

STOCHASTIC DOMINANCE:

Investment Decision Making Under Uncertainty

Stochastic Dominance

by Haim Levy

Myles Robinson Professor of Finance

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Previously published books in the series:

Viscusi, W. Kip: STUDIES IN RISK AND UNCERTAINTY

Luken, R.: ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION:
TECHNOLOGY, AMBIENT AND BENEFITS-BASED
APPROACHES

Shubik, M.: RISK, ORGANIZATIONS AND SOCIETY

Edwards, W.: UTILITY THEORIES: MEASUREMENTS AND
APPLICATIONS

Martin, W.: ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMICS AND THE
MINING INDUSTRY

Kunreuther, H. and Easterling, D.: THE DILEMMA OF A SITING
OF HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORY

Kniesner, T. and Leeth, J.: SIMULATING WORKPLACE
SAFETY POLICY

Christe, N.G.S. and Soguel, N.C.: CONTINGENT VALUATION,
TRANSPORT SAFETY

Battigalli, P., Montesano, A. and Panunzi, F.: DECISIONS,
GAMES AND MARKETS

Freeman, P. and Kunreuther, H.: MANAGING
ENVIRONMENTAL RISK THROUGH INSURANCE

Kopp, R.J., Pommerehne, W.W. and Schwartz, N.:
DETERMINING THE VALUE OF NON-MARKETED
GOODS

Bishop, R.C. and Romano, D.: ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE
VALUATION: APPLICATIONS OF THE
CONTINGENT VALUATION METHOD IN ITALY

STOCHASTIC DOMINANCE

Investment Decision Making under Uncertainty

by

Haim Levy

**Myles Robinson Professor of Finance
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem**



Springer Science+Business Media, LLC

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Stochastic dominance : investment decision making under uncertainty /
edited by Haim Levy.

p. cm. -- (Studies in risk and uncertainty)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4757-2842-2 ISBN 978-1-4757-2840-8 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-1-4757-2840-8

1. Investment analysis--Mathematics.
2. Stochastic processes.
3. Statistical decision. I. Levy, Haim. II. Series.

HG4529.S75 1998

332.6'01'51--dc21

98-34577

CIP

Copyright © 1998 by Springer Science+Business Media New York.

Originally published by Kluwer Academic Publishers in 1998

Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 1998

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher, Springer Science+Business Media, LLC.

Printed on acid-free paper.

To Tal, Shira, Tamar, and Neta

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	1
1	
On the Measurement of Risk	5
1.1	What is Risk?
1.2	Measures of Risk
	a) Domar and Musgrave Risk Indexes
	b) Roy's Safety First Rule
	c) Dispersion as a Risk Index: Variance and Standard Deviation
	d) Semi-variance (SV) as an index of risk
	e) Baumol's Risk Measure
	f) Loss as an Alternative Cost: The Minimax Regret
1.3	Summary
2	
Expected Utility Theory	21
2.1	Introduction
2.2	Investment Criteria
	a) The Maximum Return Criterion (MRC)
	b) The Maximum Expected Return Criterion (MERC)
2.3	The Axioms and Proof of the Maximum Expected Utility Criterion (MEUC)
	a) The Payoff of the Investments
	b) The Axioms
	c) Proof that the Maximum Expected Utility Criterion (MEUC) is Optimal Decision Rule
2.4	The Properties of Utility Function
	a) Preference and Expected Utility
	b) Is $U(x)$ a Probability Function or a Utility Function?
2.5	The Meaning of the Utility Units
2.6	MRC, MERC as Special Cases of MEUC
2.7	Summary

