

**INVESTOR'S FORTUNE AND UNIT TRUST
RATINGS**

AHMAD RIDHUWAN BIN ABDULLAH

**MASTER OF SCIENCE (FINANCE)
UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA
FEBRUARY 2011**

INVESTOR'S FORTUNE AND UNIT TRUST RATINGS

BY

AHMAD RIDHUWAN BIN ABDULLAH

**Thesis Submitted to the Centre for Graduate Studies,
Universiti Utara Malaysia,
in Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Science (Finance)**



KOLEJ PERNIAGAAN
(College of Business)
Universiti Utara Malaysia

PERAKUAN KERJA KERTAS PROJEK
(Certification of Project Paper)

Saya, mengaku bertandatangan, memperakukan bahawa
(I, the undersigned, certified that)

AHMAD RIDHUWAN B. ABDULLAH (806029)

Calon untuk Ijazah Sarjana

(Candidate for the degree of) **MASTER OF SCIENCE (FINANCE)**

telah mengemukakan kertas projek yang bertajuk

(has presented his/her project paper of the following title)

INVESTOR'S FORTUNE AND UNIT TRUST RATING

Seperti yang tercatat di muka surat tajuk dan kulit kertas projek
(as it appears on the title page and front cover of the project paper)

Bahawa kertas projek tersebut boleh diterima dari segi bentuk serta kandungan dan meliputi bidang ilmu dengan memuaskan.

(that the project paper acceptable in the form and content and that a satisfactory knowledge of the field is covered by the project paper).

Nama Penyelia : **PROF. DR. NUR ADIANA HIAU BT ABDULLAH**
(Name of Supervisor)

Tandatangan :
(Signature)

Tarikh : **13 FEBRUARY 2011**
(Date)

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a post graduate degree from Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the University Library may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in a part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor or, in her absence, by Dean of College of Business. Due recognition shall be given to me, my supervisor, and to Universiti Utara Malaysia for any scholarly use which may be made of any material from my thesis.

Request for permission to copy or to make use of materials in this thesis, in whole or in a part, should be addressed to:

**Dean,
Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business,
College of Business,
Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 Sintok,
Kedah Darul Aman.**

ABSTRACT

This study examines the usefulness of rating information supplied by Lipper using a sample of 68 Malaysian unit trust funds from December 2000 to November 2010. Four performance measures were used namely the Sharpe ratio, Treynor ratio, Jensen's alpha, and Fama and French 3-factor model. Overall, the study provides evidence unit trusts underperformed the market index and risk free rate in 3-year, 5-year, and 10-year investment horizons except for the highest rated funds which were able to provide positive returns. The test on performance differential between funds in each rating categories shows that the highest rated funds, second to highest and third to highest significantly outperformed the lowest rated funds especially in a longer investment horizons. This result indicated that Lipper rating system is rather useful in identifying the lowest to highest performance funds.

Keywords: Unit trusts; Rating; Performance

ABSTRAK

Penyelidikan ini bertujuan untuk menguji kegunaan maklumat penilaian yang disediakan oleh Lipper menggunakan sampel sebanyak 68 unit amanah Malaysia dari Disember 2000 hingga November 2010. Empat pengukur prestasi digunakan iaitu nisbah Sharpe, nisbah Treynor, Jensen alpha, dan Fama-French 3-faktor model. Secara keseluruhan, kajian ini memberikan bukti bahawa unit amanah tidak dapat mengatasi prestasi indeks pasaran dan pulangan bebas risiko dalam tempoh masa pelaburan selama 3 tahun, 5 tahun, dan 10 tahun kecuali unit amanah yang mendapat penilaian yang tertinggi atau dikenali sebagai 'Lipper leaders' yang dilihat mampu memberikan hasil yang positif. Ujian terhadap perbezaan prestasi antara saham amanah dalam setiap kategori penilaian menunjukkan bahawa unit amanah yang dinilai tertinggi, kedua tertinggi dan ketiga tertinggi secara signifikan mengatasi prestasi unit amanah nilai terendah terutama dalam jangkamasa panjang. Keputusan ini menunjukkan bahawa sistem penilaian oleh Lipper agak berguna dalam mengenalpasti prestasi unit amanah yang terendah dan tertinggi.

Kata kunci: Unit amanah; Penilaian; Prestasi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, my humble gratitude and appreciation to Almighty Allah, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful, for enabling me to proceed with this Project Paper work until its final form.

I am greatly indebted to my supervisor, Professor Dr. Adiana Hiau Abdullah who has made a significant contribution until the completion of this research and deserves special thanks for her kindness, patient, generosity and guidance when supervising my work. My thanks also to my examiner, Dr. Kamarun Nisham Taufil Mohd, for his support in order to make this research more meaningful.

