Financial Analysts Journal ›
Volume 72, 2016 - Issue 5

Free access

829 Views | 17 CrossRef citations to date | 36 Altmetric

Listen

Viewpoint

The Evolution and Success of Index Strategies in ETFs

Joanne M. Hill

Pages 8-13 | Published online: 27 Dec 2018

Cite this article https://doi.org/10.2469/faj.v72.n5.2 Check for updates

Abstra

Taking is gies that are based o significant innovati l and strategi

This articl Finan

We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 907 partners store and access personal data, like browsing data or unique identifiers, on your device. Selecting "I Accept" enables tracking technologies to support the purposes shown under "we and our partners process data to provide," whereas selecting "Reject All" or withdrawing your consent will disable them. If trackers are disabled, some content and ads you see may not be as relevant to you. You can resurface this menu to change your choices or withdraw consent at any time by clicking the ["privacy preferences"] link on the bottom of the webpage [or the floating icon on the bottom-left of the webpage, if applicable]. Your choices will have effect within our Website. For more details, refer to our Privacy Policy. Here

We and our partners process data to provide:

I Accept

Reject All

Show Purpose

Investm ry and success e highlights the grow end of 2015, index m nutual fund assets compared with only 4% in 1995. According to Bogle, the fundamental principles

of the first index fund were to “buy virtually the entire US stock market and hold it intact ‘forever.’ . . . These simple principles have won the day.”[2]

Bogle emphasizes that the combination of the cost advantages of index management and the inability of stock selection strategies to consistently outperform has been a key component of the growth of index assets as a share of equity mutual fund holdings. But he is disturbed by the fact that exchange-traded funds (ETFs), the fastest-growing form of index product, represent about half of all indexed assets in the United States. He notes that only one-fifth of all equity ETF assets are invested in the S&P 500 Index, with the rest in ETFs benchmarked to MSCI EAFE, MSCI Emerging Markets, country, industry, “smart beta,” leveraged, and theme-based ETFs.

According to Bogle, these ETFs, rather than being held forever, are “traded at a frenzied pace” and are “held largely by financial institutions and mostly used for speculation, hedging, arbitrage, or other short-term purposes.”[3] He complains that the 1,800 ETFs available in the United States (as of the end of 2015) are a betrayal of the original concept of indexing, because they are “less diversified, carry greater risk, and are used largely for rapid-fire trading.”[4] Bogle acknowledges that some investors are using ETFs properly, trading “only moderately and strategically,”[5] but notes that they are the smallest segment of ETF investors. The purpose of this piece is to take issue with Bogle’s description of how investors use ETF-based index strategies and to shed light on [redacted]owth in indexing

ETFs T[redacted]

Few wou[redacted]ed investors to embra[redacted] game versus d[redacted] investors with [redacted]wning a market p[redacted]M concepts of Willia[redacted]re asset class ho[redacted]

But the [redacted]ETF packagi[redacted]ETFs represe[redacted]onstruction to include rules-based managed portfolios that can be bought, held, and traded like

stocks. ETFs can be accessed through exchanges and held by the smallest and largest investors for the same management fee. In this sense, ETFs are often said to have democratized investing; the range of investment exposures available in ETF packaging brings to the average investor what was available only to the largest institutions 20 years ago.

ETFs also bring together investors with different motivations and horizons. Holders include long-term investors looking for cheap and efficient ways to build and periodically rebalance a long-term portfolio, as well as shorter-horizon investors who want to adapt their portfolios to changing market views or conditions—including frequent traders who wish to “speculate.” Now that ETFs are so large and liquid, institutions are increasing their use of ETFs as an alternative to hiring money managers and to using derivative instruments. In particular, for fixed-income investing, ETFs have revolutionized the investment process. Before the introduction of fixed-income ETFs, index investing was a very small portion of fixed-income mutual funds and institutional assets. Today, bond index investing has grown considerably through investor adoption of fixed-income ETFs that have become an efficient and transparent vehicle for gaining exposure to portfolios of fixed-income securities. The market structure of ETF trading has facilitated advances in price discovery with respect to trading bond portfolios, a process that had been largely hidden to most investors.

