

# Empirical distributions of stock returns: European securities markets, 1990–95

FELIPE M. APARICIO<sup>1</sup> and JAVIER ESTRADA<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Carlos III University (Madrid, Spain), Department of Statistics and Econometrics*

<sup>2</sup>*IESE (Barcelona, Spain), Department of Finance*

*(Received May 1997: Accepted September 1999)*

---

The assumption that daily stock returns are normally distributed has long been disputed by the data. In this article the normality assumption is tested (and clearly rejected) using time series of daily stock returns for 13 European securities markets. More importantly, four alternative specifications are fitted to the data, overall support is found for the scaled-*t* distribution (and partial support for a mixture of two Normal distributions), and the magnitude of the error that stems from predicting returns by using the Normal distribution is quantified. Data also show that normality may be a plausible assumption for monthly (but not for daily) stock returns.

*Keywords:* distributions of stock returns, non-normality, European markets

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The assumption that stock returns are normally distributed is widely used, implicitly or explicitly, in theoretical finance. Investors' preferences can be modelled in a simple way by assuming mean-variance behaviour. However, as is well known, this type of behaviour is consistent with the more general criterion of expected-utility maximization under either one of two conditions, namely, that investors' utility functions are quadratic or that stock returns are (jointly) normally distributed. Since, as is also well known, a quadratic utility function exhibits some implausible properties,<sup>1</sup> mean-variance behaviour is usually justified through the assumption of normally-distributed stock returns.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, the widespread use of mean-variance behaviour, together with the implausibility of quadratic utility functions, may help to explain the popularity of the normality assumption for stock returns.

From a theoretical point of view, however, the normality of stock returns is questionable if information does not arrive linearly at the market, or, even if it does, if investors do not react linearly to its arrival. In both cases, a leptokurtic

<sup>1</sup> A plausible utility function should exhibit decreasing absolute risk aversion, constant relative risk aversion, and increasing risk tolerance. However, the quadratic utility function exhibits increasing absolute risk aversion, increasing relative risk aversion, and decreasing risk tolerance.

<sup>2</sup> Chamberlain (1983) shows that the distinguishing characteristic of the distributions for which expected utility is a function only of a portfolio mean and variance is spherical symmetry. A vector is spherically distributed about the origin if its distribution is invariant under orthogonal linear transformations that leave the origin fixed.

distribution of stock returns should be observed. If information arrives at the market in infrequent clumps instead of in a linear fashion, investors would be forced to react similarly; in other words, if the distribution of information is leptokurtic, so should be the distribution of stock returns. Alternatively, if information arrives at the market linearly but investors ignore it until trends are well in place, and then react in a cumulative fashion to all the information ignored up to that point, a leptokurtic distribution of stock returns would also be obtained;<sup>3</sup> see Peters (1991). Thus, if either argument is true, the distribution of stock returns should have fatter tails than expected under the Normal distribution.

Empirical evidence against the normality assumption, on the other hand, has been mounting since the pioneering articles by Mandelbrot (1963), Fama (1965), and Clark (1973). Mandelbrot (1963) argued that price changes can be characterized by a stable Paretian distribution with a characteristic exponent less than 2, thus exhibiting fat tails and an infinite variance.<sup>4</sup> He directly tested the infinite-variance hypothesis by computing the sample variance of a large number of samples containing the returns of cotton prices, and found that the variances did not converge to any limiting value. Rather, they evolved in an erratic fashion, just as would be expected under the infinite-variance hypothesis.

Fama (1965), using the 30 stocks of the Dow Jones Industrial Average, confirmed Mandelbrot's (1963) hypothesis that a stable Paretian distribution with a characteristic exponent less than 2 describes stock returns better than a Normal distribution. Thus, since stable Paretian markets tend to evolve in jumps (rather than continuously and smoothly like Gaussian markets), he concluded that stocks are riskier than indicated by the standard deviation of a Normal distribution.<sup>5</sup>

The infinite variance of stable Paretian distributions, and the fact that if stock returns follow this distribution then the usual statistical tools may be badly misleading, led many researchers to look for alternatives. Clark (1973) argued in favour of a finite-variance subordinated stochastic process and found that a member of this class (the lognormal distribution) fitted data on cotton futures prices better than a stable Paretian distribution.

Several other distributions have been fitted to stock returns. Smith (1981), Gray and French (1990) and Peiró (1994) tested the logistic distribution. Praetz (1972), Blattberg and Gonedes (1974), Gray and French (1990), and Peiró (1994) fitted the scaled- $t$  distribution. Hsu (1982), Gray and French (1990), and Peiró (1994) used the exponential power distribution. Press (1967) argued that stock returns may be generated by the interaction of a continuous diffusion (Brownian motion) process and a discontinuous jump (Poisson) process, where the former

<sup>3</sup> Note that under this second theory, unlike under the first, changes in stock prices depend on past information, thus contradicting the efficient market hypothesis.

<sup>4</sup> When the characteristic exponent of a stable Paretian distribution is exactly equal to 2, then the Normal distribution is obtained. Hence, the latter is a special case of the former.

<sup>5</sup> In fact, in a stable Paretian market, the sample standard deviation cannot be used as a meaningful measure of risk. This is due to the fact that this statistic exhibits a very erratic behaviour in the sense that, as the sample size increases, it does not converge to any given value.

captures continuous changes in stock prices and the latter models large informational shocks. Finally, Kon (1984) fitted several mixtures of Normal distributions.

This article analyses the distributions of stock returns of 13 European securities markets during the first half of the decade. We start by testing the normality assumption for daily stock returns, which (not surprisingly) we clearly reject in all markets. Then, we attempt to find the specification that best fits the data in each market, and find overall support for the scaled- $t$  distribution and partial support for a mixture of two Normal distributions. Then, we quantify the magnitude of the error that stems from predicting returns by using the Normal distribution, and find that such a specification significantly underestimates the risk of investing in European stocks. Finally, we analyse the distributions of monthly stock returns, and find that they are reasonably well described by a Normal distribution.

