

Dr. Shikha Rajput\*

**ABSTRACT**

The mutual fund industry in India has shown dramatic improvements in quantity as well as quality of product and service offering in recent years. The active involvement of mutual funds in the economic development can be seen by their dominant presence in the money and capital market. The objective of this paper is to evaluate the performance of Equity fund schemes in terms of risk and return and contrast with market Benchmark. The judgment has been made with benchmark portfolio during the period April 7, 2011 to March 30, 2012. Performance measures applied are, Sharpe ratio, Treynor ratio, Jensen's alpha and coefficient values. It is found that majority of the schemes have acquired positive return and less systematic risk than the market portfolio. However, some of them were not performed satisfactory and require more diversification. In overall, 13 Growth Fund schemes had performed outstanding in market under Sharpe & Treynor measure. Best performance have been found under; HDFC Equity Funds, Fidelity Equity Fund, HDFC Top 200 Fund, ICICI Prudential Dynamic Plan and Kotak 50-G whereas, Escorts Growth Fund, Principal growth fund, Birla Sun Life Equity Fund, Kodak Contra Scheme, JM basis fund and Taurus discovery fund were found more volatile and worst among all.

**Keywords :** Performance of Equity Fund Schemes

**INTRODUCTION**

A mutual fund is a trust that pools the saving of a number of investors who share a common financial goal. The money thus collected is then invested in capital market instruments such as shares, debentures and other securities. The income earned through their investments and the capital appreciation realized, are shared by its unit holders in proportion to the number of units owned by them. Therefore, a mutual fund is the most suitable investment for the common man as it offers an opportunity to invest in a diversified, professionally managed basket of securities at a relatively low cost.

Mutual fund are the best and hassle free avenue for investment now a days for each class of investor whether big or small under any risk profile, whether low, moderate or high. The future of mutual funds is bright as it has seen a great upward trend in its first phase of operation and is set to grow manifold in near future. The investors are looking at the trend and finding it, the most beneficial avenue considering liquidity, safety and return aspects. The challenge before the mutual fund industry now is to educate the

investor about the principles of prudent investing and the need to take a reasonably long-term view of equity investment. The major challenge before the industry is to reach out to such investors and convince them of this fact.

Presently in India, there is a greater scope of development of mutual fund investment programmes and also there are wide variety of mutual fund schemes that cater to the needs of various classes of investors according to their age, risk tolerance, return expectations which aim to provide both capital appreciation income by periodical distribution of dividend as per the choice of investor. Therefore, the need arises to study the performance of mutual funds in India.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

The concept mutual fund is a fairly new one to the Indian capital market but not to the international capital world. By the 1930's a large number of close-ended mutual funds have been formed in the United States of America consequently, more studies have been conducted in other countries.

\* Assistant Professor, Dept. of Commerce, Shaheed Bhagat Singh College, University of Delhi, E-mail: shikharajput9@yahoo.com

The study by Mc Donald (1974) examined the performance of 123 mutual funds in relation to the stated objectives of each fund. The results showed positive relationship between fund objectives and risk measures. This implied that a funds risk increases when it becomes more aggressive. Salvi (1991) evaluated money market mutual funds and found the average rate of return provided by MMMF's in the United States, which was in the range of 8 percent to 9 percent. Brown, Stephen (1992) analyzed the relationship between volatility and returns in a sample that was truncated by survivorship and showed that this relationship gave rise to the appearance of predictability. Jayadev (1998) examined the performance of 62 mutual funds schemes using monthly NAV data for the period of April 1987 to March 1995. He explored superior performance of bulk (30 out of 44) of the sample schemes when total risk was considered. Only 24 out of 44 schemes outperformed the benchmark portfolio. Gupta (2000) evaluated 73 mutual fund schemes based on weekly NAV data for the five year period i.e. from April 1, 1994 to March 31, 1999. The empirical results reported a mixed performance of sample schemes during the study period. No conclusive evidence scheme was available which warranted their performance to be superior to the relevant benchmark. Smith (2001) examined the degree of performance persistency between the two classes to discern if closed end funds are able to maximize their liquidity advantages and thereby display a greater performance persistency than that of open end funds. The empirical analysis included the spearman rank correlation coefficient to examine relative performance persistency. Singh and Vanita (2002) conducted a study, based on a survey of 150 respondents in Delhi. Their results showed that investor in general, did not perceive the risk inherent in mutual fund investment and used it primarily as a task saving instrument. However, open ended schemes and balanced funds were most preferred by the investor. Alexander (2003) found a significant and negative relationship between the volatility of daily fund flows and cross-sectional differences in performance. Monthly analysis indicated that this relationship applies only to current monthly returns and that flow volatility does not influence the returns of future months. Similarly, Mehru (2004) observed that mutual funds failed to provide safety, liquidity and returns on investments to the small investors,

