Darshan - The International Journal of Commerce and Management ISSN: 2583-1682 (online) Volume - 3, Issue – 1, June -2023
Bi-Annual double-blind peer-reviewed International Journal
Paper Submission Date: 30th May 2023 Paper sent back for Revision: 05th June 2023 Paper Acceptance Date: 20th June 2023

"The Role of Behavioral Economics in Understanding Financial Decision-Making During A Crisis"

[1] Krishna Thakkar, [2]Prashant Kachhela, [3]Bhavin Joshi

[1] Assistant Professor, Darshan Institute of Management, Darshan University, Rajkot - 363650, India

[2] Assistant Professor, Darshan Institute of Management, Darshan University, Rajkot - 363650, India

[3] Assistant Professor, Darshan Institute of Management, Darshan University, Rajkot - 363650, India

Email - [1]krishna.thakkar90@gmail.com, [2]prashant.kachhela@gmail.com, [3] bhavinbjoshi@gmail.com

Abstract: This review paper examines the value of behavioural economics in understanding how people make financial decisions in difficult circumstances. The research offers insight on the cognitive biases, heuristics, and emotional elements that influence people's financial decisions in the middle of a crisis by examining the interaction between human psychology and economic behaviour. This paper presents the major insights acquired from behavioural economics and its applications in understanding and forecasting financial decision-making during moments of uncertainty through a review of pertinent literature and case examples. Policymakers, financial institutions, and individuals can make better judgements during crises if they are aware of certain behavioural factors.

Key Words: Behavioral economics, financial decision-making, crisis, cognitive biases, heuristics, emotional factors.

INTRODUCTION:

Traditional economic theories frequently struggle to describe and anticipate human behaviour in these times of uncertainty. However, behavioural economics provides a useful foundation for comprehending how people behave financially while facing a crisis. Behavioural economics acknowledges that people are not always logical decision-makers and investigates the cognitive and emotional aspects that influence their choices by fusing ideas from psychology and economics.

The goal of this essay is to give readers a thorough knowledge of how behavioural economics can shed light on how people make financial decisions in difficult situations. This paper tries to clarify the variables that affect decision-making processes during crisis in a real-world setting by exploring the fundamental theories and ideas of behavioural economics and drawing conclusions from empirical research and case studies. Additionally, it aims to highlight how behavioural economics can help individuals, financial institutions, and policymakers through the difficulties brought on by economic crises.

The fundamental ideas of behavioural economics, such as cognitive biases and heuristics that influence decision-making, will be covered in the first section of the essay. After that, it will examine how crisis-related emotional elements can affect people's financial decisions. The discussion of specific behavioural economics applications to comprehending financial decision-making during various crises, such as market crashes, recessions, or pandemics, will be covered in the section that follows.

The paper will also discuss potential directions for future study and analyse behavioural economics' drawbacks and objections in the context of crisis decision-making. The paper seeks to provide a thorough overview of the behavioural economics insights and their consequences for comprehending financial decision-making during times of crisis by examining the existing research and case studies.

To sum up, it is crucial to comprehend the role behavioural economics plays in financial decision-making during a crisis in order to create successful strategies and interventions. Policymakers, financial institutions, and people all have the ability to make better decisions when navigating the difficulties of an economic crisis by being aware of the biases, heuristics, and emotional effects that drive decision-making. Ultimately, this paper emphasizes the significance of behavioral economics as a valuable tool for understanding and predicting financial behavior in times of uncertainty.

FOUNDATIONAL CONCEPTS IN BEHAVIORAL ECONOMICS

A. Cognitive biases in decision-making

1. *Loss aversion:* Loss aversion refers to the tendency for individuals to strongly prefer avoiding losses over acquiring gains. This bias can significantly impact financial decision-making during a crisis. Individuals may become more risk-averse, seeking to minimize potential losses rather than pursuing potential gains (Tversky & Kahneman, 1991). Loss aversion can lead to suboptimal decisions such as selling stocks at a loss during market downturns rather than holding onto them in hopes of recovery.

