INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT

IJRCM

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed (Refereed/Juried) Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

Indexed & Listed at:

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, ProQuest, U.S.A., EBSCO Publishing, U.S.A., Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A.,
Open J-Gage, India [link of the same is duly available at Inflibnet of University Grants Commission (U.G.C.)],
The American Economic Association's electronic bibliography, EconLit, U.S.A.,
Index Copernicus Publishers Panel, Poland with IC Value of 5.09 & number of libraries all around the world.

Circulated all over the world & Google has verified that scholars of more than 4255 Cities in 176 countries/territories are visiting our journal on regular basis.

Ground Floor, Building No. 1041-C-1, Devi Bhawan Bazar, JAGADHRI – 135 003, Yamunanagar, Haryana, INDIA

http://ijrcm.org.in/

CONTENTS

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to recent developments & practices in the areas of Computer Science & Applications; Commerce; Business; Finance; Marketing; Human Resource Management; General Management; Banking; Economics; Tourism Administration & Management; Education; Law; Library & Information Science; Defence & Strategic Studies; Electronic Science; Corporate Governance; Industrial Relations; and emerging paradigms in allied subjects like Accounting; Accounting Information Systems; Accounting Theory & Practice; Auditing; Behavioral Accounting; Behavioral Economics; Corporate Finance; Cost Accounting; Econometrics; Economic Development; Economic History; Financial Institutions & Markets; Financial Services; Fiscal Policy; Government & Non Profit Accounting; Industrial Organization; International Economics & Trade; International Finance; Macro Economics; Micro Economics; Rural Economics; Co-operation; Demography: Development Planning; Development Studies; Applied Economics; Development Economics; Business Economics; Monetary Policy; Public Policy Economics; Real Estate; Regional Economics; Political Science; Continuing Education; Labour Welfare; Philosophy; Psychology; Sociology; Tax Accounting; Advertising & Promotion Management; Management Information Systems (MIS); Business Law; Public Responsibility & Ethics; Communication; Direct Marketing; E-Commerce; Global Business; Health Care Administration; Labour Relations & Human Resource Management; Marketing Research; Marketing Theory & Applications; Non-Profit Organizations; Office Administration/Management; Operations Research/Statistics; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Organizational Development; Production/Operations; International Relations; Human Rights & Duties; Public Administration; Population Studies; Purchasing/Materials Management; Retailing; Sales/Selling; Services; Small Business Entrepreneurship; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation; Tourism & Hospitality; Transportation Distribution; Algorithms; Artificial Intelligence; Compilers & Translation; Computer Aided Design (CAD); Computer Aided Manufacturing; Computer Graphics; Computer Organization & Architecture; Database Structures & Systems; Discrete Structures; Internet; Management Information Systems; Modeling & Simulation; Neural Systems/Neural Networks; Numerical Analysis/Scientific Computing; Object Oriented Programming; Operating Systems; Programming Languages; Robotics; Symbolic & Formal Logic; Web Design and emerging paradigms in allied subjects.

Anybody can submit the **soft copy** of unpublished novel; original; empirical and high quality **research work/manuscript** ***anytime*** in ***M.S. Word format*** after preparing the same as per our **GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION**; at our email address i.e. infoijrcm@gmail.com or online by clicking the link **online submission** as given on our website (***FOR ONLINE SUBMISSION, CLICK HERE***).

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT

1. **COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION:**

DATED: _____

THE EDITOR

IJRCM

Subject: **SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT IN THE AREA OF _____.**

(e.g. Finance/Mkt./HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, please specify)

DEAR SIR/MADAM

Please find my submission of manuscript entitled '_____' for possible publication in one of your journals.

I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore, it has neither been published elsewhere in any language fully or partly, nor is it under review for publication elsewhere.

I affirm that all the co-authors of this manuscript have seen the submitted version of the manuscript and have agreed to their inclusion of names as co-authors.

Also, if my/our manuscript is accepted, I agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of the journal. The Journal has discretion to publish our contribution in any of its journals.

NAME OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR	:
Designation	:
Institution/College/University with full address & Pin Code	:
Residential address with Pin Code	:
Mobile Number (s) with country ISD code	:
Is WhatsApp or Viber active on your above noted Mobile Number (Yes/No)	:
Landline Number (s) with country ISD code	:
E-mail Address	:
Alternate E-mail Address	:
Nationality	:

NOTES:

a) The whole manuscript has to be in ***ONE MS WORD FILE*** only, which will start from the covering letter, inside the manuscript. ***pdf. version is liable to be rejected without any consideration***.

b) The sender is required to mention the following in the **SUBJECT COLUMN of the mail**:

New Manuscript for Review in the area of (e.g. Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, please specify)

c) There is no need to give any text in the body of mail, except the cases where the author wishes to give any **specific message** w.r.t. to the manuscript.

d) The total size of the file containing the manuscript is expected to be below **1000 KB**.

e) **Abstract alone will not be considered for review** and the author is required to submit the **complete manuscript** in the first instance.

f) ***The journal gives acknowledgement w.r.t. the receipt of every email within twenty four hours*** and in case of non-receipt of acknowledgment from the journal, w.r.t. the submission of manuscript, within two days of submission, the corresponding author is required to demand for the same by sending a separate mail to the journal.

g) The author (s) name or details should not appear anywhere on the body of the manuscript, except the covering letter and the cover page of the manuscript, in the manner as mentioned in the guidelines.

2. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE: The title of the paper should be **bold typed**, **centered** and **fully capitalised**.

3. **AUTHOR NAME (S) & AFFILIATIONS: Author (s) **name**, **designation**, **affiliation** (s), **address**, **mobile/landline number** (s), and **email/alternate email address** should be given underneath the title.

4. **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: Acknowledgements can be given to reviewers, guides, funding institutions, etc., if any.

5. **ABSTRACT: Abstract should be in **fully italicized text**, ranging between **150** to **300 words**. The abstract must be informative and explain the background, aims, methods, results & conclusion in a **SINGLE PARA**. ***Abbreviations must be mentioned in full***.

6. **KEYWORDS: Abstract must be followed by a list of keywords, subject to the maximum of **five**. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stop at the end. All words of the keywords, including the first one should be in small letters, except special words e.g. name of the Countries, abbreviations.

7. **JEL CODE: Provide the appropriate Journal of Economic Literature Classification System code (s). JEL codes are available at www.aeaweb.org/econlit/jelCodes.php, however, mentioning JEL Code is not mandatory.

8. **MANUSCRIPT: Manuscript must be in ***BRITISH ENGLISH*** prepared on a standard A4 size ***PORTRAIT SETTING PAPER***. *It should be free from any errors i.e. **grammatical, spelling** or **punctuation.** It must be thoroughly edited at your end*.

9. **HEADINGS: All the headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.

10. **SUB-HEADINGS: All the sub-headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.

11. **MAIN TEXT**:

THE MAIN TEXT SHOULD FOLLOW THE FOLLOWING SEQUENCE:

INTRODUCTION
REVIEW OF LITERATURE
NEED/IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
OBJECTIVES
HYPOTHESIS (ES)
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
RESULTS & DISCUSSION
FINDINGS
RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS
CONCLUSIONS
LIMITATIONS
SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH
REFERENCES
APPENDIX/ANNEXURE

The manuscript should preferably range from ***2000 to 5000 WORDS***.

