

## **Performance and Persistency of Islamic and Conventional Unit Trust: A Case Study of CIMB-Principal Asset Management**

Nurdiyana Yacob  
Pusat Pengajian Ekonomi  
Fakulti Ekonomi dan Pengurusan  
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor  
E-mail: [diyanayacob@gmail.com](mailto:diyanayacob@gmail.com)

Zulkefly Abdul Karim  
Pusat Pengajian Ekonomi  
Fakulti Ekonomi dan Pengurusan  
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor  
E-mail: [zak1972@ukm.my](mailto:zak1972@ukm.my)

Norlin Khalid  
Pusat Pengajian Ekonomi  
Fakulti Ekonomi dan Pengurusan  
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor  
E-mail: [nrlin@ukm.my](mailto:nrlin@ukm.my)

### **ABSTRACT**

CIMB-Principal Asset Management is one of the top performance unit trust companies in Malaysia and the most awarded unit trust fund manager in the Islamic and conventional unit trust sector. Up to date, there are 21 Islamic funds and 32 conventional funds. Thus, the main objective of this study is to evaluate the performance and persistency of selected Islamic and conventional unit trust funds managed by CIMB-Principal Asset Management relative to the market benchmark. The method of Sharpe-Index, Treynor-Index and Jensen Alpha Index are used in evaluating the funds' performance and to compare the performance of the unit trust funds against the market benchmark. The data set of this study is monthly frequency, spanning from January 2007 to December 2014. The sample of the study has been divided into two sub-periods that is during financial crisis and after financial crisis. The finding of this study is expected to give valuable information to the market participant and fund managers in managing their portfolio risks and return.

Key words: Islamic and conventional unit trust; CIMB Principal Asset Management; Performance; Persistency; Market benchmark.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Unit trust funds, also known as managed investments, is an investment scheme that allow investor to pool money with that of many other investors so that the unit trust fund can buy a wide range of investments managed by a professional fund managers. Then, this pooled money is invested in diversified portfolio approved by Securities Commission includes investments which may not ordinarily be available to individual through direct investment such as large commercial properties and corporate bonds. Unit trust investors are gain returns from three types of returns such as capital gain; unit split (bonus) and income distribution (dividend). As at May 2015, there were 44 unit trust management companies managing total of 611 funds. Out of 634 funds, 188 funds belong to Shariah based funds and the rest of 423 funds are conventional based funds. The amount of total approved fund size is 448.115 billion units which are contributing to total NAV RM 359.618 billion. The total NAV of unit trust funds as of end May 2015 represented 21.22 percent of the market capitalisation of Bursa Malaysia.

CIMB-Principal Asset Management Berhad (CPAM) is one of the unit trust fund management private company. It is one of the top performance unit trust companies in Malaysia and the most awarded unit trust fund manager in the Islamic and conventional unit trust sector. In recognition of CPAM's investment performance for the year ended December 31, 2013, CPAM has awarded the Best Performance fund for 10 years in a row for Equity Malaysia and Equity Malaysia (Islamic) by The

Edge Lipper Fund Awards 2014, which the fund name CIMB-Principal Equity Fund and CIMB Islamic DALI Equity Growth Fund. For the first time in 2013 that CIMB-Principal has won a prestigious award at an 'Asian' level. The award is awarded to the best overall fund house headquartered in Asia Pacific, recognised for a combination of business strategy, execution, investment performance, asset gathering, innovation and success. This award conferred by Asian Investor Investment Performance Awards 2013.

CIMB-Principal is jointly owned by CIMB Group, one of Southeast Asia's leading universal banking groups; and The Principal Financial Group, U.S.A., a NYSE-listed global financial service company and a leading Fortune 500 company. CIMB-Principal Asset Management Berhad was established in 1995; it is one of the largest asset management companies in Malaysia with regional footprint covering Singapore, Indonesia and Thailand. Since then, CIMB-Principal has over 19 years' experience in unit trusts management. Up to date, there are 21 Islamic funds and 32 conventional funds managed by the CIMB-Principal. The first fund is CIMB-Principal Equity Growth & Income was launched at 15 May 1991 and the first Islamic fund CIMB-Islamic Equity Aggressive was launched on 15 June 1995.

