INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE HUMANITY & MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

ISSN (print) 2833-2172, ISSN (online) 2833-2180

Volume 05 Issue 01 January 2026

DOI: 10.58806/ijsshmr.2026v5i1n13, Impact Factor: 6.79

Page No. 104-112

Factors Influencing Risk Appetite in Stock Market Investment among Young Investors: A Theoretical Review

Thi Hien Luong Le[1], Khanh Linh Nguyen[2], Huyen Nhung Nguyen[3]

[1,2,3]Student at College of Economics, Vinh University

ABSTRACT: This study synthesizes theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence regarding the risk appetite of young investors in the stock market within the contemporary digital landscape. Drawing upon classical finance theories, behavioral finance perspectives, and technology acceptance models, the paper demonstrates that risk appetite is not a fixed personal trait but rather a dynamic, context-dependent construct shaped by the interaction of cognitive, emotional, and technological forces. The review indicates that younger cohorts, such as Millennials and Generation Z, tend to exhibit higher risk acceptance due to longer investment horizons and their proficiency with financial technology (Fintech). However, the research also highlights the dual nature of financial knowledge and the "gamification" features of trading platforms, which can amplify overconfidence and impulsive investment behaviors. The paper proposes an integrative behavioral–technological perspective and emphasizes the need for future longitudinal studies to track the evolution of risk appetite across different market cycles to support effective policy-making and financial education.

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid diffusion of financial technology (Fintech) has fundamentally altered how individuals engage with the stock market, particularly for younger demographics. Research on young investors in financial markets commonly distinguishes Millennials and Generation Z as distinct yet closely related generational cohorts whose financial behaviors are shaped by their socio-economic and technological environments. Millennials are generally defined as individuals born between 1981 and 1996, whereas Generation Z comprises those born from approximately 1997 onward. Together, these cohorts typically span late adolescence to the mid-thirties and represent a rapidly expanding segment of stock market participants, particularly in emerging economies (Antwi & Naanwaab, 2022).

Compared with older generations, young investors tend to enter financial markets earlier in their life cycle, often before accumulating substantial wealth or long-term investment experience—a pattern facilitated by the widespread availability of digital financial technologies. In this digitalized landscape, understanding "risk appetite"—the level of uncertainty an investor is willing to accept—becomes critical. However, the literature emphasizes that the imprecise use of terms like risk appetite and risk tolerance often leads to ambiguity in empirical interpretations. Establishing clear definitions is essential for aligning theoretical arguments with actual investment behavior (Grable, 2000; Grable & Lytton, 1999).

Classical finance theories, such as Expected Utility Theory, assume that these young investors act as rational agents seeking to maximize returns. Yet, behavioral finance suggests a different reality, where psychological biases significantly influence decisions (Shiller, 2003). Young investors are often susceptible to "irrational exuberance" and herding behavior, especially in volatile markets (Shiller, 2015; Nguyễn & Lê, 2017). Furthermore, the "normal people" described in modern behavioral finance may exhibit overconfidence, leading to excessive trading (Statman, 2014; Phan Trần Trung Dũng, 2020).

This paper aims to provide a theoretical review of the factors influencing the risk appetite of these cohorts. By synthesizing traditional models with behavioral insights and the impact of Fintech, the study offers a comprehensive framework for understanding the unique financial behavior of Generation Z and Millennials (Pokharel & Maharjan, 2024). Ultimately, this review contributes to better financial education and policy-making for a new generation of digital investors.

2. FUNDAMENTAL DEFINITIONS

2.1. Young Investors

A rigorous examination of risk appetite in stock market investment requires a clear and consistent conceptual framework, as prior studies have documented substantial variation in how closely related constructs—such as risk appetite, risk tolerance, and financial behavior—are defined and operationalized. The literature repeatedly emphasizes that the interchangeable or imprecise use of these

concepts often leads to ambiguity and inconsistent empirical interpretations, particularly when comparing findings across studies that rely on different theoretical perspectives or measurement instruments (Grable, 2000; Grable & Lytton, 1999). While some strands of research integrate behavioral finance theories with demographic or generational cohort analysis to explain how risk attitudes differ across age groups, other studies adopt a more focused approach by examining specific determinants such as financial literacy or the use of financial technology. Establishing clear and consistent definitions is therefore essential for aligning theoretical arguments with empirical evidence on risk-related investment behavior.