12. **FIGURES & TABLES:** These should be simple, crystal **CLEAR**, **centered**, **separately numbered** & self explained, and **titles must be above the table/figure**. **Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure**. *It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text*.

13. **EQUATIONS/FORMULAE:** These should be consecutively numbered in parenthesis, horizontally centered with equation/formulae number placed at the right. The equation editor provided with standard versions of Microsoft Word should be utilised. If any other equation editor is utilised, author must confirm that these equations may be viewed and edited in versions of Microsoft Office that does not have the editor.

14. **ACRONYMS:** These should not be used in the abstract. The use of acronyms is elsewhere is acceptable. Acronyms should be defined on its first use in each section: Reserve Bank of India (RBI). Acronyms should be redefined on first use in subsequent sections.

15. **REFERENCES:** The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. ***The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript*** and they are supposed to follow Harvard Style of Referencing. **Also check to make sure that everything that you are including in the reference section is duly cited in the paper**. The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per the following:

- All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.
- Use (**ed.**) for one editor, and (**ed.s)** for multiple editors.
- When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc, in chronologically ascending order.
- Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.
- The title of books and journals should be in italics. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.
- For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parenthesis.
- ***Headers, footers, endnotes*** *and* ***footnotes*** *should* ***not be used*** *in the document.* However, **you can mention short notes to elucidate some specific point**, which may be placed in number orders after the references.

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:

BOOKS

- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.
- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio" Ohio State University, Nigeria.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS

- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

JOURNAL AND OTHER ARTICLES

- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

CONFERENCE PAPERS

- Garg, Sambhav (2011): "Business Ethics" Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19–23

UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS

- Kumar S. (2011): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

ONLINE RESOURCES

- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

WEBSITES

- Garg, Bhavet (2011): Towards a New Gas Policy, Political Weekly, Viewed on January 01, 2012 http://epw.in/user/viewabstract.jsp

EXISTENCE OF JANUARY EFFECT: AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION ON INDIAN STOCK MARKET

PRAGYAN PARIMITA SARANGI
ASST. PROFESSOR
BHAVAN'S CENTER FOR COMMUNICATION & MANAGEMENT
KHARAVELANAGAR

DR. N. C. KAR
PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
UTKAL UNIVERSITY
VANI VIHAR

DR. MUNMUN MOHANTY
PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
REVENSHAW UNIVERSITY
CUTTACK

ABSTRACT

A January effect, the subject of the study, is an external factor which explains the price abnormality. By the end of year, most investors sell stocks which show low performance. With the New Year, investors repurchase these stocks to their portfolio at a cheap price. This demand on stocks in the first month of the year increases the prices of stocks. There are several studies which shall confirm this assumption in the literature. The common feature of these studies is that incomes in January return more than December and the relevance is significant statistically. Three important reasons are argued which can explain this phenomenon. The first reason is that in January, investors want to repurchase their stocks at a cheap price which they sold in December in order to decrease tax losses. Therefore, investors sell their stocks in December in order to avoid tax. The second reason is that portfolio managers want to sell their stocks with low performance in order to ameliorate their portfolio. The portfolio manager wants to increase the portfolio performance by carrying out this transaction. The third reason is that portfolio managers aim at stock certificates of more small-sized companies by selling certain stocks and that they want to make profit over the value which they use as a criterion. On the other hand, there are also studies with different approaches about the availability of January effect in literature. In the study, whether January Effect is available has been analyzed by being examined using observations of 15 years, from 1998 to 2013, of the two major indices reported by National Stock Exchange (NSE), i.e. Standard & Poor's (S & P) Nifty and CNX Nifty Junior. The January effect is examined by using Friedman's sum rank test, Mann-Whitney U-test and dummy variable regression analysis, which are tests for seasonality.

KEYWORDS

Seasonality, Dummy variable regression, Mann-Whitney *U*-test, Weekend effect.

THE JANUARY EFFECT

The January effect is a calendar related anomaly in the financial market where the stock prices increases in the month of January. This creates an opportunity for the investors to buy stocks for lower prices before January and sell them after their value increases and gain profit, thus proving the market inefficiency. This phenomenon was first observed in 1942, by investment banker Sidney B.Wachtel. The occurrence of this is attributed to the fact that there is considerable selling of their stock holding to claim capital losses which would benefit them for tax purposes. As the calendar year rolls over, the investors plough this amount back into the market which in turn pushes the price up. This phenomenon occurs between the last trading day in December of the previous year and the fifth trading day of the New Year in January.

Statistics on the returns generated in Sensex between the last trading day in December of the previous year and the fifth trading day of the New Year in January. Out of 11 instances (since 2000 -2010), only 2 instances have seen negative returns and they have been marginal, however, on the other 9 instances, one has clocked profits, on some such occasions, the returns have been significant too.

Year	Returns
2000	7.02%
2001	5.33%
2002	3.48%
2003	-0.58%
2004	3.43%
2005	-2.08%
2006	2.34%
2007	0.53%
2008	1.97%
2009	6.51%
2010	1.64%

A second reasoning is that the January effect is related to institutional trading behavior around the turn of the years. It has been noted, for example, that the ratio of buys to sells for institutions drops significantly below average in the day before the turn of the year and picks to above average in the months that follow. Another important behavioural aspect has been observed is due to Christmas and holiday season. Since it is festival and holiday time in the western countries people need money for spending. Hence they go for wide-spread selling. This causes the stock prices to tumble just before the festive season i.e early and mid-December. The same investors will again come back in January for putting fresh money and starting again, hence the January effect predominates.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A considerable body of researchers supports the view that January anomaly could be exploited to make abnormal returns. For instance, research studies of ***Gultekin and Gulltekin (1983), Lakonishok & Smidt (1984), Jagadeesh (1991)*** report seasonality in stock returns they further state that stock returns are abnormally high compared other months of the year.

The study by KEIM, Donald B., 1983, examines month-by-month, the empirical relation between abnormal returns and market value of NYSE and AMEX common stocks. Evidence is provided that daily abnormal return distributions in January have large means relative to the remaining eleven months, and that the relation between abnormal returns and size is *always* negative and more pronounced in January than in any other month even in years when, on average, large firms earn larger risk-adjusted returns than small firms. In particular, nearly fifty percent of the average magnitude of the 'size effect' over the period 1963–1979 is due to January abnormal returns. Further, more than fifty percent of the January premium is attributable to large abnormal returns during the first week of trading in the year, particularly on the first trading day.

The study conducted by ***LAKONISHOK, Josef and Seymour SMIDT, 1988*** uses 90 years of daily data on the Dow Jones Industrial Average to test for the existence of persistent seasonal patterns in the rates of return. Methodological issues regarding seasonality tests are considered. We find evidence of persistently anomalous returns around the turn of the week, around the turn of the month, around the turn of the year, and around holidays.

