

The Mathematics Behind Financial Decision-Making: How Quantitative Models Shape and Misshape Investor Behavior

Vardhan Bothra

Fountainhead School, Surat, India

vardhanbothra@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Financial decision-making is widely assumed to be driven by rational analysis of available information. This paper challenges that assumption by examining the gap between the mathematical models that underpin modern finance and the behavioral realities of how financial decisions are actually made — by professionals and by ordinary participants alike. Drawing on a primary research component involving structured interviews with academics from CUNEF Universidad (Madrid), Universitat Pompeu Fabra (Barcelona), Lincoln University, and the Gulf University for Science and Technology, as well as observational data gathered through the author's experience founding and leading a school Investment and Trading Club with over 30 members, conducting financial literacy workshops for 250+ participants, and publishing a finance research blog with readership spanning 15 countries, this paper argues that mathematical literacy in finance is necessary but not sufficient for sound decision-making. The paper reviews key mathematical frameworks — probability theory, stochastic calculus, and optimisation — documents the systematic ways in which real-world behavior diverges from model predictions, and examines the implications of artificial intelligence for the interpretability of financial systems. It concludes with a discussion of alternative financial architectures, with particular reference to Islamic finance, and with recommendations for how financial education must evolve to bridge the gap between formal theory and practical judgment.

Keywords: financial decision-making, quantitative finance, behavioral economics, market efficiency, machine learning, Islamic finance, financial literacy

1. Introduction

The question of why people make poor financial decisions — not just uninformed people, but educated, motivated, and analytically capable people — has occupied economists and psychologists for decades. It is also a question I encountered not in a lecture hall but in practice, in the process of building and running a student investment club at my school in Surat, India.

When the club launched, the initial response was striking. Students were eager — sending follow-up emails, attending sessions, asking to participate. Many had read about markets and had formed strong opinions about where to invest. And yet, when given a simulated portfolio and the freedom to manage it, the errors that followed were remarkably consistent. Students over-trusted AI-generated analysis without verifying the sources behind it. They made decisions based on recent price movement rather than fundamental assessment. They confused confidence with competence. The students who performed best were not necessarily those who had read the most — they were the ones who could sit with uncertainty, question their assumptions, and revise their thinking when new information arrived.

This observation — that financial knowledge and financial judgment are not the same thing — is the animating question of this paper. It is a question that sits at the intersection of mathematics, psychology, and institutional design. And it is one that has become more, not less, urgent as artificial intelligence introduces new tools for financial prediction that are powerful but not always well understood by the people using them.

This paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews the mathematical foundations of modern finance. Section 3 examines the gap between theoretical models and real-world application. Section 4 addresses the behavioral dimensions of financial decision-making, drawing on both academic literature and primary observational data. Section 5 considers the role of artificial intelligence and its limitations. Section 6 introduces the alternative mathematical framework of Islamic finance. Section 7 concludes with implications for financial education and future research.

2. Mathematical Foundations of Modern Finance

Finance is, at its core, a discipline concerned with decision-making under uncertainty. Mathematics is what allows that uncertainty to be quantified, modeled, and — to a degree — managed. Without the mathematical infrastructure of probability theory, stochastic calculus, and optimisation, modern financial markets as they currently function would be impossible.

2.1 Probability Theory and Risk Quantification

Probability theory provides the foundational language for quantifying risk. Asset returns are modeled as random variables with associated probability distributions. The expected return and variance of those returns form the basis of portfolio selection, option pricing, and risk management frameworks (Ross, 1976; Markowitz, 1952).

However, a foundational assumption embedded in many standard models — that asset returns follow a normal distribution — is empirically problematic. Real markets exhibit fat tails: extreme events occur with far greater frequency than a normal distribution predicts. Mandelbrot (1963) documented this decades before it became widely acknowledged in practice, and Taleb (2007) popularized the concept of "Black Swan" events — high-impact, low-probability occurrences that standard probability models systematically underestimate. The 2008 global financial crisis illustrated this failure at scale: models assigned negligible probability to events that then occurred with devastating consequences (Brunnermeier, 2009).

2.2 Stochastic Calculus and Price Dynamics

The modeling of how prices evolve through time requires tools beyond static probability. Stochastic differential equations, underpinned by Ito calculus, model asset prices as continuous-time diffusion processes that incorporate both deterministic drift and random volatility. The Black-Scholes-Merton model (1973), derived from a partial differential equation under assumptions of continuous trading and constant volatility, provides a tractable closed-form solution for European option prices and remains the benchmark against which more sophisticated models are measured.

The limitations of the Black-Scholes framework are well-documented: implied volatility surfaces in real markets are not flat, as the model assumes, but exhibit systematic skew and term structure. Practitioners routinely adjust model outputs using market-observed parameters — a practice known as "volatility surface calibration" — acknowledging that the model is an approximation that must be continuously corrected against reality (Hull, 2017).

