



## How To Avoid the Worst Sector ETFs

Question: Why are there so many ETFs?

Answer: ETF providers tend to make lots of money on each ETF so they create more products to sell.

The large number of ETFs has little to do with serving your best interests. Below are three red flags you can use to avoid the worst ETFs:

### 1. Inadequate Liquidity

This issue is the easiest to avoid, and our advice is simple. Avoid all ETFs with less than \$100 million in assets. Low levels of liquidity can lead to a discrepancy between the price of the ETF and the underlying value of the securities it holds. Plus, low asset levels tend to mean lower volume in the ETF and larger bid-ask spreads.

### 2. High Fees

ETFs should be cheap, but not all of them are. The first step here is to know what is cheap and expensive.

To ensure you are paying average or below average fees, invest only in ETFs with [total annual costs](#) below 0.48%, which is the average total annual costs of the 178 U.S. equity Sector ETFs we cover. The weighted average is lower at 0.26%, which highlights how investors tend to put their [money in ETFs with low fees](#).

Figure 1 shows PowerShares KBW High Dividend Yield Financial Portfolio (KBWD) is the most expensive sector ETF and Schwab US REIT ETF (SCHH) is the least expensive. ETF Series Trust (UTES, BBP) provides two of the most expensive ETFs while Fidelity (FNCL, FSTA, FTEC, FHLC) ETFs are among the cheapest.

**Figure 1: 5 Least and Most Expensive Sector ETFs**

| Ticker                 | Name                                                    | Sector                 | Total Annual Cost |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Most Expensive</b>  |                                                         |                        |                   |
| KBWD                   | PowerShares KBW High Dividend Yield Financial Portfolio | Financials             | 3.50%             |
| HECO                   | Strategy Shares EcoLogical Strategy ETF                 | Industrials            | 1.06%             |
| UTES                   | ETF Series Trust Reaves Utilities ETF                   | Utilities              | 1.06%             |
| BBP                    | ETF Series Trust BioShares Biotechnology Products       | Health Care            | 0.95%             |
| FFTY                   | Academy Funds Innovator IBD 50 Funds                    | Financials             | 0.89%             |
| <b>Least Expensive</b> |                                                         |                        |                   |
| SCHH                   | Schwab US REIT ETF                                      | Financials             | 0.08%             |
| FNCL                   | Fidelity MSCI Financials Index                          | Financials             | 0.09%             |
| FSTA                   | Fidelity MSCI Consumer Staples Index                    | Consumer Staples       | 0.09%             |
| FTEC                   | Fidelity MSCI Information Technology Index              | Information Technology | 0.09%             |
| FHLC                   | Fidelity MSCI Health Care Index                         | Health Care            | 0.09%             |

Sources: New Constructs, LLC and company filings

Investors need not pay high fees for quality holdings. Fidelity MSCI Financials Index (FNCL) earns our Very Attractive rating and has low total annual costs of only 0.09%.

On the other hand, Fidelity MSCI Materials Index ETF (FMAT) holds poor stocks and earns our Dangerous rating, yet has low total annual costs of 0.09%. No matter how cheap an ETF, if it holds bad stocks, its performance will be bad. The quality of an ETF's holdings matters more than its price.

### 3. Poor Holdings

Avoiding poor holdings is by far the hardest part of avoiding bad ETFs, but it is also the most important because an ETF's performance is determined more by its holdings than its costs. Figure 2 shows the ETFs within each sector with the worst holdings or [portfolio management ratings](#).

