International Research in Economics and Finance; Vol. 9, No. 1; 2025
ISSN 2529-8038 E-ISSN 2591-734X
Published by ChapJuly Press

Efficient Markets, Behavioral Anomalies, and the Evolving Practice of Investment Management

Elizabeth Vance[1]

[1] Haslam College of Business, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, USA

Correspondence: Haslam College of Business, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA.

Received: February 2, 2025 Accepted: March 30, 2025 Online Published: April 22, 2025

Abstract

The efficient market hypothesis (EMH) has framed the study of financial markets for more than half a century, yet its empirical status remains contested. This paper provides a focused synthesis of the theoretical foundations and empirical evidence on market efficiency and investment management. We first revisit the mean-variance foundations of Markowitz (1952), the capital asset pricing model of Sharpe (1964) and Lintner (1965), and the arbitrage pricing framework of Ross (1976), before turning to the EMH of Fama (1970, 1991). We then review well-documented anomalies—size, value, momentum, calendar, and volatility effects—and the behavioral explanations of Kahneman and Tversky (1979), De Bondt and Thaler (1985), and Shleifer and Vishny (1997). We examine the evolution of factor models from Fama and French (1993, 2015) to the machine-learning approach of Gu, Kelly, and Xiu (2020), and we assess the active-versus-passive debate in light of Sharpe (1991) and Fama and French (2010). We conclude that markets are neither perfectly efficient nor wholly predictable: prices deviate from fundamentals, yet the deviations are costly and risky to arbitrage. The practical art of investment management therefore lies in recognizing the limits of arbitrage while respecting the costs and risks of exploiting it.

Keywords: market efficiency, asset pricing, behavioral finance, anomalies, factor investing, active management, volatility clustering

1. Introduction

In the half-century since Fama (1970) codified the efficient market hypothesis (EMH), the academic and practical debate over the informational efficiency of financial markets has never fully settled. In its semi-strong form, the hypothesis holds that asset prices rapidly and fully reflect all publicly available information and that, consequently, systematic risk-adjusted outperformance is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve on a consistent basis. The hypothesis underpins much of modern finance: it motivates index investing, informs regulatory design, and frames how practitioners interpret price movements. Yet the accumulation of empirical anomalies, the emergence of behavioral finance, and the rapid growth of quantitative and machine-learning investing have each challenged the strongest versions of the hypothesis and reshaped how academics and practitioners alike think about markets.

The stakes are not merely academic. If markets are perfectly efficient, then active management, security analysis, and market timing are, in aggregate, exercises in futility; if markets are grossly inefficient, then patient, informed investors may be richly rewarded. The resolution of this question conditions trillions of dollars of asset allocation, the structure of the investment-management industry, and the design of securities regulation. This paper does not attempt a comprehensive survey—the literature is too vast—but instead provides a focused, integrative review of the ideas and evidence that matter most for the practice of investment management.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 lays out the theoretical foundations, from mean-variance portfolio theory and the capital asset pricing model (CAPM) to arbitrage pricing and the EMH. Section 3 surveys empirical evidence on well-documented anomalies that appear to contradict market efficiency. Section 4 turns to behavioral finance, examining prospect theory, cognitive biases, and the limits of arbitrage. Section 5 traces the evolution from factor models to factor investing. Section 6 assesses the active-versus-passive debate and the role of machine learning. Section 7 discusses liquidity, volatility, and systemic risk. Section 8 concludes.

Throughout, the paper adopts a position that has come to define the modern consensus: the strongest formulations of market efficiency are empirically untenable, but weaker, cost-adjusted forms retain substantial explanatory power. Prices do not always equal fundamental values, yet the deviations are difficult to exploit after

accounting for the risks, costs, and capital constraints faced by real arbitrageurs. Investment management is therefore best understood as the disciplined exploitation of imperfect, costly arbitrage opportunities rather than the search for a free lunch.

The treatment is deliberately selective rather than exhaustive. Priority is given to contributions that are both intellectually foundational and practically consequential, that have withstood the test of replication, and that illuminate the central tension between efficiency and behavioral explanation. The intended readership includes graduate students of finance and economics, practitioners seeking an accessible map of the field, and researchers who want a concise orientation before engaging the primary literature. Where the evidence is contested, the paper presents the competing positions fairly and notes the conditions under which each is likely to hold.

