Investor growth expectations: Analysts vs. history

Analysts' growth forecasts dominate past trends in predicting stock prices.

James H. Vander Weide and Willard T. Carleton

For the purposes of implementing the Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) cost of equity model, the analyst must know which growth estimate is embodied in the firm's stock price. A study by Cragg and Malkiel (1982) suggests that the stock valuation process embodies analysts' forecasts rather than historically based growth figures such as the ten-year historical growth in dividends per share or the five-year growth in book value per share. The Cragg and Malkiel study is based on data for the 1960s, however, a decade that was considerably more stable than the recent past.

As the issue of which growth rate to use in implementing the DCF model is so important to applications of the model, we decided to investigate whether the Cragg and Malkiel conclusions continue to hold in more recent periods. This paper describes the results of our study.

STATISTICAL MODEL

The DCF model suggests that the firm's stock price is equal to the present value of the stream of dividends that investors expect to receive from owning the firm's shares. Under the assumption that investors expect dividends to grow at a constant rate, g, in perpetuity, the stock price is given by the following simple expression:

$$P_S = \frac{D(1+g)}{k-g} \quad (1)$$

where:

P_S = current price per share of the firm's stock;

D = current annual dividend per share;

g = expected constant dividend growth rate; and

k = required return on the firm's stock.

Dividing both sides of Equation (1) by the firm's current earnings, E, we obtain:

$$\frac{P_S}{E} = \frac{D}{E} \cdot \frac{(1+g)}{k-g} \quad (2)$$

Thus, the firm's price/earnings (P/E) ratio is a nonlinear function of the firm's dividend payout ratio (D/E), the expected growth in dividends (g), and the required rate of return.

To investigate what growth expectation is embodied in the firm's current stock price, it is more convenient to work with a linear approximation to Equation (2). Thus, we will assume that:

$$P/E = a_0(D/E) + a_1 g + a_2 k. \quad (3)$$

(Cragg and Malkiel found this assumption to be reasonable throughout their investigation.)

Furthermore, we will assume that the required

JAMES H. VANDER WEIDE is Research Professor at the Fuqua School of Business at Duke University in Durham (NC 27706). WILLARD T. CARLETON is Karl Eller Professor of Finance at the University of Arizona in Tucson (AZ 85721). Financial support for this project was provided by BellSouth and Pacific Telesis. The authors wish to thank Paul Blalock at BellSouth, Mohan Gyani at Pacific Telesis, Bill Keck at Southern Bell, and John Carlson, their programmer, for help with this project.

rate of return, k, in Equation (3) depends on the values of the risk variables B, Cov, Rsq, and Sa, where B is the firm's Value Line beta; Cov is the firm's pretax interest coverage ratio; Rsq is a measure of the stability of the firm's five-year historical EPS; and Sa is the standard deviation of the consensus analysts' five-year EPS growth forecast for the firm. Finally, as the linear form of the P/E equation is only an approximation to the true P/E equation, and B, Cov, Rsq, and Sa are only proxies for k, we will add an error term, e, that represents the degree of approximation to the true relationship.

With these assumptions, the final form of our P/E equation is as follows:

$$P/E = a_0(D/E) + a_1 g + a_2 B + a_3 Cov + a_4 Rsq + a_5 Sa + e. \quad (4)$$

The purpose of our study is to use more recent data to determine which of the popular approaches for estimating future growth in the Discounted Cash Flow model is embodied in the market price of the firm's shares.

We estimated Equation (4) to determine which estimate of future growth, g, when combined with the payout ratio, D/E, and risk variables B, Cov, Rsq, and Sa, provides the best predictor of the firm's P/E ratio. To paraphrase Cragg and Malkiel, we would expect that growth estimates found in the best-fitting equation more closely approximate the expectation used by investors than those found in poorer-fitting equations.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA

Our data sets include both historically based measures of future growth and the consensus analysts' forecasts of five-year earnings growth supplied by the Institutional Brokers Estimate System of Lynch, Jones & Ryan (IBES). The data also include the firm's dividend payout ratio and various measures of the firm's risk. We include the latter items in the regression, along with earnings growth, to account for other variables that may affect the firm's stock price.

