

NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

STOCK PRICES, EARNINGS
AND EXPECTED DIVIDENDS

John Y. Campbell

Robert J. Shiller

Working Paper No. 2511

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
February 1988

An earlier version of this paper was presented at a joint session of the American Economic Association and the American Finance Association, Chicago, IL, on December 28, 1987. This research was supported by the National Science Foundation. The research reported here is part of the NBER's research program in Financial Markets and Monetary Economics. Any opinions expressed are those of the authors and not those of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

Stock Prices, Earnings and Expected Dividends

ABSTRACT

This paper presents estimates indicating that, for aggregate U.S. stock market data 1871-1986, a long historical average of real earnings is a good predictor of the present value of future real dividends. This is true even when the information contained in stock prices is taken into account. We estimate that for each year the optimal forecast of the present value of future real dividends is roughly a weighted average of moving average earnings and current real price, with between $2/3$ and $3/4$ of the weight on the earnings measure. This means that simple present value models of stock prices can be strongly rejected.

We use a vector autoregressive approach which enables us to compute the implications of this for the behavior of stock prices and returns. We estimate that log dividend-price ratios are more variable than, and virtually uncorrelated with, their theoretical counterparts given the present value models. Annual returns on stocks are quite highly correlated with their theoretical counterparts, but are two to four times as variable.

Our approach also reveals the connection between recent papers showing forecastability of long-horizon returns on corporate stocks, and earlier literature claiming that stock prices are too volatile to be accounted for in terms of simple present value models. We show that excess volatility directly implies the forecastability of long-horizon returns.

JEL No. 313. Keywords: stock market, dividends, earnings, present value model, vector autoregression, long-horizon returns.

John Y. Campbell
Woodrow Wilson School
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544
(609)-452-4787

Robert J. Shiller
Cowles Foundation
Box 2125 Yale Station
New Haven, CT 06520
(203)-432-3708

1. Introduction

In this paper we present estimates indicating that data on accounting earnings, when averaged over many years, help to predict the present value of future dividends. This result holds even when stock prices themselves are taken into account. The data are the real Standard and Poor Composite Index and associated dividend and earnings series 1871-1987. Our estimates indicate to what extent dividend-price ratios and returns on this index behave in accordance with simple present value models, and allow us to shed new light on earlier claims that stock prices are too volatile to accord with such models (LeRoy and Porter 1981, Shiller 1981, Mankiw, Romer, and Shapiro 1985, Campbell and Shiller 1987a, 1987b, and West 1988).

It seems appropriate to consider earnings data for forecasting dividends, since earnings are constructed by accountants with the objective of helping people to evaluate the fundamental worth of a company. However the precise economic meaning of earnings data is not clearly defined; accounting definitions are complicated and change through time in ways that are not readily documented. Because of this, many studies of financial time series have avoided the use of earnings data and have thus omitted relevant information about fundamental value from the analysis¹.

¹ There is a large accounting literature on the response of securities prices to earnings announcements; see Kormendi and Lipe (1987) for a list of references. However with a few exceptions, notably Kormendi and Lipe, this literature does not ask whether the response is consistent with a particular fundamental valuation model for the security price.

Our approach is to introduce earnings, measured either annually or as an average over a number of years, as an information variable in a vector autoregressive (VAR) framework. Any errors in measurement in earnings are accounted for automatically by the estimation procedure, which allows earnings to enter the model only insofar as they are useful in forecasting. The VAR framework, developed originally in Campbell and Shiller (1987a, 1987b), enables us to answer two questions. First, what component of stock returns can be predicted given the information used in the VAR system? Secondly, what component of stock returns can be accounted for ex post by news about future dividends? The existing literature addresses the first question, but the second question is also important for evaluating present value models. As Shiller (1984) and Summers (1984) have shown, it is possible to construct a model in which only a small fraction of 1-period stock returns is predictable, but in which news about fundamental value accounts for only a small part of the variability of ex post returns.

Our approach reveals that stock returns and dividend-price ratios are too volatile to be accounted for by news about future dividends. Further, this excess volatility is closely related to the predictability of multi-period returns. It has recently been shown that stock returns are more highly predictable when they are measured over intervals of several years, rather than over short intervals of a year or less. Fama and French (1987a, 1987b) have made this point most forcefully, although the result can also be found in Flood, Hodrick and Kaplan (1986), and Poterba and Summers (1987). (See also DeBondt and Thaler 1985). These papers found that 20% or 30% of the variance of 4- or 5-year stock

returns can be explained by variables such as lagged multi-year stock returns or dividend-price ratios. The explained variances are higher when dividend-price ratios are used than when lagged returns are used.

It may be helpful, by way of motivation, to give at the outset a simple story indicating why excess volatility is fundamentally related to this forecastability of multi-period returns. Let us consider the simplest argument for excess volatility given in the original LeRoy and Porter (1981) and Shiller (1981) papers. It was argued in those papers that if, as the present value model asserts, price P_t is the expectation of P_t^* , the present value of actual future dividends, then the data must satisfy the variance inequality: $\text{var}(P_t^*) \geq \text{var}(P_t)$. The proof that the model implies this variance inequality was as follows. Since P_t is known at time t , we may write $P_t^* = P_t + u_t$, where u_t is a forecast error. A forecast error must be uncorrelated with the corresponding forecast, so u_t must be uncorrelated with P_t . Therefore $\text{var}(P_t^*) = \text{var}(P_t) + \text{var}(u_t)$. Since variances cannot be negative, the variance inequality follows. This argument can be reversed to show that if the variance inequality is violated in U.S. data, then it must be that $P_t^* - P_t$ is forecastable. We will show below that $P_t^* - P_t$ may itself be considered a sort of infinite-period return. Hence, excess volatility directly implies forecastability of infinite-period returns.

While the above simple story is illustrative of the nature of our argument, we will restate it below in terms of dividend-price ratios to allow for nonstationary dividends and prices, we will avoid any comparisons of P_t and P_t^* estimated with a terminal condition, we will take account of earnings data, and we will allow for a simple form of

time-variation in the real discount rate on stock. These advances are made possible by our use of the VAR framework discussed above. In our earlier work using this framework (Campbell and Shiller 1987b), we found that our rejection of the hypothesis that one-period returns are unforecastable was much less strong than our rejection of the hypothesis that the dividend-price ratio equals the theoretical dividend-price ratio given the present value model. We will see that this is essentially the same result as noted by Fama and French and others that the one-period return is much less forecastable than the multiperiod return. The limit of their excess return regression, where returns are computed over an infinite period of time, is essentially our test that the stock price equals the expected present value of future dividends. Thus we argue that excess volatility and predictability of multi-period returns are not two phenomena, but one.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In section 2 we discuss our data and show that dividend-price and earnings-price ratios predict stock returns measured over several years. We also present an approximation to the continuously compounded stock return, which we need to use in our VAR analysis. We show that predictability of approximate returns is close to that of exact returns. In section 3 we explain our VAR methodology and relate it to research on multi-period returns. In section 4 we present basic VAR results, and in section 5 we use them to compare the historical behavior of stock prices and returns with the behavior implied by the present value model. Section 6 checks the robustness of our results to changes in specification. Section 7 concludes, and there is a brief Appendix describing our data sources.

