On the robustness of persistence in mutual fund performance

Juan Carlos Matallín-Sáez[*1] Emili Tortosa-Ausina[2] Amparo Soler-Domínguez[1]

March 12, 2012

Abstract

This paper analyzes the persistence of performance in US equity mutual funds over the period 2001-2011 for both net and gross returns. The aim of this study is to assess the robustness of persistence methodologies by means of a set of simulated passive funds. Firstly the results show, in general, how the funds' performance is close to zero. However, some funds exhibit significantly more negative (positive) performance when net (gross) returns are used. With regard to persistence, first we apply contingency tables and transition matrixes in accordance with the previous literature. Results show how these methodologies are biased towards finding evidence of persistence too easily. A recursive portfolio approach is therefore applied that assesses the performance of investing following past performance recommendations. Our results show the importance of estimating the persistence for each fund style group and of considering a cross-sectional simulated procedure to estimate the significance of persistence. Thus, the results do not support the evidence of persistence in performance. Only very scarce evidence is found in some cases, but this also conditioned by whether net or gross returns are considered.

Key words
Mutual fund, performance, persistence.

JEL Code: G23, G11

---

[*] This study is part of the research projects P11B2009-54 supported by the Universitat Jaume I & Fundació Caixa Castelló-Bancaixa, and ECO2011-27227 supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación. Address for correspondence: Juan C. Matallín-Sáez, Dpto. de Finanzas y Contabilidad, Universitat Jaume I, E-12080 Castellón, Spain. Tel: +34 964 728 560, Fax: +34 964 728 565. E-mail: matallin@cofin.uji.es.
[1] Universitat Jaume I, Dept. Finanzas y Contabilidad
[2] Universitat Jaume I, Dept. de Economía e IVIE

1. Introduction

For decades the development of mutual fund industries has motivated a large body of literature that attempts to further understanding of mutual fund performance, an important issue for both investors and managers because of its undeniable impact on wealth. The question of whether mutual fund managers are skilled enough to beat the market is still under debate. However, while the issue of past added value is important, of greater concern is the question of whether it might arise in the future. Indeed, both individual and institutional investors have an interest in performance methodology that can help them select the funds that will give the best future results. As a consequence, a large body of literature now focuses on analyzing the persistence of fund performance, including authors such as Carhart (1997), Bollen and Busse (2005), Kosowski et al. (2006), Busse et al. (2010) and Fama and French (2010), among others.

In this context, the present study contributes by assessing the *robustness* of the methodologies considered in the literature to measure mutual fund performance persistence. By comparing a set of simulated and passive funds we find that using contingency tables and transition probability matrix methodologies suggests that results are biased towards evidence supporting mutual fund performance persistence. As suggested in more recent literature, we also measure persistence through the performance of portfolios that follow investment recommendations according to mutual fund past performance. Our results reveal the importance of estimating persistence by considering a separate analysis for groups of funds according to their style. When persistence is analyzed for all mutual fund styles, evidence of persistence might be due not to persistence in the value added by active management, but rather to the behaviour of the underlying classes of stock in which the fund invests. Moreover, we construct a probability distribution by simulating random investment recommendations in order to control for the significance of the performance of these portfolios. This allows us to differentiate the performance attributable to investments according to past performance from that obtained by investments in a particular style group of funds. The results show limited evidence of performance different from zero. If performance is close to zero, the persistence of this performance would also be expected to be limited, in general. Thus, only very scarce evidence of persistence is found in some cases, such as the worst Small Growth mutual funds, but this is also conditioned by whether net or gross returns are considered. On the other hand, some evidence of contrarian persistence is found when portfolios based on past performance invest in groups of funds with low active management such as index funds and simulated passive funds.

A large body of literature dealing with portfolio performance has evolved around the application of asset pricing models. The unconditional models of Sharpe (1966), Treynor (1966) and Jensen (1968) were followed by the contributions of Fama and French (1993) and today, the *three-factor model* is generally accepted for performance measurement. Also in this multifactor model context, Sharpe (1992) proposed an *asset class factor model* and showed how performance should be considered when comparing active and passive management. In these circumstances, managers will add value if mutual fund results outperform those from a passive investment that replicates a mutual fund style. In this vein, Elton and Gruber (1996), Pástor and Stambaugh (2002) and Matallín-Sáez (2006), among others, showed the importance of including benchmarks representing all the classes of assets in which the mutual funds invest, thus avoiding the effect of their omission. Elton et al. (1996), Gruber (1996) and Carhart (1997) introduced a four-factor model by adding the momentum effect. Such approaches compare the return of the funds with the expected returns according to the model of asset pricing considered, and the difference between them is identified as the value added by managers. Also in the asset pricing context, Ferson and Schadt (1996) and Christopherson *et al.* (1998), among others, have proposed assessing performance using conditional models and by considering the economic information available for managers.

The literature has not reached a unanimous conclusion on the value of performance. Some studies argue that it is impossible for funds to beat the market, while others find positive performance for a certain number of funds, thereby justifying active management. Undoubtedly, the effect of fund management costs on performance is a relevant aspect; studies by Carhart (1997), Wermers (2000), Fama and French (2010), among others, show how performance is penalized if net returns are considered. For this reason we use both gross and net fund returns to evaluate performance, and subsequently, persistence. We use the Carhart four-factor model (1997) to measure performance, which has been widely used in recent literature, such as studies by Kosowski (2006), Busse *et al.* (2010) and Fama and French (2010), among others.

The advancement of these methodologies is therefore important to attain an accurate evaluation of funds and their active management, but from the investor's perspective this analysis will be even more valuable if it explores the relationship between past and future performances. Studies by Gruber (1996), Chen *et al.* (2000) and Cohen *et al.* (2005), Cremers and Petajisto (2009) have tested performance finding evidence of persistence. However, controversy remains on the sources of persistence: Carhart's (1997) influential paper shows how persistence could be caused by managers' costs and the momentum effect, rather than managers' ability. Gottesman and Morey (2007) attribute persistence to the expense ratio and more recently, in the same vein, Fama and French (2010) identify costs as the source of persistence. Bollen and Busse (2005) find persistence beyond expenses or momentum. Wermers (2005) examines managers'

momentum and finds evidence of persistence in superior growth funds, but before deducting expenses and trading costs. Teo and Woo (2004) explore style effects and, more recently, Kosowski et al. (2006), using net returns after trading costs and fees, find evidence of persistence in growth-oriented funds, but find no evidence of ability among managers of income-oriented funds. On the other hand, other research provides evidence of persistence mainly in underperforming funds, as shown by Hendricks *et al.* (1993), Brown and Goetzmann (1995) and Elton et al. (1996), among others. The first two of these papers find that common investment strategies adopted by managers, but not captured by benchmarks or risk adjustment, could cause evidence of persistence. Carhart (1997), with the exception of the worst performing funds, reveals no significant evidence of persistence in his analysis of investment strategies based on past performance. Other studies, such as, Quigley and Sinquefield (2000), Cuberthson et al. (2008), Massa and Patgiri (2009) draw a similar conclusion. In contrast, Lynch and Musto (2003) find persistence among winning funds, but not among losers, coinciding with Cohen et al. (2005) and Kosowski et al. (2006).

Persistence assessment is carried out to explain the potential relationship between past and future performance, in other words, whether persistence should be taken as a predictor of future performance. As in previous studies such as Carpenter and Lynch (1999) and Fletcher and Forbes (2002), we propose several methodologies to measure persistence and focus on their robustness. The application of statistical measures such as contingency tables by Brown et al. (1992), Goetzmann and Ibbotson (1994), Brown and Goetzmann (1995), Malkiel (1995), Kahn and Rudd (1995), Allen and Tan (1999), Lunde *et al*. (1999), Droms and Walker (2001), Silva *et al.* (2005), Babalos *et al.* (2008) and Elyasiani and Jia (2011), has reinforced the persistence evidence mainly over short time horizons. Simultaneously, alternative approaches have emerged, such as the recursive portfolio proposed by Carhart (1997), which overcomes some of the limitations or shortcomings of contingency tables identified in the previous literature. These limitations include the difficulty for investors to interpret and take advantage of aggregate information presented as predictability, and whether this predictability is significant or not (Cuthbertson et al. 2010). Furthermore, Cortez et al. (1999) pointed out how results from contingency tables for small mutual fund samples should be interpreted with caution. In addition, we use a transition matrix approach following Brown et al. (1997) and Fernandez and Aquilue (2005) by computing the Z-test devised by Malkiel (1995). We examine the above mentioned methodologies for an extensive display of data, as this study covers more than US 3,500 mutual funds. Results using these methodologies would indicate a generalized evidence of persistence; however results for simulated mutual funds are also very similar. Therefore, because simulated funds are passive and any value is added by managers, these methodologies seem to be biased to show persistence. Consequently, we apply the recursive portfolio, one of

the most extended methodologies since Grinblatt and Titman (1993), Hendricks et al. (1993) and Carhart (1997). Also to assess persistence, more recently, Bollen and Busse (2005), Cohen *et al.* (2005), Busse and Irvine (2006), Kacperczyk *et al*. (2008), Busse *et al.* (2010), Fama and French (2010) and Benos and Jochec (2011) also apply a similar approach in different markets. In this line, we contribute to the extant literature on two issues: (i) by highlighting the relevance of estimating persistence separately in each fund group style type, and (ii) by controlling the cross-sectional significance of the performance of the recursive portfolios. Our results do not find general evidence of persistence, coinciding with the conclusions drawn by Carhart (1997), Cuthbertson *et al.* (2010), Busse *et al.* (2010) and Fama and French (2010).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 proposes the methodological framework. In section 3, the US market and US mutual fund data is described. Section 4 contains the empirical results for both performance and persistence, and finally section 5 concludes.

2. Performance methodology

To add value to a given portfolio, a mutual fund manager can implement a set of strategies *Sj*, for *j*=1 to *J*. These strategies may vary widely, however. Some examples of different strategies may include investing in the risk free asset; investing in the stock market index; investing in microcap stocks; or exploiting an arbitrage opportunity.

Therefore, the return of a portfolio *p* can be expressed as

$$R_{p,t} = \sum_j E_{Sj,t} \Big/ A_{p,t-1} \tag{1}$$

where $E_{Sj,t}$ is the earning from the *Sj* strategy and $A_{p,t-1}$ the value of the assets of the portfolio at the beginning of the period.

Computing the return for a given strategy $R_{Sj,t}$ as the quotient of $E_{Sj,t}$ and $A_{p,t-1}$, the return of the portfolio may be expressed as the sum of the returns of the strategies, namely

$$R_{p,t} = \sum_j R_{Sj,t} \tag{2}$$

In the literature it is frequently the case that performance measures compare mutual fund returns with a set of factors, or benchmarks, in the context of a linear model. Likewise, the strategies may be assessed by a model such as

$$R_{Sj,t} = a_{Sj} + \sum_i \beta_{Sj,i} F_{i,t} + v_{Sj,t} \tag{3}$$

where a_{Sj} measures the value added by strategy Sj to the performance measure defined by factors $F_{i,t}$, for i=1 to N, and, $v_{Sj,t}$ is the error term of the model. For instance, in the CAPM, only two factors $F_{i,t}$ would be considered in (3), namely, the return of the risk free asset $r_{f,t}$ (assuming that $\beta_{Sj,f}$ is equal to one), and the excess return of the market $r_{m,t}$.

