THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

Analysts: Still Coming Up Rosy --- Over-Optimism on Growth Rates Is Rampant, and the Estimates Help to Buoy Market's Valuation

By Ken Brown. **Wall Street Journal**. (Eastern edition).New York, N.Y.: Jan 27, 2003. pg. C.1

WALL STREET IS pretty downcast these days, what with a $1.5 billion settlement pending with regulators over stock-research conflicts, continuing layoffs at big securities firms and a stock market that is teetering yet again -- not to mention a cold snap that could freeze the thumbs of Blackberry users.

Yet stock analysts are unshaken in their optimistic, if delusional, belief that most of the companies they cover will have above-average, double-digit growth rates during the next several years. That is, of course, highly unlikely. Historically, corporate earnings have grown at about the same rate as the economy over time, and few expect the economy to grow at a double-digit rate any time soon.

But analysts refuse to bend to reality. Of the companies in the Standard & Poor's 500-stock index, analysts expect 345 of them to boost their earnings more than 10% a year during the next three to five years, and 123 companies to grow more than 15%, according to Multex, a stock-market-data firm.

"Hope springs eternal," says Mark Donovan, who manages Boston Partners Large Cap Value Fund. "You would have thought that, given what happened in the last three years, people would have given up the ghost. But in large measure they have not."

These overly optimistic growth estimates also show that, even with all the regulatory focus on too-bullish analysts allegedly influenced by their firms' investment-banking relationships, a lot of things haven't changed: Research remains rosy and many believe it always will.

In some ways, these high estimated growth rates underpin the market's current valuation, which remains pricey by historical standards. Investors expect to pay a higher price for stocks that are growing strongly. So if people realize these long-term growth-rate numbers are largely fictional, then a pillar of support for the market's valuation -- the S&P 500 currently trades at a price-to-earnings ratio of 18.5 based on 2002 earnings -- could go out of the stock market, sending prices lower.

The long-term growth figures come from the earnings estimates Wall Street analysts post for the companies they cover. Besides issuing buy and sell recommendations and predicting earnings during the next few quarters, analysts typically estimate how quickly the companies' earnings will grow during the next few years. Such long-term growth-rate numbers, which are imprecise by nature, give a hint of how analysts feel about companies' future prospects.

A long-term growth-rate number is often used by investors to determine whether a stock is cheap or expensive. Online auctioneer eBay Inc., for example, trades at a price-to-earnings ratio of 88 based on the past year's earnings. Some investors take solace in the fact that the company is expected to expand earnings 40% a year, but even with that growth, it would take until 2006 for the company's price-to-earnings ratio to fall to 22, assuming the stock price remained stalled at today's level.

These rosy figures come on top of three years of little or no growth for many companies. For example, Charles Schwab Corp. hasn't grown at all since 2000 as it has struggled with the stock-market collapse. But analysts, on average, still expect the company will expand its earnings 18% a year during the next several years. While that doesn't justify the company's price-to-earnings ratio of 33, it does give some hope to shareholders that the company one day indeed could resume its old growth rate.

Not surprisingly, the glow is rosiest in the technology sector. Of the 91 tech companies in the S&P 500, analysts expect 82 to grow faster than 10% a year, and 18 to grow better than 20% a year, meaning tech companies account for more than half of the index's 35 top growers.

To be sure, many of these companies could actually meet those growth expectations, if only because earnings have been in such a slump they are bound to rebound at some point. Analysts expect Schwab, for example, to earn 40 cents a share in 2003, up from the 29 cents it earned last year. If the analysts are right, that would be a healthy 38% jump in earnings.

But some also concede that their growth rates are optimistic. Guy Moszkowski, who covers Schwab for Salomon Smith Barney, and whose long-term growth estimate of 18% matches the consensus, concedes that this figure might be optimistic in the years after the expected short-term earnings pop. "If we can get enough of a recovery in the market that they can achieve that 40 cents in earnings, then they'll be on the way to establishing a kind of mid-teens growth track," he says. "But I think it's really hard to make the case they can do much better than that."

Mark Constant, who covers the company for Lehman Brothers and has a 15%-a-year growth estimate, also says the company probably won't reach his target. "I've always characterized it in print as an optimistic growth rate," he says.

If it were true that analysts were expecting a rebound following the current slump and ratcheting up their expectations accordingly, they might now be able to argue that they aren't being overly optimistic. The truth is, however, they have been growing increasingly pessimistic since the tech-stock bubble burst. Back in mid 2000, when earnings had been soaring for years, analysts were predicting that earnings for the S&P 500 would continue growing 15% a year, according to Morgan Stanley. Now, they are predicting 12% annual earnings growth for these same companies.

You can't blame analysts for everything,though. Companies themselves are guilty of being overly optimistic as well. "I think there's an immense amount of inertia in the system. That's the problem," says Steve Galbraith, Morgan Stanley's chief investment strategist. "One of the things people are struggling with are creative ways of reducing your guidance without reducing your guidance."

The problem, he adds, is that many companies set their growth expectations a decade ago, when interest rates and inflation were higher than today. Growth rates are measured in nominal terms, meaning inflation gives them a boost. With virtually no inflation and interest rates near zero, it is harder for companies to post double-digit growth. "I do think this is something that corporate America broadly is wrestling with: How do we ratchet down expectations that we set 10 years ago when things were different?" he says.

The danger comes from companies that can't face the reality that their growth has slowed. "Where I think clients should get concerned is where a company is claiming they're a 15% grower and they're setting their capital expenditures accordingly," Mr. Galbraith says. If the market is pricing in that level of growth, then the company will likely keep investing in itself in an attempt to keep returns high. The danger of that: Companies could be throwing away capital that could be given back to investors in the form of dividends or share buybacks.

Every chief financial officer who took Corporate Finance 101 knows that the bigger the portion of earnings a company reinvests in its business, the faster it conceivably can grow. Sending cash out to investors reduces the amount the company can invest in itself, ultimately lowering its potential growth rate.

But there are signs -- including Microsoft Corp.'s plan to pay a dividend -- that executives are starting to realize that reinvesting all their excess cash in their own business might not produce the highest returns. "It hasn't gotten quite that far, but I think it's going to get there," says Jeff van Harte, who manages Transamerica Premier Equity fund. "It just takes a long time to change attitudes. Some companies are forever lost."
