

**NEW
REGULATORY
FINANCE**

Roger A. Morin, PhD

**2006
PUBLIC UTILITIES REPORTS, INC.
Vienna, Virginia**

Chapter 6: Alternative Asset Pricing Models

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:

$$K = R_f + \alpha + \beta \times (MRP - \alpha) \quad (6-5)$$

where α 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 α , which must be estimated econometrically from market data. Table 6-2 summarizes¹⁰ 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).

New Regulatory Finance

TABLE 6-2 EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE ON THE ALPHA FACTOR	
Author	Range of alpha
Fischer (1993)	-3.6% to 3.6%
Fischer, Jensen and Scholes (1972)	-9.61% to 12.24%
Fama and McBeth (1972)	4.08% to 9.36%
Fama and French (1992)	10.08% to 13.56%
Litzenberger and Ramaswamy (1979)	5.32% to 8.17%
Litzenberger, Ramaswamy and Sosin (1980)	1.63% to 5.04%
Pettengill, Sundaram and Mathur (1995)	4.6%
Morin (1989)	2.0%

For an alpha in the range of 1%–2% and for reasonable values of the market risk premium and the risk-free rate, Equation 6-5 reduces to the following more pragmatic form:

$$K = R_F + 0.25 (R_M - R_F) + 0.75 \beta(R_M - R_F) \quad (6-6)$$

Over reasonable values of the risk-free rate and the market risk premium, Equation 6-6 produces results that are indistinguishable from the ECAPM of Equation 6-5.¹²

An alpha range of 1%–2% is somewhat lower than that estimated empirically. The use of a lower value for alpha leads to a lower estimate of the cost of capital for low-beta stocks such as regulated utilities. This is because the use of a long-term risk-free rate rather than a short-term risk-free rate already incorporates some of the desired effect of using the ECAPM. That is, the

¹² Typical of the empirical evidence on the validity of the CAPM is a study by Morin (1989) who found that the relationship between the expected return on a security and beta over the period 1926–1984 was given by:

$$\text{Return} = 0.0829 + 0.0520 \beta$$

Given that the risk-free rate over the estimation period was approximately 6% and that the market risk premium was 8% during the period of study, the intercept of the observed relationship between return and beta exceeds the risk-free rate by about 2%, or 1/4 of 8%, and that the slope of the relationship is close to 3/4 of 8%. Therefore, the empirical evidence suggests that the expected return on a security is related to its risk by the following approximation:

$$K = R_F + x(R_M - R_F) + (1 - x)\beta(R_M - R_F)$$

where x is a fraction to be determined empirically. The value of x that best explains the observed relationship $\text{Return} = 0.0829 + 0.0520 \beta$ is between 0.25 and 0.30. If $x = 0.25$, the equation becomes:

$$K = R_F + 0.25(R_M - R_F) + 0.75\beta(R_M - R_F)$$

Chapter 6: Alternative Asset Pricing Models

long-term risk-free rate version of the CAPM has a higher intercept and a flatter slope than the short-term risk-free version which has been tested. Thus, it is reasonable to apply a conservative alpha adjustment. Moreover, the lowering of the tax burden on capital gains and dividend income enacted in 2002 may have decreased the required return for taxable investors, steepening the slope of the ECAPM risk-return trade-off and bring it closer to the CAPM predicted returns.¹³

To illustrate the application of the ECAPM, assume a risk-free rate of 5%, a market risk premium of 7%, and a beta of 0.80. The Empirical CAPM equation (6-6) above yields a cost of equity estimate of 11.0% as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} K &= 5\% + 0.25 (12\% - 5\%) + 0.75 \times 0.80 (12\% - 5\%) \\ &= 5.0\% + 1.8\% + 4.2\% \\ &= 11.0\% \end{aligned}$$

As an alternative to specifying alpha, see Example 6-1.

Some have argued that the use of the ECAPM is inconsistent with the use of adjusted betas, such as those supplied by Value Line and Bloomberg. This is because the reason for using the ECAPM is to allow for the tendency of betas to regress toward the mean value of 1.00 over time, and, since Value Line betas are already adjusted for such trend, an ECAPM analysis results in double-counting. This argument is erroneous. Fundamentally, the ECAPM is not an adjustment, increase or decrease, in beta. This is obvious from the fact that the expected return on high beta securities is actually lower than that produced by the CAPM estimate. The ECAPM is a formal recognition that the observed risk-return tradeoff is flatter than predicted by the CAPM based on myriad empirical evidence. The ECAPM and the use of adjusted betas comprised two separate features of asset pricing. Even if a company's beta is estimated accurately, the CAPM still understates the return for low-beta stocks. Even if the ECAPM is used, the return for low-beta securities is understated if the betas are understated. Referring back to Figure 6-1, the ECAPM is a return (vertical axis) adjustment and not a beta (horizontal axis) adjustment. Both adjustments are necessary. Moreover, recall from Chapter 3 that the use of adjusted betas compensates for interest rate sensitivity of utility stocks not captured by unadjusted betas.

¹³ The lowering of the tax burden on capital gains and dividend income has no impact as far as non-taxable institutional investors (pension funds, 401K, and mutual funds) are concerned, and such investors engage in very large amounts of trading on security markets. It is quite plausible that taxable retail investors are relatively inactive traders and that large non-taxable investors have a substantial influence on capital markets.