According to ***REINGANUM, Marc R.,(1983).*** Small firms experience large returns in January and exceptionally large returns during the first few trading days of January. The empirical tests indicate that the abnormally high returns witnessed at the very beginning of January appear to be consistent with tax-loss selling. However, tax-loss selling cannot explain the entire January seasonal effect. The small firms least likely to be sold for tax reasons (prior year 'winners') also exhibit large average January returns, although not unusually large returns during the first few days of January.

AGRAWAL, Anup and Kishore TANDON, 1994 examined five seasonal patterns in stock markets of eighteen countries: the weekend, turn-of-the-month, end-of-December, monthly and Friday-the-thirteenth effects. We find a daily seasonal in nearly all the countries, but a weekend effect in only nine countries. Interestingly, the daily seasonal largely disappeared in the 1980s. The last trading day of the month has large returns and low variance in most countries. Many countries have large December pre-holiday and inter-holiday returns. The January returns are large in most countries and a significant monthly seasonal exists in ten countries.

POTERBA, James M. and Scott J. WEISBENNER, 2001 studied that changes in the capital gains tax rules facing individual investors do not affect the incentives for "window dressing" by institutional investors, but they can affect the incentives for year-end tax-induced trading by individual investors. Empirical evidence for the 1963 to 1996 period suggests that when the tax law encouraged taxable investors who accrued losses early in the year to realize their losses before year-end, the correlation between early year losses and turn-of-the-year returns was weaker than when the law did not provide such an early realization incentive. These findings suggest that tax-loss trading contributes to turn-of-the-year return patterns."

CONSTANTINIDES, George M., (1984) in his study has stated that "the tax law confers upon the investor a timing option - to realize capital losses and defer capital gains. With the tax rate on long term gains and losses being about half the short term rate, the law provides a second timing option - to realize losses short term and gains long term, if at all. Our theory and simulation over the 1962–1977 period establish that taxable investors should realize long term gains in high variance stocks and repurchase stock in order to realize potential future losses short term. Tax trading does not explain the small-firm anomaly but predicts a seasonal pattern in trading volume which maps into a seasonal pattern in stock prices, the January anomaly, only if investors are irrational or ignorant of the price seasonality."

Study by ***ROLL, R., 1983*** reveals that stock returns for small and large firms reveals a pattern in that average returns are high in general and the average returns of small firms are invariably greater than the average returns of large firms. The pattern cannot be explained by data errors, listings, de-listings or outliers. Instead, it is closely associated with tax loss selling induced by negative returns over the previous year. Transaction costs and low liquidity probably prevent arbitrageurs from eliminating the return seasonality. The tradition of efficient markets is applied to provide arguments concerning the large average return difference between small and large firms. The presence of the seasonality creates a substantial econometric problem in measuring systematic risk and in testing risk/return relationships.

BHARDWAJ, Ravinder K. and Leroy D. BROOKS, (1992) in his study found that the January effect is primarily a low-share price effect and less so a market value effect. In the recent 1977–1986 period, after-transaction-cost raw and excess January returns are lower on low-price stocks than on high-price stocks. Failure of informed traders to eliminate significantly large before-transaction-cost excess January returns on low-price stocks is potentially explained by higher transaction costs and a bid-ask bias. At the least, the January anomaly found in prior tests is not persistent, and thereby, not likely to be exploitable by typical investors.

SULLIVAN, Ryan, Allan TIMMERMANN and Halbert WHITE, (2001) in his findings has stated that "Economics is primarily a non-experimental science. Typically, we cannot generate new data sets on which to test hypotheses independently of the data that may have led to a particular theory. The common practice of using the same data set to formulate and test hypotheses introduces data-mining biases that, if not accounted for, invalidate the assumptions underlying classical statistical inference. A striking example of a data-driven discovery is the presence of calendar effects in stock returns. There appears to be very substantial evidence of systematic abnormal stock returns related to the day of the week, the week of the month, the month of the year, the turn of the month, holidays, and so forth. However, this evidence has largely been considered without accounting for the intensive search preceding it. In this paper we use 100 years of daily data and a new bootstrap procedure that allows us to explicitly measure the distortions in statistical inference induced by data mining. We find that although nominal *p*-values for individual calendar rules are extremely significant, once evaluated in the context of the full universe from which such rules were drawn, calendar effects no longer remain significant."

RITTER, Jay R., (1988) states that the average returns on low-capitalization stocks are unusually high relative to those on large-capitalization stocks in early January, a phenomenon known as the turn-of-the year effect. This paper finds that the ratio of stock purchases to sales by individual investors displays a seasonal pattern, with individuals having a below-normal buy/sell ratio in late December and an above-normal ratio in early January. Year-to-year variation in the early January buy/sell ratio explains forty-six percent of the year-to-year variation in the turn-of-the-year effect during 1971-1985.

The issue of the seasonality of stock returns has been investigated in many developed countries. The existence of seasonal effect has been found in Australia (Officer, 1975 ; Brown ,Keim, Kleidon and Marsh ,1983), UK (Lewis ,1989), Canada(Berges Mc Connel, and Schlarbaum ,1984; Tinic, Barone-Adesi and West, (1990and Japan (Aggarwal, Rao & Hiraki,1990). Boudreaux (1995) reported the presence of month-end effect in markets in Denmark, Germany & Norway. In a study of 17 industrial countries with different tax laws, Gultekin & Gultekin (1983) confirmed the January effect. ***Jaffe& Westerfield (1989)*** found a weak monthly effect in stock returns of many countries.

I M Pandey studied the seasonality in the Sensex monthly returns. The study used the monthly data of the BSE's sensitivity index for the period April 1991 to March 2002 and used autoregressive moving average model with dummy variable for the analysis. The results of the study confirm the monthly effect in stock returns in India and also supported the 'tax-loss selling' hypothesis.

Mask Haug & Mask Hirschey (2006) studied whether the January effect for small-cap stocks persisted after passage of the tax reform Act 1980. They found that a persistent January effect for small-cap stocks in equal – weighted returns, even during the period of tax reforms.

Dr. Rengaswamy Elango & Dr. Dayanand Pandey examined the presence of January anomaly for five most important indices of NSE for a period from 1999 to 2007. K-W Test, Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test, dummy variable regression and Friedman **Anova** tests were used for the analysis of the data. The analytical results indicated the presence of January effect in S&P CNX Nifty which is the benchmark index of the NSE.

Sah (2008) studies seasonality in S&P CNX Nifty, investigating both the day of the week effect and the month of the year effect, finding evidence for a Friday effect and market anomalies for July, September, December & January.

Elango and Pandey (2008) studied the Month-of-the-year effect in NSE, finding the presence of a January anomaly, with March and April having significant negative returns, and November & December showing significant positive returns.

Patel (2008) also studied calendar effects in monthly returns in Indian stock markets, finding two distinct effects: A November-December were significantly higher than those in the other ten months, and a March-to May effect, in which mean returns for the months March to May were significantly lower than those during other nine months; and they showed that these effects were independent of each other.

