



# The Impact Of Cognitive Biases On Investment Decisions: A Study Of Retail Investors In India

## Article History:

### Name of Author:

Dr. Jyoti <sup>1</sup>, Dr. Ankita <sup>2</sup>, Dr. Dewansh Verma<sup>3</sup>, Dr. Devchand<sup>4</sup>

### Affiliation:

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor (Guest Faculty)  
Department of Commerce, Mahatma Gandhi Kashi Vidyapeeth University, Varanasi, India  
ORCID: 0009-0004-7103-7713,

Email ID : [jyotibhu708@gmail.com](mailto:jyotibhu708@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor (Guest Faculty)

Department of Commerce, Mahatma Gandhi Kashi Vidyapeeth University, Varanasi, India  
Email ID : [ankita.s199403@gmail.com](mailto:ankita.s199403@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup>Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, India

Email ID : [dewanshvermal@email.com](mailto:dewanshvermal@email.com)

<sup>4</sup>Assistant Professor (Guest Faculty)

Department of Commerce, Mahatma Gandhi Kashi Vidyapeeth University, Varanasi, India  
Email ID : [devchand017@gmail.com](mailto:devchand017@gmail.com)

**How to cite this article:** Dr. Jyoti, Dr. Ankita, Dr. Dewansh Verma, Dr. Devchand. The Impact Of Cognitive Biases On Investment Decisions: A Study Of Retail Investors In India: 953-961.

©2025 the Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

## Abstract

Behavioural finance has emerged as a critical field that challenges the traditional notion of investor rationality. This study examines the impact of cognitive biases on investment decisions among retail investors in India. Despite increasing access to financial information and technology, investor behavior often deviates from rational decision-making models due to inherent psychological tendencies. The research focuses on identifying key biases such as overconfidence, anchoring, herd behavior, and loss aversion, and assessing their influence on portfolio selection, risk perception, and trading frequency. Primary data collected through structured questionnaires from individual investors across major Indian cities is analyzed using statistical tools to determine the significance and direction of these biases. The findings reveal that cognitive biases play a substantial role in shaping investor preferences and risk-taking behavior, often leading to suboptimal investment outcomes. The study contributes to the growing body of behavioural finance literature by providing insights into the psychological patterns of Indian retail investors and highlights the importance of financial literacy and behavioural training to promote rational investment decisions.

**Keywords:** Behavioral Finance, Cognitive Biases, Retail Investors, Overconfidence, Herd Behavior, Anchoring, Loss Aversion, Investment Decisions, Financial Literacy, India

## Introduction

Investment decision-making is one of the most critical aspects of financial behavior, traditionally explained through the lens of classical finance theories. Conventional finance assumes that investors are rational individuals who make decisions based on logic, available information, and the objective maximization of wealth. Models such as the Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH) and Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT) rest upon the premise that investors are unbiased and markets are efficient in reflecting all available information. However, the recurring anomalies in financial markets—such as bubbles, crashes, and irrational price movements—have challenged these assumptions and

paved the way for a new paradigm known as Behavioral Finance. This field integrates insights from psychology, sociology, and finance to explain why and how investors deviate from rationality in real-world decision-making. Background of the Study:

Behavioural finance argues that psychological influences and emotional factors significantly impact the financial choices of individuals and institutions. Investors are not always guided by logical reasoning; rather, they are influenced by cognitive biases—systematic patterns of deviation from rational judgment. These biases arise due to limitations in human cognition, information processing, and emotional responses to uncertainty. For example, overconfidence bias leads

investors to overestimate their knowledge and underestimate risks; anchoring bias causes individuals to rely excessively on initial information when making decisions; herd behavior results in following the crowd rather than independent analysis; and loss aversion makes investors more sensitive to losses than to equivalent gains. In the Indian context, the study of behavioural biases is particularly important. Over the past two decades, India has witnessed a significant transformation in its investment landscape, driven by financial inclusion, digitalization, and rising participation of retail investors in stock markets, mutual funds, and other financial instruments. According to data from the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), the number of demat accounts and mutual fund investors has grown rapidly, particularly after the COVID-19 pandemic. This surge in retail participation has brought behavioural tendencies into sharper focus, as many new investors are influenced by media hype, social platforms, and emotional decision-making rather than by thorough financial analysis.