- 3.1 Partial Ordering: Efficient and Inefficient Sets
- 3.2 First Degree Stochastic Dominance (FSD)
 - a) Probability Function, Density Function and Cumulating Probability Function
 - b) The FSD Rule
 - c) The Graphical Exposition of the FSD Rule
 - d) FSD: A Numerical Example of FSD
 - e) The Intuitive Explanation of FSD
- 3.3 Optimal Rule, Sufficient Rules and Necessary Rules for FSD
 - a) Sufficient Rules
 - b) Necessary Rules
- 3.4 Type I and Type II Errors When Sufficient Rules or Necessary Rules are not Optimal for Investment Screening
- 3.5 Second Degree Stochastic Dominance (SSD)
 - a) Risk Aversion
 - b) The SSD Investment Decision Rule
 - c) Graphical Exposition of SSD
 - d) An Intuitive Explanation of SSD
- 3.6 Sufficient Rules and Necessary Rules for SSD
 - a) Sufficient Rules
 - b) Necessary Rules for SSD
- 3.7 Third Degree Stochastic Dominance (TSD)
 - a) A Preference for Positive Skewness as a Motivation for TSD
 - b) The Definition of Skewness
 - c) Lottery, Insurance and Preference for Positive Skewness
 - d) Empirical Studies and Positive Skewness Preference (or $U''' > 0$)
 - e) Decreasing Absolute Risk Aversion (DARA), and Positive Skewness Preferences (or $U''' > 0$)
 - f) The Optimal Investment Rule for $U \in U_3$: TSD
 - g) Graphical Exposition of TSD
 - h) The Intuitive Explanation of TSD
- 3.8 Sufficient Rules and Necessary Rules for $U \in U_3$
 - a) Sufficient Rules
 - b) Necessary Rules for TSD
- 3.9 Decreasing Absolute Risk Aversion (DARA) Stochastic Dominance (DSD)
 - a) DARA Utility Functions
 - b) DSD with Equal Mean Distributions
- 3.10 n^{th} Order Stochastic Dominance

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 3.11 Stochastic Dominance Rules: Extension to Discrete Distributions
- 3.12 The Role of the Mean and Variance in Stochastic Dominance Rules
- 3.13 Summary

4

Stochastic Dominance: The Quantile Approach **127**

- 4.1 The Distribution Quantile
- 4.2 Stochastic Dominance Rules Stated in Terms of Distribution Quantiles
 - a) The FSD Rule with Quantiles
 - b) The SSD Rule with Quantiles
 - c) The TSD and Higher Order Stochastic Dominance Rule with Quantiles
- 4.3 Stochastic Dominance Rules with a Riskless Asset: A Perfect Capital Market
 - a) FSD with a Riskless Asset: The FSDR Rule
 - b) Graphical Illustration of the FSDR Rule
 - c) SSD with a Riskless Asset: The SSDR Rule
 - d) TSD with a Riskless Asset: The TSDR Rule
 - e) The SD and SDR Efficient Sets
- 4.4 Stochastic Dominance Rules with a Riskless Asset: An Imperfect Capital Market
- 4.5 Summary

5

Algorithms for Stochastic Dominance **163**

- 5.1 Using the Necessary Conditions and Transitivity to Reduce the Number of Comparisons
- 5.2 The FSD Algorithm
- 5.3 The SSD Algorithm
- 5.4 The TSD Algorithm
- 5.5 The SDR Algorithms
 - a) FSDR Algorithm
 - b) SSDR Algorithm
 - c) TSDR Algorithm
- 5.6 Summary

6		
	Stochastic Dominance with Specific Distributions	189
6.1	Normal Distributions	
	a) Properties of the Normal Distribution	
	b) Dominance Without a Riskless Asset	
	c) Dominance With a Riskless Asset	
6.2	Lognormal Distributions	
	a) Properties of the Lognormal Distribution	
	b) Dominance Without a Riskless Asset	
	c) Dominance With a Riskless Asset	
6.3	Truncated Normal Distributions	
	a) Symmetrical Truncation	
	b) Non-symmetrical Truncation	
6.4	Distributions that Intercept Once at Most	
6.5	Summary	
7		
	The Empirical Studies	215
7.1	The Effectiveness of the Various Decision Rules: A Perfect Market	
7.2	The Effectiveness of the Various Decision Rules: An Imperfect Market	
7.3	The Performance of Mutual Funds With Transaction Costs	
7.4	Convex Stochastic Dominance (CSD)	
7.5	Sampling Errors: Statistical Limitations of the Empirical Studies	
7.6	Summary	
8		
	Applications of Stochastic Dominance Rules	229
8.1	Capital Structure and the Value of the Firm	
8.2	Production, Saving and Diversification	
8.3	Estimating the Probability of Bankruptcy	
8.4	Option Evaluation, Insurance Premium and Portfolio Insurance	
8.5	Application of SD Rules in Agricultural Economics	
8.6	Application of SD Rules in Medicine	
8.7	Measuring Income Inequity	
8.8	Application of SD Rules in the Selection of Parameter Estimators	
8.9	Summary	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

