

(Not) Everybody's Working for the Weekend: A Study of Mutual Fund Manager Effort

Boone Bowles¹ Richard B. Evans²

¹Texas A&M University – Mays

²University of Virginia – Darden

American Finance Association

January 3, 2025

Moral hazard and observability

Bengt Holmström

Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration

The role of imperfect information in a principal-agent relationship subject to moral hazard is considered. A necessary and sufficient condition for imperfect information to improve on contracts based on the payoff alone is derived, and a characterization of the optimal use of such information is given.

1. Introduction

■ It has long been recognized that a problem of moral hazard may arise when individuals engage in risk sharing under conditions such that their privately taken actions affect the probability distribution of the outcome.¹ This situation is common in insurance, labor contracting, and the delegation of decisionmaking responsibility, to give a few examples. In these instances Pareto-optimal risk sharing is generally precluded, because it will not induce proper incentives for taking correct actions. Instead, only a second-best solution, which trades off some of the risk-sharing benefits for provision of incentives, can be achieved.

13,455 citations

Moral hazard and observability

Bengt Holmström

Swedish School of Economics and Business

The role of imperfect information to moral hazard is considered. A need for information to improve on contracts is characterized and a characterization of the optimal us

1. Introduction

■ It has long been recognized that individuals engage in risk sharing and taken actions affect the probability of responsibility, to give a few examples, risk sharing is generally precluded, because taking correct actions. Instead, only some of the risk-sharing benefits for

13,455

Agency Problems and the Theory of the Firm

Eugene F. Fama

University of Chicago

This paper attempts to explain how the separation of security ownership and control, typical of large corporations, can be an efficient form of economic organization. We first set aside the presumption that a corporation has owners in any meaningful sense. The entrepreneur is also laid to rest, at least for the purposes of the large modern corporation. The two functions usually attributed to the entrepreneur—management and risk bearing—are treated as naturally separate factors within the set of contracts called a firm. The firm is disciplined by competition from other firms, which forces the evolution of devices for efficiently monitoring the performance of the entire team and of its individual members. Individual participants in the firm, and in particular its managers, face both the discipline and opportunities provided by the markets for their services, both within and outside the firm.

Economists have long been concerned with the incentive problems that arise when decision making in a firm is the province of managers who are not the firm's security holders.¹ One outcome has been the development of "behavioral" and "managerial" theories of the firm which reject the classical model of an entrepreneur, or owner-

20,200 citations

Moral hazard and observability

Bengt Holmström

Swedish School of Economics and Business

The role of imperfect information to moral hazard is considered. A need for information to improve on contracts is characterized and a characterization of the optimal us

1. Introduction

■ It has long been recognized that individuals engage in risk sharing when taken actions affect the probability of risk. This is common in insurance, labor contracts, and responsibility, to give a few examples. Risk sharing is generally precluded, because taking correct actions. Instead, only some of the risk-sharing benefits for

13,455

Agency Problems and

Eugene F. Fama

University of Chicago

This paper attempts to explain the form of economic organization that a corporation has owners and control, typical of modern corporation. The two entrepreneur—management are also laid to rest, at rally separate factors within the is disciplined by competition evolution of devices for efficient the entire team and of its ind parts in the firm, and in pa discipline and opportunities p ices, both within and outside

Economists have long been concerned with the incentive problems that arise when decision making in a firm is the province of managers who are not the firm's security holders.¹ One outcome has been the development of "behavioral" and "managerial" theories of the firm which reject the classical model of an entrepreneur, or owner-

20,200 citations

Performance Pay and Top-Management Incentives

Michael C. Jensen

Harvard University

Kevin J. Murphy

University of Rochester

Our estimates of the pay-performance relation (including pay, options, stockholdings, and dismissal) for chief executive officers indicate that CEO wealth changes \$3.25 for every \$1,000 change in shareholder wealth. Although the incentives generated by stock ownership are large relative to pay and dismissal incentives, most CEOs hold trivial fractions of their firms' stock, and ownership levels have declined over the past 50 years. We hypothesize that public and private political forces impose constraints that reduce the pay-performance sensitivity. Declines in both the pay-performance relation and the level of CEO pay since the 1930s are consistent with this hypothesis.

