



A Conversation With

Steven Bleiberg
Managing Director,
Portfolio Manager,
TD Epoch

Traversing the Equity Style Spectrum

Investors often think of the equity market as being divided into value stocks and growth stocks. Can you describe the difference between the two?

Value is essentially a price-driven characterization. A stock is considered a “value” stock when its price is low relative to either its book value, its annual earnings, or its dividend, compared to other companies. Implicitly, these three metrics – book value, earnings, and dividends – are viewed as being indicative of a company’s intrinsic worth. The less you have to pay per dollar of book value (or earnings or dividends), the better “value” you are thought to be getting. Growth has nothing to do with price; it’s all about how fast a company is growing its revenues and its earnings. “growth” stocks are simply stocks with high levels of revenue and/or earnings growth.

Is it common for stocks to move from one of these buckets to the other?

Before I answer that, I should point out that growth and value, under the definitions I just outlined, are not really opposites. A company might have high revenue growth while also selling at a low multiple of its earnings, meeting the criteria for both designations. Or it might meet neither one! That is, a company might have a low growth rate while selling at high valuation multiples. So it’s not quite accurate to think of stocks as always necessarily falling into one, and only one, of these two buckets. The companies that provide indices, like MSCI and Russell, acknowledge this, and will sometimes assign a stock partially to one index and partially to another, as odd as that might seem. So with that background, yes, sometimes a stock might move completely from one bucket to the other. At other times a stock might go from being completely in one bucket to being in both, or vice

versa. Or sometimes it might stay in both buckets simultaneously but the proportions might change. A famous example from recent history is one of today's tech giants. Between September of 2021 and October of 2022, the stock fell 75%. While the company's earnings did fall in 2022, they did not fall nearly as much as the price, so the price/earnings ratio dropped significantly, and in mid-2022 the company got added to value indices after years of being classified as purely a growth stock. But by the middle of 2023 the stock had tripled off of its low, and was once again moved back into the growth bucket in the indices. One more thing to keep in mind is that the index providers like to keep the market capitalizations of the growth and value sub-indices within a broader index equal, and that will also affect how these weighting decisions are made.

Does it change your view on these companies when they move from one category to another?

In a word, no. Think about the above example I just mentioned. Did the company fundamentally change between 2021 and 2022, or between 2022 and 2023? Not really. What happened was that many investors panicked in 2022 about the impact that changes in the privacy settings implemented by another tech giant would have on this company's ability to sell ads, then decided in 2023 that the panic had been mistaken. In other words, investors got it wrong, yet somehow we were supposed to believe that the company had gone from being a growth company to a value company because of that error. This just highlights the limited usefulness of these two categories. As I said earlier, growth and value are not opposites, so what sense does it make to split the market evenly into these two buckets? Here's another thing: you would think that stocks that are "cheap" should outperform over time, shouldn't they? Otherwise, being a value stock has no real significance. But as we pointed out in our paper titled [What Do We Mean When We Talk About Value](#) a few years ago, the value indices have not outperformed the growth indices over the long term. So whether a stock is classified as value or growth is not something we focus on.

What are some better ways of categorizing stocks and defining value and growth?

Ask yourself a question: what is the purpose of a company? It's to generate returns for the owners of the

business. The problem with the usual valuation and growth metrics is that they literally tell you nothing about what kind of returns on invested capital (ROIC) the company is earning, when in the end that is all that should matter to the people who have put up that capital. Let's start with growth – a company is growing, hooray. Does that necessarily mean it is creating wealth for the shareholders? Maybe, but maybe not. Growth doesn't just fall from the sky – companies have to invest to generate growth, by building factories, hiring more people, and so on. Suppose a company invests a billion dollars and in the end they grow their earnings by \$40 million. That represents a 4% return on their investment. Did that create wealth for the shareholders? If management had returned the capital to the shareholders instead of investing it, the shareholders could have invested their money in risk-free government bonds and earned a similar or higher return. Capital has an opportunity cost, and not all growth creates value for shareholders. Focusing on growth in isolation is not giving you a complete picture of whether a company is succeeding. And the same holds true for traditional value metrics. If I tell you one company is trading at 10 times earnings and another is trading at 15 times earnings, does that mean that the first company is cheaper than the second? Again, maybe, maybe not. As we demonstrated in another paper [The P/E Ratio: A User's Manual](#), the "right" P/E ratio for a company depends on the ROIC that the company earns. A company trading at 15 times earnings can be undervalued, and a company trading at 10 times earnings can be overvalued, depending not on differences in their growth rates but on differences in their ROIC. Ultimately, we believe that ROIC is really the best metric for comparing and categorizing stocks.

