The Genetics of Investment Biases*

Henrik Cronqvist and Stephan Siegel†

This draft: August 20, 2013
First draft: September 19, 2011

Abstract

For a long list of investment "biases," including lack of diversification, excessive trading, and the disposition effect, we find that genetic differences explain up to 45% of the remaining variation across individual investors, after controlling for observable individual characteristics. The evidence is consistent with a view that investment biases are manifestations of innate and evolutionary ancient features of human behavior. We find that work experience with finance reduces genetic predispositions to investment biases. Finally, we find that even genetically identical investors, who grew up in the same family environment, often differ substantially in their investment behaviors due to individual-specific experiences or events.

*A previous version of this paper was circulated as "Why Do Individuals Exhibit Investment Biases?" We are thankful for comments from an anonymous referee as well as from seminar participants at Aalto University, Arizona State University Sonoran Winter Conference, Australian National University, BI - Norwegian Business School, California State University - Fullerton (Psychology Department), China Europe International Business School, China International Conference in Finance, 14th Congress of the International Society of Twin Studies, Copenhagen Business School, Erasmus University, Florida State University SunTrust Conference, HKUST Symposium on Household Finance, 1st Linde Institute Conference at Caltech, Maastricht University, Nanyang Technological University, NBER Conference on Household Finance at Saïd Business School at University of Oxford, National Taiwan University International Conference on Finance, Singapore Management University, Swedish Institute for Financial Research (SIFR), Tilburg University, University of Luxembourg, University of Mannheim, University of Michigan - Dearborn, University of New South Wales, University of Sydney, University of Technology Sydney, Washington University in St. Louis, Warwick Business School, Western Finance Association and for discussions with Julie Agnew, Brad Barber, Alon Brav, Colin Camerer, Jack Goldberg, David Hirshleifer, Zoran Ivković, Markku Kaustia, Matti Keloharju, Samuli Knüpfer, Lisa Kramer, Andy Lo, Annamaria Lusardi, Alexandra Niessen, Stefan Ruenzi, Mark Seasholes, Nancy Segal, Hersh Shefrin, Oliver Spalt, Per Strömberg, Meir Statman, Martin Weber, Mike Weisbach, Frank Yu, and Paul Zak. We acknowledge generous research funding from the 2011-12 Faculty Research Award of the Betty F. Elliott Initiative for Academic Excellence, College of Business, The University of Michigan - Dearborn. We thank Florian Münkel, Lucas Perin, and Lew Thorson for excellent research assistance. This project was pursued in part when Cronqvist was Olof Stenhammar Visiting Professor at SIFR, which he thanks for its support, and while Siegel was visiting W. P. Carey School of Business at Arizona State University, which he thanks for their hospitality. Statistics Sweden and the Swedish Twin Registry (STR) provided the data for this study. STR is supported by grants from the Swedish Research Council, the Ministry of Higher Education, AstraZeneca, and the National Institute of Health (grants AG08724, DK066134, and CA085739). Any errors or omissions are our own.

†Cronqvist: China Europe International Business School (hcronqvist@ceibs.edu); Siegel: Michael G. Foster School of Business; University of Washington (ss1110@uw.edu).

I Introduction

The list of investment "biases" that individual investors exhibit is long. Many investors lack diversification and have a preference for familiar investments (French and Poterba (1991) and Huberman (2001)), trade too much (Odean (1999)), are reluctant to realize their losses (Odean (1998) and Dhar and Zhu (2006)), extrapolate recent superior returns (Benartzi (2001)), and have a preference for skewness and lottery-type investments (Kumar (2009)). These behaviors have been partially attributed to various psychological mechanisms: Ambiguity aversion and familiarity for lack of diversification (Ellsberg (1961) and Heath and Tversky (1991)), overconfidence and sensation seeking for excessive trading (Griffin and Tversky (1992)), loss aversion and mental accounting for the reluctance to realize losses (Kahneman and Tversky (1979) and Thaler (1985)), representativeness and the hot hands fallacy for excessive extrapolation of past returns (Tversky and Kahneman (1974)), and cumulative prospect theory for skewness preferences (Tversky and Kahneman (1992)).[1]

While the referenced studies have shown that individual investors, on average, exhibit these investment biases, little research has been devoted to uncovering the origins of these investment biases and the differences across investors. Are investors genetically endowed with certain predispositions that manifest themselves as investment biases? Or do investors exhibit biases as a result of parenting or individual-specific experiences or events? Distinguishing between genetic and environmental sources of investment biases has potentially important implications for the extent to which education and market incentives may be expected to reduce investment biases as well as for the design of public policy (Bernheim (2009)).[2] Evidence of a significant genetic component would also provide empirical support for recent models proposing that behavioral biases could be the outcome of natural selection (e.g., Rayo and Becker (2007) and Brennan and Lo (2011)), a mechanism that requires that behaviors are at least partly genetically determined.

We use empirical methodology adopted from quantitative behavioral genetics research (see Neale and Maes (2004) for details), which has recently been used also in finance research (e.g., Cesarini

[1]Throughout the paper, we will refer to these behaviors as "biases" because they constitute non-standard preferences and beliefs from the perspective of standard models used in financial economics.

[2]It is beyond the scope of this paper to provide estimates of the potential welfare losses attributed to any of these behaviors. Some of the referenced papers provide such estimates.

et al. (2009a), Barnea, Cronqvist, and Siegel (2010), and Cesarini et al. (2010)). Our data set from the world's largest twin registry, the Swedish Twin Registry (STR), matched with detailed data on the twins' investment behaviors, enables us to decompose differences across individuals into genetic versus environmental components. This decomposition is based on an intuitive insight: Identical twins share 100% of their genes, while the average proportion of shared genes is only 50% for fraternal twins. If identical twins exhibit more similarity with respect to these investment biases than do fraternal twins, then there is evidence that these behaviors are influenced, at least in part, by genetic factors.

We can summarize our results as follows. First, for a long list of investment biases, we find that genetic differences explain up to 45% of the remaining variation across individual investors, after controlling for observable individual characteristics. Consistent with a view that investment biases are manifestations of innate and evolutionary ancient features of human behavior, we find that the genetic factors that influence investment biases also affect behaviors in other, non-investment, domains. For example, we show that the correlation between a preference for familiar stocks and familiarity preferences in other domains is due to shared genetic influences. While our results are consistent with several behavioral genetic studies that have shown significant heritability of human behavior, they provide the first direct evidence from real-world, non-experimental data that persistent investment biases are to a significant extent determined by genetic endowments. Such evidence provides support for evolutionary arguments that behaviors which manifest themselves as investment biases in today's financial markets have survived because they were advantageous in evolutionary ancient times (e.g., Rayo and Becker (2007) and Brennan and Lo (2011)).

The relative importance of genetic relative to environmental factors is found to vary across different investors. Most importantly, among investors with work experience with finance, we find a significant reduction of the relative amount of genetic variation, which is consistent with practical experience in finance moderating genetic predispositions. We cannot rule out, though, that the selection of profession reduces the relevant genetic variation in this sub-sample. Controlling for selection, we also investigate the role of general education, measured as years of educations, in moderating the relative importance of genetic factors. We do not find that general education reduces the relative importance of genetic factors in explaining investment biases.

Finally, we find that even genetically identical investors who grew up in the same family environment differ substantially in terms of their investment behaviors. Individual-specific environments, experiences, or events must therefore play an important role in shaping individuals' investment behaviors. Examining differences between investment biases of genetically identical investors, we show how genetically informed data, such as twin data used in this study, can be used to better establish the causal impact of individual-specific factors, such as education.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II is an overview of related research. Section III describes our data sources, reports summary statistics, and defines our measures of investment biases. Section IV describes our empirical methodology. Sections V and VI report our results and robustness checks. Section VII concludes and Section VIII outlines some possible directions for future research.

II Overview of Related Research

While it is beyond the scope of this paper to review the vast literature on the evolution of behavior, we note that social scientists have recently proposed that the psychological mechanisms behind the investment biases we study in this paper could be the outcome of natural selection (e.g., Rayo and Becker (2007), McDermott, Fowler, and Smirnov (2008), Brennan and Lo (2011), and Johnson and Fowler (2011)).[3] These studies argue that behaviors that represent investment biases in today's environment, such as for example a preference for familiarity or the extrapolation of trends, might have been advantageous in evolutionary ancient times, in the sense that these behaviors conferred greater "fitness", i.e. reproductive success, and therefore became more common in the population.[4] Unless such behaviors lead to a *reproductive* disadvantage in modern times, they can persist and shape individuals' investment decisions. Rayo and Becker (2007), for example, conclude (p. 304):

[3]Other models of the natural selection of preferences and human behaviors include Rogers (1994), Waldman (1994), Robson (1996), and Netzer (2009). Some of these papers explain why biases may have evolved and survived natural selection (e.g., Waldman (1994)). Some evolutionary models have appeared in financial economics research (e.g., Luo (1998) and Hirshleifer and Luo (2001)).

[4]While evolutionary models of behavioral biases offer an explanation why these biases may exist, they do not imply that all individuals exhibit these biases. In general, different behaviors can exist in a population as long as they lead to similar reproductive success.

> "[W]hen talking about fitness-maximizing [utility] functions, we refer to functions that optimized genetic multiplication during hunter-gatherer times (before agriculture and animal domestication were developed). In modern times, on the other hand, we presumably share most of the innate characteristics of our hunter-gatherer ancestors. But since the technological landscape has changed so rapidly since the rise of agriculture, our [utility] functions need no longer optimally promote the present multiplication of our genes."

A necessary condition for evolutionary models of behavioral biases is that at least some of the variation in the relevant behaviors is due to genetic differences between individuals. Before presenting our findings on the importance of genetic variation specifically with respect to investment biases, we briefly discuss the existing evidence on genetic determinants of the psychological mechanisms that underly investment biases. In Table 1, we list for each investment bias the related psychological mechanisms and report twin and gene candidate studies that relate these mechanisms to genetic variation across individuals.

<u>Diversification and Home Bias.</u> Investors often diversify their portfolios less than is recommended by standard models. For example, they overweight stocks from their home market (e.g., French and Poterba (1991)). Ambiguity aversion and familiarity (e.g., Heath and Tversky (1991) and Fox and Tversky (1995)) are potential explanations, but the home bias is not easy to explain (e.g., Lewis (1999)). The recent gene association study by Chew et al. (2011) identifies several specific genes that affect ambiguity aversion and familiarity.

<u>Turnover.</u> One important stylized facts about individual investors is that they often trade too much (e.g., Odean (1999), Barber and Odean (2000), and Barber, Lee, Liu, and Odean (2009)). Excessive trading has been found to be related to individual characteristics that are partly genetic, such as overconfidence and sensation seeking (e.g., Barber and Odean (2001) and Grinblatt and Keloharju (2009)). Twin studies have documented that both of these behaviors are partially genetic (Cesarini et al. (2009b) and Fulker et al. (1980)). More recent research links sensation seeking to specific genes (Derringer et al. (2010)).

<u>Disposition Effect.</u> Shefrin and Statman (1985) argue that investors are more likely to sell stocks with a gain than with a loss. The disposition has been linked to loss aversion, prospect theory, and narrow framing. A recent study by Zhong et al. (2009) identifies specific genes that affect the concavity and convexity of the prospect theory value function in the gain and loss domains.

Furthermore, loss aversion has been found also in animals that are genetically close to humans. Chen, Lakshminarayanan, and Santos (2006) show that capuchin monkeys exhibit loss aversion: "[L]oss aversion is an innate and evolutionarily ancient feature of human preferences, a function of decision-making systems that evolved before the common ancestors of capuchins and humans diverged" (Chen et al. (2006), p. 520). Twin studies have also documented that loss aversion is partially genetic (e.g., Cesarini et al. (2012)).

