

INNOVATIVE MUTUAL FUND PRICING

December 27, 2004

Mari Korpela

Pohjola Asset Management
Lönrotinkatu 5
FI-00100 Helsinki, Finland
mari.korpela@pohjola.fi

Vesa Puttonen*

Helsinki School of Economics
Runeberginkatu 22-24
FI-00100 Helsinki, Finland
vesa.puttonen@hkkk.fi

* Professor in Finance and corresponding author. We would like to thank Tom Smythe, Matti Suominen, and seminar participants at the GSFFA Research Seminar for helpful comments and suggestions.

INNOVATIVE MUTUAL FUND PRICING

Abstract

We examine the determinants of fund expenses. Finnish registered mutual funds are of our particular interest as fund management companies have disclosed new mutual fund statistics since 2002. In general, Finnish registered equity and balanced funds distributed through bank offices charge higher expense ratios than equity and balanced funds distributed through fund management companies. Our results suggest that existing customer relationship, bank cross-selling and convenience contribute to fund selection of bank mutual fund customers rather than operational expenses.

We find that Tracking error and Turnover correlate positively with expense ratios. Turnover reflects greater trading activity and tracking error reflects active risk relative to a benchmark index. The positive coefficients suggest that fund managers charge for analysis work and trading activity. Consistent with the previous studies, Finnish registered equity funds with incentive fees charge lower operational fixed expenses than funds without incentive fee.

A substantial part of the seeming decrease of expenses in time of Finnish registered mutual funds may be due to product and fee structure development. Total expense ratios of new fund-of-fund structures are much higher than what traditional expense ratios would suggest.

Keywords: mutual funds, fees, expense ratio

1. Introduction

Mutual funds have received considerable attention in the finance literature. Previous studies have shown that fund size, fund age, fund family size, turnover and external fund growth as well as performance and investment objectives have an effect on mutual fund expenses. Investors choosing a mutual fund should not only consider investment policy, prior performance and risk characteristics, but also the fee structure of the fund. Expenses are worth pointing out since they are one of the few predictable features of fund investing.

It has been suggested that fund managers price superior performance by charging higher operational expenses. However, according to studies such as Gruber (1996) and Carhart (1997), higher expenses are associated with inferior rather than superior management and thus investors should prefer buying funds with low expense ratios. Carhart (1997) suggests that wealth-maximising mutual fund investors should become conscious that expense ratio, transaction costs and load fees have a direct and negative impact on fund performance. Moreover, Malkiel (1995) suggests that most investors would be considerably better off by purchasing low expense index funds than by trying to select an active fund manager who appears to possess a “hot hand” since active fund management generally fails to provide excess returns compared to passive approaches.

The objective of this study is to examine variables affecting Finnish mutual fund expenses. Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004) analysed the cross-sectional determinants of fund expenses during the years 1993 to 2000. Their findings suggested that Finnish fund expenses have decreased over time, consistent with EU membership reducing market segmentation and generating competition. Another key finding of the study was that bank-managed and older funds charge higher expenses but investors are not compensated with higher risk-adjusted returns.

We employ a new set of variables in examining the determinants of fund expenses. The Finnish Association of Mutual Funds requires the industry to disclose new variables such as turnover and tracking error from 2002. Using this information we are able to examine whether bank-managed funds are managed more actively than their non-bank competitors, which would explain their higher management fees.

We also analyse whether passively managed index funds charge lower expenses than actively managed mutual funds, as seems rational. Further, incentive fees as a part of mutual fund fee structures are examined. Finally, we examine the development of fund expenses in time. In particular, we focus on TER (Total Expense Ratio) figures provided by Fund Management companies and find that fund-of-funds incur much higher expenses than what their Expense ratios would suggest.

2. Previous studies

The pioneering study to explain how expense ratios differ in a cross-sectional sample of mutual funds was conducted by Ferris and Chance (1987). They found that large funds charged lower expenses suggesting that there were substantial economies of scale. Furthermore, their findings demonstrated that the existence of a 12b-1 plan increased expenses indicating that the plan was a dead-weight cost to investors.

The findings of Malhotra and McLeod (1997) suggested that expense conscious investors should look carefully at fund size, fund age, turnover ratio, cash ratio and 12b-1 plan of equity funds before investing. Their findings also indicated that if investors are looking for bond funds with low expense ratios, they should select large funds with low load fees, higher weighted average maturities and no 12b-1 plans.

Dellva and Olson (1998) analysed the relationship between fund characteristics and total fund expenses. Their results demonstrated that there were economies of scale in the industry and operational efficiencies experienced by larger funds were passed onto investors in the form of lower costs. Furthermore, they found that higher turnover funds charged higher expenses and U.S funds with objectives of investing in international securities experienced higher expenses than funds investing in the U.S securities markets.

Latzko (1999) suggests that economies of scale existed in administration of nearly all types of equity and bond mutual funds. In a follow up study, Latzko (2003) analysed variables influencing mutual fund expenses to evaluate the existence of economies of scale with a panel

of 600 funds during the period from 1995 to 2001. According to the findings, however, the average fund did not experience economies of scale.

In order to analyse whether the mutual fund industry showed declining production costs LaPlante (2001) examined all stock and bond funds that were available to investors from 1994 through 1998. Based on the findings, fund size, age, fee structure, management style, clientele, distribution network and investment objective had an effect on fund expenses. After controlling for factors influencing mutual fund expenses, LaPlante (2001) found that the average fund showed declining shareholder fees.


Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004) examined cross-sectional determinants of Finnish mutual fund expenses. They found that expenses charged by Finnish mutual funds were declining over time, emphasizing that the Finnish fund market has become more competitive. The findings further indicated that banks charged higher expenses compared to independent fund management companies, older funds charged higher fees and larger funds did not exhibit economies of scale, in contrast with U.S studies. They also found wide variation in fund expenses based on fund type. Analysis of fee structure variables demonstrated that having a front-end load, a back-end load or both load fees had no influence on expenses but, however, funds designed for institutional investors charged significantly lower expenses.

