

Behavioral Finance: The Impact of Investor Expectation on Financial Decision-Making

Jikai Cui^{1,a,*}

¹*Alliance Manchester Business School, The University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, United Kingdom*

a. jikai.cui@student.manchester.ac.uk

**corresponding author*

Abstract: Behavioral finance challenges traditional financial theories by questioning the assumption of investor rationality, highlighting the influence of cognitive biases, emotions, and psychological factors on decision-making. This deviation from conventional models like the Efficient Market Hypothesis recognizes the complexity of human decision-making in financial contexts. The field focuses on key phenomena: loss aversion, market anomalies, the framing effect, and the endowment effect. Loss aversion reveals a stronger reaction to losses than equivalent gains, influencing overly cautious decisions. Market anomalies, such as momentum and trend reversals, challenge efficient market expectations. The framing effect shows how decision-making is swayed by information presentation. The endowment effect impacts perceived asset value, affecting financial decisions. These biases significantly impact investor behavior, potentially leading to suboptimal portfolio choices. Recognizing these biases is crucial for making informed financial decisions. Behavioral finance research has profound implications, emphasizing the integration of behavioral insights with traditional models. Future studies should explore cumulative behavioral effects, conduct cross-cultural analyses, and investigate diverse market conditions for more effective investment strategies and regulations. Understanding global financial behavior through behavioral finance is essential for comprehensive insights into market dynamics and decision-making processes.

Keywords: Loss Aversion, Momentum and Reversal, Framing Effect, Endowment Effect

1. Introduction

Traditional financial theories, such as the Efficient Market Hypothesis, operate under the assumption that investors are rational beings. These theories posit that investors make decisions based on available information in a way that maximizes their utility, leading to optimal market prices that reflect all known information. This rationality implies that investors have self-control, are not swayed by emotions, and consistently seek to maximize their wealth. Such models often assume perfect information, no transaction costs, and that investors have a clear understanding of the potential risks and returns associated with their choices.

Behavioral finance challenges the traditional views of rational investor behavior by highlighting the real-world implications of irrational behaviors and expectations in financial markets. It recognizes that investors often act irrationally due to various cognitive biases, emotions, and psychological factors. Behavioral finance suggests that these irrational behaviors can lead to market inefficiencies,

such as mispricing of assets and anomalies in market trends. This field of study emphasizes the impact of human psychology on financial decision-making, which often deviates from the optimal strategies predicted by traditional financial theories.

The aim of this essay is to analyze four significant phenomena within behavioral finance - loss aversion, market anomalies, the framing effect, and the endowment effect - and examine their impact on investors. This analysis seeks to understand how these behavioral concepts influence financial decision-making and market behavior, thereby challenging the traditional notions of investor rationality.

Understanding these behavioral finance phenomena is crucial for enhancing the decision-making process in financial contexts. Recognizing the impact of loss aversion, market anomalies, the framing effect, and the endowment effect on investor behavior can lead to more informed and effective investment strategies. This understanding helps in identifying and mitigating biases, thus contributing to more rational and efficient market behavior. It also offers valuable insights for financial practitioners and policymakers in designing tools and regulations that account for these behavioral tendencies.

2. Loss Aversion

Loss aversion refers to the phenomenon where people's perception and reaction to losses are stronger than to an equivalent amount of gains. This concept was first introduced by Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky in their groundbreaking Prospect Theory. In this theory, loss aversion is manifested in the value function being steeper for losses than for gains. In other words, the disutility caused by a loss is greater than the utility provided by a gain of the same amount. This theory plays a significant role in explaining and predicting human decision-making behavior under risk and uncertainty [1].

The fundamental assumption of loss aversion, widely recognized in literature, is that losses generally outweigh gains. In fact, loss aversion is closely related to people's expectations regarding the price of goods. If investors make financial decisions based on their expectations, the likelihood of being influenced by loss aversion decreases. Specifically, forgoing gains that meet investors' expectations may not be perceived as a loss internally [2].

Research by Merkle involving a survey of investors at Barclays Bank, further confirmed the relationship between expectations and loss aversion [3]. Their study found that even though the coefficients for loss aversion might be lower than those in most previous studies, its impact is indeed present. Moreover, managing expectations and acquiring more financial knowledge can help investors avoid being influenced by loss aversion in financial decision-making.

3. Market Anomalies

3.1. Momentum

The momentum effect in finance refers to the tendency of securities that have performed well in the past to continue performing well in the near future, and conversely, for securities that have performed poorly to continue underperforming. This concept was thoroughly investigated in the seminal work by Jegadeesh and Titman, who found that stocks with high returns over the past 3 to 12 months tended to yield higher average returns in the following months compared to stocks with low past returns [4]. This phenomenon challenges the efficient market hypothesis, which posits that past price movements should not predict future returns. The momentum effect has become a crucial topic in behavioral finance, where it's often attributed to investors' behavioral biases and market inefficiencies. For example, stocks that have shown strong returns over a period (e.g., 3 to 12 months) tend to maintain this performance in the subsequent period. This phenomenon, highlighted in seminal works like Jegadeesh and Titman's study, indicates a deviation from market efficiency where past price

movements are not supposed to predict future returns [4]. Such persistence suggests that information diffuses slowly into market prices, allowing trends to continue before price corrections occur.