Ben Mrad Douagi Fatma Wyeme and Chaouachi Olfa investigated the existence of the month of the year effect in daily market returns in Tunis stock exchange (TSE) over a period of January 2, 2003 to December 31, 2008. The study proved the of month of the year effect, specially an April effect in which the mean daily market returns were significantly higher in April than the rest of the year.

A few studies have revealed the presence of seasonal effect of stock returns for the ECMs (emerging capital markets). ***Ramcharan (1997)*** however rejected the seasonal effect for the stock market in Jamaica. A few studies also urge that January anomaly of low price stocks out performing high-price stocks can't be used to earn abnormal returns (Bhardwaj & Brooks (1992), Mills and Coutts (1995), Draper and Paudyal (1997), Booth and Keim (2000). They state that given prohibitive transaction costs lower bid-ask spread and commission, the suggested excess profit disappears. So they argue that January anomaly cannot economically be exploited. Kiran Meheta and Ramesh Chander re-examined the January effect in two major indices of BSE i:e BSE Sensex and BSE 500, for a period from July 1997 to December 2007. The results obtained discarded the possibility of the January effect in Indian capital market.

An **alternative explanation of the January effect**, proposed by ***Haugen and Lakonishok (1988)*** is institutional investor window dressing, which refers to actions by portfolio managers in which they sell losing issues before a period ends in order to avoid revealing that they have held poorly performing stocks. Evidence consistent with the window – dressing hypothesis has been found in markets for instruments held primarily by institutional investors. For example, ***Musto (1997)*** finds a turn-of-the-year effect among money market instruments, which do not generate capital losses i.e. tax effects. He concludes that at least some of the January effect in the equity market represents window-dressing by portfolio managers, and not tax-loss selling.

Maxwell (1998) concludes that window dressing is a significant factor for the January effect in non investment grade bonds. Because many of the predictions of the window dressing and tax-loss selling hypothesis are the same, it is difficult to determine which, if either drives the January effect.

Sias & Starks (1997) and Poterba and Weisbenner (2001) designed controlled tests to disentangle and evaluate the two hypothesis in the equity, market. Both studies find evidence more consistent with the tax-loss-selling hypothesis. However, the inability to identify institutional trades from individual trades or tax motivated trades from other trades makes their results suggestive, but incomplete as neither study is able to completely control for the potential existence of the window-dressing hypothesis.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To empirically examine the presence January effect in S&P CNX Nifty returns.
2. To empirically examine the presence of January effect in S&P CNX Nifty Junior returns.
3. To assess whether January effect strategy can be followed to exploit the market by the investors.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study considers the daily indices as reported by NSE. NSE has market capitalization of around US$1.65 trillion an over 1646 listings as of January 2015. The NSE's key index is the S&P CNX Nifty, known as the NSE Nifty (national stock exchange fifty), an index of fifty major stocks weighted by market capitalization. This study considers the daily indices reported by NSE.

INDICES STUDIED UPON

This study considers the daily indices reported by NSE. This study makes an attempt to examine the presence of January effect, if any in one of the most active stock exchanges in India, the NSE, hence, S&P CNX Nifty and CNX Nifty junior was chosen for the study. The S&P CNX Nifty is a well diversified 50 stock index accounting for 22 sectors of the economy. The S&P Nifty junior has in it, the next 50 large liquid growth stocks in India. So these two indices make up the 100 most liquid stocks traded in NSE.

COLLECTION OF DATA

The data comprise daily closing prices of the national stock exchange (NSE) from 1.1.1998 to 31.12.2013 covering a period of about fifteen years. The required data has been downloaded from NSE website www.nseindia.com and yahoo finance.

The indices included for the study along with the period covered are given below:

Sl. No.	Index	Period	No. of Observations
1.	S&P CNX NIFTY	1.1.1998 to 31.12.2013	4002
2.	CNX NIFTY JUNIOR	1.1.1998 to 31.12.2013	4002

The Indian stock exchanges, opens on Monday and close on Fridays. For this present study we have taken into consideration all the working days. All the data points where returns are zero have been eliminated. The various hypothesis tested have been listed below. Both the non-parametric and parametric tests have been adopted for the study.

METHODOLOGY FOR DATA CALCULATION

TESTING OF HYPOTHESIS

In order to examine the presence of the January effect, the following null hypothesis has been tested:

Hypothesis (Ho): $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = a_4 = a_5 = a_6 = a_7 = a_8 = a_9 = a_{10} = a_{11} = a_{12}$

Here a_1, a_2 represents mean returns of different months of the year. The null hypothesis implies that there is no significant difference in mean returns across the different months in a year.

Hypothesis (Ho): **Each a_i is tested for significance (difference from zero)**

If this hypothesis is rejected, it would imply that the yearly average returns a_i is significantly different from each other, i.e. there is seasonality in returns across the months.

1. COMPUTATION OF MONTHLY RETURNS

First of all the daily returns on NSE index were computed using the first differences of the logarithmic price index. This approach of logarithmic transformation of the time series data was first suggested by Osborne (1959). The argument put forth is that lognormal returns tends to follow the normal distribution more closely than arithmetic returns (Lauterbach and Ungar (1995)).

The returns are calculated as:

$$R_t = \left[\ln\left(\frac{P_t}{P_{t-1}} \right) \right] \times 100$$

Where,

Rt is the daily return from the index

P is the price index,

P_t represents the current closing index price of the day.

$P_{(t-1)}$ represents the immediate preceding index price.

Followed by this, the mean return for each month is computed by applying simple arithmetic mean.

$$R_m=\sum \frac{Rt_1+Rt_2+Rt_3.....Rt_n}{N}$$

Where,
Rm= Mean return percent from the index for the respective month.
Rt_1 to Rt_n= The daily mean return percentages from the price index for the month.
N= Number of observations during the month.

2. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Parametric tests like mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis have been applied to study the distribution pattern of the monthly returns across the year.

3. TESTS FOR SEASONALITY

Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney (U) test

Non-parametric methods have been employed to test the seasonality because of their robustness arising from lack of restrictive assumptions such as population normality and homoscedastic variance. Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney (U) pair-wise test has been applied to capture the January effect. This test examines if the average January return is different and statistically significant from returns generated from each of the other remaining eleven months of the year, based on ranking differences in pair-wise observations

The Mann-Whitney "U" is then given by:

$$U=\frac{N_1(N_1+1)}{2}-R_1$$

Where n_1 is the two sample size for sample 1, and R1 is the sum of the ranks in sample 1.

Friedman Rank sum test

This is a non-parametric test equivalent of one-way ANOVA which identifies skewness or seasonality of distribution. We perform a Friedman test when we have one within-subjects independent variable with two or more levels and a dependent variable that is not interval and normally distributed (but at least ordinal).