Performance Chasing. Individual investors often extrapolate recent good stock or fund performance even when it shows little to no persistence (e.g., Patel, Zeckhauser, and Hendricks (1991) and Benartzi (2001)). In their work on representativeness, Tversky and Kahneman (1974) find that people expect that a sequence of outcomes generated by a random process will resemble the essential characteristics of that process even when the sequence is short. Griffin and Tversky (1992) provide an extension documenting that people focus on the strength or extremeness of the evidence with insufficient regard of its credence, predictability, and weight. Two recent twin studies using experimental data reach opposite conclusions with respect to the genetics of representativeness (Cesarini et al. (2012) and Simonson and Sela (2011)). We are not aware of existing research that directly links excessive extrapolation to specific genes.

Skewness Preference. Investors often exhibit a preference for positive skewness, i.e., lottery-type investments (e.g., Kumar (2009)). Such behavior is expected if investors make decisions based on cumulative prospect theory (Tversky and Kahneman (1992) and Barberis and Huang (2008)). Twin studies have found that the preference to gamble are partially genetic (e.g., Slutske et al. (2000)). Furthermore, the recent gene association study by Zhong et al. (2009) finds that a specific gene results in a preference for gambles with a small probability of a very large payoff.

III Data

A Data Sources

Our data set is constructed by matching a large number of twins from the Swedish Twin Registry (STR), the world's largest twin registry, with data from individual tax filings and other databases by Statistics Sweden. In Sweden, twins are registered at birth, and the STR collects additional data through in-depth interviews.[5] Importantly, STR's data provide us with the zygosity of each twin pair: Identical or "monozygotic" (MZ) twins are genetically identical, while fraternal or "dizygotic" (DZ) twins are genetically different, and share on average 50% of their genes.[6]

Until 2007, taxpayers in Sweden were subject to a wealth tax. Prior to the abolishment of this tax, all Swedish banks, brokerage firms, and other financial institutions were required by law to report to the Swedish Tax Authority information about individuals' portfolios (i.e., stocks, bonds, mutual funds, derivatives, and other securities) held as of December 31 and also all sales transactions during the year.

We have matched the twins with portfolio and sales transaction data between 1999 and 2007, providing us with detailed information on investment behavior. For each individual, our data set contains all securities held at the end of the year (identified by each security's International Security Identification Number (ISIN)), the number of each security held, the dividends received during the year, and the end of the year value. We also have data on which securities were sold over the year, and in the case of stocks, the number of securities sold and the sales price.[7] Security level data have been collected from several sources, including Bloomberg, Datastream, Morningstar, SIX Telekurs, Standard & Poor's, and the Swedish Investment Fund Association.

B Sample Selection and Summary Statistics

We follow prior research on investment biases by analyzing equity investments, i.e., individual stocks as well as equity and mixed mutual funds, with a particular focus on individual stocks. We therefore exclude individuals who do not participate in equity markets. Our empirical methodology also

[5]STR's databases are organized by birth cohort. The Screening Across Lifespan Twin, or "SALT," database contains data on twins born 1886–1958. The Swedish Twin Studies of Adults: Genes and Environment database, or "STAGE," contains data on twins born 1959–1985. In addition to twin pairs, twin identifiers, and zygosity status, the databases contain variables based on STR's telephone interviews (for SALT), completed 1998–2002, and combined telephone interviews and Internet surveys (for STAGE), completed 2005–2006. For further details about STR, we refer to Lichtenstein et al. (2006).

[6]Zygosity is based on questions about intrapair similarities in childhood. One of the questions was: Were you and your twin partner during childhood "as alike as two peas in a pod" or were you "no more alike than siblings in general" with regard to appearance? STR has validated this method with DNA analysis as having 98 percent accuracy on a subsample of twins. For twin pairs for which DNA has been collected, zygosity status is based on DNA analysis.

[7]Sales transaction data are not available for 2001 and 2002, and we do not have the exact dates (within a given year) of any of the sales transactions in our data set.

requires that we exclude incomplete pairs of twins.

We have 15,208 adult twin pairs in which each twin has at least one year of non-missing equity investment data. Panel A of Table 2 reports summary statistics for our data set, which includes 30,416 individuals. Opposite-sex twins are the most common (37%); identical male twins are the least common (13%). The distribution in the table is consistent with what would be expected from large samples of twins (e.g., Bortolus et al. (1999)).

Table 2 Panel B reports summary statistics separately for identical and fraternal twins. Socioeconomic characteristics are averaged over those years an investor is in our data set.[8] While identical and fraternal twins are relatively similar with respect to socioeconomic characteristics, we observe substantial cross-sectional variation. We find that the average (median) investor holds about 4 (2) equity securities with a combined value of about \$20,000 (\$4,000) in the portfolio.[9] About 80% hold at least one equity mutual fund, and about 40% hold at least one stock. Finally, we have verified that the socioeconomic characteristics of the twins in our sample are similar to non-twins of the same age and gender who participate in the equity market (not tabulated).

C Measures of Investment Biases

In this subsection, we define our measures of investment behaviors. Appendix Table A1 reports detailed definitions and Table 3 reports summary statistics for direct stock holdings as well as all equity investments consisting of direct stock as well as mutual fund holdings.

For direct stock holdings, we measure *Diversification* as the number of distinct stocks held in an individual's portfolio at the end of a given year. For holdings of stocks and mutual funds, we follow Calvet et al. (2009) and define *Diversification* as the proportion of equity investments invested in mutual funds as opposed to individual stocks. To reduce measurement error, we calculate the equally weighted average *Diversification* across all years the individual is in the data set. Summary statistics in Table 3 show that the average investor with direct holdings of stocks holds about three

[8] The educational variables are based on the maximum, not an average.

[9] We use the average end-of-year exchange rate 1999-2007 of 8.0179 Swedish krona per U.S. dollar to convert summary statistics. When we estimate models in Section V, all values are in Swedish krona, i.e., not converted to dollars. In terms of size, the portfolios in our data set are comparable to those in other data sets of a broad set of individual investors. For example, in Grinblatt and Keloharju (2009) the average (median) investor holds about 2 (1) equity securities with a combined value of about EUR 24,600 (EUR 1,600) in the portfolio.

stocks, while across all investors about 70% of their equity portfolio is invested in mutual funds. The standard deviations of about 4 for the number of stocks and about 40% for the proportion invested in mutual funds are evidence of substantial cross-sectional variation.

We measure *Home Bias* by the average proportion invested in Swedish securities. Table 3 shows that for individual stocks the average home bias is 94%, but drops to about 50% once we include mutual fund investments. Cross-sectional variation exist again in both cases, with standard deviations of about 15% in case of individual stocks and 30% in case of all equity investments.

We measure *Turnover*, i.e., an individual's propensity to trade and turnover the portfolio, following Barber and Odean (2000, 2001). Specifically, for direct stock holdings, we divide, for each individual investor and year, the sales volume (in Swedish krona) during the year by the value of directly held stocks at the beginning of the year. Since we do not have sales prices for mutual funds, we also construct a turnover measure using the number of sales transactions during the year divided by the number of equity securities in the investor's portfolio at the beginning of the year. For each measure, we compute the average turnover using all years with available data.

Table 3 reports that for the average investor in our data who holds individual stocks, annual (sales) turnover is about 20%, a magnitude similar to that reported by Agnew, Balduzzi, and Sundén (2003) for a large set of retirement savings accounts in the U.S., and Grinblatt and Keloharju (2009) for a large sample of individual investors in Finland. Even though many investors in our data trade relatively little, substantial variation exists, as indicated by the cross-sectional standard deviation of about 33%. Some of the investors in our data set therefore likely trade too much, as in, e.g., Odean (1999). That is, they trade more than what is needed to rebalance their portfolios or to satisfy liquidity needs. To control for cross-sectional variation in such reasons to trade, we follow Grinblatt and Keloharju (2009) and control for socioeconomic characteristics that may correlate with rebalancing needs and liquidity demands. The remaining variation may then be considered variation in "excessive" trading.

We measure the *Disposition Effect* in the spirit of Odean (1998) and Dhar and Zhu (2006). Specifically, at the end of each year during which we observe a sales transaction, we classify securities in an investor's portfolio as winners or losers based on the security's price relative to the approximate price at which the investor acquired the security.[10] Using data across all years with sales transactions, we calculate for each investor the the proportion of gains realized to the total number of realized and unrealized gains (PGR) as well as the proportion of losses realized to total losses (PLR). The larger the difference between PGR and PLR, the more reluctant a given investor is to realize losses.

Table 3 reveals that we are able to calculate the *Disposition Effect* only for a subset of investors. The reduction in sample size is due to missing information on purchase prices for securities that are present in an investor's portfolio before 1999, the first year of our sample period, as well as infrequent trading by some investors. The average investor exhibits a disposition effect of about 4% with respect to direct equity holdings and of about 2% when including mutual funds. Most importantly, given that the PGR – PLR difference is bounded by -1 and $+1$, the standard deviation of about 40% shows that there is significant variation across individuals with respect to the reluctance to realize losses.

We measure *Performance Chasing* by an individual's propensity to purchase securities that have performed well in the recent past. More specifically, each year we sort stocks and equity mutual funds separately into return deciles using the returns during the year. For each investor and year with net increases in holdings of stocks or mutual funds, we calculate the fraction of purchased securities with returns in the top two deciles. The higher that fraction, the more the individual chases performance by overweighting securities with higher recent performance. *Performance Chasing* is the average fraction over all years with net acquisitions of equity securities. Table 3 shows, on average, about 10-15% of the securities acquired have shown relatively strong recent performance. Since not all investors make net acquisitions during our sample period, *Performance Chasing* is only available for a subset of investors

We measure an individual's *Skewness Preference* as in Kumar (2009). For each investor and year we calculate the proportion of the portfolio that is invested in "lottery" securities, i.e., securities with a below median price as well as above median idiosyncratic volatility and above median skewness. *Skewness Preference* is the fraction of lottery securities averaged over all years with portfolio data. Table 3 shows that, on average, about 3-4% of an investor's portfolio is held in lottery securities.

[10]Since we do not observe the exact price at which an investors acquires a given security, we use the end-of-year price (averaged between the year before an acquisition and the year of the acquisition) as the reference price.

To reduce the dimensionality of some of our analysis, we also construct an index that summarizes the above investment behaviors for each investor with holdings of individual stocks. Specifically, for each of the investment behaviors, we assign a value of zero (no bias), one, or two (most biased), depending on the observed level. For example, for the *Disposition Effect*, we assign two to investors with a disposition effect over 40% (one standard deviation above zero), one to investors with a strictly positive disposition effect, and zero otherwise. Appendix Table A1 provides a detailed description of the construction of the *Investment Bias Index*. If for a given investor, a behavior is missing, we use the median behavior to assign the bias index component (zero, one, or two). An individual's *Investment Bias Index* is the sum across all the investment behaviors and takes on values between zero and twelve.

IV Empirical Methodology

To decompose the cross-sectional variation in investment behaviors into genetic and environmental components, we model each measure of an investment bias y_{ij} for twin j (1 or 2) of pair i as a function of observable socioeconomic characteristics $\mathbf{X}_{ij}$ as well as three unobserved effects. We assume that y_{ij} is a function of an additive genetic effect, a_{ij}, an effect of the environment common to both twins (e.g., parenting), c_i, and an individual-specific effect, e_{ij}, also capturing idiosyncratic measurement error:

$$y_{ij} = f(\mathbf{X}_{ij}, a_{ij}, c_i, e_{ij}). \tag{1}$$

We assume initially that a_{ij}, c_i, and e_{ij} are uncorrelated with one another and across twin pairs and normally distributed with zero means and variances σ_a^2, σ_c^2, and σ_e^2, respectively, so that the total residual variance σ^2 is the sum of the three variance components. We later model gene-environment interactions by allowing a_{ij}, c_i, and e_{ij} to vary with specific, observable experiences or circumstances.