**Rationale of the Study:** Understanding the behavioural patterns of retail investors is crucial for ensuring the stability and efficiency of financial markets. In India, retail investors often act on limited financial literacy, peer influence, and emotional reactions to short-term market movements. This behavior can lead to mispricing of securities, excessive speculation, and poor portfolio performance. By identifying and analysing the cognitive biases that affect retail investors, this study seeks to bridge the gap between theoretical financial models and real-world investor behavior. Moreover, recognizing these biases can assist policymakers, regulators, and financial advisors in designing interventions to promote rational investment practices. For instance, if overconfidence and herd behavior are found to be dominant among investors, financial education campaigns and advisory services can be tailored to mitigate their effects.

**Conceptual Framework:** Cognitive biases are inherent mental shortcuts or errors in judgment that affect how individuals perceive, interpret, and act upon financial information. Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky, the pioneers of behavioral economics, introduced the **Prospect Theory**, which explains that individuals evaluate potential outcomes in terms of gains and losses relative to a reference point, rather than in absolute terms. They demonstrated that investors tend to avoid losses more strongly than they seek gains, leading to risk-averse behavior when facing potential profits and risk-seeking behavior when confronting potential losses.

Some of the major cognitive biases relevant to investment decisions include:

1. **Overconfidence Bias:** Investors often overestimate their analytical abilities and

forecasting skills, leading them to take excessive risks or trade more frequently than is optimal.

2. **Anchoring Bias:** This occurs when investors rely heavily on specific reference points, such as past stock prices or target returns, even when new information suggests otherwise.
3. **Herd Behavior:** Investors tend to mimic the actions of the majority, especially during periods of market euphoria or panic. This behavior can amplify market bubbles and crashes.
4. **Loss Aversion Bias:** Investors are more sensitive to potential losses than to equivalent gains, often resulting in holding losing investments too long or selling winning investments too early.
5. **Confirmation Bias:** Individuals seek information that confirms their existing beliefs and ignore evidence that contradicts them, leading to poor judgment.
6. **Disposition Effect:** This refers to the tendency of investors to sell assets that have increased in value while holding assets that have dropped in value.

**Indian Investment Scenario and Behavioural Trends:** India's financial ecosystem is undergoing rapid transformation. The rise of online trading platforms, mobile investment apps, and social media investment discussions has made market access easier than ever before. However, it has also exposed investors to excessive noise and information overload. Many retail investors enter the market without adequate understanding of financial principles, relying instead on social influence, media trends, or gut feelings. The COVID-19 pandemic further accelerated retail participation in stock markets, as individuals sought alternative income sources during lockdowns. This period also witnessed speculative trading and herd-driven behavior in several sectors such as pharmaceuticals, technology, and digital assets. While some investors benefited from short-term gains, many suffered losses due to impulsive decisions and lack of risk management. These events underline the necessity of studying behavioral biases to understand why rational decision-making often fails in practice.

**Need for the Study:** Although behavioural finance has been widely studied in developed economies, research in emerging markets like India remains relatively limited. The cultural, social, and economic diversity of Indian investors presents a unique context for examining behavioural patterns. Retail investors in India differ in age, income, education, risk appetite, and exposure to financial information. Therefore, a deeper investigation into the **cognitive biases influencing their investment behavior** can yield valuable insights for financial institutions, policy-makers, and educators. Furthermore, this study is relevant for designing targeted financial literacy programs that address psychological aspects of decision-making, not just technical knowledge. Understanding behavioural biases can also help

financial advisors develop client-centric investment strategies that consider emotional and cognitive factors alongside traditional financial metrics.

## Review of Literature:

The field of behavioral finance has gained prominence over the last few decades as scholars and practitioners recognized that traditional financial theories often fail to explain actual investor behavior. Behavioral finance integrates insights from psychology and economics to understand how individuals' cognitive and emotional biases influence their financial decisions (Barberis & Thaler, 2003). This literature review explores key studies related to cognitive biases and their impact on investment decision-making, with a particular focus on retail investors and the Indian context.

### 1. Theoretical Foundations of Behavioral Finance:

The roots of behavioral finance can be traced to the pioneering works of **Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky (1979)**, who introduced the **Prospect Theory**. They argued that individuals make decisions based on perceived gains and losses relative to a reference point, rather than on absolute outcomes. This theory challenged the assumptions of rationality and utility maximization central to traditional finance. They also found that people tend to be **loss averse**, meaning they experience more pain from losses than pleasure from equivalent gains. Similarly, **Shefrin and Statman (1985)** explained investor behavior through the **Behavioral Life-Cycle Hypothesis**, suggesting that psychological factors affect how people allocate, spend, and save their wealth. **Shiller (2000)** further demonstrated how investor sentiment and irrational exuberance lead to market bubbles, indicating that emotions often drive asset prices away from their intrinsic values.

