INTELLIGENT INVESTOR

Raj Kumar

INTELLIGENT INVESTOR

INTELLIGENT INVESTOR

Raj Kumar

ALEXIS PRESS

Published by: Alexis Press, LLC, Jersey City, USA
www.alexispress.us

© RESERVED

This book contains information obtained from highly regarded resources.
Copyright for individual contents remains with the authors.
A wide variety of references are listed. Reasonable efforts have been made to publish reliable data and information, but the author and the publisher cannot assume responsibility for the validity of all materials or for the consequences of their use.

No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted, or utilized in any form by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereinafter invented, including photocopying, microfilming and recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission from the publishers.

For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from this work please access alexispress.us

First Published 2023

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Intelligent Investor by *Raj Kumar*

ISBN 979-8-89161-404-8

CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Comparisons between Investments versus Speculation 1

— *Raj Kumar*

Chapter 2. Analyzing the Relationship between Investor and Inflation 10

— *Poonam Singh*

Chapter 3. General Portfolio Policy: The Defensive Investor 19

— *Thejus R Kartha*

Chapter 4. The Defensive Investor and Common Stocks 28

— *Jaimine Vaishnav*

Chapter 5. Portfolio Policy for the Enterprising Investor: Negative Approach 36

— *Bineet Naresh Desai*

Chapter 6. Exploring the Fields for Enterprising Investment 44

— *Shoaib Mohammed*

Chapter 7. A Comprehensive Review of Investor and Market Fluctuations 54

— *Hemal Thakker*

Chapter 8. Exploring Investment Fund Options: A Comprehensive Guide 61

— *Sadaf Haseen Hashmi*

Chapter 9. Investment Counsel and Trust Services of Banks 68

— *Somayya Madakam*

Chapter 10. CFA Certificate for Financial Analysts: An Analysis 76

— *Puneet Tulsiyan*

Chapter 11. Factors Affecting the Capitalization Rate: A Review Study 84

— *Aditya Kashyap*

Chapter 12. Stock Selection for the Enterprising Investor 96

— *Shilpi Kulshrestha*

CHAPTER 1

COMPARISONS BETWEEN INVESTMENTS VERSUS SPECULATION

Raj Kumar, Assistant Professor
Department of uGDX, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India
Email Id-raj.kumar@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:
This paper explores the dichotomy between investment and speculation, shedding light on the distinct characteristics, objectives, and risks associated with each financial activity. While both investment and speculation involve deploying capital in financial markets to generate returns, their fundamental differences lie in the underlying principles guiding decision-making and the time horizon of the participants. Investment is traditionally characterized by a strategic and long-term approach, emphasizing the careful analysis of fundamental factors such as company performance, economic indicators, and market trends. Investors seek to build wealth steadily over time, often relying on diversification and compounding to mitigate risks and achieve financial goals. On the other hand, speculation is marked by a more short-term and opportunistic mindset, where participants often take calculated risks in pursuit of quick profits. Speculators may rely on technical analysis, market sentiment, and short-term trends, making their strategies inherently more volatile and subject to rapid market fluctuations. The paper delves into the various financial instruments used in both investment and speculation, highlighting the differences in risk management, research methodologies, and decision-making processes. Additionally, it examines the impact of external factors such as market conditions, economic events, and regulatory environments on the outcomes of both practices.

KEYWORDS:

Assets, Risk, Returns, Strategy, Volatility.

INTRODUCTION

The opinions that will be presented in the next sections will be summarized in this. Specifically, our goal is to first refine our idea of a suitable portfolio policy for the average, non-professional investor. This word will be used in contrast to "speculator" throughout. We sought to precisely define the distinction between the two as follows in our 1934 paper Security Analysis: An investing activity is defined as one that, after careful examination, guarantees both a sufficient return and the protection of the capital. Any operations that don't adhere to these guidelines are risky[1], [2].

In the 38 years that have passed, we have clung firmly to this definition, but it is important to recognize the significant shifts in how the word "investor" has been used. Following the massive market crash of 1929–1932, most people believed that all common stocks were inherently speculative. We were thus forced to defend our definition against the accusation that it gave the idea of investment an excessively broad connotation. Our issue now is of a different kind. We have to stop our viewers from falling for the prevalent lingo that refers to everyone who is involved in the stock market as an "investor." We referenced the following title from a front-page story published in June 1962 in our premier financial newspaper in our previous edition. Small investors are pessimistic and are shorting oddlots. The same

publication published an editorial criticizing "reckless investors" in October 1970, who were this time making rash purchases. These statements effectively highlight the long-standing uncertainty about the meanings of investment and speculation. Consider our above-mentioned definition of investment and contrast it with the sale of a small number of stock shares by an unskilled individual on the open market who does not even own the shares, but is primarily motivated by emotion to believe that he will be able to repurchase them at a significantly lower cost. More broadly, the word "reckless investors" may be seen as a ridiculous contradiction in terms, akin to "spendthrift misers," if this misapplication of language had not been done maliciously.

The term "investor" was used by the newspaper in these cases because, in Wall Street parlance, anybody who purchases or sells a securities is considered an investor, regardless of the kind of asset purchased, its intended use, its price, or whether it is done with cash or on margin. Contrast this with the public's perception of common stocks in 1948, when more than 90% of those surveyed said they were against buying common stocks. Roughly 50% of respondents said "not safe, a gamble" and another 50% cited "not familiar with." The study that Graham mentions is hilarious in fact; it was carried out by the University of Michigan for the Federal Reserve and published in the Federal Reserve Bulletin in July 1948. Say a guy chooses not to spend his money, was the question posed to the public. He has three options for where to place it: a bank, bonds, or investments. What do you believe would be the best course of action for him to take these days with the moneybanking it, investing it in real estate, purchasing common stock, or buying savings bonds? Just 4% of respondents believed that common stock would provide a “satisfactory” return; 26% said it was “not safe” or a “gamble.”

The stock market experienced one of its highest 10-year returns in history from 1949 to 1958. However, at a time when common stocks were selling at an extremely attractive price and were about to make their greatest advance in history, common stock purchases of all kinds were generally viewed as highly speculative or risky; on the other hand, the very fact that they had advanced to what were clearly dangerous levels as judged by past experience later transformed them into “investments,” and the general public who bought stocks into “investors. It is concerning when this line in common stock investing and speculation disappears since it has always been helpful. We have said repeatedly that Wall Street as an organization would be wise to bring back this difference and to make sure everyone knows about it when interacting with the public. If not, the stock exchanges may eventually be held accountable for significant speculative losses that those who experienced them had not received enough warning about. Ironically, it seems that the inclusion of speculative common stocks in their capital funds is much to blame for the current financial embarrassment of several stock-exchange corporations. We hope that after reading this, the reader will have a fair understanding of the dangers associated with common stock commitments. These risks are inextricably linked to the profit-making potential they provide, and the investor must account for both in their calculations[3], [4].

The aforementioned suggests that a simple, pure investment strategy consisting of representative common stocks may no longer exist since it would always be impossible to purchase them at a price that would not entail a market or "quotation" loss significant enough to cause unease. Most of the time, an investor has to acknowledge that some of his common stock holdings are speculative. It is his responsibility to maintain this element within reasonable bounds and to be psychologically and financially ready for unfavorable outcomes that might last for a short while or a long time.It would be helpful to include two lines on stock speculation in general as opposed to the intrinsic speculative component, which is now

averaging 18.7% yearly. A BusinessWeek poll at year-end 2002 revealed that, in a curious reversal of that early Fed study, just 24% of investors were inclined to increase their investments in mutual funds or stock portfolios, down from 47% only three years before, in the majority of representative common stocks. Speculating openly is not unethical nor unlawful, nor is it financially advantageous. Furthermore, some speculating is both required and inevitable since, in many common-stock scenarios, there are significant opportunities for both profit and loss, and someone has to take on the associated risks. Just as there is intelligent investment, there is intelligent speculating. However, there are several ways that conjecture might be stupid. The most common ones are: speculating when you believe you are investing; speculating seriously rather than as a hobby; speculating when you lack the necessary expertise; and speculating with more money than you can afford to lose[5], [6].

According to our conservative perspective, every nonprofessional who trades on leverage needs to understand that he is effectively speculating, and his broker should be responsible for informing him of this. Furthermore, anybody who purchases a purportedly “hot” common stock issuance or anything like it is engaging in either speculation or gambling. When you are ahead of the game, speculation can be a lot of fun and is always entertaining. Set aside a percentage of your wealth in a separate fund for this reason, the lesser the better, if you wish to try your hand at it. Never top up this account with more funds merely because the Speculation is advantageous in two ways: Firstly, in the absence of speculation, nascent enterprises would be unable to obtain the required funds for growth. The oil that keeps the wheels of invention turning is the seductive, long-shot possibility of a massive benefit. Second, each time a stock is purchased or sold, risk is transferred. The principal risk that this stock may decline is acquired by the buyer.

The possibility that the stock the seller just sold might increase in value is still a residual risk that he has! With a margin account, you may use the money you borrow from the brokerage company to purchase stocks. When you invest using borrowed funds, you stand to gain more when equities rise, but you also run the risk of losing everything when they fall. The value of the assets in your account serves as security for the loan; thus, if the value decreases below the amount borrowed, you will need to provide more funds. Outcomes the Defensive Investor Should Expect. As we've previously established, a defensive investor values safety and trouble-free living above all else. What path should he take generally, and assuming "average normal conditions" do exist, what kind of return can he anticipate? To address these queries, we will first review our writing from seven years ago on the topic, then look at any notable alterations to the fundamental elements influencing the investor's expected return, and lastly discuss what the investor should do and anticipate in the current environment.

We suggested that the investor split his holdings between premium bonds and top-performing common stocks; that the percentage of bonds held should never be less than 25% or greater than 75%, with the opposite always being true for the common-stock component; that the easiest option would be to keep a 50–50 split between the two, making adjustments to bring it back to parity when, say, 5% of market developments had upset it. As an alternate approach, he might decide to move his common-stock component toward the maximum of 75% "if he felt that a decline in stock prices was making them increasingly attractive" or decrease it to 25% "if he felt the market was dangerously high. About 41.2% of excellent tax-able bonds and 31.4% of superb tax-free bonds were available to investors in 1965. Leading common stocks had a dividend return of just around 3.2%. Several facts, including this one, advised caution. According to our implied expectations, "at normal levels of the market," the investor should be able to receive an initial dividend return on his stock purchases of between 31-22% and 41-22%. To this should be added a consistent increase in the underlying value of a

representative stock list of roughly the same amount, resulting in an annual return from dividends and appreciation of roughly 71.2%. Before income tax, the divide of stocks and bonds in half would produce around 6%. We also said that a reasonable level of protection against a decline in buying power due to widespread inflation should be provided by the equity component.

It should be noted that the mathematics above predicted a much slower pace of stock market advancement than had actually been seen between 1949 and 1964. For listed equities overall, that rate had averaged much higher than 10%, and it was widely considered a kind of assurance that equally positive outcomes might be anticipated going forward. The idea that historically high rates of advancement indicate stock prices are "now too high" and that, as a consequence, "the wonderful results since 1949 would imply not very good but bad results for the future" attracted little attention.

DISCUSSION

While first-grade bond prices have recovered significantly from their 1970 lows, the primary shift since 1964 has been the increase in interest rates to all-time highs. Good corporate issues may now provide returns of around 71.2%, which is much higher than the 41.2% in 1964. As we write, the dividend return on DJIA-type companies has decreased to less than 3.5% from 3.2% at the end of 1964, although it did have a good rise during the 1969–70 market collapse. During this era, the market price of medium-term bonds had a maximum decrease of around 38% due to the shift in interest rates. These advancements have a paradoxical quality. We spoke a lot in 1964 about the prospect that stock prices were too high and would eventually see a significant collapse, but we didn't address the idea that high-grade bond prices may have the same fate. In light of the events that have transpired subsequently, we believe that the cautionalong with the accompanying examplesthat “a long-term bond may vary widely in price in response to changes in interest rates” was not appropriately emphasized.

The truth is that, even at the lowest point in 1970, the investor's estimated loss would have been less than that of reputable long-term bonds if he had invested the same amount in the DJIA at its closing price of 874 in 1964. He would have made a tiny profit on the index in late 1971. But if he had limited his bond-type investments to short-term corporate issues, U.S. savings bonds, or savings accounts, he would have avoided a loss in the market value of his principle during this time and received a better income return than what strong stocks might have provided. Therefore, it turned out that, in 1964, genuine "cash equivalents" outperformed ordinary stocks as investments—despite the inflation experience that, in principle, should have favored stocks over cash. Good longer-term bonds' stated principal value declined as a result of events in the money market, an obscure sector that typically has little impact on people's investing decisions. This is simply one more instance in a never-ending string of events that have shown that security price predictions are never accurate. Bond prices have often varied much less than stock prices, so investors can normally purchase quality bonds with any maturity and not worry about fluctuations in the market value. This norm had a few exceptions, and the years following 1964 turned out to be one of them. We will discuss changes in bond prices in greater detail later[7], [8].

Policies and Expectations in Late 1971 and Early 1972

By the end of 1971, strong medium-term corporate bonds might earn 8% taxable interest, while good state or municipal securities could earn 5.7% tax-free interest. Regarding U.S. government issues that are due in five years, the investor may earn around 6% in the shorter-term sector. In the latter instance, the purchaser need not worry about it. Reread Graham's statement and take notice of what the greatest authority on investing is saying: Security prices

never predict the future. As you continue reading, take note of how every other piece of information Graham gives you is intended to support you in facing that reality. You have to learn to anticipate and manage your own behavior since you have no influence over how the markets will behave. A potential decline in market value, given that he is certain to get his whole investment back, along with the 6% income, after a very short holding time. The DJIA yields just 3.5% when it is at its recurring price level of 900 in 1971.

Assume for the moment that, as in the past, the primary policy choice is how to allocate the fund between top DJIA-type equities and high-grade bonds. In the absence of compelling evidence to support a firm forecast of either a substantial upward or negative movement shortly, what path should an investor take given the current circumstances? Let us first emphasize that the conservative investor should be able to depend on the current 3.5% dividend yield on his stocks and an average yearly increase of around 4%, provided that there is no significant negative change. This appreciation is mostly predicated on the many corporations reinvesting a matching amount each year from undistributed earnings, as we will explain later. The average aggregate return of his equities would thus be, say, 7.5% before taxes, which is somewhat less than his interest on high-grade bonds. The average return on equities would be around 5.3% after taxes.This would be comparable to what is already available on quality medium-term, tax-free bonds[9], [10].

Compared to our 1964 research, these expectations are now substantially less advantageous for equities against bonds. How accurate was Graham's prediction? At first glance, everything seems to be going rather nicely: from the start of 1972 to the close of 1981, stocks returned an average of 6.5% annually. But throughout this time, inflation roared at 8.6% yearly, wiping out every gain that equities made. Graham summarizes the "Gordon equation" in this portion of his book, which states that the future return of the stock market is equal to the sum of the present dividend yield and projected profit growth. Given the dividend yield of little less than 2% at the beginning of 2003, 2% long-term profit growth, and slightly over 2% inflation, it is reasonable to assume an average annual return of 6% in the future. because the principal and interest payments on quality bonds are more secure and, thus, more predictable than stock dividends and price growth. As a result, we are compelled to conclude that, at this point in 1971, investing in bonds seems to be a better option than investing in stocks. We would have to tell the defensive investor to invest all of his money in bonds and none in common stocks until the existing yield relationship significantly shifts in favor of stocks if we could be certain that this conclusion is correct.

Naturally, therefore, we cannot guarantee that bonds will perform better than equities at their current prices. Immediately, the reader will consider inflation to be a strong argument against. In the following, we'll make the case that, given the current yield differentials, choosing stocks over bonds is not justified given the substantial experience with inflation in the US over the last century. However, there's always the chancewhich we see as remoteof an acceleration of inflation, which would have to somehow make stocks more advantageous than bonds with set dollar maturities. The other possibilitywhich we also see as very unlikelyis that American industry would grow to such a degree of prosperity that, in the absence of higher inflation, common stock prices will see a significant rise in the coming years. Lastly, the more likely scenario is that the stock market will see yet another massive speculative gain without any true basis in the underlying values. Even at current more enticing yield levels, the investor may come to regret a 100% concentration in bonds for any of these reasonsand maybe some more we haven't considered.

Therefore, following this condensed discussion of the key factors, we reiterate the same fundamental compromise strategy. Since the introduction of Treasury Inflation-Protected

Securities in 1997, stocks have no longer been the unquestionably better option for investors who anticipate rising inflation. Unlike other bonds, TIPS increase in value in response to an increase in the Consumer Price Index, therefore protecting the holder against inflation-related financial loss. Indeed, stocks are a pretty poor hedge against rising rates of inflation and offer no such assurance. For defensive investorsthat is, to maintain a sizeable portion of their assets in stocks and a sizeable portion in bond-like securities at all times. It is nevertheless true that they have the option to stick with a straightforward 50–50 split between the two components or, based on their judgment, choose a ratio that ranges from a minimum of 25% to a maximum of 75% of either. We will discuss these alternate approaches in further depth at a later time.

No matter how an investor allocates his funds between the two components, his current expected return will not vary much since the total return from bonds and common stocks is now almost equal. According to the calculations above, the combined return from the two components should be around 5.5% tax-free or 7.8% before taxes. Over the majority of the long run, this order's return has been noticeably greater than that of the average cautious investor. It may not sound appealing when compared to the about 14% return that common stocks demonstrated over the course of the 20 years when the market was mostly bullish after 1949. However, it should be kept in mind that the DJIA's price increased more than five times between 1949 and 1969, while its profits and dividends almost doubled over that same period. Therefore, rather than underlying company values, the majority of the spectacular market record for that period was based on a shift in the views of investors and speculators. In that sense, it certainly qualifies as a "bootstrap operation [11], [12].

The defensive investor's common-stock portfolio has only been covered about leading issues, which are comprised of the 30 components that make up the Dow Jones Industrial Average. We didn't do this to suggest that he should buy only these 30 issues; rather, we did it for convenience. In actuality, there are several additional businesses with calibers that either match or surpass the average of the Dow Jones list; these would include a wide range of public utilities. The Standard & Poor's 500-stock index and the Wilshire 5000 index are currently the most accessible alternatives to the Dow Jones Industrial Average. The 500 major, well-known companies that comprise the S&P account for around 70% of the whole value of the U.S. equities market. The main takeaway from this is that the defensive investor's overall results are unlikely to differ significantly from one diversified or representative list to another, or, more precisely, that neither he nor his advisers could predict with certainty whatever differences would eventually develop. The Wilshire 5000 tracks the returns of almost every significant, publicly traded company. It is true that choosing investments that would outperform the overall market is seen to be a key component of the art of skillful or clever investing. We are doubtful that defensive investors can, in general, achieve higher than average resultsthat is, surpass their total performancefor reasons that will be discussed later. Let's use an example to demonstrate our argument, which would first seem to demonstrate the reverse. From December 1960 to December 1970, the DJIA increased by 36%, from 616 to 839. However, the much bigger Standard & Poor's weighted index of 500 companies increased by 58%, from 58.11 to 92.15, over the same period. It was clear that the second group was a greater "buy" than the first. However, who would have been so imprudent as to assume in 1960 that the aristocratic "thirty tyrants" of the Dow would unquestionably be outperformed by what seemed to be a random mix of all types of ordinary stocks? We maintain that all of this evidence shows that accurate forecasts of price changes, whether absolute or relative, are uncommon. Without apologizing, we will reiterate here that purchasing new offerings or "hot" securities of any kindthat is, those suggested for a rapid profitwill not provide an investor with better-than-average results. In the long run, however,

the opposite is almost certainly to be true. The defensive investor is limited to holdings in significant businesses that have a track record of profitable operations and sound financial standing.

As we wrap off this part, let me to quickly discuss three complementary ideas or strategies for the defensive investor. The first is that instead of building his portfolio of ordinary stocks, he buys shares of reputable investment vehicles. He may also use one of the "common trust funds," also known as "commingled funds," which are managed by banks and trust businesses in several states.

Alternatively, if he has a sizable amount of money, he may hire a reputable investment advisory company. He will be able to manage his investment program professionally and according to standards thanks to this. The third technique is called "dollar-cost averaging," which essentially means that the practitioner makes the same number of monthly or quarterly investments in common equities. As a result, he purchases more shares during periods of low market activity than during periods of high activity, increasing the likelihood that he will get a fair price on all of his holdings. This approach is, strictly speaking, a subset of a broader strategy known as "formula investing," which was previously mentioned in our suggestion that the investor may adjust his holdings of common stocks between the minimum of 25% and the maximum of 75%, in inverse relation to market movement. These concepts make sense for cautious investors, and we'll talk about them in more detail in subsequent

Outcomes the Aggressive Investor Is Expecting

Naturally, our entrepreneurial security buyer will aim for and anticipate greater total outcomes than his passive or defensive partner. He must first ensure that his outcomes won't be worse. Bringing a lot of enthusiasm, research, and natural talent to Wall Street and losing money is not a hard trick to pull off. If these qualities are used improperly, they might be mistaken for disabilities. Therefore, the ambitious investor must begin with a thorough understanding ofLet's start by talking about a few strategies that traders and investors have used to try to outperform the market. Among them are:

Engaging in market trading.

This often entails purchasing stocks during a period of market advancement and selling them during a period of market decline. The stocks that are chosen are probably some of the ones that have been "behaving" better than the average for the market. Short selling is a common practice among a tiny percentage of professionals. Here, they will use the existing stock market process to sell issues that they have borrowed rather than owned. Their goal is to purchase these issues back at a discount to what they sold them for, profiting from a later decrease in their value.

Temporal selectivity

Purchasing stocks of companies that are projected to post higher profits or that are expected to see some other positive development is what this signifies.

Extended selectivity

In this case, the focus is often on a strong track record of previous growth that is anticipated to continue in the future. In some instances, the "investor" may also choose businesses that have not yet produced noteworthy outcomes but are anticipated to do so in the future. We have already said that we do not believe the investor will be successful in these areas of operation generally. The first has been excluded from the investing arena for theoretical and

practical reasons. Further information about stock trading will be provided in a later section. Stock trading is not an activity "which, on thorough analysis, offers the safety of principal and a satisfactory return."

The investor encounters two types of challenges in his pursuit of choosing the most promising equities, one related to human fallibility and the other related to the competitive environment. His prediction of the future might be off, or even if it is correct, the present price on the market could already completely account for his expectations. Regarding near-term selectivity, Wall Street often considers the company's current year performance as common knowledge, whereas projected prospects for the next year are already being closely evaluated.

Therefore, an investor who chooses investments primarily based on the exceptional performance of this year or what they are informed they may anticipate for the next year is likely to discover that others have made the same decision for the same reason.

When selecting equities based on their long-term potential, investors have similar handicaps. There is no question that there is a higher chance of an outright forecast mistake than there is when working with near-term earnings, as our airline example on page 6 shows. Theoretically, an investor stands to gain a great deal by correctly predicting when Wall Street goes astray in these kinds of projections since the experts often get it wrong. That is all theoretical, however. How many astute investors could rely on possessing the sagacity or precognitive talent to surpass expert analysts in their preferred game of projecting long-term future earnings?

CONCLUSION

The contrast between speculation and investment highlights the important differences that influence the financial environment. Even while money is used in both activities to generate returns, there are significant distinctions in technique, mentality, and time horizon that have a significant impact on both participants and the larger financial ecosystem. Investors value careful consideration of basic variables, cautious risk management, and long-term wealth building. Their decisions are driven by a strategic and long-term outlook. They often use compounding and their dedication to a diverse portfolio as strong defenses against market volatility. Conversely, speculation, which is distinguished by its short-term orientation and readiness to take measured risks, aims to make quick money by taking advantage of opportunities. Speculators recognize the inherent volatility of their tactics and often depend on technical analysis, market emotion, and short-term trends. Understanding the range between these two strategies, market players need to balance risk and return considerations according to their risk tolerance and financial objectives. Additionally, the research highlights the influence of outside variables on speculation as well as investment, highlighting the fluid character of financial markets.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Sultana, N. Zulkifli, and D. Zainal, “Environmental, social and governance (ESG) and investment decision in Bangladesh,” *Sustain.*, 2018.

[2] C. T. Nguyen and L. T. Trinh, “The impacts of public investment on private investment and economic growth: Evidence from Vietnam,” *J. Asian Bus. Econ. Stud.*, 2018.

[3] M. Benlemlih and M. Bitar, “Corporate Social Responsibility and Investment Efficiency,” *J. Bus. Ethics*, 2018.

[4] M. Leković, “Investment diversification as a strategy for reducing investment risk,” *Ekon. horizonti*, 2018.

[5] J. C. Sort and C. Nielsen, “Using the business model canvas to improve investment processes,” *J. Res. Mark. Entrep.*, 2018.

[6] A. Geddes, T. S. Schmidt, and B. Steffen, “The multiple roles of state investment banks in low-carbon energy finance: An analysis of Australia, the UK and Germany,” *Energy Policy*, 2018.

[7] I. Lee and Y. J. Shin, “Fintech: Ecosystem, business models, investment decisions, and challenges,” *Bus. Horiz.*, 2018.

[8] A. Puška, A. Beganovic, and S. Šadic, “Model for investment decision making by applying the multi-criteria analysis method,” *Serbian J. Manag.*, 2018.

[9] J. Hu, R. Harmsen, W. Crijns-Graus, and E. Worrell, “Barriers to investment in utility-scale variable renewable electricity (VRE) generation projects,” *Renewable Energy*. 2018.

[10] B. Dudić, J. Smoleň, Z. Dudić, and V. Mirković, “Support for foreign direct investment inflows in Serbia,” *Econ. Ann.*, 2018.

[11] C. J. Rutten, W. Steeneveld, A. G. J. M. Oude Lansink, and H. Hogeveen, “Delaying investments in sensor technology: The rationality of dairy farmers’ investment decisions illustrated within the framework of real options theory,” *J. Dairy Sci.*, 2018.

[12] V. Cherkasova and E. Kuzmin, “Financial flexibility as an investment efficiency factor in Asian companies,” *Gadjah Mada Int. J. Bus.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 2

ANALYZING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INVESTOR AND INFLATION

Poonam Singh, Associate Professor
Department of ISME,ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India
Email Id-poonam.singh@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:
The intricate relationship between investors and inflation, exploring the multifaceted impact of inflationary pressures on investment strategies, portfolio management, and wealth preservation. Inflation, as a persistent economic phenomenon, has the potential to erode the purchasing power of currency over time, presenting challenges and opportunities for investors across various asset classes. The study begins by examining the historical context of inflation and its cyclical nature, providing insights into the factors contributing to rising prices and their repercussions on financial markets. It then analyzes the diverse investment vehicles available to investors seeking to hedge against inflation, such as real assets, commodities, and inflation-protected securities. Furthermore, the paper explores the nuanced strategies investors employ to adapt to inflationary environments, including the consideration of dividend-paying stocks, floating-rate bonds, and alternative investments. Risk management techniques, diversification strategies, and the role of central bank policies in mitigating inflationary risks are also discussed in the context of investor decision-making. The research emphasizes the importance of an adaptive and well-informed investment approach in the face of changing inflationary dynamics. By assessing the potential winners and losers in various asset classes during inflationary periods, investors can tailor their portfolios to enhance resilience and capitalize on emerging opportunities.

KEYWORDS:

Decision-Making, Diversification, Financial Goals, Market Conditions, Long-Term, Short-Term.

INTRODUCTION

As a result, we arrive at the following reasonable yet unsettling conclusion: Investors must adhere to policies that are fundamentally solid, promising, and unpopular on Wall Street if they want to have a fair chance of continuing to achieve better-than-average performance. Exist any such insurance that the intrepid investor may access? Again, the answer should be yes in principle, and there are good grounds to believe that this is also the case in actuality. It is common knowledge that speculative stock movements are often overdone in both directions, both in the overall market and consistently in certain specific concerns. In addition, a common stock may be undervalued due to apathy or unwarranted public prejudice. We may even go so far as to say that, in an astoundingly high percentage of common stock trading, the participants don't seem to recognize, to put it politely, one part of their anatomy from another. We will highlight many instances of price and value disparities in this. Therefore, it would seem that any intelligent individual with a keen sense of observation should have a nice picnic on Wall Street, fending against the folly of others. It seems that way, but things aren't quite so cut-and-dry. Purchasing a neglected and, hence, undervalued problem for financial gain usually turns out to be a lengthy and patient process. Additionally, selling short a too well-liked and so overpriced issue is likely to be a test of

one's financial resources as well as bravery and endurance. The idea is sound, and it is not hard to apply well, but mastering this technique is by no means simple[1], [2].

Additionally, there is a sizable category of "special situations" that, for a considerable amount of time, might be relied upon to provide a respectable yearly return of 20% or higher with the least amount of risk possible for those well-versed in this industry. These consist of intersociety arbitrages, liquidation payments or workouts, and certain types of protective hedges. The most common scenario is a planned merger or acquisition that offers some shares at a price that is much higher than what they were valued at on the announcement date. The volume of these transactions has skyrocketed in the last several years, and for the elite, this ought to have been a very lucrative time. However, as merger announcements multiplied, so did barriers to mergers and acquisitions that fell through; as a result, these once-reliable businesses suffered many individual losses. Perhaps excessive competition also hurt the total rate of profit. When you "sell short" a stock, you are wagering against an increase in the company's share price. Three steps make up the shorting process: You borrow shares from someone who owns them first; you then sell the borrowed shares right away; and last, you replace the borrowed shares with shares that you purchase later. You will be able to purchase your replacement shares for less money if the stock declines. Your gross profit is the difference between the price you received for the replacement shares and the price at which you sold the shares you borrowed. However, your potential loss is limitless if the stock price rises rather than falls, which makes short sales too risky for the majority of individual investors[3], [4].

Wall Street established institutional arbitrage desks in the late 1980s in response to the surge in aggressive corporate takeovers and leveraged buyouts, hoping to benefit from price mistakes in these intricate transactions. They grew so proficient at it that the quick money vanished and a large number of these desks were shut down. Graham does talk about it again, but for most individuals, this kind of trading is no longer viable or suitable since only deals involving millions of dollars may result in significant returns. This approach is available to wealthy people and institutions via hedge funds that focus on merger or "event" arbitrage.

Throughout the nineteenth century, the Rothschild family, headed by Nathan Mayer Rothschild, dominated European brokerage and investment banking. Anomalies were easy to detect; for a fascinating history, see Niall Ferguson, The House of Rothschild: Money's Prophets, 1798–1848. A list of the almost 200 publications of this kind that were on the market was released in 1957. Almost all of these bargain issues proved to be profitable in one way or another, and the average yearly return was far higher than that of most other investments. However, they also all but vanished from the stock market over the next ten years, taking with them a reliable domain for astute and prosperous maneuvering by the entrepreneurial investor. Nonetheless, a sizable number of these "sub-working-capital" issues reappeared at the low prices of 1970, and even with the market's robust recovery, there were still enough of them by the end of the year to constitute a full-sized portfolio.

In the current climate, an ambitious investor still has several opportunities to outperform the market. A reasonable percentage of the massive list of market securities that meet rational and fairly reliable conditions for being undervalued must be included. On average, they should provide better outcomes than the DJIA or any other comparable representative list. We believe that an investor should not hunt for them until he reasonably expect to increase the average yearly return from the equity component of his portfolio by, say, 5% before taxes. We will work to create one or more of these methods for choosing stocks so that active investors may utilize them. The public's consciousness has been heavily focused on inflation and the battle against it in recent years. Wall Street's thinking has been profoundly impacted

by the previous shrinking of the dollar's buying power, and especially by the fear of a significant additional decrease in the future. Those on fixed incomes would be negatively impacted by rising living expenses, and this also holds for people on set dollar principles. On the other side, stockholders may be able to offset a decline in the value of the dollar by increases in dividend payments and share prices.

These indisputable facts have led several financial experts to conclude that bonds are by their very nature an unfavorable kind of investment and that common stocks are thus more desirable than bonds. Chari institutions have reportedly received advice to allocate 100% of their portfolio to equities and 0% to bonds. Compared to the past, when trust investments could only be made in high-grade bonds due to legal restrictions, this is a significant turnaround. Our readers must be astute enough to understand that, in any given scenariothat is, regardless of how high the stock market may rise and how low the present dividend yield may be in comparison to bond rateseven premium stocks cannot be a superior investment than bonds. Such a claim would be as ridiculous as the opposite one, which was all too often made years ago and according to which any bond is safer than any stock. To draw some conclusions about the degree to which an investor may be prudently affected by assumptions about future increases in the price level, we will attempt to apply several metrics to the inflation element in this[5], [6].

Like with a great deal of other financial issues, we have to base our opinions about future policy on historical experience. Is inflation, at least in the severe shape it has assumed since 1965, a novel concept for our nation? What can we learn from past experiences dealing with inflation to combat the inflation of today if we have seen similar inflations in real life? First, let's look at a simplified historical table that provides a wealth of information on shifts in the overall price level and the corresponding shifts in the market value and profits of common stocks. Our timeline will start in 1915 and span 55 years, with five-year gaps between each entry. First thing we observe is that there has been a lot of inflation in the past. The cost of living almost doubled from 1915 and 1920, which was the biggest five-year dosage. In contrast, a 15% advancement occurred between 1965 and 1970. There have been six periods of increases at varied rates, some very slight, in between the three eras of dropping prices. Based on this data, the investor should explicitly factor in the likelihood that inflation would continue or reoccur.

Our does not provide a definitive answer; it displays a wide range of options. But it would make sense to use the rather consistent track record of the last 20 years as a guide. Throughout this time, the consumer price level has increased by 2.5% year on average; from 1965 to 1970, it increased by 4.5%, and in 1970 alone, it increased by 5.4%. There are many reasons to think that federal programs will be more successful going forward than they have been in previous years, despite official government policy being vehemently opposed to widespread inflation. At this time, we believe it would be appropriate for an investor to base his judgments and thoughts on an estimated 3% annual rate of future inflation. It would consume around half of the income now available on decent medium-term tax-free bonds due to increased living expenses. Although this decrease would be significant, it shouldn't be overstated. It wouldn't imply that the investor's riches would lose buying power or actual worth over time. Even in the face of 3% yearly inflation, he could keep this purchasing power if he spent half of his interest income after taxes.

Naturally, the following issue is, "Even at the historically high rate of return provided in 1970–1971, can the investor be reasonably confident that they will do better by purchasing and holding assets other than high-grade bonds?" For instance, would an all-stock program not be better than a part-bond, part-stock one? Are common stocks not practically certain to

provide a higher return over time than bonds, and do they not already have built-in inflation protection? Throughout the 55 years of our analysis, have stocks not served the investor significantly better than have bonds?

These questions have a fairly complex response. In the past, common stocks have outperformed bonds over extended periods of time. A yearly compound rate of around 4% may be derived from the DJIA's climb from an average of 77 in 1915 to an average of 753 in 1970. An additional 4% can be added for average dividend return. These all add up to 8%. It's uncommon for Graham to make a mistake like this. Inflation reached its greatest level since the conclusion of World War II in 1973, barely two years after President Richard Nixon enforced wage and price restrictions. At that time, it was 8.7%. Naturally, the annual returns on bonds over the same 55-year period are much inferior than those obtained from living expenses, which more than quadrupled during the most inflationary decade in modern American history, which lasted from 1973 to 1982. However, they are not more than what high-grade bonds now give. This leads us to our next logical question: Is there strong evidence that common stocks will do much better in the next years than they did over the last five and a half decades? We have to answer this important question with a resounding no. While it is not a given that common stocks would do better in the future than they have in the past, this is possible. Here, we have to deal with two distinct temporal components in investment outcomes. The first discusses what is anticipated to happen in the far future, let's say the next 25 years. The second pertains to the investor's expected outcomes within brief or intermediate timeframes, such as five years or fewer, in terms of both financial and psychological outcomes. His attitude, his fears and hopes, his contentment or discontentment with his actions, and most importantly, his decisions on what to do next, are all shaped by his experiences from year to year rather than by looking back on a lifetime of investment.

We can be categorical on this issue. The fluctuation of prices and profits of common stocks is not correlated with inflationary circumstances. The most recent era, 1966–1970, is an apparent example. The cost of living increased by 22%, the most in five years since 1946–1950. However, since 1965, stock values have decreased overall as well as in terms of profits. Similar discrepancies in both directions may be seen in the five-year records from earlier times.

