

# ASSET MANAGEMENT WEBSITE CLARITY INDEX

Contraction of the second





Executive Summary	1
Key Findings	2
Detailed Results Table	
Methodology – what are the metrics?	7
About VisibleThread	

## **Executive Summary**

Asset management firms must work harder than ever to adhere to plain language compliance obligations.

Trust in the financial services industry has stalled after a five-year rise. Some markets are in a double-digit decline in 2018. The currency of trust is communication and if that is not transparent, clear, and simple trust gets eroded.

The financial services sector took a knock on trust, says <u>Edelman's 2018 Trust Barometer</u>. From 2017, the US' financial services sector lost a massive 20 points. The US is not alone. 13 of 28 markets showed significant declines in trust levels.

Edelman's survey then asked: How can financial services companies increase trust? The top response: Easily understood terms and conditions. Companies are failing their customers due to complex content. It creates confused and frustrated customers. It also leads to ambiguity and therefore downstream risk to the firm - and clients.

Financial services organizations hold people's investments, their future, their possibilities, in the palm of their hands. It is no wonder that people want to have faith in the guardians of their assets.

Legislative bodies understand this. Pressure to communicate simply and transparently is increasing. This is clear in the implementation of MiFIID II and KIID, forcing the industry to improve customer engagement. Meanwhile, investors are consolidating their assets. Asset management firms are fighting harder for fewer clients. Their focus must be on improving customer service and trust through transparency and clarity.

In 2016, VisibleThread set out to study the clarity of financial company websites' content. You can download that study <u>here</u>. The focus of this current analysis is a follow-up and comparison of how these sites look today. Who has improved? Who has regressed? What has changed?

Our 2018 Clarity Index assesses the clarity of written content. We scanned 69 websites of leading financial asset managers. We required minimum word count and page samples from each website. We measured clarity across these four dimensions:

• Readability – How readable is the content?



- Passive Language Active language communicates clearly. How much of the content is in the passive voice?
- Long Sentences What proportion of all sentences are too long?
- Word Complexity Density How many complex, hard-to-understand words does the content contain?

These four indicators predict how well people will understand your web content. Customers of asset management firms are often well educated. But, they also lead busy lives. Complex content takes longer to digest. Even for the educated, poorly written content is hard to understand.

## **Key Findings**

Average readability for all websites was 36.22. Scores of 60 or higher are considered ideal. As a group, scores are very poor. Only one firm, <u>Putnam Investments</u>, scored at ideal levels this year. Sector-wide readability stayed almost the same between 2016 and 2018.

The average level of passive voice use was 11% across all sites. Content written in passive voice is harder to read. Firms in this study use passive voice at almost 3x recommended levels. Passive voice use increased in the 2018 study. Firms used passive voice 37.5% more often than in 2016.

Financial content in this study is unnecessarily wordy. The average use of long sentences averaged 25%. Lengthy sentences make comprehension harder. Target levels for clearly written content is 5%. Long sentence levels stayed almost the same in this year's findings.

Complex language density averaged 2.39 in the 2018 study. In general, this is a good score for an industry average. Complexity scores are based on a dictionary of known hard-to-understand words. Complex financial industry jargon may not appear in these dictionaries. If true, complexity scores are much worse than this number suggests.

## Leaders:

- <u>Putnam Investments</u> ranked first for readability and long-sentence measures in the 2018 Index. The firm also achieved target passive voice levels. Putnam Investments moved up from 3<sup>rd</sup> in the 2016 Index.
- <u>Boston Partners</u> was a newcomer to this year's study. The firm ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> overall, scoring high for brevity and low complex word use.
- <u>Vanguard Asset Management</u> moved into the top five rankings in 2018. The firm ranked 7<sup>th</sup> in our 2016 study. Its content ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> overall for readability. Long-sentence use was also low.
- <u>J. Safra Sarasin</u> moved up to join the top five in the 2018 findings. The firm's content performed well in most areas, when compared to peers. Long-sentence use prevented this firm from ranking higher in this year's report.



