Revisiting Global Asset Pricing Paradigms: Theoretical Evolution, Empirical Contestation, And Bibliometric Insights Across Developed And Emerging Markets

Alejandro M. Fernández
Department of Finance, University of Melbourne, Australia

María Elena Rodríguez
Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Barcelona, Spain

ABSTRACT

Asset pricing theory occupies a central position in modern financial economics, serving as the conceptual backbone for understanding how risk is priced in capital markets and how expected returns are determined across assets, time, and geographies. Since the formalization of the Capital Asset Pricing Model, the field has experienced successive waves of theoretical refinement, empirical testing, and methodological critique, culminating in a rich ecosystem of multifactor models and global extensions. This article offers an extensive, integrative, and theoretically grounded examination of global asset pricing paradigms by synthesizing classical theory, empirical evidence from developed and emerging markets, and bibliometric perspectives on the evolution of the literature. Particular attention is devoted to the intellectual structure and thematic trajectories identified in recent bibliometric analyses of global asset pricing research, which illuminate how scholarly focus has shifted from single-factor equilibrium models toward multifactor, behavioral, and market-specific frameworks (Keshari & Gautam, 2022).

The study is positioned at the intersection of theory, evidence, and scholarly meta-analysis. It revisits the foundational assumptions of equilibrium asset pricing, critically interrogates the empirical validity of canonical models such as the Capital Asset Pricing Model, and explores the motivations behind the development of multifactor alternatives including the Fama–French three-factor, four-factor, and five-factor models. The discussion extends beyond model mechanics to address deeper epistemological questions concerning risk measurement, market efficiency, and the contextual dependence of asset pricing relationships across institutional environments. By drawing on a wide range of empirical studies from Europe, Australia, and emerging markets, the article demonstrates that asset pricing is not a monolithic phenomenon but a context-sensitive process shaped by market structure, investor behavior, and macroeconomic conditions.

Methodologically, the article adopts a qualitative, theory-driven synthesis of prior empirical findings rather than new econometric estimation. This approach allows for a nuanced interpretation of results reported in the literature, highlighting patterns of convergence and divergence across markets and time periods. The results section articulates how empirical regularities such as size, value, momentum, and profitability effects have been documented, contested, and reinterpreted, often yielding contradictory conclusions depending on sample selection and methodological choices. The discussion section provides a deep comparative analysis of competing scholarly viewpoints, identifies persistent limitations in global asset pricing research, and outlines promising avenues for future inquiry, including the integration of bibliometric insights with substantive theory development.

Overall, the article contributes a comprehensive, publication-ready synthesis that situates global asset pricing models within their historical, theoretical, and empirical contexts. By embedding bibliometric evidence within a broader conceptual narrative, it advances a more reflexive understanding of how asset pricing knowledge is produced, validated, and contested in the global academic community.

Keywords: Global asset pricing; Capital Asset Pricing Model; Fama–French models; Emerging markets; Bibliometric analysis; Risk premia.

INTRODUCTION

The question of how assets are priced in financial markets has long been regarded as one of the most fundamental and challenging problems in economics and finance. At its core, asset pricing seeks to explain the relationship between risk and expected return, offering a theoretical framework through which investors, policymakers, and scholars can interpret observed price dynamics and allocate capital efficiently. The intellectual origins of modern asset pricing are deeply rooted in neoclassical economic theory, particularly in the assumptions of rationality, equilibrium, and market efficiency that characterized post-war financial economics

(Campbell, 1996). These assumptions provided the fertile ground upon which the Capital Asset Pricing Model was developed, offering a parsimonious and elegant explanation of how systematic risk should be rewarded in equilibrium markets (Black et al., 1972).

Despite its conceptual appeal, the CAPM quickly became the subject of intense empirical scrutiny. Early empirical tests revealed systematic deviations between model predictions and observed returns, particularly in relation to firm size, valuation ratios, and other firm-specific characteristics (Black et al., 1972). These anomalies were not merely statistical curiosities but posed serious challenges to the model's underlying assumptions, prompting scholars to question whether a single-factor representation of risk could adequately capture the complexity of real-world markets (Fabozzi & Francis, 1978). As empirical evidence accumulated, it became increasingly clear that asset pricing relationships were more nuanced and context-dependent than originally envisioned.

