

Stock Market Anomalies and Efficient Market Hypothesis: Empirical Analysis of Monday Effect of Selected Securities from Nigeria

LENYIE, Leesi and Umasom Philip

Department of Banking and Finance, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

DOI: 10.56201/ijbfr.v9.no2.2023.pg22.33

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to examine stock market anomalies and efficient market hypothesis with empirical analysis of Monday effect of selected securities from Nigeria. Daily stock prices of 20 quoted firms were sourced from www.cashcraft.com. The study used Friday 4/11/2022, and Friday 3/12/2022 to test against Monday Effect 7/11/2022 and Monday 5/12/2022. The prices of the stocks on Friday against Monday were used to test the market anomalies and the efficient market hypothesis. Findings of the study revealed a mix reaction of stock market anomalies and efficient market hypothesis among the studied securities. Evidence from table 1 and 2 proved that some stocks have return greater or less than zero which implies that investors in such stocks had abnormal return which contrary to the assumptions of efficient market hypothesis. However, some stocks have no return from the price of Friday and the price of Monday which implies that the investor have no return, this is in line with efficient market hypothesis. The study recommends that the regulatory authorities should develop the stock market such that the functioning of the market is in line with the stock market of the developed countries to reflect relevant assumptions and theories.

Keywords: *Stock Market Anomalies, Efficient Market Hypothesis, Monday Effect Securities, Nigeria*

INTRODUCTION

The Nigeria capital market is classified among the emerging financial market of world and one of the fast growing in Africa. Nigerian Capital market was established in 1960 for the purpose of bridging savings and investment gap and simplifies the sourcing long term fund (Anyamaobi, 2018). It constitute a network of financial institutions and investors interact to mobilize and allocate long term funds to productive investment and funds are exchanged for financial assets issued by borrowers or traded by stock holders which in turn offers access to a variety of financial instruments that enable economic agents to pool, price, and exchange risk (Akani and Imegi, 2017, Lucky et al., 2015).

According to efficient market hypothesis markets are rational and prices of stocks fully reflect all available information. The securities prices quickly adjust to new information as readily that information is available. But according to behavioral finance this kind of efficient market cannot explain the observed anomalies in Market anomalies are the unusual occurrence or abnormality

in smooth pattern of stock market. Stock market anomalies refer to a situation when a security or market performs contrary to the notion of EMH. It can be described as a situation where market returns are not consistent with the traditional asset pricing behaviour (Bundoo, 2011) and where, as put further by Shiller (2001), the principle of rational behaviour by investors is not entirely correct. There are many stock market anomalies, some occur once or twice and disappear, while others are continuous (Archana, Safer & Kevin, 2014). Stock market anomalies could be related to calendar anomalies Field (1934), size effect and value effect (Keim, 1983) which are called fundamental anomalies; announcement anomalies and technical trading rules anomalies in form of momentum effect. Anomalies can affect the market as well as influence investors' decisions and behaviour in the market. Investors are always conscious of their returns and will usually want to predict returns in the market as a reward for their investment. If stock markets

Anomalies are the indicator of inefficient markets, some anomalies happen only once and vanish, while others happen frequently, or continuously (Tversky & Kahneman, 1986) defined market anomalies as an anomaly is a deviation from the presently accepted paradigms that is too widespread to be ignored, too systematic to be dismissed as random error, and too fundamental to be accommodated by relaxing the normative system. While in standard finance theory, financial market anomaly means a situation in which a performance of stock or a group of stocks deviate from the assumptions of efficient market hypotheses. Such movements or events which cannot be explained by using efficient market hypothesis are called financial market anomalies (Silver, 2011).

