



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Huber, P. P. (1995). A review of Wilkie's stochastic investment model (Actuarial Research Paper No. 70). London, UK: Faculty of Actuarial Science & Insurance, City University London.

This is the unspecified version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/2224/>

Link to published version:

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

***A REVIEW OF WILKIE'S STOCHASTIC
INVESTMENT MODEL***

by

Paul Huber

Department of Actuarial Science and Statistics
The City University
London

Actuarial Research Paper No. 70

ISBN 1 874 770 70 0

***A REVIEW OF WILKIE'S STOCHASTIC
INVESTMENT MODEL***

Paul Huber, B.Sc., F.I.A., F.S.S.

To be presented to a Joint Meeting of the Staple Inn Actuarial Society and
the Royal Statistical Society, General Applications Section on
Tuesday 14 March 1995.

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the stochastic investment model developed by Wilkie (1984, 1986). This model's four component models are described and analysed from a statistical perspective. The distributions of their predicted values are derived and potential problems with the model's structure are discussed. Suggestions are made for the future development of actuarial stochastic investment models.

The paper shows that Wilkie's model does not provide a particularly good description of the data. The retail prices index model does not appear to correctly allow for the apparent non-stationarity and shocks in the inflation data. These features seem to contribute towards a spurious autoregressive effect in the retail prices index model, and inappropriate transfer functions with the retail prices index in the share dividend yield and share dividend index models. Both the share dividend index and Consols yield models appear to be over-parameterised.

KEYWORDS

Stochastic Investment Models; Wilkie's Model; Financial Time Series

1. INTRODUCTION

Although Wilkie's model (Wilkie, 1984, 1986) appears to have become the standard actuarial stochastic investment model in the United Kingdom (e.g. Daykin and Hey, 1990; Ross, 1989), only a small part of it (the retail prices index model) has been reviewed from a statistical perspective (e.g. Geoghegan *et al.*, 1992; Kitts, 1988, 1990). Geoghegan *et al.* (1992: 179) concluded that "... there was little evidence to suggest that a better fitting parsimonious model could be estimated using standard Box-Jenkins methodology." This paper reviews Wilkie's entire model from a statistical perspective and provides evidence that challenges this conclusion.

Wilkie's model is composed of four connected models, a retail prices index model, a share dividend yield model, a share dividend index model, and a Consols yield model. These models are analysed consecutively by assessing their structure, the data on which they were based and their predicted values over the period 1983-93.

Each model's structure is first examined by describing the distribution of the predicted values, and by assessing the appropriateness of the transformations made to the raw data and the significance of the parameters. The criteria used to examine the transformations include whether they result in a stationary series, whether they are compatible with each other, whether they have a meaningful interpretation, and whether they prevent inadmissible values from occurring. The significance of each parameter is assessed by analysing its sensitivity to various features in the data.

The data on which the model was based is then described. Although the parameter estimates are conditional on the data over the period 1661-1919, the model was only fitted to the data over the period 1919-82. Therefore, this section will concentrate on the data after 1919. A number of problems with this data set are reported and each model is refitted to a corrected data set.

Each model is then used to calculate one year ahead predicted values over the period 1983-93 and goodness-of-fit tests are carried out on the resulting residuals.

Finally, the overall stability and suitability of Wilkie's model is discussed and suggestions for an alternative model are given.

The SAS computer package was used to perform all the calculations.

2. RETAIL PRICES INDEX MODEL

The retail prices index model is defined by the following equation (for $t > 0$):

$$\nabla \log_e Q(t) = QMU + QA \times (\nabla \log_e Q(t-1) - QMU) + QSD \cdot QZ(t)$$

where $Q(t)$ is a retail prices index, ∇ represents the backwards difference operator, and $QZ(t)$ is a sequence of independently distributed unit normal random variables.

Parameter values for the full standard basis and "neutral" initial conditions are:

$$QMU = 0.05, QA = 0.6, QSD = 0.05, \nabla \log_e Q(0) = QMU.$$

This model has attracted all the attention in the other reviews of Wilkie's model (Kitts, 1988, 1990; Geoghegan *et al.*, 1992). These reviews generally criticised this model for failing to explicitly take into account "... the existence of bursts of inflation

... the existence of large, irregular shocks ... the possible non-normality of residuals ...” (Geoghegan *et al.*, 1992: 179). This section illustrates the extent to which these features were taken into account by the retail prices index model. The conclusions reached are similar to those in the above-mentioned reviews, but are arrived at using a different approach.

2.1 THE STRUCTURE OF THE MODEL

2.1.1 The distribution of the predicted values

As shown by Kitts (1988) and Hürlimann (1992), the distribution of the predicted values of the retail prices index model is (for $t, k > 0$ and $QA \neq \pm 1$):

$$\nabla \log_e Q(t+k|t) \sim N\left(QMU + QA^k \times (\nabla \log_e Q(t) - QMU), \frac{QSD^2 \times (1 - QA^{2k})}{(1 - QA^2)}\right)$$

For $t, k > 0$ and $QA = 1$:

$$\nabla \log_e Q(t+k|t) \sim N(\nabla \log_e Q(t), k \times QSD^2)$$

Therefore, the predicted values of the force of inflation have a mean and variance that tend to QMU and $QSD^2/(1 - QA^2)$ respectively (for $-1 < QA < 1$) at a rate determined by the value of QA . The fluctuations about the mean are equally likely to be positive or negative. The predicted rate of inflation has a lognormal distribution. From a neutral starting position a 95 percent prediction interval for the force of inflation in the following year, using the full standard basis, is $(-0.05, 0.15)$. As this interval is relatively wide, the model provides little information on the level of future inflation rates.

2.1.2 The transformation

The retail prices index was transformed into a series of the force of inflation. This transformation has a meaningful interpretation and prevents inadmissible values from occurring, but does not appear to result in a stationary series. The mean and standard deviation of the force of inflation changes from -0.025 and 0.076 over the period 1919-33, to 0.039 and 0.035 over the period 1934-73, and to 0.138 and 0.052 over the period 1974-82 (see figure 1, that plots Wilkie’s original data). This observation is supported by Wilkie’s finding (Appendix B of Geoghegan *et al.*, 1992) that the force of inflation series is heteroskedastic and various other econometric papers (Franses and Paap, 1994; Osborn, 1990). The following section shows how this important feature influenced the retail prices index model.

2.1.3 The significance of the parameters

The retail prices index model expresses the force of inflation in any year as a linear function of the force of inflation in the previous year. The slope of this function is QA . Figure 2 illustrates the significance of this relationship by plotting the force of inflation in each year (minus QMU) against the force of inflation in the previous year (minus QMU), and the retail prices index model. The residuals in every year are equal to the vertical distance between these points and the line.




Figure 1. The force of inflation, $\nabla \log Q(t)$.




Figure 2. $\nabla \log Q(t) - QMU$ plotted against $\nabla \log Q(t-1) - QMU$.

Figure 2 shows that the model provides a reasonable fit to the data over the period 1919-82, but not over the three sub-periods (which are represented separately in figure 2). The parameter estimates for the period 1934-73 are presented in table 1. (The other two sub-periods are too short for any meaningful parameter estimates to be calculated.) This shows that QA is not significantly different from zero over this central sub-period, which contradicts Wilkie's remark that "[t]here is fairly little uncertainty about the appropriate value[s] for QA ..." (Wilkie, 1986: 346).