This paper aims to evaluate the performance of selected Islamic and conventional unit trust funds in the context of funds managed by CIMB-Principal Asset Management Berhad, in terms of performance and persistency relative to the market benchmark in changing economic conditions spanning from January 2007 to December 2014. Particularly, this paper studies the performance of unit trust funds during and after the financial crisis (subprime crisis). Thus, this study enriches the literature and gives valuable information to the market participant as well as fund managers in managing their portfolio risks and return. The remaining of this paper is organised as follows. The next section reviews the literature on the performance and volatility of unit trust. The third section outlines the methodology and measurement employed in this study followed by the fourth section which discusses the findings from the empirical analysis. The final section concludes and highlights the implications.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

The most study has been done about unit trust is the performance evaluation. There are so many procedures are being used in measuring the unit trust performance. Mainly were covered by the Sharpe (1966), Treynor (1965) and Jensen (1968). The literature on the performance of unit trust funds is extensive and spans for several decades. Studies on the performance of unit trust funds examine many perspectives. Among the perspectives are: investment horizon, performance measurement, fund managers performance, fund persistent and funds characteristics. Performance of unit trust in changing economic conditions which is crisis and non-crisis period has been studied by a few researchers such as Hesham Merdad et al., (2010) Mansor and Bhatti (2011) Kassim and Kamil (2012) and Norman et al. (2013).

An enriching aspect of the study by Kassim and Kamil (2012) is that to analyse the performance of the Islamic unit trusts in changing economic conditions on 33 Malaysian Islamic equity unit trust funds over the period of January 2000 to December 2009. Consistent with Abdullah et al. (2007), the findings show that during the non-crisis period, the performance of the Islamic unit trusts is comparable to that of the market benchmark, while during the crisis period, the Islamic unit trusts perform better. The findings also suggest that the Islamic unit trust funds can be an ideal hedging instrument during a down market. Such finding are consistent with Hesham Merdad et al. (2010) which their study involving Islamic and conventional mutual funds in Saudi Arabia, from January 2003 to January 2010 which the sample period is divided in four segments such as full period, bull period, bearish period and financial crisis period. This is supported by Mansor and Bhatti (2011) which their finding denotes that on average both Islamic and conventional unit trust funds outperform the market benchmark. During particular market trend, bullish and bearish market there is no significant different in term of performance of Islamic and conventional funds.

There are several studies that examine the relationship between unit trust funds and local stock market indices for example, Low (2007), Mansor and Bhatti (2011) and Suhana et al. (2012). The study by Low (2007) which examines selectivity and timing performance of fund manager using 40 unit trust funds comparable to market benchmark Kuala Lumpur Composite Index (KLCI) and Exchange Main Board All-Share Index (EMAS). The finding shows that the funds have negative overall performance with either the KLCI or the EMAS index. Study by Suhana et al. (2012) showed that Islamic unit trusts produce lower returns than the market portfolio and can be concluded that Islamic unit trust is slightly underperformed the KLCI index. Another segment of the study in unit trust performance is evaluating

the domestic and international funds. Abdullah and Abdullah (2009) used KLCI as the local funds benchmark while The Morgan Stanley Capital International All Country (MSCI AC) and MSCI World Free are used as the international funds' benchmarks. A study of 26 local funds and 23 internationally invested funds found that performance of international funds is not significantly different from the performance of funds that invested in local market. Muhamad and Nawawi (2011) study only international unit trust funds FBM KLCI (FBM Kuala Lumpur Composite Index), MSCI EAFE (Morgan Stanley Capital International Europe, Australasia, Far-East) index and S&P 500 index as the market benchmarks.

Malaysian Capital Market is experiencing a very encouraging growth for the last decade and showing that Islamic financial products are highly demanded since majority of Malaysian are Muslims. Unit trust industry in Malaysia is beginning in 1959 while Islamic unit trust fund first launch in 1993 by Arab-Malaysian Securities. Rapid growth in Islamic unit trust is started in year 2000. Therefore, the study in Islamic unit trust funds is still minimal. For the past few years there were many researchers tend to study the comparison performance between Islamic and conventional unit trust funds. Among the study were by Ahmad dan Haron (2006). The result shown that on average, the Islamic funds failed to outperform the performance of conventional funds. Abdullah et al. (2007) study sample consist of 65 funds which 14 are Islamic funds with the longer period starting from January 1992 to December 2001. The study reveals both conventional and Islamic funds were unable to achieve at least 50 per cent market diversification levels, though conventional funds are found to have a marginally better diversification level than the Islamic funds. Bashir and Wan Nawang (2011) evaluate the overall performance of 11 Islamic and 29 conventional unit trust funds in term of risk, return and diversification for the 5 year period from 2002 to 2006. The finding found that conventional funds outperform the market while the Islamic funds underperform the market.