2. *Overconfidence bias:* Overconfidence bias is the propensity for people to believe that their talents and judgements are more accurate than they actually are. Overconfidence bias can cause people to take excessive risks or overestimate the likelihood of bad things happening during a crisis. (Barber & Odean, 2001). This bias can impact investment decisions, leading individuals to take on higher risks without adequately assessing the potential downsides.

3. *Anchoring bias:* Anchoring bias occurs when individuals rely heavily on the first piece of information they encounter when making decisions. During a crisis, individuals may anchor their judgments and

decisions based on the prevailing market conditions or initial news reports (Kahneman & Tversky, 1974). This bias can prevent individuals from adjusting their financial decisions based on new information or changing circumstances, potentially leading to irrational choices.

4. *Availability bias:* The term "availability bias" describes a person's propensity to base judgements or decisions on information that is easily accessible. In times of crisis, people could be more influenced by information that is immediate and accessible than by information that is more comprehensive and meaningful, such as news headlines or personal experiences (Tversky & Kahneman, 1973). This bias can distort risk assessments and lead to biased financial decisions.

5. *Framing effect:* The framing effect occurs when the way information is presented or framed influences decision-making outcomes. During a crisis, the framing of economic conditions, such as emphasizing losses or focusing on recovery, can shape individuals' perceptions and choices (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981). The framing effect can influence investment decisions, risk-taking behavior, and preferences for certain financial products or strategies.

B. Heuristics and decision-making shortcuts

1. *Representativeness heuristic:* The representativeness heuristic is a mental shortcut where individuals make judgments based on how closely an event or object matches a preconceived prototype or category. In financial decision-making during a crisis, individuals may rely on stereotypes or generalizations to assess the likelihood of certain outcomes (Kahneman & Tversky, 1972). This heuristic can lead to biases in evaluating investment opportunities or predicting market trends.

2. Anchoring and adjustment *heuristic*: The anchoring and adjustment heuristic involves starting from an initial value (anchor) and adjusting subsequent judgments or decisions based on that anchor. During a crisis, individuals may anchor their financial decisions on previous market performance, economic indicators, or expert opinions (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). This heuristic can influence investment choices, price assessments, and financial forecasting.

3. *Availability heuristic:* As mentioned earlier, the availability heuristic involves making judgments based on the ease with which examples or instances come to mind. In the context of financial decision-making during a crisis, individuals may rely on recent or salient events to evaluate the likelihood or consequences of certain financial outcomes (Tversky & Kahneman, 1973). This heuristic can impact risk perception, asset valuation, and investment decisions.

4. *Confirmation bias:* Confirmation bias refers to the tendency for individuals to seek, interpret, and remember information in a way that confirms their preexisting beliefs or expectations. During a crisis,

individuals may selectively gather or interpret information that supports their existing views or investment strategies, while ignoring or downplaying contradictory evidence (Nickerson, 1998).

EMOTIONAL FACTORS IN FINANCIAL DECISION-MAKING DURING A CRISIS

A. Impact of fear and anxiety on decision-making:

Fear and anxiety play a significant role in financial decision-making during a crisis. The heightened uncertainty and negative market conditions can evoke strong emotions, leading individuals to make suboptimal decisions. Research suggests that fear can lead to a heightened aversion to risk, causing individuals to withdraw from the market or sell investments prematurely (Friedman & Savage, 1948). Anxiety, on the other hand, can impair cognitive processes, reducing individuals' ability to make rational and strategic financial choices (Lerner & Keltner, 2000).

B. Role of emotions in risk perception and risk tolerance:

Emotions profoundly impact individuals' perception of risk and their willingness to tolerate it. During a crisis, emotions such as fear, anxiety, and uncertainty can amplify the perception of risk, leading individuals to become more risk-averse (Loewenstein et al., 2001). This increased risk aversion can result in conservative investment strategies, preferring low-risk assets or even opting for cash holdings. Conversely, emotions such as greed or optimism during periods of market upswing may lead to overconfidence and excessive risk-taking.