9		
Stochastic Dominance and Risk Measures		245
9.1	When is One Investment Riskier Than Another Investment?	
9.2	Mean Preserving Spread (MPS)	
9.3	Unequal Means and “Riskier Than” with the Riskless Asset	
9.4	“Riskier Than” and DARA Utility Function: Mean Preserving Antispread	
9.5	Summary	
10		
Stochastic Dominance and Diversification		259
10.1	Arrow’s Condition for Diversification	
	a) Diversification Between a Risky and a Riskless Asset	
	b) The Effect of Shifts in Parameters on Diversification	
10.2	Extension of the SD Analyses to the Case of Two-Risky Assets	
10.3	Diversification and Expected Utility: Some Common Utility Functions	
	a) Shift in r	
	b) Shift in x	
	c) MPS Shifts	
	d) MPA Shifts	
	e) MPSA Shifts	
10.4	Summary	
11		
Decision Making and the Investment Horizon		281
11.1	Tobin’s M-V Multi-Period Analysis	
11.2	Sharpe’s Reward-to-Variability Ratio and the Investment Horizon	
11.3	The Effect of the Investment Horizon on Correlations	
11.4	The Effect of the Investment Horizon on the Composition of M-V Portfolios	
11.5	The Effect of the Investment Horizon on Beta	
11.6	Stochastic Dominance and the Investment Horizon	
11.7	Contrasting The Size of the M-V and SD Efficient Set	
11.8	Summary	

12		
The CAPM and Stochastic Dominance		301
12.1	The CAPM with Heterogeneous Investment Horizon	
	a) Quadratic Utility Function	
	b) Single-Period Normal Distributions	
	c) Multiperiod Normal Distributions	
	d) Lognormal Distributions	
12.2	Summary	
13		
Non-Expected Utility and Stochastic Dominance		319
13.1	The Allias Paradox	
13.2	Non-Expected Utility Theory	
13.3	Prospect Theory	
13.4	Prospect Stochastic Dominance (PSD)	
13.5	Summary	
14		
Future Research		337
14.1	Portfolio Construction and Stochastic Dominance Equilibrium	
14.2	The Stochastic Dominance Rules and Length of the Investment Horizon	
14.3	Uncertain Investment Horizon	
14.4	Risk Index	
14.5	Stochastic Dominance and Increasing Interest Rate	
14.6	Truncated Distributions and Stochastic Dominance	
14.7	Employing Stochastic Dominance Criteria in other Research Areas	
14.8	Refining the Stochastic Dominance Criteria	
14.9	Stochastic Dominance and Option Valuation	
14.10	Experimental Stochastic Dominance Criteria	
Bibliography		349
Index		371

PREFACE

This book is devoted to investment decision-making under uncertainty. The book covers three basic approaches to this process:

- a) The stochastic dominance approach, developed on the foundation of von-Neumann and Morgenstern¹ expected utility paradigm.
- b) The mean-variance approach developed by Markowitz² on the foundation of von-Neumann and Morgenstern's expected utility or simply on the assumption of a utility function based on mean and variance.
- c) The non-expected utility approach, focusing on prospect theory and its modified version, cumulative prospect theory. This theory is based on an experimental finding that subjects participating in laboratory experiments often violate expected utility maximization: They tend to use subjective probability beliefs that differ systematically from the objective probabilities and to base their decisions on changes in wealth rather than on total wealth.

The above approaches are discussed and compared in this book. We also discuss cases in which stochastic dominance rules coincide with the mean-variance rule and cases in which contradictions between these two approaches may occur. We then discuss the relationship between stochastic dominance rules and prospect theory, and establish a new investment decision rule which combines the two and which we call prospect stochastic dominance. Although all three approaches are discussed, most of the book is devoted to the stochastic dominance paradigm.

