

ASSET RETURNS AND INFLATION*

Eugene F. FAMA

Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637, U.S.A.

G. William SCHWERT

Graduate School of Management, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627, U.S.A.

Received June 1977, revised version received September 1977

We estimate the extent to which various assets were hedges against the expected and unexpected components of the inflation rate during the 1953-71 period. We find that U.S. government bonds and bills were a complete hedge against expected inflation, and private residential real estate was a complete hedge against both expected and unexpected inflation. Labor income showed little short-term relationship with either expected or unexpected inflation. The most anomalous result is that common stock returns were negatively related to the expected component of the inflation rate, and probably also to the unexpected component.

The recent episode of high inflation rates has focused interest on the question of which assets, if any, provide effective hedges against inflation. In this paper we examine the qualities of a variety of assets as hedges against the expected and unexpected components of the inflation rate.

1. Hedging against inflation: Theory

Irving Fisher (1930) noted that the nominal interest rate can be expressed as the sum of an expected real return and an expected inflation rate. The proposition that expected nominal returns contain market assessments of expected inflation rates can be applied to all assets. Thus, if the market is an efficient or rational processor of the information available at time $t-1$, it will set the price of any asset j so that the expected nominal return on the asset from $t-1$ to t is the sum of the appropriate equilibrium expected real return and the best possible assessment of the expected inflation rate from $t-1$ to t . Formally,

$$E(\tilde{R}_{jt} | \phi_{t-1}) = E(i_{jt} | \phi_{t-1}) + E(\tilde{\Delta}_t | \phi_{t-1}), \quad (1)$$

*The comments of Nicholas Gonedes, Michael Jensen, John Long, William Meckling, Charles Plosser, Harry Roberts, Richard Roll, Michael Rozeff, and Clifford Smith are gratefully acknowledged. This research is supported by the National Science Foundation.

where \tilde{R}_{jt} is the nominal return on asset j from $t-1$ to t , $E(\tilde{r}_{jt}|\phi_{t-1})$ is the appropriate equilibrium expected real return on the asset implied by the set of information ϕ_{t-1} available at $t-1$, $E(\tilde{A}_t|\phi_{t-1})$ is the best possible assessment of the expected value of the inflation rate \tilde{A}_t that can be made on the basis of ϕ_{t-1} , and tildes denote random variables.

The story meant to be conveyed by eq. (1) is that the market uses ϕ_{t-1} to correctly assess the expected inflation rate and to determine the appropriate equilibrium expected real return on asset j , including perhaps a risk adjustment which differentiates the expected return on asset j from that on other assets. The market then sets the price of the asset so that its expected nominal return is the sum of the equilibrium expected real return and the correctly assessed expected inflation rate.

As a quantity theorist Fisher felt that the real and monetary sectors of the economy are largely independent. Thus, he hypothesized that the expected real return in (1) is determined by real factors, like the productivity of capital, investor time preferences, and tastes for risk, and that the expected real return and the expected inflation rate are unrelated. This assumption is convenient for our purposes because it allows us to study asset return-inflation relationships without introducing a complete general equilibrium model for expected real returns.

Given some way to measure the expected inflation rate, $E(\tilde{A}_t|\phi_{t-1})$, tests of the joint hypotheses that the market is efficient and that the expected real return and expected inflation rate vary independently can be obtained from estimates of the regression model,

$$\tilde{R}_{jt} = \alpha_j + \beta_j E(\tilde{A}_t|\phi_{t-1}) + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{jt}. \quad (2)$$

Since a regression estimates the conditional expected value of the dependent variable as a function of the independent variable, an estimate of the regression coefficient β_j which is statistically indistinguishable from 1.0 is consistent with the hypothesis that the expected nominal return on asset j varies in one-to-one correspondence with the expected inflation rate. Since the expected real return on the asset is its expected nominal return minus the expected inflation rate, an estimate of β_j which is indistinguishable from 1.0 is also consistent with the hypothesis that the expected real return on the asset and the expected inflation rate are unrelated.

We are also interested in the extent to which asset returns at t reflect the unanticipated component of the inflation rate between $t-1$ and t , $\tilde{A}_t - E(\tilde{A}_t|\phi_{t-1})$. To this end, we expand (1) as follows:

$$E(\tilde{R}_{jt}|\phi_{t-1}, \Delta_t) = E(\tilde{r}_{jt}|\phi_{t-1}) + E(\tilde{A}_t|\phi_{t-1}) + \gamma_j [\Delta_t - E(\tilde{A}_t|\phi_{t-1})]. \quad (3)$$

Estimates of (3) can be based on the regression model,

$$\tilde{R}_{jt} = \alpha_j + \beta_j E(\tilde{A}_t | \phi_{t-1}) + \gamma_j [A_t - E(\tilde{A}_t | \phi_{t-1})] + \tilde{\eta}_{jt}. \quad (4)$$

An estimate of the regression coefficient γ_j which is statistically indistinguishable from 1.0 is consistent with the hypothesis that on average the nominal return to asset j varies in one-to-one correspondence with the unexpected inflation rate.

Fisher's model says that all assets should have a coefficient $\beta_j = 1.0$ for the expected inflation rate in (4), but to obtain hypotheses about the coefficient γ_j for the unexpected inflation rate, we must rely largely on intuition, and our intuition about γ_j is different for different assets. For example, since the nominal value of a treasury bill which matures at time t is fixed at $t-1$, the return on the bill from $t-1$ to t cannot react to the unexpected rate of inflation from $t-1$ to t . On the other hand, there is a general belief that real estate and common stocks are hedges against inflation, unanticipated as well as anticipated, so that γ_j for these assets should be positive. It is also widely believed [see, for example, Kessel and Alchian (1960)] that income from human capital adjusts to both anticipated and unanticipated inflation, although possibly with a lag. For longer-term bonds, whose cash payoffs are fixed in nominal terms, the signs and magnitudes of γ_j in (3) and (4) depend on how the unanticipated inflation rate is related to changes in the discount rates that the market will use to price bonds in the future, a link that we investigate in some detail.

Since the unexpected rate of inflation is, by definition, uncorrelated with the expected rate of inflation, eq. (4) produces tests of the Fisher hypothesis that $\beta_j = 1.0$ which are identical to those that would be obtained from (2). We concentrate on models based on (4). When the tests suggest that $\beta_j = 1.0$, we say that the asset is a *complete hedge against expected inflation*: The expected nominal return on the asset varies in one-to-one correspondence with the expected inflation rate, and the expected real return on the asset is uncorrelated with the expected inflation rate. When $\gamma_j = 1.0$, the asset is a *complete hedge against unexpected inflation*. When the tests suggest that $\beta_j = \gamma_j = 1.0$, we say that the asset is a *complete hedge against inflation*: The nominal return on the asset varies in one-to-one correspondence with both the expected and unexpected components of the inflation rate, and the *ex post* real return on the asset is uncorrelated with the *ex post* inflation rate.

The fact that an asset is a complete hedge against expected and/or unexpected inflation does not imply that the real return on the asset has zero variance or even a small variance. Noninflation factors can generate variation in nominal returns which can be large or small relative to the variation in nominal returns associated with the expected and unexpected components of the inflation rate. In terms of equation (4), an asset might be a complete hedge against inflation, that is, both β_j and γ_j equal to 1.0, but inflation might 'explain' a small fraction of the variation in the asset's nominal return; that is, the variance of the dis-

turbance $\tilde{\eta}_{jt}$, which in this case is the variance of the asset's real return, might be large relative to the variance of the expected and unexpected components of the inflation rate.

2. The data

2.1. *The rate of inflation*

We use the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index (CPI) to estimate the rate of inflation. The rate of inflation, Δ_t , is defined as the natural logarithm of the ratio of the values of the CPI at t and $t-1$. Given the assumption that the purpose of investment is eventual consumption, the use of an inflation rate for consumption goods is appropriate – a point clearly recognized by Fisher (1930, ch. I) in his development of the theory.

In 1953 the Bureau of Labor Statistics increased the coverage of the CPI sample of goods and the frequency with which prices of individual goods are collected. Thus, the CPI data since January 1953 provide a more current and comprehensive measure of inflation than did earlier data. In August 1971 the government imposed price controls which discouraged increases in quoted prices of goods. The effective prices of goods and services increased during this period because of longer average purchase delays and increases in other costs of search in purchasing goods. When price controls were phased out in 1973 and 1974, the changes in the measured prices of goods in the CPI probably overstated the true inflation rate, as producers switched to prices as a means of rationing output among consumers. Thus, it is likely that from August 1971 until sometime in late 1974 the CPI was not a good measure of the cost to consumers of obtaining goods and services, so for the most part we concentrate on the period from January 1953 through July 1971. Fama and Schwert (1977b) discuss in detail the time series behavior of the CPI and its major components during this period.

2.2. *Returns on assets*

The return on an asset is the change in the price of the asset from $t-1$ to t plus the cash flow paid to owners of the asset during the period, all relative to the price of the asset at $t-1$. For common stocks, we use returns on an equally-weighted portfolio of all New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) stocks and on a value-weighted portfolio of NYSE stocks, labeled s_{et} and s_{vt} , respectively. Both series are from the Center for Research in Security Prices of the University of Chicago. Like the inflation rate, the common stock returns are continuously compounded. In general, continuous compounding is used in calculating asset returns.

Returns on U.S. treasury bills with one to six months to maturity, denoted B_{1t} through B_{6t} , are derived from the Salomon Brothers quote sheets. The details of the calculations are described in Fama (1976b, ch. 6). Data for bills with one to three months to maturity are available since January 1953, while data for bills with four to six months to maturity are available since March 1959. Since bills pay no coupons, the return on a bill depends only on the change in its price from $t-1$ to t .

