Performance Evaluation of Pakistani Mutual Funds: Through Carhart Four-Factor Model

Naveed[*] and Umar Farooq[**]

Abstract:

The study was conducted by evaluating the performance of Pakistan mutual funds. Mutual fund is an enterprise that puts resources into a differentiated arrangement of securities. Individuals who pay for shares of a mutual fund are its proprietors or shareholders. Out of the total 119 mutual funds, 89 mutual funds were selected for the sample of the study. The data were collected from financial statement of the Mutual Funds, Mutual Funds Association of Pakistan and State Bank of Pakistan from 1962 to 2015. The results found that in Rm-Rf money market, income, equity, assets allocation, balanced and sharia of the open ended Mutual Funds was significant and closed ended was insignificant. In small minus big (SMB) balanced fund was significant. In high minus low income and equity fund were significant and in momentum money market, equity, assets allocation and sharia funds were significant.

Keywords: Carhart, SMB, HML and Momentum.

Introduction

A mutual fund can profit from its securities in two ways: a security can pay profits or enthusiasm to the fund or a security can ascend in esteem. A fund can likewise lose cash and drop in esteem. The decreased danger of a portfolio originates from the advantages of enhancement given by mutual funds, chiefs to the speculators or investors. Chiefs charge little measure of expenses for their administration and for taking care of the expenses related with exchanging securities.

The Carhart four-factor model is an expansion of the Fama–French three-factor display including a momentum factor, additionally referred to in the business as the MOM factor (monthly momentum). Momentum in a stock is portrayed as the inclination of the stock cost to keep rising in the event that it is going up and to keep declining on the off chance that it is going down. The MOM can be figured by subtracting the equivalent weighted average of the most noteworthy performing firms from the equivalent measured normal of the least performing firms,

---

[*]Naveed, Ph.D Scholar, Abasyn University, Peshawar, Pakistan, E mail: naveedtoro97@gmail.com.

[**] Dr. Umar Farooq, Vice Chancellor, Abasyn University, Peshawar, Pakistan

slacked one month (Carhart, 1997).[1] Additionally, a stock is indicating momentum if its earlier 12-month average of profits is certain. Like the three factor model, the momentum variable is characterized as a self-financing arrangement of (long positive momentum) + (short negative momentum). Momentum procedures continue being famous in money related markets with the end goal that financial examiners consolidate the 52-week value high/low in their Buy/Sell proposals.

According to Fang et al. (2014) a mutual fund is an organization that puts resources into a differentiated arrangement of securities. Individuals who purchase shares of a mutual fund are its proprietors or shareholders. Investments made by them give the cash to the mutual fund to purchase securities, for example, stocks and bonds.[2]

Objective of the Study
1) To determinant factors affecting Performance of the mutual funds.
2) To evaluate Performance of Mutual Funds in Pakistan for the period 1962 – 2015.

Significance of the Study
1) The research will benefit academic area, as it will contribute to the existing body of knowledge.
2) The investors can benefit from this study by gaining knowledge of how to utilize their investments in mutual funds.
3) This study provides understanding to financial specialists and managers to utilize and enhance mutual funds.

Literature Review
Grinblatt & Titman (1992) found the positive attentiveness in the mutual funds.[3] Grinblatt& Titman (1993) affirmed the presence of both negative and positive execution constancy in the mutual funds. As per their review, if a mutual reserve has not performed well in the past then it won't give great returns later on and if the store has performed well before, it will keep on performing admirably later on moreover. [4]Carhart (1997) found the confirmations of a negative diligence in mutual funds for long haul.[5] In actuality, James & Douglas (1998) in their review on security mutual funds found that there is no connection between past execution and future returns similarly as security mutual funds are concerned and along these lines they didn't bolster the presence of execution steadiness in the mutual funds. In another review done by Jan & Hung (2004), the creators did not bolster the execution tirelessness in the mutual funds. [6]