The high positively by ETF inve ors want liquidity raded not only by l iquidity provider e traders are making s securities, after acc es is partly the p ants trade ETFs w ons, and similar t

Bogle sa “strategy follows s packaging structure investment objective

transparency facilitates the creation and redemption process, which, for most ETFs, can

be done “in-kind” by the exchange of securities and ETF shares (without having to raise or invest cash), thus reducing the market impact of flows in and out of the fund. The flexibility of the ETF creation and redemption process also allows ETFs to be more tax efficient than mutual funds—an after-tax cost advantage.

A Brief History of Tradable Index Products

The story behind the origin of ETFs offers insights into their success as a product innovation. The creation of the Standard & Poor’s Depositary Receipt (SPDR) on the AMEX in 1993 (ticker symbol: SPY) was partly in response to calls from the SEC for a single product for trading baskets of stocks after the 1987 stock market crash. SPDRs (“Spiders”) were thought to have the potential to reduce the volatility impact on individual stocks from the arbitrage of stock index futures.[9] The SEC white paper published in response to the 1987 market crash called for “the availability of a basket trading on an exchange that would restore program trades to more traditional stock trading techniques.”[10]

Nate Most and Steve Bloom of the American Stock Exchange saw an opportunity to provide all types of investors with access to an S&P 500 exchange-traded product that would trade like a stock at a fee set at the same level as Bogle’s Vanguard index fund. (This account is in contrast to Bogle’s assertion that ETFs were created and “originally designe ew, SPY started t al Advisors (SSGA), hat there was an a m traders to be in the funds and some re pension fund from out

It is ation was occurri not been invente ld probably have gr e via index futures a short-term and long s and stock prices al s listed primaril open

outcry pits at the CME. Futures also had a different regulatory structure, with daily marking to market, and many mutual funds and pension funds were not authorized to use derivatives at the time. An S&P 500 ETF provided an alternative to futures for long-term investors who preferred the stock format and exchange access, and it also gave more active traders and those who wanted to short stocks a flexible and low-cost tool for their strategies.

Keep in mind that even before the launch of SPY, longer-term index investing through tradable index futures was finding its way into institutional and retail mutual funds. SSGA started the first synthetic commingled fund in 1983; called the Stock Performance Index Futures Fund (SPIFF), it appealed primarily to pensions, which could use it for equitizing cash cheaply and as a way to efficiently maintain their target equity weights. In 1993, PIMCO launched its first equity mutual fund by combining short-term fixed-income investing and S&P 500 Index futures with the goal of outperforming the S&P 500 by capitalizing on (1) the fund's ability to generate superior fixed-income returns relative to the interest rate implied in S&P 500 futures and (2) any cheapness in the S&P 500 futures prices.

The Growth of ETFs' Strategic Applications Reflects Wider Adoption of Indexing

The expa uity indexes —includi g with such factors a pansion also incorpor as fixed income, ackRock), SSGA, a es geared to institutio other segm as Bogle sugg a quest by investor assets, consiste

ETFs als y-and-hold investing t-class portfolio who wanted to imple ndustry had

only the choice of stocks or bonds traded in less liquid dealer markets; they also had limited tools for overall risk management. New strategies, such as global asset allocation, became more widely adopted, as did hedge fund investing that involved shorting ETFs as a hedge. For institutional investors, especially large public and corporate funds, looking to add to emerging-market equity and commodity exposure, ETFs became the vehicle of choice.

Another factor in the growth of ETFs was the fallout from the two bear equity markets that occurred in the decade of 2000–2009, which contributed to an increase in more dynamic approaches to managing asset classes as a key part of investing. These more volatile market conditions led to an interest in more asset class diversification and dynamic risk management. Today's investors want an element of their portfolio construction to be adaptable to the ever-changing information and risk conditions in financial markets.

Questioning the proliferation of ETFs to cover both broad and narrow segments of financial markets, Bogle expresses concern about their turnover as a sign that they are being used for speculation and market timing. Investor surveys and conversations with investors indicate that although their initial use of ETFs may be for tactical purposes or for areas of the portfolio where liquidity is critical, the typical pattern is for investors to turn to ETFs more for long-term holdings and as a replacement for derivatives.