2. Predicting Stock Returns Using Prices, Dividends and Earnings

The data set used in this paper consists of annual observations on prices, dividends and earnings for the Standard and Poors Composite Stock Price Index, extended back to 1871 by using the data in Cowles (1939). The series on prices and dividends are also used in Campbell and Shiller (1987a, 1987b), and in much of the literature on volatility tests. Campbell and Shiller (1987b) show that the properties of the post-1926 data are very similar to those of the CRSP series on the value-weighted New York Stock Exchange Index, while Wilson and Jones (1987) have carefully analyzed the pre-1926 data. We deflate nominal series using a January Producer Price Index (annual average before 1900). More details on the data are given in the Appendix to the paper.

We write the real price of the stock index, measured in January of year t , as P_t . The real dividend paid on the index during period t is written D_t . The realized log gross return on the portfolio, held from the beginning of year t to the beginning of year $t+1$, is $h_{1t} = \log((P_{t+1}+D_t)/P_t) = \log(P_{t+1}+D_t) - \log(P_t)$. The realized log gross return over i years, from the beginning of year t to the beginning of year $t+i$, is

$$h_{it} = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} h_{1,t+j}. \quad (1)$$

We also wish to study excess returns on common stock over short debt. The short term interest rate we use is the annual return on 4-6 month prime commercial paper, rolled over in January and July. If we write the realized log real return on commercial paper in year t as r_t , and

aggregate to a multi-period return r_{it} in the manner of equation (1), then the excess return on stock over i periods is $h_{it} - r_{it}$. Working with excess returns has the advantage that price deflators cancel so that results are not contaminated by measurement error in the deflators.

We begin our empirical work by regressing real and excess stock returns on some explanatory variables which are known in advance (at the start of year t). For real returns, we consider the following variables²: the log dividend-price ratio, $\delta_t = d_{t-1} - p_t$ (the dividend is lagged one year to ensure that it is known at the start of year t); the lagged dividend growth rate, Δd_{t-1} ; the log earnings-price ratio $\epsilon_t = e_{t-1} - p_t$; and two log earnings-price ratios based on moving averages of earnings. The latter two are a 10-year moving average of log real earnings minus current current log real price, $\epsilon_t^{10} = ((e_{t-1} + \dots + e_{t-10})/10) - p_t$, and a 30-year moving average of log real earnings minus current log real price, $\epsilon_t^{30} = ((e_{t-1} + \dots + e_{t-30})/30) - p_t$.

The ratio variables are used here with the same motivation that we see in the financial press, as indicators of fundamental value relative to price. The notion is that if stocks are underpriced relative to fundamental value returns tend to be high subsequently, conversely if stocks are overpriced. A moving average of earnings is used because yearly earnings are quite noisy as measures of fundamental value; they could even be negative while fundamental value cannot be negative. The use of an average of earnings in computing the earnings-price ratio has a long history. Graham and Dodd (1934) recommended an approach that

²In this paper lower-case letters indicate natural logs of the corresponding upper-case letters.

"shifts the original point of departure, or basis of computation, from the current earnings to the average earnings, which should cover a period of not less than five years, and preferably seven to ten years."

(Security Analysis, page 452). We push their averaging scheme even further, to 30 years, in recognition of the substantial decadal variability of earnings, under the supposition that fundamental value may be less variable than this decadal variability.

We regress real stock returns on each of these variables individually, and also on the combination $(\delta_t, \Delta d_{t-1}, \epsilon_t^{30})$. For excess stock returns, the procedure is similar except that we use the excess of dividend growth over the commercial paper rate, $\Delta d_{t-1} - r_{t-1}$, in place of the real dividend growth rate.

Table 1 presents regression results for the period 1871-1987 (truncated where necessary at the end of the sample to allow computation of multi-period returns, and at the beginning of the sample to allow computation of ϵ_t^{10} and ϵ_t^{30}). Returns are measured over 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 and 10 years. Panel A gives results for real returns, and panel B gives results for excess returns. For each regression the table reports the R^2 statistic, and in parentheses the significance level for a Wald test of the hypothesis that all coefficients (other than a constant) are zero. The Wald test corrects for the moving average structure of the equation errors when the dependent variable is a multi-period return, but it does not correct for heteroskedasticity³.

³ As in our previous paper (Campbell and Shiller 1987b), the results are hardly changed by using White's (1984) heteroskedasticity correction for standard errors.

The table shows that several of the variables in our list have a striking ability to predict returns on the Standard and Poors Index. This is true whether returns are measured in real terms or as an excess over commercial paper rates. The variables with predictive power are those which include the stock price itself: the log dividend-price ratio δ_t , and the three earnings-price ratios ϵ_t , ϵ_t^{10} and ϵ_t^{30} . The forecasting power of these variables is statistically significant at conventional levels for one-period returns, but the fraction of variance explained is modest at this horizon: 3.9% of the variance of one-year real returns is explained by the log dividend-price ratio, for example. As the number of years used to compute the return increases, however, the fraction of variance explained also increases, and the constant expected return model is rejected more strongly. The log dividend-price ratio explains 26.6% of the variance of 10-year real returns, for example, and the 30-year moving-average earnings-price ratio explains 54.6% of this variance. These results confirm and extend the findings of Fama and French (1987b) for a longer data set, and establish that a very high proportion of multiperiod returns are forecastable using a long moving average of earnings⁴.

The lagged rate of dividend growth, by contrast, does not predict stock returns at any horizon. This is true whether we deflate it with a

⁴ When we use the Fama-French sample period, 1927-86, we find that the dividend-price ratio explains 21.9% of the variance of exact 4-year real returns (4 years was the longest horizon they reported). This roughly confirms their estimated R^2 of 29%. The 30-year average of earnings does slightly worse than the dividend-price ratio over this sample period and return horizon, explaining 21.4% of the variance of returns. When we extend the horizon to 10 years, however, the 30-year earnings average explains 45.5% and the dividend-price ratio only 24.8% of the variance of returns.

price index or using the commercial paper rate. Also the system of three variables does not achieve an R^2 statistic which is much greater than that for ϵ_t^{30} alone.

In what follows, we will be concerned with the relationship between the realized log 1-period return h_{1t} , the dividend growth rate Δd_t and the log dividend-price ratio δ_t . The exact relationship between these variables is nonlinear. It takes the form:

$$h_{1t} = \log(\exp(\Delta d_t + \delta_t - \delta_{t+1}) + \exp(\delta_t + \Delta d_t)). \quad (2)$$

However this equation can be linearized by a first-order Taylor expansion around the point $\Delta d_t = g$ and $\delta_t = \delta_{t+1} = \delta$. We argued in Campbell and Shiller 1987b that both real dividend growth and the log dividend-price ratio follow stationary stochastic processes, so that they have fixed means which can be used as the expansion points g and δ . We will also define the interest rate implicit in the chosen g and δ , as $r = g + \ln(1 + \exp(\delta))$. We obtain

$$h_{1t} \approx \xi_{1t} \quad (3)$$

$$\xi_{1t} = \delta_t - \rho \delta_{t+1} + \Delta d_t + k = (1 - \rho)d_t + \rho p_{t+1} - p_t + k,$$

where $\rho = 1/(1 + \exp(\delta)) = \exp(-(r - g))$, and $k = \log(1 + \exp(\delta)) - \delta \exp(\delta)/(1 + \exp(\delta))$.