Therefore, strategies will be assessed by means of

$$R_{Sj,t} = a_{Sj} + r_{f,t} + \beta_{Sj,m} r_{m,t} + v_{Sj,t} \tag{4}$$

Let us suppose there is a given fund with a particular strategy, Sf, which consists of investing in the risk free asset. Then, when it is assessed by (4), and assuming cov($r_{f,t}$;$r_{m,t}$)=0, the performance a_{Sf} will be equal to zero since $R_{Sf,t} = r_{f,t}$. In other words, this strategy does not add any value when (4) is used to measure performance.

Another example is a fund with a strategy Sx that invests an amount x in a stock market index, and (1-x) in a risk free asset. Then, $R_{Sx,t}$ = (1-x) $r_{f,t}$ + $xR_{m,t}$; in other words $R_{Sx,t} = r_{f,t} + x(R_{m,t} - r_{f,t})$ and when it is assessed by (4), $\beta_{Sx,m}$ is equal to x and the performance a_{Sx} will be equal to zero. This result is the same for any value of x, i.e., any strategy on the Capital Market Line of the CAPM.

Another example is a strategy based on arbitrage, which we refer to as Sb. If it is uncorrelated with respect to $r_{m,t}$, then the performance when (4) is applied will be computed directly as a_{Sb} = E($R_{Sb,t}$ - $r_{f,t}$). In general, the last result will be expected for any strategy uncorrelated with the market factor.

Analogously, if a strategy Sj shows any level of dependence, part of the $R_{Sj,t}$ is captured by the factor, but another part will be priced by a_{Sj}. Therefore, a strategy based on investing in small cap stocks may yield a performance different from zero when (4) is applied. However if a factor for small stocks is considered in (3), it is very possible that the strategy will be correlated with the new factor, and then the performance a_{Sj} will be closer to zero.

At the mutual fund portfolio level, by substituting (3) into (2) we can obtain the following expression:

$$R_{p,t} = \sum_j a_{Sj} + \sum_j \sum_i \beta_{Sj,i} F_{i,t} + \sum_j v_{Sj,t} \tag{6}$$

And, if we compare (6) with the following expression:

$$R_{p,t} = \alpha_p + \sum_i \beta_{p,i} F_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{p,t} \tag{7}$$

we will obtain the following three expressions:

$$\alpha_p = \sum_j a_{Sj} \tag{8}$$

$$\beta_{p,i} = \sum_j \beta_{Sj,i} \tag{9}$$

$$\varepsilon_{p,t} = \sum_j v_{Sj,t} \tag{10}$$

Therefore, the performance of a *p* mutual fund, α_p, can be expressed as the sum of the performance a_{Sj} of the strategies implemented by the mutual fund manager. If a manager aims to achieve a positive performance, she/he must carry out strategies with a positive performance. In this task, the strategy will be, up to a certain level, uncorrelated with factors. On this question, Sharpe (1991, 1992) indicated that in order to beat the market or benchmark, a mutual fund will be differentiated from the benchmark, and then the residual variance of a model like (7) will measure the level of active management of the mutual fund.

However, as noted above this relationship may not be biunivocal, i.e. it is possible that managers will follow a passive strategy, such as buy and hold, but that in (4) a value of performance a_{Sj} will be obtained because, for instance, they invest in a class of stocks that is not perfectly correlated with the factors, or benchmarks in (3). One solution might be to include relevant factors or benchmarks to ensure that all asset classes are considered in the performance model in order to avoid omitted benchmark bias, (Elton et al., 1993; Pástor and Stambaugh, 2002; Matallín-Sáez, 2006). In this vein, the most recent literature on mutual fund performance has applied the following model to the particular case of (7):

$$r_{p,t} = \alpha_p + \beta_{p,m} r_{m,t} + \beta_{p,smb} r_{smb,t} + \beta_{p,hml} r_{hml,t} + \beta_{p,wml} r_{wml,t} + \varepsilon_{p,t} \quad (11)$$

Five factors are considered in (11). The first, analogously to (4), is the return of the risk free asset but on the left-hand side, and then $r_{p,t}$ is the excess return of the mutual fund portfolio. The next three are the Fama and French (1993) factors: excess market return $r_{m,t}$, the return of small stocks minus the return of big stocks $r_{smb,t}$, and the difference of the return between higher and lower book-to-market ratio stocks $r_{hml,t}$. The final factor is the momentum factor, the return of past winners minus past losers $r_{wml,t}$ proposed by Carhart (1997). This model has been widely applied in the recent mutual fund literature, by Kacperczyc (2005), Kosowski *et al.* (2006), Kacperczyc and Seru (2007), Huij and Verbeek (2007), Fama and French (2010), Busse *et al.* (2010), Barras *et al.* (2010), Hackethal *et al.* (2012) among others.

Following this literature, we applied model (11) to measure the performance of a sample of US equity mutual funds. As the factors are representative of US stock markets, the omitted benchmark bias is *a priori* lower. However, it is important to point out that, even so, a passive strategy, with low correlation with factors, could yield non-zero performance. This is especially relevant in the case of some classes of stocks which, during the sample period, perform differently from others. Thus, for instance, if $a_{Svalue} > a_{Sgrowth}$ in (3), i.e. if value stocks show better performance than growth stocks, then value style mutual funds will perform better than growth style funds, even though managers have not undertaken any particular active management in either case.

Analogously, 'artificial' evidence of persistence could be found in the case where performance between stock classes is persistent over time. For this reason, we consider different groups of mutual funds to estimate persistence. But, even so, it is possible that in (3) some other passive management strategy will obtain non-zero performance that persists over time. We therefore test the robustness of the persistence measurement with a nonparametric approach in which performance and persistence results are benchmarked to the performance and persistence of simulated passive funds. This approach of building portfolios by mimicking style, or simulating strategies, has been documented in previous literature such as Bollen and Busse (2001), Bollen and Busse (2005), and Benos and Jochec (2011), among others.

The simulated funds are constructed following Sharpe's (1992) methodology. In this approach, the passive management of a fund is identified by the weight invested in each class of asset. Therefore, the set of weights will define the style of the fund. In contrast, the deviations from the style in each period are identified as the active management. Therefore, for each fund *p* in

the sample we construct a simulated fund *Sp* that replicates its style. This procedure guarantees that the simulated funds will be diversified in the same way as the mutual funds are.[3] To form simulated funds, we applied the methodology proposed by Sharpe (1992), finding the weight $w_{Sp,b}$ invested in each benchmark *b* (for *b*=1 to *B* benchmarks) that solve the following linear programming problem,

$$r_{Sp,t} = \sum_{b=1}^{B} w_{Sp,b} r_{b,t} \tag{12}$$

$$\varepsilon_{Sp,t} = r_{p,t} - r_{Sp,t} \tag{13}$$

$$\text{Minimize } \sum_{t=1}^{T} \varepsilon_{Sp,t}^{2} \tag{14}$$

$$\text{Subject to: } w_{Sp,b} \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{b=1}^{B} w_{Sp,b} = 1 \tag{15}$$

(i.e. subject to conditions of non-negativity and convexity).

The mutual fund performance literature is usually concerned with analyzing whether managers add value from the investor's perspective. To this end, net returns are used in models (11) and (12)-(15). Net returns are computed by comparing the NAV (the net asset value of the fund) on particular dates, and considering any distributed gain. The NAV is net of expenses, and for this reason it is a good proxy for the investor's return without accounting for subscription and redemption costs. However, we also show results using gross returns, since this is especially relevant for measuring persistence. In fact, if cross-sectional performance is explained, up to a significant level, by expenses, artificial evidence of persistence may be found if the differences in the expenses across the mutual funds are persistent over time.[4] We compute gross returns by adding expenses to net returns.

3. Data

Against this background, our objective is to analyze the performance persistence of US domestic equity mutual funds. For this reason, we are interested in analyzing a large number of funds with complete data for an extended period of time. First, a large sample allows us to infer

[3] We also considered the possibility of totally random simulated funds, but these investments were highly variable in different classes of stocks. As a result, although they were passively managed funds, some performance and persistence were evidenced by the implicit effect of the performance and persistence of certain classes of stocks. For this reason we constructed simulated funds that replicate the style of each fund.

[4] This issue is especially important for the case of fixed income or cash mutual funds. Given that the return of the underlying asset does not show very much volatility and active management is lower, the main factor explaining performance is expenses. Although our sample is made up of equity funds and the impact of expenses is lower in cross-sectional terms, we show all the results for both net and gross returns.

more robust performance compared to the performance of the fund industry in general. In this way a sufficiently high number of funds can be included to analyze persistence in each different fund group. On the other hand, we are interested in mutual funds with complete data to assess performance over time. However, the number of mutual funds has increased notably in recent decades. There is therefore a trade-off between the number of funds and the length of the sample period. Hence, the longer the sample period, the lower the number of mutual funds with complete data will be. However, if we select a more recent period, this number increases. In light of this trade-off, the sample period runs from March 1, 2001 to May 17, 2011. During this period, some funds were created, and others did not survive. Thus, since only mutual funds with complete data are selected, there could be a survivorship bias. To assess the performance of mutual funds in the industry and to avoid this bias, both new and non-survivor mutual funds could be considered. But, as our main objective is to analyze persistence, the inclusion of funds with limited data has several effects: (i) the low number of observations affects the robustness of the performance, and limits persistence measurement; (ii) there may be a bias if the mutual fund's performance is correlated with the period with available data (for instance, the performance could differ in bad or good states of the economy); and (iii) in consequence, comparing funds with different periods of existence could add some noise to the estimations. Therefore, the sample contains all US domestic equity mutual funds with complete data over the sample period.

We initially considered 3,558 multi-share mutual funds from the Morningstar database. However, many of these funds have the same portfolios, the only difference being the expenses for investors for each type of share. Therefore, the performance from the NAV data, i.e. from net returns, will be slightly different for each type of share, even though the gross value added by managers is the same. The funds of a common portfolio show similar performances, and some results will thus be repeated. This convolutes the percentage of funds with good or bad performance in the aggregate and complicates the persistence analysis, making it difficult to identify the number of winner or loser funds over time. Therefore, using the Morningstar portfolio identification number, multi-share funds with the same portfolio were averaged and taken into account as one single unit, or mutual fund. The number of mutual funds thus fell to 1,450, from which we removed 7 funds that did not report any investment objective or style. The final sample consisted of 1,443 mutual funds.