3. The Finnish mutual fund market

Mutual funds in Finland were established rather late compared to other developed countries such as other EU member countries and the United States. It was not until the year 1987 when banks introduced the first mutual funds after the formation of the legal framework for mutual funds. However, the industry did not experience growth until the latter part of the 1990's. Figure 1 presents the growth in net asset value of Finnish registered mutual funds during the period from 1993 to end of the June 2003. Assets under management have increased from EUR 626 million in the year 1993 to EUR 19 912 million at the end of June 2003 according to the Mutual Fund Reports¹.

¹ Mutual Fund Report is a monthly report provided by the Finnish Association of Mutual Funds.

Figure 1. Net Asset Value of Finnish Registered Mutual Funds during the Period from 1993 to the End of June 2003




Source: Mutual Fund Reports.

In addition to tremendous growth in assets under management, the number of mutual funds in the Finnish market has also increased significantly. Figure 2 illustrates that the number of mutual funds has grown from 25 funds in the year 1993 to 321 funds at the end of June 2003. However, if all the mutual funds marketed in the Finnish financial market are taken into consideration, the total number of funds amounted to 734 at the end of June 2003 from which 413 funds are in foreign registry. Fund management companies charged together management fees worth EUR 171 million during the year 2002².

² Financial Supervision Authority's Bulletin 2/2003. Available at <http://www.rahoitustarkastus.fi>.

Figure 2. Number of Finnish Registered Mutual Funds during the Period from 1993 to the End of June 2003



Source: Statistics Finland, Mutual Fund Reports and Finnish Association of Mutual Funds.

Product development has been intense. Since the year-end 1999, hedge funds, fund-of-funds and especially index funds, among others, have established an evident foothold in the Finnish market³. Product development has also focused on mutual fund fee structures. For example, the use of performance-based compensation in the form of incentive fees has increased among actively managed funds. A specific feature of incentive fees in Finland is that they are asymmetrical i.e. never negative⁴.

Transparency of pricing is an important issue in fund marketing. Operational expenses, which compensate fund management companies for providing portfolio management, administrative and other related services are deducted daily from the value of a fund, and thus investors do not pay them explicitly. According to Barber et al. (2002), investors tend to be more sensitive to salient mutual fund expenses such as load fees than operational expenses, which are ongoing fees that are easily masked by the volatility of returns. The study of Barber et al. (2002) further implied that investors are more likely to buy funds that attracted their attention through exceptional performance, marketing or advertising than funds with favourable fee

³ First fund with incentive fee, Seligson & Co Phalanx, was established on December 1997 and the first index fund, Seligson & Co HEX25, was founded on April 1998.

⁴ While frequently used in hedge funds regular mutual funds cannot use asymmetric incentive fees in the US. Mutual fund managers may use a performance-based compensation but the fee should be symmetric around the benchmark index. The reasoning behind the strict incentive fee regulation in US is the concern that the fee structure rewards fund managers for outperforming a benchmark without penalizing for underperforming. Thus, it provides an incentive to take excessive risks.

structure. Jain and Wu (2000) show that advertising performance specifically leads to incremental flows. Gallagher et al (2004) also show that investor flows to a family of funds have a piecewise linear relation with a family's relative levels of advertising expenditures as well as the past performance.

In order to increase transparency in the Finnish mutual fund market, the Finnish Association of Mutual Funds recommended in November 2001 that all Finnish fund management companies should announce new statistics with respect to funds under their management. Recommendations for regular reporting of certain fund statistics was prepared in cooperation with the Financial Supervision Authority (FSA) with an aim to create a uniform practice for reporting of mutual fund statistics. The recommendations cover the following mutual fund statistics⁵:

- Tracking error
- Portfolio turnover ratio
- Total expense ratio (TER)
- Brokerage commissions paid to investment service providers under common control with the fund manager
- Standard deviation

These new statistics were reported for the first time in mutual funds' semi-annual reports for 2002 but, however, at the latest in the year 2002 annual reports. As mutual funds have not previously disclosed information concerning total costs, tracking error as well as portfolio turnover rate and trading costs the development into greater transparency was welcomed.

4. Data

The majority of the data analysed in this study was obtained from the Mutual Fund Reports which provide information on fund returns over various investment horizons, risk measures (volatility and beta) and risk-adjusted returns (Sharpe ratio and Jensen's alpha). The Mutual Fund Reports also include information on fund characteristics such as fund age, minimum

⁵ Finnish Association of Mutual Funds (2001).

initial investment and number of investors. Furthermore, the Reports provide information on load fees, existence of incentive fee, expense ratio consisting of management fee and custodian fee as well as assets under management and external fund growth.

Additional fund statistics prepared in compliance with the recommendations of the Finnish Association of Mutual Funds were collected from 2002 mutual fund annual reports and from 2002 and 2003 semi-annual reports. Additional data related to fund characteristics were collected from annual and semi-annual reports and fund prospectuses.

In general, for a mutual fund to be qualified in the sample, it must have at least one-year of performance history since a minimum of twelve months of past performance is required to calculate tracking error and volatility in compliance with the recommendations of the Association. Furthermore, in order to be qualified in the sample, all requisite information on fund characteristics must be available.

The cross-sectional analysis of Finnish mutual fund expenses was implemented in two steps. First, a general analysis of Finnish mutual fund expenses was conducted with a sample consisting of both Finnish and foreign registered funds at the end of the year 2002. Out of the 612 mutual funds included in the general analysis, 264 were registered in Finland and 348 were in foreign registry.

Second, cross-sectional analysis of Finnish registered mutual funds with the new variables was carried out⁶. At the end of June 2002, there were 189 Finnish registered funds that had at least one-year of performance history and disclosed all the new mutual fund ratios in accordance with the recommendations of the Finnish Association of Mutual Funds. The number of funds was 219 at the year end 2002 and 255 at the end of June 2003, respectively.