Research on young investors in financial markets commonly distinguishes Millennials and Generation Z as distinct yet closely related generational cohorts whose financial behaviors are shaped by their socio-economic and technological environments. Millennials are generally defined as individuals born between 1981 and 1996, whereas Generation Z comprises those born from approximately 1997 onward. Together, these cohorts typically span late adolescence to the mid-thirties and represent a rapidly expanding segment of stock market participants, particularly in emerging economies (Antwi & Naanwaab, 2022). Compared with older generations, young investors tend to enter financial markets earlier in their life cycle, often before accumulating substantial wealth or long-term investment experience—a pattern facilitated by the widespread availability of digital financial technologies.

Empirical evidence confirms that both Generation Z and Millennials exhibit distinctive patterns of financial decision-making shaped by their generational contexts. In a recent empirical study conducted in Nepal, Pokharel and Maharjan (2024) analyze the financial behavior of Generation Z and Millennials and demonstrate that both risk tolerance and financial literacy exert significant influences on overall financial behavior, including investment-related decisions. Their findings reveal meaningful differences between the two cohorts in levels of financial literacy, attitudes, and ethical considerations, which in turn affect how they engage with financial markets. Importantly, the study shows that risk tolerance has a statistically significant effect on financial behavior for both generations, underscoring the central role of individuals' willingness to accept uncertainty in shaping investment decisions.

Consistent with these findings, broader empirical research on generational investment behavior suggests that Generation Z's risk tolerance interacts with technological factors, financial attitudes, and socio-economic conditions to influence investment preferences. Antwi and Naanwaab (2022), for example, document significant generational differences in financial risk tolerance and ownership of financial securities, showing that younger cohorts display distinct risk-taking profiles relative to older investors. These differences are partly attributed to variations in financial knowledge, access to digital tools, and exposure to financial markets at earlier stages of life.

Such behavioral patterns can be partially explained by the distinctive psychological and technological environments in which young investors develop. As digital natives, Generation Z and Millennials have grown up with extensive access to the internet, mobile applications, and online trading platforms, which shape how they acquire information, execute trades, and perceive financial risk. Empirical evidence indicates that early exposure to digital financial technologies lowers entry barriers to market participation and emphasizes convenience and speed of execution, while simultaneously increasing exposure to complex and higher-risk financial instruments (Antwi & Naanwaab, 2022).

Importantly, the empirical literature demonstrates that young investors' risk-related attitudes are not static traits but evolve through interaction with contextual factors such as financial literacy, digital literacy, and prevailing behavioral norms. Pokharel and Maharjan (2024) report a positive relationship between financial literacy, risk tolerance, and overall financial behavior among both Generation Z and Millennials, suggesting that greater understanding of financial concepts is associated with more active engagement in investment activities. These findings reinforce the view that risk appetite among young investors is a dynamic construct shaped by both individual capabilities and the broader technological and institutional environment.

2.2. Stock Market Investment Behavior

Stock market investment behavior refers to the set of cognitive, emotional, and procedural processes through which individuals allocate financial resources to equity securities under conditions of uncertainty with the expectation of future returns. This behavior extends beyond the mechanical act of trading and encompasses information acquisition, interpretation of market signals, risk assessment, portfolio construction, and post-investment evaluation. Behavioral finance research emphasizes that even when investors have access to extensive information, decision-making is shaped by subjective beliefs, psychological biases, and emotional responses rather than purely rational calculation (Barberis & Thaler, 2003; Statman, 2014).

A well-established distinction in the literature is that between investment and speculation. Investment is typically associated with long-term horizons, reliance on fundamental analysis, and diversification strategies aimed at sustainable value creation and risk management. In contrast, speculation focuses on short-term price movements and often relies on technical indicators, market sentiment, or collective behavior rather than intrinsic value (De Long et al., 1990; Shiller, 2003). Empirical evidence shows that speculative trading becomes more prevalent in environments characterized by high uncertainty, rapid information diffusion, and strong social influence.