2.3 Optimisation and Portfolio Construction

Markowitz's mean-variance framework (1952) established optimisation as the central tool of investment management. The mathematical problem — minimizing portfolio variance for a given expected return — is a quadratic programming problem with well-developed solution methods. Extensions including the Capital Asset Pricing Model (Sharpe, 1964), factor models

(Fama & French, 1993), and risk-parity approaches have built substantially on this foundation.

More recent work on connectedness-based portfolio construction offers an alternative risk measure rooted in network theory. Rather than minimizing variance, the minimum connectedness portfolio minimizes the transmission of shocks between portfolio constituents — offering a more systemic view of risk that is particularly relevant in periods of market stress (Diebold & Yilmaz, 2014). Research in this area has practical implications for retail investors, who cannot rebalance daily due to transaction costs but may use connectedness signals as early indicators of elevated systemic fragility.

2.4 The Toolkit in Practice

The breadth of mathematical tools in finance is often underappreciated. A professor of quantitative finance interviewed for this research identified the foundational disciplines as probability theory, differential equations, functional analysis, and numerical analysis — noting that "mathematics is the basis. No other way." Different financial problems draw on different parts of this toolkit: network models for systemic risk, game theory for strategic interaction between market participants, simulation methods for scenario analysis under complex dependencies. The mathematics follows the question.

3. The Gap Between Mathematical Models and Financial Reality

The existence of rigorous mathematical frameworks does not guarantee that financial decisions will be well-made. Models are approximations. They are built on assumptions that hold under certain conditions and fail under others. The distance between the model and the reality it represents is not a flaw to be eventually corrected — it is a permanent feature of the problem.

A quantitative finance professor interviewed for this paper articulated this directly from professional experience: "You have to adapt theory every day in real practice. Models cannot be used directly." This observation captures something that formal training in finance often obscures: the most important competency in applied mathematical finance is not the ability to construct models, but the judgment to know when they can be trusted and when they must be overridden.

The 2008 financial crisis is the most consequential recent demonstration of this gap. Collateralized debt obligations were priced using models that assumed low correlation between regional US housing markets. When that assumption failed — when housing prices across different regions fell together rather than independently — the models produced outputs that bore no relationship to actual risk. The mathematics was internally consistent. The model of the world it encoded was not (Brunnermeier, 2009; Gorton, 2010).

This dynamic is visible at much smaller scales as well. In the Investment and Trading Club I founded and have led for over a year, a consistent pattern emerged among student participants: those who placed the greatest confidence in quantitative signals — particularly AI-generated analysis — performed the worst when market conditions shifted. The analysis they relied on was often accurate as a description of past patterns. It was less reliable as a guide to future behavior, particularly when those patterns were disrupted. Students who performed well were those who treated quantitative outputs as one input among several, not as a definitive answer.

Kahneman (2011) describes this as the difference between "inside view" thinking — relying on the specific details of a model or situation — and "outside view" thinking — anchoring judgments in base rates and historical distributions. Effective financial judgment requires the capacity to move between both, and to recognize which is more reliable in a given context.

4. Behavioral Dimensions of Financial Decision-Making

If mathematical models describe how rational agents should make financial decisions, behavioral finance documents the systematic ways in which real agents deviate from that ideal. These deviations are not random. They follow predictable patterns rooted in cognitive architecture that evolved for environments very different from modern financial markets (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008).

4.1 Overconfidence and the Illusion of Informational Edge

Overconfidence is among the most robust findings in financial behavioral research. Investors systematically overestimate the precision of their forecasts and the uniqueness of their information. The Efficient Market Hypothesis (Fama, 1970) — which holds that asset prices fully and instantly reflect all publicly available information — implies that consistent risk-adjusted outperformance through public information is not achievable. Yet retail

investors routinely act as though they possess a unique analytical advantage.

This pattern was directly observable in the trading competition I organised at my school, in which over 200 students participated managing simulated portfolios. The most common error was not inadequate analysis — it was excessive confidence in incomplete analysis. Students would identify a single positive signal and construct a large position around it, without adequately accounting for counterarguments or downside scenarios. The students who avoided this error were typically those who had internalized the concept of market efficiency — who understood that if a signal is obvious to them, it is likely already reflected in the price.

4.2 Misconceptions About Risk Instruments

A second behavioral pattern, observed in a different context, concerns the systematic misunderstanding of financial risk instruments. In financial literacy workshops I co-conducted for school teachers and support staff — reaching over 250 participants across two sessions — the most consistent misconception encountered was the conflation of stock market participation and insurance products with gambling.