Investment objectives by fund sample can be seen in Table 1. Due to small number of foreign registered money market funds, money market funds were analysed together with bond funds. Further, risk and hedge funds (OTHER) were not analysed separately due to the small number of funds included in the samples analysed in this study.

⁶ Foreign registered funds are not required to follow the recommendations of the Finnish Association of Mutual Funds. Therefore, they do not report additional statistics.

Table 1. The number of funds categorized according to the investment objective of a fund

	ALL MUTUAL FUNDS		FINNISH REGISTERED FUNDS	
	12/02	06/02	12/02	06/03
EQUITY	24	19	21	26
BALANCED	9	9	9	8
EUREQUITY	115	30	35	36
INTEQUITY	256	44	55	67
INTBALANCED	75	36	40	50
BOND	36	21	24	24
CORBOND	16	6	8	10
INTBOND	42	2	2	5
MONEY	27	16	19	22
OTHER	12	6	6	7
TOTAL:	612	189	219	255

In line with previous research, the dependent variable, i.e. expense ratio (EXPENSE) is defined as the annual percentage of the total value of the mutual fund. The expense ratio reported in the Mutual Fund Reports consists of a management fee and custody fee. Correspondingly, TER includes all annual operational expenses of a mutual fund and is calculated according to the Finnish Association of Mutual Funds (2001) as follows:

$$TER = A + B + C + D \quad (1)$$

where,

A = Management fees payable out of fund assets, expressed as an annual percentage of assets under management. Incentive fees are reported separately with the TER figure.

B = Possible additional custody fees payable out of fund assets, expressed as an annual percentage.

C = Possible account maintenance fees and other bank charges payable out of fund assets.

D = Other additional fees and charges that can be subtracted directly from the fund assets based on applicable mutual fund rules. With respect to Finland-domiciled mutual funds, these expenses are covered under the management fee.

If fund-of-funds had all the requisite fund characteristics available, they were also included into analyses although their fee structure may differ significantly from other funds. Total

expense ratio (TER) was used for funds-of-funds instead of expense ratio in the first empirical analysis.

The portfolio turnover is calculated according to the Finnish Association of Mutual Funds (2001) as follows:

$$Turnover = \frac{Min(A, B)}{C} \quad (2)$$

where,

A = Total value of securities purchased during the period

B = Total value of securities sold during the period

C = Mean asset value of the fund during the period

Tracking error is expressed as the percentage tracking error over the previous year. According to the Finnish Association of Mutual Funds (2001), tracking error is calculated only if a fund has a pre-specified benchmark index and at least twelve months of performance history. The tracking error figures reported by fund management companies are computed according to the Finnish Association of Mutual Funds (2001) as follows:

$$Tracking\ Error = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_t^T (R_{Pt} - R_{Bt})^2}{T - 1}} \quad (3)$$

where,

R_{Pt} = Return of the portfolio in period t

R_{Bt} = Return of the pre-specified benchmark index in period t

T = Number of observations.

Frye (2001) examined whether U.S banks offered competitive products in the mutual fund industry. The findings indicated that expense ratios of non-bank bond funds were generally higher than that of bank managed funds. According to Frye (2001), banks may have been able to charge fees from other services provided to investors and thus they may not have needed to cover fixed costs with mutual fund fees, or alternatively differences in expense ratios may

have reflected less risk taken by bank fund managers. In contrast to Frye (2001), Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004) reported that being a bank fund increased expenses by 12 basis points, thus implying that Finnish bank customers as mutual fund investors were more interested in convenience than fund performance.

Finnish financial markets are characterised by strong bank dominance and retail banks have been able to maintain their strong position in the market since the first mutual funds were established. Although the number of bank-managed funds has recently increased in the United States, their role in the mutual fund market differs significantly from that of Finland partly due to the history of the regulatory climate in which they operate. However, according to Alexander et al. (2001), the role of banks in the U.S mutual fund industry is likely to continue to expand.

In order to compare empirical findings to those of Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004), independent variable BANK is included in the analysis. BANK is equal to one if the fund is distributed through the office network of a bank and zero otherwise.

To study the effect of load fees on mutual fund expenses, the variable regarding front-end load (FLFEE) is equal to one if the fund has only a front-end load and zero otherwise and correspondingly, the variable concerning back-end load (BLFEE) is equal to one if the fund has only a back-end load. If the fund has both load fees, the variable (BOTHFEE) is equal to one and otherwise zero. Due to the fact that the level of load fees in percentage terms may depend on the size of an investment and some funds charge fixed load fees, this study analyses only the existence of load fees. Further, the institutional fund (INSTL) variable equals one if the fund is targeted to institutional or wealthy investors with a minimum initial investment of EUR 100 000 or more and zero otherwise.

Expense ratio includes the management fee and other operational expenses such as administrative expenses, distribution and marketing expenses as well as custody fees. Load fees and transaction costs are not included among these expenses. Thus, the expense ratio includes all annual operational expenses of mutual funds incurred from fund management. As operational expenses are taken into consideration in the fund value on an ongoing basis, investors do not pay expense ratios explicitly.

Total Expense Ratio (TER) includes all annual operational expenses of mutual fund, and thus load fees and trading costs are excluded. The formula is based on a U.S. Investment Company Institute standard and has also been approved by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission⁷. The difference between Expense ratio and Total Expense Ratio is discussed later in the empirical analysis.

According to the Financial Supervision Authority (1999), the rules of a mutual fund should clearly state the criteria according to which fees are charged and additionally the rules should also contain information on the maximum amount of each fee. The Financial Supervision Authority (1999) concluded that the fee structures of mutual funds should be as clear and transparent as possible to investors.

5. Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics of all mutual funds in the Finnish market included in the sample at the end of the year 2002 are reported in Table 2. The sample used in this study accounted for 82,4 percent of mutual funds included in the Mutual Fund Report January 2003.

The average expense ratio is 1,30 percent over the sample consisting of 612 funds. 43 percent of funds included in the sample are in Finnish registry and 40 percent of funds are distributed through a bank office network.

