1): 137–67.