mendation that is different than the expected ROE that the method assumes the utility will earn forever. For example, using an expected return on equity of 11% to determine the growth rate and using the growth rate to recommend a return on equity of 9% is inconsistent. It is not reasonable to assume that this regulated utility company is expected to earn 11% forever, but recommend a 9% return on equity. The only way this utility can earn 11% is that rates be set by the regulator so that the utility will in fact earn 11%. One is assuming, in effect, that the company will earn a return rate exceeding the recommended cost of equity forever, but then one is recommending that a different rate be granted by the regulator. In essence, using an ROE in the sustainable growth formula that differs from the final estimated cost of equity is asking the regulator to adopt two different returns.

The circularity problem is somewhat dampened by the self-correcting nature of the DCF model. If a high equity return is granted, the stock price will increase in response to the unanticipated favorable return allowance, lowering the dividend yield component of market return in compensation for the high g induced by the high allowed return. At the next regulatory hearing, more conservative forecasts of r would prevail. The impact on the dual components of the DCF formula, yield and growth, are at least partially offsetting.

Third, the empirical finance literature discussed earlier demonstrates that the sustainable growth method of determining growth is not as significantly correlated to measures of value, such as stock price and price/earnings ratios, as other historical growth measures or analysts' growth forecasts. Other proxies for growth, such as historical growth rates and analysts' growth forecasts, outperform retention growth estimates. See for example Timme and Eiseman (1989).

In summary, there are three proxies for the expected growth component of the DCF model: historical growth rates, analysts' forecasts, and the sustainable growth method. Criteria in choosing among the three proxies should include ease of use, ease of understanding, theoretical and mathematical correctness, and empirical validation. The latter two are crucial. The method should be logically valid and consistent, and should possess an adequate track record in predicting and explaining security value. The retention growth method is the weakest of the three proxies on both conceptual and empirical grounds. The research in this area has shown that the first two growth proxies do a better job of explaining variations in market valuation (M/B and P/E ratios) and are more highly correlated to measures of value than is the retention growth proxy.

Ibbotson® SBBI®

2015 Classic Yearbook

Market Results for
Stocks, Bonds, Bills, and Inflation
1926–2014

SBBI

MORNINGSTAR®

Chapter 7

Company Size and Return

One of the most remarkable discoveries of modern finance is the finding of a relationship between company size and return.[1] Historically on average, small companies have higher returns than those of large ones. Earlier chapters of this book document this phenomenon for the smallest stocks on the New York Stock Exchange, or NYSE. The relationship between company size and return cuts across the entire size spectrum; it is not restricted to the smallest stocks. This chapter examines returns across the entire range of company size.

Construction of the Size Decile Portfolios

The portfolios used in this chapter are those created by the Center for Research in Security Prices, or CRSP, at the University of Chicago's Booth School of Business. CRSP has refined the methodology of creating size-based portfolios and has applied this methodology to the entire universe of NYSE/AMEX/NASDAQ-listed securities going back to 1926.

The NYSE universe excludes closed-end mutual funds, preferred stocks, real estate investment trusts, foreign stocks, American Depository Receipts, unit investment trusts, and Americus Trusts. All companies on the NYSE are ranked by the combined market capitalization of all their eligible equity securities. The companies are then split into 10 equally populated groups or deciles. Eligible companies traded on the NYSE, the NYSE MKT LLC (formerly known as the American Stock Exchange, or AMEX), and the NASDAQ Stock Market (formerly the NASDAQ National Market) are then assigned to the appropriate deciles according to their capitalization in relation to the NYSE breakpoints. The portfolios are rebalanced using closing prices for the last trading day of March, June, September, and December. Securities added during the quarter are assigned to the appropriate portfolio when two consecutive month-end prices are available. If the final NYSE price of a security that becomes delisted is a month-end price, then that month's return is included in the quarterly return of the portfolio. When a month-end NYSE price is missing, the month-end value is derived from merger terms, quotations on regional exchanges, and other sources. If a month-end value is not available, the last available daily price is used.