Arewa, Nwakanma and Torbira (2014) market anomalies are basically referred to inefficiency or failure of any of the pricing models to hold. Precisely, irregularities such as presences of volatility, normality, linear dependency, serial correlations, autocorrelation and absence of randomness in stock prices or their first differences are common evidences of anomalies. Anomalies make prediction, speculation and arbitraging possible which induces addition earnings to an investor at the detriments of others. It is important to know that anomalies cannot be completely averted; once they appear in well-functioning markets they quickly die off through the activities of professional arbitrageurs. Different researchers like Agrawal & Tendon (1994), Gultekin & Gultekin (1983) and Ariel (1984) exhibited the existence of observed anomalies with their evidences in different stock exchanges of world. But yet the evidences on anomalies are debatable. This study examined Monday effect of stock market anomalies and efficient market hypothesis in Nigeria.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Efficient Market Hypothesis

Efficient Market Hypothesis was developed in late 1960 by the Nobel Prize Awarded Professor Fama (1970). The theory states that prices of financial assets in a liquid market are random and are fully reflected by all available information; the prices are the intrinsic value, not under nor overvalued. According to EMH, efficient markets can be distinguished in three different forms depending on available information: "weak", "semi strong" and "strong (Fama, 1970). The weak form of efficiency emphasizes that the current prices reflect all historical information, meaning that no investor can successfully study historical returns in order to gain future returns. Therefore, technical analysis, technique of identifying previous trends in price movements, is not

an efficient tool of generating profits because there are no patterns in a random walk time series (Fama, 1970).

The semi-weak form states that current asset prices reflect all available public information, in addition to historical prices, the semi-weak form includes company announcements, quarterly and annual reports as well as publications and non-financial news such as macro-economic data. It is not possible to generate excess returns based on what is known to the public, as prices rapidly adjust to all new public information. Neither technical nor fundamental analysis, i.e. analysis and forecasts of a corporation's financial record, is a consistent tool to achieve excess returns (Fama, 1970). The strong form is the most extensive of EMH as prices reflect all information, including both public and insider information (private). Insider trading is regulated by national laws and is illegal and therefore not possible, except for countries without legal barriers (Fama, 1970).

Stock Market Anomalies

Conceptually, market anomalies refer to the action of the stock price that goes contrary to the expected behavior of the stock market. The case traders and investors use the behavior of the market to find opportunities throughout the market. It can also refer to the differences in the performance of stocks from the price assumptions as from the Efficient Market Hypothesis. It could be recalled that the Efficient Market Hypothesis assumed that share prices reflect all of the information available at any given time. In theory, it is impossible to purchase overvalued stocks, or sell a stock above its value, because it would always trade at a fair market price. However, in practice, efficient markets are difficult to create and even more difficult to maintain. The appearance of financial market anomalies provides evidence that the Efficient Market Hypothesis does not always hold true, as not all relevant information is priced in straight away or at all.

The Monday effect

Monday effect is also called the weekend effect; this refers to a situation where return on Monday is seen to be lower than that of Friday the previous week. This is one of the most documented effect or anomalies in the stock market. Urquhart and McGroarty (2014) reported that the Monday effect fluctuates over time with some sub-periods exhibiting positive coefficients and others negative coefficients. Many supporters of behavioural finance speculate that the Monday effect is caused by negativity surrounding a new working week. But others believe that a more likely explanation of the weekend effect is that companies often release bad news on Friday evenings, after the market has closed. This would be supported by the tendency of investors to sell off their stocks on Friday afternoons to avoid slippage over the weekend.

The January Effect

This is stock market anomaly where there is an increase in stock prices during the month of January. It was reported for the first time in 1976 by Rozeff and Kinney (1976) whose study showed that the average return in January was 3.48% compared to the 0.42% during other months. The UK stock market exhibit steady increase in the prices of stocks in January 2020. This implies that the investors have outperformed the stock market and thereby reject the efficient market hypothesis. It is believed that the January effect is caused by the turn of the tax calendar. Typically, according to this theory, prices drop in December when investors sell off their assets

in order to realize capital gains. And, the increases in January are caused by traders rushing back into the market. The month of the year effect is described by the existence of patterns in stock returns during a particular month of the year; the most discussed effect is the January effect. The January effect is associated with the higher average stock returns in January compared with the other months of the years

Turn of the Month Effect

This is an anomaly based on the discovery that the last day of the month and the first three trading days of the following month (TOTM) have a higher rate of return. It was first found by Ariel (1987) in the US stock market. Historically, the outsized gains at the turn of each month have a higher combined return than all 30 days in the month. There is little agreement about whether this is just a coincidence of random behaviour, or the result of positive business news being more likely to be announced at the end of the month.