Concepts similar to stochastic dominance have been known for many years but the two papers published by Hadar and Russell, and Hanoch and Levy in 1969, and the paper published by Rothschild and Stiglitz in 1970³ paved the way for a new paradigm called stochastic dominance, with hundreds of studies following in their tracks. These studies, deal with theoretical as well as empirical issues in various areas of economics, finance, accounting, statistics, agriculture, and medicine.

The need to develop the stochastic dominance rules, at least in the view of the author of this book, stems from paradoxes that are sometimes revealed by the commonly

¹ von Neumann, J., and O. Morgenstern, *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1953.

² Markowitz, H.M., "Portfolio Selection," *Journal of Finance*, 1952, pp. 77–91.

³ Hadar, J. and W.R. Russell, "Rules for Ordering Uncertain Prospects," *American Economic Review*, 1969, pp. 25–34; Hanoch, G. and H. Levy, "The Efficiency Analysis of Choices Involving Risk," *Review of Economic Studies*, 1969, pp. 335–346 and Rothschild M. and J. Stiglitz, "Increasing Risk. I. A Definition," *Journal of Economic Theory*, 1970, pp. 225–243.

used mean-variance rule. To be more specific, there are cases in which a clear-cut choice between two risky assets exist, yet the mean-variance rule is unable to distinguish between the two alternate investments. When I was a second-year MBA student, only the mean-variance investment rule was taught. I presented my teacher with the case of two alternative investments: x providing \$1 or \$2 with equal probability and y providing \$2 or \$4 with equal probability, with an identical initial investment of, say, \$1.1. A simple calculation shows that both the mean and the variance of y are greater than the corresponding parameters of x ; hence the mean-variance rule remains silent regarding the choice between x and y . Yet, any rational investor would (and should) select y , because the lowest return on y is equal to the largest return on x . Well, this is a trivial case in which the mean-variance rule fails to show the superiority of one investment over another. However, there are many more such cases in which the mean-variance rule is unable to distinguish between two investments. These cases are sometimes quite complex and the superiority of one investment over the other cannot be detected by the naked eye: Hence my motivation to develop general decision rules, well-known nowadays as stochastic dominance rules.

In spite of its common use, the mean-variance rule coincides precisely⁴ with the expected utility paradigm only in two cases: normal distribution of returns in the face of risk aversion, and quadratic utility function. The quadratic utility function, apart from the disadvantage of restricting the analysis to one type of preference, has other drawbacks, too. Hence, most researchers focus on the normal case. However, in the normal case, we face a severe problem: the returns range is from minus infinity to plus infinity but actual rates of returns are bounded by -100% , that is, the asset price can drop to zero and no further. Assuming lognormal distribution provides a rescue from this limited liability issue because lognormal distribution is defined only for non-negative asset prices, thus conforming with the fact that, in practice, asset prices cannot be negative. However, although the assumption of lognormal distribution overcomes the limited liability issue, it gives rise to another issue: If each asset is lognormally distributed, linear combination of these assets (a portfolio) will not be lognormally distributed. The continuous time model suggested by Merton,⁵ overcomes this difficulty of lognormal distribution because, for any finite terminal date, each selected portfolio will be lognormally distributed. However, the lognormal case is saved at the cost of assuming a continuous time model in which the investor revises the portfolio weights continuously. This implies that even a tiny transaction cost will induce a negative rate of return on the terminal date; hence, existing transaction costs ruin the model.

The stochastic dominance framework does not suffer from the above deficiencies. However, this paradigm has its own deficiencies: a method to construct all the effi-

⁴ One can use the mean-variance rule as an approximation to the expected utility. For more details, see Levy, H., and H. Markowitz, "Approximating Expected Utility by a Function of Mean and Variance," *American Economic Review*, 1979, pp. 308–317.

⁵ Merton, R.E., "An Intertemporal Capital Pricing Model," *Econometrica*, September 1973, pp. 867–887.

cient portfolios and a separation theorem (as in the mean-variance framework) have yet to be developed. Therefore, we suggest that stochastic dominance rules do not substitute for the mean-variance rule but rather offer an alternative approach, complimenting rather than replacing it. However, in cases that are not related to portfolio construction (e.g., applications in agriculture, medicine, statistics, and some applications in economics and finance), application of the stochastic dominance paradigm will be optimal because no assumptions are needed regarding the distribution of returns.