2. Theoretical Foundations of Financial Markets and Asset Pricing

2.1 Portfolio Selection and the Capital Asset Pricing Model

Modern asset pricing begins with Markowitz (1952), who recast the portfolio problem as an explicit trade-off between expected return and variance. By demonstrating that diversification could reduce idiosyncratic risk, Markowitz provided a rigorous rationale for holding broad portfolios and established the mean-variance efficient frontier as the set of portfolios offering the highest expected return for a given level of risk. Tobin (1958) extended this framework to the allocation between a riskless asset and the risky portfolio, introducing the separation principle—that the optimal composition of the risky portfolio is independent of an investor's preferences—that later became central to the capital asset pricing model.

Sharpe (1964), Lintner (1965), and Mossin (1966) independently derived the CAPM from Markowitz's framework, obtaining an equilibrium in which the market portfolio is mean-variance efficient and the expected return on any asset is a linear function of its beta, the covariance between the asset and the market portfolio divided by the variance of the market. The CAPM formalized the crucial distinction between systematic and idiosyncratic risk and implied that, in equilibrium, only systematic risk should be priced. Its empirical record, however, is mixed: beta explains only a modest fraction of the cross-sectional variation in average returns, and the model is plagued by the difficulty of identifying the true market portfolio. These limitations, documented extensively in the decades after its derivation, motivated the multi-factor models discussed in Section 5, and they illustrate the general lesson that elegant theoretical constructs often require substantial empirical qualification.

For all its theoretical elegance, the CAPM has proven difficult to test. Its central prediction—that the market portfolio is mean-variance efficient—cannot be falsified independently of the choice of a market proxy, and Roll's critique showed that tests of the model are jointly tests of the model and of the market index. Practical use of the CAPM nevertheless persists: it remains the standard tool for estimating the cost of equity capital, for benchmarking fund performance, and for communicating about risk in investment committees. Its continued use in practice, even after decades of empirical criticism, illustrates how a theoretically coherent but imperfect model can serve as a useful approximation when better alternatives have not yet been widely adopted.

2.2 Arbitrage Pricing and No-Arbitrage Valuation

Ross (1976) provided an alternative and more flexible foundation with the arbitrage pricing theory (APT), which derives expected returns from a linear factor structure without requiring strong assumptions about investor preferences or the existence of an observable market portfolio. In the APT, the expected return on an asset is a linear function of its sensitivities, or factor loadings, to a set of common risk factors, and equilibrium is enforced by the absence of arbitrage opportunities. The APT's strength lies in its parsimony and its robustness: because it relies on the no-arbitrage principle rather than on a particular equilibrium, it remains valid under a wider range of conditions than the CAPM.

The no-arbitrage logic also underlies modern derivatives pricing. Black and Scholes (1973) and Merton (1973) showed that the price of an option could be derived from a self-financing, continuously rebalanced portfolio that replicates the option's payoff, leading to the celebrated Black-Scholes-Merton formula. The pricing of contingent claims illustrated a subtle but crucial point: even when underlying asset prices are not perfectly informationally efficient, relative-value relationships must hold to preclude arbitrage. This insight—that the absence of arbitrage, rather than full informational efficiency, is the operative constraint in many markets—became a recurring theme in the subsequent literature on the limits of arbitrage (Shleifer & Vishny, 1997).

2.3 The Efficient Market Hypothesis

Fama (1970) synthesized the emerging evidence into the EMH, distinguishing weak, semi-strong, and strong forms according to the information set reflected in prices. The random-walk and martingale properties of prices documented by Fama (1965) were consistent with the weak form; event studies supported the semi-strong form;

and the strong form—that prices reflect all private information—was generally rejected even in early tests. In his 1991 update, Fama reframed the three forms as tests of return predictability, event studies, and private information, and concluded that the accumulated evidence was broadly consistent with market efficiency.

The EMH carries a subtle but important qualification articulated by Grossman and Stiglitz (1980). If markets were fully informationally efficient, no one would have an incentive to gather and trade on information, and the process by which information becomes reflected in prices would collapse. Markets are therefore necessarily efficient only to the extent that information acquisition and arbitrage are costly. This 'Grossman-Stiglitz paradox' laid the groundwork for the modern view that efficiency is an equilibrium outcome shaped by the costs of information and arbitrage, a theme to which Section 4 returns.

