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What returns should investors expect the US stock market to deliver on average during the next century? Does the experience of the last century provide a reliable guide to the future? In this short note I first discuss alternative methodologies for forecasting average future equity returns, then discuss current market conditions, and finally draw conclusions for long-term return forecasts. Throughout I work in real, that is inflation-adjusted, terms.

I. Methods for forecasting returns

1. Average past returns

Perhaps the simplest way to forecast future returns is to use some average of past returns. Very naturally, this method has been favored by many investors and analysts. However there are several difficulties with it.

a) Geometric average or arithmetic average? The geometric average return is the cumulative past return on US equities, annualized. Siegel (1998) studies long-term historical data on value-weighted US share indexes. He reports a geometric average of 7.0% over two different sample periods, 1802–1997 and 1871–1997. The arithmetic average return is the average of one-year past returns on US equities. It is considerably higher than the geometric average return, 8.5% over 1802–1997 and 8.7% over 1871–1997.\(^1\)

When returns are serially uncorrelated, the arithmetic average represents the best forecast of future return in any randomly selected future year. For long holding periods, the best forecast is the arithmetic average compounded up appropriately. If one is making a 75-year forecast, for example, one should forecast a cumulative return of $1.08575$ based on 1802–1997 data.

When returns are negatively serially correlated, however, the arithmetic average is not necessarily superior as a forecast of long-term future returns. To understand this, consider an extreme example in which prices alternate deterministically between 100 and 150. The return is 50% when prices rise, and -33% when prices fall. Over any even number of periods, the geometric average return is zero, but the arithmetic average return is 8.5%. In this case the arithmetic average return is misleading because it fails to take account of the fact that high returns always multiply a low initial price of 100, while low returns always multiply a high initial price of 150. The geometric average is a better indication of long-term future returns.

---

\(^1\)When returns are lognormally distributed, the difference between the two averages is approximately one-half the variance of returns. Since stock returns have an annual standard deviation of about 18% over these long periods, the predicted difference is \(0.18^2/2 = 0.016\) or 1.6%. This closely matches the difference in the data.
prospects in this example.²

This point is not just a theoretical curiosity, because in the historical data summarized by Siegel, there is strong evidence that the stock market is mean-reverting. That is, periods of high returns tend to be followed by periods of lower returns. This suggests that the arithmetic average return probably overstates expected future returns over long periods.

b) \textit{Returns are very noisy.} The randomness in stock returns is extreme. With an annual standard deviation of real return of 18%, and 100 years of past data, a single year’s stock return that is only one standard deviation above average increases the average return by 18 basis points. A lucky year that is two standard deviations above average increases the average return by 36 basis points. Even when a century or more of past data is used, forecasts based on historical average returns are likely to change substantially from one year to the next.

c) \textit{Realized returns rise when expected returns fall.} To the extent that expected future equity returns are not constant, but change over time, they can have perverse effects on realized returns. Suppose for example that investors become more risk-tolerant and reduce the future return that they demand from equities. If expected future cash flows are unchanged, this drives up prices and realized returns. Thus an estimate of future returns based on average past realized returns will tend to increase just as expected future returns are declining.

Something like this probably occurred in the late 1990’s. A single good year can have a major effect on historical average returns, and several successive good years have an even larger effect. But it would be a mistake to react to the spectacular returns of 1995–99 by increasing estimates of 21st Century returns.

d) \textit{Unpalatable implications.} Fama and French (2000) point out that average past US stock returns are so high that they exceed estimates of the return to equity (ROE) calculated for US corporations from accounting data. Thus if one uses average past stock returns to estimate the cost of capital, the implication is that US corporate investments have destroyed value; corporations should instead have been paying all their earnings out to stockholders. This conclusion is so hard to believe that it further undermines confidence in the average-return methodology.

One variation of the average-past-returns approach is worth discussing. One might take the view that average past equity returns in other countries provide relevant evidence about US equity returns. Standard international data from Morgan Stanley Capital International, available since the early 1970’s, show that equity returns in most other industrialized countries have been about as high as those in the US. The exceptions are the heavily commodity-dependent markets of Australia and Canada, and the very small Italian market (Campbell 1999). Jorion and Goetzmann (1999) argue that other countries’ returns were

²One crude way to handle this problem is to measure the annualized variance of returns over a period such as 20 years that is long enough for returns to be approximately serially uncorrelated, and then to adjust the geometric average up by one-half the annualized 20-year variance as would be appropriate if returns are lognormally distributed. Campbell and Viceira (2001, Figure 4.2) report an annualized 20-year standard deviation of about 14% in long-term annual US data, which would imply an adjustment of $0.14^2/2 = 0.010$ or 1.0%.
lower than US returns in the early 20th Century, but this conclusion appears to be sensitive
to their omission of the dividend component of return (Dimson, Marsh, and Staunton 2000).
Thus the use of international data does not change the basic message that the equity market
has delivered high average returns in the past.