facing several problems in our country like the structural, investors related and performance related. He concluded that the greater transparency, increased innovations, better services to the investor, liquidity and higher returns will make mutual fund schemes more popular and investor friendly. Henri and Peter (2005) studied the size of mutual fund industry in 56 countries. It was larger in countries with stronger rules, laws, and regulations and specifically where mutual fund investors' rights were better protected. The industry was smaller in countries where barriers to entry were higher. Thus, the results indicated that laws and regulations, supply-side and demand-side factors simultaneously affected the size of the fund industry. D.N Rao (2006) classified 419 open-ended equity mutual fund schemes into six distinct investment styles and analyzed the financial performance of open-ended equity mutual fund schemes for the period 1st April 2005 - 31st March 2006. His analysis indicated that Growth plans have generated higher returns than that of Dividend plans but at a higher risk. Further, Acharya and Gajendra (2007) attempted a study to classify hundred mutual funds employing cluster analysis by using a criteria like the 1 year total return, 2 year annualized return, 3 year annualized return, 5 year annualized return, alpha, beta, R-squared, Sharpe ratio, mean and standard deviation etc. Their study found evidences of inconsistencies between the investment style/objective classification and the return obtained by the fund. Jaksa and Wang (2008) studied the effects of Sharpe ratio which demonstrated that if manager's focus on the short horizon, it will be detrimental to the long-horizon investor. When the returns were low, the performance drop its significant, even when horizons were not very different. When the returns were mean reverting, the performance was exacerbated. Anshuman (2009) found that top-performing funds receive net inflow of new money. However, funds that perform unwell did not lose many assets. A high correlation between the rating and the subsequent cash inflow into the fund was one such standard that investors consider while making investments. The study also compared the funds' performance in the out-of-sample period (different period) with the in-the-sample period (sample data period) ratings. Ravi and Aditi (2010) examined the performance of mutual funds which was a great deal of attention from both practitioners and academics.

Their idea behind evaluation was to find the returns provided by the individual schemes especially growth funds and the risk levels at which they were delivered in comparison with the market and the risk free rates.

## SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study is an attempt to evaluate the performance of Equity fund schemes on the basis of weekly returns compared with risk free security returns and BSE index during the period April 2011 to March 2012. It analyzed 30 different open-ended schemes floated by the different institutions in India.

### OBJECTIVES

On the basis of the relevance and scope of the study, following objectives are framed:

1. To evaluate the investment performance of selected Equity fund schemes in terms of risk and returns.
2. To study the impact of stock market fluctuations on selected mutual fund schemes.

### DATA COVERAGE

The sample consists of 30 different open-ended mutual fund schemes from public sector financial institutions, banks, private sector organizations and unit trust of India for the period of 52 weeks. The selection of the schemes was based on the condition that they have an exposure of at least three years and their details are available. Broad 100 share based BSE national index has been used as proxy to find out the performance of the schemes in market.

The collection of data is based upon secondary information which has been collected through various books, studies, annual reports of various institutions and websites. In addition, various Journals, magazines, articles, books, published and unpublished document have also been considered.

### METHODOLOGY

The analysis and interpretation is based upon following methodology as under:

Portfolio return: 
$$R_p = \frac{NAV_t - NAV_{t-1}}{NAV_{t-1}}$$

Where,  $R_p$  is a difference between net asset values for two consecutive days divided by the NAV of preceding week.

Market Return: 
$$R_m = \frac{M.Ind_t - M.Ind_{t-1}}{M.Ind_{t-1}}$$

Where  $R_m$  is the difference between Market Indexes (M.Ind) of two consecutive days divided by the market index for the preceding week.

Average return: 
$$AR_p = \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{R_p}{T}$$

Where,  $AR_p$  is Average returns on portfolio

$$AP_m = \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{R_m}{T}$$

= Market Average Return

### MEASURING RISK RETURN RELATIONSHIP

To measure the relationship between risk and return precisely, following tools have been used.