The Halloween effect

This is an anomaly based on the idea that stocks perform better between October 31 and May 1 than during the period from the beginning of May to the end of October. It was first discovered by Bouman and Jacobsen (2002) who demonstrated that the effect was present in thirty-six out of thirty-seven equity markets investigated from 1970 to 1998. From the movement in the stock prices in UK over the periods covered in this study, the UK stock market does not exhibit Halloween effect as the prices of the stock does not fluctuate like the January effect, therefore, the investors does not outperform the market, the efficient market hypothesis is validated.

Seasonality Effect

Seasonality effect, we can also call it calendar effect. Seasonality in stock returns is a subject closely related to week-form-efficiency. When week-form-efficiency is analyzed the relevant information set is restricted to previous prices, seasonality in stock returns as a persistent phenomenon implies that investors have different required rates of returns on risky assets depending for instance on which calendar month a monthly investment span. The people try to specify a certain period of time or a group of time to test the special phenomenon about the stock returns, then to see if any rules we can follow or any speculation opportunities we can catch. The calendar effect include: January effect, the day of the week effect, the month of the year effect, monthly effect, holiday effect, Monday effect, Weekend effect, turn of the year effect.

Day of the Week Effect

Day of the week effect is primarily relating to stock market patterns occurring on Friday and Monday trading days. The tendency for stock prices to rise on Fridays and fall on Mondays. With more evidence appearing, the day of the week effect not only occurs on Mondays and Fridays but also on the other days among the world stock markets. The day of the week effect has been a hot topic for decades. The most common case is the Monday effect, meaning that the Monday's average return is significantly lower than the other days' average returns. The Fridays normally present the highest return over the most of the stock markets of the world. However, some special case appeared after some empirical studies broadly in different stock markets, for instance in some market the Tuesday effect exists instead of the Monday effect.

During the past decades, many studies about the day of the week effect have been carried out. The most discussed market is US stock market, a study from Gibbons and Hess (1981) reported the US stock market from 1962 to 1978. They found that the Monday returns are much lower than the other days' returns and the Friday returns are much higher than the other day's returns. Keim and Stambaugh (1984) used the data from US stock market from 1928 to 1982 and they also provided evidence that the Monday negative returns and Friday positive returns on US market.

Calendar Anomalies

Calendar anomalies are anomalies or market inefficiencies that are linked to a particular time. It can also be described as stock prices anomalies or stock return changes that are attributable to calendar. The existence of this anomaly is a denial of the weak form of EMH which states that stock prices reflect all past information. It also depicts that returns are invariant, meaning that there exist short term seasonal pattern in stock returns (Mishra, 2012). This implies seasonality in stock market. Nonetheless, evidence overtime suggests that stock returns do not remain constant and that the market can be outperformed by means of calendar or seasonal dummies.

Empirical Review

Derbali and Hallara (2016) examined the effect of the day-of-the-week for the Tunisian stock exchange index (TUNINDEX). The authors used daily returns over the period 31 December 1997 to 7 April 2014. In order to extract useful conclusions out of the data, autoregressive heteroscedasticity models, such as GARCH, EGARCH, and TGARCH, were used. The empirical findings are supportive of market inefficiency with a presence of the day-of-the-week effect upon TUNINDEX returns. Specifically, the authors presented evidence on a positive Thursday effect and a negative Tuesday effect. It could be concluded that volatility is persistent, or, in other terms, that volatility appears in clusters. From the mean equation of the GARCH output it could be established that a positive and highly significant return on Thursdays is present at a 99% confidence level. Furthermore, Wednesday has a positive impact on the TUNINDEX return and Tuesday has a negative impact at a 95% confidence level. The results from the mean equation from the EGARCH and TGARCH confirm the previous findings from the GARCH. This suggests that the TUNINDEX is weak form inefficient. From the variance equation of the GARCH, all the parameters were significant at a 99% confidence level for the three models, which suggests the persistence of volatility within the Tunisian stock market index. The highly significant gamma parameter from the EGARCH and TGARCH show evidence that a leverage effect exists. Derbali and Hallara argued that this means that bad news tends to increase volatility more than good news.