Table 1. *Estimated parameters for the retail prices index model, 1934-73*

QA	QMU	QSD
0.2545	0.0395	0.0331
(0.1541)	(0.0073)	

Therefore, the significance of QA appears to be dependent on the changes in mean that occurred around 1934 and 1974; probably referred to as "... the existence of bursts of inflation ...", by Geoghegan *et al.* (1992).

If a non-stationary mean was the only feature of the data, then QA would be expected to equal one. However, assuming the residuals are independent and normally distributed, QA is significantly less than one (Wilkie (1984) estimates QA as 0.5976, with a standard error of 0.0985). As the residuals are clearly not normally distributed (The skewness coefficient, $\beta_1 = -0.49$ and the kurtosis coefficient, $\beta_2 = 6.07$), further analysis is required before the hypothesis, that the force of inflation series has a non-stationary mean, can be rejected.

An important feature contributing to the non-normality of the residuals is the sharp changes in the force of inflation; referred to as "... the existence of large, irregular shocks ...", by Geoghegan *et al.* (1992). These shocks have a relatively large influence on the regression and, taken on their own, would be expected to result in a value of zero for QA . Therefore, it is likely that these shocks mask the non-stationarity in the data. Excluding the shocks in the years 1920-23, 1940-41, 1948, and 1951-52 from the regression, over the period 1919-82, results in an estimate of 0.8 for QA with a standard error of 0.09. This supports the hypothesis that the force of inflation series has a non-stationary mean. It is difficult to arrive at any definite conclusions because the shocks over the period 1974-82 cannot be excluded without eliminating the entire period, which removes the major source of the non-stationarity.

Therefore, the retail prices index model appears to "average" the effects of a non-stationary mean and shocks in the data. This results in a model that does not produce either future changes in the mean or future shocks, rather it produces a spurious tendency for the series to revert to the mean.

Using a stationary model to describe non-stationary data makes it very difficult to determine appropriate values for QMU and QSD because the data provides a number of alternatives depending on the period considered. According to Wilkie (1986: 346), there is "... considerable uncertainty about the value to use for QMU , where anything between 0.04 and 0.10 might be justifiable ..."

2.2 THE DATA

2.2.1 Description of the data

The inflation index, used in Wilkie (1984), was constructed by linking the Schumpeter-Gilboy Consumers' Goods Index A and B (1661-1790), the Gayer, Rostow and Schwarz Domestic and Imported Commodities Index (1790-1850), the Rousseaux Overall Price Index (1850-1871), the Board of Trade Wholesale Price Index (1871-1914), the Cost of Living Index (1914-1947), the Interim Index of Retail Prices (1947-1956), and the General Index of Retail Prices (1956-1982).

The data for the earlier indices, the Cost of Living Index and the Retail Prices Index over the period 1947-61, was obtained from Mitchell (1962) and Mitchell and Jones (1971). This data represents the annual average values of these indices (not June values as was intended), which may have the effect of inducing a spurious moving average effect, see: Working (1960). From 1962 the inflation index was constructed from the June Retail Prices Index values.

Most of the earlier indices are of doubtful relevance to the modelling of future inflation rates because they do not measure changes in the general level of retail

prices. The Gayer, Rostow and Schwarz index is based on the prices of commodities and the Board of Trade index is based on the prices of wholesale goods. These indices also tend to have a very narrow coverage of goods.

The Cost of Living Index used constant weights that were based on a working class family budget enquiry made in 1904. This index was dominated by the food category that made up 60 percent of the index. (Comparable weights for the Interim Index in 1947 and the General Index in 1994 are 35 percent and 14 percent respectively.) Allen (1948) questioned the appropriateness of this index, because it had a very narrow coverage and tended to concentrate on items that were subsidised during World War II. Using weights based on a working class family budget enquiry made in 1937-38, Allen estimated that the index would have increased by approximately 60 percent over the period 1938-47 compared with an increase of approximately 30 percent in the official figures. For the above reasons, it is probably not suitable to use this index in the construction of a retail prices index model.

The Interim Index of Retail Prices used weights that were based on a family budget enquiry made in 1937-38 (covering workers with incomes not exceeding £250 per annum). Minor modifications were made to these weights in January 1952. As this index did not cover all types of households, it is not strictly compatible with the General Index of Retail Prices.

The results of a comprehensive family budget enquiry made in 1953-54, covering all types of households except for pensioners and the extremely wealthy, were used to determine the initial weights of the General Index of Retail Prices. This index's weights have been updated annually since 1962 based on the results of family expenditure surveys for the three years ending in June in the previous year.

2.2.2 Refitting the model to the corrected data

A corrected data set was constructed using month-end index values rather than annual averages. The inflation rates before 1947 were calculated using July index values (rather than June values) because the Cost of Living index was calculated at the beginning of every month. Unconditional maximum likelihood parameter estimates for this corrected data are not significantly different from those in Wilkie (1984), but QA is less stable than Wilkie's estimates imply. The revised estimates of QA are: 0.5031, 0.5040, and 0.6023, with standard errors of 0.1095, 0.1241, and 0.1327, over the periods 1919-82, 1933-82, and 1946-82, respectively. These estimates are also dependent on the particular month used (Franses and Paap, 1994). Over the period 1930-82, revised estimates of QA are: 0.5716 and 0.7416, with standard errors of 0.1142 and 0.0912, using June and December values respectively. The effect of using the maximum likelihood estimation technique as opposed to Wilkie's method (least squares conditional on all the available historical data), was negligible.

2.3 THE RESIDUALS OVER THE PERIOD 1983-93

Table 2 presents the one-step ahead residuals for Wilkie's retail prices index model over the period 1983-93. There are too few residuals for a detailed statistical analysis, but some general observations can be made. The standard deviation of the residuals is 0.0247, which is greater than the standard deviation of the actual data: 0.0237. Therefore, over the period 1983-93, a simpler model (with QA equal to zero) would have provided a better fit than the retail prices index model.

Table 2. *Residuals for the retail prices index model, 1983-93*

<i>Year</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Predicted</i>	<i>Residual</i>
1983	0.0359	0.0726	-0.0367
1984	0.0501	0.0415	0.0086
1985	0.0673	0.0501	0.0172
1986	0.0247	0.0604	-0.0357
1987	0.0411	0.0348	0.0063
1988	0.0451	0.0447	0.0004
1989	0.0793	0.0471	0.0323
1990	0.0934	0.0676	0.0258
1991	0.0568	0.0761	-0.0193
1992	0.0380	0.0541	-0.0160
1993	0.0121	0.0428	-0.0307

The standard deviation of the residuals is also significantly less than QSD , which is to be expected because there were no major shocks over this period.

3. SHARE DIVIDEND YIELDS MODEL

The share dividend yields model is defined by the following equations (for $t > 0$):

$$\log_e Y(t) = YW \cdot \nabla \log_e Q(t) + YN(t)$$

$$\text{where: } (1 - YA \cdot B) \times (YN(t) - \log_e YMU) = YE(t) = YSD \cdot YZ(t)$$

where $Q(t)$ is a retail prices index, $Y(t)$ is a share dividend yield, ∇ represents the backwards difference operator, B represents the backwards step operator, and $YZ(t)$ is a sequence of independently distributed unit normal random variables.