#### Standard Deviation ( $\sigma$ )

It is used to measure variation in the individual returns from the average expected return over a certain period. Lower the investors risk tolerance, less likely it is that he or she will hold the risky fund long enough to achieve its ultimate return.

$$\sigma_p = \sum_{t=1}^n \left[ \frac{(R_p - AR_p)^2}{t-1} \right]^{1/2}$$

Where,

$\sigma_p$  is total risk of the scheme portfolio. The total risk on the market portfolio is computed as follows:

$$\sigma_m = \sum_{t=1}^n \left[ \frac{(R_m - AR_m)^2}{t-1} \right]^{1/2}$$

Where,  $\sigma_m$  is Total risk of the market portfolio and  $\sigma_p$  is Total risk of the scheme portfolio.

### Beta ( $\beta$ )

Beta reflects the sensitivity of the fund's return to fluctuate in the market index. The beta for the average well-diversified portfolio equals to 1.0. Betas greater than 1.0 indicate above-average volatility as the higher the beta, the greater the risk. Betas less than 1.0 reflect below-average volatility.

$$\beta_p = \frac{(T \sum_{t=1}^n er_{mt} \cdot er_{pt}) - (\sum_{t=1}^n er_{mt} \sum_{t=1}^n er_{pt})}{(T \sum_{t=1}^n er_{mt}^2) - (\sum_{t=1}^n er_{mt})^2}$$

Where,

$er_{mt}$  is Excess return on market index

$er_{pt}$  is Excess return on portfolio

Such sense can also be conveyed by certain CAPM based measures of portfolio performance.

### Risk free rate

Risk free rate of return refers to that minimum return on investment that has no risk of losing the investment over which it is earned. In the present study, 91-day Treasury bills (T-bills) has been used as proxy for risk free rate which is the standard practice under empirical research in finance world over.

## MEASURES OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The performance of selected mutual fund schemes has been evaluated by using following measures. A brief description of these measures is given below.

### Sharpe ratio

Sharpe index measures the risk premium of the portfolio relative to total amount of risk in the portfolio. This ratio is referred as reward to variability ratio. The Sharpe ratio for different mutual fund schemes as well as benchmark portfolio has been computed by using following equation:

$$S_r = \frac{AR_p - AR_f}{\sigma_p}$$

Where,

$S_r$  is Sharpe's Ratio

$AR_p$  is Average return on portfolio

$AR_f$  is Average risk free return

$\sigma_p$  is Standard deviation of return on portfolio

### Treynor Index

The volatility ratio indicates the relationship between additional return and systematic risk. A comparison can be made with the benchmark taking systematic risk of market portfolio.

$$T_r = \frac{AR_p - AR_f}{\beta_p}$$

Where:

$T_r$  is Treynor's Ratio

$AR_p$  is Average return on portfolio

$AR_f$  is Average risk-free rate of return

$\beta_p$  is Sensitivity of fund return to market return

It measure portfolio risk in terms of beta, and the ratio is relevant to the investors. The higher the ratio better is the performance.

### Jensen's measure

The Jensen measure suggests explicit account of the effects of risk on returns of the portfolio. It is regression of excess fund return with excess market return. The intercept of the equation provides Jensen's measure performance. It is expressed as:

$$R_p - R_f = \alpha + \beta (R_m - R_f) + e_i$$

Where:

Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) is the intercept term

$\beta$  is Systematic risk

$R_m$  is Market return

$R_p$  is Return on portfolio

$R_f$  is Return on risk-free asset

### Coefficient values

Coefficient of variation is applied to measure the variability of return in terms of risk. Higher value shows greater variability in returns of a particular scheme. Coefficient of correlation has also been applied to amount the degree of relationship between Equity schemes and market portfolio. The value under "r" provides an indication of how closely the excess return on scheme portfolio is associated with the excess return on the BSE index (Benchmark). The coefficient of determination represents the proportion of variation in the excess return on scheme that is related to the variation in the excess return on the market index. R2 indicates the degree of diversification. Coefficient of non-determination represents the proportion of movement in the excess return on scheme which is not due to the market.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

An attempt has been made to evaluate the performance of selected Growth schemes in India. Table 1 categorized the performance of sample schemes in terms of risk and return. All schemes have earned positive return except JM Basic Fund and Taurus Discovery Fund which is a healthy sign as stock with progressive return can perform better in market. In overall, 13 schemes have made higher return in

comparison to the market and remaining 17 have acquired lower returns. The top performers in terms of return are HDFC Equity Fund, UTI Equity Fund-G, Fidelity Equity Fund, UTI Master Value Fund and HDFC Top 200 Fund. The average return earned by the all sample schemes is .1515 whereas average risk free return for the same period works out to be 1431. This implies that the sample schemes on an average performed well than the risk free asset.