Zilca (2017) studied the day-of-the-week effect in three 18-year sub periods on all stocks listed on NYSE, AMEX, and NASDAQ exchanges. The purpose was to examine the evolution of the day-of-the-week effect over time. The full period runs from 1956-2006, where each sub period is 18 years. By using different types of portfolios, equally weighted (EW), value-weighted (VW), and 10 deciles sorted by market capitalization for smallest and largest capitalization, Zilca tried to find changes in the pattern of the day-of-the-week effect over time. Zilca found that returns increase as the week progresses in the smallest capitalization deciles when taking into account

the full period. Furthermore, it was suggested that the reason behind increasing returns during a week is due to a behavioural factor, that mood often tends to increase throughout the week. Zilca also found that the day-of-the-week effect has declined over the years as it is not as clearly evident in the latter years compared to the beginning years of the investigated period. In some of the portfolios, for example the VW portfolio, the effect was totally vanished in the last 18-year sub period.

Claesson (1987) took a point at the day-of-the-week effect using data from OMXS30 in Claesson's doctoral thesis. This can be regarded as the pioneer work of the day-of-the-week effect in Sweden. Claesson starts out by reviewing earlier important studies of the-day-of-the-week anomaly, included French (1980), Keim and Stambaugh (1984), Lakonishok and Levi (1982), and Jaffe and Westerfield (1985). Claesson agrees with these researchers on the conclusion that Monday returns are most often negative, while the returns toward the end of the week tend to be more positive. Claesson further examines the day-of-the-week effect in Sweden by using stock return data between the years 1978-1984 for individual stocks listed on the Stockholm Stock Exchange. Mainly, descriptive statistics including mean and standard deviation are presented. Claesson concludes that settlement effects can be a reasonable explanation of the day-of-the-week effect in this return data. Specifically, it is explained by the payment system of stock purchases. Claesson also investigates if there is a correlation between the distributions of the returns in two consecutive years. Claesson further concludes that a day-of-the-week effect it does exist on the Stockholm Stock exchange in the years 1978-1984. However, Claesson argues that this effect tends to be rather small and it implies low practical use for an investor due to transaction costs.

Cross (1973) examined the distribution and the relationship of price changes on Fridays and on Mondays. Cross (1973) used included daily closing prices of the Standard and Poor's Composite Stock Index between the years 1953 to 1970. This data, however, includes in total 844 Mondays and 844 Fridays. Cross (1973) was looking into whether the daily closing prices of the S&P Composite Stock Index advanced or declined on Fridays and Mondays respectively in the data set. Cross found out that this resulted in that the index advanced in 62 percent of all the Fridays and in 39.5 percent of all Mondays. The mean percentage change was also higher on Fridays compared to Mondays. Furthermore, Cross (1973) also researched how the Mondays' price changes were contingent on Fridays' price changes. Hence the results showed that in 48,8 percent of the cases where there was an advance on a Friday, the advance on a Friday led to an advance on the following Monday. In the other 313 cases where there was a negative Friday, the subsequent Monday rose in 24 percent of the cases. Furthermore, Cross (1973) found significance of negative Monday returns throughout the whole dataset

Gibbon and Hess (1981) examined the day-of-the-week effect regarding asset returns including stocks from the Standard and Poor's 500 stock index, the Dow Jones 30 stock index and two portfolios of different securities created by the CRSP. One of the portfolios was value-weighted including different securities and one portfolio was an equally-weighted including different securities. These are tested statistically on the equality of the means for each day-of-the-week. The time range of data used in the study was from 1962 to 1978. The study showed that negative mean returns on Mondays are rather uniform, both concerning the S&P 500 stock index, and also across different security types, such as American treasury bills which shows a below average

returns on Mondays. Gibbon and Hess (1981) argued that the aggregation of returns in portfolios can eliminate the day-of-the-week effect regarding market adjusted returns.