3. Empirical Evidence: Market Efficiency and Well-Documented Anomalies

3.1 Size, Value, and Momentum Effects

Beginning in the late 1970s, a series of empirical findings challenged the sufficiency of the CAPM. Banz (1981) documented a size effect: smaller firms, measured by market capitalization, earned higher average returns than the CAPM predicted, even after controlling for beta. Basu (1977) showed that stocks with low price-earnings ratios outperformed stocks with high price-earnings ratios, an early manifestation of the value effect. De Bondt and Thaler (1985) found that portfolios of past 'losers' subsequently outperformed past 'winners,' a long-run reversal consistent with investor overreaction to extreme news.

Jegadeesh and Titman (1993) provided perhaps the most robust and consequential anomaly, documenting a momentum effect: stocks that performed well over the prior three to twelve months tended to continue performing well over the following months. Momentum has proven remarkably persistent across markets, asset classes, and time periods, and it is difficult to reconcile with rational asset pricing because it implies that investors underreact to information for extended periods. The momentum effect resisted explanation within the standard factor framework, leading Carhart (1997) to add a momentum factor to the three-factor model. Together, the size, value, and momentum effects defined the 'anomaly' literature that both threatened the EMH and, as Section 5 discusses, supplied the raw material for factor-based investing.

A vigorous debate surrounds whether the size, value, and momentum effects represent compensation for risk or evidence of mispricing. Rational accounts interpret the returns to value and size portfolios as premiums for bearing distress risk or other systematic risks that the CAPM's single factor fails to capture; behavioral accounts interpret them as the predictable consequence of investor overreaction and underreaction. The two interpretations are not mutually exclusive, and the five-factor model of Fama and French (2015) can be read as an attempt to bring the anomalies within a rational, multifactor risk framework. The debate matters practically because it determines whether factor premiums are expected to persist, shrink, or reverse as capital chases them.

3.2 Calendar and Seasonality Effects

A related strand of the literature documented calendar effects that appeared hard to reconcile with efficiency. Rozeff and Kinney (1976) identified a January effect, in which returns in January, particularly for small stocks, were systematically higher than in other months. French (1980) documented a weekend effect, with negative average returns on Mondays. These patterns, while often economically significant in early samples, have tended to weaken or disappear in more recent data and under methodological scrutiny. Their rise and fall illustrate both the promise and the fragility of calendar-based strategies, and they serve as a cautionary tale about data mining and multiple testing in empirical finance.

3.3 Volatility Clustering and Fat Tails

Empirical asset-return distributions depart sharply from the normality assumed by early theoretical models. Mandelbrot (1963) showed that speculative prices exhibit heavy tails and non-Gaussian behavior, while Engle (1982) and Bollerslev (1986) formalized volatility clustering through ARCH and GARCH models, in which periods of high volatility tend to be followed by high volatility. These statistical regularities—fat tails, skewness, and time-varying volatility—have profound implications for risk management and option pricing. They imply that extreme losses occur more frequently than Gaussian models predict, that risk is not constant but conditional, and that the Value-at-Risk and similar measures popular in industry must account for the dynamics of volatility. They also underpin the 'fat tails and volatility' concerns that recur in discussions of systemic risk in Section 7.

4. Behavioral Finance and the Limits of Arbitrage

4.1 Prospect Theory and Cognitive Biases

Behavioral finance offers a systematic account of how investors depart from the rational, expected-utility-

maximizing agent of classical theory. The foundational contribution is prospect theory (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979), which replaces expected utility with a value function that is concave in the domain of gains, convex in the domain of losses, and defined over changes in wealth relative to a reference point rather than over final wealth. The theory's signature predictions—loss aversion, diminishing sensitivity, and the reflection effect—have been widely confirmed in laboratory and field settings.

The heuristics and biases catalogued by Tversky and Kahneman (1974)—representativeness, anchoring, and availability—provide microfoundations for the mispricing that behavioral finance seeks to explain. In the investment domain, the disposition effect, the tendency to sell winners too early and ride losers too long (Shefrin & Statman, 1985), has been documented using brokerage records (Odean, 1998) and links directly to loss aversion. These findings demonstrate that systematic, predictable biases in judgment and decision-making are not confined to laboratory subjects but pervade the behavior of real investors.