### 2. Cognitive Biases and Investment Decisions:

Cognitive biases are systematic deviations from rational judgment that arise from limitations in human information processing. Researchers have identified various biases that affect investors' decision-making processes. **Overconfidence bias** has been extensively studied. **Odean (1998)** found that overconfident investors tend to trade excessively, believing they possess superior knowledge or skills. This behavior often results in lower returns due to higher transaction costs and poor timing. **Barber and Odean (2001)** further confirmed that male investors are generally more overconfident than female investors, leading to greater trading frequency and lower net returns. **Anchoring bias**, first introduced by **Tversky and Kahneman (1974)**, occurs when individuals rely too heavily on an initial reference point when making decisions. In investment contexts, investors often anchor their expectations to historical prices or past performance. **Kaustia, Alho, and Puttonen (2008)** demonstrated that investors anchor on past returns when predicting future performance, leading to biased expectations and suboptimal decisions. **Herd behavior** is another critical bias influencing investment decisions. **Banerjee (1992)**

proposed a model of herd behavior showing that individuals often imitate others' actions when they face uncertainty. **Bikhchandani and Sharma (2001)** described herd behavior as the tendency of investors to follow the crowd, even when it contradicts private information or logical reasoning. This behavior amplifies market volatility and contributes to asset bubbles. **Loss aversion**, a core concept in Prospect Theory, has been empirically supported by several studies. **Thaler, Tversky, Kahneman, and Schwartz (1997)** found that investors are reluctant to sell losing stocks, hoping for a rebound, while quickly selling winning stocks to "lock in" gains—a phenomenon known as the **disposition effect**. **Barberis and Huang (2001)** argued that loss-averse investors' reactions to gains and losses can explain several market anomalies, including excessive volatility and momentum effects. **Confirmation bias** also affects decision-making, as investors tend to seek information that supports their pre-existing beliefs and ignore contrary evidence. **Rabin and Schrag (1999)** illustrated that this bias leads investors to hold unrealistic confidence in their judgments, potentially resulting in misinformed financial choices.

### 3. Empirical Evidence from Global Studies:

Numerous empirical studies have explored how cognitive biases influence investment decisions globally. **Pompian and Longo (2004)** categorized investor biases into cognitive and emotional types and examined their effects on financial decisions. Their findings revealed that cognitive biases, being related to information processing errors, are more likely to be corrected through education and experience compared to emotional biases. **Nofsinger (2005)** emphasized that social and emotional factors strongly shape investor behavior, often leading to herd mentality during market crises. Similarly, **Statman, Thorley, and Vorkink (2006)** observed that individual investor sentiment affects stock returns and market trends, highlighting the collective impact of biases on financial systems. In developed markets, **Grinblatt and Keloharju (2009)** found that behavioral biases such as overconfidence and home bias lead investors to trade local stocks excessively, demonstrating the role of familiarity and comfort in financial decision-making. **Kumar and Lee (2006)** further suggested that individual investor sentiment significantly contributes to mispricing and stock return volatility.

### 4. Behavioral Finance Research in the Indian Context:

Behavioral finance has recently become a popular area of research in India, where the rapid growth of retail participation has made investor psychology an important determinant of market trends. **Chandra and Kumar (2012)** conducted one of the earliest comprehensive studies on Indian investors and found that biases such as overconfidence, representativeness, and anchoring strongly influenced investment behavior. Their results indicated that even experienced investors were not immune to psychological errors. **Purohit and Soni (2018)** examined behavioral biases among Indian retail investors and discovered that loss aversion and

herd behavior significantly impacted investment decisions, often leading to panic selling or irrational exuberance during market swings. Similarly, **Sultana and Pardhasaradhi (2012)** found that demographic factors such as age, education, and income influence the intensity of cognitive biases among Indian investors. Younger investors displayed more overconfidence, while older investors tended to be more loss averse. **Sewwandi and Widanapathirana (2016)** explored the relationship between investor overconfidence and trading volume in emerging markets and found a strong positive correlation, consistent with global findings. **Sharma and Vyas (2020)** highlighted the role of herd behavior among Indian investors during the COVID-19 pandemic, where social media and online trading platforms intensified collective decision-making, leading to short-term market distortions. In another study, **Singh and Bansal (2019)** analyzed anchoring and representativeness biases among mutual fund investors in India. Their findings revealed that many investors relied heavily on past performance and recommendations from peers rather than conducting independent analysis. This behavior resulted in suboptimal investment outcomes and frequent fund switching. **Gupta and Jain (2021)** further investigated the influence of cognitive biases on investment decisions of millennials in India. Their study found that technological access, social influence, and lack of financial literacy intensified biases like overconfidence and confirmation bias. **Raut and Kumar (2021)** used regression analysis to assess the impact of behavioral biases on portfolio diversification and risk perception among Indian retail investors. They found that overconfidence and anchoring were the most significant determinants of biased decision-making.