Lee et al. (1990) conducted a study of the day-of-the-week effect with a major focus on the Asian second tier stock markets between the years 1980-1988. However, Lee et al. argue that the explanations of the results from earlier mentioned studies, namely that stock returns are significantly different from each other on Mondays and on Fridays and as well as different from the other weekdays in terms of mean returns, can be questioned. Since the explanations of these abnormal patterns are mainly targeting on settlement practices and dividend payment practices, Lee et al. consider these theories of explanation to be rather weak. Lee et al. (1990) found that the day-of-the-week effect is present in the majority of the Asian stock markets during 1980-1988. Following up on previous studies, their findings are rather consistent with those of Cross, French, and Gibbon and Hess. Hong Kong, Japan, Korea and Singapore show a tendency of a negative mean return on Mondays, but especially on Tuesdays. However, the S&P 500 show greater results of negative Mondays compared to the Asian stock markets under these years. However, the equally weighted US index show mostly negative Monday returns.

Gbeda and Peprah (2017) conducted a study of the day-of-the-week effect on the stock markets in Ghana and Kenya by examining daily closing prices and daily returns between the years 2005-2014 on GSE-CI (Ghana) and NSE-20 (Nairobi). Gbeda and Peprah conducted an OLS regression with daily returns as the dependent variable and with four dummy variables representing all weekdays (except for the Monday, which is the intercept in the model) as explanatory variables. The OLS regression does also include an autoregressive term. A rejection of the null hypothesis implies that the stock returns exhibit a day-of the-week-effect. The studies above are foreign; this study therefore examined stock market anomalies and efficient market hypothesis in Nigeria.

METHODOLOGY

This is an empirical research based on insights drawn from the analysis of the existing literature of different studies on stock market anomalies. The research serves as a means to help acquire useful information or knowledge about stock market anomalies and efficient market hypothesis. The study used data for the month of November and December, 2022.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following tables give details on the stock market anomalies and the test of efficient market hypothesis in Nigeria.

Table 1: Monday Effect 7/11/2022

Security	Friday 4/11/2022						Monday Effect 7/11/2022						Summary	Conclusion
	Price	P-Change	P-Close	P-Open	High	Low	Price	P-Change	P-Close	P-Open	High	Low		
ACCESSC	7.9		7.9	7.9	8.1	7.9	8.1				8.1	8.0	8.10>7.9	Reject
ORP	5	0.05	5	5	0	0	0	0.3	7.95	7.95	5	0	5	EMH
AIICO	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.05	0.56	0.56	0.5	0.5	0.50=0.5	Accept