The conflict of interest between shareholders of a publicly owned corporation and the corporation's chief executive officer (CEO) is a

10,795 citations

Moral hazard and observability

Bengt Holmström

Swedish School of Economics and Business

The role of imperfect information to moral hazard is considered. A need for information to improve on contracts is characterized and a characterization of the optimal us

1. Introduction

■ It has long been recognized that individuals engage in risk sharing and taken actions affect the probability of risk. This is common in insurance, labor contracts, and responsibility, to give a few examples. Risk sharing is generally precluded, because taking correct actions. Instead, only some of the risk-sharing benefits for

13,455

Agency Problems and

Eugene F. Fama

University of Chicago

This paper attempts to explain the agency problems, typical of the form of economic organization that a corporation has owners and an entrepreneur is also laid to rest, at a modern corporation. The two entrepreneur—management are really separate factors within the firm is disciplined by competition and evolution of devices for efficient the entire team and of its individual parts in the firm, and in particular discipline and opportunities provided, both within and outside

Economists have long been concerned with the incentive problems that arise when decision making in a firm is the province of managers who are not the firm's security holders.¹ One outcome has been the development of "behavioral" and "managerial" theories of the firm which reject the classical model of an entrepreneur, or owner-

Performance Pay and Top-Management Incentives

Michael C. Jensen

Harvard University

Kevin J. Murphy

University of Rochester

Our estimates of the pay-performance relationship, stockholdings, and disincorporate that CEO wealth change shareholder wealth. Although ownership are large relative to CEOs hold trivial fractions of the firm have declined over the past 50 years and private political forces impair performance sensitivity. Decline in the level of CEO pay is consistent with the hypothesis.

The conflict of interest between the corporation and the corporation

10,795

Journal of Financial Economics 3 (1976) 305-360. © North-Holland Publishing Company

THEORY OF THE FIRM: MANAGERIAL BEHAVIOR, AGENCY COSTS AND OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE

Michael C. JENSEN and William H. MECKLING*

University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14027, U.S.A.

Received January 1976, revised version received July 1976

This paper integrates elements from the theory of agency, the theory of property rights and the theory of finance to develop a theory of the ownership structure of the firm. We define the concept of agency costs, show its relationship to the 'separation and control' issue, investigate the nature of the agency costs generated by the existence of debt and outside equity, demonstrate who bears these costs and why, and investigate the Pareto optimality of their existence. We also provide a new definition of the firm, and show how our analysis of the factors influencing the creation and issuance of debt and equity claims is a special case of the supply side of the completeness of markets problem.

The directors of such [joint-stock] companies, however, being the managers rather than other people's money than of their own, it cannot well be expected, that they should watch over it with the same anxious vigilance with which the partners in a private copartnership frequently watch over their own. Like the stewards of a rich man, they are apt to consider attention to small matters as not for their master's honour, and very easily give themselves a dispensation from having it. Negligence and profusion, therefore, must always prevail, more or less, in the management of the affairs of such a company.

Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, 1776, Cannan Edition (Modern Library, New York, 1937) p. 700.

128,049 citations

20,200 citations

A common thread here is the unobservability of effort.

Moral hazard and observability

Bengt Holmström

Swedish School of Economics and Business

The role of imperfect information to moral hazard is considered. A new information to improve on contracts a characterization of the optimal as

1. Introduction

■ It has long been recognized that individuals engage in risk sharing when taken actions affect the probability of risk. This is common in insurance, labor contracts, and joint ventures. In general, risk sharing is generally precluded, because taking correct actions. Instead, only some of the risk-sharing benefits for

13,455

Agency Problems and

Eugene F. Fama

University of Chicago

This paper attempts to explain the relationship between ownership and control, typical of the form of economic organization that a corporation has owners. The entrepreneur is also laid to rest, at modern corporation. The two entrepreneur—management are really separate factors within the firm is disciplined by competition: evolution of devices for efficient the entire team and of its impacts in the firm, and in particular discipline and opportunities provided, both within and outside