In the previous section we pointed out how in expression (3) passive strategies can be found that will provide non-zero performance, and how they are linked to the behaviour of the different classes of stocks. To ameliorate the severity of this issue, mutual funds are grouped according their investment style as defined by the Morningstar Style Box. Previous studies, such as Teo

and Woo (2004), have also demonstrated the suitability of using the Style Box. These categories are useful to show performance results, but also are necessary to measure mutual fund persistence. If we evaluate the persistence for all funds as a whole, i.e. without grouping by style, it is likely that most of the persistence that we might find would not be attributable to managers, but to the persistence of the stock style classes in which the fund invests. Panel A of Table 1 shows some descriptive statistics of the mutual funds sample, and the varied behaviour across the mutual fund style groups is noteworthy. This highlights the need to perform the persistence analysis within each group. For Table 1 and for the rest of the article, mutual funds' daily net returns are computed by comparing the NAV (the net asset value of the fund) for daily dates and considering any distributed gain. Gross returns are subsequently estimated by adding daily fund expenses.

First, Panel A of Table 1 shows that the largest groups are those corresponding to Large styles; in fact 54.3% of the 1,443 funds in the sample belong to these groups. Moreover the assets managed by Large funds account for 74.4% of the total. If Index funds are also added, which also invest mainly in large values, this percentage rises to 85.9% of the assets managed. This is important information because any results or conclusions drawn about these groups of funds have implications for most of the assets managed in the sample. Also notable is that, on average, Large and Index funds are the largest in terms of size, are cheaper, and show lower return and risk. In contrast, Mid and Small style groups only account for 14.1% of the assets managed and, on average, these funds are smaller in terms of size, are more expensive, and achieve higher levels of return and risk.

Second, we look at the data for the mutual funds in Panel A of Table 1 based on the characteristics of growth, blend and value. Note that the number of funds and the relative size of the group decrease as we move from growth funds to blend and value funds (within each set of Small, Mid and Large funds, respectively). In general, the relative size of the fund also decreases. This pattern is monotonically repeated for expenses, thus growth funds are more expensive than blend funds, which in turn also more expensive than value funds. In contrast, return, on average, increases from growth to value funds, and in general, growth style funds are more risky than blend and value funds.

The above descriptive data tell us something about the characteristics of the mutual fund sample, but a performance model must be applied to assess management. To apply model (11) we use the daily data of the returns of the three Fama and French factors and the Carhart momentum factor. This data – together with the data for the risk free asset, the one-month Treasury bill rate, to compute excess returns for mutual funds – was taken from French's

website (2011).[5] Panel B of Table 1 shows the annualized mean of daily return and risk (measured by s.d. of the returns) for these data.

Finally, we apply expressions (12)-(15) to estimate the simulated mutual funds. To this end, we need to compute the returns, $r_{b,t}$, of each benchmark *b*. We use the Russell indexes for the US stock market as data for the benchmarks. These indexes represent a wide variety of stock style classes, which is very useful for developing simulated funds that replicate the style or investment objectives of the funds in the sample. Panel C of Table 1 shows the annualized mean of daily return and risk (measures by standard deviation of the returns) for these data.

4. Results

4.1 Performance

Model (11) is applied to measure the performance of the 1,443 funds in the sample. Table 2 shows a summary of the results: Panel A when performance is estimated from mutual fund net returns and Panel B for gross returns. Annualized performance from daily alpha is reported. In each panel, results are grouped by style type and the average of the all funds is reported at the bottom. Figures 1a and 1b show the mean performance of the quintiles formed by the funds from worst to best performance for all fund style types. From net returns, Panel A shows an average performance with a negative value of -0.78%, with the percentage of negative values twice that of positive values (68.14% negative to 31.86% positive) and with a much more compact degree of significant funds for the negative performance case: 16.21%, compared to 1.93% for the positive case. This is a common result in the mutual funds literature: in general performance is not significant, and in any case it is negative and close to zero. However, if performance is estimated with gross returns, as reported in Panel B, positive performance increases. Hence, the aggregate performance has a positive value of 0.43%, and 45.72% of the alphas are negative (and 54.28% positive). Significance remains low but it clearly diminishes to 3.24% for negative performance and, in contrast, it increases to 6.90% in the positive case. In short, as documented widely in the literature, mutual fund expenses erode performance and, in aggregate, managers do not provide added value for final investors, as Sharpe's (1991) theoretical proposal indicated. In fact, the distance of the mean performance from gross returns, 0.43%, and that from net returns, -0.78%, in Table 2 is exactly the mean of the expense ratio 1.21% in Table 1.

[5] French, K. (2011) http://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/ken.french/data_library.html

However, differences can be found in the performance across funds and type of funds. Panel A shows percentages of significant negative alphas in most of the fund styles, which are particularly relevant for the Large Capitalization funds (Large Growth, Large Blend, Large Value and Index). Figures 1a and 1b show how these funds achieve, in general, the worst performance and notably, they represent 85.9% of the sample funds' assets and are therefore driving aggregate results. In fact, when aggregated performance is computed weighting alpha by the relative size of the fund, it is lower, -1.04% in Panel A and -0.106% in Panel B, than the simple mean.

The report for the Index funds is worth additional mention: in Panel A, 84.16% of these funds present negative alphas of which 48.51% are significant, while only 15.84% are positive, but none is significant. This result sheds light on the efficient-market hypothesis debate. Index funds offer an investment alternative for less sophisticated investors because they are cheaper than other fund styles (see expense ratio data in Table 1), and the inefficiencies of stock selection can be avoided. However, the worst values are observed for Index funds (in theory, passive investments) in which, by definition, managers do not intervene very actively. Moreover, the results of Index funds' gross returns improve, but none of the funds show a significant positive performance. This result shows the perverse asymmetric behaviour of Index funds: they are unable to achieve positive performance because they are unable to beat the market, but negative values may be achieved due to expenses and the impact of mimicking index rules in the context of a multifactor model like (11) for performance measurement.

In contrast, the positive values of performance reported for the Mid Value funds are particularly relevant. Hence, in Panel A, 84.38% of alphas are positive, 18.75% significant, and the best average performance is achieved (1.85%). Considering gross returns in Panel B, these values are: 93.75% of positive alphas, 50% significant and an annual mean of 3.16%. Figures 1a and 1b also show how Mid Value funds obtain higher performance. However, it should be noted that the Mid Value fund group is the least numerous in the sample: only 32 funds, representing only 1.19% of the assets managed by the US funds in the sample.

If we consider the patterns in the column of the mean annualized performance, we can see that within each group of three (small, mid and large), performance increases from growth, to blend and then to value funds. That is to say, regardless of the size characteristic of the fund, value funds obtain better performance than blend funds, which in turn perform better than growth funds. This pattern is seen in Figures 1a and 1b, which display the plots of the quintile performance of the funds in each mutual fund group.

The differences in performance between each mutual fund style group indicated above highlight the relevance of estimating persistence for each group. Thus, if we analyze the persistence for all funds, we can find that persistence is not due to the fact that the value added by managers is persistent, but because the performance of the underlying type of stocks for any group of funds is persistent.

As stated in the methodology section, we will compare the performance and persistence results of the sample funds with those of passively managed funds that mimic their style. The style of each mutual fund is estimated by applying expressions (12)-(15), which gives a simulated fund for each real mutual fund. This procedure is carried out for both net and gross returns.

Table 3 presents the results of applying model (11) to the simulated mutual funds' daily returns. Panel A shows the results when net returns were used in the style estimation. Funds with negative and positive performances are equally balanced: 53.72% of the simulated funds have a negative alpha, while for 46.28%, it is positive. What is most notable is the practical absence of significant alphas, specifically 0.34% for negative performance and none for positive performance. This result was to be expected because, by construction, simulated mutual funds are *passive*, and neither positive nor negative values may be added by active management. So, for all the fund style type groups the number of significant alphas is zero, except for the Small Growth type, for which it is 3.05% for negative alphas. That is to say, according to (3), a passive strategy *Sj* based on investment in small growth stocks may lead to negative performance. In other words, a small part of the negative performance found in Panel A of Table 2 for the Small Growth group funds could be due to the negative performance of the underlying stocks and not to active management. In fact, a common pattern can be seen in the columns of the mean annualized performance in Panel A in Tables 2 and 3. Figures 2.a and 2.b show the mean performance of the quintiles formed by the simulated funds from worst to best performance for any style type. A comparison of these figures with their counterparts for the case of the mutual funds in Figures 1.a and 1.b reveals: (i) in general, the order of best to worst performance remains the same for the different fund types: from Mid Value to Small Growth. This result demonstrates the importance of analyzing funds according to style type, since on average, the underlying type of stocks perform differently; (ii) as simulated funds are passive, they show less performance dispersion than real mutual funds, so in Figures 2.a and 2.b the lines of the performance across quintiles are almost flat, whereas those for mutual funds in Figures 1.a and 1.b have more marked slopes. The distribution of the simulated funds for any style may be considered as a performance distribution under the null hypothesis of passive management; that is, zero value added and thus, zero performance.

We therefore run a test that only considers significant those mutual funds' alphas that fall outside the 95% of the distribution of the alphas from simulated funds. The results are shown in Table 4; specifically, the percentage of the number of funds with significant performance both in Table 2 and from the simulated funds performance distribution test. In general, the evidence found in Table 2 holds. This result is not surprising if we compare Figure 1.a with 2.a and 1.b with 2.b. Specifically, mutual fund performance distribution is wider and many mutual funds with significant alphas are on the tails that are outside the range of the 95% of the simulated funds performance distribution. The most notable difference is seen in Panel A for the Index funds, where for -37.62% of the funds with significant and negative performance in Table 2, this is due to the investment characteristics of the fund.

In summary, the results show very slight evidence of performance. In any event, when performance is calculated from net returns, it takes a negative value close to zero. This result is due, to a large extent, to the expenses incurred by the fund, as can be seen in the improved performance when the estimation is based on gross results. In general, having compared performance with that of the simulated funds, we can conclude that the significant performance achieved by some mutual funds does not seem to be explained directly by the type of assets they invest in, but rather by the active management of the fund. Despite the scant evidence of performance found for the entire sample period, in the next section we analyze whether this performance persisted over time.

4.2 Persistence

The evidence on mutual fund performance persistence in the existing literature is inconclusive. This section aims to add further evidence to this literature, for which we will be using non-parametric methodology, first based on contingency tables as in Brown and Goetzmannn (1995), Silva et al. (2005) and Elyasiani and Jia (2011), among others, and then transition probability matrices of the funds, grouped in quintiles, over two consecutive periods. Secondly, we analyze persistence by assessing the performance of investment strategies based on past performance.

4.2.1. Contingency tables and transaction matrix.

The two-way contingency tables rank funds as winners (losers) depending on whether the fund performance is above (below) the median relative performance of the group. The analysis considers semi-annual periods. We define as WW (winner-winner) the number of funds that are

winners in both the current and the subsequent period. The inverse criterion is used to identify LL (loser-loser) funds. LW and WL correspond to funds with performance reversals. We then compare the number of cases observed with the theoretical values under the null hypothesis of absence of independence. The non-parametric CPR (Cross Product Ratio) test by Agarwal and Naik (2000) is then applied, where the Z-Statistic tests the null hypothesis of absence of persistence for all funds in the group (Z total). However, the evidence of persistence could be non-symmetrical. It is therefore also pertinent to isolate the persistence of the winner funds from that of the loser funds. For instance, evidence from previous research suggests that persistence is only revealed in the worst mutual funds. Statistics are therefore computed to analyze only winners' persistence (Z WW) and losers' persistence (Z LL).