Collectively, these studies underscore that cognitive biases significantly affect the financial decision-making of Indian investors, irrespective of their education or experience levels.

**5. Research Gaps Identified:** While substantial research has explored behavioral biases globally, gaps remain in understanding their nuances within the Indian context.

1. **Limited focus on combined biases:** Most studies examine individual biases (such as overconfidence or herd behavior) separately, but fewer analyze how multiple biases interact to shape decisions.
2. **Regional and demographic variation:** There is insufficient comparative analysis across different regions of India or among investor age groups.
3. **Impact of digitalization:** With the increasing role of online trading and social media, there is limited research on how technology-driven information exposure amplifies behavioural biases.
4. **Longitudinal evidence:** Few Indian studies have used longitudinal data to analyze how

investor biases evolve over time or during economic cycles.

Addressing these gaps can provide deeper insights into the psychological underpinnings of retail investor behavior and help in developing targeted financial literacy and behavioural training programs.

**6. Summary of the Literature:** The review of literature clearly demonstrates that cognitive biases such as **overconfidence, anchoring, herd behavior, and loss aversion** are universal phenomena influencing investors across markets. However, their intensity and manifestation vary based on cultural, economic, and demographic factors. In India, the rapid increase in retail investors and the growing use of digital platforms have made behavioural finance more relevant than ever.

### Objectives of the Study:

The broad objective of this study is to examine the impact of cognitive biases on the investment decisions of retail investors in India.

Specific objectives include:

1. To identify the major cognitive biases affecting retail investors.
2. To analyse the relationship between cognitive biases and investment behavior such as risk preference, trading frequency, and portfolio diversification.
3. To assess whether demographic factors (age, income, education, experience) influence the presence or strength of these biases.
4. To suggest measures for reducing the adverse impact of biases through financial education and behavioural awareness.

### Research Hypotheses:

**Objective 1: To identify the major cognitive biases affecting retail investors**

**H<sub>01</sub> (Null Hypothesis):** There is no significant presence of cognitive biases such as overconfidence, anchoring, herd behavior, and loss aversion among retail investors.

**H<sub>11</sub> (Alternative Hypothesis):** There is a significant presence of one or more cognitive biases (overconfidence, anchoring, herd behavior, loss aversion) among retail investors.

**Objective 2: To analyze the relationship between cognitive biases and investment behavior such as risk preference, trading frequency, and portfolio diversification**

**H<sub>02</sub> (Null Hypothesis):** There is no significant relationship between cognitive biases (overconfidence, anchoring, herd behavior, loss aversion) and investment behaviors (risk preference, trading frequency, portfolio diversification) among retail investors.

**H<sub>12</sub> (Alternative Hypothesis):** There is a significant relationship between cognitive biases and investment behaviors, such that biases influence risk preference,

How to cite this article: Dr. Jyoti, Dr. Ankita , Dr. Dewansh Verma, Dr. Devchand. The Impact Of Cognitive Biases On Investment Decisions: A Study Of Retail Investors In India: 953-961.

trading frequency, and portfolio diversification among retail investors.

**Objective 3: To assess whether demographic factors (age, income, education, experience) influence the presence or strength of these biases**

**H<sub>03</sub> (Null Hypothesis):** Demographic factors such as age, income, education, and investment experience have no significant influence on the presence or intensity of cognitive biases among retail investors.

**H<sub>13</sub> (Alternative Hypothesis):** At least one demographic factor (age, income, education, or experience) significantly influences the presence or intensity of one or more cognitive biases among retail investors.

**Objective 4: To suggest measures for reducing the adverse impact of biases through financial education and behavioral awareness**

**H<sub>04</sub> (Null Hypothesis):** Financial education and behavioral awareness programs have no significant effect in reducing the impact of cognitive biases among retail investors.

**H<sub>14</sub> (Alternative Hypothesis):** Financial education and behavioral awareness programs significantly reduce the impact of cognitive biases among retail investors.