DISCUSSION

Examining the profit rate on capital shown by American businesses is another, and maybe even more significant, method of approaching the topic. Naturally, this has varied with the overall pace of economic activity, but it hasn't shown a consistent trend to rise in tandem with the cost of living or wholesale pricing. In actuality, despite the period's inflation, this rate has decreased significantly during the last 20 years. Our thorough research has led us to the conclusion that investors cannot expect to earn much more than the 10% net tangible asset backing the shares, which is the most recent five-year rate achieved by the DJIA group. Because these issues' market value is far higher than their worth (900 vs. 560 in mid-1971, for example), the profits on the present market price only add up to around 61⁄4%. Our approach aligns with the prior notion that an investor may anticipate an average dividend return of around 3.5% on the market value of their equities, in addition to an annual appreciation of approximately 4% from reinvested profits. The reader would argue that ultimately, our calculations fail to account for the rise in common-stock prices and profits that would come from our 3% annual inflation projection. Our rationale stems from the lack of indication that a similar level of inflation in the past has had a discernible impact on reported profits per share. The cold figures show that the DJIA unit's earnings rise over the last 20 years has been entirely attributable to a proportionally big increase in invested capital

from reinvested profits. The "value" of previously existing capital would have increased if inflation had functioned as a distinct beneficial factor. This, in turn, should have increased the rate of profits on such old capital and, therefore, on the old and new capital combined. However, throughout the previous 20 years, during which the wholesale price level has increased by about 40%, nothing of has really occurred. Inflation can only increase the value of common stocks by increasing the rate of return on capital investment. Based on historical performance, this hasn't been the case[7], [8].

In previous economic cycles, increasing prices were associated with excellent business, while dropping prices were associated with bad business. Most people believed that "a little inflation" helped boost corporate profits. The history of 1950–1970, which shows a mix of usually ongoing prosperity and generally growing costs, does not refute this idea. However, the data shows that the impact of all of this on common-stock capital's earning potential has been quite little; in fact, it hasn't even helped to sustain the investment's rate of return. It is obvious that there have been significant counteracting factors that have kept American firms' overall actual profitability from rising. The two that have likely had the most impact on the ratio of sales to capital employed are the growth in pay rates that has outpaced the advances in productivity and the need for massive quantities of new capital[9], [10].

The public utility companies are seen by the stock market as the main victims of inflation as they are unable to raise their rates in compliance with regulations and are forced to bear the brunt of a significant increase in the cost of borrowing money. However, now may be the appropriate time to point out that these firms are in a solid strategic position for the future simply because the unit prices of gas, electricity, and telephone services have increased so much less than the overall price index. As with previous inflations, its stockholders will likely be protected by their legal right to charge rates high enough to provide a satisfactory return on their capital. Taking into account everything mentioned above, we conclude that an investor buying a portfolio of common stocks in the DJIA at the late 1971 price level had no reasonable expectation of earning more than an average total return of, say, 8%. However, there would be no argument for an all-stock investing program even if it turned out that these expectations were far lower than anticipated. If there is one certainty for the future, it is that the average yearly market value and profits of a stock portfolio will not increase at a consistent pace of four percent, or any other. As the venerable J. said it well. First of all, this indicates that John Pierpont Morgan, the most influential banker of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, was the common stock buyer at the current prices. He was often asked what the stock market would do next due to his enormous impact.

Options for Common Stocks as Hedges against Inflation

Buying and holding gold has been the traditional course of action for individuals who distrust their currencies all over the globe. Fortunately for them, American citizens have been prohibited from doing this since 1935. The price of gold on the open market has increased by just 35% over the last 35 years, from $35 per ounce in early 1972 to $48. However, the gold owner hasn't seen a return on his investment over this whole period and has instead had to pay yearly storage costs. Despite the increase in overall prices, he would have done considerably better investing his money at interest in a savings bank.

The almost total incapacity of gold to fend off a decline in the dollar's buying power raises serious concerns about the average investor's capacity to hedge against inflation by investing in "things."Graham was "dead wrong," according to finance guru Peter L. Bernstein, about precious metals, especially gold, which has shown a strong tendency to outpace inflation. Financial advisor William Bernstein concurs, noting that even a little investment in a

preciousmetals fund won't significantly reduce your total profits if gold performs badly. However, when gold performs well, its returns are often so amazing that they may even surpass 100%. Over time, the market value of certain items has increased dramatically, including diamonds, master-painted canvases, first edition books, rare coins and stamps, etc. However, the claimed prices seem to have an aspect of the precarious, artificial, or even unreal in many, if not most, of these situations. We realize we are out of our depth in this field, but it is difficult to see spending $67,500 for an 1804 U.S. silver dollar as an "investment operation." Not many of our readers will find swimming there to be simple and safe[11], [12].

Real estate ownership in its entirety has long been seen as a wise long-term investment that offers significant inflation protection. Regrettably, there are risks associated with salesmen's cunning; significant mistakes may be made about location, price paid, etc.; and real estate prices are also susceptible to large swings. Lastly, the investor with modest resources cannot benefit from diversification unless they engage in a variety of activities with others and accept the unique risks associated with new flotations, which are not all that different from owning ordinary stock. We are not in this field either. "Make sure it's yours before you go into it," is all we should advise the investor.

The Level of Stock Prices in Early 1972: A Century of Stock-Market History

The common stocks in an investor's portfolio will constitute a tiny portion of the vast and powerful entity known as the stock market. Adequate knowledge of the stock market's past is recommended by prudence, especially about significant price swings and the diverse correlations between company prices, profits, and dividends. With this background, he may be able to provide an informed assessment of the merits or drawbacks of the market's level as it develops over time. Fortuitously, valuable statistical information about prices, profits, and dividends can be traced back to 1871, a mere century ago. We will provide a significantly condensed version of the s with two items in view in this chapter. The first is to illustrate the overall process by which equities have advanced throughout the last century's several cycles. The second way to look at the image is to compare it to consecutive ten-year averages of stock prices, profits, and dividends. This will highlight the different relationships between the three key variables. With this abundance of information serving as a backdrop, we will now examine the stock price level at the start of 1972.To provide a comprehensive picture of the evolution of our shared economy over the last ten years, matching figures for profits and dividends should be added to the record of price variations. This kind of conspectus is what we provide in ours. While we do expect the reader to examine all of them carefully, we also hope that some will find them interesting and educational.

Let's make the following observations about them: The whole 10 years even out the year-to-year variations and provide a broad impression of steady progress. Of the nine decades that followed the first, just two exhibit declining average prices and profits, and none of the decades that followed 1900 exhibit declining average dividends. However, all three groups' growth rates vary widely. Though the progress in the 1960s was not as significant as it was in the 1950s, overall, performance after World War II has been better than that of previous decades. Although the current investor cannot determine from this record what percentage increase in prices and profits dividends he may anticipate over the next ten years, it does provide all the motivation he needs to maintain a constant strategy of investing in common stocks.

But there's something to note here that's not revealed in ours. A considerable decline in our companies' total profits position was seen in 1970. The rate of return on capital invested

dropped to a level not seen since the years of World War II. The fact that a sizable portion of businesses declared net losses for the year, that many of them become "financially troubled," and that there were a handful of significant bankruptcy filings for the first time in three decades are equally startling. The claim expressed above* that the great boom period may have ended in 1969–1970 is inspired by these facts more than by any other.

The shift in price/earnings ratios since World War II is a notable aspect of 3-2. For example, in June 1949, the S&P composite index sold for just 6.3 times the actual earnings of the previous 12 months; in March 1961, the ratio was 22.9 times. In a similar vein, the dividend yield on the S&P index decreased from nearly 7% in 1949 to only 3.0% in 1961. This difference was made even more striking by the fact that high-grade bond interest rates increased concurrently, from 2.60% to 4.50%. This is perhaps the most notable shift in public opinion in the history of the stock market.

The shift from one extreme to the other signaled trouble ahead to those with extensive experience and natural caution. They could not help but be alarmed by memories of the disastrous aftermath of the bull market of 1926–1929. However, the experience has not validated these worries. Yes, the DJIA's closing price. A straightforward method for gauging the state of the market is to look at a firm's or a market average's "price/earnings ratio," such as the S&P 500 stock index. A company's price/earnings ratio would be 8.93 if, for example, the stock is selling for $8.93 per share and it generated $1 per share of net income during the previous year; if the stock is selling for $69.70, the ratio would be 69.7. Price/earnings ratios of 10 are generally regarded as low, those of 10 to 20 as moderate, and those of 20 or more as costly.

Early 1972 Stock Market Level

Observing a century-long trajectory of stock prices, profits, and dividends, allows us to make some educated guesses on the levels of the DJIA at 900 and the S&P composite index at 100 in January 1972. We have addressed the state of the stock market at the time of writing in each of our previous editions, and we have attempted to address the issue of whether it was too high for cautious purchases. A review of the findings we arrived at on these previous occasions would be instructive to the reader. This is not only a self-punishment activity. It will provide as a kind of connecting thread between the many phases of the stock market over the last 20 years and a realistic depiction of the challenges faced by anybody attempting to make an educated and critical assessment of the state of the market now. First, let us restate our summary of our analyses from the 1965 edition for the years 1948, 1953, and 1959: in 1948, we approached the Dow Jones level of 180 using conservative standards, and we had no trouble concluding that "it was not too high concerning underlying values." In 1953, we took up this problem again, and this time the average market level had reached 275, a gain of more than 50% in just five years. In light of the subsequent spectacular advance, it may seem strange to have to report that it was by no means easy for us to reach a definitive conclusion as to the attractiveness of the 1953 level. We asked ourselves the same question: "whether in our opinion the level of 275 for the Dow Jones Industrials was or was not too high for sound investment." While we did state unequivocally that "the conclusion about 1953 stock prices must be favorable—from the standpoint of value indications—our chief investment guide—we were concerned about the fact that the averages had advanced for a longer period of time in 1953 than in most previous bull markets and that its absolute level was historically high." In light of these considerations and our positive value assessment, we recommended a cautious or compromise approach. This was not really wise advice, as it turned out. A competent oracle would have predicted that the market level would rise by an extra 100% during the next five years. Since few, if any, of those whose profession it was to anticipate

the stock market—as ours was not—had any greater idea of what lied ahead than we had, maybe we could add self-defense to the list of benefits.

The DJIA reached an all-time high of 584 at the start of 1959. The extensive examination we conducted from every angle may be summed up as follows: "All things considered, we are forced to declare that the current level of stock prices is precarious. Given that the costs are already very high, it may be dangerous. Even in the unlikely event that this is not the case, the market's momentum will unavoidably drive it to absurd heights. Sincerely, we are unable to envision a future stock market where every tyro can be assured of a substantial profit on his stock purchases and where there will never be any significant losses. During this time, a number of recently launched common stocks of small businesses—dubbed "hot issues"—were offered to the public at absurdly high prices, only to have their values further driven up to almost unimaginable heights by needless speculation. In a few of months, some of these lost 90% or more of the quotes. The fall in the first half of 1962 was unsettling, if not devastating, for a great number of self-acknowledged speculators and maybe for many more reckless individuals who referred to themselves as "investors." However, the financial world was similarly unaware of the turnaround that occurred later that year.

CONCLUSION

The complex dance between inflation and investors highlights the ongoing difficulty of maintaining and increasing wealth in unstable economic environments. Inflation is a constant factor that may reduce the buying power of money, therefore investors in all financial sectors need to take it seriously and adopt flexible tactics. This essay has examined inflation's historical background, analyzing its cyclical character and the underlying variables that influence its course. The research has illuminated the range of options accessible to investors who want to protect themselves from the depreciating consequences of growing prices by analyzing the impacts of inflation on different asset classes, ranging from conventional investments to unconventional vehicles. Furthermore, the study has emphasized the need of a knowledgeable and flexible approach to investing. In addition to having the ability to recognize asset classes that have consistently performed well during inflationary times, investors also need to be adaptable enough to modify their plans in reaction to changing market circumstances. The requirement for a sophisticated grasp of the investor's toolset in the face of inflationary pressures is further highlighted by the discussion of risk management tactics, diversification methods, and the function of central bank policies. Equipped with this information, investors may actively seek out possibilities for wealth creation and preservation while navigating the hurdles presented by inflation.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. C. C. Chan, T. E. Clark, and G. Koop, “A New Model of Inflation, Trend Inflation, and Long-Run Inflation Expectations,” *J. Money, Credit Bank.*, 2018.

[2] G. Sasongko and A. D. Huruta, “Monetary policy and the causality between inflation and money supply in Indonesia,” *Bus. Theory Pract.*, 2018.

[3] E. Nakamura, J. Steinsson, P. Sun, and D. Villar, “The elusive costs of inflation: Price dispersion during the U.S. great inflation,” *Q. J. Econ.*, 2018.

[4] S. W. Hawking and T. Hertog, “A smooth exit from eternal inflation?,” *J. High Energy Phys.*, 2018.

[5] G. Wollie, “The Relationship between Inflation and Economic Growth in Ethiopia,” *Budapest Int. Res. Critics Inst. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.

[6] V. Mishchenko, S. Naumenkova, S. Mishchenko, and V. Ivanov, “Inflation and economic growth: The search for a compromise for the Central Bank’s monetary policy,” *Banks Bank Syst.*, 2018.

[7] N. K. Sharma and M. Bicchal, “The properties of inflation expectations: Evidence for India,” *EconomiA*, 2018.

[8] G. C. Montes and L. L. da Cunha Lima, “Effects of fiscal transparency on inflation and inflation expectations: Empirical evidence from developed and developing countries,” *Q. Rev. Econ. Financ.*, 2018.

[9] O. Farooq and N. Ahmed, “Does inflation affect sensitivity of investment to stock prices? Evidence from emerging markets,” *Financ. Res. Lett.*, 2018.

[10] R. K. Pan, A. M. Petersen, F. Pammolli, and S. Fortunato, “The memory of science: Inflation, myopia, and the knowledge network,” *J. Informetr.*, 2018.

[11] A. Dunn, S. D. Grosse, and S. H. Zuvekas, “Adjusting Health Expenditures for Inflation: A Review of Measures for Health Services Research in the United States,” *Health Serv. Res.*, 2018.

[12] C. Kwofie and R. K. Ansah, “A Study of the Effect of Inflation and Exchange Rate on Stock Market Returns in Ghana,” *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 3

GENERAL PORTFOLIO POLICY: THE DEFENSIVE INVESTOR

Thejus R Kartha, Assistant Professor
Department of uGDX,ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India
Email Id-thejus.kartha@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:
A comprehensive analysis of the principles and strategies associated with the defensive investor in the realm of portfolio management. Coined by renowned economist Benjamin Graham, the defensive investor's approach emphasizes a prudent and risk-averse strategy to achieve long-term financial objectives. The study explores key components of the defensive investment philosophy, including asset allocation, diversification, and the selection of securities that align with a conservative risk tolerance. Beginning with an examination of the foundational principles laid out by Graham, the paper outlines the importance of a systematic and disciplined investment approach. The defensive investor prioritizes the preservation of capital, consistently favoring well-established and financially stable companies over speculative ventures. This conservative stance is complemented by a focus on income-generating investments, such as dividend-paying stocks and fixed-income securities, to provide a reliable stream of returns. Furthermore, the study delves into the significance of diversification in the defensive investor's portfolio, spreading risk across different asset classes to enhance resilience against market volatility. The role of market timing, or lack thereof, in the defensive strategy is also discussed, highlighting the emphasis on a long-term perspective and an aversion to attempting to predict short-term market movements.

KEYWORDS:

Asset Allocation, Bonds, Conservative, Diversification, Fixed-Income, Investment Strategy.

INTRODUCTION

Simply because they read about the 1964 market level in this, investors shouldn't conclude that it is dangerous. They have to balance our logic against the opposing logic that the most knowledgeable and seasoned individuals on Wall Street will tell them. Each person must ultimately come to his conclusion and take responsibility for it. On the other hand, we advise the investor to choose the cautious route if he is unsure about what to do. Under 1964 circumstances, the investment principles outlined below would need the following policies, in the following order of urgency: No taking out loans to purchase or keep stocks. There will be no rise in the percentage of money invested in common stocks. A decrease in common stock holdings to a maximum of 50% of the whole portfolio when necessary. The profits of the capital gains tax must be deposited in premium bonds or kept as a savings account, and the tax must be paid as gracefully as feasible. Logic dictates that investors who have been adhering to a legitimate dollar-cost averaging strategy for some time may choose to either keep up their recurring purchases at this level or halt them until they determine that the market is no longer risky. We would strongly advise against starting a new dollar-averaging plan at the levels of late 1964 since many investors would not be able to persevere through such a scheme if the results showed a sharp decline in value shortly after the plan was started. We may now declare that our prudence paid off. The DJIA increased by over 11% further, reaching 995, before errantly declining to a low of 632 in 1970. The price of "hot issues" saw a similar kind of pandemonium, with drops as high as 90%, as it did during the 1961–1962

slump. Furthermore, the whole financial picture seemed to have shifted in the direction of less zeal and more skepticism, as was mentioned in the Introduction. The narrative may be summed up by one fact: The DJIA had its lowest closing level since 1944 when it closed in 1970, six years earlier. These were our attempts to assess previous stock-market levels. Can our readers and we learn anything from them? In 1948 and 1953, the market was deemed good for investment; nevertheless, by 1959, it was deemed "dangerous," and in 1964, it was deemed "too high." Even now, skillful arguments may be used to support each of these rulings. However, it is unlikely that they have been as helpful as our more typical advice, which discourages attempts to "pick the winners" or "beat the market" in favor of a consistent and regulated common-stock program[1], [2].

Even yet, even if what we have to say turns out to be more interesting than practically beneficial, or more suggestive than decisive, we believe that our readers may profit from a fresh look at the state of the stock market as of late 1971. "It is the mark of an educated mind to expect that amount of exactness which the nature of the particular subject admits" is a good passage that appears near the beginning of Aristotle's Ethics. Demanding exact demonstration from an orator and accepting just likely findings from mathematicians are equally irrational. An orator and a mathematician are two different professions from which financial analysts operate.

The Dow Jones Industrial Average briefly reached the 892 level of November 1964 that we examined in our last edition in 1971. However, rather than using the 30-stock DJIA as a representative sample of the market, we have chosen to utilize the price level and associated data for the Standard & Poor's composite index in our statistical analysis since it is more thorough. We will focus on comparing this information around the four end-of-years of our previous editions plus 1968; we will use the handy value of 100 for the present price level, which was recorded at several points in 1971 and early 1972. We utilize the latest twelve months' profits for 1971 dividends, the average of three calendar years' earnings for our earnings, and the bond interest and wholesale prices from August 1971 for 1971. Based on the three-year earnings, we conclude that the improved price/earnings ratio for late 1971 is offset by the negative shift in the bond-yield/stock-yield ratio. Therefore, our opinion of the market level in early 1972 would generally be the same as it was about seven years agothat is, that it is unappealing from the perspective of cautious investing[3], [4].

The 1971 picture would still seem to be one of an erratic recovery from the severe setback suffered in 1969–1970 in terms of previous market fluctuations. Such recoveries have in the past signaled the start of a new phase of the ongoing bull market that started in 1949. It is too early for another spin on the new-issue merry-go-round, given the dreadful experience had by the public purchasers of low-grade common-stock issues during the 1968–1970 cycle. Therefore, the consistent indicator of impending market risk that we examined in our last edition is absent today, just as it was in November 1964, at the DJIA's 892 level. From a technical standpoint, however, it would seem that before the next major decline or collapse, there will likely be another significant gain that occurs far above the 900 DJIA level. However, we are unable to end the issue there, even though we probably ought to. We find it concerning that the early 1971 market seemed to be unaware of the dreadful events that had occurred less than a year before. Is such carelessness forgiven? We believe that investors need to be ready for challenging times ahead. These might manifest as either a rapid recurrence of the 1969–1970 drop or as another bull market bubble that will likely be followed by a more catastrophic collapse.

DISCUSSION

The position and traits of the owner or owners often dictate the fundamental features of an investment portfolio. Savings banks, life insurance firms, and so-called legal trust funds have been at one extremity of the spectrum. Their investing options were restricted to high-grade bonds and, in some situations, high-grade preferred stocks a generation ago in many states due to legal restrictions. On the opposite end of the spectrum is the wealthy and seasoned businessperson, who will add any kind of stock or bond to his security list as long as he believes it to be a compelling investment[5], [6].

The idea that those who cannot afford to take risks should settle for a comparatively low rate of return on their investments is a well-established and sensible one. The broad idea that an investor should strive for a rate of return that is roughly commensurate to the level of risk they are willing to take has arisen from this. We have a different perspective. Instead, the rate of return that is desired should depend on how much clever work the investor is willing and able to put into the job at hand. Our passive investor receives the least return since he or she wants both security and worry-free living. The astute and resourceful investor who uses all of their knowledge and expertise will obtain the highest return. Even the best long-term bonds lost a significant portion of their market value in subsequent years due to the rise in interest rates, so we added in 1965 that "in many cases, there may be less real risk associated with buying a 'bargain issue' offering the chance of a large profit than with a conventional bond purchase yielding about 41.2%." This statement turned out to be more accurate than we had anticipated.

The Fundamental Issue with Bond-Stock Allocation

The defensive investor's portfolio policy has previously been succinctly described. He ought to allocate his money between premium common stocks and premium bonds. As a basic guideline, we have recommended that an investor's holdings should never be less than 25% or more than 75% in common stocks, with an inverse range of 75% to 25% in bonds. This suggests that the two main investment channels should be divided equally, or 50–50, as the conventional split. The traditional rationale for increasing the proportion of common stocks is the emergence of the "bargain price" levels that are generated after an extended down market. On the other hand, prudent protocol would dictate a 50% reduction in the commonstock component when the investor believes the market has reached an extremely high level[7], [8].

These basic maxims have always been simple to state but difficult to live by because they contradict the same aspects of human nature that lead to the excesses of the bull and bear markets. It is almost a contradiction in words to recommend to the typical stockholder that he reduces his holdings after a market gain and increase them after a matching collapse as a workable approach. The tremendous advancements and collapses of the past, and the likelihood of their recurrence in the future, are because the typical man operatesand presumably must operate oppositely. We might see investors as a cunning, seasoned group that sells out to the careless, foolish speculators at high prices and buys back from them at low levels if the line between investment and speculative activities were as distinct as it previously was. Although this image may have had some validity in the past, it is difficult to reconcile it with developments in finance after 1949. Nothing suggests that professional operations like the mutual fund ones have been carried out in this way. The two primary fund types"balanced" and "common-stock"—have relatively little variation in the proportion of their portfolio that is invested in stocks from year to year. Their efforts to move from less promising to more promising assets have been substantially tied to their selling activity.

We cannot provide the investor with any trustworthy guidelines that would allow him to lower his holdings of common stock to the 25% minimum and subsequently rebuild them to the 75% maximum if, as we have long maintained, the stock market has lost touch with its old boundaries and new ones have not yet been created. We can strongly recommend that, in general, an investor should not hold more than half of his portfolio in stocks unless he is quite confident in the strength of his stock position and certain that he would be able to handle a market downturn similar to that of 1969–1970. We find it difficult to understand how such high levels of confidence could be justified at the beginning of 1972. Therefore, at this moment, we would advise against allocating more than 50% to common equities. However, for related reasons, it is almost as difficult to suggest a 50% decrease in the well, unless the investor is personally uneasy about the state of the market and would be content to restrict his participation in any future increase to, say, 25% of his entire money. Thus, we are forced to provide what can seem like an oversimplified 50–50 formula to the majority of our readers. The goal of this approach is to keep bond and equity holdings as evenly divided as is practically possible. Once the proportion of common stock has increased to, say, 55% due to market fluctuations, one-eighth of the stock portfolio would be sold, with the profits going into bonds, to make up the difference. On the other hand, if the amount of common stock dropped to 45%, one-eleventh of the bond money would need to be used to purchase more stocks[9], [10].

For many years after 1937, Yale University had a similarly similar approach; however, it was centered on a 35% "normal holding" in common equities. But Yale seems to have abandoned its renowned strategy in the early 1950s; in 1969, 61% of its portfolio was comprised of stocks. The Yale case study demonstrates the almost fatal impact of the significant market advancement on the hitherto common formula method of investing. Nevertheless, we firmly believe that the conservative investor would benefit greatly from our 50/50 version of this strategy. It is very straightforward, it certainly aims in the right direction, and it gives the follower the impression that he is at least responding to market developments. Most importantly, though, is that it will prevent him from becoming increasingly drawn into common stocks as the market rises to increasingly risky heights. Furthermore, in a rising market, a properly cautious investor will be content with the returns on half of his portfolio; in a catastrophic fall, he may find great comfort in realizing how much luckier he is than many of his more adventurous peers.

Even while our suggested 50–50 division is unquestionably the most straightforward "all-purpose program" that has been created, it could not end up producing the greatest outcomes. One compelling argument in favor of the bond component is the much higher income return that decent bonds now provide compared to comparable equities. The investor's decision to invest 50% of his stocks or less may mostly depend on his personality and outlook. He would probably prefer the low 25% equity component at this point if he could serve as a calculating arbitrator. He may decide to divide bonds and stocks 50–50 at the median level once the DJIA dividend yield reaches, say, two thirds of the bond yield. The DJIA would need to drop to as low as 660 if there is no decrease in bond yields and no increase in dividends, or the taxable bond yields would need to drop from 71⁄2% to roughly 5.5% without affecting the current return on leading stocks. This would start at 900 for the DJIA and require dividends of $36 on the unit. A program of such type is not very complex; the difficult thing is to embrace it and adhere to it, not to mention the risk that it may turn out to have been far too cautious. A combination of intermediate modifications might yield the same "buying point."

The Component of Bonds

Two primary considerations will guide the investor's selection of bonds for the bond portion of his portfolio: should he purchase bonds with taxable or tax-free maturities, and should he purchase bonds with shorter or longer maturities? The choice regarding taxes should mostly come down to math, based on how different the returns are from the investor's tax bracket. When it came to 20-year maturities in January 1972, the options were to get, let's say, 71.2% on “grade Aar” corporate bonds or 5.3% on top tax-free issues. As a result, there was a 30% decrease in revenue for this maturity when it moved from the corporate to the municipal domain. Therefore, by selecting municipal bonds, the investor would have a net savings after taxes if his maximum tax rate was more than 30%; if it was lower than 30%, the converse would be true. After deductions, a single person's income exceeds $10,000, at which point they are subject to a 30% rate; for a married couple, the rate is applicable when their total taxable income exceeds $20,000. It seems obvious that a sizable fraction of individual investors would get a superior return on their investment after taxes from quality municipal bonds as opposed to quality corporate bonds[11], [12].

A distinct consideration arises when deciding between longer and shorter maturities: does the investor want to hedge against bond price declines at the expense of a lower annual return and the potential for a large principal value gain? We believe that talking about The Investor and Market Fluctuations is the wisest course of action. The only logical bond purchases for people for a long while in the past were the U.S. savings issues. They offered a larger return than other first-quality bond investments, their safety wasand still isundeniable, and they featured additional benefits like a money-back option that significantly increased their appeal. Previously, we published a whole section labeled "U.S. Savings Bonds: An Advantage for TradersAs we will demonstrate, American savings bonds continue to have some special qualities that make them an excellent choice for any individual investor. In our opinion, bonds remain the most straightforward and optimal option for individuals with limited resources, such as those who have $10,000 or less to invest. Larger budgets, however, can make alternative media more appealing. Let's outline some significant bond categories that merit investor consideration and have a quick conversation on their basic attributes, safety, yield, market price, risk, income-tax status, and other aspects.

We will first summarize its key clauses before quickly going over the many benefits of these distinctive, alluring, and very practical investments. Like other bonds, the Series H bonds include semi-annual interest payments. For the first year, the rate is 4.29%; for the next nine years, until maturity, the rate is a flat 5.10%. The Series E bonds do not pay interest; instead, the holder receives interest via increases in the value of the bonds upon redemption. The bonds mature at 100% in 5 years and 10 months after purchase, having been sold for 75% of their face value. The yield, compounded semi-annually, comes out to 5% if held to maturity. The dividend increases if the investment is redeemed early, rising from a minimum of 4.01% in the first year to an average of 5.20% over the next 45.66 years. State income tax does not apply to the interest paid on the bonds, but federal income tax does. Nonetheless, the holder of a Series E bond may choose to withhold payment of federal income tax until the bond is disposed of, or they may choose to pay it yearly as interest is accrued.

Series E bondholders can redeem their bonds at any moment for their current redemption value. Series H bondholders are entitled to cash in their bonds at par value. Bonds in Series E may be exchanged for bonds in Series H, with certain tax benefits. Bonds that are misplaced, damaged, or stolen may be replaced for free. The majority of investors can acquire as many as they can afford since there are restrictions on yearly acquisitions and generous allowances for family members to co-own. Remark: No other investment offers the complete certainty of

principle and interest payments, the flexibility to demand the whole amount of "money back" at any moment, and the promise of a minimum 5% interest rate for a minimum of 10 years. The ability to extend bonds at maturity allowed holders of the earlier Series E bond offerings to keep accruing yearly values at progressively increasing rates. We estimate that the effective net-after-tax rate received has grown by as much as a third in normal circumstances due to the income-tax payments being deferred over these extended periods, providing a significant financial benefit. On the other hand, in prior low-interest rate years, purchasers of bonds had complete protection against the shrinkage of principal value that befell many bond investors due to their right to cash in the bonds at cost price or better. Put another way, this allowed them to take advantage of the rise in interest rates by moving their low-interest holdings into very-high-coupon issues on an even-money basis. We believe that the unique benefits that owners of savings bonds are now enjoying will more than makeup for the bonds' lower current yield when compared to other direct government liabilities.

Additional US bonds

It's also noteworthy to observe that, often, the US government's indirect liabilities yield noticeably more than its direct commitments with equivalent maturities. The yield was fully 1% higher than that on direct liabilities of the U.S., maturing the same year, and an offering of 7.05% of "Certificates Fully Guaranteed by the Secretary of Transportation of the Department of Transportation of the United States" appeared as we write. The Trustees of the Penn Central Transportation Co. issued the certificates, but they were sold based on a declaration made by the U.S.

Attorney General

Many indirect responsibilities of this kind have been taken on by the U.S. government in the past, and all of them have been carefully respected. The guarantee "brings into being a general obligation of the United States, backed by its full faith and credit.The reader may be wondering why there is all this hoopla, a greater final cost to the public, and an ostensibly "personal guarantee" from our Secretary of Transportation. The Congress-imposed debt ceiling on government borrowing has been the main cause of the indirection. It seems that government guarantees are not considered debts, which is a semantic benefit for astute investors. The emergence of tax-free Housing Authority bonds, which have the status of U.S. guarantees and are essentially the only tax-exempt offerings comparable to government bonds, may be the situation's most significant effect. The freshly established New Community Debentures, which were offered to earn 7.60% in September 1971, are another kind of government-backed securities.

Municipal and State Bonds

These are not subject to federal income tax. In the state in question, they are often exempt from income tax, but not in other states. They are either "revenue bonds" that rely on interest payments from toll roads, bridges, building leases, etc., or direct obligations of a state or subdivision. Defensive investors may not always find tax-free bonds to be sufficiently well-protected to warrant their purchase. The ratings that Moody's or Standard & Poor's assign to each issue might serve as a guide for him while making his choice. The top three ratings from both agencies, ought to be enough to indicate appropriate safety. These bonds have variable yields based on both quality and maturity; lower returns are associated with shorter durations. The average quality rating, maturity, and yield of the securities included in Standard & Poor's municipal bond index in late 1971 were AA, 20 years, and 5.78%, respectively. Bonds from Vineland, New Jersey, were rated AA for A, and a typical sale offered a return of about 3% for bonds with a one-year term, up to 5.8% for those with a 1995 and 1996 expiry.

Corporate Bonds

Federal and state taxes apply to these bonds. The best-grade bonds yielded 7.19% for a 25-year term at the beginning of 1972, according to the Moody's corporate bond index's reported yield. For extended maturities, the so-called lower-medium-grade issues (rated Baa) had returns of 8.23%. Shorter-term commitments would produce considerably less than longer-term obligations in each type. The summaries above show that there are several high-grade bond options available to the typical investor. Undoubtedly, strong tax-free issues provide a higher net return for those in high income-tax categories than taxable ones. Regarding the others, it seems that in early 1972, the taxable yield ranged from 5.00% for U.S. savings bonds with special options to around 71.2% for high-grade corporate offerings.

Investments in Higher-Yielding Bonds

An investor might increase the income return on his bonds by compromising quality. Experience has shown again and again that it is smarter for the average investor to avoid these kinds of high-yield bonds. Overall, they could be a little better than the first-quality problems in terms of return, but they subject the owner to too many individual risks of undesirable developments, from unsettling price drops to outright default.

It would be appropriate to note that Congress's restrictions on the US government's ability to issue direct bonds have given rise to two different kinds of "bargain opportunities" for investors looking to purchase government-backed liabilities. An offering of tax-exempt "New Housing" issues in July 1971 yielded as high as 5.8%, free from both Federal and state taxes, while an issue of New Community debentures sold in September 1971 yielded 7.60%. One is provided by the tax-exempt "New Housing" issues, and the other by the recently created "New Community debentures." Both commitments are unquestionably secure since they are backed by the "full faith and credit" of the US government. Additionally, they yield much more than typical US bonds on a net basis.

Savings Accounts Rather Than Bonds

These days, an investor can get the same interest rate on a savings account from a commercial or savings bank as he can on a short-term, first-grade bond. Even though bank savings account interest rates might drop in the future, they now serve as a suitable alternative to an individual's short-term bond investment.

Call Specifications

We covered this issue of bond financing in depth in earlier editions as it involves a significant but little-noticed unfairness to the investor. In most cases, bonds were callable at moderate premiumssay, 5%above the issue price, and they were callable quite shortly after they were issued. This implied that the investor was denied all but a small portion of the benefits of positive changes during a time of extreme swings in the underlying interest rates and that the investor had to endure the entire weight of adverse changes.The American Gas & Electric 100-year 5% debentures that were offered to the public at 101 in 1928 serve as our baseline example. In almost a panic four years later, the yield on these solid bonds dropped to 8% for 622. Bonds of this kind could be offered for a mere 3% yield by 1946, a significant decline from the 5% issuance, which ought to have been priced at about. However, the business then used the call clause to its advantage and redeemed the issue for a measly.

The bond-purchasing institutions finally refused to accept this unfair arrangement; in recent years, the majority of long-term high-coupon issues have been protected against redemption for ten years or more after issuance. The call feature in these bond contracts was a thinly

disguised instance of "heads I win, tails you lose." This keeps their potential price increase limited, but not unfairly. In real terms, we suggest that the investor in long-term issues give up a little income in exchange for the guarantee of non-call ability, let's say for a period of 20 or 25 years. In a similar vein, purchasing a low-coupon bond at a discount has advantages over purchasing a high-coupon bond that is callable in a few years and selling at about par. Since the discount gives complete protection against unfavorable call action, for example, a 31.85% yielding bond would be purchased for 63.5%.

Straight Preferred Stocks, or Nonconvertible Stocks

Here, a few broad remarks on preferred stocks should be stated. There are very excellent preferred stocks out there, but they are good despite their intrinsically poor investing form. Generally, the security of a preferred shareholder depends on the company's willingness and capacity to pay dividends on its common shares. His personal position becomes perilous if the common dividends are withheld or even threatened, since the directors are not obligated to pay him unless they also pay on the common. Conversely, ordinary preferred stock often bears no further profit-sharing beyond the predetermined dividend rate. As a result, the preferred holder is neither entitled to the profit opportunities of a common shareholder nor the legal claim of the bondholder.

In times of depression, these flaws in preferred stock's legal standing often become apparent. A very tiny portion of all favored issues are firmly established enough to retain their position as unquestionable investments notwithstanding all adversities. Experience has shown that when momentary difficulty causes preferred stocks' price to drop excessively, it is a good opportunity to purchase them. To put it another way, they ought to be purchased at a discount or not at all. Later on, we will discuss convertible and similarly privileged issues, which have unique profit opportunities. Typically, one would not choose them for a conservative portfolio.

