The stocks of real estate investment trusts (REITs) can provide diversification benefits to a portfolio, yet many investors have remained underexposed to this asset class despite its low correlation and commendable track record of performance relative to other assets (see Exhibit 10, page 7). The following article will argue why many investors should consider maintaining a higher exposure to commercial property through REIT stocks, particularly in multi-asset-class portfolios with longer-term, strategic objectives. In addition, we will provide an analytical perspective on some common misperceptions about REITs.

**REITs provide diversification benefits to multi-asset-class portfolios**

Combining assets that exhibit low performance correlation can play an important role in reducing portfolio risk without sacrificing return potential, and reflects the central focus of portfolio optimization. One asset category that historically has demonstrated an ability to provide such diversification benefits is REIT stocks. REITs own, and in most cases manage and lease, investment-grade, income-producing real estate, including office buildings, apartments, shopping centers, and storage facilities. During the past 20 years, an allocation to REIT stocks would have boosted the risk-adjusted returns of a portfolio including U.S. stocks and investment-grade bonds.

Despite strong performance over an extended time period, REIT stocks are generally underutilized as a portfolio diversification tool; many investors remain underexposed to the asset category. The contractual nature of commercial real estate leases results in recurring cash flows, which affords REITs earnings visibility and consistent dividend income—attributes which can help provide diversification benefits to multi-asset-class portfolios.

Publicly traded REITs generally own commercial real estate, which have different investment characteristics than residential housing, and each should be viewed separately in an investment context. Historically, there is an imperfect correlation between REIT stock performance and interest-rate movements, though the factors driving interest-rate changes and the magnitude of changes in rates have influenced REIT stock returns.

**EXHIBIT 1: Adding REIT stocks to a portfolio of U.S. stocks and U.S. investment-grade bonds led to improved risk-adjusted performance during the past 20 years.**
Exhibit 2: Dividends have been a significant portion of REITs’ total returns over time and have provided a source of stability during equity bear markets.

Past 20 years, REITs have had imperfect performance correlation with the broader equity market (0.56 correlation) and very little correlation to investment-grade bonds (0.13 correlation), both typically viewed as core holdings in a diversified portfolio. (Note: perfect negative correlation at −1, absence of correlation at 0, and perfect positive correlation at +1.)

To illustrate the potential diversification benefits of including REITs in a strategic portfolio over an extended horizon, we constructed five hypothetical portfolios with varying allocations to U.S. stocks, U.S. investment-grade bonds, and REITs, and utilized a mean-variance optimization analysis (MVO). Our overall objective was to maximize risk-adjusted returns for any given level of risk, with the standard Sharpe ratio providing a barometer of risk-adjusted performance. Of the five portfolios, the two without any exposure to REITs (portfolios #4 and #5) had the lowest Sharpe ratios over the time period, indicating relatively weaker risk-adjusted performance (see Exhibit 1, page 1). The addition of REITs in portfolio #1 (10% REITs), #2 (20% REITs), and #3 (33.3% REITs) resulted in improved risk-adjusted returns (Sharpe ratio).

Looking at all three portfolios with varying REIT exposures, portfolio #2 (40% stocks/40% bonds/20% REITs) was more efficient than portfolio #1 (55% stocks/35% bonds/10% REITs) from a mean-variance standpoint because it generated a higher return with less volatility. When evaluating portfolio #2 (20% REITs) versus #3 (33% REITs), it is important to consider risk tolerance. Although portfolio #3 has the higher Sharpe ratio of the two, portfolio #2 is not inefficient, because a risk-averse investor may be willing to accept the lower expected return in exchange for the perceived lower volatility offered by portfolio #2.

As stated earlier, the compelling influence of REITs on a portfolio’s diversification is due in large part to the imperfect performance correlation between REITs and both U.S. stocks and U.S. investment-grade bonds over this historical period. The following characteristics of REITs help differentiate their performance from other assets:

- REITs are required to distribute at least 90% of their taxable income in the form of dividends. This dividend income has constituted nearly two-thirds of REITs’ total returns and has helped to dampen volatility during periods of equity market stress (see Exhibit 2, above left).

Exhibit 3: REIT stocks are well represented in major equity market indexes (left), though they tend to represent a higher exposure in mid- and smaller-cap segments, and in value-oriented indices (right).