The subsequent development of multifactor models marked a pivotal shift in the literature. The Fama–French three-factor model, which incorporated size and value factors alongside the market portfolio, represented a pragmatic response to persistent empirical anomalies documented across U.S. and international markets (Davis et al., 2000). Rather than abandoning equilibrium reasoning altogether, multifactor models reinterpreted anomalies as proxies for omitted risk factors or systematic patterns in investor behavior. This reinterpretation sparked vigorous debate, with some scholars arguing that multifactor models restored empirical credibility to asset pricing theory, while others contended that they merely re-labeled anomalies without providing deeper theoretical justification (Daniel & Titman, 1997).

As asset pricing research expanded beyond the confines of developed markets, new layers of complexity emerged. Studies focusing on European, Australian, and emerging markets revealed that factor premiums varied substantially across institutional settings, levels of market development, and regulatory regimes (Beltratti & Trio, 2002; Faff, 2004). In emerging markets in particular, issues such as market segmentation, liquidity constraints, and informational inefficiencies complicated the direct application of canonical models developed in mature financial systems (Connor & Sehgal, 2003). These findings underscored the importance of adopting a global perspective on asset pricing, one that recognizes heterogeneity rather than assuming universal validity.

Within this expanding global literature, bibliometric analyses have begun to play an increasingly important role in mapping the intellectual structure of asset pricing research. By systematically analyzing citation networks, thematic clusters, and publication trends, bibliometric studies provide a meta-level understanding of how the field has evolved over time. The bibliometric analysis of global asset pricing research by Keshari and Gautam (2022) is particularly instructive in this regard, as it highlights the growing diversification of research themes, the increasing prominence of emerging market studies, and the gradual integration of behavioral and methodological innovations into mainstream asset pricing discourse. Such analyses do not merely summarize the literature but offer critical insights into the dynamics of knowledge production and scholarly influence.

The motivation for the present article arises from the recognition that, despite the vast and growing body of research on asset pricing, there remains a need for integrative, theory-driven syntheses that bridge classical models, empirical findings, and bibliometric perspectives. Much of the existing literature is fragmented, with studies focusing narrowly on specific models, markets, or periods, often without situating their contributions within a broader intellectual context. This fragmentation can obscure underlying patterns and limit the cumulative progress of the field. By contrast, a comprehensive synthesis can illuminate connections between seemingly disparate strands of research, clarify points of contention, and identify unresolved questions that warrant further investigation (Keshari & Gautam, 2022).

Accordingly, this article seeks to address three interrelated objectives. First, it revisits the theoretical foundations of asset pricing, tracing the evolution from single-factor equilibrium models to multifactor and global frameworks. Second, it critically examines empirical evidence from developed and emerging markets, emphasizing both consistencies and contradictions in reported findings. Third, it incorporates insights from bibliometric analysis to contextualize these theoretical and empirical developments within the broader trajectory of scholarly research. By pursuing these objectives, the article aims to contribute a nuanced and reflexive understanding of global asset pricing that is both theoretically informed and empirically grounded.

The remainder of the article is organized as follows. The methodology section outlines the qualitative, literature-based approach adopted in this study, including the criteria for source selection and the limitations inherent in narrative synthesis. The results section presents a descriptive and interpretive analysis of empirical findings reported in the literature, focusing on key factor premiums and their variability across markets. The discussion section offers an in-depth theoretical interpretation of these findings, engages with competing scholarly perspectives, and explores implications for future research. The article concludes by summarizing the main contributions and reflecting on the evolving nature of asset pricing research in a global context (Campbell,

1996).

METHODOLOGY

The methodological approach adopted in this article is explicitly qualitative, interpretive, and theory-driven, reflecting the study's objective of producing an integrative synthesis rather than generating new econometric estimates. In the context of asset pricing research, such an approach is particularly appropriate, given the extensive accumulation of empirical findings over several decades and the persistent debates regarding their interpretation (Daniel & Titman, 1997). Rather than privileging any single dataset or model specification, the methodology emphasizes comparative analysis, conceptual coherence, and critical engagement with the literature.

The primary corpus of sources consists of peer-reviewed journal articles and working papers that have made substantive contributions to asset pricing theory and empirical testing across different markets. These sources encompass foundational theoretical works, influential empirical studies, and more recent contributions that extend traditional models to international and emerging market contexts (Beltratti & Trio, 2002; Cakici et al., 2013). In addition, bibliometric analyses of asset pricing research are incorporated to provide a meta-level perspective on the evolution of the field, with particular emphasis on the insights offered by Keshari and Gautam (2022).

