



---

## Modern Portfolio Theory vs. Behavioural Finance: A Theoretical Dilemma in Investment Decision-Making

**Dr. Umesh Rabari**

Adhyapak Sahayak, Anand Commerce College, Affiliated to Sardar Patel University.

E-Mail: umesh.rabari@yahoo.com

**Dr. Dignesh Panchasara**

Adhyapak Sahayak, Department of Commerce, Y. S. Arts and K. S. Shah Commerce College, Devgadh Baria, Affiliated to Shri Govind Guru University

E-Mail: digneshpanchasara@gmail.com

---

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16785411>

---

### ARTICLE DETAILS

**Research Paper**

**Accepted:** 18-07-2025

**Published:** 10-08-2025

---

**Keywords:**

*Modern Portfolio Theory, Behavioural Finance, Investment Decision-Making, Cognitive Biases, Rationality, Risk-Return Trade-off, Efficient Market Hypothesis, Investor Behaviour.*

---

### ABSTRACT

The field of investment decision-making has traditionally been dominated by Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT), which posits that investors are rational actors who make optimal choices based on risk-return trade-offs. However, the rise of Behavioural Finance (BF) challenges this assumption by incorporating psychological factors, cognitive biases, and real-world anomalies into the analysis of investor behaviour. This paper explores the theoretical conflict between MPT and BF, examining their foundational assumptions, key models, and relevance in contemporary financial decision-making. While MPT provides a structured and mathematical framework, it fails to account for irrationalities that often prevail in actual markets. Behavioural Finance, conversely, highlights the influence of heuristics, emotions, and biases that affect investor choices, often leading to suboptimal decisions. This paper further investigates how these two paradigms can be reconciled or integrated to offer a more comprehensive understanding of investment behaviour. Through a detailed theoretical comparison and analysis, the study emphasizes the importance of acknowledging both rational and behavioural dimensions to improve



portfolio construction, financial advising, and policy-making. The paper concludes with implications for future research and practical strategies for balancing theory with investor psychology in financial markets.

---

---

## Introduction

Investment decision-making is a foundational concern in finance, impacting individual investors, institutional portfolios, and national economies. For decades, scholars and practitioners have relied on rational choice models to understand and predict market behaviour. Chief among these is Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT), introduced by Harry Markowitz in 1952, which posits that investors are rational, risk-averse agents who make decisions based on the trade-off between risk and return (Markowitz, 1952). MPT, along with supporting frameworks like the Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH) and the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM), has significantly influenced portfolio construction and risk management.

However, real-world financial markets often exhibit anomalies, crashes, and investor behaviours that deviate from the predictions of these models. The 2008 financial crisis, tech bubble, and numerous market inefficiencies have questioned the assumptions underlying traditional financial theories. In response, Behavioural Finance (BF) has emerged as a vital alternative, challenging the notion of rationality and introducing concepts from psychology, neuroscience, and cognitive science into financial analysis (Shiller, 2003).

Behavioural Finance theorists argue that investors are influenced by biases, heuristics, emotions, and social factors, which often lead to irrational or suboptimal decisions. Kahneman and Tversky's Prospect Theory (1979) demonstrated how individuals value gains and losses differently, contradicting the linear risk-return relationship proposed by MPT.

This paper aims to explore the theoretical dilemma between MPT and Behavioural Finance in the context of investment decision-making. While MPT offers mathematical elegance and predictive utility, Behavioural Finance introduces a more realistic but less formalized understanding of market behaviour. The objective is to evaluate the strengths and limitations of both frameworks and analyse whether they can coexist or must be viewed as mutually exclusive paradigms.

## 2.0 Foundations of Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT)

Modern Portfolio Theory was developed by Harry Markowitz and presented in his seminal paper, "Portfolio Selection" (1952). It revolutionized investment management by providing a mathematical framework for constructing an "efficient frontier" — a set of optimal portfolios that offer the maximum expected return for a given level of risk.

### 2.1 Key Assumptions of MPT



MPT is built on several critical assumptions:

- Investors are rational and risk-averse.
- Markets are efficient, and all information is freely available.
- Investors aim to maximize returns while minimizing risk.
- Returns follow a normal distribution.
- The correlation between assets is stable over time (Elton & Gruber, 1997).

Under these assumptions, risk is quantified using standard deviation or variance of returns, and diversification is seen as the primary tool to reduce risk.

## 2.2 Core Models Related to MPT

- **Efficient Frontier:** A graphical representation of optimal portfolios (Markowitz, 1952).
- **CAPM (Capital Asset Pricing Model):** Developed by Sharpe (1964), it links an asset's expected return to its systematic risk (beta).
- **Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH):** Fama (1970) suggested that prices always reflect all available information, making it impossible to outperform the market consistently.

## 2.3 Criticisms of MPT

Despite its strengths, MPT has been criticized for its unrealistic assumptions. Real investors often do not act rationally, markets are not perfectly efficient, and asset correlations can change during crises. Additionally, risk is not always perceived linearly, and the use of variance as a risk measure does not account for asymmetric return distributions (Lo, 2005).

## 3.0 Foundations of Behavioral Finance

Behavioral Finance emerged as a counterpoint to traditional finance, emphasizing the psychological and emotional factors that influence investor behavior. Rooted in cognitive psychology and experimental economics, it challenges the rational actor model and introduces alternative explanations for market anomalies.