**Table 1 Performance Evaluation of Equity Fund Schemes**

Name of Schemes	Average Return	Total Risk( $\sigma$ )	Beta( $\beta$ )	Alpha( $\alpha$ )	Sr	Tr
Baroda Pioneer Growth Fund	0.1519	2.2732	0.9835	-0.0194	0.0039	0.0089
Birla Sun life Equity Fund-Growth	0.0776	2.3183	0.9807	-0.0936	-0.0283	-0.0668
CanaraRobecoMulticap	0.221	1.7317	0.6771	0.0584	0.0450	0.1150
DSP Blackrock Micro Cap Fund	0.2089	2.7349	0.7651	0.0439	0.0241	0.0860
Escort Growth Plan	0.0372	2.2801	0.8494	-0.1304	-0.0464	-0.1247
Fidelity Equity Fund	0.3247	1.9962	0.8001	0.1586	0.0910	0.2270
Franklin India Prima Fund	0.1121	2.5057	0.9301	-0.0578	-0.0124	-0.0333
Franklin Pharma Fund	0.2558	1.5501	0.4203	0.1006	0.0727	0.2681
HDFC Equity Fund	0.3661	2.0818	0.784	0.2004	0.1071	0.2844
HDFC Top 200 Fund	0.3201	2.1021	0.8419	0.1527	0.0842	0.2102
HSBC Equity Fund-G	0.2028	2.1514	0.9105	0.0335	0.0277	0.0656
ICICI Prudential Dynamic Plan	0.2645	1.4931	0.5952	0.1043	0.0813	0.2040
ICICI Top 100 Fund	0.2179	2.0099	0.8429	0.0505	0.0372	0.0887
ING Mid Cap Fund	0.1605	2.37	0.8456	-0.0068	0.0073	0.0206
JM Basic Fund	-0.5034	3.0543	1.3603	-0.6857	-0.2117	-0.4753
Kotak Contra Scheme	0.0778	2.1952	0.9169	-0.0917	-0.0297	-0.0712
Kotak 50-G	0.2809	1.6216	0.4914	0.1236	0.0850	0.2804
L&T Mid Cap Fund	0.1164	2.366	0.9041	-0.0527	-0.0113	-0.0295
LIC MF Equity Fund-G	0.1851	2.2708	0.9689	0.0141	0.0185	0.0433
PRINCIPAL Growth Fund	0.0449	2.2851	0.9826	-0.1264	-0.0430	-0.0999
Reliance Growth Plan	0.1103	2.3573	0.947	-0.0601	-0.0139	-0.0346
Reliance Vision Fund	0.1594	2.3084	0.9563	-0.0112	0.0071	0.0170
Sahara Growth Funds	0.1214	2.1762	0.9184	-0.0481	-0.0100	-0.0236
SBI Blue-Chip Fund	0.0837	2.2346	0.9764	-0.0875	-0.0266	-0.0608
SBI Magnum Multiplier Plus-93	0.1191	2.4023	0.963	-0.0517	-0.0100	-0.0249
Sundaram Select Focus-G	0.1434	2.2983	0.9654	-0.0275	0.0001	0.0003
Tata Pure Equity Fund	0.1305	2.132	0.9031	-0.0386	-0.0059	-0.0140
Taurus Discovery Fund	-0.0457	2.7971	1.054	-0.2128	-0.0675	-0.1791
UTI Equity Fund-G	0.2762	2.018	0.8238	0.1094	0.0660	0.1616
UTI Master Value Fund	0.3231	2.3356	0.8408	0.1559	0.0771	0.2141
Market Index(Benchmark)	0.1719	2.3088	1	-	0.0125	0.0288

Note: Sr is Sharpe ratio and Tr is Treynor ratio

Source: Compiled from website [www.mutualfundsindia.com](http://www.mutualfundsindia.com).

Birla Sunlife Equity Fund-Growth, Reliance Growth Plan, Franklin India Prima fund, SBI Magnum multiplier plus-93, JM Basic Fund, DSP Blackrock Micro Cap Fund, ING Mid Cap Fund, L&T Mid Cap Fund, UTI Master Value Fund and Taurus Discovery Fund have found high risk than the benchmark whereas it is lowest in ICICI Prudential Dynamic Plan. The average risk of all schemes is 2.2150, lower than the market. The top performers in terms of risk are HDFC Top 200 Fund, ICICI Top 100 Fund, HDFC Equity Fund, ICICI Dynamic Plan, UTI Equity Fund and Kotak 50-G as they acquired high return and low risk than the market.