#### Significance of the Study:

The significance of this study lies in its potential to contribute both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, it extends the understanding of behavioural finance by contextualizing it within the Indian investment environment. Practically, it offers valuable insights for policymakers, investment advisors, and educators aiming to enhance the decision-making capabilities of retail investors. By identifying key cognitive biases, the research can assist in designing behavioral interventions, risk communication strategies, and investor protection frameworks.

#### Research Methodology:

The present study adopts a **quantitative and descriptive research design** to examine the impact of cognitive biases on retail investors' behavior. The study primarily focuses on identifying major behavioral biases, analyzing their relationship with investment patterns, and assessing the moderating role of demographic factors.

**Sample Design:** Data were collected from **retail investors** through a structured questionnaire using a **convenience sampling technique**. The sample comprised respondents of varying age groups, income levels, educational backgrounds, and investment experience to ensure representativeness.

**Data Collection Tools:** A **Likert-scale based survey instrument** was used to measure five key cognitive

biases — **Overconfidence, Anchoring, Herd Behavior, Loss Aversion, and Confirmation Bias**. Investment behavior was captured through variables like **risk preference, trading frequency, and portfolio diversification**.

**Statistical Techniques:** The collected data were analyzed using **SPSS and Excel**. Various statistical tests were applied to test the hypotheses:

- **One-sample t-test** to determine the presence of biases among investors.
- **Correlation analysis (Pearson's r)** to examine the relationship between cognitive biases and investment behavior.
- **ANOVA** to assess the influence of demographic factors on biases.
- **Paired sample t-test** to measure the effect of financial education and awareness programs in reducing biases.

All hypotheses were tested at a **5% level of significance ( $p < 0.05$ )**, and reliability of the scales was verified through **Cronbach's Alpha**.

#### Data Analysis and Interpretation:

**Objective 1: To identify the major cognitive biases affecting retail investors**

#### Hypotheses:

- **H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant presence of cognitive biases among retail investors.
- **H<sub>11</sub>:** There is a significant presence of one or more cognitive biases among retail investors.

**Table:1**

| Cognitiv<br>e Bias       | Me<br>an<br>Sc<br>ore | St<br>d.<br>D<br>ev<br>. | t-<br>val<br>ue | p-<br>valu<br>e | Res<br>ult                    | Interpr<br>etation        |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Overcon<br>fidence       | 5.1<br>2              | 1.<br>04                 | 9.2<br>4        | 0.00<br>0**     | Rej<br>ect<br>H <sub>01</sub> | Strongly<br>present       |
| Anchori<br>ng            | 3.7<br>4              | 1.<br>08                 | 4.1<br>8        | 0.00<br>1**     | Rej<br>ect<br>H <sub>01</sub> | Moderat<br>ely<br>present |
| Herd<br>Behavior         | 3.4<br>5              | 1.<br>34                 | 3.9<br>2        | 0.00<br>2**     | Rej<br>ect<br>H <sub>01</sub> | Moderat<br>ely<br>present |
| Loss<br>Aversion         | 4.6<br>8              | 1.<br>27                 | 7.6<br>3        | 0.00<br>0**     | Rej<br>ect<br>H <sub>01</sub> | Highly<br>present         |
| Confirm<br>ation<br>Bias | 4.3<br>5              | 1.<br>22                 | 6.5<br>4        | 0.00<br>0**     | Rej<br>ect<br>H <sub>01</sub> | Strongly<br>present       |

#### Interpretation:

The analysis aimed to determine whether significant cognitive biases are present among retail investors. The results of the one-sample t-test indicate that **all five biases—overconfidence, anchoring, herd behavior, loss aversion, and confirmation bias—are statistically significant**, as their **p-values are less than 0.05**. This leads to the **rejection of the null hypothesis ( $H_{01}$ )** and acceptance of the **alternative hypothesis ( $H_{11}$ )**. Among these, **overconfidence (Mean = 5.12,  $t = 9.24$ ,  $p < 0.01$ )** and **loss aversion (Mean = 4.68,  $t = 7.63$ ,  $p < 0.01$ )** emerged as the most dominant biases. This suggests that retail investors tend to overestimate their knowledge and decision-making abilities while simultaneously showing a strong fear of losses. **Confirmation bias (Mean = 4.35,  $t = 6.54$ ,  $p < 0.01$ )** was also found to be significantly prevalent, indicating that investors prefer information that supports their existing beliefs. On the other hand, **anchoring (Mean = 3.74)** and **herd behavior (Mean = 3.45)** were moderately present, implying that while some investors rely on initial reference points or follow market trends, these tendencies are not as strong as overconfidence or loss aversion. Overall, the results confirm that **retail investors are not entirely rational decision-makers**. Their investment choices are significantly influenced by behavioral biases—particularly overconfidence, loss aversion, and confirmation bias—which can lead to suboptimal financial decisions.

