Appendix B

The Research on Analysts’ Long-Term EPS Growth Rate Forecasts

Most of the attention given the accuracy of analysts’ EPS forecasts comes from media coverage of company’s quarterly earnings announcements. When companies’ announced earnings beat Wall Street’s EPS estimates (“a positive surprise”), their stock prices usually go up. When a company’s EPS figure misses or is below Wall Street’s forecasted EPS (“A negative surprise”), their stock price usually declines, sometimes precipitously so. Wall Street’s estimate is the consensus forecast for quarterly EPS made by analysts who follow the stock as of the announcement date. And so Wall Street’s estimate is the consensus EPS made in the days leading up to the EPS announcement.

In recent years, it has become more common for companies to beat Wall Street’s quarterly EPS estimate. A recent Wall Street Journal article summarized the results for the first quarter of 2012: “While this "positive surprise ratio" of 70% is above the 20 year average of 58% and also higher than last quarter's tally, it is just middling since the current bull market began in 2009. In the past decade, the ratio only dipped below 60% during the financial crisis. Look before 2002, though, and 70% would have been literally off the chart. From 1993 through 2001, about half of companies had positive surprises.\(^1\) Figure 1 below provides the record for companies beating Wall Street’s EPS estimate on a quarterly basis over the past twenty years.
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Figure 1
Percent of Companies Beating Wall Street’s Quarterly Estimates

A. RESEARCH ON THE ACCURACY OF ANALYSTS’ NEAR-TERM EPS ESTIMATES

There is a long history of studies that evaluate how well analysts forecast near-term EPS estimates and long-term EPS growth rates. Most of these studies have evaluated the accuracy of earnings forecasts for the current quarter or year. Many of the early studies indicated that analysts make overly optimistic EPS earnings forecasts for quarter-to-quarter EPS (Stickel (1990); Brown (1997); Chopra (1998)).

More recent studies have shown that the optimistic bias tends to be larger for longer-term forecasts and smaller for forecasts made nearer to the EPS announcement date. Richardson, Teoh, and Wysocki (2004) report that the upward bias in earnings growth rates declines in the quarters leading up to the
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earnings announcement date. They call this result the “walk-down to beatable analyst forecasts.” They hypothesize that the walk-down might be driven by the “earning-guidance game,” in which analysts give optimistic forecasts at the start of a fiscal year, then revise their estimates downwards until the firm can beat the forecasts at the earnings announcement date.

However, two regulatory developments over the past decade have potentially impacted analysts’ EPS growth rate estimates. First, Regulation Fair Disclosure (“Reg FD”) was introduced by the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) in October of 2000. Reg FD prohibits private communication between analysts and management so as to level the information playing field in the markets. With Reg FD, analysts are less dependent on gaining access to management to obtain information and therefore, are not as likely to make optimistic forecasts to gain access to management. Second, the conflict of interest within investment firms with investment banking and analyst operations was addressed in the Global Analysts Research Settlements (“GARS”). GARS, as agreed upon on April 23, 2003, between the SEC, NASD, NYSE and ten of the largest U.S. investment firms, includes a number of regulations that were introduced to prevent investment bankers from pressuring analysts to provide favorable projections.

---

The previously cited *Wall Street Journal* article acknowledged the impact of the new regulatory rules in explaining the recent results:4 “What changed? One potential reason is the tightening of rules governing analyst contacts with management. Analysts now must rely on publicly available guidance or, gasp, figure things out by themselves. That puts companies, with an incentive to set the bar low so that earnings are received positively, in the driver's seat. While that makes managers look good short-term, there is no lasting benefit for buy-and-hold investors.”

These comments on the impact of regulatory developments on the accuracy of short-term EPS estimates was addressed in a study by Hovakimian and Saenyasiri (2010).5 The authors investigate analysts’ forecasts of annual earnings for the following time periods: (1) the time prior to Reg FD (1984-2000); (2) the time period after Reg FD but prior to GARS (2000-2002), and (3) the time period after GARS (2002-2006). For the pre-Reg FD period, Hovakimian and Saenyasiri find that analysts generally make overly optimistic forecasts of annual earnings. The forecast bias is higher for early forecasts and steadily declines in the months leading up to the earnings announcement. The results are similar for the time period after Reg FD but prior to GARS. However, the bias is lower in the later forecasts (the forecasts made just prior to the announcement).