Equation (3) says that the log 1-period return on the stock portfolio, h_{1t} , can be approximated by a variable ξ_{1t} which is linear in the log dividend-price ratios δ_t and δ_{t+1} and the dividend growth rate Δd_t . The

approximation in (3) replaces $\log(P_{t+1}+D_t)$ with $\rho\log(P_{t+1})+(1-\rho)\log(D_t)$, where ρ is a parameter related to the mean ratio of prices to dividends.

We now define a multiperiod extension of (3). For the purpose of showing the relation between the excess volatility literature and the multi-period return forecasting literature, it is helpful to define this slightly differently than would be natural given (1). We define the discounted i -period return ξ_{it} as:

$$\xi_{it} = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \rho^j \xi_{1,t+j}. \quad (4)$$

The variable ξ_{it} is the discounted sum of approximate returns from t to $t+i-1$. It has the convenient property that it depends only on δ_t , δ_{t+1} , and dividend growth rates from t to $t+i$; log dividend-price ratios for times between t and $t+i$ do not appear. While the summation in (1) approaches infinity as i increases, the summation in (4) instead approaches (under the assumption that δ_t and Δd_{t-1} are jointly stationary) a well-defined limit, a stationary stochastic process. We can thus speak of an infinite-period log return, which we will see below is related to the log dividend-price ratio; this is why use of the definition (4) ties the multi-period return literature to our own earlier study of the behavior of the dividend-price ratio.

One interpretation of the discounted i -period return ξ_{it} is that it is (up to a constant term that depends on i) a linearization of an exact i -period log return H_{it} where dividends paid are reinvested not in the

stock itself but in an instrument that pays a fixed real return⁵. H_{it} can be written in terms of the log dividend-price ratio and log dividend growth rates:

$$H_{it} = \ln(\exp(\delta_t - \delta_{t+i} + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \Delta d_{t+j}) + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \exp(\delta_t + \sum_{k=0}^j \Delta d_{t+k} + r(i-j-1)))$$

The first term inside the curly brackets is the price relative P_{t+i}/P_t . The subsequent terms give the terminal value of total dividends received between t and $t+i-1$ divided by P_t . Note that since reinvestments are not made in the stock, dividend-price ratios between t and $t+i$ do not enter the expression, as also with (4). Let us linearize the above expression around $\delta_t = \delta$ and $\Delta d_{t+j} = g$, for all j . This gives us the discounted i -period return ξ_{it} defined in equation (4), plus a constant that increases with i .

Naturally equations (3) and (4) do not give actual log returns exactly; since they were derived from a linearization there is some approximation error. In Campbell and Shiller (1987b), we presented considerable evidence that in practice the error is quite small for one-period returns. Here we supplement that analysis by repeating the regressions of Table 1 using discounted multi-period returns ξ_{it} rather than exact returns h_{it} . We treat the parameter ρ as fixed, and set it equal to 0.936 following Campbell and Shiller (1987b)⁶.

⁵ We assume this reinvestment rate of return is equal to the rate of return r implicit in the ρ used in the linearization, that is, $r = g - \ln(\rho)$.

⁶ In that paper we showed that varying ρ in a plausible range did not greatly affect our conclusions. Here too, when we set $\rho = 1$ in equation (4) (but retain $\rho = 0.936$ in equation (3)), so that ξ_{it} becomes the simple sum which approximates h_{it} , we obtain very similar results to

The results are given in Table 2. They are generally similar to those in Table 1; while there is a slightly greater tendency to reject the constant-expected return model in Table 2 (indicating that the approximation error is correlated with the explanatory variables), the difference is relatively minor. This confirms that we can speak of our definition of multiperiod returns (4) as roughly interchangeable, for present purposes, with the definition (1) used by Fama and French (1987a, 1987b) and others.

those reported.

3. A Vector Autoregressive Approach

In the previous section we derived an approximation to the log return on stock which is linear in log dividend-price ratios and dividend growth rates. We now exploit this linearity in analyzing stock price movements.

First, we write the discounted i -period log return as an explicit linear function of δ_t , δ_{t+i} and Δd_{t+j} , $j=0, \dots, i-1$. From equations (3) and (4) we have:

$$\xi_{it} = \delta_t - \rho^i \delta_{t+i} + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \rho^j \Delta d_{t+j} + k(1-\rho^i)/(1-\rho). \quad (5)$$

Equation (5) shows that the discounted i -period return is higher, the higher is the dividend-price ratio when the investment is initiated, the lower is the dividend-price ratio when the investment is terminated, and the higher is dividend growth between those two dates⁷.

We can also use this equation to see the relationship between multi-period returns and the literature on price volatility. If we take the limit of (5) as i increases, assuming that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \rho^i E_t \delta_{t+i} = 0$ (which follows from the stationarity of δ_t), we find that we have

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \xi_{it} = (1-\rho) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho^j d_{t+j} - p_t + k/(1-\rho).$$

⁷ Note that as i grows larger, less weight is given in (5) to the terminal dividend-price ratio δ_{t+i} , and hence to the terminal price. One might wonder why the terminal price is downweighted in an approximate expression for log total return over t to $t+i$. The reason is that as i is increased the component of total return due to reinvestment of intervening dividends at the fixed rate grows larger, causing the slope of the log function at the point of linearization to approach zero as i is increased.

The first term on the right hand side of this expression is the present discounted value of log dividends, which is a log-linearization of P_t^* , while the second term is the log of P_t . Thus, as noted in the introduction, the infinite-period discounted log return is a log-linearization of the variable $P_t^* - P_t$ which is the subject of the volatility literature. Moreover, for finite i ξ_{it} is a log-linear representation of $P_t^* - P_t$ where P_t^* is computed under the assumption that the present value in period $t+i$ of dividends from $t+i$ onwards equals P_{t+i} . This assumption was used in the volatility literature to obtain an estimate of P_t^* with a finite record of dividends.

Equation (5) makes it easy to compute the implications of a returns model for the dividend-price ratio. For example, suppose our model is that expected real 1-period stock returns are constant: $E_t \xi_{1t} = r$. Then $E_t \xi_{it} = r(1-\rho^i)/(1-\rho)$. Taking conditional expectations of the left and right hand sides of (5) and rearranging, we have

$$\delta_t = - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \rho^j E_t \Delta d_{t+j} + \rho^i E_t \delta_{t+i} + (r-k)(1-\rho^i)/(1-\rho). \quad (6)$$

This equation says that the log dividend-price ratio at time t is determined by expectations of future real dividend growth over i periods, by the i -period-ahead expected dividend-price ratio, and by the constant required return on stock. If we take the limit as i increases, assuming as before that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \rho^i E_t \delta_{t+i} = 0$, we obtain

$$\delta_t = - \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho^j E_t \Delta d_{t+j} + (r-k)/(1-\rho) \quad (7)$$

Equation (7) expresses the log dividend-price ratio as a linear function of expected real dividend growth into the infinite future.