4.2 Noise Trader Risk and the Limits of Arbitrage

A crucial objection to the view that anomalies reflect temporary mispricing is that rational arbitrageurs should, in principle, correct any deviation from fundamental value. Shleifer and Vishny (1997) explain why this corrective force is weaker than classical theory suggests. Arbitrage is typically conducted by specialized, professional managers whose capital is short-term and whose performance is evaluated frequently. If mispricing deepens before it corrects, arbitrageurs may face withdrawals precisely when the opportunity is most attractive. This 'noise trader risk' and the agency frictions of delegated arbitrage imply that deviations from fundamental value can persist, sometimes for extended periods.

The limits-of-arbitrage framework reconciles the persistence of anomalies with rationality at the margin. Prices may deviate from fundamentals, but the deviations are not riskless, costless, or immediately arbitraged away. It also explains why the strongest anomalies tend to concentrate in securities that are difficult or costly to arbitrage, such as small, young, and illiquid stocks, and why the apparent disappearance of some anomalies in recent decades may reflect the entry of capital that reduced the mispricing while never eliminating it entirely.

The practical implication of the limits-of-arbitrage literature is significant. It explains why quantitative strategies that identify mispricing cannot simply scale without bound: capital constraints, short-sale restrictions, and the risk of being 'right too early' all cap the extent to which prices can be corrected. It also explains the episodic nature of financial crises, in which forced deleveraging by leveraged arbitrageurs can convert small deviations into large dislocations. For investors, the lesson is that apparent mispricing is an opportunity only when it can be financed, timed, and survived; the discipline of risk and capital management is inseparable from the identification of mispricing itself.

4.3 Investor Sentiment and the Cross-Section of Returns

If some investors trade on sentiment rather than fundamentals, and if arbitrage is limited, sentiment should affect prices. Barberis, Shleifer, and Vishny (1998) and Daniel, Hirshleifer, and Subrahmanyam (1998) built models in which psychological biases generate both underreaction and overreaction, thereby accounting for momentum and long-run reversal within a single framework. Baker and Wurgler (2006) provided direct evidence that investor sentiment affects the cross-section of returns, with sentiment-sensitive stocks—young, small, unprofitable, and speculative securities—being more strongly affected. These models and findings moved behavioral finance from a collection of anomalies toward a coherent account of how psychological forces shape equilibrium prices, complementing rather than replacing the rational benchmark.

5. From Asset-Pricing Models to Factor Investing

5.1 The Fama–French Multi-Factor Models

The failure of the CAPM to explain the size and value effects prompted the development of multi-factor models. Fama and French (1993) proposed a three-factor model that augments the market factor with a size factor (SMB) and a value factor (HML), and showed that the model explained a large fraction of the cross-sectional variation in average returns. The momentum effect, however, remained outside the three-factor framework, leading Carhart (1997) to add a momentum factor (UMD), which substantially improved the model's ability to explain persistence in mutual fund returns.

Fama and French (2015) extended the model to five factors, adding profitability and investment factors (RMW and CMA) and demonstrating improved explanatory power, particularly for value-related patterns. These models are not merely academic exercises; they transformed the practice of investing by providing a vocabulary for decomposing returns into exposure to risk factors and a residual, or alpha, component. The development of index products and exchange-traded funds that systematically harvest size, value, momentum, quality, and low-

volatility factors reflects the translation of academic factor research into investable strategies. The factor-investing industry is, in essence, the commercialization of the anomaly literature.

5.2 Skill, Luck, and Persistence in Active Management

A central practical question is whether active managers possess genuine skill—persistent, risk-adjusted outperformance—rather than luck. Fama and French (2010) analyzed the cross-section of mutual fund returns and concluded that, with a few exceptions at the extreme right tail of the distribution, the observed dispersion of risk-adjusted returns was largely consistent with luck rather than skill. Carhart (1997) reached a similar conclusion, attributing apparent persistence to momentum exposure and costs rather than to manager skill. These findings, together with the arithmetic of active management (Sharpe, 1991), have profound implications for the active-versus-passive debate, to which the next section turns. They also highlight the statistical challenge of distinguishing skill from luck in samples that are short relative to the volatility of returns.

6. Investment Management in Practice: Active Versus Passive

6.1 The Arithmetic of Active Management

Sharpe (1991) provided a deceptively simple but powerful argument. Before costs, the return on the average actively managed dollar must equal the return on the average passively managed dollar, because the market portfolio is the value-weighted average of all investors' holdings. Consequently, after costs—management fees, transaction costs, and taxes—the average active dollar must underperform the average passive dollar. This 'arithmetic of active management' implies that, in aggregate, active management is a negative-sum game for investors, even if some individual managers add value.