Dummy variable Regression Model

To examine the weekend effect and days of the week effect, the following dummy variable regression model is specified as follows:

$$\mathbf{R_t = \beta_1 d_1 + \beta_2 d_2 + \beta_3 d_3 + \beta_4 d_4 + \beta_5 d_5 + \beta_6 d_6 + \beta_7 d_7 + \beta_8 d_8 + \beta_9 d_9 + \beta_{10} d_{10} + \beta_{11} d_{11} + \beta_{12} d_{12} e_t}$$

Where,
R_t is the return on month t,
d_1 =dummy variable equal to 1 if t is January otherwise 0.
d2= dummy variable equal to 1 if t is February otherwise 0.
d3= dummy variable equal to 1 if t is March otherwise 0.
d4= dummy variable equal to 1 if t is April otherwise 0.
d5= dummy variable equal to 1 if t is May otherwise 0.
d6= dummy variable equal to 1 if t is June otherwise 0.
d7= dummy variable equal to 1 if t is July otherwise 0.
d8= dummy variable equal to 1 if t is August otherwise 0.
d9= dummy variable equal to 1 if t is September otherwise 0.
d10= dummy variable equal to 1 if t is October otherwise 0.
d11= dummy variable equal to 1 if t is November otherwise 0.
d12= dummy variable equal to 1 if t is December otherwise 0.
e_t is the random error term for day t.

The intercepts, β1.....β12, represent the average deviation of each day from January return. Thus, if the daily returns are equal, one expects the dummy variable coefficients to be statistically close to zero. So, the coefficients of the regression are the mean returns obtained from January to December, applying the ordinary least square.

DATA PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

The calculated returns are put to find out the descriptive statistics. The descriptive statistics calculates the mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis which reveals the nature of the data and quantifies the main features of the taken data. It helps to describe, and summarize data in a meaningful way such that a particular pattern might emerge from the data.

TABLE 1:DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Month	Value	S&P CNX Nifty	NIFTY JUNIOR
January	Obsv.	15	15
	Mean	-0.04006	-0.03230
	St.dev.	0.3840	0.43159
	Skewness	-0.3504	-0.10674
	Kurtosis	-0.6664	-0.04364
February	Obsv.	15	15
	Mean	0.03941	-0.00956
	St.dev.	0.24171	0.31637
	Skewness	-0.1861	-0.02376
	Kurtosis	0.2564	-0.64674
March	Obsv.	15	15
	Mean	-0.0097	-0.05619
	St.dev.	0.38191	0.59371
	Skewness	-0.4418	-1.11278
	Kurtosis	-0.6789	0.38619
April	Obsv.	15	15
	Mean	0.02869	0.11313
	St.dev.	0.34589	0.63610
	Skewness	0.51978	-0.03829
	Kurtosis	0.39655	2.37439
May	Obsv.	15	15
	Mean	-0.0071	0.03542
	St.dev.	0.52781	0.69740
	Skewness	0.6410	0.74110
	Kurtosis	0.9261	1.41103
June	Obsv.	15	15
	Mean	0.0172	-0.07802
	St.dev.	0.3563	0.49989
	Skewness	-1.1907	-1.32165
	Kurtosis	1.8523	1.17974
July	Obsv.	15	15
	Mean	0.04901	0.12712
	St.dev.	0.2688	0.33507
	Skewness	-0.4702	-0.21066
	Kurtosis	-0.3615	-1.03603
August	Obsv.	15	15
	Mean	0.0515	0.0849
	St.dev.	0.2885	0.28077
	Skewness	0.1394	0.2947
	Kurtosis	0.49535	-0.0483
September	Obsv.	15	15
	Mean	0.10269	0.090347
	St.dev.	0.39391	0.49352
	Skewness	-0.85634	-1.01767
	Kurtosis	-0.34853	-0.39988
October	Obsv.	15	15
	Mean	-0.06703	-0.08719
	St.dev.	0.53605	0.5286
	Skewness	-1.2016	-2.0524
	Kurtosis	2.6812	5.5547
November	Obsv.	15	15
	Mean	0.15136	0.19958
	St.dev.	0.30590	0.41033
	Skewness	-0.51687	-0.67729
	Kurtosis	-0.5478	-0.47416
December	Obsv.	15	15
	Mean	0.1950	0.07221
	St.dev.	0.20898	0.0299
	Skewness	0.34526	-2.8907
	Kurtosis	1.1903	10.2560

INTERPRETATION OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Monthly pattern of the returns

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of monthly mean stock returns percentage and standard deviation of both the returns.

January, February, March and October yield negative returns

The possible reason for this could be that January, February and March are the months during which income tax are generally assessed and paid. Till February the individuals would have to normally pay 25% of their tax and the rest (75%) of the dues need to be settled before the end of the assessment year. To generate the required amount to settle their tax dues, investors start selling their scrips. This could possibly create a bearish trend tending the share prices to come down and the same is closely related to the tax-loss selling hypothesis. Hence this would offer the investors an excellent opportunity to buy stocks during these months. In April investors may again start buying the shares, so it puts an upward pressure that provides higher returns in April.

November and December witnessed reasonably high returns

The mean returns of November and December in both the indices show higher returns. Therefore, if the investors want to sell their holdings these two months could be considered as the best period.

In case of CNX Nifty the month of December is least volatile with a standard deviation of 0.20898 and the highest volatility is seen in the month of May with a standard deviation of 0.52781.Nifty junior also reports highest volatility in the month of may (0.69740) and least volatility in August (0.2807). Most of the months in both the indices are negatively skewed which for investors can mean a greater chance of negative outcomes.

TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF THE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS RESULTS

STOCK INDICES	S&P CNX NIFTY	CNX NIFTY JUNIOR
Highest Mean Returns	November, December	December, November
Lowest mean returns	March, October	February, March
Highest volatile months	May, October	May, December
Least volatile months	December, February	August, February

Tests for Seasonality

To test the presence of January effect, the test for seasonality has to be done. Non-parametric tests i:e Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney U-Test, Dummy Variable Regression Model and ANOVA have been used for this study.

TABLE 3: REGRESSION MODEL (ANOVA) FOR S&P CNX NIFTY

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14061.502	12	1171.792	.734	.699[a]
	Residual	4786.512	3	1595.504		
	Total	18848.015	15			
R Value	*0.864*		*R Sqaure*	*0.746*	*P-value*	*0.699*

TABLE 4: REGRESSION MODEL (ANOVA) FOR NIFTY JUNIOR

REGRESSION STATISTICS					
Multiple R	0.9803				
R Square	*0.9610*				
Adjusted R Square	0.4936				
Standard Error	0.0993				
Observations	12				
ANOVA					
	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*Significance F*
Regression	11	0.243	0.022	2.209	0.501
Residual	1	0.010	0.010		
Total	12	0.253			

INTERPRETATION OF ANOVA

The Table 3 and 4 shows that the calculated value of F test statistic for both the indices both the F values 0.734 and 2.209 are less than the critical value; hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. The above table shows that since the significant level is greater than 0.05, hence, the relationship between the dependent and independent variables are highly insignificant. This infers that the daily returns of the indices are independent of the trading months, evidencing the absence of January effect.