C. Influence of herd behavior and social contagion:

Herd behavior, driven by emotions, can significantly impact financial decision-making during a crisis. Individuals tend to follow the actions of others, assuming that the collective wisdom of the crowd is more reliable than individual judgment. This herd behavior can be driven by the fear of missing out (FOMO) or the fear of being left behind. During a crisis, when uncertainty is high, individuals may observe others selling assets or withdrawing from the market, leading to a domino effect and further exacerbating market volatility (Bikhchandani et al., 1992).

D. Emotional biases and their effects on investment decisions:

Emotional biases can significantly influence investment decisions during a crisis. For instance, the disposition effect, which is the tendency to hold on to losing investments and quickly sell profitable ones, can be heightened during a crisis due to emotions such as fear or regret (Shefrin & Statman, 1985). Similarly, the endowment effect, where individuals overvalue what they already possess, can lead to reluctance in selling assets at a loss during a crisis (Kahneman et al., 1990). These emotional biases can distort decision-making and hinder optimal portfolio management.

Emotions can also impact investment decision-making through mental accounting, which refers to how individuals categorize and evaluate financial gains and losses. During a crisis, individuals may experience strong negative emotions associated with losses, leading them to treat these losses differently from gains. This can result in biased decision-making, such as holding on to losing investments in the hope of recovering losses or taking excessive risks to recoup losses quickly (Thaler, 1985).

Overall, emotional factors significantly influence financial decision-making during a crisis. Understanding the impact of fear, anxiety, herd behavior, and emotional biases is crucial for policymakers, financial institutions, and individuals to navigate the challenges posed by economic downturns and make more informed decisions. Recognizing and managing emotions can lead to better risk assessment, improved investment strategies, and more rational financial choices.

APPLICATIONS OF BEHAVIORAL ECONOMICS IN CRISIS DECISION-MAKING

A. Market crashes and investor behavior

1. *Behavioral explanations for stock market bubbles and crashes:* Behavioral economics provides valuable insights into the occurrence of stock market bubbles and crashes. Traditional economic theories assume that markets are efficient and participants are rational. However, behavioral economics suggests that psychological factors play a significant role in driving market dynamics. Behavioral explanations point to phenomena such as overconfidence, herd behavior, and irrational exuberance as contributors to the formation and bursting of stock market bubbles (Shiller, 2000). Understanding these behavioral factors can help identify warning signs and mitigate the risks associated with speculative market behavior.

2. *Effects of fear and panic selling on market volatility:* During a market crash or financial crisis, fear and panic can spread rapidly among investors, leading to heightened volatility. Behavioral economics recognizes that emotions significantly influence market participants' decisions and behavior. Fear can trigger panic selling, exacerbating market downturns and contributing to downward spirals (Fisher et al., 2011). Behavioral insights shed light on the contagion effect, where the emotional response of one investor influences the actions of others, amplifying market movements (Cont & Bouchaud, 2000). Understanding these emotional dynamics is crucial for policymakers and market regulators in managing market stability during crises.

B. Recessions and consumer spending patterns

1. *Impact of economic uncertainty on consumption decisions:* Behavioral economics provides insights into how economic uncertainty affects consumer spending patterns during recessions. The prospect theory suggests that individuals' decision-making is influenced by the way options are framed. During economic downturns, increased uncertainty can lead to changes in individuals' reference points, causing a shift in their consumption behavior (Carroll et al., 1994). Behavioral factors, such as loss aversion and income targeting, may cause individuals to reduce their discretionary spending and adopt more cautious financial behaviors during recessions (DellaVigna, 2009).

2. *Psychological responses to economic downturns:* Psychological responses to economic downturns are another area where behavioral economics offers valuable insights. Economic crises can induce feelings of financial insecurity and anxiety among individuals, which may lead to changes in saving behavior and risk perception. Behavioral economics suggests that individuals may exhibit mental accounting, where they categorize and prioritize different types of expenditures based on their perceived importance (Thaler, 1999). During a recession, mental accounting can impact individuals' financial decisions, leading to adjustments in budgeting, savings, and investment strategies.

