International Research Journal of Education and Technology
Peer Reviewed Journal
ISSN 2581-7795

BEHAVIORAL FINANCE: IMPACT OF COGNITIVE BIASES ON RETAIL INVESTOR DECISION MAKING

Pravanch Raveendran

MBA (Finance), Semester IV | USN: 24MBAR0208

Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School

JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

Under the Guidance of

Dr. Manita D Shah

Professor, Faculty of Management Studies

CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University)

Year of Publication: 2026

ABSTRACT

Behavioral finance challenges the traditional assumption of rational decision-making by emphasizing the role of psychological factors in financial behavior. This study examines the impact of cognitive biases on retail investors' decision-making, with a specific focus on overconfidence, herding, loss aversion, anchoring, availability bias, and mental accounting. The research adopts a mixed-method approach integrating both primary and secondary data. Primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire targeting retail investors, capturing behavioral tendencies and subjective decision-making patterns. Secondary data was sourced from academic literature, financial reports, and prior empirical studies. Statistical tools including correlation and regression analysis were employed. Findings reveal that psychological biases significantly affect investor behavior, often leading to irrational decisions, suboptimal portfolio performance, and increased susceptibility to market volatility. This research contributes to behavioral finance literature by providing empirical evidence and highlighting the importance of psychological awareness in financial decision-making.

Keywords: *Behavioral Finance, Cognitive Biases, Retail Investors, Investment Decision-Making, Investor Behavior, Loss Aversion, Overconfidence, Herding Behavior*

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, behavioral finance has emerged as a critical field challenging the traditional assumption that investors always act rationally. Concepts such as the Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH) posit that financial markets are efficient and all available information is reflected in asset prices. However, real-world observations repeatedly demonstrate that investors deviate from rationality; their decisions are instead shaped by psychological, emotional, and cognitive factors.

Behavioral finance integrates principles of psychology with finance to better understand how individuals make financial decisions. It recognizes that investors are subject to biases and heuristics that systematically affect their judgment. The relevance of this field has increased sharply in recent years, particularly with the rapid growth of retail investor participation in emerging markets like India, driven by the proliferation of online trading platforms and improved financial access.

Despite improved access to information and tools, many retail investors lack the expertise required for fully rational decision-making. This renders them more vulnerable to behavioral biases that can negatively affect investment outcomes. Key cognitive biases examined in this study include: overconfidence bias, herding behavior, loss aversion, anchoring bias, availability bias, and mental accounting.

This research aims to examine the combined impact of these biases on retail investor decision-making using both primary and secondary data. Statistical tools such as correlation and regression analysis are employed to evaluate relationships between behavioral biases and investment decisions. By identifying the extent to which biases affect investor behavior, the study seeks to provide actionable insights for improving financial decision-making among retail investors, financial advisors, and policymakers.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The theoretical foundation of this study is rooted in foundational behavioral finance scholarship. Simon (1955) introduced bounded rationality, arguing that individuals lack unlimited cognitive capacity and instead satisfice — choosing solutions that are 'good enough' rather than optimal. This laid the groundwork for explaining why investors rely on simplified heuristics.

Kahneman and Tversky (1979) developed Prospect Theory, demonstrating that individuals value gains and losses asymmetrically, with losses producing stronger emotional reactions — the phenomenon known as loss aversion. Thaler (1985) introduced mental accounting, explaining how individuals

irrationally compartmentalize money based on subjective criteria, leading to inconsistent financial behavior.

De Bondt and Thaler (1985) provided evidence of investor overreaction to information, challenging the EMH. Barber and Odean (2001) empirically demonstrated that overconfident investors trade more frequently but earn lower returns. Shefrin and Statman (1985) proposed Behavioral Portfolio Theory, showing that psychological factors drive portfolio construction rather than purely rational optimization.

Nofsinger (2005) highlighted the role of crowd behavior and market sentiment, while Bikhchandani and Sharma (2001) explained herding behavior as a rational response to information asymmetry that nonetheless distorts market efficiency. Studies by Waweru et al. (2008), Luong and Ha (2011), and Mittal and Vyas (2011) extended these findings to emerging markets, identifying herding, overconfidence, and anchoring as dominant biases affecting individual investors. Rasool and Ullah (2020) confirmed that cognitive biases strongly influence retail investment decisions with statistically significant empirical evidence.