Parameter values for the full standard basis and “neutral” initial conditions are:

$$YW = 1.35, \quad YMU = 0.04, \quad YA = 0.6, \quad YSD = 0.175, \quad \nabla \log_e Q(0) = QMU, \\ Y(0) = YMU \cdot e^{YW \cdot QMU}.$$

3.1 THE STRUCTURE OF THE MODEL

3.1.1 The distribution of the predicted values

The distribution of the predicted values of the share dividend yields model is:

$$\log_e Y(t+k|t) \sim N(\mu_y(t+k|t), \sigma_y^2(t+k|t)), \quad \text{for } t, k > 0$$

where (for $YA \neq \pm 1$ and $QA \neq \pm 1$):

$$\mu_y(t+k|t) = \log_e YMU + YW \cdot QMU + QA^k \cdot YW \times (\nabla \log_e Q(t) - QMU) \\ + YA^k \times (\log_e Y(t) - \log_e YMU - YW \cdot \nabla \log_e Q(t))$$

$$\sigma_y^2(t+k|t) = \frac{YSD^2 \times (1 - YA^{2k})}{(1 - YA^2)} + \frac{(YW \cdot QSD)^2 \times (1 - QA^{2k})}{(1 - QA^2)}$$

The predicted share dividend yields have a lognormal distribution. Note that if $YA = QA$, then the force of inflation in year t has no influence on the mean, $\mu_y(t+k|t)$. From a neutral starting position a 95 percent prediction interval for the logarithm of the share dividend yield in the following year, using the full standard basis, is $(-3.52 = \log_e(0.03), -2.78 = \log_e(0.06))$. This interval is fairly wide, suggesting that this model is dominated by the error term.

3.1.2 The transformation

The share dividend yield data was transformed by taking logarithms. This transformation prevents inadmissible values from occurring and appears to produce a stationary time series, but its mean increases substantially over the period 1974-82 (see figure 3). The transformation does not have any meaningful interpretation and is incompatible with the retail prices index transformation. Taking logarithms of the dividend yield causes a change in yields from y_1 to y_2 to be as significant as a change from y_1 to $y_1 \times y_2 / y_1$, for any initial yield y_1 . On the other hand, the inflation transformation causes a change in the inflation rate from e_1 to e_2 to be as significant as a change from e_1 to $(1 + e_1) \times (1 + e_2) / (1 + e_1) - 1$, for any initial inflation rate e_1 . This reduces the significance (relative to the retail prices index transformation) of the high yields in 1920-21, 1940, and 1974-75, and increases the relative significance of the low yields in 1933-37 and 1943-47.

3.1.3 The significance of the parameters

The share dividend yield model can be represented as follows (for $t > 0$):

$$\begin{aligned} \log_e Y(t) - \log_e YMU - YW \cdot \nabla \log_e Q(t) \\ = YA \times (\log_e Y(t-1) - \log_e YMU - YW \cdot \nabla \log_e Q(t-1)) + YE(t) \end{aligned}$$




Figure 3. The log of the share dividend yield, $\log_e Y(t)$.




Figure 4. $\log_e Y(t) - \log_e YMU - YW$ plotted against $\log_e Q(t) - \log_e Q(t-1)$

Using this representation, figure 4 shows that the autoregressive nature of the model is not related to the increase in yields and inflation over the period 1974-82. A negative value of YA would have been obtained over this period.

The share dividend yield model can also be represented as follows (for $t > 0$):

$$(1 - YA \cdot B) \times (\log_e Y(t) - \log_e YMU) = YW \times (1 - YA \cdot B) \times \nabla \log_e Q(t) + YE(t)$$

Using this representation, figure 5 illustrates the sensitivity of YW to the outliers in 1920-22, 1940, 1974-75, and 1980. This explains why "[t]he values of YW vary considerably according to the period chosen ..." (Wilkie, 1984: 58). Over the periods 1919-82, 1933-82, and 1946-82 Wilkie (1984) estimated YW as 1.35, 2.41, and 1.77 respectively.




Figure 5. $(1 - YA \cdot B) \times (\log_e Y(t) - \log_e YMU)$ plotted against $(1 - YA \cdot B) \times \nabla \log_e Q(t)$.

These outliers all correspond to years in which inflation shocks occurred and the outliers in 1920, 1940, and 1974 correspond to years in which the greatest increases in yields occurred. If these outliers are excluded from the regression then YW becomes insignificantly different from zero. Therefore, YW does not describe a general tendency for changes in yields to be correlated with changes in inflation, but describes the tendency for large increases in yields to be correlated with inflation shocks. As the retail prices index model does not allow for these shocks (see section 2), YW should be set to zero for modelling purposes.

3.2 THE DATA

3.2.1 Description of the data

The share dividend yield data, used in Wilkie (1984), was obtained from the BZW equity index (1919-30), the Actuaries Industrials (All Classes Combined) Index (1931-53), the Second Series Actuaries Industrials (All Classes Combined) Index (1954-61), and the FT-Actuaries All Share Index (1962-82).

The data from the BZW index is only calculated at the end of every year (not in June as was assumed). If the BZW data is to be included then end of December values should be used.

There are a number of significant differences between these indices that may distort the true underlying relationships in the data. The FT-Actuaries index includes shares from all types of companies, whereas the others exclude financial company shares. The Actuaries indices are geometrically averaged indices (Haycocks and Plymen, 1956), whereas the others are arithmetically averaged indices. The BZW index was based on 30 shares; the Actuaries indices are based on roughly 150 shares; the FT-Actuaries index is currently based on roughly 850 shares (594 in 1962).

The Actuaries price indices have generally underperformed other equity price indices over similar time periods. Over the periods 1930-49, 1940-50, and 1950-60, the Actuaries price index increased by -48, 96, and 152 percent respectively, compared to increases of -35, 115, and 224 percent respectively in the *Investors Chronicle* equity price index (Haycocks and Plymen, 1964). (The *Investors Chronicle* index was an arithmetically averaged index based on roughly 100 shares.)

A significant event that should be allowed for when modelling share indices is that in November 1972, the government froze dividend payments. This initial freeze was changed to a maximum increase in dividends of 5 percent in March 1973, 12.5 percent in July 1974, and 10 percent in July 1975. The controls expired in July 1979.

3.2.2 Refitting the model to the corrected data

A corrected data set was constructed using both December and June values. Unconditional maximum likelihood parameter estimates for this data, using June values, are not significantly different from those reported in Wilkie (1984). When December values are used, YW is not significant. A revised estimate of YW is: 0.4017, with a standard error of 0.3937, over the period 1919-82 using December values.

3.3 THE RESIDUALS OVER THE PERIOD 1983-93

Table 3 presents the one-step ahead residuals for Wilkie's share dividend yield model over the period 1983-93.

Table 3. *Residuals for the share dividend yield model, 1983-93*

<i>Year</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Predicted</i>	<i>Residual</i>
1983	-3.0879	-2.9892	-0.0986
1984	-3.0221	-3.1017	0.0796
1985	-3.0366	-3.0505	0.0140
1986	-3.2545	-3.1307	-0.1238
1987	-3.4933	-3.2047	-0.2886
1988	-3.1749	-3.3560	0.1811
1989	-3.1442	-3.1219	-0.0223
1990	-3.0534	-3.1122	0.0589
1991	-2.9838	-3.1186	0.1348
1992	-3.0241	-3.0725	0.0483
1993	-3.2493	-3.1165	-0.1329

The standard deviation of the residuals is 0.1370 which is not significantly less than the standard deviation of the actual data, 0.1496, at the 39 percent significance level using an F-test. Therefore, over the period 1983-93, a simpler model (with YA and YW equal to zero) would not have provided a significantly worse fit.