TABLE 5: RESULTS OF WILCOXON MANN-WHITNEY TEST

Return Pair	S & P CNX Nifty		S & P CNX Nifty Jr.	
Feb - Jan	Z	-1.448	Z	.000
	P Value	.148	P Value	1.000
Mar - Jan	Z	-.982	Z	-.170
	P Value	.326	P Value	.865
Apr - Jan	Z	-.052	Z	-.398
	P Value	.959	P Value	.691
May - Jan	Z	-.207	Z	-.227
	P Value	.836	P Value	.820
Jun - Jan	Z	-.310	Z	-.170
	P Value	.756	P Value	.865
Jul - Jan	Z	-.414	Z	-1.420
	P Value	.679	P Value	.156
Aug - Jan	Z	-.827	Z	-2.045
	P Value	.408	P Value	.041
Sept - Jan	Z	-.052	Z	-.738
	P Value	.959	P Value	.460
Oct - Jan	Z	-.776	Z	-.227
	P Value	.438	P Value	.820
Nov - Jan	Z	-1.293	Z	-1.761
	P Value	.196	P Value	.078
Dec - Jan	Z	-1.655	Z	-1.761
	P Value	.098	P Value	.078

ANALYSIS OF *U* TEST

The size of the *P*-value for a coefficient says nothing about the size of the effect that variable is having on the dependent variable, i.e. on the return. The higher the *P*-value, the less we can believe that the observed relation between variables in the sample is a reliable indicator of the relation between the respective variables in the population. The higher the percentage of *P*-value, higher will be the chances of no relation between the independent variable and the return. A *P*-value of 0.05 (i.e. 1/20) indicates that there is a 5% probability that there will be no relation between the variables, which means there will be 95% chance that variables are having relation.

The findings of the above Table 5 show that every *P*-value is positive for both the CNX nifty and CNX nifty junior. In statistical significance testing, the *P*-value is the probability of obtaining a test statistic at least as extreme as the one that was actually observed, assuming that the null hypothesis is true. One often 'rejects the null hypothesis' when the *P*-value is less than 0.05 or 0.01, corresponding respectively to a 5 or 1% chance of rejecting the null hypothesis when it is true.

Results those are significant at the $P \leq 0.01$ level are commonly considered statistically significant. The p-values are greater than 0.05 for both the indices showing that the null hypothesis is accepted.

All the *Z*-values are negative for both the indices, just the reverse of *P*-values. Roger Mundry and Julia Fischer have done a *U*-test using *Z*-values. They have found that the critical value of *Z* is 1.96 and if the value of *Z* exceeds the critical value then we can say that null hypothesis is rejected.

Our result shows that every *Z*-value is way below the critical value 1.96 at a standard significance level of 5%. Though, in our result, all the significance levels are different, but we can safely say that the *Z*-value will not go beyond 1.96, showing that our null hypothesis is accepted and there is no dependency among variables. From the above test, one can safely conclude that there are no fluctuations when it comes to January return

TABLE 6: RESULTS OF DUMMY VARIABLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Month	Parameter	S&P CNX Nifty	CNX Nifty Jr
β_1 Jan (Intercept)	Coeff.	0.147	0.059
	Std. Error	1.767	0.099
	t-stat	0.083	0.598
	Prob.	0.939	0.657
β_2 Feb	Coeff.	1.142	-0.261
	Std. Error	3.022	0.532
	t-stat	0.378	-0.491
	Prob.	0.731	0.709
β_3 Mar	Coeff.	0.157	-0.508
	Std. Error	1.71	0.194
	t-stat	0.092	-2.612
	Prob.	0.933	0.233
β_4 Apr	Coeff.	-0.744	0.322
	Std. Error	2.475	0.149
	t-stat	-0.301	2.161
	Prob.	0.783	0.276
β_5 May	Coeff.	-1.907	0.030
	Std. Error	1.735	0.162
	t-stat	-1.099	0.184
	Prob.	0.352	0.884
β_6 Jun	Coeff.	-1.281	-0.091
	Std. Error	1.875	0.061
	t-stat	-0.683	-1.495
	Prob.	0.543	0.375
β_7 Jul	Coeff.	-0.768	0.166
	Std. Error	2.781	0.142
	t-stat	-0.276	1.168
	Prob.	0.8	0.451
β_8 Aug	Coeff.	0.836	0.339
	Std. Error	2.251	0.599
	t-stat	0.371	0.566
	Prob.	0.735	0.672
β_9 Sept	Coeff.	0.142	0.473
	Std. Error	2.436	0.384
	t-stat	0.058	1.232
	Prob.	0.957	0.434
β_{10} Oct	Coeff.	-1.066	-0.456
	Std. Error	1.558	0.224
	t-stat	-0.684	-2.032
	Prob.	0.543	0.291
β 11 Nov	Coef	0.784	-0.049
	Std.Err	2.059	0.101
	t-stat	0.381	-0.482
	Prob	0.729	0.714
β_{12} Dec	Coef	2.679	0.189
	Std.Err	2.804	0.222
	t-stat	0.955	0.852
	Prob	0.41	0.551
	R square	**0.746**	**0.963**

ANALYSIS OF THE DUMMY VARIABLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

The above table indicated that all the values of the t-stats are less than 2 for CNX Nifty and CNX Nifty junior, except on April for nifty junior. This denotes that the t-stats values coefficients are having no significant impact on the dependent variable, hence proving that there is no existence of the January effect. The probability values show that all the values are greater than 0.05 which indicated that the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant difference in the mean returns across the different months in a year.

The value of the R^2 signifies the proportion of variance in the dependent variable (i.e. return of the months), which can be explained by the independent variable (months of the year, i.e. January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October and December). This is an overall measure of the strength of association and does not reflect the extent to which any particular independent variable is associated with the dependent variable.

The R^2 values are 0.746 (74%) and 0.963 (96%) for the CNX NIFTY and CNX NIFTY JUNIOR, respectively, which denotes that in CNX NIFTY, 74% of the variation in the daily stock return is explained by the closest previous day's return and in case of CNX NIFTY JUNIOR, only 96% of the variation in the daily stock return is explained by the closest previous day's return. Since both the R square is very high, the previous month's stock price is a good predictor of the current month's stock price. Thus, the value of R square denotes that independent variable (months of the year) has a significant influence on the dependent variable (returns). But since, probability values are insignificant, it negates the presence of January effect.

TABLE 7: FRIEDMAN RANK SUM TEST

Nifty Junior		Nifty	
N	15	N	15
Chi-Square	18.846	Chi-Square	11.321
df	14	df	14
Asymp. Sig.	.064	Asymp. Sig.	.417

ANALYSIS TO FRIEDMAN RANK SUM TEST

The table 7 above shows that for both the indices the significant level is more than 0.05, hence, inferring that the dependent and independent variable are statistically insignificant, thus accepting the null hypothesis. In the table 8 of the results of Equality of Monthly Returns, also all the p-values of the different months for both the indices, are highly insignificant supporting the null hypothesis that there is no difference in the mean returns of the months of the year.