It is worth mentioning another oddity about preferred stock positions generally. Compared to individual investors, corporations have a much better tax situation. Only 15% of dividend income is subject to income tax for corporations; nevertheless, they are taxed on the whole amount of their regular interest income. $100 obtained as dividends on preferred stock is taxed just $7.20, but $100 received as bond interest is taxed $48 since the 1972 corporate rate is 48%. Conversely, with the exception of a small recent exception, individual investors in preferred stocks pay precisely the same tax as they do on bond interest. Therefore, by logical logic, corporations should purchase all investment-grade preferred stocks, just as income tax payers should purchase all tax-exempt bonds.

CONCLUSION

Benjamin Graham's defensive investor theory offers a reliable and classic framework for negotiating the challenges of managing a portfolio. The defensive investor's strategy, which emphasizes caution, risk aversion, and a disciplined approach, is a guide for those who want to prioritize capital preservation while achieving long-term financial success. The research has detailed the defensive approach's main principles, emphasizing the value of methodical investing, concentrating on well-established and financially solid businesses, and favoring assets that provide income. The importance of diversity in reducing risk and strengthening the portfolio's resistance to market volatility has been emphasized. The defensive investor's intentional rejection of market timing in favor of a firm commitment to a long-term outlook is a crucial component of their mentality. This strategy emphasizes the need of steady and patient wealth-building tactics while acknowledging the inherent challenge of anticipating short-term market swings. The defensive investor's tenets are still applicable and beneficial as

financial markets develop. With these guidelines in hand, investors may confidently and resiliently traverse the ups and downs of market cycles.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. Wang and N. Taylor, "A comparison of static and dynamic portfolio policies," *Int. Rev. Financ. Anal.*, 2018.

[2] L. M. Peng, X. Y. Cui, and Y. Shi, "Time-Consistent Portfolio Policy for Asset-Liability Mean-Variance Model with State-Dependent Risk Aversion," *J. Oper. Res. Soc. China*, 2018.

[3] N. M. Schmidt and A. Fleig, "Global patterns of national climate policies: Analyzing 171 country portfolios on climate policy integration," *Environ. Sci. Policy*, 2018.

[4] B. Hu, X. Chen, F. T. S. Chan, and C. Meng, "Portfolio procurement policies for budget-constrained supply chains with option contracts and external financing," *J. Ind. Manag. Optim.*, 2018.

[5] M. Galeotti, Y. Rubashkina, S. Salini, and E. Verdolini, "Environmental policy performance and its determinants: Application of a three-level random intercept model," *Energy Policy*, 2018.

[6] R. Koepke, "Fed policy expectations and portfolio flows to emerging markets," *J. Int. Financ. Mark. Institutions Money*, 2018.

[7] T. Gehrig, L. SSgner, and A. Westerkamp, "Making Parametric Portfolio Policies Work: Comments on Brandt, Santa-Clara and Valkanov (2009)," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018.

[8] D. Cumming, S. Johan, and Y. Zhang, "Public policy towards entrepreneurial finance: Spillovers and the scale-up gap," *Oxford Rev. Econ. Policy*, 2018.

[9] K. S. Chen and H. Tsai, "Taxing the rich policy, evasion behavior, and portfolio choice: A sustainability perspective," *Cogent Bus. Manag.*, 2018.

[10] W. Li, L. Liu, S. Zhang, and H. Zhang, "Will the tradable green certifications and renewable portfolio standard policy work well in China: A recursive CGE analysis," *J. Renew. Sustain. Energy*, 2018.

[11] L. Scordato, A. Klitkou, V. E. Tartiu, and L. Coenen, "Policy mixes for the sustainability transition of the pulp and paper industry in Sweden," *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2018.

[12] R. Elkamhi and D. Stefanova, "Where to Hide in Bad Times: Or Should One Still Diversify Internationally?," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 4

THE DEFENSIVE INVESTOR AND COMMON STOCKS

Jaimine Vaishnav, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India
Email Id-jaimine.vaishnav@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:
The application of Benjamin Graham's defensive investment philosophy specifically in the context of common stocks. As articulated in Graham's seminal work, "The Intelligent Investor," the defensive investor's approach emphasizes a prudent and risk-averse strategy tailored for individuals seeking capital preservation and consistent returns. Focusing on the unique considerations surrounding common stocks, this study delves into key principles such as stock selection criteria, diversification strategies, and risk management techniques that align with the defensive investor's mindset. The analysis begins with an examination of Graham's timeless principles, outlining the importance of thorough fundamental analysis in the selection of common stocks. The defensive investor prioritizes financially stable companies with a history of consistent earnings and dividend payments, seeking to mitigate risks associated with market volatility. Furthermore, the paper explores the role of diversification within the context of common stock investments. It delves into the challenges and opportunities presented by a concentrated versus a diversified stock portfolio, providing insights into how the defensive investor can strike a balance between risk and reward while navigating the dynamic nature of equity markets. Risk management is a central theme in the defensive investor's strategy, and the study discusses various techniques employed to safeguard against market fluctuations. The paper also addresses the importance of a long-term perspective, highlighting how the defensive investor's approach aligns with the principles of patience and discipline in the pursuit of wealth accumulation.

KEYWORDS:

Market Fluctuations, Passive Approach, Portfolio Management, Risk Tolerance, Securities, Selective Stock Picking.

INTRODUCTION

As discussed so far, the bond form and the preferredstock form are well-known and very straightforward concepts. A bondholder is entitled to principal repayment and fixed interest on a certain date. A set dividend, and nothing more, is due to the owner of a preferred stock and has to be paid before any common dividend. He does not have a specified due date for his principal value. There are many variations from these forms, but the following covers the usual requirements and probably most bond and preferred offerings. The most well-known varieties are income bonds and convertible securities. The latter form exempts interest payments unless the corporation earns them. Companies should employ income bonds much more often. Graham's reasoning still holds, although the figures are different. Currently, corporations may deduct 70% of their dividend income, while the usual corporate tax rate is 35%. Therefore, instead of paying $35 in taxes on $100 in interest revenue, a business would pay around $24.50 in taxes on $100 in dividends from preferred shares. Preferred stock does not provide any tax advantages to individuals since they pay the same income tax rate on dividend income as they do on interest income. More broadly than they are. Their avoidance seems to stem from a simple historical accident of the economy: since they were first used extensively in conjunction with railroad reorganizations, they have always been linked to

weak finances and unfavorable investment status. However, the form itself has several useful features, particularly when compared to and used in place of the many preferredstock offerings that have been issued in recent years. The primary benefit is that interest payments are deductible from the business's taxable income, thus halving the cost of that kind of financing. In the majority of circumstances, it is usually ideal for the investor to have an unrestricted right to receive interest payments when they are earned by the business, as well as a right to other kinds of protection if interest is not produced and paid. Income bond conditions may be adjusted in a way that best serves the needs of the lender and the borrower. This widespread acceptance of the intrinsically weak preferred-stock form and the widespread rejection of the stronger income-bond form is an interesting example of how old institutions and practices frequently manage to survive on Wall Street despite changing circumstances that demand a new perspective. We are willing to reject history and tried-and-true values with each new wave of optimism or pessimism, but we cling obstinately and unquestioningly to our prejudices[1], [2].

The Investing Value of Common Stocks

We felt that at this point in our first edition, it was vital to provide a lengthy explanation of the reasons why any investing portfolio should include a sizable portion of common stock. Because common stocks were perceived as highly speculative and therefore dangerous, their decline from the high levels of 1946 had the opposite effect of drawing investors in due to their reasonable prices: it undermined confidence in equity securities. We have discussed the opposite scenario that has emerged during the next 20 years, in which a significant increase in stock prices has made them seem like secure and profitable investments at all-time highs that may include a significant amount of risk[3], [4].

The case we presented in 1949 for common stocks became Beginning in 1949, the average annual return generated by equities for the preceding twenty years was 3.1%, while long-term Treasury bonds provided an average annual return of 3.9%. This means that $10,000 invested in stocks would have increased to $18,415 over that time, while the same amount in bonds would have grown to $21,494. As expected, 1949 proved to be an excellent year to purchase stocks: The Standard & Poor's 500-stock index had one of the highest long-term gains in American stock market history during the following ten years, averaging 20.1% annual growth. Graham's prior remarks on this topic are visible. Imagine what he would have thought of the late 1990s stock market when every new high on the market was seen as further "proof" that investing in stocks was a risk-free way to become wealthy. Two primary ideas. First, unlike bonds, which provided no security at all, they had provided a fair amount of defense against inflation's devaluation of an investor's currency. Common stocks offered investors a larger average return over time, which was their second benefit. This resulted from the reinvestment of undistributed earnings over time, which increased market value, as well as an average dividend income that was higher than the yield on quality bonds.

Although these two benefits have been significant and have helped common stocks outperform bonds over the long run, we have always cautioned that stock buyers risk losing these advantages if they purchase their shares at an excessive price. It was evident in 1929 that this was the case, and it took 25 years for the market level to return to the precipice from which it had precipitously plummeted between 1929 and 1932. Since 1957, common stocks have once again lost their historical dividend yield advantage over bond interest rates due to their high values. It still has to On September 3, 1929, the Dow Jones Industrial Average closed at a then-record high of 381.17. It closed at 382.74 on November 23, 1954, more than 25 years after it first closed above that level. But since dividend yields averaged more than 5.6% annually, stock returns were excellent for patient investors who reinvested their income

during this otherwise bleak decade. Elroy Dimson, Paul Marsh, and Mike Staunton, lecturers at London Business School, state that if you invested $1 in American equities in 1900 and used up all of your profits, your stock portfolio would have increased to $198 by the year 2000. Nevertheless, your stock portfolio would have been worth $16,797 if you had reinvested all of your dividends! Dividends are the driving force in stock investment, not an afterthought. The ratio of a company's cash dividend to the cost of a single share of common stock is known as its yield. A company's yield is 2% if it distributes a $2 yearly dividend at a stock price of $100 per share. However, the dividend yield will decrease to 1% if the stock price doubles and the payout remains the same. When the pattern that Graham had identified in 1957 was widely apparent in 1959, most Wall Street observers wondered whether inflation and economic growth would eventually offset this sharply negative development[5], [6].The reader should be able to see that, at the late 1971 DJIA level of 900, we are not very enthusiastic about common stocks in general. We believe that, even if the defensive investor must see common stocks as the lesser of two evils the bigger being the dangers associated with an all-bond holding he cannot afford to be without a meaningful part of them in his portfolio for the reasons previously mentioned.

Guidelines for the Common-Stock Part

Choosing common stocks for the defensive investor's portfolio should be a very straightforward process. Here, we propose four guidelines to be adhered to:

1. Diversification should be sufficient but not excessive. This may imply a maximum of around thirty issues, and a minimum of ten.
2. Every chosen firm need to be sizable, well-known, and conservatively capitalized. Even though these adjectives must be indefinite, their overall meaning is evident. Finally, some observations are given on this subject.
3. Each business should have a lengthy history of consistently making dividend payments. The yield on bonds remained constant.

A different perspective on diversification may be found in the commentary's sidebar on the 14-year-old who satisfied the dividend requirement in 1971. To be more precise, we would recommend mandating dividend payments to be made continuously starting at least in 1950. The price an investor is willing to pay for an issue should be limited in proportion to the issue's average profits over a period of time, say the last seven years. We propose setting this cap at a maximum of twenty times the average wages from the previous twelve months, but no more than twenty times those average earnings. However, almost all of the most powerful and well-known businesses would be removed from the portfolio by such a limitation. Specifically, it would outlaw almost the entire class of "growth stocks," which have been institutional investors' and speculators' preferred picks for a few years now. We have to explain why we would suggest such a severe exclusion [7], [8].

DISCUSSION

A stock that has historically grown its profits per share at a pace much higher than that of common stocks in general and is predicted to do so in the future is referred to as a "growth stock." These kinds of stocks are obviously desirable to own and hold, provided that the cost is reasonable. The issue is that a defensive investor in the modern day should presumably demand dividend payments for at least ten years running. It would not be too restrictive to even need 20 years of continuous dividend payments; as of year-end 2002, 255 businesses in the S&P 500 matched that criterion, according to Morgan Stanley. The "Rule of 72" is a

useful cognitive aid. Just divide the expected growth rate of a quantity of money by 72 to get the approximate time it takes to double. For example, at 6%, the amount of money will double in 12 years. Given that growth businesses have historically sold for high multiples of their average prior profits as well as high prices relative to present earnings, a growth company will double its earnings at the 7.1% pace Graham indicated in less than ten years. This has made effective operations in this sector far from straightforward, and it has added a speculative element of substantial weight in the growth-stock picture.

International Business Machines has long been the main growth concern, and those who invested in it years ago and held onto it tenaciously have reaped tremendous dividends. However, as we have previously said, this "best of common stocks" really had a six-month decrease in market price of 50% in 1961–1962 and approximately the same amount in 1969–1970. Even more susceptible to unfavorable events have been other growth stocks; in some instances, not only have the prices dropped but also the profits, leaving owners with a double disadvantage. For our purposes, Texas Instruments is an excellent second example. In only six years, the company went from being valued at five to twenty-six, without paying a dividend, and its profits per share jumped from forty cents to $3.91. However, after two years, the price had plummeted by four-fifths to 49 and the profits had decreased by roughly 50%.

These examples should help the reader appreciate why we believe growth stocks are too erratic and dangerous a vehicle for the conservative investor overall. Of course, miracles may be achieved with the appropriate personal choices, purchased at the appropriate prices, and then sold after a significant increase but before the likely collapse. However, the typical investor cannot anticipate achieving this any more than they can discover money sprouting on trees.

Modifications to the Portfolio

Submitting all security lists for periodic examination to see if their quality may be enhanced has become normal procedure. Naturally, this is a significant portion of the services that financial advisors provide their customers. In exchange for the commission business involved, almost all brokerage companies are willing to give comparable advice without charging a premium. Investment services are maintained by some brokerage companies on a fee basis[9], [10].Our conservative investor should presumably seek the same type of counsel about portfolio modifications as he did when his money was first committed, or at least once a year. He must only commit himself to companies with the best reputation since he won't have much of his expertise to depend on. If he doesn't, he may easily end himself in the hands of dishonest or incompetent people. Regardless, it is crucial that he explicitly communicates to his advisor at each such meeting that he intends to strictly follow the four common-stock selection guidelines that were previously provided in this. Incidentally, there shouldn't be a requirement for frequent or extensive revisions if his list was skillfully chosen in the first place.

P/E, or price/earnings ratios, are a measure of how much investors are prepared to pay for a stock concerning the profitability of the underlying firm. The term "earnings multiplier" is a synonym for these ratios. Currently, investors have the option to use interactive “portfolio trackers” available on websites like Quicken.com, Moneycentral.msn.com, Finance.yahoo.com, and Morningstar.com to build up their automatic system to keep an eye on the quality of their assets. Graham would caution against depending only on this kind of approach; you still need to augment the program with your judgment.

Dollar-to-Cost Average

The "monthly purchase plan," in which an investor invests the same amount of money each month to acquire one or more common stocks, has been heavily promoted by the New York Stock Exchange. This is the use of dollar-cost averaging, a unique kind of "formula investment." The outcomes of such a process were guaranteed to be quite acceptable throughout the mostly rising-market experience since 1949, especially as they stopped the practitioner from focusing his buying at the incorrect moments. The author of a thorough analysis of formula investment programs, Lucile Tomlinson1, provided a computation of the outcomes of dollar-cost averaging in the set of equities that comprise the Dow Jones industrial index. 23 ten-year purchase periods were tested, the first concluding in 1929 and the latest in 1952. In all cases, there was a profit at the end of the purchase term or within the next five years. Excluding dividends, the average estimated profit after the 23 purchasing periods was 21.5%. There was a significant temporary loss of market value in some cases. While dollar-cost averaging makes sense in theory, some may argue that it is practically impractical since few individuals are in a position where they can invest the same amount of money in the common stock year for, say, twenty years. I believe that this apparent criticism has become less compelling in the last several years. The widespread consensus is that common stocks are an essential part of a good savings and investment program. Therefore, consistent and methodical purchases of common stocks may not be any more financially or psychologically taxing than regular payments for life insurance and US savings bonds, to which they should be complimentary. Even though the monthly payment may seem little, the returns over twenty or more years may surprise and benefit the saver[11], [12].

The individual circumstances of the investor

We mentioned the role of the individual portfolio owner at the outset of this. Let's go back to this topic in light of our overall policy debate that follows. How much should an investor's choice of securities change depending on his situation? We will use three specific examples to illustrate the vastly different circumstances: a successful mid-career doctor with savings of $100,000 and annual contributions of $10,000; a widow who was left $200,000 to support herself and her children; and a young man who made $200 per week and saved $1,000 annually. The widow finds it very difficult to make ends meet on her salary. However, she must be very cautious with her investments. Her fund should be split almost equally between first-grade common stocks and US bonds, which strikes a balance between both goals and is in line with our general recommendation for defensive investing.

We do not rule out the potential that the widow meets the requirements for becoming an entrepreneurial investor, in which case her goals and approaches will change significantly. Taking speculative risks to "make some extra income"—that is, aiming for big income or profits without the necessary tools to provide complete trust in overall success—is the one thing the widow must avoid doing. To make ends meet, it would be considerably better for her to take out $2,000 a year from her principal rather than risk half of it on speculative, ill-founded endeavors. Despite not having the widow's constraints and compulsions, we assume that the wealthy doctor makes essentially the same decisions. Is he prepared to show a genuine interest in the investing industry? It would be preferable for him to accept the simple job of the cautious investor if he lacks the flare or the urge. Then, his portfolio should be divided exactly like that of a "typical" widow, with the same portion of it up to him to decide how much of the stock component to repair. The yearly savings and the overall money should be invested in about equal amounts.

The typical doctor is probably more likely to choose to become an entrepreneurial investor than the average widow, and he may also have a higher chance of success. One significant shortcoming, however, is that he doesn't have as much time to devote to managing his money and furthering his skills in investing. In fact, medical men have a very poor track record when it comes to security transactions. The reason for this is that they typically lack awareness that successful investment requires both significant attention to detail and a professional approach to security values. Instead, they have a strong desire to make a good return on their money and a sufficient confidence in their own intelligence. Ultimately, for yet other reasons, the young guy who saves $1,000 year and hopes for a steady improvement finds himself faced with the same decisions. His funds need to automatically be invested in Series E bonds. Because of how little the amount is, it doesn't seem like it would be worth it for him to go through a rigorous educational and temperamental regimen to become an aggressive investor. Therefore, the simplest and most sensible course of action for the defensive investor would be to simply refer to our regular program. This is no time to overlook human nature. For many intelligent yet underprivileged young people, finance is a fascination. Even though their incomes are much more significant to them than investment income, they nevertheless want to use their funds wisely and creatively. This mindset is beneficial. The young capitalist has a lot to gain by starting his financial education and experience early. He will undoubtedly make some errors and incur some losses if he operates as an aggressive investor. Young people may overcome these setbacks and grow from them. We implore the novice asset buyer to avoid wasting time and money on attempting to outperform the market. Allow him to research security values and use the smallest amounts to try his first assessment of price vs worth.Thus, we go back to the initial claim that an investor's financial resourcesthat is, his knowledge, experience, and temperament—determine the type of assets to buy and the rate of return to pursue, rather than his financial resources.

A Remark on the Idea of Risk

It's generally knowledge that excellent bonds carry less risk than excellent preferred stocks, which in turn carry less danger than excellent ordinary stocks. The conventional wisdom that common stocks are not "safe" sprang from this, as shown by the Federal Reserve Board's 1948 study. We would like to draw attention to the fact that people often confuse the terms "risk" and "safety" when referring to securities since they are used in two distinct contexts.

When a bond misses interest or principal payments, it is undeniably dangerous. In a similar vein, if a preferred stock, or even a common stock, is purchased with the hope that a certain dividend rate would be maintained, any decrease in or passing of the dividend indicates that the investment has proven hazardous. An investment is considered risky if there is a reasonable chance that the holder may need to sell when the price is well worth it. However, even while a decrease in a security's price might be cyclical and transient in nature and the holder is unlikely to be obliged to sell at such times, the concept of risk is sometimes expanded to include such a loss. These risks are present in all securities with the exception of US savings bonds and are more prevalent in the general market than in senior issues taken as a whole. However, we think that this situation does not provide a real danger in the practical meaning of the word. If an individual with a mortgage on a building were forced to sell it at a bad moment, he may have to absorb a significant loss. The sole factor used to determine the safety or risk of standard real estate mortgages is the assurance of on-time payments. This aspect is not taken into consideration. Similarly, the risk associated with a typical commercial enterprise is determined by the likelihood of financial loss rather than the outcome of the owner's forced sale.

We will outline our belief that a genuine investor does not lose money just because the market value of his assets drops; as a result, the possibility of a reduction does not imply that he is really facing a danger of loss. A group of carefully chosen common stock investments will have proven to be "safe" if their total return over a reasonable number of years is satisfactory. During that time, the market value of the investments will undoubtedly fluctuate, and it is likely that they will sell for less than the buyer's cost for a while. The investment would have to be deemed both dangerous and safe at the same time if that fact rendered it "risky." If we limit the definition of risk to a loss of value that is either realized through an actual sale, results from a significant deterioration in the company's position, or, more frequently, is the consequence of paying an excessive price relative to the intrinsic worth of the security, we may be able to avoid this confusion. A lot of common stocks do have a danger of this kind of decline. However, our argument is that a well-executed group investment in common stocks does not include any material risk of this kind, and as a result, it should not be classified as "risky" just because price fluctuations occur. However, this kind of risk exists if there's a chance that the price turns out to have been unquestionably too high by intrinsic-value standards—even if a significant market collapse occurs and is recovered several years later. A Remark on the "Large, Prominent, and Conservatively Financed Corporations" Category

The sentence that we have used in our caption was used before in the to characterize the sort of common stocks that defensive investors should restrict their acquisitions to—as long as they have also paid consistent dividends for a significant amount of time. Adjective-based criteria are inherently vague. What is the boundary for prominence, size, and financial structure conservatism? Regarding the last issue, we may propose a particular standard that, albeit being subjective, is consistent with conventional wisdom. Financially speaking, an industrial business is not conservative until its common stock accounts for a minimum of half of its entire capitalization, which includes all bank loans. A railroad or public utility should have a minimum of thirty percent. The terms "large" and "prominent" convey the idea of being both quite large and holding a prominent position in the business. These businesses are often referred to as "primary," and all other common stocks are referred to as "secondary," with the exception that investors who purchase growth stocks typically classify them as such and put them in a different category. To provide some context, let's say that a corporation is considered "large" in the modern sense if it has $50 million in assets or generates $50 million in revenue. Once again, a firm has to be in the first quarter or first third of its industry group in terms of size in order to be considered "prominent. But to insist on such arbitrary standards would be silly. They are provided to those who may seek for help just as guidelines. However, any guideline that the investor establishes for himself and that does not conflict with the reasonable interpretations of "large" and "prominent" should be accepted. Due to the nature of the situation, a sizable number of businesses must be among those eligible for defensive investment, some of which will and some of which won't. This kind of variety in thought and behavior is not harmful. As a matter of fact, it benefits stock market circumstances by allowing for a progressive separation or shift between major and secondary stock issuance categories.

CONCLUSION

Applying Benjamin Graham's ideas to common stocks as a defensive investor provides a practical and long-lasting strategy for preserving money in the ever-changing equity markets. By carefully analyzing a company's track record of dividend payments, steady profitability, and financial stability, the defensive investor chooses common stocks that are in line with the main objective of capital preservation. The defensive framework's subtle concerns for

investing in common stocks have been examined in this research. The importance of fundamental examination in choosing stocks was underlined, supporting the defensive investor's inclination toward businesses with a track record of strong financial management. Additionally, the research clarified the critical role that diversification plays in risk management and offered advice on how a defensive investor should balance concentration and risk distribution across a range of common companies. It was said that risk management strategies, which are part of the defensive investor's approach, are crucial instruments for negotiating the inherent volatility of stock markets. The research also emphasized the long-term view as a guiding concept, highlighting the defensive investor's dedication to perseverance and self-control in the quest of long-term wealth building.

REFERENCES:

[1] C. W. Senarath and W. Long, "Industry competition and common stock returns," *Montenegrin J. Econ.*, 2018.

[2] B. Huang, L. He, S. Xiong, and Y. Zhang, "The impact of bond rating downgrades on common stock prices in China," *Econ. Polit. Stud.*, 2018.

[3] C. W. Senarathne, "The Impact of Corporate Cultural Behaviour on Common Stock Return: Some Implications for Corporate Governance," *Manag. Organ. Syst. Res.*, 2018.

[4] R. B. Gacus and J. E. Hinlo, "The Reliability of Constant Growth Dividend Discount Model (DDM) in Valuation of Philippine Common Stocks," *Int. J. Econ. Manag. Sci.*, 2018.

[5] H. Bessembinder, "Do stocks outperform Treasury bills?," *J. financ. econ.*, 2018.

[6] S. C. Ahn, A. R. Horenstein, and N. Wang, "Beta Matrix and Common Factors in Stock Returns," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 2018.

[7] H. Shin and S. Park, "Do foreign investors mitigate anchoring bias in stock market? Evidence based on post-earnings announcement drift," *Pacific Basin Financ. J.*, 2018.

[8] O. Wagdi, Y. Tarek, and N. Edres, "Performance of Stock and Treasury Bills under Inflation and Floating: Evidence from Egypt," *Int. J. Econ. Financ.*, 2018.

[9] S. E. Hidayat, M. M. Nadeem, A. J. AlMadaifa, Z. Ali, and - -, "Impacts of Basel III on Islamic Finance," *J. Islam. Financ. Stud.*, 2018.

[10] H. Grove and M. Clouse, "Due Diligence Procedures and Principles for Financial Analysis and Corporate Governance," *J. Corp. Financ. Res. / Корпоративные Финансы | ISSN 2073-0438*, 2018.

[11] G. A. Karolyi and Y. Wu, "A New Partial-Segmentation Approach to Modeling International Stock Returns," *J. Financ. Quant. Anal.*, 2018.

[12] L. Olawale and B. Ilo, "The Effect of Dividend Policy on Stock Price in Nigeria.," *Acta Univ. Danubius. Œconomica*, 2018.

CHAPTER 5

PORTFOLIO POLICY FOR THE ENTERPRISING INVESTOR: NEGATIVE APPROACH

Bineet Naresh Desai, Professor
Department of ISME,ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India
Email Id-bineet.desai@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:
The unique portfolio policy considerations tailored for the enterprising investor adopting a negative approach, as conceptualized by Benjamin Graham in his seminal work, "The Intelligent Investor." Unlike the defensive investor, the enterprising investor is characterized by a more active and opportunistic stance, seeking to capitalize on market inefficiencies and undervalued assets. The negative approach explored in this study revolves around risk mitigation and the identification of potential pitfalls, emphasizing the importance of a thorough analysis of both individual securities and market conditions. The analysis encompasses key elements such as contrarian strategies, margin of safety, and the use of financial indicators to guide the enterprising investor in constructing a portfolio that aligns with a proactive and risk-aware investment philosophy. The study begins by outlining the principles of the negative approach and its departure from the defensive investor's conservative mindset. It explores the enterprising investor's willingness to engage in market timing, recognizing opportunities when securities are undervalued and disposing of assets perceived as overvalued. Further, the paper discusses the importance of a contrarian mindset in the negative approach, emphasizing the enterprising investor's ability to identify and exploit market mispricings. The concept of a margin of safety is also explored, underscoring the enterprising investor's commitment to purchasing securities at a price significantly below their intrinsic value, thereby mitigating downside risks.

KEYWORDS:

Active Management, Contrarian, Market Timing, Risk Tolerance, Short Selling, Speculation.

INTRODUCTION

Starting from the same place as the defensive investor, the "aggressive" investor should allocate his money between high-grade bonds and high-grade common stocks that were purchased at fair prices. He will be willing to take on more security responsibilities, but he will always need a good explanation for the withdrawal. As there is no one perfect pattern for aggressive operations, it is challenging to have an organized discussion on this subject. There is a lot of options available; the decision should be made based not only on the candidate's skills and qualifications but also, maybe just as much, on his preferences and hobbies. Negative generalizations are the most beneficial for the astute investor. Permit him to provide corporate purchasers the high-grade preferred stocks. Additionally, let him stay away from preferred stocks and subpar bond kinds unless they can be purchased at sale rates, which are often at least 30% less than what high-coupon[1], [2].

Here Graham has stumbled over his words. Graham reverts to the widely held belief that adventurous investors are more "aggressive" after adamantly stating that the definition of an "enterprising" investor is determined by the amount of effort one is prepared to put in rather than the level of risk they want. But it's evident from the remainder of the Graham sticks to his initial meaning. Problems, and much less so for the smaller coupons. Even if the yield on

foreign government bonds could be alluring, he will let someone else to purchase them. Additionally, he will be cautious about any new concerns that come up, such as enticing convertible bonds and preferred, as well as common stocks with outstanding results that are limited to the recent past. When investing in standard bonds, the aggressive investor would be well-advised to adhere to the pattern advised by his defensive colleague. He should select between high-grade taxable bonds, which yield approximately 71.4%, and high-quality tax-free bonds, which yield up to 5.30% on longer maturities.

Preferred Stocks and Bonds of Second Class

Since first-rate corporate bonds might yield 71.4% as late as 1971, and even higher, it would be foolish to purchase second-grade offerings only for their greater return. In reality, in the last two years, it has been almost difficult for firms with relatively bad credit to offer "straight bonds"—that is, nonconvertiblesto the general public. Therefore, in order to finance their debt, convertible bonds have been sold, putting them in a different class. As a result, almost all of the nonconvertible bonds with lower ratings are really older securities that are being offered at a steep discount. As a result, they provide the chance of a sizable rise in principle value in the event that favorable circumstances materialize, which in this case would include a combination of a higher firm credit rating and lower general interest rates[3], [4].

We make reference to the potential for any well-defined and extended market scenario from the past to recur in the future throughout this. Therefore, we should think about the course of action that an aggressive investor may need to take in the bond market if high-grade issue prices and yields were to revert to historical norms. We will reiterate our remarks from the 1965 edition, when high-grade bonds yielded only 41.2%, for this reason. It is now appropriate to discuss investing in second-grade concerns, which may easily be identified to provide returns of any desired amount up to 8% or more. The primary distinction between bonds categorized as first or second is often determined by how many times the interest payments have been offset by profits. For instance: Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul, and Pacific 5% income debenture notes yielded 7.35% at 68 at the beginning of 1964. However, in 1963, the road's total interest costs (before income taxes) were only 1.5 times what we required for a well-protected railroad issue[5], [6].

These securities are purchased by many investors who "need income" and are unable to accept the pitiful return provided by top-grade issues. Experience has amply shown that purchasing a bond or preferred only because of its alluring yield is foolish when it comes to inadequate safety.* If these assets are purchased at full price, meaning there aren't many points below 100 *, there's a very good probability the holder will eventually see significantly lower quotes. Because these kinds of issues are particularly vulnerable to severe declining phases when bad company or just a terrible market arises; usually, interest or dividends are discontinued or at least put in jeopardy, and there is sometimes a declared price weakness even if the operational results are not at all poor. To provide a concrete example of this attribute of senior issues of second-quality, allow us to provide the price movement of 10 railroad income bonds during the 1946–1947 period. These are all of the pieces that sold for 96 or more in 1946, with an average high price of 1021⁄2. The group's average price by the next year was just 68, which represents a rapid loss of one-third of the market value. Strangely enough, the nation's railroads were reporting much higher profits in 1947 than they had in 1946; as a result, the sharp price drop was a reflection of the overall market selloff and went against the economic outlook. Nevertheless, it should be noted that these income bonds had a substantially greater contraction than the ordinary equities on the Dow Jones industrial list. It goes without saying that the buyer of these bonds at a price higher than $100 could not have anticipated to have any share in a further increase in the securities market. Only the

income return, which averaged about 4.25%, was appealing. However, the sequel revealed all too quickly and clearly that the buyer of these second-grade bonds was taking a significant risk by risking the loss of a sizable portion of his principle in exchange for a negligible yearly income benefit.

The aforementioned illustration enables us to honor the popular illusion known as a "businessman's investment." This entails investing in a security that has a higher yield than what can be obtained from a high-grade issue, but it also has a higher risk. Accepting the known risk of principle loss in return for only 1% or 2% of annual income increase is lousy business. You should be confident that, should everything go according to plan, you may enjoy a very significant rise in principle value if you are ready to take on some risk. Therefore, it is nearly always a terrible idea to buy a second-grade 5.5 or 6% bond that is selling at par. You may be able to purchase the same issue at 70 if you are patient, and it could make more sense at that point[7], [8].

An astute investor must keep in mind two contradictory characteristics of preferred stocks and second-grade bonds. In poor markets, almost all experience prolonged periods of decline. However, when favorable circumstances return, a significant percentage of them regain their position, so things eventually "work out all right." This is true even for preferred equities that have a protracted dividend payment history. The protracted downturn of the 1930s led to a number of these problems in the early 1940s. Many of these sizable accumulations were paid off in cash or in new securities during the postwar boom years of 1945–1947, and the principal was often discharged as well. Consequently, those who had purchased these securities a few years earlier when they were unfriendly and sold for cheap prices gained significant gains. In an overall accounting, it's possible that the higher yields on senior second-grade issues will have more than made up for the irrecoverable principal losses. Put otherwise, an investor who purchased all of these issues at the time of their issuing might theoretically do just as well in the long term as someone who only purchased first-quality securities, if not slightly better. But practically speaking, the question is very meaningless. In any case, when the price of second-grade issues drops sharply, the customer who paid full price for them will be unhappy and concerned. In addition, he is unable to purchase enough securities to guarantee a "average" outcome and is unable to lay away any amount of his higher income in order to "amortize" or offset those principle losses that turn out to be irreversible. Ultimately, it is only basic sense to avoid purchasing stocks at about 100 if past performance suggests that they are likely to be purchased for 70 or below during the next down market.

DISCUSSION

Since 1914 foreign bonds have generally had a poor track record as investments, as every investor, no matter how inexperienced, knows. This was inevitable given the two world wars and the unprecedented depth of the interwar global slump. However, the market circumstances every few years are good enough to allow the selling of some fresh foreign issues at a price that is roughly equal. This occurrence provides valuable insights into the mental processes of typical investors, not only those involved in the bond market. An argument of sorts was advanced years ago to support the buying of foreign bonds here, arguing that a wealthy creditor country like ours had a moral duty to lend overseas. Time, the bringer of many retributions, has given us our own intractable balance-of-payments issue, which we partly attribute to American investors buying foreign bonds in bulk in an attempt to gain a little yield edge. For many years, we have questioned the buyer's intrinsic attraction to these investments; maybe we should clarify now that, should he refuse these possibilities, he would benefit both his nation and himself.

New Matters in General

Attempting to make generalizations regarding new concerns as a class may seem misguided, given that they include the greatest variety of quality and appeal. There will undoubtedly be outliers to any recommended guidelines. All investors, in our opinion, should be cautious when investing in fresh issues. To put it another way, they should be thoroughly inspected and put through exceptionally rigorous testing before being acquired[9], [10].

This double warning exists for two reasons. The first is that new issues are the product of unique salesmanship, necessitating a unique level of sales resistance. The second is that most new issues are offered under "favorable market conditions," which are advantageous for the seller and, as a result, less advantageous for the buyer.

As we go down the scale from the highest-quality bonds to second-grade senior offerings and, at the bottom, common-stock flotation's, the impact of these factors becomes more significant. A massive amount of financing was done in the past, which included calling in old bonds and replacing them with new issuance with reduced yields. Preferred stocks and high-grade bonds made up the majority of this. Financial institutions made up the majority of the purchasers, and they were well-qualified to defend their interests. Because of this, the prices of these offers were carefully set to match the market rate for similar difficulties, and aggressive marketing had little impact on the result. The purchasers eventually realized that the price of these issues was too high as interest rates continued to drop, and many of them saw a significant collapse in the market thereafter. This is a part of the broader trend of selling new securities of all kinds at the best possible time for the issuer; however, in the case of first-quality offerings, the buyer's losses are more likely to be minor than catastrophic[11], [12].

When we examine the lower-grade bonds and preferred stocks that were sold in 1945–1946 and 1960–1961 eras, the picture becomes somewhat different. Since the majority of these problems were most likely assigned to inexperienced individual investors, the impact of the marketing effort is more apparent in this instance. These products were characterized by their lackluster performance over a sufficient number of years, as determined by the firms' performance. If it could be expected that the recent results would continue without a significant setback, they did seem to be rather secure overall. The investment bankers who raised these concerns most likely agreed with this supposition, and their salespeople had no trouble convincing both themselves and their clients in a similar manner. However, it was an unwise investment strategy that would probably end up being expensive.