As stated earlier, the compelling influence of REITs on a portfolio’s diversification is due in large part to the imperfect performance correlation between REITs and both U.S. stocks and U.S. investment-grade bonds over this historical period. The following characteristics of REITs help differentiate their performance from other assets:

- REITs are required to distribute at least 90% of their taxable income in the form of dividends. This dividend income has constituted nearly two-thirds of REITs’ total returns and has helped to dampen volatility during periods of equity market stress (see Exhibit 2, above left).

- The contractual nature of commercial real estate leases and the predictability of rental income and expenses give REITs a...
Today, REITs are well represented within each of these major indexes—particularly the mid-cap-oriented S&P 400 and small-cap-oriented S&P 600 indexes, because the market caps of most U.S. REITs are less than $10 billion (see Exhibit 3, page 2, left). Utilizing the traditional equity style box framework, which depicts size (market cap) and style (value, blend, growth), REITs represent a progressively larger weight as the representative indexes decline in capitalization (top to bottom), and lean toward value (right to left, see Exhibit 3, page 2, right).

**Active managed fund investors remain underweight REITs**

Despite the proliferation of REITs in major equity market indexes, many investors may be underexposed to this asset class. For example, investors who utilize actively managed U.S. equity mutual funds within their portfolios may hold sub-optimal exposure to REITs. Diversified U.S. equity mutual funds, on average, are underweight REITs—and have been so for the bulk of the past decade. An analysis of the primary Morningstar U.S. equity mutual fund peer groups highlights the magnitude of this underweight in REITs. Across all nine peer groups, the average weighting for equity funds was significantly below that of the corresponding Russell index representing each category as of June 30, 2013 (see Exhibit 4, left).

Our analysis also shows that equity fund managers on average have remained underweight REITs for the majority of the past decade. In each of Morningstar’s nine style box categories, the average equity fund has been underweight REITs relative to the respective benchmark index since August 2003 (see Exhibit 5, page 4). Looking across all market capitalizations (small, mid, and large), value-oriented equity funds have maintained the largest underexposure to REITs—and consistently greater than growth-oriented equity funds. The relatively larger underweighting in value equity funds suggests value fund managers have generally been somewhat more uncomfortable holding the higher benchmark REIT exposure accorded value benchmarks relative to growth benchmarks (which have lower REIT exposure, see Exhibit 4).

The other interesting pattern this analysis shows is that fund managers across all three market capitalizations have tended to allocate less capital to REITs over time (Exhibit 5, page 4). For example, in the mid-cap universe, the average relative REIT exposure of value equity funds has declined from a –4.8 percentage point underweighting in August 2003 to a –7.6 percentage point underweight in June 2013. In the small-cap universe, the average relative REIT exposure of value equity funds has fallen from –5.4 percentage points to –8.4 percentage points over the same period. The underweights to REITs have also appeared to increase more significantly over the past few years across all market capitalizations and styles. In the large-cap spectrum, the average REIT underexposure of growth funds has declined from –0.28 percentage points in May 2009 to –1.1 percentage points in June 2013.

Investors who utilize passively managed equity strategies that track major indexes may have adequate exposure to REITs that can provide an optimal level of diversification. But investors who...
EXHIBIT 5: Across market capitalizations and styles, U.S. equity funds have been underweight REITs for the bulk of their existence in major equity market indexes, and the underweight to REITs generally has accelerated in recent years.

Relative weight % = percentage points. Average fund REIT weights are simple averages of the percentage of total assets invested in REIT securities for all equity funds categorized within the nine primary Morningstar U.S. equity fund categories that have reported holdings. Index weightings represented by: Russell Mid Cap Value Index; Russell Mid Cap Index; Russell Mid Cap Growth Index; Russell 1000 Value Index; Russell 1000 Index; Russell 1000 Growth Index; Russell 2000 Value Index; Russell 2000 Index; Russell 2000 Growth Index. Average fund weightings calculated using Morningstar data. All data as of June 30, 2013.

utilize actively managed equity strategies may want to take a closer look at the strategies’ underlying REIT exposure to determine whether their allocation is adequate given their own unique investment objectives.