Different perspective study is by Saad et al. (2010) which the efficiency of selected conventional and Islamic unit trust companies is being studied during the period of 2002 to 2005. The study indicates that technical efficiency is the main contributor to enhancing the efficiency of the Malaysian unit trust industry. In addition, the larger the size of the unit trust companies, the more inefficient the performance. In comparing the efficiency of unit trust companies, the study finds that some of the Islamic unit trust companies perform better than their conventional counterparts.

In the context of Malaysia, a case study of unit trust has been done is funds manage by a particular fund manager that is Public Mutual Berhad. Among the study were by Mansor and Sulaiman (2009), Abd Razak et al. (2011) and Norman et al (2013). Mansor and Sulaiman (2009) were analysed Islamic unit trust funds operation by Public Mutual Berhad. The study discusses Shariah principles, criteria and the Advisory Board roles in the funds operations. In addition, they also compare five unit trust funds returns performance against the market returns. The study found that Islamic unit trust funds outperform the market return in duration of three years, and in years thereafter. The same study also has been done by Shaikh (2012) in Pakistan. The study discuss the theoretical problems in screening principles followed in investment policy, identifies the problematic and less ideal investment alternatives used in practice, and highlights the anomalies in income purification methodology.

Abd Razak et al. (2011) study ten unit trust funds performance in Public Mutual Berhad in different economic cycles in the period of 2001 to 2010. The result indicates that there is relationship between the unit trust's performance and different economic cycle where the funds perform very well in the period 2009 to 2010 which market is trending (recovery). Norman et al. (2013) study the comparative performance of 7 Islamic and 7 conventional unit trust funds of Public Mutual Berhad in term of economic condition and risk-return profile for 10 year period from January 2007 to December 2009. Consistent with previous study, the finding is Islamic unit trust funds have better performance during the crisis period (bearish) and less sensitive to the changes in market condition.

## DATA AND METHODOLOGY

### Data

By focusing on ten Islamic and ten conventional unit trust funds under CPAM, the data used for the research are the net asset value (NAV) published by fund manager. This is the closing price which has not been historically adjusted for bonus and rights issues. This figure therefore represents actual or 'raw' prices as recorded on the day. Funds selected are based on the availability of full dataset from January 2007 to December 2014. The source of data is collected from the Datastream. The benchmark used is FTSE Bursa Malaysia KLCI (FBM KLCI) while three-month Treasury-bill is used as risk-free

rate benchmark. This would allow for the comparison of the performance of the unit trusts against the equity market and free-risk rate performance.

### Selection of Sample Period

In effort to measure the performance of the fund, the study considers data from January 2007 till December 2014. Furthermore, in order to study the pattern of the fund performance, the sample period is further divided into two sub-periods reflecting the changing economic or market environment which are during and after the economic crisis. In particular, the period from January 2007 to December 2009 is labelled as during crisis period and from January 2010 to December 2014 is labelled as after crisis period. The selection of the sub-periods is consistent with several studies on the impact of the 2007 global financial crisis on the equity market such as Kassim and Kamil (2012) and Norman et al. (2013).

### Measurement of Performance

For the purpose of this study, the returns on the unit trust funds are calculated based on capital gain only. The rate of returns for each fund is calculated as follows:

$$R_{t,r} = \frac{NAV_t - NAV_{t-1}}{NAV_{t-1}}$$

Where  $R_{t,r}$  is rate of return of the  $i$  unit trust at time  $t$ ,  $NAV_t$  is net asset value at time  $t$ ,  $NAV_{t-1}$  is net asset value one period before time  $t$ .

Three standard methods are used in this study to evaluate the performance of the conventional and Islamic unit trust funds which are Sharpe index, Treynor index and Jensen Alpha index.

### Sharpe Index

Sharpe index (SI) can be calculated by subtracting the risk-free rate from the rate of return for fund and dividing the results by the standard deviation of fund's returns as follows:

$$SI = \frac{\text{Fund Return} - \text{Risk-Free Returns}}{\text{Std Deviation}} \\ = (R_j - R_f) / \sigma$$

Where ;

SI = 'reward to variability' as stated by Sharpe

$R_j$  = average monthly return of fund 'j' over the evaluation period

$R_f$  = average monthly risk-free rate of return with the same duration under the study

$\sigma$  = standard deviation of the fund's returns

### Treynor Index

Treynor index (TI) is calculated by subtracting the risk-free rate from the rate of return for fund and dividing the results by the beta of fund's returns as follows:

$$TI = \frac{\text{Fund Return} - \text{Risk Free Return}}{\text{Beta}} \\ = (R_j - R_f) / \beta_j$$

Where;

TI = the 'reward-to-volatility' ratio

$R_j$  = the average return of fund 'j' over the evaluation period

$R_f$  = average risk free interest rate with the same duration under the study

$\beta_j$  = a measure of the sensitivity / volatility of a fund 'j's return compared to the market index.