Panel A in Table 5 shows the results of these tests when net returns are considered to estimate performance. In general, the Chi-Square test rejects the null hypothesis of independence between winners and losers in each pair of consecutive periods. From these results, and considering the distribution of the values of the categories WW, LL, WL and LW, we can infer strong positive persistence for most of the funds, mainly for those styles that include a higher number of funds. Panel B shows the persistence results when performance is estimated with gross returns. The results are very similar to those from net returns. However, the Index funds reveal a strong influence of the impact of costs on the degree of persistence achieved and it is precisely these costs that cause the persistence phenomenon.

We also perform an analysis of five groups and the transition between them over two periods. Specifically, mutual funds are ranked by performance to form quintiles from Q1 (worst) to Q5 (best) in each period. The results are shown in the last columns on the left of Table 5. For virtually all the categories of mutual funds we find significant evidence of persistence. It is noteworthy that the three lowest values of the Chi-Square test, and therefore lowest persistence, correspond to the three categories of mutual funds with the lowest number of funds, and in contrast, the highest value of the Chi-Square statistic is found for the Index funds, precisely a type of fund that *a priori* will show the lowest level of active management.

To test the robustness of the methodologies applied above, we analyze the persistence of the simulated mutual funds. In Table 6, Panel A and Panel B show the results when simulated funds were estimated from mutual fund net or gross returns, respectively. Given that, by definition, simulated funds are passive portfolios, significant evidence of persistence will not be expected. However, both panels in fact reveal persistence. In other words, methodologies based on contingency tables and transition matrixes allow the existence of persistence all too easily. This raises serious doubts about the results in Table 5. The previous evidence of persistence,

therefore, may not in fact be due to fund manager activity, but rather, to the use of a methodology with questionable robustness. This finding leads us to the next section, in which we apply a methodology to evaluate the results of following investment recommendations based on past performance.

4.2.2. Portfolios based on past performance

In this section we assess persistence by analyzing the performance of portfolios that invest according to the mutual funds' past performance. This so-called recursive portfolio approach was initially proposed in the literature by Carhart (1997) and is one of the most commonly used methods in the literature, as in Bollen and Busse 2005, and subsequent papers, including Kosowski *et al.* (2006), Busse *et al.* (2010) and Fama and French (2010), who have also proposed variations to this approach, in some cases related to the statistical significance of the alphas.

We have already highlighted the importance of estimating the persistence between each group of funds in terms of the funds' *style*. For instance, Table 2 shows that the *Small Growth type* mutual funds show the worst performance; if we analyze the persistence of all mutual funds, we can find persistence for the worst funds, not because of poor management, but because investing in small growth stocks was an *Sj* strategy that showed negative performance a_{Sj} in (3) for the sample period. Then, when the persistence for any type of fund is analyzed, the number of funds in each group may be reduced and, for this reason, we use quintiles instead of deciles, following Carhart (1997), to differentiate from worst to best mutual funds. In order to develop a homogeneous analysis, we follow the same window period as in the previous approaches; that is, we analyze whether there is persistence between two consecutive six-month periods.

We first estimate the performance of the mutual funds by means of (11) for the first semester of the sample period. Next, for each style group, we rank mutual funds in increasing order according to the performance they achieved in the period, to form quintiles. Then, for each style group, at the beginning of the next semester we form five equally weighted portfolios according to quintile past performance. Hence, the first portfolio, Q1, invests in the worst performing funds in the previous semester and, conversely, the last portfolio, Q5, invests in the previous best funds.

The same pattern is followed for the other quintiles. This procedure is repeated at the beginning of each semester, so that each portfolio represents a dynamic investment strategy that rebalances selected funds according to their previous performance. We therefore compute the daily return

of 50 portfolios (5 for each of the 10 styles) and then we estimate the performance of the portfolio, also using model (11). We hypothesize that if there is persistence in mutual fund performance, a portfolio with investments based on a poor (good) past performance will show a negative (positive) performance. This procedure is performed for mutual fund performance from both net and gross returns.

Figure 3a shows the performance of these portfolios based on mutual funds' past performance when it is estimated from net returns. In some cases, the performance improves slightly from Q1 portfolios (that invest in past worst funds) to Q5 portfolios (that invest in past best funds); this pattern may be observed in Small Growth funds. In contrast, the lines for other types of funds are flatter, even showing a negative slope, as in the case of the Index mutual funds. Analogously, Figure 3b shows the performance across portfolios-quintiles when mutual fund performance was estimated from gross returns. The results are quite similar, although as seen in the panels of Table 2, the performance is higher when gross returns are used. In sum, in general there is no clear evidence of persistence.

Table 7 shows the values of the performance and statistical significance of the portfolios. Panel A presents the results when mutual funds net returns were used to estimate performance in (11), and Panel B reports results for the case of gross returns. The panels show two *p*-values for the estimates. The first is the standard *p-value* from the regression model (11) with the Newey and West (1987) heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance estimator. The second p-value, which we refer to as *cross-sectional p-value*, is the critical probability estimated by means of simulations in each style-type mutual fund group. This *second* p-value is necessary to differentiate between the performance *per se* of the portfolio, compared with the performance achieved by following a strategy of investing in past worst or best mutual funds. Take, for instance, the case of Mid Value mutual funds. As seen in Table 2, these funds achieved the best performance, an annualized mean of 1.85% for net returns and 3.16% with gross returns. Thus, any portfolio that invests in these funds will probably show a good performance *per se*, simply because these were good funds. Therefore, a portfolio that invests in the past worst or best Mid Value mutual funds is also likely to show good performance. In fact, Figures 3a and 3b show that the best performance is that of the portfolios, from Q1 to Q5, based on the past performance of the Mid Value mutual funds. If we observe Panel B of Table 6, the performance for these portfolios varies from 2.36% for Q1 to 3.15% for Q5, and standard p-values are below 0.05 in all of the five portfolios; in other words, they show positive and significant performance. We then need to differentiate between the performance of the group of mutual funds and that achieved following a dynamic strategy based on past performance. To do this, we will form portfolios in the same way as the previous 50 portfolios based on past performance, but with the difference that now the funds invested in are not based on past

performance, but selected randomly. If there is persistence in the added value from managers, worst or best mutual funds will repeat that ranking in the future and a strategy based on their past performance should achieve a better performance than a random strategy that invests in funds without any criteria.

For each of the 10 style groups of mutual funds in the sample, 2,000 synthetic equally-weighted portfolios were formed that invest randomly in a quintile of the group's funds. The daily return of the synthetic portfolios is computed and model (11) is applied to estimate performance. Consequently, for each style group of mutual funds a distribution of 2,000 alphas is formed to test for the significance of the performance of following investment recommendations based on past performance. Next, for each of the portfolios based on past performance, the *cross-sectional p-value* is computed as the percentage of synthetic portfolios which produce an alpha greater than the corresponding value for that past-performance-based portfolio. In sum, Table 7 shows two p-values, the first (the standard *p-value*) measuring whether the performance of the past-performance-based portfolio is significantly different from zero; the second, the *cross-sectional p-value* measures whether this performance is linked to investment in past worst or best mutual funds, and thus if it is significantly different from the result of any random investment in these funds.

As can be inferred from Figures 3a and 3b, Table 7 provides no general evidence of persistence. The performance achieved by following past-performance-based investment strategies is only significant in some specific cases. In Panel A, from net mutual funds returns, the performance achieved from investing in the past worst (Q1) Small Growth mutual funds is significant. It provides an annualized alpha of -3.10%, the standard *p-value* is 0.010, and the *cross-sectional p-value* is 0.000. In this same mutual fund style type the performance for the Q2 case is also significant, achieving -2.20% annualized performance with p-values of 0.024 and 0.042, respectively. For Large Blend mutual funds, investing in the worst past funds (Q1) provides a significant performance of -1.38%. In these three cases, following a strategy of investing in the worst past mutual funds leads to a significant negative performance. In other words, we find persistence for the performance of the worst mutual funds.

However, for these cases, this evidence vanishes in Panel B when gross mutual funds are used to estimate mutual fund performance, i.e. the significant persistence found in Panel A is probably due to the effect of persistence in the expenses incurred by the fund. In Panel B, significant persistence is only found for the best mutual funds (Q5) for two categories of funds; specifically, Small Blend funds achieve a performance of 2.07% with a standard p-value of 0.024 and a cross-sectional p-value of 0.003 and for Mid Growth funds, with 2.29% performance and p-values of 0.038 and 0.009 respectively.

Index funds are a special case. The Index fund line in Figures 3a and 3b shows a negative slope. From Panel A of Table 7 the performance of these strategies ranges from -0.40% for Q1 to -2.06% for Q5; the latter is significant with a standard *p-value* equal to 0.024 and a *cross-sectional p-value* of 0.000. That is, strategies that invest in past best (worst) mutual funds exhibit worse (better) performance. This result contradicts the idea of mutual fund performance persistence. This pattern is repeated in Panel B, but for Q5 the significance is borderline. Next, when the persistence of the simulated funds is analyzed we show how this contrarian behaviour may be implicit for passive portfolios or low active management, as in the case of Index mutual funds.

Finally, to test the robustness of this methodology we analyze the persistence of the performance of the simulated mutual funds. Table 3 showed how simulated funds provide alphas close to zero and not significant except for one case. Because of this result, and because simulated funds are passive and in theory do not add any management value, we would not expect to find evidence of persistence of performance over time. Table 8 shows the performance of investment strategies based on past performance: Panel A when net mutual fund returns were used to estimate simulated funds and Panel B for the gross returns case. These panels show that the only result consistent, to some extent, with persistence is for the Small Growth simulated funds in Panel B. Their annualized performance is -1.80%, with a standard *p-value* on the border equal to 0.050, and a *cross-sectional p-value* of 0.018. It should be remembered that precisely this type of fund, despite the reduced performance evidence in general in Table 3 for simulated funds, had the highest percentage of negative alphas (85.98% in Panel A and 95.73 in Panel B) and was significant (3.05%). For the rest of the simulated mutual funds no evidence is found in Table 8 of significant persistence, as was expected.