**Figure 2: Sector ETFs with the Worst Holdings**

| Ticker | Name                                       | Sector                 | Portfolio Management Rating |
|--------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| RTH    | Van Eck Vectors Retail ETF                 | Consumer Discretionary | Dangerous                   |
| PSCC   | PowerShares S&P Small Cap Consumer Staples | Consumer Staples       | Neutral                     |
| XLE    | State Street Energy Select Sector SPDR     | Energy                 | Dangerous                   |
| KBWY   | PowerShares KBW Premium Yield Equity REIT  | Financials             | Dangerous                   |
| XBI    | State Street SPDR S&P Biotech              | Health Care            | Dangerous                   |
| EVX    | Van Eck Vectors Environmental Services     | Industrials            | Dangerous                   |
| ARKK   | ARK Innovation ETF                         | Information Technology | Dangerous                   |
| XME    | State Street SPDR S&P Metals & Mining      | Materials              | Dangerous                   |
| IYZ    | iShares U.S. Telecommunications ETF        | Telecom Services       | Dangerous                   |
| FUTY   | Fidelity MSCI Utilities Index              | Utilities              | Dangerous                   |

Sources: New Constructs, LLC and company filings

State Street (XLE, XBI, XME) appears more often than any other provider in Figure 2, which means that they offer the most ETFs with the worst holdings.

State Street SPDR S&P Biotech (XBI) is the worst rated ETF in Figure 2. State Street SPDR S&P Metals & Mining (XME) and ARK Innovation ETF (ARKK) also earn a Very Dangerous [predictive overall rating](#), which means not only do they hold poor stocks, they also charge high total annual costs.

Our [overall ratings on ETFs](#) are based primarily on our [stock ratings](#) of their holdings.

#### The Danger Within

Buying an ETF without analyzing its holdings is like buying a stock without analyzing its business and finances. Put another way, research on ETF holdings is necessary due diligence because an ETF's performance is only as good as its holdings' performance. Don't just take our word for it, [see what Barron's says](#) on this matter.

PERFORMANCE OF ETFs HOLDINGS = PERFORMANCE OF ETF

*This article originally published [here](#) on February 9, 2017.*

*Disclosure: David Trainer, Kyle Guske II, and Kyle Martone receive no compensation to write about any specific stock, sector, or theme.*

*Scottrade clients get a Free Gold Membership (\$588/yr value) as well as 50% discounts and up to 20 free trades (\$140 value) for signing up to Platinum, Pro, or Unlimited memberships. [Login or open your Scottrade](#) account & find us under Quotes & Research/Investor Tools.*



## ***New Constructs® – Profile***

---

### ***How New Constructs Creates Value for Clients***

We find it. You benefit. Cutting-edge technology enables us to scale our [forensic accounting expertise](#) across 3000+ stocks. We shine a light in the dark corners of SEC filings so our clients can make safer, more informed decisions.

Our [stock rating methodology](#) instantly informs you of the quality of the business and the fairness of the stock's valuation. We do the diligence on earnings quality and valuation so you don't have to.

In-depth risk/reward analysis underpins our ratings. Our rating methodology grades every stock, ETF, and mutual fund according to what we believe are the 5 most important criteria for assessing the quality of an equity. Each grade reflects the balance of potential risk and reward of buying that equity. Our analysis results in the 5 ratings described below. Very Attractive and Attractive correspond to a "Buy" rating, Very Dangerous and Dangerous correspond to a "Sell" rating, while Neutral corresponds to a "Hold" rating.

QUESTION: Why shouldn't fund research be as good as stock research? Why should fund investors rely on backward-looking price trends?

ANSWER: They should not.

Don't judge a fund by its cover. Take a look inside at its holdings and understand the quality of earnings and valuation of the stocks it holds. We enable you to choose the best fund based on its stock-picking merits so you do not have to rely solely on backward-looking technical metrics.

The drivers of our [forward-looking fund ratings](#) are Portfolio Management (i.e. the aggregated ratings of its holdings) and Total Annual Costs. The Total Annual Costs Rating ([details here](#)) captures the all-in cost of being in a fund over a 3-year holding period, the average period for all fund investors.

### ***Our Philosophy About Research***

Accounting data is not designed for equity investors, but for debt investors. [Accounting data must be translated into economic earnings](#) to understand the profitability and valuation relevant to equity investors. Respected investors (e.g. Adam Smith, Warren Buffett and Ben Graham) have repeatedly emphasized that accounting results should not be used to value stocks. [Economic earnings](#) are what matter because they are:

1. Based on the complete set of financial information available.
2. Standard for all companies.
3. A more accurate representation of the true underlying cash flows of the business.