Identifying variation due to a_{ij}, c_i, and e_{ij} separately is possible due to constraints on the covariances. These constraints are motivated by the genetic similarity of twins as well as assumptions of their upbringing and other aspects of their common environment. Consider two twin pairs $i = 1, 2$ with twins $j = 1, 2$ in each pair, where the first is a pair of identical twins and the second is a pair of fraternal twins. The genetic effects are: $a = (a_{11}, a_{12}, a_{21}, a_{22})'$. Analogously, the common and individual-specific environmental effects are: $c = (c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{21}, c_{22})'$ and $e = (e_{11}, e_{12}, e_{21}, e_{22})'$. Identical and fraternal twin pairs differ in their genetic similarity. Identical twins are genetically identical, and the correlation between a_{11} and a_{12} is set to one. Fraternal twins share on average only 50% of their genes, such that the correlation between a_{21} and a_{22} is 0.5. For both identical and fraternal twin pairs, an equal effect of the common environment is assumed. As a result, we use the following covariance matrices:

$$\mathrm{Cov}(a) = \sigma_a^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \mathrm{Cov}(c) = \sigma_c^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \mathrm{Cov}(e) = \sigma_e^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For the measures of investment biases in this study, we assume that f is a linear function:

$$y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta \mathbf{X}_{ij} + a_{ij} + c_i + e_{ij}, \tag{2}$$

where β_0 is an intercept term and β measures the effects of the observable socioeconomic characteristics ($\mathbf{X}_{ij}$), e.g., age, education, income and wealth. We use maximum likelihood to estimate the model using Mplus (Muthén and Muthén, 2010). Reported standard errors are bootstrapped from 1,000 resamples.

Finally, we calculate the variance components A, C, and E. A is the proportion of the total residual variance in an investment bias that is due to an additive genetic factor:

$$A = \frac{\sigma_a^2}{\sigma_a^2 + \sigma_c^2 + \sigma_e^2}$$

The proportions attributable to the common environment (C) and individual-specific environmental effects (E) are computed analogously.

V Results

We first compare correlations between genetically identically investors with correlations between related, but genetically non-identical investors. Such a comparison provides intuitive evidence on the importance of latent genetic factors. We then provide formal estimation results from decomposing investment biases into genetic and environmental variation. Finally, we perform a large number of robustness checks.

A Evidence from Correlations

For each investment behavior defined previously, Figure 1 reports correlations between identical twins as well as same and opposite-sex fraternal twins. We draw several conclusions from the evidence. First, for each measure, we find that the correlation is significantly greater between identical relative to fraternal twins. This difference indicates that to some extent investors display more or less of a given investment bias due to their genetic make-up. On average, the correlation between identical twins is about twice the correlation between fraternal twins. Second, the correlations for same-sex fraternal twins is generally larger than those for opposite-sex twins. This result suggests that gender affects investment behaviors. In our empirical models below, we will therefore control for gender. In addition, we will provide a robustness check that excludes opposite-sex twins. Finally, we note that the correlation for identical twins is between 25 and 50%, i.e., significantly different from one, suggesting that individual-specific experiences and events are also important for the understanding of why investors exhibit investment biases.

B Empirical Decomposition of Investment Biases

We use the model in equation (2) to empirically decompose the variation in investment behaviors across individuals into genetic and environmental components. In Panel A of Table 4, we report results from a model that only controls for gender and age which explain very little of the variation in investment behaviors. Thus, most of the variation remains unexplained. This unexplained variation is decomposed into genetic and environmental components. For each component, we report its relative contribution to the unexplained variation of each investment behavior. A denotes genetic variation, while C and E denote common and individual-specific environmental variation.

The evidence suggests that variation across individual investors with respect to all six investment biases examined reflects to a significant extent genetic differences between investors. Genetic factors seem to be particularly influential in determining *Diversification* and *Home Bias*, where they account for around 45% of the unexplained variation. For the remaining behaviors, genetic variation still accounts for between a quarter and a third of the variation. That is, individuals are to a significant extent born with predispositions that later in life and under the conditions typically experienced by an investor in our data set manifest themselves in the investment biases we examine in this paper. The findings also suggest that at least 55% of the unexplained variation in investment behaviors is due to environmental factors, represented by the C and E components. Almost all of the environmental variation reflects individual-specific experiences, circumstances, events, and possibly measurement error.[11] The C component is insignificant suggesting that upbringing or other aspects of the common environment do not affect investment biases. That is, the notion that children learn investment biases from their parents is inconsistent with the data.[12]

Wealthier, more educated, and generally more sophisticated investors often make better financial decisions and exhibit fewer investment biases (e.g., Agnew (2006), Dhar and Zhu (2006), Kumar (2009), Calvet et al. (2009)). It is possible that certain frictions, such as transaction costs, are less binding for these investors or that these investors have access to better financial advice. At the same time, they likely have superior cognitive abilities which have also been shown to lower investment biases (Grinblatt et al. (2011, 2012)). Importantly, some of the variation in these characteristics, i.e. wealth, education, and, in particular, IQ is due to genetic differences across investors (see, e.g., Bouchard and McGue (1981), Davies et al. (2011), Behrman and Taubman (1989), and Cronqvist and Siegel (2011)). To rule out that our findings with respect to the genetic origins of behavioral biases reflect genetic variation in these characteristics, we repeat the analysis controlling for several of these socioeconomic characteristics. In particular, in addition to age and gender, we control for

[11] Since our data set comes from the Swedish Tax Agency, which in turn obtains the data directly from financial institutions, reporting errors should be relatively rare. To reduce measurement error, we use whenever possible time-series averages (over up to nine years) of annually measured investment behaviors.

[12] The evidence of an insignificant C component is consistent with evidence from behavioral genetics research (e.g., Bouchard et al. (1990)) and recent research on risk preferences (e.g., Barnea, Cronqvist, and Siegel (2010) and Cesarini et al. (2010)).

education, marital status, wealth, and income.[13] We do not have data on cognitive abilities, but several of the included characteristics, in particular education and wealth, have been shown to be correlated with measures of IQ. The results in Panel B of Table 4 confirm that in particular education and wealth are often associated with lower investment biases. At the same time, the additional controls explain relatively little of the variation in investment biases. As a result, decomposing the remaining unexplained variation yields very similar results as in Panel A.

Finally, in Table 5, we repeat our analysis for investment behaviors measured across all equity investments, including mutual funds. While much of the existing literature in finance has focused on individual investors' choices with respect to individual stocks, many investors invest in mutual funds as well. It is possible that genetic predispositions are moderated by delegating mainly the selection of specific assets to an outside fund manager. We re-estimate the models previously estimated for stock investments only and find that the relative importance of genetic factors as captured by the A components is lower than what we found for the case of direct stock holdings, but only slightly so. The A component ranges between 16-38%, depending on the investment behavior. We conclude that genetic differences affect preference or belief differences with respect to direct as well as indirect or delegated equity investments.

C Robustness

C.1 Same-Sex Twins

We noted in Figure 1 that the correlations for same-sex fraternal twins are generally greater than those for opposite-sex twins. A concern is that including opposite-sex twins in our analysis results in an upward bias of the relative importance of genetic factors, as captured by A, as identical twins always have the same sex. As a robustness check, we re-estimate the models for same-sex twins only. Panel A of Table 6 shows that our results are essentially unaltered compared to the previously

[13]For the *Disposition Effect*, we also include *Turnover* and the *Number of Holdings* as control (see Dhar and Zhu (2006)).

reported estimates.[14]

C.2 Model Misspecification

Some of the reported C components in Table 4 are exactly zero, reflecting a corner solution as we constrain the variance components to be non-negative. This raises concerns about model misspecification. As a robustness check, we re-estimate the model in equation (2), without non-negativity constraints on the individual variance components. Table 6 Panel B shows that the negative C components are very small in magnitude (-3.9% to -9.8%) and never statistically significant from zero, reducing concerns about misspecification bias.

A related concern is that some of the measures of investment behaviors are censored (e.g., *Home Bias* is between 0 and 1). We have verified that a Tobit model specification results in unchanged, and sometimes stronger, A components (not tabulated).

C.3 Model Assumptions

Equal Environments Assumption (EEA). If parents or others in an individual's environment treat identical twins more similarly than fraternal twins (along dimensions that are relevant for the investment behaviors we study), then A may be upward biased. This is a well-recognized problem in twin research, and substantial resources have been devoted to tests of the EEA.[15] From research on IQ and personality, where the EEA has to date been tested most rigorously, the evidence suggests that any bias from violations of the EEA is not of first order importance (e.g., Bouchard (1998)). Specifically, researchers have studied twins reared apart, i.e., twins separated at birth or early in life, for which there is no common parental environment. Such studies often produce heritability estimates similar to those using twins who were reared together (e.g., Bouchard et al. (1990)). Perhaps even more convincingly, recent progress in genotyping has enabled researchers to construct DNA-based measures of pairwise genetic relatedness, which were then related to different outcomes,

[14] We also examine the correlation between monozygotic twins by gender. If men are more influential with respect to investment decisions in a household, we expect that the correlations are higher between monozygotic male twins than between monozygotic female twins. In untabulated results, we do not find any systematic patterns. For three of the biases, the correlations among male identical twins are somewhat higher; for another three biases, the correlations are somewhat higher among female identical twins.

[15] See, e.g., Goldberger (1979) for a discussion of common concerns r elated to twin studies.

e.g., IQ (Jian et al. (2010) and Davies et al. (2011)). Differently from twin studies, these studies use unrelated subjects and show without relying on any assumptions such as the EEA that at least 50% of the variation in the studied outcomes is due to genetic variation. At the same time, twin researchers continue to test the EEA. One concern has been that the matched physical appearance of identical twins result in more similar treatment by those who are a part of these individuals' environments, in the end causing more similar outcomes. Using a novel research design, Segal (2013) studies unrelated look-alike individuals, and finds that their correlations for personality measures are much lower than for identical twins, suggesting that identical twins' similarity with respect to personality mostly reflects similarity in their genes, and not similar treatments by others. Finally, a concern relevant for this paper is that inheritances that twins receive from their parents might be more similar (for example, with respect to the asset composition) for identical than fraternal twins. Since by law, children in Sweden inherit any assets only after the death of the last parent, we perform a robustness check by excluding twins for whom both parents are deceased from the samples used in Table 5. Re-estimating all six models, we find estimates (not tabulated) that are very similar to those reported in Table 5. We conclude that inheritances do not seem to confound our results.

Intra-Twin Pair Communication. If identical twins communicate more with one another than fraternal twins, and if such interaction impacts their investments (e.g., Bikhchandani, Hirshleifer, and Welch (1998) and Hong, Kubik, and Stein (2004)), then A may reflect the direct as well as indirect (via increased communication) effects of genetic similarity. We address this concern using two robustness checks. First, we exclude twin pairs with more than 50% similarity in their portfolios.[16] Panel C of Table 6 reveals evidence of a substantial genetic effect even when excluding twins with similar portfolios. Second, we control directly for intra-twin pair communication. To do so, we sort twin pairs into deciles based on intra-twin pair contact frequency (available for a subset of twins from STR) and randomly exclude twins until we have equally many identical and fraternal pairs in each decile. We repeat this process 100 times and then perform one estimation for each of the 100 samples. Table 6 Panel D reports that the median A components are still large and

[16]Specifically, we drop twin pairs for whom the sum of the absolute value of portfolio weight differences is less than one (on a range between zero for identical portfolios and two for non-overlapping portfolios).

statistically significant.[17] Only for the *Disposition Effect* do we no longer find a significant genetic effect once we control for communication, but the sample size for this specific robustness check is very small contributing to the large confidence interval.