Economists have long been concerned with the incentive problems that arise when decision making in a firm is the province of managers who are not the firm's security holders.' One outcome has been the development of "behavioral" and "managerial" theories of the firm which reject the classical model of an entrepreneur, or owner-

20,200 citations

Michael C. Jensen

Harvard University

Kevin J. Murphy

University of Rochester

Our estimates of the pay-performance, stockholdings, and disincorporate that CEO wealth change shareholding wealth. Although ownership are large relative to CEOs hold trivial fractions of it have declined over the past 50 and private political forces impact performance sensitivity. Decline and the level of CEO pay is hypothesis.

The conflict of interest between corporation and the corporation

10,795

Journal of Financial Economics 3 (1976) 305-360. © North-Holland Publishing Company

THEORY OF THE FIRM: MANAGERIAL BEHAVIOR, AGENCY COSTS AND OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE

Michael C. JENSEN and William H. MECKLING*

University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627, U.S.A.

Received January 1976, revised version received July 1976

This paper integrates elements from the theory of agency, the theory of property rights and the theory of finance to develop a theory of the ownership structure of the firm. We define the concept of agency costs, show its relationship to the 'separation and control' issue, investigate the nature of the agency costs generated by the existence of debt and outside equity, demonstrate who bears these costs and why, and investigate the Pareto optimality of their existence. We also provide a new definition of the firm, and show how our analysis of the factors influencing the creation and issuance of debt and equity claims is a special case of the supply side of the completeness of markets problem.

The directors of such [joint-stock] companies, however, being the managers rather than other people's money than of their own, it cannot well be expected, that they should watch over it with the same anxious vigilance with which the partners in a private copartnership frequently watch over their own. Like the stewards of a rich man, they are apt to consider attention to small matters as not for their master's honour, and very easily give themselves a dispensation from having it. Negligence and profusion, therefore, must always prevail, more or less, in the management of the affairs of such a company.

Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, 1776, Cannan Edition (Modern Library, New York, 1937) p. 700.

128,049 citations

A common thread here is the unobservability of effort.

Moral hazard and observability

Bengt Holmström
Swedish School of Economics

**AR ANNUAL
REVIEWS**

Annual Review of Financial Economics

Conflicts of Interest in Asset Management and Advising

Chester S. Spatt

Tepper School of Business, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, USA;
email: csatt@andrew.cmu.edu

The role of imperfect information to moral hazard is considered. The paper provides a characterization of the

1. Introduction

It has long been recognized that the actions taken by individuals engage in risk-taking actions affect the risk. This is common in insurance, where the responsibility, to give a fair price for sharing is generally predicated on taking correct actions. Instead, only some of the risk-sharing benefits for

entrepreneur—management are really separate factors within the firm. The firm is disciplined by competition, evolution of devices for efficient operation of the entire team and of its individual parts in the firm, and in particular discipline and opportunities for services, both within and outside

the firm, and the level of CEO pay is a function of the performance hypothesis.

The conflict of interest between the corporation and the corporation

is a problem that managers must address who bear these costs and why, and investigate the Pareto optimality of their existence. We also provide a new definition of the firm, and show how our analysis of the factors influencing the creation and issuance of debt and equity claims is a special case of the supply side of the completeness of markets problem.

The directors of such [joint-stock] companies, however, being the managers rather than the owners of the money than of their own, it cannot well be expected, that they should watch over it with the same anxious vigilance with which the partners in a private copartnership frequently watch over their own. Like the stewards of a rich man, they are apt to consider attention to small matters as not for their master's honour, and very easily give themselves a dispensation from having it. Negligence and profusion, therefore, must always prevail, more or less, in the management of the affairs of such a company.

Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, 1776, Cannan Edition (Modern Library, New York, 1937) p. 700.