A similar approach can be used when our returns model is that expected excess returns on stock, over some alternative asset with return r_t , are constant: $E_t \xi_{1t} = E_t r_t$. In our empirical work, we take r_t to be the real return on commercial paper. For this model we have

$$\delta_t = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \rho^j E_t [r_{t+j} - \Delta d_{t+j}] + \rho^i E_t \delta_{t+i} - k(1-\rho^i)/(1-\rho), \quad (6)'$$

and taking the limit as i increases,

$$\delta_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho^j E_t [r_{t+j} - \Delta d_{t+j}] - k/(1-\rho). \quad (7)'$$

This relation is what Campbell and Shiller (1987b) call the "dividend-ratio model". It may also be described as a dynamic Gordon model, after the simple growth model proposed by Myron Gordon (1962), which makes the dividend-price ratio equal the interest rate minus the growth rate of dividends. The original Gordon model did not specify how the dividend-price ratio should change through time if interest rates or growth rates change through time: equation (7)' says that the dividend-price ratio is related to a present value of expected one-period interest rates and dividend growth rates.

The linearity of these relationships makes it possible to test them as restrictions on a vector autoregression. This procedure has several

advantages over the straightforward multi-period regression approach discussed in the previous section. First, one need only estimate the VAR once: then one can conduct Wald tests of (6) or (6)' for any i , without reestimating the system. Secondly, as i increases the regression approach forces one to shorten the sample period. This becomes quite serious when returns are calculated over 5 or 10 years. The VAR, by contrast, can be estimated over the whole sample. Thirdly, the VAR can be used to test the restrictions (7) or (7)', which are the limits of (6) and (6)' as i increases. This is important because (7) and (7)' directly state the implications of the returns model for the dividend-price ratio. Finally, the VAR approach enables us to characterize the historical behavior of the dividend-price ratio in relation to an unrestricted econometric forecast of future dividends and discount rates. It is important to note that if the present value model is correct, then this unrestricted forecast, which we call δ'_t , should equal the log dividend-price ratio δ_t no matter how much information market participants have. The reason for this is that δ_t , which is included in the VAR system, is a sufficient statistic for market participants' information about the present value of future dividends.

A detailed account of the VAR framework is given in Campbell and Shiller (1987a, 1987b). Here we briefly summarize it for the constant-expected returns case. Consider estimating a VAR for the variables δ_{t+1} , Δd_t and ϵ_{t+1}^{30} . The last variable, a moving-average earnings-price ratio, is included only as a potential predictor of stock returns. If the VAR has only one lag, then the system estimated is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \delta_{t+1} \\ \Delta d_t \\ \epsilon_{t+1}^{30} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta_t \\ \Delta d_{t-1} \\ \epsilon_t^{30} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} u_{1t} \\ u_{2t} \\ u_{3t} \end{bmatrix} \quad (8)$$

where the variables in the vector are demeaned. This can be written more compactly, in matrix form, as $z_{t+1} = Az_t + v_{t+1}$.

Now a first-order vector autoregression has the desirable property that to forecast the variables ahead k periods, given the history $H_t = (z_t, z_{t-1}, \dots)$, one just multiplies z_t by the k 'th power of the matrix A :

$$E[z_{t+k} | H_t] = A^k z_t \quad (9)$$

This makes it easy to translate equations (6) and (7) into restrictions on the VAR. First, define vectors $e_1 = [1 \ 0 \ 0]'$, so that $e_1' z_t = \delta_t$, and $e_2 = [0 \ 1 \ 0]'$, so that $e_2' z_t = \Delta d_{t-1}$. Next, take the expectation of equation (6), conditional on H_t :

$$\delta_t = - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \rho^j E[\Delta d_{t+j} | H_t] + \rho^i E[\delta_{t+i} | H_t] + (r-k)(1-\rho^i)/(1-\rho). \quad (6)''$$

The left hand side is unaffected, because δ_t is in the information set H_t , and the right hand side becomes an expectation conditional on H_t .

Finally, apply the multi-period forecasting formula (9):

$$e_1' z_t = - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \rho^j A^{j+1} e_2' z_t + \rho^i A^i e_1' z_t + (r-k)(1-\rho^i)/(1-\rho). \quad (10)$$

If (10) is to hold for arbitrary z_t , we must have

$$e1'(I-\rho^i A^i) = -e2'A(I-\rho A)^{-1}(I-\rho^i A^i). \quad (11)$$

These are complicated nonlinear restrictions on the coefficient matrix A , but they do simplify in two special cases, which are emphasized in Campbell and Shiller (1987b). First, if $i=1$ then we have a set of linear restrictions that 1-period returns are unpredictable: $e1'(I-\rho A) = -e2'A$. In terms of the individual coefficients, the restrictions are $a_{21} = \rho a_{11} - 1$, $a_{22} = \rho a_{12}$ and $a_{23} = \rho a_{13}$. The coefficients in the equation for the earnings-price ratio, a_{31} , a_{32} , and a_{33} , are unrestricted. Secondly, if $i=\infty$ then we have a set of nonlinear but simple restrictions that the log dividend-price ratio δ_t equals the unrestricted VAR forecast of real dividend growth into the infinite future, which we will call δ'_t . The restrictions are $\delta_t = e1'z_t = -e2'A(I-\rho A)^{-1}z_t = \delta'_t$, which requires that $e1' = -e2'A(I-\rho A)^{-1}$. We will compare the historical behavior of δ'_t , the VAR forecast of future real dividend growth, with that of the log dividend-price ratio δ_t .

Of course, the restrictions for all i are algebraically equivalent. If $e1'(I-\rho A) = -e2'A$, then one can postmultiply by $(I-\rho^i A^i)$ for any i to get the i -period restriction. The reverse is also possible since stationarity of the VAR guarantees nonsingularity of $(I-\rho^i A^i)$. This algebraic equivalence reflects the fact that if 1-period returns are completely unpredictable, then i -period returns must also be; and vice versa. Nevertheless, Wald tests on the VAR may yield different results

depending on which value of i is chosen, just as regression tests did in Tables 1 and 2.

The VAR approach can easily be modified to handle different specifications. To test the model in which expected excess returns are constant, one simply replaces Δd_t with $\Delta d_t - r_t$ and proceeds as before. To handle higher-order VAR behavior, one estimates the higher-order system and then stacks it into first-order "companion" form as discussed by Sargent (1979) and Campbell and Shiller (1987a, 1987b). When z_t , A , e_1 and e_2 are suitably redefined, the restriction (11) remains correct.

4. Results of the VAR Procedure

In Table 3 we apply the VAR method to our data on stock prices, dividends and earnings over the period 1871-1987. The sample period is truncated at the beginning to allow for construction of a 30-year moving average of earnings, but it need not be truncated at the end even though we will test for unpredictability of multi-period returns. We estimate first-order VAR's, using real dividend growth in panel A (to test the constant expected real return model), and the excess of dividend growth over the commercial paper rate in panel B (to test the constant expected excess return model). We devote most of our attention to the results in panel A, discussing the panel B results briefly in section 6.