It is important to note that our whole analysis is based on *unconditional* distributions of stock returns. As is well known, the leptokurtosis in stock returns motivated the proliferation of ARCH-type models, which seek to incorporate the information contained in the tails of a distribution of stock returns into time series models. An analysis of the conditional distributions of European stock returns is beyond the scope of this paper, but the interested reader is referred to the pioneering articles by Engle (1982) on the ARCH model; Bollerslev (1986) on the GARCH model; Engle *et al.* (1987) on the ARCH-M model; and Nelson (1991) on the EGARCH model. Bollerslev *et al.* (1992) offer an excellent literature review on the topic.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. In section 2, we describe the data and run three tests of normality. In section 3, we introduce the statistical distributions to be fitted to the data. In section 4, we report and discuss the results of our estimations. In section 5, we assess the magnitude of the error that stems from predicting returns by using a Normal (instead of a more appropriate) distribution. In section 6, we analyse the distributions of monthly stock returns. And, finally, in section 7, we summarize the main findings of our study. An appendix with figures concludes the article.

## 2. DATA AND TESTS OF NORMALITY

The sample under consideration consists of 13 European securities markets, namely, Austria (AUS), Belgium (BEL), Denmark (DEN), England (ENG), Finland (FIN), France (FRA), Germany (GER), Italy (ITA), Netherlands (NET), Norway (NOR), Spain (SPA), Sweden (SWE) and Switzerland (SWI). The behaviour of each of these markets is summarized by Financial Times Actuaries Indices, measured in local currency and published daily in the Financial Times. We also analyse the distribution of a World index (WOR), which is computed on the basis of 2249 stocks worldwide. The sample period extends from 1 January 1990 to 31 December 1994. The temporal behaviour of the 14 indices considered is shown in section A1 of the appendix.

We focus our attention on the series of returns defined as  $R_t = [\ln(I_t) - \ln(I_{t-1})]$ , where  $R_t$  and  $I_t$  are the return and the index in day  $t$ , respectively.

**Table 1.** Sample moments of the distributions of daily stock returns

Market	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Skw	SSkw	Krt	SKrt
AUS	-0.0064	1.1853	-7.5998	6.9370	0.1758	2.5918	6.1939	45.6561
BEL	-0.0020	0.7190	-5.5734	6.9116	0.1069	1.5761	14.6793	108.2030
DEN	-0.0030	0.8232	-5.8997	4.9312	-0.0936	-1.3803	5.9536	43.8846
ENG	0.0180	0.8185	-3.9943	5.5348	0.3340	4.9238	3.4455	25.3974
FIN	0.0377	1.2440	-5.4757	5.2919	0.2328	3.4316	2.1259	15.6700
FRA	-0.0026	0.9996	-7.2685	5.4874	-0.2973	-4.3833	3.8782	28.5867
GER	0.0046	1.0478	-10.3649	5.2958	-0.6131	-9.0381	9.7663	71.9886
ITA	-0.0017	1.3691	-8.2403	5.2754	-0.1918	-2.8278	2.2403	16.5131
NET	0.0241	0.7273	-3.6398	3.0222	-0.3147	-4.6391	1.6304	12.0176
NOR	0.0069	1.3307	-8.8584	10.8018	0.3662	5.3988	8.8477	65.2171
SPA	-0.0021	1.1249	-8.6287	6.7887	-0.2627	-3.8733	5.8811	43.3505
SWE	0.0282	1.2504	-6.8453	9.3145	0.5003	7.3755	5.7016	42.0272
SWI	0.0306	0.9313	-7.2125	5.3787	-0.6884	-10.1489	7.3683	54.3125
WOR	-0.0023	0.6535	-4.2796	3.9281	-0.0142	-0.2088	5.5388	40.8272

Mean returns, standard deviations (SD), minimum returns (Min), and maximum returns (Max) expressed in %.  $Skw = Skewness = m_3/s^3$  and  $Krt = Kurtosis = m_4/s^4 - 3$ , where  $m_i$  and  $s$  are the  $i$ th central sample moment and the sample standard deviation of each distribution, respectively; both coefficients computed with a finite-sample adjustment.  $SSkw = Standardized\ skewness$  and  $SKrt = Standardized\ kurtosis$ . Sample period: Jan/01/90–Dec/31/94.

Table 1 summarizes some relevant information about the empirical distributions of stock returns under consideration. The statistics reported are the mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum return during the sample period, coefficients of skewness and kurtosis, and standardized coefficients of skewness and kurtosis.

Preliminary evidence on the normality of each distribution of stock returns can be gathered from the last four columns of Table 1; that is, by considering the third and fourth central moments of each distribution. Under the assumption of normality, the coefficients of skewness and excess kurtosis are asymptotically distributed as  $N(0,6/T)$  and  $N(0,24/T)$ , respectively, where  $T$  is the sample size. Hence, values of these standardized coefficients ( $SSkw$  and  $SKrt$ ) outside the range  $[-1.96, 1.96]$  indicate significant departures from normality.<sup>6</sup>

Table 1 shows that not all the distributions are negatively skewed, as daily data from the US typically indicates. This table shows that eight markets display negative skewness and the other six markets display positive skewness. Note, however, that the coefficients of standardized skewness indicate that the observed asymmetry is not significant in three of the 14 markets analysed. In addition, the last column of Table 1 shows that *all* 14 distributions are clearly leptokurtic, thus exhibiting fat tails (and high peaks). The departures from normality detected by the coefficients of standardized skewness and kurtosis can also be seen in the histograms displayed in section A2 of the appendix,

<sup>6</sup> Conclusions from this and all other tests in this article are drawn at the 5% significance level.

where Normal distributions generated by the sample mean and standard deviation of each market are shown together with the empirical histograms.

The coefficients of standardized skewness and kurtosis provide strong evidence about departures from normality, but more formal conclusions can be reached through the tests of normality reported below in Table 2. Although these three tests use different information,<sup>7</sup> the results of all three point in the same direction, namely, to the outright rejection of the normality assumption for European daily stock returns.<sup>8</sup>

The results in Table 2 should come as no surprise; virtually all studies that use daily data also reject the normality of stock returns. In order to test whether alternative specifications fit the data better than the Normal distribution, we consider in the next section four alternative distributions. We admit from the outset that we have no *ex ante* underlying financial theory to justify the use of all specifications. Rather, our purpose is to fit four distributions that allow for the characteristics of the data discussed above, to determine which one of those distributions best fits each market, and to quantify the error that can be made by predicting returns by using the Normal distribution.

**Table 2.** Tests of normality (daily stock returns)

Market	Goodness of fit			Kolmogorov–Smirnov		Jarque–Bera	
	Statistic	df	<i>p</i> -value	Statistic	<i>p</i> -value	Statistic	<i>p</i> -value
AUS	153.704	9	0.0000	0.0748	0.0000	2 078.466	0.0000
BEL	159.076	7	0.0000	0.0845	0.0000	11 643.940	0.0000
DEN	118.647	7	0.0000	0.0716	0.0000	1 915.955	0.0000
ENG	45.830	10	0.0000	0.0365	0.0621	664.950	0.0000
FIN	123.383	13	0.0000	0.0612	0.0001	255.479	0.0000
FRA	43.022	9	0.0000	0.0441	0.0126	831.051	0.0000
GER	75.741	7	0.0000	0.0554	0.0007	5 244.135	0.0000
ITA	85.782	13	0.0000	0.0444	0.0117	278.655	0.0000
NET	64.326	13	0.0000	0.0504	0.0026	164.729	0.0000
NOR	79.617	8	0.0000	0.0594	0.0002	4 257.388	0.0000
SPA	80.346	9	0.0000	0.0629	0.0001	1 882.717	0.0000
SWE	128.317	9	0.0000	0.0626	0.0001	1 809.783	0.0000
SWI	92.872	9	0.0000	0.0561	0.0001	3 035.028	0.0000
WOR	89.716	9	0.0000	0.0629	0.0001	1 656.584	0.0000

The goodness-of-fit test follows a chi-square distribution with the degrees of freedom (df) indicated above. The asymptotic critical value for the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test at the 5% significance level is 0.038. The Jarque–Bera test is asymptotically distributed as a chi-square with two degrees of freedom; its critical value at the 5% significance level is 5.99.

<sup>7</sup> The Jarque–Bera test uses information on the third and fourth moments of a distribution. The goodness-of-fit test divides a distribution in intervals and compares, across intervals, the observed returns with those that would be expected if the underlying distribution were Normal. Finally, the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test computes the maximum distance between an observed cumulative distribution and the Normal cumulative distribution.

<sup>8</sup> Note that the null hypothesis of normality is not rejected only in the English market under the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test.

### 3. ALTERNATIVE DISTRIBUTIONS OF STOCK RETURNS

The results reported and discussed above indicate that the 14 markets we consider are characterized by somewhat skewed distributions with fat tails and high peaks. As a result, we consider in this part three specifications that allow for leptokurtosis and one that also allows for skewness.

The *logistic* distribution, which is very similar to the Normal but has fatter tails, has a density function that can be written as

$$f(x) = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{x - \mu}{\alpha}\right)}{\alpha \left[1 + \exp\left(\frac{x - \mu}{\alpha}\right)\right]^2} \quad (1)$$

where  $\mu$  ( $-\infty < \mu < \infty$ ) is a location parameter and  $\alpha$  ( $\alpha > 0$ ) is a dispersion (or scale) parameter. If  $R_t$  follows a logistic distribution, then  $E(R_t) = \mu$  and  $\text{Var}(R_t) = \sigma^2 = (\pi^2/3)\alpha^2$ .

The *scaled- $t$*  distribution, which is also very similar to the Normal but has fatter tails, has a density function that can be written as

$$f(x) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{v+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma(v/2) \sqrt{\pi} (v-2)\sigma^2} \left[1 + \frac{(x - \mu)^2}{(v-2)\sigma^2}\right]^{-\left(\frac{v+1}{2}\right)} \quad (2)$$

where  $\Gamma(\bullet)$  represents the gamma function,  $\mu$  ( $-\infty < \mu < \infty$ ) and  $\sigma^2$  ( $\sigma^2 > 0$ ) represent a location and a dispersion parameter, respectively, and  $v$  ( $v > 0$ ) is a degrees of freedom parameter. If  $R_t$  follows a scaled- $t$  distribution and  $v > 2$ , then  $E(R_t) = \mu$  and  $\text{Var}(R_t) = \sigma^2$ .

The *exponential power* distribution, which displays more peakedness and fatter tails (that shrink at an exponential rate) than the Normal distribution, has a density function that can be written as

$$f(x) = \frac{\exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\left|\frac{x - \mu}{\alpha}\right|^{\left(\frac{2}{1+\beta}\right)}\right]}{2 \binom{3+\beta}{2} \alpha \Gamma\left(\frac{3+\beta}{2}\right)} \quad (3)$$

where  $\mu$  ( $-\infty < \mu < \infty$ ),  $\alpha$  ( $\alpha > 0$ ) and  $\beta$  ( $-1 < \beta \leq 1$ ) are a location, a dispersion, and a shape parameter, respectively. This last parameter, in particular, measures the kurtosis of the distribution. More precisely,  $\beta < 0$  implies a platykurtic distribution, the Normal distribution is obtained when  $\beta = 0$ , and fat tails and a high peak are obtained when  $0 < \beta \leq 1$ , with the thickness of the tails increasing in  $\beta$ .<sup>9</sup> If  $R_t$  follows an exponential power distribution, then  $E(R_t) = \mu$  and

<sup>9</sup> For  $\beta = 1$ , the double-exponential distribution is obtained.

$$\text{Var}(R_t) = \sigma^2 = 2^{(1+\beta)} \cdot \frac{\Gamma[2(1+\beta)/2]}{\Gamma[(1+\beta)/2]}$$

An alternative to assuming that stock returns are generated from a single distribution is to assume that they are generated by a mixture of distributions. Perhaps the simplest specification within this family is the *mixture of two Normal* distributions, which has a density function that can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_1^2}} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu_1)^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} && \text{with probability } \lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_2^2}} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu_2)^2}{2\sigma_2^2}} && \text{with probability } (1-\lambda) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\mu_i$  ( $-\infty < \mu < \infty$ ) and  $\sigma_i^2$  ( $\sigma_i^2 > 0$ ) are location and dispersion parameters, respectively. This specification implies that stock returns are drawn from a Normal distribution with mean  $\mu_1$  and standard deviation  $\sigma_1$  with probability  $\lambda$ , and from a Normal distribution with mean  $\mu_2$  and standard deviation  $\sigma_2$  with probability  $(1-\lambda)$ . If  $R_t$  follows such a mixture of distributions, then  $E(R_t) = \mu = \lambda\mu_1 + (1-\lambda)\mu_2$  and  $\text{Var}(R_t) = \sigma^2 = \lambda[(\mu_1 - \mu)^2 + \sigma_1^2] + (1-\lambda)[(\mu_2 - \mu)^2 + \sigma_2^2]$ . Of all the specifications we consider, this is the only one that allows for skewness in the data.<sup>10</sup>

#### 4. ESTIMATION OF PARAMETERS AND GOODNESS-OF-FIT TESTS

We report in Table 3 the (maximum-likelihood) estimates that result from fitting the theoretical distributions described in the previous part to the series of daily stock returns of the fourteen markets under consideration.

At least two things are worth noting from Table 3. First, recall that the Normal and the  $t$ -distribution tend to converge as the degrees of freedom of the latter increase. However, the table shows that the estimated degrees of freedom of the scaled- $t$  distributions are very small in all markets (between 2.5 and 6.5), thus indicating that these empirical distributions diverge significantly from the Normal, particularly in the tails. Second, recall that the parameter  $\beta$  of the exponential power distribution is a measure of its kurtosis, that for  $\beta = 0$  the Normal distribution is obtained, and that  $\beta$  is increasing in the thickness of the tails (with an upper bound at  $\beta = 1$ ). Table 3 shows that  $\beta$  is larger than 0.5 in all markets and larger than 0.8 in ten markets. This provides additional evidence of departures from normality, and, in particular, of the thickness of the tails of the empirical distributions analysed.

<sup>10</sup> The coefficient of skewness ( $k_3$ ) that follows from the mixture of two Normal distributions is given by

$$k_3 = \frac{\lambda[(\mu_1 - \mu)^2 + (\mu_1 - \mu)\sigma_1^2] + (1-\lambda)[(\mu_2 - \mu)^2 + 3(\mu_2 - \mu)\sigma_2^2]}{\left\{ \lambda[(\mu_1 - \mu)^2 + \sigma_1^2] + (1-\lambda)[(\mu_2 - \mu)^2 + \sigma_2^2] \right\}^{3/2}}$$

In order to compare the relative fit of the theoretical distributions considered, we performed goodness-of-fit tests.<sup>11</sup> To that purpose, we divided the range of returns into 20 equal, non-overlapping intervals contained in the range  $[-10\%, 10\%]$ . The results of these tests are shown in Table 4.

This table shows that, as expected, the Normal distribution provides the worst fit among all the specifications considered; it is clearly rejected in all

**Table 3.** Parameter estimates

		AUS	BEL	DEN	ENG	FIN	FRA	GER
N:	$\mu$ :	-0.00636	-0.00205	-0.00301	0.01804	0.03770	-0.00258	0.00455
	$\sigma$ :	1.18440	0.71846	0.82253	0.81787	1.24302	0.99880	1.04666
L:	$\mu$ :	-0.00224	0.01136	-0.00153	0.00871	0.01425	0.00330	0.01087
	$\alpha$ :	0.58850	0.34741	0.41885	0.44202	0.66172	0.53471	0.53856
S-t:	$\mu$ :	0.00441	0.01780	-0.00072	0.00801	0.00629	0.00460	0.01237
	$\sigma$ :	1.31263	0.75490	0.86401	0.80960	1.28016	0.99498	1.03513
EP:	$\mu$ :	2.88560	2.97920	3.34660	6.42820	4.26650	5.50990	4.28490
	$\alpha$ :	0.00000	0.00000	-0.00000	0.00045	-0.00000	0.00000	0.00001
MN:	$\beta$ :	0.39868	0.23524	0.28459	0.50094	0.51754	0.50065	0.42224
	$\lambda$ :	1.00000	1.00000	0.99999	0.50265	0.86572	0.69250	0.87113
	$\mu_1$ :	0.01638	-0.24906	-0.01645	0.20329	-0.05409	-0.23954	0.01268
	$\sigma_1$ :	0.73017	1.63780	1.45330	1.85350	0.82717	2.05880	0.84158
	$\mu_2$ :	-0.09754	0.02832	0.00058	0.00638	0.23524	0.01831	-0.11628
	$\sigma_2$ :	2.20880	0.49141	0.54173	0.70185	1.82780	0.84055	2.61410
	$\lambda$ :	0.80036	0.10946	0.21064	0.05918	0.68276	0.08102	0.93694
	$k_3$ :	-0.14149	-0.51387	-0.00157	0.18099	0.16450	-0.19913	-0.12140
		ITA	NET	NOR	SPA	SWE	SWI	WOR
N:	$\mu$ :	-0.00167	0.02405	0.00689	-0.00205	0.02819	0.03055	-0.00233
	$\sigma$ :	1.36806	0.72673	1.32966	1.12401	1.24940	0.93056	0.65305
L:	$\mu$ :	0.00150	0.03809	-0.00854	0.00216	0.01305	0.04793	-0.00399
	$\alpha$ :	0.73705	0.39449	0.67926	0.58409	0.64014	0.48036	0.33609
S-t:	$\mu$ :	0.00195	0.04037	-0.01467	0.00289	0.00929	0.05299	-0.00481
	$\sigma$ :	1.38416	0.73395	1.30499	1.12765	1.27511	0.92339	0.66291
EP:	$\mu$ :	5.19850	5.68060	4.25530	4.22110	3.69760	4.28370	3.83590
	$\alpha$ :	-0.00000	0.03355	-0.00000	-0.00001	0.00000	0.03790	-0.00319
MN:	$\beta$ :	0.66812	0.41144	0.52770	0.45866	0.43700	0.38771	0.27211
	$\lambda$ :	0.72176	0.58354	0.88132	0.86788	1.00000	0.84330	0.84280
	$\mu_1$ :	0.00460	-0.05175	0.00135	0.00379	-0.00012	-0.28008	0.01230
	$\sigma_1$ :	1.66170	0.94692	1.06820	0.89482	0.91374	2.02840	1.20920
	$\mu_2$ :	-0.01178	0.08743	0.10965	-0.06216	0.22347	0.06269	-0.00536
	$\sigma_2$ :	0.66026	0.45959	3.66050	2.45450	2.55450	0.72034	0.46024
	$\lambda$ :	0.61738	0.45537	0.94890	0.91149	0.87338	0.09374	0.17163
	$k_3$ :	0.01064	-0.17260	0.03141	-0.05833	0.10426	-0.37755	0.01247

N=Normal; L=Logistic; S-t=Scaled-t; EP=Exponential Power; MN=Mixture of two Normal distributions. The coefficient of skewness ( $k_3$ ) follows from the expression in footnote 10.

<sup>11</sup> We do not use the likelihood-ratio test for the obvious reason that not all these distributions are nested within each other; hence, their log-likelihood functions are not comparable.

**Table 4.** Goodness-of-fit tests

	N	p-value	L	p-value	S-t	p-value	EP	p-value	MN	p-value
AUS	1.8e06	0.00	1 339.9	0.00	78.6	0.00	194.7	0.00	101.1	0.00
BEL	9.3e13	0.00	11 562.8	0.00	63.4	0.00	3027.8	0.00	532.1	0.00
DEN	1.3e06	0.00	233.2	0.00	14.7	0.55	29.4	0.02	30.7	0.01
ENG	5.5e06	0.00	296.9	0.00	53.3	0.00	659.3	0.00	19.0	0.17
FIN	577.2000	0.00	43.6	0.00	16.8	0.40	19.7	0.23	16.6	0.28
FRA	2.5e09	0.00	1 863.4	0.00	93.1	0.00	994.9	0.00	106.8	0.00
GER	34 344.3000	0.00	397.2	0.00	56.1	0.00	103.1	0.00	45.6	0.00
ITA	1.2e06	0.00	322.1	0.00	114.7	0.00	181.5	0.00	7214.9	0.00
NET	939.6000	0.00	30.0	0.03	12.3	0.72	20.5	0.20	30.9	0.01
NOR	2.2e10	0.00	749.5	0.00	21.5	0.16	111.1	0.00	19.1	0.16
SPA	5.5e09	0.00	3 595.4	0.00	55.9	0.00	486.7	0.00	100.7	0.00
SWE	2.2e09	0.00	1 351.9	0.00	20.7	0.19	94.8	0.00	40.7	0.00
SWI	5.9e11	0.00	33 157.4	0.00	185.6	0.00	4179.7	0.00	356.9	0.00
WOR	1.7e06	0.00	189.2	0.00	6.4	0.98	40.5	0.00	18.2	0.20

N = Normal; L = Logistic; S-t = Scaled-t; EP = Exponential Power; MN = Mixture of two Normal distributions. The goodness of fit test follows a chi-square distribution with  $p-k-1$  degrees of freedom, where  $p$  is the number of intervals and  $k$  is the number of parameters estimated for each distribution. Degrees of freedom are 17 for N and L, 16 for S-t and EP, and 14 for MN.

markets. The logistic distribution does not fit much better, and is also clearly rejected in all markets. The exponential power distribution also provides a very poor fit, being rejected in 12 of the 14 markets analysed.

Table 4 shows partial support for a mixture of two Normal distributions. This specification cannot be rejected in four markets, and is the one that best fits three markets. Finally, the scaled- $t$  is the distribution that provides the best overall fit among all the specifications considered. This distribution cannot be rejected in six markets, and is the one that best fits 10 of the 14 markets analysed.<sup>12</sup>

The good fit of the scaled- $t$  distribution is reinforced by the fact that this specification can also be justified on theoretical grounds. Praetz (1972) shows that when a Brownian motion is modified (through the Bayesian method of assigning a prior distribution to an unknown parameter) to account for the changing variance of returns, the resulting distribution is a scaled- $t$ . In other words, the scaled- $t$  distribution can be justified on Bayesian grounds.<sup>13</sup>

Furthermore, the support we find for the scaled- $t$  distribution (and to a lesser degree for a mixture of two Normal distributions) in European markets is fully consistent with results reported for the US market. Praetz (1972), Blattberg and Gonedes (1974), Gray and French (1990), and Peiró (1994), among several others, have also found that the scaled- $t$  distribution fits stock returns better than many competing alternatives. Kon (1984), on the other hand, after fitting mixtures of up to five Normal distributions to the thirty stocks of the Dow Jones, concludes that a mixture of four Normal distributions best fits seven stocks, a mixture of three Normal distributions best fits 11 stocks, and a mixture of two Normal distributions best fits the remaining 12 stocks.

It may also be interesting to contrast our results with those reported by Peiró (1994), who, although using different indices and sample periods, also analyses the English, German, French, and Spanish markets. In general, his results seem to be more optimistic than ours. He finds, for example, that the scaled- $t$  distribution cannot be rejected in any of these four markets; we reject it in all four. He also finds that neither the logistic, nor the scaled- $t$ , nor the mixture of two Normal distributions can be rejected in the German market; we reject all three specifications. And he finds that the French market is best fitted by an exponential power distribution, although we clearly reject such specification.

The interesting issue is whether these different results stem from distributions that change significantly over time. Peiró (1994) uses two years of data we do not use (1988–9), we use two years of data he does not use (1993–4), and we overlap in three years (1990–2). Thus, if the differences between our results and his stem from changes in the distributions of stock returns, practitioners should then be wary of using statistical models that assume that the distributions of stock returns are time invariant. It may be the case that, contrary to such an assumption, these distributions may actually be changing rapidly over time.

<sup>12</sup> All five specifications considered are clearly rejected in the Swiss market. The fact that (as Table 1 shows) the Swiss market is the one that exhibits the largest degree of skewness may perhaps explain this finding.

<sup>13</sup> We thank Chris Adcock and an anonymous referee for suggesting this idea.

## 5. ERRORS IMPLIED BY THE NORMALITY ASSUMPTION

The tests of normality reported in Section 2 established that the distributions of stock returns of the 14 markets analysed exhibit significant departures from normality. In addition, the goodness-of-fit tests reported in Section 4 established that a scaled- $t$  distribution and a mixture of two Normal distributions provide a significantly better fit than the Normal distribution. In this part, we quantify the error that can be made by predicting the probability of obtaining returns in specified intervals by assuming an underlying Normal distribution.

In order to assess this error, we first estimate the (unconditional) probability of obtaining returns in a given interval using the parameters previously estimated (and reported in Table 3) for the Normal distribution; we subsequently repeat this process for the 12 intervals we consider. Then we estimate the same probability using the parameters previously estimated (and reported in Table 3) for the scaled- $t$  distribution for the same 12 intervals.<sup>14</sup> We finally compare, one by one, the probability of obtaining returns in each interval. The results of our estimations are reported in Table 5.

**Table 5.** Probabilities of obtaining returns in specified intervals

<i>Normal</i>	$[\bar{x}, \bar{x}-s]$	$[\bar{x}-s, \bar{x}-2s]$	$[\bar{x}-2s, \bar{x}-3s]$	$[\bar{x}-3s, \bar{x}-4s]$	$[\bar{x}-4s, \bar{x}-5s]$	$[\bar{x}-5s, \bar{x}-6s]$
<i>All markets</i>	0.34144	0.13585	0.02136	0.00131	0.00003	2.83E-7
<i>Scaled-t</i>	$[\bar{x}, \bar{x}-s]$	$[\bar{x}-s, \bar{x}-2s]$	$[\bar{x}-2s, \bar{x}-3s]$	$[\bar{x}-3s, \bar{x}-4s]$	$[\bar{x}-4s, \bar{x}-5s]$	$[\bar{x}-5s, \bar{x}-6s]$
AUS	0.40124	0.07899	0.01617	0.00488	0.00192	0.00090
BEL	0.41415	0.07917	0.01542	0.00448	0.00171	0.00079
DEN	0.39052	0.08591	0.01703	0.00472	0.00170	0.00074
ENG	0.34208	0.11980	0.02565	0.00539	0.00131	0.00038
FIN	0.36763	0.09442	0.01837	0.00448	0.00140	0.00053
FRA	0.37242	0.10624	0.01932	0.00394	0.00101	0.00031
GER	0.38555	0.09478	0.01736	0.00407	0.00124	0.00046
ITA	0.37016	0.10536	0.01974	0.00423	0.00114	0.00037
NET	0.37219	0.11176	0.02080	0.00421	0.00106	0.00032
NOR	0.37961	0.08966	0.01630	0.00385	0.00118	0.00044
SPA	0.38255	0.09533	0.01784	0.00427	0.00132	0.00050
SWE	0.38109	0.08683	0.01676	0.00438	0.00149	0.00061
SWI	0.39018	0.09796	0.01799	0.00421	0.00128	0.00048
WOR	0.38354	0.09017	0.01723	0.00438	0.00145	0.00058

Results in the first row for the Normal distribution are the same for all markets; all other results refer to the scaled- $t$  distribution. Each number shows the probability of obtaining a return in the specified interval under the specified distribution. Each distribution is centred around its sample mean ( $\bar{x}$ ), and the length of each interval is equal to each distribution's sample standard deviation ( $s$ ), both taken from Table 1. Both specifications are symmetric; hence, predictions are reported for only one half of each distribution.

<sup>14</sup> We report results only for the scaled- $t$  distribution because the difference between the probabilities predicted by such specification, and those predicted by the mixture of two Normals in the markets for which the latter provides a better fit (ENG, GER, NOR) is negligible.

Table 5 shows that the probability of obtaining returns in any given interval is very different depending on whether the Normal or the scaled- $t$  are assumed as the underlying distribution. Recall that leptokurtic distributions have a high peak, thus exhibiting clustering of observations around the mean. Accordingly, Table 5 shows that the probability of obtaining returns one standard deviation around the mean is higher under the scaled- $t$  distribution than under the Normal distribution in all markets. Furthermore, note that the opposite is the case in the intervals  $[\bar{x} - s, \bar{x} - 2s]$  and  $[\bar{x} - 2s, \bar{x} - 3s]$ ; that is, the probability of obtaining returns in both intervals is higher under the Normal distribution than under the scaled- $t$  distribution in all markets.

Note, however, that the situation reverses again for the interval  $[\bar{x} - 3s, \bar{x} - 4s]$  and all intervals beyond. In other words, the probability of obtaining returns in any of these intervals is higher under the scaled- $t$  distribution than under the Normal distribution in all markets. Furthermore, note that the *difference* between the probability predicted by each distribution increases dramatically as we move away from the mean. To illustrate, the probability of obtaining a return between three and four standard deviations away from the mean is, on average, over three times higher (3.4) under the scaled- $t$  distribution; the probability of obtaining a return between four and five standard deviations is, on average, over 45 times higher (45.7) under the scaled- $t$  distribution; and the probability of obtaining a return between five and six standard deviations is, on average, almost 2000 times higher (1870) under the scaled- $t$  distribution.

The previous results show that investors who predict returns by assuming an underlying Normal distribution may significantly underestimate the risk of investing in European stocks. This underestimation, as the numbers above show, is particularly severe in the tails of the distribution; that is, when predicting the probability of large (positive or negative) returns. In fact, returns three and more standard deviations away from the mean, which occur with a negligible probability under the Normal distribution, occur *much* more frequently under a scaled- $t$  distribution.

Another (perhaps more intuitive) way to look at this issue is by comparing the number of outliers that would be expected under a Normal distribution with those expected under a scaled- $t$  distribution. Table 6 reports these numbers, as well as the *observed* number of outliers in each of the markets considered. For the purposes of the table, we consider outliers to be those returns at least three standard deviations away from the mean.

Table 6 shows that, as expected, the Normal distribution consistently underestimates the number of outliers in all markets. The scaled- $t$  distribution, on the other hand, provides a much better prediction of the number of outliers. Furthermore, this distribution (unlike the Normal) does not display a *systematic* bias in its predictions; that is, the predicted number of outliers is in some cases higher and in some cases lower than the observed number of outliers. These results, as well as those discussed above, show that the normality assumption unequivocally leads investors to underestimate the risk of investing in European stocks.

**Table 6.** Expected and observed outliers

Market	> 3s			> 4s			> 5s			> 6s		
	N	S-t	Obs	N	S-t	Obs	N	S-t	Obs	N	S-t	Obs
AUS	1.75	11.78	11	0.04	5.42	7	0.0004	2.92	3	0.0000	1.75	0
BEL	1.75	10.57	6	0.04	4.72	3	0.0004	2.49	2	0.0000	1.46	2
DEN	1.75	10.54	9	0.04	4.39	4	0.0004	2.17	2	0.0000	1.21	0
ENG	1.75	9.52	8	0.04	2.49	3	0.0004	0.77	2	0.0000	0.28	1
FIN	1.75	9.00	11	0.04	3.16	3	0.0004	1.33	0	0.0000	0.65	0
FRA	1.75	7.13	7	0.04	1.99	1	0.0004	0.68	1	0.0000	0.27	0
GER	1.75	8.09	8	0.04	2.77	3	0.0004	1.16	3	0.0000	0.55	0
ITA	1.75	7.83	7	0.04	2.32	0	0.0004	0.84	0	0.0000	0.35	0
NET	1.75	7.56	3	0.04	2.07	1	0.0004	0.69	0	0.0000	0.27	0
NOR	1.75	7.68	5	0.04	2.66	4	0.0004	1.12	2	0.0000	0.54	2
SPA	1.75	8.54	7	0.04	2.98	4	0.0004	1.26	2	0.0000	0.61	1
SWE	1.75	9.33	12	0.04	3.62	5	0.0004	1.68	3	0.0000	0.89	1
SWI	1.75	8.35	7	0.04	2.86	2	0.0004	1.19	1	0.0000	0.57	0
WOR	1.75	9.17	8	0.04	3.46	4	0.0004	1.56	2	0.0000	0.80	1

$N$  = Normal;  $S-t$  = Scaled- $t$ ;  $Obs$  = Observed;  $s$  = sample standard deviation. Numbers under  $N$  and  $S-t$  show the *expected* number of outliers under each Normal and Scaled- $t$  distribution, respectively. Numbers under  $Obs$  show the *observed* number of outliers under each empirical distribution.

Using the same data of this study, and consistent with the results just discussed, Estrada (1999) finds that investors who mistakenly assume that stock prices follow a random walk (and use the stationarity implications of such theory) may underestimate the risk of investing in European stocks by an average of around 1% a month. Certainly, an argument can be made against using simplifying assumptions (such as random walks and normality) that may lead investors to make such significant mistakes.

## 6. THE DISTRIBUTION OF MONTHLY STOCK RETURNS

We briefly examine in this part whether the departures from normality observed in daily stock returns are also observed in monthly stock returns. To that purpose, we compute monthly stock returns ( $MR_t$ ) as  $MR_t = [\ln(I_k) - \ln(I_{k-1})]$ , where  $I_k$  and  $I_{k-1}$  are the value of an index on the last day of month  $k$  and the last day of month  $k-1$ , respectively. Table 7 summarizes some relevant information about the empirical distributions of monthly stock returns of the 14 markets under consideration.

The columns labelled  $SSkw$  and  $SKrt$  in Table 7 show the standardized coefficients of skewness and kurtosis for monthly stock returns. These coefficients show, unlike those from Table 1, that only one distribution displays a significant degree of skewness (GER), and five distributions (AUS, GER, SWE, SWI, WOR) display a significant degree of kurtosis. In other words, the departures from normality measured by the standardized coefficients of

**Table 7.** Sample moments of the distributions of monthly stock returns

Market	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Skw	SSkw	Krt	SKrt
AUS	-0.1384	8.3512	-25.4979	20.2526	-0.3408	-1.0776	1.5646	2.4739
BEL	-0.0445	4.6504	-12.2494	13.2179	-0.2539	-0.8028	1.0643	1.6828
DEN	-0.0655	5.1179	-11.0931	11.6782	-0.0524	-0.1658	-0.3183	-0.5032
ENG	0.3923	4.7308	-8.6594	10.4902	0.0773	0.2445	-0.3561	-0.5631
FIN	0.8200	8.7771	-20.4114	20.9633	0.0505	0.1596	-0.1234	-0.1951
FRA	-0.0560	5.4079	-14.7757	11.9082	-0.2230	-0.7051	0.0088	0.0139
GER	0.0993	5.6230	-19.7969	9.3121	-1.0676	-3.3760	2.5415	4.0185
ITA	-0.0363	7.4437	-16.1316	20.8624	0.3993	1.2626	0.1139	0.1801
NET	0.5231	3.9566	-9.9611	9.0035	-0.0950	-0.3006	-0.3188	-0.5041
NOR	0.1498	6.8552	-16.4028	12.6052	-0.3229	-1.0210	-0.4515	-0.7139
SPA	-0.0446	6.4968	-20.7705	12.8100	-0.4144	-1.3104	0.4918	0.7775
SWE	0.6132	7.6259	-23.9370	23.0205	-0.2962	-0.9366	1.5848	2.5057
SWI	0.6646	4.8953	-14.5733	12.0524	-0.5547	-1.7542	1.6346	2.5845
WOR	-0.0507	4.0607	-12.9982	9.7972	-0.5708	-1.8051	1.5585	2.4642

Mean returns, standard deviations (SD), minimum returns (Min), and maximum returns (Max) expressed in %. Skw = Skewness =  $m_3/s^3$  and Krt = Kurtosis =  $m_4/s^4 - 3$ , where  $m_i$  and  $s$  are the  $i$ th central sample moment and the sample standard deviation of each distribution, respectively; both coefficients computed with a finite-sample adjustment. SSkw = Standardized skewness and SKrt = Standardized kurtosis. Sample period: Jan/90–Dec/94.

skewness and kurtosis are far less evident in monthly stock returns than in daily stock returns.<sup>15</sup>

In order to evaluate more formally the plausibility of the normality assumption as it applies to monthly stock returns, we rerun the three tests of normality run in part II for daily stock returns. The results of these tests for monthly data are reported below in Table 8.

Table 8 shows that normality does seem to be a reasonable assumption for monthly stock returns. The null hypothesis of normality is rejected in no market under the goodness-of-fit test and the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test, and in five markets under the Jarque-Bera test. These results, though significantly different from those reported in Table 2 for daily data, should not be entirely surprising. Under the central limit theorem, the longer the time interval for which returns are computed, the more the resulting distribution should conform to the Normal distribution, due to the fact that monthly returns are simply aggregated daily returns.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

The evidence against the assumption that daily stock returns are normally distributed has been mounting for over 30 years. Most of the empirical evidence

<sup>15</sup> Campbell *et al.* (1997) compare the daily and monthly distributions of stock returns for two indices and 10 stocks from the US for the period 1962–94. Predictably, they find that the skewness and kurtosis displayed by the monthly distributions is significantly lower than those displayed by the daily distributions.

**Table 8.** Tests of normality (monthly stock returns)

Market	Goodness of fit			Kolmogorov–Smirnov		Jarque–Bera	
	Statistic	df	<i>p</i> -value	Statistic	<i>p</i> -value	Statistic	<i>p</i> -value
AUS	6.0487	4	0.1955	0.0958	0.6410	5.5850	0.0613
BEL	5.3849	5	0.3707	0.1169	0.3851	2.5452	0.2801
DEN	3.9205	5	0.5609	0.0622	0.9745	0.4078	0.8155
ENG	7.3708	6	0.2879	0.0715	0.9190	0.5094	0.7751
FIN	5.1417	4	0.2731	0.0873	0.7498	0.1362	0.9341
FRA	3.0409	4	0.5510	0.0755	0.8835	0.4928	0.7816
GER	3.8972	5	0.5643	0.0910	0.7035	23.3325	8.6e-6
ITA	5.2280	4	0.2647	0.0804	0.8324	1.5149	0.4689
NET	4.4380	5	0.4882	0.0647	0.9630	0.4684	0.7912
NOR	4.8551	5	0.4338	0.0977	0.6153	1.6489	0.4385
SPA	2.6113	5	0.7596	0.0652	0.9608	1.9440	0.3783
SWE	2.4648	4	0.6509	0.0630	0.9712	5.4399	0.0659
SWI	3.8341	5	0.5735	0.1025	0.5534	7.8461	0.0198
WOR	5.0296	5	0.4123	0.1043	0.5308	7.5403	0.0230

The goodness-of-fit test follows a chi-square distribution with the degrees of freedom (df) indicated above. The asymptotic critical value for the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test at the 5% significance level is 0.176. The Jarque–Bera test is asymptotically distributed as a chi-square with two degrees of freedom; its critical value at the 5% significance level is 5.99.

analyses US data, although some recent studies have considered European markets. In this article, we used data from the first half of the decade to test the plausibility of the normality assumption as it applies to European stock returns.

We started by testing the normality hypothesis and we clearly rejected it. Not surprisingly, we found that these distributions exhibit fat tails and high peaks, as well as skewness in different directions. These results are fully consistent with those found for several other markets and reported in many other studies.

We then fitted the Normal distribution to the data, as well as four alternative specifications, all of which exhibit fat tails and one that also allows for skewness. Predictably, we found that the Normal distribution exhibited the worst fit in all markets. We also found that neither the logistic nor the exponential power distributions provide a good fit to the empirical distributions of European stock returns. However, we found partial support for a mixture of two Normal distributions, which cannot be rejected in four markets and best fits three markets, and overall support for the scaled-*t* distribution, which cannot be rejected in six markets and best fits 10 of the 14 markets analysed.

We also attempted to quantify the error that can be made by predicting returns by using the Normal distribution instead of the more appropriate specification. We have shown that such errors can be very large, particularly in the tails, and that the Normal distribution (unlike the scaled-*t* distribution) consistently underestimates the probability of (positive or negative) large returns.

Therefore, we can argue that booms and crashes in European markets are much more likely to occur than a Normal distribution would predict.


Finally, we examined whether the departures from normality observed in daily data are also observed in monthly data. As expected under the central limit theorem, we found that this is not the case. The data showed that the Normal distribution may in fact be a reasonable approximation to the empirical distributions of European monthly stock returns.







## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS





We would like to thank Chris Adock, Asani Sarkar, Miguel Sofer, Allan Timmermann, two anonymous referees, and seminar participants at Gothenburg University, the Helsinki School of Economics, and Torcuato Di Tella University for valuable comments. The views expressed below and any errors that may remain are entirely our own.

## APPENDIX



### A1. Market behaviour



















## A2. Histograms







**REFERENCES**

- Blattberg, R. and Gonedes, N. (1974). A comparison of the stable and student distributions as statistical models for stock prices, *Journal of Business*, **47**, 244–80.
- Bollerslev, T. (1986) Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity, *Journal of Econometrics*, **31**, 307–27.
- Bollerslev, T., Chou, R. and Kroner, K. (1992) ARCH modeling in finance: a review of the theory and empirical evidence, *Journal of Econometrics*, **52**, 5–59.
- Campbell, J., Lo, A. and MacKinlay, C. (1997) *The Econometrics of Financial Markets*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chamberlain, G. (1983) A characterization of the distributions that imply mean-variance utility functions, *Journal of Economic Theory*, **29**, 185–201.
- Clark, P. (1973) A subordinated stochastic process model with finite variance for speculative prices, *Econometrica*, **41**, 135–55.
- Engle, R., Lillien, D. and Robbins, R. (1987) Estimating time varying risk premia in the term structure: the ARCH-M model, *Econometrica*, **55**, 391–407.
- Estrada, J. (1999) The temporal dimension of risk, *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, forthcoming.
- Fama, E. (1965) The behavior of stock market price, *Journal of Business*, **38**, 34–105.
- Gray, B. and French, D. (1990) Empirical comparisons of distributional models for stock index returns, *Journal of Business, Finance & Accounting*, **17**, 451–9.
- Hsu, D. (1982) A Bayesian robust detection of shift in the risk structure of stock market returns, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, March, 29–39.
- Kon, S. (1984) Models of stock returns – a comparison, *Journal of Finance*, **39**, 147–65.
- Mandelbrot, B. (1963) The variation of certain speculative prices, *Journal of Business*, **36**, 394–419.
- Nelson, D. (1991) Conditional heteroskedasticity in asset returns: a new approach, *Econometrica*, **59**, 347–70.
- Peiró, A. (1994) The distribution of stock returns: international evidence, *Applied Financial Economics*, **4**, 431–9.
- Peters, E. (1991) *Chaos and Order in the Capital Markets. A New View of Cycles, Prices, and Market Volatility*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Praetz, P. (1972) The distribution of share price changes, *Journal of Business*, **45**, 49–55.
- Press, J. (1967) A compound events model for security prices, *Journal of Business*, **40**, 317–35.
- Smith, J. (1981) *The Probability Distribution of Market Returns: A Logistic Hypothesis*. PhD dissertation, University of Utah.

For the purpose of the Research Assessment Exercise, we would like to note that this paper was published in December 2000.