13,455

10,795

Economists have long been concerned with the incentive problems that arise when decision making in a firm is the province of managers who are not the firm's security holders.¹ One outcome has been the development of "behavioral" and "managerial" theories of the firm which reject the classical model of an entrepreneur, or owner-

128,049 citations

20,200 citations

A common thread here is the unobservability of effort.

Moral hazard and observability

Bengt Holmström

Swedish School of Economics

AR ANNUAL
REVIEWS

Annual Review of Financial Economics

Conflicts of Interest in Asset Management and Advising

Chester S. Spatt

Tepper School of Business, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, USA;
email: csatt@andrew.cmu.edu

The role of imperfect information to moral hazard is considered. A characterization of the

1. Introduction

■ It has long been recognized that the actions taken by individuals engage in risk-taking actions affect the risk. It is common in insurance, where the insurer's responsibility, to give a fair price for sharing is generally predicated on the insured taking correct actions. Instead, some of the

Economists have long been concerned with the incentive problems that arise when decision making in a firm is the province of managers who are not the firm's security holders.¹ One outcome has been the development of "behavioral" and "managerial" theories of the firm which reject the classical model of an entrepreneur, or owner-

128,049 citations

20,200 citations

Holland Publishing Company

RIAL BEHAVIOR,
P STRUCTURE

MECKLING*

14627, U.S.A.

ceived July 1976

theory of property rights and the structure of the firm. We define the notion and control issue, investigate debt and outside equity, demonstrate the Pareto optimality of their existence, and discuss the factors influencing the supply side

managers rather of
d, that they should
owners in a private
rich man, they are
and honour, and very
and profusion, there-
the affairs of such a

Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, 1776, Cannan Edition
(Modern Library, New York, 1937) p. 700.

A common thread here is the unobservability of effort.

Moral hazard and observability

Bengt Holmström
Business School at Harvard

AR ANNUAL
REVIEWS

Annual Review of Financial Economics Conflicts of Interest in Asset Management and Advising

Chester S. Spatt

Tepper School of Business, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, USA;
email: csatt@andrew.cmu.edu


The role of imperfect
information in corporate
governance and the
characteristics of the

1. Introduction


It has long been recognized that individuals engaged in discretionary actions often face incentives to shirk their responsibilities, to give up shirking is generally preferred to taking correct actions. Indeed, some of the

Especially true in asset management,
where the main input is human capital.


But for researchers, effort is now observable!



10 employees all worked
4 days this week.
40 employee workdays.



10 employees all worked
4 days this week.
40 employee workdays.



Most employees
claimed they worked
very hard this week.



We can tie EDGAR usage to mutual funds and observe their day-to-day activity of viewing (requesting) filings.

We aggregate usage at the family-level each month and define TotalWDs and TotalReqs.



To speci cally measure e ort, we focus on weekends.
Relatively how many requests came on weekends?

We define $PctWk$ as the ratio of weekend work activities to total work activities over a month's time.

E ort leads to
higher future returns

Especially for high ac-
tive share, low turnover,
and competitive funds

November - February

Large and Expensive Funds

Managers facing many
competitive incentives

Following out ows and in-
creased idiosyncratic volatility

Deeper information acqui-
sition and more trading.

E ort causes
higher future returns

Especially for high ac-
tive share, low turnover,
and competitive funds

November - February

Large and Expensive Funds

Managers facing many
competitive incentives

Following out ows and in-
creased idiosyncratic volatility

Deeper information acqui-
sition and more trading.

What follows from effort?

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)

Panel A: All Observations.