Among young and retail investors, these two approaches frequently coexist. Empirical studies indicate that limited market experience, combined with high information intensity and easy access to online trading platforms, can blur the boundary between disciplined long-term investment and short-term speculative trading. Barber and Odean (2001) demonstrate that individual investors

tend to trade excessively and underperform market benchmarks, a pattern commonly attributed to overconfidence and speculative behavior rather than informed investment decisions. This tendency is particularly pronounced among newer market participants who may lack experience in navigating market downturns.

Importantly, stock market investment behavior inherently takes place under conditions of uncertainty, where future prices and returns cannot be predicted with certainty even in the presence of abundant information. As a result, behavioral factors such as emotions, heuristics, and social influence play a central role in shaping observed decisions. Prospect Theory highlights how investors evaluate gains and losses asymmetrically, leading to context-dependent risk-taking behavior (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979). In this context, risk appetite emerges as a key explanatory construct for understanding why investors facing similar information and market conditions may adopt markedly different investment strategies.

2.3. Risk Appetite, Risk Tolerance, and Risk Preference

Risk appetite is a central construct in financial decision-making, yet it is frequently conflated with related concepts such as risk tolerance and risk preference. In the financial planning and behavioral finance literature, risk appetite generally refers to the degree of uncertainty an individual is willing to accept in pursuit of expected returns, reflecting a subjective willingness to bear potential losses rather than an objective financial capacity to do so (Grable, 2000). As such, risk appetite captures an attitudinal dimension of decision-making that is sensitive to perception and context.

Risk tolerance, by contrast, is typically conceptualized as a relatively stable personal trait representing an individual's general comfort level with risk across situations. Risk preference refers more narrowly to the ordering of risky versus risk-free alternatives within a given choice set (Grable & Lytton, 1999). While these constructs are related, risk appetite differs from both in its adaptive and situational nature. It may vary over time and across market conditions, decision frames, and emotional states, even when underlying risk tolerance remains relatively stable.

A further important distinction is that between objective risk capacity and subjective risk attitude. Objective risk capacity is determined by measurable economic factors such as income, wealth, liabilities, and investment horizon. Subjective risk attitude, in contrast, reflects individual perceptions, beliefs, and emotional responses to uncertainty. Behavioral research demonstrates that subjective perceptions of risk often diverge from objective risk measures and exert a stronger influence on actual decision-making (Weber, Blais, & Betz, 2002).

Empirical evidence suggests that subjective risk attitudes frequently dominate objective constraints, particularly among younger investors. Dohmen et al. (2011) show that individual risk attitudes, measured through self-assessment, are robust predictors of economic behavior and remain influential even after controlling for income and wealth. This implies that individuals with limited financial capacity may still exhibit high risk-taking behavior if their subjective risk attitudes favor uncertainty. Such findings are consistent with behavioral asset-pricing models that emphasize context-dependent risk attitudes shaped by reference points and past experiences (Barberis, Huang, & Santos, 2001).

The dynamic and context-sensitive nature of risk appetite therefore makes it especially relevant for analyzing the investment behavior of young investors, whose financial identities, experience levels, and perceptions of risk are still evolving. Unlike older investors with established portfolios and stable reference points, younger investors are more likely to adjust their willingness to take risk in response to changing market conditions, technological environments, and personal learning experiences.

3. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS RELATED TO RISK APPETITE

3.1. Classical Finance Theories

3.1.1. Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT)

Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT), originally developed by Markowitz (1952), represents one of the most influential frameworks in classical finance for understanding risk and return. At its core, MPT assumes that investors are rational agents who seek to maximize expected returns for a given level of risk or, equivalently, minimize risk for a given level of expected return. Risk is conceptualized as the variance or standard deviation of portfolio returns, and diversification is presented as the primary mechanism for reducing unsystematic risk.

Within the MPT framework, risk appetite is implicitly defined by the investor's position along the efficient frontier. Investors with higher risk appetite select portfolios with greater expected returns and higher variance, while more risk-averse investors choose portfolios closer to the minimum-variance point. Importantly, MPT assumes that investors possess sufficient information and analytical capability to evaluate risk-return trade-offs objectively.

Applied to young investors, MPT provides a normative benchmark for rational risk-taking. Financial knowledge plays a critical role in this framework, as understanding diversification and covariance structures enables investors to accept risk in a calculated manner rather than avoiding it altogether (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014). However, empirical observations suggest that many young investors deviate from MPT prescriptions, often holding under-diversified portfolios or concentrating on high-volatility stocks. These deviations highlight the limitations of MPT in explaining real-world behavior, particularly when psychological and technological factors are present.