C.4 Relatively Large Portfolios

Investors with relatively small portfolios may not be incentivized to overcome innate predispositions to certain biases. As a robustness check, we therefore exclude all individuals for whom the equity portfolio does not constitute at least 20% of their total assets, including real estate assets. The results in Table Panel E of Table 6 suggest that genetic factors continue to be important even among investors with substantial equity exposure.

VI Additional Results

A Behavioral Consistency: Investment Biases and Behaviors in Other Domains

We examine whether some of the previously analyzed investment biases are in fact facets of broader behaviors. Specifically, we identify behaviors in domains other than investments, and then we estimate the genetic correlation between investment biases and those behaviors in other domains. An example is the preference for familiarity. As described in Section II, recent papers study the genetic basis of familiarity (e.g., Chew et al. (2011)). We therefore examine if a preference for the familiar in the investment domain is correlated with a preference for familiarity in some other domains, and most importantly, whether genetic factors influencing the *Home Bias* also affect familiarity preferences in other domains. We consider two measures of familiarity preferences in domains other than investments: the distance between an individual's home location and her birth place, *Distance to Birthplace*, and an indicator for whether an individual's spouse is born in the same region as the individual herself, *Spouse from Home Region*.

In Table 7, we report results from decomposing the covariance of these investment and other behaviors into components corresponding to genetic effects and effects of common and individual-

[17]Below each median variance share, we report the corresponding 5^{th} and 95^{th} percentile values.

specific environments. Specifically, we use a bivariate Cholesky decomposition (see Neale and Maes (2004) for details). This model controls for individual socioeconomic characteristics such as income and wealth that may determine both investment behavior and non-investment choices.

We report several results. First, variation in familiarity in other, non-investment, domains reflects significant genetic differences: 40% for home location and 15% for choice of spouse. Second, *Home Bias* and *Distance to Birthplace* are significantly negatively correlated, suggesting that those with relatively more local stocks also have a stronger preference for a home location close to their birth place. Finally, and most importantly, the significantly negative genetic correlation between both behaviors suggests that the genetic factors affecting *Home Bias* also affect *Distance to Birthplace*. While we do not find an overall correlation between *Home Bias* and *Spouse from Home Region*, we find a large, though statistically not significant, positive genetic correlation between both behaviors.

This evidence is important because it suggests that behavioral consistency across several domains might be due to genetic endowments. That is, individuals are born with certain predispositions that affect their behaviors in many domains, including investments. The finding is also consistent with the view that preferences or behavior reflect psychological mechanisms that have been shaped by evolutionary forces whose effects extend to choices, such as financial investment decisions, that did not exist in ancient times.

B Moderators of Genetic Effects on Investment Biases

The relative importance of genetic relative to non-genetic factors can vary across different investors or environments. Cunha and Heckman (2010) go as far as concluding that "the nature versus nurture distinction is obsolete" (p. 3), and they argue that the notion that genes are moderated by environments should receive more attention in economic research. For an extensive review of research on so called "gene-environment interactions," we refer to Rutter (2006).

B.1 Work Experience in Finance

Does work experience in, for example, a bank or a corporate treasury department reduce the impact of genetic predispositions with respect to investment biases? We use data on an individual's occupation, based on the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-88) by the International Labour Organization (ILO) and available for a subset of our sample, to identify twins with work experience related to finance. We re-estimate the above models including only twin pairs with relevant finance experience. To increase the sample size we consider direct as well as indirect holdings of equity. We include the same socioeconomic controls as previously.

Table 8 reports the corresponding results.[18] For twins with finance work experience, the relative importance of genetic factors is substantially smaller for each of the investment behaviors than for the overall population. Only for *Skewness Preference* does the A component remain marginally significant at 15%. For *Diversification*, *Home Bias*, and *Performance Chasing*, genetic differences seem to account for almost none of the variation. For *Turnover*, the A share decreases to 10% and is no longer statistically significant. At the same time, the similar work environment experienced by this specific subset of twins seems to generate pair-specific commonality in their behavior.

While we cannot rule out that the selection into specific occupations reduces the relevant genetic variation in this particular sub-sample, the evidence in Table 8 is consistent with finance work experience reducing the impact of genetic predispositions with respect to investment biases.

B.2 Education

Education is another potentially important moderator of genetic effects. For example, Johnson et al. (2010) report, in a different context, that general education reduces expressions of genetic predispositions to poor health. Individuals may be born with a propensity to poor health, but education enables them to reduce such genetic propensities. In our paper, it is therefore interesting to examine the extent to which education moderates the importance of genetic factors for investment biases.

In terms of empirical methodology, we rely on the gene-environment interaction model by Purcell (2002). Figure 2 provides a graphical description of the model. In contrast with the model outlined in equation (2), a moderator (M), here education, interacts with the unobservable genetic and environmental factors of the investment behavior (y). The model allows education and the investment

[18] We have too few twin pairs with occupation data to estimate a separate model for *Disposition Effect.*

behavior to be correlated via exposure of the investment behavior to the unobservable genetic and environmental factors of the moderator. That is, we include all twins with non-missing education data and account for the possibility that educational outcomes and investment behaviors are not independent. Finally, we use regressions to remove the effect of the socioeconomic characteristics used as control variables in Table 4, with the exception of educational characteristics (not tabulated).

We measure educational outcome with *Years of Education* which is based on the highest completed degree.[19] To reduce the dimensionality of the analysis, we employ the previously introduced *Investment Bias Index* that summarizes the six investment behaviors for each individual.

Figure 3 reports a graphical summary of the results, displaying the absolute size of the genetic and environmental variances (vertical axis) as a function of *Years of Education* (horizontal axis). We find that education does not reduce the effect of genetic predisposition to investment biases. In particular, the detailed results of the model estimation in Appendix Table A2 suggest a small increase in genetic variance due to education.[20] Further, Figure 3 shows that the variance of common environmental effects also increases slightly, but in a statistically insignificant way, as individuals obtain more education, while the individual-specific environmental variation remains unchanged. These results suggest that differences in genetic propensity to investment biases are not reduced by an increase in general education.

C Evidence from Discordant Twin Pair Research Design

While our results demonstrate the important role genetic factors play in determining investment behaviors, they also show that substantial variation observed among the individuals in our sample is due to individual-specific environmental effects, captured by the E component in our variance decomposition models. Identifying the specific circumstances, experiences, or events as well as the mechanisms through which they impact investment choices is important for better models of investor behavior as well as public policy. One challenge researchers face is that individuals self-select into experiences and life events partly as a function of their genetic predispositions. Consequently,

[19] For some individuals, we have information on their highest degree, but not on *Years of Education*. We use a linear regression model to estimate *Years of Education* for those individuals. See Appendix Table A1 for details.

[20] This conclusion is based on a significantly positive estimate of *alpha_u* which has the same sign as the estimate of *a_u*. For estimation purposes, *Years of Education* is expressed in units of 10 years.

controlling for genetic factors is important in the search of environmental factors that matter for investment behaviors. Using the socioeconomic variables included in our model, we show how genetically informed data, such as twin data, can be used to address such confounding effects.

Using data on identical twins allows us to apply a "discordant twin pair research design" that approximates a natural experiment. The approach allows to compare the investment behaviors of twin pairs who are discordant on, e.g., education, but match on genes and shared environment. The design provides a useful analogue to a counterfactual design, and the absence of an association within discordant twin pairs means that a previously observed association between an individual characteristic and investment behavior is attributable to shared genetic or environmental factors.[21]

Assume an investment bias y_{ij}, observed for a pair i of identical twins ($j = 1, 2$), is a linear function of observable socioeconomic characteristics and unobservable genetic and environmental effects, a_i, c_i, and e_{ij}, such that

$$y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta \mathbf{X}_{ij} + a_i + c_i + e_{ij}. \tag{3}$$

We can then eliminate the genetic and shared environmental effects, a_i and c_i, by considering the difference between the twins in a pair:

$$y_{i1} - y_{i2} = \beta(\mathbf{X}_{i1} - \mathbf{X}_{i2}) + e_{i1} - e_{i2} \ . \tag{4}$$

To implement this research design, we select all identical twins from our sample of twins with direct stock holdings. While identical twins are similar in many aspects, we observe that in our sample about 20% of them are discordant with respect to their education. We use a standard linear regression model to regress the *Investment Bias Index* on a set of socioeconomic characteristics, including education. The first column in Table 9 reports the results. One of the important results is that college degree is significantly inversely related to investment biases. In the second column of Table 9, we report corresponding regression results when using differences between twins as opposed to levels for each twin. Comparing the estimates in the first and second columns, we conclude that

[21]See Taubman (1976) for an early application of this empirical methodology.

the effects of a college degree is reduced once we eliminate genetic and shared environmental effects. That is, the effects of college degree on investment biases reported in the first column are confounded, and attributable to unobservable genetic or shared environmental factors. More generally, the evidence presented here suggests that genetically informed data can play an important role when evaluating the causal effect of circumstances, experiences, or events with respect to investment behavior.

VII Conclusion

For a long list of investment "biases," including lack of diversification, excessive trading, and the disposition effect, we find that genetic differences explain up to 45% of the remaining variation across individual investors, after controlling for observable individual characteristics. Our results provide the first direct evidence from real-world, non-experimental data that persistent investment behaviors are to a significant extent determined by genetic endowments.

The importance of genetic relative to environmental factors is found to vary across different investors. Most importantly, among investors with finance related work experience, we find a significant reduction of the relative amount of genetic variation, which is consistent with practical experience in finance moderating genetic predispositions. Interestingly, general education does not seem to have a similar moderating effect.

These results have implications for the design of public policy in the domain of financial literacy (e.g., Lusardi and Mitchell (2007) and Van Rooij, Lusardi, and Alessie (2011)). Specifically, the evidence suggests that policy should be designed accounting for the existence of genetic predispositions to investment biases and considering the challenges in reducing such biases. Some contemporaneous research has reached similar conclusions. For example, Bhattacharya et al. (2012) show in a large field study that investors who are offered unbiased investment advice often are not interested in the advice and even those who are interested generally do not follow the advice.

So what explains the genetic effects we find? As argued in Table 1 of our paper, recent research in behavioral genetics has related specific genes to several of the psychological mechanisms that may manifest themselves as investment biases. That is, some individuals are endowed with genes related to familiarity (e.g., Chew et al. (2011)), overconfidence (e.g., Cesarini et al. (2009b)), or sensation-seeking (e.g., Derringer et al. (2010)), and these genes may manifest themselves in the individual's investment behavior, as well as in the individual's behavior in other, non-investment domains. An additional explanation for some of our results, which is consistent with recent work in finance (e.g., Grinblatt, Keloharju, and Linnainmaa (2011, 2012)), is that variation in IQ is genetic, which results in genetic variation in investment biases.

VIII Future Research

We see several directions for future research related to the genetics of investment biases. First, while recent studies in molecular genetics, using DNA-level data, have confirmed the importance of genetic differences (for height and IQ) first documented using twin studies (Jian et al. (2010) and Davies et al. (2011)), the relative variation that can be explained by individual candidate genes has so far remained low, rarely exceeding 10%. With the increasing availability of large genetic data sets, we expect that genome-wide association studies (GWAS) that consider very large number of genes can be applied to complex, economic behaviors, including investment biases. Such studies might reveal that a large number of genes is required to successfully predict differences between individual investors.[22]

Second, we have examined the genetic correlations among the investment biases (not tabulated). The magnitudes of these correlations are generally rather low. Perhaps the most interesting result from this exercise, given that we are not aware of any candidate genes mapped to representativeness so far (see Table 1), is a positive genetic correlation of 0.23 between *Performance Chasing* and *Skewness Preference*. This suggests that the same set of genes that contribute to performance chasing may also help to explain the preference for skewness, but further inter-disciplinary research is required to fully understand these relationships.