Sixty-one percent of funds have both load fees, i.e. front-end load and back-end load while four percent of funds charge no load fees at all. The average front-end load and back-end load are 2,10 percent and 0,56 percent, respectively. Seven percent of funds in the sample have a minimum initial investment of EUR 100 000 implying that these funds are targeted to institutional investors.

⁷ Finnish Association of Mutual Funds (2001).

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of all Mutual Funds marketed in Finland at the Year-End 2002

Table presents descriptive statistics of variables used in empirical analysis of mutual funds marketed and sold in the Finnish financial market at the end of the year 2002. The sample included 612 mutual funds from which 264 funds were registered in Finland and 348 funds were in foreign registry. The sample included Finnish mutual funds, which had at least one-year performance history in addition to other relevant fund characteristics.

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
EXPENSE RATIO	0,00	3,30	1,30	0,532
SIZE (meur)	0,05	7 980,83	124,51	372,640
FAMILY SIZE (meur)	9,23	22 072,58	5 429,84	6 561,624
AGE	1,04	45,18	6,59	5,112
MIN INVESTMENT	0	3 000 000	45 831,93	233 710,946
FINLAND	0	1	0,43	0,496
BANK	0	1	0,40	0,490
VOLATILITY	0,10	54,30	19,77	10,997
RETURN	-65,73	65,57	-20,66	18,442
FRONT-END LOAD	0,00	5,25	2,10	1,806
BACK-END LOAD	0,00	2,00	0,56	0,440
FLFEE	0	1	0,27	0,444
BLFEE	0	1	0,07	0,259
BOTHFEE	0	1	0,61	0,487
NOFEE	0	1	0,04	0,206
INSTL	0	1	0,07	0,247
VALID N	612			

Descriptive statistics of the Finnish registered mutual funds are presented in Table 3. Variation of expenses charged by Finnish registered mutual funds is extensive. Whereas the lowest expense ratio is 0,10 percent, the highest expense ratio totals to 3,30 percent of fund value. The average expense ratio is 1,24 percent at the end of year 2002, which is slightly lower than that for the whole sample.

Total expense ratios (TER), which are reported in compliance with the recommendations of the Finnish Association of Mutual Funds, are slightly higher than average expense ratios. The difference between expense ratio and TER would be higher if expense ratio were used in connection with funds of funds. This difference will be analysed later. Furthermore, neither expense ratio nor total expense ratio includes the potential incentive fee.

The average fund was turned over 1,05 times during the year 2002. Average brokerage commissions paid to investment services providers under common control with the fund manager (BROKE) was approximately 18 percent of total brokerage commissions. Average

volatility was 17,35 percent at year-end 2002. Volatilities vary extensively from 0,12 percent to 54,06 percent. Six percent of funds included in the sample had incentive fees in their fee structures. The relative share of index funds increased from six percent to eight percent from end June 2002 to end June 2003.

54 percent of funds are distributed through a bank office network. The majority of Finnish registered funds, i.e. 73 percent, have both load fees and the average front-end load and back-end load are 0,74 percent and 0,77 percent, respectively. 11 percent of funds are targeted to institutional or wealthy investors. Descriptive statistics at the end of June 2002 and 2003 are in line with those of year-end 2002.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Finnish Registered Mutual Funds at the Year-End 2002

Table presents descriptive statistics of variables used in empirical analysis of Finnish registered mutual fund expenses at the end of the year 2002. The sample included 219 mutual funds, which had at least one-year performance history in addition to other relevant fund characteristics.

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
EXPENSE RATIO	0,10	3,30	1,24	0,689
TER	0,10	3,30	1,25	0,691
TURNOVER	0,02	6,03	1,05	0,898
TRACKING ERROR	0,06	62,40	8,61	8,354
BROKE	0,00	100,00	18,20	28,440
INDEX	0	1	0,07	0,261
INCFEE	0	1	0,06	0,245
SIZE (meur)	1,93	870,03	61,92	98,993
FAMILY SIZE (meur)	53,11	3 858,38	1 873,60	1 511,972
AGE	1,08	15,22	4,83	3,249
NO OF INVESTORS	51	80 731	4 369,95	9 208,412
MIN INVESTMENT	0	2 500 000	77 914,23	308 487,905
BANK	0	1	0,54	0,501
VOLATILITY	0,12	54,06	17,35	11,674
RETURN	-61,82	23,34	-16,68	18,290
GROWTH	-101,32	336,57	8,29	38,265
FRONT-END LOAD	0,00	2,50	0,74	0,486
BACK-END LOAD	0,00	2,00	0,77	0,376
FLFEE	0	1	0,06	0,237
BLFEE	0	1	0,17	0,380
BOTHFEE	0	1	0,73	0,449
NOFEE	0	1	0,05	0,209
INSTL	0	1	0,11	0,313
VALID N	219			

6. Results

This section presents the regression results of Finnish mutual fund expenses. Although the focus is on Finnish registered mutual funds, foreign registered funds are also analyzed in the first section.

The regression results of all mutual fund expenses in the Finnish market are presented in Table 4. The regression model explains approximately 46 percent of the variation of Finnish mutual fund expenses at year-end 2002. The regression presented in Table 4 has the same focus as Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004), who analysed cross-sectional determinants of Finnish mutual fund expenses in general. However, the sample used by Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004) was dominated by Finnish registered funds. In general, 68,4 percent of funds in their sample were in Finnish registry. In our sample from 2002, 43 percent of funds are registered in Finland.

Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004) found the variable FINLAND was positively but not significantly related to Finnish mutual fund expenses. However, on the basis of results presented in Table 4, expenses charged by Finnish registered mutual funds were on the contrary negatively related to expenses, but the coefficient estimate for FINLAND was not statistically significantly different from zero.

Mutual funds distributed through bank office networks charge higher expenses compared to fund management companies, a finding that is consistent with Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004) who found that being a bank fund significantly increased expenses by 12 basis points. Also, consistent with Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004) being an INSTL fund leads to a negative and statistically significant relationship to mutual fund expenses. Similar results that funds targeted to institutional investors charged lower expenses have also been found in Tufano and Sevick (1997), LaPlante (2001) and Lesseig et al. (2002).

