# WHAT DRIVES CLOSED-END FUND DISCOUNTS? EVIDENCE FROM COVID-19 (SSRN LINK)

\*Darla Moore School of Business, University of South Carolina, E-mail: liang.ma@moore.sc.edu

## **Motivation and Introduction**

- One long-standing anomaly in finance is the closed-end fund (CEF) discount puzzle: CEFs usually trade at lower prices (discounts) than their NAVs (Pratt 1966).
- No consensus yet regarding what drives CEF discounts (Cherkes 2012).
- It remains under debate whether and to what extent CEF discounts arise from investor sentiment (irrationality).
  - Behavioral explanation based on individual investor sentiment (De Long et al. 1990 and Lee et al. 1991) vs. Rational explanations (see Cherkes 2012 for a review).
  - Important for sentiment-related financial research in general: the CEF discount is one main component in the widely-used Baker-Wurgler index of investor sentiment (Baker and Wurgler 2006, 2007).
- Empirical evidence has been mixed. Most empirical tests rely on (potentially endogenous) proxies for different factors  $\Rightarrow$  hard to draw **causal** interpretations.
- This paper:
  - Exploits the negative exogenous shock to individual investor sentiment induced by the COVID-19 outbreak, which has the advantage of being a truly exogenous and fully unanticipated shock.
  - Shows the causal effect of individual investor sentiment on CEF discounts using the difference-in-differences (DiD) approach.

## **COVID-19: a Negative Shock to Sentiment**

Figure 1 plots the weekly individual investor sentiment measure from the American Association of Individual Investors (AAII). The vertical line indicates February 24, 2020, the date of the COVID-19 outbreak.



Fig. 1: Individual investor sentiment over time.

There was a large decline in individual investor sentiment after the COVID-19 outbreak.

## Hypotheses

- Hypothesis 1: CEF discounts increase on average after the COVID-19 outbreak.
- Hypothesis 2: CEFs more subject to individual investor sentiment experience a larger increase in discounts after the COVID-19 outbreak.

## Liang Ma<sup>\*</sup>



## Data, Sample, and Variables

- Sample construction starts with all CEFs (second digit of shrcd = 4) existing on CRSP at the end of 2019.
- Daily prices/NAVs from Bloomberg; other data from CRSP, 13f, Capital IQ, and SEC filings.
- Exclude CEFs without valid prices/NAVs at the end of 2019, delisted before 02/24/2020, or without at least 52 week data of valid prices/NAVs during 2017:02-2020:01.
- Final sample: 485 CEFs. Sample period: 2019:12-2020:05.
- Main dependent variable:  $Discount_{it} = 100 \times \frac{NAV_{it} P_{it}}{NAV_{it}}$ .
- Main measure of (ex-ante) exposure to individual investor sentiment: sentiment beta  $(Beta_i^S)$  calculated using weekly data over 2017:02-2020:01.
- Dummy  $POST_t$  equals 1 if day t is on or after 02/24/2020 and zero otherwise.
- Control variables follow e.g., Pontiff (1996) and Bradley et al. (2010).



Fig. 2: The average CEF discount over time.

	Discount	Discount	Discount	Discou		
POST	4.33***	3.63***	3.99***	4.03**		
	(13.25)	(7.58)	(4.82)	(4.73		
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Fund Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		

Tab. 1: Effect of COVID-19 on CEF Discounts

Figure 2 and Table 1 show that the average CEF discount increased substantially after the COVID-19 outbreak, which supports Hypothesis 1.

To test Hypothesis 2, the following DiD specification is used:

 $Discount_{it} = \mathbf{b}_0 Beta_i^S \times POST_t + b_1 X_{it} + \gamma_i + \gamma_t + \epsilon_{it}.$ 

	Discount	Discount	Discount	Discou
$Beta^S \times POST$	0.82***	0.77***	0.77***	0.72**
	(4.15)	(3.98)	(3.96)	(3.50
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fund Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Time Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Tab. 2: Main Difference-in-Differences (DiD) Results.

## **Results Cont.**

• Table 2 shows that CEFs with higher  $Beta_i^S$  experienced a larger increase in discounts after the COVID-19 outbreak, which supports Hypothesis 2. • Parallel trends assumption satisfied:



Fig. 3: Trends in discounts for high sentiment beta and low sentiment beta CEFs.

- Main DiD results are:
  - Robust to using retail ownership as an alternative measure of exposure to individual investor sentiment.
  - Robust to using March 11, 2020 (when the WHO announced COVID-19) as a pandemic) as an alternative date of the COVID-19 outbreak.
  - Unlikely to be driven by alternative channels such as the liquidity, expense, payout, and leverage channels.

## Conclusion

- Using the novel setting of COVID-19, this paper shows the causal effect of individual investor sentiment on CEF discounts.
- Results also support the use of the CEF discount as a measure of investor sentiment (Baker and Wurgler 2006, 2007).

### References

Bradley, M., Brav, A., Goldstein, I., Jiang, W., 2010. Activist arbitrage: A study of open-ending attempts of closed-end funds. Journal of Financial Economics 95, 1–19.

Baker, M., Wurgler, J., 2006. Investor sentiment and the cross-section of stock returns. Journal of Finance 61, 1645–1680.

Baker, M., Wurgler, J., 2007. Investor sentiment in the stock market. Journal of Economic Perspectives 21, 129–152.

Cherkes, M., 2012. Closed-end funds: A survey. Annual Review of Financial Economics 4, 431–445.

De Long, J. B., Shleifer, A., Summers, L. H., Waldmann, R. J., 1990. Noise trader risk in financial markets. Journal of Political Economy 98, 703–738. Lee, C., Shleifer, A., Thaler, R. H., 1991. Investor sentiment and the closed-end fund puzzle. Journal of Finance 46, 75–109. Pratt, E. J., 1966. Myths associated with closed-end investment company dis-

counts. Financial Analysts Journal 22, 79–82. Pontiff, J., 1996. Costly arbitrage: Evidence from closed-end funds. Quarterly Journal of Economics 111, 1135–1151.

unt \*\*

unt \*\* (1)