New Offerings of Common Stock

The following passages from the 1959 version are copied verbatim with an additional comment:

Two types of financing are available for common stock. For firms that are already listed, new shares are distributed to existing investors on a pro rata basis. The second kind involves the public offering of formerly privately held companies' common stock. The controlling interests sell the majority of this shares in order to profit from a rising market and to offset their exuberance, which caused the 1987 catastrophe. After that, the cycle reversed itself, with IPOs ceasing to occur between 1988 and 1990. Due to the scarcity, the 1990s saw a bull market. Coincidentally, Wall Street resumed its production of new stocks, generating close to 5,000 initial public offerings (IPOs). Then, in 2001, after the bust of the 2000 bubble, there were only 88 initial public offerings (IPOs)—the fewest since 1979. Every time there has been an initial public offering (IPO), the public has been burnt, withdrawn for a minimum of

two years, and then returned for another round of burning. Investors have experienced this manic-depressive cycle throughout the duration of stock markets. During the 1825 initial public offering (IPO) boom in America, a man is said to have died after being crushed by a stampede of investors attempting to purchase shares in the newly established Bank of Southwark. The richest investors reportedly employed goons to force their way to the head of the line. As predicted, equities had dropped to around 25% of their original worth by 1829.

Graham is discussing rights offers here when stockholders are required to contribute more funds to retain their proportionate ownership stake in the business. This kind of funding, while still common in Europe, is becoming uncommon in the US, exceptfor closed-end funds. Because of the nature of the securities markets, this behavior follows a well-defined pattern that will inevitably cause the public to suffer significant losses and disappointments. The risks stem from the nature of the companies that get this funding as well as the market dynamics that enable the funding.

Many of our top businesses were first exposed to public trade around the beginning of the century. Since there were fewer and fewer first-class businesses that were tightly held throughout time, the initial common-stock flotations have tended to focus more and more on relatively modest businesses. Unfortunately, at the same time, the public that purchases stocks has been forming a deep-rooted bias against smaller firms and a strong preference for larger ones. Like many other prejudices, this one also tends to wane as bull markets gain strength. The enormous and rapid returns shown by common stocks as a whole are enough to both strengthen the public's acquisitive impulse and dull its analytical capacity. There are also a lot of privately held companies that are doing very well at these times, even if the majority of them wouldn't have as remarkable of a track record if they were to go back, say, 10 years or more.

The following outcomes result from the combination of these factors: the first common-stock flotations arrive sometime during the bull market. The purchasers of the early issues make some significant gains, and they are priced fairly. As the market continues to increase, this kind of financing becomes more common; the firms' quality continuously declines; and the prices demanded and received approach the absurd. The fact that new common stocks of tiny and unremarkable firms are being issued at prices somewhat higher than the existing level for many medium-sized companies with a lengthy market history is one reasonably reliable indicator of the impending conclusion of a bull movement.

During Graham's time, the most esteemed investment banks often avoided the initial public offering (IPO) industry, seeing it as an indecent abuse of unsuspecting investors. But by the time the IPO bubble peaked in late 1999 and early 2000, Wall Street's largest investment banks had already dug in deep. Respectable companies abandoned their customary caution and acted like inebriated mud wrestlers, frantically trying to push absurdly expensive stocks on a public that was in dire need of them. If there are any classes on investment banking ethics that cover the years 1960–1964, Graham's explanation of the IPO process is a classic that should be required reading. The stock market's remarkable ability to quickly distance itself from that catastrophe reminds us of the invulnerability it displayed during the great Florida real estate collapse in 1925.

Is a resurgence of the new-stock-offering frenzy necessary before the current bull market may finally end? Who knows? However, we do know that a wise investor will remember what happened in 1962 and will not allow others to benefit quickly from this venture in the future, only to suffer horrifying losses in the process. In the 1965 version, we cited "A Horrible Example"—that is, the November 1961 sale of Aetna Maintenance Co. shares for $9—after

these words. In usual manner, the shares rose quickly to $15; the next year, they dropped to $23.8, and in 1964, they dropped to $7.8. This company's latter history was rather unusual and serves as an example of some of the bizarre transformations that American industry, both large and small, has undergone recently. Appendix 5 contains both the earlier and modern history of this venture for the inquisitive reader.

It would be quite easy to provide even more horrific instances from the most recent reimagining of "the same old story," which took place between 1967 and 1970. The story of AAA Enterprises, which just so happens to be the first business listed in Standard & Poor's Stock Guide at that time, couldn't be more pertinent to our goals. The shares were first offered to the public in 1968 for $14, quickly rising to $28, but were only listed at a pitiful 25¢ at the beginning of 1971. This flotation's narrative has so much to teach us and so many crucial cautions to take away that we have saved it for a thorough analysis.

Portfolio Management for the Ambitious Investor: The Advantage

By definition, the ambitious investor will focus a good deal of his attention and energy on achieving an investment outcome that exceeds the average. We have offered some recommendations for bond investments in our discussion on general investment policy, primarily aimed at the entrepreneurial investor. The following types of exceptional possibilities would be of interest to him: tax-free New Housing Authority bonds that are practically guaranteed by the federal government of the United States. New Community bonds are taxable yet have a high yield and are guaranteed by the US government. Municipalities create tax-free industrial bonds, but powerful businesses provide the lease payments.

Conversely, there might be bonds of lesser quality that are available at such cheap prices that they represent great value. However, they would fall under the category of "special situations," in which bonds and common stocks are identical. The New Housing Authority and New Community bonds are no longer issued, as was previously mentioned. Distressed or defaulted bonds are the modern terms for these "lower-quality bonds" under the "special situation" category. A company's common stock is effectively worthless when it files for bankruptcy because bondholders have a much greater legal claim than stockholders have under US bankruptcy law. However, bondholders often get ownership in the reorganized business once it successfully emerges from bankruptcy, and the bonds' value normally increases once the company is once again able to pay interest. As a result, the common stock of a financially sound corporation may outperform the bonds of a struggling one. As Graham states, "no true distinction exists between bonds and common stocks in these special situations."

Growth-Stock Method

Selecting stocks of firms that outperform the average over a sustained period is the desire of every investor. A growth stock has shown this behavior in the past and is predicted to continue doing so. Therefore, it stands to reason that a wise investor would focus on choosing growth companies. As we will attempt to demonstrate, the situation is much more convoluted.Finding businesses that have historically "out-performed the averages" is just a statistical task. The investor's broker can provide a list of fifty or one hundred such businesses. Why then wouldn't he just choose the fifteen or twenty most likely-looking concerns from this group and presto! Does he own an assuredly profitable stock portfolio? Pay close attention to what Graham is saying here. In a 1972 essay, he argues that the more than 22-year period from 1949 is too short to allow for the trustworthy drawing of conclusions! Graham, who is a math whiz, never forgets that lengthy samples with copious

quantities of data are necessary for drawing impartial conclusions. Charlatans selling "time-tested" stock-picking schemes almost always base their conclusions on smaller samples than Graham could ever approve of.

This straightforward concept comes with two caveats. First, common stocks with solid track records and promising futures tend to fetch premium prices. Just because he has fully paid for the anticipated wealth does not mean that the investor will do well even if his assessment of their chances is accurate. The other is that his prediction about the future could turn out to be incorrect. Unusually quick development is not sustainable; once a business has achieved a fantastic expansion, the sheer scale of the expansion makes it harder to repeat the success. The growth curve eventually flattens out and, in many circumstances, begins to decline. It is clear that, if one limits oneself to a small number of well selected cases, in retrospect, he may show that fortunes can easily be created or lost in the growth-stock area. How can the total outcomes that may be achieved here be accurately assessed? We believe that a review of the outcomes obtained by the investment funds that specialize in the growth-stock method allows for the reasonable drawing of conclusions. The reputable guidebook "Investment Companies," which is published yearly by New York Stock Exchange members Arthur Wiesenberger & Company, calculates the yearly performance of around 120 of these "growth funds" over a number of years. Forty-five of them have records that go back at least 10 years. Unweight for fund size, the average total return for these businesses throughout the decade 1961–1970 comes out to 18%. This compares to 15% for the S & P composite and 83% for the DJIA.3 Most of the 126 "growth funds" underperformed both indexes in the years 1969 and 1970. Our previous investigations yielded similar outcomes. This suggests that, as compared to investing in common stocks generally, diversified growth company investments did not provide particularly high returns. Funds investing in major growth businesses, today's version of what Graham refers to as "growth funds," earned an average of 5.6% annually for the ten years ended December 31, 2002, lagging the broader stock market by an average of 3.7 percentage points annually. But during the same period, "large value" funds that invested in larger, more fairly priced firms also underperformed the market.

Observe that Graham is adamant about using a multiyear average of prior earnings to determine the price/earnings ratio. By doing this, you lessen the likelihood that you would overestimate the worth of a business based on a brief, exceptionally profitable period. Assume that a business made $3 per share in the last twelve months, but only made an average of fifty cents per share in the preceding six years. Which figure, the unexpected $3 or the consistent 50 cents, is more likely to signify a long-term trend? If the stock were valued at 25 times its earnings of $3 in the previous year, it would be trading for $75. However, the stock would only be valued at $21.43 if it were 25 times the average profits for the preceding seven years. The number you choose has a significant impact. Lastly, it's important to remember that the dominant approach on Wall Street at the moment, which bases price/earnings ratios mostly on "next year's earnings," would be the notable feature of growth companies as a class is their propensity for large price fluctuations. This holds true for the biggest and most well-known businesses, like General Electric and International Business Machines, and it's even more true for the more recent and prosperous little businesses. They demonstrate our theory, which is that the primary feature of the stock market since 1949 has been the infusion of a very speculative element into the shares of the most brilliantly successful companiescompanies that themselves would be deserving of a high investment ratinginto their shares. Over an extended period, the investment quality of this firm could remain constant, but the risk characteristics of its shares will fluctuate based on its performance in the stock market. The public's enthusiasm for it and its rate of advancement relative to the rise in profits indicate how riskier the idea is as time goes on.

CONCLUSION

The portfolio policy provides a flexible and advantageous framework for managing the intricacies of financial markets for the ambitious investor who chooses a negative strategy. This approach, which is based on Benjamin Graham's ideas, emphasizes a proactive approach that looks to take advantage of inexpensive assets and market inefficiencies rather than the defensive investor's cautious outlook. This essay has examined the essential elements of the negative approach, illuminating the readiness of the adventurous investor to take up contrarian tactics, participate in market timing, and choose securities with a margin of safety. Astute investors actively seek to detect and take advantage of market mispricing to strategically position themselves to seize opportunities and reduce negative risks. In the context of the negative approach, the research also underlined the importance of financial indicators and market analysis, showing how astute investors may make use of information asymmetry and analytical tools to make well-informed investment choices. An entrepreneurial investor may better manage shifting market circumstances and spot possibilities that the general market might miss by using rigorous analytical methods and a proactive mentality.

REFERENCES:

[1] T. McNulty and D. Nordberg, "Ownership, Activism and Engagement: Institutional Investors as Active Owners," *Corp. Gov. An Int. Rev.*, 2016.

[2] I. R. Appel, T. A. Gormley, and D. B. Keim, "Passive investors, not passive owners," *J. financ. econ.*, 2016.

[3] E. Bajo, T. J. Chemmanur, K. Simonyan, and H. Tehranian, "Underwriter networks, investor attention, and initial public offerings," *J. financ. econ.*, 2016.

[4] A. O. I. Hoffmann and T. Post, "How does investor confidence lead to trading? Linking investor return experiences, confidence, and investment beliefs," *J. Behav. Exp. Financ.*, 2016.

[5] D. P. Liston, "Sin stock returns and investor sentiment," *Q. Rev. Econ. Financ.*, 2016.

[6] P. R. Martin and D. V. Moser, "Managers' green investment disclosures and investors' reaction," *J. Account. Econ.*, 2016.

[7] M. P. Kirk and S. Markov, "Come on over: Analyst/investor days as a disclosure medium," *Accounting Review*. 2016.

[8] S. Aren, S. D. Aydemir, and Y. Şehitoğlu, "Behavioral biases on institutional investors: a literature review," *Kybernetes*. 2016.

[9] J. Siekkinen, "Value relevance of fair values in different investor protection environments," *Account. Forum*, 2016.

[10] L. Koonce, N. Seybert, and J. Smith, "Management Speaks, Investors Listen: Are Investors Too Focused on Managerial Disclosures?," *J. Behav. Financ.*, 2016.

[11] P. Muniandy, G. Tanewski, and S. K. Johl, "Institutional investors in Australia: Do they play a homogenous monitoring role?," *Pacific Basin Financ. J.*, 2016.

[12] J. Liu, R. Gao, C. Y. J. Cheah, and J. Luo, "Incentive mechanism for inhibiting investors' opportunistic behavior in PPP projects," *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 2016.

CHAPTER 6

EXPLORING THE FIELDS FOR ENTERPRISING INVESTMENT

Shoaib Mohammed, Associate Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India
Email Id-shoaib.mohammed@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:
The diverse fields and sectors offer enterprising investors opportunities for active and strategic investment. Rooted in the principles of Benjamin Graham's "The Intelligent Investor," the enterprising investor seeks to capitalize on market inefficiencies, undervalued assets, and emerging trends. The study identifies and analyzes several key fields that present promising prospects for enterprising investment, encompassing equity markets, alternative investments, technology-driven sectors, sustainable and ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) investments, and emerging markets. It examines the unique considerations, risk factors, and strategic approaches associated with each field, providing insights to guide enterprising investors in making informed and opportunistic investment decisions. The analysis begins with an overview of equity markets, emphasizing the enterprising investor's approach to actively identifying undervalued stocks and employing contrarian strategies. Alternative investments, including real estate, commodities, and private equity, are explored as avenues for diversification and potential alpha generation. Furthermore, the paper delves into technology-driven sectors, recognizing the transformative impact of innovation on investment opportunities. Sustainable and ESG investments are highlighted as fields where ethical considerations intersect with potential financial gains, aligning with the growing emphasis on responsible investing.

KEYWORDS:

Commodities, Crypto Currencies, Distressed Assets, Emerging Markets, Growth Stocks, Initial Public Offerings (IPOS).

INTRODUCTION

To get superior investment returns over an extended period, a selection or operating strategy must include double benefits. It has to deviate from the majority of investors' or speculators' policies and pass objective or reasonable standards of fundamental soundness. Based on our research and expertise, we have identified three investing strategies that satisfy these requirements. They vary greatly from one another, and the people who test them may need to possess varying degrees of expertise and dispositions. The modern counterpart of investors "who have a close relationship with the particular company" are those who assist in running the business and own large blocks of shares, sometimes known as "control persons." CEOs who have direct influence over a company's future, such as Warren Buffett of Berkshire Hathaway or Bill Gates of Microsoft, are seen as a vote of confidence by outside investors, who want to see them keep their substantial shareholdings. However, less experienced managers and regular employees are unable to affect the company's share price with their own choices; as a result, they need to invest no more than a modest portion of their assets in the stock of their employer. Regarding outside investors, the same criticism holds regardless of how well they believe they understand the firm[1], [2].

The Mostly Unpopular Big Business

It makes sense to anticipate that the market will undervalueat least relativelycompanies that are out of favor due to unsatisfactory developments of a temporary nature if we assume that it is the habit of the market to overvalue common stocks that have been showing excellent growth or are glamorous for some other reason. This might be seen as a foundational rule of the stock market and offers an approach to investing that is both cautious and constructive. The important thing in this situation is that the ambitious investors focus on the bigger businesses that are going through a difficult time right now. Small businesses have the danger of both a permanent loss of profitability and long-term market neglect despite higher profits, even as they may also be undervalued for comparable reasons and often go on to grow their earnings and share price. Hence, the big businesses have a distinct edge over the competition. First of all, they possess the financial and intellectual capital necessary to overcome adversity and return to a respectable earnings base. Second, any improvement will probably be met with a fair amount of speed from the market. Studies of the price behavior of controversial items in the Dow Jones Industrial Average provide a striking illustration of the validity of this idea. In these, it was expected that an annual investment was made in the six or ten DJIA stocks that were trading at the lowest multiples of their profits from the prior or current year. These stocks may be referred to as the "cheapest" on the list, and it is clear from their low price that traders and investors find them to be somewhat unpopular. Furthermore, it was expected that these acquisitions would be fulfilled after one to five-year holding periods. The outcomes of these investments were then contrasted with those shown in the highest multiplier group or the DJIA overall[3], [4].

The comprehensive data that we now possess pertains to the outcomes of the yearly purchases that were made throughout the previous 53 years. During the first years, 1917–1933, this strategy was unsuccessful. However, the strategy has produced very good outcomes since 1933. In 34 one-year holding tests conducted by Drexel & Company between 1937 and 1969, the inexpensive stocks exceeded the average over 25 years; in just three cases the cheap stocks did worse than the DJIA. In six other cases, the results were about the same. The average results for five years, when compared to the DJIA and the ten high-multiplier equities, demonstrate the continuously superior performance of the low-multiplier companies. According to the Drexel estimate, an initial $10,000 investment in the low-multiplier issues in 1936, which was thereafter swapped annually in line with the concept, would have increased to $66,900 by 1962. If the same actions had been performed on all thirty stocks, the initial fund would have grown to $44,000, while the identical procedures on high-multiplier stocks would have only resulted in a value of $25,300. Buying "unpopular large companies" was the idea of Drexel Firestone, a Philadelphia investment bank that merged with Burnham & Co. in 1973 to become Drexel Burnham Lambert. Drexel Burnham Lambert is most known for funding junkbonds during the 1980s takeover boom. The practice of purchasing the lowest-priced companies inside the Dow Jones Industrial Average has come to be known as the “Dogs of the Dow” strategy[5],[6].

We evaluated the DJIA-low-multiplier technique findings while writing this version, applying it to a group that was presumably purchased at the end of 1968 and revalued on June 30, 1971. This time, the results were very dismal, with the high-multiplier selections showing a healthy profit and the low-multiplier selections suffering a severe loss. Although this one negative example shouldn't invalidate findings drawn from thirty or more tests, its recent occurrence lends it extra unfavorable weight. Maybe the ambitious investor could build his portfolio using the "low-multiplier" concept as a base and then add additional quantitative and qualitative needs.

Acquisition of Bargain Concerns

A bargain issue is one that seems to be worth much more than it is selling for, based on facts discovered via research. The genus comprises common stocks, bonds, and preferred stocks that are trading significantly below market value. To be as specific as feasible, let us say that unless the specified value is at least 50% higher than the price, an issue is not a real "bargain." What type of evidence would support the idea that there is such a large discrepancy? How do deals go into existence, and how can an investor make money off of them?

There are two ways to identify a good deal in common stock. The first is via the assessment process. This mostly depends on projecting future profits and multiplying them by the proper factor for that specific problem. If the investor is confident in the method used and the resulting value is sufficiently higher than the market price, he may label the stock as a deal. The worth of the company to a private owner serves as the second test. Additionally, predicted future earnings are often the primary factor used to establish this value; in this scenario, the outcome may be the same as the first. However, the second test is likely to focus more on the assets' realizable value, namely the net current assets, or working capital. By these metrics, a significant fraction of common stocks are bargain issues during market downturns. While it is true that both the present profits and the near-term prospects are bad, a rational assessment of the typical future circumstances would show values that are far higher than the going rates. Thus, the employment of tenable value analysis methodologies, in addition to the voice of experience, validates the prudence of exercising fortitude in down markets. Many individual deals occur at practically all market levels, for the same market forces that often generate a cheap situation in the general list. The market tends to magnify little problems and turn ordinary vicissitudes into significant setbacks. The simple absence of passion or interest may drive a price decrease to ridiculously low levels. Therefore, it seems that there are two main causes of undervaluation: the present lackluster performance and long-term disregard or disfavor.

That being said, none of these factors alone should be used as a benchmark for profitable common stock investments. How can we be certain that the present unsatisfactory outcomes will only last temporarily? We indeed have plenty of instances of such occurring. The steel stocks were formerly known for their exceptional cyclical performance, allowing an astute investor to purchase them at a discount during a period of low profits and sell them during prosperous years at a handsome profit. Creating money in the stock market would be simple if stocks with erratic earnings always behaved this way. Regretfully, there are several instances of decreases in Among the tallest mountains lately constructed from molehills are the following: Six men using Pfizer's anti-impotence medication Viagra died after heart attacks during sexual encounters, according to a May 1998 announcement from Pfizer Inc. and the US Food and Drug Administration. Pfizer's shares fell sharply right after, dropping 3.4% in a single day due to intense trading. However, Pfizer's stock shot up when more studies revealed there was no need to be concerned; throughout the next two years, the stock increased by around a third. When sales of Warner-Lambert Co.'s new diabetic medication were briefly suspended in England in late 1997, the company's shares plunged 19% in a single day. However, the stock almost quadrupled in six months. Cruise ship operator Carnival Corp. suffered a 10% loss in value towards the end of 2002 when travelers began experiencing severe diarrhea and vomiting on ships owned and operated by other businesses. The company's profits and price did not immediately rebound handsomely from this setback. Anaconda Wire and Cable was one example, with significant profits up to 1956 and a peak price of 85 in that year. After that, the profits went down steadily for six years. In 1962, the

price dropped to 231, and the following year, its parent company acquired it for only 33. Numerous examples of this kind of experience imply that the investor would want more than a simple decline in price and profits to provide him with a solid foundation for buying. He should demand proof of at least a fair level of earnings stability over the last ten years or morethat is, no year with a loss in profitsas well as the necessary size and financial stability to withstand any future setbacks. Therefore, a big, well-known firm that is selling both its past average price and its past average price/earnings multiplier well would be the optimal combo in this case. Given that corporations like Chrysler often have high price/earnings ratios in conjunction with their low-price years, this would have undoubtedly eliminated the majority of their profit chances. However, let us reassure the reader right awayand we will undoubtedly do so once morethat "hindsight profits" and "real-money profits" are quite different. We doubt that our ambitious investor would find a Chrysler-style roller coaster to be a suitable medium for operations. A second factor contributing to price decreases to unreasonably low levels has been noted: prolonged neglect or disfavor. National Presto Industries seems to be a modern example of this kind. It sold for 45 at its peak in the 1968 bull market, which was just eight times the $5.61 in profits for that year. Although the price dropped to only 21 in 1970, the earnings per share grew in both 1969 and 1970. This was less than the net current asset value and less than four times the profits for that year. It was sold in March 1972 for 34, which was around its increased net-current-asset value and yet just 51.2 times the most recent reported profits. A further example of this kind is now being offered by Standard Oil of California, a significant issue. Early in 1972, it was selling for almost the same amount as it had thirteen years before 56. Over the course of the time, its profits had shown a remarkable level of stability, with just one little dip and very tiny rise. It was worth around the same as the asking amount. The corporation has never shown an average yearly price as high as 15 times its current profits, despite its quite positive 1958–71 performance. Early in 1972, the ratio of price to profits was just around 10. The market's inability to accurately assess a common stock's earnings picture might be the third reason for an unreasonably low price. Northern Pacific Railway is a prime example of this, declining from 36 to 131⁄2 in 1946–1947. In 1947, the road's actual profits per share were around $10. The $1 dividend was a major factor in keeping the stock price low. It was also disregarded because railroad-specific accounting practices obscured a large portion of its profit potential[7], [8].

A common stock that sells for less than the company's net working capital after subtracting all previous liabilities is the easiest sort of bargain issue to spot. This would imply that the buyer would not pay anything at all for the goodwill goods that may exist or the permanent assets, such as buildings, machines, etc. Though there are sporadic examples, very few businesses end up being worth less than the working capital alone. Instead, what is shocking is the sheer number of attainable businesses that have been valued on this basis of bargaining in the market. About 150 of these popular stocks were revealed in a collection prepared in 1957, when the market was by no means at its lowest point. The outcome of purchasing one share of each of the 85 businesses on the list, whose data was available in Standard & Poor's Monthly Stock Guide, on December 31, 1957, and holding those shares for two years.

Coincidentally, throughout the course of the two years, every group progressed to a point close to the total net-current-asset value. During that time, the whole "portfolio" gained 75%, compared to Standard & Poor's 425 industrials' 50% increase. Equal more amazing is the fact that 78 of the problems had noticeable advances, seven stayed about equal, and none of the difficulties had any meaningful losses.

For many years before 1957, our experience with this kind of investment selection—on a diversified basis was consistently positive. It is probably reasonable to say that it constitutes a professional and secure way to identify and capitalize on undervalued circumstances. However, these chances were increasingly rare during the overall market increase after 1957, and many of those that were accessible were showing minimal operational profits or even losses. The market downturn of 1969–1970 gave rise to a fresh batch of these stocks dubbed "sub-working capital.

DISCUSSION

A secondary firm is described as one that does not have a leading position in a reasonably significant sector. As a result, it is often among the smallest companies in its industry, yet it might also be the main player in a crucial line. Exceptionally, a firm that has become a growth stock is not often seen as "secondary." During the 1920s great bull market, there was not much differentiation made between industry leaders and other listed concerns, as long as the latter were of a reasonable size. The public believed that a middle-sized business had a greater chance of really exceptional growth than a huge corporation since it was small enough to withstand storms. However, the enterprises that ranked highest in terms of size or intrinsic stability were especially severely damaged during the downturn years of 1931–1932. Following that experience, investors have since acquired a strong predilection for market leaders and, for the most part, a lack of interest in the average firm that is of secondary significance. As a result, compared to the former group, the latter has often sold for significantly lower prices when considering profits and assets. It has also meant that the price has often dropped to the point that the bargain class is affected.

Investors expressed their conviction or anxiety that secondary firms would not have a bright future when they rejected their stocks, even though they sold for very little money. Subconsciously, they reasoned that because they were becoming extinct, any price would be too much for them, just as the companion notion for the "blue chips" in 1929 held that there was no limit to what might be done for them in the future. These two points of view were inflated and led to significant mistakes in investments. When compared to the ordinary privately held firm, a typical middle-sized listed corporation is really rather substantial. There isn't a good reason why these businesses shouldn't go on operating continuously, enduring the ups and downs of our economy while generally making a reasonable return on their capital investments[9], [10].

This succinct analysis shows that secondary firms are often treated unfairly by the stock market, which leads to many instances of significant undervaluation during regular times. In actuality, smaller businesses benefited more during the World War II era and the postwar boom than did bigger ones, since the former were able to more dramatically increase sales and profit margins while the latter were spared from the usual rivalry for customers. As a result, by 1946 the market's pattern had entirely changed from what it had been before the war. Standard & Poor's index of cheap companies surged by at least 280% over the same time, whereas the Dow Jones Industrial Average's leading equities gained just 40% from the end of 1938 to the peak in 1946. With the customary short memory of stock market enthusiasts, many speculators and self-styled investors were willing to purchase both new and old shares of minor businesses at exorbitant prices. The pendulum had thus clearly swung to the other extreme. The class of secondary issues that had historically provided the majority of bargain opportunities was suddenly the one offering the most instances of overvaluation and overenthusiasm. This phenomenon was replicated in different ways in 1961 and 1968, with the focus now being on new offerings of small companies' shares that were not of a

secondary nature, as well as on almost all businesses in certain favored fields like "computers," "electronics," "franchise" concerns, and others.

The subsequent market falls were mostly caused by these overvaluations, as was to be anticipated. The swing of the pendulum may have in some instances reached the point of clear undervaluation. Given that secondary issues often exhibit low market value, what grounds does the investor have to think he might make money in this particular situation? Will he not always be in the same market position as when he purchased the issue, if it continues indefinitely? Here, the solution is a little more nuanced. There are many ways in which acquiring secondary firms at deep discounts may provide significant financial gains. The dividend return is quite high, to start. Second, the price will eventually change due to the considerable reinvested profits compared to the amount paid. These benefits may add up to quite a bit in a well-chosen list over the course of five to seven years. Third, low-priced issues often get the most attention in a bull market, which tends to elevate the average bargain issue to a respectable level. Fourth, secondary issues that were undervalued may climb to the typical level for their kind of security, if not above, during times of the market that are comparatively featureless. This process of price adjustment is ongoing. Fifth, the particular reasons why tiny stocks beat big companies by an astounding average of 17.6 percentage point’s year from 1975 to 1983. The investing public greeted tiny stocks with great enthusiasm, mutual fund providers launched hundreds of new funds focused on them, and small stocks complied by outperforming big stocks over the following ten years by five percentage points annually. When tiny stocks outperformed large companies by almost nine percentage points in 1999, the cycle was repeated, prompting investment bankers to offer hundreds of hot little high-tech firms to the public for the first time. The names of these companies no longer included terms like "electronics," "computers," or "franchise." A change in management, the implementation of new policies, or the introduction of new circumstances might all be reasons for a dismal track record of profitability. In recent times, a significant emerging element has been the bigger corporations' purchase of smaller ones, often as a means of diversification. In these situations, the amount paid has often been rather substantial and much over the bargain levels that were in place not so long ago[11], [12].

Bonds and preferred stocks that sold at significant discounts to their claim amount were included in the category of bargain issues during the period when interest rates were much lower than they were in 1970. Presently, things are different; even highly secured issues trade at significant discounts if they have coupon rates of, say, 41.2 percent or less. Situations like these are not for the novice investor; he might burn his fingers since he doesn't have a strong sense of values in this field. However, there is a tendency for the market fall in this subject to be exaggerated; as a result, the group as a whole extends a particularly fruitful invitation to cautious and daring analysis. The billion-dollar group of railroad bonds that had failed in the decade that ended in 1948 offered many and amazing chances in this field. Since then, there haven't been many of these possibilities, but in the 1970s, they may come again.

Today's railroad defaulted bonds don't provide many prospects. However, as previously said, trash bonds that are distressed or in default, together with convertible bonds issued by high-tech businesses, can have genuine worth after the market crisis that occurred between 2000 and 2002. However, diversification in this domain is crucial—and unfeasible without allocating at least $100,000 to distressed stocks exclusively. Unless you are a multimillionaire, this kind of diversification is not feasible.

This sector used to almost guarantee an appealing rate of return for anyone who understood their way around it, and this was true in practically any kind of general market scenario. The general public was not really prohibited from accessing it. Those with a natural aptitude for

this kind of work might pick up the skills and become rather competent practitioners without requiring extensive schooling or an apprenticeship. Others have been astute enough to see the fundamental validity of this strategy and align themselves with intelligent young men who managed capital primarily allocated to these “special situations.” However, the field of “arbitrages and workouts” has recently become less professional and riskier for reasons we will discuss later. It's possible that circumstances in this industry may improve in the next years. Regardless, it is useful to describe the overall characteristics and source of these procedures, including one or two instances for clarification.

The common "special situation" emerged from the growing number of major companies acquiring smaller ones as more and more management teams embraced the concept of product diversification. Purchasing an established firm in the industry one wants to join, as opposed to launching a brand-new enterprise from the ground up, often seems like smart business for such an enterprise. It is almost always essential to propose a price that is far higher than the present level in order to enable such an acquisition and to get approval of the transaction by the requisite huge majority of the smaller company's shareholders. These business decisions have been offering intriguing prospects for financial gain to those who have studied this area and have sound judgment supported by a wealth of expertise. Not that long ago, astute investors gained a significant amount of money by buying bonds from railroads that were declaring bankruptcy; they knew these bonds would increase in value significantly when the railroads were eventually restructured. Following the announcement of the restructuring plans, a "when issued" market for the new securities emerged. These could almost always be sold for a significant amount more than the previous issues that were supposed to be traded in return for them. Although there was a chance that the designs wouldn't be used or that there would be unforeseen delays, overall these "arbitrage operations" proved to be quite profitable.

Similar possibilities resulted from the 1935 law that broke up public-utility holding firms. When these businesses were converted from holding corporations to a collection of independent operating firms, almost all of them turned out to be much more valuable. The fundamental cause of this is the security markets' propensity to minimize the importance of problems included in intricate judicial cases. The old Wall Street maxim, "Never buy into a lawsuit," may be wise counsel for the speculator looking to make a swift move with his assets. But because the bias against them drives their values down to unreasonably low levels, the general public's acceptance of this attitude is sure to provide bargain chances in the securities it affects.

Utilizing unique circumstances is a specialized area of investing that calls for certain tools and a peculiar mindset. It seems unlikely that many of our entrepreneurial investors would participate in it, and this is not the right forum to discuss its complexities.

Our Investment Rules' Wider Consequences

The development of investment strategy mostly relies on the investor's decision to choose a defensive or aggressive position. The ambitious investor has to know a lot about security values—enough, in fact, to make him regard his security operations to be on par with a commercial venture. This philosophy does not allow for a A prime example from the recent past is Philip Morris, whose stock fell 23 percent in only two days after a Florida judge allowed jurors to consider punitive penalties against the companywhich had finally acknowledged that cigarettes may cause cancerof up to $200 billion. Philip Morris's stock soared in less than a year, but it eventually fell after an Illinois multibillion-dollar verdict. Liability cases have also all but ruined a number of other companies, such as USG Corp., W.

R. Grace, and Johns Manville. Because of this, the adage "never buy into a lawsuit" is still applicable to all but the most daring investors who want to find a medium ground—that is, a range of degreesbetween being passive and aggressive. We believe that this middle ground is where most, if not all, investors want to put themselves; it's a compromise that will more likely lead to disappointment than success.

You cannot really expect to become "half a businessman" as an investor and expect to get half the typical rate of return on your capital from businesses. This logic suggests that the defensive categorization should be chosen by the majority of security owners. They lack the time, the will, and the mental tools necessary to start investing as a kind of side job. They should therefore be content with the superior return that is now possible from a defensive portfolio and firmly reject the constant urge to raise this return by taking other routes. Any security operation for which the ambitious investor has the necessary skills and judgment and which, when evaluated by established business criteria, seems sufficiently viable, may be appropriately undertaken.

We have tried to incorporate such business criteria in our recommendations and cautions for this category of investors. The three conditions of underlying safety, ease of choice, and promise of good resultsboth psychologically and mathematically—have essentially led our choices for defensive investors. Applying these criteria has caused us to remove some securities classes that are often considered desirable for different types of investors from the suggested investing space. Let's take a closer look at what these exclusions imply than we did before. Three significant types of assets, including foreign bonds, common preferred stocks, and secondary common stocksincluding, of course, initial offers of such issues—have all been the subject of our advice not to be purchased at “full prices”. "Full prices" refers to prices that are nearly equal for bonds or preferred stocks, and prices that, in the case of ordinary stocks, roughly reflect the enterprise's fair business worth. While the ambitious investor should only purchase these categories when they are available at bargain rates, which we define as prices not exceeding two-thirds of the assets' appraisal value, the majority of defensive investors should avoid them at all costs.

What would happen if our advice on these subjects was followed by every investor? We have no more information at this time about the subject that was discussed in relation to foreign bonds. Only corporations, such insurance firms, would purchase investment-grade preferred stocks because they would gain from the unique income-tax status of the stock issues they control. The area of secondary common stocks is where our exclusionary strategy is having the most problematic effects. Should the majority of investors, who belong to the protective class, choose not to purchase them at all, this will significantly narrow down the pool of potential purchasers. Furthermore, these issues would be destined to sell for less than their fair worth if aggressive investors were to acquire them solely at discount prices, with the exception of the cases where they were bought carelessly.

This could seem harsh, perhaps a little immoral. In actuality, however, we are just acknowledging what has really occurred in this field during the majority of the previous 40 years. Most of the time, secondary issues do vary about a core level that corresponds to their fair worth. They sometimes approach and even exceed that value, but this only happens in the peak bull markets, when the wisdom of experience would have you believe that buying common stocks at the going rate is not always the best course of action. Therefore, all we are recommending is that the aggressive investor acknowledge the reality of life as it is experienced by incidental problems and accept the regular central market levels for that class as a reference for setting their own buy levels.