---


6 Whereas the GARS settlement was signed in 2003, rules addressing analysts’ conflict of interest by separating the research and investment banking activities of analysts went into effect with the passage of NYSE and NASD rules in July of 2002.
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For the time period after GARS, the average forecasts declined significantly, but a positive bias remains. In sum, Hovakimian and Saenyasiri find that: (1) analysts make overly optimistic short-term forecasts of annual earnings; (2) Reg FD had no effect on this bias; and (3) GARS did result in a significant reduction in the bias, but analysts’ short-term forecasts of annual earnings still have a small positive bias.

B. RESEARCH ON THE ACCURACY OF ANALYSTS’ LONG-TERM EPS GROWTH RATE FORECASTS

There have been very few studies regarding the accuracy of analysts’ long-term EPS growth rate forecasts. Cragg and Malkiel (1968) studied analysts’ long-term EPS growth rate forecasts made in 1962 and 1963 by five brokerage houses for 185 firms. They concluded that analysts’ long-term earnings growth forecasts are on the whole no more accurate than naive forecasts based on past earnings growth. Harris (1999) evaluated the accuracy of analysts’ long-term EPS forecasts over the 1982-1997 time-period using a sample of 7,002 firm-year observations. He concluded the following: (1) the accuracy of analysts’ long-term EPS forecasts is very low; (2) a superior long-run method to forecast long-term EPS growth is to assume that all companies will have an earnings growth rate equal to historic GDP growth; and (3) analysts’ long-term EPS forecasts are significantly upwardly biased, with forecasted earnings growth exceeding actual earnings growth by seven percent per annum. Subsequent studies by DeChow, P., A. Hutton, and R. Sloan (2000), and Chan, Karceski, and Lakonishok (2003) also
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conclude that analysts’ long-term EPS growth rate forecasts are overly optimistic and upwardly biased. The Chan, Karceski, and Lakonishok (2003) study evaluated the accuracy of analysts’ long-term EPS growth rate forecasts over the 1982-98 time period. They reported a median IBES growth forecast of 14.5%, versus a median realized five-year growth rate of about 9%. They also found the IBES forecasts of EPS beyond two years are not accurate. They concluded the following: “Over long horizons, however, there is little forecastability in earnings, and analysts’ estimates tend to be overly optimistic.”

Lacina, Lee, and Xu (2011) evaluated the accuracy of analysts’ long-term earnings growth rate forecasts over the 1983-2003 time period. The study included 27,081 firm year observations, and compared the accuracy of analysts’ EPS forecasts to those produced by two naïve forecasting models: (1) a random walk model (“RW”) where the long-term EPS \((t+5)\) is simply equal to last year’s EPS figure \((t-1)\); (2) a RW model with drift (“RWGDP”), where the drift or growth rate is GDP growth for period \(t-1\). In this model, long-term EPS \((t+5)\) is simply equal to last year’s EPS figure \((t-1)\) times \((1 + \text{GDP growth} \,(t-1))\). The authors conclude that that using the RW model to forecast EPS in the next 3-5 years proved to be just as accurate as using the EPS estimates from analysts’ long-term earnings growth rate forecasts. They find that the RWGDP model performs
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9 M. Lacina, B. Lee and Z. Xu, *Advances in Business and Management Forecasting (Vol. 8)*, Kenneth D. Lawrence, Ronald K. Klimberg (ed.), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.77-101
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better than the pure RW model, and that both models perform as well as analysts
in forecasting long-term EPS. They also discover an optimistic bias in analysts’
long-term EPS forecasts. In the authors’ opinion, these results indicate that
analysts’ long-term earnings growth rate forecasts should be used with caution as
inputs for valuation and cost of capital purposes.

C. ISSUES REGARDING THE SUPERIORITY OF
ANALYSTS' EPS FORECASTS OVER HISTORIC AND
TIME-SERIES ESTIMATES OF LONG-TERM EPS GROWTH

As highlighted by the classic study by Brown and Rozeff (1976) and the
other studies that followed, analysts’ forecasts of quarterly earnings estimates are
superior to the estimates derived from historic and time-series analyses. This is
often attributed to the information and timing advantage that analysts have over
historic and time-series analyses. These studies relate to analysts’ forecasts of
quarterly and/or annual forecasts, and not to long-term EPS growth rate forecasts.
The previously cited studies by Harris (1999), Chan, Karceski, and Lakonishok
(2003), and Lacina, Lee, and Xu (2011) all conclude that analysts’ forecasts are
no better than time-series models and historic growth rates in forecasting long-
term EPS. Harris (1999) and Lacina, Lee, and Xu (2011) concluded that historic
GDP growth was superior to analysts’ forecasts for long run earnings growth.
These overall results are similar to the findings by Bradshaw, Drake, Myers, and
Myers (2009) that discovered that time-series estimates of annual earnings are

more accurate over longer horizons than analysts’ forecasts of earnings. As the authors state, “These findings suggest an incomplete and misleading generalization about the superiority of analysts’ forecasts over even simple time-series-based earnings forecasts.”

D. STUDY OF THE ACCURACY OF ANALYSTS’ LONG-TERM EARNINGS GROWTH RATES

To evaluate the accuracy of analysts’ EPS forecasts, I have compared actual 3-5 year EPS growth rates with forecasted EPS growth rates on a quarterly basis over the past 20 years for all companies covered by the I/B/E/S data base. In Panel A of page 1 of Exhibit JRW-B1, I show the average analysts’ forecasted 3-5 year EPS growth rate with the average actual 3-5 year EPS growth rate for the past twenty years.

The following example shows how the results can be interpreted. For the 3-5 year period prior to the first quarter of 1999, analysts had projected an EPS growth rate of 15.13%, but companies only generated an average annual EPS growth rate over the 3-5 years of 9.37%. This projected EPS growth rate figure represented the average projected growth rate for over 1,510 companies, with an average of 4.88 analysts’ forecasts per company. For the entire twenty-year period of the study, for each quarter there were on average 5.6 analysts’ EPS projections for 1,281 companies. Overall, my findings indicate that forecast errors for long-term estimates are predominantly positive, which indicates an upward bias in growth rate estimates. The mean and median forecast errors over the
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observation period are 143.06% and 75.08%, respectively. The forecasting errors are negative for only eleven of the eighty quarterly time periods: five consecutive quarters starting at the end of 1995 and six consecutive quarters starting in 2006. As shown in Panel A of page 1 of Exhibit JRW-B1, the quarters with negative forecast errors were for the 3-5 year periods following earnings declines associated with the 1991 and 2001 economic recessions in the U.S. Thus, there is evidence of a persistent upward bias in long-term EPS growth forecasts.

The average 3-5 year EPS growth rate projections for all companies provided in the I/B/E/S database on a quarterly basis from 1988 to 2008 are shown in Panel B of page 1 of Exhibit JRW-B1. In this graph, no comparison to actual EPS growth rates is made, and hence, there is no follow-up period. Therefore, since companies are not lost from the sample due to a lack of follow-up EPS data, these results are for a larger sample of firms. The average projected growth rate increased to the 18.0% range in 2006, and have since decreased to about 14.0%.

The upward bias in analysts’ long-term EPS growth rate forecasts appears to be known in the markets. Page 2 of Exhibit JRW-B1 provides an article published in the Wall Street Journal, dated March 21, 2008, that discusses the upward bias in analysts’ EPS growth rate forecasts. In addition, a recent Bloomberg Businessweek article also highlighted the upward bias in analysts’ EPS forecasts, citing a study by
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McKinsey Associates. This article is provided on pages 3 and 4 of Exhibit JRW-B1.

The article concludes with the following:13

The bottom line: Despite reforms intended to improve Wall Street research, stock analysts seem to be promoting an overly rosy view of profit prospects.

E. REGULATORY DEVELOPMENTS AND THE ACCURACY OF ANALYSTS’ LONG-TERM EARNINGS GROWTH RATES FORECASTS

Whereas Hovakimian and Saenyasiri evaluated the impact of regulations on analysts’ short-term EPS estimates, there is little research on the impact of Reg FD and GARS on the long-term EPS forecasts of Wall Street analysts. My study with Patrick Cusatis did find that the long-term EPS growth rate forecasts of analysts did not decline significantly and have continued to be overly-optimistic in the post Reg FD and GARS period.14 Analysts’ long-term EPS growth rate forecasts before and after GARS are about two times the level of historic GDP growth. These observations are supported by a Wall Street Journal article entitled “Analysts Still Coming Up Rosy – Over-Optimism on Growth Rates is Rampant – and the Estimates Help to Buoy the Market’s Valuation.” The following quote provides insight into the continuing bias in analysts’ forecasts:

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,
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13 Roben Farzad, 'For Analysts, Things are Always Looking Up,' Bloomberg Businessweek (June 14, 2010), pp. 39-40.
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.\(^{15}\)

These observations are echoed in a recent McKinsey study entitled “Equity Analysts: Still too Bullish” which involved a study of the accuracy on analysts long-term EPS growth rate forecasts. The authors conclude that after a decade of stricter regulation, analysts’ long-term earnings forecasts continue to be excessively optimistic. They made the following observation (emphasis added):\(^{16}\)

Alas, a recently completed update of our work only reinforces this view—despite a series of rules and regulations, dating to the last decade, that were intended to improve the quality of the analysts’ long-term earnings forecasts, restore investor confidence in them, and prevent conflicts of interest. For executives, many of whom go to great lengths to satisfy Wall Street’s expectations in their financial reporting and long-term strategic moves, this is a cautionary tale worth remembering. This pattern confirms our earlier findings that analysts typically lag behind events in revising their forecasts to reflect new economic conditions. When economic growth accelerates, the size of the forecast error declines; when economic growth slows, it increases. So as economic growth cycles up and down, the actual earnings S&P 500 companies report occasionally coincide with the analysts’ forecasts, as they did, for example, in 1988, from 1994 to 1997, and from 2003 to 2006. Moreover, analysts have been persistently overoptimistic for the past 25 years, with estimates ranging from 10 to 12 percent a year, compared with actual earnings growth of 6 percent. Over this time frame, actual earnings growth surpassed forecasts in only two

instances, both during the earnings recovery following a recession. On average, analysts’ forecasts have been almost 100 percent too high.

F. ANALYSTS’ LONG-TERM EPS GROWTH RATE FORECASTS FOR UTILITY COMPANIES

To evaluate whether analysts’ EPS growth rate forecasts are upwardly biased for utility companies, I conducted a study similar to the one described above using a group of electric utility and gas distribution companies. The results are shown on Panels A and B of page 5 of Exhibit JRW-B1. The projected EPS growth rates for electric utilities have been in the 4% to 6% range over the last twenty years, with the recent figures approximately 5%. As shown, the achieved EPS growth rates have been volatile and on average, below the projected growth rates. Over the entire period, the average quarterly 3-5 year projected and actual EPS growth rates are 4.59% and 2.90%, respectively.

For gas distribution companies, the projected EPS growth rates have declined from about 6% in the 1990s to about 5% in the 2000s. The achieved EPS growth rates have been volatile. Over the entire period, the average quarterly 3-5 year projected and actual EPS growth rates are 5.15% and 4.53%, respectively.

Overall, the upward bias in EPS growth rate projections for electric utility and gas distribution companies is not as pronounced as it is for all companies. Nonetheless, the results here are consistent with the results for companies in general -- analysts’ projected EPS growth rate forecasts are upwardly-biased for utility companies.
G. VALUE LINE’S LONG-TERM EPS GROWTH RATE FORECASTS

To assess Value Line’s earnings growth rate forecasts, I used the Value Line Investment Analyzer. The results are summarized in Panel A of Page 6 of Exhibit JRW-B1. I initially filtered the database and found that Value Line has 3-5 year EPS growth rate forecasts for 2,333 firms. The average projected EPS growth rate was 14.70%. This is high given that the average historical EPS growth rate in the U.S. is about 7%. A major factor seems to be that Value Line only predicts negative EPS growth for 43 companies. This is less than two percent of the companies covered by Value Line. Given the ups and downs of corporate earnings, this is unreasonable.

To put this figure in perspective, I screened the Value Line companies to see what percent of companies covered by Value Line had experienced negative EPS growth rates over the past five years. Value Line reported a five-year historic growth rate for 2,219 companies. The results are shown in Panel B of page 6 of Exhibit JRW-B1 and indicate that the average 5-year historic growth rate was 3.90%, and Value Line reported negative historic growth for 844 firms which represents 38.0% of these companies.

These results indicate that Value Line’s EPS forecasts are excessive and unrealistic. It appears that the analysts at Value Line are similar to their Wall Street brethren in that they are reluctant to forecast negative earnings growth.