|                      |           |           |       |                 |                            |                                                                   |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ancho<br>ring        | -<br>0.22 | -<br>0.18 | +0.14 | 0.0<br>47<br>*  | Re<br>jec<br>t<br>$H_{02}$ | Weak<br>but<br>signifi<br>cant<br>relatio<br>n                    |
| Herd<br>Behav<br>ior | +0.4<br>1 | +0.4<br>8 | -0.35 | 0.0<br>01<br>** | Re<br>jec<br>t<br>$H_{02}$ | Stron<br>g link<br>with<br>freque<br>nt tradin<br>g               |
| Loss<br>Aversi<br>on | -<br>0.45 | -<br>0.38 | +0.29 | 0.0<br>00<br>** | Re<br>jec<br>t<br>$H_{02}$ | Highe<br>r loss<br>aversi<br>on reduc<br>es risky<br>behav<br>ior |

#### Objective 2: To analyze the relationship between cognitive biases and investment behavior

#### Hypotheses:

- **$H_{02}$ :** No significant relationship exists between cognitive biases and investment behavior.
- **$H_{12}$ :** A significant relationship exists between cognitive biases and investment behavior

Table:2

| Cogni<br>tive<br>Bias  | Risk<br>Pref<br>erence<br>(r) | Tra<br>ding<br>Fre<br>quency<br>(r) | Portfo<br>lio<br>Diver<br>sificat<br>ion (r) | p-<br>val<br>ue | Re<br>su<br>lt             | Inter<br>pretat<br>ion                                                      |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Overc<br>onfide<br>nce | +0.6<br>1                     | +0.6<br>7                           | -0.43                                        | 0.0<br>00<br>** | Re<br>jec<br>t<br>$H_{02}$ | Positi<br>ve relatio<br>nship<br>with<br>risk-<br>taking<br>and tradin<br>g |

#### Interpretation:

The objective of this analysis was to examine whether cognitive biases such as overconfidence, anchoring, herd behavior, and loss aversion significantly influence key aspects of investment behavior — namely **risk preference**, **trading frequency**, and **portfolio diversification**. Correlation analysis was employed to test the relationships. The results clearly indicate that **cognitive biases are significantly correlated with investment behavior**, as all p-values are below 0.05. Therefore, the **null hypothesis ( $H_{02}$ ) is rejected**, and the **alternative hypothesis ( $H_{12}$ ) is accepted**. Among the various biases, **overconfidence** shows the **strongest positive correlation** with both **risk preference ( $r = +0.61$ )** and **trading frequency ( $r = +0.67$ )**, suggesting that overconfident investors tend to take higher risks and trade more frequently. However, its **negative relationship with portfolio diversification ( $r = -0.43$ )** implies that such investors often fail to diversify adequately, possibly due to excessive belief in their own judgment. **Herd behavior** also demonstrates a **positive relationship with risk preference ( $r = +0.41$ )** and **trading frequency ( $r = +0.48$ )**, and a **negative correlation with diversification ( $r = -0.35$ )**. This indicates that investors who follow market trends or others' decisions are likely to engage in more trades and take collective risks, often leading to similar, undiversified portfolios. **Loss aversion**, conversely, shows a **negative correlation with both risk preference ( $r = -0.45$ )** and **trading frequency ( $r = -0.38$ )**, but a **positive link with portfolio diversification ( $r = +0.29$ )**. This suggests that investors who strongly fear losses prefer safer investments and tend to diversify more to minimize potential risks. Finally, **anchoring bias** exhibits relatively **weak but statistically significant correlations**, showing a slight negative relationship with risk and trading but a mild positive tendency toward diversification, reflecting investors' reliance on initial reference points in their decisions. Overall, the findings confirm that **cognitive biases significantly shape investment behavior**. Overconfident and herding investors exhibit **aggressive and less diversified trading patterns**, while loss-averse investors adopt **conservative and well-diversified strategies**. This underscores the critical role of behavioral factors in influencing individual investment decisions in financial markets.

**Objective 3: To assess whether demographic factors influence cognitive biases**

#### Hypotheses:

- **$H_{03}$ :** Demographic factors do not influence the presence or strength of cognitive biases.

- **$H_{13}$ :** At least one demographic factor significantly influences one or more cognitive biases.

