**Journal of Management Studies and Development**
Vol. 5, No. 02, pp. 251-261
journal.iistr.org/index.php/JMSD
DOI: 10.56741/IISTR.jmsd.001998

# Understanding Behavioural Finance: Investor Psychology and Market Anomalies

**[1]T. Venkatesan*, [2]V. Viswaprakash, [3]R. Alexzander**
Corresponding Author: * proftvv@gmail.com
[1] Knowledge Institute of Technology, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India
[2] Valliammai Engineering College, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India
[3] Silicon City College (Autonomous), Bengaluru, India

ARTICLE INFO

**Article history**
Received 13 January 2026
Revised 30 April 2026
Accepted 4 May 2026

**Keywords**
Behavioral Finance
Cognitive Biases
Financial Decision-Making
Investor Psychology
Market Anomalies

ABSTRACT

This study explores the evolving field of behavioral finance, focusing on how psychological factors influence investor decision-making and contribute to persistent market anomalies. Unlike traditional financial theories that assume rational behavior and efficient markets, behavioral finance integrates cognitive biases, emotional influences, and social dynamics to explain deviations from expected market outcomes. The research examines key behavioral concepts such as overconfidence, loss aversion, herding, and framing effects, and their implications for asset pricing, risk perception, and investor behavior. Drawing upon recent empirical and theoretical work from both global and Indian contexts (2020–2025), the study highlights how these psychological elements lead to mispricing and volatility in financial markets. The findings suggest that incorporating behavioral insights can improve investment strategies, regulatory frameworks, and financial literacy programs. By advancing a multidisciplinary approach, this paper contributes to a deeper understanding of real-world financial behavior and calls for more adaptive and inclusive financial systems.

This is an open-access article under the CC–BY-SA license.

## Introduction

The field of behavioral finance has gained substantial recognition as an interdisciplinary framework that integrates psychological insights into traditional financial theory to explain real-world investor behavior better. Conventional finance models, particularly the Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH), assume that investors act rationally and that financial markets efficiently incorporate all available information into asset prices. Under this perspective, price movements reflect fundamental information, and persistent mispricing should not occur. However, repeated empirical evidence from financial crises, speculative bubbles, and persistent market anomalies challenges these assumptions and reveals systematic deviations from rational behavior [1],[2]. Events such as abrupt market crashes, extreme volatility, and prolonged asset mispricing demonstrate that investors do not always process information objectively or make decisions purely based on rational evaluation.

Behavioral finance addresses these limitations by emphasizing the influence of cognitive biases, emotional responses, and social dynamics on financial decision-making. Investors often rely on mental shortcuts that simplify complex financial information but simultaneously distort judgment and risk perception. Biases such as overconfidence, loss aversion, anchoring, framing effects, and herding have been widely documented as key drivers of mispricing, excessive trading, and heightened market volatility [3],[4]. Overconfidence encourages investors to overestimate their knowledge and predictive abilities, leading to frequent trading and underestimation of market risks. Anchoring causes investors to rely excessively on initial reference points when evaluating asset prices, preventing them from adjusting expectations appropriately when new information becomes available. Empirical studies further demonstrate that investor sentiment and emotions play a crucial role during periods of uncertainty, such as financial crises and pandemics, leading to overreaction and irrational market movements [5],[6]. Emotional responses such as fear, panic, and excessive optimism can amplify price fluctuations and contribute to herd-driven investment behavior.

Recent literature between 2020 and 2025 highlights the growing relevance of behavioral finance across diverse financial contexts. Research has shown that behavioral factors shape investment preferences in areas such as ESG investing, retirement planning, and the adoption of digital finance [3],[4],[7]. Investors increasingly consider psychological satisfaction, ethical alignment, and perceived social value in addition to financial returns when making investment decisions. In emerging markets, including India, behavioral biases such as anchoring, herding, and framing effects significantly influence retail investor behavior, cryptocurrency investment decisions, and responses to influencer-based stock recommendations [8]-[10]. Social media platforms and digital communication channels have intensified the spread of investor sentiment, accelerating information diffusion and sometimes

amplifying speculative trading behavior. Advances in technology have further expanded behavioral finance research through sentiment analysis, robo advisory systems, and neurofinance approaches using biometric and EEG data [11]-[13]. These developments allow researchers to observe investor emotions and decision processes more directly and in real time.