	6		5	5	6	5	6				8	5	0	EHH
CUSTODI	5.9		6.5	6.5	5.9	5.9	5.9				0.0	0.0	5.90=5.9	Accept
AN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.90	5.90	0	0	0	EHH
	10.		10.	10.	0.0	0.0	10.		10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0=10.	Accept
ETI	00	0.25	00	00	0	0	00	0	0	0	0	0	0	EHH
	9.9		9.9	9.9	9.9	9.8	10.				10.	9.9	10.0>9.9	Reject
FBNH	0	-0.05	0	0	5	0	00	0.35	9.90	9.90	00	0	0	EMH
	3.4		3.4	3.4	0.0	0.0	3.4				0.0	0.0	3.40=3.4	Accept
FCMB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.34	3.40	3.40	0	0	0	EHH
FIDELITY	4.1		4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0				4.0	4.0	4.05<4.1	Reject
BK	0	-0.01	1	1	2	0	5	0.01	4.10	4.10	5	2	0	EMH
	17.		17.	17.	17.	17.	17.		17.6	17.6	17.	17.	17.55>1	Reject
GTCO	60	0.5	60	60	65	60	55	0.25	0	0	60	55	7.60	EMH
JAIZBAN	0.9		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9				0.0	0.0	0.94=0.9	Reject
K	4	0	9	9	4	4	4	-0.02	0.94	0.94	0	0	4	EMH
	0.8		0.8	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.8				0.0	0.0	0.87=0.8	Accept
LASACO	7	0	7	7	0	0	7	0.02	0.87	0.87	0	0	7	EHH
LINKASS	0.3		0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4				0.4	0.4	0.40>0.3	Reject
URE	9	0	6	6	9	9	0	0	0.39	0.39	0	0	9	EMH
	1.5		1.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5				0.0	0.0	1.50=1.5	Accept
NEIMETH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.50	1.50	0	0	0	EHH
	4.0		4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0				0.0	0.0	4.00=4.0	Accept
NEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.00	4.00	0	0	0	EHH
	6.1		6.1	6.1	0.0	0.0	6.1				0.0	0.0	6.15=6.1	Accept
NNFM	5	0	5	5	0	0	5	0	6.15	6.15	0	0	5	EHH
	28.		28.	28.	28.	28.	28.		28.0	28.0	0.0	0.0	28.00=2	Accept
STANBIC	00	0	00	00	00	00	00	0	0	0	0	0	8.00	EHH
STERLNB	1.4		1.4	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.4				1.4	1.3	1.40=1.4	Accept
ANK	0	-0.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.40	1.40	0	5	0	EHH
	7.0		6.8	6.8	7.0	7.0	7.0				7.0	7.0	7.00	Accept
UBA	0	-0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0.7	7.00	7.00	5	0	=7.00	EHH
UNITYBN	0.4		0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4				0.4	0.4	0.42>0.4	Reject
K	2	0.01	2	2	0	0	0	0.04	0.42	0.42	0	0	0	EMH
WEMABA	3.2		3.2	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.2				0.0	0.0	3.20=3.2	Accept
NK	0	0	8	8	0	6	0	0	3.20	3.20	0	0	0	EHH
ZENITHB	19.		19.	19.	19.	19.	20.		19.8	19.8	20.	19.	19.85>2	Reject
ANK	85	0.45	90	90	90	80	00	0	5	5	00	85	0.00	EMH

Source: www.cashcraft.com

Table 2: Monday Effect 5/12/2022

Security	Friday 3/12/2022						Monday 5/12/2022						Summary	Conclusion
	Pri	P- Cha	P- Clo	P- Op	Hi	Lo	Pri	P- Cha	P- Clo	P- Ope	Hi	Lo		
ACCESS	8.7		8.6	8.6	8.7	8.6	8.5		8.7	8.7	8.7	8.5	8.70 > 8.55	Reject
CORP	0	0.05	5	5	5	0	5	0.05	0	0	0	5		EMH