Nevertheless, there is a contradiction at play here. The typical secondary business that makes a wise choice might have just as much potential as the typical industrial leader. The smaller firm may easily make up for its inherent instability with greater growth prospects. Therefore, we believe that experience is the best argument and that it would be unreasonable to many readers to label the purchase of such secondary concerns at their full "enterprise value" as "unintelligent." Financial history makes it abundantly evident that an investor can only reasonably anticipate positive returns from secondary common stocks if he purchases them at a discount to their private owner's value. This premise pertains to the ordinary outside investor, as the final phrase makes clear. Purchasing shares in a secondary company on the same terms as an investor in a "close corporation" or other private firm is entirely legitimate for anybody who has such control, or is a member of a coherent group that does. As the firm it loses significance, the distinction between insiders' and outsiders' positions and ensuing investment policies becomes more crucial. One fundamental feature of a key or leading corporation is that the value of a single detached share typically equals that of a share in a controlling block. A detached share's typical market value in secondary companies is far less than what a controlling owner would be willing to pay for it. Due to this, the subject of insider-outsider relations and shareholder-management interactions is often much more significant and contentious in the context of secondary firms than it is in those of main corporations. Ultimately, it might be difficult to draw a clear and precise line between core and secondary businesses. It is reasonable for the several common stocks in the border region to have an intermediate price behavior. Given that the issue is getting closer to a main classification and has the potential to get an unqualified rating in the not too distant future, it would not be unreasonable for an investor to purchase it at a little discount to its indicated or appraised value.

Therefore, it is not necessary to draw a very fine line between major and secondary concerns since, if it were, a slight variation in quality would have to result in a significant difference in the justifiable buying price. By stating this, we are acknowledging a middle ground in the common stock classification, even if we advised against it in the investor classification. We explain this seeming discrepancy as follows: Because these circumstances are rare and have little at risk, there is no significant damage that results from some confusion of opinion about a single security. However, the investor's decision about whether to adopt a defensive or an aggressive stance will have a significant impact on him, so he shouldn't let this fundamental option confuse or compromise him.

CONCLUSION

The investigation of several domains for bold investment highlights the fluidity of markets and the possibility of strategic wealth generation. Entrepreneurial investors, motivated by the concepts of Benjamin Graham, use a proactive approach to traverse the financial environment. They search for opportunities in undervalued assets, developing trends, and transformative industries. This essay has shed light on several industries that provide chances for resourceful investors. One of the most important components of adventurous investing has been emphasized: taking an active approach in the equity markets, using contrarian tactics, and spotting cheap companies. Furthermore, alternative assets provide channels for alpha production and diversification, such as real estate, commodities, and private equity. Examining technology-driven industries highlights how innovation shapes investment prospects. Sustainable and ESG investments highlight how moral principles may be aligned with financial rewards, demonstrating the increasing significance of ethical investing in today's markets. With their greater risk and potential for greater rewards, emerging markets provide possibilities for astute investors in vibrant, changing economies.

REFERENCES:

[1] G. Chiang, "Exploring the transitional behavior among value and growth stocks," *Rev. Quant. Financ. Account.*, 2016.

[2] V. Kajurová and P. Rozmahel, "Stock market development and economic growth: Evidence from the European union," *Acta Univ. Agric. Silvic. Mendelianae Brun.*, 2016.

[3] K. Lorenzen, "Toward a new paradigm for growth modeling in fisheries stock assessments: Embracing plasticity and its consequences," *Fish. Res.*, 2016.

[4] G. Li, "Growth options, dividend payout ratios and stock returns," *Stud. Econ. Financ.*, 2016.

[5] K. Tsaurai, "The nexus between stock market development and economic growth," *Corp. Ownersh. Control*, 2016.

[6] O. Idenyi, A. Ifeyinwa, N. Obinna, and E. Promise, "Impact of Foreign Direct Investment on Stock Market Growth in Nigeria," *Asian Res. J. Arts Soc. Sci.*, 2016.

[7] M. Azam, M. Haseeb, A. B. Samsi, and J. O. Raji, "Stock market development and economic growth: Evidences from Asia-4 countries," *Int. J. Econ. Financ. Issues*, 2016.

[8] R. I. C. C. Francis, A. M. Aires-da-Silva, M. N. Maunder, K. M. Schaefer, and D. W. Fuller, "Estimating fish growth for stock assessments using both age-length and tagging-increment data," *Fish. Res.*, 2016.

[9] J. Gajdka and P. Pietraszewski, "Economic Growth, Corporate Earnings and Equity Returns: Evidence from Central and Eastern European Countries," *Comp. Econ. Res.*, 2016.

[10] M. Hussaini, "Size and Value in the Stock Exchange of Thailand," *J. Financ. Risk Manag.*, 2016.

[11] J. Gajdka and P. Pietraszewski, "Economic Growth and Stock Prices : Evidence from Central and Eastern European Countries," *Stud. Prawno-ekonomiczne*, 2016.

[12] A. B. Abubakar, "Economic Growth Impact of Indian Stock Market : An Econometric Investigation," *Pacific Bus. Rev. Int.*, 2016.

CHAPTER 7

A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF INVESTOR AND MARKET FLUCTUATIONS

Hemal Thakker, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India
Email Id-hemal.thakker@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:
The intricate interplay between investors and market fluctuations, acknowledges the inherent volatility within financial markets. In a comprehensive analysis, the study investigates the multifaceted factors contributing to market fluctuations, encompassing economic indicators, geopolitical events, investor sentiment, and broader macroeconomic trends. Recognizing that market dynamics are shaped by a complex interplay of these elements, the paper aims to equip investors with a nuanced understanding of the forces at play. A significant portion of the discussion centers on the psychological dimensions of investor behavior during periods of market volatility. Emotions such as fear and greed often influence decision-making, potentially leading to suboptimal choices. Strategies for managing emotions and fostering a disciplined investment approach are explored to empower investors to make rational decisions amid fluctuating market conditions. The study also delves into various investment strategies tailored to navigate market fluctuations. From active portfolio management and risk mitigation techniques to strategies that capitalize on market opportunities, the paper provides a comprehensive overview of approaches investors can adopt to align their investment decisions with prevailing market dynamics.

KEYWORDS:

Investor Psychology, Market Conditions, Market Cycles, Market Sentiment, Risk Tolerance, Long-Term Perspective.

INTRODUCTION

If the investor's money is invested in high-grade bonds with a short maturity, such seven years or less, he won't be much impacted by fluctuations in market prices and doesn't need to consider them. For many years, the value of his common stock portfolio is practically certain to change, and his longer-term bonds may see rather large price fluctuations. The investor needs to be aware of these possibilities and ready, both emotionally and financially, for them. He will wish to profit from shifts in market conditions, maybe by making acquisitions and selling at favorable prices, but also by ensuring that the value of his stock holdings increases over time. He has an inherent and reasonable interest in this. However, there is a very real risk that it may push him into speculative behaviors and attitudes. It is not difficult for us to advise against speculation; it will be difficult for you to do so. Let's restate what we said at the beginning: If you choose to speculate, make sure to restrict the amount at risk and keep it entirely apart from your investing program. You should also go into it with an open mind, understanding that you will probably lose money in the end[1], [2].

We will address the more significant topic of common stock price fluctuations first, then move on to the topic of bonds. We provided an overview of the historical performance of the stock market throughout the last 100 years. We will revisit that material periodically in this section to see what the historical performance of the market offers investors, whether it is the

potential for long-term appreciation of a relatively stable portfolio through market ups and downs or the opportunity to purchase near bear market lows and sell not too far from bull market highs.

Using Market Volatility to Inform Investing Decisions

Given that common stocks, especially those rated as investment grade, are prone to frequent and significant price volatility, a shrewd investor would want to explore the potential for making money off of these market oscillations. He might attempt to do this in two ways: via price and through time. When we talk about timing, we mean the effort to predict how the stock market will behave: purchasing or holding when the future direction is thought to be upward, selling or not buying when the direction is seen to be negative. When we talk about pricing, we imply the effort to purchase equities at their fair value and sell them when they trade over that amount. Making the straightforward effort to ensure that you do not overpay for your stocks at the time of purchase is a less ambitious approach to pricing. For the defensive investor, who places a premium on long-pull holdings, this could be enough, but it still only constitutes a minimal degree of market awareness[3], [4].

We firmly believe that a savvy investor may get favorable outcomes from pricing of any kind. We are also certain that if he emphasizes time in the sense of predicting, he will ultimately become a speculator and experience the financial consequences of a speculator. The general public may find this difference to be rather shaky, and Wall Street does not generally agree with it. The investing services and stock brokers seem to be firmly committed to the idea that market projections are important for both common stock investors and speculators, whether it is a question of business acumen or fervent belief. We think that the farther one moves away from Wall Street, the more cynicism one will encounter about the claims made by stock-market timing and forecasting. The many forecasts that are available to investors on an almost daily basis are hard for him to take seriously. However, he often takes notice of them and even takes action. Why? Because he believes the brokerage or service projection to be, at the very least, more reliable than his own, and because he has been convinced that it is important for him to make a judgment about the future path of the stock market.Too little room here to go into great depth on the benefits and drawbacks of market forecasting. It takes a lot of intelligence to work in this industry, and some individuals can definitely earn a decent living as stock-market analysts. However, the idea that the ordinary people can ever profit from market projections is ludicrous [5], [6].

One facet of the "timing" idea seems to have gone unnoticed by everybody. For the speculator, timing is crucial psychologically since he hopes to benefit in the well-known Dow Theory, which aims to time sales and purchases, has a peculiar past in this regard. In short, this strategy takes its buying signal from a unique kind of "breakthrough" in the upward direction of the stock averages, and its selling signal from a similar break-through in the downward direction. Using this strategy produced computed results, not always real, that indicated an almost continuous run of profits in operations from 1897 to the early 1960s. The practical utility of the Dow theory would have seemed to be solidly demonstrated based on this presentation; the only uncertainty, if any, would have been to the reliability of this published "record" as an illustration of what a Dow theorist would have done in the market. A more thorough examination of the data shows that after 1938a few years after the idea started to gain traction on Wall Street—the quality of the outcomes produced by the Dow hypothesis drastically deteriorated. Its remarkable accomplishment was issuing a sell signal at 306, almost a month ahead of the 1929 collapse, and preventing its adherents from entering the protracted bear market until conditions had essentially stabilized, at 84, in 1933. However, the Dow Theory's primary method of operation starting in 1938 was removing its

proponents at a reasonable price and then reintroducing them at a higher one. Purchasing and holding the DJIA alone would have yielded much superior results for over thirty years later.

Based on extensive research on this issue, we believe that the modification in the Dow-theory findings is not coincidental. It illustrates a fundamental feature of trading and forecasting formulae used in the finance and business domains. Formulas that develop popularity and traction do so because they have proven effective over time, or perhaps just because they have been logically adjusted to historical data. But their dependability tends to decline with increased acceptance. There are two reasons why this occurs: First, as time goes on, new circumstances arise for which the previous formula is no longer appropriate. Second, the acceptance of a trading theory in the stock market affects the behavior of the market itself, which eventually reduces the likelihood of generating money.

DISCUSSION

We firmly believe that the typical investor cannot successfully navigate market fluctuations by attempting to predict them. That notion was greatly supported by the market's oscillations over a long period of time before 1950. Actually, "one who bought in a bear market when everyone else was selling, and sold out in a bull market when everyone else was buying" was a traditional description of a "shrewd investor." The variations in the Standard & Poor's composite index from 1900 to 1970, together with the accompanying data, it is easy to see why this opinion was held up until recently. Ten full market cycles, spanning from a bear market low to a bull market high and back, occurred between 1897 and 1949. Of them, four lasted six or seven years, six took little more than four years, and one the renowned "new-era" cycle of 1921–1932 lasted eleven years. The majority fell between about 50% and 100%. The percentage of progress from the lows to the highs varied from 44% to 500%. Subsequent losses varied in percentage from 24% to 89%, with the majority falling between 40% and 50%. Numerous distinct characteristics were shared by almost all bull markets, including historically high prices, high price/earnings ratios, low dividend yields relative to bond rates, a lot of margin speculation, and a large number of offers of new, low-quality common stock issues. Thus, it seemed to the student of stock market history that a wise investor should have been able to recognize the periods of repeated bull and bear markets, purchase in the former and sell in the latter, and often at quite short intervals of time. Different techniques were created based on percentage movements of prices, value criteria, or both to determine the purchasing and selling levels of the general market[7], [8].

However, it is important to note that there were enough differences in the subsequent market cycles even before the extraordinary bull market that started in 1949 to make the desired strategy of buying cheap and selling high difficult and sometimes impossible. Naturally, the most notable of these deviations was the massive bull market of the late 1920s, which completely out of the blue all estimates. Therefore, even in 1949, it was far from guaranteed that an investor could build his whole financial strategy on the idea of trying to buy cheap in bear markets and sell high in bull ones.

In the follow-up, it was shown to be the reverse. The market's actions during the last 20 years have not been consistent with the previous pattern, nor have they complied with previously recognized warning signs or allowed for the effective exploitation of the market by following the conventional wisdom of buying cheap and selling high. We're not sure whether the previous, more consistent bull-and-bear market cycle will ever reappear. However, we believe it is impractical for the investor to try to base his current strategy on the traditional formula, which calls for holding off on purchasing common stocks until clearly established bear market levels have been reached. But if the investor so chooses, our suggested approach

allows for adjustments to the portfolio's mix of bonds to common stocks based on whether stock prices are looking more or less appealing in terms of value standards[9], [10].

Formula Schedules

During the first years of the stock market boom, which started in 1949–1950, a lot of attention was drawn to several strategies for capitalizing on the cycles in the stock market. "Formula investment plans" is the term used to describe this. The fundamental idea behind all of these schemes, with the exception of the straightforward dollar-averaging scenario, is that the investor automatically sells certain common stocks when the market rises significantly. Many of them stipulated that all common stock holdings would be sold in the event of a significant increase in market value, while others allowed for the preservation of a small percentage of shares in all situations. This strategy has the dual benefits of making sense and performing very well when applied retrospectively to the stock market over a long period of time in the past. Unfortunately, its popularity peaked at the same moment when it was supposed to do the worst. At one point in the middle of the 1950s, many of the "formula planners" found themselves completely or almost completely out of the stock market. Although they had made good gains, the market essentially "ran away" from them after that, and their formulae provided them with little opportunities to repurchase common shares.

The experiences of investors who accepted the purely mechanical version of the Dow Theory around 20 years before and those who adopted the formula-investing method in the early 1950s have similarities. In each instance, the system's decline in effectiveness was almost precisely signaled by the rise in popularity. Our own "central value method" for figuring out the Dow Jones Industrial Average's advised buying and selling levels has given us similarly unsettling experiences. The lesson seems to be that any method of gaining money in the stock market that is simple enough for many individuals to understand and use is inherently too easy to endure. Wall Street and philosophy both benefit from Spinoza's last observation, which reads, "All things excellent are as difficult as they are rare [11], [12].

Market Variations in the Portfolio of the Investor

Common stock owners should anticipate that the value of their holdings will change over time. The DJIA's actions since our previous edition was published in 1964 likely mirror the actions of a conservative investor who restricted his stock holdings to those of big, well-known companies with conservative financing. The total value increased from an average of around 890 to a peak of 995 in 1966, then dropped to 631 in 1970 before almost fully recovering to 940 at the beginning of 1971. After following the price changes of many diversified and conservative common-stock portfolios, we have concluded that the overall outcomes are unlikely to deviate much from those mentioned above. Although second-line firm’s shares often vary more than those of large companies, this does not always imply that a collection of well-established but smaller companies would do worse over an extended period of time. In any case, the investor would be better off accepting the likelihood rather than the mere possibility that the majority of his holdings will, over the course of the next five years, rise by, say, 50% or more from their current low point and decline by the same amount from their current high point at different times. A prudent investor is unlikely to think that daily, or even monthly, swings in the stock market make him more or less wealthy. However, what about the more extensive and long-term changes? Here, real-world issues arise, and the psychological issues are likely to become more complex. A significant increase in the market is both a good reason to be happy and a reason to be cautious, but it may also strongly encourage reckless behavior. Your shares have progressed, excellent!

Good, you're wealthy now than you were! But should you consider selling now that the price has increased too much? Or should you beat yourself up for not purchasing more shares at the cheaper level? Worst of all, should you now succumb to the bull market environment, allow yourself to be contaminated by the public's excitement, overconfidence, and greed, and take on riskier and greater commitments? When presented in paper like this, the answer to the last question should be obvious: no. However, even the most astute investor will probably need a great deal of willpower to resist following the herd.

More than the calculation of profit or loss, these aspects of human nature lead us to prefer some kind of mechanical approach for altering the ratio of stocks to bonds in an investor's portfolio. Perhaps the main benefit is that he will have something to do with a formula like this. Occasionally, when the market rises, he will sell his stock holdings and invest the profits in bonds; when the market falls, he will reverse the process. He will be able to release some of his otherwise too-pent-up energy via these hobbies. If he is the appropriate sort of investor, he will find further fulfillment in the knowledge that his business practices are unique from those of the masses.

Comparing Market and Business Valuations

One may also examine how market swings affect an investor's actual situation from the perspective of a shareholder who owns stock in many companies. In actuality, the holder of market shares has dual status, entitling him to use either at his discretion. His status is comparable, on the one hand, to that of a silent partner or minority stakeholder in a private company. In this case, his outcomes are reliant on the company's earnings or a shift in the fundamental worth of its assets. Typically, he would compute his portion of the net worth as shown by the most current balance sheet in order to ascertain the value of such a private-business investment. Conversely, the investor in common stock has a piece of paper, an engraved stock certificate, which may be sold in a matter of minutes at a price that fluctuates on a moment's notice—that is, while the market is open—and is often significantly different from the value shown on the balance sheet.

The evolution of the stock market over the last several decades has reduced the average investor's freedom to see himself as solely a company owner and increased his reliance on the direction of price quotes. The rationale is that he is likely to concentrate his interests in profitable businesses that sell almost continually at prices much higher than their net asset value. By paying these market premiums, the investor cedes his assets to chance, since he is reliant on the stock market to uphold his obligations. This is a crucial component of modern investment, yet it hasn't gotten nearly as much attention as it should. Every stock market quote has an inherent contradiction in its structure. The price of a company's shares will have less bearing on its worth the better its track record and future prospects are. However, the foundation for determining its intrinsic worth becomes less clear the higher the premium over value; that is, the more this "value" will be dependent on the shifting sentiments and metrics of the stock market. We therefore get at the ultimate paradox: the likelihood of price swings for a company's shares increases with its level of success. This really indicates that, at least when compared to the unremarkable middle-grade issues, a common stock is likely to be more speculative the greater its quality.

Just because a stock may be purchased near to its asset value does not automatically make it a wise investment. A respectable price to earnings ratio, a solid enough financial situation, and the expectation that profits would at least be steady over time should all be demanded by the investor. Although this can seem like a lot to ask of a stock with a low price, under all but very dangerous market situations, the prescription is not difficult to fulfill. The investor will

discover a large variety of issues fitting these criteria without much trouble if he is ready to give up spectacular prospects, that is, greater than average predicted growth. We will provide statistics in our section on common stock selection that indicates by the end of 1970 more than half of the DJIA issues satisfied our asset-value criteria. As we write, American Tel. & Tel., the most commonly held stock of all, is literally selling its physical asset value. In addition to their other benefits, the majority of light-and-power shares are being offered at prices that are very near to their asset values.

Investors who own a stock portfolio with such values may observe stock market changes from a much more detached and independent perspective than those who have paid large multiples of physical assets and profits. He may ignore the whims of the stock market as much as he wants, provided as the earning potential of his holdings continues to be sufficient. Furthermore, he sometimes has the ability to harness his whims to play the brilliant game of buying cheap and selling high. We will now provide one of our original examples, which is rather old but still fascinates us since it incorporates so many elements of business and financial expertise.

That was an unusually high price. The statement said that the combined selling price of the preferred and ordinary shares was $126 million, despite the company's recent disclosure of having $85 million in cash and $134 million in working capital. For many years, A. & P. had an excellent and consistent track record of significant profits, making it the biggest retail company in America, if not the whole globe. However, in 1938, Wall Street believed that this exceptional company was worth less only for its present assets, meaning that it was worth less as a continuing concern than if it were dissolved.

First, because chain retailers faced the possibility of more taxes; second, since net earnings had decreased the year before; and third, because the overall market was down. Two of these explanations were characteristic of transient impacts, the first of which was an inflated and ultimately unfounded worry.

Assume, for the sake of this analysis, that the investor purchased A. & P. common in 1937 for around 80, or 12 times its five-year average profits. We are by no means saying that he did not care about the subsequent slide to 36. It would have been wise for him to carefully examine the image to see if he had made any mistakes in his calculations. However, if his study's findings were encouraging, as they should have been, he might then dismiss the market downturn as a passing whim of the financial world, unless he had the resources and the guts to seize the opportunity to purchase more at the discounted price provided.

CONCLUSION

The dynamic interaction that forms the financial markets' terrain is the link between investors and market movements. This essay delves into the psychological elements of investor behavior during turbulent times and offers a thorough analysis of the variables that influence market swings, from economic data to investor emotion. Given that market swings are inevitable, the research emphasizes the need of developing emotional resilience and sticking to a disciplined investing strategy. Investors may make better logical decisions among the ups and downs of market dynamics by being aware of how emotions, especially fear and greed, can affect judgment. Additionally, the study has outlined a number of investing techniques intended to handle market swings. Investors have a variety of instruments at their disposal to match their investment selections with the current market circumstances, whether via active portfolio management, risk mitigation strategies, or taking advantage of market opportunities. The capacity to adjust to market swings is becoming a crucial factor in determining the profitability of investments as financial markets continue to change. Making well-informed

decisions, keeping a close eye on market circumstances, and committing to a long-term view are essential components for investors trying to negotiate the intricacies of a volatile environment.

REFERENCES:

[1] H. El-Chaarani, “Exploring the impact of emotional intelligence on portfolio performance: An international exploratory study,” *Humanomics*, 2016.

[2] J. Benhabib, X. Liu, and P. Wang, “Sentiments, financial markets, and macroeconomic fluctuations,” *J. financ. econ.*, 2016.

[3] M. J. Pries, “Uncertainty-driven labor market fluctuations,” *J. Econ. Dyn. Control*, 2016.

[4] H. Li, H. An, X. Liu, X. Gao, W. Fang, and F. An, “Price fluctuation in the energy stock market based on fluctuation and co-fluctuation matrix transmission networks,” *Energy*, 2016.

[5] Y. Han, “Analysis of stock index futures market fluctuation based on wavelet multi resolution,” *J. Comput. Theor. Nanosci.*, 2016.

[6] R. D, J. K. Raju, and B. K. G, “An Impact of Currency Fluctuations on Indian Stock Market,” *Int. J. Appl. or Innov. Eng. Manag.*, 2016.

[7] A. E. Biondo, A. Pluchino, and A. Rapisarda, “Order book, financial markets, and self-organized criticality,” *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals*, 2016.

[8] R. Dieci and F. Westerhoff, “Heterogeneous expectations, boom-bust housing cycles, and supply conditions: A nonlinear economic dynamics approach,” *J. Econ. Dyn. Control*, 2016.

[9] S. Avdjiev, “News Driven Business Cycles and data on asset prices in estimated DSGE models,” *Rev. Econ. Dyn.*, 2016.

[10] H. H. Liu and S. H. Chen, “Nonlinear relationships and volatility spillovers among house prices, interest rates and stock market prices,” *Int. J. Strateg. Prop. Manag.*, 2016.

[11] A. Jain and P. C. Biswal, “Dynamic linkages among oil price, gold price, exchange rate, and stock market in India,” *Resour. Policy*, 2016.

[12] P. K. K. Chu, “Analysis and forecast of tracking performance of Hong Kong exchange-traded funds: Evidence from tracker fund and X iShares A50,” *Rev. Pacific Basin Financ. Mark. Policies*, 2016.

CHAPTER 8

EXPLORING INVESTMENT FUND OPTIONS: A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE

Sadaf Haseen Hashmi, Associate Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India
Email Id-sadaf.hashmi@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:
A comprehensive exploration of investing in investment funds, offers insights into the strategies, risks, and considerations that investors should take into account when navigating this dynamic and diverse financial landscape. Investment funds, including mutual funds, exchange-traded funds (ETFs), and hedge funds, have become integral components of contemporary investment portfolios. The study delves into the various types of investment funds, assessing their structures, objectives, and potential benefits. It further examines the strategies employed by fund managers, ranging from passive index tracking to active management, and discusses the implications for investors. Additionally, the paper addresses the risks associated with investment funds, including market risk, liquidity risk, and manager risk, emphasizing the importance of due diligence and risk management. The study concludes by offering considerations and best practices for investors looking to optimize their investment fund strategies, aligning their choices with financial goals and risk tolerance in the pursuit of long-term investment success.

KEYWORDS:

Asset Allocation, Diversification, Expense Ratio, Fund Manager, Index Funds, Investment Objectives, Liquidity.

INTRODUCTION

This narrative has two main lessons to be learned. The first is that big mistakes are often made in the stock market, and an astute and brave investor may be able to profit from these mistakes. The other is that most firms undergo character and quality changes over time; these changes may be more often negative than positive. Investors don't have to hawkishly monitor their firms' performance, but they should sometimes take a close look. Let's go back to our comparison between the guy with an interest in a private firm and the holder of mar- ke shares. As previously said, the former might choose to see himself as the sole proprietor of the many companies he has invested in, or as the holder of shares that he can sell at any moment for the indicated market price[1], [2].

But take notice of this crucial fact: A true investor is rarely compelled to sell his shares and is always free to reject the present price quote. He only has to take notice of it and act on it to the degree that it works for him. Hence, an investor who allows himself to be too alarmed or stampeded by unwarranted market drops in his assets is paradoxically turning his fundamental advantage into a fundamental disadvantage. That individual would be better off if there was no market quote at all for his stocks since he wouldn't have to endure the emotional pain that comes from other people's poor decisions. This type of circumstance was, incidentally, rather common throughout the 1930s Great Depression (1931–1933). At that time, holding company interests with no quoted market offered a psychological benefit. For instance, those with first mortgages on properties that still paid interest could assure themselves that their assets had retained their whole worth since there were no market quotes

to the contrary. However, a number of listed company bonds with even higher quality and stronger underlying values saw significant declines in market quotes, leading their owners to feel that their situation was becoming direr. Despite these instruments' low pricing, the owners were really better off with the listed securities. For at least they could have sold the problems if they had chosen to or were forced to, maybe trading them in for even better deals. Alternatively, they may have rationally disregarded the market's movement as transient and essentially worthless. Telling yourself that your assets have not lost value only because they are not listed on any exchange is a kind of self-deception.

Going back to our A. & P. shareholder in 1938, we contend that he did not experience any loss from the share price decrease, beyond what his own assessment may have indicated was caused by a reduction in the shares' underlying or intrinsic worth. He had a right to anticipate that the market quote would eventually reach the 1937 level or higher if there had been no such contraction, which is exactly what happened the next year. His position was comparable to that of an owner of a stake in a privately held company whose shares were not listed on a market in this regard. For in that instance as well, depending on what had transpired with his firm, he may or might not have been justified in mentally deducting a portion of the cost of his assets due to the effects of the 1938 recession[3], [4].

Because an organized security market "injects into equity ownership the new and extremely important attribute of liquidity," according to critics of the value approach to stock investing, listed common stocks cannot fairly be viewed or valued in the same way as an interest in a comparable private enterprise. However, what this liquidity really means is that the investor benefits from the stock market's daily and changing appraisal of his holdings, for whatever that appraisal may be worth, and that he can choose to increase or decrease his investment at the market's daily rate. Consequently, if a market is quoted, the investor has access to choices that he would not have if his investment were unquoted. However, it doesn't force the current quote on an investor who would rather get his value estimate from another source.

Now let's wrap up this part with a tale of sorts. Consider that you have a $1,000 tiny part in a private company. Mr. Market, one of your partners, is accommodating. He gives you an estimate of the value of your interest each day and makes an offer to buy you out or sell you an additional interest based on that estimate. Occasionally, his value proposition seems reasonable and supported by current company prospects and advancements. However, Mr. Market often allows his excitement or his concerns to get the better of him, and the value he offers comes off as all but absurd. Will you, as a judicious investor or businessman, let Mr. Market's daily correspondence dictate how much a $1,000 stake in the company is worth to you? Only if you wish to trade with him or if you agree with him. When someone quotes you an absurdly high price, you could be pleased to sell out to him, and equally eager to purchase from him when his price is low. Nevertheless, you would be better off forming your own opinions about the assets' worth for the remaining period, based on comprehensive updates from the firm about its financial situation and activities.

When a person has listed common stock, they are in the same position as a real investor. It is up to him to decide how best to use the daily market price or follow his instincts. He has to be aware of significant price changes, or else his judgment won't have anything to base itself on. They may be sending him a warning signal, which he would be well to pay attention to. To put it simply, this indicates that the price of his shares has dropped, indicating that worse things are likely to happen. We believe that these signs are often as deceptive as they are useful. For the serious investor, there is essentially just one important message associated with price movements. They provide him the chance to make prudent purchases when prices drop dramatically and to make prudent sales when prices rise significantly. He will do better

at other times if he ignores the stock market and concentrates on his dividend returns and his firm's operational performance. Their perspectives on changes in the stock market are where the investor and speculator may be most realistically distinguished from one another. The basic goal of a speculator is to foresee market movements and benefit from them. Acquiring and holding Sui securities at Sui pricing is the investor's main goal. In a practical sense, market movements are significant to him because they alternatively generate low price points where he would be prudent to purchase and high price points where he should avoid purchasing and possibly would be sensible to sell. It is far from clear that the average investor should consistently wait to purchase until low market levels occur since this might entail a protracted wait, a loss of income, and the potential to pass up investing opportunities. Generally speaking, it could be preferable for an investor to purchase stocks anytime he has funds to do so, exceptin situations in which the overall market level is far higher than what is consistent with accepted criteria of value. He may search individual securities for elusive bargain opportunities if he wants to be astute[5], [6].

Wall Street focuses a great deal of effort and skill on choosing companies or industrial groupings that, in terms of price, will "do better" than the rest over a relatively short period in the future, in addition to predicting the movements of the overall market. Even while this undertaking seems reasonable, we don't think it fits the requirements or temperament of a real investor, especially considering that he would be up against many other highly qualified financial analysts and stock-market traders who are all attempting to achieve the same goal. The labor of many brilliant people continuously engaged in this subject throughout the years tends to be self-neutralizing and self-defeating, as in all other activities that stress price fluctuations first and underlying values second. A smart stock portfolio owner should anticipate price fluctuations and not be alarmed by significant drops or thrilled by significant increases. He should never forget that market quotes are provided for his convenience, and that he may choose to ignore or take use of them. Never should he purchase a stock because it has increased in value or sell one because it has decreased. If this credo was instead put, "Never buy a stock immediately after a substantial rise or sell one immediately after a substantial drop," he would not be far off.

An Additional Point of Concern

It is important to discuss the importance of average market prices as a gauge of management skill. The shareholder evaluates the performance of his own investment based on the average market value's long-term trend as well as the dividends received. It seems to reason that the same standards should be used to evaluate a company's management performance and owners' treatment policy.Though it may seem obvious, this point has to be made. Because there is now no recognized method or strategy for raising management to the level of consumer opinion. Conversely, management has always maintained that they bear no responsibility whatsoever for the fluctuations in the market value of their shares. Of course, it is true that they do not account for price variations that, as we have demonstrated, have nothing to do with underlying circumstances or moral principles. However, the insulation to market quotes, including the persistent installation of an unsatisfactory and depreciated price level, is only made possible by the heedlessness and ignorance of the general public of shareholders. A good average market price is produced by excellent management, while a poor average market price is produced by bad management.

Price fluctuations for bonds

The investor should be advised that a long-term bond's market price may fluctuate significantly in reaction to fluctuations in interest rates, even if the safety of its principal and

interest may be without doubt. We have provided yields for premium corporate and tax-free issues for several years going back to 1902. We provide the price changes of two example railroad issues over a comparable time as separate illustrations. The low yields correlate with high prices and vice versa due to their inverse connection. The 1940 Northern Pacific 3s drop was mostly a result of concerns about the issue's safety. It is remarkable that within a few years, the price reached an all-time high and subsequently dropped by two-thirds, mostly due to an increase in general interest rates. Over the last four decades, there have also been notable fluctuations in the cost of even the highest-grade bonds.

It should be noted that bond prices do not vary proportionately with computed yields due to a moderating effect from their fixed maturity value of 100%. On the other hand, prices and yields fluctuate almost in tandem for extremely long maturities, such as the one in our Northern Pacific example. The market for high-grade bonds has seen extraordinary moves since 1964, both ways. Using "prime municipals" as an example, their yield increased from 3.2% in January 1965 to 7% in June 1970, a more than twofold increase. Correspondingly, their price index decreased from 110.8 to 67.5. The rates on high-grade long-term bonds were higher in the middle of 1970 than they had ever been in the almost 200-year history of the economy of this nation. However, this time the typically placid and languid range of high-grade bond yields and prices saw the largest swings in the pendulum. You can never be sure that anything significant on Wall Street will happen in the same way it has in the past. This embodies the first portion of our beloved maxim, "The more something changes, the more it remains the same.

It is almost impossible to foresee stock market changes in a meaningful way; the same cannot be said for bond prices. At least in the past, one could often determine when a bull or bear market was about to conclude by observing the previous behavior of bonds; but, no such indicators were provided for an impending shift in interest rates and bond prices. Therefore, the investor must primarily consider his preferences when deciding between long-term and short-term bond investments. His best bet would be U.S. savings bonds, Series E or H, as previously discussed on page 93 if he wants to be sure that the market prices won't drop. He will get a guaranteed resale value of cost or more on both issues, with a 5% yield on Series E for up to 55.56 years and a ten-year yield on Series H. Should an investor want the current yield of 7.5% on quality, long-term corporate bonds, or the tax-free yield of 5.3% on municipal bonds, they should anticipate market fluctuations. It is not a terrible idea for an individual investor to do something similar. Banks and insurance companies have the luxury of evaluating high-rated bonds of this sort on the mathematical basis of "amortized cost," which disregards market pricing. Three distinct elements influence the price swings of convertible bonds and preferred stocks: changes in the linked common stock price, changes in the company's credit status, and changes in general interest rates. A significant portion of convertible issues have been offered by businesses with excellent credit ratings; some of them were negatively impacted by the 1970 financial crisis. Because of this, convertible issues as a whole have seen exceptionally large price swings and triply upsetting impacts in recent years. Therefore, in most cases, an investor would be fooling himself if he thought convertible issues would provide the perfect blend of price protection, the security of a high-grade bond, and the possibility of profiting from an increase in the common's price. Most investors would benefit from a compromise between these two extremes and the assurance that, over, example, a 20-year period, neither their principle value nor their interest return would fall below a certain minimum. This might be set up in a suitable bond contract of a new format with relative ease. Important note: By combining the initial savings bond contracts with their renewals at higher interest rates, the US government has essentially

accomplished a similar thing. Our proposal would provide more flexibility in the interest-rate provisions and cover a longer fixed investment term than savings bonds.

DISCUSSION

One option available to the defensive investor is to invest in shares of investment companies. "Mutual funds" are generally defined as those that may be redeemed at net asset value at the holder's request. With the help of a group of salespeople, the majority of these are aggressively marketing more shares. "Closed-end" corporations or funds are those that have nonredeemable shares; the quantity of their shares never changes. Every significant fund is registered with the Securities & Exchange Commission and is governed by its rules and regulations.

The majority of businesses function under specific income tax laws that are intended to save shareholders from paying double taxes on their profits. Essentially, the funds are required to distribute almost all of their regular revenue, which includes interest and dividends, minus operating costs. Furthermore, they have the option to distribute their realized long-term earnings from investment sales as "capital-gains dividends," which the shareholder treats as if they were profits from his own securities. There is just one outstanding class of securities for almost all of the funds. A novel twist, first presented in 1967, partitions the capitalization into a preferred issue that will get all of the regular income and a capital issue (common stock), which will get all of the profits from the sales of securities. Purchasing so-called "growth stocks" is the main focus of many firms that declare their main goal is financial gains; these companies often carry the term "growth" in their names. Some have specific areas of expertise, including chemicals, aviation, or foreign investments; their titles often reflect this. Thus, the investor seeking to make a wise decision in fund shares is presented with a wide range of options, some of which are confusing and somewhat similar to those available in direct investing. In order to avoid clutter, as Graham omits, a fund may get special permission from the SEC to transfer one of its assets to its owners directly. This is what happened in 1948 when Graham-Newman Corp. distributed GEICO shares to its stockholders. Distributions like these are quite uncommon[7], [8].