**Table:3**

| Demographic Factor    | Dependent Variable (Bias) | F-value | p-value | Result          | Interpretation                        |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------|---------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Age Group             | Overconfidence            | 4.38    | 0.005** | Reject $H_{03}$ | Younger investors more overconfident  |
| Education Level       | Herd Behavior             | 3.79    | 0.012*  | Reject $H_{03}$ | Lower education increases herding     |
| Income Bracket        | Loss Aversion             | 2.56    | 0.042*  | Reject $H_{03}$ | Low-income investors more loss-averse |
| Investment Experience | Confirmation Bias         | 5.01    | 0.001** | Reject $H_{03}$ | Experienced investors less biased     |

#### Interpretation

The purpose of this analysis was to determine whether demographic variables — such as **age**, **education**, **income**, and **investment experience** — significantly influence the presence or intensity of cognitive biases among retail investors. A **one-way ANOVA test** was conducted to examine these relationships. The results show that all the tested demographic factors have **p-values less than 0.05**, indicating statistically significant relationships with at least one type of cognitive bias. Consequently, the **null hypothesis ( $H_{03}$ ) is rejected**, and the **alternative hypothesis ( $H_{13}$ ) is accepted**. This means that demographic characteristics play a meaningful role in shaping investor behavior and susceptibility to biases. Specifically, **age** has a significant effect on **overconfidence ( $F = 4.38$ ,  $p = 0.005$ )**. The findings suggest that **younger investors tend to be more overconfident** compared to older ones, possibly due to limited experience and higher risk appetite. **Education level** significantly affects **herd behavior ( $F = 3.79$ ,  $p = 0.012$ )**, indicating that investors with **lower educational backgrounds are more likely to follow market trends or peer decisions** instead of relying on independent analysis. Similarly, **income level** shows a significant relationship with **loss aversion ( $F = 2.56$ ,  $p = 0.042$ )**, revealing that **low-income investors are more sensitive to potential losses** and therefore display higher loss aversion. This can be attributed to their lower financial security and risk-bearing capacity. Finally, **investment experience** has a strong influence on **confirmation bias ( $F = 5.01$ ,  $p = 0.001$ )**. The results

show that **experienced investors exhibit lower levels of confirmation bias**, as they are more accustomed to analyzing diverse information sources and adjusting their decisions based on evidence rather than beliefs. Overall, the analysis confirms that **demographic characteristics significantly influence the formation and strength of cognitive biases**. Younger, less educated, and lower-income investors are more prone to behavioral distortions, while experience serves as a mitigating factor. These insights highlight the importance of **tailored investor education programs** that address the specific behavioral tendencies of different demographic groups.

#### Objective 4: To suggest measures for reducing the adverse impact of biases

##### Hypotheses:

- **H<sub>04</sub>**: Financial education and behavioral awareness have no significant effect in reducing cognitive biases.
- **H<sub>14</sub>**: Financial education and behavioral awareness significantly reduce the impact of biases.

Table:4

| Inter<br>venti<br>on<br>Meas<br>ure                                      | Me<br>an<br>Bia<br>s<br>Sco<br>re<br>(Be<br>for<br>e) | Me<br>an<br>Bia<br>s<br>Sco<br>re<br>(A<br>fte<br>r) | Mea<br>n<br>Diff<br>eren<br>ce | t-<br>va<br>lu<br>e | p-<br>val<br>ue | Re<br>su<br>lt                        | Interp<br>retati<br>on                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Finan<br>cial<br>Liter<br>acy<br>Work<br>shop                            | 4.8<br>2                                              | 3.9<br>1                                             | 0.91                           | 6.<br>87            | 0.0<br>00<br>** | Re<br>jec<br>t<br>H <sub>0</sub><br>4 | Signifi<br>cant<br>impro<br>vemen<br>t |
| Beha<br>vioral<br>Awar<br>eness<br>Cam<br>paign                          | 4.6<br>5                                              | 3.9<br>4                                             | 0.71                           | 5.<br>44            | 0.0<br>00<br>** | Re<br>jec<br>t<br>H <sub>0</sub><br>4 | Bias<br>reduct<br>ion<br>observ<br>ed  |
| Portf<br>olio<br>Advi<br>sory<br>&<br>Ment<br>orshi<br>p<br>Progr<br>ams | 4.4<br>1                                              | 3.7<br>2                                             | 0.69                           | 5.<br>12            | 0.0<br>01<br>** | Re<br>jec<br>t<br>H <sub>0</sub><br>4 | Enhan<br>ced<br>ration<br>ality        |
| Real-<br>time<br>Inves<br>tment                                          | 4.5<br>8                                              | 3.9<br>7                                             | 0.61                           | 4.<br>89            | 0.0<br>02<br>** | Re<br>jec<br>t                        | Impro<br>ved<br>decisi<br>on           |

|                     |  |  |  |  |  |                     |             |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|-------------|
| Simu<br>lation<br>s |  |  |  |  |  | H <sub>0</sub><br>4 | contro<br>l |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|-------------|

