Soothing Investors: The Impact of Manager Communication on Mutual Fund Flows Ahmed Guecioueur

INSEAD

Motivation

- Investors tend to be reluctant to bear risk: even those who hold stocks tend to put only a small fraction of their financial wealth in them (Calvet et al. 2023)
- Can investors be encouraged to take more risk? If so, how?
- Gennaioli, Shleifer, and Vishny (2015) hypothesize that trusted financial intermediaries ("money doctors") can give their clients the confidence to overcome their anxieties and take risks, including through communication
- Communication by fund managers is prevalent (Hillert, Niessen-Ruenzi, and Ruenzi 2021): over 9/10 semi-annual reports contain fund letters. Risk is a major topic.
- Is the money doctors mechanism of anxiety alleviation at work in this setting?

Empirical setting

The effect is concentrated among anxious readers

Cross-sectional median split; i.e. always same time period

Dependent Variable:	Net Flow $_{i,t \rightarrow t+1}$ (%)					
Sub-sample:	Low A	nxiety	High A	nxiety		
	(1) (2)		(3)	(4)		
Risk Detail _{i,t}	-0.1019 (0.1386)	-0.1170 (0.1365)	0.5850*** (0.2064)	0.5795*** (0.2065)		
Risk Level _{<i>i</i>,<i>t</i>}		0.1137 (0.1060)		0.2221** (0.1109)		
Local Economy Controls $_{i,t}$	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark		
Fund Controls _{<i>i</i>,<i>t</i>}	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark		
Year-month FEs	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark		
Fund FEs	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark		

- Focus on communication by index mutual funds that track the S&P 500 market index to aid identification (Hortaçsu and Syverson 2004)
- Extract statements related to risk the very thing investors fear
 - Measure both amount/detail of communication & level of risk conveyed
- Examine aggregate flows to & from these funds to study investors' behavior

Providing more detail about risk encourages risk-taking

- *Risk Detail*_{*i*,*t*} is the log word count about risk. (Total length is controlled for.)
- Effect is present in the cross-section, and over time (i.e. within-fund)
- The level of risk conveyed is informative but investors don't learn from it
- Other specifications involving changes to sentiment from a prior \Rightarrow similar result

Dependent Variable:	Net Flow $_{i,t \rightarrow t+1}$ (%)					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Risk Detail _{i,ti,t}	0.5044*** (0.1808)	0.4976*** (0.1768)	0.5258*** (0.1974)	0.5022*** (0.1842)	0.4950*** (0.1877)	0.4795** (0.2002)
Risk Level _{i,t}		0.1043 (0.1123)		0.0058 (0.0169)	0.0144 (0.0201)	

Ν	553	552	686	685
R^2	0.61	0.61	0.52	0.52

Clustered (Fund & Year-month) standard-errors in parentheses: ***: 0.01, **: 0.05, *: 0.1

Measuring investor anxiety at a fund-month level

- For readership of letter issued by fund *i* during month *t*:
- Geographic anxiety attitudes based on Google search activity for anxiety-related topics, varying per state & month:

Anxiety_{*i*,*t*}

is defined as the asset-weighted mean of local anxiety attitudes:

Anxiety_{*i*,*t*} = $\frac{\sum_{j} \text{Investment}_{j,t} \times \text{Geographic Anxiety}_{j,t}}{\sum_{i} \text{Investment}_{i,t}}$,

with Investment weight = reader count × mean per-capita fund investment (Census Bureau SIPP) and reader count based on SEC EDGAR geolocated IP addresses

Interpreting the empirical findings

- In the literature, effective risk aversion increases with anxiety (e.g. Kuhnen and Knutson 2011; Guiso, Sapienza, and Zingales 2018) ...
- ... and communication reduces anxiety (e.g. Hayward 1975; Hall, Roter, and Katz 1988)
- Consider an investor who holds the (mean-variance-efficient) fraction

<pre>1{High Risk Level}</pre> i,t			0.3339			0.5278
			(0.8204)			(1.242)
Risk Detail _{i,t}			-0.0457			-0.0404
$\times \ \mathbb{1}{\{High Risk Level\}_{i,t}}$			(0.1380)			(0.2232)
Risk Level measure		Sentiment	Sentiment I	High-Low Word	s High Words	High Words
$\mathbb{1}{High Risk Level}$ threshold			Median			0
Fund Controls $_{i,t}$	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
Year-month FEs	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
Fund FEs	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
Ν	1,155	1,137	1,137	1,154	1,154	1,154
R ²	0.44	0.43	0.43	0.44	0.44	0.44

Fund controls: total (log) word count, fund's prior month return, its square, fees & (log) size, and fund family's (log) age & (log) size. Clustered (Fund & Year-month) standard-errors in parentheses. Signif. Codes: ***: 0.01, **: 0.05, *: 0.1

An explicit test for belief-based persuasion

Weaker prior (i.e. higher <u>V</u>VIX) should produce stronger updates; however...