The implication is not that all active management is worthless, but that the burden of proof lies on active managers to demonstrate that their fees are justified by superior returns. The empirical evidence reviewed in Section 5.2 suggests that, on average, they do not. Active strategies can, however, be justified where they exploit genuine, persistent opportunities that passive strategies cannot reach—in less efficient markets, in illiquid securities, and through skill in risk management and factor timing—provided the costs are controlled.

The arithmetic of active management also clarifies the role of fees. Because active management is a negative-sum game in aggregate, the difference between gross and net returns—fees, transaction costs, and taxes—determines the share of wealth transferred from investors to intermediaries. The industry's drift toward lower-cost products, from mutual funds to exchange-traded funds, reflects growing recognition of this arithmetic. It also implies that the quality of an active manager is not measured by gross alpha alone but by alpha net of all costs, and that investors should be skeptical of claims of edge that do not explicitly address the cost hurdle.

6.2 The Rise of Index Investing and Its Critics

The logic of Sharpe (1991), combined with the evidence of Fama and French (2010) and Carhart (1997), has driven the remarkable growth of passive index investing. The EMH, as articulated by Fama (1970, 1991), provides intellectual cover for this shift, and Malkiel (2003), while conceding the empirical evidence for anomalies, defended the practical relevance of market efficiency for most investors. Critics, however, point out that the growth of index investing itself may have consequences for price discovery, market quality, and corporate governance. If a large fraction of capital is allocated mechanically, the informational content of prices may deteriorate, and the very anomalies that passive strategies cannot capture may persist or strengthen. The debate between active and passive thus remains unresolved, with the balance of evidence suggesting a role for both: low-cost passive exposure for most investors, and disciplined, cost-aware active strategies in markets where limits to arbitrage are binding.

6.3 Machine Learning in Empirical Asset Pricing

The latest development in empirical asset pricing is the application of machine-learning methods to the prediction of returns. Gu, Kelly, and Xiu (2020) conducted a comprehensive comparison of machine-learning techniques—including penalized regressions, random forests, gradient-boosted trees, and neural networks—for the canonical problem of measuring asset risk premiums. They found that machine-learning methods delivered substantial economic gains relative to traditional regression-based approaches, in some cases doubling the performance of leading strategies, with the gains driven by the ability of nonlinear methods to capture interactions among predictors. The dominant predictive signals included variations on momentum, liquidity, and volatility. This research suggests that the frontier of investment management is increasingly quantitative and that the distinction between 'factor' and 'machine-learning' investing is blurring, even as the practical challenges of implementation, overfitting, capacity, and governance remain significant.

Machine-learning methods also raise distinctive challenges for investment practice. Their flexibility makes them prone to overfitting, so out-of-sample and economic-significance tests are essential; their complexity reduces interpretability, complicating governance and risk attribution; and their predictive power, concentrated in momentum, liquidity, and volatility signals, is subject to capacity constraints and to the risk that the same methods, applied by many funds, arbitrage away the very premiums they identify. The academic literature is therefore converging on a set of best practices—cross-validation, shrinkage, economic constraints, and transparent model governance—that temper the enthusiasm of the early machine-learning boom.

7. Liquidity, Volatility, and Systemic Risk in Modern Markets

Modern financial markets are characterized not only by the pricing relationships discussed above but also by the market frictions of liquidity and time-varying volatility. Amihud (2002) documented an illiquidity premium: stocks with greater illiquidity, measured by the price impact of trading, earn higher expected returns, consistent with investors demanding compensation for bearing illiquidity risk. Liquidity itself is time-varying and can evaporate precisely when it is most needed, a phenomenon central to episodes of market stress and to the fragility of highly leveraged institutions.

Volatility, as modeled by Engle (1982) and Bollerslev (1986), is clustered and persistent. High-volatility regimes are associated with elevated risk premia, wider bid-ask spreads, and greater sensitivity to sentiment (Baker & Wurgler, 2006). The fat tails documented by Mandelbrot (1963) imply that extreme events occur more frequently than Gaussian models predict, a fact that risk-management frameworks must accommodate. The interaction of illiquidity, volatility, and leverage can produce systemic crises in which individually rational actions—deleveraging, selling, withdrawing—collectively amplify distress. Understanding these dynamics is essential for both investors and regulators. It tempers the presumption of efficiency: markets are efficient in the weak sense that prices are difficult to predict from public information, but they are also fragile, occasionally disorderly, and prone to dislocations that create both risks and, for the patient, opportunities.