The purpose of this study is to synthesize recent theoretical and empirical contributions to behavioral finance to explain how investor psychology contributes to recurring market anomalies. By integrating insights from psychology, finance, and data-driven methodologies, this research proposes a more realistic framework for understanding market dynamics. Such an approach has important implications for improving investment strategies, enhancing regulatory and policy design, and strengthening financial literacy and investor education programs in both developed and emerging financial markets.

## Results and Discussion

### A. Psychological Biases Underlying Investor Decision-Making

Table 1 synthesizes the dominant psychological biases that shape investor decision-making across financial environments. The prevalence of cognitive biases such as overconfidence and anchoring suggests that investors frequently overestimate their informational advantage while simultaneously relying on heuristic reference points when evaluating market signals [14], [15]. Such cognitive distortions weaken the assumptions of rational expectations embedded in traditional finance theory. Empirical evidence consistently indicates that overconfident investors trade more frequently, incur higher transaction costs, and experience greater portfolio volatility without achieving superior returns.

**Table 1.** Core Psychological Biases and Decision-Making Effects

| Bias Category | Bias | Observed Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Cognitive | Overconfidence refers to investors' tendency to overestimate their knowledge, predictive ability, and control over financial outcomes when making investment decisions. | Leads to excessive trading, underestimation of risks, and belief in superior forecasting ability, increasing market volatility, and often reducing long-term portfolio returns. |
| Cognitive | Anchoring occurs when investors rely heavily on initial information, such as purchase prices or historical benchmarks, when evaluating asset values and future expectations. | Causes slow adjustment to new information and reliance on outdated reference points, contributing to persistent mispricing and inefficient valuation in financial markets. |
| Emotional | Loss aversion reflects the tendency to perceive losses as psychologically more painful than equivalent gains, shaping investment preferences and risk attitudes. | Investors delay selling losing assets while prematurely selling profitable assets, weakening portfolio performance, and creating behavioral distortions in market participation. |
| Social | Herd behavior arises when investors imitate the actions of others rather than relying on independent information or analytical judgment. | Collective imitation amplifies price movements, potentially producing speculative bubbles or crashes and weakening the link between asset prices and fundamental value. |
| Cognitive–Emotional | Mental accounting describes the tendency to separate financial decisions into different psychological accounts rather than evaluating overall portfolio outcomes. | Fragmented evaluation of investment results in inefficient diversification, suboptimal risk management, and inconsistent portfolio allocation strategies. |

Anchoring further exacerbates pricing inefficiencies by limiting investors' ability to update beliefs when new information becomes available [8], [16]. Instead of adjusting valuations dynamically, investors tend to rely on previously observed prices or salient reference values, leading to persistent mispricing. These findings align with behavioral finance models that emphasize bounded rationality and cognitive simplification in financial decision-making.

Emotional biases also play a substantial role in shaping market outcomes, particularly during periods of uncertainty. Loss aversion (one of the central propositions of prospect theory) causes investors to retain underperforming assets longer than predicted by rational asset pricing models [17], [18]. This behavior contributes to the well-documented disposition effect, which delays price adjustments and reduces portfolio efficiency. In parallel, herd behavior amplifies market fluctuations by encouraging investors to imitate prevailing market sentiment rather than rely on independent analysis [15], [19], [20]. Such collective behavior may intensify price momentum and contribute to speculative bubbles or synchronized market downturns.

Mental accounting and framing effects further illustrate how financial decisions are influenced by psychological categorization rather than objective optimization. Investors often segregate funds into subjective categories, evaluating outcomes relative to mental reference frames instead of considering portfolio performance holistically [16], [21]. This fragmentation undermines diversification and weakens long-term portfolio efficiency. Collectively, these behavioral patterns reinforce the argument that deviations from rationality are systematic and predictable, providing a compelling explanation for persistent inefficiencies observed in financial markets [22], [23].