	HHI		Turnover		ActiveShare	
PctWk _{t-3}	0.16** (0.07)		-0.29*** (0.10)		0.53 (0.88)	
PctWk _{t-12}		0.18** (0.07)		-0.28** (0.11)		3.76*** (0.95)
N	23,713	20,865	25,492	20,990	25,564	21,059
R ²	0.53	0.53	0.27	0.27	0.66	0.65

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Panel A: All Observations.						
					Turnover	ActiveShare
PctWk _{t-3}			-0.29*** (0.10)		0.53 (0.88)	
PctWk _{t-12}				-0.28** (0.11)		3.76*** (0.95)
N	23,713	20,865	25,492	20,990	25,564	21,059
R ²	0.53	0.53	0.27	0.27	0.66	0.65

" E ort " Concentration

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Panel A: All Observations.							
						ActiveShare	
PctWk _{t-3}						0.53 (0.88)	
PctWk _{t-12}						3.76*** (0.95)	
N		23,713	20,865	25,492	20,990	25,564	21,059
R ²		0.53	0.53	0.27	0.27	0.66	0.65

" E ort " Concentration

" E ort # Turnover

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)

Panel A: All Observations.

PctWk _{t-3}	[Yellow]		[Red]		[Green]	
PctWk _{t-12}	[Yellow]		[Red]		[Green]	
N	23,713	20,865	25,492	20,990	25,564	21,059
R ²	0.53	0.53	0.27	0.27	0.66	0.65

" E ort " Concentration

" E ort # Turnover

" E ort " ActiveShare

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)

Panel A: All Observations.

PctWk _{t-3}						
PctWk _{t-12}						
N	23,713	20,865	25,492	20,990	25,564	21,059
R ²	0.53	0.53	0.27	0.27	0.66	0.65

" E ort " Concentration

" E ort # Turnover

" E ort " ActiveShare

These relations are
primarily driven
by High E ort

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6)

Panel A: All Observations.

	<u>%UniqueFirms</u>	<u>%UniqueFilings</u>	<u>%10KQ</u>	<u>FilingAge</u>	<u>PctNonHolding</u>
PctWk	-0.32*** (0.08)	-0.47*** (0.09)	-0.09 (0.06)	1.32*** (0.46)	0.14 (0.09)
N	4,563	4,563	4,563	4,563	4,563
R ²	0.44	0.30	0.45	0.29	0.55

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Panel A: All Observations.						
				%10KQ		actNonHolding
PctWk				-0.09 (0.06)		0.14 (0.09)
N				4,563		4,563
R ²				0.45		0.55

" Event ! acquiring info about fewer firms, fewer firms, and older firms.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Panel A: All Observations.						
				%10KQ		actNonHolding
PctWk				-0.09 (0.06)		0.14 (0.09)
N				4,563		4,563
R ²				0.45		0.55

" E ort ! acquiring info about fewer firms, fewer listings, and older listings.

We also show that e ort decreases the likelihood of buying new stocks while increasing the likelihood of buying more of current holdings. E ort and Information Acquisition together increase the likelihood of selling.

Does e ort lead to better performance?

(1)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Panel A. All Observations.			
	$\text{Alpha}_{1\ 6}$	$\text{Alpha}_{7\ 12}$	$\text{Alpha}_{13\ 18}$
PctWk	-1.25* (0.68)	-0.78 (0.61)	2.05*** (0.69)
N	25,257	25,357	25,513
R ²	0.13	0.12	0.12

Panel B. Observations where PctWk > 0.

	$\text{Alpha}_{1\ 6}$	$\text{Alpha}_{7\ 12}$	$\text{Alpha}_{13\ 18}$
PctWk	-1.00 (0.78)	-1.52** (0.73)	1.69** (0.79)
N	21,137	21,125	21,185
R ²	0.13	0.13	0.13

Panel C. Observations where MedWk > 1.

	$\text{Alpha}_{1\ 6}$	$\text{Alpha}_{7\ 12}$	$\text{Alpha}_{13\ 18}$
PctWk	-1.74** (0.77)	-1.01 (0.77)	1.70** (0.73)
N	19,561	19,614	19,675
R ²	0.13	0.12	0.13

(1)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Panel A. All Observations.			
		Alpha _{7 12}	Alpha _{13 18}
PctWk		-0.78 (0.61)	2.05*** (0.69)
N	25,257	25,357	25,513
R ²	0.13	0.12	0.12