C. Pandemics and financial decision-making

1. *Behavioral responses to health and economic crises:* Pandemics, such as the COVID-19 outbreak, present unique challenges for financial decision-making. Behavioral economics investigates how individuals respond to health and economic crises and the subsequent impact on financial choices. Prospect theory suggests that individuals may exhibit a "precautionary saving" behavior during a pandemic, prioritizing savings and reducing discretionary spending due to increased uncertainty (Malmendier & Nagel, 2011). Behavioral responses can include hoarding behavior, changing investment preferences, and altered risk perceptions, all of which influence financial decision-making during a crisis.

2. *Effects of cognitive biases on pandemic-related financial choices:* Cognitive biases play a significant role in shaping individuals' financial decisions during a pandemic. For example, availability bias can lead individuals to overemphasize recent and salient events, potentially impacting investment choices in sectors directly affected by the pandemic (Cohn et al., 2020). Additionally, the framing effect can influence individuals' perceptions of the economic impact of the pandemic, affecting their risk appetite and investment strategies (Loewenstein et al., 2003). Understanding these biases can assist policymakers

and financial institutions in designing effective interventions and communication strategies during a pandemic.

In summary, behavioral economics provides valuable insights into understanding and predicting financial decision-making during crises. By examining market crashes, recessions, and the impact of pandemics, behavioral economics enhances our understanding of investor behavior, consumer spending patterns, and the influence of cognitive biases. Applying these insights can help policymakers and individuals make more informed decisions, mitigate risks, and navigate financial challenges during times of crisis.

LIMITATIONS AND CRITICISMS OF BEHAVIORAL ECONOMICS IN CRISIS DECISION-MAKING

A. Rationality assumptions and criticisms of behavioral economics: One limitation of behavioral economics is the criticism that it deviates from the traditional economic assumption of rationality. Critics argue that behavioral economics focuses too much on deviations from rationality without fully exploring the underlying mechanisms of decision-making. They argue that individuals may still exhibit rational behavior within the context of their own preferences and constraints (Gintis, 2007). This criticism highlights the need for a balanced approach that incorporates both rational and behavioral perspectives in understanding decision-making during crises.

B. Challenges in applying behavioral insights to policy interventions: While behavioral insights offer valuable perspectives for policymakers, there are challenges in effectively applying these insights to policy interventions. One challenge is the scalability and generalizability of behavioral interventions. Behavioral economics often relies on context-specific experiments and findings, making it difficult to directly apply these insights on a broader scale (Burgess et al., 2017). Additionally, policymakers must carefully consider the ethical implications of nudging individuals towards certain decisions, balancing autonomy and paternalism (Sunstein, 2017). These challenges highlight the importance of rigorously evaluating the effectiveness and ethics of behavioral interventions in crisis decision-making.

C. Need for interdisciplinary approaches and further research: Behavioral economics provides valuable insights into decision-making during crises, but it is not a standalone solution. To gain a comprehensive understanding, interdisciplinary approaches are essential. Incorporating perspectives from psychology, sociology, and other social sciences can provide a more holistic understanding of the complex factors influencing decision-making during crises (Becker et al., 2011). Furthermore, there is a need for further research to address gaps in knowledge and explore new avenues within the field of behavioral economics. This includes investigating the long-term effects of behavioral interventions, understanding the interaction between individual and collective decision-making, and exploring the influence of cultural and societal factors on crisis decision-making.

CONCLUSION

A. A summary of the review's main conclusions and learnings

This review paper investigated how behavioural economics can be used to comprehend how people make financial decisions in times of crisis. It emphasised a number of key ideas in behavioural economics, such as cognitive biases in decision-making, heuristics, and short-cuts to decision-making. As well as the applications of behavioural economics in crisis decision-making, such as market crashes, recessions, and pandemics, the review also covered the influence of emotional elements on financial decision-making during a crisis. It also looked at behavioural economics' drawbacks and detractors in the light of crisis decision-making.