2. Valuation ratios

An alternative approach is to use valuation ratios—ratios of stock prices to accounting
measures of value such as dividends or earnings—to forecast future returns. In a model
with constant valuation ratios and growth rates, the famous Gordon growth model says that
the dividend-price ratio

\[ \frac{D}{P} = R - G, \]  

where \( R \) is the discount rate or expected equity return, and \( G \) is the growth rate of dividends
(equal to the growth rate of prices when the valuation ratio is constant). This formula can
be applied either to price per share and conventional dividends per share, or to the total
value of the firm and total cash paid out by the firm (including share repurchases). A less
well-known but just as useful formula says that in steady state, where earnings growth comes
from reinvestment of retained earnings which earn an accounting ROE equal to the discount
rate \( R \),

\[ \frac{E}{P} = R. \]  

Over long periods of time summarized by Siegel (1998), these formulas give results con-
sistent with average realized returns. Over the period 1802–1997, for example, the average
dividend-price ratio was 5.4% while the geometric average growth rate of prices was 1.6%.
These numbers add to the geometric average return of 7.0%. Over the period 1871–1997
the average dividend-price ratio was 4.9% while the geometric average growth rate of prices
was 2.1%, again adding to 7.0%. Similarly, Campbell and Shiller (2001) report that the
average P/E ratio for S&P500 shares over the period 1872-2000 was 14.5. The reciprocal of
this is 6.9%, consistent with average realized returns.

When valuation ratios and growth rates change over time, these formulas are no longer
exactly correct. Campbell and Shiller (1988) and Vuolteenaho (2000) derive dynamic ver-
sions of the formulas that can be used in this context. Campbell and Shiller show, for
example, that the log dividend-price ratio is a discounted sum of expected future discount
rates, less a discounted sum of expected future dividend growth rates. In this note I will
work with the simpler deterministic formulas.

II. Current market conditions

Current valuation ratios are wildly different from historical averages, reflecting the un-
precedented bull market of the last 20 years, and particularly the late 1990’s. The attached
figure, taken from Campbell and Shiller (2001), illustrates this point. The bottom left
panel shows the dividend-price ratio \( D/P \) in January of each year from 1872–2000. The
long-term historical average is 4.7%, but \( D/P \) has fallen dramatically since 1982 to about
1.2% in January 2000 (and 1.4% today).
The dividend-price ratio may have fallen in part because of shifts in corporate financial policy. An increased tendency for firms to repurchase shares rather than pay dividends increases the growth rate of dividends per share, by shrinking the number of shares. Thus it increases $G$ in the Gordon growth formula and reduces conventionally measured $D/P$. One way to correct for this is to add repurchases to conventional dividends. Recent estimates of this effect by Liang and Sharpe (1999) suggest that it may be an upward adjustment of 75 to 100 basis points, and more in some years. Of course, this is not nearly sufficient to explain the recent decline in $D/P$.

Alternatively, one can look at the price-earnings ratio. The top left panel of the figure shows $P/E$ over the same period. This has been high in recent years, but there are a number of earlier peaks that are comparable. Close inspection of these peaks shows that they often occur in years such as 1992, 1934, and 1922 when recessions caused temporary drops in (previous-year) earnings. To smooth out this effect, Campbell and Shiller (2001), following Graham and Dodd (1934), advocate averaging earnings over 10 years. The price-averaged earnings ratio is illustrated in the top right panel of the figure. This peaked at 45 in January 2000; the previous peak was 28 in 1929. The decline in the S&P500 since January 2000 has only brought the ratio down to the mid-30’s, still higher than any level seen before the late 1990’s.

The final panel in the figure, on the bottom right, shows the ratio of current to 10-year average earnings. This ratio has been high in recent years, reflecting robust earnings growth during the 1990’s, but it is not unprecedentedly high. The really unusual feature of the recent stock market is the level of prices, not the growth of earnings.

III. Implications for future returns

The implications of current valuations for future returns depend on whether the market has reached a new steady state, in which current valuations will persist, or whether these valuations are the result of some transitory phenomenon.

If current valuations represent a new steady state, then they imply a substantial decline in the equity returns that can be expected in the future. Using Campbell and Shiller’s (2001) data, the unadjusted dividend-price ratio has declined by 3.3 percentage points from the historical average. Even adjusting for share repurchases, the decline is at least 2.3 percentage points. Assuming constant long-term growth of the economy, this would imply that the geometric average return on equity is no longer 7%, but 3.7% or at most 4.7%. Looking at the price-averaged earnings ratio, adjusting for the typical ratio of current to averaged earnings, gives an even lower estimate. Current earnings are normally 1.12 times averaged earnings; $1.12/35 = 0.032$, implying a 3.2% return forecast. These forecasts allow for only a very modest equity premium relative to the yield on long-term inflation-indexed bonds, currently about 3.5%, or the 3% safe real return assumed recently by the Trustees.