**B. Heuristics, Prospect Theory, and Behavioral Mechanisms**

Table 2 illustrates the asymmetric evaluation of gains and losses predicted by prospect theory, highlighting loss aversion as a fundamental mechanism in investor psychology [17], [18]. Unlike the symmetrical utility assumptions embedded in expected utility theory, prospect theory posits that losses exert a significantly stronger psychological impact than equivalent gains. This asymmetry helps explain several observed investment behaviors, including premature profit realization and excessive risk avoidance following financial losses [15], [18], [23].

These behavioral responses reflect the dominance of intuitive and heuristic-based decision processes, often described as System 1 thinking. Under conditions of uncertainty, investors frequently rely on cognitive shortcuts that simplify complex information but simultaneously distort probability assessments and risk perception [24], [25]. Such heuristics become particularly influential during volatile market periods, when emotional stress and cognitive load limit the capacity for analytical reasoning.

**Table 2.** Prospect Theory Outcomes in Investment Contexts

| Scenario | Behavioral Response |
|---|---|
| Equivalent gains | Investors experience moderate satisfaction from gains of similar magnitude, but the psychological impact is limited because gains are evaluated relative to expectations and reference points. |
| Equivalent losses | Losses of equal size generate stronger emotional reactions than gains, producing disproportionate dissatisfaction and motivating investors to avoid realizing negative outcomes whenever possible. |
| Avoiding loss vs gaining | When choosing between avoiding a loss and achieving a comparable gain, investors generally prioritize loss avoidance, reflecting asymmetric risk perception predicted by prospect theory. |

The implications of prospect theory extend beyond individual decision-making and have significant consequences for broader market dynamics. Loss-averse investors typically demand higher compensation for perceived risk, contributing to risk premium anomalies and conservative asset allocation strategies [21], [22]. Consequently, behavioral preferences may influence aggregate market outcomes by shaping asset pricing patterns and investment flows. Recognizing these mechanisms, therefore, provides a more comprehensive explanation for market behavior than models based solely on rational expectations [26], [27].

### C. Behavioral Origins of Market Anomalies

Table 3 demonstrates how individual-level behavioral biases can aggregate into persistent market anomalies. Calendar anomalies such as the January Effect are often associated with shifts in investor sentiment and behavioral resets rather than changes in fundamental economic information [15], [23]. Tax-loss selling at the end of the fiscal year, followed by renewed optimism and portfolio rebalancing in early trading periods, can generate predictable return patterns that challenge the assumptions of informationally efficient markets [27], [28].

**Table 3.** Behavioral Explanations of Market Anomalies

| Anomaly | Behavioral Driver |
|---|---|
| January Effect | Investors rebalance portfolios after year-end tax-loss selling and sentiment reset, increasing demand for undervalued stocks and temporarily raising prices during early January. |
| Momentum | Investors underreact to new information and follow prevailing market trends. Herding behavior reinforces price movements, causing winning assets to continue outperforming in the short term. |
| Reversal | Excessive optimism or pessimism leads to overreaction to news, pushing prices away from intrinsic values before eventual correction and return toward fundamental valuation. |
| Asset Bubbles | Collective optimism, fear of missing out, and social contagion drive rapid price increases beyond fundamentals, creating speculative bubbles that often end with abrupt market corrections. |

Momentum and reversal patterns provide further evidence of behavioral influences in price formation. In the short term, investors frequently underreact to new information, allowing price trends to persist as herd behavior reinforces collective market movements [19], [29]. Over longer horizons, however, excessive optimism or pessimism may lead to

overreaction, eventually producing price reversals when valuations realign with underlying fundamentals [15], [29].

These dynamics directly challenge the Efficient Market Hypothesis, which assumes that financial markets incorporate information rapidly and without bias [22]. Behavioral explanations suggest instead that investor sentiment, cognitive limitations, and emotional responses systematically shape price formation processes. Integrating psychological variables into asset pricing models, therefore, enhances the explanatory power of financial theory by providing a more realistic account of market behavior and anomaly persistence [21], [26], [30].