For investors and regulators alike, the practical lessons are threefold. First, diversification and risk budgeting must respect the reality of fat tails and time-varying volatility, not the convenient assumption of constant, Gaussian risk. Second, liquidity is an asset that is valuable in calm times and indispensable in stress, and its cost is reflected in the illiquidity premium documented by Amihud (2002); investors who sacrifice liquidity without compensation are effectively giving up a priced attribute. Third, the fragility of leveraged, maturity-transforming intermediaries means that systemic risk is an externality that markets do not price efficiently on their own, which is the principled justification for prudential regulation. A complete account of investment management therefore cannot stop at asset pricing; it must extend to the institutional and regulatory environment in which prices are formed.

8. Conclusion

This paper has surveyed the theoretical foundations and empirical evidence on market efficiency and investment management. The classical framework—mean-variance portfolio theory, the capital asset pricing model, arbitrage pricing, and the efficient market hypothesis—provides an indispensable baseline, but its strongest implications are contradicted by a robust body of anomalies, from size, value, and momentum to calendar and volatility effects. Behavioral finance offers a coherent account of how psychological biases, combined with the limits of arbitrage, allow deviations from fundamental value to persist. The evolution of factor models, from Fama and French (1993, 2015) to the machine-learning approaches of Gu, Kelly, and Xiu (2020), reflects the field's progress in describing the cross-section of expected returns and has transformed the practice of investing.

The central message is a reconciliation. Markets are not perfectly efficient: prices deviate from fundamentals, and anomalies exist. But neither are they systematically exploitable: the deviations are costly and risky to arbitrage, and the average active manager fails to beat a cost-adjusted benchmark (Sharpe, 1991; Fama & French, 2010). Investment management, therefore, is best understood as the disciplined management of risk and cost in a world that is nearly, but not perfectly, efficient. The successful investor recognizes the limits of arbitrage, respects the arithmetic of active management, and allocates effort where the evidence supports genuine, sustainable edge. In this sense, the half-century of debate between efficiency and behavioral finance has converged on a pragmatic synthesis: efficiency is not an axiom to be assumed but an equilibrium to be examined, and it holds only where the costs of information and arbitrage allow it to hold.

A productive agenda for future research includes three broad questions. The first concerns the stability of anomalies and factor premiums as the investment industry adapts: do the returns to size, value, and momentum survive the capital that chases them, or are they eroded by arbitrage? The second concerns the boundary between rational and behavioral explanations: can a unified framework, grounded in microeconomic principles,

simultaneously accommodate the pricing factors and the sentiment effects documented in the literature? The third concerns the institutional environment: how do liquidity, leverage, and regulation interact to determine the efficiency and stability of modern markets? Answers to these questions will continue to shape both the science of asset pricing and the practice of investment management.

References

Amihud, Y. (2002). Illiquidity and Stock Returns: Cross-Section and Time-Series Effects. *Journal of Financial Markets, 5*(1), 31-56. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1386-4181(01)00024-6

Baker, M., & Wurgler, J. (2006). Investor Sentiment and the Cross-Section of Stock Returns. *Journal of Finance, 61*(4), 1645-1680. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2006.00885.x

Banz, R. W. (1981). The Relationship between Return and Market Value of Common Stocks. *Journal of Financial Economics, 9*(1), 3-18. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(81)90018-0

Barberis, N., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. (1998). A Model of Investor Sentiment. *Journal of Financial Economics, 49*(3), 307-343.

Basu, S. (1977). Investment Performance of Common Stocks in Relation to Their Price-Earnings Ratios: A Test of the Efficient Market Hypothesis. *Journal of Finance, 32*(3), 663-682. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1977.tb01979.x

Black, F., & Scholes, M. (1973). The Pricing of Options and Corporate Liabilities. *Journal of Political Economy, 81*(3), 637-654. https://doi.org/10.1086/260062

Bollerslev, T. (1986). Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics, 31*(3), 307-327. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(86)90063-1

Carhart, M. M. (1997). On Persistence in Mutual Fund Performance. *Journal of Finance, 52*(1), 57-82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1997.tb03808.x

Daniel, K., Hirshleifer, D., & Subrahmanyam, A. (1998). Investor Psychology and Security Market Under- and Overreactions. *Journal of Finance, 53*(6), 1839-1885. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-1082.00077