All equity fund schemes have positive Beta, indicates the direct relationship of schemes with the market changes. In overall, 28 schemes have Beta less than one predicts that these are defensive in nature and less sensitive to the market forces whereas, 2 schemes namely JM Basic Fund (1.3603) and Taurus Discovery (1.054) have beta more than one. Thus, the analysis reveals that beta for all schemes ranged from the minimum of .4203 for Franklin Pharma fund to maximum of 1.3603 for JM Basic Fund.

While comparing the value of Sharpe index with market it is found that 57 percent schemes have positive results whereas 43 percent have negative values. It is noted that 13 schemes have outperformed in market and some of these are HDFC Equity Fund, ICICI Prudential Dynamic Plan, Kotak-50 G, Fidelity Equity Fund and HDFC Top 200 Fund.

It can also be seen that, 17 schemes have attained positive values under Treynor measure and also outperformed in the market except Baroda Pioneer Growth Fund, ING Mid Cap Fund, Reliance Vision Fund and Sundaram Select Focus -G. Top performers under this measure are HDFC Equity, ICICI Prudential, Kotak -50G, Franklin Pharma Fund, Fidelity Equity, UTI Master Value Fund and HDFC Top 200 Fund.

As per Jensen measure, some growth schemes failed to get desirable results due to inefficiency of fund managers to identify market movements on time.

Alpha values are highest in HDFC Equity Fund, UTI Master Value, HDFC Top 200 and Fidelity Equity Fund which indicates that their fund manager are competent to anticipate future security prices in

time whereas it is negative in JM Basic Fund, Taurus Discovery Fund, Escort Growth Plan and Principal Growth Fund which are the worst performers among all. Thus, in growth schemes superior performance is noticeable in HDFC Equity fund.

The value under correlation Coefficient in Table 2 provides an indication that LIC MF Equity Fund, HSBC Equity Fund, SBI Blue-Chip Fund and ICICI Top 100 Fund are largely associated with the market.

It ranges from .6576 (DSP black rock Micro Cap Fund) to .9935 (Baroda Pioneer Growth Fund). The value of R<sup>2</sup> represents the proportion of variation in the excess return under Baroda pioneer growth fund (.9870) is highly linked with the excess return of the market. DSP Blackrock, Franklin Pharma Fund and Kotak 50-G indicating comparatively low value of R<sup>2</sup>, therefore require more diversification.

High degree of correlation depicts low value of non-determination under Baroda Pioneer (.0130) and LIC MF Equity Fund (.0209). On the other hand; DSP Blackrock and Franklin Pharma Fund have high value of non-determination. Further, the coefficient of variation is intended to verify the consistency among returns of various growth schemes. This measure reveals that Escorts Growth Fund, Principal growth fund, Birla Sun Life Equity Fund and Kodak Contra Scheme have high variations in returns as compared to their risk whereas, HDFC Equity Funds, ICICI Prudential Dynamic Plan and Kotak 50-G have low volatility in returns. In overall, 28 growth schemes have positive and only two schemes have negative variation in returns which results good performance of sample schemes.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Majority of the schemes showed positive return than the risk free rate and market as well. However, some of the schemes could not get desirable results due to negative return namely, JM Basic Fund and Taurus Discovery Fund. In terms of risk, two third of the sample schemes had less risk than market. Maximum number of sample schemes acquired less systematic risk than the market whereas JM basis fund and Taurus discovery fund were found more volatile. On the basis of alpha, more than half schemes failed to get desirable results due to the inefficiency of fund