Finally, while we focus on genetics in this paper, it is important to emphasize that the environment also affects investment biases, either directly or as a moderator of genetic predispositions.

[22]For early evidence from genome-wide association studies in economics, see for example Beauchamp et al. (2011) and Benjamin et al. (2012)

Indeed, more than 50% of the variation in investment biases across investors is attributable to individual-specific experiences and events. Interestingly, our results show that first-order individual characteristics leave most of the variation in investment biases unexplained. This suggests that the environmental factors and mechanisms representing these individual-specific experiences and events could also be complex, possibly consisting of many particular experiences, and their interactions. Future research should further exam which specific experiences (e.g., early in an individual's life or career) are most important when it comes to determining investment behaviors.

References

Agnew, J., Balduzzi, P., Sundén, A., 2003. Portfolio choice and trading in a large 401(k) plan. American Economic Review 93 (1), 193–215.

Agnew, J. R., 2006. Do behavioral biases vary across individuals? Evidence from individual level 401(k) data. Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis 41 (4), 939–962.

Barber, B., Lee, Y., Liu, Y., Odean, T., 2009. Just how much do individual investors lose by trading? Review of Financial Studies 22 (2), 609–632.

Barber, B. M., Odean, T., 2000. Trading is hazardous to your wealth: The common stock investment performance of individual investors. Journal of Finance 55 (2), 773–806.

Barber, B. M., Odean, T., 2001. Boys will be boys: Gender, overconfidence, and common stock investment. Quarterly Journal of Economics 116 (1), 261–292.

Barberis, N., Huang, M., 2008. Stocks as lotteries: The implications of probability weighting for security prices. American Economic Review 98 (5), 2066–2100.

Barnea, A., Cronqvist, H., Siegel, S., 2010. Nature or nurture: What determines investor behavior? Journal of Financial Economics 98, 583–604.

Beauchamp, J. P., Cesarini, D., Johannesson, M., van der Loos, M. J., Koellinger, P. D., Groenen, P. J., Fowler, J. H., Rosenquist, J. N., Thurik, A. R., Christakis, N. A., 2011. Molecular genetics and economics. Journal of Economic Perspectives 25 (4), 57–82.

Behrman, J., Taubman, P., 1989. Is schooling “mostly in the genes"? Nature-nurture decomposition using data on relatives. Journal of Political Economy 97, 1425–1446.

Benartzi, S., 2001. Excessive extrapolation and the allocation of 401(k) accounts to company stock. Journal of Finance 56 (5), 1747–1764.

Benjamin, D. J., Cesarini, D., Chabris, C. F., Glaeser, E. L., Laibson, D. I., Guðnason, V., Harris, T. B., Launer, L. J., Purcell, S., Smith, A. V., et al., 2012. The promises and pitfalls of genoeconomics. Annual review of economics 4, 627–662.

Bernheim, B., 2009. On the potential of neuroeconomics: A critical (but hopeful) appraisal. American Economic Journal: Microeconomics 1 (2), 1–41.

Bhattacharya, U., Hackethal, A., Kaesler, S., Loos, B., Meyer, S., 2012. Is unbiased financial advice to retail investors sufficient? Answers from a large field study. Review of Financial Studies 25, 975–1032.

Bikhchandani, S., Hirshleifer, D., Welch, I., 1998. Learning from the behavior of others: Conformity, fads, and informational cascades. Journal of Economic Perspective 12 (3), 151–170.

Bortolus, R., Parazzini, F., Chatenoud, L., Benzi, G., Bianchi, M., Marini, A., 1999. The epidemiology of multiple births. Human Reproduction Update 5 (2), 179–87.

Bouchard, T. J., 1998. Genetic and environmental influences on adult intelligence and special mental abilities. Human Biology 70, 257–279.

Bouchard, T. J., Lykken, D. T., McGue, M., Segal, N. L., Tellegen, A., 1990. Sources of human psychological differences: The Minnesota study of twins reared apart. Science 250, 223–228.

Bouchard, T. J., McGue, M., 1981. Familial studies of intelligence: A review. Science 212, 1055–1059.

Brennan, T. J., Lo, A. W., 2011. The origin of behavior. Quarterly Journal of Finance 1, 55–108.

Calvet, L. E., Campbell, J. Y., Sodini, P., 2009. Measuring the financial sophistication of households. American Economic Review 99, 393–398.

Cesarini, D., Dawes, C. T., Johannesson, M., Lichtenstein, P., Wallace, B., 2009a. Genetic variation in preferences for giving and risk taking. Quarterly Journal of Economics 124, 809–842.

Cesarini, D., Johannesson, M., Lichtenstein, P., Sandewall, O., Wallace, B., 2010. Genetic variation in financial decision making. Journal of Finance 65, 1725–1754.

Cesarini, D., Johannesson, M., Lichtenstein, P., Wallace, B., 2009b. Heritability of overconfidence. Journal of the European Economic Association 7 (2-3), 617–627.

Cesarini, D., Johannesson, M., Magnusson, P. K. E., Wallace, B., 2012. The behavioral genetics of behavioral anomalies. Management Science 58, 21–34.

Chen, M. K., Lakshminarayanan, V., Santos, L. R., 2006. How basic are behavioral biases? Evidence from Capuchin monkey trading behavior. Journal of Political Economy 114 (3), 517–537.

Chew, S. H., Ebstein, R. P., Zhong, S., 2011. Ambiguity aversion and familiarity bias: Evidence from behavioral and gene association studies. Journal of Risk and Uncertainty 44, 1–18.

Cronqvist, H., Siegel, S., 2011. The origins of savings behavior. Working paper, University of Washington, Michael G. Foster School of Business.

Cunha, F., Heckman, J., 2010. Investing in our young people. In: Reynolds, A. (Ed.), Cost Effective Early Childhood Programs in the First Decade: A Human Capital Integration. Cambridge University Press.

Davies, G., Tenesa, A., Payton, A., Yang, J., Harris, S. E., Liewald, D., Ke, X., Le Hellard, S., Christoforou, A., Luciano, M., McGhee, K., Lopez, L., Gow, A. J., Corley, J., Redmond, P., Fox, H. C., Haggarty, P., Whalley, L. J., McNeill, G., Goddard, M. E., 2011. Genome-wide association studies establish that human intelligence is highly heritable and polygenic. Molecular Psychiatry 16 (10), 996 – 1005.

Derringer, J., Krueger, R., Dick, D., Saccone, S., Grucza, R. A., Agrawal, A., Lin, P., Almasy, L., Edenberg, H., Foroud, T., Nurnberger, J. I., Hesselbrock, V., Kramer, J., Kuperman, S., Porjesz, B., Schuckit, M., Bierut, L., 2010. Predicting sensation seeking from dopamine genes: A candidate-system approach. Psychological Science 21, 1282–1290.

Dhar, R., Zhu, N., 2006. Up close and personal: Investor sophistication and the disposition effect. Management Science 52 (5), 726–740.

Ellsberg, D., 1961. Risk, ambiguity, and the Savage axioms. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 643–669.

Fox, C. R., Tversky, A., 1995. Ambiguity aversion and comparative ignorance. Quarterly Journal of Economics 110 (3), 585–603.

French, K. R., Poterba, J. M., 1991. Investor diversification and international equity markets. American Economic Review 81 (2), 222–226.

Fulker, D. W., Eysenck, S. B. G., Zuckerman, M., 1980. A genetic and environmental analysis of sensation seeking. Journal of Research in Personality 14, 261–281.

Goldberger, A., 1979. Heritability. Economica 46 (184), 327–347.

Griffin, D., Tversky, A., 1992. The weighting of evidence and the determinants of confidence. Cognitive Psychology 24, 411–435.

Grinblatt, M., Keloharju, M., 2009. Sensation seeking, overconfidence, and trading activity. Journal of Finance 64, 549–578.

Grinblatt, M., Keloharju, M., Linnainmaa, J., 2011. IQ and stock market participation. Journal of Finance 66 (6), 2121–2164.

Grinblatt, M., Keloharju, M., Linnainmaa, J. T., 2012. IQ, trading behavior, and performance. Journal of Financial Economics 104 (2), 339–362.

Heath, C., Tversky, A., 1991. Preferences and beliefs: Ambiguity and competence in choice under uncertainty. Journal of Risk and Uncertainty 4 (1), 5–28.

Hirshleifer, D., Luo, G., 2001. On the survival of overconfident traders in a competitive securities market. Journal of Financial Markets 4 (1), 73–84.

Hong, H., Kubik, J. D., Stein, J. C., 2004. Social interaction and stock-market participation. Journal of Finance 59 (1), 137–163.

Huberman, G., 2001. Familiarity breeds investment. Review of Financial Studies 14 (3), 659–680.

Jian, Y., Benyamin, B., McEvoy, B. P., Gordon, S., Henders, A. K., Nyholt, D. R., Madden, P. A., Heath, A. C., Martin, N. G., Montgomery, G. W., Goddard, M. E., Visscher, P. M., 2010. Common SNPs explain a large proportion of the heritability for human height. Nature Genetics 42 (7), 565 – 569.

Johnson, D. D. P., Fowler, J. H., 2011. The evolution of overconfidence. Nature, 317–320.

Johnson, W., Kyvik, K. O., Mortensen, E. L., Skytthe, A., Batty, G. D., Deary, I. J., 2010. Education reduces the effects of genetic susceptibilities to poor physical health. International Journal of Epidemiology 39 (2), 406–414.

Kahneman, D., Tversky, A., 1979. Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica 47 (2), 263–292.

Kumar, A., 2009. Who gambles in the stock market? Journal of Finance 64 (4), 1889–1933.

Lewis, K., 1999. Trying to explain home bias in equities and consumption. Journal of Economic Literature 37 (2), 571–608.

Lichtenstein, P., Sullivan, P. F., Cnattingius, S., Gatz, M., Johansson, S., Carlström, E., Björk, C., Svartengren, M., Wolk, A., Klareskog, L., de Faire, U., Schalling, M., Palmgren, J., Pedersen, N. L., 2006. The Swedish twin registry in the third millennium: An update. Twin Research and Human Genetics 9, 875–882.

Luo, G., 1998. Market efficiency and natural selection in a commodity futures market. Review of Financial Studies 11 (3), 647–674.

Lusardi, A., Mitchell, O. S., 2007. Financial literacy and retirement preparedness: Evidence and implications for financial education. Business Economics 42, 35–44.

McDermott, R., Fowler, J., Smirnov, O., 2008. On the evolutionary origin of prospect theory preferences. Journal of Politics 70 (2), 335–50.

Muthén, L., Muthén, B., 2010. Mplus user's guide (6th ed.).

Neale, M. C., Maes, H. H. M., 2004. Methodology for Genetic Studies of Twins and Families. Kluwer Academic Publishers B.V., Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Netzer, N., 2009. Evolution of time preferences and attitudes toward risk. American Economic Review 99, 937–955.

Odean, T., 1998. Are investors reluctant to realize their losses? Journal of Finance 53 (5), 1775–1798.

Odean, T., 1999. Do investors trade too much? American Economic Review 89, 1279–1298.

Patel, J., Zeckhauser, R. J., Hendricks, D., 1991. The rationality struggle: Illustrations from financial markets. American Economic Review 81 (2), 232–236.

Purcell, S., 2002. Variance components models for geneenvironment interaction in twin analysis. Twin Research 5, 554–571.

Rayo, L., Becker, G., 2007. Evolutionary efficiency and happiness. Journal of Political Economy 115 (2), 302–337.