Returns on longer-term U.S. government bonds are based on indices constructed by Bildersee (1974). We use his indices to compute returns to bonds with from one to two years to maturity, D_{1t} ; from two to three years to maturity, D_{2t} ; from three to four years to maturity, D_{3t} ; and from four to five years to maturity, D_{4t} . The statistical properties of these bond returns are analyzed in Fama and Schwert (1977a).

The return to privately held residential real estate, r_t , is measured as the rate of inflation of the Home Purchase Price component of the CPI. The Home Purchase Price index is based on the purchase prices of homes with mortgages newly insured by the FHA. To control for fluctuation in the quality of units in the sample, average prices for different quality classes are combined with fixed weights and the index is expressed as a price per square foot. However, the data have some deficiencies. The index is available only as a three month moving average. The FHA reports the sale price at the time the home is insured, so a lag of one to three months may occur between the date when the price is determined and the date when it is reflected in the index. In addition, there is a one month lag between the time that the FHA collects the data and the time when they show up in the CPI. Finally, FHA-insured housing is not a representative sample of all owner-occupied residential real estate. Nevertheless, the Home Purchase Price index seems to be the best available quality adjusted index of transaction prices for real estate.¹

Ideally, we would like to have a measure of the return to real estate net of expenses but including the value of the service flows to owner-occupied housing. Owner-occupied housing differs from other assets such as stocks and bonds in that the 'dividend' return on housing is received in kind, so the relevant data are not available. Our hope is that our measure of the capital gain return to real estate, r_t , provides an adequate proxy for the variation of the total return to real estate, though not of the level of the total return.

Finally, since there is a general presumption that nominal income from human capital changes to reflect inflation, we include it in our tests. All of our other asset returns include changes in capital values, but these are not available for

¹The Home Purchase Price index is described in 'Housing Costs in the Consumer Price Index', *Monthly Labor Review* (February 1956), pp. 189-196, and 'Housing Costs in the Consumer Price Index', *Monthly Labor Review* (April 1956), pp. 442-446. B.L.S. Bulletin No. 1517, 'The Consumer Price Index, History and Techniques' (1966), describes the construction of the entire CPI in detail.

human capital. The income variable we use is the rate of change of labor income per capita of the labor force,

$$h_t = \ln(H_t/L_t) - \ln(H_{t-1}/L_{t-1}) \quad (5)$$

where H_t is the sum of wages and salary disbursements plus the proprietors' income portion of seasonally adjusted personal income, as reported monthly in the *Survey of Current Business*, and L_t is the seasonally adjusted monthly total civilian labor force collected by the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce. Since h_t is the rate of change in income per capita, it must adjust to reflect the inflation rate if real labor income is to be independent of the price level. The arguments are detailed in Fama and Schwert (1977a).

2.3. *Statistical properties of the data*

Table 1 shows estimates of the first twelve autocorrelations of the CPI inflation rate and the nominal returns on the different assets for monthly data from January 1953 to July 1971. The sample autocorrelations of the monthly holding period returns to treasury bills (B_{1t} , B_{2t} , B_{3t}), are large for all twelve lags, which suggests that the expected monthly nominal returns on bills change through time. The sample autocorrelations of the returns to real estate, r_t , and the inflation rate, Δ_t , are similar at all twelve lags and reliably different from zero. On the other hand, the autocorrelations of the returns on the government bond portfolios (D_{1t} , D_{2t} , D_{3t} , D_{4t}), the NYSE common stock portfolios (s_{vt} , s_{et}), and the income variable, h_t , are generally close to zero at all lags except lag one. In short, the behavior of the autocorrelations of nominal returns differs across assets.

Table 2 shows estimates of the first twelve autocorrelations of the monthly real returns on the assets for the January 1953 to July 1971 period. The real return is the nominal return minus the observed CPI inflation rate for the period. Except for some small positive autocorrelation at lag one, and sometimes at lags 2 and 12 (the seasonal lag), the autocorrelations of the real returns are close to zero.

The combination of the heterogeneous autocorrelations of the nominal returns on different assets in table 1 with the relatively homogeneous autocorrelations of real returns in table 2 is consistent with the proposition that the nominal returns on all assets vary with the inflation rate, but the persistent positive autocorrelation of the inflation rate is more evident in the nominal returns on assets that have smaller standard deviations. In other words, the inflation-related variation in asset returns shows up better in the time series behavior of the nominal returns on assets that are subject to less non-inflation variation. Then, because the inflation-related variation in nominal returns is common to all assets, all real returns are serially uncorrelated.

Table 1

Means, standard deviations and autocorrelations of monthly nominal rates of return, January 1953 - July 1971.^a

Asset	ρ_1	ρ_2	ρ_3	ρ_4	ρ_5	ρ_6	ρ_7	ρ_8	ρ_9	ρ_{10}	ρ_{11}	ρ_{12}	Mean	Standard deviation
Treasury bills														
B_{1t}	0.97	0.95	0.93	0.91	0.88	0.85	0.83	0.81	0.78	0.74	0.72	0.70	0.0026	0.0013
B_{2t}	0.91	0.88	0.86	0.83	0.81	0.76	0.74	0.73	0.71	0.68	0.66	0.64	0.0029	0.0014
B_{3t}	0.83	0.79	0.78	0.75	0.73	0.67	0.63	0.64	0.63	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.0031	0.0015
Government bonds														
D_{1t}	0.25	0.09	0.13	0.12	0.12	0.04	-0.05	0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.06	0.06	0.0031	0.0044
D_{2t}	0.16	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.01	0.02	-0.11	-0.05	-0.03	-0.06	0.00	0.02	0.0031	0.0066
D_{3t}	0.18	0.11	0.05	0.10	-0.01	-0.02	-0.11	-0.10	-0.04	-0.05	-0.02	-0.03	0.0029	0.0080
D_{4t}	0.15	0.05	0.08	0.11	-0.07	-0.04	-0.11	-0.09	-0.01	-0.04	-0.06	0.00	0.0026	0.0096
Real estate														
r_t	0.39	0.21	0.06	0.13	0.13	0.21	0.21	0.18	0.18	0.25	0.29	0.25	0.0017	0.0036
Labor income														
h_t	0.09	0.11	-0.02	0.14	0.08	0.10	0.02	-0.03	-0.05	-0.07	0.00	-0.12	0.0032	0.0059
Common stocks														
s_{st}	0.11	0.01	0.01	0.14	0.09	-0.03	-0.09	-0.11	0.07	-0.17	0.00	0.01	0.0089	0.0362
s_{et}	0.19	0.08	-0.01	0.11	0.06	0.04	-0.14	-0.21	0.01	-0.09	0.04	0.00	0.0102	0.0425
Inflation														
A_t	0.37	0.36	0.27	0.30	0.28	0.28	0.25	0.33	0.35	0.33	0.26	0.36	0.0019	0.0023

^aSample autocorrelations are estimated as regression coefficients. The asymptotic standard error of ρ_t is 0.07 under the hypothesis that the true autocorrelations are all equal to zero.

Table 2
Means, standard deviations and autocorrelations of monthly real rates of return, January 1953 - July 1971.^a

Asset	ρ_1	ρ_2	ρ_3	ρ_4	ρ_5	ρ_6	ρ_7	ρ_8	ρ_9	ρ_{10}	ρ_{11}	ρ_{12}	Mean	Standard deviation
Treasury bills														
B_{1t}	0.11	0.12	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02	-0.02	-0.07	0.05	0.10	0.10	0.03	0.19	0.0007	0.0020
B_{2t}	0.13	0.14	-0.02	-0.03	-0.01	-0.06	-0.08	0.03	0.06	0.12	0.04	0.18	0.0010	0.0020
B_{3t}	0.15	0.14	-0.03	-0.06	-0.01	-0.08	-0.09	0.01	0.05	0.11	0.03	0.17	0.0012	0.0020
Government bonds														
D_{1t}	0.17	0.07	0.04	0.01	0.07	-0.03	-0.12	-0.05	-0.05	-0.03	0.03	0.05	0.0012	0.0047
D_{2t}	0.14	0.12	0.02	0.04	-0.01	0.00	-0.13	-0.07	-0.05	-0.05	0.00	0.04	0.0012	0.0068
D_{3t}	0.18	0.14	0.03	0.07	-0.02	-0.02	-0.12	-0.10	-0.03	-0.03	0.00	-0.01	0.0010	0.0083
D_{4t}	0.15	0.08	0.07	0.09	-0.07	-0.03	-0.11	-0.09	0.00	-0.03	-0.05	0.02	0.0007	0.0099
Real estate														
r_t	0.14	-0.03	-0.16	-0.16	-0.02	0.04	0.05	0.01	-0.02	0.05	0.09	0.13	-0.0002	0.0034
Labor income														
h_t	0.16	0.15	0.00	0.10	0.03	0.10	0.03	-0.02	-0.03	-0.06	0.03	-0.12	0.0013	0.0061
Common stocks														
s_{1t}	0.14	0.02	0.03	0.14	0.10	-0.03	-0.09	-0.10	0.08	-0.16	0.00	0.01	0.0070	0.0366
s_{2t}	0.21	0.09	0.00	0.11	0.07	0.04	-0.13	-0.20	0.02	-0.09	0.04	0.00	0.0084	0.0430

^aThe asymptotic standard error of ρ_i is 0.07 under the hypothesis that the true autocorrelations are all equal to zero.