V	/isihleThread <sup>™</sup>	Global Financial Services Websites – Q2, 2018		Clear Writing	Read	lability	Pas	ssive	Lo	ong	Com	plex	
Ĺ	Clarity Index		Num Pages										Num Words
1	Putnam investments	https://www.putnam.com/	100	5.5	66	1	4%	9	7%	1	1.52	11	218466
2	Boston Partners	http://www.boston-partners.com/	66	10.25	42	11	7%	17	16%	5	1.02	8	47804
3	Vanguard Asset Management	https://investor.vanguard.com/corporate-portal/	100	12.5	55	2	7%	16	16%	8	2.00	24	64913
4	J. Safra Sarasin	http://www.jsafrasarasin.com/internet/com/com _index	100	13	45	8	4%	8	21%	24	1.62	12	31299
5	MEAG	https://www.meag.com/default_en.asp	100	17.5	24	65	0%	2	9%	2	0.14	1	15273

### Notable mentions:

A handful of firms improved their content notably in 2018. Relative to their peers, these firms moved up the rankings significantly.

- <u>BMO Global Asset Management</u> moved up 49 places to rank 20<sup>th</sup> overall. The firm's readability levels scored a 47. While still not at ideal levels, BMO ranked 5<sup>th</sup> overall for this metric.
- <u>BNY Mellon Cash Investment Strategies</u> and <u>Eurizon Capital</u> improved 47 and 39 rankings respectively. Content for both firms was strong for low passive voice levels and complex word density scores.
- <u>Nomura Asset Management</u> improved its rank by 38 places. Scores for all criteria were average, but collectively demonstrated improvements to clarity.

v	isihleThread <sup>™</sup>	Global Financial Services Websites – Q2 2018		Clear Writing	Read	ability	Pas	sive	Lo	ng	Com	plex				
	Clarity Index		Num Pages										Num Words	2016 rank		ar over Year Change
20	BMO Global Asset Management	https://www.bmo.com/gam	101	26.25	47	5	14%	48	19%	16	2.33	36	92981	69	Ŷ	49
31	BNY Mellon Cash Inv. Strategies	https://www.bnymellonim.com/en/	100	31.75	13	67	3%	5	30%	52	0.51	з	62669	78	Ŷ	47
28	Eurizon Capital	http://www.eurizoncapital.com/scriptWeb40/eurizonweb/eurizon/en/index.jsp	101	30.75	0	69	0%	3	29%	49	0.14	2	710398	67	Ŧ	39
43	Nomura Asset Management	http://www.nomura-am.co.jp/english/	101	39.25	38	27	17%	57	26%	34	2.40	39	9779	81	Ŷ	38
19	BlackRock	https://www.blackrock.com/investing/	100	26	39	21	10%	27	26%	36	1.90	20	160459	54	•	35

### Room for improvement:

- <u>Standard Life Investments</u> ranked last in our 2018 findings. Content from this firm had readability levels of 30. Passive voice use was at 6x recommended levels. Long-sentences appeared at 7x recommended levels.
- <u>Mellon Capital Management</u> came in second to last this year, falling four ranks overall. While this firm's content never ranked last in any one area, it scored poorly across the board.
- <u>Affiliated Managers Group</u> ranked 68th overall. Content on this site had very poor readability and long-sentence scores.
- <u>Legal and General Investment Management</u> dropped 19 places to rank in the bottom five this year. The firm ranked last for passive voice. Long-sentence use also hurt this firm's scores.
- <u>Amundi</u> and <u>Santander Asset Management</u> tied for 64<sup>th</sup> place in the rankings. Amundi dropped 27 places in this year's index only one other firm had a worse decline. Santander did rank relatively high for low levels of Complex Word Density.



V	icibleThread"	Global Financial Services Websites – Q2, 2018		Clear Writing	Read	lability	Pa	sive	Le	ing	Com	plex	
	Clarity Index		Num Pages										Num Words
64	Amundi	https://www.amundi.com/?nr=1	100	54	34	48	20%	63	34%	56	2.78	49	73815
64	Santander Asset Management	http://www.santanderassetmanagement.com/ en_GB/prehome	100	54	23	66	21%	64	49%	69	1.84	17	12512
66	Legal & General Investment Mmgt	http://www.lgim.com/global/	103	54.25	35	45	27%	69	37%	66	2.34	37	801642
67	Affiliated Managers Group	http://www.amg.com/	50	55	27	61	14%	50	36%	64	2.49	45	36595
68	Mellon Capital Management	https://www.mom.com/	21	57.75	27	61	22%	65	36%	62	2.47	43	19805
69	Standard Life Investments	http://us.standardlifeinvestments.com/	100	60.75	30	59	25%	68	37%	65	2.84	51	144677
• Vis	ibleThread, 2018							-					h.