Many persons had involved directly and indirectly, with full of willingness trying to contribute their efforts, time, energy and idea, in the preparation of this work. There are no words that can express my feeling of grateful unless by showing my thankfully to them in this acknowledgement.

Finally, special respects and thanks to my beloved father's soul, Abdullah Jaafar who inspired me to succeed now and hereafter. May his soul rest in peace and blessed by Allah S.W.T. My special respects and thanks also goes to my mother, Hjh. Samsiyah Hj Musa for her unconditional love and encouragement, and for my family and friends for being supportive throughout my study at Universiti Utara Malaysia.

Last but not least, I am grateful to Allah S.W.T for giving me faith, will and strength to complete my study.

Thank you.

	Page
<hr/>	
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN	
3.1 Introduction	27
3.2 Data Collection Method	27
3.2.1 Overview of Lipper Leader Rating System	27
3.2.2 Sample of Unit Trusts	31
3.3 Portfolio Performance Measures	34
CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	
<hr/>	
4.1 Introduction	41
4.2 Descriptive Statistics	42
4.3 Correlation Coefficients of Unit Trust Returns and Market Indices	45
4.4 Lipper Rating System and Unit Trust Performance	47
4.5 Concluding Remarks	56
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION	
<hr/>	
5.1 Conclusion	57
5.2 Limitation of the Study	58
5.3 Implications of the Study	59
5.4 Direction for Future Study	59
REFERENCES	61
<hr/>	
 APPENDIXES	 66
<hr/>	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PERMISSION TO USE	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Problem Statement	4
1.3	Research Questions	7
1.4	Research Objectives	8
1.5	Significance of the Study	9

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Introduction	10
2.2	Modern Portfolio Theory	10
2.3	The Important of Fund Ratings	12
	2.3.1 Introduction	12
	2.3.2 Stock and Fund Recommendations	13
	2.3.3 Rating and Fund Performance	17
2.4	Hypothesis	25
2.5	Conclusion	26

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1	Introduction	25
3.2	Data Collection Method	25
	3.2.1 Overview of Lipper Leader Rating System	25
	3.2.2 Sample of Unit Trusts	29
3.3	Portfolio Performance Measures	31

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

4.1	Introduction	38
4.2	Descriptive Statistics	39
4.3	Correlation Coefficients of Unit Trust Returns and Market Indices	42
4.4	Lipper Rating System and Unit Trust Performance	44
4.5	Concluding Remarks	53

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

5.1	Conclusion	54
5.2	Limitation of the Study	55
5.3	Implications of the Study	56
5.4	Direction for Future Study	56

REFERENCES

APPENDIXES

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 3.1	Lipper Leader ratings metrics	29
Table 3.2	Sample of unit trusts in each rating category	32
Table 4.1	Summary statistics of benchmark indices and unit trust returns from December 2000 to November 2010	42
Table 4.2	Correlation coefficients of unit trust returns with benchmark indices	46
Table 4.3	Risk-adjusted performance of unit trust based on Lipper Leader rating system for 10-year, 5-year, and 3-year investment horizons from December 2000 to November 2010	49
Table 4.4	Performance differential between fund ratings using the Jensen and Fama-French three-factor model	55

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SMB	Small minus big
HML	High minus low
REITs	Real estate investment trusts
US	United States
SC	Security Commission of Malaysia
FIMM	Federation of Investment Managers Malaysia
EPF	Employees Provident Fund
ETP	Economic Transformation Program
NKEAs	National Key Economic Areas
MPT	Modern Portfolio Theory
NAV	Net asset value
UTODAY	Unit Trust Today Magazine
BM	Bursa Malaysia
FTSE	The Financial Times and the London Stock Exchange
MSCI	Morgan Stanley Capital International
MGS	Malaysian Government Securities
S	Sharpe ratio
T	Treynor ratio
R_i	Return of fund i
R_{m_t}	Market return at period t
RFR	Risk free rate
T-stat	T-Statistics

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Today, unit trusts or mutual funds have become one of the popular investment alternatives that could offer attractive and promising returns to investors. There are several types of unit trust which include balanced funds, fixed income funds, equity funds, real estate investment trusts (REITs), and money market funds. Both retail and institutional investors use these alternatives as part of their portfolio composition. They will select a particular type of unit trust that serve their preferences or investment objectives. Normally, investors who are adequately informed made their selection criteria based on past, current, and expected future performance of such funds which in turn increased the need for performance evaluation. Furthermore, the growing popularity of unit trusts as an investment alternative to investors has put an additional weight on funds performance evaluation. As such, portfolio performance evaluation has become one of the dynamic academic studies that have been long documented and evolved in finance field. Consequently, there were many performance measurements have been developed, innovated, and employed in many studies conducted across the globe in order to examine funds performance.