**D. Heterogeneity in Investor Behavior**

Table 4 highlights the substantial heterogeneity in behavioral biases across different investor groups, indicating that investor psychology cannot be treated as a homogeneous construct. Retail investors are particularly vulnerable to emotional and cognitive biases such as the disposition effect, which is often reinforced by limited financial experience, information asymmetry, and stronger emotional attachment to investment outcomes [15], [23]. As a consequence, retail investors frequently exhibit suboptimal timing behavior, holding underperforming assets for extended periods while prematurely realizing gains. Such patterns ultimately reduce long-term portfolio performance and represent persistent deviations from the predictions of rational investment theory [14], [31].

**Table 4.** Behavioral Differences Across Investor Types

| Investor Group | Dominant Bias | Market Implication |
|---|---|---|
| Retail investors | Retail investors frequently exhibit the disposition effect, preferring to sell winning assets quickly while holding losing assets in hopes of recovery. | This behavior reduces overall portfolio performance because investors realize small gains prematurely and retain underperforming assets, lowering long-term net returns. |
| Institutional investors | Institutional investors may demonstrate herding tendencies, aligning investment decisions with market consensus or peer institutions to reduce perceived reputational risk. | Collective institutional behavior can amplify price movements and increase short-term market volatility, especially during periods of uncertainty or rapid information diffusion. |
| Younger investors | Younger investors often display higher overconfidence due to limited market experience and strong belief in their ability to predict short-term market movements. | Overconfidence encourages speculative trading, higher turnover, and increased risk-taking, which may lead to unstable returns and greater exposure to market fluctuations. |

Institutional investors, although equipped with greater analytical resources and access to market information, are not immune to behavioral distortions. Herding behavior among institutional investors often arises from career incentives, benchmarking pressures, and reputational concerns rather than purely informational considerations [20], [22]. In this context, herding may represent a form of rational strategic behavior aimed at minimizing professional risk. However, when adopted collectively, such behavior can amplify price

volatility and contribute to systemic risk, particularly during periods of heightened market uncertainty [15], [29].

Demographic characteristics also play a critical role in shaping behavioral tendencies. Younger investors typically display higher levels of risk tolerance and overconfidence, partly driven by their exposure to digital investment platforms, social media information flows, and peer influence networks [19], [31]. These factors can increase participation in speculative trading and short-term investment strategies, particularly in emerging financial markets and digital asset ecosystems [14], [15]. The existence of such behavioral heterogeneity highlights the need for segmented approaches in financial education, regulation, and investment advisory services. Policies that assume uniform investor behavior may therefore fail to address the diverse psychological drivers underlying financial decision-making [26], [27].

### E. Behavioral Finance in Portfolio Management and Strategy

Table 5 illustrates how behavioral biases systematically shape portfolio construction and asset allocation decisions. Loss aversion often leads investors to overweight low-risk assets, prioritizing short-term capital preservation over long-term return maximization [17], [18]. While such behavior may provide psychological comfort during periods of uncertainty, it frequently results in overly conservative portfolios that fail to capture available risk premiums in financial markets.

**Table 5.** Behavioral Biases and Portfolio Implications

| Bias | Portfolio Impact |
|---|---|
| Loss Aversion | Investors prioritize avoiding losses over achieving gains, leading to overly conservative allocations with excessive cash or low-risk assets that may limit long-term portfolio growth. |
| Overconfidence | Investors overestimate their ability to select winning assets, concentrating investments in a few securities and reducing diversification across sectors, markets, or asset classes. |
| Mental Accounting | Investors separate funds into psychological categories, evaluating investments independently rather than collectively, resulting in fragmented strategies and inefficient overall portfolio management. |

Overconfidence represents another influential bias affecting portfolio structure. Investors who overestimate their informational advantage tend to concentrate investments in a limited number of assets, resulting in under-diversified portfolios and elevated exposure to idiosyncratic risk [14]. This behavior contradicts the diversification principles central to modern portfolio theory. Similarly, mental accounting encourages investors to divide wealth into separate psychological categories rather than evaluate investments within an integrated portfolio framework [16], [21]. Such segmentation reduces portfolio efficiency and distorts risk–return optimization.

