#### MTH6157 Survival Models

#### **Practice Questions on Statistical Tests – Solutions**

## Question 1

(a) The null hypothesis is that the standard table values accurately represent the mortality experience for policyholders in their fifties.

Age	Exposed	Observed	Standard	Expected	Z <sub>X</sub>	$Z_x^2$
	to Risk	deaths	table	deaths		
			rate			
50	4100	45	0.011	45.1	-0.015	0.00022
51	4555	54	0.012	54.7	-0.089	0.00797
52	4505	61	0.013	58.6	0.318	0.10124
53	3900	59	0.015	58.5	0.065	0.00427
54	3995	65	0.018	71.9	-0.815	0.66400
55	4250	71	0.022	93.5	-2.327	5.41444
56	3060	80	0.027	82.6	-0.288	0.08308
57	2465	90	0.035	86.3	0.401	0.16083
58	2015	99	0.046	92.7	0.655	0.42956
59	1680	105	0.058	97.4	0.766	0.58655
Total						7.45217

the sum of  $z_x^2$  values is 7.45

we compare this to the  $\chi^2$  critical value on 10 degrees of freedom because we are testing over 10 years of age

$$\chi^2_{0.95; 10} = 18.31 > 7.45$$

therefore we do not reject the null hypothesis

the standard table values accurately represent the mortality experience for policyholders in their fifties

## (b) This would not detect:

- a large deviation offset by many small deviations (outliers)
- small overall positive or negative bias
- a run or clump of ages with a positive or negative bias

### (c) Use:

- standardised deviations test
- signs test (or the cumulative deviations test)
- grouping of signs test (also called Steven's test)

## **Question 2**

- (a) the mortality policy is a concern because:
  - would expect to use different mortality tables for term assurance and annuity calculations
  - partly because the financial risk relating to mortality estimation is the opposite way around for these two classes of business
  - a standard table that is 'many years' old will not reflect more recent mortality trends
  - as mortality rates tend to fall over time this is particularly concerning for annuity rate calculations
  - use of incorrect tables over multiple products opens the company to the risk of adverse selection

## (b) from looking at the $z_x$ values:

- there are more positive than negative values
- 3 of 16 values are > 2 (whereas for N(0,1) samples we would expect less than 5% to be >2)
- we would hope that term assurance policyholder mortality would be lower than general population mortality (because of company underwriting practice)
- positive z<sub>x</sub> values would be evidence of term assurance mortality experience being higher than the standard table not lower

# (c) the overall test of goodness of fit is the chi-squared test

the null hypothesis is that the standard table remains a good fit for mortality experience amongst term assurance policyholders [Note – need to stress the investigation is amongst term assurance policyholders whilst the use of the

table has been across term assurance and annuities – therefore the conclusions can only apply to term assurance business here.]

age x	Z <sub>X</sub>	$Z_x^2$
35	0.832	0.692
36	2.343	5.490
37	-0.599	0.359
38	-0.458	0.210
39	-0.791	0.626
40	2.228	4.964
41	-0.783	0.613
42	1.334	1.780
43	0.230	0.053
44	0.595	0.354
45	2.465	6.076
46	-1.529	2.338
47	0.436	0.190
48	-0.663	0.440
49	0.287	0.082
50	1.387	1.924
sum		26.190

we have 16 ages of data so we compare the statistic above with the upper 5% critical value of the chi-squared distribution on 16 degrees of freedom

$$\sum z_x^2 = 26.190 < 26.296 = \chi^2_{0.95;16}$$

therefore we do not reject the null hypothesis at the 95% significance level

based on this chi-squared test the standard table remains a adequate fit for the term assurance mortality experience

however we note that the test statistic is very close to the critical value at 95% and so acceptance / rejection of the null hypothesis is very marginal

## (d) conclusions we can draw:

• from (c) above we conclude the overall fit of the existing standard table to term assurance mortality experience is close enough not to reject the null hypothesis using the chi-squared test

- however the test statistic is very close to the critical value suggesting further investigation is warranted
- there are differences between the experience and the table that are not detected by the chi-squared test
- in particular the number of  $z_x$  values >2 could be investigated using the standard deviations test
- at these ages the rate of mortality is typically very low so we would not expect large deviations
- also, the greater number of positive z<sub>x</sub> values could be investigated by the signs test
- if this standard table has been tested against experience before (given it has been in use for many years) we could compare our chisquared test with previous ones to see whether there is evidence of deterioration in goodness-of-fit over the years (evidence of time selection perhaps)