Carhart (1997) analyzed the profits of mutual funds from 1962 to 1993 to search for proof of execution steadiness. Carhart's essential logical procedure was to frame execution deciles arrangement of mutual funds on January 1 of every year in view of profits over the previous year. The portfolios are then held for one year and checked for any anomalous execution. On the off chance that execution is persevering, funds that performed well in the past ought to perform well later on, and the top deciles portfolios ought to beat alternate portfolios. He found that past victors do outflank past washouts, that as it may, the greater part of this industriousness is clarified by a four-calculate show including component emulating portfolios for the market return, measure, book-to-market, and one-year force. Force is the greatest clarification of the industriousness. The rest of the diligence is for the most part clarified by reserve costs and exchange costs, which are higher in the lower execution deciles. Of the 8% distinction in yearly returns that he finds between the top and base deciles, 4.6% is clarified by four-consider loadings, 0.7% is clarified by cost contrasts, and 1.0% is clarified by exchange cost contrasts. This leaves an unexplained return spread of 1.7%, all of which is moved in the distinction between the ninth and tenth deciles. At the end of the day, Carhart discovers some confirmation that the most exceedingly awful funds keep on underperforming however finds no proof of persevering aptitude in any of alternate deciles.

Moreover, looking at the property returns distinguishes the wellspring of the tireless underperformance of the most exceedingly awful funds in Carhart (1997). Is this underperformance because of picking awful stocks, or is it the consequence of exchange costs, shrouded costs, or other in secret activities? Given that the study locate no unexplained determination in the possessions returns, the study presume that Carhart's industrious underperformance must be because of different activities of the mutual reserve, likely exchange costs from being compelled to offer shares as investors haul out cash. At last, dissecting the possessions information is valuable in light of the fact that any inconsistency can be made an interpretation of straightforwardly into an exchanging procedure. Ingenuity in mutual store returns is fascinating however hard to misuse. The investors can buy the triumphant funds, however I can't short the washouts.

Wermers et al. (2007) examine the profits of mutual store possessions and arrive at the inverse conclusion that great administrators have noteworthy stock-picking aptitude.[7] They distinguishes "great" supervisors in light of past alpha gauges and afterward frames an equivalent weight portfolio that is long stocks held lopsidedly by "great" directors and short stocks held excessively by "awful" administrators.

They find that this exchanging methodology brings about huge alpha, which they translate as confirmation of stock-picking ability. A critical issue with this investigation is that framing portfolios in light of a similar model used to dissect returns could inclination the outcomes. Critical alpha could originate from predispositions in the model. Also, utilizing rise to weight arrangement of stocks will overweight little stocks. I keep away from these issues by sorting in light of profits rather than alpha gauges and shaping equivalent weight arrangement of store returns rather than stock returns.

Many researchers have proven that momentum does not exist in the Japanese share market. Asness (2012) analyzed data from 1981 to 2010, and obtained a Sharpe ratio of 0.03, almost zero, which suggests that momentum does not exist in Japan.[8] Bretschger & Lechthaler (2012) study monthly data for the time period 1984 to 2009, and find that the Carhart model performs reasonably well, and performs even better when the period is split into two periods around 1998.[9] Fama& French (2012) test whether asset pricing models capture value and momentum patterns, by utilizing data for 23 countries for the timeframe of 1989 to 2011, with one of the countries being Japan. The results show no momentum in any of the size groups; however value premiums are evident in all size groups, with similar results for both small and large shares. It is results like this that have led many researchers to draw the conclusion that momentum does not exist in Japan.[10]

Correspondingly, Bangash (2012) broke down the execution of European mutual funds and the impact of charges and different expenditures on that execution. A Sample of 122 equity mutual funds, out of 296 open-ended mutual funds was taken after careful screening for the time of June 1990-December 2009. The risk balanced execution of mutual reserve returns was discovered utilizing Carhart four components display (1997). A considerable negative relationship was found to exist between mutual funds' execution and the charges demanded on those funds. [11]

Carhart found a large portion of this ingenuity is clarified by a four-calculate show, including variable emulating portfolios for the market return, estimate, book-to-market, and one-year force. Energy is the greatest clarification of the constancy. The rest of the industriousness is chiefly clarified by store costs and exchange costs, which are higher in the lower execution deciles. Of the 8% distinction in yearly returns that Carhart finds between the top and base deciles, 4.6% is clarified by four-calculate loadings, 0.7% is clarified by cost contrasts, and 1.0% is clarified by exchange cost contrasts. This leaves an unexplained return spread of 1.7%, all of which is amassed in the distinction between the

ninth and tenth deciles. At the end of the day, Carhart discovered some proof that the most noticeably bad funds keep on underperforming however there was no confirmation of constant aptitude in any of alternate deciles.