Participants frequently expressed the view that investing in equities was equivalent to gambling, and that insurance products were inherently exploitative. These beliefs, while understandable given genuine experiences with financial fraud and misselling, led to financially suboptimal behavior: avoiding equity exposure entirely, declining insurance coverage, and keeping savings in low-yield or no-yield instruments. The law of large numbers — which underpins the mathematics of insurance — was not a familiar concept. Once explained, it substantially shifted participants' understanding of why insurance is mathematically rational even when individual claims are never made.

This finding is consistent with broader research on financial literacy. Lusardi and Mitchell (2014) document that basic financial literacy — understanding compound interest, inflation, and risk diversification — is associated with substantially better financial outcomes across populations. The gap is not in access to information but in the conceptual frameworks needed to evaluate it.

4.3 The Role of Behavioral Finance in Research

In conversations conducted for this research, multiple academics identified behavioral finance as the most practically important development in financial economics over the past four decades. The insight that financial decisions are shaped not only by information and

incentives but by cognitive architecture — by the way human minds process uncertainty, loss, and probability — has fundamentally changed how researchers and practitioners think about markets.

Prospect theory (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979) demonstrated that people evaluate outcomes relative to a reference point rather than in absolute terms, and that losses are felt approximately twice as strongly as equivalent gains. This asymmetry generates systematic patterns: investors hold losing positions too long (to avoid realizing a loss) and exit winning positions too early (to lock in a gain). These patterns are not eliminated by education or experience — they are features of human cognition that must be actively managed rather than expected to disappear.

5. Artificial Intelligence: Predictive Power and Interpretability

The integration of machine learning into financial services has accelerated dramatically in the past decade. Algorithms perform credit scoring, fraud detection, portfolio optimisation, and high-frequency trading at speeds and scales that human teams cannot match. These capabilities represent genuine advances over previous methods in many specific domains.

However, machine learning introduces a specific challenge that is particularly acute in finance: the tension between predictive accuracy and interpretability. A neural network may predict credit default with high accuracy without generating any explanation of the economic mechanisms driving that prediction. It identifies patterns. It does not construct causal models. In a regulated environment — where credit decisions must be explainable, auditable, and defensible — this opacity is a significant operational and legal constraint.

Dr. Sadeq Damrah, Assistant Professor of Applied Mathematics and Islamic Finance at the Gulf University for Science and Technology, identifies this as one of the central unresolved challenges in the field: "More prediction does not always mean better financial understanding. One of the big open questions is how to combine AI accuracy with interpretability, fairness, robustness, and economic meaning."

This concern is not merely theoretical. In the Investment and Trading Club context, the most significant behavioral error observed among student participants was the uncritical application of AI-generated analysis. Students would receive an AI-generated summary of a company's prospects and treat it as authoritative, without evaluating the sources underlying

the analysis or the assumptions embedded in it. AI tools aggregate and synthesize information efficiently, but they do not independently verify sources, they can reflect the biases present in their training data, and they lack the contextual judgment that experienced human analysts develop over time. The outputs are useful starting points. They are not substitutes for original thinking.

The most productive direction for AI in finance is likely not replacement of mathematical models but integration with them. Hybrid approaches — combining the interpretability and economic grounding of classical models with the pattern-recognition capacity of machine learning — are an active research frontier. Specific applications include behavioral finance combined with ML pattern recognition, network models of financial contagion informed by epidemiological mathematics, and natural language processing applied to the analysis of earnings calls and regulatory filings (Dixon, Halperin & Bilokon, 2020).

6. Alternative Mathematical Frameworks: The Case of Islamic Finance

The mathematical structure of conventional finance is not the only possible mathematical structure for a financial system. It reflects specific assumptions about how risk, value, and obligation should be allocated — assumptions rooted in a debt-based, interest-bearing architecture that has been dominant in Western financial systems for several centuries. Islamic finance offers a substantively different set of foundational principles, and with them, a different mathematical structure.

The prohibition of *riba* — broadly translated as interest or usury — eliminates the standard debt instrument as a primary financing mechanism. In its place, Islamic finance employs structures built on asset-backing, profit-and-loss sharing (*mudarabah* and *musharakah*), and risk-sharing between counterparties. Financing is linked more directly to real economic activity rather than to the time-value of money in isolation (Iqbal & Mirakhor, 2011).

As Dr. Damrah explains: "Islamic finance is not only about making financial transactions work, but about making them work within ethical and legal principles. The prohibition of interest means money itself should not generate a guaranteed return just by being lent. Instead, Islamic finance emphasizes asset-backing, profit-and-loss sharing, risk-sharing, and avoidance of excessive uncertainty or speculation. This changes the structure of the financial system: financing is linked more directly to real economic activity, contracts, and shared business outcomes."