In October 2008, NYSE Euronext acquired the American Stock Exchange and rebranded the index as NYSE Amex. Later, in May 2012, it was renamed NYSE MKT LLC. For the sake of continuity, we refer to this index as AMEX, its historical name.

Base security returns are monthly holding period returns. All distributions are added to the month-end prices. Appropriate adjustments are made to prices to account for stock splits and dividends. The return on a portfolio for one month is calculated as the value weighted average of the returns for the individual stocks in the portfolio. Annual portfolio returns are calculated by compounding the monthly portfolio returns.

Aspects of the Company Size Effect

The company size phenomenon is remarkable in several ways. First, the greater risk of small-cap does not, in the context of the capital asset pricing model, fully account for their higher returns over the long term. In the CAPM only systematic, or beta risk, is rewarded; small-cap stock returns have exceeded those implied by their betas.

Second, the calendar annual return differences between small- and large-cap companies are serially correlated. This suggests that past annual returns may be of some value in predicting future annual returns. Such serial correlation, or autocorrelation, is practically unknown in the market for large-cap stocks and in most other equity markets but is evident in the size premium series.

Table 7-5: Size-Decile Portfolios of the NYSE/AMEX/NASDAQ Number of Companies, Historical and Recent Market Capitalization

Decile	Historical Average Percentage of Total Capitalization	Recent Number of Companies	Recent Decile Market Capitalization (in Thousands)	Recent Percentage of Total Capitalization
1-Largest	64.03%	185	14,808,784,274	64.25%
2	14.04	199	3,247,447,914	14.09
3	6.88	194	1,579,432,904	6.85
4	4.56	221	1,042,428,212	4.52
5	3.03	215	694,147,086	3.01
6	2.56	265	585,657,120	2.54
7	1.99	317	449,325,255	1.95
8	1.51	417	333,731,801	1.45
9	0.80	395	173,673,205	0.75
10-Smallest	0.61	948	135,401,288	0.59
Mid-Cap 3-5	14.47	630	3,316,008,202	14.39
Low-Cap 6-8	6.05	999	1,368,714,176	5.94
Micro-Cap 9-10	1.41	1,343	309,074,493	1.34

Data from 1926–2014. Source: Morningstar and CRSP. Calculated (or Derived) based on data from CRSP US Stock Database and CRSP US Indices Database ©2015 Center for Research in Security Prices (CRSP®), The University of Chicago Booth School of Business. Used with permission.

Historical average percentage of total capitalization shows the average, over the last 89 years, of the decile market values as a percentage of the total NYSE/AMEX/NASDAQ calculated each month. Number of companies in deciles, recent market capitalization of deciles, and recent percentage of total capitalization are as of Sept. 30, 2014.

Decile	Recent Market Capitalization (in Thousands)	Company Name
1-Largest	$591,015,721	Apple Inc
2	24,272,837	Cummins Inc
3	10,105,622	Murphy Oil Corp
4	5,844,592	Alaska Airgroup Inc
5	3,724,186	Great Plains Energy Inc
6	2,542,913	Wolverine World Wide Inc
7	1,686,860	Wesco Aircraft Holdings Inc
8	1,010,634	First Bancorp P R
9	548,839	G P Strategies Corp
10-Smallest	300,725	M V Oil Trust

Source: Morningstar and CRSP. Calculated (or Derived) based on data from CRSP US Stock Database and CRSP US Indices Database ©2015 Center for Research in Security Prices (CRSP®), The University of Chicago Booth School of Business. Used with permission. Market capitalization and name of largest company in each decile are as of Sept. 30, 2014.

Long-Term Returns in Excess of Systematic Risk

The capital asset pricing model, or CAPM, does not fully account for the higher returns of small-cap stocks. Table 7-6 shows the returns in excess of the riskless rate over the past 89 years for each decile of the NYSE/AMEX/NASDAQ.

