INVESTMENT MANAGER | LONG-TERM GROWTH STOCK INVESTING

T. Rowe Price Made Growth Investing a Fiduciary Business, Not a Stock Market Slogan

T. Rowe Price Jr.'s legacy rests on turning growth investing into a research-driven fiduciary business built for long-term clients.

Thomas Rowe Price Jr. turned a Baltimore advisory firm into the template for research-driven growth investing, but his legacy also shows how patience, valuation, and client alignment can be tested when growth becomes a crowd.

Sharemaestro Editorial Desk | 24 Jun 2026 | 10 sources | **sharemaestro.com**

In brief

A Sharemaestro profile of Thomas Rowe Price Jr., founder of T. Rowe Price & Associates and one of the central architects of growth investing. The article traces his move from chemistry to investment counsel, the founding of his firm in 1937, his insistence on research and client alignment, the launch of the Growth Stock Fund and New Horizons Fund, his record, mistakes, succession, and the continuing relevance and risks of his approach in an era shaped by index funds, mega-cap growth, and retirement investing.

- Price's central innovation was not merely buying fast-growing companies. It was packaging growth investing inside a fee-based, research-led advisory business that tried to align the manager's success with the client's capital.
- His growth stock theory emphasized well-managed companies in expanding fields, durable earnings growth, reinvestment opportunity, and long holding periods rather than quick trading gains.
- The Growth Stock Fund, launched in 1950, and New Horizons Fund, launched in 1960, made his philosophy accessible beyond private accounts and helped turn growth investing into a mutual-fund discipline.
- Price's record was powerful but uneven. The early funds benefited from postwar growth and careful company research, yet New Horizons also showed how volatile emerging growth stocks could be when enthusiasm ran ahead of fundamentals.
- His lasting influence is visible less in any single stock pick than in the modern active manager's operating model: proprietary research, investment committees, no-load fund distribution, attention to fiduciary duty, and a long-term client franchise.

Performance markers

Copyright 2026 Sharemaestro. All rights reserved.

sharemaestro.com
Educational financial journalism and market research only. Not financial, investment, trading, tax, or legal advice. Market data and an

Year founded	1937 Thomas Rowe Price Jr. founded the firm in Baltimore in 1937; the company later went public in 1986.
Firmwide AUM at year-end 2024	$1.6066 trillion T. Rowe Price Group reported assets under management of $1.6066 trillion at December 31, 2024, up $162.1 billion from year-end 2023.
Firmwide AUM reported in 2026 profile	$1.83 trillion The firm's About Us page listed total assets under management of $1.83 trillion as of April 30, 2026.
Target date retirement AUM at year-end 2024	$475.6 billion Target date retirement products represented 29.6 percent of managed assets at December 31, 2024.
Net flows in 2024	-$43.2 billion Market appreciation lifted assets in 2024, but the annual report recorded net cash outflows of $43.2 billion.
U.S. mutual funds beating Morningstar median over 10 years	70% For the 10 years ended December 31, 2024, T. Rowe Price reported that 70 percent of its U.S. mutual funds outperformed the Morningstar median.
Growth Stock Fund inception	April 11, 1950 The flagship Growth Stock Fund traces back to 1950, when the firm converted from partnership to corporation and entered the mutual fund business.
New Horizons Fund inception	June 3, 1960 The New Horizons Fund was launched to invest in smaller, rapidly growing companies, extending Price's theory into emerging growth stocks.

Charts and timelines

Copyright 2026 Sharemaestro. All rights reserved.

sharemaestro.com
Educational financial journalism and market research only. Not financial, investment, trading, tax, or legal advice. Market data and an

Risk	
Style risk	Growth can underperform other styles
Company maturity risk	High growth may not persist
Sector exposure	Common shocks can hit clustered holdings
Emerging growth volatility	-29% fund decline versus -9% S&P 500
Business-model pressure	Passive share gains and fee pressure

Timeline	
Price enters finance	Joined Mackubin, Goodrich & Co.
Firm founded	Price Associates founded in Baltimore
First mutual fund	Growth Stock Fund launched
Small growth expansion	New Horizons Fund launched
Founder retires	Price retires from the firm
Public company era	T. Rowe Price Associates shares offered to public