The data include:

Earnings Per Share. Because our goal is to determine which earnings variable is embodied in the firm's market price, we need to define this variable with care. Financial analysts who study a firm's financial results in detail generally prefer to "normalize" the firm's reported earnings for the effect of extraordinary items, such as write-offs of discontinued operations, or mergers and acquisitions. They also attempt, to the extent possible, to state earnings for different firms using a common set of accounting conventions.

We have defined "earnings" as the consensus analyst estimate (as reported by IBES) of the firm's earnings for the forthcoming year.[1] This definition approximates the normalized earnings that investors most likely have in mind when they make stock purchase and sell decisions. It implicitly incorporates the analysts' adjustments for differences in accounting treatment among firms and the effects of the business cycle on each firm's results of operations. Although we thought at first that this earnings estimate might be highly correlated with the analysts' five-year earnings growth forecasts, that was not the case. Thus, we avoided a potential spurious correlation problem.

Price/Earnings Ratio. Corresponding to our definition of "earnings," the price/earnings ratio (P/E) is calculated as the closing stock price for the year divided by the consensus analyst earnings forecast for the forthcoming fiscal year.

Dividends. Dividends per share represent the common dividends declared per share during the calendar year, after adjustment for all stock splits and stock dividends). The firm's dividend payout ratio is then defined as common dividends per share divided by the consensus analyst estimate of the earnings per share for the forthcoming calendar year (D/E). Although this definition has the deficiency that it is obviously biased downward — it divides this year's dividend by next year's earnings — it has the advantage that it implicitly uses a "normalized" figure for earnings. We believe that this advantage outweighs the deficiency, especially when one considers the flaws of the apparent alternatives. Furthermore, we have verified that the results are insensitive to reasonable alternative definitions (see footnote 1).

Growth. In comparing historically based and consensus analysts' forecasts, we calculated forty-one different historical growth measures. These included the following: 1) the past growth rate in EPS as determined by a log-linear least squares regression for the latest year,[2] two years, three years, . . ., and ten years; 2) the past growth rate in DPS for the latest year, two years, three years, . . ., and ten years; 3) the past growth rate in book value per share (computed as the ratio of common equity to the outstanding common equity shares) for the latest year, two years, three years, . . ., and ten years; 4) the past growth rate in cash flow per share (computed as the ratio of pretax income, depreciation, and deferred taxes to the outstanding common equity shares) for the latest year, two years, three years, . . ., and ten years; and 5) plowback growth (computed as the firm's retention ratio for the current year times the firm's latest annual return on common equity).

We also used the five-year forecast of earnings

per share growth compiled by IBES and reported in mid-January of each year. This number represents the consensus (i.e., mean) forecast produced by analysts from the research departments of leading Wall Street and regional brokerage firms over the preceding three months. IBES selects the contributing brokers "because of the superior quality of their research, professional reputation, and client demand" (IBES *Monthly Summary Book*).

Risk Variables. Although many risk factors could potentially affect the firm's stock price, most of these factors are highly correlated with one another. As shown above in Equation (4), we decided to restrict our attention to four risk measures that have intuitive appeal and are followed by many financial analysts: 1) B, the firm's beta as published by Value Line; 2) Cov, the firm's pretax interest coverage ratio (obtained from Standard & Poor's Compustat); 3) Rsq, the stability of the firm's five-year historical EPS (measured by the R^2 from a log-linear least squares regression); and 4) Sa, the standard deviation of the consensus analysts' five-year EPS growth forecast (mean forecast) as computed by IBES.