### ***Additional Information***

Incorporated in July 2002, [New Constructs](#) is an independent publisher of investment research that provides clients with consulting and research services. We specialize in quality-of-earnings, forensic accounting and discounted cash flow valuation analyses for all U.S. public companies. We translate accounting data from 10Ks into economic financial statements, i.e. [NOPAT](#), [Invested Capital](#), and [WACC](#), to create [economic earnings models](#), which are necessary to understand the true profitability and valuation of companies. Visit the [Free Archive](#) to download samples of our research. New Constructs is a [BBB accredited](#) business and a member of the [Investorside Research Association](#).



## DISCLOSURES

---

New Constructs®, LLC (together with any subsidiaries and/or affiliates, "New Constructs") is an independent organization with no management ties to the companies it covers. None of the members of New Constructs' management team or the management team of any New Constructs' affiliate holds a seat on the Board of Directors of any of the companies New Constructs covers. New Constructs does not perform any investment or merchant banking functions and does not operate a trading desk.

New Constructs' Stock Ownership Policy prevents any of its employees or managers from engaging in Insider Trading and restricts any trading whereby an employee may exploit inside information regarding our stock research. In addition, employees and managers of the company are bound by a code of ethics that restricts them from purchasing or selling a security that they know or should have known was under consideration for inclusion in a New Constructs report nor may they purchase or sell a security for the first 15 days after New Constructs issues a report on that security.

## DISCLAIMERS

---

The information and opinions presented in this report are provided to you for information purposes only and are not to be used or considered as an offer or solicitation of an offer to buy or sell securities or other financial instruments. New Constructs has not taken any steps to ensure that the securities referred to in this report are suitable for any particular investor and nothing in this report constitutes investment, legal, accounting or tax advice. This report includes general information that does not take into account your individual circumstance, financial situation or needs, nor does it represent a personal recommendation to you. The investments or services contained or referred to in this report may not be suitable for you and it is recommended that you consult an independent investment advisor if you are in doubt about any such investments or investment services.

Information and opinions presented in this report have been obtained or derived from sources believed by New Constructs to be reliable, but New Constructs makes no representation as to their accuracy, authority, usefulness, reliability, timeliness or completeness. New Constructs accepts no liability for loss arising from the use of the information presented in this report, and New Constructs makes no warranty as to results that may be obtained from the information presented in this report. Past performance should not be taken as an indication or guarantee of future performance, and no representation or warranty, express or implied, is made regarding future performance. Information and opinions contained in this report reflect a judgment at its original date of publication by New Constructs and are subject to change without notice. New Constructs may have issued, and may in the future issue, other reports that are inconsistent with, and reach different conclusions from, the information presented in this report. Those reports reflect the different assumptions, views and analytical methods of the analysts who prepared them and New Constructs is under no obligation to insure that such other reports are brought to the attention of any recipient of this report.

New Constructs' reports are intended for distribution to its professional and institutional investor customers. Recipients who are not professionals or institutional investor customers of New Constructs should seek the advice of their independent financial advisor prior to making any investment decision or for any necessary explanation of its contents.

This report is not directed to, or intended for distribution to or use by, any person or entity who is a citizen or resident of or located in any locality, state, country or jurisdiction where such distribution, publication, availability or use would be contrary to law or regulation or which would be subject New Constructs to any registration or licensing requirement within such jurisdiction.

This report may provide the addresses of websites. Except to the extent to which the report refers to New Constructs own website material, New Constructs has not reviewed the linked site and takes no responsibility for the content therein. Such address or hyperlink (including addresses or hyperlinks to New Constructs own website material) is provided solely for your convenience and the information and content of the linked site do not in any way form part of this report. Accessing such websites or following such hyperlink through this report shall be at your own risk.

All material in this report is the property of, and under copyright, of New Constructs. None of the contents, nor any copy of it, may be altered in any way, copied, or distributed or transmitted to any other party without the prior express written consent of New Constructs. All trademarks, service marks and logos used in this report are trademarks or service marks or registered trademarks or service marks of New Constructs.

Copyright New Constructs, LLC 2003 through the present date. All rights reserved.