TABLE 8: RESULTS OF EQUALITY OF MONTHLY RETURNS

	Nifty Junior						Nifty					
Test Statistics	**Jan**	**Feb**	**Mar**	**Apr**	**May**	**Jun**	**Jan**	**Feb**	**Mar**	**Apr**	**May**	**Jun**
Mann-Whitney U	10.0	17.0	16.0	7.0	17.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	10.0	12.0	13.0	10.0
Wilcoxon W	25.0	32.0	44.0	35.0	45.0	23.0	52.0	14.0	16.0	57.0	58.0	16.0
Z	-1.218	-.081	-.244	-1.705	-.081	-1.543	-1.202	-1.017	-.647	-.277	-.092	-.647
P - Value	.223	.935	.808	.088	.935	.123	.229	.309	.518	.782	.926	.518
Test Statistics	**Jul**	**Aug**	**Sep**	**Oct**	**Nov**	**Dec**	**Jul**	**Aug**	**Sep**	**Oct**	**Nov**	**Dec**
Mann-Whitney U	17.0	8.0	14.0	9.0	6.0	13.0	7.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	10.0	9.0
Wilcoxon W	32.0	23.0	42.0	24.0	21.0	41.0	13.0	14.0	17.0	49.0	55.0	15.0
Z	-.081	-1.543	-.568	-1.380	-1.868	-.731	-1.202	-1.017	-.462	-1.757	-.647	-.832
P - Value	.935	.123	.570	.167	.062	.465	.229	.309	.644	.079	.518	.405

OBSERVATIONS FROM THE ANALYSIS ON THE EXISTENCE OF JANUARY EFFECT

The January effect is considered to be the most common calendar anomaly in equity markets. Several explanations have been put forward to justify its existence. Three of the most prominent among these theories are the tax-loss selling hypothesis (Wachtel, 1942), the window dressing hypothesis (Haugen and Lakonishok, 1988) and the information release hypothesis (Rozeff and Kinney, 1976). The tax-loss selling hypothesis suggests that investors wait until the tax-year end to sell poorly performing stocks in order to realize capital losses for tax purposes. Investors then buy stocks after the first of the year to re-establish their portfolios and this buying pressure creates the January effect. The window dressing hypothesis argues that at the end of the year, fund managers sell securities that have performed poorly during the year and replaced them with more liquid assets to ameliorate the impression of portfolio composition. These activities are reversed in January of the following year. The information release hypothesis assumes that January representing the beginning and end of many potentially important financial and informational events. Consequently, for those firms with year-end financial closing, the month of January represents a period of increased uncertainty and expectation, due to the release of potentially important information.

The above analysis showed that some of the months really play an important role in determining the investment strategy. Literature reviews have shown that there were signals of the presence of this seasonality till 2008. The regression results confirm that seasonal effect does not exist in stock returns in India. The study reveals that January, February & March have negative returns but can be the best months to buy the scrip and November & December show significant positive high returns which can be used to sell securities. Tax-loss selling hypothesis could be the possible explanation for the above phenomenon. Although the t-coefficient of December month did not report any significance but the presence of December effect can be tested over Indian stock market. The study also provides evidence that the market was not able to price the risk appropriately as higher returns were possible by taking less risk and this indicates market inefficiency.

REFERENCES

1. AGGARWAL, R. and P. RIVOLI, 1989. Seasonal and Day-of-the-Week Effects in Four Emerging Stock Markets. *The Financial Review.*[
2. AGRAWAL, Anup and Kishore TANDON, 1994. Anomalies or illusions? Evidence from stock markets in eighteen countries, *Journal of International Money and Finance*, Volume 13, Issue 1, February 1994, Pages 83-106.
3. ATHANASSAKOS, G. and J. SCHNABEL, 1994. Professional Portfolio Managers and the January Effect: Theory and Evidence. *Review of Financial Economics.*
4. BARRY, C.B. and S.J. BROWN, 1984. Differential information and the small firm effect. *Journal of Financial Economics.*
5. BERGES, A., J.J. MCCONNELL and G.G. SCHLARBAUM, 1984. The Turn-of-the-Year in Canada. *The Journal of Finance*, 39, March, 185-92.
6. BHABRA, H.S., U. DHILLON and G.G. RAMIREZ, 1999. A November Effect: Revisiting the Tax-Loss Selling Hypothesis. *papers.ssrn.com.*
7. BHARDWAJ, Ravinder K. and Leroy D. BROOKS, 1992. The January Anomaly: Effects of Low Share Price, Transaction Costs, and Bid-Ask Bias, *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 47, No. 2. (Jun., 1992), pp. 553-575.
8. CHEN, H. and V. SINGAL, 2003. The January Effect?A Reexamination.
9. CHEN, H. and V. SINGAL, 2001. What Drives the January Effect?
10. CHEUNG, K.C., 1999. The January effect and monthly seasonality in the Hang Seng index: 1985-97. *Applied Economics Letters.*
11. CHOUDHRY, T., 2001. Month of the year effect and January effect in pre-WWI stock returns: evidence from a non-linear .*International Journal of Finance & Economics.* [Cited by 3] (0.57/year)
12. CONSTANTINIDES, George M., 1984. Optimal stock trading with personal taxes: Implications for prices and the abnormal January returns, *Journal of Financial Economics*, Volume 13, Issue 1, March 1984, Pages 65-89.
13. COX, D.R., K. JOHNSTON and E. STRATEGIES, 1998. The January Effect Is Not Driven by Tax Loss Selling,(Digest Summary). *Journal of Investing.*
14. DYL, E.A. and E.D. MABERLY, 1992. Odd-Lot Transactions around the Turn of the Year and the January Effect. *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis.*
15. ECONOMICS, A.F., 2002. Emerging stock markets return seasonalities: the January effect and the tax-loss selling hypothesis. *Applied Financial Economics.*
16. GRIFFITHS, M.D. and D.B. WINTERS, 2004. The Turn of the Year in Money Markets: Tests of the Risk-Shifting Window Dressing and Preferred …. *Journal of Business.*
17. GRIFFITHS, M.D. and R.W. WHITE, 1993. Tax-Induced Trading and the Turn-of-the-Year Anomaly: An Intraday Study. *The Journal of Finance.*
18. GRIFFITHS, M.D. and D.B. WINTERS, 1997. On a Preferred Habitat for Liquidity at the Turn-of-the-Year: Evidence from the Term-Repo Market. *Journal of Financial Services Research.*
19. GU, A.Y., 2003. The declining January effect: evidences from the US equity markets. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance.*
20. GULTEKIN, Mustafa N. and N. Bulent GULTEKIN, (1983) Stock Market Seasonality: International Evidence, *Journal of Financial Economics*, Volume 12, Issue 4, December 1983, Pages 469-481.
21. HAUGEN, R.A. and P. JORION, 1996. The January Effect: Still There after All These Years. *Financial Analysts Journal.*
22. HAUGEN, R.A. and J. LAKONISHOK, 1987 or 1988?. The incredible January effect. Dow Jones-Irwin Homewood, Ill.
23. HAUGEN, R.A. and J. LAKONISHOK, 1988. The Incredible January Effect: The Stock Market's Unsolved Mystery. Dow Jones-Irwin.