Philosophy	
Client alignment	Fee-based counsel over commission pressure
Business quality	Well-managed companies in fertile fields
Research discipline	Company analysis before conviction
Patience	Long-term ownership through cycles

Performance	
AUM	$1.6066T
Net cash flows	-$43.2B
Target date AUM	$475.6B
All U.S. funds outperforming Morningstar median	70%
Growth Stock Fund	04/11/1950
New Horizons Fund	06/03/1960

The quiet revolution from Baltimore

Thomas Rowe Price Jr. did not look like a man trying to remake Wall Street. He built from Baltimore, not Broad Street, and his preferred instruments were not theatrics, leverage, or macro calls. His edge was slower and more demanding: identify businesses capable of compounding earnings for years, understand why they could keep doing it, and give clients a way to own them without being pushed from one commissionable trade to the next.

That idea sounds ordinary now because Price helped make it ordinary. In the 1930s, when the memory of the crash still shaped investor behavior, common stocks were often treated as cyclical trading vehicles or income instruments. Price argued for something different. A superior company in a fertile field could grow through economic cycles, reinvest intelligently, and reward patient owners through a rising stream of earnings and value.

The firm that still carries his name became the institution around that belief. Its later scale, public listing, global reach, retirement franchise, and mutual fund lineup can obscure the original act of dissent. Price's contribution was to make growth investing a professional practice rather than a speculative mood. He gave optimism a file room, an interview schedule, and a fiduciary spine.

Why Price still matters

Price matters because he sits at the junction of three histories: the rise of growth investing, the professionalization of investment counsel, and the conversion of private portfolio management into mass-market mutual funds. He was not the only investor to appreciate expanding companies, and Philip Fisher later gave growth investors a language of qualitative inquiry. Price's distinct achievement was institutional. He joined philosophy to organization.

Copyright 2026 Sharemaestro. All rights reserved.

Educational financial journalism and market research only. Not financial, investment, trading, tax, or legal advice. Market data and an

That distinction is central to understanding the modern active manager. T. Rowe Price Group now describes itself as an active, independent investment firm serving individuals, advisers, institutions, and retirement plans across equities, fixed income, multi-asset products, and alternatives. As of April 30, 2026, the firm reported $1.83 trillion in total assets under management across those capabilities.

The distance between a small 1937 Baltimore advisory partnership and a trillion-dollar global manager is the measure of Price's influence. His name became a brand, but the brand was built around a set of operating assumptions: research should precede conviction, client trust is an asset, growth requires time, and the manager's business model can either support or corrupt investment judgment.

A chemist who changed careers

Price came to investment management by way of science. He graduated from Swarthmore College in 1919 with a chemistry degree and briefly worked in the chemical field, including a period associated with DuPont. The biographical detail is not decorative. His later investment practice retained a chemist's respect for process, observation, classification, and cause-and-effect relationships.

The early financial career was more improvisational. In the 1920s, he moved through brokerage and bond work before joining Mackubin, Goodrich & Co. in Baltimore in 1925. There he rose quickly, becoming head of the bond department and, by 1930, head of investment management. By 1934, he had persuaded the firm to support an investment management department, but his style and philosophy met resistance.

The tension was personal and strategic. Price believed the advisory relationship should rest on careful analysis and long-term ownership. The brokerage culture around him was often transaction-centered. When Mackubin, Goodrich moved to phase out the investment management operation in 1937, Price and several associates chose the riskier path. The new firm began as a bet that clients would eventually pay for judgment rather than trades.

The firm as a critique of Wall Street

The founding of Price Associates in 1937 was also a critique of how customers were treated in financial markets. The firm later became T. Rowe Price & Associates, but the early idea was already clear: offer investment counseling, charge for advice, and reduce the conflict between recommending securities and earning brokerage commissions. Price was not merely selecting stocks. He was redesigning the adviser-client bargain.

That redesign mattered because the investment business of the period was fragmented and lightly controlled. Before the Investment Company Act of 1940 and related reforms, financial firms could operate with conflicts that were often poorly disclosed. Price's own discomfort with combining advice and brokerage anticipated the fiduciary language that would later become central to the profession.