For seve onal
investor cent survey,
conduct nd public
pension nsurance
compani Of the
survey r ns,
endo nvested
more

Surveys were
rebalanc er, the most
recent s egan
several obtaining
core exp gic"—up
from 58 0% of ETF

usage was for holding periods of two years or longer and 25% for one to two years. Only 5% of ETF usage was for holding periods of under a month, refuting Bogle's assertion that institutions primarily use ETFs for speculation. The survey report's conclusion summarizes the typical pattern of institutional ETF applications:

> Initially using ETFs for simple, tactical tasks, institutions discover that ETFs provide an effective means of obtaining long-term exposures, and over time they integrate the funds more deeply into their investment strategies. Institutions that start using ETFs in equity portfolios find that the funds are equally as useful in fixed income and other asset classes.[14]

This pattern of institutions using ETFs for both tactical and core asset class exposure with index strategies is similar to the way in which financial advisers use ETFs for their retail clients. This finding stands in contrast to Bogle's statement that "most of today's 1,800 ETFs are less diversified, carry greater risk, and are used largely for rapid-fire trading—speculation, pure and simple."[15] Certainly, many applications of the 1,800 ETFs are based on a forecast or view relative to current prices, but that is also true of individual stocks. There is a natural balance between investors who have a bottom-up stock, industry, or thematic view and those who want broad asset class exposure to fulfill a buy-and-hold target allocation or one based on a more top-down view of relative risk and return. For many investors who have short or long investment horizons and who are posure, ETFs are ncreased adoption

ETF Tu

Bogle su th evidence that the highlights that a as of the end of A $1.687 trillion o ents some 80% of E es. Other sponsors are based on activ 2,000% a year. Bo ve a turnover

If we look more closely at these statistics, we see that the data translate into an average holding period of 30 trading days, or about 1.5 months, for the ETFs of the sponsors with the largest assets and primarily traditional index strategies. That does not sound like speculative, frantic trading, especially when we consider that the volume statistics include the activity of liquidity providers that arbitrage the ETFs with the underlying securities to keep prices in line. Indeed, it seems quite reasonable for a vehicle that is used by a substantial group for rebalancing and cash equalization along with liquidity overlay. Even the trading activity of the “most active ETF sponsors” relative to assets translates into an average holding period of 10 trading days, or two weeks, when dividing dollars of assets by dollars of turnover in Table 2 of Bogle’s article. For tactical strategies implemented with ETFs, a horizon of one to two weeks should not be surprising and can at times probably be even shorter, depending on the volatility of market conditions.

Looking at the 100 largest stocks, a similar calculation shows that their shares outstanding turn over, on average, every 208 trading days, or nine months, a striking contrast with ETFs. But stocks are different in that many shares of public companies are more costly to trade and are held by owner/managers, company founders, or company buyback programs. In addition, even though stock investors hold positions, on average, for longer terms than ETF investors, Bogle and others have shown that bottom-up stock selection

Why D

Concern een ETF
trading a ffect
relations ve look at
markets activity and
inves d stock and
bond ws between
bottom- managers
tend to t flows or
withdraw ation enters
the finar on as
outlooks ence and
volatility ty.

The footprint of investors who choose to react and trade in response to more volatility and dynamic market conditions shows up in a higher percentage of trading activity in ETFs and futures and relatively less activity in stock investing. Some investors shorten their investment horizons and are more inclined to rebalance their strategies as financial market conditions move front and center, accompanied by a higher rate of macro information flows with greater volatility. Risk preferences may change, resulting in transactions from both risk-averse and opportunistic investors. The portion of equityholders who want to transact may increase sharply in face of this new macro uncertainty.

Other investors, especially those with a more bottom-up orientation, may choose to stay on the sidelines until the outlook becomes clear and more stable. Investors who take a longer view may wish to have more complete information on the impact of new macroeconomic conditions on individual companies before they act. As these more deliberate and patient market participants move to the sidelines during times of uncertainty and turbulence, the marketplace can become dominated by the abundant shorter-horizon “macro” investors looking to reduce their risk profile or to take advantage of opportunities in the marketplace. Their implementation tools of choice are typically the liquid ETFs, the largest stocks, and futures and other derivatives.