After careful analysis of the data used in our study, we felt that we could obtain more meaningful results by imposing six restrictions on the companies included in our study:

1. Because of the need to calculate ten-year historical growth rates, and because we studied three different time periods, 1981, 1982, and 1983, our study requires data for the thirteen-year period 1971-1983. We included only companies with at least a thirteen-year operating history in our study.
2. As our historical growth rate calculations were based on log-linear regressions, and the logarithm of a negative number is not defined, we excluded all companies that experienced negative EPS during any of the years 1971-1983.
3. For similar reasons, we also eliminated companies that did not pay a dividend during any one of the years 1971-1983.
4. To insure comparability of time periods covered by each consensus earnings figure in the P/E ratios, we eliminated all companies that did not have a December 31 fiscal year-end.
5. To eliminate distortions caused by highly unusual events that distort current earnings but not expected future earnings, and thus the firm's price/earnings ratio, we eliminated any firm with a price/earnings ratio greater than 50.
6. As the evaluation of analysts' forecasts is a major part of this study, we eliminated all firms that IBES did not follow.

Our final sample consisted of approximately sixty-five utility firms.[3]

RESULTS

To keep the number of calculations in our study to a reasonable level, we performed the study in two stages. In Stage 1, all forty-one historically oriented approaches for estimating future growth were correlated with each firm's P/E ratio. In Stage 2, the historical growth rate with the highest correlation to the P/E ratio was compared to the consensus analyst growth rate in the multiple regression model described by Equation (4) above. We performed our regressions for each of three recent time periods, because we felt the results of our study might vary over time.

First-Stage Correlation Study

Table 1 gives the results of our first-stage correlation study for each group of companies in each of the years 1981, 1982, and 1983. The values in this table measure the correlation between the historically oriented growth rates for the various time periods and the firm's end-of-year P/E ratio.

The four variables for which historical growth rates were calculated are shown in the left-hand column: EPS indicates historical earnings per share growth, DPS indicates historical dividend per share growth, BVPS indicates historical book value per share growth, and CFPS indicates historical cash flow per share growth. The term "plowback" refers to the product of the firm's retention ratio in the currennt year and its return on book equity for that year. In all, we calculated forty-one historically oriented growth rates for each group of firms in each study period.

The goal of the first-stage correlation analysis was to determine which historically oriented growth rate is most highly correlated with each group's year-end P/E ratio. Eight-year growth in CFPS has the highest correlation with P/E in 1981 and 1982, and ten-year growth in CFPS has the highest correlation with year-end P/E in 1983. In all cases, the plowback estimate of future growth performed poorly, indicating that — contrary to generally held views — plowback is not a factor in investor expectations of future growth.

Second-Stage Regression Study

In the second stage of our regression study, we ran the regression in Equation (4) using two different measures of future growth, g: 1) the best historically oriented growth rate (g_h) from the first-stage correlation study, and 2) the consensus analysts' forecast (g_a) of five-year EPS growth. The regression results, which are shown in Table 2, support at least

TABLE 1

Correlation Coefficients of All Historically Based Growth Estimates by Group and by Year with P/E

Historical Growth Rate Period in Years

Current Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1981										
EPS	−0.02	0.07	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.12	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09
DPS	0.05	0.18	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.15	0.19	0.23	0.23	0.23
BVPS	0.01	0.11	0.13	0.13	0.16	0.18	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
CFPS	−0.05	0.04	0.13	0.22	0.28	0.31	0.30	0.31	−0.57	−0.54
Plowback	0.19									
1982										
EPS	−0.10	−0.13	−0.06	−0.02	−0.02	−0.01	−0.03	−0.03	0.00	0.00
DPS	−0.19	−0.10	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.13	0.13
BVPS	0.07	0.08	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.09
CFPS	−0.02	−0.08	0.00	0.10	0.16	0.19	0.23	0.25	0.24	0.07
Plowback	0.04									
1983										
EPS	−0.06	−0.25	−0.25	−0.24	−0.16	−0.11	−0.05	0.00	0.02	0.02
DPS	0.03	−0.10	−0.03	0.08	0.15	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.22	0.24
BVPS	0.03	0.10	0.04	0.09	0.15	0.16	0.19	0.21	0.22	0.21
CFPS	−0.08	0.01	0.02	0.08	0.20	0.29	0.35	0.38	0.40	0.42
Plowback	−0.08									

two general conclusions regarding the pricing of equity securities.