Robson, A. J., 1996. A biological basis for expected and non-expected utility. Journal of Economic Theory 68 (2), 397–424.

Rogers, A. R., 1994. Evolution of time preference by natural selection. American Economic Review 84 (3), 460–81.

Rutter, M., 2006. Genes and behavior: Nature/nurture interplay explained. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, UK.

Segal, N. L., 2013. Personality similarity in unrelated look-alike pairs: Addressing a twin study challenge. Forthcoming Personality and Individual Differences 54, 23–28.

Shefrin, H., Statman, M., 1985. The disposition to sell winners too early and ride losers too long: Theory and evidence. Journal of Finance, 777–790.

Simonson, I., Sela, A., 2011. On the heritability of consumer decision making: An exploratory approach for studying genetic effects on judgment and choice. Journal of Consumer Research 37 (6), 951–966.

Slutske, W. S., Eisen, S., True, W. R., Lyons, M. J., Goldberg, J., Tsuang, M., 2000. Common genetic vulnerability for pathological gambling and alcohol dependence in men. Archives of General Psychiatry 7, 666–673.

Taubman, P., 1976. The determinants of earnings: Genetics, family, and other environments: A study of white male twins. American Economic Review 66 (5), 858–870.

Thaler, R. H., 1985. Mental accounting and consumer choice. Marketing Science 4 (3), 199–214.

Tversky, A., Kahneman, D., 1974. Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. Science 211, 453–458.

Tversky, A., Kahneman, D., 1992. Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. Journal of Risk and Uncertainty 5 (4), 297–323.

Van Rooij, M., Lusardi, A., Alessie, R., 2011. Financial literacy and stock market participation. Journal of Financial Economics 101, 449–472.

Waldman, M., 1994. Systematic errors and the theory of natural selection. American Economic Review, 482–497.

Zhong, S., Israel, S., Xue, H., Sham, P., Ebstein, R., Chew, S., 2009. A neurochemical approach to valuation sensitivity over gains and losses. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 276 (1676), 4181–4188.

Table 1
The Genetic Basis of Investment Biases

Investment behavior	Psychological mechanism(s)	Gene(s)	Empirical evidence
Insufficient diversification	Ambiguity aversion	DRD5 (microsatellite marker); ESR2 (CA repeat)	Chew et al. (2011)
	Familiarity	SLC6A4 (5-HTTLPR indel)	Chew et al. (2011)
Excessive trading	Overconfidence		Twin study design: Cesarini et al. (2009)
	Sensation seeking	Multiple SNPs in 4 dopamine genes	Derringer et al. (2010)
			Twin study design: Fulker et al. (1980)
Disposition effect	Prospect theory	9-repeat vs. 10-repeat allele of DAT1	Zhong et al. (2009)
		10-repeat vs. 12-repeat allele of STin2	Zhong et al. (2009)
	Loss Aversion		Loss aversion in Capuchin monkeys (Chen et al. (2006))
	Mental accounting / Framing		Narrow framing in Capuchin monkeys (Lakshminarayanan et al. (2011))
			Twin study design: Cesarini et al. (2012)
Performance chasing	Excessive extrapolation		
	Hot hands fallacy		
	Representativeness		Twin study design: Cesarini et al. (2012); Simonson and Sela (2011)
Skewness preference	Cumulative prospect theory	Monoamine oxidase A (4 repeat)	Zhong et al. (2009)
			Twin study design: Slutske et al. (2000)

Table 1 provides information on existing evidence from behavioral genetics with respect to investment behaviors examined in this paper.

Table 2
Summary Statistics

Panel A: Number of Twins by Zygosity and Gender

	All Twins	Identical Twins			Fraternal Twins			
		Male	Female	Total	Same Sex: Male	Same Sex: Female	Opposite Sex	Total
Number of twins (*N*)	30,416	4,066	5,206	9,272	4,522	5,326	11,296	21,144
Fraction (%)	100%	13%	17%	30%	15%	18%	37%	70%

Panel B: Socioeconomic Characteristics and Equity Portfolio Characteristics

	All Twins	Identical Twins			Fraternal Twins		
Variable	*N*	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
Age	30,416	47.08	48.00	17.64	53.06	55.00	15.51
Less than High School	30,416	0.15	0.00	0.35	0.20	0.00	0.40
High School	30,416	0.22	0.00	0.41	0.26	0.00	0.44
College or more	30,416	0.58	1.00	0.49	0.47	0.00	0.50
No Education Data available	30,416	0.06	0.00	0.23	0.06	0.00	0.24
Married	30,416	0.46	0.00	0.50	0.54	1.00	0.50
Disposable Income (USD)	30,416	31,379	25,476	27,592	35,203	27,678	35,449
Financial Assets (USD)	30,416	40,759	14,537	155,296	48,062	17,342	442,298
Total Assets (USD)	30,416	124,351	71,883	252,478	142,603	83,504	576,198
Total Debt (USD)	30,416	31,802	16,020	68,330	30,396	13,759	149,778
Net Worth (USD)	30,416	92,549	42,961	223,277	112,207	56,417	516,665
Number of Stocks and Equity Mutual Funds	30,416	3.56	2.33	3.80	3.62	2.25	3.97
Value of Stocks and Equity Mutual Funds (USD)	30,416	16,841	3,662	109,292	24,815	4,159	663,773
Number of Stocks	12,378	3.32	1.89	3.91	3.42	1.89	4.15
Value of Stocks (USD)	12,378	22,558	2,825	163,360	29,218	2,819	543,596
Number of Equity Mutual Funds	23,870	2.41	1.89	1.84	2.34	1.80	1.86
Value of Equity Mutual Funds (USD)	23,870	7,018	2,059	20,160	7,788	2,292	17,304

Table 2 Panel A provides information on the number of identical and non-identical twins used in this study. Panel B provides summary statistics for several socioeconomic characteristics and portfolio characteristics, separately for identical and non-identical twins. All variables are defined in detail in Appendix Table A1.

Table 3
Investment Behaviors

	All Twins	Identical Twins			Fraternal Twins		
	N	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
Stocks							
Diversification	12,378	3.32	1.89	3.91	3.42	1.89	4.15
Home Bias	12,378	0.94	1.00	0.16	0.94	1.00	0.15
Turnover	11,508	0.20	0.03	0.35	0.17	0.02	0.33
Disposition Effect	782	0.04	0.00	0.38	0.05	0.00	0.47
Performance Chasing	6,672	0.15	0.00	0.22	0.14	0.00	0.22
Skewness Preference	12,378	0.04	0.00	0.10	0.03	0.00	0.10
Investment Bias Index	12,378	4.67	5.00	1.49	4.58	5.00	1.43
Stocks and Equity Mutual Funds							
Diversification	30,416	0.70	0.93	0.38	0.67	0.89	0.39
Home Bias	30,416	0.51	0.47	0.30	0.53	0.49	0.31
Turnover	28,108	0.27	0.17	0.38	0.25	0.14	0.37
Disposition Effect	3,086	0.02	0.00	0.43	0.02	0.00	0.43
Performance Chasing	25,530	0.10	0.00	0.16	0.10	0.00	0.16
Skewness Preference	30,416	0.05	0.00	0.10	0.06	0.00	0.10

Table 3 reports summary statistics for the main measures of investment behavior, *Diversification*, *Home Bias*, *Turnover, Disposition Effect*, *Performance Chasing*, and *Skewness Preference* as well as the *Investment Bias Index*. *Diversification* and *Turnover* are measured differently for stocks and stocks and equity mutual funds. See Appendix Table A1 for a detailed definition of all variables.

Table 4
Decomposition of Investment Behaviors

Panel A: Controlling for Gender and Age

	Diver-sification	Home Bias	Turnover	Disposition Effect	Performance Chasing	Skewness Preference
Intercept	1.916	0.912	0.152	-0.146	0.126	0.012
	0.344	0.017	0.031	0.161	0.030	0.008
Male	0.553	0.011	0.078	-0.038	0.026	0.012
	0.074	0.003	0.006	0.034	0.005	0.002
Age	0.220	0.010	0.017	0.098	0.012	0.013
	0.151	0.007	0.012	0.064	0.012	0.003
Age - squared	0.001	-0.001	-0.003	-0.010	-0.002	-0.002
	0.016	0.001	0.001	0.006	0.001	0.000
Fraction of Unexplained Variance	0.992	0.990	0.977	1.000	0.989	1.000
A Share	0.437	0.456	0.254	0.294	0.303	0.279
	0.099	0.053	0.027	0.135	0.091	0.051
C Share	0.091	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.102	0.000
	0.066	0.028	0.000	0.057	0.066	0.029
E Share	0.471	0.544	0.746	0.706	0.595	0.721
	0.043	0.037	0.027	0.105	0.038	0.034
N	12,378	12,378	11,508	782	6,672	12,378

Table 4 (continued)

Panel B: Controlling for Socioeconomic Characteristics

	Diver-sification	Home Bias	Turnover	Disposition Effect	Performance Chasing	Skewness Preference
Intercept	-7.780	0.938	-0.265	-0.482	0.014	-0.095
	1.216	0.035	0.073	0.384	0.060	0.024
Male	0.210	0.013	0.076	-0.055	0.024	0.010
	0.068	0.003	0.006	0.036	0.006	0.002
Age	-0.698	0.016	0.025	0.098	0.015	0.013
	0.151	0.007	0.013	0.067	0.013	0.003
Age - squared	0.053	-0.001	-0.004	-0.010	-0.003	-0.002
	0.015	0.001	0.001	0.006	0.001	0.000
High School	0.116	0.001	0.021	0.000	-0.016	-0.001
	0.105	0.004	0.010	0.061	0.010	0.003
College or More	0.512	-0.013	0.029	-0.068	-0.027	0.001
	0.113	0.004	0.009	0.045	0.009	0.003
No Education Data Available	0.027	-0.008	0.009	-0.080	-0.015	0.005
	0.081	0.003	0.007	0.034	0.007	0.002
Married	-0.086	-0.002	-0.005	-0.017	-0.013	0.003
	0.087	0.003	0.008	0.038	0.007	0.002
Second Net Worth Quartile Indicator	0.458	-0.006	-0.031	-0.052	0.006	-0.003
	0.060	0.004	0.010	0.067	0.009	0.003
Third Net Worth Quartile Indicator	0.979	-0.014	-0.051	-0.029	0.003	-0.008
	0.080	0.004	0.010	0.069	0.010	0.003
Highest Net Worth Quartile Indicator	2.862	-0.026	-0.055	-0.042	-0.006	-0.010
	0.108	0.004	0.010	0.065	0.009	0.003
Log of Disposable Income	0.939	-0.002	0.033	0.039	0.012	0.009
	0.111	0.002	0.006	0.033	0.005	0.002
Turnover (Sales)				0.008		
				0.008		
Number of Holdings				-0.003		
				0.002		
Fraction of Unexplained Variance	0.868	0.990	0.969	0.979	0.989	0.967
A Share	0.453	0.452	0.251	0.272	0.311	0.275
	0.084	0.053	0.029	0.127	0.091	0.050
C Share	0.030	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.095	0.000
	0.052	0.028	0.007	0.045	0.065	0.028
E Share	0.516	0.548	0.749	0.728	0.594	0.725
	0.042	0.037	0.027	0.109	0.039	0.034
N	12,378	12,378	11,508	782	6,672	12,378

Table 4 reports results from maximum likelihood estimation. The different investment behaviors are modeled as linear functions of observable socioeconomic variables and random effects representing additive genetic effects (A), shared environmental effects (C), as well as an individual-specific error (E). For each estimated model, we report the coefficient estimates for the socioeconomic variables, the *Fraction of Variance Unexplained*, i. e. the amount of total variation that cannot be explained by the observable independent variables, and the fraction of this unexplained variance that is due to unobserved genetic and environmental effects (*A* Share – for the additive genetic effect, *C* Share – for common environmental effect, *E* Share – for the individual-specific environmental effect) as well as the corresponding bootstrapped standard errors (1,000 resamples). Only direct stock holdings are considered in the measurement of the different investment behaviors. Panel A and B differ only with respect to the included control variables. All variables are defined in Appendix Table A1. *N* provides the number of observations used in each estimation.