The selection of references is guided by relevance rather than exhaustiveness. Priority is given to studies that have shaped major debates, introduced influential models, or provided robust empirical evidence that has been widely cited and contested. This criterion reflects the recognition that asset pricing research is cumulative and dialogical, with new contributions often responding explicitly or implicitly to earlier findings (Fama & French, as discussed in Davis et al., 2000). By focusing on such dialogical relationships, the methodology seeks to illuminate how knowledge has evolved through scholarly exchange rather than through isolated discoveries.

A key methodological principle underlying this study is triangulation through thematic comparison. Empirical findings are not treated as definitive proof of any particular model's validity but are instead interpreted in relation to theoretical expectations, alternative explanations, and institutional contexts. For example, evidence supporting size and value premiums in one market is compared with contradictory findings in another, prompting discussion of market-specific factors such as liquidity, taxation, and investor composition (Brennan, 1970; Elfakhani & Wei, 2003). This comparative approach aligns with the insights of global asset pricing research, which emphasizes heterogeneity over uniformity (Cakici et al., 2016).

The bibliometric dimension of the methodology deserves particular attention. Bibliometric analysis, as employed by Keshari and Gautam (2022), uses quantitative indicators such as citation counts and co-authorship networks to map the intellectual structure of a research field. While the present article does not replicate such analyses, it draws on their findings to contextualize theoretical and empirical developments. This integration of bibliometric insights with substantive analysis represents a methodological innovation, enabling a reflexive examination of how scholarly attention has shifted over time and how certain models have gained or lost prominence.

Despite its strengths, the chosen methodology is subject to important limitations. Narrative synthesis inevitably involves interpretive judgment, which may introduce bias in the selection and weighting of evidence. Moreover, the absence of new empirical testing means that the study cannot adjudicate conclusively between competing models or resolve longstanding empirical controversies (Black et al., 1972). Instead, its contribution lies in clarifying the contours of these controversies and highlighting areas where further empirical and theoretical work is needed. By acknowledging these limitations, the methodology maintains transparency and situates the article within the broader ecosystem of asset pricing research (Campbell, 1996).

RESULTS

The empirical literature on asset pricing, when viewed collectively, reveals a complex and often contradictory set of findings that resist simple generalization. Across developed and emerging markets alike, studies have documented systematic patterns in stock returns that challenge the explanatory sufficiency of single-factor models, while simultaneously raising questions about the interpretation and persistence of multifactor premiums (Faff, 2004). The results synthesized in this section are presented descriptively, with an emphasis on identifying recurring themes and points of divergence rather than asserting definitive conclusions.

One of the most consistently reported empirical regularities is the size effect, whereby stocks of smaller firms tend to earn higher average returns than those of larger firms. This phenomenon has been documented in various markets, including Europe and Australia, and has often been interpreted as evidence of an additional risk factor not captured by the CAPM (Barber et al., 1997; Faff, 2004). However, the magnitude and statistical significance of the size effect appear to vary considerably across samples and time periods, suggesting that it may be contingent on market structure and investor behavior rather than representing a universal law of asset pricing (Elfakhani & Wei, 2003).

Similarly, the value effect, typically proxied by book-to-market ratios, has been widely observed and incorporated into multifactor models. Empirical studies have shown that high book-to-market stocks tend to outperform low book-to-market stocks, a finding that has been replicated in both developed and emerging markets (Beltratti & Trio, 2002; Cakici et al., 2013). Yet, as with the size effect, the interpretation of the value premium remains contested. Some scholars argue that it reflects compensation for distress risk, while others view it as the result of systematic mispricing driven by investor overreaction (Daniel & Titman, 1997).

Momentum effects constitute another prominent empirical finding, particularly following the introduction of the four-factor model that augmented the Fama–French framework with a momentum factor (Carhart, 1997). Evidence of return continuation over intermediate horizons has been reported in a wide range of markets, including emerging economies, lending support to the notion that past performance contains information about future returns (Cakici et al., 2016). At the same time, the persistence of momentum profits poses challenges for traditional equilibrium models, as it appears inconsistent with fully rational expectations and frictionless markets (Campbell, 1996).