Institutional investors have embraced REITs
While many individual investors have been underexposed to REITs, pension plan sponsors, endowments, foundations, and other institutional investors have long embraced commercial real estate as a core asset class due to its attractive combination of investment attributes. Commercial real estate exposure can be accessed via direct investment or through both the private and publicly traded securities markets. Publicly traded REITs offer investors the primary merits of commercial property investment—diversification (via multiple regions, countries, and sectors), income (rent), and a hedge against inflation (property = real asset); plus liquidity, transparency, and low capital requirements.

Some institutions have favored publicly traded real estate securities, such as REITs, as a simple, liquid, and efficient means to
gaining exposure to commercial real estate. Publicly listed securities allow institutional investors to make tactical adjustments to their strategic asset allocations, which is not possible with direct property investment, due to liquidity constraints and capital requirements. U.S. public pension plans, in particular, have embraced listed real estate securities. Of the largest U.S. public pension plans with assets in excess of $50 billion, 81% hold some level of publicly listed real estate exposure (see Exhibit 6, above). In addition, a 2012 survey of 145 public pension funds found that plans in the $500 million-$1 billion range held an average allocation to REITs of 2.4%. Notable examples include the $12.8 billion Idaho Public Employees Retirement System, which targets an 8% allocation to commercial real estate and utilizes publicly traded REITs for nearly half of that exposure ($491 million); and the $49 billion Massachusetts Pension Reserves Investment Trust Fund, which holds $1.2 billion in publicly traded REITs, or 2.4% of total fund assets.

Reasons for investors’ lack of REIT exposure
It is difficult to determine exactly why diversified U.S. equity mutual funds on average have been perennially underweight REITs. Some of the most common speculated reasons, which are debatable, include a general lack of understanding among diversified U.S. equity portfolio managers of how to value REITs given their unique structure, a lack of research depth devoted to REITs within many investment organizations, and concerns about liquidity given the smaller market cap of the asset class relative to the broader equity market.

Further exacerbating this general underexposure are some investor misperceptions about REITs that may factor into portfolio decision making.

Let’s take a closer look at a couple of these misperceptions.

Many investors own a home, which they believe provides adequate exposure to real estate. In reality, single-family home-ownership is quite different from commercial real estate investment. Consider:

- A residential home is primarily a need-based consumption good and, for many people, not purchased as an investment—particularly when it is financed with a mortgage. A residential home does not generate income, but rather requires regular mortgage interest, real estate tax, and insurance payments, plus other occasional expenditures, to be properly maintained. By contrast, commercial real estate generates continual rental income.

- Furthermore, securities issued by companies that own and operate commercial real estate, such as REITs, represent a diversified investment with exposure to a range of properties in a variety of geographic locations. By comparison, a home’s investment risk is not diversified; rather, it is highly concentrated in a single location.

- People primarily own homes for four reasons: the need for shelter, personal reasons such as family, neighborhoods, and schools; mortgage interest tax deductibility; and as an investment. On the other hand, commercial real estate ownership is generally undertaken by investors in pursuit of stable and reliable income, inflation protection, and diversification.

- Unlike single-family residential property, direct ownership of commercial property is unrealistic for most individuals due to high capital requirements. REIT stocks are an ideal way for indi-
individual investors to get exposure to the commercial real estate asset class. The REIT vehicle was created by U.S. Congress in 1960 to give all Americans—not just the affluent—the opportunity to invest in income-producing real estate. REITs represent a diverse mix of property sectors, such as office, retail, industrial and health care, to name a few. This mix of property sectors has expanded recently owing to a wave of REIT conversions by cell tower owners, billboard owners, prison operators, data centers, and others. Today, there are nearly 170 U.S. public REITs with a total equity market capitalization in excess of $650 billion (Exhibit 7, page 6).

REITs are sensitive to interest-rate movements. With historically low government policy rates and investment-grade bond yields near historically low levels due in large part to unprecedented levels of central bank activity in recent years, some investors may be concerned about a potential rise in interest rates and the impact it could have on REITs.

In reality, the performance of REITs historically has demonstrated surprisingly minimal sensitivity to changes in interest rates. This is contrary to the widely held belief that because real estate is a capital-intensive business, the equation of higher interest rates resulting in higher borrowing costs serves as a headwind to commercial property owners. While there is some validity to this point, broadly speaking, there are other factors at play that serve to negate the negative effects of increased capital costs. Gradually rising interest rates generally portend an improving economic backdrop, which is supportive of REIT cash flows due to strengthening demand for commercial real estate and an increased ability for landlords to increase rental rates to adapt to improving conditions. Further...