This performance model or Treynor index is a risk adjusted measure of portfolio performance where risk is measured by beta. Beta is the measure of portfolio's risk in relation to the market.

### Jensen index

Jensen index, however measures the performance of unit trust fund based upon the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM), which calculate the excess return on a portfolio over time. Alpha is used to determine by how much the realised return of the fund varies from the required return as determined by

CAPM. Specifically, if alpha is significantly positive, there is evidence of superior performance and vice versa, and if the alpha insignificantly different from zero, there is evidence that the portfolio manager has matched the market on the risk-adjusted basis (Zaidi et al, 2004) his CAPM model is recognized as the most widely employed benchmark model in evaluating the fund performance measurement. The single factor of CAPM model is formulated as follows:

$$JI = (R_j - R_f) - \beta_j (R_m - R_f)$$

Where;

JI = intercept of Capital Asset Pricing Model after allowing for risk free rate of return

R<sub>m</sub> = average return on the market index for the period under study

β<sub>j</sub> = systematic risk of portfolio 'j'

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the average return and risk profile for Islamic fund, Conventional funds and market benchmark during and after crisis. Result shows that the highest average monthly return during crisis for Islamic unit trust is DALI4 which shows the value of 0.8295 and for Conventional unit trust is SCF with value of 0.9267. While after crisis shows that the highest average monthly return for Islamic unit trust is ISCF which shows the value of 1.1690 and for Conventional unit trust is SCF with value of 1.4517. The results show that during crisis five Islamic funds and five conventional funds are above the market benchmark. After crisis shows that only three Islamic funds and three conventional funds are outperform the market.

Standard deviation measures the total risk of the unit trust funds. The larger the value of standard deviation, the higher the risk covered by the unit trust funds. By comparing the standard deviation of Islamic and conventional unit trust funds for the whole period from January 2007 until December 2009, five Islamic funds and one conventional funds show that the standard deviation value are lower than market. DALI2 and GCEF have the greatest value for Islamic and conventional funds. It is shown that both funds are more risky. In January 2009 until December 2014, the results show that four Islamic funds and two conventional funds have lower value than market. ISCF and SCF show the highest value of standard deviation. It is found that high standard deviation means that both funds are more risky. ISF has the lowest value among of all funds at all the time. This is indicating that ISF has the lowest risk.

Beta<sup>1</sup> is used to measure the systematic risk in the unit trust funds. Low beta will show that these funds relatively low sensitivity to the market. The higher the value of beta shows the sensitivity of the funds to the changes in the market. As shown in Table 1, during crisis six out of ten conventional funds have greater value than market, while Islamic funds show only three funds have greater value than market. It implies that, conventional funds are more sensitive to the changes of market. After crisis results in both Islamic and Conventional funds have three funds that have greater value than market. The result also shows that IEAF, ISCF, EAF1, EAF3 and SCF have greater value than market during and after crisis. This is indicates that these funds are sensitive to the market changes at all time.

Table 2 presents the comparative performance analysis of both funds, Islamic and conventional during crisis and after crisis period which consists of Sharpe index, Treynor index and Jensen index. It is shown that three Islamic funds (DALI, IEAF and ISCF) record a positive value during and after crisis consistent result using Sharpe, Treynor and Jensen. The conventional funds also record three funds have positive value during and after crisis which they are EAF3, KLF and SCF. This indicates that these funds have better performance over the crisis and after the crisis period.

During and after crisis, the results show that conventional funds record positive value using Sharpe and Treynor. It is implies that conventional funds have better performance at all time during and after crisis. By using Sharpe and Treynor index, Islamic funds only show positive value for all funds in after crisis period and this is indicate that Islamic funds have better performance after crisis period. Overall performance for Jensen Index for both unit trust funds indicates majority of the funds have negative value. The negative value for alpha (α) shows the less ability of the fund managers to manage the unit trust funds. As a result, the fund is having a negative return and it is sign a bad decision making for the investors to achieve their profit.

Table 3 shows performance ranking based on raw returns. During crisis, DALI4 and SCF result in the highest return. After crisis, show that ISCF and SCF have the highest return. This is shown

<sup>1</sup> Beta is estimated using a standard capital asset pricing model (CAPM).

that SCF has the best performance at all the time and outperform the market. DALI, ISCF and EAF3 resulted have the better performance than market and persistent to be at rank number 3 during and after crisis. Other funds show that the performance is different and the rank is change during and after crisis. Overall observation indicates that during crisis 50 percent of Islamic and conventional unit trust funds outperform the market. While after crisis, it is resulted that only 30 percent of Islamic and conventional funds have better performance than market. It is show that unit trust funds have better performance than market during the crisis.