4. SHARE DIVIDEND INDEX MODEL

The share dividend index model is defined by the following equations (for $t > 0$):

$$\nabla \log_e D(t) = DM(t) + DX \cdot \nabla \log_e Q(t) + DMU + DY \cdot YE(t-1) + (1 + DB \cdot B) \times DSD \cdot DZ(t)$$

where:
$$DM(t) = DW \times \left(\frac{DD}{1 - (1 - DD) \times B} \right) \times \nabla \log_e Q(t)$$

where $Q(t)$ is a retail prices index, $D(t)$ is a share dividend index, $YE(t)$ is obtained from the share dividend yield model, ∇ represents the backwards difference operator, B represents the backwards step operator, and $DZ(t)$ is a sequence of independently distributed unit normal random variables.

Parameter values for the full standard basis (reduced standard basis in brackets where these values differ) and “neutral” initial conditions are:

$$DW=0.8, \quad DD=0.2, \quad DX=0.2, \quad DY=-0.2 \text{ } (-0.3), \quad DMU=0, \quad DB=0.375 \text{ } (0), \quad DSD=0.075 \text{ } (0.1), \quad YE(0)=0, \quad DM(0)=DW \cdot QMU, \quad DZ(0)=0.$$

4.1 THE STRUCTURE OF THE MODEL

4.1.1 The distribution of the predicted values

The distribution of the predicted values of the share dividend index model is:

$$\nabla \log_e D(t+k|t) \sim N(\mu_d(t+k|t), \sigma_d^2(t+k|t)), \quad \text{for } t, k > 0$$

where, for $k=1$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_d(t+1|t) &= (DW.DD + DX) \times (QMU + QA \times (\nabla \log_e Q(t) - QMU)) \\ &\quad + DM(t) \times (1 - DD) + DMU + DY.YE(t) + DB.DSD.DZ(t) \\ \sigma_d^2(t+1|t) &= DSD^2 + QSD^2 \times (DW.DD + DX)^2\end{aligned}$$

For $k > 1$, $(1 - DD) \neq \pm 1$, $QA \cdot (1 - DD) \neq 1$, $QA - (1 - DD) \neq 0$, and $QA \neq \pm 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_d(t+k|t) &= DMU + QMU \times (DX + DW) + (DM(t) - DW.QMU) \times (1 - DD)^k \\ &\quad + (\nabla \log_e Q(t) - QMU) \times (DX.QA^k + (\alpha - DX) \times (QA^k - (1 - DD)^k))\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_d^2(t+k|t) &= DSD^2 \times (1 + DB^2) + YSD^2.DY^2 \\ &\quad + QSD^2 \times \left(\alpha^2 \times \left(\frac{1 - QA^{2k}}{1 - QA^2} \right) - 2.\alpha.\beta \times \left(\frac{1 - (QA.(1 - DD))^k}{1 - QA.(1 - DD)} \right) + \beta^2 \times \left(\frac{1 - (1 - DD)^{2k}}{1 - (1 - DD)^2} \right) \right)\end{aligned}$$

where: $\alpha = \frac{DW.DD.QA}{QA - (1 - DD)} + DX$, and $\beta = \frac{DW.DD.(1 - DD)}{QA - (1 - DD)}$

From a neutral starting position a 95 percent prediction interval for the force of growth of dividends in the following year, using the full standard basis, is $(-0.10, 0.20)$. The predicted growth of share dividends has a lognormal distribution.

4.1.2 The transformation

The share dividend index was transformed into a series of the force of change in the share dividend index (see figure 6). This transformation appears to be appropriate, but it is incompatible with the dividend yield transformation (see section 3.1.2).




Figure 6. The force of increase in the share dividend index, $\nabla \log_e D(t)$.

4.1.3 The significance of the parameters

The share dividend index model is over-parameterised, even based on Wilkie's estimates (see table 4). Virtually all the parameters are not significantly different from zero over the periods 1933-82 and 1946-82. Over the period 1920-82, DX is not significantly different from zero and DD , DW , DX , and DMU are highly correlated with one another (see table 5). Surprisingly, Wilkie (1984, 1986) did not comment on this extremely poor fit. In addition, the standard errors of DD and DW were grossly under-estimated by Wilkie (1984). Revised estimates of these standard errors, over the period 1920-82, are: 0.1415 and 0.9503, respectively. These estimates imply that DD , DW , and DX are not significantly different from zero over all the periods considered.

Table 6 shows the parameter estimates obtained when excluding DD , DW , and DMU . As DSD does not increase significantly, these parameters appear to be superfluous. This suggests that lagged terms of $\nabla \log_e Q(t)$ contribute little additional information to the share dividend index model. The high correlation between DMU and DD and DW , suggests that the term $DM(t)$ is a measure of the mean of $\nabla \log_e D(t)$. After DD and DW were excluded, the term involving DX was found to provide a better measure of the mean than the constant DMU .

Table 4. *Estimated parameters for the dividend index model*

Period	DD	DW	DX	DMU	DY	DB	DSD
1920-82	0.1151 (0.0582)	1.3240 (0.5458)	0.3721 (0.2145)	-0.0104 (0.0193)	-0.2667 (0.0527)	0.3931 (0.1301)	0.0702
1933-82	0.0669 (0.1373)	1.1529 (1.3968)	0.3227 (0.2300)	0.0037 (0.0250)	-0.1766 (0.0453)	0.3612 (0.1662)	0.0543
1946-82	0.1167 (0.1634)	0.6221 (0.6305)	0.2258 (0.2465)	0.0316 (0.0222)	-0.1056 (0.0494)	0.2846 (0.1865)	0.0490

Source: Table 7.2 of Wilkie (1984)

Table 5. *Correlation matrix of the parameter estimates, 1920-82*

Parameter	DD	DW	DX	DMU	DY	DB
DD	1	-0.8220	-0.4738	0.7103	0.0026	0.0257
DW	-	1	0.0762	-0.8592	-0.1487	-0.0309
DX	-	-	1	-0.2249	0.2203	0.0160
DMU	-	-	-	1	0.1076	0.0317
DY	-	-	-	-	1	0.1981
DB	-	-	-	-	-	1

Table 6. *Estimated parameters for the dividend index model*

Period	DD	DW	DX	DMU	DY	DB	DSD
1920-82	-	-	0.8162 (0.1550)	-	-0.2267 (0.0502)	0.4778 (0.1156)	0.0749
1934-73	0.0214 (0.1975)	1.9327 (10.9230)	-0.2018 (0.2870)	0.0278 (0.0357)	-0.1855 (0.0549)	0.3102 (0.1643)	0.0503
1934-73	-	-	-	0.0460 (0.0116)	-0.1707 (0.0508)	0.3654 (0.1541)	0.0511

To assess whether the retail prices index transfer function was only included because the force of inflation has a non-stationary mean, the model was fitted both including and excluding this transfer function over the period 1934-73 (see table 6). These estimates illustrate that this transfer function is of no significance over this period in which the force of inflation is relatively stationary (see section 2.1.3). Therefore, the retail prices index transfer function appears to only measure the mean of $\nabla \log_e D(t)$. As Wilkie's model assumes a stationary mean force of inflation, the parameters DW , DD , and DX should be set to zero for modelling purposes.

The parameters DY and DB both appear to have a fairly meaningful role in the share dividend index model, but their values are influenced by outliers. The parameter DB is mainly affected by the outliers in the period 1920-42 and becomes only marginally significant once these outliers are taken into account (see table 4). (Note that setting DB to zero corresponds to the reduced standard basis.) Parameter estimates of $DY = -0.2$ and $DB = 0.3$ appear to be appropriate after taking the outliers into account. The value and significance of DY are hardly affected if the errors from the share dividend yield model are calculated with YW set to zero.