Table 3

Average, annualized, percent, nominal returns on assets and average CPI inflation rates.*

Variable	Period				
	1/53- 12/57	1/58- 12/62	1/63- 12/67	1/68- 7/71	8/71- 12/75
Inflation					
Δ_t	1.3	1.3	2.2	5.1	7.1
Treasury bills					
B_{1t}	1.9	2.2	3.7	5.5	5.7
B_{2t}	2.1	2.7	4.0	5.9	6.0
B_{3t}	2.3	3.0	4.1	6.1	6.4
Government bonds					
D_{1t}	2.3	3.5	3.6	6.1	N.A.
D_{2t}	2.7	3.6	3.2	5.7	N.A.
D_{3t}	2.6	3.7	2.9	5.1	N.A.
D_{4t}	2.4	3.3	2.6	4.5	N.A.
Real estate					
r_t	1.0	0.6	1.7	5.9	6.2
Labor income					
h_t	2.2	3.4	5.2	4.7	6.1
Common stocks					
s_{ot}	12.3	12.8	12.5	3.0	1.6
s_{et}	10.5	14.4	18.5	3.3	-0.6

*Average nominal returns and inflation rates are annualized from monthly average returns like those in table 1. For bills (B_{1t} , B_{2t} , B_{3t}) and bonds (D_{1t} , D_{2t} , D_{3t} , D_{4t}) this means that instruments of a given maturity are purchased and sold each month, and then the average monthly returns are annualized, that is, multiplied by 1,200. Data for the bond portfolios are not available (N.A.) for the latest subperiod.

A general picture of the qualities of different assets as inflation hedges is also provided by table 3, which shows average annualized percent inflation rates and nominal asset returns for subperiods. For the real estate variable (r_t) and for each of the three treasury bills (B_{1t} , B_{2t} , B_{3t}), the subperiod ordering of average nominal returns corresponds exactly to the ordering of average inflation rates. The correspondence between the ordering of average returns and average inflation rates is not so exact for the four government bond portfolios (D_{1t} , D_{2t} , D_{3t} , D_{4t}), but the tendency for average returns to follow the average inflation rate is still noticeable. The average rates of change of income per capita (h_t) generally move with average inflation rates, but h_t is relatively high during the 1963 to 1967 subperiod when the average inflation rate is relatively low. Finally,

a phenomenon that perplexes us throughout this study is the apparent inverse relationship between stock returns (s_{vt}, s_{st}) and inflation rates since 1953.

Note, however, that in spite of their inverse relationship with inflation rates, average returns on stocks are higher for the overall period than average returns on other assets, a fact which is more evident in tables 1 and 2. Note also that, with the exception of the last subperiod in table 3, average returns on bills and bonds are greater than the average inflation rate, so that real returns on these instruments are generally positive. Moreover, average returns on bills increase with maturity, a pattern which is less evident in the bond returns. Finally, the fact that the average returns to private residential real estate shown in table 3 are generally less than the average inflation rates does not necessarily imply negative average real returns to real estate since our measure of the real estate return covers only capital gains.

Tables 1 to 3 provide a useful introduction to the properties of different assets as inflation hedges, but the picture that emerges is impressionistic. The tests that follow provide more precise measures of the relationships between asset returns and the two components of the inflation rate, expected and unexpected.

3. Tests of assets as hedges against expected inflation

3.1. A measure of expected inflation

To implement tests of assets as hedges against expected and unexpected inflation using the model in (4), an empirical measure of the expected inflation rate, $E(\tilde{A}_t | \phi_{t-1})$, based on data available at time $t-1$, is needed. The nominal return or interest rate on a treasury bill which matures at time t , B_t , is known at $t-1$. Fama (1975) notes that if the expected real return on the bill is constant through time, and if the bill market is efficient, the nominal return on the bill is equal to the constant expected real return plus the expected inflation rate,

$$B_t = E(\tilde{r}) + E(\tilde{A}_t | \phi_{t-1}). \quad (6)$$

Thus, the expected inflation rate is

$$E(\tilde{A}_t | \phi_{t-1}) = -E(\tilde{r}) + B_t. \quad (7)$$

Tests of (7) can be obtained from estimates of

$$\tilde{A}_t = \alpha + \beta B_t + \tilde{\epsilon}_t, \quad (8)$$

where the proposition of (7) is that $\beta = 1.0$ and $E(\tilde{\epsilon}_t | \phi_{t-1}) = 0$; that is, all variation in the nominal return B_t set at $t-1$ reflects variation in $E(\tilde{A}_t | \phi_{t-1})$, the best possible assessment at $t-1$ of the expected value of the inflation rate to be observed at t . The unexpected component of the inflation rate is then just the disturbance $\tilde{\epsilon}_t$ in (8).

The estimate of (8) using monthly data for the January 1953–July 1971 period is shown in table 4. Consistent with the hypothesis of (7), the estimate of β is 0.98 with a standard error of 0.10, and the first three autocorrelations of the residuals, $\rho_1(\hat{\epsilon})$, $\rho_2(\hat{\epsilon})$, and $\rho_3(\hat{\epsilon})$, are close to zero. Table 4 also shows the estimate of the regression of the quarterly inflation rate on the return to maturity or interest rate on a three month treasury bill, B_{3t} , set at the beginning of the quarter. The estimate of the slope coefficient $\hat{\beta}$ is close to one with a small standard error, \bar{R}^2 is 0.48, and the residuals seem to be serially uncorrelated. Finally, the regression of the semiannual inflation rate on B_{6t} , the return to maturity or interest rate on a six month treasury bill set at the beginning of the six month period, indicates that B_{6t} is a good proxy for the semiannual expected inflation rate. The estimate of β is 1.06 with a standard error of 0.10, \bar{R}^2 is 0.82, and the residuals do not seem to be autocorrelated.

A more detailed discussion of the interest rate–inflation model of eqs. (6) to (8) is in Fama (1975) and Fama and Schwert (1977b). For our purposes, the important empirical finding is that estimates of eq. (8) are consistent with the proposition that changes in the interest rate, B_t , correspond to changes in the expected inflation rate, $E(\tilde{\Delta}_t | \phi_{t-1})$. Thus, we use the nominal return or interest rate on a treasury bill which matures at the end of period t as a proxy for the expected inflation rate for period t , and the unexpected inflation rate is measured as $\Delta_t - B_t$, the difference between the inflation rate realized *ex post* and the *ex ante* interest rate. The empirical analog of eq. (4) is then²

$$\tilde{R}_{jt} = \alpha_j + \beta_j B_t + \gamma_j (\Delta_t - B_t) + \tilde{\eta}_{jt}. \quad (9)$$

Finally, the proxies for the expected and unexpected monthly inflation rates have very different time series properties. The autocorrelations of B_{1t} in table 1 are close to 1.0 at lower-order lags and only decay slowly at higher-order lags, which is suggestive of a non-stationary process such as a random walk. Thus, the proxy for the expected inflation rate wanders slowly over time with little affinity for any particular value. In contrast, since the estimated regression of Δ_t on B_{1t} in table 4 produces a slope coefficient $\hat{\beta} = 0.98$, the residuals from the regression have time series properties almost identical to those of $\Delta_t - B_{1t}$. Thus from the monthly results in table 4 we can conclude that $\Delta_t - B_{1t}$ has the properties required of a proxy for the unexpected inflation rate; that is, $\Delta_t - B_{1t}$ is serially uncorrelated and uncorrelated with the proxy for the expected inflation rate. The inflation rate, which is just the sum of its expected and unexpected components, is therefore approximately a random walk plus serially uncor-

²There is some evidence that inflation can be predicted slightly better by using additional information available at time $t-1$, such as lags of the inflation rate [see, for example, Hess and Bicksler (1975) or Nelson and Schwert (1977)]. Taking account of such complications does not materially affect the results.

Table 4
Interest rates as measures of expected inflation, $\Delta_t = \hat{a} + \beta B_t + \varepsilon_t$ (standard errors in parentheses).^a

Interest rate ^b B_t	Period	Sample size T	\hat{a}	β	R^2	$S(\varepsilon)$	$\rho_1(\varepsilon)$	$\rho_2(\varepsilon)$	$\rho_3(\varepsilon)$
Monthly, B_{1t}	1/53 - 7/71	223	-0.0007 (0.0003)	0.98 (0.10)	0.29	0.0020	0.10	0.12	-0.02
Quarterly, B_{3t}	1/53 - 6/71	74	-0.0023 (0.0011)	0.93 (0.11)	0.48	0.0038	0.00	0.04	0.10
Semi-annual, B_{6t} ^c	7/59 - 6/71	24	-0.0097 (0.0024)	1.06 (0.10)	0.82	0.0038	0.00	-0.04	0.16

^aThe coefficients of determination, R^2 , are adjusted for degrees of freedom. $S(\varepsilon)$ is the standard error of the regression residuals, and $\rho_t(\varepsilon)$ is the residual autocorrelation at lag t .

^b B_t is the return on interest rate on a treasury bill which matures at the end of period t . It is known at the beginning of the period.

^cReturns on six-month bills are only available since March 1959.

related noise. This is consistent with the autocorrelations of the inflation rate in table 1 which are much less than one but do not decay as the lag is increased.³

3.2. Tests based on monthly data

Estimates of eq. (9) for monthly data from January 1953 to July 1971 are shown in table 5. The estimates of β_j , the coefficient for the expected inflation proxy in (9), are close to one for treasury bills (B_{2t} , B_{3t}), the government bond portfolios (D_{1t} , D_{2t} , D_{3t} , D_{4t}), and real estate (r_t). Although the estimates of β_j for the returns to two and three month bills are more than two standard errors above one, the standard errors of the coefficients are underestimated in this case because the residuals and the expected inflation proxy are both positively autocorrelated [cf. Theil (1971, pp. 254–257)]. The estimate of β_j for the income variable, h_t , is 0.51 with a standard error of 0.31, so we cannot comfortably reject the hypothesis that $\beta_j = 1$. However, since there is a wide range of alternative hypotheses that also can't be rejected, table 5 does not provide much evidence that labor income is a hedge against the monthly expected inflation rate.

Since the regressions for treasury bill and bond returns yield coefficient estimates for B_{1t} that are close to 1.0 and coefficients for $\Delta_t - B_{1t}$ that are generally within one standard error of zero, the time series properties of the residuals from these regressions correspond to the properties of the premiums on bills and bonds, that is, the differences between their one month returns and the return on a one month bill. The non-trivial autocorrelations of these premiums, evident in the residual autocorrelations in table 5, are documented and discussed in Fama (1976a).