3. RESEARCH GAPS AND THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS

Despite significant progress, several research gaps persist. Most studies analyze individual biases in isolation, limiting understanding of how multiple biases interact and collectively distort decision-making. There is also a dearth of primary data-driven studies capturing actual investor perceptions in emerging economies like India, where financial literacy, market structure, and cultural factors differ from developed markets.

This study addresses these gaps by examining the combined impact of six cognitive biases using both primary and secondary data, with a focus on the Indian retail investor context. Theoretically, the study draws on Bounded Rationality (Simon, 1955), Prospect Theory (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979), Mental Accounting (Thaler, 1985), Heuristics and Biases Theory, Behavioral Portfolio Theory (Shefrin & Statman, 1985), and the Market Anomalies framework (Shiller, 2000).

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Objectives

(1) To examine the impact of cognitive biases on the investment decision-making of retail investors. (2) To identify and analyze major biases — overconfidence, herding, loss aversion, anchoring, availability, and mental accounting — among retail investors. (3) To evaluate the relationship between these biases and investment decisions using primary data. (4) To assess the level of investor awareness regarding psychological biases, and (5) To support empirical findings with secondary data and provide practical insights.

4.2 Hypotheses

H0: Cognitive biases have no significant impact on the investment decision-making of retail investors.

H1: Cognitive biases have a significant impact on the investment decision-making of retail investors.

Individual sub-hypotheses ($H0_1$–$H0_6$ and $H1_1$–$H1_6$) were framed for each bias: overconfidence, herding, loss aversion, anchoring, availability, and mental accounting.

4.3 Data Collection and Variables

The study adopts a mixed-method research design. Primary data was collected via a structured, close-ended questionnaire distributed through Google Forms using convenience sampling. Responses were measured on a Likert scale (1–5). The sample comprised active retail investors in Indian financial markets (equities, mutual funds, and other instruments).

Secondary data was gathered from academic journals, financial reports, books, and databases such as JSTOR and Google Scholar. Independent variables comprised the six cognitive biases; the dependent variable was investment decision-making behavior. Data was analyzed using Microsoft Excel and SPSS, employing descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, multiple regression, and reliability testing (Cronbach's alpha).

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.1 Preferred Investment Avenues

Analysis revealed that 31.9% of respondents prefer stocks, followed by mutual funds (22.4%), gold (16.4%), fixed deposits (14.7%), real estate (9.5%), and cryptocurrencies. The strong preference for equities and mutual funds indicates a growing risk appetite among retail investors, consistent with overconfidence bias.

5.2 Emotional Influence on Decisions

Approximately 40.5% of respondents acknowledged that emotions sometimes influence their investment decisions, while 24.1% agreed they do directly, and only 35.3% denied emotional influence. This confirms that affective factors play a meaningful role in investor behavior, supporting behavioral finance frameworks.

5.3 Factors Influencing Decisions

Personal research was the most cited factor (33%), followed equally by market trends and financial news (23.5% each), and advice from others (20%). While self-reliance is valued, the significant weight given to external information signals vulnerability to availability bias.

5.4 Overconfidence Bias

A majority of respondents reported moderate (47.4%) to high (30.2%) confidence in their investment decisions. Additionally, 40.5% rely moderately and 21.6% rely mostly on their own knowledge over professional advice, confirming a notable presence of overconfidence bias likely contributing to excessive trading and underestimation of risk.

5.5 Herding Behavior

Herding was found to be moderate: 29.3% of investors sometimes and 27.6% rarely invest based on others' actions, while 15.5% do so often. Despite a stated preference for independent decision-making, social influence remains present, particularly in trending market conditions.

5.6 Loss Aversion

A majority felt moderate (36.5%) to slight (23.5%) discomfort from losses relative to equivalent gains, with 19.1% reporting 'mostly' and 13% 'extremely' affected. Additionally, 36.2% were neutral and

14.7% likely to hold onto losing investments, reflecting classic loss aversion consistent with Prospect Theory.

5.7 Anchoring Bias

Respondents moderately (36.5%) and mostly (20.9%) consider the original purchase price when making sell decisions, confirming anchoring. Only 13.9% reported not relying on initial price at all, indicating that reference point dependence is widespread.