4.2 THE DATA

4.2.1 Description of the data

The share dividend index data was obtained from the same sources as the share dividend yield data. Therefore, the comments made in section 3.2.1 are equally applicable to this section.

4.2.2 Refitting the model to the corrected data

A corrected data set was constructed using a share dividend index linked when the underlying dividend indices first overlap. Unconditional maximum likelihood parameter estimates for this corrected data were found to be not significantly different from those presented in Wilkie (1984).

4.3 THE RESIDUALS OVER THE PERIOD 1983-93

Table 7 presents the one-step ahead residuals for Wilkie's share dividend index model over the period 1983-93. The standard deviation of the residuals is 0.0590 which is not significantly less than the standard deviation of the actual data, 0.0735, at the 25 percent significance level using an F-test. Therefore, over the period 1983-93, Wilkie's share dividend index model does not provide a significantly better fit than a model that simply predicts the force of dividend growth by the mean force of dividend growth.

There is a significant cross-correlation between these residuals and the retail prices index model's residuals at a lag of zero and the share dividend yield model's residuals at a lag of 2. This suggests that the transfer function with the retail prices index model was incorrectly specified over this period. The significant cross-correlation with the yield residuals is mainly caused by the fall in yields in 1987. The average of the residuals is 0.0188, which is high but not significantly different from zero.

Table 7. *Residuals for the dividend index model, 1983-93*

<i>Year</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Predicted</i>	<i>Residual</i>
1983	0.0625	0.0577	0.0048
1984	0.1267	0.1038	0.0229
1985	0.1852	0.0747	0.1105
1986	0.0966	0.1024	-0.0058
1987	0.1074	0.0844	0.0229
1988	0.1383	0.1255	0.0128
1989	0.1652	0.0372	0.1279
1990	0.1521	0.1283	0.0238
1991	0.0609	0.0633	-0.0025
1992	0.0063	0.0297	-0.0234
1993	-0.0620	0.0259	-0.0879

5. CONSOLS YIELD MODEL

The Consols yield model is defined by the following equations (for $t > 0$):

$$C(t) = CM(t) + CN(t)$$

where:
$$CM(t) = CW \times \left(\frac{CD}{1 - (1 - CD) \times B} \right) \times \nabla \log_e Q(t)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \log_e CN(t) = & (CA1.B + CA2.B^2 + CA3.B^3) \times (\log_e CN(t) - \log_e CMU) \\ & + \log_e CMU + CY.YE(t) + CB.CI(t) + CSD.CZ(t) \end{aligned}$$

where $Q(t)$ is a retail prices index, $C(t)$ is the Consols yield, $YE(t)$ is obtained from the share dividend yield model, ∇ represents the backwards difference operator, B represents the backwards step operator, $CZ(t)$ is a sequence of independently distributed unit normal random variables, and $CI(t)$ is an intervention variable for 1974.

A minimum value of 0.005 is postulated for $C(t)$.

Parameter values for the full standard basis (reduced standard basis in brackets where these values differ) and "neutral" initial conditions are:

$$\begin{aligned} CW=1, \quad CD=0.045 \text{ (0.05)}, \quad CY=0.06 \text{ (0)}, \quad CMU=0.035, \quad CA1=1.2 \text{ (0.91)}, \\ CA2=-0.48 \text{ (0)}, \quad CA3=0.2 \text{ (0)}, \quad CB=0, \quad CSD=0.14 \text{ (0.165)}, \quad CM(0)=CW \cdot CMU, \\ CN(0)=CN(-1)=CN(-2)=CMU. \end{aligned}$$

5.1 THE STRUCTURE OF THE MODEL

5.1.1 The distribution of the predicted values

The distribution of the predicted values of the allowance for future inflation is:

$$CM(t+k|t) \sim N(\mu_{cm}(t+k|t), \sigma_{cm}^2(t+k|t)), \text{ for } t, k > 0$$

where (for $(1 - CD) \neq \pm 1$, $QA \cdot (1 - CD) \neq 1$, $QA - (1 - CD) \neq 0$, and $QA \neq \pm 1$):

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{cm}(t+k|t) = & CW.QMU + (CM(t) - CW.QMU) \times (1 - CD)^k \\ & + (\nabla \log_e Q(t) - QMU) \times CD.CW.QA \times \left(\frac{QA^k - (1 - CD)^k}{QA - (1 - CD)} \right)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{cm}^2(t+k|t) = & QSD^2 \times \left(\frac{CW.CD}{QA - (1 - CD)} \right)^2 \times \left(QA^2 \times \left(\frac{1 - QA^{2k}}{1 - QA^2} \right) \right. \\ & \left. - 2.QA.(1 - CD) \times \left(\frac{1 - (QA.(1 - CD))^k}{1 - QA.(1 - CD)} \right) + (1 - CD)^2 \times \left(\frac{1 - (1 - CD)^{2k}}{1 - (1 - CD)^2} \right) \right)\end{aligned}$$

From a neutral starting position a 95 percent prediction interval for the allowance for expected future inflation in the following year, using the full standard basis, is (0.0456, 0.0544). This interval is very narrow, suggesting that there is little uncertainty about the allowance for future inflation.

The distribution of the predicted values of the Consols real yield model is:

$$\log_e CN(t+k|t) \sim N(\mu_{cn}(t+k|t), \sigma_{cn}^2(t+k|t)), \text{ for } t, k > 0$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{cn}(t+k|t) = & \phi_{1,k} \times (\log_e CN(t) - \log_e CMU) + \phi_{2,k} \times (\log_e CN(t-1) - \log_e CMU) \\ & + \phi_{3,k} \times (\log_e CN(t-2) - \log_e CMU) + \log_e CMU \\ \sigma_{cn}^2(t+k|t) = & ((CY.YSD)^2 + CSD^2) \times \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} (\phi_{1,n})^2\end{aligned}$$

where (for $k > 0$, and $i = 1, 2$, and 3):

$$\phi_{i,k} = CA1.\phi_{i,k-1} + CA2.\phi_{i,k-2} + CA3.\phi_{i,k-3}$$

$$\phi_{1,0} = 1, \phi_{1,-1} = 0, \phi_{1,-2} = 0, \phi_{2,0} = 0, \phi_{2,-1} = 1, \phi_{2,-2} = 0, \phi_{3,0} = 0, \phi_{3,-1} = 0, \phi_{3,-2} = 1$$

For the full standard basis (for $k > 0$, and $i = 1, 2$, and 3):

$$\phi_{i,k} = \alpha_i.\lambda^k + \gamma^k \times (\beta_i.\cos(\theta.(k-1)) + \delta_i.\sin(\theta.(k-1)))$$

where:

$\lambda=0.9143, \gamma=0.4677, \theta=1.2604, \alpha_1=1.0536, \beta_1=0.5062, \delta_1=0.2185, \alpha_2=-0.3010, \beta_2=-0.4378, \delta_2=-0.4566, \alpha_3=0.2305, \beta_3=-0.0229, \delta_3=0.2347.$

For the reduced standard basis (for $t, k > 0$ and $CAT \neq \pm 1$):

$$\phi_{1,k} = CAT^k, \text{ and } \phi_{2,k} = \phi_{3,k} = 0$$

From a neutral starting position a 95 percent prediction interval for the logarithm of the Consols real yield in the following year, using the full standard basis, is $(-3.6276 = \log_e(0.0266), -3.0772 = \log_e(0.0461))$. The predicted Consols real yield has a lognormal distribution.