Returns are LOW immediately after e ort

Panel B. Observations where PctWk > 0.			
	Alpha _{1 6}	Alpha _{7 12}	Alpha _{13 18}
PctWk	-1.00 (0.78)	-1.52** (0.73)	1.69** (0.79)
N	21,137	21,125	21,185
R ²	0.13	0.13	0.13

Panel C. Observations where MedWk > 1.			
		Alpha _{7 12}	Alpha _{13 18}
PctWk		-1.01 (0.77)	1.70** (0.73)
N	19,561	19,614	19,675
R ²	0.13	0.12	0.13

(1)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Panel A. All Observations.			
PctWk		Alpha _{7 12}	
		-0.78 (0.61)	
N	25,257	25,357	25,513
R ²	0.13	0.12	0.12

Returns are LOW immediately after e ort

	Alpha _{1 6}	Alpha _{7 12}	
Panel B. Observations where PctWk > 0.			
PctWk	-1.00 (0.78)	-1.52** (0.73)	
N	21,137	21,125	21,185
R ²	0.13	0.13	0.13

Returns are HIGH after a while

		Alpha _{7 12}	
Panel C. Observations where MedWk > 1.			
PctWk		-1.01 (0.77)	
N	19,561	19,614	19,675
R ²	0.13	0.12	0.13

(1)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Panel A. All Observations.			
PctWk		Alpha _{7 12}	
		-0.78 (0.61)	
N	25,257	25,357	25,513
R ²	0.13	0.12	0.12


Returns are LOW immediately after e ort


	Alpha _{1 6}	Alpha _{7 12}	
Panel B. Observations where PctWk > 0.			
PctWk	-1.00 (0.78)	-1.52** (0.73)	
N	21,137	21,125	21,185
R ²	0.13	0.13	0.13

Returns are HIGH after a while


		Alpha _{7 12}	
Panel C. Observations where MedWk > 1.			
PctWk		-1.01 (0.77)	
N	19,561	19,614	19,675
R ²	0.13	0.12	0.13

This is the average effect across all managers





The relation between e ort and future re- turns is strongest for small, expensive funds with high concentration and active share, low turnover, and highly competitive incentives.



The relation between e ort and future returns is strongest for small, expensive funds with high concentration and active share, low turnover, and highly competitive incentives.

Stocks they buy and sell during during periods of high e ort (especially those they acquire information about) outperform their portfolio and benchmark.

Does effort cause better performance?

Does e ort cause better performance?

The concern is reverse causality (Pastor, Stambaugh, and Taylor (2017)).

Mutual funds trade more when they foresee more profitable future opportunities.

Does e ort cause better performance?

The concern is reverse causality (Pastor, Stambaugh, and Taylor (2017)).

Mutual funds trade more when they foresee more profitable future opportunities.

We need exogenous variation in e ort, and we look to the effects of e ort .

Does effort cause better performance?

The concern is reverse causality (Pastor, Stambaugh, and Taylor (2017)).

“Mutual funds trade more when they foresee more profitable future opportunities.”

We need exogenous variation in effort, and we look to the costs of effort.

Costly Effort

Does effort cause better performance?

The concern is reverse causality (Pastor, Stambaugh, and Taylor (2017)).

“Mutual funds trade more when they foresee more profitable future opportunities.”

We need exogenous variation in effort, and we look to the costs of effort.

Costly Effort

Easy Effort

(1)	(2)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	First Stage	Second Stage			
	All Obs.	E-Score 4			
	PctWkF	Alpha	CAPM	FF3	FF4
PctWkF		56.94*** (15.63)	16.79*** (2.68)	13.12*** (3.08)	18.41*** (3.04)
Rain	0.03** (0.01)				
N	12,349	5,764	5,670	5,670	4,841
R ²	0.77	0.15	0.21	0.17	0.16

For the funds that benefit from extra effort, more rain-induced effort results in higher returns in the future.

Effort causes
higher future returns

Especially for high active share, low turnover, and competitive funds

November - February

Large and Expensive Funds

Managers facing many competitive incentives

Following outflows and increased idiosyncratic volatility

Deeper information acquisition and more trading.