However, it is interesting to analyze the contrarian behaviour, in persistence terms, for the simulated mutual funds in Table 8, as commented above for Index funds in Table 7. Figures 4a and 4b help us show this behaviour. The figures show the performance achieved by investment strategies based on past performance: Q1 strategy invests in the worst simulated funds in the previous period and so on until the last strategy, Q5, which invests in the previous best simulated funds. These figures show how, except for small type funds, the slopes of the lines are negative, that is to say, investing in past best (worst) simulated funds lead to worse (better) performance. This behaviour is also seen in Table 8, and it is significant in Panel A for Q5 for Large Growth and Index categories and in Panel B also for Large Growth Q5 and Small Blend Q3. In these cases the performance achieved is negative. This evidence of contrarian behaviour in terms of performance persistence is not attributable to active management because simulated funds are passive by construction. Thus, in order to explain this behaviour several hypotheses were analyzed: (i) as the dynamics involve investing and disinvesting in different funds, the

portfolio's parameters could vary over time; therefore all estimates were repeated considering time-varying parameters, but the evidence of contrarian behaviour remained; (ii) we also ran regressions for different versions for model (11), for instance without including the momentum factor (since this contrarian behaviour goes against it), but results are also similar. In conclusion, the dynamics of the strategy itself might explain this result. In this vein, there is a large body of literature on contrarian investment strategy from DeBondt and Thaler (1985), Chan (1988), to Yao (2011) among others. Haan and Kakes (2011) show how institutional investors tend to be contrarian traders, buying past losers and selling past winners, and how this behaviour may have a stabilising impact on financial markets. The contrarian effect is the opposite of the momentum investment strategy: buy past winners and sell past losers, also well documented in the literature by Jegadeesh and Titman (1993), Griffin et al. (2003) and Wang and Wu (2011), among others.

Although an analysis of these issues goes beyond the scope of this study, our results from simulated funds support the existence of a contrarian effect. Remember that in Figures 4.a and 4.c and Table 8, Q1 is a strategy that invests in the past worst simulated funds and Q5 invests in the past best simulated funds. These funds allocate in different classes of stocks and are passive by definition. Therefore, our evidence of the contrarian effect is linked to a contrarian or reversal effect in the different style class of stocks. In a similar way, Teo and Woo (2004) find strong evidence that stocks in styles that performed poorly in the past, relative to other styles, tend to do well in the future. Thus, in our case, simulated funds that are winners (losers) in one period tend to be losers (winners) in the next period and for this reason Q1 performs better than Q5. However when strategies based on past performance are computed for the real mutual funds, this contrarian effect is not present in Figures 3a and 3b and Table 7, except for Index mutual funds. Thus, active management is what makes mutual funds differ from passive portfolios, and the performance across periods will not be reversed. Concretely, according to our evidence, the relationship of mutual fund performance between periods is in general flat and neither positive (persistence) nor negative (reversal or contrarian).

5. CONCLUSIONS

This paper examines the performance and persistence of a sample of 1,443 US equity mutual funds. It tests the robustness of persistence measurement by comparing the performance and persistence obtained from simulated passive funds. Specifically, performance persistence is assessed by applying the contingency tables, the transition matrix and recursive portfolio approaches.

Performance results presented in both net returns and gross returns follow the pattern established previously in the literature. Hence, from net returns, performance is close to zero in general, but the presence of negative values is more common than positive values. However, performance improves when gross returns are considered. In short, although there are differences at the individual level, in aggregate and after considering management and operational expenses, mutual funds do not add value for final investors.

In the analysis of performance persistence, we first applied methodologies based on a winner-loser approach, namely, contingency tables, Z-tests and transition matrix. When comparing the persistence results of mutual funds with those achieved by simulated passive mutual funds, the conclusion is that these methodologies are biased to show persistence much too easily. The scepticism surrounding the accuracy of previous methods was overcome by applying an approach to persistence measured from the performance achieved by recursive portfolios that invest according to past mutual fund performance. When we controlled for mutual fund group style type and considered cross-sectional significance, the results did not show evidence of persistence in general.

Only for a few cases, and depending on whether gross or net mutual fund returns were considered, did we find some evidence of persistence. When these results were compared with those achieved by investing according to the past performance of simulated mutual funds, active management was shown to compensate a reversal effect in the dynamic performance of passive portfolios.

6. References

Agarwal, V. & Naik, N. (2000), 'Multi-period performance persistence analysis of hedge funds', *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* **35**(3), 327--342.

Allen, D. & Tan, M. (1999), 'A Test of the Persistence in the Performance of UK Managed Funds', *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting* **26**(5-6), 559--593.

Babalos, V.; Caporale, G.; Kostakis, A. & Philippas, N. (2008), 'Testing for persistence in mutual fund performance and the ex-post verification problem: evidence from the Greek market', *European Journal of Finance* **14**(8), 735--753.

Barras, L.; Scaillet, O. & Wermers, R. (2010), 'False discoveries in mutual fund performance: Measuring luck in estimated alphas', *Journal of Finance* **65**(1), 179--216.

Benos, E. & Jochec, M. (2011), 'Short term persistence in mutual fund market timing and stock selection abilities', *Annals of Finance* **7**, 221--246.

Bollen, N. & Busse, J. (2005), 'Short-term persistence in mutual fund performance', *Review of Financial Studies* **18**(2), 569--597.

Bollen, N. & Busse, J. (2001), 'On the timing ability of mutual fund managers', *Journal of Finance* **56**(3), 1075--1094.

Brown, G.; Draper, P. & McKenzie, E. (1997), 'Consistency of UK pension fund investment performance', *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting* **24**(2), 155--178.

Brown, S. & Goetzmann, W. (1995), 'Performance persistence', *Journal of Finance* **50**(2), 679--698.

Brown, S.; Goetzmann, W.; Ibbotson, R. & Ross, S. (1992), 'Survivorship bias in performance studies', *Review of Financial Studies* **5**(4), 553--580.

Busse, J. A.; Goyal, A. & Wahal, S. (2010), 'Performance and persistence in institutional investment management', *Journal of Finance* **65**(2), 765--790.

Busse, J. & Irvine, P. (2006), 'Bayesian alphas and mutual fund persistence',*Journal of Finance* **61**(5), 2251--2288.

Carhart, M. M. (1997), 'On Persistence in Mutual Fund Performance', *Journal of Finance* **52**(1), 57--82.

Carpenter, J. & Lynch, A. (1999), 'Survivorship bias and attrition effects in measures of performance persistence', *Journal of Financial Economics* **54**(3), 337--374.

Chan, K. (1988), 'On the contrarian investment strategy', *Journal of Business* **61**(2), 147--163.

Chen, H.; Jegadeesh, N. & Wermers, R. (2000), 'The value of active mutual fund management: An examination of the stockholdings and trades of fund managers', *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* **35**(3), 343--368.

Christopherson, J.; Ferson, W. & Glassman, D. (1998), 'Conditioning Manager Alphas on Economic Information: Another Look at the Persistence of Performance', *Review of Financial Studies* **11**(1), 111--142.

Cohen, R.; Coval, J. & Pastor, L. (2005), 'Judging fund managers by the company they keep', *Journal of Finance* **60**(3), 1057--1096.

Cortez, M.; Paxson, D. & Armada, M. (1999), 'Persistence in Portuguese mutual fund performance', *European Journal of Finance* **5**(4), 342--365.

Cremers, K. & Petajisto, A. (2009), 'How active is your fund manager? A new measure that predicts performance', *Review of Financial Studies* **22**(9), 3329--3365.

Cuthbertson, K.; Nitzsche, D. & O'Sullivan, N. (2010), 'Mutual Fund Performance: Measurement and Evidence1', *Financial Markets, Institutions & Instruments* **19**(2), 95--187.

Cuthbertson, K.; Nitzsche, D. & O'Sullivan, N. (2008), 'UK mutual fund performance: Skill or luck?', *Journal of Empirical Finance* **15**(4), 613--634.

De Bondt, W. & Thaler, R. (1985), 'Does the stock market overreact?', *Journal of Finance* **40**(3), 793--805.

De Haan, L. & Kakes, J. (2011), 'Momentum or contrarian investment strategies: evidence from Dutch institutional investors', *Journal of Banking & Finance* **35(9)**, 2245--2251.

Droms, W. & Walker, D. (2001), 'Persistence of mutual fund operating characteristics: returns, turnover rates, and expense ratios', *Applied Financial Economics* **11**(4), 457--466.

Elton, E. & Gruber, M. (1996), 'The persistence of risk-adjusted mutual fund performance', *Journal of Business* **69**(2), 133--157.

Elton, E.; Gruber, M.; Das, S. & Hlavka, M. (1993), 'Efficiency with costly information: A reinterpretation of evidence from managed portfolios', *Review of Financial Studies* **6**(1), 1--22.

Elyasiani, E. & Jia, J. (2011), 'Performance persistence of closed-end funds', *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting*, 1--28.

Fama, E. F. & French, K. R. (2010), 'Luck versus Skill in the Cross-Section of Mutual Fund Returns', *Journal of Finance* **65**(5), 1915--1947.

Fama, E. & French, K. (1993), 'Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds', *Journal of Financial Economics* **33**(1), 3--56.

Fernandez, A. & Aquilue, R. (2005), 'Persistencia de resultados en los fondos de inversion españoles', *Investigaciones Económicas* **29**(3), 525--573.

Ferson, W. & Schadt, R. (1996), 'Measuring fund strategy and performance in changing economic conditions', *Journal of Finance* **51**(2), 425--461.

Fletcher, J. & Forbes, D. (2002), 'An exploration of the persistence of UK unit trust performance', *Journal of Empirical Finance* **9**(5), 475--493.

Goetzmann, W. & Ibbotson, R. (1994), 'Do winners repeat?', *Journal of Portfolio Management* **20**(2), 9--18.

Gottesman, A. & Morey, M. (2007), 'Predicting Emerging Market Mutual Fund Performance', *Journal of Investing* **16**(3), 111--122.

Griffin, J.; Ji, X. & Martin, J. (2003), 'Momentum investing and business cycle risk: Evidence from pole to pole', *Journal of Finance* **58**(6), 2515--2547.

Grinblatt, M. & Titman, S. (1993), 'Performance measurement without benchmarks: An examination of mutual fund returns', *Journal of Business*, 47--68.

Gruber, M. (1996), 'Another puzzle: The growth in actively managed mutual funds', *Journal of Finance* **51**, 783--810.

Hendricks, D.; Patel, J. & Zeckhauser, R. (1993), 'Hot hands in mutual funds: Short-run persistence of relative performance, 1974-1988', *Journal of Finance*, 93--130.

Huij, J. & Verbeek, M. (2007), 'Cross-sectional learning and short-run persistence in mutual fund performance', *Journal of Banking and Finance* **31**(3), 973--997.

Jegadeesh, N. & Titman, S. (1993), 'Returns to buying winners and selling losers: Implications for stock market efficiency', *Journal of Finance* **48**(1), 65--91.

Jensen, M. (1968), 'The performance of mutual funds in the period 1945-1964', *Journal of Finance* **23**(2), 389--416.

Kacperczyk, M.; Sialm, C. & Zheng, L. (2008), 'Unobserved actions of mutual funds', *Review of Financial Studies* **21**(6), 2379--2416.

Kacperczyk, M. & Seru, A. (2007), 'Fund manager use of public information: New evidence on managerial skills', *Journal of Finance* **62**(2), 485--528.

Kacperczyk, M.; Sialm, C. & Zheng, L. (2005), 'On the industry concentration of actively managed equity mutual funds', *Journal of Finance* **60**(4), 1983--2011.