Table 4 shows performance ranking bases on various performance measures using Sharpe index, Treynor index and Jensen index. Based on the risk adjusted performance measured for Islamic funds, during crisis, the ranking for Sharpe Index show the highest return was ISF by 0.2668. For conventional funds, the highest return was KLF by 0.1252. After crisis, the ranking for Sharpe index show ISF maintain the highest return among the Islamic funds by 0.3512 while for conventional funds SCF has the highest return by 0.3000.

The ranking for Treynor index shows ISCF and SCF have the highest return for Islamic and conventional funds during crisis. ISCF has higher return than SCF by 4.3078. It shows that during crisis, ISCF has the highest return among all the funds. The results also indicate that ISF and SCF consistently have the highest return during and after the crisis. During crisis period, the ranking for Jensen index shows different result where DALI4 and GCEF have the highest return. In addition after crisis period, ISCF and SCF have the highest return. In overall observations, the results show that SCF has the highest return and be at the top rank by using all the methods during and after crisis.

## CONCLUSION

This paper focuses on examining unit trust funds performance managed by CIMB-Principal Asset Management over the period of 2007 until 2014. Performance is analysed from return performance perspective. The perspective is investigating returns performance of unit trust and measuring it against an appropriate benchmark. This research provides some evidence on the comparative performance between selected Islamic and conventional unit trust funds over the period by using monthly observations.

The paper finds that during crisis five Islamic funds and five conventional funds are above the market benchmark. After crisis shows that only three Islamic funds and three conventional funds are outperform the market. It also finds that SCF has the highest return during and after crisis. This indicates that conventional fund has better performance in sense of return compared to Islamic funds but overall Islamic and conventional funds turn to be equally performed. It is also finds that most Islamic funds have better performance after crisis period. However, in terms of risk-return characteristics of the funds, ISCF and SCF show the highest value of standard deviation and means that both funds are more risky. ISF has the lowest value among of all funds at all the time. This is indicating that ISF has the lowest risk since ISF is categorised under sukuk fund whereby the portfolio is majority in bond so it is not directly affected by the changes of market like equity fund. During crisis, conventional funds are more sensitive to the changes of market and there are two Islamic funds and three conventional funds that are sensitive to the market changes during and after crisis.

This study finds that DALI, ISCF, SCF and EAF3 have the best performance at all the time and outperform the market, they show their persistent to be rank at top three during and after crisis. It is also finds that, all unit trust funds has outperform the market during crisis. This implies that unit trust funds can be used as a hedging instrument during any financial meltdown or economic slowdown. The finding will give benefit to the investors since they can invest in unit trust at any time even during the market turndown.

In conclusion, the unit trust funds on average do not show any persistence in performance. However, individually, some funds persist in performing above average returns than the others. The ranking performance by individual funds also gives similar results. The ability and experience of fund managers in selecting fund portfolio according to market condition is one of the main factors that contribute to the well performance and persistence of the funds as CPAM is recognised as the best Asset Manager in Southeast Asia. Fund managers able to choose the sectors to invest that can give good returns such as oil and gas, commodity, telecommunication and others.