The predicted values of the Consols yield model have the following mean and variance (for $t, k > 0$):

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_c(t+k|t) &= \mu_{cm}(t+k|t) + e^{\mu_{cm}(t+k|t) + 0.5 \times \sigma_{cm}^2(t+k|t)} \\ \sigma_c^2(t+k|t) &= \sigma_{cm}^2(t+k|t) + \left(e^{2 \times \mu_{cm}(t+k|t) + \sigma_{cm}^2(t+k|t)} \right) \times \left(e^{\sigma_{cm}^2(t+k|t)} - 1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

From a neutral starting position a 95 percent prediction interval for the Consols yield in the following year, using the full standard basis, is roughly $(0.0746, 0.0961)$. This interval is also very narrow.

5.1.2 The transformation

The inflation component of the Consols model was modelled without any transformation and the logarithm of the real yield was modelled. This results in a non-linear model that cannot be put into an ARIMA format. These transformations do not satisfy any of the requirements for suitable transformations. Wilkie's model prevents negative real yields from occurring, but allows negative nominal yields to occur, whereas negative real yields are possible but negative nominal yields are not. The logarithm of the Consols yield series has a highly non-stationary mean (see figure 7).




Figure 7. The log of the Consols yield, $\log C(t)$.

5.1.3 The significance of the parameters

Wilkie (1984) estimated the Consols yield model's parameters by setting CW to 1 and CD to a "plausible" value, estimating the other parameters so as to minimise CSD , and repeating this process, after adjusting CD , until CSD was minimised. To check whether Wilkie's estimates are optimal and to obtain an estimate of the standard error of CD , the Consols model was refitted with the parameter CD included in the fitting procedure (see table 8). (To prevent negative real yields, it was necessary to include the restriction: $0.0025 < CD < 0.0623$.) Table 8 shows that Wilkie's estimates are not optimal because they result in a higher residual standard deviation than the alternative estimates, and that CD is not significant. The parameter estimates for the model, excluding the term $CM(t)$, are also presented in table 8. These estimates provide an even better fit than those obtained including $CM(t)$, which was forced into the Consols yield model because of the constraints: $CW = 1$ and $0.0025 < CD < 0.0623$.

The parameter CY is not significant (see table 8) and consequently should be set to zero (as in the reduced standard basis).

The parameters $CA1$ and $CA2$, and, $CA2$ and $CA3$ are highly correlated suggesting that the model is over-parameterised. This was noted by Wilkie (1984: 112), and allowed for in the reduced standard basis by setting $CA2$ and $CA3$ to zero. These parameters were not set to zero in the full standard basis because, according to Wilkie, this did not provide "... a satisfactory representation of the past ..." (Wilkie, 1984: 111). Surprisingly, this discrepancy was not pursued further.

Omitting $CA2$ from the model, significantly increases CSD and decreases the significance of $CA3$. This implies that $CA1$, $CA2$, and $CA3$ are functions of one another rather than that some of them are superfluous. An ARIMA model of the Consols yield series is likely to contain a unit root because it has a non-stationary mean. This implies that: $CA1 = 1 - CA2 - CA3$. Using this parameterisation, $CA2$ and $CA3$ still appear to be functions of one another. A suitable parameterisation for $CA2$ was found to be: $CA2 = -2 \times CA3$.

Table 8. Estimated parameters for the Consols model, 1919-82

Parameter	Estimate	Wilkie's Estimates	Setting $CM(t)=0$	
CMU	0.0363 (0.0035)	0.0355 (0.0085)	0.1471 (0.3439)	-
$CA1$	1.1882 (0.1163)	1.2019 (0.1064)	1.1943 (0.1155)	$1 + CA3$
$CA2$	-0.5048 (0.1744)	-0.4806 (0.1716)	-0.5014 (0.1727)	$-2 \times CA3$
$CA3$	0.2987 (0.1125)	0.2045 (0.1115)	0.2954 (0.1104)	0.2580 (0.0852)
CD	0.0124 (0.0082)	0.0450	-	-
CY	0.0600 (0.0792)	0.0649 (0.0633)	0.0475 (0.0671)	0.0258 (0.0629)
CB	0.4132 (0.1091)	0.4968 (0.1409)	0.3522 (0.0898)	0.3614 (0.0876)
CSD	0.0926	0.1288	0.0784	0.0796

Source: Table 8.6 of Wilkie (1984)

Assuming $CA1 = 1 + CA3$ and $CA2 = -2 \times CA3$, the Consols yield model can be represented as:

$$\nabla \log_e C(t) = CA3 \times \nabla^2 \log_e C(t) + CY.YE(t) + CB.CI(t) + CE(t), \text{ for } t > 0$$

This parameterisation represents the change in the Consols yield as a function of the acceleration of the Consols yield. Table 8 presents this model's parameter estimates (CMU is irrelevant because $CA1 + CA2 + CA3 = 1$). This parameterisation appears to be appropriate because it does not significantly increase CSD . The value of $CA3$ (given in table 8) is highly influenced by the years 1974-76. An estimate of $CA3 = 0.35$ is appropriate after taking these outliers into account.

Therefore, it appears that the Consols yield model attempts to represent the above relationship rather than the more elaborate relationships in the actual model. As far as the reduced standard basis is concerned, it seems appropriate to set CY to zero but it does not appear to be appropriate to set $CA2$ and $CA3$ to zero.

5.2 THE DATA

5.2.1 Description of the data

The Consols yield series used in Wilkie (1984) was obtained from Mitchell (1962) over the period 1756-1929, *The Actuaries' Investment Index* over the period 1935-61, the *FT-SE Actuaries Share Indices* over the period 1962-80, and the *Financial Times* over the period 1981-82. Over the period 1930-34, the Consols yields were supposedly obtained from *The Actuaries' Investment Index*, but the Consols yield was only reported in *The Actuaries' Investment Index* from the December 1933. The yield used for 1934 is not equal to the yield reported in *The Actuaries' Investment Index*.

The yields in Mitchell (1962) appear to represent the coupon divided by the annual average of the daily prices of the stock (not the running yield at the end of June as was intended).

5.2.2 Refitting the model to the corrected data

A corrected data set was constructed from the prices of 2.5% Consolidated Stock reported in the *Financial Times*. It was not possible to obtain exact maximum likelihood estimates for the Consols yield model because of the non-linear transformation. Therefore, the estimation method used in Wilkie (1984) (conditional least squares) was used to try to obtain parameter estimates for the corrected data. It was not possible to obtain a reasonable set of estimates because they were found to be highly dependent on $CM(0)$, and to be highly correlated with one another. This confirms that the model is ill-conditioned and over-parameterised (see section 5.1).

5.3 THE RESIDUALS OVER THE PERIOD 1983-93

Table 9 presents the one-step ahead residuals for Wilkie's Consols yield model over the period 1983-93. The standard deviation of the residuals is 0.2973 which is greater than the standard deviation of the actual data, 0.2519. Therefore, over this period, the Consols yield model provides a worse fit than a model that simply predicts the Consols real yield by the mean Consols real yield. The standard deviation of the residuals is also significantly greater than CSD .

Table 9. *Residuals for the Consols yield model, 1983-93*

<i>Year</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Predicted</i>	<i>Residual</i>
1983	-3.4985	-2.9894	-0.5092
1984	-3.2603	-3.6345	0.3742
1985	-3.3639	-3.0791	-0.2848
1986	-3.8058	-3.4471	-0.3588
1987	-3.6553	-3.8899	0.2346
1988	-3.5357	-3.4897	-0.0460
1989	-3.5152	-3.5190	0.0038
1990	-3.2303	-3.5168	0.2864
1991	-3.2714	-3.1564	-0.1150
1992	-3.5832	-3.3435	-0.2398
1993	-4.0611	-3.6518	-0.4093

There is a significantly large positive correlation between these residuals and the retail prices index model's residuals at a lag of zero. This suggests that the allowance of future inflation model was incorrectly specified over this period. The average of the residuals is -0.0967 , which is low but not significantly different from zero.