First, we found overwhelming evidence that the consensus analysts' forecast of future growth is superior to historically oriented growth measures in predicting the firm's stock price. In every case, the R^2 in the regression containing the consensus analysts' forecast is higher than the R^2 in the regression containing the historical growth measure. The regression coefficients in the equation containing the consensus analysts' forecast also are considerably more significant than they are in the alternative regression. These results are consistent with those found by Cragg and Malkiel for data covering the period 1961-1968. Our results also are consistent with the hypothesis that investors use analysts' forecasts, rather than historically oriented growth calculations, in making stock buy–and–sell decisions.

TABLE 2

Regression Results
Model I

Part A: *Historical*

$P/E = a_0 + a_1 D/E + a_2 g_h + a_3 B + a_4 Cov + a_5 Rsq + a_6 Sa$

Year	$\hat{a}_0$	$\hat{a}_1$	$\hat{a}_2$	$\hat{a}_3$	$\hat{a}_4$	$\hat{a}_5$	$\hat{a}_6$	R^2	F Ratio
1981	−6.42*	10.31*	7.67*	3.24	0.54*	1.42*	57.43	0.83	46.49
	(5.50)	(14.79)	(2.20)	(2.86)	(2.50)	(2.85)	(4.07)		
1982	−2.90*	9.32*	8.49*	2.85	0.45*	−0.42	3.63	0.86	65.53
	(2.75)	(18.52)	(4.18)	(2.83)	(2.60)	(0.05)	(0.26)		
1983	−5.96*	10.20*	19.78*	4.85	0.44*	0.33	32.49	0.82	45.26
	(3.70)	(12.20)	(4.83)	(2.95)	(1.89)	(0.50)	(1.29)		

Part B: *Analysis*

$P/E = a_0 + a_1 D/E + a_2 g_a + a_3 B + a_4 Cov + a_5 Rsq + a_6 Sa$

Year	$\hat{a}_0$	$\hat{a}_1$	$\hat{a}_2$	$\hat{a}_3$	$\hat{a}_4$	$\hat{a}_5$	$\hat{a}_6$	R^2	F Ratio
1981	−4.97*	10.62*	54.85*	−0.61	0.33*	0.63*	4.34	0.91	103.10
	(6.23)	(21.57)	(8.56)	(0.68)	(2.28)	(1.74)	(0.37)		
1982	−2.16*	9.47*	50.71*	−1.07	0.36*	−0.31	119.05*	0.90	97.62
	(2.59)	(22.46)	(9.31)	(1.14)	(2.53)	(1.09)	(1.60)		
1983	−8.47*	11.96*	79.05*	2.16	0.56*	0.20	−34.43	0.87	69.81
	(7.07)	(16.48)	(7.84)	(1.55)	(3.08)	(0.38)	(1.44)		

Notes:
* Coefficient is significant at the 5% level (using a one-tailed test) and has the correct sign. T-statistic in parentheses.

Second, there is some evidence that investors tend to view risk in traditional terms. The interest coverage variable is statistically significant in all but one of our samples, and the stability of the operating income variable is statistically significant in six of the twelve samples we studied. On the other hand, the beta is never statistically significant, and the standard deviation of the analysts' five-year growth forecasts is statistically significant in only two of our twelve samples. This evidence is far from conclusive, however, because, as we demonstrate later, a significant degree of cross-correlation among our four risk variables makes any general inference about risk extremely hazardous.

