ABSTRACT

This thesis provides a comprehensive comparison between Exchange—Ttraded formula (ETFs) and mMutual formula. Over the period from of January 1st, 200501/01/2005 to December 31st, 201612/31/2016 we compare a total of 122 Ffunds and 70 bBenchmark indices. This sample is further divided into the segments Equity Large-cCap, mMid-cCap, sSmall-cCap and frixed—ilncome.

Based on daily prices, the average returns are calculated. We find that ETFs and mMutual fFunds both underperform their benchmark indices. The greater underperformance of Mutual Fundsmutual funds can be partially distributed to a higher expense ratio. Based ion the regression model and standard deviation, analysis the tracking errors are estimated. Only in the lLarge-cCap section doprovide ETFs provide the less risky investment alternative, while Mmutual fFunds show lower risk indicators in the other three sections. Finally, we compute the premiums and discount as well as spreads to investigate the major cost sources of ETFs and compare the expense ratios of both types of fFunds.

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Superscript

Commented [NK1]: Are these all prefixes for funds? (e.g., large-cap funds, fixed-income funds) If so, "fixed-income" should be hyphenated.

Commented [NK2]: passive voice—consider "we calculate average returns."

**this is an example of a heavier/style-based copyedit

Commented [NK3]: Do you mean "attributed"?

INTRODUCTION

Exchange—tTraded fFunds (ETFs), which fall in the group of relatively new financial vehicles, experienced, especially in the United States, more and more attention over the last two decades. This is not surprising since the United States was one of the first countries where in which Eexchange—tTraded pProducts (ETPs) were created. In 1989, the Index Participation Share (IPS) was the very first instrument that replicated the movement of an Index. The IPS was a synthetic portfolio, that had the S&P 500 as the underlying benchmark. Due to its synthetic structure, it soon was forbidden to be traded at sStock eExchanges, which what resulted in an imminent liquidation. Other creations like the Toronto Stock Exchange Index Participation (TIPs) or Supershares, that aimed to replicate a certain Index also failed because of ana not unsustainable structure or unmarketable expense ratios (Gastineau, 2001).

Only a little later, the Standard & Poor's Depositaory Receipts—well_known as SPDRs—was were introduced to the market. Although; it experienced less attention and slow growth in the very beginning, which was mainly due to its complex and unfamiliar structure; in the mid 19902s, investors realized the benefits of the investment characteristics and tax efficiency. Nowadays, the SPDR is still the largest ETF and takes second place of all actively traded funds behind the Vanguard 500 Mutual Fund. In many publications it is also considered as the very first exchange-traded form, although this title belongs to the TIPs. Around the same time the World Equity Benchmark Shares (WEBS), which were later renamed into iShares MSCI, was were released. This series of frunds opened the opportunity; to invest in a basket that only contained foreign stocks. Sector SPDR allowed investors to focus their placement of funds on one particular segment of stocks within the S&P 500.

Commented [NK4]: For clarity, I suggest something like "ETFs are relatively new financial vehicles and have experienced more and more attention over the last two decades, especially in the United States."

**this is an example of a heavier copyedit/style suggestion

Commented [NK5]: I suggest you omit this (unnecessary)

**this is an example of a style suggestion

Commented [NK6]: I think you mean this—not totally clear

Commented [NK7]: I searched this term, and what came up was "Vanguard 500 Index Fund." Is that what you mean or is that something different? (Also I am fairly sure that "index fund" or "mutual fund" should be lowercase.)

Commented [NK8]: Google says it's World Equity Benchmark Series, not Shares. Make sure to double check.