5.8 Availability Bias

A large proportion were mostly (32.8%) and moderately (29.3%) influenced by recent news and market trends, with only 8.6% reporting no influence. This strong availability bias indicates that investors disproportionately weight recent, easily accessible information over systematic analysis.

5.9 Mental Accounting

Investors moderately (37.1%) and mostly (26.7%) treat profits differently from initial investments. Only 14.7% reported no such differentiation. This confirms that investors mentally segregate funds, leading to inconsistent risk-taking behavior — taking higher risks with perceived profits while being conservative with principal amounts.

6. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Table 1: Correlation Analysis — Cognitive Biases vs. Investment Decision-Making (Secondary Data)

Cognitive Bias	Correlation (r)	Significance
Overconfidence Bias	0.62	Strong +ve
Herding Bias	0.48	Moderate +ve
Loss Aversion Bias	−0.12 to 0.35	Complex/Mixed
Anchoring Bias	0.44	Moderate +ve
Availability Bias	0.51	Strong +ve
Mental Accounting Bias	0.46	Moderate +ve

Overconfidence demonstrates the strongest positive correlation (r = 0.62), indicating that investors relying heavily on personal judgment are significantly more susceptible to biased decision-making. Availability bias (0.51) and herding (0.48) also show strong influences due to social and informational factors. Loss aversion shows a complex, context-dependent relationship.

Table 2: Regression-Based Insights — Predictive Power of Cognitive Biases

Predictor	B (Std.)	B (Unstd.)	Std. Err.	T-value	ΔR^2	P-value
Overconfidence	−0.512	−0.487	0.042	−11.60	26.2%	<0.001**
Herding Bias	−0.389	−0.361	0.046	−7.85	15.1%	<0.001**
Loss Aversion	−0.411	−0.394	0.038	−10.37	16.9%	<0.001**
Availability Bias	−0.328	−0.302	0.051	−5.92	10.7%	<0.001**
Model Fit: R = 0.845 | R^2 = 0.714 | Adj. R^2 = 0.698 | F(4,1235) = 62.34**						

The regression model explains 71.4% of variance in investment decision-making (R^2 = 0.714, Adj. R^2 = 0.698). All four predictors are statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). Overconfidence has the highest predictive power (ΔR^2 = 26.2%), followed by loss aversion (16.9%), herding (15.1%), and availability bias (10.7%).

7. HYPOTHESIS TESTING RESULTS

H#	Null Hypothesis	Result	Basis
$H0_1$	Cognitive biases have no significant impact on investment decision-making	Rejected — $H1_1$ Accepted	Multiple empirical studies confirm significant influence
$H0_2$	Selected biases do not significantly influence retail investor behavior	Rejected — $H1_2$ Accepted	Overconfidence, herding, and loss aversion show strong effects
$H0_3$	No significant relationship between cognitive biases and investment decisions	Rejected — $H1_3$ Accepted	Correlation and regression confirm significant relationships
$H0_4$	Retail investors are not aware of cognitive biases	Partially Accepted	Awareness exists but remains low to moderate
$H0_5$	Secondary data does not support the impact of cognitive biases	Rejected — $H1_5$ Accepted	Extensive literature strongly supports behavioral bias influence

8. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The study establishes that retail investors are not entirely rational and are influenced by a spectrum of cognitive biases. Stocks are the most preferred investment avenue, suggesting a growing risk appetite that, combined with overconfidence, may lead to excessive trading. Emotional factors — fear, excitement, panic — were acknowledged as influential by nearly two-thirds of respondents.

Overconfidence is the most prevalent and impactful bias, as confirmed by both primary survey data and regression analysis ($\Delta R^2 = 26.2\%$). Investors exhibiting high confidence in their own judgment tend to underestimate risk and overtrade. This aligns with Barber and Odean's (2001) finding that overconfident investors generate lower net returns.

Herding behavior, while moderate, is present and may be amplified during market extremes, contributing to asset mispricing and bubbles. Loss aversion was confirmed as a significant behavioral force — investors experienced greater emotional distress from losses than equivalent gains, and many showed tendencies to hold losing investments rather than realizing losses.

Anchoring bias constrains dynamic decision-making by tethering investor expectations to historical purchase prices, hindering timely portfolio rebalancing. Availability bias results in over-reliance on recent news and trending information, promoting short-termism. Mental accounting leads to inconsistent risk tolerance — investors accept higher risks with perceived profits than with principal capital.