Behavioral Portfolio Theory provides an alternative conceptual framework by recognizing that investors often pursue multiple psychologically meaningful objectives rather than a single

utility-maximizing goal [24]. Within this perspective, investors may intentionally combine conservative assets with high-risk speculative investments, creating layered portfolios that reflect emotional as well as financial motivations. Although such strategies may appear inefficient under traditional models, they can be interpreted as rational within a behavioral context [22].

From a practical standpoint, these insights have encouraged the development of behaviorally informed investment strategies, including contrarian investing and smart beta approaches. By systematically exploiting predictable behavioral errors, such strategies seek to improve risk-adjusted performance while simultaneously aligning portfolio structures with investor psychology [22], [29]. Integrating behavioral insights into portfolio management, therefore, enhances both theoretical relevance and practical applicability within contemporary financial markets [26].

### F. Media, Technology, and Emerging Behavioral Interventions

Table 6 highlights the increasingly important role of technological innovation in shaping behavioral dynamics within financial markets. Digital media platforms and online investment communities have significantly accelerated the diffusion of investor sentiment, thereby intensifying herd behavior and emotional contagion across market participants [15], [19]. The rapid circulation of information through social networks can amplify short-term price movements and temporarily decouple asset prices from underlying economic fundamentals [20], [29].

**Table 6.** Behavioral Technologies and Market Implications

| Technology | Behavioral Function |
|---|---|
| Sentiment Analysis | Uses natural language processing and big data analytics to monitor investor sentiment from news, financial reports, and social media discussions. |
| Robo-Advisors | Algorithm-based advisory platforms that incorporate behavioral nudges, automated portfolio rebalancing, and goal-based prompts to encourage disciplined and rational investment decisions. |
| Neurofinance | Applies neuroscience methods such as brain imaging and cognitive experiments to measure emotional responses, risk perception, and neural mechanisms underlying financial decision-making. |

At the same time, technological advances also provide mechanisms for mitigating behavioral biases. Sentiment analysis tools enable analysts, regulators, and financial institutions to monitor collective investor mood in real time, offering early indicators of excessive optimism or panic in financial markets [22], [29]. Such insights can improve risk management and enhance the ability of market participants to anticipate behavior-driven volatility.

Robo-advisory platforms represent another important behavioral intervention. By incorporating automated portfolio rebalancing, goal-based investment frameworks, and behavioral nudges, robo-advisors help investors avoid impulsive decision-making and

maintain long-term investment discipline [27], [30]. These systems are designed to reduce the impact of emotional reactions and cognitive biases that frequently undermine traditional investment strategies.

Neurofinance further extends this technological frontier by examining the biological foundations of financial decision-making. Through techniques such as neuroimaging and physiological measurement, researchers are increasingly able to link neural responses to risk perception, reward anticipation, and emotional reactions during financial decision processes [24], [25]. Such insights contribute to a deeper understanding of investor behavior and enable more sophisticated models of financial decision-making. Collectively, these developments suggest a shift in behavioral finance from a primarily descriptive discipline toward a more prescriptive and intervention-oriented framework with important implications for financial advisory practices and regulatory policy [22], [26].

## Conclusion and Future Directions

The exploration of behavioral finance provides a vital lens through which to understand the psychological underpinnings of investor decision-making and the resulting market anomalies that often elude traditional financial models. This study reinforces the notion that cognitive biases, emotional responses, and social influences play a significant role in shaping individual and collective financial behavior. By challenging the assumptions of rationality and market efficiency, behavioral finance not only deepens theoretical understanding but also offers practical insights for improving financial market outcomes.

The evidence presented underscores the necessity for investors, financial advisors, and policymakers to account for psychological factors when evaluating market dynamics. Moreover, recognizing the impact of behavioral patterns can lead to more robust risk management strategies and better-designed regulatory interventions that enhance market resilience and investor welfare.