### 3.1 Key Theoretical Foundations

- **Prospect Theory:** Developed by Kahneman & Tversky (1979), it argues that people value gains and losses differently, leading to decisions that deviate from expected utility theory.
- **Mental Accounting:** Proposed by Thaler (1985), it shows how individuals mentally separate money into different accounts based on subjective criteria.
- **Overconfidence and Confirmation Bias:** Investors often overestimate their knowledge and seek out information that confirms their beliefs (Barber & Odean, 2001).

### 3.2 Common Behavioral Biases in Finance



Bias	Description
Anchoring	Relying too heavily on initial information
Loss Aversion	Feeling losses more intensely than gains
Herd Behavior	Imitating others during uncertainty
Framing	Making decisions based on how information is presented

These biases can explain speculative bubbles, herding behavior, and deviations from rationality in both individual and institutional investors.

### 3.3 Strengths of Behavioural Finance

- Explains anomalies like the equity premium puzzle, disposition effect, and excess volatility.
- Provides insights into market inefficiencies and financial crises.
- More aligned with empirical evidence and real investor behavior (Shiller, 2003).

## 4.0 Theoretical Dilemma: A Comparative Analysis

### 4.1 Rationality vs. Bounded Rationality

The fundamental divide between MPT and BF lies in their conceptualization of human rationality. While MPT assumes that investors are perfectly rational, Behavioral Finance argues for bounded rationality — the idea that individuals use shortcuts (heuristics) due to cognitive limitations (Simon, 1955).

### 4.2 Risk Perception

MPT quantifies risk using variance or beta, assuming that investors react symmetrically to gains and losses. BF, however, shows that investors are loss-averse and weigh losses more heavily than equivalent gains (Tversky & Kahneman, 1991).

### 4.3 Market Efficiency

EMH suggests that prices always reflect true value. Yet BF demonstrates that prices can deviate significantly from fundamentals due to collective investor behavior (Baker & Wurgler, 2007).

### 4.4 Integration Efforts

Some scholars have attempted to reconcile both paradigms:

- **Adaptive Markets Hypothesis** (Lo, 2004): Combines EMH with evolutionary psychology.
- **Behavioral Asset Pricing Models**: Integrate psychological variables into traditional valuation models (Shefrin & Statman, 1994).

## 5.0 Implications for Investment Decision-Making

The theoretical divergence between MPT and BF has practical consequences in areas such as portfolio management, financial advising, and public policy.

### 5.1 Portfolio Construction



MPT encourages diversification to reduce risk. However, if investors are prone to biases like home bias or mental accounting, their portfolios may become suboptimal. BF suggests that tailoring portfolios to individual psychology may improve outcomes (Statman, 2000).

### 5.2 Financial Advising

Advisors who use only MPT-based tools may miss key emotional and behavioral cues. BF-based advising involves understanding client biases, emotional triggers, and decision styles, leading to more personalized recommendations (Montier, 2002).

### 5.3 Risk Communication

Investors often misinterpret statistical risk. Using framing and visual tools informed by behavioral insights can help clients better understand volatility and loss probabilities.

## 6.0 Conclusion

The debate between Modern Portfolio Theory and Behavioral Finance reflects a broader philosophical divide between mathematical rationalism and psychological realism in economics. MPT has provided a robust foundation for portfolio optimization and financial modeling, but its assumptions are increasingly questioned by empirical market behavior and investor psychology. Behavioral Finance, though less formalized, offers a necessary correction by incorporating the real-world irrationalities of decision-making. Rather than viewing the two as mutually exclusive, future research and practice should seek integrative models that combine the predictive strength of MPT with the descriptive accuracy of BF.

A balanced approach can lead to more effective financial education, policy design, and investment strategies that account for both theoretical elegance and human complexity.

## References

- Barber, B. M., & Odean, T. (2001). Boys will be boys: Gender, overconfidence, and common stock investment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(1), 261–292. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003355301556400>
- Elton, E. J., & Gruber, M. J. (1997). Modern portfolio theory, 1950 to date. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 21(11-12), 1743–1759. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4266\(97\)00048-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4266(97)00048-4)
- Fama, E. F. (1970). Efficient capital markets: A review of theory and empirical work. *Journal of Finance*, 25(2), 383–417. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2325486>
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–291. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185>
- Lo, A. W. (2004). The adaptive markets hypothesis. *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 30(5), 15–29. <https://doi.org/10.3905/jpm.2004.442611>



- Markowitz, H. (1952). Portfolio selection. *Journal of Finance*, 7(1), 77–91. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2975974>
- Montier, J. (2002). *Behavioral Finance: Insights into Irrational Minds and Markets*. Wiley.
- Shiller, R. J. (2003). From efficient markets theory to behavioral finance. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17(1), 83–104. <https://doi.org/10.1257/089533003321164967>
- Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69(1), 99–118. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1884852>
- Statman, M. (2000). Cognitive errors, behavioral finance and their implications for financial advisors. *Journal of Financial Planning*, 13(2), 62–68.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1991). Loss aversion in riskless choice: A reference-dependent model. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106(4), 1039–1061. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2937956>