Dependent Variables:	Net Flow $_{i,t \rightarrow t+1}$ (%)		$Inflow_{i,t \to t+1} (\%)$		$Outflow_{i,t o t+1}$ (%)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Risk Detail _{i,t}	0.5248***	0.5195***	0.5569***	0.5160**	0.0350	0.0958

$$x_t = rac{\mathbb{E}_t[R_{t+1}]}{\gamma_t \mathbb{V} \operatorname{ar}_t(R_{t+1})}$$

(1)

(2)

of her financial wealth in the risky asset with excess return R_{t+1} (and the remainder in the risk-free asset)

 If communication does not shift her beliefs (as shown by my empirical results), the results are instead consistent with a decrease in effective risk aversion:

Wet Flow
$$= rac{x_{t+1} - x_t}{x_t} = rac{\gamma_t}{\gamma_{t+1}} - 1$$

Asset pricing implications for the stock market

- In the paper, I show that communication-driven flows are persistent and not due to rebalancing between equity funds \Rightarrow fresh flows into the stock market \Rightarrow a \$1 inflow increases the value between \$1.9-\$5 (Gabaix and Koijen 2021; Hartzmark and Solomon 2023)
- Allows me to produce rough counterfactuals for the S&P 500 level over my sample period, based on my flow estimates × each estimated market multiplier
- Effect is responsible for a 27–67 b.p. annual average return
- Observed S&P 500 annual ex-div. return was $8\% \Rightarrow$ about 3–8% of that

References

	(0.1633)	(0.1917)	(0.1886)	(0.2005)	(0.0667)	(0.0804)
Risk Detail _{i,t}	-0.0778	-0.0346	-0.1485	-0.1028	-0.0546	-0.1038
$\times 1{Low Prior Strength}_t$	(0.1141)	(0.1328)	(0.1271)	(0.1536)	(0.0873)	(0.0948)
Fund Controls _{<i>i</i>,<i>t</i>}	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
Fund FEs	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
Market Controls _t	\checkmark		\checkmark		\checkmark	
Year-month FEs		\checkmark		\checkmark		\checkmark
Ν	1,155	1,155	1,155	1,155	1,155	1,155
R^2	0.31	0.44	0.74	0.79	0.83	0.85

Clustered (Fund & Year-month) standard-errors in parentheses: ***: 0.01, **: 0.05, *: 0.1

- Calvet, Laurent E, Claire Célérier, Paolo Sodini, and Boris Vallée. 2023. "Can security design foster household risk-taking?" Journal of Finance 78 (4): 1917–1966.
- Gabaix, Xavier, and Ralph SJ Koijen. 2021. "In search of the origins of financial fluctuations: The inelastic markets hypothesis." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 28967.
- Gennaioli, Nicola, Andrei Shleifer, and Robert Vishny. 2015. "Money doctors." *Journal of Finance* 70 (1): 91–114.
- Guiso, Luigi, Paola Sapienza, and Luigi Zingales. 2018. "Time varying risk aversion." Journal of Financial Economics 128 (3): 403–421.
- Hall, Judith A, Debra L Roter, and Nancy R Katz. 1988. "Meta-analysis of correlates of provider behavior in medical encounters." Medical Care 26 (7): 657–675.
- Hartzmark, Samuel M, and David H Solomon. 2023. "Marketwide predictable price pressure." Available at SSRN 3853096.
- Hayward, Jack. 1975. "Information a prescription against pain." The Study of Nursing Care Project Reports, 2nd ser., no. 5, Royal College of Nursing, London.
- Hillert, Alexander, Alexandra Niessen-Ruenzi, and Stefan Ruenzi. 2021. "Mutual fund shareholder letters: flows, performance, and managerial behavior." Available at SSRN 2524610.
- Hortaçsu, Ali, and Chad Syverson. 2004. "Product differentiation, search costs, and competition in the mutual fund industry: A case study of S&P 500 index funds." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 119 (2): 403–456.
- Kuhnen, Camelia M, and Brian Knutson. 2011. "The influence of affect on beliefs, preferences, and financial decisions." *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 46 (3): 605–626.



Presenter bio at — www.ahmedgc.com

CEPR Paris Symposium 2023