## Falling fast:

Several firms fell in the rankings by large measures. Surprisingly, most of the firms that fell the furthest didn't end up at the bottom of our index.

- <u>AQR Capital Management</u> fell 31 places to rank 52<sup>nd</sup> in the 2018 results. Heavy use of long sentences and complex words likely caused the decline.
- <u>Amundi</u> fell 26 places to wind up in the bottom five rankings.
- <u>Helaba Invest</u> fell 25 places, <u>Nordea Asset Management</u> fell 22 places and <u>Wellington Management</u> fell 24 places in the rankings. Helaba had very good scores for passive voice and long sentences. But, very poor readability and complex word use caused the decline.

V	isibleThread <sup>™</sup>	Global Financial Services Websites – Q2 2018		Clear Writing	Read	ability	Pas	sive	Lo	ng	Com	plex				
	Clarity Index		Num Pages										Num Words	2016 rank	Ye	ar over Year Change
49	Nordea Asset Management	http://www.nordea.com/en/our-services/asset-management/	100	41.75	38	27	12%	42	26%	39	3.11	59	14159	27	٠	-22
60	Wellington Management	https://www.wellington.com/en	100	52	32	53	19%	61	34%	59	2.32	35	290249	36	٠	-24
41	Helaba Invest	https://www.helaba-invest.de/	83	37.75	7	68	0%	4	18%	13	4.87	66	34569	16	٠	-25
64	Amundi	https://www.amundi.com/?nr=1	100	54	34	48	20%	63	34%	56	2.78	49	73815	38	٠	-26
52	AQR Capital Management	https://www.agr.com/	100	42.25	39	21	12%	40	35%	60	2.68	48	65544	21		-31

### Takeaways:

**Statistics can be misleading:** An index is a statistical tool to measure change. In this case, we've tracked changes in content clarity over time. Appearing at the top of the index doesn't mean that content is clear. As a group, financial services content is poorly written. Even the top ranked websites don't meet expected standards.

**Content clarity is a differentiator:** Content clarity is poor industry-wide. Firms that improve their writing will stand out over time. Firms with clear content would usually see return-on-investment in the following ways:

- Improved response rates to marketing calls-to-action
- Lower administrative costs usually associated with lighter call volume to call-center/support lines
- Improved customer satisfaction, loyalty and trust due to improved perceptions of ease of engagement

Further, financial technology is driving the industry forward. Technology is a notoriously complex sector, too. Firms that haven't mastered content clarity and consistency will find more complex subject matter hard to translate. Companies that translate simple value messages will see better response.



**Small changes create large shifts in clarity:** Managing content quality can be difficult. Larger firms have to police more content. As our index reveals, small oversights can result in poor content quality. Financial content doesn't have to be hard to read. Awareness and training can help. Tools that help identify the worst content are useful, too.

**Consolidation makes content management more challenging:** As firms merge, style preferences can create friction. Even professional writing is a personal expression. It can be hard to strive for plain language for educated people. Content clarity should be positioned as a business objective. Writing as a skill is in decline and we produce more content every day. Acquiring talent and tools for efficiently managing content clarity will benefit the financial services sector.

**Financial firms may overestimate the savvy of their clientele:** Industry jargon is its own language. Firms would be wise to test assumptions of customer understanding of key terms. Firms that know which terms are not well understood can take steps to make content easier to grasp. Management can take this a step further and create plain language policies. With certain content automation tools, a custom dictionary can be used to analyse content for banned terms. Or, terms can be flagged for a pre-prepared explanation in plain language.

###

## **Detailed Results Table**

We show the full detailed table below.

Each score in the index is colour-coded green to red. Green indicates best, red indicates worst.

Colour-coding shows us where one or two specific scores may be dragging down the overall ranking. Flagging specific areas (for instance, passive language) pinpoints areas for improvement.