When these empirical patterns are examined through a global lens, additional complexities emerge. Studies focusing on emerging markets often report stronger or more volatile factor premiums, reflecting differences in market maturity, liquidity, and institutional quality (Connor & Sehgal, 2003). For instance, size and value effects may be amplified in markets characterized by limited analyst coverage and higher information asymmetry, while momentum effects may be attenuated by trading constraints and regulatory frictions (Cakici et al., 2016). These findings underscore the importance of contextualizing empirical results rather than assuming cross-market homogeneity.

From a bibliometric perspective, the accumulation of such empirical findings has contributed to a diversification of research themes within asset pricing. As documented by Keshari and Gautam (2022), there has been a notable increase in studies examining multifactor models, international evidence, and market-specific adaptations of canonical frameworks. This diversification is reflected not only in the topics addressed but also in the methodological pluralism of the literature, which now encompasses traditional regression-based tests, portfolio sorts, and alternative risk proxies. The results synthesized here thus point to a field characterized by empirical richness but also by unresolved tensions regarding theory, interpretation, and generalizability.

DISCUSSION

The empirical patterns described in the preceding section invite deeper theoretical reflection on the nature of risk, return, and market equilibrium in a global context. At the heart of the discussion lies a fundamental question: do multifactor models represent genuine advances in our understanding of asset pricing, or do they merely provide descriptive frameworks that fit historical data without offering robust explanatory foundations? This question has animated scholarly debate for decades and remains unresolved despite substantial empirical progress (Daniel & Titman, 1997).

From a traditional risk-based perspective, multifactor models are interpreted as extensions of the CAPM that capture additional dimensions of systematic risk. In this view, size, value, and momentum factors proxy for underlying economic risks related to business cycles, investment opportunities, or financial distress (Campbell, 1996). Empirical support for this interpretation is often drawn from the persistence of factor premiums across markets and time periods, suggesting that they are not easily arbitraged away. However, critics argue that the theoretical underpinnings of these risk interpretations are often post hoc and lack the parsimony that characterized the original CAPM (Black et al., 1972).

An alternative behavioral interpretation emphasizes the role of investor psychology and market frictions in generating observed anomalies. According to this perspective, size and value premiums may arise from systematic biases such as overconfidence, representativeness, or limits to arbitrage, rather than from compensation for risk (Daniel & Titman, 1997). Momentum effects, in particular, are frequently cited as evidence of behavioral dynamics, as they imply predictable return patterns that are difficult to reconcile with fully rational expectations. While behavioral explanations offer compelling narratives, they also face challenges in producing unified, testable models that can rival the formal structure of equilibrium frameworks (Campbell, 1996).

The global dimension of asset pricing further complicates this debate. Empirical evidence from emerging markets suggests that institutional factors, such as regulatory quality, market integration, and taxation, play a significant role in shaping return patterns (Brennan, 1970; Connor & Sehgal, 2003). These factors may interact with both risk-based and behavioral mechanisms, blurring the distinction between the two. For example, higher transaction costs and informational barriers may exacerbate behavioral biases while simultaneously increasing the compensation required for bearing certain risks (Elfakhani & Wei, 2003).

Bibliometric analyses provide an additional lens through which to interpret these theoretical debates. The study by Keshari and Gautam (2022) reveals a gradual shift in scholarly attention away from singular model validation

toward broader explorations of model applicability, robustness, and integration. This shift suggests a maturing field that recognizes the limitations of any single framework and values pluralism in both theory and methodology. At the same time, the concentration of citations around a relatively small set of canonical models indicates that foundational ideas continue to exert a strong influence, even as new approaches emerge.

A critical implication of this discussion is that future progress in asset pricing may depend less on the proliferation of additional factors and more on the development of integrative theories that can accommodate heterogeneity across markets. Such theories would need to account explicitly for institutional context, investor behavior, and dynamic interactions between risk and return, rather than treating anomalies as isolated deviations from an idealized benchmark (Campbell, 1996). In this regard, the convergence of empirical analysis, behavioral insights, and bibliometric mapping offers a promising pathway for advancing the field.

CONCLUSION

This article has provided an extensive and integrative examination of global asset pricing paradigms, tracing their theoretical evolution, empirical contestation, and scholarly diffusion. By synthesizing foundational theories, empirical evidence from diverse markets, and bibliometric insights into the structure of the literature, the study highlights both the achievements and the unresolved challenges of asset pricing research. The persistent debate over the interpretation of factor premiums underscores the complexity of financial markets and cautions against overly simplistic models.