## REFERENCES

- Abd Razak, S. F. F., Maniam, K. and Abd Razak, S. S., 2011. Analyzing Performances of Different Economic Cycles Towards Unit Trust Funds: A Case Of Public Mutual Berhad. International Conference on Management Proceeding (ICM 2011). 1541-1557
- Abdullah, F., Hassan, T. and Mohamad, S., 2007. Investigation of Performance of Malaysian Islamic Unit Trust Funds Comparison with Conventional Unit Trust Funds. *Managerial Finance*, **Vol. 33** (2), 142-153
- Abdullah, N. A. and Abdullah, N. A. H., 2009. The Performance of Malaysian Unit Trusts Investing in Domestic Versus International Markets. *Asian Academy of Management Journal of Accounting and Finance*, **Vol. 5** (2), 77-100
- Ahmad, M. and Haron, R., 2006. The Comparison Of Performance Of Islamic And Conventional Unit Trust Funds In Malaysia. 1-25
- Bashir, M. S. and Wan Nawang, W.R., 2011. Islamic and Conventional Unit Trusts in Malaysia: A Performance Comparison. *Journal of Islamic Economics, Banking and Finance*, **Vol. 7**(10), 9-24
- Jensen, M. C., 1968. The performance of mutual funds in the period 1945-1964. *Journal of Finance*, **23**(2), 389-416
- Kassim, S. H. and Kamil, S., 2012. Performance of Islamic Unit Trusts During The 2007 Global Financial Crisis: Evidence From Malaysia. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, **Vol. 1** (2), 59-78
- Low, S. W., 2007. Malaysian Unit Trust Funds' Performance During Up and Down Market Conditions: A Comparison of Market Benchmark. *Managerial Finance*, **Vol. 33** (2), 154-166
- Mansor, F. and Bhatti, M. I. , 2011. Islamic Mutual Funds Performance For Emerging Market, During Bullish and Bearish: The Case of Malaysia. 2nd International Conference on Business And Economic Research Proceeding (2nd ICBER 2011). 770-789
- Mansor, F. and Sulaiman, F., 2009. Operasi Dana Saham Amanah Secara Islam: Kajian Kes Di Public Mutual Berhad. *Shariah Journal*, **Vol. 17** (1) 69-88
- Merdad, H., Hassan, M.K. and Alhenawi, Y., 2010. Islamic Versus Conventional Mutual Funds Performance in Saudi Arabia: A Case Study. *JKAU: Islamic Economics*, **Vol. 23** (2), 157-193
- Muhamad, A. H. and Nawawi, A. H. M., 2011. Evaluation on International Unit Trust Funds: A Case for Malaysia. 2011 International Conference on Business, Engineering and Industrial Applications (ICBEIA). 24-29
- Norman, N., Almsafir, M. K. and Smadi, A., 2013. Comparative Study of Conventional and Shariah based Unit Trust Funds Performance of Public Mutual Berhad. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, **7**(9), 354-363
- Saad, N.M., Abd. Majid, M. S., Kassim, S., Hamid, Z. and Yusof, R. M., 2010. A Comparative Analysis of The Performance of Conventional and Islamic Unit Trust Companies in Malaysia. *International Journal of Managerial Finance*, **Vol. 6** (1), 24-47
- Shaikh, S. A., 2012. Analysis of Islamic Mutual Funds Operations in Pakistan. Munich Personal RePEc Archive, MPRA Paper No. 42495, posted 7. November 2012 15:46 UTC.
- Sharpe, W.F., 1966. Mutual Fund Performance. *The Journal of Business*, Vol. 39 (1), 119-138
- Suhana, M. Raja Zuraidah, R. Nooririnah, O. Ruziah, A. L. and Zaibedah, Z., 2012. Performance Analysis on Islamic Unit Trust. Proceedings International Conference of Technology Management, Business and Entrepreneurship 2012 (ICTMBE2012). 643-655
- Treynor, J. L., 1965. How to rate management of investment funds. *Harvard Business Review*, 43, 63-75.
- Zaidi, M. A. S., Karim, Z. A. and Zulkefli, Z., 2004. The Performance of Islamic Unit Trust Funds in Malaysia: Does Persistence Exist?. *The Journal of Muamalat and Islamic Finance Research*, **Vol. 1** (1), 39-64

TABLE 1: Average Return and Risk profile for Islamic Funds, Conventional Funds and Market Benchmark

Islamic Fund	During Crisis			After Crisis		
	Average Return	Standard Deviation	Beta	Average Return	Standard Deviation	Beta
DALI2	-0.2617	7.8974	0.9931	0.2067	3.3676	0.9862
DALI	0.7039	5.2591	0.9038	0.6175	3.2119	1.0149
IEAF	0.6577	6.4989	1.1284	0.6675	3.4697	1.1005
DALI4	0.8295	6.5556	1.0692	0.1985	3.1581	0.8523
ISCF	0.7573	6.6468	1.0086	1.1690	6.0213	1.1854
IBF	0.1902	4.5958	0.6715	0.1156	1.8362	0.3621
IBGF	0.0568	4.2132	0.6988	0.5316	1.9847	0.5689
IESF	-0.0362	2.2275	0.2787	0.0758	1.3872	0.1281
ISF	0.2569	0.9264	0.0574	0.2647	0.7260	0.0273
IAPEF	0.6798	6.8675	0.8501	0.1694	3.5072	0.6000
Conventional Fund	During Crisis			After Crisis		
	Average Return	Standard deviation	Beta	Average Return	Standard Deviation	Beta
EAF1	0.2650	6.7087	1.0893	0.3959	3.3597	1.1098
EAF3	0.7387	6.1524	1.0755	0.7046	3.0115	1.0369
EF	0.6574	5.9813	0.9882	0.5417	3.1956	0.9702
EGIF	0.8409	7.2668	1.1947	0.3034	3.2829	0.8986
EIF	0.1721	7.1806	1.1432	0.2621	3.0365	0.8363
KLF	0.6953	5.4732	0.9863	0.7529	2.6492	0.9959
SCF	0.9267	7.5701	1.1873	1.4517	4.8061	1.1439
BIF	0.2683	4.7472	0.7544	0.1939	2.3469	0.5249
AEF	0.2623	6.8225	0.8796	0.3309	3.6461	0.5981
GCEF	0.3518	8.7675	1.1185	0.3858	3.8632	0.5800
Market benchmark	During Crisis			After Crisis		
KLCI	0.5622	5.4511	1.0000	0.5763	2.6101	1.000