Obstacles to ETF and Indexing Growth

Notwiths ETFs, several l and small investor estment process, uring both normal a designed for stock tra are still adapt discretionary mark narket condition volatility, do not refle dex arbitrag rge number of stocks tep away from ma ally. With respect y or derivative trades in a market structure different from that of the ETF, which complicates

both the arbitrage process and the price discovery process. Improved coordination is needed for any rules related to closing and reopening products across stock/ETF exchanges as well as futures and options exchanges.

The regulatory structure for ETFs needs to become more integrated and more focused on the product's hybrid features as a tradable fund product. In the United States, most ETFs are regulated by the SEC under both the rules of the Investment Act of 1940 and the rules that apply to primary stock offerings and secondary market exchange-traded securities. But given the importance of ETFs in capital markets and as an asset management product, the time may have come to consider whether using rules designed for stocks and mutual funds is adequate and operationally efficient. Access to efficient and low-cost investment tools is critical to the financial welfare of savers and investors seeking to maximize their retirement income. We need to make sure that regulation provides protection as well as a framework for improving the investment opportunity set for asset allocation and risk management.

Conclusion: The Value Proposition of Index Strategies vs. the Market Index Portfolio

The financial marketplace consists of a diverse set of participants. Some hold positions for seconds and others for years. Some are highly informed, expert institutional investor ocus, looking t meet many of their i tocks, whereas s. Each type of invest o drive prices to

As Bogle ated by both mutu value proposi 00 Index mutual f tfolio, a major fo f rules-based, n has been the lowe s well as, in most cas

The concept of a market portfolio of risky assets is too theoretical to be a viable investment choice because all investors are “local” and have different choice sets in terms of access costs, tax regimes, and availability.[16] Thus, investors are happy to apply the proven concept of indexing whenever feasible, given the liquidity of the underlying securities. We should celebrate this development as the next step in the evolution of the “triumph of indexing” and seek opportunities to increase the use of ETFs in portfolio management and to adapt our exchange structures and regulatory frameworks to accommodate this growth.

I would like to acknowledge the pioneering contribution of John Bogle in translating the call to action by Dr. Paul Samuelson into the 1975 launch of the Vanguard 500 index fund. This fund represents one of the most significant financial innovations of the last 50 years by providing individual investors access to the favorable relative performance of index investing with low fees. I would also like to thank Executive Editor Stephen J. Brown for suggestions on the direction and content of this Viewpoint.

Notes

[1] John C. hallenge,” Financia

[2] Bogle,

[3] Bogle,

[4] Bogle,

[5] Bo

[6] For mo ave Nadig, and Mat) (Charlot

[7] William der Conditio 5–442.

[8] Bogle, “The Index Mutual Fund,” 10.

[9] Eric Balchunas, “The ETF Files: How the U.S. Government Inadvertently Launched a $3 Trillion Industry,” Bloomberg Markets (7 March 2016).

[10] US SEC, The October 1987 Market Break, SEC Division of Market Regulation (February 1988): 18.

[11] Most and Bloom took their idea to Bogle with the intention of using the S&P 500 Vanguard mutual fund as the basis for a basket-trading vehicle but were rebuffed; they then turned to custodian and index manager State Street. For Bogle’s account, see Bogle, “The Index Mutual Fund,” Note 4.

[12] Email from James Ross to Joanne Hill (10 February 2016).

[13] Greenwich Associates, “Institutional Investment in ETFs: Versatility Fuels Growth” (Q1 2016).

[14] Greenwich Associates, “Institutional Investment in ETFs,” 15.

[15] Bogle, “The Index Mutual Fund,” 13.

[16] Joanne M. Hill, “Alpha as a Net Zero-Sum Game,” Journal of Portfolio Management, vol. 32, no. 4 (Summer 2006): 24–32.

Downloa
Share
nd out more
Re

Copyright

Accessibi

or & Francis Group

orma business

Registered

5 Howick Pl