The VAR coefficients, a_{ij} for $i, j = 1, 2, 3$, are reported at the top of the table. Below each coefficient is an asymptotic standard error in parentheses. The coefficients in the second row (the dividend growth equation) are perhaps of special interest; they show that the dividend-price ratio has strong forecasting power for dividend growth, and the earnings-price ratio ϵ_t^{30} is also highly significant. These results suggest that some improvement is possible in the dividend growth equation proposed by Marsh and Merton (1986, 1987), which does not use the long average of earnings variable.

The hypothesis that expected real returns on stock are constant restricts the coefficients in the first two rows, the equations for the dividend-price ratio and real dividend growth respectively. We should have $a_{21} = \rho a_{11} - 1$, $a_{22} = \rho a_{12}$ and $a_{23} = \rho a_{13}$. As before, we fix the parameter ρ at 0.936.

These restrictions do not hold exactly, and the differences

$a_{21} - \rho a_{11} + 1$, $a_{22} - \rho a_{12}$ and $a_{23} - \rho a_{13}$ are the coefficients obtained in a regression of ξ_{1t} on the VAR explanatory variables. Coefficients from such a regression are reported in Table 3 below the VAR results. (This regression was also used in Table 2, panel A, bottom left entry).

Wald tests of the model restriction (11), for $i = 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10$ and ∞ , are reported next in Table 3. The test statistic for $i=1$ is numerically identical to the statistic obtained from the regression of ξ_{1t} on the VAR explanatory variables; its significance level of 0.047 is therefore identical to the one reported in Table 2, panel A, bottom left entry. When $i > 1$, the exact equivalence of the regression test and the VAR test is broken, but the general nature of the results is the same. The VAR tests, like the multi-period regression tests, reject more and more strongly as the return horizon increases. In the limit, at $i = \infty$, the null hypothesis is that the log dividend-price ratio δ_t equals the unrestricted VAR forecast of the present value of future real dividend growth δ'_t . This hypothesis can be rejected at better than the 0.1% level.

5. Comparison of Historical and Theoretical Stock Prices and Returns

In this section we use the VAR estimates in Table 3 to compare actual stock prices and returns with their theoretical counterparts. We find that with the constant expected real return model, the log dividend-price ratio δ_t has only a weak relation to its theoretical counterpart δ'_t , a result that strongly contradicts the model. The variables δ'_t and δ_t have a correlation of only 0.131 (this estimate has a standard error of 0.162), and δ'_t is less variable than δ_t , see the bottom of Table 3, Panel A. Its standard deviation is 0.638 times that of δ_t , with a small standard error of 0.074. This would suggest that the dividend-price ratio is unrelated to the theoretical value implied by the constant expected real return model. However, a plot of δ_t and δ'_t (Figure 1) shows a suggestion of short-run coherence, even though the overall correlation between the two is virtually zero. Our VAR results also indicate that the dividend-price ratio helps to forecast short-run dividend changes.

One-period returns ξ_{1t} are about four times as variable as they should be given the model. To see this, we computed a variable $\xi'_{1t} = \delta'_t - \rho\delta'_{t+1} + \Delta d_t$. This is our estimate of what the 1-year return on stock would be, if the constant expected real return model held so that δ_t equalled δ'_t . Note that ξ_{1t} should equal ξ'_{1t} even if the market has superior information not available to econometricians. We find that ξ'_{1t} has a standard deviation only 0.277 as large as that of ξ_{1t} . This appears to be a strong result, as the standard error on this ratio of standard deviations is only 0.069. This result is good evidence that returns on stocks are far too volatile to accord with the constant expected real

return present value model, confirming the earlier claims of the volatility literature.

Although returns seem to be too volatile, we do estimate a remarkably high correlation coefficient between actual returns ξ_{1t} and their theoretical counterparts ξ'_{1t} , equal to 0.908. Returns may be too volatile, but they appear to be on-track in the sense that they correlate very well with their theoretical values.

This result is due to the same feature of the data which gives the short-run coherence between δ_t and δ'_t observed in Figure 1. It is easy to see where the result comes from if we use the derived equation defining δ'_t , as shown in Table 3, Panel A. This equation defines δ'_t as $\delta'_t = 1.022\delta_t - .090\Delta d_{t-1} - .761\epsilon_t^{30}$. Let us define p'_t as the theoretical log real price implied by the model, $p'_t = d_{t-1} - \delta'_t$. The present value model implies that p'_t should equal p_t , even if economic agents have superior information not observed by econometricians. By contrast, our estimates imply that $p'_t = 0.761\epsilon_t^{30} + 0.261p_t + 0.068d_{t-1} - 0.090d_{t-2}$, where ϵ_t^{30} is the 30-year moving average of log real earnings. This shows that p'_t is essentially 3/4 times the long moving average of real log earnings plus 1/4 times the current price. It is a weighted average of the moving average of log real earnings and of log real price with most of the weight on the moving average.

A plot of p_t and p'_t over the period 1901-1986 is shown in Figure 2. The variable p'_t is strikingly smoother than p_t and at the same time shows short-run movements that are highly correlated with it. This is as we would expect: the long moving average of real earnings is very smooth, since long moving averages smooth out the series averaged. Hence, most

of the short-run fluctuations in p_t are seen, in an attenuated form, in p'_t . Since returns ξ_{1t} and ξ'_{1t} are essentially changes in p_t , their behavior is dominated by the short-run movements in the series so that they are highly correlated with each other. Dividend-price ratios δ_t and δ'_t , on the other hand, are determined by the levels of p_t and p'_t and are not very correlated.

6. How Robust Are the Results to Changes in Specification?

In panel B of Table 3, we repeat all these exercises using dividend growth deflated by the commercial paper rate rather than the inflation rate of the producer price index. The null hypothesis here is that expected excess returns on stock over commercial paper are constant. We obtain results which are similar to, though for the most part somewhat less dramatic than, those in panel A. The correlation between δ_t and δ'_t is small, at 0.246. The standard deviation of ξ'_{1t} is just under half that of ξ_{1t} , and the two have a substantial correlation, of 0.727. The implied variable p'_t now places a weight of 0.638 on e_t^{30} and 0.288 on p_t . Again, the long moving average of earnings dominates the stock price in forecasting dividend growth adjusted for commercial paper rates.

In Table 4 we check to see whether our VAR results are robust to increases in the lag length of the VAR. We estimate VARs of order 1 through 5. For each lag length, we report regressions of exact and approximate 1-period returns on the VAR explanatory variables, and the summary statistics $\sigma(\delta'_t)/\sigma(\delta_t)$, $\text{corr}(\delta'_t, \delta_t)$, $\sigma(\xi'_{1t})/\sigma(\xi_{1t})$ and $\text{corr}(\xi'_{1t}, \xi_{1t})$. Except for the fact that the significance levels in the 1-period return regression decline with lag length, the conclusions for the most part do not seem to be very sensitive to the order of the estimated VAR.

