FINANCIAL
SERVICES
REVIEW

Financial Services Review 28 (2020) v–vii

From the Editor

This issue contains **Volume 28 - Issue 1** of *Financial Services Review* (*FSR*). I would like to thank the board and members of the Academy of Financial Services for their continued support. I continue to work in broadening the scope of articles, while still focusing on individual financial management and personal financial planning. I encourage authors to reach out when discussing implications of their findings in a more comprehensive way. As such, all articles in the Journal more appropriately relate to financial planning issues.

The lead article “The decrease in life insurance ownership: Implications for financial planning” is coauthored by Kyoung Tae Kim at University of Alabama, Travis P. Mountain at Virginia Tech University, Sherman D. Hanna at Ohio State University, and Namhoon Kim at Korea Rural Economic Institute. Using the Survey of Consumer Finances dataset the authors find the proportion of households owning a life insurance policy decreased from 72% in 1992 to 60% in 2016. They estimate logistic regressions on the likelihood of ownership of term and cash value life insurance. They find that changes in household characteristics accounted for the decrease in term life insurance ownership, but not for the decreases in cash value life insurance ownership. They also find a positive association between use of a financial planner and life insurance ownership.

The second article “Are ‘Fun’ Sources of Windfalls Destined to be Spent Hedonistically?” is coauthored by Eugene Bland at Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi and Valrie Chambers at Stetson University. The authors show that fun sources of income are more likely to be spent on a fun expenditures. Money won on a game show would be spent more on ‘fun’ than money received from a tax rebate. They find support for rejecting the hypothesis that there is no difference in allocations for regular expenses, credit card payments, durable assets or investing in stocks, bonds and savings account (“adult” uses of funds) by source of windfall. They found significant evidence that there is a difference in investing based on the source of the windfall. People apparently spend significantly more on fun when a fun windfall is received, but that spending on fun is not limitless. Additionally they find that there may be such a thing as “enough spending on fun.

The third article, “A Portfolio of Leveraged Exchange Traded Funds” is coauthored by William J. Trainor Jr., Indudeep Chhachhi, and Christopher L. Brown, all at Western Kentucky University. In this study, the authors demonstrate how a portfolio of leveraged exchange traded funds (LETFs) outperforms a portfolio using traditional ETFs while simultaneously reducing downside risk. Their results are primarily a function of LETFs borrowing short while the investor lends the additional wealth generated from this leverage in 1 to

7- year Treasury bonds or similar type of assets. They also present that for every 1% earned above the implied borrowing rate, a portfolio of 2x and 3x LETFs outperforms a traditional portfolio by 0.41% and 0.63% respectively, They show that more than 90% of LETFs outperformance is explained by the borrowing lending differential.

The final article, "Are Multiple Share Class Funds Poorly Governed?" is coauthored by Jonathan Handy at Furman University and Thomas Smythe at Florida Gulf Coast University. Utilizing independent Morningstar Stewardship Grades, the authors find that multiple share class mutual funds (MS funds) have lower quality governance. Using ordered probit regressions they find that MS funds are more likely to have lower board quality ratings and managerial incentive ratings. Their results show that less sophisticated investors seeking financial advice (those typically utilizing MS funds) may potentially be directed to funds that underperform and have higher costs.

Thanks to those who make the journal possible, especially the referees and contributing authors. Over the past year, the following reviewers provided excellent reviews of the articles you enjoyed within the pages of Financial Services Review. I would like to send a special thank you to the many reviewers that have significantly contributed to the quality of our journal by providing timely and thorough reviews of the submissions to our journal.

John E. Grable	Tim Kaiser
Sina Ehsani	Travis L. Jones
Michael Highfield	Swarn Chatterjee
William Trainor	Sarah Reiter
John Clinebell	Shaun Pfeiffer
Sophie Shive	Yuliya Plyakha
Xu Sun	Gene Stout
Timothy Krause	John Clinebell
Laszlo Sandor	Anders Carlander
Lewis W. Coopersmith	Kenneth Ryack
Jerry Stevens	Sonya Britt
Robert Ottr	Gary Porter
Kent Baker	David Yeske
Jean Lown	Scott Moore
Stuart Heckman	Jonathan Guyton
Haiwei Chen	Shibashish Chakraborty
Wade D. Pfau	Jiri Sindelar
Timothy Lu	Tianyang Wang
Kaustav Misra	Daniel Huerta-Sanchez
Sandeep Singh	Sara Shirley
Larry Frank	Philippe Cogneau
Greg Geisler	David Perkins
James Dow	Stuart Heckman
HanNa Lim	Jian Zhou
Sherman Hanna	David Hulse
Victoria Bryant	Jeremy Burke
Jeremy Clark	Cathy Faulcon Bowen
Hem C. Basnet	Yan Liu
George Korniotis	Diego Escobari
Harin Desilva	Juan Gallardo
Hal Hershfield	Jason P. Berkowitz
David Nanigian	Sharon Danes

Please consider submission to the Financial Services Review and rely on the style information provided to ease readability and streamline the review process. The Journal welcomes articles over the range of areas that comprise personal financial planning. While FSR articles are certainly diverse in terms of topic, data, and method, they are focused in terms of motivation. FSR exists to produce research that addresses issues that matter to individuals. I remain committed to the goal of making Financial Services Review the best academic journal in individual financial management and personal financial planning.

Best regards,
Stuart Michelson
Editor *Financial Services Review*