The coefficient estimate for fund size is positive but not statistically significantly different from zero. Thus average Finnish mutual fund does not appear to experience economies of scale, a finding consistent with Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004). In contrast to their findings,

fund age does not explain Finnish mutual fund expenses in our sample. The coefficient is positive but not statistically significant.

Consistent with Latzko (2003), average funds belonging to a larger fund family did not charge lower expenses due to economies of scale at the fund family level, although the variable LNFAMILY was negatively related to expenses. Malhotra and McLeod (1997), Lesseig et al. (2002) as well as Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004) have found that the amount of fund family assets had a negative and statistically significant affect on individual fund costs. Furthermore, the regression results presented in Table 4 show that previous year return did not explain Finnish mutual fund expenses. Previous studies related to past performance of mutual funds have been contradictory. Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004) found that funds with higher previous year performance had higher expenses.

Consistent with previous studies, there were wide variations in fund expenses between different investment objectives with risk and hedge funds (OTHER) having the highest expenses while bond and money market funds having the lowest expenses.

Table 4. Regression Results of Finnish Mutual Fund Expenses at the Year-End 2002

Table reports regression results for the dependent variable expense ratio. The sample included 612 Finnish mutual funds at the end of the year 2002 from which 264 funds were registered in Finland and 348 funds were in foreign registry. Expense ratio is expressed as a percentage of fund assets under management. If the fund is registered in Finland, the variable FINLAND is equal to one and zero otherwise. LNSIZE is natural logarithm of fund assets under management and LNAGE is natural logarithm of the fund age in years. LNFAMILY is natural logarithm of total amount of assets under management at the fund family level. BANK is equal to one if the fund is distributed through bank and zero otherwise. RETURN is percentage previous year return of the fund. FLFEE is equal to one if the fund has only a front-end load and zero otherwise and correspondingly, BLFEE is equal to one if the fund has only a back-end load and zero otherwise. BOTHFEE is equal to one if the fund has both load fees and zero otherwise. INSTL is equal to one if the fund is targeted to institutional investors and zero otherwise. EQUITY, BALANCED, EUREQUITY, INTEQUITY, INTBALANCED, BOND, CORBOND, INTBOND, MONEY and OTHER denote Finnish equity funds, Finnish balanced funds, European equity funds, international equity funds, international balanced funds, European bond funds, European corporate bond funds, international bond funds, European money market funds as well as risk and hedge funds, respectively.

	Coefficient	Std. error	t-value	
CONSTANT	1,167	0,127	9,165	***
FINLAND	-0,054	0,047	-1,154	
LNSIZE	0,004	0,012	0,348	
LNAGE	0,026	0,021	1,219	
LNFAMILY	-0,018	0,012	-1,485	
BANK	0,110	0,038	2,917	***
RETURN	-0,0006	0,002	-0,359	
FLFEE	0,425	0,102	4,183	***
BLFEE	-0,020	0,104	-0,194	
BOTHFEE	0,382	0,103	3,713	***
INSTL	-0,353	0,070	-5,034	***
EQUITY	0,086	0,102	0,844	
BALANCED	0,181	0,128	1,418	
EUREQUITY	0,060	0,040	1,542	
INTEQUITY	0,061	0,039	1,542	
INTBALANCED	-0,197	0,074	-2,678	***
BOND	-0,658	0,086	-7,629	***
CORBOND	-0,596	0,109	-5,452	***
INTBOND	-0,632	0,068	-9,307	***
MONEY	-0,632	0,107	-5,931	***
OTHER	0,433	0,191	2,268	**
Adjusted R-square	0,460			
N	612			
F-value	28,36			
F-significance	0,000			

*** Significant at 1 % level, ** Significant at 5 % level, * Significant at 10 % level

We then analysed funds that reported the new fund statistics in their 2002 annual reports. The regression results of Finnish registered mutual fund expenses at the end of the year 2002 are presented in Table 5. Regression models explain over 60 percent of the variation of the mutual fund expenses.

Consistent with prior academic literature and preconceptions, passively managed index funds charge lower expenses than actively managed funds. The coefficient estimate INDEX is statistically significant at the one percent level. Further, turnover has a positive influence on Finnish registered mutual fund expenses emphasising that actively managed mutual funds with higher turnover ratios charge higher expenses. This finding is consistent with previous studies such as Dellva and Olson (1998) and Lesseig et al. (2002), which have found that higher portfolio turnover rates increase operational expenses. The coefficient estimates for TRERROR and TURNOVER are positive and statistically significant. Turnover reflects greater trading activity and tracking error reflects active risk relative to a benchmark index. The positive coefficients suggest that fund managers charge for analysis work and trading activity.

In order to test whether Finnish registered mutual funds with incentive fees charged lower fixed expenses than non-incentive fee funds, the variable INCFEE was included into the analysis. Having an incentive fee statistically significantly decreases fixed operational expenses. This finding is consistent with Elton et al. (2003), who documented that funds with incentive fees had lower fixed expenses than funds without such a fee. However, it should be noted that incentive fees will be added to fund expenses on top of fixed expenses and thus the total expenses charged by funds with incentive fees could be considerably higher than those of non-incentive fee funds.

Consistent with previous studies, there are wide variations in fund expenses between different investment objectives with risk, hedge funds (OTHER) having the highest expenses and bond and money market funds having the lowest expenses. Due to a small number of international bond funds (INTBOND), this class was excluded from the analysis. Having a front-end load, back-end load or both load fees have no influence on fund expenses, a finding consistent with Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004). Finnish registered funds targeted to institutional investors have lower expenses consistent with the previous studies.