We also checked to see whether a shorter 10-year moving average of earnings gives similar results to those reported in Tables 3 and 4. As one would expect from the regression results in Tables 1 and 2, the 10-year moving average gets less weight in the estimated equation (constant real returns model) for p'_t , which is $p'_t = 0.369e_t^{10} + 0.467p_t + 0.290d_{t-1}$

- $0.126d_{t-2}$. The correlation between δ'_t and δ_t is correspondingly higher, although other results are similar to those in Tables 3 and 4. We note that this correlation is sensitive to VAR lag length; it falls towards the values in Tables 3 and 4 when the lag length is increased. Thus it seems that the use of a 3-decade moving average of earnings is not essential to our results.

Finally, we estimated the VAR system in Table 3 for the shorter sample 1927-86. We obtained results which were very similar to those for the full sample period.

7. Conclusion

Our results indicate that a long moving average of real earnings helps to forecast future real dividends. The ratio of this earnings variable to the current stock price is a powerful predictor of the return on stock, particularly when the return is measured over several years. We have shown that these facts make stock prices and returns much too volatile to accord with a simple present value model. Yet annual returns do seem to carry some information and are correlated with what they should be given the model.

Whenever a new variable is introduced into an analysis, in this case the long moving average of earnings, and the new variable plays an important role in the results, it is natural for critics to wonder if the new variable really belongs in the analysis. There is always the possibility that many different variables were attempted, until the results changed, and only the one that changed the results was reported. However, we think that it can be argued that a long moving average of earnings is a very natural variable to use to represent fundamental value, and that there are not many competitors for this role. We note also that we found evidence of excess volatility in earlier research (Campbell and Shiller 1987b) which did not use the information in earnings.

In evaluating our results, it should also be borne in mind that (disregarding small sample considerations) if we find one variable that destroys the model, then introducing new variables can never save the model. Since the log dividend-price ratio δ_t is in the information set assumed, it should get a unit coefficient and all other variables should

get zero coefficients in the equation for the theoretical log dividend price ratio δ'_t . Adding more variables can never bring us back to this situation, so long as the earnings variable is included. Another way to put this, recalling our argument that excess volatility is the same as forecastability of multi-period returns, is that once a forecasting variable is found that predicts multiperiod returns, adding new forecasting variables can never make them unforecastable.

Appendix: Data Sources

The stock price and dividend data, the producer-price index data and the interest rate data are the same as in Campbell and Shiller (1987b). The nominal stock price index is the Standard and Poor Composite Index for January of each year. The Dividend series is the total dividends per share for the year adjusted to index. The producer price index is the BL series (formerly wholesale price index) for January starting in 1900, annual average before 1900. The nominal interest rate series is the total return to investing for six months in January at the January 4-6 month prime commercial paper rate (six month starting January 1980) and for another six months at the July 4-6 month prime commercial paper rate (six month starting July 1980). The nominal earnings series for 1926 to 1986 is from Standard and Poor Statistical Service: earnings per share adjusted to index, composite, four quarter total, fourth quarter. The Standard and Poor earnings series begins in 1926, however, Alfred Cowles who is also responsible for the published Standard and Poor Composite Index 1871-1925, extended the earnings series back to 1871 (1939). The problem he faced was absence of earnings data for many of the stocks in the Standard and Poor Composite Index. He thus computed an annual series P_{EA-1} - "prices of stocks for which Earnings Data are available, all stocks," a series of earnings $E-1$ on these stocks, and the ratio $R-1$ of these series, the "earnings-price ratio." Our nominal earnings is series $R-1$ (Cowles (1939) pages 404-5) times the annual average Standard and Poor Composite Index for the year. (The S&P Composite Index 1871-1925 is the same as Cowles "common stock index" series P-1, for all stocks, Cowles (1939), pages 66-7, times a constant.)

The absence of earnings data for some stocks is of some importance for the accuracy of the earnings series. One indication of the potential importance of their omission can be found by comparing the series P-1 (The Cowles index for all stocks) and the series $P_{EA}-1$ (the Cowles series prices of stocks for which earnings data are available). The ratio of P-1 to $P_{EA}-1$ 1871-1925 ranged from 0.98 to 1.27, the biggest discrepancies occurring in the earliest years of the sample. Another suggestion of the importance of the omissions is in Cowles list ((1939), Appendix II, pp.456-75) of the companies in the index and the years for which the companies' earnings are available. Typically, lack of data on earnings comes for isolated years (as if earnings reports were occasionally missing) or for single years near the begin or end of the inclusion of the company in the index.

Wilson and Jones (1987) have recently examined the Cowles data for accuracy. They found some apparent errors in Cowles' monthly series of cumulated returns (Cowles data implied negative dividends for some months) and produced an alternative monthly return series that attempted to correct these errors. They concluded that "the overall impact of these revisions as compared to the original Cowles Commission data is minimal."⁸ We do not use the Cowles monthly data that they criticise, computing returns on a January to January basis assuming dividends are not reinvested during the year.

⁸Wilson and Jones [1987], page 244.

TABLE 1
PREDICTING STOCK RETURNS, 1871-1987

Explanatory variables	Number of years over which return is measured					
	1	2	3	5	7	10
A. <u>Real Returns</u>						
δ_t	0.039 (0.033)	0.092 (0.011)	0.110 (0.015)	0.212 (0.003)	0.241 (0.003)	0.266 (0.001)
Δd_{t-1}	0.000 (0.964)	0.000 (0.937)	0.004 (0.522)	0.000 (0.997)	0.001 (0.723)	0.003 (0.485)
ϵ_t	0.023 (0.104)	0.071 (0.022)	0.095 (0.019)	0.156 (0.005)	0.167 (0.005)	0.232 (0.001)
ϵ_t^{10}	0.036 (0.049)	0.079 (0.029)	0.102 (0.040)	0.177 (0.021)	0.229 (0.013)	0.357 (0.001)
ϵ_t^{30}	0.065 (0.015)	0.137 (0.008)	0.187 (0.010)	0.296 (0.005)	0.393 (0.002)	0.546 (0.000)
$\delta_t, \Delta d_{t-1}, \epsilon_t^{30}$	0.073 (0.082)	0.155 (0.034)	0.196 (0.055)	0.321 (0.016)	0.420 (0.010)	0.617 (0.000)
B. <u>Excess Returns</u>						
δ_t	0.016 (0.180)	0.068 (0.029)	0.080 (0.037)	0.192 (0.003)	0.203 (0.009)	0.184 (0.033)
$\Delta d_{t-1} - r_{t-1}$	0.026 (0.082)	0.009 (0.374)	0.027 (0.127)	0.023 (0.146)	0.010 (0.283)	0.000 (0.811)
ϵ_t	0.010 (0.283)	0.053 (0.048)	0.064 (0.054)	0.090 (0.031)	0.089 (0.050)	0.145 (0.021)
ϵ_t^{10}	0.048 (0.022)	0.112 (0.007)	0.136 (0.013)	0.202 (0.008)	0.221 (0.014)	0.306 (0.006)
ϵ_t^{30}	0.062 (0.018)	0.141 (0.006)	0.186 (0.007)	0.275 (0.003)	0.358 (0.003)	0.480 (0.002)
$\delta_t, \Delta d_{t-1} - r_{t-1}, \epsilon_t^{30}$	0.085 (0.047)	0.152 (0.038)	0.193 (0.048)	0.302 (0.012)	0.365 (0.017)	0.496 (0.012)