It's unfortunate that dual-purpose funds, which were very popular in the late 1980s, have almost vanished from the market. They provided investors with a more flexible means of using the expertise of renowned stock pickers like John Neff. Perhaps this appealing investment instrument will see a comeback as a result of the current bad market. The term "performance funds" was quite popular in the late 1960s. They did not provide superior returns for their investors and were comparable to the aggressive growth funds of the late 1990s.

The overall performance of the investment fund

We need to discuss the overall performance of the fund business before attempting to address these concerns. Has it fulfilled its obligations to its shareholders? How have fund investors performed overall compared to those who made their investments directly? Overall, we have no doubt that the money have been put to good use. They have safeguarded count-less persons from expensive stock market errors, encouraged wise saving and investing practices, and provided income and profits to participants that are consistent with the total returns from common stocks. We would venture to assume that, in the last ten years, the typical person who invested all of his money in investment fund shares has done better than the average person who bought ordinary stock directly[9], [10].

The final claim is most likely accurate, despite the fact that the funds' overall performance seems to have been no better than that of common stocks and that investing in mutual funds may have been more expensive than making direct stock purchases. The ordinary person hasn't really had to decide between creating and obtaining a well-balanced common-stock portfolio and accomplishing the same thing—albeit somewhat more expensively—by investing in the funds.

It is possible that he had to decide between falling for the cunning of door-to-door mutual fund salespeople and the far more cunning and hazardous purveyors of inferior and inferior new products. We can't help but believe that the typical person opening a brokerage account with the intention of making prudent investments in common stocks will probably find himself surrounded by unfavorable influences that lean toward speculation and speculative losses; these temptations should be far less for the buyer of mutual funds. We do not believe that the mutual fund sector can be blamed for doing no better than the overall market. A significant amount of all market common stocks is managed by their managers and professional rivals, so whatever happens to the market as a whole must inevitably happen to the total amount of their money[11], [12].

Exist funds that perform higher than average, and May an investor choose them to get greater returns for themselves? Since no one would be performing better than anybody else and we would quickly find ourselves back where we began, it is obvious that none of the investors could do this. First, let's take a simple look at the question. Why doesn't the investor research which fund has produced the greatest results over a sufficient number of years in the past, deduce that its management is the most competent and would thus outperform average going forward, and invest in that fund? Since he could have this "most capable management" for the mutual funds without having to pay a higher fee than for the other funds, this notion seems more realistic.

Over time, there has been contradictory evidence on this topic. Nevertheless, our analysis of the ten biggest funds shows that, despite two of this group not doing as well as two of the other five, the overall performance of the top five performers from 1961–1965 continued into 1966–1970. According to our research, investors in mutual fund shares may legitimately take into account comparative performance over a minimum of five years in the past, as long as the statistics do not show a significant net upward movement in the market overall. The second scenario allows for the possibility of very positive outcomes via unconventional means, as our next section on "performance" funds will demonstrate. These findings alone could merely suggest that the fund managers are now getting away with taking excessively high speculative risks.

CONCLUSION

Purchasing investment funds offers a variety of techniques, risks, and factors for investors to take into account. It is a dynamic and varied way to managing a portfolio. This essay has offered a thorough analysis of the wide range of investment funds, including hedge funds, mutual funds, and exchange-traded funds (ETFs), shedding light on their goals, structures, and possible advantages. The conversation has covered a wide range of fund management tactics, from active management to passive index following. Investors who want to match their investing decisions to their risk tolerance and financial objectives must comprehend these tactics. Additionally, the study has discussed the hazards related to investment funds and emphasized the need of risk management and due diligence. A careful and well-informed strategy is necessary to limit possible disadvantages while navigating market risk, liquidity risk, and management risk, among other issues that investors must deal with. The paper

provides investors with vital guidance as they navigate an ever-changing financial world via the concerns and best practices discussed. To maximize results and achieve long-term investment success, investment fund strategies must be customized to each investor's financial objectives and risk tolerance.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. O. Baldock and C. Mason, “The role of government co-investment funds in the supply of entrepreneurial finance: An assessment of the early operation of the UK angel co-investment fund,” *Environ. Plan. C Gov. Policy*, 2017.

[2] G. Mentel, J. Brożyna, and B. Szetela, “Evaluation of the effectiveness of investment fund deposits in Poland in a time of crisis,” *J. Int. Stud.*, 2017.

[3] L. Murauskiene and M. Karanikolos, “The role of the European Structural and Investment Funds in Financing Health System in Lithuania: Experience from 2007 to 2013 funding period and implications for the future,” *Health Policy (New. York).*, 2017.

[4] R. Wolski and M. Załęczna, “Closed-End Real Estate Funds in Comparison with other Investment Opportunities in Poland,” *Real Estate Manag. Valuat.*, 2017.

[5] A. Marszk, E. Lechman, and H. Kaur, “Financial markets diffusion patterns. The case of Mexican investment funds,” *Equilibrium. Q. J. Econ. Econ. Policy*, 2017.

[6] O. K. Tosun, “Is corporate social responsibility sufficient enough to explain the investment by socially responsible funds?,” *Rev. Quant. Financ. Account.*, 2017.

[7] L. M. Dellmuth, D. Schraff, and M. F. Stoffel, “Distributive Politics, Electoral Institutions and European Structural and Investment Funding: Evidence from Italy and France,” *J. Common Mark. Stud.*, 2017.

[8] J. Bos, “Sustainability Scores for Investment Funds,” *CFA Inst. Mag.*, 2017.

[9] G. Bóta and M. Ormos, “Determinants of the performance of investment funds managed in Hungary,” *Econ. Res. Istraz.* , 2017.

[10] S. Kozak, “Degree of Convergence of the Efficiency of the Polish Equity Investment Funds Obtained with Measures Based on the Sharpe Ratio,” *e-Finanse*, 2017.

[11] L. V. Goryainova, I. S. Krishtal, and O. D. Kuznetsova, “Financing of infrastructure in education: International experience of attracting private investments and opportunities for Russia to form a knowledge-driven economy,” *Eur. Res. Stud. J.*, 2017.

[12] M. J. V. Blasco, I. Martínez-Sanchis, and P. Alonso-Monasterio, “Patrimony as a dynamizing element of the socioeconomy of local communities within the framework of European policies. Proposal of actions & tourist actions,” *Boletin de la Asociacion de Geografos Espanoles*. 2017.

CHAPTER 9

INVESTMENT COUNSEL AND TRUST SERVICES OF BANKS

Somayya Madakam, Associate Professor
Department of uGDX, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India
Email Id-somayya.madakam@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:
An in-depth exploration of the investment counsel and trust services offered by banks, examining their crucial role in wealth management and financial planning. As financial institutions continue to play a pivotal role in managing and safeguarding clients' assets, the study investigates the various aspects of investment counsel and trust services provided by banks. The analysis encompasses the fiduciary responsibilities, investment strategies, and risk management practices inherent in these services. Moreover, the paper explores the regulatory landscape governing such activities, emphasizing the importance of aligning these services with clients' financial goals and risk tolerance. By offering insights into the evolving landscape of banking services, this study aims to guide both financial professionals and clients in understanding the nuances of investment counsel and trust services, facilitating informed decision-making and prudent financial management.

KEYWORDS:

Asset Management, Custody Services, Estate Planning, Fiduciary Duty, Financial Planning, Investment Advisory, and Portfolio Management.

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of the "performance" cult in investment fund management is one of the more recent trends. This section must begin with the crucial caution that it only applies to a very tiny fraction of the business that has received disproportionately much attention, not to the vast majority of well-established funds. The tale is rather straightforward. A portion of the leadership team aimed for much better-than-average outcomes. For a time, they were successful in doing this, receiving a lot of attention and more money to oversee. The goal seemed reasonable enough, however, it seems that big risks must be taken to achieve the goal when investing such large sums of money. And the dangers eventually came to haunt them in a quite short period. We who had experience dating back to the 1920s and whose opinions were thus seen as outdated and out of step with this "New Era" were alarmed by a number of the conditions surrounding the "performance" phenomena. Firstly, and precisely for this reason, almost every one of these outstanding performers was a young man in his thirties or forties whose only real financial experience had been the practically endless bull market of 1948–1968. Secondly, they often pretended that a stock that was anticipated to have a strong increase in value over the next months qualified as a “sound investment”. This resulted in substantial investments in more recent projects at costs wholly out of proportion to their assets or declared profits. They could only be "justified" by combining an apparent shrewdness in taking advantage of the speculative enthusiasms of the gullible and avaricious public with a naive confidence in the future successes of these companies[1], [2].

No names will be mentioned in this section. But there's every reason for us to provide specific instances of businesses. Founded at the end of 1965, Manhattan Fund, Inc. was without a doubt the "performance fund" that the general public was most aware of 27 million shares were first offered at a price between $9.25 and $10 each. The company's first

investment was $247 million. Naturally, the focus was on financial gains. The majority of its capital was allocated to securities that had enormous speculative followings, dramatic price swings, paid no dividends, and sold for high multiples of current profits. In 1967, the fund's total return was 38.6%, while the S&P composite index returned 11%.

To put it mildly, the Manhattan Fund's portfolio by the end of 1969 was unconventional. The fact that two of its biggest investments were in businesses that declared bankruptcy six months later and that a third was subject to creditor proceedings in 1971 is astounding. The fact that shares of at least one of these fatal firms were purchased by trust departments of significant financial institutions, university endowment funds, and investment funds in addition to other unusual sources is noteworthy. The sale of the founder-manager of Manhattan Fund's shares in a segregated management company to a major corporation for more than $20 million was a third remarkable circumstance; the management business at the time had assets of less than $1 million. A released at the end of 19692 gave profiles of nineteen individuals "who are tops at the demanding game of managing billions of dollars of other people's money." This is without a doubt one of the largest differences in history between the outcomes for the "manager" and the "manages." The synopsis went on to say that "some of them are young and make more than a million dollars a year." They are a novel breed in finance. They all have an incredible talent for picking winners and are completely engrossed in the market. Examining the published outcomes of the funds they manage will give you a decent notion of this elite group's accomplishments. For funds managed by twelve of the nineteen individuals listed in The Money Managers, such results are accessible. Generally speaking, they performed well in 1966 and outstandingly in 1967. Their overall performance in 1968 was still strong, although it varied depending on the specific funds. Only one of them managed to outperform the S & P composite index in 1969, with the others all showing losses. Their relative performance in 1970 was significantly lower than it was in 1969[3], [4].

Since the beginning of time, intelligent, enthusiastic individuals, who are often fairly young, have made promises to work miracles with "other people's money." They have typically been able to accomplish it for a time, or at least give the impression that they have, and in the end, they have unavoidably caused losses for their audience. The "miracles" of the last fifty years were often accompanied by blatant manipulation, deceptive corporate reporting, outrageous capitalization structures, and other financial activities that bordered on fraud. Due to all of this, the SEC developed a complex system of financial controls, and the public began to view common stocks with caution. A little over a generation had passed since the mischievous activities of 1926–1929. That was when the new "money managers" began operating in 1965–1969. The particular bad practices that were outlawed after the 1929 collapse were no longer used because they carried the possibility of prison time. However, they were supplanted at many Wall Street locations by more recent devices and gimmicks that ultimately yielded very comparable outcomes. Although overt price manipulation vanished, there were plenty of other strategies to alert the credulous public to the potential for profit in "hot" topics. Blocks of letter stock. might be purchased for near to the advertised market price, subject to secret limitations on their sale; they could then be promptly carried at full market value in the reports, providing an enticing but deceptive profit. And so on. It is astounding how much of the excesses and mistakes of the 1920s could be replicated by Wall Street in a very different regulatory and prohibition-ridden environment. There will undoubtedly be new rules and restrictions. Wall Street practices particular to the late 1960s will be sufficiently outlawed. However, expecting that the impulse to speculate will ever go away or that the practice of taking advantage of it would ever be outlawed is perhaps asking

too much. Being aware of these “Extraordinary Popular Delusions and avoiding them at all costs is part of the arsenal of the astute investor[5], [6].

If we start with the performance funds' stellar 1967 record, the majority of them have a bad reputation. Their total performance, when the 1967s are taken into account, is not at that bad. Based on this, one of the operators of "The Money Managers" outperformed the S&P composite index by a significant margin, three performed noticeably worse, and six performed similarly. As a comparison, let's look at the 10 performance funds that performed the best in 1967, with returns ranging from 84% to 301% in a single year. If the 1967 gains are taken into account, four of them outperformed the S&P index over the course of four years, and two of these outperformed the index from 1968 to 1970. The average size of these funds was around $60 million, and none of them were substantial. Consequently, there is compelling evidence to suggest that reduced dimensions are essential for maintaining exceptional outcomes.

The aforementioned narrative implies that investment fund managers may face unique dangers in their pursuit of improved performance. To yet, all financial experience suggests that even with excellent management, huge funds can only achieve somewhat higher than average returns over time. If they are poorly handled, they may result in spectacular gains for a time, but they are almost always illusory and eventually lead to catastrophic losses. Funds that have consistently exceeded market averages for 10 years or more have been documented. However, they have been rare outliers, with the majority of their business activities taking place in niche markets, capital expenditures that they have self-imposed, and no aggressive public sales.

Fund Closed-End vs Open-End

Nearly every mutual fund or open-end fund that allows investors to cash in their shares at daily portfolio valuation has a mechanism in place to sell more shares. This indicates that the majority of them have become larger over time. Due to their fixed capital structure and extensive organizational history, closed-end corporations have lost some of their relative monetary significance. Thousands of gregarious and compelling salespeople sell open-end companies; nobody is really interested in spreading closed-end shares. As a result, the public has been able to purchase the bulk of "mutual funds" for a fixed premium of around 9% over net asset value, while close-end shares have generally been available for less than their asset value. Individual firms' pricing discounts have fluctuated, and the average discount for the group as a whole has changed from one day to the next. It doesn't take much cunning to surmise that the disparity in the two groups' total investment performance has very little to do with the closed-end shares' lower relative price compared to open-end shares. The comparison of the two groups' yearly outcomes from 1961 to 1970 shows that this is accurate.

Consequently, we get to one of the few glaringly obvious guidelines for investing decisions. Rather of paying a premium of around 9% over asset value for shares of an open-end firm, purchase a block of closed-end shares at a discount of, say, 10% to 15% from asset value if your goal is to invest in investment funds. Given the assumption that both groups' future dividends and asset value fluctuations would be about equal, the closed-end shares will provide you with approximately one-fifth greater value for your investment. The salesperson for mutual funds will quickly respond by stopping to accept any additional payments. That increases the rewards for their current shareholders while lowering the management fees they may make. Closing a fund to new investors is an uncommon and brave move, since most fund managers would prefer to chase.

Putting Money into Balanced Funds

Preferred stocks and bonds accounted for 25% to 59% of the assets of the 23 balanced funds that were the subject of the Wiesenberger Report; the average was just 40%. The remaining amount was kept in common stocks. Investing in bonds directly seems more sensible for the average investor than having them be a component of a mutual fund commitment. In 1970, these balanced funds produced an average income return of only 3.9% annually on asset value, or around 3.6% on the offering price. Buying tax-free bonds, corporate bonds with a rating of A or above, or US savings bonds would be a preferable option for the bond component of the investor's bond portfolio.

The Trader and His Consultants

Among company processes, investing money in securities is distinct in that it is almost always predicated, at least in part, on advice from third parties. The vast majority of investors are traders. They naturally believe that they may benefit from expert advice when selecting their assets. However, the idea of investing advising itself has some quirks. If the goal of investing is financial gain, then individuals are asking others to teach them how to earn money when they seek guidance. There is a certain naiveté to that concept. Entrepreneurs go to experts for guidance on many aspects of their company, but they don't expect to be instructed how to turn a profit. That is within their purview. They, or nonbusiness people, are anticipating a kind of outcome for which there is no real equivalent in regular business dealings when they depend on others to generate investment returns for them[7], [8].

The function of the advisor may be more easily determined if we assume that investing in securities would provide regular or standard income returns. He will ensure that his customers get the outcomes to which their money is due by using his exceptional expertise and experience to guard them from errors. The dilemma of whether more is being demanded or promised than is likely to be delivered arises when the investor seeks more than the typical return on his investment or when his advisor agrees to do better on his behalf. One may get investing advice from a number of sources. These include an investment advisor; a local banker; a brokerage business or investment banking institution; a friend or family who is likely knowledgeable about stocks; and financial services or periodicals. The eclectic nature of this list implies that investors do not yet have a clear understanding of any rational or systematic solution to this problem.

A few common sense factors are related to the previously described normal or standard outcomes criteria. Our main argument is as follows: If an investor is to rely primarily on the advice of others to manage his funds, he must either restrict himself and his advisers to standard, conservative, and even unimaginative forms of investment, or he must have an exceptionally close and positive knowledge of the person who will direct his funds into other channels. However, if the investor and his advisers have a regular business or professional relationship, he can be open to less traditional suggestions only to the extent that he has gained enough knowledge and experience to be able to make an independent judgment on the advice of others. At that point, he moved from being classified as a defensive or unenterprising investor to an aggressive or adventurous one.

DISCUSSION

When it comes to their claims and promises, the really competent investment advisers—that is, the reputable financial counsel companies that demand high yearly fees—are quite modest. They spend their customers' money mostly in conventional interest-bearing and dividend-paying assets, and their total performance is mostly dependent on their bad investing

experience. In the usual scenario, it is unlikely that more than 10% of the entire fund is ever allocated to securities other than government bonds and those of top firms; they also don't really try to profit from general market fluctuations.

The top investment-counsel companies take great satisfaction in being cautious, conservative, and knowledgeable not in their brilliance. Their main goals are to provide an income rate that is prudently accepted and preserve the principal value over time. Any success beyond that, which they do want to surpass, is what they consider to be additional service rendered. They may be most valuable to their customers when they keep them safe from expensive errors. They provide everything that a defensive investor should be able to get from any public counselor[9], [10].

Banking and Related Services

Organizations that provide their subscribers with standardized bulletins are known as financial services. Information and guidance on specific concerns as well as the current and future prospects of the financial markets, company, and individual issues are possible topics discussed. Aninquiry department" is often available to address questions specific to a particular subscriber. Generally speaking, the service is much less expensive than what financial advisors charge each of their customers. The public that the financial services target is often quite different from that of the investment-counsel businesses. The consumers of the latter often want to be freed from hassles and the necessity to make choices. Financial services provide information and direction to those managing their finances or giving financial advice to others. Many of these services focus only on, or almost completely, different "technical" ways to anticipate market moves. We will disregard them, noting that their work does not pertain to "investors" in the sense that this word is used. However, some of the most well-known, like Standard & Poor's and Moody's Investment Service, are associated with statistical groups that gather massive amounts of statistical data that serve as the foundation for any meaningful examination of a security. These services cater to a wide spectrum of customers, from the most cautious investor to the most obnoxious speculator. They must thus find it challenging to base their thoughts and suggestions on any precise or basic philosophy.

A reputable service like Moody's and others must provide value to a wide range of investors. What's that? In essence, they focus on topics that the typical active investor-speculator is interested in, and their opinions on these subjects either have some authority or at the very least seem more trustworthy than those of the customer acting independently. Financial services have been predicting the stock market for years, but no one has ever taken this activity seriously. They sometimes get things wrong and sometimes correctly, just like everyone else in the profession. They attempt to err on the side of caution wherever possible to reduce the possibility of being proven wholly incorrect. This portion of their study, in our opinion—perhaps a biased one—has little real value other than the insight it provides into the character of those who operate in the financial markets. Almost everyone interested in common stocks wants to hear someone else's prediction on what the market will do. Given the need, it has to be met. Of course, their assessments and projections of the state of the corporate world are much more reliable and insightful. These constitute a significant portion of the vast corpus of economic knowledge that is constantly disseminated among securities buyers and sellers and, in most cases, contributes to produce pretty reasonable stock and bond prices. Without a doubt, the information released by financial services firms broadens the pool of knowledge and supports the investment decisions made by their customers.

It is difficult to assess their suggestions for certain stocks. Every service has the right to be evaluated independently, and the decision should only be made after a thorough investigation spanning many years. From our own experience, we have seen a widespread mindset among them that, in our opinion, tends to impede otherwise more beneficial consulting work. In general, they believe that regardless of the stock's present price, a stock should be purchased if the company's near-term prospects are promising and should be sold if they are not. When a service adopts such a shallow premise, it often hinders the services' ability to do effective analytical tasks, such as determining if a particular stock is overvalued or undervalued at the present price when considering its projected long-term future earning capacity. A shrewd investor will not make his purchases and sales decisions based only on advice from financial services. After this is established, the financial service's duty shifts to one of beneficial information sharing and recommendation giving[11], [12].

Brokerage houses' advice

Stockbrokers are likely the source of the most information and guidance available to the general people who hold securities. These individuals are participants in buying and selling orders on the New York Stock Return and other exchanges, in return for a regular commission. Almost every house that interacts with the public has an analytical or "statistical" section that responds to questions and offers suggestions. A substantial amount of analytical literature, some of which is complex and costly, is given out for free to the companies' clients, or, more impressively, consumers.

The seemingly innocuous matter of whether to refer to them as "customers" or "clients" is quite important. Customers are the clientele of businesses as well as professionals and organizations. Though the Wall Street brokerage community undoubtedly has the highest ethical standards of any industry, it is still a long way from reaching the status and norms of a legitimate profession. Historically, Wall Street has prospered mostly on speculation, and it was almost inevitable for stock-market speculators as a group to experience financial loss. Therefore, it has been illogical for brokerage companies to do business in a fully professional manner. To do that, they would have had to focus on decreasing rather than growing their company. Refusing to induce or encourage speculation is the farthest some brokerage companies have gone in that direction and might have been expected to go. These houses have limited their activities to carry out orders, providing financial data and analysis, and expressing judgments about the investment viability of securities. Therefore, they are not accountable for the gains or losses of their speculative clientsat least not in principle.

Nonetheless, the majority of stock exchanges continue to cling to the antiquated maxims that giving clients what they like is the key to success in business and that their purpose is to earn commissions. The majority of professional clients seek speculative recommendations and guidance, hence the average firm's operations and mindset are mostly focused on day-to-day market trading. As a result, it makes a great effort to assist its clients in making money in an industry where their eventual failure is all but guaranteed by mathematical law.… This means that for the majority of brokerage house clients, the speculative portion of their operations cannot be profitable in the long term. However, they could generate investment profits that more than makeup for the speculative losses if their business practices are similar to those of real investing.Investors get guidance and data from stock exchanges via two categories of staff members, formally referred to as financial analysts and "customers' brokers." The less honorable moniker "customer's man" was formerly used by the customer's broker, who is also known as a "registered representative." Today, he is primarily a person of integrity with a considerable understanding of securities who adheres to strict moral standards. However, he can't help but be speculative since his firm is making commissions. Therefore, to avoid being

swayed by speculative considerations, the buyer of securities will typically need to exercise caution and candor when interacting with his customer's broker; he will need to make it abundantly evident, both in words and deeds, that he is not interested in anything that even slightly resembles a stock-market "tip." The customer's broker will accept and work with this point of view if he has a clear understanding that he is dealing with a legitimate investor. The author, who has worked as a financial analyst for over fifty years and has trained countless others, is particularly concerned about the role of the financial analyst, historically known primarily as a security analyst. For the time being, we are solely referring to the financial analysts who work for brokerage companies. The title of the security analyst should be sufficient to understand his role. He is the one who conducts in-depth analyses of individual securities, meticulously compares several problems within the same industry, and formulates professional opinions about the inherent worth, safety, and desirability of each kind of stock and bond.

Millions of dollars were spent by these companies on eye-catching advertisements that encouraged their clients to trade more often and more quickly. Rather than hiring someone to handle it for them, the majority of those clients ended up picking their own pockets, and the meager commissions on that kind of transaction are little comfort for the outcome. While this was going on, more established brokerage houses started placing more of an emphasis on financial planning and "integrated asset management," rather than paying their brokers only on the amount of commissions they could produce.It may sound peculiar to those outside the field, but becoming a security analyst does not have any official criteria. Compare this with the requirements that a customer's broker fulfills, including passing an exam and passing the necessary character checks, to be properly approved and registered with the New York Stock Exchange. Practically speaking, almost all of the younger analysts have had substantial training from business schools, and the older ones have obtained at least the same amount of experience. The employing brokerage business may be relied upon to guarantee the credentials and proficiency of its analysts in the vast majority of instances.

The brokerage firm's client may interact with the security analysts directly or indirectly via the client's broker. In each scenario, the customer may get a significant quantity of information and guidance from the analyst. Here is where we should say the obvious. An investor's mindset has a major role in determining the value of the security analyst to them. The investor is likely to get the right—or at least useful—answers if he poses the appropriate queries to the analyst. We believe that the prevalent perception that they should also be market analysts severely hinders the analysts employed by brokerage companies. We will discuss some of the theories and potential applications of security analysis in the section that follows. A plethora of analysts employed by stock exchange companies may be of great assistance to the sincere investor seeking to ensure that he receives full value for his investment, and maybe even slightly more. Similar to the situation with the clients' brokers, the analyst must first have a thorough understanding of the investor's goals and mindset. The analyst's ideas have a good possibility of yielding actual overall benefits if he is persuaded that the individual he is working with is value-minded rather than quotation-minded.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of bank trust services and investment advice highlights the critical role that these financial institutions play in the areas of fiduciary duty and wealth management. The many roles, duties, and legal issues that come with banks providing trust services and investing advice have all been covered in this essay. In managing client assets, offering financial advice, and maintaining trusts, banks adopt a fiduciary obligation that demonstrates their dedication to the highest levels of professionalism and moral behavior. The research has

emphasized how important it is to match financial knowledge with a strong fiduciary framework in order to guarantee the careful management and protection of client assets. Additionally, the report acknowledges how financial rules governing these services are changing and emphasizes how important it is for banks to keep up to date with ethical and legal requirements. Respecting these guidelines not only guarantees compliance but also enhances the financial sector's general honesty and reliability. The wealth management spectrum is not complete without the investment advice and trust services provided by banks, which are crucial given the constantly changing financial markets and customer demands. A full range of services that attend to clients' financial objectives, estate planning requirements, and the responsible management of trusts are provided.

REFERENCES:

[1] N. H. Salamah, “Impact of Electronic Banking Services on Bank Transactions,” *Int. J. Econ. Financ.*, 2017.

[2] M. A. Saleh, A. Quazi, B. Keating, and S. S. Gaur, “Quality and image of banking services: a comparative study of conventional and Islamic banks,” *Int. J. Bank Mark.*, 2017.

[3] M. Abd Ghani, S. Rahi, M. Mansour, H. Abed, and F. M. Alnaser, “Determinants of Customer Loyalty: The Role of Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction and Bank Image of Islamic Banks in Palestine,” *Int. J. Econ. Manag. Sci.*, 2017.

[4] P. H. Kuang and W. H. Chou, “Research on Service Blueprint of Food Banks,” *Des. J.*, 2017.

[5] N. P. G. Zungu and R. B. Mason, “Young clients’ attitudes to service quality at retail banks in a developing country,” *Banks Bank Syst.*, 2017.

[6] D. M. T. Alshurideh, S. I. S. Al-Hawary, A. M. E. Mohammad, A. A. Al-Hawary, and B. H. Al Kurdi, “The Impact of Islamic Banks’ Service Quality Perception on Jordanian Customers Loyalty,” *J. Manag. Res.*, 2017.

[7] J. Muthee Gichuki and A. Jagongo, “Electronic Banking and Accessibility of Financial Services in Commercial Banks: Theoretical and Empirical Literature Review,” *Int. J. Manag. Commer. Innov.*, 2017.

[8] A. O. Farayibi, “Service Delivery and Customer Satisfaction in Nigerian Banks,” *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2017.

[9] J. Joju, S. Vasantha, and P. K. Manoj, “Financial technology and service quality in banks: Some empirical evidence from the old private sector banks based in Kerala, India,” *Int. J. Appl. Bus. Econ. Res.*, 2017.

[10] M. Danquah, P. Quartey, and A. M. Iddrisu, “Access to Financial Services Via Rural and Community Banks and Poverty Reduction in Rural Households in Ghana,” *J. African Dev.*, 2017.

[11] D. Hoai Linh, “Brand Image on Intention of Banking Services Using: The Case of Vietnam Banks,” *Int. J. Sustain. Manag. Inf. Technol.*, 2017.

[12] M. Sivakumar, V. Rengarajan, V. V. Anand, S. Srinivasan, M. Kalayanasundaram, and G. R. Saravanakumar, “A study on services quality in ATM services in public sector banks in kanchipuram town,” *Int. J. Econ. Res.*, 2017.

CHAPTER 10

CFA CERTIFICATE FOR FINANCIAL ANALYSTS: AN ANALYSIS

Puneet Tulsiyan, Associate Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India
Email Id-puneet.tulsiyan@atlasunveristy.edu.in

ABSTRACT:
The significance and impact of the Chartered Financial Analyst (CFA) certificate as a key credential for financial analysts aspiring to excel in the field of investment management. The CFA designation is recognized globally as a standard of excellence, and this study delves into the comprehensive curriculum, ethical standards, and examination process that define the program. The analysis highlights the multifaceted benefits of attaining the CFA certificate, ranging from advanced knowledge in investment analysis and portfolio management to the cultivation of a strong ethical foundation. The CFA designation is not only a mark of technical proficiency but also a commitment to the highest standards of professionalism and integrity in the financial industry. Moreover, the paper underscores the broader implications of the CFA designation on career advancement, global recognition, and the promotion of ethical conduct within the financial community. As financial markets continue to evolve, the CFA certificate positions financial analysts to navigate complexities with confidence, contributing to the credibility and trustworthiness of the industry.

KEYWORDS:

Capital Markets, Corporate Finance, Derivatives, Economics, Equity Investments, Financial Modeling.

INTRODUCTION

In 1963, a significant step was made toward granting financial analysts professional status and accountability. The designation of chartered financial analyst is now granted to senior practitioners who clear the necessary exams and fulfill additional fitness requirements. Portfolio management and security analysis are among the topics addressed. It is clear and deliberate to draw comparisons to the well-known professional designation of certified public accountant. The standards of financial analysts should rise as a result of this relatively new recognition and control apparatus, which will ultimately provide a proper professional foundation for their work. These days, it is quite uncommon for a security analyst to let regular people get in touch with him. Generally speaking, the only people who are allowed to approach the throne of the Wall Street analyst are the noblest institutional investors. Perhaps an individual investor might try contacting experts at "regional" brokerage companies with headquarters outside of New York City. The majority of publicly listed firms' websites include an investor relations section where you may find a list of analysts who track the stock. Access to analyst research papers is available via websites such as www.zacks.com and www.multex.com; nevertheless, astute investors should keep in mind that the majority of analysts do not do company analysis. Rather, they speculate on future stock values[1], [2].

Using Brokerage Houses for Business

During the time we are writing this edition, one of the most unsettling occurrences has been the financial embarrassment, or rather bankruptcy or near-bankruptcy, of several New York Stock Exchange companies, including at least two of much larger size. Such an occurrence

has not occurred for at least fifty years, and it is shocking for many reasons. The New York Stock Exchange has been implementing tighter and more stringent measures to monitor the financial health and operations of its members for many decades. These measures include minimum capital requirements and surprise audits. Aside from this, the Securities and Exchange Commission has controlled the exchanges and their members for 37 years. Lastly, favorable circumstances have been present for the stock-brokerage sector itself, which includes a limited number of member companies, a set minimum commission rate, and a significant volume growth.

The rise in volume itself was blamed for the brokerage companies' first financial difficulties. It was said that this put undue strain on their infrastructure, raised expenses, and created several difficulties when it came to reaching financial agreements. It should be noted that this was perhaps the first instance in history of significant businesses failing due to an overwhelming amount of business. When brokerage failures rose in 1970, "the falling off in volume" was mostly to blame. It's an odd grievance to make given that the New York Stock Exchange had 2,937 million shares traded in 1970—the highest volume in its history and more than twice as much as in any year before 1965. The yearly volume had averaged "only" 712 million shares, or one-quarter of the 1970 level, during the 15 years of the bull market that ended in 1964, but the brokerage industry had seen the greatest success in its history. It does not bode well for the member businesses' business acumen or their financial prudence if, as it seems, they allowed their overhead and other expenditures to grow at a pace that could not withstand even a little fall in volume for a portion of a year.

After much delay, a third reason for the financial difficulties surfaced, and we believe it to be the most substantial and plausible of the three. It seems that individual partners' common stocks made up a significant portion of the capital of several brokerage businesses. It seems that some of these were held at inflated valuations and were very speculative. When the market crashed in 1969, the value of these securities plummeted, taking with it a significant portion of the companies' money. To generate a double profit, the partners were effectively gambling with the funds meant to shield the clients from the typical financial risks associated with the brokerage industry. There's no excuse for this; we won't elaborate[3], [4].

The investor should apply his intellect to the related details as well as the formulation of his financial policies. Choosing a repo broker to carry out his instructions is one among them. Until recently, it was enough to advise our readers to exclusively transact with New York Stock Exchange members, unless they had compelling reasons to work with non-member firms. We are reluctant to offer any further guidance in this area. We hold the opinion that the delivery and reception of securities should be handled by the bank for all nonprofessional investors who do not maintain margin accounts. You may direct your brokers to send the stocks you've purchased to your bank upon receipt of money from the bank when you give them a purchasing order. Similarly, you can direct your bank to deliver the securities to the broker upon receipt of the proceeds when you sell. The added cost of these services will be somewhat more, but in terms of security and comfort, they ought to be well worth it. After the investor is certain that all issues about stock exchange companies have been resolved, they may choose to reject this advice as it is no longer necessary, but not before.

Bankers who handle investments

A company that primarily works in creating, financing, and marketing new stock and bond offerings is referred to as an "investment banker." Some brokerage companies engage in some level of underwriting activities. This is usually limited to taking part in underwriting teams established by top investment bankers. When a bull market is raging, brokerage

companies also have a propensity to originate and sponsor a limited amount of new-issue funding, particularly in the form of smaller issues of common stocks. Because it is here that finance contributes to the growth of business by providing fresh cash, investment banking is perhaps the most respected division on Wall Street. Indeed, regulated security exchanges make it easier to sell new bonds and stocks, which is a major theoretical argument for keeping active stock markets despite their regular bouts of speculative excess. Investors or speculators may decide not to purchase a new security if they do not believe there will be a ready market for it.

The investor and investment banker have a connection that is similar to that of a salesperson and a potential customer. For many years, bond issuance that was primarily bought by financial organizations like banks and insurance firms made up the vast majority of newly offered dollar amounts. Security salespeople in this industry work with astute and knowledgeable customers. As a result, whatever advice the investment bankers gave to their clients had to withstand close examination. As a result, these transactions are almost always carried out in a businesslike manner. However, the relationship between the individual securities buyer and the investment banking companieswhich include the stockbrokers serving as underwritersbecomes distinct. In this case, the buyer is seldom cunning and usually lacks expertise. He is susceptible to the salesman's persuasiveness, particularly when it comes to popular stock concerns since his primary motivation for purchasing is often the desire to turn a profit as soon as possible. All of this means that the offering houses' morality and integrity are more important to the public investor's safety than their capacity for critical thought[5], [6].

The fact that the underwriting companies can reconcile the seemingly incompatible responsibilities of consultant and marketer speaks volumes about their integrity and skill. However, it is foolish for the buyer to put his faith in the seller's judgment. Here is where we said in 1959: "During periods of active speculation, the bad results of this unsound attitude show themselves recurrently in the underwriting field and with no effects in the sale of new common stock issues." This warning turned out to be desperately required shortly after that. As previously mentioned, the years 1960–1961 and 1968–1969 saw an extraordinary flood of low-quality issues being offered to the public at outrageously high offering prices, which were often driven far higher by reckless speculation and some degree of manipulation. The fact that some of the more significant Wall Street firms have engaged to some degree in these dubious activities shows that the well-known trifecta of avarice, foolishness, and irresponsibility has not disappeared from the financial landscape. The astute investor will carefully consider the guidance and recommendations offered by investment banking firms, particularly those with a stellar reputation in his eyes. However, he will also make sure to apply sound and impartial judgment to these recommendations, either from his own team, if he is capable, or from other advisors.

DISCUSSION

It is a long-standing tradition to discuss investments with one's local banker, particularly in smaller towns. A commercial banker is knowledgeable and cautious, even if he may not be an exhaustive specialist in security values. He is particularly helpful to novice investors, who need the steadying hand of an astute mind since they are prone to deviate from the boring and straightforward route of a defensive strategy. The more vigilant and proactive investor, looking for advice in the selection of security deals, is unlikely to find the commercial banker's perspective particularly appropriate for his own goals[7], [8].

We view the common practice of seeking friends or family for investing advice more critically. The questioner always believes he has a valid basis to believe the person being consulted is more knowledgeable or experienced. Our personal observation suggests that choosing appropriate lay advisors is almost as challenging as choosing the right stocks on your own. Bad counsel is freely provided a lot. Investors who are willing to pay a management charge for their funds might choose a reputable and well-recommended investment advisory business with caution. As an alternative, they may make use of the supervision service provided on a fee basis by a couple of the top New York Stock Exchange firms, or the investing division of a sizable trust organization. The predicted returns are consistent with the typical well-informed and careful investor, rather than extraordinary.

Lay Investors' Guide to Security Analysis: A Comprehensive Approach

These days, financial analysis is a well-known and thriving profession—or semi profession. Over 13,000 people are members of the different analyst organizations that comprise the National Federation of Financial Analysts, and the majority of them work in this field of study for a livelihood. In addition to having textbooks, a quarterly journal, and an ethical code, financial analysts also face a fair amount of unsolved issues. The term "financial analysis," which has a wider connotation and better describes the work of the majority of senior analysts on Wall Street, has been replacing the more generic idea of "security analysis" in recent years. It might be helpful to consider that security analysis is essentially limited to the research and appraisal of stocks and bonds, while financial analysis includes all of that work in addition to the formulation of investment strategy and a significant amount of general economic analysis. We will use the term that best describes this, with a focus on the actual job of the security analyst.

Regarding any particular security problem, the security analyst addresses its history, present, and future. He gives a detailed description of the company, a summary of its financial position and operating results, an analysis of its opportunities and risks, a projection of its future earning power based on a variety of assumptions, or a "best guess," and detailed comparisons of different companies or the same company at different points in time. Lastly, he offers his assessment of the issue's safety if it's a bond or investment-grade preferred stock, or its purchasing appeal if it's a common stock. The security analyst uses a variety of methods, from the most basic to the most complex, to accomplish all of these tasks. Even if the company's annual statements have the sacrosanct seal of approval from a certified public accountant, he is free to make significant changes to them. He is especially watching for elements in these reports that might indicate much more or less than they really do. The security analyst creates and implements safety criteria that allow us to determine if a certain bond or preferred stock is deemed reliable enough to warrant investing. While capital structure, working capital, asset valuations, and other issues are also taken into consideration, the main focus of these requirements is previous average profits[9], [10].

Until recently, the security analyst hardly ever used value criteria for ordinary stocks, although his safety requirements for bonds and preferred stocks were well stated. He often defended himself with a rundown of previous performances, a somewhat speculative projection of the future (focusing mostly on the next year), and an almost arbitrary conclusion. The latter was and is often shown with one eye fixed on the market charts or the stock ticker. However, the issue of valuing growth companies has received a lot of attention from professional analysts in the last several years. Many of them have sold for prices so high compared to historical and present profits that individuals who are buying them have felt obligated to provide very specific estimates of prospective earnings that extend very far into

the future in order to justify their purchase. It has been necessary to use some quite complex mathematical approaches to justify the values that have been determined.

We will discuss these methods, in condensed form, a bit later. But we have to draw attention to a troubling contradiction here: just in those domains where one would think mathematical values are least trustworthy, they have grown most common. Because valuations are more susceptible to major errors and potential miscalculations the more reliant they are on future expectations and the less anchored in historical performance. The value discovered for a high-multiplier growth stock is mostly based on estimates for the future, which deviate significantly from historical performance, with the possible exception of growth rate. It may thus be said that security analysts nowadays are forced to become the most "scientific" and mathematical in the very circumstances that are least conducive to precise handling. Still, let's continue talking about the most crucial components and methods of security analysis. The demands of the non-professional investor are the focus of the previously very condensed approach. He should be able to discern between solid and shallow analysis, at the very least, and should know what the security analyst is talking about and trying to get across.

For the average investor, the process of analyzing security starts with analyzing an organization's yearly financial statement. We have already written a separate article for laypeople on this topic, titled The Interpretation of Financial Statements. We don't think it's necessary or acceptable to go over the same terrain here, particularly because the focus right now is on attitudes and values rather than facts and descriptions. Let's go on to the two fundamental queries that guide investment selection. Analysis of Bonds

The most reliable and, thus, highly regarded area of securities research focuses on the quality and safety of investment-grade preferred stocks and bond issuance. The primary requirement for corporate bonds is the frequency with which available profits for a given year have met the whole cost of interest. It is the number of times the combined preferred dividends and bond interest have been paid out in the case of preferred stocks. Apart from the earnings-coverage test, many additional tests are often used. Among them are the following:

1. The enterprise's size

A company must meet a certain threshold for both population and commercial volume, which varies depending on the industry, utility, or railroad.

2. Ratio of Stock to Equity

This is the market price of the junior stock issuesdivided by the debt plus preferred stock, or the total face amount of the debt. It is a crude indicator of the "cush- ion," or protection, provided by having a junior investment that has to absorb the majority of negative events first. The market's assessment of the company's potential for the future is one of these factors.

3 .Worth of a Property

In the past, the primary security and safeguard for a bond issuance was thought to be the asset valuations, either as reported on the balance sheet or as evaluated. Experience has proven that, in most situations, earning power is where safety lies, and if this is lacking, assets lose the majority of their perceived worth. Nonetheless, asset values continue to be significant as an independent measure of sufficient security for bonds and preferred stocks in three business categories: investment firms, real estate corporations, and public utilities.

The prudent investor should now question themselves, "How reliable are safety tests based on previous and current performance, considering that principle and interest payments are

contingent on future events?The sole basis for the response is experience. Investment history demonstrates that, for the most part, preferred stocks and bonds that have passed strict safety requirements based on historical performance have been able to withstand future market fluctuations. This has been glaringly evident in the significant railroad bond market, which has been characterized by an alarmingly high number of bankruptcies and significant losses. Almost all of the troubled roads had been over bonded for a long time and had not shown enough coverage of fixed costs during times of ordinary prosperity. As a result, investors using stringent safety standards would have rejected these roads. On the other hand, almost all roads that have passed these standards have avoided financial ruin. The financial records of the several railroads reformed in the 1940s and 1950 dramatically supported our hypothesis. With one notable exception, each of them began their careers with fixed charges that were gradually decreased until the existing fixed-interest obligations were covered adequately, or at least adequately. The New Haven Railroad was the anomaly, earning its new charges only around 1.1 times in 1947, the year of its restructuring. Consequently, in 1961 the New Haven fell back into trusteeship, whereas all the other highways managed to weather some very challenging years without experiencing any financial difficulties.

We will talk about a few facets of the 1970 Penn Central Railroad bankruptcy that rocked the financial world. One basic truth in this situation was that, as early as 1965, the coverage of fixed costs did not fulfill conservative requirements; hence, a wise bond investor would have stayed away from or sold the system's bond issuance well in advance of its financial collapse. Our conclusions about the suitability of previous performance to assess future safety also apply, if not more so, to public utilities, which make up a significant portion of bond investment. It is almost hard to acquire a well-funded utility firm or system. Since the implementation of Securities and Exchange Commission oversight and the dissolution of the majority of holding company structures, public utility funding has been stable and bankruptcies have not been reported. Financial excesses and poor management were almost entirely to blame for the financial difficulties faced by gas and electric utilities in the 1930s, and these issues were evident in the capitalization structures of the affected corporations. Thus, simple but rigorous safety checks would have alerted the investor to the potential risks associated with the later-defaulting securities. The long-term track record of industrial bond offerings has been distinct. While the industrial sector as a whole has outperformed the railroads and utilities in terms of earnings power growth, individual enterprises and business sectors have exhibited less intrinsic stability. Therefore, there have historically been strong arguments in favor of limiting the acquisition of industrial bonds and preferred stocks to businesses that are not only sizable but have also shown a history of withstanding severe economic downturns.

Since 1950, there haven't been many industrial bond defaults; however, this is partially due to the lack of a significant slump during this time. Numerous industrial enterprises have seen unfavorable changes in their financial standing since 1966. Unwise growth has resulted in significant issues. While this has often resulted in operational losses rather than the anticipated gains, it has often required significant increases to bank loans and long-term debt. Beginning in 1971, it was estimated that over the previous seven years, interest payments made by all nonfinancial firms had increased from $9.8 billion in 1963 to $26.1 billion in 1970. Additionally, interest payments had taken up 29% of the total profits before interest and taxes in 1971, up from 16% in 1963. Needless to say, this was a far higher burden for many individual firms. Overly indebted businesses are all too common. We should reiterate the word of caution from our 1965 edition. We are not yet prepared to propose that the investor may lower his requirements for selecting bonds in the industrial or any other category, believing that this advantageous scenario would last indefinitely.

Analysis of Common Stocks

A valuation of the issue that can be compared to the present price to determine whether or not the asset is a desirable buy is the result of the optimal form of common-stock analysis. In turn, this valuation would typically be determined by multiplying the estimated average profits over a number of years in the future by a suitable "capitalization factor."

The current accepted method for projecting earning potential begins with average historical data for operating margin, prices received, and physical volume. The amount of change in volume and price level over the prior base is therefore assumed to be the foundation for projecting future sales in dollars. These estimations are based, in turn, on specific computations relevant to the industry and firm in issue as well as on broad economic projections of the gross national product[11], [12].

An example of this valuation technique may be found in our 1965 edition, which can be updated by include the sequel. Leading investing service The Value Line uses the process described above to anticipate future profits and dividends. It then applies a valuation formula to each issue that is mostly based on specific historical connections to determine the issue's "price potentiality." The combined projections turned out to be slightly, but not significantly, low. The equivalent projections from six years before had shown to be too optimistic about profits and dividends; however, this had been counteracted by using a low multiplier, resulting in the "price potentiality" for 1963 turning out to be roughly equal to the actual average price.

The reader will see that many of the individual forecasts were off by a significant margin. This example supports our general belief that estimates for composites or groups are probably far more reliable than predictions for individual enterprises. Perhaps the security analyst should focus his own and his clients' interests on the three or four firms whose futures he believes he understands the most, and make his own predictions about them. Regretfully, it seems to be almost difficult to distinguish ahead of time between specific projections that may be trusted and those that have a significant margin of error. Essentially, this is the rationale for the investment funds' extensive diversification. For the purpose of diversity alone, it is definitely preferable to concentrate on a single stock that you know will do really well rather than diluting your results to a mediocre level. However, since it cannot be done consistently, this is not done. Wall Street's repeated lip paid to the fantasy of "selectivity" is pragmatically rejected by the widespread broad diversity.

CONCLUSION

For financial analysts looking to advance in their professions, pursuing and earning the Chartered Financial Analyst (CFA) qualification is a major accomplishment. The significance and advantages of the CFA qualification have been discussed in this essay, with a focus on how widely accepted it is as a benchmark for financial experts worldwide. The conversation has brought attention to the CFA program's demanding coursework, moral principles, and thorough testing procedure. By dedicating themselves to this educational path, aspiring financial analysts may distinguish themselves in the competitive and ever-changing financial scene by gaining a deep and sophisticated grasp of investment management, ethics, and professional standards. Moreover, the article has emphasized the wider consequences of holding the CFA certification, including not just professional growth and prospects but also cultivating a dedication to moral behavior and a fiduciary responsibility towards stakeholders and clients. The values included in the CFA program support the integrity and legitimacy of the financial sector overall in addition to aiding in the professional growth of the person. The CFA credential is a tribute to an analyst's dedication to quality, lifelong learning, and ethical

standards even as financial markets change and become more globalized. The CFA certificate is more valuable than just a certification since it attests to an analyst's commitment to the greatest levels of professionalism and expertise in the financial industry.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. Bae, W. Hur, J. Lee, and J. Goh, "Patent citations and financial analysts' long-term growth forecasts," *Sustain.*, 2017.

[2] W. Cheng and J. Ho, "A corpus study of bank financial analyst reports: Semantic fields and metaphors," *Int. J. Bus. Commun.*, 2017.

[3] N. Masoud, "The effects of mandatory IFRS adoption on financial analysts' forecast: Evidence from Jordan," *Cogent Bus. Manag.*, 2017.

[4] J. Krasodomska and C. H. Cho, "Corporate social responsibility disclosure: Perspectives from sell-side and buy-side financial analysts," *Sustain. Accounting, Manag. Policy J.*, 2017.

[5] T. Fedyk, "Refining financial analysts' forecasts by predicting earnings forecast errors," *Int. J. Account. Inf. Manag.*, 2017.

[6] H. Turki, S. Wali, and Y. Boujelbene, "IFRS mandatory adoption effect on the information asymmetry: Immediate or delayed?," *Australas. Accounting, Bus. Financ. J.*, 2017.

[7] G. Kaplanski and H. Levy, "Analysts and sentiment: A causality study," *Q. Rev. Econ. Financ.*, 2017.

[8] R. D. Leece and T. P. White, "The effects of firms' information environment on analysts' herding behavior," *Rev. Quant. Financ. Account.*, 2017.

[9] S. Liu, "Does the requirement of an engagement partner signature improve financial analysts' information environment in the United Kingdom?," *Rev. Quant. Financ. Account.*, 2017.

[10] A. Stotz, "An Empirical Study of Financial Analysts Earnings Forecast Accuracy," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2017.

[11] M. Caylor, M. Cecchini, and J. Winchel, "Analysts' qualitative statements and the profitability of favorable investment recommendations," *Accounting, Organ. Soc.*, 2017.

[12] M. Hao, D. A. Forgione, L. Guo, and H. Zhang, "Improvement in clinical trial disclosures and analysts' forecast accuracy: evidence from the pharmaceutical industry," *Rev. Quant. Financ. Account.*, 2017.

CHAPTER 11

FACTORS AFFECTING THE CAPITALIZATION RATE: A REVIEW STUDY

Aditya Kashyap, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India
Email Id-aditya.kashyap@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The intricate web of factors influencing the capitalization rate, a crucial metric in real estate valuation. The capitalization rate, often referred to as the "cap rate," plays a pivotal role in determining the value of income-generating properties. The study explores a comprehensive array of factors that impact the cap rate, encompassing property-specific attributes, market dynamics, economic conditions, and investor sentiment. Through an in-depth analysis, the paper sheds light on how fluctuations in interest rates, property location, asset class, and overall market conditions can significantly influence the capitalization rate. Understanding these factors is essential for real estate professionals, investors, and stakeholders engaged in property valuation, investment decision-making, and portfolio management. Ultimately, this research contributes to a nuanced comprehension of the dynamic nature of the capitalization rate, offering valuable insights for optimizing real estate investment strategies in diverse market conditions.

KEYWORDS:

Financing Costs, Investor Expectations, Market Analysis, Property Type, Rental Income, Risk Perception.

INTRODUCTION

Even though typical future profits are meant to be the primary component in determining value, a security analyst considers a variety of other aspects that are more or less certain. The majority of them will be included into his capitalization rate, which is subject to change greatly based on the stock issue's "quality." Therefore, even if the analyst believes that two firms would earn the same amount per share in 1973–1975, say $4, they may value one at 40 and the other at 100. Let's quickly go over a few of the factors that go into these divergent multipliers[1], [2].

Overall Long-Term Expectations

Although it is impossible to predict what will occur in the far future, experts and investors nonetheless have strong opinions about it. The significant differences in the price/earnings ratios of particular businesses and industry categories represent these opinions. We then included the following in our 1965 edition: By the end of 1963, for instance, the chemical businesses in the DJIA were selling at far higher multipliers than the oil companies, a sign that the former had more faith in their future than the latter. These market-driven divisions are often well-founded, but they run the risk of being incorrect as well as correct when they are primarily based on historical performance. We will include here the year-end 1963 data on the oil and chemical companies listed in the DJIA, together with their profits through the end of 1970. It will be seen that the chemical companies had almost no increase in profits in the years after 1963, even with their high multipliers. Compared to the chemicals, the oil

firms performed far better and about in accordance with the increase indicated by their 1963 multipliers.5. Consequently, our chemical-stock scenario turned out to be one of the instances when the market multipliers were shown to be incorrect.

Graham's observation on the oil and chemical industries in the 1960s is relevant to almost every business throughout history. The general opinion on Wall Street about the direction of any specific industry is often either too optimistic or overly pessimistic. Even worse, the consensus is most optimistic when equities are most overvalued and most pessimistic when they are at their lowest. Of course, the most recent example is the stock market for technology and telecommunications, which peaked in 1999 and early 2000, just when the future seemed brightest, and then fell sharply through 2002. History demonstrates that Wall Street's so-called "expert" forecasters are exactly as bad at projecting the a. 1963 s corrected for General Motors share distribution and the b. 1963 s adjusted for future stock splits[3], [4].

Supervisory

There is a lot of talk on Wall Street about this topic, but not much of it is really beneficial. This element will remain obscured until objective, quantitative, and somewhat accurate assessments of management competency are developed and implemented. It is reasonable to infer that a firm with exceptional performance has exceptionally competent management. This will have already shown itself in the historical data; it will do so once again in the estimates for the next five years and again in the long-term prospects aspect that was previously discussed. Counting it again as a distinct bullish element is a habit that may easily result in costly overvaluations. We believe that situations when a recent change hasn't had time to demonstrate its impact in the actuals are where the management element is most helpful.

Capital Structure and Financial Stability

It is obvious that buying stock from a firm with a lot of excess cash and no stock ahead of the common is preferable to buying stock from another company with the same profits per share but significant bank loans and senior securities. Security analysts appropriately and meticulously consider these aspects. A small quantity of preferred stock or bonds, the overall market performance, industry sector performance, and stock specific performance. The likelihood that individual investors can do any better is low, as Graham notes. The astute investor thrives by making choices independent of the precision of any individual's projections, even their own.

The Dividend History

An unbroken history of dividend payments over many years is one of the strongest indicators of great quality. We believe that a company's track record of consistently paying dividends for the last 20 years or more adds significantly to its quality grade. It might be reasonable for the defensive investor to restrict their acquisitions to assets that satisfy this criterion.

Dividend Rate at Present

The final additional aspect we will discuss is the most challenging to address satisfactorily. Thankfully, most businesses now adhere to what may be referred to as a conventional dividend policy. Approximately two-thirds of their average earnings have been distributed as a result, with the exception of the current time of high profits and inflationary demands for additional capital, when the distribution has tended to be lower. In cases when there is a regular correlation between the dividend and earnings, the valuation may be conducted using either approach without significantly impacting the outcome. A normal secondary firm, for

instance, would be valued at 12 times its profits or 18 times its dividend, resulting in a value of 36 in both scenarios. Its estimated average earnings would be $3 and its expected dividend would be $2. On the other hand, a growing number of businesses are breaking with the traditional practice of paying out at least 60% of earnings as dividends. They argue that it will serve the interests of the shareholders better to keep almost all of the profits to fund future development. The trouble with the topic is that it calls for rigorous distinctions. We have decided to move our conversation on the crucial issue of appropriate dividend policy to a later segment when we will address it in connection with the larger issue of management-shareholder relations[5], [6]s.

Rates of Capitalization for Growth Stocks

Security analysts write on the value of growing stocks in formal assessments for the most part. After examining the different approaches, we have proposed a simplified and abbreviated formula for growth stock valuation that should provide results that are comparable to those obtained from more complex mathematical computations. As it turned out, the real growth rates for IBM and Xerox were quite similar to the high growth rates that our algorithm suggested. This excellent performance naturally led to a significant increase in the price of both problems, as previously mentioned. The closing market price in 1963 roughly predicted the rise of the DJIA itself. The mathematical conundrum faced by IBM and Xerox was not present at the moderate rate of 5%, however. As it turned out, the 28% total dividend return and the 23% price increase through the end of 1970 produced a result that was rather close to the 71.2% yearly total gain that our algorithm predicted. It may be sufficient to state that the other four businesses' development fell short of the expectations reflected in the 1963 pricing and that their quotes did not increase as much as the DJIA. Note: This information is provided only for illustrative reasons due to the unavoidable need in security research to forecast the pace of growth for the majority of the organizations under investigation. It is important to avoid misleading the reader into believing that these forecasts are very reliable or, on the other hand, that future prices will always follow through on the predictions, whether they come true, are exceeded, or are not.

It is important to note that future interest rates must be taken into consideration in any "scientific," or at least somewhat reliable, stock appraisal based on projected future outcomes. Assuming a higher interest structure than a lower one would result in a reduced current value for a given schedule of projected profits, or dividends. Forecasts of this kind are almost presumptuous due to the recent sharp fluctuations in long-term interest rates, which have always made such assumptions impossible to make with any degree of certainty. Because no new formula would seem more logical, we have thus stuck with the previous one [7], [8].

DISCUSSION

Given that market prices are largely determined by an enterprise's overall prospects, it seems sense that a security analyst would pay close attention to the financial standing of both the industry as a whole and each individual firm operating within it. These kinds of studies may cover a vast amount of information. Occasionally, they provide crucial insights about significant aspects that are underappreciated in the present market but will be operational in the future. When such a judgment can be made with a reasonable amount of confidence, it provides a solid foundation for financial choices. However, based on our own observations, we are forced to downplay the usefulness of the majority of the industry studies that are provided to investors. Typically, the content produced is of a kind that the general public is already somewhat acquainted with and that has already had a significant impact on market quotes. According to "the rule of 72," a given amount of money doubles at 10% interest in

little over seven years, whereas it doubles at 7% interest in just over ten years. A high-interest rate reduces the amount of money you must save now to attain a certain value later since it will allow your money to grow more quickly. A future stream of revenue or dividends is thus less valuable as interest rates rise since investing in bonds is now a more appealing option. It is rare to come across a brokerage-house report that asserts, via a compelling set of data, that one unpopular sector is poised for growth while another is headed for collapse. Given Wall Street's well-known propensity for making inaccurate long-term predictions, a significant portion of its research must be focused on estimating how earnings will develop across a range of businesses.

It is essential to acknowledge, nonetheless, that the rapid and widespread advancement of technology in recent times has had a significant impact on the mindset and duties of security analysts. More than in the past, the average company's trajectory in the next ten years may be determined by how it approaches new processes and products, which the analyst may have an opportunity to research and assess beforehand. Therefore, there is undoubtedly a potential area for the analyst's successful job, based on field visits, research man interviews, and extensive independent technology study. Investment decisions that are primarily based on these futuristic glimpses and are not backed by now observable value carry certain risks. However, there can be equal risks associated with strictly adhering to the value ranges established by careful calculations based on factual data. Investors are not able to have it both ways. He may be creative and aim for the large profits that come with vision that is validated by reality, but he also runs a significant danger of making a significant mistake in judgment. Alternatively, he may choose to be cautious and only agree to pay a little premium for potential that has not yet been shown; nevertheless, in that scenario, he will need to prepare himself for the regret of lost chances in the future[9], [10].

A Two-Step Evaluation Procedure

For a minute, let's go back to the topic of common stock value or appraisal, which we started talking about on page 288 above. After giving the matter a lot of thought, we've come to the conclusion that this need to be done quite differently from how it's now done. We advise analysts to calculate what we refer to as the "past-performance value" first, since it is entirely dependent on historical data. This would show the stock's value if it were expected that its relative historical performance would be steady going forward, either as a fixed amount or as a 15 % of the DJIA or the S&P composite. A formula that assigns distinct weights to previous performance in terms of profitability, stability, and growth as well as present financial situation might be used to automate this procedure. The degree to which the value based just on previous performance should be updated due to new circumstances anticipated in the future should be examined in the second section of the study.

Under such a technique, senior and junior analysts would split up the labor as follows: the senior analyst would create the formula that would be used to determine past-performance value for all firms in general. For the targeted firms, the younger analysts would calculate these criteria essentially in a mechanical manner. After that, the senior analyst would assess how much a company's performance—whether absolute or relative—is expected to deviate from its historical performance and what adjustments to the valuation should be made to account for these changes. The senior analyst's report should ideally include the updated value as well as the original one, along with his justifications.

Is this type of work worth doing? Although our response is affirmative, the reader may find our justifications to be a little cynical. We have our doubts that the values so arrived at will be sufficiently reliable in the case of the average industrial enterprise, regardless of size.

We'll use our discussion of the Aluminum Company of America in the following section to demonstrate the challenges of this work. Still, it ought to be carried out for these popular stocks. Why? First, as part of their regular job, many security analysts will inevitably create present or anticipated appraisals. Our suggested approach should be superior to the ones now in use. Second, it ought to provide the analysts who use this strategy with insightful and helpful expertise. Thirdly, since the research of this kind has the potential to create a priceless body of documented experience, as has long been the medicine case, which might result in improved process techniques and a helpful understanding of its potential and constraints. Public utility stocks might be a significant area where this strategy really shines in terms of practicality. The astute analyst will eventually limit his scope to those sectors where the future seems fairly predictable or where there is such a wide margin of safety between past performance value and current price that he can take a chance on future fluctuations, just as he does when choosing senior securities that are well-secured. We will provide specific examples of the use of analytical methods in the following sections. However, they will only be illusions. Before deciding whether or not to make a final buy-or-sell decision on a security problem, the reader should investigate an intriguing topic methodically and completely.

An Analysis of Four Listed Companies

To provide a more thorough explanation, let us quickly recapitulate the main components of performance as they are presented in our s.

Turnover

While the profits for each of the firms are respectable when compared to their worth, Emerson and Emery's earnings are much larger. Strong yearly growth rates in profits per share are often correlated with high rates of return on invested capital. With the exception of Emery, all the firms had higher profits per share in 1969 compared to 1961; nonetheless, Emery's figure was notably larger in both years. The profit per dollar of sales for manufacturing firms often indicates their relative strengths and weaknesses. The "ratio of operating income to sales" provided in Standard & Poor's Listed Stock Reports is what we utilize in this instance. Once again, all four businesses are pleased with the outcomes, with Emerson putting up a particularly strong performance. The modifications made by each company between 1961 and 1969 differ significantly[11], [12].

Consistency

We gauge this by comparing the highest loss in per-share profits over the last 10 years to the average of the three years before. The two widely held worries noted that there is no such thing as 100% stability in the face of deterioration. However, ELTRA and Emhart's shrinkages in the "bad year" of 1970 were rather mild, coming in at just 8% each according to our assessment compared to 7% for the DJIA.

Expanding

Both of the low-multiplier businesses have satisfactory manufacturing growth rates, outperforming the Dow Jones group in both instances. Particularly striking are the ELTRAs in relation to their low price/earnings ratio. Of course, the increase for the high-multiplier pair is more remarkable.

Status of Finances

The usual ratio of $2 in current assets for $1 in current liabilities is not met by the three manufacturing enterprises, indicating their strong financial standing. Although Emery Air

Freight has a lower ratio, it is in a different league and, given its stellar track record, it should have no trouble acquiring the necessary capital. Every company has very little long-term debt. "Dilution" note: At the end of 1970, Emerson Electric had outstanding low-dividend convertible preferred shares valued at $163 million. We have accounted for the dilution effect in our study by considering the preferred as if it were transformed into common. Due to this, recent profits were down by around 4%, or 10 cents per share.

Payouts

The history of uninterrupted continuation is what matters most. Emhart's has the finest track record here, having not stopped a payment since 1902. ELTRA has an excellent track record, Emerson is rather content, and Emery Freight is a recent addition. The differences in payment % don't appear to be very noteworthy. According to the price/earnings ratios, the present dividend yield on the "cheap pair" is twice as high as that on the dear pair.

Overarching Notes on the Four Companies

Compared to the aggregate valuation of the other three firms, Emerson Electric has a far larger overall market value. One of our "good-will giants," more on which will be discussed later. A well-memorized financial analyst will draw a comparison between Zenith Radio and Emerson Electric, which is not comforting.

For many years, Zenith had an exceptional track record of growth, selling for $1.7 billion on the market. However, during that year's major selloff, its price dropped to $221⁄2 from the previous peak of 89, and its profits dropped from $43 million in 1968 to about half that amount in 1970. Great values come with a great risk.

To be even somewhat justified, Emery Air Freight's price/earnings ratio of over 40 times its highest reported profits suggests that it is the most promising of the four companies in terms of future development. Of course, the greatest notable increase to date has occurred in the past. However, if we take into account that these figures began rather modestly, with just $570,000 in net profits in 1958, they may not be as important going forward. Maintaining rapid growth is sometimes much more challenging after volume and earnings have reached significant levels. The most astonishing part of Emery's tale is how, despite 1970 being the worst year for the domestic air passenger sector, the company's profits and market value increased rapidly. This is a very amazing accomplishment, but it begs the issue of whether future earnings won't be susceptible to unfavorable events like heightened competition, demand for new agreements between forwarders and airlines, etc. Although a thorough investigation may be required to make a solid assessment on these issues, the conservative investor must take them into consideration overall.

ELTRA and Emhart. Over the last 14 years, Emhart has performed better in its business than in the stock market. It sold for as much as 22 times current profits in 1958, which is comparable to the DJIA's ratio. Since then, its earnings have quadrupled, compared to the Dow's growth of less than 100%. However, in 1970, it closed at a price just a third over its 1958 peak, compared to the Dow's 43% increase. The ELTRA record is somewhat comparable. Despite the fact that none of these businesses seems to have glamor or "sex appeal" in the current market, they both do astonishingly well according to all the statistical data. Their prospects for the future? Here are some wise words from Standard & Poor's on the four firms from 1971, in case you missed them: ELTRA—"Long-term Prospects: An established competitive position and diversification are offsetting fac- tors, but certain operations are cyclical."

Emerson Electric—"The shares have appeal for the long term, even though they are reasonably priced given the current outlook. A sustained acquisition policy, a strong position in industrial fields, and an expedited international program suggest further sales and earnings progress."

"The shares appear amply priced on cur- rent prospects, but are well worth holding for the long pull," says Emery Air Freight. Emhart—"Earnings should benefit from a better business climate in 1972, even though they were limited this year by lower capital spending in the glass-container industry. It makes sense to retain the shares. It's possible that Emerson and Emery's superior "market action" and quicker recent earnings growth are the main reasons why many financial experts will regard these companies to be more intriguing and tempting than the other two. The first is not a good enough justification for selection in accordance with our conservative investing guidelines; it is something for the speculators to experiment with.

However, ELTRA, at 27, and Emhart, at 33, exhibit the telltale signs of businesses that have enough value to support their prices and make for investments that are at least somewhat safeguarded. Here, the investor has the option to pay a fee that corresponds to the amount of money shown on the balance sheet as being invested in these businesses, thereby making him a part owner. The historical growth rate was shockingly high, but the rate of return on invested capital has long been excellent, as has the stability of profits. The two businesses satisfy our seven statistical criteria, making them suitable for a conservative investor's portfolio. These are summarized as follows, however they will be expanded upon in the following

1. Suitable size.
2. A good enough financial position.
3. Dividend payments over the last 20 years or more.
4. Not a single pay gap during the previous 10 years.
5. A minimum one-third increase in profits per share over a ten-year period.
6. Stock price limited to 11⁄2 time's net asset value.
7. Price should not exceed fifteen times the previous three years' average profits.

Regarding ELTRA's or Emhart's prospective earnings performance, we have no forecasts. Certain common companies on an investor's diverse list are always going to be underwhelming; this might apply to one or both of these stocks. However, the diversified list itself ought to perform admirably over time based on the aforementioned selection factors as well as any other reasonable standards the investor chooses to use. Long experience suggests as much, at least.

As a last point, even if an expert security analyst agreed with our overall analysis of these four businesses, he would not have been inclined to suggest, at the close of 1970, that an owner of Emerson or Emery exchange their shares for ELTRA or Emhart, unless the owner was fully aware of the rationale behind the suggestion. There was no reason to believe that the low-multiplier pair would beat the high-multipliers in any short amount of time. The latter were well regarded in the market and hence have a significant amount of momentum that might last indefinitely. The client's well-considered decision that he favored value-type investments over glamour-type investments served as a solid foundation for his preference for ELTRA and Emhart over Emerson and Emery.

Therefore, a common-stock investing program must largely rely on the mindset of the individual investor. We go into more detail about this strategy in our upcoming.

Choosing Stocks for the Prudent Investor

It's time to move on to some more extensive uses of security analysis methods. It would make sense for us to now explain how security analysis is used to carry out the investment plans that have been suggested for our two kinds of investors, given that we have previously provided a broad description of them. A defensive investor following our recommendations will buy only high-grade bonds together with a diverse selection of top common equities. He must ensure that, in light of relevant criteria, the price at which he purchased the latter was not too exorbitant. He has two options for creating this diversified list: the statistically evaluated portfolio or a portfolio similar to the DJIA. In the first, he obtains a real cross-section sample of the top issues, including less well-known and less costly businesses in addition to a few preferred growth firms, whose shares trade at very high multipliers. The simplest way to do this could be to purchase identical quantities of each of the thirty stocks that make up the Dow-Jones Industrial Average. Purchasing ten shares of each, at the average price of 900, would come to a total of almost $16,000.1 Based on historical performance, he might anticipate roughly the same outcomes from purchasing shares in several representative investment funds.

Sufficient Scale of the Business

All of our minimums have to be arbitrary, particularly when it comes to the necessary size. Our intention is to exclude small businesses, particularly those in the industrial sector that would be more vulnerable to extreme adversity than the average. Let's utilize round numbers: a public utility's entire assets cannot be less than $50 million, and an industrial company's yearly revenues cannot be less than $100 million.

An Adequately Robust Financial Situation

A two-to-one current ratio, or current assets to current liabilities, is recommended for industrial enterprises. Furthermore, net current assets should not be greater than long-term debt. The debt to stock equity ratio for public utilities should not be more than twice.

General remarks

These specifications are tailored specifically to meet the expectations and temperament of defensive investors. In two different ways, they will rule out the vast majority of ordinary stocks as portfolio prospects. Companies that are too tiny, have a comparatively poor financial standing, have a deficit stigma in their ten-year track record, or do not have a lengthy history of consistent dividend payments will be excluded. The financial strength tests are the most difficult of them in light of the current financial situation. In recent years, a significant portion of our big, historically well-established businesses have either overextended their debt or impaired their cur-rent ratio, or both.

Our last two criteria, which need higher profits and more assets per dollar of price than the popular issues would provide, are exclusive in the other direction. Although most financial professionals would argue that even conservative investors should be willing to pay high prices for the stocks of their preferred firms, this is by no means their common opinion. We have discussed our opposing viewpoint above; it is based mostly on the lack of a sufficient safety factor when an excessive amount of the price must be based on future profits that will never stop rising. The reader will have to make his own decision on this crucial issue after considering the reasons made by both sides. Nevertheless, during the last ten years, we have

chosen to include a moderate growth criterion. In the absence of it, the average business would regress, at least in terms of earnings per capital invested. Although these firms may be considered bargains if the price is low enough, there is no need for the defensive investor to include them.

Utilizing Our Standards for the DJIA at the Close of 1970

The DJIA issues at the end of 1970 met all of our recommended requirements, but two of them were narrowly met. This study is based on the 1970 closing price and the applicable s.

1.Each organization has more than enough space.

2.Overall, financial standing is sufficient, but not for every business.

3.Since at least 1940, every corporation has paid a dividend of some kind. Of the dividend records, five date back to the previous century.

Purchasing Financial Enterprise Stocks

The term "financial companies" might refer to a wide range of businesses, such as banks, insurance providers, savings and loan organizations, credit and small-loan providers, mortgage providers, and "investment companies." All of these businesses have the trait of having comparatively little material assets, such as goods inventories and fixed assets, but the majority of them also have short-term liabilities that much exceed their stock capital. As a result, compared to the average industrial or commercial firm, the issue of financial soundness is more pertinent here. As a consequence, many regulations and supervision measures have been developed, with the overall goal of safeguarding against risky financial activities. In general, investment returns from financial companies' shares have been comparable to those from other kinds of common shares.

Railway Problems

The utilities' narrative is quite different from the railroads. Strict regulations coupled with intense competition have hurt the carriers tremendously. Most of their passenger business has been taken over by cars, buses, and aircraft, leaving the remaining portion mostly unprofitable; trucks have largely taken over its freight traffic. Over half of the nation's railroad miles has experienced bankruptcy at some point in the last 50 years.

However, the carriers have not had a completely bad fifty years. The industry has seen times of prosperity, particularly during the war years. Despite the overall challenges, several of the lines have been able to keep their earning potential and dividends. Between the low point of 1942 and the peak point of 1968, the Standard & Poor's index increased seven times, while the public-utility index gained less percentage.

Making general recommendations for whole classes of securities is often unwise, and there are similar arguments against making harsh condemnations. The railroad share price history in 14-6 demonstrates that the group as a whole has often provided opportunities for significant profits. Let us limit our recommendation to this: The investor should ensure that he is receiving such a high return on investment before purchasing any railroad shares that it would be irrational to search for anything else. There are now just a few significant rail stocks left, including Union Pacific, CSX, Norfolk Southern, and Burlington Northern. The guidance in this section applies to airline equities now just as much as it did to railroads in Graham's day, given their enormous current losses and over fifty years of consistently negative returns.

Prudence for the Protective Investor

Every investor wants their list to outperform the average or show more promise. Therefore, the reader will wonder whether he should not be able to expect to get an investment package of really superior attributes if he finds himself a qualified counsel or security analyst. "After all, the guidelines you've laid out are fairly straightforward and laid back," he would remark. For something as evident as the Dow Jones list, a highly skilled analyst should be able to significantly enhance it with all of his skills and tactics. Assume that we asked one hundred security experts to choose the "best" five Dow Jones Average stocks to purchase at the end of 1970 as a kind of practical test. Few people would have made the same choices, and many of the lists would have been very different from one another. This is not as shocking as it may seem at first. The fundamental explanation is that the present market value of any well-known stock rather accurately captures the key elements of its track record both financially and in terms of the perception of its prospects going forward. Therefore, an analyst's opinion that one company is a better investment than the others must stem in large part from his own biases and assumptions, or from his preference to emphasize some elements over others while conducting an examination. Should every expert agree that a certain stock outperformed the others, the stock would swiftly rise to a point where its prior benefits would be nullified?

Our intention was to highlight the dual foundation for market values by stating that the present price reflects both known facts and future assumptions. These two types of value components correspond to two essentially distinct methods of security analysis. Indeed, every skilled analyst looks forward rather than backward, and he understands that the success or failure of his job depends more on what is ahead than on what has already occurred. However, there are two approaches that may be taken to the future itself: the protective method and the prediction approach.

Predictive thinkers will try to project the company's future performance reasonably correctly, especially if profits are expected to expand at a significant and sustained pace. These results may come from a fairly naïve projection of the line of historical growth into the future, or they could come from a very careful assessment of aspects like volume, pricing, and costs, or supply and demand in the business. Without giving any thought to the price at which the stock is trading, these experts will nearly always advocate buying the stock if they believe the reasonably long-term prospects are very positive. For instance, this was the prevailing mindset about the airtransport stocks, which continued for many years in spite of the really poor outcomes often shown after 1946. We discussed the discrepancy between this industry's robust price movement and comparatively dismal profit record in the Introduction. One of Graham's main arguments is this. A harsh paradox faces all investors: although we invest for the future, we also invest for the present. And, regrettably, there is almost little certainty about the future. The future of individual companies and their industries frequently turns out to be the opposite of what most investors expect. Geopolitical upheavals like war, commodity shortages, and terrorism arrive without warning. Inflation and interest rates are unpredictable. Economic recessions come and go at random. As a result, making investments based only on projections is foolish; even the predictions made by so-called experts are not as trustworthy as tossing a coin. The wisest course of action for the majority of people is to invest based on protection—from overpaying for stock and from having too much faith in their own judgment. On the other hand, those who place a strong emphasis on protection are always especially worried about the cost of the problem at the time of study. Their primary goal is to ensure that they have a large suggested present value buffer over the market price, which will allow them to absorb any adverse future events. Therefore, in general, it is more important for them to be relatively sure that the business will succeed than it is for them to be enthusiastic

about the long-term prospects of the firm. The first, or predictive, strategy is also known as the qualitative approach because it places a strong emphasis on prospects, management, and other quality-related but non-quantifiable aspects. The protective strategy, which is the second one, is also known as the quantitative or statistical approach because it places emphasis on the quantifiable correlations between selling price and assets, profits, dividends, and other variables. Interestingly, the quantitative approach is just a generalization of the perspective that security analysis has shown to be reliable when choosing bonds and preferred stocks for investment—into the realm of common stocks. Our professional work and attitude have always been centered on the quantitative approach. We wanted to be certain right away that we were receiving a good deal on our investment in terms that could be seen and verified. We didn't want to take the hopes and promises of the future in exchange for something that didn't have enough worth right now. Investment authorities have not always held this view; in fact, most would likely agree that prospects, management caliber, other intangibles, and “the human factor” far outweigh the clues provided by any analysis of the company's historical performance, balance sheet, and all the other cold data.

As a result, the topic of selecting the "best" stocks is fundamentally quite contentious. We advise the conservative investor to get away from it. Allow him to stress diversity over personal preference. It is worth noting that the widely recognized concept of diversity involves, at minimum, resolving the aspirational pre-tensions associated with selection. The only way to lose by diversifying would be if one could choose the best stocks without error. However, there is some leeway for a fair amount of preference within the parameters of the defensive investor's four most basic common-stock selection guidelines. Indulging in such preferences shouldn't hurt anything at worst, and if anything, it could improve the outcome. The investor cannot exclude technology advancements from his calculations due to their growing influence on long-term company success. He has to find a middle ground between overemphasis and carelessness here, as elsewhere.

CONCLUSION

This analysis of the variables impacting the capitalization rate offers important new perspectives on the complex dynamics underlying real estate value. A key indicator in property appraisal, the capitalization rate is the result of a complicated interaction between market dynamics, investor attitude, and characteristics unique to a certain property. The importance of comprehending how variables like asset class, market circumstances, and property location may affect the capitalization rate has been emphasized throughout the article. Furthermore, it has been shown that changes in interest rates and general economic trends are important factors to take into account when determining the value of assets that generate income. When making judgments about investments, valuing properties, and managing portfolios, real estate professionals, investors, and stakeholders may all benefit from having a sophisticated understanding of these aspects. The capitalization rate's dynamic nature emphasizes the need of flexibility and a deep understanding of the always shifting real estate market.

REFERENCES:

[1] E. Oikarinen and H. Falkenbach, “Foreign investors’ influence on the real estate market capitalization rate–evidence from a small open economy,” *Appl. Econ.*, 2017.

[2] S. Clements, A. Tidwell, and C. Jin, “Futures markets and real estate public equity: Connectivity of lumber futures and Timber REITs,” *J. For. Econ.*, 2017.

[3] E. Ardielli, J. Ardielli, and D. Slavata, "Calculation and Spatial Distribution of Capitalization Rates in the Selected Segment of Reality Properties," *Int. J. Entrep. Knowl.*, 2017.

[4] P. McAllister and A. Nanda, "Do Foreign buyers compress office real estate cap rates?," *J. Real Estate Res.*, 2017.

[5] M. Ciuna, M. De Ruggiero, F. Salvo, and M. Simonotti, "Automatic research of the capitalization rate for the residential automated valuation: An experimental study in Cosenza (Italy)," in *Studies in Systems, Decision and Control*, 2017.

[6] H. Belguith and M. Bellouma, "Income Structure, Profitability and Stability in the Tunisian Banking Sector," *Int. J. Eng. Res. Sci.*, 2017.

[7] I. Ben-David, A. Palvia, and C. Spatt, "Banks' Internal Capital Markets and Deposit Rates," *J. Financ. Quant. Anal.*, 2017.

[8] A. Pham Hoang and L. Vo Thi Kim, "Factors affecting net interest margin of joint-stock commercial banks in Vietnam," *J. Asian Bus. Econ. Stud.*, 2017.

[9] M. N. G. Omofa, "An Empirical Investigation into the Effect of Financial Sector Development on Consumption and Inflation in Nigeria: 1986-2012," *Open J. Bus. Manag.*, 2017.

[10] S. Chan, J. Chu, S. Nadarajah, and J. Osterrieder, "A Statistical Analysis of Cryptocurrencies," *J. Risk Financ. Manag.*, 2017.

[11] J. Royer, "Financing agricultural cooperatives with retained earnings," *Agric. Financ. Rev.*, 2017.

[12] D. Ruf, "Agglomeration Effects and Liquidity Gradients in Local Rental Housing Markets," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2017.

CHAPTER 12

STOCK SELECTION FOR THE ENTERPRISING INVESTOR

Shilpi Kulshrestha, Associate Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India
Email Id-shilpi.kulshrestha@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:
The art and science of stock selection is tailored for the enterprising investor. Building upon Benjamin Graham's principles outlined in "The Intelligent Investor," the study explores diverse strategies, risks, and opportunities associated with selecting individual stocks in the pursuit of long-term financial success. It scrutinizes the importance of thorough fundamental analysis, emphasizing financial stability, earnings history, and dividends as key criteria. The paper also examines various stock selection methods, including value investing, growth investing, and contrarian approaches, providing insights into their respective merits and risks. Furthermore, the study addresses the challenges of market timing, the significance of a margin of safety, and risk management techniques essential for enterprising investors navigating the dynamic landscape of equity markets. By comprehensively analyzing stock selection considerations, this research aims to empower enterprising investors with the knowledge to make informed decisions aligned with their financial goals and risk tolerance.

KEYWORDS:

Earnings Growth, Financial Analysis, Fundamental Analysis, Growth Stocks, Market Inefficiencies, Portfolio Diversification.

INTRODUCTION

In the preceding section, we discussed commonstock selection in terms of broad categories of acceptable securities. As long as sufficient diversity is attained, the defensive investor is free to compile whatever list that he or his advisor desires. When it comes to selection, we have focused mostly on exclusions: we have advised against any issues that are clearly of low quality and against the best issues if their price is so high that it entails a significant speculative risk. This article, which is aimed at the adventurous investor, discusses how we may make specific decisions that will probably turn out to be more profitable than a general average. As the phrase goes, we would be less than forthright if we did not first voice some serious concerns about this matter. At first glance, it seems obvious why selection should be effective. It should not need any type of extraordinary talent to get average outcomes, such as those comparable to the DJIA's performance. A portfolio that is either the same as or comparable to those thirty well-known problems is all that is required. Therefore, it should be feasible to get much better outcomes than the DJIA by using even a modest level of talent, which is acquired via education, experience, and natural ability. Even if the people doing this have the best credentials, there is compelling evidence that this is a very difficult task. The various investment firms' records, or "funds," which have been in business for a long time, provide the proof. The majority of these funds are big enough to hire the top financial and security analysts in the industry, along with every other component needed for a sufficient research department. Their operating costs, when distributed across their large capital, amount to an average of less than 0.5 percent annually. While these expenses are not insignificant in and of themselves, they do not amount to much when contrasted with the about 15% annual total return on common stocks during the years 1951–1960 and even the

6% return during the years 1961–1970. A little bit more improved selection skillsare needed to be able to overcome that financial disadvantage and produce a better net outcome for the fund stockholders[1], [2].

When considered collectively, nevertheless, the all-common-stock funds were unable to generate returns nearly as strong as those indicated by Standard & Poor's 500-stock averages or the overall market over an extended period. Numerous comprehensive research have supported this finding. According to the most recent one in front of us, which spans the years 1960–1968:These findings suggest that random portfolios of New York Stock Exchange equities, with an equal allocation to each stock, outperformed mutual funds in the same risk class over the period on average. For the low- and medium-risk portfolios, the differences were rather significant; however, for the high-risk portfolios, the changes were relatively tiny. These comparisons do not negate the investment funds' value as a financial institution, as we noted in point 9. Because they provide the opportunity for all members of the investing public to get outcomes on their common-stock commitments that are about average. Most people who invest in common stocks of their choosing do not do nearly as well for several reasons. However, the inability of the funds to improve the performance of a wide average seems to the objective observer to be a very clear sign that such an accomplishment is quite difficult, not simple[3], [4].

Two distinct explanations come to mind, either of which could have some merit. The first is the potential that all relevant information about the past and present performance of the firms, as well as any reasonable predictions for their future, are reflected in the prices set by the stock market. If this is the case, then the many market fluctuations that follow—many of which are severe must be the outcome of novel discoveries and breakthroughs that were not always foreseeable. As a result, the price fluctuations would be purely coincidental and unpredictable. If the aforementioned is accurate, then security analysts, no matter how clever or comprehensive, must be doing much of their job in vain because, at bottom, they are attempting to foresee the unpredictable.

This outcome could have been influenced significantly by the simple fact that there are now many security analysts. It would seem reasonable to assume that a significant common stock's current price would fairly accurately represent the consensus of knowledgeable opinion on its worth given the hundreds or even thousands of specialists examining its value-related aspects. People who would rather focus on it than other problems would likely do so out of optimism or personal bias, which may or may not be correct. We have frequently considered the comparison between the performance of master bridge players at a duplicate-bridge event and the work of the top security analysts on Wall Street. In order to get the highest score for every hand played, the latter attempt to choose the stocks that are "most likely to succeed." Only a select handful are able to achieve both goals. The victors will probably be decided by different types of "breaks" rather than better talent if every bridge player is about at the same level of expertise. The freemasonry that permeates the industry on Wall Street, where ideas and discoveries are openly exchanged at the many social gatherings of all kinds, contributes to the leveling process. It almost seems as if the different experts were debating each hand as it was played in the comparable bridge event, peering over each other's shoulders. The second idea is entirely unrelated to the first. It's possible that a weakness in their fundamental strategy for handling the stock selection dilemma hinders a large number of securities analysts. They look for industries with the strongest development potential as well as businesses in these sectors that have superior management and other benefits. The inference is that they will shun less promising sectors and firms regardless of how low the price of their shares is, and they will invest in such industries and such

companies at any price, no matter how high. If the profits of the excellent enterprises were guaranteed to increase at a fast pace eternally into the future, then this would be the only appropriate course of action since, in principle, their worth would be unlimited. Additionally, the experts would be justified in finding the less promising businesses unattractive at all if they were on the verge of becoming extinct and could not be saved[5], [6].

The reality of our business endeavors is very different

Very few businesses have shown sustained high growth rates over extended periods of time. Surprisingly few of the bigger businesses eventually go out of business. Most people's histories are filled with ups and downs, vicissitudes, and shifts in their relative status. The slogan "from rags to riches and back" used to be a traditional one attributed to the steel industry. In certain cases, however, the variations have been recognized with dramatic changes associated with either degradation or improvement of management on an almost cyclical basis.

It initially implies that he is embarking on a challenging and maybe unfeasible task. Even with their intelligence and knowledge, readers of this could hardly hope to outperform the nation's best analysts in terms of portfolio selection. However, if it is accurate to say that a sizable portion of the stock market is often singled out for neglect or discrimination in standard analytical decisions, as some have suggested, then a shrewd trader may be able to take advantage of the ensuing undervaluation’s[7], [8].

But in order to do this, he has to adhere to certain procedures that are not often recognized on Wall Street since those that are don't appear to provide the desired outcomes for everyone. Given the caliber of minds employed in the stock market, it would be peculiar if there were methods that are both sensible and comparatively uncommon. However, our reputation and career have been built on this improbable reality.

DISCUSSION

It might be worthwhile to provide a quick overview of the many activities we conducted over the thirty-year existence of Graham-Newman Corporation, from 1926 to 1956, in order to provide context for the above statement.

Arbitrages

When a security is bought and one or more other securities are sold at the same time in order to swap them for another security as part of a merger, restructuring, or similar scheme.

Sales and liquidations

Acquisition of shares that were to be liquidated by the firm and receive one or more cash payments. The operations of these two classes were chosen based on two criteria: first, we looked for an annual return calculation of 20% or above; second, we looked for a probability of success of at least four out of five[9], [10].

Associated Hedges

The acquisition of convertible bonds or convertible preferred shares, together with the concurrent selling of the common stock that served as its exchange counterpart. The situation was set at almost parity, meaning that if the senior problem really needed to be converted and the procedure ended that way, there would only be a little maximum loss. However, if the position closed out in the market and the common stock declined far more than the senior issue, a profit would be realized.

Issues with Net-Current Assets

The goal was to purchase as many issues as possible for less money than their net-current-assets alone value, meaning that the plant account and other assets would be worthless. Usually, we paid two-thirds or less of this devalued asset when we made our purchases. We typically covered a broad variety of problems here, with at least 100 distinct ones.

It is worth noting that we have sometimes made large-scale purchases of the control kind, but they are unrelated to the topic at hand. We closely monitored the outcomes shown by every operation class. Due to these follow-ups, we had to stop two bigger areas whose total findings were deemed inadequate. First, based on our overall analysis, the acquisition of issues that were appealing but could not be obtained for less than their working-capital worth alone. The second kind of hedging activity was "unrelated," meaning that the common shares sold could not be exchanged for the acquired asset. A securities issued by a di both instances. After reviewing our results over a ten-year period or more, we concluded that the operations weren't "headache proof" enough and the earnings weren't consistent enough to support our decision to keep going.

Therefore, starting in 1939, our activities were restricted to working capital agreements, related hedges, "self-liquidating" scenarios, and a few control procedures. From that point on, each of these classes provided us with mostly adequate returns, with the bonus that the associated hedges produced healthy gains in downturn markets when our "undervalued issues" were underperforming.

We are hesitant to advise any significant number of wise investors to follow our diet. The professional methods we have used are inappropriate for the defensive investor, who is by definition a novice. Regarding the aggressive investor, it's possible that a very tiny percentage of them possess the temperament required to severely restrict their investment options to a narrow segment of the securities market. The majority of proactive practitioners would rather explore more avenues. Their natural hunting grounds would be those securities that, in their opinion, were not overpriced by conservative standards and that, in comparison to the typical common stock, seemed noticeably more appealing, either due to their prospects or their track record, or both. They would do well to employ a variety of price-reasonableness and quality evaluations in such decisions, along the lines we have suggested for the defensive investor. However, they need to be more accommodating, allowing a substantial advantage in one area to balance out a little negative in another. For instance, if a corporation had shown a loss in 1970 and its shares seemed inexpensive due to significant factors like strong average profits, he may not have disregarded it. The enterprising investor may limit his selection to sectors and firms that he is enthusiastic about, but we highly advise against purchasing a stock at a premium due to such excitement. If he adhered to our concept in this area, he would probably purchase significant cyclical businesses—like steel shares, for example when the market is now negative, the outlook is dim, and the low price accurately reflects the present pessimism[11], [12].

Secondary Enterprises

Secondary firms that are doing well and have a satisfactory track record but don't seem to appeal to the general public would be examined and perhaps selected next. These businesses would be comparable to ELTRA and Emhart at their closing prices in 1970. There are many approaches to find these businesses. Here, we'd want to attempt something different and provide a rather thorough explanation of one such stock selecting activity. Ours is a dual intent. The approach we'll take may be very useful to many of our readers, or it may provide other approaches they may explore. In addition, our actions will expose them to one of the

most essential and entertaining small books out there and help them cope with the realities of common stocks. The monthly publication, Standard & Poor's Stock Guide, is accessible to the general public with an annual membership. Additionally, a lot of brokerage houses provide their customers with the Guide.

About 230 pages of distilled statistical data on the stocks of over 4,500 firms make up the majority of the Guide. These include 1,500 unlisted items in addition to all 3,000 listed issues on the different exchanges. This compendium contains the majority of the elements required for a preliminary, if not a second, look at a certain firm. The Stock Guide is a goldmine for the investor who enjoys tinkering with corporate entities. When accessible, he may turn to any page to view a condensed panorama of the joys and sufferings of the stock market, complete with historical high and low values dating back to 1936. He will come across companies that have increased their pricing from the pitiful low to the breathtaking high by a factor of 2,000. In the dividend record column, he will find one that dates back to 1791—paid by Industrial National Bank of Rhode Island. If he looks at the Guide for the year-end of 1969, he will read that Penn Central Co. has been paying dividends steadily since 1848; unfortunately!, it was destined for bankruptcy after just a few months. He'll discover that one firm is selling for only two times its most recent profits, while another is selling for 99 times same earnings.3 In the majority of these situations, it will be difficult for him to determine the business from the corporate name; for example, one U.S. There will be three steel companies, such as Santa Fe Industries and ITI Corp. A remarkable variety of price histories, dividend and earnings histories, financial situations, capitalization configurations, and other information are all available to him. All sorts of Wall Street gizmos and widgets, ordinary featureless enterprises, backward-leaning conservatism, and the strangest combinations of "principal business" are there, ready to be perused or examined with a serious eye. The Guides include, when appropriate, separate columns with the most recent 12-month price/earnings ratios and dividend yields. This last factor is what sets us up for success in our common-stock selection exercise.

A De-Storage of the Stock Manual

Let's say we are searching for a straightforward prima facie indicator of a cheap stock. One such hint that immediately springs to mind is a cheap price compared to previous results. Let's compile a preliminary list of equities that ended 1970 selling at a multiple of nine or less. The final column of the even-numbered pages easily provides that data. We will use the first 20 of these low-multiplier stocks as an example sample; they start with Aberdeen Manufacturing, the sixth firm on the list. Co. completed the year at 101.44, which is nine times its reported earnings per share for the twelve months that ended in September 1970. American Maize Products is the sixteenth such issue, closing at 91⁄2, also with a multiplier of 9. Even if 10 of the issues sold for $10 a share, the group could have seemed average. Let's run some figures before we take a closer look. Out of the first 200 issues examined, our list reflects around one in 10. Based on that, the Guide ought to produce, let's say, 450 issues that sell for multipliers of less than 10. This would provide a respectable number of candidates for further screening. Now, let's add a few more standards to our list that aren't quite as strict as those we recommended for the defensive investor. We recommend the following:

1. Financial status: Debt should not exceed 110% of net current assets, and current assets should be at least 11⁄2 time's current liabilities.

2. Stability of earnings: There hasn't been a shortfall in the previous five Stock Guide-covered years.

3. Refund history: A little amount of current dividend.

4. Growth in profits: Last year's earnings exceeded 1966's.
5. Less than 120% of net tangible assets are the price.

Because the profits in the Guide were typically for the period ending September 30, 1970, they do not account for any potentially poor quarters towards the end of that year. However, a wise investor shouldn't start off expecting the moon. Keep in mind that there is no minimum size requirement for the business. If small businesses purchase cautiously and collectively, they may be able to afford enough protection. After applying the five extra criteria, there are only five candidates left on our list of twenty. Let's keep looking until the first 450 issues of the Guide provide us with a small "portfolio" of 15 equities that satisfy each of our six criteria. Naturally, the organization is only being used as an example and was not necessarily selected by our curious investor.

One Standard to Select Common Stocks

A curious reader may wonder whether selecting a better-than-average portfolio may be done more easily than what we have just described. Could a single reasonable criterion—like a high dividend yield, a low price/earnings ratio, or a sizable asset value—be employed to excellent effect? The two strategies of this kind that we have discovered to produce fairly consistently positive outcomes over the longer term are buying low-multiplier stocks of significant corporations and selecting a diverse collection of equities that are trading below their net-current-asset value. As we have previously said, when the DJIA's performance is examined until the middle of 1971, the low-multiplier criteria that was implemented at the end of 1968 performs horribly. The only negative point on the record of common stock acquisitions done at prices below their working capital value is that these possibilities have dwindled throughout the majority of the last ten years.

The key finding from our many experiments concerns the performance of equities that are randomly purchased. We examined this performance on three 30-stock portfolios, each consisting of issues that were included in both the August 31, 1971, edition and the December 31, 1968, Stock Guide's first line. The DJIA dropped by around 5% between these two days, but the S&P composite remained essentially steady. Without accounting for the 19 issues that were removed from the Guide and likely exhibited higher losses, the average reduction for our 90 randomly selected issues was 22%. These comparative results clearly show how smaller, lower-quality issues have a tendency to be relatively overpriced in bull markets, to experience more severe price declines than higher-quality issues during the subsequent market collapse, and to postpone their full recovery—often indefinitely. Obviously, the lesson for the astute investor is to steer clear of subpar investments while assembling a portfolio, unless they provide demonstrable value for the adventurous investor. Additional findings from our portfolio research may be summed up as follows:

Just three of the investigated categories outperformed the S & P composite, namely: Industry, which had the best quality score. During that time, they increased by 91⁄2% while the DJIA and S&P industrials fell by 2.4% and 5.6%, respectively. It is noteworthy that the S & P rankings performed admirably in only one test. A portfolio with a higher score consistently outperformed one with a lower ranking. While the indices saw a little dip, companies with more than 50 million shares outstanding saw no change overall. Oddly enough, there was a little composite gain in equities that were selling at a high price per share.

We conducted many tests, one of which was value-based and not included in the Stock Guide. Contrary to our investing philosophies, we discovered that firms with significant scale and a high goodwill component in their market price performed very well overall over the

course of the 21.2-year holding period. The thirty issues that comprised our list of "good-will giants" each had a goodwill component exceeding $1 billion, or more than half of their market value. By the end of 1968, these goodwill products had a combined market worth of almost $120 billion! The group as a whole demonstrated a price rise per share of 15% between December 1968 and August 1971 despite these optimistic market values, and it performed the best out of the roughly 20 lists examined.

This kind of information cannot be disregarded while writing about investment policies. It is evident that organizations that possess the qualities of large size, a stellar track record of profits in the past, the public's anticipation of future earnings growth, and robust market performance over several previous years, at the very least, have a significant momentum associated with them. Even while the price seems high by our quantitative measures, these problems might last for a very long time due to the underlying market momentum. It is challenging to determine how much of the better market performance is attributable to enduring popularity and how much to "true" or objective investment advantages. Without question, both elements matter in this case. The benevolent giants' current and long-term market performance would suggest them for a diverse portfolio of common stocks. However, we still choose other kinds that exhibit several positive investing characteristics, such as asset valuations that are at least two-thirds the market price.

Overall, the tests with additional criteria show that random lists selected for one positive factor outperformed random lists selected for the opposite factor. For example, low-multiplier issues saw a smaller decline during this time than high-multiplier issues and long-term dividend payers experienced a smaller loss than those that stopped paying dividends at the end of 1968. The findings, in that regard, are consistent with our suggestion that the chosen topics satisfy a mix of concrete or quantitative requirements. Lastly, we should discuss how much worse our lists performed overall as compared to the S&P composite's price history. Our tests are predicated on obtaining one share of each company, while the latter is weighted by the size of each enterprise. The findings indicate that the S&P method's stronger focus on gigantic corporations contributed significantly to their better price stability as compared to "run-of-the-mine" companies.

Issues with Convertibles and Warrants

Preferred stocks and convertible bonds have been more important in the senior finance space in recent years. In parallel, there has been an increase in the number of stock-option warrants, which are long-term rights to purchase common shares at predetermined prices. Conversion rights are now granted to more than half of the preferred offerings listed in Standard & Poor's Stock Guide. This also applied to a significant portion of the corporate bond financing that took place between 1968 and 1970. The American Stock Exchange deals in at least sixty distinct kinds of stock-option warrants.

From an overall perspective, the convertible concerns are much more significant than the warrants, therefore we will start by talking about them. From the investor's perspective, there are two primary factors to take into account. It is said that convertible issues are particularly beneficial to the issuing company and the investor. In addition to the chance to profit from any significant increase in the value of the common stock, the investor gets the better protection of a bond or preferred stock. If the anticipated prosperity materializes, the issuer will swap the senior obligation for common shares, therefore relieving it of its financial burden, and it will be able to raise capital at a reasonable interest or preferred dividend cost. As a result, the agreement will benefit both parties exceptionally. The above statement overstates the situation in some way since a bargain cannot be made much better for both

parties by a single clever solution. An investor often forfeits a significant amount of quality, yield, or both in return for the conversion right. On the other hand, if the conversion feature allows the firm to get funding at a reduced cost, it is forfeiting a portion of the common shareholders' right to future improvements. Many deceptive arguments can be made on this topic, both pro and con. The most secure conclusion is that convertible concerns are similar to other types of security in that their design does not ensure that they will be either appealing or ugly. The answer to that question will rely on all the details about the specific problem.

However, we are aware that the convertible issues that were floated in the latter stages of a bull market would inevitably provide subpar outcomes overall. We will continue to use the example from our first edition of the relative price behavior of convertible and straight preferred offered in 1946, the last year of the bull market before the extraordinary one that began in 1949, as a group illustration. The poor consequences must be evident from the timing itself, since a wide decline in the stock market must invariably make the conversion privilege much less attractiveand, often, also, call into question the underlying safety of the issue itself. These may not necessarily lead to the conclusion that convertible securities are less attractive than nonconvertible or "straight" assets. The converse is true, all other things being equal. However, it is evident that in reality, other factors are not equal, and the inclusion of the conversion privilege frequentlypossibly even alwaysbetrays a lack of true investment quality for the problem.

Naturally, there is less chance of a convertible preferred stock eventually losing its principle than there is for the company's ordinary stock. To that degree, it makes sense for individuals who purchase fresh convertibles rather than the same amount of ordinary stock. However, in the majority of these circumstances, the convertible preferred would have been a better option overall, and the common would not have been a wise buy at the prevailing price. Additionally, a significant portion of convertible purchases were made by investors who were enticed by what appeared to be the perfect blend of a prior claim plus a conversion privilege near the current market, but who had no particular interest in or confidence in the common stock—that is, they would never have considered purchasing the common at the time. Although this combination has been successful in many cases, statistics tend to indicate that it is more likely to prove to be a trap.There is a unique issue that most investors are unaware of when it comes to convertible ownership.

Impact of Convertible Debt on the Common Stock's Status

The deal usually produces a pro forma increase in the reported earnings per share of common stock; the shares rise as a result of these supposedly higher earnings as well as the management's demonstrated drive, initiative, and capacity to generate greater profits for the shareholders. However, in optimistic markets, one of the balancing elements is almost overlooked, while the other is completely disregarded. The first is the dilution of the common stock's present and future profits that results arithmetically from the additional conversion rights. This dilution may be measured by computing the adjusted earnings per share if all of the convertible shares or bonds were converted, using the most recent results or assuming some alternative figure. For most organizations, there is no substantial decrease in earnings per share as a consequence. However, there are a lot of exceptions to this rule, and they may develop more quickly than is comfortable. The leading practitioners of convertible legerdemain have been the rapidly growing "conglomerates". Suggested Exchanges of Common Stock for Preferred Stocks. Before 1956, for example, ordinary stocks of the same firms gave higher returns than preferred stocks; this was especially true if the preferred stock had a conversion privilege near the market. Right now, this is usually not the case. Consequently, a sizable number of convertible preferred stocks exist, which unquestionably

more are appealing than the corresponding ordinary shares. By converting their junior shares into the senior issue, common owners stand to receive significant benefits and stand to lose nothing.

Option-Stock Warrants

We see the recent evolution of stock-option warrants as a possible calamity, an ongoing threat, and a close scam. They have invented enormous aggregate "values" in dollars. Other than deceiving investors and speculators, they have no justification for being. They need to be outlawed or, at the very least, carefully restricted to a small portion of a company's overall capitalization. We direct the reader to the portion of Faust where Goethe explains the creation of paper money for comparison in general history and literature. We may discuss the warrants of American & Foreign Power Co., which in 1929 had a stated market value of over a billion dollars, even though they were only included as a footnote to the company's balance sheet, as a concerning precedent on Wall Street history. This billion dollars had decreased to $8 million by 1932, and even though the corporation had remained stable, the warrants were eliminated in the recapitalization in 1952. Originally, stock-option warrants were often comparable to a partial conversion privilege and were sometimes tied to bond issuance. They caused no damage since their quantity was insignificant. Along with many other financial misdeeds, their usage increased in the late 1920s, but they vanished from view for a considerable amount of time after that. Since 1967, they have become well-known "instruments of finance," as they were certain to resurface like bad pennies. A standard operating procedure has evolved for large bank affiliates seeking to raise capital for new real estate ventures by selling units of an equal number of common shares and warrants to purchase additional common shares at the same price.

Four Exceptionally Educational Case Studies

Since the histories depict a variety of extremes that have recently been seen on Wall Street, the term "extremely" in the title is kind of punny. Everyone with a serious connection to the stock and bond market is advised to read them carefully. This includes bankers who lend money to corporations as well as professionals, fund managers, security analysts, administrators of trust accounts, and regular investors and speculators. The following four businesses will be examined, together with the many extremes they represent: Penn Central Co. An extreme instance of how those in charge of bonds or shares in this system have ignored the simplest indicators of financial distress. A prime example of hasty and reckless "empire building," with a near-certain collapse in the end, aided by careless bank lending. NVF Enterprises. An extreme case of a corporate takeover is when a little business acquires a larger corporation seven times its size, racking up enormous debt, and using some shocking accounting tricks. AAA Enterprises. An extreme example of a tiny business being publicly financed via stock exchanges, with major stock exchanges supporting it and its worth largely determined by the magic word "franchising." Two years after the stock sale and the reckless stock market's doubling of the original inflated price, bankruptcy ensued.

CONCLUSION

Examining stock selection for the entrepreneurial investor reveals a complex environment with tactics, dangers, and possibilities. This study, which is based on the timeless ideas of Benjamin Graham, has broken down the important factors that help investors who want to be adventurous choose stocks. A key component for ambitious investors is a thorough fundamental study that emphasizes dividends, earnings history, and financial stability. The investigation has shown several stock selection strategies, each with unique benefits and hazards, such as value investing, growth investing, and contrarian approaches. The detailed

explanation of these tactics gives investors the knowledge they need to match their strategy to their financial goals. It has been said that the entrepreneurial investor's toolset must include risk management strategies, a margin of safety, and the difficulties of timing the market. The paper acknowledges that stock markets are dynamic and that investors must traverse this complexity with a disciplined and knowledgeable approach. The factors discussed in this article provide a framework for wise decision-making as investors navigate the always-shifting stock market. Armed with a thorough awareness of the subtleties of stock selection, the entrepreneurial investor is better equipped to recognize opportunities, efficiently manage risks, and achieve long-term, sustainable financial success.

REFERENCES:

[1] T. F. Oloko, “Portfolio diversification between developed and developing stock markets: The case of US and UK investors in Nigeria,” *Res. Int. Bus. Financ.*, 2018.

[2] E. Mwangi and Z. Onsomu, “Effect of financial literacy on portfolio diversification at the Nairobi securities exchange market, Kenya,” *J. Financ. Invest. Anal.*, 2018.

[3] A. H. Beaudreau, M. N. Chan, and P. A. Loring, “Harvest portfolio diversification and emergent conservation challenges in an Alaskan recreational fishery,” *Biol. Conserv.*, 2018.

[4] N. Antonakakis, J. Cunado, G. Filis, D. Gabauer, and F. Perez de Gracia, “Oil volatility, oil and gas firms and portfolio diversification,” *Energy Econ.*, 2018.

[5] O. A. Aluko, O. Fapetu, and B. A. Azeez, “International portfolio diversification in the Nigerian stock market: A global financial crisis perspective,” *Futur. Bus. J.*, 2018.

[6] L. M. Viceira, Z. (Kevin) Wang, and J. Zhou, “Global Portfolio Diversification for Long-Horizon Investors,” *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018.

[7] Y. Jaffar, G. Dewandaru, and M. Masih, “Exploring Portfolio Diversification Opportunities Through Venture Capital Financing: Evidence from MGARCH-DCC, Markov Switching, and Wavelet Approaches,” *Emerg. Mark. Financ. Trade*, 2018.

[8] H. Belguith and M. Bellouma, “The Impact of Loan Portfolio Diversification on Tunisian Bank’s Profitability,” *Int. J. Emerg. Res. Manag. Technol.*, 2018.

[9] I. Filiz, T. Nahmer, M. Spiwoks, and K. Bizer, “Portfolio diversification: the influence of herding, status-quo bias, and the gambler’s fallacy,” *Financ. Mark. Portf. Manag.*, 2018.

[10] G. Newell and M. J. Bin Marzuki, “The significance and performance of property companies on the AIM stock market,” *J. Eur. Real Estate Res.*, 2018.

[11] P. Sharma and Vipul, “Improving portfolio diversification: Identifying the right baskets for putting your eggs,” *Manag. Decis. Econ.*, 2018.

[12] F. Cesarone and S. Colucci, “Minimum risk versus capital and risk diversification strategies for portfolio construction,” *J. Oper. Res. Soc.*, 2018.