Kahn, R. & Rudd, A. (1995), 'Does historical performance predict future performance?', *Financial Analysts Journal*, 43--52.

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--2595.

Lunde, A.; Timmermann, A. & Blake, D. (1999), 'The Hazards of Mutual Fund Underperformance: A Cox Regression Analysis', *Journal of Empirical Finance* **6**, 121--152.

Lynch, A. & Musto, D. (2003), 'How investors interpret past fund returns', *Journal of Finance* **58**(5), 2033--2058.

Malkiel, B. (1995), 'Returns from investing in equity mutual funds 1971 to 1991', *Journal of Finance* **50**(2), 549--572.

Massa, M. & Patgiri, R. (2009), 'Incentives and Mutual Fund Performance: Higher Performance or Just Higher Risk Taking?', *Review of Financial Studies* **22**(5), 1777--1815.

Matallin-Saez, J. (2006), 'Seasonality, market timing and performance amongst benchmarks and mutual fund evaluation', *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting* **33**(9-10), 1484--1507.

Newey, W. & West, K. (1987), 'A simple, positive semi-definite, heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix', *Econometrica* **55**(3), 703--708.

Pastor, L. & Stambaugh, R. (2002), 'Investing in equity mutual funds', *Journal of Financial Economics* **63**(3), 351--380.

Quigley, G. & Sinquefield, R. (2000), 'Performance of UK equity unit trusts', *Journal of Asset Management* **1**(1), 72--92.

Sharpe, W. (1992), 'Asset allocation: Management Style and Performance Measurement', *Journal of Portfolio Management* **18**(2), 7--19.

Sharpe, W. (1991), 'The arithmetic of active management', *Financial Analysts Journal*, 7--9.

Sharpe, W. (1966), 'Mutual fund performance', *Journal of Business* **39**(1), 119--138.

Silva, F.; Cortez, M. & Armada, M. (2005), 'The persistence of European bond fund performance: Does conditioning information matter', *International Journal of Business* **10**(4), 341--361.

Teo, M. & Woo, S. (2004), 'Style effects in the cross-section of stock returns', *Journal of Financial Economics* **74**(2), 367--398.

Treynor, J. & Mazuy, K. (1966), 'Can mutual funds outguess the market', *Harvard Business Review* **44**(4), 131--136.

Wang, J. & Wu, Y. (2011), 'Risk adjustment and momentum sources', *Journal of Banking & Finance* **35**(6), 1427--1435.

Wermers, R.(2005), 'Is money really smart? New evidence on the relation between mutual fund flows, manager behavior, and performance persistence', *Unpublished Manuscript, University of Maryland.*

Wermers, R. (2000), 'Mutual fund performance: An empirical decomposition into stock-picking talent, style, transactions costs, and expenses', *The Journal of Finance* **55**(4), 1655--1703.

Yao, Y. (2011), 'Momentum, contrarian, and the January seasonality', *Journal of Banking & Finance* (Forthcoming).

7. Tables and Figures

Table 1. Summary statistics for the mutual funds in the sample

Panel A

Mutual fund style group	Number of multi-share funds	Number of mutual funds	Relative size of the style group	Average relative size of fund	Average expense ratio	Average annualized net return	Average annualized s.d.
Small Growth	402	164	2.80%	0.017%	1.436%	8.77%	24.08%
Small Blend	210	85	1.31%	0.015%	1.352%	10.81%	23.25%
Small Value	127	52	0.75%	0.014%	1.346%	11.26%	23.85%
Mid Growth	426	162	6.77%	0.042%	1.352%	7.78%	23.22%
Mid Blend	166	64	1.28%	0.020%	1.321%	8.88%	23.13%
Mid Value	89	32	1.19%	0.037%	1.313%	10.26%	22.35%
Large Growth	937	363	38.43%	0.106%	1.240%	4.77%	22.10%
Large Blend	587	249	20.90%	0.084%	1.136%	5.31%	20.99%
Large Value	465	171	15.11%	0.088%	1.129%	6.09%	21.07%
Index	133	101	11.47%	0.114%	0.503%	6.44%	22.67%
All funds	3542	1443	100.00%	0.069%	1.208%	6.82%	22.40%

Panel B

Factors	Annualized mean return	Annualized s.d.
Market	6.49%	21.43%
Smb	5.23%	9.36%
Hml	3.92%	9.80%
Wml	1.25%	17.52%
Risk free asset	2.01%	0.11%

Panel C

Benchmarks	Annualized mean return	Annualized s.d.	Benchmarks (cont.)	Annualized mean return	Annualized s.d.
Russell 1000® Growth Index	4.64%	21.82%	Russell Microcap® Growth Index	8.05%	24.19%
Russell 1000® Index	5.86%	21.55%	Russell Microcap® Index	10.18%	24.02%
Russell 1000® Value Index	7.04%	22.38%	Russell Microcap® Value Index	11.84%	24.42%
Russell 2000® Growth Index	9.08%	26.47%	Russell Midcap® Growth Index	8.87%	24.78%
Russell 2000® Index	10.62%	26.04%	Russell Midcap® Index	10.63%	22.83%
Russell 2000® Value Index	11.97%	26.32%	Russell Midcap® Value Index	11.50%	22.67%
Russell 2500™ Growth Index	9.58%	24.95%	Russell Small Cap Completeness® Growth Index	8.57%	25.51%
Russell 2500™ Index	11.08%	23.87%	Russell Small Cap Completeness® Index	10.03%	24.11%
Russell 2500™ Value Index	11.98%	23.90%	Russell Small Cap Completeness® Value Index	11.28%	23.91%
Russell 3000® Growth Index	4.94%	22.01%	Russell Top 200® Growth Index	3.44%	21.13%
Russell 3000® Index	6.18%	21.76%	Russell Top 200® Index	4.19%	21.31%
Russell 3000® Value Index	7.37%	22.52%	Russell Top 200® Value Index	5.20%	22.58%

Table 2. Mutual fund performance

The table presents the performance analysis results from model (11) considering daily net returns in Panel A, and from gross returns in Panel B for the sample period 2001-2011.

Panel A: Performance estimated with mutual fund net returns

		Percentage of total number of funds in group				**Annualized performance**				
Style	Number of funds	<0	p-value <=0.05	>0	p-value <=0.05	Mean	Median	Min	Max	Average by fund size
Small Growth	164	74.39%	16.46%	25.61%	0.61%	-1.50%	-1.52%	-8.33%	4.62%	-1.61%
Small Blend	85	55.29%	10.59%	44.71%	2.35%	-0.13%	-0.30%	-6.13%	7.31%	0.14%
Small Value	52	57.69%	5.77%	42.31%	1.92%	-0.23%	-0.49%	-4.73%	3.57%	-0.15%
Mid Growth	162	51.85%	4.94%	48.15%	4.32%	-0.30%	-0.09%	-7.06%	5.91%	-0.60%
Mid Blend	64	42.19%	6.25%	57.81%	7.81%	0.34%	0.32%	-6.52%	5.68%	0.71%
Mid Value	32	15.63%	0.00%	84.38%	18.75%	1.85%	1.82%	-3.22%	6.80%	2.27%
Large Growth	363	78.51%	16.25%	21.49%	0.55%	-1.24%	-1.34%	-5.72%	6.95%	-1.29%
Large Blend	249	73.49%	24.10%	26.51%	1.20%	-0.96%	-0.99%	-5.81%	7.69%	-1.33%
Large Value	171	66.08%	8.19%	33.92%	0.58%	-0.44%	-0.39%	-4.64%	4.67%	-0.85%
Index	101	84.16%	48.51%	15.84%	0.00%	-0.94%	-1.06%	-3.61%	2.07%	-0.77%
All funds	1443	68.14%	16.21%	31.86%	1.93%	-0.78%				-1.04%

Panel B: Performance estimated with mutual fund gross returns

		Percentage of total number of funds in group				**Annualized performance**				
Style	Number of funds	<0	p-value <=0.05	>0	p-value <=0.05	Mean	Median	Min	Max	Average by fund size
Small Growth	164	53.05%	5.49%	46.95%	5.49%	-0.07%	-0.16%	-6.88%	6.75%	-0.33%
Small Blend	85	29.41%	4.71%	70.59%	11.76%	1.22%	1.14%	-4.09%	8.51%	1.33%
Small Value	52	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%	11.54%	1.12%	0.97%	-3.35%	4.80%	0.98%
Mid Growth	162	32.10%	0.62%	67.90%	16.67%	1.05%	1.30%	-5.92%	7.48%	0.57%
Mid Blend	64	21.88%	0.00%	78.13%	15.63%	1.64%	1.70%	-4.35%	6.55%	1.81%
Mid Value	32	6.25%	0.00%	93.75%	50.00%	3.16%	3.26%	-1.78%	8.19%	3.39%
Large Growth	363	56.47%	2.75%	43.53%	1.38%	0.00%	-0.23%	-4.42%	8.05%	-0.26%
Large Blend	249	51.41%	4.82%	48.59%	3.61%	0.18%	-0.03%	-5.11%	8.94%	-0.39%
Large Value	171	29.82%	0.58%	70.18%	4.68%	0.69%	0.72%	-2.83%	5.67%	0.13%
Index	101	80.20%	7.92%	19.80%	0.00%	-0.44%	-0.65%	-2.77%	2.23%	-0.54%
All funds	1443	45.72%	3.24%	54.28%	6.90%	0.43%				-0.106%

Table 3. Simulated funds performance

Panel A: Performance of simulated funds from mutual fund net returns.

Style	Number of funds	Percentage of total number of funds in group				Mean annualized performance
		<0	p-value <=0.05	>0	p-value <=0.05	
Small Growth	164	85.98%	3.05%	14.02%	0.00%	-0.68%
Small Blend	85	78.82%	0.00%	21.18%	0.00%	-0.54%
Small Value	52	78.85%	0.00%	21.15%	0.00%	-0.55%
Mid Growth	162	32.10%	0.00%	67.90%	0.00%	0.37%
Mid Blend	64	28.13%	0.00%	71.88%	0.00%	0.50%
Mid Value	32	18.75%	0.00%	81.25%	0.00%	0.67%
Large Growth	363	41.32%	0.00%	58.68%	0.00%	0.11%
Large Blend	249	53.01%	0.00%	46.99%	0.00%	0.01%
Large Value	171	49.71%	0.00%	50.29%	0.00%	0.03%
Index	101	79.21%	0.00%	20.79%	0.00%	-0.36%
All funds	1443	53.72%	0.34%	46.28%	0.00%	-0.05%

Panel B: Performance of simulated funds from mutual fund gross returns.