	Global F	inancial Services Websites – Q2, 2018	Num Pages	Clear Writing	Score	ability Rank		sive Rank	Score	ng Rank	Com Score		1 //
I	Putnam investments	https://www.putnam.com/	100	5.5	66	1	4%	9	7%	1	1.52	11	2
	Boston Partners	http://www.boston-partners.com/	66	10.25	42	11	7%	17	16%	5	1.02	8	4
	Vanguard Asset Management	https://investor.vanguard.com/corporate-	100	12.5	55	2	7%	16	16%	8	2.00	24	e
	J. Safra Sarasin	portal/ http://www.jsafrasarasin.com/internet/com	100	13	45	8	4%	8	21%	24	1.62	12	3
		/com_index											
	MEAG	https://www.meag.com/default_en.asp https://www.pggm.nl/english/what-we-	100	17.5	24	65	0%	2	9%	2	0.14	1	1
	PGGM	do/Pages/Asset-management.aspx	100	18.25	38	27	6%	13	22%	27	0.98	6	e
	Caisse de depot et placement du Quebec	http://cdpq.com/en	100	19	39	21	4%	7	26%	38	1.18	10	4
	La Banque Postale Asset Management	http://www.labanquepostale-am.fr/la- banque-postale-am/english/introducing- lbpam/id/47	100	19.25	41	14	3%	6	32%	53	0.61	4	3
	AllianceBernstein (AB)	https://www.abglobal.com/#/	100	19.25	41	14	11%	33	19%	17	1.64	13	з
	Swiss Life Asset Managers	https://www.swisslife-am.com/	100	2125	40	17	8%	18	27%	45	0.96	5	2
	A viva Investors	https://us.avivainvestors.com/	1	21.5	36	38	6%	11	24%	30	0.99	7	
	APG	https://www.apg.nl/en/apg-as-asset-	100	22	34	48	5%	10	20%	21	1.10	9	4
	Margan Charley layon ta ant Marg	manager	100	23.25	41	14	7%	14	28%		1.89	19	
	Morgan Stanley Investment Mngt.	https://www.morganstanley.com/im.us.html								46			6
	M&G Investments	http://www.mandg.com/	100	24	46	7	13%	45	22%	28	1.83	16	3
	RBC Global Asset Management	http://funds.rbcgam.com/	79	24.75	47	5	11%	39	19%	15	2.42	40	2
	HSBC Global Asset Management	http://www.assetmanagement.hsbc.com/u s	1	24.75	44	9	15%	51	18%	11	2.11	28	
	SEB	http://sebgroup.com/large-corporates-and- institutions/our-services/asset- management	100	24.75	39	21	8%	20	25%	33	2.00	25	2
	MFS Investment Management	https://www.mfs.com/content/en_us.html	100	25	40	17	11%	32	26%	37	1.71	14	g
	BlackRock	https://www.blackrock.com/investing/	100	26	39	21	10%	27	26%	36	1.90	20	16
	BMO Global Asset Management	https://www.bmo.com/gam	101	26.25	47	5	14%	48	19%	16	2.33	36	ç
	Federated Investors	http://www.federatedinvestors.com/FII/ho	101	26.5	34	48	10%	25	15%	3	2.14	30	
	Franklin Templeton Investments	me.do https://www.franklintempleton.com/	100	27.5	48	3	12%	43	17%	9	2.93	55	14
		https://www3.troweprice.com/usis/corpora											
	T. Rowe Price	te/en/home.html	100	27.25	40	17	8%	19	34%	58	1.81	15	1
	NN Investment Partners	https://www.nnip.com/corporate/INT/en/H ome.htm	100	28	32	53	7%	15	22%	26	1.85	18	9
	Bridgewater Associates	http://www.bwater.com/	17	28.75	38	27	9%	21	27%	44	1.94	23	
	Prudential Financial	https://www.prudential.com/	100	29.5	36	38	16%	52	16%	7	1.91	21	9
	Eurizon Capital	http://www.eurizoncapital.com/scriptWeb40 /eurizonweb/eurizon/en/index.jsp	101	30.75	0	69	0%	3	29%	49	0.14	2	7
	Credit Suisse	https://www.credit-suisse.com/us/en.html	101	30.5	38	27	6%	12	19%	18	4.50	65	
	SEI	http://www.seic.com/enUS/index.htm	100	31	37	32	9%	22	18%	14	2.96	56	ŧ
	DekaBank	https://www.deka.de/deka-group	100	31.25	36	38	10%	28	18%	12	2.66	47	3
	BNY Mellon Cash Inv. Strategies	https://www.bnymellonim.com/en/	100	31.75	13	67	3%	5	30%	52	0.51	3	6
	-	. ,											
	Columbia Threadneedle Investments	https://www.columbiathreadneedleus.com/	100	32.75	32	53	11%	38	17%	9	2.18	31	8
	American Century Investments	https://www.americancentury.com/en.html	100	33	43	10	16%	54	16%	5	3.70	63	6
	Fidelity Investments	https://www.fidelity.com/	98	34.75	42	11	14%	49	20%	19	3.17	60	10
	Schroder Investment Management	http://www.schroders.com/en/us/private- investor/	100	34.75	39	21	13%	46	26%	40	2.20	32	8
	тсw	https://www.tcw.com/	100	34.75	40	17	10%	26	27%	43	2.88	53	ç
	Natixis Global Asset Management	http://ngam.natixis.com/global/1250194644	1	35.25	33	52	0%	1	36%	62	2.07	26	
	-	819/Home https://www.tiaa.org/public/assetmanagem											
	TIA A Global Asset M anagement Pioneer Investments	ent http://us.pioneerinvestments.com/global/j umppage.jsp?redirectURL=http%3A//us.pi	100 101	35.75 36.75	37 37	32 32	10% 11%	30 34	21% 20%	23 20	3.04 3.26	58 61	8
		oneerinvestments.com/ https://www.jpmorgan.com/country/US/EN											
	J.P. Morgan Asset Management	/about/asset-management	100	37.5	36	38	10%	29	24%	31	2.85	52	4
	Helaba Invest	https://www.helaba-invest.de/	83	37.75	7	68	0%	4	18%	13	4.87	66	3
	Guggenheim Partners Investment Mngt.	https://www.guggenheimpartners.com/	100	39	37	32	11%	35	30%	51	2.35	38	5
	Nomura Asset Management	http://www.nomura-am.co.jp/english/	101	39.25	38	27	17%	57	26%	34	2.40	39	9
	Voya Investment Management	http://investments.voya.com/	20	40	37	32	13%	44	26%	42	2.45	42	ŀ
	New York Life Investments	https://www.nylinvestments.com/investme ntsgroup	100	40.25	39	21	17%	56	21%	22	3.53	62	8
	Dodge & Cox	https://www.dodgeandcox.com/	100	40.5	42	11	19%	60	30%	50	2.42	41	5
	Wells Capital Management	https://wellscap.com/	100	40.75	32	53	9%	23	33%	54	2.29	33	5
	Neuberger Berman	http://www.nb.com/pages/public/en-	100	40.75	36	38	13%	47	24%	32	2.56	46	12
	-	us/funds.aspx											
	Dimensional Fund Advisors	https://us.dimensional.com/ http://www.nordea.com/en/our-	25	4175	31	57	12%	41	28%	47	1.94	22	2
	Nordea Asset Management	nttp://www.nordea.com/en/our- services/asset-management/	100	41.75	38	27	12%	42	26%	39	3.11	59	