TABLE 2: Unit Trust Performance by Various Performance Measures

Islamic Fund	During Crisis			After Crisis		
	TI	SI	JI	TI	SI	JI
DALI2	-0.2734	-0.0344	-0.0083	0.1997	0.0585	-0.0038
DALI	0.7679	0.1320	0.0010	0.5989	0.1892	0.0005
IEAF	0.5742	0.0997	0.0015	0.5977	0.1896	0.0013
DALI4	0.7667	0.1250	0.0030	0.2215	0.0598	-0.0044
ISCF	0.7411	0.1125	0.0020	0.9779	0.1925	0.0067
IBF	0.2687	0.0393	-0.0051	0.2925	0.0577	-0.0071
IBGF	0.0674	0.0112	-0.0063	0.9175	0.2630	-0.0021
IESF	-0.1650	-0.0206	-0.0090	0.5160	0.0476	-0.0084
ISF	4.3078	0.2668	-0.0070	9.3248	0.3512	-0.0069
IAPEF	0.7882	0.0976	0.0006	0.2662	0.0455	-0.0056
Conventional Fund	During Crisis			After Crisis		
	TI	SI	JI	TI	SI	JI
EAF1	0.2343	0.0381	-0.0026	0.3480	0.1149	-0.0014
EAF3	0.6778	0.1185	0.0021	0.6702	0.2308	0.0014
EF	0.6554	0.1083	0.0009	0.5483	0.1665	-0.0005
EGIF	0.6957	0.1144	0.0036	0.3269	0.0895	-0.0031
EIF	0.1420	0.0226	-0.0033	0.3018	0.0831	-0.0038
KLF	0.6950	0.1252	0.0013	0.7462	0.2805	0.0018
SCF	0.7723	0.1211	0.0044	1.2605	0.3000	0.0093
BIF	0.3427	0.0545	-0.0040	0.3510	0.0785	-0.0057
AEF	0.2871	0.0370	-0.0035	0.5370	0.0881	-0.0040
GCEF	0.3058	0.0390	0.0052	0.6485	0.0974	-0.0036

TABLE 3: Performance Ranking Based on Raw Returns

Islamic Fund	During Crisis		Islamic Fund	After Crisis	
	Average Return	Rank		Average Return	Rank
DALI4	0.8295*	1	<b>ISCF</b>	<b>1.1690*</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ISCF</b>	<b>0.7573*</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>IEAF</b>	<b>0.6675*</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>DALI</b>	<b>0.7039*</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>DALI</b>	<b>0.6175*</b>	<b>3</b>
IAPEF	0.6798*	4	IBGF	0.5316	4
<b>IEAF</b>	<b>0.6577*</b>	<b>5</b>	ISF	0.2647	5
ISF	0.2569	6	DALI2	0.2067	6
IBF	0.1902	7	DALI4	0.1985	7
IBGF	0.0568	8	IAPEF	0.1694	8
IESF	-0.0362	9	IBF	0.1156	9
DALI2	-0.2617	10	IESF	0.0758	10
Conventional Fund	During Crisis		Conventional Fund	After Crisis	
	Average Return	Rank		Average Return	Rank
<b>SCF</b>	<b>0.9267*</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>SCF</b>	<b>1.4517*</b>	<b>1</b>
EGIF	0.8409*	2	<b>KLF</b>	<b>0.7529*</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>EAF3</b>	<b>0.7387*</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>EAF3</b>	<b>0.7046*</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>KLF</b>	<b>0.6953*</b>	<b>4</b>	EF	0.5417	4
EF	0.6574*	5	EAF1	0.3959	5
GCEF	0.3518	6	GCEF	0.3858	6
BIF	0.2683	7	AEF	0.3309	7
EAF1	0.2650	8	EGIF	0.3034	8
AEF	0.2623	9	EIF	0.2621	9
EIF	0.1721	10	BIF	0.1939	10
Note: - * indicates that the fund performance is above the market - Figures in bold show that the fund persist over time					