6. CONCLUSION AND AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Wilkie's stochastic investment model does not provide a particularly good description of the data and does not appear to be any better than a model that simply uses the means as predictors for the four transformed series.

The transformations used by Wilkie (1986) are incompatible with one another, do not all have meaningful interpretations, and permit negative Consols yields. These problems can be overcome in future models by transforming each asset class (including inflation) into a series of the force of growth of total returns and, for assets with non-negative, non-constant cash-flows, a series of the force of growth of cash-flows. These transformations will not always result in a stationary series. Non-stationarity will need to be taken into account by using alternatives to standard ARIMA models, such as: cointegrated models, ARCH models and threshold models.

Wilkie's model is over-parameterised as *DD*, *DW*, *DB*, *CD*, and *CY* all appear to be insignificant and *CA1* and *CA2* can be replaced by $1 + CA3$ and $-2 \times CA3$, respectively. The inflation data contained shocks and was non-stationary. These features cannot be explicitly taken into account in standard ARIMA models and appear to have caused *QA* and *YW* to be incorrectly included in the model. Considerable further research is required to determine more appropriate relationships between the retail prices index model and the other models. The relationship represented by *YA* appears to be far less significant after 1974. Since 1982, *QSD* is significantly less than, and *CSD* is significantly greater than, their respective estimates.

There are numerous problems with the data on which Wilkie's model was based. In particular, the data was compiled from a number of different sources that are not entirely compatible. The effects of these differences should have been examined before the combined data was used. The effects of seasonality in the retail prices index also need to be examined.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are due to my supervisors Steven Haberman and Richard Verrall for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

REFERENCES

- The Actuaries' Investment Index*. The Institute of Actuaries, London, and the Faculty of Actuaries, Edinburgh, December 1928 - December 1962. (Also known as: *The Actuaries' Investment Index (Second Series)*, August 1953 - December 1957; *The Actuaries' Investment Index (Second Series-Revised)*, January 1958 - December 1962.)
- ALLEN, R.G.D. (1948). Retail prices. *London & Cambridge Economic Service Bulletin*, **26**: 18.
- BZW equity & gilt study*. Barclays de Zoete Wedd Research Limited, London, 38th edition, 1992.
- DAYKIN, C.D. & HEY, G.B. (1990). Managing uncertainty in a general insurance company. *Journal of the Institute of Actuaries*, **117**: 173-277.
- Employment Gazette*. H.M. Stationary Office, London, July 1914 - March 1994. (Previously known as: *The Board of Trade Labour Gazette*, July 1914 - June 1917; *The Labour Gazette*, July 1917 - May 1922; *The Ministry of Labour Gazette*, June 1922 - March 1949; *Ministry of Labour Gazette*, April 1949 - May 1968; *Employment and Productivity Gazette*, June 1968 - December 1970; *Department of Employment Gazette*, January 1971 - December 1978.)
- Financial Times*. The Financial Times Limited, London, various issues 30 July 1914 - 30 April 1994.
- FT-Actuaries Share Indices*. The Financial Times Limited, London, 1976 - 1990.
- FT-SE Actuaries Share Indices*. The Financial Times Limited, London, January 1969 - February 1994. (Previously known as: *FT-Actuaries Share Indices-Monthly UK Stock Indices*, January 1969 - December 1989; *FT-Actuaries Share Indices-Finstat*, January 1990 - December 1993.)
- FRANSES, P.H. & PAAP, R. (1994). Model selection in periodic autoregressions. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, **56**, 4: 421-439.
- GEOGHEGAN, T.J., CLARKSON, R.S., FELDMAN, K.S., GREEN, S.J., KITTS, A., LAVECKY, J.P., ROSS, F.J.M., SMITH, W.J. & TOUTOUNCHI, A. (1992). Report on the Wilkie stochastic investment model. *Journal of the Institute of Actuaries*, **119**: 173-228.
- HAYCOCKS, H.W. & PLYMEN, J. (1956). Investment policy and index numbers. *Journal of the Institute of Actuaries*, **82**: 333-390.
- HAYCOCKS, H.W. & PLYMEN, J. (1964). The design, application and future development of the *Financial Times-Actuaries Index*. *Journal of the Institute of Actuaries*, **90**: 267-324.
- HÜRLIMANN, W. (1992). Numerical evaluation of the Wilkie inflation model. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **11**: 311-314.
- KITTS, A. (1988). Applications of stochastic financial models: a review. Department of Social Statistics, University of Southampton.
- KITTS, A. (1990). Comments on a model of retail price inflation. *Journal of the Institute of Actuaries*, **117**: 407-412.
- MITCHELL, B.R. (1962). *Abstract of British historical statistics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- MITCHELL, B.R. & JONES, H.G. (1971). *Second abstract of British historical statistics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- OSBORN, D.R. (1990). A survey of seasonality in UK macroeconomic variables. *International Journal of Forecasting*, **6**: 327-336.
- ROSS, M.D. (1989). Modelling a with-profits life office. *Journal of the Institute of Actuaries*, **116**: 691-715.
- Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom*. In each of the last fifteen years from 1910-1924. H.M. Stationary Office, London, **69**. 1926.
- WILKIE, A.D. (1984). Steps towards a comprehensive stochastic model. *Occasional Actuarial Research Discussion Paper*, The Institute of Actuaries, London, **36**: 1-231.
- WILKIE, A.D. (1986). A stochastic investment model for actuarial use. *Transactions of the Faculty of Actuaries*, **39**: 341-403.
- WORKING, H. (1960). Note on the correlation of first differences of averages in a random chain. *Econometrica*, **28**: 916-918.

DEPARTMENT OF ACTUARIAL SCIENCE AND STATISTICS
Research Papers

1. Haberman S. Long Term Prognosis after Cerebral Infarction. 78 pages, 1984 (out of print).
2. Haberman S. Long Term Prognosis after Subarachnoid Haemorrhage. 43 pages, 1984 (out of print).
3. Haberman S. Age Variation in Incidence of Cerebrovascular Disease. 36 pages, 1985 (out of print).
4. Kaye G.D. Taxation of Pension Funds. 11 pages, 1985.
[Also: Haberman S. and Bloomfield D.S.F. Social Class Differences in Mortality Around 1981. SSRU Working Paper No. 55. 41 pages, 1987.]
5. Kaye G.D. Life Offices' Expenses Regression Analyses I, 98 pages, 1988. (Limited circulation).
6. Kaye G.D. Life Assurance Taxation - Comments in Response to the Board of the Inland Revenue's Consultative Document Concerning the Taxation of Life Insurance. 11 pages. 1988.
7. Verrall R.J. Bayesian Linear Models and the Claims Run-Off Triangle. 32 pages. 1988.
8. Kaye G.D. Life Offices' Expenses Regression Analyses II. 12 pages. 1989. (Limited circulation).
9. Bloomfield D.S.F. and Haberman S. The Assessment of Damages and the Measurement of Work time Lost to Sickness, Unemployment and Stoppages. 100 pages. 1989.
10. Adams A.T. Pricing Property Investment Company Shares. 14 pages. 1989.
11. Booth P.M. History of Exchange Controls in the EC with Particular Reference to the United Kingdom. 39 pages. 1989.
12. Verrall R.J. Chain Ladder and Maximum Likelihood. 12 pages. 1989.
13. Verrall R.J. On the Unbiased Estimation of Reserves from Loglinear Models. 13 pages, 1989.
14. Adams A.T. An Analysis of Investment Trust Shares, 1990. 31 pages.
15. Haberman S. Demographic Trends Towards 2000. 16 pages. 1989.
16. Haberman S. British Life Insurance: The Role of the Actuary and 1992. 30 pages. 1990.
17. Verrall R.J. Bootstrapping, Saddlepoint Approximations and the Probability of Ruin. 10 pages. July 1990.