3.1.2. Expected Utility Theory

Expected Utility Theory (EUT), formalized by von Neumann and Morgenstern (1944), provides a foundational model for decision-making under uncertainty. According to EUT, individuals evaluate risky choices by comparing the expected utility of different outcomes, weighted by their probabilities. Risk attitudes are captured through the curvature of the utility function: concave utility functions represent risk aversion, linear functions indicate risk neutrality, and convex functions imply risk-seeking behavior.

Within this framework, risk appetite is treated as a stable preference parameter inherent to the individual. Investors with higher risk appetite derive relatively more utility from uncertain outcomes and are therefore more willing to engage in risky investments. EUT has been widely used to model portfolio choice and asset allocation decisions.

Despite its theoretical elegance, EUT has been criticized for its strong assumptions of consistency, rationality, and stable preferences. In practice, young investors often display context-dependent risk attitudes that fluctuate with market sentiment, recent gains or losses, and social influence. Such behavior challenges the notion of a fixed utility function and suggests that risk appetite may be more dynamic than classical models assume (Grable, 2000).

3.2. Behavioral Finance Theories

Behavioral finance emerged as a response to the empirical anomalies that classical theories failed to explain. By integrating insights from psychology, behavioral finance emphasizes the role of cognitive biases, emotions, and social factors in financial decision-making.

3.2.1. Prospect Theory

Prospect Theory, developed by Kahneman and Tversky (1979), fundamentally reshaped the understanding of risk behavior. Unlike Expected Utility Theory, Prospect Theory posits that individuals evaluate outcomes relative to a reference point rather than in absolute terms. Losses are perceived more intensely than equivalent gains, a phenomenon known as loss aversion.

This framework has profound implications for risk appetite. Individuals tend to be risk-averse in the domain of gains but risk-seeking in the domain of losses. For young investors, this asymmetry helps explain why periods of market downturn may trigger aggressive risk-taking behaviors, such as doubling down on losing positions, rather than conservative retrenchment. Prospect Theory thus highlights the situational and emotional nature of risk appetite, which varies depending on recent experiences and perceived reference points.

3.2.2. Overconfidence and Illusion of Control

Overconfidence is one of the most extensively documented biases in behavioral finance. It refers to the tendency of individuals to overestimate their knowledge, predictive ability, or control over outcomes (Barber & Odean, 2001). The illusion of control further reinforces this bias by creating the perception that one can influence inherently random processes.

Empirical studies consistently show that overconfident investors trade more frequently, take larger positions, and exhibit higher risk appetite than their less confident counterparts. Among young investors, overconfidence is often amplified by partial financial knowledge and early success in favorable market conditions (Sunarko & Sutrisno, 2025). This dynamic can lead to excessive risk-taking and suboptimal performance, especially when market conditions reverse.

3.2.3. Herding Behavior and Social Influence

Herding behavior refers to the tendency of investors to mimic the actions of others rather than relying on their own information or analysis. Social influence plays a particularly strong role in shaping risk appetite, as observing peers engage in risky investments can normalize or even glorify such behavior (Beck et al., 2023).

For young investors, digital communities and social trading platforms intensify herding effects. The fear of missing out (FOMO) can push individuals to accept higher levels of risk in order to participate in perceived collective opportunities. From a theoretical standpoint, herding illustrates how risk appetite can be socially constructed rather than individually determined.

3.3. Technology Acceptance and Risk Behavior

3.3.1. Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), proposed by Davis (1989), explains user adoption of technology through two key beliefs: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. While TAM was originally developed in the context of information systems, it has been widely applied to financial technology adoption.

In investment contexts, TAM suggests that when trading platforms are perceived as useful and easy to use, individuals are more likely to engage with them frequently. This increased engagement has behavioral consequences. Reduced cognitive and procedural barriers lower the psychological threshold for taking action, thereby facilitating faster and potentially riskier decision-making (Chen et al., 2024).

3.3.2. Fintech as a Behavioral Environment

Beyond adoption, Fintech functions as a behavioral environment that actively shapes investor psychology. Features such as real-time price updates, visual analytics, and gamified interfaces influence attention, emotion, and perceived risk. For young investors, these design elements can enhance engagement but also desensitize users to losses and volatility (Beck et al., 2023).