Possible Misspecification of Risk

The stock valuation theory says nothing about which risk variables are most important to investors. Therefore, we need to consider the possibility that the risk variables of our study are only proxies for the "true" risk variables used by investors. The inclusion of proxy variables may increase the variance of the parameters of most concern, which in this case are the coefficients of the growth variables.[4]

To allow for the possibility that the use of risk proxies has caused us to draw incorrect conclusions concerning the relative importance of analysts' growth forecasts and historical growth extrapolations, we have also estimated Equation (4) with the risk variables excluded. The results of these regressions are shown in Table 3.

Again, there is overwhelming evidence that the consensus analysts' growth forecast is superior to the historically oriented growth measures in predicting the firm's stock price. The R^2 and t-statistics are higher in every case.

TABLE 3

Regression Results
Model II

Part A: *Historical*

$P/E = a_0 + a_1 D/E + a_2 g_h$

Year	$\hat{a}_0$	$\hat{a}_1$	$\hat{a}_2$	R^2	F Ratio
1981	−1.05	9.59	21.20	0.73	82.95
	(1.61)	(12.13)	(7.05)		
1982	0.54	8.92	12.18	0.83	167.97
	(1.38)	(17.73)	(6.95)		
1983	−0.75	8.92	12.18	0.77	107.82
	(1.13)	(12.38)	(7.94)		

Part B: *Analysis*

$P/E + a_0 + a_1 D/E + a_2 g_a$

Year	$\hat{a}_0$	$\hat{a}_1$	$\hat{a}_2$	R^2	F Ratio
1981	3.96	10.07	60.53	0.90	274.16
	(8.31)	(8.31)	(20.91)	(15.79)	
1982	−1.75	9.19	44.92	0.88	246.36
	(4.00)	(4.00)	(21.35)	(11.06)	
1983	−4.97	10.95	82.02	0.83	168.28
	(6.93)	(6.93)	(15.93)	(11.02)	

Notes:
* Coefficient is significant at the 5% level (using a one-tailed test) and has the correct sign. T-statistic in parentheses.

CONCLUSION

The relationship between growth expectations and share prices is important in several major areas of finance. The data base of analysts' growth forecasts collected by Lynch, Jones & Ryan provides a unique opportunity to test the hypothesis that investors rely more heavily on analysts' growth forecasts than on historical growth extrapolations in making security buy–and–sell decisions. With the help of this data base, our studies affirm the superiority of analysts' forecasts over simple historical growth extrapolations in the stock price formation process. Indirectly, this finding lends support to the use of valuation models whose input includes expected growth rates.

[1] We also tried several other definitions of "earnings," including the firm's most recent primary earnings per share prior to any extraordinary items or discontinued operations. As our results were insensitive to reasonable alternative definitions of "earnings" we report only the results for the IBES consensus.

[2] For the latest year, we actually employed a point-to-point growth calculation because there were only two available observations.

[3] We use the word "approximately," because the set of available firms varied each year. In any case, the number varied only from zero to three firms on either side of the figures cited here.

[4] See Maddala (1977).

REFERENCES

Bower, R. S., and D. H. Bower. "Risk and the Valuation of Common Stock." *Journal of Political Economy*, May-June 1969, pp. 349-362.

Cragg, J. G., and Malkiel, B. G. "The Consensus and Accuracy of Some Predictions of the Growth of Corporate Earnings." *Journal of Finance*, March 1968, pp. 67-84.

Cragg, J. G., and Malkiel, B. G. *Expectations and the Structure of Share Prices*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Elton, E. J., M. J. Gruber, and Mustava N. Gultekin. "Expectations and Share Prices." *Management Science*, September 1981, pp. 975-987.

Federal Communications Commission. *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*. CC Docket No. 84-800, August 13, 1984.

IBES *Monthly Summary Book*. New York: Lynch, Jones & Ryan, various issues.

Maddala, G. E. *Econometrics*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977.

Malkiel, B. G. "The Valuation of Public Utility Equities." *Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science*, Spring 1970, pp. 143-160.

Peterson, D., and P. Peterson. "The Effect of Changing Expectations upon Stock Returns." *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, September 1982, pp. 799-813.

Theil, H. *Principles of Econometrics*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971.