However, these residual autocorrelations gain additional interest in our work. Since B_{1t} in (9) is the proxy for the expected inflation rate in eqs. (1) to (4), the residual autocorrelations in the regressions for bills and bonds in table 5 can be interpreted as variation in expected real returns which is independent of variation in the expected inflation rate. Thus, the residual autocorrelations are evidence of the type of independent variation of expected real returns and the expected inflation rate which allows (2) and (4) to provide meaningful measures of variation in expected nominal returns in response to variation in the expected inflation rate. On the other hand, the large first-order residual autocorrelation for the real estate return r_t in table 5 is less interesting since it is probably a consequence of the fact that the Home Purchase Price index on which r_t is based is a three month moving average.

Given an asset whose expected return varies directly with B_{1t} , we can expect the large autocorrelations of B_{1t} to have a more noticeable effect on the time series behavior of the asset's return when the proxy for the expected inflation rate

³Box and Jenkins (1976, pp. 123–124 and 200–201) describe such a process and the behavior of its sample autocorrelations.

Table 5

Hedges against monthly expected and unexpected inflation, $R_{jt} = \hat{\alpha}_j + \beta_j B_{1t} + \hat{\gamma} \Delta_t + \hat{\eta}_{jt}$ (standard errors in parentheses);1/53 - 7/71, $T = 223$.

Asset	$\hat{\alpha}_j$	β_j	$\hat{\gamma}_j$	R^2	$S(\hat{\eta}_j)$	$\rho_1(\hat{\eta}_j)$	$\rho_2(\hat{\eta}_j)$	$\rho_3(\hat{\eta}_j)$
B_{2t}	0.0002 (0.0001)	1.04 (0.02)	0.01 (0.01)	0.94	0.0003	0.34	0.20	0.18
B_{3t}	0.0002 (0.0001)	1.08 (0.03)	0.02 (0.02)	0.85	0.0006	0.28	0.13	0.20
D_{1t}	0.0001 (0.0006)	1.11 (0.22)	-0.11 (0.14)	0.10	0.0042	0.20	0.02	0.07
D_{2t}	0.0002 (0.0010)	1.03 (0.34)	-0.15 (0.22)	0.03	0.0065	0.14	0.07	0.06
D_{3t}	0.0002 (0.0012)	0.94 (0.41)	-0.26 (0.27)	0.02	0.0079	0.18	0.09	0.06
D_{4t}	-0.0001 (0.0015)	0.90 (0.50)	-0.36 (0.33)	0.01	0.0096	0.15	0.04	0.08
r_t	-0.0012 (0.0005)	1.19 (0.16)	0.31 (0.11)	0.21	0.0032	0.22	-0.01	-0.17
h_t	0.0020 (0.0009)	0.51 (0.31)	0.16 (0.20)	0.01	0.0059	0.09	0.11	-0.03
s_{9t}	0.0228 (0.0055)	-5.52 (1.85)	-0.77 (1.22)	0.03	0.0356	0.06	-0.02	-0.03
s_{8t}	0.0235 (0.0064)	-5.70 (2.17)	-2.35 (1.44)	0.03	0.0418	0.13	0.07	-0.05

is a large component of the variance of the asset's return. This is observed in the results for real estate, bills, and bonds in tables 1 and 5. In the regressions of table 5, the coefficients of determination, R^2 , are large for the monthly returns on two and three month bills while the R^2 statistics are relatively small for real estate and the government bond portfolios. In table 1, the autocorrelations of the bill returns are likewise larger than those for real estate and bonds.

Having discussed the results for assets whose expected returns seem to vary directly with our proxy for the expected inflation rate, we turn now to the prime counterexample. In table 5, the estimates of β_j for s_{ot} and s_{vt} , the returns to the NYSE common stock portfolios, are both approximately -5.5 , with standard errors of about 2.0. We can reject the hypothesis that common stocks are a hedge against the expected monthly inflation rate. The negative relationship between common stock returns and expected inflation rates has also been noted by Lintner (1975), Body (1976), Nelson (1976), and Jaffe and Mandelker (1976), among others. The anomalous behavior of common stock returns is analyzed in more detail in section 4.

3.3. Tests based on quarterly and semiannual data

The Fisher hypothesis that expected nominal returns should vary directly with the expected inflation rate can be applied to any time interval over which the variables might be measured. Table 6 shows estimates of eq. (9) based on quarterly and semiannual returns and inflation rates. The nominal return or interest rate on a three month bill observed at the beginning of each quarter, B_{3t} , is the proxy for the expected quarterly inflation rate. The *ex ante* six month bill rate, B_{6t} , is likewise taken as the proxy for the semiannual expected inflation rate. Since data for six month bills are not available prior to March 1959, the semiannual tests only cover the second half of 1959 through the first half of 1971.

The quarterly and semiannual results in table 6 are similar to the monthly results in table 5. Government bonds and real estate are complete hedges against the expected inflation rate since the estimates of β_j , the coefficient of the expected inflation proxy in (9), are close to one for these assets. Quarterly labor income is positively related to the quarterly expected inflation proxy while semiannual labor income is negatively related to the semiannual expected inflation proxy, but both coefficient estimates have large standard errors. Although the standard errors of the coefficients get progressively larger, common stock returns show negative relationships with the quarterly and semiannual expected inflation proxies similar in magnitude to those observed in the monthly data.

4. Tests of assets as hedges against unexpected inflation

4.1. Tests based on monthly data

In the monthly tests of table 5, the estimates of γ_j , the regression coefficient in

(9) that measures the quality of an asset as a hedge against the unexpected component of the inflation rate, are mostly less than one standard error from zero. The only estimate of γ_j which is more than two standard errors from zero is obtained when the return to real estate, r_t , is the dependent variable in the regression. Thus, there is some evidence that real estate is a partial hedge against unexpected monthly inflation. Apparently it is not a complete hedge since the estimate of γ_j for real estate is reliably less than unity.

There is a suggestive pattern in the relationships between the unexpected inflation proxy and the returns to the government bond portfolios. The estimates of γ_j for D_{1t} , D_{2t} , D_{3t} and D_{4t} are all negative and they increase in absolute value with term to maturity. An explanation for this result, having to do with the information that current unexpected inflation contains about future expected inflation, is explored later. Current unexpected inflation seems to have a negative effect on the nominal returns to NYSE common stocks, but the standard errors of the estimates of γ_j are large relative to the values of the coefficients.

Table 6

Hedges against quarterly and semiannual expected and unexpected inflation,
 $R_{jt} = \hat{\alpha}_j + \hat{\beta}_j B_t + \hat{\gamma}_j (d_t - B_t) + \hat{\eta}_{jt}$ (standard errors in parentheses).

Asset	$\hat{\alpha}_j$	$\hat{\beta}_j$	$\hat{\gamma}_j$	R^2	$S(\hat{\eta}_j)$	$\rho_1(\hat{\eta}_j)$	$\rho_2(\hat{\eta}_j)$	$\rho_3(\hat{\eta}_j)$
(A) Quarterly data: 1/53-6/71, $T = 74$								
B_{1t}	-0.0002 (0.0002)	0.95 (0.02)	0.05 (0.02)	0.97	0.0007	0.17	0.06	0.29
D_{1t}	-0.0026 (0.0023)	1.21 (0.23)	-0.50 (0.25)	0.29	0.0080	0.11	0.06	-0.07
D_{2t}	-0.0041 (0.0037)	1.23 (0.38)	-0.93 (0.40)	0.17	0.0130	0.11	0.03	-0.09
D_{3t}	-0.0054 (0.0045)	1.18 (0.46)	-1.33 (0.49)	0.15	0.0158	0.18	0.00	-0.07
D_{4t}	-0.0069 (0.0054)	1.19 (0.55)	-1.47 (0.58)	0.12	0.0187	0.16	-0.05	-0.05
r_t	-0.0032 (0.0019)	1.15 (0.19)	0.56 (0.20)	0.35	0.0065	-0.20	0.03	-0.02
h_t	0.0049 (0.0031)	0.45 (0.32)	-0.32 (0.33)	0.02	0.0108	0.19	0.18	-0.15
s_{vt}	0.0572 (0.0199)	-4.88 (2.04)	-4.11 (2.14)	0.09	0.0693	0.01	-0.08	-0.10
s_{st}	0.0549 (0.0247)	-4.95 (2.54)	-6.50 (2.66)	0.09	0.0861	0.04	-0.02	-0.13

Table 6 (continued)

Asset R_{jt}	$\hat{\alpha}_j$	$\hat{\beta}_j$	$\hat{\gamma}_j$	R^2	$S(\hat{\eta}_j)$	$\rho_1(\hat{\eta}_j)$	$\rho_2(\hat{\eta}_j)$	$\rho_3(\hat{\eta}_j)$
(B) Semiannual data: 7/59-6/71, $T = 24$								
B_{1t}	0.0025 (0.0017)	0.84 (0.06)	0.23 (0.11)	0.92	0.0020	0.44	0.46	0.09
B_{2t}	0.0018 (0.0013)	0.89 (0.04)	0.15 (0.09)	0.95	0.0016	0.35	0.37	0.00
B_{3t}	0.0027 (0.0013)	0.88 (0.04)	0.16 (0.08)	0.95	0.0015	0.07	0.35	-0.09
D_{1t}	-0.0110 (0.0089)	1.08 (0.29)	-1.15 (0.59)	0.38	0.0106	0.03	-0.27	0.12
D_{2t}	-0.0158 (0.0143)	1.03 (0.47)	-1.75 (0.95)	0.19	0.0170	0.01	-0.38	0.11
D_{3t}	-0.0183 (0.0185)	0.88 (0.61)	-2.37 (1.24)	0.12	0.0220	0.01	-0.44	0.05
D_{4t}	-0.0212 (0.0223)	0.79 (0.73)	-2.75 (1.49)	0.09	0.0266	-0.03	-0.47	0.03
r_t	-0.0054 (0.0073)	1.27 (0.24)	1.14 (0.49)	0.60	0.0087	-0.21	0.39	-0.15
h_t	0.0367 (0.0125)	-0.13 (0.41)	1.40 (0.84)	0.04	0.0149	0.08	-0.10	0.01
s_{vt}	0.1169 (0.0990)	-4.26 (3.25)	-2.09 (6.62)	0.00	0.1178	-0.20	-0.18	-0.04
s_{et}	0.1222 (0.1266)	-4.87 (4.15)	-4.38 (8.46)	-0.01	0.1506	-0.03	-0.19	-0.05

4.2. Tests based on quarterly and semiannual data

The quarterly and semiannual results in table 6 suggest more pronounced relationships between unexpected inflation rates and asset returns. The negative relationship between the common stock returns, s_{et} , and s_{vt} , and the unexpected inflation proxy shows up more reliably, at least in the results for quarterly data. For the returns on the government bond portfolios (D_{1t} , D_{2t} , D_{3t} , and D_{4t}), the estimates of γ_j get progressively more negative as one goes from the monthly regressions in table 5 to the quarterly and semiannual regressions in table 6, and in all cases, the absolute magnitude of $\hat{\gamma}_j$ increases with term to maturity.