De Bondt, W. F. M., & Thaler, R. (1985). Does the Stock Market Overreact? *Journal of Finance, 40*(3), 793-805. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1985.tb05004.x

Engle, R. F. (1982). Autoregressive Conditional Heteroscedasticity with Estimates of the Variance of United Kingdom Inflation. *Econometrica, 50*(4), 987–1007. https://doi.org/10.2307/1912773

Fama, E. F. (1965). The Behavior of Stock-Market Prices. *Journal of Business, 38*(1), 34-105. https://doi.org/10.1086/294743

Fama, E. F. (1970). Efficient Capital Markets: A Review of Theory and Empirical Work. *Journal of Finance, 25*(2), 383-417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1970.tb00518.x

Fama, E. F. (1991). Efficient Capital Markets: II. *Journal of Finance, 46*(5), 1575-1617. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1991.tb04636.x

Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. (1993). Common Risk Factors in the Returns on Stocks and Bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics, 33*(1), 3-56. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(93)90023-5

Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. (2010). Luck versus Skill in the Cross-Section of Mutual Fund Returns. *Journal of Finance, 65*(5), 1915-1947. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2010.01598.x

Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. (2015). A Five-Factor Asset Pricing Model. *Journal of Financial Economics, 116*(1), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2014.10.010

French, K. R. (1980). Stock Returns and the Weekend Effect. *Journal of Financial Economics, 8*(1), 55-69.

Grossman, S. J., & Stiglitz, J. E. (1980). On the Impossibility of Informationally Efficient Markets. *American Economic Review, 70*(3), 393-408.

Gu, S., Kelly, B., & Xiu, D. (2020). Empirical Asset Pricing via Machine Learning. *Review of Financial Studies, 33*(5), 2223-2273. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhaa009

Jegadeesh, N., & Titman, S. (1993). Returns to Buying Winners and Selling Losers: Implications for Stock

Market Efficiency. *Journal of Finance, 48*(1), 65-91. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1993.tb04702.x

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk. *Econometrica, 47*(2), 263-291. https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185

Lintner, J. (1965). The Valuation of Risk Assets and the Selection of Risky Investments in Stock Portfolios and Capital Budgets. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 47*(1), 13-37. https://doi.org/10.2307/1924119

Malkiel, B. G. (2003). The Efficient Market Hypothesis and Its Critics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 17*(1), 59-82. https://doi.org/10.1257/089533003321164958

Mandelbrot, B. B. (1963). The Variation of Certain Speculative Prices. *Journal of Business, 36*(4), 394-419. https://doi.org/10.1086/294632

Markowitz, H. (1952). Portfolio Selection. *Journal of Finance, 7*(1), 77-91. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1952.tb01525.x

Merton, R. C. (1973). Theory of Rational Option Pricing. *Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science, 4*(1), 141–183. https://doi.org/10.2307/3003143

Mossin, J. (1966). Equilibrium in a Capital Asset Market. *Econometrica, 34*(4), 768-783. https://doi.org/10.2307/1910098

Odean, T. (1998). Are Investors Reluctant to Realize Their Losses? *Journal of Finance, 53*(5), 1775-1798. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-1082.00072

Ross, S. A. (1976). The Arbitrage Theory of Capital Asset Pricing. *Journal of Economic Theory, 13*(3), 341-360. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531(76)90046-6

Rozeff, M. S., & Kinney, W. R. (1976). Capital Market Seasonality: The Case of Stock Returns. *Journal of Financial Economics, 3*(4), 379-402. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90028-3

Sharpe, W. F. (1964). Capital Asset Prices: A Theory of Market Equilibrium under Conditions of Risk. *Journal of Finance, 19*(3), 425-442. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1964.tb02865.x

Sharpe, W. F. (1991). The Arithmetic of Active Management. *Financial Analysts Journal, 47*(1), 7-9.

Shefrin, H., & Statman, M. (1985). The Disposition to Sell Winners Too Early and Ride Losers Too Long: Theory and Evidence. *Journal of Finance, 40*(3), 777-790. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1985.tb05002.x

Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). The Limits of Arbitrage. *Journal of Finance, 52*(1), 35-55. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1997.tb03807.x

Tobin, J. (1958). Liquidity Preference as Behavior Towards Risk. *Review of Economic Studies, 25*(2), 65-86. https://doi.org/10.2307/2296205

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science, 185*(4157), 1124-1131. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).