From this perspective, Fintech does not merely transmit information; it frames risk and reward in ways that can systematically alter risk appetite. Easy access to leverage, rapid execution, and constant feedback loops can amplify both confidence and risk-taking tendencies.

3.4. Integrative Behavioral–Technological Perspective

Taken together, classical finance, behavioral finance, and technology acceptance theories suggest that risk appetite is not a fixed individual trait but an adaptive outcome shaped by cognitive, emotional, and environmental factors. While classical theories provide normative benchmarks for rational risk-taking, behavioral theories explain deviations from these benchmarks, and technology-focused frameworks highlight how digital environments intensify or modify behavioral tendencies.

For young investors, the interaction between financial knowledge and Fintech is particularly salient. Knowledge can enable calculated risk-taking consistent with MPT, but when combined with behavioral biases and technology-driven stimuli, it may also fuel overconfidence and excessive risk appetite. An integrative behavioral–technological perspective is therefore essential for understanding contemporary risk-taking behavior in stock markets, especially in digitally mediated investment environments.

4. Empirical Studies on Determinants of Risk Appetite in Stock Market Investment

Building on the theoretical foundations discussed in the previous section, a growing body of empirical literature has examined the determinants of risk appetite in stock market investment. These studies highlight that risk appetite is shaped by a complex interaction of demographic, psychological, cognitive, and technological factors. This section synthesizes key empirical findings, with particular attention to young investors and the evolving digital investment environment.

4.1. Demographic and Socio-Economic Determinants

Early empirical research on risk appetite largely focused on demographic and socio-economic characteristics. Age, gender, income, education, and investment experience have consistently been identified as significant predictors of risk tolerance and risk-taking behavior.

Age is among the most robust determinants. Numerous studies document a negative relationship between age and risk appetite, suggesting that younger investors are generally more willing to accept risk than older cohorts (Grable, 2000). This pattern is commonly explained through life-cycle considerations, where younger individuals have longer investment horizons and greater capacity to recover from losses. Empirical evidence from emerging markets further supports this view, showing that young investors tend to allocate a higher proportion of their portfolios to volatile assets such as equities (Nguyễn Thị Liên Hoa & Lê Nữ Minh Phương, 2017).

Gender differences in risk appetite have also been extensively documented. Barber and Odean (2001) provide strong evidence that male investors tend to exhibit higher risk appetite and trade more frequently than female investors, a behavior often attributed to higher levels of overconfidence. However, more recent studies suggest that gender gaps may be narrowing among younger cohorts, particularly in digitally mediated investment environments where access to information and platforms is more equalized (Beck et al., 2023).

Income and education generally exhibit a positive relationship with risk appetite, although the effects are not uniform. Higher income is associated with greater objective risk capacity, enabling individuals to bear potential losses more comfortably. Education, especially financial education, influences how individuals perceive and manage risk. Nevertheless, empirical findings indicate that among young investors, subjective perceptions often outweigh objective financial conditions, leading to risk-taking behavior that is not fully aligned with income or wealth constraints.

4.2. Psychological and Behavioral Determinants

Beyond demographic variables, psychological factors have emerged as powerful determinants of risk appetite. Behavioral finance research emphasizes that cognitive biases and emotional responses systematically shape how investors perceive and accept risk.

Overconfidence is one of the most consistently supported behavioral determinants. Empirical studies show that investors who overestimate their knowledge or predictive ability exhibit significantly higher risk appetite, engage in more frequent trading, and hold less diversified portfolios (Barber & Odean, 2001). Among young investors, overconfidence is often reinforced by limited yet positive early experiences in rising markets, creating a feedback loop that amplifies risk-taking behavior (Sunarko & Sutrisno, 2025).

Loss aversion, derived from Prospect Theory, has also been empirically validated as a determinant of asymmetric risk behavior. Studies find that investors tend to avoid risk after gains but become risk-seeking following losses, particularly when attempting to

recover previous setbacks (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979). For young investors, who may lack experience with prolonged market downturns, this behavioral asymmetry can result in abrupt shifts in risk appetite during volatile periods.