Methodology
In the proposed study closed ended and open ended mutual funds form Mutual Funds Association of Pakistan (MUFAP) was considered as population of the review and that is 119 mutual funds. Out of the total 119 mutual funds, 89 mutual funds were selected for the sample of the study on the basis of the availability of the data. Data was collected from these mutual funds from 1962 to 2015. For analysis the data was gathered from their yearly reports and also from Balance sheet investigation of State Bank of Pakistan. The information of the Net Assets Values (NAVs) was the major component of the data analysis. The historical data of NAVs were collected from the official web site of Mutual Funds Association of Pakistan (MUAF).

Carhart model develops Fama-French Three Factor Model by including one extra component; momentum. This component was included, on the grounds that many reviews, as Jegadeesh& Titman (1993)[12], Fama& French (1996)[13] and again Jegadeesh& Titman (2001) found that it was conceivable to build your profit by purchasing stock that was doing admirably in the course of the last 1-6 months and offering stocks that were doing gravely throughout the last 1-6 months.[14] This system is regularly utilized as a part of situations when you need to choose in a few minutes which stocks you wish to purchase. Purchasing stocks that simply lost a great deal of significant worth and offering stocks that expanded in esteem tends to give great outcomes. The explanation for this is simply that the market dependably rectifies. After an extensive pick up in esteem, there are individuals who desire to make money out of their benefit and offer their stock at the high cost, diminishing the estimation of the stock simultaneously. Another hypothesis says that after an (extensive) increment in esteem, the stock might be overrated and will rapidly come back to its genuine esteem. UMD is short for up minus down. UMD measures the (verifiable) abundance returns of the winners that went up less the losers that lost esteem. This brought about the accompanying equation:

$$E(R) = R_f + \beta_4 (K_m - R_f) + b_{smb} * SMB + b_{hml} * HML + b_{umd} * UMD$$

Result & Discussion

The current study was conducted in checking the performance of Pakistani mutual funds. This study used to divide them into portfolios in-order to get most accurate results both individually and sector wise. The current study makes the portfolios on the basis of their nature and sector. The same sector firms are associated into a single portfolio.

Table: 1 Portfolio

S.No	Portfolio	Name	No of funds
1	Portfolio 1	Money Market	15
2	Portfolio 2	Income	19
3	Portfolio 3	Equity	14
4	Portfolio 4	Assets allocation	6
5	Portfolio 5	Balanced	7
6	Portfolio 6	Sharia Compliant	15
7	Portfolio 7	Closed ended	13
		Total	89

The Carhart four-factor model is an augmentation of the Fama–French three-figure model including an energy factor, additionally referred to in the business as the MOM figure (Carhart, 1997). Force in a stock is portrayed as the tendency at the stock cost to keep on rising in the event that it is going up and to keep declining in the event that it is going down. The MOM can be ascertained by subtracting the equivalent weighted normal of the most noteworthy performing firms from the equivalent measured normal of the least performing firms, slacked one month (Carhart, 1997). A stock is indicating energy if its earlier 12-month normal of profits is sure. Like, the three variable model, energy element is characterized without anyone else financing arrangement of (long positive momentum)+(short negative force). Momentum systems keep on being well known in budgetary markets with the end goal that money related investigators fuse the 52-week value high/low in their Purchase/Sell recommendations (Low & Tan).

Table: 2 Carhart four-factor model

Performance		Coefficient			
Portfolio	R^2	Rm-Rf	SMB	HML	Mom
Money Market	0.13	0.66	0.75	-.37	-0.54
		2.140**	1.463	-0.085	-2.58**
Income	0.17	0.18	0.16	0.66	0.73
		4.878**	0.510	2.609**	0.534
Equity	0.16	0.56	-0.32	-0.75	-0.46
		2.606**	-1.003	-2.670**	-2.45**
Asset Allocation	0.34	0.69	-0.15	-0.24	0.45
		3.372**	-0.255	-0.148	2.53**
Balanced	0.22	0.68	0.38	0.30	-0.32
		3.969**	3.327**	0.514	-0.55
Sharia	0.50	0.19	-0.29	0.39	-0.22
		6.942**	-1.086	0.562	-2.30**
Closed Ended	0.02	-0.201	0.24	0.38	-0.30
		-0.07	0.1120	1.232	-0.99