The firm had no easy start. Clients were hard to win in the aftermath of depression and war, and the partnership endured irregular compensation and slow growth. Its survival depended on restraint as much as ambition. Price wanted a business with character, but he first had to prove that character could pay salaries, retain clients, and produce a record strong enough to draw capital beyond Baltimore families.

Growth stock theory before growth became a style box

Price's Growth Stock Theory began with a simple proposition that carried radical implications. The best common stocks were not merely cheap assets or dividend machines. They were ownership stakes in businesses capable of growing earnings and dividends faster than inflation and the general economy. The investor's job was to find them early enough, understand them well enough, and hold them long enough.

The emphasis was on business quality, not glamour. Price looked for capable management, expanding markets, reinvestment opportunity, competitive strength, and financial capacity to support growth. His approach was

Copyright 2026 Sharemaestro. All rights reserved.

sharemaestro.com
Educational financial journalism and market research only. Not financial, investment, trading, tax, or legal advice. Market data and an

optimistic, but it was not carefree. He believed the compounding power of a company could be squandered by weak leadership, excessive valuation, poor capital allocation, or deteriorating industry conditions.

Modern investors often reduce growth investing to revenue acceleration, technology exposure, or high price-earnings multiples. Price's version was broader and more disciplined. It recognized that change is permanent, that new industries create wealth, and that a portfolio must be built for years rather than quarters. The theory was a defense of patience, but only after the investor had done the work.

Research before romance

Price's process was meant to protect growth investing from becoming storytelling. The firm put heavy weight on primary research, including contact with company management. Historical accounts of the firm describe a practice in which a company president's interview could be a necessary step before an investment. That does not mean Price confused access with truth. It means he wanted judgment grounded in direct evidence.

The early record reflected this discipline. Before the end of the 1940s, the firm's holdings included companies such as Sharp & Dohme, Abbott Laboratories, USF & G, Addressograph-Multigraph, 3M, and IBM. The point is not that each became a permanent winner. The point is that Price was looking for growth in pharmaceuticals, technology, industrial innovation, and services at a time when many investors were still anchored to older income habits.

The research culture also shaped the firm's later identity. Investment committees, analyst development, sector specialization, and long-term accountability all fit naturally with Price's original belief that growth had to be studied, not chased. A company could be exciting and still be uninvestable. A dull business could be a good holding if its economics improved. The difference was evidence.

The Growth Stock Fund makes the theory portable

The launch of the T. Rowe Price Growth Stock Fund in 1950 was a turning point because it translated a private-account philosophy into a pooled public vehicle. The firm also converted from partnership to corporation that year and won its first institutional client, American Cyanamid. The sequence was important: investment counsel became a scalable product business without discarding its research DNA.

The Growth Stock Fund began modestly, but it became the flagship proof that Price's philosophy could work beyond custom accounts. By 1960, a widely followed fund-rating service had ranked it as the best performer over the prior ten-year period. That success arrived during a favorable postwar economy, but it also showed that the fund structure could carry a disciplined growth strategy to a broader investing public.

The fund remains a useful historical artifact because it demonstrates both continuity and change. Its modern prospectus and fund data show the same broad objective of long-term capital appreciation through growth stocks, but today's portfolio operates in a far more competitive, data-rich, benchmark-aware market. Price's original question still applies: can active research identify durable compounding before the market fully prices it?

New Horizons and the cost of being early

If Growth Stock made Price's theory portable, New Horizons made it more aggressive. Launched in 1960, the fund sought small, rapidly growing companies that larger investors often overlooked. Early holdings cited in company histories included Texas Instruments, Hertz, and Haloid-Xerox, the precursor to Xerox. This was growth investing pushed closer to venture-style public-market discovery.

The early experience was rough. In 1962, New Horizons fell far more than the S&P 500, a reminder that emerging growth companies can punish investors before rewarding them. The fund attracted mocking nicknames, but the volatility did not invalidate the thesis. It clarified the price of the thesis: smaller growth companies can offer large upside, but their earnings, multiples, liquidity, and investor sponsorship can all break at once.

Copyright 2026 Sharemaestro. All rights reserved.

sharemaestro.com
Educational financial journalism and market research only. Not financial, investment, trading, tax, or legal advice. Market data and an

By 1965, the fund's rebound had become part of the Price legend, with strong returns compared with the broad market and surging attention from investors. The episode was instructive rather than purely triumphant. Price had identified an enduring opportunity in small-company growth, but he also exposed a central failure mode of growth investing: the same imagination that sees the future can overpay for it.