Another important behavioral factor is sensation seeking, defined as the preference for novel and intense experiences. Empirical evidence suggests that individuals with higher sensation-seeking tendencies are more likely to engage in speculative trading and accept higher levels of financial risk. This trait appears particularly salient among younger investors, who may perceive stock market participation not only as a financial activity but also as a form of challenge or excitement (Alfiyanti & Amaroh, 2024).

4.3. Financial Knowledge and Risk Appetite

The relationship between financial knowledge and risk appetite has been one of the most debated topics in empirical research. Contrary to the traditional assumption that greater knowledge leads to more conservative behavior, recent empirical studies present mixed and context-dependent findings.

Several studies support the view that financial knowledge reduces excessive risk-taking by improving risk awareness and analytical capability. Investors with higher objective financial literacy are found to diversify their portfolios more effectively and avoid extreme risk exposures (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014). From this perspective, knowledge acts as a stabilizing force, aligning behavior with rational portfolio principles.

In contrast, a growing body of empirical evidence suggests that financial knowledge can increase risk appetite, particularly among young investors. Hrulekha and Tandan (2025) find that financially literate young investors are more confident in their decision-making and more willing to allocate funds to high-risk, high-return assets. This effect is often mediated by financial self-efficacy, which strengthens the belief that risks are manageable and controllable.

Importantly, studies distinguish between objective and subjective financial knowledge. Subjective knowledge, or perceived financial competence, has been shown to exert a stronger influence on risk appetite than actual knowledge levels. Empirical research in emerging markets indicates that young investors often overestimate their financial understanding, leading to elevated risk-taking and susceptibility to behavioral biases (Phan Trần Trung Dũng, 2020). This discrepancy helps explain why similar levels of education or training can produce divergent risk behaviors across individuals.

4.4. Financial Technology and Risk Appetite

With the rapid diffusion of Fintech, empirical research has increasingly examined the role of digital platforms in shaping risk appetite. Fintech adoption is consistently associated with higher market participation and increased trading activity, particularly among young investors (Chen et al., 2024).

Empirical studies show that the ease of access provided by trading applications lowers entry barriers and reduces the psychological cost of taking action. As a result, individuals are more willing to engage in risky investments, even with limited experience or capital. Damayanti and Rafik (2025) demonstrate that perceived ease of use and accessibility significantly increase both trading frequency and willingness to use leverage.

Moreover, the design features of trading platforms have measurable behavioral effects. Gamification elements, such as visual rewards, rankings, and real-time feedback, are empirically linked to higher engagement and increased risk appetite (Beck et al., 2023). These features can normalize volatility and losses, framing them as temporary or even entertaining aspects of the investment process.

Empirical evidence also suggests that Fintech can decouple risk appetite from traditional financial constraints. Young investors with relatively low income may still exhibit high risk appetite due to the availability of fractional shares, margin trading, and automated tools. This structural shift challenges conventional assumptions about the relationship between financial capacity and risk-taking behavior.

4.5. Interaction Effects between Financial Knowledge and Fintech

Recent empirical studies increasingly emphasize the interaction between financial knowledge and Fintech. Rather than acting independently, these factors often reinforce or counterbalance each other in shaping risk appetite.

Some studies highlight complementary effects, where Fintech enhances learning-by-doing and improves financial understanding through experiential engagement (Chen et al., 2024). In such cases, technology supports informed risk-taking consistent with rational investment principles.

However, other studies reveal substitution or distortion effects. Easy-to-use platforms may encourage reliance on technological cues at the expense of analytical reasoning, particularly among investors with limited objective knowledge. When combined with high subjective confidence, this dynamic can amplify overconfidence and lead to excessive risk appetite (Sunarko & Sutrisno, 2025).

Overall, empirical findings suggest that the impact of Fintech on risk appetite is conditional on individual characteristics, especially financial knowledge and behavioral traits. This interaction underscores the need for integrative models that account for both cognitive and technological influences.

5. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This review has synthesized the major theoretical and empirical strands of literature on risk appetite in stock market investment, with particular emphasis on young investors in an increasingly digitalized financial environment. Drawing from classical finance theories, behavioral finance perspectives, and technology acceptance frameworks, the study highlights that risk appetite is neither a fixed personal trait nor solely a function of financial capacity. Instead, it emerges as a dynamic and context-dependent construct shaped by cognitive, emotional, social, and technological forces.