	0.5		0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5		0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.54 > 0.53	Reject
AIICO	4	0	4	4	5	4	3	0	4	4	4	3		EMH
CUSTO	5.3		5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3		5.3	5.3	0.0	0.0	5.35 =5.35	Accept
DIAN	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	0	0		EHH
	10.		10.	10.	10.	10.	10.		10.	10.	0.0	0.0	10.05	Accept
ETI	05	0.25	05	05	05	05	05	0.25	05	05	0	0	=10.05	EHH
	11.		11.	11.	11.	11.	10.		11.	11.	11.	10.	11.20	Reject
FBNH	20	-0.05	20	20	20	15	95	-0.05	20	20	05	95	>10.95	EMH
	3.3		3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2		3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.30 <3.25	Reject
FCMB	0	0	1	1	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	5		EMH
FIDELIT	4.1		4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1		4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.15 =4.15	Accept
YBK	5	-0.01	5	5	5	4	5	-0.01	5	5	5	2		EHH
	21.		20.	20.	21.	20.	21.		21.	21.	21.	21.	21.40	Accept
GTCO	40	0.5	30	30	40	35	40	0.5	40	40	50	15	=21.40	EHH
JAIZBA	0.8		0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8		0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.87 =0.87	Accept
NK	7	0	9	9	7	7	7	0	7	7	7	7		EHH
LASAC	0.8		0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8		0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.89.> 0.85	Reject
O	9	0	5	5	9	9	5	0	9	9	5	5		EMH
LINKAS	0.4		0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4		0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.40<0.43	Reject
SURE	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	3		EMH
NEIMET	1.3		1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.4		1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.39 <1.40	Reject
H	9	0	7	7	9	9	0	0	9	9	0	0		EMH
	4.5		4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5		4.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	4.50 =4.50	Accept
NEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		EHH
	6.1		6.1	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.1		6.1	6.1	0.0	0.0	6.15 =6.15	Accept
NNFM	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	0	0		EHH
NPFMC	1.7		1.5	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.7		1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.71=1.71	Accept
RFBK	1	-0.12	8	8	1	0	1	-0.12	1	1	0	0		EHH
PRESTI	0.4		0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4		0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.42=0.42	Accept
GE	2	-0.04	2	2	2	2	2	-0.04	2	2	0	0		EHH
STANBI	30.		30.	30.	30.	30.	30.		30.	30.	0.0	0.0	30.55	Accept
C	55	0	55	55	55	55	55	0	55	55	0	0	=30.55	EHH
STERLN	1.4		1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.4		1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.40=1.40	Accept
BANK	0	-0.03	3	3	1	9	0	-0.03	0	0	0	7		EHH
	7.3		7.5	7.5	7.3	7.3	7.2		7.3	7.3	7.3	7.2	7.30 >7.25	Reject
UBA	0	-0.05	5	5	5	0	5	-0.05	0	0	5	5		EMH
UNITYB	0.5		0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5		0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.57=0.57	Accept
NK	7	0.01	7	7	7	7	7	0.01	7	7	0	0		EHH
WEMAB	3.4		3.1	3.1	3.4	3.2	3.4		3.4	3.4	0.0	0.0	3.43 =3.43	Accept
ANK	3	0	2	2	3	8	3	0	3	3	0	0		EHH
ZENITH	22.		22.	22.	22.	22.	22.		22.	22.	22.	22.	22.75>22.2	Reject
BANK	75	0.45	75	75	75	60	20	0.45	75	75	70	00	0	EMH

Source: www.cashcraft.com

Discussion of Findings

From Table 1 and 2, study found a positive Monday effect and rejects the efficient market hypothesis of selected securities while other securities have no stock return from Friday and Monday which implies the validity of the efficient market hypothesis. The findings of the study are in line with relevant studies such as the findings of Derbali and Hallara (2016) that a leverage effect exists and argued that this means that bad news tends to increase volatility more than good news, Zilca (2017) that returns increase as the week progresses in the smallest capitalization deciles when taking into account the full period and blamed the increasing returns during a week on behavioural factor, that mood often tends to increase throughout the week and concluded that the day-of-the-week effect has declined over the years as it is not as clearly evident in the latter years compared to the beginning years of the investigated period, Claesson (1987) settlement effects can be a reasonable explanation of the day-of-the-week effect in this return data and that a day-of-the-week effect it does exist on the Stockholm Stock exchange in the years 1978-1984, Cross (1973) that this resulted in that the index advanced in 62 percent of all the Fridays and in 39.5 percent of all Mondays and that in 48,8 percent of the cases where there was an advance on a Friday, the advance on a Friday led to an advance on the following Monday, Gibbon and Hess (1981) that negative mean returns on Mondays are rather uniform, both concerning the S&P 500 stock index, and also across different security types, such as American treasury bills which shows a below average returns on Mondays and the findings of Lee et al. (1990) that the day-of-the-week effect is present in the majority of the Asian stock markets during 1980-1988.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined the stock market anomalies and efficient market hypothesis with empirical analysis of Monday effect of selected securities from Nigeria. The study used daily security prices listed on the Nigeria Exchange. Findings of the study revealed a mix reaction of stock market anomalies and efficient market hypothesis among the studied securities. Evidence from table 1 and 2 proved that some stocks have return greater or less than zero which implies that investors in such stocks had abnormal return which contrary to the assumptions of efficient market hypothesis. However, some stocks have no return from the price of Friday and the price of Monday which implies that the investor have no return, this is in line with efficient market hypothesis. From the findings, the study makes the following recommendations:

- i. The regulators should develop the stock market such that the functioning of the market is in line with the stock market of the developed countries to reflect relevant assumptions and theories
- ii. The Securities and Exchange Commission should take a leading role in regulating abnormal financial activities in the stock market
- iii. Market operators culpable for insider trading offences should be punished to ensure availability of information on securities to the market allowing the free interplay of demand and supply to determine security values as current market values of securities on the NSE reflect available security information.