TABLE 2
PREDICTING DISCOUNTED STOCK RETURNS, 1871-1987

Explanatory variables	Number of years over which return is measured					
	1	2	3	5	7	10
A. <u>Real Returns</u>						
δ_t	0.048 (0.017)	0.109 (0.005)	0.135 (0.006)	0.244 (0.001)	0.284 (0.001)	0.327 (0.000)
Δd_{t-1}	0.000 (0.977)	0.000 (0.931)	0.004 (0.568)	0.000 (0.948)	0.001 (0.700)	0.003 (0.537)
ϵ_t	0.028 (0.072)	0.081 (0.014)	0.110 (0.011)	0.173 (0.003)	0.190 (0.002)	0.255 (0.000)
ϵ_t^{10}	0.043 (0.031)	0.092 (0.018)	0.121 (0.025)	0.203 (0.013)	0.262 (0.008)	0.385 (0.001)
ϵ_t^{30}	0.076 (0.008)	0.158 (0.004)	0.218 (0.005)	0.338 (0.002)	0.444 (0.001)	0.597 (0.000)
$\delta_t, \Delta d_{t-1}, \epsilon_t^{30}$	0.086 (0.047)	0.177 (0.017)	0.228 (0.027)	0.363 (0.007)	0.468 (0.004)	0.650 (0.000)
B. <u>Excess Returns</u>						
δ_t	0.022 (0.114)	0.082 (0.016)	0.101 (0.019)	0.155 (0.005)	0.247 (0.003)	0.246 (0.010)
$\Delta d_{t-1} - r_{t-1}$	0.026 (0.082)	0.009 (0.353)	0.026 (0.134)	0.024 (0.130)	0.014 (0.203)	0.001 (0.758)
ϵ_t	0.013 (0.215)	0.060 (0.034)	0.076 (0.035)	0.106 (0.018)	0.115 (0.023)	0.168 (0.010)
ϵ_t^{10}	0.056 (0.013)	0.127 (0.004)	0.160 (0.007)	0.236 (0.004)	0.275 (0.005)	0.365 (0.002)
ϵ_t^{30}	0.074 (0.009)	0.162 (0.003)	0.219 (0.003)	0.322 (0.001)	0.426 (0.001)	0.550 (0.001)
$\delta_t, \Delta d_{t-1} - r_{t-1}, \epsilon_t^{30}$	0.096 (0.029)	0.174 (0.020)	0.227 (0.023)	0.348 (0.004)	0.435 (0.004)	0.555 (0.005)

TABLE 3

1-LAG VAR RESULTS, 1871-1987

A. Real Returns

Dependent variable	Explanatory variable			R^2
	δ_t	Δd_{t-1}	ϵ_t^{30}	
δ_{t+1}	0.572 (0.141)	0.227 (0.175)	0.113 (0.096)	0.506
Δd_t	-0.457 (0.069)	0.349 (0.086)	0.231 (0.047)	0.384
ϵ_{t+1}^{30}	0.029 (0.132)	-0.100 (0.165)	0.868 (0.090)	0.799
ξ_{1t}	0.008 (0.125)	0.137 (0.155)	0.126 (0.085)	0.086

Significance levels for VAR tests of unpredictability of returns:

Number of years over which returns are computed						
1	2	3	5	7	10	∞
0.047	0.027	0.015	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000

Some implications of the VAR estimates:

$$\delta'_t = 1.022 \delta_t - 0.090 \Delta d_{t-1} - 0.761 \epsilon_t^{30}$$

$$\begin{matrix} (0.075) & (0.048) & (0.101) \end{matrix}$$

$$\sigma(\delta'_t)/\sigma(\delta_t) = 0.638, \quad \text{corr}(\delta'_t, \delta_t) = 0.131$$

$$\begin{matrix} (0.074) & (0.162) \end{matrix}$$

$$\sigma(\xi'_{1t})/\sigma(\xi_{1t}) = 0.277, \quad \text{corr}(\xi'_{1t}, \xi_{1t}) = 0.908$$

$$\begin{matrix} (0.069) & (0.068) \end{matrix}$$

TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)

1-LAG VAR RESULTS, 1871-1987

B. Excess Returns

Dependent variable	Explanatory variable			R ²
	δ_t	$\Delta d_{t-1} - r_{t-1}$	ϵ_t^{30}	
δ_{t+1}	0.584 (0.131)	0.490 (0.164)	0.112 (0.088)	0.544
$\Delta d_t - r_t$	-0.432 (0.068)	0.244 (0.085)	0.203 (0.046)	0.367
ϵ_{t+1}^{30}	-0.008 (0.127)	0.250 (0.159)	0.905 (0.085)	0.804
ξ_{1t}	0.022 (0.119)	-0.215 (0.149)	0.098 (0.080)	0.096

Significance levels for VAR tests of unpredictability of returns:

Number of years over which returns are computed						
1	2	3	5	7	10	∞
0.029	0.014	0.005	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Some implications of the VAR estimates:

$$\delta'_t = 0.926 \delta_t + 0.041 \Delta d_{t-1} - r_{t-1} - 0.638 \epsilon_t^{30}$$

(0.135)
(0.086)
(0.209)

$$\sigma(\delta'_t) / \sigma(\delta_t) = 0.560, \quad \text{corr}(\delta'_t, \delta_t) = 0.246$$

(0.133)
(0.357)

$$\sigma(\xi'_{1t}) / \sigma(\xi_{1t}) = 0.478, \quad \text{corr}(\xi'_{1t}, \xi_{1t}) = 0.727$$

(0.044)
(0.192)

TABLE 4

SUMMARY VAR RESULTS FOR LAG LENGTHS 1 TO 5, 1871-1987

Statistic	Lag length				
	1	2	3	4	5
A. <u>Real Returns</u>					
$h_{1t}: R^2$ (model test)	0.073 (0.082)	0.101 (0.151)	0.121 (0.247)	0.140 (0.344)	0.167 (0.369)
$\xi_{1t}: R^2$ (model test)	0.086 (0.047)	0.114 (0.093)	0.133 (0.175)	0.152 (0.259)	0.178 (0.287)
$\sigma(\delta'_t)/\sigma(\delta_t)$	0.638 (0.074)	0.685 (0.101)	0.693 (0.102)	0.727 (0.105)	0.754 (0.100)
$\text{corr}(\delta'_t, \delta_t)$	0.131 (0.162)	0.076 (0.147)	0.120 (0.183)	0.116 (0.171)	0.086 (0.165)
$\sigma(\xi'_{1t})/\sigma(\xi_{1t})$	0.277 (0.069)	0.301 (0.071)	0.295 (0.074)	0.287 (0.074)	0.268 (0.066)
$\text{corr}(\xi'_{1t}, \xi_{1t})$	0.908 (0.068)	0.801 (0.130)	0.824 (0.121)	0.844 (0.098)	0.846 (0.094)
B. <u>Excess Returns</u>					
$h_{1t}: R^2$ (model test)	0.085 (0.047)	0.142 (0.031)	0.186 (0.025)	0.185 (0.099)	0.205 (0.140)
$\xi_{1t}: R^2$ (model test)	0.096 (0.029)	0.154 (0.018)	0.196 (0.017)	0.195 (0.070)	0.215 (0.102)
$\sigma(\delta'_t)/\sigma(\delta_t)$	0.560 (0.133)	0.534 (0.177)	0.431 (0.117)	0.379 (0.090)	0.405 (0.120)
$\text{corr}(\delta'_t, \delta_t)$	0.246 (0.357)	0.015 (0.421)	0.336 (0.468)	0.230 (0.587)	0.225 (0.555)
$\sigma(\xi'_{1t})/\sigma(\xi_{1t})$	0.478 (0.044)	0.625 (0.103)	0.505 (0.082)	0.531 (0.117)	0.515 (0.114)
$\text{corr}(\xi'_{1t}, \xi_{1t})$	0.727 (0.192)	0.641 (0.206)	0.664 (0.192)	0.637 (0.209)	0.628 (0.205)