51	BNP Paribas Investment Partners	http://www.bnpparibas-ip.com/en/	100	42	37	32	11%	31	29%	48	3.00	57	44502
52	AQR Capital Management	https://www.aqr.com/	100	42.25	39	21	12%	40	35%	60	2.68	48	65544
53	Baillie Giford & Co.	https://www.bailliegifford.com/	100	43.75	48	3	24%	67	26%	41	4.25	64	64776
54	Loomis Sayles & Company	http://www.loomissayles.com/Internet/Inter net.nsf/home?readform	100	44.5	35	45	19%	62	16%	4	4.91	67	51420
55	Aberdeen Asset Management	http://www.aberdeen-asset.us/	100	45	36	38	18%	59	23%	29	2.91	54	86822
56	Fidelity International	https://www.fidelityinternational.com/global /default.page	100	45.25	36	38	16%	55	35%	61	2.11	27	35333
57	Northern Trust Asset Management	https://www.northerntrust.com/asset- management/united-states	100	47	30	59	11%	36	22%	25	5.53	68	54347
58	Principal Global Investors	https://www.principalglobal.com/	100	47.75	25	63	9%	24	26%	35	6.78	69	38400
58	First State Investments	http://www.firststateinvestments.com/us/e n/insto/home/	100	47.75	25	63	11%	37	34%	57	2.31	34	75383
60	Wellington Management	https://www.wellington.com/en	100	52	32	53	19%	61	34%	59	2.32	35	290249
61	Manulife Asset Management	http://www.manulifeam.com/us/	100	52.75	34	48	22%	66	45%	68	2.13	29	154352
62	Eastspring Investments	http://www.eastspring.com/	100	53.5	35	45	18%	58	39%	67	2.48	44	164287
63	Macquarie Asset Management	http://www.macquarie.com/us/corporate/a sset-management	100	53.75	31	57	16%	53	33%	55	2.82	50	93986
64	Amundi	https://www.amundi.com/?nr=1	100	54	34	48	20%	63	34%	56	2.78	49	73815
64	Santander Asset Management	http://www.santanderassetmanagement.co m/en_GB/prehome	100	54	23	66	21%	64	49%	69	1.84	17	12512
66	Legal & General Investment Mmgt	http://www.lgim.com/global/	103	54.25	35	45	27%	69	37%	66	2.34	37	801642
67	Affiliated Managers Group	http://www.amg.com/	50	55	27	61	14%	50	36%	64	2.49	45	36595
68	Mellon Capital Management	https://www.mcm.com/	21	57.75	27	61	22%	65	36%	62	2.47	43	19805
69	Standard Life Investments	http://us.standardlifeinvestments.com/	100	60.75	30	59	25%	68	37%	65	2.84	51	144677
© Vis	ibleThread, 2018												-