24. JAFFE, J. and R. WESTERFIELD, 1985. Patterns in Japanese Common Stock Returns: Day of the Week and Turn of the Year Effects. *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis.*
25. JONES, C.P., D.K. PEARCE and J.W. WILSON, 1987. Can Tax-Loss Selling Explain the January Effect? A Note. *The Journal of Finance.*
26. JONES, S.L., W. LEE and R. APENBRINK, 1991. New Evidence on the January Effect Before Personal Income Taxes. *The Journal of Finance.* [Cited by 15] (0.98/year)
27. JONES, C.P. and J.W. WILSON, 1989. An Analysis of the January Effect in Stocks and Interest Rates Under Varying Monetary Regimes. *The Journal of Financial Research.*
28. KAMSTRA, M.J., L.A. KRAMER and M.D. LEVI, 2000. Winter blues: Seasonal affective disorder (SAD), the january effect, and stock market returns. *Faculty of Commerce, University of British Columbia Working*
29. KATO, K. and J.S. SCHALLHEIM, 1985. Seasonal and Size Anomalies in the Japanese Stock Market. *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 20, June, 107-18.
30. KEIM, Donald B., 1983. Size-related anomalies and stock return seasonality: Further empirical evidence, *Journal of Financial Economics*, Volume 12, Issue 1, June 1983, Pages 13-32.
31. KRAMER, C., 1994. Macroeconomic Seasonality and the January Effect. *The Journal of Finance.*
32. LAKONISHOK, Josef and Seymour SMIDT, 1988. Are seasonal anomalies real? A ninety-year perspective, The *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 4. (Winter, 1988), pp. 403-425.
33. LAKONISHOK, J. and S. SMIDT, 1984. Volume and Turn-of-the-Year Behavior. *Journal of Financial Economics.*
34. LAMOUREUX, C.G. and G.C. SANGER, 1989. Firm Size and Turn-of-the-Year Effects in the OTC/NASDAQ Market. *The Journal of Finance.*
35. LEE, C., D.C. PORTER and D.G. WEAVER, 1998. Indirect tests of the Haugen-Lakonishok small-firm/January effect hypotheses: window dressing versus .*The Financial Review.*
36. LIGON, J., 1997. A simultaneous test of competing theories regarding the January effect. *Journal of Financial Research.*
37. NG, L. and Q. WANG, 2003. Institutional Trading and the Turn-of-the-Year Effect. *Journal of Financial Economics.*
38. PEARCE, D.K., 1996. The Robustness of Calendar Anomalies in Daily Stock Returns. *Journal of Economics and Finance.*
39. POTERBA, James M. and Scott J. WEISBENNER, 2001. Capital Gains Tax Rules, Tax-Loss Trading, and Turn-of-the-Year Returns, *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 56, No. 1. (Feb., 2001), pp. 353-368.
40. RAJ, M., 1994. January or April? Tests of the turn-of-the-year effect in the New Zealand stock market. *Applied Economics Letters.*
41. REINGANUM, Marc R., 1983. The anomalous stock market behavior of small firms in January: Empirical tests for tax-loss selling effects, *Journal of Financial Economics*, Volume 12, Issue 1, June 1983, Pages 89-104.
42. RIEPE, M., 1998. Is Publicity Killing the January Effect?. *Journal of Financial Planning.*
43. RITTER, Jay R., 1988. The Buying and Selling Behavior of Individual Investors at the Turn of the Year, *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 43, No. 3, Papers and Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the American Finance Association, Chicago, Illinois, December 28-30, 1987. (Jul., 1988), pp. 701-717.
44. RITTER, J.R. and N. CHOPRA, 1989. Portfolio Rebalancing and the Turn-Of-The-Year Effect. *The Journal of Finance.*
45. ROLL, R., 1983. Vas ist das? The turn-of-the-year effect and the return premia of small firms, *Journal of Portfolio Management*, Winter, Vol. 9 Issue 2, pages 18-28.
46. SCHULTZ, P., 1985. Personal Income Taxes and the January Effect: Small Firm Stock Returns Before the War Revenue Act of …. *The Journal of Finance.*
47. SEYHUN, H.N., 1993. Can Omitted Risk Factors Explain the January Effect? A Stochastic Dominance Approach. *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis.*
48. SEYHUN, H.N., 1988. The January Effect and Aggregate Insider Trading. *The Journal of Finance.*
49. SULLIVAN, Ryan, Allan TIMMERMANN and Halbert WHITE, 2001. Dangers of data mining: the case of calendar effects in stock returns, *Journal of Econometrics*, Volume 105, Issue 1, November 2001, Pages 249-286.
50. SZAKMARY, A.C. and D.B. KIEFER, 2004. The Disappearing January/Turn of the Year Effect: Evidence From Stock Index Futures and Cash Markets. *Journal of Futures Markets.*
51. THALER, R.H., 1987. The January Effect. *Journal of Economic Perspectives.*
52. THALER, R.H., 1987. Amomalies: The January Effect. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Summer, 1987), pp. 197-201.
53. TINIC, S.M. and R.R. WEST, 1984. Risk and return: January vs. the rest of the year. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 13, 561-74.
54. TONG, W.H.S., 1992. An analysis of the January effect of united states, Taiwan and South Korean stock returns. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management.*
55. WACHTEL, Sidney B., 1942. Certain Observations on Seasonal Movements in Stock Prices, *The Journal of Business of the University of Chicago*, Vol. 15, No. 2. (Apr., 1942), pp. 184-193.

REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

Dear Readers

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Commerce & Management (IJRCM) acknowledges & appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to request you tosupply your critical comments and suggestions about the material published in this issue as well as on the journal as a whole, on our E-mail**infoijrcm@gmail.com** for further improvements in the interest of research.

If youhave any queries please feel free to contact us on our E-mail infoijrcm@gmail.com.

I am sure that your feedback and deliberations would make future issues better – a result of our joint effort.

Looking forward an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

Academically yours

Sd/-
Co-ordinator

DISCLAIMER

The information and opinions presented in the Journal reflect the views of the authors and not of the Journal or its Editorial Board or the Publishers/Editors. Publication does not constitute endorsement by the journal. Neither the Journal nor its publishers/Editors/Editorial Board nor anyone else involved in creating, producing or delivering the journal or the materials contained therein, assumes any liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information provided in the journal, nor shall they be liable for any direct, indirect, incidental, special, consequential or punitive damages arising out of the use of information/material contained in the journal. The journal, neither its publishers/Editors/ Editorial Board, nor any other party involved in the preparation of material contained in the journal represents or warrants that the information contained herein is in every respect accurate or complete, and they are not responsible for any errors or omissions or for the results obtained from the use of such material. Readers are encouraged to confirm the information contained herein with other sources. The responsibility of the contents and the opinions expressed in this journal are exclusively of the author (s) concerned.

ABOUT THE JOURNAL

In this age of Commerce, Economics, Computer, I.T. & Management and cut throat competition, a group of intellectuals felt the need to have some platform, where young and budding managers and academicians could express their views and discuss the problems among their peers. This journal was conceived with this noble intention in view. This journal has been introduced to give an opportunity for expressing refined and innovative ideas in this field. It is our humble endeavour to provide a springboard to the upcoming specialists and give a chance to know about the latest in the sphere of research and knowledge. We have taken a small step and we hope that with the active co-operation of like-minded scholars, we shall be able to serve the society with our humble efforts.

Our Other Journals