Regardless of the studies conducted by researchers that could help investors to select the right unit trusts (profitable funds), there is another source of information that is publicly

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

REFERENCES

- Adkisson, J. A. & Fraser, D. R. (2003). Reading the stars: Age bias in Morningstar ratings. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 59(5), 24–27.
- Barber, B., Lehavy, R., McNichols, M. & Trueman, B. (2001). Can investors profit from the prophets? Security analyst recommendations and stock returns. *Journal of Finance*, 56(2), 531–563.
- Bekaert, G., Erb, C., Harvey, C. & Viskanta, T. (1997). The cross-sectional determinants of emerging equity market returns. In Peter Carman (ed.) *Quantitative Investing for the Global Markets. Strategies, Tactics and Advanced Analytical Techniques* (pp. 221-272). Chicago: Fitzroy Fearborn Publishers.
- Blake, C. R. & Morey, M. R. (2000). Morningstar ratings and mutual fund performance. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 35(3), 451–483.
- Blume, M. E. (1998). An anatomy of Morningstar ratings. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 54(2), 19–27.
- Brinson, G. P., Hood L. R. & Beebower, G. P. (1986). Determinants of portfolio performance. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 42(4), 39–48.
- Brinson, G. P., Singer, B. D. & Beebower, G. P. (1991). Determinants of portfolio performance II: An update. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 47(3), 40–48.
- Brown, N. C., Wei, K. D. & Wermers, R. R. (2009). Analyst recommendations, mutual fund herding, and overreaction in stock prices. *Working Paper Series*, available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1092744>.
- Chan, K., Hwang, C. Y. & Mian, G. M. (2005). Mutual fund herding and dispersion of analysts' earnings forecasts. *Working Paper Series*. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=675562>.
- Comerton-Forde, C., Gallagher, D. R., Lai, J. & Walter, T. (2010). Broker recommendations and Australian small-cap equity fund management. *Accounting & Finance*, (Article published online in advance of print).

- Del Guercio, D. & Tkac P. A. (2002). The determinants of the flow of funds of managed portfolios: Mutual funds vs. Pension funds. *Journal of Financial & Quantitative Analysis*, 37(4), 523–57.
- Del Guercio, D. & Tkac, P. A. (2008). Star power: The effect of Morningstar ratings on mutual fund flows. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 43(4), 907–936.
- Desai, H., & Jain, P. C. (1995). An analysis of the recommendations of the ‘superstar’ money managers at Barron’s annual roundtable. *Journal of Finance*, 50(1), 1257–1273.
- Fama, E. (1991). Efficient capital markets: II. *Journal of Finance*, 46(5), 1575–1617.
- Fama, E., & French, K. (1992). The cross-section of expected stock returns. *Journal of Finance*, 47(2), 427–465.
- Fama, E., & French, K. (1993). Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 33(1), 3–56.
- Fauziah, Md. T. & Mansor, I. (2007). Malaysian unit trust aggregate performance. *Managerial Finance*, 33(2), 102–121.
- Federation of Malaysian Unit Trust Managers (n.d.), available at: www.fmutm.com.my (accessed on 15 November 2010).
- Ferreira, E. J. & Smith, S. D. (1999). Stock price reactions to recommendations in the Wall Street Journal “Small Stock Focus” column. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 39(3), 379–389.
- Fikriyah, A., Taufiq, H. & Shamsheer, M. (2007). Investigation of performance of Malaysian Islamic unit trust funds: Comparison with conventional unit trust funds. *Managerial Finance*, 33(2), 142–153.
- Füss, R., Hille, J., Rindler, P., Schmidt, J. & Schmidt, M. (2010). From rising stars and falling angels: On the relationship between the performance and ratings of German mutual funds. *The Journal of Wealth Management*, 13(1), 75–90.