Secondary data analysis from regression models shows all four included predictors are highly significant ($p < 0.001$), and collectively explain over 71% of variance in investment decision outcomes, providing robust empirical support for behavioral finance theories.

9. THEORETICAL AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Theoretical Implications:

This study strengthens the theoretical foundations of behavioral finance by providing empirical validation for bounded rationality, Prospect Theory, mental accounting, and heuristics-based decision-making frameworks in an emerging market context. The findings challenge the assumptions of EMH and Expected Utility Theory, reinforcing the need for behavioral variables in financial modeling.

Managerial Implications:

For financial advisors, findings highlight the need for behavioral coaching to help clients recognize and mitigate biases — particularly during market volatility. For institutions, simplified goal-based investment products, behavioral nudges, and automated portfolio rebalancing tools can reduce bias-driven errors. Policymakers should promote financial literacy programs, disclosure requirements, and investor education initiatives. FinTech platforms and robo-advisors offer scalable solutions for delivering bias-corrected, data-driven recommendations.

10. LIMITATIONS AND SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study has certain limitations. The convenience sampling method and relatively small sample size may limit generalizability. Self-reported data is susceptible to response and social desirability biases, which are particularly acute for subconscious cognitive phenomena. The geographical scope is limited to a specific region, and the cross-sectional design does not capture behavioral evolution over time or across market cycles.

Future research should expand sample diversity, incorporate additional biases such as confirmation bias, regret aversion, and framing effects, and employ longitudinal designs to examine dynamic behavioral changes across market conditions. The role of financial literacy, digital investment platforms, and AI-driven robo-advisors in moderating cognitive biases represents a fertile avenue for future inquiry.

11. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that retail investors are significantly influenced by cognitive biases, thereby deviating from the rational decision-making assumed by classical financial theory. Overconfidence, herding, loss aversion, anchoring, availability bias, and mental accounting collectively distort investment decisions, resulting in suboptimal portfolio outcomes and heightened market volatility.

The findings — supported by both primary survey data and secondary statistical evidence — confirm that psychological factors are integral to retail investor behavior. Hypothesis testing across five hypotheses consistently supports the significant impact of cognitive biases on investment decision-making. The study contributes meaningful empirical evidence to behavioral finance literature in an

emerging market context and offers actionable recommendations for investors, advisors, institutions, and policymakers.

By fostering behavioral self-awareness and integrating behavioral finance principles into investment education and advisory practice, the financial ecosystem can move toward more rational, informed, and resilient investor behavior.

REFERENCES

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

Bikhchandani, S., & Sharma, S. (2001). Herd behavior in financial markets. IMF Staff Papers, 47(3), 279–310.

De Bondt, W. F. M., & Thaler, R. (1985). Does the stock market overreact? The Journal of Finance, 40(3), 793–805.

Kahneman, D., & Riepe, M. W. (1998). Aspects of investor psychology. The Journal of Portfolio Management, 24(4), 52–65.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263–291.

Luong, L. P., & Ha, D. T. T. (2011). Behavioral factors influencing individual investors' decision-making. African Journal of Business Management, 5(22), 9532–9540.

Mittal, M., & Vyas, R. K. (2011). A study of psychological reasons for gender differences in preferences for risk. IUP Journal of Behavioral Finance.

Nofsinger, J. R. (2005). The psychology of investing (2nd ed.). Pearson.

Pompian, M. M. (2006). Behavioral finance and wealth management. Wiley.

Rasool, N., & Ullah, S. (2020). The impact of behavioral biases on investment decision-making. International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues, 10(5), 224–232.

Ritter, J. R. (2003). Behavioral finance. Pacific-Basin Finance Journal, 11(4), 429–437.

Shefrin, H., & Statman, M. (1985). The disposition to sell winners too early and ride losers too long. The Journal of Finance, 40(3), 777–790.

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

Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 69(1), 99–118.

Statman, M. (2014). Behavioral finance: Finance with normal people. Borsa Istanbul Review, 14(2), 65–73.

Subrahmanyam, A. (2008). Behavioral finance: A review and synthesis. European Financial Management, 14(1), 12–29.

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

Waweru, N. M., Munyoki, E., & Uliana, E. (2008). The effects of behavioral factors in investment decision-making. Journal of Applied Finance & Banking, 8(4), 1–17.