Risk management without a trader's vocabulary

Price was not a modern risk manager in the language of factor models, tracking error, or value-at-risk. His risk controls were embedded in behavior. He preferred research over tips, long holding periods over trading, diversification over heroic concentration, and fee alignment over commission pressure. He wanted clients to understand that growth investing required patience because the market would not reward the theory on a schedule.

This kind of risk management is easy to underestimate because it lacks drama. It does not stop every drawdown. It does not prevent valuation mistakes. It does not make growth stocks safe. What it does is reduce the chance that a manager will sell a sound business for the wrong reason, buy a poor business for excitement, or churn a portfolio to manufacture activity.

The modern T. Rowe Price fund disclosures make the risk plain: a growth approach can underperform other styles, large-cap growth companies may not sustain high growth rates indefinitely, and sector exposure can make a fund vulnerable to common shocks. Price's original discipline was built for exactly those hazards. His answer was not denial. It was process, diversification, and time.

The inflation turn and the limits of one doctrine

Price's career is often summarized through growth stocks, but his later thinking became more complicated. In the early 1970s, he warned that inflation would become a central problem for the nation and investors. That concern pushed him toward what became the New Era concept: a recognition that commodities, hard assets, and inflation-sensitive businesses could matter when the monetary regime changed.

This was not a repudiation of growth investing. It was an admission that the investor's only permanent condition is change. The postwar growth environment that helped validate Price's approach did not last forever. Inflation, oil shocks, political strain, and rising rates forced a different kind of analysis. A growth investor who ignores the cost of capital is not practicing Price's discipline; he is practicing a caricature of it.

The inflation episode also complicates the image of Price as a pure stock picker. He was capable of macro judgment when the macro facts became too large to ignore. Yet his instinct remained grounded in ownership. The question was still which businesses could preserve or expand real value for clients. The opportunity set changed; the fiduciary obligation did not.

Succession without mythology

Price's retirement from day-to-day leadership did not happen in a single clean break. He stepped back gradually during the 1960s, relinquishing roles in the flagship funds and selling interests to the firm and its employees. In 1971, he retired, and the company continued to broaden beyond the founder's direct control. That transition is one of the least glamorous but most important parts of the story.

Many investment firms struggle when a founding personality becomes the product. Price's firm had the advantage of a philosophy that could be taught, debated, and institutionalized. It also had analysts and portfolio managers who could carry the process into new funds, fixed income, international investing, and retirement products. The founder's discipline became more valuable because it was not trapped inside the founder.

This does not mean the succession was frictionless or that every later decision reflected Price's own preferences. Institutions evolve because markets force them to. But the firm's survival after Price shows that his most important

Copyright 2026 Sharemaestro. All rights reserved.

sharemaestro.com
Educational financial journalism and market research only. Not financial, investment, trading, tax, or legal advice. Market data and an

product may not have been a single fund. It was an operating culture that could outlive the first generation.

The institution after the founder

The post-founder T. Rowe Price expanded across the financial system. The firm went public in 1986, later adopted a holding company structure, and built a broader lineup across mutual funds, collective investment trusts, exchange-traded funds, separate accounts, subadvised funds, and other vehicles. It also developed major capabilities in retirement, multi-asset solutions, fixed income, and alternatives.

That expansion reveals both the strength and strain of Price's legacy. A boutique growth philosophy became a diversified asset-management enterprise. The current firm reports broad capabilities across growth, core, value, quantitative and fundamental equity, target date products, private credit, real assets, structured products, and other strategies. The name no longer refers to a single doctrine; it refers to an investment organization.

Yet the original logic remains visible. The company still describes itself around active investing, client partnership, proprietary perspective, and long-term performance. It also operates in a market where passive products take share, fees compress, and clients demand new vehicles. Price's descendants are no longer fighting only brokerage conflicts. They are fighting the arithmetic of scale, cost, and benchmark competition.

A record that is powerful but not simple

Price's record has two layers. The first is the historical record of early stock selection, firm growth, and fund performance. The firm moved from $2.3 million in assets under management in 1938 to $42 million in 1949, reached profitability after a long apprenticeship, and built mutual funds that attracted national attention. The second layer is the modern record of a large active manager trying to justify fees in a benchmarked world.