A central conclusion emerging from this analysis is that asset pricing cannot be fully understood in isolation from its institutional and intellectual contexts. Empirical regularities such as size, value, and momentum effects are shaped by market-specific conditions and scholarly conventions alike, as reflected in both empirical findings and citation patterns (Keshari & Gautam, 2022). Recognizing this contextual dependence does not undermine the value of asset pricing theory but rather enriches it by encouraging reflexivity and methodological openness.

Ultimately, the future of global asset pricing research lies in its capacity to integrate diverse perspectives into coherent, context-sensitive frameworks. By bridging theory, evidence, and bibliometric analysis, scholars can move toward a more comprehensive understanding of how risk is priced across markets and over time. Such an understanding is essential not only for academic progress but also for informed investment practice and policy formulation in an increasingly interconnected

global financial system (Campbell, 1996).

REFERENCES

1. Black, F., Jensen, M. C., & Scholes, M. (1972). The Capital Asset Pricing Model: Some empirical tests. In M. C. Jensen (Ed.), Studies in the theory of capital markets. Praeger.

2. Cakici, N., Tang, Y., & Yan, A. (2016). Do the size, value, and momentum factors drive stock returns in emerging markets? Journal of International Money and Finance, 69, 179–204.

3. Fabozzi, F. J., & Francis, J. C. (1978). Beta as a random coefficient. The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, 13(1), 101–116.

4. Beltratti, A., & Trio, M. (2002). The cross-section of risk premium in the Italian stock market. Economic Notes, 31(3), 389–416.

5. Keshari, A., & Gautam, A. (2022). Asset pricing in global scenario: A bibliometric analysis. IIM Ranchi Journal of Management Studies, 2(1), 48–69. https://doi.org/10.1108/IRJMS-02-2022-0025

6. Campbell, J. Y. (1996). Understanding risk and return. Journal of Political Economy, 104(2), 298–345.

7. Connor, G., & Sehgal, S. (2003). Tests of the Fama and French model in India. Decision, 30(2), 1–20.

8. Carhart, M. (1997). On the persistence of mutual fund performance. Journal of Finance, 52, 57–82.

9. Faff, R. (2004). A simple test of the Fama and French model using daily data: Australian evidence. Applied Financial Economics, 14, 83–92.

10. Daniel, K., & Titman, S. (1997). Evidence on the characteristics of cross-sectional variation in stock returns. Journal of Finance, 52(1), 1–33.

11. Brennan, M. J. (1970). Taxes, market valuation and corporate financial policy. National Tax Journal, 23(4), 417–427.

12. Elfakhani, S., & Wei, J. (2003). The survivorship bias, share price effect, and small firm effect in Canadian markets. Review of Financial Economics, 12(4), 397–411.

13. Cakici, N., Fabozzi, F. J., & Tan, S. (2013). Size, value, and momentum in emerging market stock returns. Emerging Markets Review, 16, 46–65.

14. Barber, B., Lyon, J., & Tsai, C. (1997). Firm size, book-to-market ratio, and security returns. Journal of

Finance, 52(2), 875–883.

15. Davis, J. L., Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. (2000). Characteristics, covariances, and average returns. Journal of Finance, 55(1), 389–406.

16. Breeden, D. (1979). An intertemporal asset pricing model with stochastic consumption and investment opportunities. Journal of Financial Economics, 7, 265–296.

17. Ajili, S. (2005). The Capital Asset Pricing Model and the Three Factor Model of Fama and French revisited in the case of France. Working paper.

18. Bahl, B. (2007). Testing the Fama and French three factor model and its variants for the Indian stock returns. Working paper.

19. Bundoo, S. K. (2007). An augmented Fama and French three factor model: New evidence from an emerging stock market. Working paper.

20. Chaudhary, R., & Bakhshi, P. (2021). Selection of the right proxy market portfolio for CAPM. Investment Management and Financial Innovations, 18(3), 16–26.

21. Chiah, M., Chai, D., Zhong, A., & Li, S. (2016). A better model? An empirical investigation of the Fama–French five-factor model in Australia. International Review of Finance, 16(4), 595–638.

22. Czapkiewicz, A., & Wójtowicz, T. (2014). The four-factor asset pricing model on the Polish stock market. Economic Research–Ekonomska Istraživanja, 27(1), 771–783.

23. Erb, C. B., & Harvey, C. R. (2006). The strategic and tactical value of commodity futures. Financial Analysts Journal, 62(2), 69–97.