Older Finnish registered funds have higher expenses consistent with the results of Tufano and Sevick (1997) and Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004), who found that funds with greater experience charged higher expenses. Funds that are distributed through banks have higher expenses consistent with Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004). External fund growth does not

explain Finnish registered fund expenses, a result consistent with Kasanen et al. (2001). Results related to previous year's return are inconclusive. Previous year return is significantly negatively related to fund expenses at the end of June 2002 while significantly positively related to expenses at the end of June 2003⁸. Fund size does not have influence on Finnish registered mutual fund expenses, whereas results show that fund family size had a statistically significant negative influence on Finnish registered mutual fund expenses at the end of June 2002 and at year-end 2002 consistent with Malhotra and McLeod (1997), Lesseig et al. (2002) and Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004).

⁸ In a table are not reported here.

Table 5. Regression Results of Finnish Registered Mutual Fund Expenses at the Year-End 2002

Table reports regression results for the dependent variable expense ratio. The sample consisted of 219 Finnish registered mutual funds at the end of the year 2002. Expense ratio is annual expense ratio expressed as a percentage of the fund assets under management. TURNOVER is percentage turnover of the fund assets over the previous year and TRERROR is percentage tracking error of the fund over the previous year. If the fund has incentive fee, variable INCFEE is equal to one and zero otherwise. INDEX is equal to one if the fund is index fund and zero otherwise. LNSIZE is natural logarithm of fund assets under management and LNAGE is natural logarithm of fund age in years. LNFAMILY is natural logarithm of total assets under management at the fund family level. BANK is equal to one if the fund is distributed through bank and zero otherwise. RETURN is percentage previous year return of the fund and GROWTH is previous year external growth of the fund. FLFEE is equal to one if the fund has only a front-end load and zero otherwise and correspondingly, BLFEE is equal to one if the fund has only a back-end load and zero otherwise. BOTHFEE is equal to one if the fund has both load fees. INSTL is equal to one if the fund is targeted to institutional investors and zero otherwise. EQUITY, BALANCED, EUREQUITY, INTEQUITY, INTBALANCED, BOND, CORBOND, MONEY and OTHER denote Finnish equity funds, Finnish balanced funds, European equity funds, international equity funds, international balanced funds, European bond funds, European corporate bond funds, European money market funds as well as risk and hedge funds, respectively.

	Coefficient	Std. error	t-value	
CONSTANT	0,906	0,216	4,202	***
TURNOVER	0,077	0,033	2,335	**
TRERROR	0,019	0,005	3,560	***
INCFEE	-0,433	0,113	-3,834	***
INDEX	-0,553	0,116	-4,780	***
LNSIZE	0,001	0,035	0,039	
LNAGE	0,246	0,060	4,098	***
LNFAMILY	-0,058	0,033	-1,768	*
BANK	0,235	0,074	3,167	***
RETURN	-0,0004	0,004	-0,097	
GROWTH	-0,0006	0,0005	-1,294	
FLFEE	0,051	0,173	0,297	
BLFEE	-0,009	0,112	-0,079	
BOTHFEE	0,144	0,137	1,051	
INSTL	-0,231	0,100	-2,298	**
EQUITY	0,053	0,122	0,436	
BALANCED	0,235	0,127	1,854	*
EUREQUITY	0,226	0,119	1,905	*
INTEQUITY	0,287	0,127	2,270	**
INTBALANCED	-0,027	0,156	-0,172	
BOND	-0,576	0,135	-4,251	***
CORBOND	-0,235	0,185	-1,268	
MONEY	-0,536	0,137	-3,927	***
OTHER	0,509	0,192	2,648	***
Adjusted R-square	0,619			
N	219			
F-value	17,08			
F-significance	0,000			

*** Significant at 1 % level, ** Significant at 5 % level, * Significant at 10 % level

Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation coefficients between key variables analysed in this study are presented in Table 6. The data included in the correlation analysis consist of 219 Finnish registered funds at the end of the year 2002.

The correlation coefficient between expense ratio and TER is almost one. However, it is not given that the expense ratio and total expense ratio (TER) are the same. First, TER would be higher if expense ratios of fund-of-funds were considered instead of TER since the expense ratio of funds of funds does not usually include management fees of funds in which it invests. Hence, the total expense ratio of funds of funds could be higher than the expense ratio. Second, if TER included incentive fees in addition to other operational expenses, TER would also be higher than the expense ratio.

Consistent with the regression results, passively managed funds INDEX correlate negatively and statistically significantly with expense ratio and TER. Turnover has a positive but insignificant correlation with expense ratio and TER. This finding is consistent with the regression analyses that showed positive but only a weak relationship between portfolio turnover rate and operational expenses of Finnish registered mutual fund expenses.

Incentive fee correlates negatively but not significantly with expense ratio and TER. Tracking error, on the other hand, correlates positively and statistically significantly with expense ratio and TER, implying that funds with higher tracking error and thus more active management style, charge higher operational expenses. Interestingly, the correlation between the Tracking error and Turnover is practically zero which suggests that they measure different forms of management activity. Turnover obviously measures trading activity but high Tracking error shows that portfolio manager holds riskier securities than the benchmark.

Correlation analysis also demonstrates that variables related to existence of incentive fees correlate positively with turnover and tracking error, indicating that funds with the incentive fees have more active management styles and trade more frequently. Furthermore, correlation analysis illustrates that variable INDEX correlates negatively with turnover and tracking error implying that index funds use passive approaches emphasising low portfolio trading activity

and low active risk as measured by the difference between performance of a fund and the benchmark index.

Table 6. Correlation Analysis of Key Variables Used in Expense Analysis of Finnish Registered Funds

Table presents the Pearson Correlation coefficients between key variables used in the regression analysis of Finnish registered mutual funds. Sample consists of 219 mutual funds at the end of the year 2002.