If current valuations are transitory, then it matters critically what happens to restore traditional valuation ratios. One possibility is that earnings and dividends are below their long-run trend levels; rapid earnings and dividend growth will restore traditional valuations without any declines in equity returns below historical levels. While this is always a possi-
bility, Campbell and Shiller (2001) show that it would be historically unprecedented. The US stock market has an extremely poor record of predicting future earnings and dividend growth. Historically stock prices have increased relative to earnings during decades of rapid earnings growth, such as the 1920’s, 1960’s, or 1990’s, as if the stock market anticipates that rapid earnings growth will continue in the next decade. However there is no systematic tendency for a profitable decade to be followed by a second profitable decade; the 1920’s, for example, were followed by the 1930’s and the 1960’s by the 1970’s. Thus stock market optimism often fails to be justified by subsequent earnings growth.\(^3\)

A second possibility is that stock prices will decline or stagnate until traditional valuations are restored. This has occurred at various times in the past after periods of unusually high stock prices, notably the 1900’s and 1910’s, the 1930’s, and the 1970’s. This would imply extremely low and perhaps even negative returns during the adjustment period, and then higher returns afterwards.

The unprecedented nature of recent stock market behavior makes it impossible to base forecasts on historical patterns alone. One must also form a view about what happened to drive stock prices up during the 1980’s and particularly the 1990’s. One view is that there has been a structural decline in the equity premium, driven either by the correction of mistaken perceptions of risk (aided perhaps by the work of economists on the equity premium puzzle), or by the reduction of barriers to participation and diversification by small investors.\(^4\) Economists such as McGrattan and Prescott (2001) and Jagannathan, McGrattan, and Scherbina (2001) argue that the structural equity premium is now close to zero, consistent with theoretical models in which investors effectively share risks and have modest risk aversion, and consistent with the view that the US market has reached a new steady state.

An alternative view is that the equity premium has declined only temporarily, either because investors irrationally overreacted to positive fundamental news in the 1990’s (Shiller 2000), or because the strong economy made investors more tolerant of risk.\(^5\) On this view the equity premium will return to historical levels, implying extremely poor near-term returns and higher returns in the more distant future after traditional valuations have been restored.

It is too soon to tell which of these views is correct, and I believe it is sensible to put some weight on each of them. That is, I expect valuation ratios to return part way but not

\(^3\) Vuolteenaho (2000) notes, however, that US corporations were unusually profitable in the late 1990’s and that profitability has some predictive power for future earnings growth.

\(^4\) Heaton and Lucas (1999) model barriers of this sort. It is hard to get large effects of increased participation on stock prices unless initial participation levels are extremely low. Furthermore, one must keep in mind that what matters for pricing is the wealth-weighted participation rate, that is, the probability that a randomly selected dollar of wealth is held by an individual who can participate in the market. This is higher than the equal-weighted participation rate, the probability that a randomly selected individual can participate.

\(^5\) Campbell and Cochrane (1999) present a model in which investors judge their well-being by their consumption relative to a recent average of past aggregate consumption. In this model investors are more risk-tolerant when consumption grows rapidly and they have a “cushion of comfort” relative to their minimum expectations. The Campbell-Cochrane model fits past cyclical variations in the stock market, which will likely continue in the future, but it is hard to explain the extreme recent movements using this model.
fully to traditional levels.⁶ A rough guess for the long term, after the adjustment process is complete, might be a geometric average equity return of 5% to 5.5% or an arithmetic average return of 6.5% to 7%.

If equity returns are indeed lower on average in the future, it is likely that short-term and long-term real interest rates will be somewhat higher. That is, the total return to the corporate capital stock is determined primarily by the production side of the economy and by national saving and international capital flows; the division of total return between riskier and safer assets is determined primarily by investor attitudes towards risk. Reduced risk aversion then reduces the equity premium both by driving down the equity return and by driving up the riskless interest rate. The yield on long-term inflation-indexed Treasury securities (TIPS) is about 3.5%, while short-term real interest rates have recently averaged about 3%. Thus 3% to 3.5% would be a reasonable guess for safe real interest rates in the future, implying a long-run average equity premium of 1.5% to 2.5% in geometric terms or about 3% to 4% in arithmetic terms.

Finally, I note that it is tricky to use these numbers appropriately in policy evaluation. Average equity returns should never be used in base-case calculations without showing alternative calculations to reflect the possibilities that realized returns will be higher or lower than average. These calculations should include an alternative in which equities underperform Treasury bills. Even if the probability of underperformance is small over a long holding period, it cannot be zero or the stock market would be offering an arbitrage opportunity or “free lunch”. Equally important, the bad states of the world in which underperformance occurs are heavily weighted by risk-averse investors. Thus policy evaluation should use a broad range of returns to reflect the uncertainty about long-run stock market performance.

---

⁶This compromise view also implies that negative serial correlation, or mean-reversion, is likely to remain a characteristic of stock returns in the 21st Century.
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