TABLE 4: Performance Ranking Bases on Various Performance Measures

Islamic Fund	During Crisis						After Crisis					
	TI	Rank	SI	Rank	JI	Rank	TI	Rank	SI	Rank	JI	Rank
DALI2	-0.2734	10	-0.0344	10	-0.0083	9	0.1997	10	0.0585	7	-0.0038	5
DALI	0.7679	3	0.1320	2	0.0010	4	0.5989	4	0.1892	5	0.0005	3
IEAF	0.5742	6	0.0997	5	0.0015	3	0.5977	5	0.1896	4	0.0013	2
DALI4	0.7667	4	0.1250	3	0.0030	1	0.2215	9	0.0598	6	-0.0044	6
ISCF	0.7411	5	0.1125	4	0.0020	2	0.9779	2	0.1925	3	0.0067	1
IBF	0.2687	7	0.0393	7	-0.0051	6	0.2925	7	0.0577	8	-0.0071	9
IBGF	0.0674	8	0.0112	8	-0.0063	7	0.9175	3	0.2630	2	-0.0021	4
IESF	-0.1650	9	-0.0206	9	-0.0090	10	0.5160	6	0.0476	9	-0.0084	10
ISF	4.3078	1	0.2668	1	-0.0070	8	9.3248	1	0.3512	1	-0.0069	8
IAPEF	0.7882	2	0.0976	6	0.0006	5	0.2662	8	0.0455	10	-0.0056	7
Conventional Fund	During Crisis						After Crisis					
	TI	Rank	SI	Rank	JI	Rank	TI	Rank	SI	Rank	JI	Rank
EAF1	0.2343	9	0.0381	8	-0.0026	7	0.3480	8	0.1149	5	-0.0014	5
EAF3	0.6778	4	0.1185	3	0.0021	4	0.6702	3	0.2308	3	0.0014	3
EF	0.6554	5	0.1083	5	0.0009	6	0.5483	5	0.1665	4	-0.0005	4
EGIF	0.6957	2	0.1144	4	0.0036	3	0.3269	9	0.0895	7	-0.0031	6
EIF	0.1420	10	0.0226	10	-0.0033	8	0.3018	10	0.0831	9	-0.0038	8
KLF	0.6950	3	0.1252	1	0.0013	5	0.7462	2	0.2805	2	0.0018	2
SCF	0.7723	1	0.1211	2	0.0044	2	1.2605	1	0.3000	1	0.0093	1
BIF	0.3427	6	0.0545	6	-0.0040	10	0.3510	7	0.0785	10	-0.0057	10
AEF	0.2871	8	0.0370	9	-0.0035	9	0.5370	6	0.0881	8	-0.0040	9
GCEF	0.3058	7	0.0390	7	0.0052	1	0.6485	4	0.0974	6	-0.0036	7

**APPENDIX 1**

ABBREVIATION	FULL NAME OF FUND
Islamic Fund	
DALI2	CIMB ISLAMIC DALI EQUITY
DALI	CIMB ISLAMIC DALI EQUITY GROWTH
IEAF	CIMB ISLAMIC EQUITY AGGRESSIVE
DALI4	CIMB ISLAMIC DALI ASIA PACIFIC EQUITY (formerly known as CIMB ISLAMIC EQUITY)
ISCF	CIMB ISLAMIC SMALL CAP
IBF	CIMB ISLAMIC BALANCED
IBGF	CIMB ISLAMIC BALANCED GROWTH
IESF	CIMB ISLAMIC ENHANCED SUKUK
ISF	CIMB ISLAMIC SUKUK
IAPEF	CIMB ISLAMIC ASIA PACIFIC EQUITY
Conventional Fund	
EAF1	CIMB PRINCIPAL EQUITY AGGRESSIVE 1
EAF3	CIMB PRINCIPAL EQUITY AGGRESSIVE 3
EF	CIMB PRINCIPAL EQUITY
EGIF	CIMB PRINCIPAL EQUITY GROWTH & INCOME
EIF	CIMB PRINCIPAL EQUITY INCOME
KLF	CIMB PRINCIPAL KLCI-LINKED
SCF	CIMB PRINCIPAL SMALL CAP
BIF	CIMB PRINCIPAL BALANCED INCOME
AEF	CIMB PRINCIPAL ASIAN EQUITY
GCEF	CIMB PRINCIPAL GREATER CHINA EQUITY