	EXPENSE	TER	TURNOVER	TRError	INCFEE	INDEX
EXPENSE	1,00					
TER	0,999 ***	1,00				
TURNOVER	0,071	0,072	1,00			
TRError	0,548 ***	0,552 ***	0,052	1,00		
INCFEE	-0,093	-0,079	0,141 **	0,167 ***	1,00	
INDEX	-0,338 ***	-0,341 ***	-0,139 **	-0,164 **	-0,073	1,00

*** Significant at 1 % level, ** Significant at 5 % level, * Significant at 10 % level

We also analysed the three new variables (TER, Turnover and Tracking error) separately for bank –managed funds and independent funds. The findings are reported in Table 7. Panel A reports all Finnish registered funds and Panel B Finnish registered equity funds only. The findings are similar in both panels suggesting that bank-managed funds charge higher expenses. This is not explained by greater portfolio management activity since both turnover and tracking errors are higher for funds managed by independent fund managers. The finding is further evidence for the hypothesis that customers of bank-managed funds are not interested in fund performance and portfolio manager’s activity.

Table 7. Differences in TER, Turnover and Tracking Error by Distribution Channel (Bank vs. Non-bank).**Panel A. All Finnish Registered Funds 12/02**

	BANK	NON-BANK	t- statistics	P value
TER	1,4053	1,2126	-2,050	0,042
Turnover	0,8589	1,3357	3,826	0,000
Tracking Error	8,3794	9,6867	1,101	0,272

Panel B. Finnish Registered Equity Funds 12/02

	BANK	NON-BANK	t- statistics	P value
TER	1,7128	1,5195	-1,930	0,057
Turnover	0,7106	1,2246	3,332	0,001
Tracking Error	11,6228	14,8991	2,203	0,030

Average Expenses of Finnish Registered Funds Established 1997-2002

This section further examines the new Finnish registered mutual funds established during the period from 1997 to 2002. Since mutual fund expense ratios are rarely changed, it is interesting to analyse the level of expenses of newly established funds. Of particular interest is how new mutual funds are priced and whether average expenses of newly established mutual funds have decreased during the period. Table 8 presents the number of new mutual funds established during the period by fund type. The majority of funds established during the period were equity funds.

Table 8. Number of New Mutual Funds Established during the Period from 1997 to 2002.

Table presents number of new Finnish registered mutual funds established during the period from 1997 to the end of June 2003 by fund type. Investment objectives EQUITY, BALANCED, BOND, MONEY and OTHER include all Finnish registered funds that belong to the fund type in question regardless of geographical focus.


	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
EQUITY	11	23	29	30	20	23
BALANCED	1	10	18	17	5	10
BOND	3	4	8	7	6	8
MONEY	2	3	2	2	3	4
OTHER	4	-	-	3	3	3
N	21	40	57	59	37	48

Source: Mutual Fund Reports.

The average expenses charged by Finnish registered mutual funds established during the period in question can be seen in Figure 3. Average expenses of Finnish registered funds established during the period have been declining since the year-end 1997. This finding is consistent with Sandvall (2001) as well as Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004), who have documented that Finnish fund expenses have decreased over time. This has previously been interpreted as a sign of the market becoming more competitive.

Figure 3. Average Expenses of Finnish Registered Mutual Funds Established during Period 1997-2002

Figure depicts average expenses of new Finnish registered mutual funds established during the period from the year-end 1997 to the year-end 2002. Investment objectives EQUITY, BALANCED, BOND, MONEY and OTHER include all Finnish registered funds that belong to the fund type in question regardless of geographical focus.



Source: Mutual Fund Reports.

Further analysis suggests that there is something else going on, too. Table 9 reports the number of new index funds, fund-of-funds and funds that employ an incentive fee.

Table 9. The number of new funds registered in the Finnish market.

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
New funds total	21	40	57	59	37	48
- New index funds	0	4	4	1	1	5
- New fund-of-funds	0	0	4	13	6	17
- New funds with incentive fee	1	3	7	7	2	4
- % of all new funds	5%	18%	23%	36%	25%	54%

These new style funds charge operational expenses on a different basis than the traditional funds in the market. In particular, the fund-of-funds and funds with performance based fees have established a foothold in the Finnish market recently. Although funds with incentive fee may charge lower fixed expenses, their total expenses could be higher after considering the performance-linked part of the management fee. So far we have analysed expense ratios only when examining operational expenses. This figure does not include the possible incentive fee.

We also observe that there are several fund-of-funds with very low expense ratios. For example, the average expense ratio of new balanced funds (0.56%) was lower than the expense ratio of new bond funds (0.59). A closer look at these funds shows that Total Expense Ratios (TER) of these funds are much higher than the expense ratios. The recommended method for calculating TER in the European UCITS simplified prospectus (Directive 2001/107/EC) states that:

When a UCITS invests at least 10% of its net asset value in other UCITS or in non-UCITS which publish a TER, a synthetic TER corresponding to that investment should be disclosed.

The synthetic TER is equal to the ratio of:

- the UCITS' total operating costs expressed by its TER and all the costs charged to the UCITS by underlying funds expressed by the TER of the underlying funds divided by
- the average net assets of the fund

It is important to notice that TER should also include the TER of the underlying funds. While fund management companies were required to disclose the TER values in 2002, we were for the first time able to compare average operational expenses using both Expense ratio and TER for each fund. The results are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Expense ratios and Total Expense Ratios (TER) for new funds registered in the Finnish market in 2002.

	Fund-of-funds only		All funds		<i>Difference</i>
	Expense ratio	TER	Expense ratio	TER	
Equity	0,54	1,53	1,07	1,33	0,26
Balanced	0,51	1,44	0,56	1,10	0,54
Bond	0,45	0,96	0,59	0,72	0,13

Obviously, there are substantial differences in fund-of-fund Expense ratios and Total Expense ratios. While 17 out of 48 new funds were fund-of-funds in 2002 this affects the picture we may get from the pricing of new funds⁹. When all new funds in 2002 are analysed, we find that total operational costs are much higher than what expense ratios would suggest. For example, new balanced funds charge 1.10% total management fee instead of 0.56% suggested by the Expense ratio. This is much closer to the levels of management fee we observed for new balanced funds in 1997-1999 in Figure 3. The same applies for equity and bond funds – the decline in expense ratios in recent years is not reinforced with TER figures.

⁹ We calculated our own TER values for all fund-of-funds launched in 2002. This required that we found out the holdings of all 17 fund-of-funds at the year-end. We found that of 17 fund-of-funds 5 reported Expense ratio as TER, which is misleading. The 'true TER' calculated from the weighted TER's of the underlying funds is used in Table 10.