Style	Number of funds	Percentage of total number of funds in group				Mean annualized performance
		<0	p-value <=0.05	>0	p-value <=0.05	
Small Growth	164	95.73%	3.05%	4.27%	0.00%	-0.89%
Small Blend	85	85.88%	2.35%	14.12%	0.00%	-0.67%
Small Value	52	82.69%	1.92%	17.31%	0.00%	-0.62%
Mid Growth	162	16.05%	0.00%	83.95%	0.00%	0.71%
Mid Blend	64	15.63%	0.00%	84.38%	1.56%	0.83%
Mid Value	32	3.13%	0.00%	96.88%	0.00%	1.23%
Large Growth	363	26.72%	0.00%	73.28%	0.28%	0.23%
Large Blend	249	48.59%	0.00%	51.41%	0.00%	0.08%
Large Value	171	42.69%	0.00%	57.31%	0.00%	0.14%
Index	101	83.17%	0.00%	16.83%	0.00%	-0.37%
All funds	1443	47.72%	0.55%	52.28%	0.14%	0.04%

Table 4. Comparative results from the significance test based on simulated funds' performance distribution. The table shows the percentage of the total number of funds in the style-type group.

Panel A. Data from net mutual fund returns.

		(1) Data from Table 2		(2) Simulated funds' performance distribution test		Difference (2)-(1)	
Style	Number of funds	Performance <0 and p-value <=0.05	Performance >0 and p-value <=0.05	Performance <0 and p-value <=0.05	Performance >0 and p-value <=0.05	Performance <0 and p-value <=0.05	Performance >0 and p-value <=0.05
Small Growth	164	16.46%	0.61%	15.85%	0.61%	-0.61%	0.00%
Small Blend	85	10.59%	2.35%	10.59%	2.35%	0.00%	0.00%
Small Value	52	5.77%	1.92%	5.77%	1.92%	0.00%	0.00%
Mid Growth	162	4.94%	4.32%	4.94%	4.32%	0.00%	0.00%
Mid Blend	64	6.25%	7.81%	6.25%	7.81%	0.00%	0.00%
Mid Value	32	0.00%	18.75%	0.00%	18.75%	0.00%	0.00%
Large Growth	363	16.25%	0.55%	16.25%	0.55%	0.00%	0.00%
Large Blend	249	24.10%	1.20%	24.10%	1.20%	0.00%	0.00%
Large Value	171	8.19%	0.58%	8.19%	0.58%	0.00%	0.00%
Index	101	48.51%	0.00%	10.89%	0.00%	-37.62%	0.00%

Panel B. Data from gross mutual fund returns.

		(1) Data from Table 2		(2) Simulated funds' performance distribution test		Difference (2)-(1)	
Style	Number of funds	Performance <0 and p-value <=0.05	Performance >0 and p-value <=0.05	Performance <0 and p-value <=0.05	Performance >0 and p-value <=0.05	Performance <0 and p-value <=0.05	Performance >0 and p-value <=0.05
Small Growth	164	5.49%	5.49%	5.49%	5.49%	0.00%	0.00%
Small Blend	85	4.71%	11.76%	3.53%	11.76%	-1.18%	0.00%
Small Value	52	0.00%	11.54%	0.00%	11.54%	0.00%	0.00%
Mid Growth	162	0.62%	16.67%	0.62%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Mid Blend	64	0.00%	15.63%	0.00%	15.63%	0.00%	0.00%
Mid Value	32	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Large Growth	363	2.75%	1.38%	2.75%	1.38%	0.00%	0.00%
Large Blend	249	4.82%	3.61%	4.82%	3.61%	0.00%	0.00%
Large Value	171	0.58%	4.68%	0.58%	4.68%	0.00%	0.00%
Index	101	7.92%	0.00%	6.93%	0.00%	-0.99%	0.00%

Table 5. Performance persistence using winner-loser approach

Panel A: Performance estimated with mutual fund net returns

Style	Number of funds	Contingency table								Transition matrix	
		χ^2	p-value	Z total	p-value	ZWW	p-value	ZLL	p-value	χ^2	p-value
Small Growth	164	33.69	(0.000)	2.52	(0.006)	2.90	(0.002)	2.90	(0.002)	103.79	(0.000)
Small Blend	85	26.48	(0.000)	2.23	(0.013)	2.35	(0.009)	2.80	(0.003)	92.17	(0.000)
Small Value	52	1.96	(0.162)	0.61	(0.272)	0.70	(0.242)	0.70	(0.242)	34.88	(0.004)
Mid Growth	162	36.24	(0.000)	2.61	(0.005)	3.01	(0.001)	3.01	(0.001)	85.12	(0.000)
Mid Blend	64	5.26	(0.022)	1.00	(0.160)	1.15	(0.126)	1.15	(0.126)	52.33	(0.000)
Mid Value	32	2.13	(0.144)	0.63	(0.263)	0.73	(0.233)	0.73	(0.233)	21.97	(0.144)
Large Growth	363	29.75	(0.000)	2.37	(0.009)	2.60	(0.005)	2.85	(0.002)	141.95	(0.000)
Large Blend	249	13.31	(0.000)	1.58	(0.057)	1.68	(0.047)	1.97	(0.024)	172.89	(0.000)
Large Value	171	6.82	(0.009)	1.13	(0.128)	1.14	(0.126)	1.47	(0.071)	98.69	(0.000)
Index	101	84.57	(0.000)	3.96	(0.000)	4.40	(0.000)	4.79	(0.000)	361.80	(0.000)

Panel B: Performance estimated with mutual fund gross returns

Style	Number of funds	Contingency table								Transition matrix	
		χ^2	p-value	Z total	p-value	ZWW	p-value	ZLL	p-value	χ^2	p-value
Small Growth	164	35.37	(0.000)	2.58	(0.005)	2.97	(0.001)	2.97	(0.001)	97.42	(0.000)
Small Blend	85	26.48	(0.000)	2.23	(0.013)	2.35	(0.009)	2.80	(0.003)	79.57	(0.000)
Small Value	52	2.33	(0.127)	0.66	(0.254)	0.76	(0.223)	0.76	(0.223)	40.59	(0.001)
Mid Growth	162	35.38	(0.000)	2.58	(0.005)	2.97	(0.001)	2.97	(0.001)	71.65	(0.000)
Mid Blend	64	7.58	(0.006)	1.19	(0.116)	1.35	(0.089)	1.40	(0.080)	49.36	(0.000)
Mid Value	32	2.13	(0.144)	0.63	(0.263)	0.73	(0.233)	0.73	(0.233)	28.23	(0.030)
Large Growth	363	24.73	(0.000)	2.16	(0.015)	2.38	(0.009)	2.60	(0.005)	170.76	(0.000)
Large Blend	249	7.07	(0.008)	1.15	(0.124)	1.19	(0.116)	1.47	(0.071)	174.78	(0.000)
Large Value	171	8.37	(0.004)	1.26	(0.105)	1.28	(0.099)	1.61	(0.054)	96.90	(0.000)
Index	101	4.29	(0.038)	0.90	(0.184)	0.80	(0.211)	1.27	(0.102)	292.31	(0.000)

Table 6. Simulated fund persistence using winner-loser approach

Panel A: Performance of simulated funds from mutual fund net returns

Style	Number of funds	Contingency table								Transition matrix	
		χ^2	p-value	Z total	p-value	ZWW	p-value	ZLL	p-value	χ^2	p-value
Small Growth	164	55.54	(0.000)	3.23	(0.001)	3.71	(0.000)	3.74	(0.000)	221.74	(0.000)
Small Blend	85	34.14	(0.000)	2.53	(0.006)	2.70	(0.003)	3.14	(0.001)	148.68	(0.000)
Small Value	52	12.70	(0.000)	1.54	(0.061)	1.78	(0.037)	1.78	(0.037)	88.64	(0.000)
Mid Growth	162	49.42	(0.000)	3.04	(0.001)	3.51	(0.000)	3.51	(0.000)	162.15	(0.000)
Mid Blend	64	17.05	(0.000)	1.79	(0.037)	2.06	(0.019)	2.06	(0.019)	71.08	(0.000)
Mid Value	32	8.53	(0.004)	1.27	(0.103)	1.46	(0.072)	1.46	(0.072)	38.14	(0.001)
Large Growth	363	0.61	(0.434)	0.34	(0.367)	0.28	(0.391)	0.51	(0.307)	517.10	(0.000)
Large Blend	249	46.08	(0.000)	2.94	(0.002)	3.26	(0.001)	3.53	(0.000)	509.89	(0.000)
Large Value	171	1.00	(0.318)	0.43	(0.332)	0.33	(0.369)	0.66	(0.253)	351.20	(0.000)
Index	101	0.18	(0.668)	0.19	(0.426)	0.00	(0.500)	0.43	(0.333)	414.65	(0.000)

Panel B: Performance of simulated funds from mutual fund gross returns

Style	Number of funds	Contingency table								Transition matrix	
		χ^2	p-value	Z total	p-value	ZWW	p-value	ZLL	p-value	χ^2	p-value
Small Growth	164	66.73	(0.000)	3.53	(0.000)	4.08	(0.000)	4.08	(0.000)	234.30	(0.000)
Small Blend	85	59.80	(0.000)	3.34	(0.000)	3.63	(0.000)	4.10	(0.000)	140.87	(0.000)
Small Value	52	16.58	(0.000)	1.76	(0.039)	2.04	(0.021)	2.04	(0.021)	134.04	(0.000)
Mid Growth	162	44.48	(0.000)	2.89	(0.002)	3.33	(0.000)	3.33	(0.000)	220.02	(0.000)
Mid Blend	64	36.96	(0.000)	2.63	(0.004)	3.04	(0.001)	3.04	(0.001)	98.53	(0.000)
Mid Value	32	16.45	(0.000)	1.75	(0.040)	2.03	(0.021)	2.03	(0.021)	78.05	(0.000)
Large Growth	363	5.62	(0.018)	1.03	(0.152)	1.07	(0.142)	1.30	(0.097)	521.94	(0.000)
Large Blend	249	67.94	(0.000)	3.57	(0.000)	3.99	(0.000)	4.25	(0.000)	493.99	(0.000)
Large Value	171	12.92	(0.000)	1.56	(0.059)	1.62	(0.053)	1.98	(0.024)	435.10	(0.000)
Index	101	0.37	(0.542)	0.26	(0.396)	0.07	(0.473)	0.54	(0.293)	589.74	(0.000)

Table 7. Mutual fund persistence obtained by assessing performance of past-persistence-based portfolios

For all styles, mutual funds are grouped in quintiles based on past performance. Portfolio Q1 consists of investing, over the next period, in the worst performing mutual funds, from the previous period, in the first quintile. The same pattern is followed by the rest of the portfolios up to Q5, which invests in the best mutual funds based on the performance achieved in the previous period.