Table 5
Stocks and Mutual Funds

Model	*N*	Variance Components *A* - Share	*C* - Share	*E* - Share
Diversification	30,416	0.379	0.020	0.601
		0.032	0.021	0.015
Home Bias	30,416	0.345	0.000	0.655
		0.012	0.002	0.012
Turnover	28,108	0.251	0.000	0.749
		0.022	0.008	0.018
Disposition Effect	3,086	0.160	0.000	0.840
		0.053	0.021	0.045
Performance Chasing	25,530	0.267	0.000	0.733
		0.019	0.003	0.019
Skewness Preference	30,416	0.266	0.000	0.734
		0.036	0.017	0.024

Table 5 reports results from maximum likelihood estimation. The different investment behaviors are modeled as linear functions of observable socioeconomic variables (see Table 4 for a list of the variables included) and unobservable random effects representing additive genetic effects (A), shared environmental effects (C), as well as an individual-specific error (E). For each estimated model, we report the variance fraction of the combined error term explained by each unobserved effect (*A* Share – for the additive genetic effect, *C* Share – for common environmental effect, *E* Share – for the individual-specific environmental effect) as well as the corresponding bootstrapped standard errors (1,000 resamples). Investment behaviors are derived from all holdings of stocks as well as equity mutual funds. All variables are defined in Appendix Table A1. *N* provides the number of observations used in each estimation.

Table 6
Robustness Checks

Panel A: Same-Sex Twins Only

Model	*N*	Variance Components *A* - Share	 *C* - Share	 *E* - Share
Diversification	7,916	0.379	0.083	0.538
		0.111	0.084	0.044
Home Bias	7,916	0.459	0.013	0.528
		0.086	0.063	0.041
Turnover	7,412	0.270	0.000	0.730
		0.053	0.033	0.032
Disposition Effect	564	0.245	0.000	0.755
		0.135	0.043	0.120
Performance Chasing	4,390	0.331	0.085	0.584
		0.102	0.079	0.040
Skewness Preference	7,916	0.282	0.000	0.718
		0.057	0.037	0.036

Panel B: Model Misspecification

Model	*N*	Variance Components *A* - Share	 *C* - Share	 *E* - Share
Home Bias	12,378	0.505	-0.044	0.539
		0.102	0.072	0.042
Turnover	11,508	0.356	-0.082	0.726
		0.077	0.051	0.033
Disposition Effect	782	0.411	-0.098	0.688
		0.292	0.180	0.136
Skewness Preference	12,378	0.325	-0.039	0.714
		0.101	0.070	0.041

Table 6 (continued)

Panel C: Excluding Similar Portfolios

Model	*N*	Variance Components *A* - Share	 *C* - Share	 *E* - Share
Diversification	9,902	0.327	0.015	0.658
		0.078	0.049	0.042
Home Bias	9,902	0.236	0.000	0.764
		0.061	0.028	0.043
Turnover	8,990	0.208	0.000	0.792
		0.044	0.021	0.033
Disposition Effect	582	0.155	0.000	0.845
		0.116	0.048	0.103
Performance Chasing	5,208	0.201	0.060	0.739
		0.087	0.060	0.040
Skewness Preference	9,902	0.111	0.054	0.835
		0.067	0.051	0.031

Panel D: Controlling for Differences in Intra-Twin Pair Communication

Model	*N*	Variance Components *A* - Share	 *C* - Share	 *E* - Share
Diversification	6,228	0.251	0.176	0.578
		0.130 - 0.369	0.073 - 0.282	0.544 - 0.598
Home Bias	6,228	0.216	0.209	0.574
		0.130 - 0.360	0.090 - 0.292	0.547 - 0.604
Turnover	5,836	0.241	0.020	0.744
		0.136 - 0.272	0.000 - 0.108	0.725 - 0.764
Disposition Effect	412	0.177	0.000	0.805
		0.000 - 0.297	0.000 - 0.080	0.702 - 0.953
Performance Chasing	3,544	0.224	0.164	0.612
		0.131 - 0.315	0.089 - 0.251	0.586 - 0.638
Skewness Preference	6,228	0.209	0.071	0.723
		0.080 - 0.290	0.000 - 0.179	0.694 - 0.757

Table 6 (continued)

Panel E: Investors with at Least 20% of Total Assets Invested in Risky Financial Assets

		Variance Components		
Model	*N*	*A* - Share	*C* - Share	*E* - Share
Diversification	2,574	0.656	0.000	0.344
		0.089	0.052	0.053
Home Bias	2,574	0.499	0.134	0.367
		0.174	0.127	0.073
Turnover	2,306	0.438	0.000	0.562
		0.143	0.078	0.089
Disposition Effect	344	0.227	0.000	0.773
		0.214	0.076	0.192
Performance Chasing	1,814	0.297	0.224	0.479
		0.171	0.133	0.068
Skewness Preference	2,574	0.350	0.040	0.609
		0.163	0.126	0.082

Table 6 reports results from maximum likelihood estimation for investment behaviors measured on direct stock holdings only. The different investment behaviors are modeled as linear functions of observable socioeconomic variables (see Table 4 for a list of the variables included) and unobservable random effects representing additive genetic effects (A), shared environmental effects (C), as well as an individual-specific error (E). For each estimated model, we report the variance fraction of the combined error term explained by each unobserved effect (*A* Share – for the additive genetic effect, *C* Share – for common environmental effect, *E* Share – for the individual-specific environmental effect) as well as (except for Panel D) the corresponding bootstrapped standard errors (1,000 resamples). Panel A presents results for the subset of twin pairs that exclude opposite-sex twin pairs. Panel B allows the variance components to take on negative values for cases where the shared environmental component (C) is estimated to be zero in Table 4. Panel C reports results for the subset of twin pairs for whom the sum of the absolute value of portfolio weight differences is at least one (on a range between zero (identical portfolios) and two (non-overlapping portfolios). In Panel D, twin pairs are sorted into ten bins based on contact frequency between them (contact frequency ranges from zero to 360 contacts per year). By randomly dropping identical or fraternal twins, we ensure that each bin has the same number of identical and fraternal twin pairs. We repeat the random selection 100 times and report the median as well as the 5^{th} and 95^{th} percentile of the estimated variance fractions. Panel E reports results for the subsample of investors who invest at least 20% of their total assets in risky financial assets. All variables are defined in Appendix Table A1. *N* provides the number of observations used in each estimation.

Table 7
Work-related Experience with Finance

Model	*N*	*A* - Share	*C* - Share	*E* - Share
		Variance Components		
Diversification	622	0.017	0.188	0.795
		0.114	0.090	0.074
Home Bias	622	0.000	0.197	0.803
		0.080	0.078	0.071
Turnover	582	0.108	0.022	0.871
		0.096	0.060	0.083
Performance Chasing	562	0.000	0.086	0.914
		0.092	0.053	0.084
Skewness Preference	622	0.152	0.000	0.848
		0.083	0.018	0.081

Table 7 reports results from maximum likelihood estimation for subsets of twins that have occupational experience in finance. The different investment behaviors are modeled as linear functions of observable socioeconomic variables (see Table 4 for a list of the variables included) and unobservable random effects representing additive genetic effects (A), shared environmental effects (C), as well as an individual-specific error (E). The variance fraction of the combined error term explained by each unobserved effect (*A* Share – for the additive genetic effect, *C* Share – for common environmental effect, *E* Share – for the individual-specific environmental effect) as well as the corresponding bootstrapped standard errors (1,000 resamples).Investment behaviors are derived from all holdings of stocks and equity mutual funds. All variables are defined in Appendix Table A1. *N* provides the number of observations used in each estimation.

Table 8
Behavioral Consistency: Investment Biases and Behaviors in Other Domains

	Model I		Model II	
	Home Bias	Distance to Birthplace	Home Bias	Spouse from Home Region
A - Share	0.453	0.400	0.356	0.148
	0.059	0.081	0.111	0.089
C - Share	0.000	0.211	0.000	0.191
	0.038	0.056	0.071	0.066
E - Share	0.547	0.389	0.644	0.661
	0.036	0.036	0.073	0.040
Correlation	-0.027		0.003	
	0.009		0.021	
Genetic Correlation	-0.101		0.221	
	0.034		0.247	
Correlation of Common Environment	0.000		0.000	
Correlation of Individual Environment	0.035		-0.073	
	0.021		0.035	
N	12,180		2,566	

Table 8 reports results from maximum likelihood estimation of two bivariate models. *Home Bias* (measured for direct holdings of stocks) and *Distance to Birthplace* (Model I) or *Spouse from Home Region* (Model II) are modeled jointly as a linear function of observable socioeconomic characteristics (*Home Bias* only - see Table 4 for a list of socioeconomic variables included) as well as three unobservable random effects representing additive genetic effects (*A*), shared environmental effects (*C*), as well as an individual-specific error (*E*). For each model, we report the variance fraction explained by each random effect (*A* Share – for the additive genetic effects, *C* Share – for shared environmental effects, *E* Share – for the individual-specific random effect), the overall correlation between both variables in a given model as well as the correlation between the genetic and individual specific environmental effects of each variable. Corresponding standard errors are bootstrapped with 1,000 resamples. Whenever one of the random effects (A, *C*, or *E*) is estimated to be zero, the corresponding correlation is set to zero. All variables are defined in Appendix Table A1. *N* provides the number of observations used in each estimation.

Table 9
Discordant Identical Twins: Investment Bias Index

	Level	Twin Differences
Intercept	2.969	-0.002
	0.594	0.034
Male	0.280	
	0.051	
Age	0.166	
	0.105	
Age - squared	0.000	
	0.000	
High School	0.046	0.218
	0.075	0.116
College or More	-0.225	0.101
	0.071	0.126
No Education Data Available	0.046	0.517
	0.146	0.244
Married	-0.085	-0.026
	0.052	0.066
Above Median Wealth Indicator	-0.557	-0.391
	0.053	0.072
Log of Disposable Income	0.090	-0.083
	0.050	0.077
R^2	0.080	0.020
N	3,952	1,976

Table 9 reports results from linear regressions of the Bias Index (column Level) and the intra twin-pair difference in the Bias Index (column Twin Difference) onto socioeconomic variables. For each estimated model, we report the coefficient estimates as well as the corresponding standard errors. Standard errors are robust to heteroscedasticity as well as correlation between twins in a twin pair. Only direct stock holdings are considered in the construction of the Bias Index. All variables are defined in Appendix Table A1. R^2 is the fraction of total variation explained by the socio-economic variables. N provides the number of observations used in each estimation.