Now, if you do still want to try to categorize stocks based on some kind of valuation metric, we would say that you should at least use a valuation metric that makes sense, and that has a record of success at identifying stocks that subsequently outperform. The metric that meets those criteria, in our minds, is the free cash flow (FCF) yield, which is in fact related to a company's ROIC, so it is a window into ROIC. Two companies may have the same earnings per share and the same growth rate, but if one has a higher ROIC than the other, it can achieve that growth with less reinvestment and hence more free cash flow than the other company. The P/E white paper showed why the company with the higher ROIC should trade at a higher P/E for this reason, meaning that P/E is of limited use in comparing the stocks. But if both stocks were fairly priced from a discounted cash flow perspective (i.e., the one with the higher ROIC selling at a higher

P/E), they would actually trade at the same free cash flow yield. That's why FCF yield is a better measure of value. And over time, stocks with higher free cash flow yields have outperformed much more reliably than the popular value indices based on price/earnings and price/book ratios. (That was the subject of another of our white papers, [Free Cash Flow Works](#).)

As a Portfolio Manager, how do you prevent style drift in your portfolios?

Our strategy is based on some core principles centered on the importance of ROIC and sound capital allocation by management. Ultimately, whether a stock makes it into our portfolio is dependent on an exercise of judgement by our team on the question of how sustainable a company's competitive advantage is. But we do use some quantitative tools to help us narrow the universe down before we begin to exercise that judgement, tools that help us focus in on companies that have high ROIC, high margins, and opportunities to reinvest in their business. The tools are a kind of disciplined gating mechanism, and they help ensure that the portfolio always maintains a consistent quality profile. If you look at our style characteristics as measured by Style Analytics, you will see that we have a very consistent style profile over time as a result of our process.



For institutional investors only. TD Global Investment Solutions represents TD Asset Management Inc. ("TDAM") and Epoch Investment Partners, Inc. ("TD Epoch"). TDAM and TD Epoch are affiliates and wholly owned subsidiaries of The Toronto-Dominion Bank. ©The TD logo and other TD trademarks are the property of The Toronto-Dominion Bank or its subsidiaries. The information contained herein is distributed for informational purposes only and should not be considered investment advice or a recommendation of any particular security, strategy or investment product. The information is distributed with the understanding that the recipient has sufficient knowledge and experience to be able to understand and make their own evaluation of the proposals and services described herein as well as any risks associated with such proposal or services. Nothing in this presentation constitutes legal, tax, or accounting advice. Information contained herein has been obtained from sources believed to be reliable, but not guaranteed. Certain information provided herein is based on third-party sources, and although believed to be accurate, has not been independently verified. Except as otherwise specified herein, TD Epoch is the source of all information contained in this document. TD Epoch assumes no liability for errors and omissions in the information contained herein. TD Epoch believes the information contained herein is accurate as of the date produced and submitted, but is subject to change. No assurance is made as to its continued accuracy after such date and TD Epoch has no obligation to any recipient of this document to update any of the information provided herein. No portion of this material may be copied, reproduced, republished or distributed in any way without the express written consent of TD Epoch.

Past Performance: Any performance information referenced represents past performance and is not indicative of future returns. There is no guarantee that the investment objectives will be achieved. To the extent the material presented contains information about specific companies or securities including whether they are profitable or not, they are being provided as a means of illustrating our investment thesis. Each security discussed has been selected solely for this purpose and has not been selected on the basis of performance or any performance-related criteria. Past references to specific companies or securities are not a complete list of securities selected for clients and not all securities selected for clients in the past year were profitable. The securities discussed herein may not represent an entire portfolio and in the aggregate may only represent a small percentage of a clients holdings. Clients' portfolios are actively managed and securities discussed may or may not be held in such portfolios at any given time. Projected or Targeted Performance: Any projections, targets, or estimates in this presentation are forward-looking statements and are based on TD Epoch's research, analysis, and its capital markets assumptions. There can be no assurances that such projections, targets, or estimates will occur and the actual results may be materially different. Additional information about capital markets assumptions is available upon request. Other events which were not taken into account in formulating such projections, targets, or estimates may occur and may significantly affect the returns or performance of any accounts and/or funds managed by TD Epoch.

Projected or Targeted Performance: Any projections, targets, or estimates in this presentation are forward-looking statements and are based on TD Epoch's research, analysis, and its capital markets assumptions. There can be no assurances that such projections, targets, or estimates will occur and the actual results may be materially different. Additional information about capital markets assumptions is available upon request. Other events which were not taken into account in formulating such projections, targets, or estimates may occur and may significantly affect the returns or performance of any accounts and/or funds managed by TD Epoch.

Non-US Jurisdictions: This information is only intended for use in jurisdictions where its distribution or availability is consistent with local laws or regulations.

Australia: Epoch Investment Partners, Inc. (ARBN: 636409320) holds an Australian Financial Services License (AFS License No: 5308587) and is incorporated in Delaware, USA (liability of members is limited). To the extent any statements contained in this document constitute financial product advice, those statements are issued by Epoch Investment Partners, Inc. The information contained herein is intended for wholesale clients and investors only as defined in the Corporations Act of 2001.

United Kingdom: Epoch Investment Partners UK, LTD is authorized and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority of the United Kingdom (Firm Reference Number: 715988).

South Africa: Epoch Investment Partners, Inc. is a licensed Financial Services Provider (license number 46621) with the Financial Sector Conduct Authority.