EXHIBIT 8: REIT stock performance has been fairly inconsistent during previous periods of rising interest rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute Return Over Various Periods of Rate Increases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REITs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;P 500 Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rate Increase During Period (basis points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Monthly Increase (basis points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart depicts nine separate periods when the 10-year U.S. Treasury yield increased by at least 50 basis points over a duration of at least five months between Dec. 31, 1993 and June 30, 2013. Source: Fidelity Investments, as of June 30, 2013.

EXHIBIT 9: Even when evaluated based on the magnitude of interest-rate movements, the performance of REIT stocks has been inconsistent during periods of rising interest rates.

Monthly changes in the 10-year U.S. Treasury yield over the period from January 1993 to June 2013 are categorized by magnitude of change as a percentage of the beginning value. Category 10 (darker shading) consists of months when interest rates experienced their biggest percentage increases, while Category 1 (lighter shading) consists of months when interest rates experienced their biggest percentage decreases over the period. Source: Fidelity Investments, as of June 30, 2013.
more, easing commercial lending standards and improved access to credit for private players has historically offered support during rising-rate environments.

More specifically, there appears to be little consistency in terms of REIT performance during periods of rising or declining interest rates, respectively. Throughout nine periods of rising interest rates in the modern REIT era (1993-2013), REIT stocks as a group have generated positive absolute returns in seven of these periods, and have outperformed broad equities as measured by the S&P 500 in five periods (see Exhibit 8, page 6). This ambiguous outcome is a result of the “tug of war” that typically occurs across REIT property sectors during rising-rate environments. More economically sensitive and shorter-lease property sectors, such as hotels, apartments, and self storage facilities can more easily raise rental rates in stronger, inflationary environments—a tailwind for these sectors. For their part, mall REITs have also fared well during periods of rising interest rates as an improving economic backdrop has tended to buoy more discretionary sectors.

On the flip side, strip shopping centers have tended to underperform during rising interest-rate periods as tenants are generally more value-oriented, and their customers have shown a propensity to “trade up” during periods of economic strength. Furthermore, the health care REIT sector, which includes senior living facilities that tend to have longer-term contractual leases, has more bond-like characteristics and thus exhibits greater interest-rate sensitivity. However, it’s important to note that REITs are not static yield investments such as bonds, as REITs offer the potential for growth—a key distinction. Thus, the varied supply/demand dynamics and lease durations found across commercial property sectors is one explanation for the overall low sensitivity of broad REIT performance to interest-rate changes.

An analysis of the magnitude of previous interest rates moves also shows that there has been inconsistent performance by REITs. For example, during months when the 10-year U.S. Treasury bond yield experienced its biggest increases over the past 20 years, REITs generated an average monthly return of −1.2% (see Exhibit 9, page 6, Category 10). This result is consistent with the aforementioned theory that rising interest rates are a headwind to REIT performance. However, REITs generated positive returns in half the 22 months when rates increased the most—muddying the conclusion. In addition, the positive 1.5% average REIT return during months featuring the second-largest rate increases (Category 9) stands in contrast to REITs’ performance in the months featuring the biggest rate increases (Category 10). Further, positive returns were registered in 14 out of 23 months featuring the second-largest rate increases. This analysis suggests that there are other factors at play that may better explain REIT stock returns at any given time, such as the macroeconomic backdrop, fundamentals, valuation, and technical conditions.

**Investment implications**

As this analysis shows, making a sizable allocation to REITs in a multi-asset-class portfolio would have helped improve the portfolio’s risk-adjusted return over time. However, many investors remain underexposed to this asset category based on an analysis of U.S. equity funds. Investors with capital earmarked for strategic investment over an extended horizon may want to reevaluate their portfolio exposure to consider whether dedicated REIT exposure is warranted in the context of achieving their investment objectives.

**EXHIBIT 10: REITs have fared well relative to other asset categories, particularly over longer time periods.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Annual Total Returns (%)</th>
<th>Year-to-Date (Cumulative)</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
<th>3 Year</th>
<th>5 Year</th>
<th>10 Year</th>
<th>20 Year</th>
<th>25 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REIT Stocks</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Equities</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Cap U.S. Equities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Equity</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Grade Bond</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. High Yield Bond</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>-17.1</td>
<td>-17.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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