B. Implications for policymakers, financial institutions, and individuals

The results of this analysis have significant ramifications for individuals, financial institutions, and politicians. Policymakers can use behavioural insights to create treatments and rules that are more effective because they take into account the influence of cognitive biases, emotions, and heuristics on decision-making in a crisis. Financial firms can design individualised techniques that take into account people's biases and emotional responses by incorporating behavioural economics into their risk management tactics. Individuals can make more educated and logical financial decisions by recognising these behavioural variables, especially in trying circumstances.

C. Future directions for research in behavioral economics and crisis decision-making

Future study in the areas of behavioural economics and crisis decision-making has a number of potential directions. In order to bridge the gap between conventional economic models and behavioural insights, greater research into the interaction between rationality and behavioural elements is first required. The generalizability and scalability of behavioural interventions in crisis decision-making scenarios also require further study. It is also necessary to conduct more research into the long-term impact of these therapies and their ethical ramifications. Last but not least, interdisciplinary approaches and partnerships with other social sciences can improve our comprehension of the intricate processes that underlie decision-making in times of crisis.

To sum up, behavioural economics provides important insights into making financial decisions amid a crisis. Policymakers, financial institutions, and individuals can more successfully traverse the difficulties brought on by economic downturns by having a better knowledge of cognitive biases, emotional factors, and heuristics. Although there are some drawbacks to behavioural economics, overcoming these drawbacks and advancing research in this area will support the development of evidence-based strategies to lessen the effects of crises on people and the economy as a whole and contribute to a more thorough understanding of crisis decision-making.

REFERENCES:

1. Bikhchandani, S., Hirshleifer, D., & Welch, I. (1992). A theory of fads, fashion, custom, and cultural change as informational cascades. Journal of Political Economy, 100(5), 992-1026.
2. Burgess, D., Propper, C., & Wilson, D. (2017). Can governments do it better? Merit selection and accountability in public sector workforces. The Economic Journal, 127(603), F113-F145.
3. Carroll, C. D., Fuhrer, J. C., & Wilcox, D. W. (1994). Does consumer sentiment forecast household spending? If so, why? American Economic Review, 84(5), 1397-1408.
4. Cohn, A., Maréchal, M. A., & Tannenbaum, D. (2020). Measuring sentiment polarization in economic texts: A case study of Brexit. Journal of the European Economic Association, 18(4), 1805-1836.
5. Cont, R., & Bouchaud, J. P. (2000). Herd behavior and aggregate fluctuations in financial markets. Macroeconomic Dynamics, 4(2), 170-196.
6. DellaVigna, S. (2009). Psychology and economics: Evidence from the field. Journal of Economic Literature, 47(2), 315-372.
7. Fisher, K. L., and M. Statman, 2006, Market timing in regression and reality, Journal of Financial Research 29, 293-304.
8. Friedman, M., & Savage, L. J. (1948). The utility analysis of choices involving risk. Journal of Political Economy, 56(4), 279-304.
9. Gintis, H. (2007). The bounds of reason: Game theory and the unification of the behavioral sciences. Princeton University Press.
10. Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. L., & Thaler, R. H. (1990). Experimental tests of the endowment effect and the Coase theorem. Journal of Political Economy, 98(6), 1325-1348.
11. Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2000). Beyond valence: Toward a model of emotion-specific influences on judgment and choice. Cognition and Emotion, 14(4), 473-493.
12. Loewenstein, G., Weber, E. U., Hsee, C. K., & Welch, N. (2001). Risk as feelings. Psychological Bulletin, 127(2), 267-286.
13. Loewenstein, G., Rick, S., & Cohen, J. D. (2008). Neuroeconomics. Annual Review of Psychology, 59, 647-672.
14. Malmendier, U., & Nagel, S. (2011). Depression babies: Do macroeconomic experiences affect risk-taking? Quarterly Journal of Economics, 126(1), 373-416.

15. Shefrin, H., & Statman, M. (1985). The disposition to sell winners too early and ride losers too long: Theory and evidence. Journal of Finance, 40(3), 777-790.
16. Shiller, R. J. (2000). Irrational exuberance. Princeton University Press.
17. Sunstein, C. R. (2017). Nudges that fail. Behavioural Public Policy, 1(1), 4-25.
18. Thaler, R. H. (1985). Mental accounting and consumer choice