Looking ahead, future research should aim to expand the empirical base through cross-cultural and longitudinal studies that capture the evolving nature of investor behavior in diverse economic settings. The integration of behavioral finance with emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence and big data analytics also presents promising avenues for advancing predictive models and real-time behavioral monitoring. Additionally, incorporating neurofinance approaches can deepen understanding of the neural processes that govern financial choices.

As financial systems grow in complexity, the importance of embedding behavioral insights into academic inquiry, policy design, and financial practice will become increasingly critical. A multidisciplinary approach, combining finance, psychology, and data science, will be

essential to navigate the challenges of modern financial markets with greater precision and foresight.

## Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References


[1] H. Shefrin and M. Statman, "Behavioral portfolio theory," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 127–151, 2000.

[2] M. Statman, "Behavioral finance: Finance with normal people," *Borsa Istanbul Review*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 65–73, 2014.

[3] O. S. Mitchell and A. Lusardi, "Financial literacy and financial behavior at older ages," in *The Routledge Handbook of the Economics of Ageing*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2023, pp. 553–565.

[4] S. Benartzi and R. H. Thaler, "Behavioral economics and the retirement savings crisis," *Science*, vol. 339, no. 6124, pp. 1152–1153, 2013.

[5] S. R. Baker, N. Bloom, S. J. Davis, and S. J. Terry, "Covid-induced economic uncertainty," National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA, USA, Working Paper w26983, 2020.

[6] S. Zheng, Y. Zhang, and Y. Chen, "Leveraging financial sentiment analysis for detecting abnormal stock market volatility: An evidence-based approach from social media data," *Academia Nexus Journal*, vol. 3, no. 3, 2024.

[7] S. Gupta, S. Kadyan, and N. K. Bhasin, "Analytical study of behavioral finance in bank merger: Impact of digitalization," *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal*, vol. 25, pp. 1–17, 2021.

[8] R. Saxena, A. Chaturvedi, A. Bhatia, A. Mehta, A. Chaudhari, and A. Jain, "Studying the influence of cognitive biases on the investment decision-making of retail investors in India," *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 2, pp. 4156–4164, 2025.

[9] N. Kumar, M. Janani, R. Pavithra, and T. M. Kumar, "Beyond the hype: A tech-driven analysis of Gen Z's cryptocurrency investment behavior amid regulatory uncertainty and risk-return perceptions in India," *NMIMS Management Review*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 186–198, 2025.

[10] S. Patil, "The impact of AI-powered influencer marketing on consumer engagement and purchase intent: An Indian perspective," *Perspective*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 4131–4148, 2025.

[11] A. W. Lo and D. V. Repin, "The psychophysiology of real-time financial risk processing," *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 323–339, 2002.

[12] J. Kim and B. Han, "A case analysis of artificial intelligence-based financial systems aimed at mitigating investor behavioral biases," *Korea Business Review*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 185–202, 2025.

[13] M. Srivastava, G. D. Sharma, A. K. Srivastava, and S. S. Kumaran, "What's in the brain for us: A systematic literature review of neuroeconomics and neurofinance," *Qualitative Research in Financial Markets*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 413–435, 2020.

[14] B. M. Barber and T. Odean, "Boys will be boys: Gender, overconfidence, and common stock investment," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 116, no. 1, pp. 261–292, 2001.

[15] R. Dasgupta and R. Singh, "Investor sentiment antecedents: A structural equation modeling approach in an emerging market context," *Review of Behavioral Finance*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 37–55, 2019.

[16] P. C. Sinha, "Stocks' pricing dynamics and behavioral finance: A review," *Management Science Letters*, vol. 5, no. 9, pp. 797–820, 2015.

[17] E. De Giorgi and T. Hens, "Making prospect theory fit for finance," *Financial Markets and Portfolio Management*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 339–360, 2006.

[18] G. Loewenstein, "Emotions in economic theory and economic behavior," *American Economic Review*, vol. 90, no. 2, pp. 426–432, 2000.