The 2024 annual report captures that modern complexity. T. Rowe Price ended 2024 with $1.6066 trillion in assets under management, up $162.1 billion from year-end 2023. Market appreciation and income added $205.3 billion, while net cash outflows subtracted $43.2 billion. Target date retirement products reached $475.6 billion, equal to 29.6 percent of managed assets at year-end.

Investment performance was mixed but respectable in long-horizon data. For the ten years ended December 31, 2024, the firm reported that 70 percent of its U.S. mutual funds outperformed the Morningstar median and 60 percent outperformed the passive peer median. Those figures support the argument that the Price culture retained investment value, but the outflows show that performance, distribution, fees, and investor preference do not always move together.

Criticism, failure modes, and the danger of a good story

The main criticism of growth investing is that its best stories can become its worst prices. A company may be excellent and still be a poor investment if expectations are too high. Price understood this better than many of his imitators. His work required not only belief in change, but skepticism about whether the market had already capitalized that change into the stock.

New Horizons offered an early demonstration. A fund built to capture emerging growth companies could lag badly when market conditions turned. Modern fund disclosures say the same in regulatory language: growth stocks can underperform other styles, large companies may struggle to sustain exceptional growth, and sector concentrations can magnify adverse events. These are not incidental risks. They are structural risks in the strategy.

A second criticism concerns scale. The larger an active manager becomes, the harder it can be to exploit small inefficiencies without moving markets, diluting conviction, or resembling the benchmark. T. Rowe Price's modern breadth helps diversify the business, but it also means the founder's original intimacy with individual companies is harder to preserve. The lesson is not that growth investing fails at scale. It is that scale changes the job.

Copyright 2026 Sharemaestro. All rights reserved.

sharemaestro.com
Educational financial journalism and market research only. Not financial, investment, trading, tax, or legal advice. Market data and an

What remains useful today

Price's lasting value is not a rule to buy growth stocks in every market. It is a way to think about ownership. He taught that the investor should search for businesses whose economics can improve over time, study management and industry context, and avoid turning volatility into unnecessary activity. That remains useful in public equities, private markets, venture investing, and retirement portfolios alike.

What remains dangerous is the temptation to keep the optimistic surface while discarding the discipline underneath. Growth investing without valuation is momentum. Long-term investing without research is inertia. Client alignment without fee awareness is branding. Price's method depended on the interaction of all three: business analysis, patience, and a structure that encouraged the adviser to succeed with the client rather than at the client's expense.

In that sense, Price's quiet revolution is still unfinished. Markets have become faster, cheaper, more indexed, and more crowded with information. Yet the basic challenge has not changed. Investors still need to distinguish durable growth from temporary fashion, patient ownership from stubbornness, and fiduciary confidence from salesmanship. T. Rowe Price Jr. did not solve those problems permanently. He gave the profession one of its better operating manuals.

Disclosure

Educational financial journalism and market research only. Not financial, investment, trading, tax, or legal advice. Market data and analysis may be delayed, incomplete, or inaccurate.

Sources

SOURCE-01 T. Rowe Price Group	T. Rowe Price Group 2024 Annual Report
SOURCE-02 T. Rowe Price	About Us
SOURCE-03 T. Rowe Price	Travelling Through Time: The History of Asset Management
SOURCE-04 John Wiley & Sons via Google Books	T. Rowe Price: The Man, The Company, and The Investment Philosophy
SOURCE-05 FundingUniverse	History of T. Rowe Price Associates, Inc.
SOURCE-06 PhillyVoice	12 of Swarthmore College's greatest alums
SOURCE-07 T. Rowe Price	T. Rowe Price Growth Stock Fund Prospectus, March 1, 2026
SOURCE-08 T. Rowe Price	Growth Stock Fund (PRGFX)
SOURCE-09 Fidelity Investments	PRGFX - T. Rowe Price Growth Stock Fund
SOURCE-10 Fidelity Investments	PRNHX - T. Rowe Price New Horizons Fund

Copyright 2026 Sharemaestro. All rights reserved.

Educational financial journalism and market research only. Not financial, investment, trading, tax, or legal advice. Market data and an