Journal of Behavioral Finance ›
Volume 12, 2011 - Issue 3

1,352 Views | 28 CrossRef citations to date | 11 Altmetric

ARTICLES

Investor Optimism, False Hopes and the January Effect

Stephen J. Ciccone

Pages 158-168 | Published online: 31 Aug 2011

Cite this article https://doi.org/10.1080/15427560.2011.602197

Sample our Behavioral Sciences Journals
>> Sign in here to start your access to the latest two volumes for 14 days

Abstract

This paper proposes that the January Effect is at least partly explained by a behavioral framework based on optimistic expectations. The turn-of-the-year is hypothesized to be a time of renewed optimism. Indeed, investor sentiment, as measured by the University of Michigan's Index of Consumer Confidence, peaks in January. Thus, optimists are expected to bid up the stock prices of firms with higher levels of uncertainty in January. These firms will subsequently underperform as they disappoint investors during the remaind sists due to the "fals ecast dispersi ism hypo

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our Privacy Policy

Accept All
Essential Only
Settings

Keywor

Notes

1. A telephone survey conducted by Opinion Research Corporation in 2006 found that more than 80% of U.S. adults responding to the survey made a New Year's resolution sometime within the previous five years. Only 15% of those surveyed never make resolutions. Harris Interactive Healthcare Surveys found that 44% of U.S. adults made health-related New Year's resolutions in 2007 and 48% made such resolutions in 2006. The success rate of the more difficult resolutions was low. For example, in 2006 only 34% of those resolving to lose weight reported success in meeting that goal. Financial goals are popular resolutions. In another survey conducted by Opinion Research Corporation in 2009, the most common resolutions for 2009 were money-related as opposed to the more traditional health-related ones. Of those making resolutions, 59% said they would start or build retirement savings, and 47% said they would start or build an investment portfolio.

2. For some recent evidence, Chen and Singal [2004] explore a variety of causes but only find support for tax loss selling. They contend window dressing is unimportant because returns in the months surrounding midyear reporting dates (June and July) are not unusual. However, Haug and Hirschey [2006] discount the value of tax loss selling by finding the January Effect still exists for small firms despite passage of the Tax Reform Act of 1986, which changed the tax period but not the reporting period. Other theories include arguments related to market microstructure (e.g., Keim [1989]), liquidity increases (Ogden [1990]), and information uncertainty risk (e.g., Kim [2006]).

3. The unadjusted file is used to avoid rounding issues related to stock splits (see Diether, Malloy, and Scherbina [2002]). While dispersion has been used or indicated as a proxy for disparity of opinion or financial distress (e.g., Diether, Malloy, and Scherbina [2002], Avramov, Chordia, Jostova, and Philipov [2009]), these other possible proxies are just [illegible]nesis. For example[illegible]uary.

4. Two [illegible]persion and optim[illegible]d Wysocki [2004]). [illegible] is performe[illegible] observat[illegible]ut a robustness check including only firms with December 31 fiscal year-ends resolves this

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our Privacy Policy

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

issue (see Table 6). Second, individual forecast dispersion, not individual forecast optimism, is relevant. In the context of this study, when dispersion is high, optimists exist and drive stock prices regardless of whether or not the consensus forecast is eventually revealed to be optimistic.

5. Although standard practice, using the logarithm of BE/ME eliminates firms with negative book-to-market ratios and therefore reduces the sample size for the regression model testing by about 5% versus the portfolio analysis. As a robustness check, the regressions are specified using BE/ME instead of log(BE/ME), which strengthens the conclusions.

6. The larger average size of firms covered by IBES and the relative dearth of micro-cap stocks eliminate the need to sort firms into size portfolios based on New York Stock Exchange breakpoints.

7. The correlations, however, are not problematically high: Disp and log(ME) is −0.16, Disp and Mom -12,-1 is −0.08, and Disp and log(BE/ME) is 0.15.

8. Although the coefficients of Disp in January are significant at the 10% level, this level is perhaps impressive when considering the small number of degrees of freedom (25).

Related research

People also read | Recommended articles | Cited by 28

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our Privacy Policy

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

Copyright © 2024 Informa UK Limited Privacy policy Cookies Terms & conditions Accessibility

Taylor & Francis Group an informa business

Registered in England & Wales No. 3099067
5 Howick Place | London | SW1P 1WG

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our Privacy Policy

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings