

An Alternative Investigation of Weak Form Efficiency in Dhaka Stock Exchange based on Technical Analysis

Md. Mahbulul Haque Khan^α & Umma Rumana Huq^σ

Abstract- One highly documented method to test a capital market for weak form efficiency is to identify the return predictability of technical trading rules in that market. Studies on these tests are fewer in number in emerging markets than that of in developed markets and most of the tests have drawn conclusion by including only trend indicators in their trading rules. But it has already been recognized in some previous developed markets studies that trend indicators generally fail to identify sufficient information content in the past prices; hence practitioners very often use these trend indicators combined with confirming indicator (Loh 2007). The current study has investigated Dhaka Stock Exchange, an emerging market of South Asia, for weak form market efficiency by approaching the tests of technical trading rules and has confirmed the profitability of these rules up to 2.15 percent costs per transaction. Here it has used stochastic oscillator as a confirming indicator combined with moving averages (trend indicators) which is the first study of its kind in this market, and has found that it can improve the return predictability only for the short length moving averages.

Keywords: dhaka stock exchange, tests of technical trading rules, market efficiency, moving averages combined with stochastic oscillator.

I. INTRODUCTION

In Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH) it is assumed that the current market price of a security reflects all the information of the respective security and investors by using the information content in the historical price cannot be able to predict current or future price to make abnormal return even if the market is efficient at its weak form (Fama 1970). So the tests of Weak Form Market Efficiency basically try to find out whether there is any relationship between the past prices and the current price, in other word whether the current price can be predicted by using the past prices of a security. By being one of the central areas of research interest during the last couple of decades, this area has showed its development in many phases.

The first formal test of market efficiency could be found when Kendall (1953) applied serial correlation coefficient test on weekly changes of nineteen indices of

Author α: Assistant Professor, Bangladesh Institute of Capital Market (BICM), BGIC Tower (3rd Floor), 34, Topkhana Road, Dhaka-1000, Bangladesh. e-mail: minmhk@gmail.com

Author σ: Lecturer, Department of Finance, Faculty of Business Studies, University of Dhaka, Dhaka-1000, Bangladesh
e-mail: rumanahuq@du.ac.bd

UK industrial stock prices and found near zero correlation coefficient, which supported the market to be complied with random walk model. After that so many studies have been conducted on some other developed markets. If we take a look at the literature up to the year 1970, most of the studies were found to be consistent with market efficiency (Kendall 1953; Fama 1965; Fama & Blume 1966; James 1968; Jensen & Benington 1970; etc.), though subsequently several studies came up with a totally opposite finding (Lo & MacKinlay 1988; Sweeny 1988; Brock et al. 1992; etc.). But to be more precise developed markets are found to be weak form efficient in so many studies (Kendall 1953; Fama 1965; Fama & Blume 1966; James 1968; Jensen & Benington 1970; Hudson, Dempsey & Keasey 1996; etc.).

Many studies have also been documented on emerging stock markets. But those are mainly based on statistical tests of independence like: serial correlation coefficient tests, runs tests, tests of normality, variance ratio test and stationarity test, etc. The evidence from emerging markets can be presented by dividing these markets into four areas. Firstly if we look at the Asian markets then we see Poshakwale (1996), Kumar & Dhankar (2011) and Gupta & Yang (2011) did their studies on Indian Stock Markets and concluded the market to be inefficient. In some other studies Moustafa (2004) and Hassan, Abdullah & Shah (2007) have concluded the stock markets of Pakistan and United Arab Emirates respectively as inefficient. Evidence from several literatures also suggests about the weak form inefficiency of the capital markets of Bangladesh (Mobarek & Keasey 2000; Mobarek, Mollah & Bhuyan 2008; Hussain, Chakraborty & Kabir 2008; Khan & Huq 2012, 2013). In Chion & Veliz C. (2008) and Metghalchi, Garza-Gomez, Glasure & Chang (2008) studies the emerging markets of South America (Peru, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Mexico, Venezuela) are found to be weak form inefficient. From the studies of Gilmore & McManush (2001) on European emerging markets (Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland) and Aly, Mehdian & Perry (2004), Ntīm, Opong & Danbolt (2007) on African emerging markets (Egypt and Ghana) the evidence of weak form inefficiency has revealed. But basically for methodological and data differences some findings contrary to previous evidence have also been documented in several studies, where some emerging

markets are found to be weak form efficient (Vaidyanathan & Gali 1994; Gilmore & McManush 2001; Akhter & Misir 2005; Cooray & Wickremasinghe 2007; Rehman, Masood, Arshed & Shah 2012).

As the review from literature shows mixed result, the efficiency of these markets has remained always inconclusive. At the same time, chronological development of testing methods in this field like using time series regression models (Fama & French 1988; Poterba & Summers 1988), applying variance ratio test (Lo & Mackinlay 1988) or using neural network and genetic algorithm (Allen & Karjalainen 1999; Hong & Lee 2003) keeps the scope for further research always open. So this paper is going to test the weak form market efficiency in Dhaka Stock Exchange, which is an emerging capital market of South Asia, by adopting test of technical trading rules based on practitioner's view point. The next few chapters of this paper will include some reviews from the relevant literature and justification of this study, the research questions which it will address and the objectives of the research, data sources and detailed research methodology, findings of this research, and in the final section it will make concluding remark along with some recommendations.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to test Weak Form Market Efficiency some of the researchers approached through statistical tests of independence like Serial Correlation Coefficient test (Kendall 1953; Fama 1965), runs test (Fama 1965) and some other approached through test of technical trading rules like filter rule (Alexander 1961; Fama & Blume 1966), Moving Averages (Van Horne & Parker 1967; James 1968; Brock, Lakonishok & LeBaron 1992; Mills 1997). In fact before 1961 the tests for market efficiency were based on statistician's or academicians' view point where the independence of the stock price was tested by using various statistical techniques. But Alexander (1961; 1964) drew attention by introducing the professional trader's view point, where the technicians could understand the trend and beat the market by using the technical trading rules. Hence the market will be efficient only if the technical trading rules can be proven worthless. He used x% filter rule on New York Stock Exchange (NYSE), DJIA and Standard & Poor's Industrial and found his results were contradictory to random walk hypothesis. From then on so many studies have been conducted based on test of technical trading rules discovering different results, aspects and methodology.

Practically capital market is not frictionless; hence the profitability of trading rules can be challenged with the existence of transaction costs. Fama & Blume (1966) confirmed that Alexander's results overstated the profit and x% filter rule would not outperform buy and hold policy considering the higher transaction costs. Van Horne & Parker (1967) also concluded the NYSE to

be consistent with random walk hypothesis after examining it with moving average technical trading rules. Sweeny (1988) came up with a different conclusion from that of Fama & Blume (1966) on DJIA. He used some new filter rules and found the trading rules were more useful than Fama & Blume did. He added that floor traders can be able to obtain data at a lower transaction cost. James (1968) applied monthly moving averages trading rule on the listed common stocks of NYSE. His results were consistent with random walk hypothesis as he found buy and hold policy was better off in most of the cases. Jensen & Benington (1970) has conducted relative strength trading rule on twenty nine independent samples of two hundred securities of NYSE and confirmed that the market was efficient as the trading rule could not earn more than buy and hold policy after netting the transaction costs. Brock, Lakonishok & LeBaron (1992) used two technical trading rules-moving average and trading range break on DJIA and found the evidence of profitability of trading strategies. The study of Brock et al. (1992) was replicated on UK market by Hudson, Dempsey & Keasey (1996) and they came up with the finding that technical trading rules cannot generate excess return if cost of transaction is considered. But they confirmed that technical trading rule may exhibit some predictability.

So far most of the trading rules like moving averages used in academic research are basically trend indicators which practitioners do not use in predicting the stock price in isolation, as they think these would be too naive to capture the information content in the past prices. Loh (2007) applied a test of technical trading rule based on practitioner's approach on five developed Asian-Pacific stock markets: Australia (ASX), Hong Kong (HKSE), Japan (NIKKEI), South Korea (KOSPI) and Singapore (STI), for the time period 1990 to 1995. His test basically denoted as combined test of trend indicator (moving average) and confirming indicator (stochastic oscillator). He got two interesting results from his analysis- a combined strategy is more effective compared with a simple moving average technique, and weak form efficiency is not determined by technological progress but factors.

In fact there are a very few studies on test of technical trading rules in Dhaka Stock Exchange and was none before Kader & Rahman (2005) tested K% filter rule in Dhaka Stock Exchange and concluded it as weak form inefficient. After that Hussain, Chakraborty & Kabir (2008) have tested Moving Average 50, 100, and 200 rules over a big data set from 1986 to 2008 with 5815 observations. They found all the MA rules could outperform buy and hold strategy even considering 0.5% transaction cost for both buy and sell.

Most of the previous studies fail to address the practitioner's viewpoint. As the practitioners very often do not use the trend indicator solely rather they adopt some confirming indicator combined with the trend

indicator to create more accurate and sophisticated technical trading rules, the tests which have included only the simple trading rules may not be able to capture the complete information content in the past prices. Considering this fact Loh (2007) adopted moving averages combined with stochastic oscillator in his study and contributed some new findings. In addition to the methodology of Loh (2007) this study has included longer length moving averages to make better comparison among the trading rules. This is the first time applied test of its kind in this country market. It has compared the findings between the traditional approach (simple moving averages) and the practitioners' approach as well as showed the profitability of these rules over buy and hold strategy even after considering the transaction costs.

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES

This study is going to address the following research questions:

- Are technical trading rules profitable in Dhaka Stock Exchange (DSE)?
- Do the confirming indicators improve the return predictability of the trading strategy when they are combined with trend indicators?
- Can the technical trading rules outperform the buy and hold strategy even after considering the transaction costs?

From the research questions the following objectives of this research can be formulated:

- To test the trading strategies like single moving averages, double moving averages and moving averages with stochastic oscillator to conclude about the profitability of these rules in this market.
- To conclude about the profitability of the strategy even after considering the transaction costs.
- To find out whether the technical trading rules can outperform the simple buy and hold strategy and whether combining the confirming indicator along with the trend indicator can improve the return predictability of the trading rules.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DATA SOURCES

Fama (1991) suggested that the test of weak form market efficiency basically denotes to the test of return predictability, which means to find out whether the past return series can predict the future return series. Fama (1965a) described two approaches for test of return predictability for the researchers. The first approach is to use some statistical tools like Serial Correlation Coefficient test, Runs test, etc. to find out whether the past return series is random and statistically independent, so that the chartist or technical analyst cannot be able to predict the prices to earn more return

than that of a buy and hold strategy. The second approach is to formulate some suitable technical trading rules and use these directly on the recent market prices to predict the market trend and to find out whether these trading rules are profitable or not. If the trading rules are profitable and can earn more return than that of a buy and hold strategy then it can be concluded that return is predictable and the market is weak form inefficient. Reilly & Brown (2004, p. 180) has named these two test approaches as firstly, Statistical Tests of Independence, and secondly, Tests of Trading Rules. In order to conduct the Test of Trading Rules, mainly the methodology of Loh (2007) has been followed here. Though Loh (2007) has used MA (5-20, 5-60) rules only, this study has used MA (1-50, 1-200, 5-50, 5-200) rules, because, these rules are more popular and widely used by the technicians (Mills 1997; Hussain, Chakraborty & Kabir 2008), besides it may help to draw some conclusion on the performance of longer length moving averages when these are combined with the confirming indicators.

There are so many trading rules. Here can be named some of the popular among those-

- The Single Moving Average trading rule
- The Double Moving Average trading rule
- The Moving Average rule combined with Stochastic Oscillator
- The Channel rule
- The Filter rule
- The rule designed around ARIMA (1,0,1) forecasts of future returns, etc.

This study is going to test the first three trading rules. A brief description of these rules and signaling process is provided here.

Moving Average Trading Rule

Moving Averages are very famous but simple and easy to use trading rules. Moving Average Trading Rule basically works with buy and sell signals received from the movement of a short run moving average (SRMA) and a long run moving average (LRMA). The formula for calculating a moving average is given below:

$$MA_t = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L P_{t-i}$$

Here, MA_t is the moving average for the time period t , L denotes to the length of moving average. P is the stock or index price. The value of L in an $SRMA_t$ ranges from one to five days. On the other hand the length of moving average L in an $LRMA_t$ depends upon the investors' preferences as the investors may like to track short run, intermediate or long run trends in the stock prices. Generally L is observed to be 200 days in a long run moving average. If the value of L in $SRMA_t$ is one then the moving average is known as Single Moving Average, because, then the price series directly can be

used as $SRMA_t$. Otherwise, for any other value of L in $SRMA_t$ the moving average is known as Double Moving Average. Generally a moving average trading rule is expressed in this form: MA SRMA-LRMA. For an example trading rule MA 1-50 denotes that this is a moving average trading rule with $SRMA = 1$ day and $LRMA = 50$ day.

Now the process of generating buy and sell signals from a moving average will be discussed. A buy (sell) signal is generated when $SRMA_t$ intersects $LRMA_t$ from below (above):

Buy signal at time period t (BS_t): $SRMA_t > LRMA_t$ and $SRMA_{t-1} < LRMA_{t-1}$

Sell signal at time period t (SS_t): $SRMA_t < LRMA_t$ and $SRMA_{t-1} > LRMA_{t-1}$

After generating a buy (sell) signal the position will be continued before another sell (buy) signal is generated by the moving average process discussed above. Hence the holding period (days) in buy position will be (D_b): $SRMA_t > LRMA_t$, and in the same way the holding period (days) in sell position will be (D_s): $SRMA_t < LRMA_t$.

Moving Average combined with Stochastic Oscillator

Most of the studies on Tests of Moving Averages as a trading rule have included only these single or double moving averages, but from the practitioner's view point depending only on the trend indicator might be misleading. Hence an inclusion of another confirming indicator named 'Stochastic Oscillator' along with the moving averages would be more meaningful. So this study is also going to test the combined signal of moving average and stochastic oscillator. The construction method of a stochastic oscillator is described below:

$$DL_t = P_t - \min(P_t, P_{t-1}, \dots, P_{t-m+1})$$

$$HL_t = \max(P_t, P_{t-1}, \dots, P_{t-m+1}) - \min(P_t, P_{t-1}, \dots, P_{t-m+1})$$

$$K_t = (DL_t / HL_t) \times 100$$

Here, DL_t denotes to the difference between the current closing price and the recent lowest price over a predefined period, m . Generally m is assumed as 14 by the practitioners, but this study has considered m equals to L in the $LRMA_t$ (Loh 2007). In the same way HL_t is the difference between the recent highest closing price and lowest closing price. K_t is the ratio of latest price range to recent price range. In order to generate a confirming signal K_t is compared with another signal line named D_t , which is calculated in the following way:

$$D_t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{t-n}$$

So from the formula above it is quite clear that D_t is an n -period moving average of K_t . 'n' is commonly assumed as 3 by the practitioners. But in this study n equals to L in the $SRMA_t$ is assumed (Loh 2007). The main intuition behind this strategy is- if the line K_t

intersects D_t from below then it is assumed by the traders that the market has moved from an oversold to an overbought position so a buy signal is generated and vice-versa. Finally a trading strategy based on moving average combined with stochastic oscillator will look like the same as below:

Buy signal at time period t (BS_t):

$$SRMA_t > LRMA_t \text{ and } SRMA_{t-1} < LRMA_{t-1} \text{ and } K_t > D_t$$

Sell signal at time period t (SS_t):

$$SRMA_t < LRMA_t \text{ and } SRMA_{t-1} > LRMA_{t-1} \text{ and } K_t < D_t$$

A buy (sell) position will be continued until a sell (buy) signal is generated by both the indicators simultaneously.

Besides the profitability, this study will also compute the break even cost (BEC) of the trading strategies. The main idea behind this BEC is that, if the trading cost is below the BEC then the strategy will be profitable despite the existence of cost of trading. The formula for calculating BEC is given below:

$$BEC_t = (D_b \times M_b - D_s \times M_s) / (2 \times (N_b + N_s))$$

Here, D_b and D_m are the total number of buy and sell days and M_b and M_s are average daily return from buy days and sell days respectively. N_b and N_s denote to the number of buy and sell signal respectively. As each buy (sell) signal is associated with a sell (buy) signal, the total number of buy and sell signals are multiplied by 2.

Data

This study has considered daily price data of two indices of Dhaka Stock Exchange (DGEN and DSE20) from the year 2002 to 2010. Here data after the year 2010 has been ignored intentionally, because, at the end of the year 2010 Bangladesh faced severe capital market turmoil which persisted for a long time and at the beginning of the year 2013 Dhaka Stock Exchanged replaced its previous two indices with new ones. In order to calculate the return series the following formula has been used (ignoring the dividends):

$$\text{Return on index at time period } t = \ln(MI_t) - \ln(MI_{t-1})$$

Here, \ln denotes to natural logarithm, MI_t is the market index price at time period t and MI_{t-1} is the price of index at time period previous of t . The standard t-test (one tailed two sample unequal variances t-test) has been used to find out whether the mean return from trading strategy is significantly higher than the mean return from buy and hold strategy. If the profitability of these trading strategies is confirmed over that of the buy and hold strategy then the weak form efficiency of this market will be questionable.

V. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

In this part three moving average trading rules (Single Moving Average-MA 1-50, MA 1-200; Double Moving Average- MA 5-50, MA 5-200; Moving Average

combined with Stochastic Oscillator, MASO 5-50, MASO 5-200) will be applied on DGEN and DSE20 return series

to find out whether these are profitable and can outperform the buy and hold strategy.

Table 5.11 : Results from trading rules (2002-2010).

Trading Rules	N _b	N _s	F _b %	F _s %	Absolute Return* %	Absolute Return from Buy and Hold Strategy %
DGEN						
MA 1-50	48	48	100	100	506	236
MA 1-200	15	15	100	100	319	224
MA 5-50	31	30	70.97	76.67	295	236
MA 5-200	10	10	80	60	243	224
MASO 5-50	28	25	78.57	84	309	236
MASO 5-200	8	7	87.50	85.71	110	224
DSE 20						
MA 1-50	50	50	94	96	437	236
MA 1-200	19	19	94.74	68.42	284	224
MA 5-50	30	29	63.33	68.97	254	236
MA 5-200	8	8	75	75	232	224
MASO 5-50	26	27	73.08	70.37	271	236
MASO 5-200	6	8	83.33	75	196	224

Note: Here N_b(N_s) denotes to number of buy (sell) signals, F_b(F_s) denotes to the percent of correctly predicted immediate upward(downward) prices by buy (sell) signals. *In return calculation trading cost has not been considered because this study has calculated Break Even Cost (BEC) to draw conclusion.

Table 5.12 : Testing the significance of results from trading rules (2002-2010).

Trading Rules	D _b	D _s	B _c %	S _c %	BUY= M _b - M _h	SELL= M _s - M _h	B - S =M _b - M _s
DGEN							
MA 1-50	1427	777	62.16	58.82	0.001546** (3.8413)	-0.002789** (-5.6396)	0.004335** (8.1858)
MA 1-200	1298	698	59.24	51.86	0.001045* (2.4282)	-0.001728** (-3.2456)	0.002773** (4.8518)
MA 5-50	1462	774	58.28	52.45	0.000763 (1.9097)	-0.00143** (-2.8900)	0.002194** (4.1558)
MA 5-200	1292	702	58.13	49.57	0.000761 (1.7651)	-0.001162* (-2.1886)	0.001923** (3.3689)
MASO 5-50	1482	754	58.23	52.65	0.000786* (1.9756)	-0.001535** (-3.0691)	0.002321** (4.3681)
MASO 5-200	1017	977	57.32	46.57	0.000603 (1.2943)	-0.000457 (-0.9675)	0.001059 (1.9421)
DSE 20							
MA 1-50	1240	997	62.74	55.47	0.00166** (3.9482)	-0.002058** (-4.5515)	0.003718** (7.3601)
MA 1-200	1212	786	59.74	51.40	0.001049* (2.3864)	-0.001435* (-2.8175)	0.002485** (4.4562)
MA 5-50	1235	1002	59.43	51.30	0.0009295* (2.2078)	-0.001139* (-2.5237)	0.0020689** (4.0970)
MA 5-200	1218	778	58.95	50.13	0.000827 (1.8842)	-0.001102* (-2.1540)	0.0019287** (3.4517)
MASO 5-50	1221	1016	60.11	51.97	0.001024* (2.4232)	-0.001224** (-2.7250)	0.002248** (4.4579)
MASO 5-200	1092	904	59.24	49.11	0.000882 (1.9407)	-0.000899 (-1.8556)	0.001782** (3.2548)

Note: D_b (D_s) means holding period in buy (sell) days; B_c (S_c) denotes to the proportion of buy (sell) days which were correctly held to the total number of holding buy (sell) days; M_b (M_s) denotes to average daily return generated in buy days and M_h denotes to average daily buy-and-hold return. In parenthesis the t-statistic for testing the differences is given. * and ** are statistically significant numbers at 5% and 1% level respectively.

From Table 5.11, all the trading strategies are found profitable over the buy and hold strategy, except for MASO 5-200 strategy. The best strategy to

outperform buy and hold strategy is MA 1-50. It is quite interesting finding that short length moving averages (1-50, 5-50) are doing better in making profit and

predicting movement of the stock price than that of the long length moving averages (1-200, 5-200). For MA 1-50 trading rule the accuracy in predicting the immediate upward or downward movement of index price (DGEN) is 100%. But at the same time it should be noted that the number of transaction is also higher for the short length moving averages (1-50, 5-50). So if the trading cost is very high in a market, the short length MA rules may not show that much profitability which is observed from the table 5.11.

In this study, a confirming indicator which is known as stochastic oscillator is used with Moving Average to improve the predictability and profitability of the moving average trading rules. Here it is found that using stochastic oscillator with moving average improves only the short length moving average (compare MA 5-50 and MASO 5-50), but for the long length moving average (Compare MA 5-200 and MASO 5-200) the result becomes reversed. So the result does not fully support the findings of Loh (2007).

Table 5.12 shows all most in all the cases (except for two cases) the holding days are found correct for more than 50% of days. Differences are significantly different from '0' at 5% and 1% level of significance. BUY must be positive and SELL must be negative in order the trading rules to be held successful in predicting the market movements.

Table 5.13: Break Even Costs (BEC)

Trading Rules	Break Even Cost (BEC) %
DGEN	
MA 1-50	2.63
MA 1-200	2.24
MA 5-50	2.42
MA 5-200	2.43
MASO 5-50	2.91
MASO 5-200	3.67
DSE 20	
MA 1-50	2.18
MA 1-200	3.73
MA 5-50	2.15
MA 5-200	7.26
MASO 5-50	2.56
MASO 5-200	7.02

Besides, using stochastic oscillator as a confirming indicator improves the predicting capacity of MA 5-50 rule in both buy and sell cases, which also complies with the findings of Loh (2007). But the same is not true for MA 5-200 rule. Rather the predictive ability has been decreased when we used stochastic oscillator. So it can be inferred that using stochastic oscillator as a confirming indicator may not applicable for improving the performance of longer length moving averages as Loh himself used MA 5-20 and MA 5-60 in his study.

Table 5.14: Results from t-test

Trading Rules	Mean Return (Trading Rules)	Mean Return (Buy and Hold strategy)	t-statistic
DGEN			
MA 1-50	.00226	.00105	3.425*
MA 1-200	.00154	.00107	1.230
MA 5-50	.00131	.00105	0.745
MA 5-200	.00117	.00107	0.243
MASO 5-50	.00138	.00105	0.922
MASO 5-200	.00053	.00107	-1.448
DSE 20			
MA 1-50	.00195	.00105	2.540*
MA 1-200	.00137	.00107	0.784
MA 5-50	.00113	.00105	0.227
MA 5-200	.00112	.00107	0.121
MASO 5-50	.00121	.00105	0.444
MASO 5-200	.00095	.00107	-0.335

Note: For this t-test, H_0 : Mean return from trading rule \leq Mean return from buy and hold strategy, H_1 : Mean return from trading rule $>$ Mean return from buy and hold strategy. *The H_0 will be rejected only if t-statistic $>$ t-critical value at 5% level of significance.

Up to this it has not been revealed whether a complete strategy can outperform the buy and hold strategy and Table 5.14 will be helpful in this regard. We assume here a complete strategy like holding the index in buy position in buy signal days and holding it in short position in sell signal days rather comparing these as a separate strategy. Average daily return of the whole holding period is calculated. This is the most interesting part of this study as now it becomes quite apparent that only MA 1-50 rule can outperform the buy and hold strategy. Because, though all other trading rules showed greater return than buy and hold strategy (except for only a few exceptions) in Table 5.11, only MA 1-50 (for both DGEN & DSE20) shows statistically significant higher return than that of buy and hold strategy in Table 5.14. This result also complies with the findings of some earlier studies where short length moving averages performed better than the long length moving averages in the markets bearing short trend in price series (Isakov & Hollistein 1999; Lento 2007).

VI. CONCLUSION

Tests of trading rules conducted in this study reveal the profitability of trading rules set on Dhaka Stock Exchange even after considering transaction costs. It implies that investors of Bangladesh can apply different technical trading strategies to predict the market movement and earn return without bearing appropriate risk. Moreover, by combining the confirming indicator along with the trend indicator the return predictability of short length moving averages can be increased significantly. As the trading rules are found to

significantly outperform the buy and hold strategy, the market is not following weak form of efficiency. Findings from the previous chapter and also from the previous studies confirm that Dhaka Stock Exchange is suffering from weak form market inefficiency and the information content in the past prices does not reflect in the current market price of securities, which is alarming for the general investors of this market. To address the issues related to weak form market inefficiency, policies should be taken to remove information asymmetry, i.e. improving the disclosure policies, creating awareness among the investors, etc. In order to uphold the general investors' interest the regulatory authority can control the opportunities of making excess return by violating the market structures. Educational and training initiatives should be taken and increased to disseminate basic investment knowledge to the investors so that they can make informed decision. Besides growing number of actively traded securities and quality IPOs can also help to enhance the securities trade flow, which may further help in raising informational efficiency in this market.

REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

- Akhter, Shelina & Misir, M Abu. (2005). Capital Markets Efficiency: Evidence from the Emerging Capital Market with Particular Reference to Dhaka Stock Exchange. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 12(3), 35-51.
- Alexander, Sidney S. (1961). Price Movements in Speculative Markets- Trends or Random Walks. *Industrial Management Review*, 2(2), 7-26.
- Alexander, Sidney S. (1964). Price Movements in Speculative Markets- Trends or Random Walks. *Industrial Management Review*, 5(2), 25-46.
- Allen, F. and Karjalainen, R. (1999). Using genetic algorithms to find technical trading rules. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 51, 245-72.
- Aly, Hassan, Mehdian, Seyed & Perry, Mark J. (2004). An Analysis of Day-of-the-Weak Effects in the Egyptian Stock Market. *International Journal of Business*, 9(3), 301-308.
- Brock, William, Lakonishok, Josef & LeBaron, Blake. (1992). Simple Technical Trading Rules and the Stochastic Properties of Stock Returns. *Journal of Finance*, 47(5), 1731-1764.
- Chion, Sergio J. & Veliz C., Carlos N. (2008). On the Normality of Stock Return Distributions: Latin American Markets, 2000-2007. *Journal of CENTUM Cathedra*, 1(2), 90-108.
- Cooray, Arusha & Wickremasinge, Guneratne. (2007). The Efficiency of Emerging Stock Markets: Empirical Evidence from the South Asian Region. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 41(1), 171-183.
- Fama, E. F. & Blume, Marshall E. (1966). Filter Rules and Stock Market Trading. *The Journal of Business*, 39(1), 226-241.
- Fama, E. F. & French, Kenneth R. (1988). Permanent and Temporary Components of Stock Prices. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 96(2), 246-273.
- Fama, E. F. (1965). The Behavior of Stock Market Prices. *The Journal of Business*, 38(1), 34-105.
- Fama, E. F. (1965a). Random Walks in Stock Market Prices. *Financial Analyst Journal*, 21(5), 55-59.
- Fama, Eugene F. (1970). Efficient Capital Markets: A Review of Theory and Empirical Work. *The Journal of Finance*, 25(2), 383-417.
- Fama, Eugene F. (1991). Efficient Capital Markets: II. *The Journal of Finance*, 46(5), 1575-1617.
- Gilmore, Clare G. & McManus, Ginette M. (2001, June). *Random-Walk and Efficiency Test of Central European Equity Markets*. European Financial Management Association Conference at Lugano, Switzerland.
- Gupta, Rakesh & Yang, Junhao. (2011). Testing Weak form Efficiency in the Indian Capital Market. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 75, 108-119.
- Hassan, Arshad, Abdullah, Muhammad Shoib & Shah, Zulfiqar Ali. (2007). Testing of Random Walks and Market Efficiency in an Emerging Market: An empirical Analysis of Karachi Stock Exchange. *The Business Review*, 9(1), 271-280.
- Hong, Y. and Lee, T.-H. (2003). Inference on via generalized spectrum and nonlinear time series models. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85, 1048-62.
- Hudson, Robert, Dempsey, Michael & Keasey, Kevin. (1996). A note on the weak form efficiency of capital market: The application of simple technical trading rules to UK stock prices- 1935-1994. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 20, 1121-1132.
- Hussain, Tashfeen, Chakraborty, Liton & Kabir, Mir Ahasan. (2008, December). *Is Dhaka Stock Exchange Efficient? An Application of Technical Trading Rule*. Paper presented at International Conference on Recent Development in Statistical Sciences (ICSS), Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Isakov, Dusan & Hollistein, Marc. (1999). *Application of Simple Technical Trading Rules to Swiss Stock Prices: Is it Profitable?* Research Paper N2. International Center for Financial Asset Management and Engineering.
- James, F. E., Jr. (1968). Monthly Moving Average- An Effective Investment Tool? *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 3(3), 315-326.
- Jensen, Michael C. & Benington, George A. (1970). Random Walks and Technical Theories: Some Additional Evidence. *Journal of Finance*, 25(2), 469-482.
- Kader, Mir Abdul & Rahman, AFM Ataur. (2005). Testing the Weak-Form Efficiency of an Emerging Market: Evidence from the Dhaka Stock Exchange

- of Bangladesh. *AIUB Journal of Business and Economics*, 4(2), 109-132.
25. Kendall, M. G. (1953). The Analysis of Economic Time-Series Part I: Prices. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 116(1), 11-34.
 26. Khan, Md. Mahbulul Haque & Huq, Umma Rumana. (2012). Distribution of Risk and Return: A Statistical Test of Normality on Dhaka Stock Exchange. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 3(3), 28-38.
 27. Khan, Md. Mahbulul Haque & Huq, Umma Rumana. (2013). An Empirical Test of Weak Form Market Efficiency on an Emerging Market: Evidence from Dhaka Stock Exchange. *Dhaka University Journal of Business Studies*, 34(2).
 28. Kumar, Rakesh & Dhankar, Raj S. (2011). Distribution of Risk and Return: A Test of Normality in Indian Stock Market. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 18(1), 109-118.
 29. Lento, Camillo. (2007). Tests of Technical Trading Rules in the Asian-Pacific Equity Markets: A Bootstrap Approach. *Academy of Financial and Accounting Studies Journal*, 11(2).
 30. Lo, Andrew W. & MacKinlay, A. Craig. (1988). Stock Market Prices Do not Follow Random Walks: Evidence from a Simple Specification Test. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 1(1), 41-66.
 31. Loh, Elaine Y. L. (2007). An alternative test for weak form efficiency based on technical analysis. *Applied Financial Economics*, 17, 1003-1012.
 32. Metghalchi, Massoud, Garza-Gomez, Xavier, Glasure, Yong & Chang, Yung-Ho. (2008). Are Moving Average Trading Rules Profitable? Evidence From The Mexican Stock Market. *The Journal of Applied Business Research*, 24(1), 115-128.
 33. Mills, Terence C. (1997). Technical Analysis and the London Stock Exchange: Testing Trading Rules Using the FT30. *International Journal of Finance & Economics*, 2(4), 319-331.
 34. Mobarek, Asma & Keasey, Keavin. (2000, May). *Weak-form market efficiency of an emerging Market: Evidence from Dhaka Stock Market of Bangladesh*. Paper presented at The ENBS Conference, Oslo, Norway.
 35. Mobarek, Asma, Mollah, A. Sabur & Bhuyan, Rafiqul. (2008). Market Efficiency in Emerging Stock Market: Evidence from Bangladesh. *Journal of Emerging Market Finance*, 7(1), 17-41.
 36. Moustafa, M.A. (2004). Testing the Weak-Form Efficiency of the United Arab Emirates Stock Market. *International Journal of Business*, 9(3), 309-325.
 37. Ntim, Collins Gyakari, Opong, Kwaku K. & Danbolt, Jo. (2007). An Empirical Re-Examination of the Weak Form Efficient Markets Hypothesis of the Ghana Stock Market Using Variance-Ratios Tests. *African Finance Journal*, 9(2).
 38. Poshakwale, Sunil. (1996). Evidence on Weak Form Efficiency and Day of the Weak Effect in the Indian Stock Market. *Finance India*, 10(3), 605-616.
 39. Poterba, James M. & Summers, Lawrence H. (1988). Mean Reversion in Stock Prices. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 22, 27-59.
 40. Rehman, Awais Ur, Masood, Mubashar, Arshed, Saleem & Shah, Syed Zulfiqar Ali. (2012). Evaluation of Weak Form of Efficiency: An Empirical Study of Emerging South Asian Stock Markets. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 88, 124-131.
 41. Reilly, Frank K. & Brown, Keith C. (2004). *Investment Analysis and Portfolio Management*. USA: Thomson.
 42. Sweeny, Richard J. (1988). Some New Filter Rule Tests: Methods and Results. *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 23(3), 285-300.
 43. Vaidyanathan, R. & Gali, Kanti Kumar. (1994). Efficiency of the Indian Capital Market. *Indian Journal of Finance and Research*, 2, 35-38.
 44. Van Horne, James C. & Parker George G. C. (1967). The Random-Walk Theory: An Empirical Test. *Financial Analyst Journal*, 23, 87-92.