On the other hand, for quarterly and semiannual labor income, the estimates of γ_j , the coefficient of the unexpected inflation proxy in (9), are very different from each other, although both estimates have large standard errors. Indeed, a coherent explanation for the monthly, quarterly, and semiannual estimates of eq. (9) for the labor income variable, h_t , is not evident. Perhaps a more detailed

analysis of the relationship between inflation and labor income, emphasizing the 'wage lag' hypothesis of Kessel and Alchian (1960) or 'Phillips Curve' phenomena, would yield more consistent results. Or perhaps there are unidentified problems in the way the labor income variable is measured. In any case, our results show little relationship between nominal labor income and the expected and unexpected components of inflation measured over periods of up to six months.

There is a more interesting story in the measured relationships between the return to real estate, r_t , and unexpected inflation rates. In tables 5 and 6, the estimates of γ_j for the return to real estate are largest for semiannual data (1.14), next largest for quarterly data (0.56), and smallest for monthly data (0.31). All of these estimates are more than two standard errors above zero. One interpretation of these results is that real estate provides a better hedge against longer-term unexpected inflation. However, an alternative explanation, based on measurement problems in the real estate data, seems more plausible. Moreover, it suggests that real estate is a complete hedge against expected and unexpected inflation, even on a monthly basis.

The Home Purchase Price index from which r_t is calculated is computed as a three month moving average, and since the actual transaction dates typically occur from one to three months prior to the time they are reflected in the index, the correlation between r_t and unexpected inflation rates is spuriously spread over six months. However, looking at longer holding periods has the effect of overcoming most of the non-synchronous measurement of r_t and unexpected inflation.

The lags built into the measurement of r_t do not have a similar attenuating effect on the estimates of β_j , the coefficient for the interest rate in (9), which are all relatively close to unity for the real estate variable, even in the monthly data of table 5. This result is probably due to the fact that the interest rate, our proxy for the expected inflation rate, is a slowly wandering series whose level shows much persistence through time (see table 1). Thus, even though it is a little out of date, the 'expected' inflation rate portion of the measured real estate return is probably highly correlated with the expected inflation rate which is built into the current interest rate.

An alternative approach to estimating the effects of nonsynchronous measurement of r_t and the monthly unexpected inflation rate is provided by the model

$$\tilde{r}_t = \alpha + \beta B_{1t} + \sum_{i=0}^6 \gamma_i (\Delta_{t-i} - B_{1t-i}) + \tilde{\varepsilon}_t \quad (10)$$

As noted earlier, our proxy for the unexpected monthly inflation rate, $(\Delta_t - B_{1t})$, is serially uncorrelated, so the seven unexpected inflation rates in eq. (10) are uncorrelated. Since there is reason to believe that the current measured return to real estate, r_t , is composed of price changes which have occurred over the last

three to six months, we expect some of the coefficients of lagged unexpected inflation rates in (10) to be positive. The estimate of eq. (10) using monthly data from July 1953 to July 1971 is

$$\begin{aligned}
 r_t = & -0.0009 + 1.22B_{1t} + 0.27(\Delta_t - B_{1t}) + 0.31(\Delta_{t-1} - B_{1t-1}) \\
 & (0.0005) (0.16) \quad (0.11) \quad (0.11) \\
 & + 0.22(\Delta_{t-2} - B_{1t-2}) - 0.06(\Delta_{t-3} - B_{1t-3}) + 0.23(\Delta_{t-4} - B_{1t-4}) \\
 & (0.11) \quad (0.11) \quad (0.11) \\
 & - 0.10(\Delta_{t-5} - B_{1t-5}) + 0.01(\Delta_{t-6} - B_{1t-6}) + \hat{\epsilon}_t, \\
 & (0.11) \quad (0.11)
 \end{aligned}$$

where standard errors are in parentheses. The F -statistic for the hypothesis that $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \dots = \gamma_6 = 0$ is 3.01, which is greater than the 0.01 fractile of the F -distribution with 6 and 208 degrees of freedom.

Moreover, applying the analysis of Scholes and Williams (1977) indicates that the sum of the estimators of the coefficients of current and lagged unexpected inflation rates in (10) is a consistent estimator of the contemporaneous relationship between the true return to real estate and the unexpected monthly inflation rate when there are no dating errors in $\Delta_t - B_{1t}$, but there are lagged dating errors in r_t . The sum of the estimated coefficients of unexpected inflation rates

$$\sum_{i=0}^6 \hat{\gamma}_i = 0.88,$$

is close to one, with a standard error (calculated as the square root of the sum of the variances of the individual coefficients) equal to 0.29.

In short, once we take account of the measurement errors in the real estate return, either in the manner of (10) or by working with semi-annual data, estimates of β_j and γ_j in (9) are both close to unity. These results are consistent with the hypothesis that real estate is a complete hedge against inflation, expected and unexpected. That is, the nominal return to real estate varies directly with both the expected and unexpected components of the inflation rate, so that the real return to real estate (the nominal return minus the inflation rate) is unrelated to the inflation rate.

Note, however, that being a complete hedge against inflation does not imply that the inflation adjusted return to real estate is certain. For example, the coefficient of determination in the semiannual regression in table 6 suggests that about 40 percent of the variance of the semiannual real estate return is left unexplained by the combined effects of the expected and unexpected components of the semiannual inflation rate.

5. Short-term bills as hedges against longer-term inflation

Table 6 also shows estimates of (9) for quarterly and semiannual data where the dependent variables are the returns from strategies of rolling over a sequence of shorter-term bills. For example, the quarterly return to one month treasury bills, labeled B_{1t} , in part A of table 6, is the sum of the three monthly returns on one month bills during the quarter. The semiannual returns on one, two, and three month bills, B_{1t} , B_{2t} , and B_{3t} , used in part B of table 6, are likewise obtained by rolling over the relevant shorter-term bills during the six month period. Thus, the six-month version of B_{2t} involves three consecutive two month bills, while B_{3t} is obtained by purchasing two consecutive three month bills.

Since short-term bill returns contain assessments of expected inflation rates which are updated within longer holding periods, the strategy of rolling over short-term bills provides a hedge against changes in expected inflation rates during longer holding periods. For example, the return to maturity on a three month bill cannot adjust to intraquarter changes in expectations about inflation, whereas month to month reassessments of the expected inflation rate are built into the quarterly return on a sequence of one month bills.

In statistical terms, the *ex ante* interest rate or return on a three month bill contains measurement error as an estimate of the sequence of one month expected inflation rates impounded in the quarterly return on three successive one month bills. Likewise, the *ex ante* interest rate or return on a six month bill contains measurement error as a measure of the expected inflation rates impounded in strategies of rolling over one, two, or three month bills during the six month period. This measurement error perhaps explains why for the short-term bills the estimates of β_j , the coefficient of the longer-term interest rate, are several standard errors less than unity in both the quarterly and semiannual regressions in table 6.

The returns to strategies of rolling over shorter-term bills produce estimates of γ_j , the coefficient of the unexpected inflation proxy in (9), which are all positive and more than two standard errors from zero. Although we now seem to be dealing with unexpected quarterly and semiannual inflation rates, this result is again traceable to the fact that rolling over shorter-term bills provides a moving hedge against changes in expected inflation rates which is not obtained when a longer-term bill is purchased and held to maturity.

For example, a sequence of six one month bills takes advantage of the market's monthly reassessments of expected inflation rates, whereas the return on a six month bill held to maturity does not benefit from such updates of inflation expectations. However, our proxy for the unexpected semiannual inflation rate is just $A_t - B_{6t}$, the *ex post* six month inflation rate minus the interest rate on a six month bill set at the beginning of the semiannual period. Even if B_{6t} fully reflects all of the information about the inflation rate for the coming six months which is available at the beginning of the period, $A_t - B_{6t}$ is nevertheless at least

partially attributable to changes in expectations about inflation that take place within the semiannual period. Since these intraperiod changes in expected inflation rates are built into the returns to strategies of rolling over shorter-term bills, they account for the positive estimates of γ_j for the returns to these strategies. The estimates of γ_j are far from unity because only a small part of the variation in the longer-term unexpected inflation rate is due to the shorter-term reassessments of expected inflation rates that are captured by the rollover strategies.

6. Common stocks and inflation

6.1. Theoretical considerations

Various arguments can be given for why common stocks might be helped or hurt by unanticipated inflation. For example, Kessel (1956) argues that unanticipated inflation is to the benefit of the stockholders of firms that are net debtors. In more general terms, unanticipated inflation should benefit the common stock of firms that have made more long-term commitments to pay fixed nominal amounts than to receive them. The net debtor-creditor hypothesis is difficult to implement empirically since a firm might have long-term contracts to purchase labor, raw materials, and capital, to sell its own products, and to borrow money to finance its operations. Nevertheless, this hypothesis and others [see, for example, Lintner's (1975) discussion of the tax effects of inflation] provide some theoretical possibilities for explaining the effects of unanticipated inflation on the returns to common stocks.

On the other hand, like others who have investigated the topic, for example, Lintner (1975), Nelson (1976), and Jaffe and Mandelker (1976), we have no explanation for the negative relationship between common stock returns and the *expected* component of the inflation rate. There are two possibilities. Some as yet unidentified phenomenon might cause equilibrium expected real returns to stocks to be negatively related to expected inflation rates, or the market might be inefficient in impounding available information about future inflation into stock prices.

We now examine the relationship between stock returns and the expected inflation rate from a different perspective and in somewhat more detail. The additional results improve our understanding of the statistical nature of the phenomenon, but we remain unable to identify its economic origins.

6.2. Some additional tests

Using data for the January 1953 to July 1971 period, the estimated regression of the monthly return to the value-weighted portfolio of NYSE common stocks on the one month treasury bill rate is

$$s_{or} = 0.0234 - 5.50B_{1t} + \hat{\epsilon}_t, \quad R^2 = 0.03, \quad S(\hat{\epsilon}) = 0.0356. \\ (0.0054) (1.85) \quad (11)$$

Thus, the estimated relationship between the expected nominal return on stocks for month t and our proxy for the expected inflation rate for month t (the one month bill rate set at the end on month $t-1$) is

$$E(\hat{s}_{vt} | B_{1,t}) = 0.0234 - 5.5B_{1,t}. \quad (12)$$

If the return on a one month bill exceeds 0.0042, that is, 0.42 percent per month, eq. (12) assesses a negative expected nominal return on the portfolio of NYSE common stocks. During the twenty-three month period from January 1969 through November 1970, $B_{1,t}$ was always greater than 0.0042, implying that expected nominal returns on NYSE stocks were negative during this period. For example, in February 1970, $B_{1,t}$ was 0.0063, which implies an expected nominal return on stocks of approximately -1.17 percent for this month.

While market efficiency does not rule out a negative relationship between expected returns on common stocks and expected inflation rates, it does rule out situations where risky assets (common stocks) have lower expected returns than less risky assets such as treasury bills or even cash. It is of some interest, then, to test more systematically the extent to which the negative relationship between interest rates and expected returns to common stocks can be used for profit. We examine the following trading strategy:

- (a) Using thirty-six months of data starting in January 1953, estimate the regression of the return to the value-weighted portfolio of common stocks, s_{vt} , on the one month treasury bill rate, $B_{1,t}$.
- (b) Use the estimates of the regression parameters along with the interest rate on one month treasury bills observed at the end of the thirty-sixth month to assess \hat{s}_{vt} , the expected return on the common stock portfolio for the thirty-seventh month.
- (c) If this prediction of the return on stocks is less than the treasury bill return, $\hat{s}_{vt} < B_{1,t}$, buy the treasury bill in that month, so that the return on the strategy is $R_{pt} = B_{1,t}$. Otherwise, buy the stock portfolio, so that $R_{pt} = s_{vt}$.
- (d) Update the estimates of the stock return-interest rate relationship in step (a) by dropping the oldest month and adding the most recent month (always using the most recent three years' worth of data for estimation), and repeat steps (b) and (c).

The strategy is in operation for each month from January 1956 through December 1975. Note that since the treasury bill rate which is being used to predict stock returns for month t is available at the beginning of the month, the strategy is of interest irrespective of one's attitude toward our proposition that the bill rate is a good proxy for the expected inflation rate.

Table 7 summarizes the returns on the strategy, R_{pt} , in comparison to the returns from a policy of buying and holding the portfolio of NYSE common stocks in each period, s_{pt} , and in comparison to the returns from holding a sequence of one month treasury bills, B_{1t} . In calculating R_{pt} , s_{pt} , and B_{1t} , there are no adjustments for transactions costs. Table 7 also summarizes the returns, R_{pt}^* , on the strategy under the assumption that a switch between bills and stocks involves a one percent cost.

In many ways the strategy of switching between stocks and bills seems to do well vis-à-vis the policy of buying and holding stocks. The standard deviations of the monthly returns to the strategy are lower than those from the stocks only policy, reflecting the fact that the variability of the returns on the switching strategy is low when bills are held. Ignoring transactions costs, the average return on the switching strategy for the overall period is 8.4 percent per year versus 7.1 percent for the stocks only policy. When the overall period is divided into three subperiods, the switching strategy provides higher average returns than the stocks only policy in two of the three comparisons. When four subperiods are examined, the switching strategy provides larger average returns in three of them.

However, other evidence in table 7 is less favorable to the strategy of switching between stocks and bills. When an adjustment is made for the higher transactions costs of the switching strategy, the comparison of average returns is reversed. The buy and hold policy then shows larger average returns than the switching strategy for the overall period and for most of the subperiods. Thus, the switching strategy does not seem to be a practical prescription for beating the market.

More interesting for understanding the economics of the pricing process is the statistical evidence in table 7 that, even when transactions costs are ignored, the switching strategy is not reliably better than the policy of buying and holding common stocks. The t -statistics for the differences between the average returns from buying and holding stocks and the average returns from switching between stocks and bills are never much different from zero. Even for the latest subperiods, when the switching strategy works best, the t -statistics are close to -1.0 . In subperiods when the stocks only policy does better, the t -statistics for the average return differences are close to 1.0 . For the overall period, the t -statistic on the difference between the average return to stocks and the average return to the switching strategy is -0.54 .

These results are important. Regressions like (11) indicate that there is a reliable negative relationship between the level of the expected returns on common stocks and the level of the treasury bill rate. Equivalently, given that the coefficient of the interest rate in (11) is about three standard errors below zero, there is little doubt that the risk premium on stocks, the difference between the expected returns on stocks and bills, varies inversely with the interest rate. However, regressions like (11) explain little of the variance of stock returns (R^2 is only 0.03), which in turn means relatively large standard errors for the estimated regression coefficient of the interest rate. This shows up in the tests of

Table 7
 Comparisons of returns to stocks (s_w), bills (B_{1t}), and an expected inflation trading strategy (R_{pt})*

Period	T	Average annualized percent returns				Standard deviations of monthly returns			Trading strategy switches			
		\bar{s}_w	R_p	R_p^*	\bar{B}_1	$S(s_w)$	$S(R_p)$	$S(R_p^*)$	$S(B_1)$	Number of months in bills	Number of switches	$t(\bar{s}_w - R_p)$
1/56 - 12/75	240	7.1	8.4	6.2	4.0	0.0407	0.0241	0.0243	0.0015	100	46	-0.54
1/56 - 12/61	72	11.8	13.1	10.6	2.3	0.0328	0.0244	0.0250	0.0006	39	16	-0.44
1/62 - 12/68	84	9.4	5.6	3.1	3.7	0.0355	0.0234	0.0239	0.0007	28	18	1.06
1/69 - 12/75	84	0.7	7.2	5.5	5.7	0.0503	0.0245	0.0242	0.0012	45	12	-1.13
1/56 - 12/60	60	9.4	11.0	8.0	2.4	0.0338	0.0238	0.0243	0.0006	27	16	-0.44
1/61 - 12/65	60	12.4	8.0	5.2	3.0	0.0341	0.0266	0.0255	0.0005	12	14	1.22
1/66 - 7/71	67	4.6	6.4	4.9	5.0	0.0421	0.0229	0.0234	0.0009	30	7	-0.35
8/71 - 12/75	53	1.6	8.7	6.9	5.7	0.0518	0.0241	0.0241	0.0014	27	8	-0.94

*The standard deviations shown are for monthly continuously compounded returns. Average annualized percent returns are average continuously compounded monthly returns multiplied by 1200. The standard deviations used in calculating the t -statistics, $t(\bar{s}_w - R_p)$, are based on the time series of the difference $s_{wt} - R_{pt}$.

the trading strategy which indicate that the regressions are not reliably identifying periods when the expected returns on stocks are less than the returns on bills.⁴

Thus, although there is good evidence that the expected risk premium on stocks varies inversely with the interest rate, the parameters of the relationship are not estimated with sufficient precision to allow reliable inferences that there are periods when the expected risk premium is negative. The reliable negative relationship between expected stock returns and the *ex ante* interest rate (which we like to interpret as a proxy for the expected inflation rate) remains an economic enigma, but we cannot as yet reliably conclude that it is evidence of a market inefficiency.

7. Effects of changes in the interest rate

7.1. Government bonds

The results in tables 5 and 6 indicate that the holding period returns to portfolios of government bonds are negatively related to the current unexpected inflation proxy. One possible explanation is that current unexpected inflation contains information about future expected inflation, which in turn affects future expected nominal returns on bonds. If there is an unanticipated rise in expected future inflation rates, current prices of bonds fall in order to raise future expected nominal returns. Moreover, the monthly expected inflation rate proxy, $B_{1,t}$, follows a process somewhat like a random walk, so any change in the expected inflation rate is expected to persist.⁵ Since long-term bonds have more future periods requiring adjustments in expected nominal returns, unanticipated changes in expected future inflation rates have a greater effect on the current *ex post* returns to longer-term bonds. Fama (1976a) provides a formal development of this argument and supporting empirical evidence.