The book starts with various commonly used measures of risk (Chapter 1) leading up to the expected utility paradigm (Chapter 2) which shows that the only relevant measure of risk is the risk premium. As the risk premium varies from one investor to another, we conclude that, in general, no one single objective index has the capacity to rank investments by their risk. Thus, the whole distribution of returns rather than one measure of profitability and one measure of risk has to be considered. Chapter 3 forms the heart of the book. In this chapter, we develop and discuss first, second, and third degree stochastic dominance rules. In Chapter 4, we extend the stochastic dominance rules to include riskless assets. In order to do this, we first reformulate the stochastic dominance rules in terms of distribution quantiles rather than cumulative distributions. Algorithms for all these stochastic dominance rules are provided in Chapter 5. Having the general stochastic dominance rules with no constraints on the distribution returns under our belt, we proceed in Chapter 6, to stochastic dominance for specific distributions including normal, lognormal and other truncated distributions. Then, in Chapter 7, we provide empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of the stochastic dominance rules as well as the mean-variance rule.

In Chapter 8 we present a few of the many applications of stochastic dominance rules in various fields of research. We discuss these applications briefly and provide references to these studies at the end of the book. Chapter 9 is devoted to the definition of situations in which one asset is identified as “more risky” than another asset, and the extension of this definition to DARA utility functions as well as to the case of the riskless asset. Chapter 10 is devoted to stochastic dominance and diversification and, in particular, to the effect of changes in the cumulative distributions on diversification. Chapter 11 analyzes the effect of changes in the assumed investment horizon on the efficient set in the frameworks of mean-variance and stochastic dominance.

The capital asset pricing model (CAPM) of Sharpe and Lintner⁶ is undoubtedly one of the main cornerstones of modern finance. However, the CAPM holds only under a set of confining assumptions, one of them being that all investors have the same investment horizon. In Chapter 12, based on the work of Levy and Samuelson,⁷ we use

⁶ Sharpe, W.F., “Capital Asset Prices: A Theory of Market Equilibrium Under Conditions of Risk,” *Journal of Finance*, September, 1964, pp. 425–442, and Lintner, J., “Security Prices, Risk, and Maximal Gains from Diversification,” *Journal of Finance*, December 1965, pp. 587–615.

⁷ Levy, H., and P.A., Samuelson, “The Capital Asset Pricing Model with Diverse Holding Periods,” *Management Science*, November 1992, pp. 1529–1542.

stochastic dominance rules to show that the CAPM holds under a much wider set of assumptions, even if investors do not have the same horizon.

Chapter 13 is devoted to non-expected utility theory with Prospect Theory suggested by Kahaneman and Tversky⁸ as the main competing theory. We suggest a reconciliation between the two competing theories by focusing on short- and long-term investment decisions.

Chapter 14 concludes the book with suggestions for further research and presentation of unsolved problems in the area of investment decision making, with emphasis on stochastic dominance. Readers interested in this field are welcome to pursue these research ideas.

AUDIENCE

This book is intended mainly for Ph.D. students, advanced MBA students specializing in finance, and advanced MA economics students interested in the economics of uncertainty. The book can be used also as a supplementary book in post-graduate courses on portfolio selection and investment decision making under uncertainty.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Benzion Barlev, Moshe Levy, and Zvi Wiener who read several chapters of this book and to Moshe Leshno and Boaz Leibovitz who read and commented on the whole manuscript. I derived a great deal of benefit from their comments on the earlier drafts of this book. I would also like to thank Yoel Hecht for preparing all the figures and to him and Allon Cohen for checking and improving the algorithms for the stochastic dominance rules. Finally, I would like to thank Hyla Berkowitz for typing the many drafts of this book and Maya Landau for her editorial contribution.

⁸ Kahaneman, D., and A. Tversky, "Prospect Theory of Decisions Under Risk," *Econometrica*, 1979, pp. 263–291.