From a mathematical standpoint, this creates genuinely different optimisation problems. In a risk-sharing system, the mathematical relationship between return and risk is structured around shared outcomes rather than fixed obligations. The pricing of sukuk (Islamic bonds) requires mathematical frameworks that differ from conventional bond pricing precisely because the cash flows are tied to the performance of underlying assets rather than to a predetermined interest rate (Jobst, 2007).

The mathematical modeling of Islamic finance instruments — particularly in the context of risk-sharing under uncertainty — represents a relatively underexplored research area. Questions about how to model profit-and-loss sharing optimally, how to price risk in the absence of interest-based benchmarks, and how to construct Islamic finance portfolios that achieve mean-variance efficiency within their constraints are live research problems with both theoretical and practical significance.

7. Conclusion and Future Directions

This paper has argued that the mathematics of finance and the practice of financial decision-making are related but distinct. Mathematical literacy is necessary — without it, the instruments and risks of modern financial markets are opaque. But it is not sufficient. The history of financial crises is, in significant part, a history of mathematically sophisticated participants making poor decisions because they confused the map for the territory: because they trusted models beyond the conditions those models were designed for.

The behavioral evidence is clear: cognitive biases systematically distort financial judgment in ways that formal training does not reliably correct. The AI evidence adds a further complication: as predictive tools become more powerful, the risk of uncritical over-reliance on those tools — without understanding their assumptions or their failure modes — grows correspondingly.

The experience of working directly with students learning to invest, and with adults encountering formal financial concepts for the first time, has reinforced a conclusion that the academic literature supports: financial literacy must be reconceived. It is not primarily about knowing which instruments exist or how to read a balance sheet. It is about developing the judgment to evaluate models, question assumptions, and recognize the limits of one's own knowledge. These are habits of mind, not bodies of information. They are developed through practice, reflection, and exposure to real decisions — not through passive instruction.

Future research directions suggested by this work include: the development of interpretable machine learning frameworks specifically designed for retail financial decision support; empirical studies of behavioral deviation from model predictions across different financial literacy levels; the mathematical modeling of risk-sharing structures in Islamic finance; and the application of network contagion models to the study of how financial stress propagates through interconnected systems. Each of these directions sits at the intersection of rigorous mathematics and practical human behavior — which is, ultimately, where the most important questions in finance have always lived.

References

- Black, F., & Scholes, M. (1973). The pricing of options and corporate liabilities. *Journal of Political Economy*, 81(3), 637–654.
- Brunnermeier, M. K. (2009). Deciphering the liquidity and credit crunch 2007–2008. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 23(1), 77–100.
- Damrah, S. (2025). Personal communication. Structured interview conducted for primary research component of this paper.
- Diebold, F. X., & Yilmaz, K. (2014). On the network topology of variance decompositions: Measuring the connectedness of financial firms. *Journal of Econometrics*, 182(1), 119–134.
- Dixon, M. F., Halperin, I., & Bilokon, P. (2020). *Machine Learning in Finance: From Theory to Practice*. Springer.
- Fama, E. F. (1970). Efficient capital markets: A review of theory and empirical work. *Journal of Finance*, 25(2), 383–417.
- 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.
- Gorton, G. B. (2010). *Slapped by the Invisible Hand: The Panic of 2007*. Oxford University Press.
- Hull, J. C. (2017). *Options, Futures, and Other Derivatives* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Iqbal, Z., & Mirakhor, A. (2011). *An Introduction to Islamic Finance: Theory and Practice* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
- Jobst, A. A. (2007). The economics of Islamic finance and securitization. *Journal of Structured Finance*, 13(1), 6–27.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–291.
- Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2014). The economic importance of financial literacy: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 52(1), 5–44.
- Mandelbrot, B. (1963). The variation of certain speculative prices. *Journal of Business*, 36(4), 394–419.
- Markowitz, H. (1952). Portfolio selection. *Journal of Finance*, 7(1), 77–91.
- Merton, R. C. (1973). Theory of rational option pricing. *Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science*, 4(1), 141–183.
- Ross, S. A. (1976). The arbitrage theory of capital asset pricing. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 13(3), 341–360.
- Sharpe, W. F. (1964). Capital asset prices: A theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk. *Journal of Finance*, 19(3), 425–442.

Shiller, R. J. (2000). *Irrational Exuberance*. Princeton University Press.

Taleb, N. N. (2007). *The Black Swan: The Impact of the Highly Improbable*. Random House.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. Yale University Press.

Anonymous Professor of Quantitative Finance, Universitat Pompeu Fabra. (2025). Personal communication. Structured interview conducted for primary research component of this paper.

Anonymous Senior Lecturer in Finance. (2025). Personal communication. Structured interview conducted for primary research component of this paper.