Recalling that B_{t+1} and B_t are observed at the end of periods t and $t-1$, respectively, the change in the treasury bill rate, $(B_{t+1} - B_t)$, measures the change in the expected inflation rate from $t-1$ to t plus any change in the expected real return to bills. If the market uses more information than that contained in past

⁴We have also tested the strategy of switching between stocks and bills with different conventions concerning the number of preceding months used to generate the time series of estimates of the stock return-interest rate relationship. When compared with other options that were tried, the results in table 7, which are based on estimates from thirty-six months of preceding data, are relatively favorable to the switching strategy.

⁵The extrapolative time series model (a first-order moving average process for the first differences of the monthly inflation rate) used by Nelson (1976) and Nelson and Schwert (1977) to predict the monthly CPI inflation rate also implies that the expected inflation rate follows a random walk. Thus, any change in the expected inflation rate is permanent, and the change in the expected inflation rate is proportional to the current unexpected inflation rate.

Table 8

Effects of changes in expectations of inflation (standard errors in parentheses).

Asset	$\hat{\alpha}_j$	$\hat{\beta}_j$	$\hat{\gamma}_j$	$\hat{\delta}_j$	R^2	$S(\hat{\epsilon}_j)$	$\rho_1(\hat{\epsilon}_j)$	$\rho_2(\hat{\epsilon}_j)$	$\rho_3(\hat{\epsilon}_j)$
(A) Monthly data: 1/53-7/71, $T = 223$									
$R_{jt} = \hat{\alpha}_j + \hat{\beta}_j B_{1t} + \hat{\gamma}_j (\Delta_t - B_{pt}) + \hat{\delta}_j (B_{1t+1} - B_{1t}) + \hat{\epsilon}_{jt}$									
B_{2t}	0.0003 (0.0001)	1.03 (0.02)	0.01 (0.01)	-0.40 (0.07)	0.95	0.0003	0.33	0.19	0.20
B_{3t}	0.0003 (0.0001)	1.06 (0.03)	0.01 (0.02)	-0.91 (0.11)	0.89	0.0005	0.18	0.17	0.20
D_{1t}	0.0006 (0.0006)	0.94 (0.19)	-0.15 (0.13)	-5.94 (0.78)	0.29	0.0037	0.04	-0.04	0.03
D_{2t}	0.0010 (0.0009)	0.77 (0.31)	-0.22 (0.20)	-8.89 (1.23)	0.22	0.0059	-0.03	0.03	0.03
D_{3t}	0.0011 (0.0011)	0.62 (0.38)	-0.34 (0.25)	-10.76 (1.51)	0.20	0.0072	0.02	0.03	0.04
D_{4t}	0.0009 (0.0014)	0.56 (0.46)	-0.45 (0.30)	-11.88 (1.85)	0.16	0.0088	0.01	0.01	0.04
r_t	-0.0012 (0.0005)	1.20 (0.17)	0.32 (0.11)	0.41 (0.67)	0.20	0.0032	0.22	0.00	-0.17
h_t	0.0019 (0.0009)	0.53 (0.31)	0.17 (0.20)	0.58 (1.25)	0.00	0.0059	0.08	0.10	-0.03
s_{vt}	0.0243 (0.0055)	-6.03 (1.84)	-0.91 (1.21)	-17.70 (7.43)	0.05	0.0352	0.08	-0.04	-0.03
s_{et}	0.0249 (0.0064)	-6.21 (2.17)	-2.49 (1.43)	-17.54 (8.77)	0.05	0.0416	0.15	0.05	-0.05
(B) Quarterly data: 1/53-6/71, $T = 74$									
$R_{jt} = \hat{\alpha}_j + \hat{\beta}_j B_{3t} + \hat{\gamma}_j (\Delta_t - B_{3t}) + \hat{\delta}_j (B_{3t+1} - B_{3t}) + \hat{\epsilon}_{jt}$									
D_{1t}	0.0014 (0.0012)	0.91 (0.12)	-0.18 (0.13)	-4.47 (0.32)	0.81	0.0042	-0.08	-0.06	-0.14
D_{2t}	0.0023 (0.0021)	0.74 (0.21)	-0.43 (0.22)	-7.16 (0.55)	0.76	0.0070	-0.08	-0.19	-0.14
D_{3t}	0.0022 (0.0026)	0.60 (0.27)	-0.74 (0.28)	-8.51 (0.69)	0.73	0.0090	0.02	-0.19	-0.10
D_{4t}	0.0018 (0.0034)	0.54 (0.35)	-0.79 (0.36)	-9.66 (0.90)	0.66	0.0116	-0.04	-0.22	-0.05
r_t	-0.0039 (0.0019)	1.20 (0.19)	0.50 (0.20)	0.80 (0.50)	0.37	0.0064	-0.16	0.09	-0.03
h_t	0.0031 (0.0031)	0.59 (0.31)	-0.46 (0.33)	1.95 (0.81)	0.08	0.0105	0.05	0.13	-0.18
s_{vt}	0.0619 (0.0204)	-5.24 (2.07)	-3.75 (2.17)	-5.21 (5.38)	0.08	0.0693	0.02	-0.08	-0.09
s_{et}	0.0614 (0.0254)	-5.44 (2.57)	-6.00 (2.70)	-7.17 (6.68)	0.09	0.0860	0.06	-0.01	-0.11

inflation rates to form expectations of future inflation rates, the change in the expected inflation rate which is incorporated in $(B_{t+1} - B_t)$ reflects more information than is in the current unexpected inflation rate. To test this hypothesis, estimates of

$$\tilde{R}_{jt} = \alpha_j + \beta_j B_t + \gamma_j (\Delta_t - B_t) + \delta_j (B_{t+1} - B_t) + \tilde{\epsilon}_{jt} \quad (13)$$

are presented in table 8. Note again that the proxy for the current unexpected inflation rate, $(\Delta_t - B_t)$, is contemporaneous with $(B_{t+1} - B_t)$. Thus, if the market uses information beyond that contained in past inflation rates to form expectations of future inflation rates, we expect that γ_j in (13) will be equal to zero and δ_j will be negative for assets such as government bonds and bills whose payoffs are fixed in nominal terms.

The estimates of (13) from monthly data, shown in part A of table 8, are consistent with the hypothesis that γ_j is zero and δ_j is negative for bills and bonds. For these assets, none of the estimates of γ_j , the coefficient for the unexpected inflation proxy, is as much as two standard errors from zero; all of the estimates of δ_j , the coefficient of the change in the one month treasury bill rate, are more than six standard errors below zero, and the estimates of δ_j become progressively more negative with increases in term to maturity.

The estimates of (13) from quarterly data, shown in part B of table 8, also produce significant negative estimates of δ_j , which is now the coefficient of the change from one quarter to the next in the three month treasury bill rate, our proxy for the change in the quarterly expected inflation rate. For the quarterly returns on the bond portfolios, the estimates of δ_j are all more than ten standard errors below zero. The estimates of γ_j , the coefficient of the quarterly unexpected inflation proxy, are closer to zero in table 8 than in table 6, where the regression model does not include the change in the treasury bill rate, but the standard errors of $\hat{\gamma}_j$ are also smaller in table 8, so $\hat{\gamma}_j$ is still more than two standard errors from zero for the longer-term bond portfolio returns, D_3 , and D_4 .

In short, $(B_{t+1} - B_t)$, our proxy for the unanticipated change in the expected inflation rate from time $t-1$ to time t , shows strong negative relationships with the *ex post* returns to government bonds from $t-1$ to t , and the magnitude of the effect increases with term to maturity. The effect of our proxy for the unexpected inflation rate, $(\Delta_t - B_t)$, on the *ex post* nominal returns to the bond portfolios is mitigated when the change in the treasury bill rate is included in the regression model, but the effect of the unexpected inflation proxy does not disappear. This could be due in part to variation in the expected real returns on bills which contaminates $(B_{t+1} - B_t)$ as a measure of the unanticipated change in the expected inflation rate and prevents the change in the interest rate from fully neutralizing the effects of the unexpected inflation proxy, $(\Delta_t - B_t)$. Moreover, to the extent that there is predictability in the changes in the expected inflation rate, that is, if the expected inflation rate is not exactly a random walk, then there

is additional error in $(B_{t+1} - B_t)$ as a measure of the unanticipated change in the expected inflation rate.⁶

7.2. Other assets

There is no reason to hypothesize that changes in the expected inflation rate from $t-1$ to t , as approximated by $(B_{t+1} - B_t)$, will have any specific effect on the *ex post* returns at time t to assets whose future cash payoffs are not fixed in nominal terms. Since cash payoffs on such assets can adjust to reflect current expectations about inflation, expected real payoffs may be independent of the expected inflation rate, in which case δ_j in (13) is equal to zero.

In the tests on monthly data in table 8, the estimates of δ_j for the real estate return, r_t , and for labor income, h_t , are less than one standard error from zero. However, in the quarterly data both variables produce estimates of δ_j that are positive and fairly large relative to their standard errors. Since the t -statistic on δ_j in the regression for the quarterly real estate return is only 1.6, we are inclined to attribute most of the deviation of the coefficient from zero to chance. On the other hand, the t -statistic for δ_j in the quarterly labor income regression is in excess of 2.0. On a statistical basis, this is more impressive, but the result is nevertheless somewhat strange, given that the estimate of the coefficient of B_{3t} , 0.58, is somewhat less than 1.0. In other words, labor income for quarter t seems to adjust in advance to changes in the three month expected inflation rate, $B_{3t+1} - B_{3t}$, while adjusting only partially to the expected inflation rate impounded in B_{3t} at the beginning of the quarter. In short, the quarterly labor income regressions in table 8, like the earlier results for labor income, leave us with a confused picture of the qualities of human capital as a hedge against inflation.