Classical finance theories, such as Modern Portfolio Theory and Expected Utility Theory, provide a normative benchmark for understanding rational risk-taking behavior. These frameworks conceptualize risk appetite as a stable preference parameter, derived from investors' trade-offs between risk and return (Markowitz, 1952; von Neumann & Morgenstern, 1944). However, empirical evidence reviewed in this study consistently demonstrates that actual investment behavior—particularly among young investors—often deviates from these rational predictions. Under-diversification, excessive trading, and concentration in high-volatility assets suggest that classical models alone are insufficient to explain observed patterns of risk-taking.

Behavioral finance theories offer more nuanced explanations by incorporating psychological biases and social influences. Prospect Theory illustrates how reference dependence and loss aversion lead to asymmetric risk behavior, where investors become risk-seeking after losses and risk-averse after gains (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979). Overconfidence and illusion of control further explain why investors, especially those with partial knowledge or early success, exhibit elevated risk appetite and excessive trading (Barber & Odean, 2001). Herding behavior and social influence underscore the collective dimension of risk appetite, showing that individual risk preferences can be reshaped by peer behavior and market sentiment (Beck et al., 2023).

A key contribution of this review lies in integrating the role of financial technology into the analysis of risk appetite. Empirical studies increasingly confirm that Fintech is not merely a neutral channel for executing trades but a behavioral environment that actively shapes perception and decision-making. Through ease of access, speed, and gamified interfaces, digital trading platforms can lower psychological barriers to risk-taking and amplify behavioral biases (Chen et al., 2024; Damayanti & Rafik, 2025). This effect is particularly pronounced among young investors, whose financial identities are still forming and who are more responsive to technological cues.

Another important insight emerging from the literature concerns the ambiguous role of financial knowledge. While traditional views emphasize the risk-reducing effect of financial literacy, recent empirical findings suggest that knowledge can also increase risk appetite by enhancing confidence and financial self-efficacy (Hrulekha & Tandan, 2025; Sunarko & Sutrisno, 2025). The distinction between objective and subjective financial knowledge is therefore critical. Subjective knowledge, or perceived competence, often exerts a stronger influence on risk appetite than actual understanding, helping to explain why similarly educated individuals may exhibit markedly different risk behaviors.

Taken together, the reviewed literature supports a conceptualization of risk appetite as an adaptive outcome resulting from the interaction between individual cognition, behavioral biases, social context, and technological environments. This perspective challenges static and purely demographic explanations of risk tolerance and underscores the need for integrative models that reflect the realities of contemporary, digitally mediated investing.

The findings of this review carry important implications for both academic research and practical policy design. From a research perspective, they call for a shift away from narrow, trait-based interpretations of risk appetite toward dynamic and process-oriented approaches. From a practical standpoint, the results highlight the importance of aligning financial education, platform design, and regulatory oversight to mitigate excessive risk-taking while preserving market accessibility for young investors.

Despite the growing body of literature on risk appetite in stock market investment, several important gaps remain, offering fertile ground for future research.

First, future studies should adopt dynamic and longitudinal approaches to measuring risk appetite. Most existing research relies on cross-sectional surveys and static risk tolerance scales, which fail to capture temporal fluctuations in risk attitudes. Longitudinal designs could shed light on how risk appetite evolves with market experience, gains and losses, and changing life circumstances, particularly among young investors.

Second, greater attention should be paid to the distinction between objective and subjective financial knowledge. While recent studies acknowledge this difference, empirical measurement remains inconsistent. Future research could benefit from simultaneously incorporating standardized literacy tests and self-assessed confidence measures to better understand their joint and separate effects on risk appetite.

Third, the role of Fintech warrants deeper investigation beyond adoption and usage frequency. Future studies should examine how specific design elements—such as gamification, notification systems, and algorithmic recommendations—influence cognitive processing and emotional responses. Experimental and behavioral data drawn directly from trading platforms could provide more granular insights into how technological environments shape risk behavior in real time.

Fourth, cross-cultural and comparative research remains limited, particularly in emerging markets. Much of the existing literature is concentrated in developed economies, yet the interaction between financial knowledge, technology, and risk appetite may differ

significantly across institutional and cultural contexts. Comparative studies could help identify which findings are universal and which are context-specific.