Appendix Table A1
Definition of all Variables

Variable	Description
Types of Twins	
Identical Twins	Twins that are genetically identical, also called monozygotic twins. Zygosity is determined by the Swedish Twin Registry based on questions about intrapair similarities in childhood.
Non-identical Twins	Twins that share on average 50% of their genes, also called dizygotic or fraternal twins. Non-identical twins can be of the same sex or of opposite sex. Zygosity is determined by the Swedish Twin Registry based on questions about intrapair similarities in childhood.
Investment Biases & Trading Behavior	
Diversification	For direct stock holdings, Diversification is defined as the number of distinct stocks held in an individual's portfolio at the end of a year. For holdings of stocks and mutual funds, Diversification is defined as the proportion invested in mutual funds, but not invested in individual stocks. To reduce measurement error, we calculate the equally weighted average Diversification across all years the individual is in the data set.
Home Bias	Home Bias is defined as the equity portfolio share of Swedish securities.In particular, at the end of each year and for each investor, we add the market value of all Swedish stocks in the investor's portfolio to the market value of the Swedish equity allocation of all mutual funds held by the investor. We divide the value of these Swedish equity holdings by the total market value of direct (i.e. stocks) and indirect (i.e. equity allocation of mutual funds) equity holdings. We classify stocks as Swedish or foreign based on the country in which the stock is legally registered, as reflected in the country code of a given stock's ISIN. For mutual funds, we collect annual fund-specific data from Morningstar on the fund's total equity allocation as well as on the fund's equity allocation to Sweden. For equity or mixed mutual funds that are not covered by Morningstar we infer the fund's investment focus from the fund's name. By default, we assume that the fund is fully invested in international equities. Only if the fund name suggests an investment focus on Swedish equity, we classify the fund as Swedish. Finally, to improve the precision of our measure, for each investor we calculate the equally weighted average Home Bias across all years with non-missing data.
Turnover	For direct stock holdings, we divide, for each individual investor and year, the sales volume (in Swedish krona) during the year by the value of directly held stocks at the beginning of the year. Since we do not have sales price information for mutual funds, we also construct a turnover measure using the number of sales during the year divided by the number of equity securities in the investor's portfolio at the beginning of the year. In each case, Turnover is defined as the average annual turnover using all years with equity holdings data for an investor. To avoid that our analysis is affected by outliers, we drop observations for which Turnover is higher than the top one percentile of the Turnover distribution.
Disposition Effect	We measure the Disposition Effect as the difference between the ratio of the number of realized to realized and unrealized gains and the ratio of the number of realized to realized and unrealized losses (see Odean (1998) and Dhar and Zhou (2006)). We do not observe purchases of securities and even though we have data on sales transactions, we do not observe the date of the transaction. We therefore use changes in the annual holding data to identify net purchases and sales of equity securities for each investor. We start by dropping all securities that are present in an investor's portfolio in 1998, the beginning of our sample period, as we cannot observe when the security entered the investor's portfolio. Next, when we observe a given security for the first time in an investor's portfolio at the end of the year, we assign the average (tax) value (averaged between the (tax) value of the previous and the current year) as the relevant purchase and reference price. We increase (decrease) this reference price when additional units of this security are purchased at a higher (lower) value in later years. At the end of each year with at least one sales transaction in the relevant group of securities (stocks or stocks and equity mutual funds), we compare the reference price of each security in an investor's portfolio (including those securities whose holdings decrease to zero over that year) to the currrent value of the security (where the current value is the average of the (tax) value of the previous and the current year). If the current value is higher (lower) than the reference price, we consider the position a gain (loss). We further categorize gains and losses as realized if the number of units held decreases relative to the previous year, and unrealized otherwise. Finally, for each investor, we count the total number of realized and unrealized gains and losses. The Disposition Effect is then the difference between the ratio of realized to realized and unrealized gains and the ratio of realized to realized and unrealized losses. It is set to missing unless both ratios exist.
Performance Chasing	Performance Chasing is measured by an individual's propensity to purchase securities that have performed well in the recent past. Specifically, each year we sort stocks and equity mutual funds separately into return deciles using the raw returns during the year. For each investor and year, we calculate the fraction of purchased securities (identified by positive net-changes of annual holdings) with returns in the top two deciles. Performance Chacing is the average of this fraction over all years in which an investor has made net-purchases of securities.
Skewness Preference	Skewness Preference is measured in the spirit of Kumar (2009). For each investor and year we calculate the fraction of the portfolio that is invested in ``lottery'' securities. We define a security as a lottery security if it has a below median price as well as above median idiosyncratic volatility and skewness. We use a the world market return, the squared world market return, the local Swedish market return, and the squared local market returns factor in our asset pricing model to determine a security's idiosyncratic error term. Regressions are performed every year using the last 24 months of return data. Skewness Preference is the fraction of lottery securities held in an investor's equity portfolio, averaged over all years with portfolio data.

Variable	Description
Investment Bias Index	The Investment Bias Index summarizes the magnitude of the six investment behaviors for direct stock holdings. It takes on values between zero and twelve. For each behavior, we assign a value of zero (no bias), one, or two (most biased), depending on the observed level. The index is the sum across all six investment behaviors. If for a given investor, a behavior is missing, we use the median behavior to assign the bias index component (zero, one, or two). In particular, for Diversification, we assign two to investors with only one stock, one to investors with two to six stocks, and zero to investors with more than six stocks. For Home Bias, we assign two to investors with a 100% allocation to Swedish stocks, one to investors with less than 100%, but more than 20% allocation to Swedish stocks, and zero for investors with less than 20% Swedish allocation. For Turnover, we assign two to investors with a value above 55%, one to investors with a value between 20% and 55%, and zero otherwise. For Disposition Effect, we assign two to investors with a disposition effect over 40%, one to investors with a strictly positive disposition effect, and zero otherwise. For Performance Chasing, we assign two to investors with a value above 40%, one to investors with a value between 20 and 40%, and zero otherwise. For Skewness preference, we assign two to investors with a value above 15%, one to investors with a value between 5 and 15%, and zero otherwise.
Socioeconomic Characteristics	
Male	An indicator variable that equals one if an individual is male and zero otherwise. Gender is obtained from Statistics Sweden.
Age	The average age over the years an individual is included in our sample. Age is obtained from the Statistics Sweden.
Less than High School	An indicator variable that equals one if an individual has not completed high school (gymnsasium) zero otherwise. Educational information is obtained from Statistics Sweden.
High School	An indicator variable that equals one if an individual has completed high school (gymnasium) but has not attended university, zero otherwise. Educational information is obtained from Statistics Sweden.
College or more	An indicator variable that equals one if an individual has attended university, zero otherwise. Educational information is obtained from Statistics Sweden.
No Education data available	An indicator variable that equals one if no educational data are available for an individual, zero otherwise. Educational information is obtained from Statistics Sweden.
Years of Education	Years of Education is based on the highest completed degree. For a subset of the sample, the variable is obtained from the Swedish Twin Registry. We use a linear regression model to extend the variable to the rest of our sample. Specifically, we regress the years of education onto indicator variables High School and College or More (avaialable for most individuals in our data set from Statistics Sweden) and then predict years of education out of sample.
Married	The average (over the years an individual is included in our sample) of an annual indicator variable that equals one if an individual is married in a given year and zero otherwise. The marital status is obtained from the Statistics Sweden.
Disposable Income	The average individual disposable income (over the years an individual is included in our sample), as defined by Statistics Sweden, that is, the sum of income from labor, business, and investment, plus received transfers, less taxes and alimony payments. Expressed in nominal Swedish Krona (SEK) (unless indicated otherwise). The data are obtained from Statistics Sweden.
Financial Assets	The average end-of-year market value of an individual's financial assets (over the years an individual is included in our sample) as reported by Statistics Sweden, expressed in nominal Swedish Krona (SEK) (unless indicated otherwise). Financial assets include checking, savings, and money market accounts, (direct and indirect) bond holdings, (direct and indirect) equity holdings, investments in options and other financial assets such as rights, convertibles, and warrants.
Total Assets	The average end-of-year market value of an individual's financial and real assets (over the years an individual is included in our sample) as reported by Statistics Sweden, expressed in nominal Swedish Krona (SEK) (unless indicated otherwise).
Net Worth	The average difference between the end-of-year market value of an individual's assets and her liabilities (over the years an individual is included in our sample), as reported by Statistics Sweden. Expressed in nominal Swedish Krona (SEK) (unless indicated otherwise). We form indicator variables that indicate whether an individual's networth is in the first, second, third, or first quartile of the net-worth distribution.
Number of Stocks and Equity Mutual Funds	The average end-of-year number of holdings of distinct individual stocks and equity mutual funds (over the years an individual is included in our sample), as reported by Statistics Sweden.
Value of Stocks and Equity Mutual Funds	The average end-of-year market value of holdings of individual stocks and equity mutual funds (over the years an individual is included in our sample), as reported by Statistics Sweden. Expressed in nominal Swedish Krona (SEK) (unless indicated otherwise).
Number of Stocks	The average end-of-year number of holdings of distinct individual stocks (over the years an individual is included in our sample), as reported by Statistics Sweden.
Value of Stocks	The average end-of-year market value of holdings of individual stocks (over the years an individual is included in our sample), as reported by Statistics Sweden. Expressed in nominal Swedish Krona (SEK) (unless indicated otherwise).
Number of Equity Mutual Funds	The average end-of-year number of holdings of distinct equity mutual funds (over the years an individual is included in our sample), as reported by Statistics Sweden.
Value of Equity Mutual Funds	The average end-of-year market value of holdings of equity mutual funds (over the years an individual is included in our sample), as reported by Statistics Sweden. Expressed in nominal Swedish Krona (SEK) (unless indicated otherwise).
Contact Intensity	The number of contacts per year between twins. The number is calculated as the average of the numbers reported by both twins. If only one twin provides a number, this number is used. The data are obtained from the Swedish Twin Registry.
Distance to Birthplace	The driving distance in kilometers to the state of birth. We define this distance to be the average distance to the center of all municipalities within the state of birth weighted by their population. The distance is obtained from Google Maps. The population numbers are obtained from Statistics Sweden.
Spouse from Home Region	An indicator variable available for married individuals that takes on the value of one if the spouse was born in the same state as the individual and zero otherwise.

Appendix Table A2
Education as a Moderator

	Years of Education		Bias Index
Moderator		**Investment Bias Index**	
a_m	0.2300	*a_c*	0.0120
	0.010		0.118
c_m	-0.1300	*alpha_c*	-0.0364
	0.010		0.102
e_m	0.1100	*a_u*	0.3620
	0.000		0.106
		alpha_u	0.3455
			0.096
		c_c	-0.1190
			0.153
		chi_c	0.1855
			0.136
		c_u	0.0180
			0.203
		chi_u	-0.1828
			0.202
		e_c	0.0290
			0.058
		epsilon_c	-0.0393
			0.101
		e_u	0.9830
			0.058
		epsilon_u	0.0697
			0.047
N		11,800	

Appendix Table A2 reports parameter estimates and standard errors (s.e.) from maximum likelihood estimation of gene-environment interactions models (see Figure 2 for a presentation of the model). The moderator variable is education as measured by years of education (divided by 10 for computational reasons). The Bias Index is based on financial behaviors related to direct stock holdings only. In a first stage (untabulated), we have removed (via linear regression) the effect of control variables listed in Table 4, with the exception of those related to education. *N* provides the number of observations.

Figure 1
Correlations by Genetic Similarity



Figure 1 reports Pearson correlation coefficients for *Diversification*, *Home Bias*, *Disposition Effect*, *Performance Chasing, Turnover,* and *Skewness Preference* between twins for different types of twin pairs. Investment behaviors are calculated using holdings and transactions of direct stock holdings only. All variables are defined in Appendix Table A1.

Figure 2
Gene-Environment Interaction



Figure 2 presents a graphical presentation of the gene-interaction model proposed by Purcell (2002). *M* symbolizes the moderator and *y* the Investment Bias Index. *A*, *C*, and *E* correspond to the unobservable genetic and environmental factors. See Purcell (2002) details.

Figure 3
Education as a Moderator



Figure 3 presents results of the gene-interaction model proposed by Purcell (2002). *Years of Education* acts as the environmental moderator. The *x*-axis represents years of education, while the *y*-axis represents the residual variance of the Investment Bias Index, due to genetic effects (A – blue), the common environment (C – red) and the individual-specific environment (E – green). See Appendix Table A2 for detailed estimation results.