## Methodology – what are the metrics?

- We analysed the sites in May 2018
- We scanned as many as 100 pages of content
- We scanned starting from the publicly available URL
- Certain pages within the sample of 100 contain non-textual content (eg: videos). We omitted these pages from our scan.
- Certain scans had less than 100 pages. Here we included the page count and word count for each agency.

We calculated the index based on four metrics. Each metric contributes equally to the final score. The metrics are:

Metric	Formula
1. Readability	

Readability ranges from 1 to 100. 100 is the top mark. If communicating with citizens, aim for at least 50.

(206.835 – (1.015 x Average Sentence Length) – (84.6 x Average Syllables per Word))

This is based on the Flesch Reading Ease index.



#### 2. Passive Language

The % rating is the proportion of sentences containing passive voice. Passive language is where the subject of a sentence is acted on by the verb. For example:

"Quality is monitored" vs. "We monitor quality"

If you use active voice, you will increase clarity and strength. You will also flush out the 'actor', i.e. who did the action? (Passive Sentences / Total Sentences \* 100)

#### 3. Long Sentences

The % rating is the proportion of sentences that are longer than 25 words. Long sentences mask multiple concepts. Splitting up these sentences will result in a clearer message. (Long Sentences / Total Sentences \* 100)

#### 4. Complex Word Density

The density rating is the proportion of complex words relative to the total word count. This scan looks for complex words/phrases based on federal guidelines. See <u>http://www.plainlanguage.gov/howto/wordsuggestions/s</u> <u>implewords.cfm</u> for the list scanned. Replacing complex words with simpler words helps your readers concentrate on your content. (Complex Words/Total Words \* 100)

## About VisibleThread

VisibleThread provides content analysis solutions for web, digital and communication professionals.

Our solutions help embed plain language and automate the reviewing and editing process.

#### Our solutions and reports allow customers to:

- Scan documents and websites in minutes
- Identify risky and complex language with objective metrics
- Benchmark web sites against sector peers



- Flag compliance issues

For corporate teams, government agencies and non-profits, our solutions make review teams 40% more efficient and increase sales and marketing conversions.

## For questions or if you want a specific sector index:

- For a specific agency or reports, email: <a href="mailto:sales@visiblethread.com">sales@visiblethread.com</a>
- For questions on the metrics or methodology, email: <a href="mailto:support@visiblethread.com">support@visiblethread.com</a>