##### Interpretation

This objective sought to evaluate whether financial education and behavioral awareness programs effectively reduce the influence of cognitive biases among retail investors. To test this, a **paired sample t-test** was applied to compare investors' mean bias scores **before and after** various intervention measures. The results indicate that all interventions led to a **significant decrease in mean bias scores**, with **p-values less than 0.05** in every case. Hence, the **null hypothesis (H<sub>04</sub>)** is **rejected**, and the **alternative hypothesis (H<sub>14</sub>)** is **accepted**. This confirms that financial education and behavioral awareness initiatives **significantly reduce the impact of cognitive biases**. Among the interventions, the **Financial Literacy Workshop** demonstrated the **greatest effect** (Mean difference = 0.91, t = 6.87, p = 0.000), showing that structured educational sessions help investors better understand market dynamics, risk, and rational decision-making. The **Behavioral Awareness Campaign** also proved highly effective (Mean difference = 0.71, p = 0.000), suggesting that spreading awareness about common behavioral pitfalls enhances self-regulation and mindful investing. Similarly, **Portfolio Advisory and Mentorship Programs** (Mean difference = 0.69, p = 0.001) contributed to improved investor rationality, as regular guidance from financial experts helped participants recognize and correct biased decision patterns. Finally, **Real-time Investment Simulations** (Mean difference = 0.61, p = 0.002) showed that experiential learning enables investors to practice judgment in risk-free environments, thereby reducing emotional and impulsive errors. Overall, the findings clearly demonstrate that **financial literacy and behavioral interventions are effective tools for mitigating cognitive biases**. Continuous education, mentorship, and simulation-based learning can promote **rational, evidence-based investment decisions**, ultimately leading to better financial outcomes and improved investor confidence.

##### Conclusion:

The findings of the study reveal that **cognitive biases are significantly prevalent among retail investors**, with **Overconfidence** and **Loss Aversion** being the most dominant. These biases have a direct and measurable impact on **investment decisions**, influencing risk-taking, trading frequency, and portfolio diversification. The analysis further establishes that **demographic factors** such as **age, education, income**, and **investment experience** significantly affect the strength and nature of these biases. Moreover, the results confirm that **financial literacy, behavioral awareness, and advisory interventions** substantially mitigate the adverse effects of biases. Investors who participated in such programs demonstrated improved rationality and decision-making efficiency. Overall, the study underscores the importance of **behavioral finance**

**education** and **policy-level initiatives** aimed at promoting investor awareness, thereby enhancing the quality of financial decisions in retail markets.

## REFERENCES

1. Banerjee, A. V. (1992). A simple model of herd behavior. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107(3), 797–817.
2. 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.
3. Barberis, N., & Thaler, R. (2003). A survey of behavioral finance. *Handbook of the Economics of Finance*, 1, 1053–1128.
4. Chandra, A., & Kumar, R. (2012). Factors influencing Indian individual investor behavior: Survey evidence. *Decision*, 39(3), 141–167.
5. Kaustia, M., Alho, E., & Puttonen, V. (2008). How much does expertise reduce behavioral biases? *Journal of Behavioral Finance*, 9(4), 191–199.
6. Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–291.
7. Kumar, A., & Lee, C. (2006). Retail investor sentiment and return comovements. *The Journal of Finance*, 61(5), 2451–2486.
8. Odean, T. (1998). Volume, volatility, price, and profit when all traders are above average. *The Journal of Finance*, 53(6), 1887–1934.
9. Purohit, H., & Soni, R. (2018). Impact of behavioral biases on investment decisions of retail investors in India. *Indian Journal of Finance*, 12(3), 45–58.
10. Raut, R., & Kumar, A. (2021). Cognitive biases and portfolio decisions of retail investors: Evidence from India. *Asian Journal of Business Research*, 11(2), 89–106.
11. Sultana, S. T., & Pardhasaradhi, S. (2012). An empirical study of demographic factors and investment decisions of investors in India. *International Journal of Financial Management*, 1(1), 14–23.