

**The Impact Of Service Charge  
On The Performance Of  
Unit Trust Funds In Malaysia**

**Tan Hwei Juin**

Bachelor of Social Science (MIS)  
The University of Melbourne  
Melbourne  
Australia  
1994

Submitted to the Faculty of Business and Accountancy,  
University of Malaya, in partial fulfillment  
Of the requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Business Administration

February 2001

Perpustakaan Universiti Malaya



A510950528

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to express my greatest gratitude to Professor Dr. Mansor Md. Isa for supervising this dissertation. I am truly appreciative to him for taking time off from his busy schedule as the Dean to provide guidance and support towards completion of this research project.

I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to the management of Southern Unit Trust Berhad and especially my General Manager, Mr Robin Hannigan who has been very understanding and supportive to me towards successful completion of this research project.

Most importantly of all, I would like to extend my love and appreciation to my husband, Jooky for his encouragement and support especially in editing and comments on the drafts of this dissertation. He has shown great understanding for the whole duration of completing this research project.

## **Abstract**

In Malaysia, Unit Trust fund investors are subjected to different types of fees and expenses. However, many investors are not aware of such fees. This study concluded that unit trust funds on average would be able to outperform the KLCI during the bear market. Nevertheless, when the front load that funds charged are taken into account, the excess return was completely eliminated and some funds even ended with under-performance. Furthermore, this study also found that the fee an investor pays as front-end load does not constitute all the investment cost as assumed by most investors. It is therefore important that investors should pay more attention to front-end load when choosing a fund to invest in. This front-end load would be part of an opportunity cost and will result in reducing returns investment.

In Malaysia unit trust funds on average are capable of generating better than market's returns when holding period increases. However these returns are found to be reduced by the front-end load that the funds charged and caused an investor to receive less than market returns. This study clearly confirmed that published returns (NAV returns) is not the actual returns investors receive from their investment. Therefore, it may be misleading to investors when unit trust management companies advertise their NAV returns.

In order to achieve better than market performance, investors are advised to choose funds with lower front-end fees and with proven years of performance track record instead of just one year's performance record. Investors are also encouraged to study the fees and expenses breakdown at the funds' prospectuses and find out the front-end load from daily major newspapers.

## Table of Contents

<b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 BACKGROUND	4
1.2 TYPES OF UNIT TRUST FUND IN MALAYSIA	5
1.2.1 Close-ended Fund	5
1.2.2 Open-ended Fund	5
1.2.3 Different Types of Open-ended Funds	5
1.3 FEES	7
Figure 1: Unit Trust Funds Fees Structure	7
1.4 THE OBJECTIVE OF THIS STUDY	10
1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	11
1.6 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY	11
1.5 ORGANISATION OF THE REPORT	12
<b>CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>13</b>
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	16
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>18</b>
3.3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	18
3.4 HYPOTHESIS	19
1.5.1 Types and Sources of Data	21
Table 1: Data Compilation Source	21
3.5 SAMPLE DESIGN	21
3.6 RATE OF RETURN	22
3.6.1 NAV Return	22
3.6.2 Actual Return	23
3.6.3 Effective Cost of Investing (ECI)	23
3.6.4 Fund Age	23
3.6.5 Persistence Performance Analysis	24
3.7 MARKET PROXY	24
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>RESEARCH RESULTS</b>	<b>26</b>
Table 1 : Number of Funds for Each Category as at 31 Dec 2000	26
4.3 YEAR ON YEAR (YOY) ANALYSIS	27
4.3.1 Analysis on YoY NAV Returns for the last 10 years	27
Figure 2 : YoY Average NAV Return for 108 funds Vs KLCI and Emas	27
Table 2 – Yearly Average NAV Return for Malaysian Unit Trust Funds	28
Figure 3: Average YoY NAV Return for Each Category Vs KLCI and EMAS for the period from 1991 to 2000	29
Table 3 – Percentage of Funds Outperformed KLCI In Each Category	29
4.3.2 Analysis On YoY Actual Returns for the Past 10 years	30
Figure 4: YoY Average Actual Returns for 108 funds Vs KLCI and Emas	30
Table 4 – YoY Average Actual Return For Malaysian Unit Trust Funds	31
Figure 4: YoY Average NAV Vs Actual Returns from 1991 - 2000	31
Table 5 – Percentage of funds outperformed the KLCI (Actual Return)	32
Figure 6: Categories 10 years YoY Average NAV Vs Actual Returns	33
1.5.2 Effective Cost of Investing	33
Table 6: Funds with more than 10% effective cost of investing for year 2000	34
Table 8: Compare the different between the front-end load Vs Average ECI	35

4.4 ANALYSIS ON CUMULATIVE RETURN .....	36
4.4.1 <i>Different Holding Period Cumulative NAV Return – 1991 until 2000</i> .....	36
Table 9: Cumulative NAV Return for Different Holding Period .....	36
Figure 7: Cumulative NAV Returns.....	37
4.4.2 <i>Different Holding Periods Cumulative Actual Return – 1991 until 2000</i> .....	38
Figure 8: Cumulative Actual Return .....	38
Table 10: Actual Returns for Different Holding Periods .....	39
Figure 9: Comparison on Average NAV and Actual Returns Vs Indices .....	40
1.5.3 <i>Effective Cost of Investing for Different Holding Period</i> .....	41
Figure 10: Effective Cost of Investing for Different Holding Period (1991-2000) .....	41
Table 11: Effective Cost of Investing for Different Holding Period .....	41
4.5 AGE OF THE FUND.....	43
Figure 11: Number of funds for different age group from 1991 to 2000.....	43
Table 12: T-Test Summary.....	44
Table 13: Mean of Excess Return for Different Age Group.....	44
4.6 PERSISTENCE PERFORMANCE.....	45
4.6.1 <i>One Year Performance Persistence (Short Term Horizons)</i> .....	45
Table 14: 1991 YoY Top 10 Equity Funds.....	45
4.6.2 <i>Three Year Performance Persistence (Medium Term Horizons)</i> .....	46
Table 15: 1991-1993 Top 10 Equity Funds (3 Years Returns) .....	46
<b>CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>47</b>
5.3 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....	47
5.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH.....	49
5.5 POLICY IMPLICATIONS .....	50