18. Booth P.M. Theoretical Aspects of the Taxation of Real Returns from Short Term Deposits. 26 pages. June 1990.
19. Booth P.M. Practical Aspects of the Taxation of Real Interest. 38 pages, 1990.
20. Puzey A.S. Actuarial Funding in Unit-linked Life Assurance - Derivation of the Actuarial Funding Factors. 19 pages. July 1990.
21. Kaye G.D. Economies of Scale in the United Kingdom Insurance Industry. A report for the Association of British Insurers. Limited Circulation. October 1990.
22. Adams A.T. & Venmore-Rowland P. Direct or Indirect Property Investment. 71 pages. September 1990.
23. England P.D. Statistical Modelling of Excess Mortality. 124 pages. September 1990.
24. Verrall R.J. & Li Z. Negative Incremental Claims: Chain Ladder and Linear Models. November 1990.
25. Haberman S. State Pension Provision and Social Security in the United Kingdom. Presented at a Conference in Lisbon on "Social Security and Private Provision; What are the Prospects?". 40 pages. October 1990.
26. Renshaw A.E. Graduation by Generalized Linear Modelling Techniques. 42 pages. February 1991.
27. England P.D. Statistical Modelling of Excess Mortality No. 2. 170 pages. June 1991.
28. Adams, A.T. The Market Pricing of Composite Insurance Shares. 37 pages. July 1991.
29. Haberman, S. The Effect of Autoregressive Rates of Return on the Variability of Pension Contributions and Fund Levels. 58 pages. September 1991.
30. Puzey, A.S. An Investigation into the Effect of Averaging Age Nearest Birthday at the Beginning of a Rate Year to Exact Age. October 1991. 33 pages.
31. Chadburn, R.G. Bias in Select Mortality Investigations where Data are Subdivided by Age at Death. November 1991. 69 pages.
32. England P.D. and Verrall R.J. Dynamic Estimation for Models of Excess Mortality. January 1992. 19 pages.
33. Verrall R.J. A State Space Formulation of Whittaker-Henderson Graduation, with Extensions. January 1992. 13 pages.
34. Verrall R.J. Graduation by Dynamic Regression Methods. January 1992. 37 pages.
35. Gerrard R.G. and Haberman S. Stability of Pension Systems when Gains/Losses are Amortized and Rates of Return are Autoregressive. March 1992. 12 pages.
36. Haberman S. HIV, AIDS and the Approximate Calculation of Life Insurance Functions, Annuities and Net Premiums. April 1992. 28 pages.
37. Cooper D.R. Savings and Loans: An Historical Perspective. May 1992. 29 pages.
38. Verrall R.J. Dynamic Bayes Estimation for AIDS Delay Tables. May 1992. 16 pages.
39. Kaye G.D. Data Sources Relating to Life Assurance Expenses. May 1992. 39 pages. Presented to the Staple Inn Actuarial Society and Royal Statistical Society - February 1992.

40. Renshaw A.E., and Haberman S. On the Graduation Associated with a Multiple State Model for Permanent Health Insurance. May 1992.
41. England P.D. Statistical Modelling of Excess Mortality Number 3. June 1992. 163 pages.
42. Bloomfield D.S.F. and Haberman S. Male Social Class Mortality Differences Around 1981: An Extension to Include Childhood Ages. 21 pages. June 1992.
43. Berg M.P. and Haberman S. Trend Analysis and Prediction Procedures for Time Nonhomogeneous Claim Processes. 33 pages. June 1992.
44. Booth P.M. The Single Market for Insurance, Free Capital Movements and attempts to Fix Exchange Rates. October 1992. 28 pages.
45. Verrall R.J. Chain Ladder with Varying Run-off Evolutions. February 1993. 15 pages.
46. Gavin J., Haberman S. and Verrall R.J. Moving Weighted Average Graduation using Kernel Estimation. November 1992. 14. pages.
47. Gavin J., Haberman S. and Verrall R.J. On the Choice of Bandwidth for Kernel Graduation. November 1992. 21 pages.
48. S. Haberman. Pension Funding with Time Delays and the Optimal Spread Period. May 1993. 13 pages.
49. S. Haberman. Stochastic Investment Returns and the Present Value of Future Contributions in a Defined Benefit Pension Scheme. May 1993. 22 pages.
50. A. Zimbidis and S. Haberman. Delay, Feedback and Variability of Pension Contributions and Fund Levels. May 1993. 19 pages.
51. S. Haberman. Pension Funding: The Effect of Changing The Frequency Valuations. June 1993. 19 pages.
52. S Haberman. HIV, AIDS Markov Chains and PHI. June 1993. 15 pages.
53. S Haberman. A Consideration of Pension Credit and Termination Insurance. June 1993. 22 pages.
54. M Z Khorasane. Survey of Actuarial Practice in the Funding of UK Defined Benefit Pension Schemes. July 1993. 19 pages.
55. P M Booth, R G Chadburn and A S K Ong. A Utility Maximisation Approach to Asset Allocation. September 1993. 40 pages.
56. R G Chadburn. Bias in Select Mortality Investigations. August 1993. 62 pages.
57. M Z Khorasane. A Comparison of Pension Funding Strategies by means of Simulations for a Model Scheme. August 1993. 43 pages.
58. A E Renshaw, P Hatzopolous and S Haberman. Recent Mortality Trends in Male Assured Lives. June 1993. 23 pages.
59. E Pitacco. Disability Risk Models: Towards A Unifying Approach. September 1993. 33 pages.
60. M Boskov and R J Verrall. Premium Rating by Geographic Area Using Spatial Models. September 1993. 14 pages.

61. R G Chadburn. Managing Mutual Life Offices: The Use of an Expense Ratio in New Business Decision Making and Expense Control. October 1993. 21 pages.
62. Haberman S. Pension Funding Modelling and Stochastic Investment Returns. 56 pages. March 1994.
63. Renshaw A E and Verrall R J. The Stochastic Model Underlying the Chain-Ladder Technique. 25 pages. April 1994.
64. Haberman S and Sung J-H. Dynamic Approaches to Pension Funding. 22 pages. April 1994.
65. Renshaw A.E. On the Second Moment Properties and the Implementation of Certain GLIM Based Stochastic Claims Reserving Models. 36 pages. September 1994.
66. Booth P.M., J.N. Allan, and J.W. Jang. An Evaluation of the UK Life Insurance Mismatching Test. September 1994.
67. Booth P.M. and Stroinski K. Insurance and Investment Markets in Poland. September 1994. 35 pages.
68. Ong A. A Stochastic Model for Treasury-Bills: An Extension to Wilkie's Model. September 1994. 12 pages.
69. Bloomfield D.S.F. Moving on from Undergraduate Exams to Professional Exams: Actuaries. November 1994. 22 pages.
70. Huber P. A Review of Wilkie's Stochastic Investment Model. January 1995. 22 pages.

ARU-ARP/aredsk