Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	
1.1 BACKGROUND	4
1.2 Types of Unit Trust Fund in Malaysia	5
1.2.1 Close-ended Fund	
1 2 2 Open-ended Fund	:
1 2 3 Different Types of Open-ended Funds	
1.3 FEES	
Figure 1: Unit Trust Funds Fees Structure	
1.4 THE OBJECTIVE OF THIS STUDY	. 10
1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	. 1
1.6 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY	. 11
1.5 ORGANISATION OF THE REPORT	
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.3 REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE ON FEES - OTHER COUNTRIES	. 13
2.4 REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE ON PERSISTENCE PERFORMANCE – OTHER COUNTRIES	. 15
2.5 REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE - MALAYSIA	. 10
CHAPTER 3	. 18
CHAF IER J	-
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
3.3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	. 1
3.4 Hypothesis	. 19
1.5.1 Types and Sources of Data	. 2
Table 1: Data Compilation Source	. 2
3.5 SAMPLE DESIGN	. 2
3.6 RATE OF RETURN	. 2:
3.6.1 NAV Return.	. 2.
3.6.2 Actual Return	. 2.
3.6.3 Effective Cost of Investing (ECI)	. 2.
3.6.4 Fund Age	. 2.
3.6.5 Persistence Performance Analysis	. 2
3.7 MARKET PROXY	
CHAPTER 4	2
RESEARCH RESULTS	2
Table 1: Number of Funds for Each Category as at 31 Dec 2000	. 2
4.3 YEAR ON YEAR (YOY) ANALYSIS	. 2
4.3.1 Analysis on YoY NAV Returns for the last 10 years	. 2
Figure 2: YoY Average NAV Return for 108 funds Vs KLCI and Emas	. 2
Table 2 - Yearly Average NAV Return for Malaysian Unit Trust Funds	2
Figure 3: Average VoV NAV Return for Each Category Vs KLCI and EMAS for the period	
from 1991 to 2000	2
Table 3 – Percentage of Funds Outperformed KLCI In Each Category	2
4 3 2 Analysis On YoY Actual Returns for the Past 10 years.	. 3
Figure 4: YoY Average Actual Returns for 108 funds Vs KLCI and Emas	3
Table 4 - YoY Average Actual Return For Malaysian Unit Trust Funds	3
Figure 4: YoY Average NAV Vs Actual Returns from 1991 - 2000	3
Table 5 - Percentage of funds outperformed the KLCI (Actual Return)	3
Figure 6: Categories 10 years YoY Average NAV Vs Actual Returns	3
1.5.2 Effective Cost of Investing	. 3
Table 6: Funds with more than 10% effective cost of investing for year 2000	3
Table 8: Compare the different between the front-end load Vs Average ECI	3

4 4 ANALYSIS ON CUMULATIVE RETU	URN	36
4.4.1 Different Holding Period Cu	umulative NAV Return - 1991 until 2000	36
Table 9: Cumulative NAV Ret	urn for Different Holding Period	36
Figure 7: Cumulative NAV Ret	turns	37
4 4 2 Different Holding Periods C	Cumulative Actual Return - 1991 until 2000	38
Figure 8: Cumulative Actual Re	etum	38
Table 10: Actual Returns for D	Different Holding Periods	39
Figure 9: Comparison on Aver	age NAV and Actual Returns Vs Indices	40
1 5 3 Effective Cost of Investing for	or Different Holding Period	41
Figure 10: Effective Cost of Inv	vesting for Different Holding Period (1991-2000)	41
Table 11: Effective Cost of Inv	vesting for Different Holding Period	41
4.5 AGE OF THE FIND	would for Different forming	43
Figure 11: Number of funds for	r different age group from 1991 to 2000	43
Table 12: T.Tast Summery	anneren age group near 1771 to 2	44
Table 12: Mann of Excess Patri	ım for Different Age Group	44
4.6 DEDECTENCE DEDECOMANCE	un for Director Age Group	45
4.0 PERSISTENCE PERFORMANCE	sistence (Short Term Horizons)	45
Table 14: 1001 VoV Top 10 E	quity Funds	45
16 2 Three Veer Performance Pe	rsistence (Medium Term Horizons)	46
Table 15: 1001 1003 Top 10 F	Equity Funds (3 Years Returns)	46
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND	RECOMMENDATIONS	47
5.3 STIMMARY AND CONCLUSION		47
5.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL I	RESEARCH	49
5.5 POLICY IMPLICATIONS	RESEARCH	50