Finally, future research should explore integrative models that combine behavioral finance with insights from information systems and data science. The increasing availability of big data and machine learning tools offers new opportunities to model investor behavior more accurately and to predict risk-taking patterns at both individual and market levels. Such interdisciplinary approaches could significantly advance understanding of risk appetite in modern financial markets.

REFERENCES

1) Antwi, J., & Naanwaab, C. B. (2022). Generational differences, risk tolerance, and ownership of financial securities: Evidence from the United States. International Journal of Financial Studies, 10(2), 35. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijfs10020035
2) Banerjee, A. V. (1992). A simple model of herd behavior. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 107(3), 797–817. https://doi.org/10.2307/2118364
3) Barber, B. M., & Odean, T. (2001). Boys will be boys: Gender, overconfidence, and common stock investment. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 116(1), 261–292.https://doi.org/10.1162/003355301556400
4) Barber, B. M., & Odean, T. (2002). Online investors: Do the slow die first? The Review of Financial Studies, 15(2), 455–488.https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/15.2.455
5) Barberis, N., & Thaler, R. (2003). A survey of behavioral finance. In G. Constantinides, M. Harris, & R. Stulz (Eds.), Handbook of the Economics of Finance (Vol. 1, pp. 1053–1128). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0102(03)01027-6
6) Barberis, N., Huang, M., & Santos, T. (2001). Prospect theory and asset prices. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 116(1), 1–53. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355301556310
7) Bikhchandani, S., Hirshleifer, D., & Welch, I. (1992). A theory of fads, fashion, custom, and cultural change as informational cascades. Journal of Political Economy, 100(5), 992–1026. https://doi.org/10.1086/261849
8) Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340.https://doi.org/10.2307/249008
9) Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263–291.https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185
10) De Long, J. B., Shleifer, A., Summers, L. H., & Waldmann, R. J. (1990). Noise trader risk in financial markets. Journal of Political Economy, 98(4), 703–738. https://doi.org/10.1086/261703
11) Dohmen, T., Falk, A., Huffman, D., Sunde, U., Schupp, J., & Wagner, G. G. (2011). Individual risk attitudes: Measurement, determinants, and behavioral consequences. Journal of the European Economic Association, 9(3), 522–550. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1542-4774.2011.01015.x
12) Glaser, M., & Weber, M. (2007). Overconfidence and trading volume. The Geneva Risk and Insurance Review, 32(1), 1–36. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10713-007-0003-3
13) Grable, J. E. (2000). Financial risk tolerance and additional factors that affect risk-taking in everyday money matters. Journal of Business and Psychology, 14(4), 625–630. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022994314982
14) Grable, J. E., & Lytton, R. H. (1999). Financial risk tolerance revisited: The development of a risk assessment instrument. Financial Services Review, 8(3), 163–181. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1057-0810(99)00041-4
15) Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263–291. https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185
16) Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2014). The economic importance of financial literacy: Theory and evidence. Journal of Economic Literature, 52(1), 5–44. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.52.1.5
17) Nguyễn, T. L. H., & Lê, N. M. P. (2017). Herding behavior and investment decisions in the Vietnamese stock market. Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business, 4(3), 23–32. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2017.vol4.no3.23
18) Phan Trần Trung Dũng. (2020). Overconfidence and trading behavior of individual investors in Vietnam. Journal of Economics and Development, 22(3), 45–58.
19) Pokharel, J., & Maharjan, I. (2024). Financial behavior of Generation Z and Millennials. Journal of Emerging Management Studies, 1(2), 148–170. https://doi.org/10.3126/jems.v1i2.71522
20) 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
21) Shiller, R. J. (2015). Irrational exuberance (3rd ed.). Princeton University Press.

22) Statman, M. (2014). Behavioral finance: Finance with normal people. Borsa Istanbul Review, 14(2), 65–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bir.2014.03.001
23) Thaler, R. H., & Johnson, E. J. (1990). Gambling with the house money and trying to break even. Management Science, 36(6), 643–660. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.36.6.643
24) Weber, E. U., Blais, A.-R., & Betz, N. E. (2002). A domain-specific risk-attitude scale: Measuring risk perceptions and risk behaviors. Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 15(4), 263–290. https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.414
25) Zuckerman, M. (2007). Sensation seeking and risky behavior. American Psychological Association.