The above table is the findings of carhart model by using four factors i.e. CAPM, SMB, HML and Momentum. The model was by the data on portfolio basis. The findings of the money market show that the CAPM and momentum shows significant effects on the performance while the SMB and HML shows the insignificant effects. The income market results shows that the CAPM and the HML have significant effects on the performance while the SMB and the momentum have insignificant effects. The remaining findings shows that the CAPM model shows a significant effects on the performance in the equity market, assets allocation, balanced funds and in sharia compliant while it shows insignificant effects on the performance in the case of closed ended mutual funds. While the results of the SMB shows significant for the balanced funds while insignificant for the equity, assets allocation sharia and closed ended funds. The results of HML are only significant for the equity while it is insignificant for the assets allocation, balanced funds, sharia and closed ended funds. The results of momentum show significant result for the equity, assets allocation and sharia while insignificant for the balanced and closed ended funds.

Proof exhibits that investors don't take after a ponder system of specifically putting resources into momentum funds. Or maybe they appear to innocently pursue late champ funds, and, all the while, they unwillingly advantage the momentum impact temporarily. This leads mechanically to the watched evident determination capacity among fund investors.

Conclusion & Recommendations

The outcomes of the study demonstrate that a typical factor in stock returns, as opposed to choice capacity, with respect to mutual fund investors, represents the clear ideal execution of new cash portfolios archived in the writing. Since Gruber, clarifies the astounding development in effectively oversaw mutual funds rests upon modern investors having the capacity to distinguish unrivaled supervisors and contribute in like manner, an essential ramifications of our discoveries is that the confound noted by Gruber still asks an answer.

The outcomes demonstrate that, steady with past reviews, there is confirmation of a keen cash impact in view of a three-figure show. Additionally appear, nonetheless, that once we represent return momentum in study execution benchmark, the clear contrast in execution is killed for each situation. The absence of positive alphas in the wake of controlling for momentum recommends that investors don't distinguish support administrators with predominant capacity. How translate the income choices of investors? There are two potential understandings of the part of momentum in clarifying the execution the new cash portfolios, each with contending suggestions for the determination capacity of fund investors.

Notes & references

[1] Carhart, M.,On Mutual Funds Performance Persistence. Journal of Finance, 52 (1997): 57-82.

[2] Fang, L. H., Peress, J., & Zheng, L., Does Media Coverage of Stocks Affect Mutual Funds' Trading and Performance?.*The Review of Financial Studies*, *27*(12), (2014): 3441-3466.

[3] Grinblatt, M., & Titman, S. The persistence of mutual fund performance. *The Journal of Finance*, *47*(5) (1992): 1977-1984.

[4] Ibid.,(1993).

[5] Op.cit., Carhart

[6] Jan, Y. C., & Hung, M. W. Short-run and long-run persistence in mutual funds. *The Journal of Investing*, *13*(1) (2004): 67-71.

[7] Wermers, R., Yao, T., & Zhao, J. The investment value of mutual fund portfolio disclosure. *Unpublished working paper, (University of Maryland*, 2007).

[8] Asness, C. S., Frazzini, A., & Pedersen, L. H. Leverage aversion and risk parity. *Financial Analysts Journal*, *68*(1) (2012): 47-59.

[9] Bretschger, L., &Lechthaler, F. Common risk factors and the macro economy: new evidence from the Japanese stock market. *Business & Economic Review*, *5*(2) (2012).

[10]Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. Size, value, and momentum in international stock returns. *Journal of financial economics*, *105*(3) (2012): 457- 472.

[11] Bangash, R. Evaluation of European Mutual Funds Performance. *World Journal of Social Sciences*, *2*(1) (2012): 154-173.

[12] Jegadeesh, N., and Titman, S. Returns to buying winners and selling losers: Implications for stock market efficiency, Journal of Finance 48, (1993): 65–91.

[13] Fama, "Components of Investment Performance", Journal of Finance, Vol. 27, (1972): 551-567.

[14] Jegadeesh, N., & Titman, S. Profitability of momentum strategies: An evaluation of alternative explanations. *The Journal of finance*, *56*(2)(2001): 699-720.