Expense ratios of newly established Finnish registered funds were collected from the Mutual Fund Reports that included data for the year-end in question. Thus expense ratio was used for all funds to examine operational expenses, including funds of funds that have been established during the period. Average expenses would be higher if total expense ratio were used for these funds. Furthermore, funds established during the period 1997-2002 also have incentive fees in their fee structures. Although funds with incentive fees may charge lower fixed expenses, after considering the performance-based compensation, expenses could be considerable higher. However, expense ratio as such does not take the incentive fee into consideration. Moreover, index funds tend to charge lower expenses compared to actively managed funds. Hence, it could be concluded that at least part of the decrease in average expenses of Finnish registered mutual funds may be due to fund product and fee structure development.

7. Conclusions

Given the general empirical evidence that average active mutual funds have not been able to outperform passively managed funds or market indices net of expenses, expenses should have an impact on investors' fund selection. The objective of this study was to examine the cross-sectional determinants of fund expenses. Finnish registered mutual funds were of particular interest in this study as fund management companies have disclosed new mutual fund statistics including portfolio turnover rate and tracking error figures in compliance with the recommendations of the Finnish Association of Mutual Funds for the first time in their 2002 semi-annual reports. The purpose was to evaluate whether turnover and tracking error explained the level of Finnish registered mutual fund expenses. Additionally, the aim was to analyse whether passively managed mutual funds charged lower expenses than actively managed mutual funds and whether operational expenses of funds with incentive fees differed from expenses charged by funds without incentive fees.

In general, Finnish registered equity and balanced funds distributed through bank offices charge higher expense ratios than Finnish registered equity and balanced funds distributed through fund management companies. Our results suggest that existing customer relationship,

bank cross-selling and convenience contribute to fund selection of bank mutual fund customers rather than operational expenses.

There is positive but weak evidence that turnover increases operational expenses of average Finnish registered mutual fund. This is consistent with previous studies, which have found that higher turnover increases operational expenses because of active trading. Thus the result suggests that investors selecting funds with lower turnover may, on average, expect lower expenses.

Equity funds that deliver higher tracking error values and thus more active management styles, charge higher operational expenses. Consistent with the previous studies, Finnish registered equity funds with incentive fees charge lower operational expenses than funds without incentive fee.

Sandvall (2001) and Korkeamaki and Smythe (2004) have reported that average expenses of Finnish mutual funds have declined over time consistent with increased competition. Similar pattern was also seen when analysing average expense ratios of Finnish registered mutual funds that were established during the period from 1997 to 2002. However, substantial part of the seeming decrease in average expenses of Finnish registered mutual fund may be due to product and fee structure development. Total expense ratios of fund-of-funds are much higher than what expense ratios only would suggest.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, Gordon J., Jones, Jonathan D. and Nigro, Peter J. (2001). Does Mutual Fund Disclosure at Banks Matter? Evidence from a Survey of Investors. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, Vol. 41, 387-403.
- Barber, Brad M., Odean, Terrance and Zheng, Lu (2002). Out of Sight, Out of Mind: The Effects of Expenses on Mutual Fund Flows. *Working Paper*, UC-Davis, UC-Berkeley and University of Michigan.
- Carhart, Mark M. (1997). On Persistence in Mutual Fund Performance. *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 52, No. 1, 57-82.
- Dellva, Wilfred L., and Olson, Gerard T. (1998). The Relationship between Mutual Fund Fees and Expenses and their Effects on Performance. *Financial Review*, No. 33, 85-103.
- Ferris, Stephen P. and Chance, Don M. (1987). The Effect of 12b-1 Plans on Mutual Fund Expense Ratios: A Note. *Journal of Finance*, Vol.42, No. 4, 1077-1082.
- Frye, Melissa B. (2001). The Performance of Bank Managed Mutual Funds. *Journal of Financial Research*, Vol. 24, No. 3, 419-442.
- Gallagher, Steven, Kaniel, Ron. & Starks, Laura. (2004). Madison Avenue meets Wall Street: Mutual fund families, competition and advertising. Working paper, University of Texas and Duke University.
- Gruber, Martin J. (1996). Another Puzzle: The Growth in Actively Managed Mutual Funds. *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 51, No. 3, 783-810.
- Jain P.C. and Wu Joanna Shuang (2000). Truth in Mutual Fund Advertising: Evidence on Future Performance and Fund Flows. *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 55, No. 2, 937-958.
- Kasanen, Eero, Lipponen, Ville and Puttonen, Vesa (2001). What determines mutual fund growth: Evidence from Finland. *Finnish Journal of Business Economics* 50:2, 227-259.
- Korkeamaki, Timo and Smythe, Thomas (2004). An empirical analysis of Finnish mutual fund expenses and returns. *European Financial Management* 10:3, 413-438.
- LaPlante, Michele (2001). Influences and Trends in Mutual Fund Expense Ratios. *Journal of Financial Research*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 45-63.
- Latzko, David A. (1999). Economies of Scale in Mutual Fund Administration. *Journal of Financial Research*, Vol. 22, No. 3, 331-339.
- Latzko, David A. (2003). Mutual Fund Expenses. *Working Paper*, Pennsylvania State University, York Campus.

- Lesseig, Vance P., Long, Michael D. and Smythe, Thomas I. (2002). Gains to Mutual Fund Sponsors Offering Multiple Share Class Funds. *Journal of Financial Research*, Vol. 25, No. 1, 81-98.
- Malhotra, D.K. and McLeod, Robert W. (1997). An Empirical Analysis of Mutual Fund Expenses. *Journal of Financial Research*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 175-190.
- Malkiel, Burton G. (1995). Returns from Investing in Equity Mutual Funds 1971 to 1991. *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 50, No. 2, 549-572.
- Sandvall, Thomas (2001). Essays on Mutual Fund Performance Evaluation. *Doctoral Dissertation*, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration.