The Case for a High and Growing Dividend Stock Strategy in Retirement Portfolios

By Jan Blakeley Holman, CFP®, CIMA®

The discussion about retirement income within the financial advisor community covers a disparate range, from simplistic comparisons of product features to academic, holistic financial planning processes. For those advisors who take a process approach to retirement income, there is a broad body of academic research regarding spending policies, tax planning techniques, and evolving asset allocation strategies. The goal of this research is to enhance the client’s annual spending in retirement and the sustainability of the retirement portfolio for 30, 40, or possibly 50 years.

In our opinion, only a few of the retirement products now available have a place on the market. So many are overpriced or too complicated, and most require loss of control over assets. We know the so-called retirement income product industry is bracing for a wave of capital from baby boomers, but we do not believe it will materialize because the products cost too much and investors are loath to lose control of their hard-earned assets. This reluctance will create an opportunity for knowledgeable financial advisors to assist baby-boomer clients. During this pivotal stage of life, boomers’ accounts will need to be consolidated under one advisor to accommodate implementation and monitoring of a retirement income process. To participate in this opportunity, advisors need to know about all the tools available to structure retirement portfolios and be committed to staying abreast of all the academic research that is being done in this area.

Building Sustainable Retirement Income Portfolios

In 1994, William P. Bengen, CFP®, pioneered research into sustainable retirement income portfolios and establishing appropriate withdrawal rates when he published “Determining Withdrawal Rates Using Historical Data” (Bengen 1994). Using historical returns data, Bengen tested 50 different 30-year retirements that ran from 1926–1955, 1927–1956, 1928–1957, and so on up to 1975–2004. The analysis covered many business cycles and included four major bear markets. A major bear market was defined as one that lasted more than one year and consumed 50 percent of the retiree’s purchasing power after factoring in effects of both the S&P 500 Index decline and inflation. Needless to say, major bear markets have a devastating effect on any portfolio, but they especially impact those also undergoing withdrawal.

As a result of this research, Bengen is credited with establishing the 4-percent withdrawal rule (or “SAFEMAX,” to use Bengen’s vernacular), which states that for a retirement portfolio with a beginning value of $1 million, a retiree can spend $40,000, or 4 percent per year, and increase the annual spending amount by an annual cost-of-living adjustment. Bengen concluded that at this spending level, there was a 100-percent probability that the portfolio would last at least 30 years. Since then, Bengen has developed asset allocation models and withdrawal methods to find ways to increase the withdrawal rate without affecting the portfolio’s sustainability.

In 2006, Bengen published the book Conserving Client Portfolios during Retirement as a review of his research (Bengen 2006). The book also provides an eight-step process for developing a withdrawal rate and retirement income portfolio tailored to a client’s needs. Bengen studied how various asset allocation strategies affect both the withdrawal rate and sustainability of a retirement portfolio in distribution. For instance, he concluded that the optimal equity allocation was 60 percent, with the remaining 40 percent allocated to intermediate-term government bonds. He studied how the addition of small-cap stocks to a retirement portfolio could offer diversification benefits and allow a retiree to increase the withdrawal rate or have greater confidence in the portfolio’s sustainability.

Many academic studies have sought to determine the benefits of allocating a portion of equity to various asset classes including small-cap, real estate investment trusts, and international stocks. We found limited information, however, on how a high and growing dividend total-return strategy might benefit a retirement portfolio that is under the duress of withdrawal. Several academics have studied high and growing dividend strategies—most notably Jeremy Siegel (2005) at Wharton in his book The Future for Investors—all these earlier studies proceeded from an accumulation perspective.

To advance this research, we analyzed a hypothetical retirement portfolio with an allocation to high-dividend-paying stocks. We found that this focus on dividends had a significantly positive impact.
Dividend-Focused Strategy
Investors focus on total return when investing, not just capital appreciation or income. Although capital appreciation may at times provide the bulk of total returns, income has contributed its fair share as well. A broad equity index for all decades from 1871 to 2010 had an annualized total return of 8.8 percent over the entire period; the income component was 4.7 percent (52.9 percent of the total). The income component of total return was greater than the capital appreciation and also significantly less volatile. The income component ranged from 1.9 percent to 6.4 percent, annualized over the 10-year periods. However, price appreciation was as low as negative 2.8 percent and as high as 14.9 percent. This wide range is unfavorable for investors compared with the income component, which can never be negative (Wilson and Jones 2002).1

Figure 1 is based on the assumption that if you bought one share of the S&P 500 Index on December 31, 1969, it would have cost you $92.06. In each subsequent year you chose to spend the dividends rather than reinvest them. In 1970, you would have received dividends totaling $3.14 for a 3.41-percent yield on cost; by 1980, your annual dividend would have increased to $6.16 for a 6.69-percent yield on cost; in 1990 you would have received $12.09 for a 13.13-percent yield on cost; and in 2015 you would have received $43.86 for an attractive 47.64-percent yield on cost. In fact, the average annual increase of the dividends over the entire 45-year period was 5.9 percent. This growth in dividend cash flow that occurred in the broad S&P 500 Index, with no dividend reinvestment, piqued our interest relative to its potential impact on a retirement portfolio in distribution.

We purchased a Standard and Poor’s database of monthly returns for the top 20 percent of dividend-paying companies in the S&P 500 Index (hereafter, the S&P Top 100 Dividend Payers). This database begins in 1968, is equally weighted, and provides returns through the present. Performing an initial comparison of the S&P Top 100 Dividend Payers to the S&P 500 Index reveals the characteristics shown in table 1. The S&P Top 100 Dividend Payers had a compounded annual return of 12.53 percent, 268 basis points higher than the S&P 500 Index. This increase, together with a small increase in the standard deviation, results in the Sharpe ratio—which measures the ratio of reward to risk for an investment—improving by 23 percent. Upon seeing these results, we reflected on Bengen’s book, in which he determined that applying an investment strategy with the ability to consistently provide superior risk-adjusted returns in excess of the index had a positive effect on the maximum withdrawal rate that could be used.

Effect of Performance on Sustainability
Before we studied the impact that a high and growing dividend strategy would have on the withdrawal rate, we wanted to understand how the performance of the S&P Top 100 Dividend Payers would affect the sustainability of a retirement portfolio in distribution. Bengen graciously provided information that allowed us to replicate the work he had done, albeit much more simplistically, because we were trying to solve for only one factor to compare performance of the Top 100 Dividend Payers with performance of the entire S&P 500 Index. We constructed a model and assumed a $1-million investment in a portfolio allocated to 60-percent equities and 40-percent bonds. But we could not match the performance that Bengen achieved.


Table 1: S&P Top 100 Dividend Payers versus S&P 500 Index, 1968–2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top 100 Dividend Payers</th>
<th>S&amp;P 500 Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Return</td>
<td>12.53%</td>
<td>9.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>16.71%</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe Ratio</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Standard & Poor’s, Thornburg Investment Management

Hypothetical is for illustration purposes only. Dividends were not reinvested. You cannot invest directly in an index. Past performance does not guarantee future results.

Source: Bloomberg, Standard & Poor’s, FactSet
bonds, using the Barclays Intermediate Government Bond Index for the bond portion. For the equity portion, we used either the S&P 500 Index or the S&P Top 100 Dividend Payers. Monthly return data were used and both portfolios were rebalanced at the end of each year. In addition, we assumed a 5-percent spending rate: $50,000 was withdrawn at the beginning of year one of the retirement, then increased by a cost-of-living adjustment each year thereafter. These annual spending amounts were removed from the investment account at the start of each year and assumed to be placed in a checking account for spending purposes.

Given that the Barclays Intermediate Government Bond Index began in January 1973, we decided to test three time frames. First, we assumed a retirement that began on December 31, 1972, and lasted for the entire 43 years of available data. Next, we tested a retirement that began right before the 1987 bear market, assuming the retirement began on August 31, 1987, and has run for more than 28 years. Finally, we looked at the impact of the tech bubble and subsequent meltdown with a retirement that began in December 1999 and has run 16 years.

Scenario 1: December 31, 1972, to December 31, 2015
Figure 2 illustrates the ending account value for each year, assuming the retirement began on December 31, 1972. The Top 100 Dividend Payers portfolio far exceeded the performance of the S&P 500 Index portfolio. The withdrawal amounts under both scenarios are identical, but the corpus of the dividend-focused portfolio grew $27.1 million more than the S&P 500 Index portfolio. As shown in table 2, the Top 100 Dividend Payers Portfolio had an ending balance of $34,282,384 compared to the S&P 500 Portfolio ending balance of $7,174,430.

Scenario 2: August 31, 1987, to December 31, 2015
For the retirement that began just before the 1987 bear market, the dividend-focused stock portfolio again outperformed the S&P 500 Portfolio. The withdrawal amounts under both scenarios are identical, but the corpus of the dividend-focused portfolio grew $1,048,147 more than the S&P 500 Index portfolio. As shown in table 3, the Top 100 Dividend Payers Portfolio had an ending balance of $3,557,610 compared to the S&P 500 Portfolio ending balance of $2,509,463. The dividend-focused strategy lagged during the technology bubble from mid-1990 to 2001 but outperformed before and after that period. As shown in table 3,
Bengen concluded the following:

His model.

We provided Bengen with the S&P Top 100 Dividend Payers database of monthly dividends, which he processed through his SAFEMAX. He agreed to study the impact of substituting Top 100 dividend paying companies across almost all sectors for S&P 500 Index stocks had very beneficial effects on the “SAFEMAX” for retirees during the 1968–1975 periods. The “SAFEMAX” was increased by about 25 percent during this period, which translates into a significant improvement of lifestyle for those retirees. Investors in the 1956–1967 periods, who had “hybrid” equity allocations of first 100 percent S&P 500 Index stocks, then Top 100 dividend-paying stocks beginning in 1968, also saw very substantial increases in their portfolio longevity.2

Bengen’s conclusion focuses on the impact that a dividend-paying strategy had on retirees who began retirement between 1956 and 1967. This time frame is of particular interest given the devastating effects that the bear market of 1973–1974 and a concurrent period of high inflation had on retirement portfolios. To paraphrase, the 25-percent increase in the annual withdrawal rate allowed the spending amount to be raised from $40,000 to $50,000 per year plus an annual cost-of-living adjustment. Therefore, the high and growing dividend strategy dramatically improved the quality of the client’s retirement years.

Key to Successful Implementation

Finding companies that have both the willingness and ability to increase dividends over time is the key to successful implementation of this retirement income strategy. If you limit your universe solely to U.S. stocks, you will be focusing primarily on financial and utility companies for their higher dividend yields but may not end up with the desired growing dividend income stream. Looking outside the United States, you will find higher dividend-paying companies across almost all sectors as well as a greater inclination by company management to grow this dividend.

The Case for a High and Growing Dividend Stock Strategy in Retirement Portfolios

Impact on SAFEMAX

Having seen that the dividend-focused strategy improves the sustainability of a retirement portfolio in distribution, we wanted to determine how much the withdrawal rate could be increased without negatively affecting the portfolio’s sustainability. Given the multiple variables, we decided it best to pose this question to Bengen. He agreed to study the impact of the dividend strategy on his SAFEMAX, or maximum sustainable withdrawal rate. We provided Bengen with the S&P Top 100 Dividend Payers database of monthly returns, which he processed through his model.

Bengen concluded the following:

Substituting Top 100 dividend paying stocks for S&P 500 Index stocks had very beneficial effects on the “SAFEMAX” for retirees during the 1968–1975 periods. The “SAFEMAX” was increased by about 25 percent during this period, which translates into a significant improvement of lifestyle for those retirees. Investors in the 1956–1967 periods, who had “hybrid” equity allocations of first 100 percent S&P 500 Index stocks, then Top 100 dividend-paying stocks beginning in 1968, also saw very substantial increases in their portfolio longevity.2

A retiree who began taking withdrawals from the dividend-focused portfolio at the start of the 2000 bear market was able to spend an equivalent amount and have a corpus more than three times as large versus the S&P 500 Index portfolio.

Scenario 3: December 31, 1999, to December 31, 2015

To illustrate a retirement that began just before the 2000 bear market, we began on December 31, 1999. Figure 4 illustrates that over a short 16-year time frame, the Top 100 Dividend Payers portfolio has been far superior to the S&P 500 Index portfolio. Given the drop in value of technology and growth stocks during this time frame, the outperformance of the dividend-focused strategy improves the sustainability of a retirement portfolio in distribution, we wanted to determine how much the withdrawal rate could be increased without negatively affecting the portfolio’s sustainability.

The “SAFEMAX” was increased by about 25 percent during this period, which translates into a significant improvement of lifestyle for those retirees. Investors in the 1956–1967 periods, who had “hybrid” equity allocations of first 100 percent S&P 500 Index stocks, then Top 100 dividend-paying stocks beginning in 1968, also saw very substantial increases in their portfolio longevity.2

Bengen’s conclusion focuses on the impact that a dividend-paying strategy had on retirees who began retirement between 1956 and 1967. This time frame is of particular interest given the devastating effects that the bear market of 1973–1974 and a concurrent period of high inflation had on retirement portfolios. To paraphrase, the 25-percent increase in the annual withdrawal rate allowed the spending amount to be raised from $40,000 to $50,000 per year plus an annual cost-of-living adjustment. Therefore, the high and growing dividend strategy dramatically improved the quality of the client’s retirement years.

Key to Successful Implementation

Finding companies that have both the willingness and ability to increase dividends over time is the key to successful implementation of this retirement income strategy. If you limit your universe solely to U.S. stocks, you will be focusing primarily on financial and utility companies for their higher dividend yields but may not end up with the desired growing dividend income stream. Looking outside the United States, you will find higher dividend-paying companies across almost all sectors as well as a greater inclination by company management to grow this dividend.

Substituting Top 100 dividend paying stocks for S&P 500 Index stocks had very beneficial effects on the “SAFEMAX” for retirees during the 1968–1975 periods. The “SAFEMAX” was increased by about 25 percent during this period, which translates into a significant improvement of lifestyle for those retirees. Investors in the 1956–1967 periods, who had “hybrid” equity allocations of first 100 percent S&P 500 Index stocks, then Top 100 dividend-paying stocks beginning in 1968, also saw very substantial increases in their portfolio longevity.2

A retiree who began taking withdrawals from the dividend-focused portfolio at the start of the 2000 bear market was able to spend an equivalent amount and have a corpus more than three times as large versus the S&P 500 Index portfolio.
This difference in dividend policy between domestic and foreign companies is cultural. In the United States, the primary measure of financial health is earnings, and chief executive officers are more inclined to reinvest the company’s capital on the next best idea in hope of attaining earnings growth. Companies outside the United States are often judged on their ability to pay a high and growing dividend, which is seen as a sign of financial health. In fact, looking at the market composites, estimated dividend yields averaged 2.1 percent in the United States, 38 percent in Europe, and 4.7 percent in the Pacific (excluding Japan). Although international investing comes with special risks, using a carefully selected portfolio of high-quality, global companies that pay a high and growing dividend can greatly benefit a retirement portfolio in distribution.

Conclusion
Financial advisors who view the retirement income challenge as a process rather than a product will be successful gathering assets and consolidating accounts from our baby-boomer brethren as we all move into retirement. This article shows that an allocation of capital on the next best opportunity to provide diversification by country and stock provides an opportunity to improve a portfolio’s equity to a high and growing dividend strategy can increase sustainability and improve retirement lifestyle via higher withdrawal rates.

Jan Blakeley Holman, CFP®, CIMA®, is director of advisor education at Thornburg Investment Management. She earned a BA in political science from the University of Denver. Contact her at jholman@thornburg.com.

Endnotes
1. Data after 1990 is from Bloomberg, Confluence, and FactSet. Calculated by Thornburg Investment Management.
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Appendix: Opportunities of a Global Dividend Strategy
Perspectives on dividends vary among cultures. Among many U.S.-domiciled companies, where executive compensation is tied to growing the share price, dividends are a sign of limited reinvestment opportunities. Arnott and Asness (2003) showed, however, that companies with high dividend payout ratios tend to subsequently have higher earnings growth than companies with lower payout ratios, and that the higher earnings growth may be due to better allocation of capital. This view of dividend payout is more prevalent outside the United States, where payment of high and growing dividends is viewed as a sign of financial strength.

A global dividend income strategy also provides an opportunity to improve a portfolio’s diversification by country and sector. This is because U.S. dividends typically have been more available via the financial and utility sectors, but attractive dividends are available in many different sectors of the international market.

Comparing the nominal performance of the S&P 500 to the S&P Dividend Aristocrats Index and the S&P Global Dividend Opportunities Index during the 2000–2015 period shows that both had positive returns and positive Sharpe ratios (see table A1).

The Dividend Aristocrats Index had an income return that was 135 basis points better than the S&P 500 Index. It also had 4.57 percent of additional price return over the S&P 500 Index (6.85 percent versus 2.28 percent). The Global Dividend Opportunities Index income return outpaced both the S&P 500 and the Dividend Aristocrats Index (by 454 and 319 basis points, respectively) and its total return of 6.58 percent outpaced the S&P 500 by 2.31 percent and lagged the total return of the Dividend Aristocrats Index by 3.61 percent.

S&P Dividend Aristocrats Index
This is an equal-weighted index of large blue-chip companies from the S&P 500 Index that have consistently increased dividends annually for the past 25 years. The index is diversified by sector, reconstructed each December, and currently includes 50 companies.

S&P Global Dividend Opportunities Index
This is a yield-weighted index of 100 exchange-listed common stocks and American Depositary Receipts from around the world that offer high dividend yield opportunities. The index is designed to provide diversification by country and industry and is rebalanced twice a year.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Price Return</th>
<th>Income Return</th>
<th>Total Return</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sharpe Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;P 500 Index</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
<td>15.13%</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend Aristocrats Index</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
<td>10.19%</td>
<td>13.63%</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Dividend Opportunities Index</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>6.53%</td>
<td>6.58%</td>
<td>19.15%</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Past performance does not guarantee future results.

Sources: Standard & Poor’s and calculated by Thornburg Investment Management