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, A., & Tandon, K. (1994). Anomalies or Illusions? evidence from stock markets changes in dividends? *American Economic Review*, 71, 3, 421-36
- Akani, H. W & Imegi, J. C. (2017). Monetary policy transmission mechanism and liquidity of capital market: A Time Series Study From Nigeria: 1981-2016. *IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance (IOSR-JEF)* , 8(5), 01-24
- Anyamaobi, C. (2018). Monetary policy and the performance of Nigeria capital market: A time variant analysis. *European Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance Research*, 6(6), 22-43.
- Archana, S., Safeer, M., & Kelvin, S. (2014). A study on market anomalies in India Stock Market. *International Journal of Business and Administration Research Review*, 1(3), 128-137
- Arewa, A., Nwakanma, P. C., & Torbira, L. L. (2014). Detecting market anomalies: do evidences hold in Nigeria? *.Bus Eco J 5: 091*.
- Ariel, R. (1987). The monthly effect in stock returns. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 18(2), 161-174.
- Ariel, R. A. (1990). High stock returns before holidays: Existence and evidence on possible causes. *The Journal of Finance*, 45(5), 1611-1626.
- Bundoo, S.K. (2011). An analysis of stock market anomalies and momentum strategies on the stock exchange of Mauritius. *AERC Research Paper*, 227(1), 1-48,
- Claesson, K., (1987). Effektiviteten på Stockholms Fondsbörs, Stockholm: s.n.
- Cross, F., (1973). The behavior of stock prices on Fridays and Mondays. *Financial Analysts Journal*,. 67-69.
- Derbali, A., & Hallara, S., (2016). Day-of-the-week effect on the Tunisian stock market return and volatility. *Cogent Business & Management*.
- Fama, E.F. (1965). The Behaviour of Stock Market Prices. *Journal of Business*, 38(1), 34-105.
- Fama, E.F. (1970). Efficient capital markets: A review of theory and empirical work. *Journal of Finance*, 25(2), 383-417.
- Gbeda, J. & Peprah, J., (2017). Day of the week effect and stock market volatility in Ghana and Nairobi stock exchanges. *Journal of Economics and Finance*, 5(4),90-106.
- Gibbon, M. & Hess, P., (1981). Day of the week effects and asset returns. *The Journal of Business*, p. 579
- Gultekin, M. N., & Gultekin, N. B. (1983). Stock Market Seasonality. International Evidence. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 12(4), 469-481.
- Keim, D. & Stambaugh, R., (1984). A Further Investigation of the Weekend Effect in Stock Returns. *The Journal of Finance*, p. 819

- Keim, D., (1983). Size-related anomalies and stock return seasonality. *Journal of Financial Economics*, pp. 13-32.
- Keim, D.B. (1983). Size-related Anomalies and Stock Return Seasonality: Further Empirical Evidence. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 12, 13-32
- Lee, I., Pettit, R. & Swankoski, M., (1990). Daily Return Relationships among Asian Stock Markets. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, pp. 265-283.
- Lucky, A. L., Akani, H. W., & Anyamaobi, C., (2015). Prudential determinants of stock prices of commercial banks in Nigeria: An application of fundamentalists and macroeconomic view. 1980 – 2014. *IIARD International Journal of Banking and Finance Research 1 (7)*, 1 – 27.
- Rozeff, M. S. & Kinney Jr., W. R. (1976). Capital market seasonality: The case of stock returns. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 379–402.
- Shiller, Robert J. (1981). Do stock prices move so much to be justified by subsequent
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D (1986). Rational choice and the framing of decisions in eighteen. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 13; 83-106.
- Urquhart, A. & McGroarty, F. (2014). Calendar effects, market conditions and the Adaptive Market Hypothesis: Evidence from long-run U.S. data. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 35, 154-166.
- Zilca, S., (2017). The evolution and cross-section of the day-of-the-week effect. *Financial Innovation*.