- Gerrans, P. (2004). Australian managed fund ratings and individual investors. *Australian Journal of Management*, 29(1), 87–107.
- Gerrans, P. (2006). Morningstar ratings and future performance. *Accounting & Finance*, 46(4), 605–628.
- Grinblatt, M. & Titman, S. (1992). The persistence of mutual fund performance. *Journal of Finance*, 47(5), 1977–1984.
- Gruber, M. J. (1996). Another puzzle: the growth in actively managed mutual funds. *Journal of Finance*, 51(3), 783–810.
- Henriksson, R. D. & Merton, R. C. 1981. On Market Timing and Investment Performance: Statistical Procedures For Evaluating Forecasting Skills. *Journal of Business*, 54, 513–533.
- Hirschey, M., Richardson, V. J. & Susan, S. (2000). How ‘foolish’ are internet investors? *Financial Analysts Journal*, 56(1), 62–69.
- Jain, P. C. & Wu, J. S. (2000). Truth in mutual fund advertising: Evidence on future performance and fund flows. *Journal of Finance*, 55(2), 937–958.
- Jensen, M. C. (1968). The performance of mutual funds in the period 1945-1964. *Journal of Finance*, 23(1), 389–416.
- Kacperczyk, M. & Seru, A. (2007). Fund manager use of public information: New evidence on managerial skills. *The Journal of Finance*, 62(2), 485–528.
- Khorana, A. & Nelling, E. (1998). The determinants and predictive ability of mutual fund ratings. *Journal of Investing*, 7(3), 61–66.
- Kosowski, R., Timmermann, A., Wermers, R. & White, H. (2006). Can mutual fund “stars” really pick stocks? New evidence from a bootstrap analysis. *Journal of Finance*, 61(6), 2551–2596.
- Kräussl, R. & Sandelowsky, R. M. R. (2007). The predictive performance of Morningstar’s mutual fund ratings. *Working Paper Series*, available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=963489>.

- Lai, M. M. & Lau, S. H. (2010). Evaluating mutual fund performance in an emerging Asian economy: The Malaysian experience. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 21, 378–390.
- Lashgari, M. & Wahab, M. (2003). The information content of Morningstar's mutual fund ratings: The case for growth funds. *American Business Review*, 21(2), 1–15.
- Leong, K. H. & Aw, M. W. (1997). Measuring unit trust performance using different benchmarks. *Capital Market Review*, 5(2), 27–44.
- Loviscek, A. L. & Jordan, W. J. (2000). Stock selection based on Morningstar's ten-year, five-star general equity mutual funds. *Financial Services Review*, 9(2), 145–158.
- Low, S. W. (2007). Malaysian unit trust funds' performance during up and down market conditions: A comparison of market benchmark. *Managerial Finance*, 33(2), 154–166.
- Markowitz, H.M. (1952). Portfolio selection. *Journal of Finance*, 7(1), 77–91.
- Mathur, I. & Waheed, A. (1995). Stock price reactions to securities recommended in business week's inside Wall Street. *Financial Review*, 30(3), 583–604.
- Merton, R. C. (1981). On market-timing and investment performance I: An equilibrium theory of value for market forecasts. *Journal of Business*, 54, 363–406.
- Morey, M. R. & Gottesman, A. (2006). Morningstar mutual fund ratings redux. *The Journal of Investment Consulting*, 8(1), 25–37.
- Morey, M. R. (2002). Rating the raters: An investigation into mutual fund rating services. *Journal of Investment Consulting*, 5(2), 30–50.
- Morey, M. R. (2005). The kiss of death: A 5-star Morningstar mutual fund rating? *Journal of Investment Management*, 3(2), 41–52.
- Reilly, F. K. & Brown K. C. (2009). *Analysis of investments and management of portfolios*. (9th ed.). Australia: South Western.

- Sant, R. & Zaman, M. A. (1996). Market reaction to Business Week 'Inside Wall Street' column: A self-fulfilling prophecy. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 20(4), 617–643.
- Sawicki, J. & Thomson, K. (2000). An investigation into the performance of recommended funds: do the managed funds 'approved' by research companies outperform the non gratae, *Advances in Pacific Basin Financial Markets*, 6, 101–124.
- Shamsher, M. & Annuar, M. N. (1995). The performance of unit trusts in Malaysia: Some evidence. *Capital Market Review*, 3, 51–69.
- Sharpe, W.F. (1966). Mutual fund performance. *Journal of Business*, 39(1), 119-138.
- Sharpe, W.F. (1992). Asset allocation management style and performance measurement. *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 18(2), 7–19.
- Sirri, E. R. & Tufano, P. (1998). Costly search and mutual fund flows. *Journal of Finance*, 53(5), 1589–1622.
- Stickel, S. E. (1995). The anatomy of the performance of buy and sell recommendations. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 51(5), 25–39.
- Treynor, J. L. (1965). How to rate management of investment funds. *Harvard Business Review*, 44(3), 63–75.
- Womack, K. L. (1996). Do brokerage analysts' recommendations have investment value? *Journal of Finance*, 51(1), 137–167.