Panel A: Performance estimated with mutual fund net returns

Style	Number of funds	Q1	p-value	cross p-value	Q2	p-value	cross p-value	Q3	p-value	cross p-value	Q4	p-value	cross p-value	Q5	p-value	cross p-value
Small Growth	164	**-3.10%**	**(0.010)**	**(0.000)**	**-2.20%**	**(0.024)**	**(0.041)**	-1.09%	(0.234)	(0.918)	-0.72%	(0.408)	(0.991)	-0.76%	(0.444)	(0.991)
Small Blend	85	-1.53%	(0.083)	(0.009)	-0.49%	(0.578)	(0.485)	-1.49%	(0.070)	(0.014)	0.60%	(0.503)	(0.010)	0.60%	(0.510)	(0.010)
Small Value	52	0.07%	(0.949)	(0.090)	-1.48%	(0.142)	(0.104)	-0.29%	(0.767)	(0.765)	-1.39%	(0.157)	(0.131)	-0.63%	(0.557)	(0.566)
Mid Growth	162	-1.32%	(0.262)	(0.000)	-0.10%	(0.926)	(0.308)	0.90%	(0.405)	(0.012)	-0.11%	(0.920)	(0.304)	1.09%	(0.323)	(0.001)
Mid Blend	64	-0.46%	(0.683)	(0.166)	0.25%	(0.784)	(0.502)	0.79%	(0.371)	(0.197)	0.17%	(0.880)	(0.546)	0.33%	(0.768)	(0.464)
Mid Value	32	1.02%	(0.414)	(0.715)	1.80%	(0.078)	(0.390)	1.49%	(0.164)	(0.521)	1.57%	(0.136)	(0.493)	1.90%	(0.149)	(0.345)
Large Growth	363	-1.30%	(0.139)	(0.172)	-0.93%	(0.156)	(0.771)	-0.67%	(0.268)	(0.972)	-1.01%	(0.120)	(0.631)	-1.57%	(0.099)	(0.010)
Large Blend	249	**-1.38%**	**(0.014)**	**(0.029)**	-1.03%	(0.013)	(0.378)	-1.00%	(0.004)	(0.420)	-1.28%	(0.001)	(0.071)	-0.08%	(0.898)	(0.000)
Large Value	171	-0.62%	(0.399)	(0.388)	-0.62%	(0.364)	(0.397)	-0.42%	(0.525)	(0.709)	-0.84%	(0.180)	(0.114)	-0.27%	(0.734)	(0.887)
Index	101	-0.40%	(0.742)	(0.987)	-0.94%	(0.193)	(0.668)	-1.41%	(0.006)	(0.136)	-0.56%	(0.487)	(0.953)	**-2.06%**	**(0.024)**	**(0.000)**

Panel B: Performance estimated with mutual fund gross returns

Style	Number of funds	Q1	p-value	cross p-value	Q2	p-value	cross p-value	Q3	p-value	cross p-value	Q4	p-value	cross p-value	Q5	p-value	cross p-value
Small Growth	164	-1.57%	(0.184)	(0.000)	-0.87%	(0.366)	(0.018)	0.20%	(0.828)	(0.168)	0.93%	(0.279)	(0.003)	0.60%	(0.553)	(0.021)
Small Blend	85	-0.06%	(0.947)	(0.020)	0.56%	(0.532)	(0.777)	0.17%	(0.831)	(0.945)	1.67%	(0.068)	(0.041)	**2.07%**	**(0.024)**	**(0.003)**
Small Value	52	1.24%	(0.285)	(0.160)	0.04%	(0.968)	(0.825)	1.10%	(0.254)	(0.218)	-0.15%	(0.878)	(0.100)	0.78%	(0.472)	(0.392)
Mid Growth	162	-0.05%	(0.968)	(0.000)	1.56%	(0.162)	(0.376)	2.04%	(0.056)	(0.046)	1.37%	(0.201)	(0.585)	**2.29%**	**(0.038)**	**(0.009)**
Mid Blend	64	0.83%	(0.462)	(0.821)	1.42%	(0.137)	(0.543)	2.51%	(0.006)	(0.076)	1.45%	(0.157)	(0.529)	1.39%	(0.232)	(0.560)
Mid Value	32	2.36%	(0.060)	(0.737)	3.15%	(0.003)	(0.385)	2.82%	(0.006)	(0.541)	2.83%	(0.009)	(0.535)	3.15%	(0.016)	(0.383)
Large Growth	363	0.09%	(0.915)	(0.580)	0.13%	(0.843)	(0.510)	0.55%	(0.355)	(0.032)	0.17%	(0.793)	(0.430)	-0.22%	(0.820)	(0.038)
Large Blend	249	-0.24%	(0.672)	(0.027)	0.22%	(0.591)	(0.441)	0.09%	(0.790)	(0.661)	-0.29%	(0.454)	(0.014)	1.12%	(0.058)	(0.000)
Large Value	171	0.63%	(0.405)	(0.430)	0.42%	(0.537)	(0.745)	0.48%	(0.475)	(0.665)	0.38%	(0.548)	(0.787)	0.93%	(0.226)	(0.078)
Index	101	0.48%	(0.696)	(0.000)	-0.81%	(0.274)	(0.233)	-0.61%	(0.236)	(0.452)	-0.18%	(0.830)	(0.900)	-1.78%	(0.054)	(0.000)

Table 8. Simulated fund persistence obtained by assessing performance of past-persistence-based portfolios

For all styles, simulated funds are grouped in quintiles based on past performance. Portfolio Q1 consists of investing, over the next period, in the worst performing synthetic funds, from the previous period in the first quintile. The same pattern is followed by the rest of the portfolios up to Q5, which invests in the best synthetic funds based on the performance achieved in the previous period.

Panel A: Performance estimated with mutual fund net returns

Style	Number of funds	Q1	p-value	cross p-value	Q2	p-value	cross p-value	Q3	p-value	cross p-value	Q4	p-value	cross p-value	Q5	p-value	cross p-value
Small Growth	164	-1.18%	(0.219)	(0.750)	-1.46%	(0.048)	(0.162)	-1.19%	(0.049)	(0.732)	-1.21%	(0.081)	(0.702)	-1.47%	(0.065)	(0.155)
Small Blend	85	-1.46%	(0.102)	(0.268)	-0.82%	(0.225)	(0.893)	-1.39%	(0.022)	(0.334)	-1.30%	(0.060)	(0.427)	-1.28%	(0.198)	(0.458)
Small Value	52	-1.93%	(0.033)	(0.079)	-1.18%	(0.133)	(0.585)	-0.75%	(0.294)	(0.909)	-1.21%	(0.141)	(0.553)	-1.27%	(0.214)	(0.502)
Mid Growth	162	0.51%	(0.547)	(0.000)	0.55%	(0.384)	(0.000)	-0.29%	(0.631)	(0.325)	-0.37%	(0.547)	(0.199)	-1.40%	(0.105)	(0.000)
Mid Blend	64	0.07%	(0.925)	(0.323)	0.45%	(0.428)	(0.028)	0.13%	(0.823)	(0.240)	-0.09%	(0.886)	(0.433)	-0.77%	(0.320)	(0.003)
Mid Value	32	0.41%	(0.527)	(0.201)	0.59%	(0.326)	(0.081)	0.42%	(0.459)	(0.186)	-0.17%	(0.795)	(0.166)	-0.51%	(0.496)	(0.018)
Large Growth	363	0.17%	(0.820)	(0.000)	-0.03%	(0.946)	(0.000)	-0.32%	(0.448)	(0.952)	-0.78%	(0.088)	(0.015)	**-1.64%**	**(0.015)**	**(0.000)**
Large Blend	249	-0.24%	(0.720)	(0.994)	-0.56%	(0.284)	(0.589)	-0.63%	(0.161)	(0.383)	-0.53%	(0.254)	(0.683)	-1.02%	(0.113)	(0.001)
Large Value	171	-0.30%	(0.692)	(0.948)	-0.05%	(0.939)	(0.000)	-0.30%	(0.606)	(0.946)	-0.65%	(0.277)	(0.149)	-1.26%	(0.077)	(0.000)
Index	101	-0.01%	(0.994)	(0.000)	-0.97%	(0.186)	(0.480)	-1.22%	(0.032)	(0.180)	-0.60%	(0.464)	(0.901)	**-2.06%**	**(0.018)**	**(0.000)**

Panel B: Performance estimated with mutual fund gross returns

Style	Number of funds	Q1	p-value	cross p-value	Q2	p-value	cross p-value	Q3	p-value	cross p-value	Q4	p-value	cross p-value	Q5	p-value	cross p-value
Small Growth	164	**-1.80%**	**(0.050)**	**(0.018)**	-1.61%	(0.037)	(0.248)	-1.36%	(0.058)	(0.907)	-1.45%	(0.052)	(0.727)	-1.40%	(0.081)	(0.842)
Small Blend	85	-1.39%	(0.060)	(0.606)	-1.49%	(0.017)	(0.398)	**-1.76%**	**(0.006)**	**(0.045)**	-1.35%	(0.059)	(0.676)	-1.14%	(0.164)	(0.940)
Small Value	52	-1.72%	(0.035)	(0.072)	-1.56%	(0.052)	(0.264)	-1.34%	(0.101)	(0.646)	-1.07%	(0.219)	(0.948)	-1.40%	(0.142)	(0.541)
Mid Growth	162	0.74%	(0.425)	(0.001)	0.92%	(0.259)	(0.000)	0.39%	(0.639)	(0.090)	-0.09%	(0.908)	(0.029)	-0.97%	(0.310)	(0.000)
Mid Blend	64	0.34%	(0.627)	(0.429)	0.77%	(0.246)	(0.023)	0.46%	(0.502)	(0.242)	0.34%	(0.618)	(0.427)	-0.40%	(0.648)	(0.002)
Mid Value	32	0.78%	(0.247)	(0.424)	1.08%	(0.140)	(0.082)	0.85%	(0.253)	(0.327)	0.46%	(0.576)	(0.867)	0.51%	(0.548)	(0.822)
Large Growth	363	0.40%	(0.592)	(0.000)	0.20%	(0.713)	(0.000)	-0.22%	(0.641)	(0.974)	-0.86%	(0.078)	(0.000)	**-1.49%**	**(0.029)**	**(0.000)**
Large Blend	249	0.08%	(0.891)	(0.000)	-0.57%	(0.242)	(0.231)	-0.54%	(0.219)	(0.370)	-0.50%	(0.276)	(0.541)	-1.00%	(0.082)	(0.000)
Large Value	171	-0.07%	(0.922)	(0.999)	-0.08%	(0.902)	(0.999)	-0.25%	(0.698)	(0.919)	-0.54%	(0.392)	(0.043)	-0.99%	(0.148)	(0.000)
Index	101	-0.15%	(0.909)	(0.996)	-1.22%	(0.123)	(0.163)	-1.04%	(0.032)	(0.355)	-1.03%	(0.289)	(0.375)	-1.32%	(0.164)	(0.092)

Figure 1a. Mutual fund performance estimated from net returns.



Figure 1b. Mutual fund performance estimated from gross returns.



Figure 2a. Simulated mutual fund performance estimated from net returns.



Figure 2b. Simulated mutual fund performance estimated from gross returns.



Figure 3a. Performance of portfolios based on mutual fund past performance estimated from net returns.



Figure 3b. Performance of portfolios based on mutual fund past performance estimated from gross returns.



Figure 4a. Performance of portfolios based on simulated fund past performance estimated from net returns.



Figure 4b. Performance of portfolios based on simulated fund past performance estimated from gross returns.