Finally, the estimates of δ_j for monthly common stock returns in part A of table 8 are negative and more than two standard errors below zero. The point estimates indicate that an increase from the end of month $t-1$ to the end of month t in the one month bill rate is associated with a lowering of common stock returns for month t which is, on average, about seventeen times as large as the increase in the interest rate. Moreover, given that B_{1t} behaves much like a random walk, and given that the expanded model in table 8 also produces negative estimated coefficients for the interest rate B_{1t} , an increase in the interest rate also reduces expected returns on stocks in the future since the higher level of B_{1t+1} is expected to persist.

This extreme picture of the double effect of a change in the interest rate on stock returns is attenuated by the results for quarterly data in table 8 where the estimated coefficients for the change in the quarterly bill rate, $B_{3t+1} - B_{3t}$,

⁶Some evidence on the existence of these possible sources of contamination of $(B_{t+1} - B_t)$ as a measure of the change in the expected inflation rate is in Hess and Bicksler (1975), Fama (1976a, 1976c), and Nelson and Schwert (1977).

though still substantially negative, are not large relative to their substantial standard errors. However, as in earlier tables, the estimates of the regression coefficient for the unexpected inflation rate $\Delta_t - B_t$, though not always large relative to their standard errors, are consistently negative. On balance, we conclude that table 8 makes a net contribution to the overall impression that common stocks are, on several counts, rather perverse inflation hedges, at least in the period since 1953.

8. Implications for multiperiod models of market equilibrium

Our results provide some of the first empirical clues about how multiperiod considerations might cause equilibrium expected returns on assets to deviate from the predictions of the Sharpe (1964) - Lintner (1965) - Black (1972) models of market equilibrium. The regression results suggest that expected nominal returns on real estate, bonds, and bills vary directly with the level of the expected inflation rate (as proxied by the nominal interest rate), so that the expected real returns on these assets are unrelated to the expected inflation rate. On the other hand, expected nominal returns to common stocks are negatively related to the level of the expected inflation rate, which implies an even stronger negative relationship between the expected inflation rate and the expected real returns on stocks. Thus, the portfolio opportunity set facing investors changes through time in that the differences between the expected real returns on stocks and the expected real returns on other assets vary with the level of the nominal interest rate.

According to the analyses of Fama (1970), Merton (1973), Long (1974), and Fama and MacBeth (1974), changes through time in the portfolio opportunity set can become a problem for the Sharpe-Lintner-Black models when (i) there are relationships between asset returns realized at t and the characteristics of the portfolio opportunity set that turns up at t , and (ii) these relationships differ across assets. When these two conditions are met, different assets do not provide equivalent hedges against changes in the opportunity set. Their differential properties as hedges can lead to differences among the expected returns on assets from $t-1$ and t above and beyond the differences implied by the 'market risks' of the assets, whereas in the Sharpe-Lintner-Black models, market risk is the sole determinant of differences in expected returns.

In our tests, the key variable for changes in the portfolio opportunity set from $t-1$ to t is the change in the interest rate, our proxy for the change in the level of the expected inflation rate, since this change seems to imply changes in the structure of expected real returns on assets from t to $t+1$. The evidence in table 8 is that the nominal returns from $t-1$ to t on common stocks and on government debt instruments are related to the change in the interest rate, and the relationships are not the same across assets. For example, the returns on the government debt instruments are progressively more sensitive to the change in

the interest rate the longer is the term to maturity of the instrument. Thus, different assets seem to have different qualities as hedges against the changes in the portfolio opportunity set that are related to changes in the interest rate, which is the sort of thing that can give rise to differential expected returns on assets from $t-1$ to t beyond those predicted by the simple versions of the Sharpe-Lintner-Black models.

9. Conclusions

9.1. Summary of results

The evidence suggests that, of all the assets examined, only private residential real estate is a complete hedge against both expected and unexpected inflation during the 1953-71 period. On average, the nominal real estate return moves in one-to-one correspondence with both the expected and unexpected components of the inflation rate, so that the *ex post* real return to real estate is unrelated to the *ex post* inflation rate.

Government debt instruments, bonds and bills, are complete hedges against expected inflation. The expected nominal returns on these instruments vary directly with the expected inflation rate so that their expected real returns are unrelated to the expected inflation rate.

At least for time intervals up to six months in length, human capital is at best a partial hedge against expected and unexpected inflation. However, the estimates of the relationships between labor income and expected and unexpected inflation rates are consistent with such wide ranges of values for the coefficients that the regression results do not provide convincing evidence on the qualities of human capital as an inflation hedge. More qualitative evidence for longer subperiods, like that in table 3, suggests that labor income tends to move with the inflation rate, but even in these rough tests the correspondence is not always consistent across subperiods.

Common stock returns are negatively related to the expected inflation rate during the 1953-71 period. Although the results are less consistent, common stock returns also seem to be negatively related to the unexpected inflation rate and to changes in the expected inflation rate. Thus, contrary to long-held beliefs, but in line with accumulating empirical evidence, common stocks are rather perverse as hedges against inflation. However, little of the variation in stock returns is accounted for by their negative measured relationships with expected and unexpected inflation rates. Moreover, our attempts to construct trading rules based on the stock return-expected inflation rate relationship do not lead to the conclusion that expected returns on stocks have sometimes wandered so low during periods of high expected inflation as to be below treasury bill rates.

9.2. Relation to previous studies

Fama (1975, 1976a) documents the properties of treasury bills as hedges against expected inflation rates. This paper extends his analysis by examining longer-term bills as hedges against shorter-term expected inflation rates, by examining the ability of a succession of short-term bills to hedge against expected and unexpected inflation rates over longer holding periods, and by analyzing the effects of changes in expectations of future inflation rates on the holding period returns to longer-term bills.

The analysis of private residential real estate and of the Bildersee (1974) government bond portfolios as hedges against expected and unexpected inflation does not seem to have a precedent. In Fama and Schwert (1977a), we suggest that human capital might have been a hedge against inflation during the 1953-72 period, but the results reported here do not strongly support that conjecture.

The negative relationship observed between the returns to common stocks and expected inflation rates confirms and extends the evidence of Lintner (1975), Jaffe and Mandelker (1976), Body (1976), and Nelson (1976). This finding stands out even more in our work since the other assets that we examine are at least partial hedges against expected inflation. While the negative relationship of common stock returns with expected inflation rates does not account for a large portion of the variation in common stock returns, and although it does not seem to imply profitable trading rules, the existence of the relationship is nonetheless anomalous.

References

- Bildersee, John, 1974, Some new bond indexes extended and expanded results, Working Paper no. 2-74, Jan. (Rodney White Center for Financial Research, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA).
- Black, Fischer, 1972, Capital market equilibrium with restricted borrowing, *Journal of Business* 45, July, 444-455.
- Body, Zvi, 1976, Common stocks as a hedge against inflation, *Journal of Finance* 31, May, 459-470.
- Box, G.E.P. and G.M. Jenkins, 1976, *Time series analysis*, rev. ed. (Holden-Day, San Francisco, CA).
- Fama, Eugene F., 1970, Multiperiod consumption-investment decisions, *American Economic Review* 60, March, 163-174.
- Fama, Eugene F., 1975, Short-term interest rates as predictors of inflation, *American Economic Review* 65, June, 269-282.
- Fama, Eugene F., 1976a, Inflation uncertainty and expected returns on treasury bills, *Journal of Political Economy* 84, June, 427-448.
- Fama, Eugene F., 1976b, *Foundations of finance* (Basic Books, New York).
- Fama, Eugene F., 1976c, Forward rates as predictors of future spot rates, *Journal of Financial Economics* 3, Oct., 362-377.
- Fama, Eugene F. and James MacBeth, 1974, Tests of the multi-period two parameter model, *Journal of Financial Economics* 1, May, 43-66.
- Fama, Eugene F. and G. William Schwert, 1977a, Human capital and capital market equilibrium, *Journal of Financial Economics* 4, Jan., 95-125.

- Fama, Eugene F. and G. William Schwert, 1977b, Inflation, interest and relative prices, Working Paper no. 7720, May (Graduate School of Management, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY) forthcoming in the *Journal of Business*.
- Fisher, Irving, 1930, *The theory of interest* (MacMillan, New York).
- Hess, Patrick J. and James L. Bicksler, 1975, Capital asset prices versus time series models as predictors of inflation: The expected real rate of interest and market efficiency, *Journal of Financial Economics* 2, Dec., 341-360.
- Jaffe, Jeffrey and Gershon Mandelker, 1976, The 'Fisher effect' for risky assets: An empirical investigation, *Journal of Finance* 31, May, 447-458.
- Kessel, Reuben, 1956, Inflation-caused wealth redistribution: A test of a hypothesis, *American Economic Review* 46, March, 128-141.
- Kessel, Reuben and Armen Alchian, 1960, The meaning and validity of the inflation-induced lag of wages behind prices, *American Economic Review* 50, March, 45-66.
- Lintner, John, 1965, The valuation of risk assets and the selection of risky investments in stock portfolios and capital budgets, *Review of Economics and Statistics* 47, Feb., 13-37.
- Lintner, John, 1975, Inflation and security returns, *Journal of Finance* 30, May, 259-280.
- Long, John B., 1974, Stock prices, inflation and the term structure of interest rates, *Journal of Financial Economics* 1, July, 131-170.
- Merton, Robert C., 1973, An intertemporal capital asset pricing model, *Econometrica* 41, Sept., 867-887.
- Nelson, Charles R., 1976, Inflation and rates of return on common stocks, *Journal of Finance* 31, May, 471-483.
- Nelson, Charles R. and G. William Schwert, 1977, On testing the hypothesis that the real rate of interest is constant, *American Economic Review* 67, June, 478-486.
- Scholes, Myron and Joseph Williams, 1977, Estimating betas with nonsynchronous data, Working paper (University of Chicago, Chicago, IL) forthcoming in the *Journal of Financial Economics*.
- Sharpe, William F., 1964, Capital asset prices: A theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk, *Journal of Finance* 19, Sept., 425-442.
- Theil, Henri, 1971, *Principles of econometrics* (Wiley, New York).