Table 2 Coefficient Value's under Equity Fund Schemes

Name of Schemes	Coefficient of Correlation	Coefficient of Determination (R <sup>2</sup> )	Coefficient of Non Determination	Coefficient of Variation
Baroda Pioneer Growth Fund	0.9935	0.9870	0.0130	14.9651
Birla Sun Life Equity Fund-Growth	0.9509	0.9042	0.0958	29.8750
CanaraRobecoMulticap	0.9251	0.8558	0.1442	7.8357
DSP Blackrock Micro Cap Fund	0.6576	0.4324	0.5676	13.0919
Escort Growth Plan	0.8244	0.6796	0.3204	61.2930
Fidelity Equity Fund	0.9767	0.9539	0.0461	6.1478
Franklin India Prima Fund	0.8425	0.7098	0.2902	22.3524
Franklin Pharma Fund	0.6676	0.4457	0.5543	6.0598
HDFC Equity Fund	0.9321	0.8688	0.1312	5.6864
HDFC Top 200 Fund	0.9719	0.9446	0.0554	6.5670
HSBC Equity Fund-G	0.9873	0.9748	0.0252	10.6085
ICICI Prudential Dynamic Plan	0.9637	0.9287	0.0713	5.6450
ICICI Top 100 Fund	0.9839	0.9681	0.0319	9.2240
ING Mid Cap Fund	0.8225	0.6765	0.3235	14.7664
JM Basic Fund	0.8841	0.7816	0.2184	-6.0673
Kotak Contra Scheme	0.9378	0.8795	0.1205	28.2159
Kotak 50-G	0.7496	0.5619	0.4381	5.7729
L&T Mid Cap Fund	0.8684	0.7541	0.2459	20.3265
LIC MF Equity Fund-G	0.9895	0.9791	0.0209	12.2680
PRINCIPAL Growth Fund	0.9575	0.9168	0.0832	50.8931
Reliance Growth Plan	0.9114	0.8306	0.1694	21.3717
Reliance Vision Fund	0.9539	0.9099	0.0901	14.4818
Sahara Growth Funds	0.9602	0.9220	0.0780	17.9259
SBI Blue-Chip Fund	0.9836	0.9675	0.0325	26.6977
SBI Magnum Multiplier Plus-93	0.9123	0.8323	0.1677	20.1704
Sundaram Select Focus-G	0.9625	0.9264	0.0736	16.0272
Tata Pure Equity Fund	0.9665	0.9341	0.0659	16.3372
Taurus Discovery Fund	0.8204	0.6731	0.3269	-61.2057
UTI Equity Fund-G	0.9773	0.9551	0.0449	7.3063
UTI Master Value Fund	0.8748	0.7653	0.2347	7.2287

Source: Compiled from website [www.mutualfundsindia.com](http://www.mutualfundsindia.com).

managers. In terms of Sharpe & Treynor measure, 13 growth schemes had performed well in market such as, HDFC Equity Fund, ICICI Prudential Dynamic Plan, Kotak-50 G, Fidelity Equity Fund and HDFC Top 200. In overall, Baroda pioneer growth fund was largely associated with market Index whereas DSP Blackrock, Franklin Pharma Fund and Kotak 50-G require more diversification. It can be concluded that

Escorts Growth Fund, Principal growth fund, Birla Sun Life Equity Fund and Kodak Contra Scheme are risky schemes with less consistency in return whereas, HDFC Equity Funds, Fidelity Equity Fund, HDFC Top 200 Fund, ICICI Prudential Dynamic Plan and Kotak 50-G are realible schemes. Thus, some of the schemes were not conformity with their stated objective and require more diversification.

Investors have to make self-analysis of one's needs, risk-bearing capacity, and expected returns so as to develop a prudent investment ideology. Some investors prefer low risk with low and steady returns while some desire a scheme with high return whatever risk is engaged with it. Longer time horizon allows investor to take greater risk, with a greater potential to earn by investing across different market environments. If investors prefer to invest in equity fund, a closer look is must at other equity fund schemes of the same mutual fund. This can be useful for the investors, when changes have to be made either due to non-performance or in view of revised investment objective/s as well as time horizon.

## REFERENCES

1. Singh & Meera. (2001). Mutual funds and Indian capital market: Performance and profitability. New Delhi: Kanishka publishers
2. Sathak. (1997). Mutual funds in India: Marketing strategies and investment practices. New Delhi: Response book
3. Indian Institute of Banking and Finance. (2010). Mutual funds Products and Services. New Delhi: Taxmann Publications
4. Donald. (1974). Objectives and Performance of Mutual Funds. Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis
5. Jayadev, M. (1996). Mutual Fund Performance: An Analysis of Monthly Returns. Finance India
6. Gupta Amitabh. (2000). Investment Performance of Indian Mutual Funds: An Empirical Study. Finance India
7. Singh, Y.P., & Vinita. (2002). Mutual funds investors' preferences and perceptions. Indian journal of commerce
8. Mehru, K.D. (2004). Problems of Mutual Funds in India. Finance India
9. Acharya & Gajendra. (2007). Classifying Mutual Funds in India: Some Results from Clustering. Indian Journal of Economics and Business