inance professors are by their
ture a skeptical lot, but their
disdain for the forecasting practice
known as charting has been especially
notable.

Charting is the branch of technical
analysis that tries to predict price changes
in a stock on the basis of certain visual
patterns in a chart of its historical prices
or volume data. In some academic
circles, charting is dismissed out of hand.

But according to a new study, much of
this scorn may have resulted from a
simple breakdown in communication
between the academics and the chartists. The study was prepared by
Andrew W. Lo, a professor at the Sloan School of Management at the
Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Jiang Wang, a professor of
finance at MIT; and Harry Mamaysky, a graduate student.

In the past, academics didn't comprehend the chartists' argot, which is
filled with terms like “double top” -- the pattern that is formed after two
successive rallies end at more or less the same price, which is supposed to
signal weakness in a stock's share price.

If academics had only understood what the chartists were talking about,
the study contends, they might have found much with which they could
agree.

Consider the following sentence: "The presence of clearly identified
support and resistance levels, coupled with a one-third retracement
parameter when prices lie between them, suggests the presence of strong
buying and selling opportunities in the near term." That mouthful is
crystal clear to a chartist but is inscrutable, if not ridiculous, to an
academic.

How about this one, written in professor-speak: "The magnitudes and
decay pattern of the first 12 autocorrelations and the statistical
significance of the Box-Pierce Q-statistic suggest the presence of a
high-frequency predictable component in stock returns."

According to Lo and his co-authors, the two sides' sentences say
essentially the same thing: that past prices contain information that may
be useful in predicting future movements.

Why did it take so long to discover that chartists and finance professors
may at times be basically in agreement? In part, it is because of the
difficulties of translating chartists' visual pattern recognition into the
mathematics on which academics rely.

The professors believe, however, that recent advances make the
translation easier. Because charting patterns can now be expressed in
terms that academics can understand and measure, they say, researchers
can now focus on gauging which charting techniques actually work.

The authors have done so with five popular but previously elusive chart
patterns, known as head and shoulders, broadening tops (and the related bottoms), triangles, rectangles and double tops (and the related bottoms). After defining them mathematically, the researchers back-tested the patterns' predictive prowess on price data for 750 stocks over 35 years ending in 1996.

One of their findings is that the patterns predict the future direction of Nasdaq stocks better than they do exchange-listed issues. Some that seemed to work well as buy or sell signals for Nasdaq shares failed utterly when applied to exchange-listed stocks. More research is needed to determine why that should be so.

Of the five patterns studied, two worked particularly well with both kinds of stocks in forecasting price weakness: double tops and the so-called head and shoulders -- a pattern in which a stock rallies and falls back again three successive times, with the second of the three rallies (the head) advancing further than either the first or the third (the shoulders).

Unfortunately, Lo and his colleagues did not calculate the returns that would have been garnered had investors bought and sold stocks based on signals from the chart patterns. The results, they conclude, simply suggest that charting "can add value to the investment process."

Still, from a team of academics, that's a remarkable endorsement.
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