[19] H. A. Khan and R. J. K. Chahal, "Asymmetric impact of social media sentiments and stock market uncertainty on Indian sectoral returns: A quantile-on-quantile approach," *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, vol. 79, p. 102456, 2025.

[20] L. H. Singh, K. Kumar, and G. Tanty, "Modeling investor herding behavior through social media sentiment: A machine learning approach using YouTube Shorts," *Journal of Behavioral Finance*,

pp. 1–13, 2025.
[21] R. H. Thaler, "The end of behavioral finance," *Financial Analysts Journal*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 12–17, 1999.
[22] R. P. Buckley, D. W. Arner, D. A. Zetzsche, and E. Selga, "The dark side of digital financial transformation: The new risks of fintech and the rise of techrisk," *UNSW Law Research Paper*, no. 19-89, 2019.
[23] J. M. Prosad, S. Kapoor, and J. Sengupta, "Behavioral biases of Indian investors: A survey of Delhi-NCR region," *Qualitative Research in Financial Markets*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 230–263, 2015.
[24] C. Camerer, G. Loewenstein, and D. Prelec, "Neuroeconomics: How neuroscience can inform economics," *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 9–64, 2005.
[25] B. Knutson and S. M. Greer, "Anticipatory affect: Neural correlates and consequences for choice," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, vol. 363, no. 1511, pp. 3771–3786, 2008.
[26] M. Cull, S. Burton, and R. Lam, "Ethics in financial products marketing," in *The SAGE Handbook of Marketing Ethics*. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications, 2020, pp. 301–325.
[27] G. A. Mumbi Mugo, K. Athanasiadis, and D. Koufopoulos, "Gender differences in financial literacy: An empirical study of professionals in Nairobi, Kenya, using the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) toolkit," *Cureus Journal of Business and Economics*, pp. 1–38, 2026.
[28] P. V. Bhandare, S. Guha, R. H. Chaudhury, and C. Ghosh, "Impact of financial literacy models on the financial behavior of individuals: An empirical study on the Indian context," *Strategic Change*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 377–387, 2021.
[29] J. S. Dote-Pardo, M. C. Cordero-Díaz, M. T. Espinosa Jaramillo, and J. Parra-Domínguez, "Leveraging artificial intelligence for enhanced decision-making in finance: Trends and future directions," *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 2025.
[30] H. Canton, "Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development—OECD," in *The Europa Directory of International Organizations 2021*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2021, pp. 677–687.
[31] S. Banerjee, M. Murshidabad, and P. Ray, "Factors affecting investors' inclination towards sustainable investment: A comparative study based on gender," *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, vol. 29, Special Issue 3, pp. 1–9, 2025.

## Authors



**Dr. T. Venkatesan** is Vice Principal in the Department of Management Studies. He obtained his M.A. (Public Administration), M.Com, M.Phil, and MBA from Annamalai University and a Ph.D. degree in Management Studies, specializing in Finance from Bharathiar University, Tamil Nadu. He has published more than 40 articles in national and international journals. He has organized four international conferences. His areas of interest are Finance and Management Accounting. He has taught a diverse set of subjects like Management Accounting, Financial Accounting, Advanced Corporate Finance, Derivatives, and Investments. (email: proftvv@gmail.com).



**Dr. V. Viswaprakash** is an Associate Professor at SRM Valliammai Engineering College, Chennai, with over 19 years of academic and industry experience. He holds a Ph.D. in Management from Bharathiyar University. His expertise includes Financial Management, Strategic Management, and Marketing. He has published several research papers in reputed journals and presented papers at national and international conferences, contributing significantly to management education, research, and student development. (email: drviswaprakash@gmail.com).



**Dr. R. Alexzander** is an Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Management at Silicon City College (Autonomous), Bengaluru. He has over 15 years of teaching experience and one year of corporate experience. His expertise includes finance, marketing, and general management. He has published research articles in reputed journals and actively contributes to academic development through research, training programs, conferences, and curriculum development initiatives (email: alexklency@gmail.com).