Figure 1

Log dividend-price ratio δ_t (solid line) and theoretical counterpart δ'_t (dashed line), 1901-86. The variable δ'_t is the optimal forecast of the present value of future real dividend growth rates (constant discount rate), based on the vector-autoregressive model as given in Table 3a. That is, $\delta'_t = -e_2'A(I-\rho A)^{-1}z_t = 1.022\delta_t - 0.090\Delta d_t - 0.761\epsilon_t$.

Log of
Real Index




Figure 2

Log real stock price index, p_t (solid line) and theoretical log real price index, p'_t (dashed line), 1901-86. The theoretical log real price index p'_t is the optimal forecast of the log-linearized present value (constant rate of discount) of real dividends based on the vector autoregressive forecasting model presented in Table 3a. The variable p'_t is computed as $d_{t-1} - \delta'_t$ where δ'_t is the series plotted in Figure 1.

NOTES TO TABLES

Table 1

The numbers reported are the R^2 in the regression of return on the explanatory variables, and in parentheses the significance level of a Wald test of the hypothesis that all coefficients in the regression are zero. The Wald test adjusts for overlapping data in regressions with multi-period returns, but does not adjust for heteroskedasticity. The sample period is 1871-1987, truncated at the end where necessary to compute multi-period returns.

Table 2

See notes for Table 1.

Table 3

Results are for vector autoregressions with three element vector including ϵ_{30} . The first group of numbers reported are regression coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses. (In the δ'_t column the numbers are implied coefficients from the VAR, with asymptotic standard errors calculated numerically). Also reported are R^2 statistics from the regressions. Below this are significance levels for Wald tests of restrictions (11), with $i=1,2,3,5,7,10$ and ∞ . The Wald test at $i=\infty$ is a test of the hypothesis that $\delta_t = \delta'_t$. Below this are some implied statistics computed from the VAR, with asymptotic standard errors calculated numerically in parentheses.

Table 4

Results are for vector autoregressions with three element vector including ϵ_{30} . The first two rows report R^2 statistics from regressions of exact and discounted stock returns on 1,2,3,4 and 5 lags of the VAR explanatory variables, and in parentheses the significance levels of Wald tests of the hypothesis that all the coefficients are zero. The remaining rows report implied statistics computed from the VARs, with asymptotic standard errors in parentheses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Campbell, John Y. and Robert J. Shiller (1987a), "Cointegration and Tests of Present Value Models", Journal of Political Economy 95:1062-1088, October 1987.
- Campbell, John Y., and Robert J. Shiller (1987b), "The Dividend-Price Ratio and Expectations of Future Dividends and Discount Factors," unpublished paper, Princeton University and Yale University, revised October 1987.
- Cowles 3rd, Alfred, and Associates, Common-Stock Indexes, Second Edition, Principia Press, Bloomington Indiana, 1939.
- DeBondt, Werner, and Richard Thaler, "Does the Stock Market Overreact?" Journal of Finance, Vol. 60, No. 3, pp. 793-805, July 1985.
- Fama, Eugene F. and Kenneth R. French (1987a), "Permanent and Temporary Components of Stock Prices", forthcoming Journal of Political Economy.
- Fama, Eugene F. and Kenneth R. French (1987b), "Dividend Yields and Expected Stock Returns", unpublished paper, University of Chicago, July 1987.
- Flood, Robert P., Robert J. Hodrick and Paul Kaplan, "An Evaluation of Recent Evidence on Stock Market Bubbles", NBER Working Paper No. 1971, July 1986.
- Gilles, Christian and Stephen F. LeRoy, "The Variance-Bounds Tests: A Critical Survey", unpublished paper, University of California Santa Barbara, August 1987.
- Gordon, Myron J., The Investment, Financing and Valuation of the Corporation, Irwin, Homewood Illinois, 1962.
- Graham, Benjamin, and David L. Dodd, Security Analysis, First Edition, McGraw Hill, New York, 1934.
- Gregory, Allan W. and Michael R. Veall, "Formulating Wald Tests of Nonlinear Restrictions", Econometrica 53:1465-1468, November 1985.
- Kleidon, Allan W., "Variance Bounds Tests and Stock Price Valuation Models", Journal of Political Economy 94:953-1001, October 1986.
- Kormendi, Roger C. and Robert Lipe, "Earnings Innovations, Earnings Persistence and Stock Returns", Journal of Business 60:323-345, 1987.
- LeRoy, Stephen F. and Richard D. Porter, "Stock Price Volatility: Tests Based on Implied Variance Bounds", Econometrica 49:97-113, 1981.
- Mankiw, N. Gregory, David Romer, and Matthew D. Shapiro, "An Unbiased Reexamination of Stock Market Volatility", Journal of Finance 40:677-87, May 1985.

Marsh, Terry A. and Robert C. Merton, "Dividend Variability and Variance Bounds Tests for the Rationality of Stock Market Prices", American Economic Review 76:483-498, June 1986.

Marsh, Terry A. and Robert C. Merton, "Dividend Behavior for the Aggregate Stock Market", Journal of Business 60:1-40, January 1987.

Poterba, James M. and Lawrence H. Summers, "Mean Reversion in Stock Prices: Evidence and Implications", unpublished paper, Harvard University, revised March 1987.

Sargent, Thomas J., "A Note on the Estimation of the Rational Expectations Model of the Term Structure," Journal of Monetary Economics, 5: 133-43, 1979.

Shiller, Robert J., "Do Stock Prices Move Too Much to be Justified by Subsequent Changes in Dividends?", American Economic Review 71:421-436, June 1981.

Shiller, Robert J., "Stock Prices and Social Dynamics", Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 2:457-498, 1984.

Summers, Lawrence H., "Does the Stock Market Rationally Reflect Fundamental Values?", Journal of Finance 41:591-601, July 1986.

West, Kenneth D., "Dividend Innovations and Stock Price Volatility", forthcoming Econometrica, January 1988.

White, Halbert, Asymptotic Theory for Econometricians, Academic Press, Orlando Florida, 1984.

Wilson, Jack W., and Charles P. Jones, "A Comparison of Annual Common Stock Returns: 1871-1925 with 1926-85," Journal of Business, Vol. 60, No. 2, April, 1987.