

The Engineering Economist >

A Journal Devoted to the Problems of Capital Investment

Volume 56, 2011 - Issue 2

454 | 17

Views | CrossRef citations to date | Altmetric

0

ARTICLES

Aggregate Return on Investment and Investment Decisions: A Cash-Flow Perspective

Carlo Alberto Magni

Pages 140-169 | Published online: 09 Jun 2011

Cite this article <https://doi.org/10.1080/0013791X.2011.573617>

Sample our
Engineering & Technology
Journals
>> [Sign in here](#) to start your access
to the latest two volumes for 14 days

Full Article

Figures & data

References

Citations

Metrics

Reprints & Permissions

[Read this article](#)

We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 843 partners store and/or access information on a device, such as unique IDs in cookies to process personal data. You may accept or manage your choices by clicking below, including your right to object where legitimate interest is used, or at any time in the privacy policy page. These choices will be signaled to our partners and will not affect browsing data. [Privacy Policy](#)

We and our partners process data to provide:

Use precise geolocation data. Actively scan device characteristics for identification. Store and/or access information on a device. Personalised advertising and content, advertising and content measurement, audience research and services development.

List of Partners (vendors)

I Accept

Essential Only

Show Purpose



interest foregone on the capital that is given up by the investor. This perspective enables one to decompose the project net present value (NPV) into an excess-rate share and an excess-capital share. The traditional IRR is just a particular case of both AIRR and AROI, but the latter approach has the advantage that the IRR's nature (rate of return versus rate of cost) does not depend on the market rate and is unambiguously determined by the capital invested.

Notes

Hazen (2003, 2009) and Magni (2010a) used the expression investment stream. In this article we prefer to use the expression capital stream, to avoid any misunderstanding.

The terminal value c^*_T of the capital stream c^* is univocally determined by cash flow stream and market rate, which means, in general, that $c^*_T \neq 0$.

This definition is essential in correctly interpreting the financial nature of the IRR. Until [Hazen \(2003\)](#), the notion of investment and borrowing was connected to the sign of the outstanding capital c_t (see Teichrow et al. 1965a, 1965b); but this perspective brings about unfavorable cases where the sign of c_t changes over time, which implies that neither the IRR's financial nature (lending rate versus borrowing rate) nor the project's financial interpretation (investment versus borrowing) is univocal. Hazen's (2003) definition (and Magni's [2010a], generalization) is important because it sweeps away

such mixed cases. Note that the IRR is not a function of any

project a

Note that the IRR is not a function of any rate, therefore, an AIRR

does not depend on the market rate, does not

change

If $0 < r < i$, the IRR is a function of the market rate

compon

The sym

PV-equivalent streams (see [Magni \(2010a\)](#)). In the

latter, two or more capital streams are PV-equivalent if they share an equal $PV(c_t | r)$.



The analyst does not even need fix the capital streams if the NCFC or the market-investment AROI is employed.

Related research

People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by
17

Information for

Authors
R&D professionals
Editors
Librarians
Societies

Opportunities

Reprints and e-prints
Advertising solutions
Accelerated publication
Corporate access solutions

Open access

Overview
Open journals
Open Select
Dove Medical Press
F1000Research

Help and information

Help and contact
Newsroom
All journals
Books

Keep up

Register to
by email

 Sign up

 

 

Copyright

Accessib

Registered
5 Howick Pl



or & Francis Group
orma business