The CAPM can be expressed as follows:

$$k_s = r_f + (\beta_s \times ERP)$$

where,

k_s = the expected return for company **s**;
r_f = the expected return of the riskless asset;
β_s = the beta of the stock of company **s**; and,
ERP = the expected equity risk premium, or the amount by which investors expect the future return on equities to exceed that on the riskless asset.

Table 7-6 uses the CAPM to estimate the return in excess of the riskless rate and compares this estimate to historical performance. According to the CAPM, the expected return on a security should consist of the riskless rate plus an additional return to compensate for the systematic risk of the security. The return in excess of the riskless rate is estimated in the context of the CAPM by multiplying the equity risk premium by β (beta). The equity risk premium is the return that compensates investors for taking on risk equal to the risk of the market as a whole (systematic risk). Beta measures the extent to which a security or portfolio is exposed to systematic risk. The beta of each decile indicates the degree to which the decile's return moves with that of the overall market.

A beta greater than one indicates that the security or portfolio has greater systematic risk than the market; according to the CAPM equation, investors are compensated for taking on this additional risk. Yet, Table 7-6 illustrates that the smaller deciles have had returns that are not fully explained by their higher betas. This return in excess of that predicted by CAPM increases as one moves from the largest companies in decile 1 to the smallest in decile 10. The excess return is especially pronounced for micro-cap stocks (deciles 9-10). This size-related phenomenon has prompted a revision to the CAPM, which includes a size premium.

NEW
REGULATORY
FINANCE

Roger A. Morin, PhD

2006
PUBLIC UTILITIES REPORTS, INC.
Vienna, Virginia

The model is analogous to the standard CAPM, but with the return on a minimum risk portfolio that is unrelated to market returns, R_Z, replacing the risk-free rate, R_F. The model has been empirically tested by Black, Jensen, and Scholes (1972), who find a flatter than predicted SML, consistent with the model and other researchers' findings. An updated version of the Black-Jensen-Scholes study is available in Brealey, Myers, and Allen (2006) and reaches similar conclusions.

The zero-beta CAPM cannot be literally employed to estimate the cost of capital, since the zero-beta portfolio is a statistical construct difficult to replicate. Attempts to estimate the model are formally equivalent to estimating the constants, a and b, in Equation 6-2. A practical alternative is to employ the Empirical CAPM, to which we now turn.

6.3 Empirical CAPM

As discussed in the previous section, several finance scholars have developed refined and expanded versions of the standard CAPM by relaxing the constraints imposed on the CAPM, such as dividend yield, size, and skewness effects. These enhanced CAPMs typically produce a risk-return relationship that is flatter than the CAPM prediction in keeping with the actual observed risk-return relationship. The ECAPM makes use of these empirical findings. The ECAPM estimates the cost of capital with the equation:

$$K = R_F + \acute{\alpha} + \beta \times (MRP - \acute{\alpha}) \qquad (6\text{-}5)$$

where $\acute{\alpha}$ is the "alpha" of the risk-return line, a constant, and the other symbols are defined as before. All the potential vagaries of the CAPM are telescoped into the constant $\acute{\alpha}$, which must be estimated econometrically from market data. Table 6-2 summarizes[10] the empirical evidence on the magnitude of alpha.[11]

[10] The technique is formally applied by Litzenberger, Ramaswamy, and Sosin (1980) to public utilities in order to rectify the CAPM's basic shortcomings. Not only do they summarize the criticisms of the CAPM insofar as they affect public utilities, but they also describe the econometric intricacies involved and the methods of circumventing the statistical problems. Essentially, the average monthly returns over a lengthy time period on a large cross-section of securities grouped into portfolios are related to their corresponding betas by statistical regression techniques; that is, Equation 6-5 is estimated from market data. The utility's beta value is substituted into the equation to produce the cost of equity figure. Their own results demonstrate how the standard CAPM underestimates the cost of equity capital of public utilities because of utilities' high dividend yield and return skewness.

[11] Adapted from Vilbert (2004).