Empirical analysis from the study "Time Series Momentum" by Moskowitz, Ooi, and Pedersen significantly contributes to understanding this phenomenon [5]. The study reveals significant momentum across various asset classes, including equity indexes, currencies, commodities, and bond futures. Their findings indicate persistent returns for periods ranging from 1 to 12 months, followed by a partial reversal. This pattern suggests a market behavior characterized by initial under-reaction to information, followed by a delayed over-reaction, aligning with behavioral finance theories about investor sentiment and decision-making processes. The study's examination of time series momentum also offers valuable insights for developing trading strategies. It underscores the potential for profitable strategies that capitalize on the observed momentum trends, while also highlighting the roles of different market participants, such as speculators and hedgers, in these dynamics.

In summary, the momentum effect and its empirical investigation provide critical insights into market inefficiencies and investor behavior, challenging traditional financial theories and offering avenues for novel investment strategies.

3.2. Reversal

The trend-reversal effect in market anomalies refers to the tendency of assets that have experienced prolonged price movements in one direction to eventually revert to their mean or long-term average. This effect has been traditionally perceived as a counterpoint to the momentum effect, suggesting that while prices may continue to move in the direction of a trend in the short term (momentum), they tend to reverse over longer periods. This perception of trend-reversal is anchored in the belief that prices that deviate significantly from their intrinsic value will eventually correct. This effect is often attributed to overreaction by investors to news or market events, leading to an eventual correction as new information is absorbed or as market conditions change [6].

Empirical studies from Gutierrez and Pirinsky use sophisticated econometric analyses to demonstrate the presence and characteristics of the reversal effect in various markets and time frames [7]. Key findings highlight the role of investor behavior, particularly the actions of institutional investors, in influencing market dynamics and contributing to the reversal effect. These behaviors often include overreaction to news or market events, leading to price distortions that eventually correct themselves.

The research by Kelly also delves into the factors influencing the reversal effect [8]. It is noted that market conditions, investor sentiment, and the mechanics of trading strategies play significant roles. These factors can lead to price trends that deviate from fundamental values, culminating in eventual market corrections. These insights from the empirical studies provide a nuanced understanding of the reversal effect, challenging traditional market efficiency theories and underscoring the importance of behavioral factors in market dynamics.

4. Framing Effect

The framing effect, as defined in the realm of behavioral economics, refers to the phenomenon where people's decisions are influenced by the way information is presented, rather than just by the information itself. This concept, explored extensively by Tversky and Kahneman, suggests that the context or 'frame' in which choices are presented can significantly impact decision-making [9]. For example, individuals may react differently to a situation depending on whether it is framed in terms of potential losses or gains, even if the underlying facts remain the same. This effect demonstrates how cognitive biases can lead to deviations from rational decision-making in financial and other contexts.

In the realm of behavioral finance, the desire for certain gains and aversion to certain losses are pivotal components of the framing effect. Participants facing potential losses tend to favor options with higher risks. Additionally, investors' emotions significantly influence the framing effect, encompassing both anticipated and incidental emotions. However, distinguishing the specific impacts of these emotional states is challenging in practice, and individuals with different personalities may respond differently to framing. It's evident that modulating factors affecting emotions, and thereby influencing the framing effect, is a viable approach. Adjusting elements like investors' initial capital or their sense of security could lead to more stable financial decision-making.

In summary, the framing effect, a concept rooted in behavioral economics and extensively explored by Tversky and Kahneman, highlights how decision-making is influenced by the presentation of information rather than the information itself [9]. This effect, a manifestation of cognitive biases, shows how the same factual scenario can lead to different choices when framed in terms of gains or losses. In behavioral finance, this effect is further compounded by emotional factors. The inclination towards certain gains and the aversion to definite losses, coupled with the variability of emotional responses, can lead to riskier choices when facing potential losses. Personalities also play a role in how individuals are affected by framing. Therefore, modifying emotional influencers, like initial capital or perceived security, could lead to more rational financial decisions.

5. Endowment Effect

The endowment effect is a phenomenon in behavioral economics where individuals value an owned item more highly than the same item when it is not owned. This effect is rooted in the concept of loss aversion, where the pain of losing an object is perceived to be greater than the pleasure of acquiring it [9]. The endowment effect challenges the traditional economic theory of rational choice by highlighting the impact of ownership on value perception.

The concept of the endowment effect was first rigorously explored by Thaler in the late 20th century. It gained significant attention after the influential study by Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, which provided empirical evidence of the effect through a series of experiments [10]. This research built upon earlier work by Thaler and others that began to question the assumptions of rational decision-making in economics, thus contributing significantly to the development of behavioral economics.

The endowment effect has significant implications in finance, particularly in behavioral finance. In investment decisions, this effect can lead investors to overvalue assets they own, impacting their selling and buying behavior. Investors might demand a higher price to part with an asset than they would be willing to pay for it if they did not own it, leading to suboptimal trading decisions [10]. Furthermore, the endowment effect influences portfolio diversification, as investors might irrationally cling to underperforming stocks due to a sense of ownership [11]. These biases challenge the traditional financial theory that assumes rational and unbiased decision-making, highlighting the need for understanding psychological factors in financial behavior.

Knetsch and Wong investigate the endowment effect through experimental design. The study explores how different treatment conditions, like ownership and manipulation of reference states, impact participants' willingness to trade [12]. It reveals that the endowment effect is significantly influenced by the reference state and that this effect can be altered by changing experimental conditions. This research has implications for understanding the endowment effect in financial decision-making, particularly how market behavior and asset valuation are influenced by perceived ownership and reference states.

In conclusion, the endowment effect significantly alters financial behavior, as evidenced by various studies. It affects how investors value and manage assets, often leading to irrational decision-making influenced by ownership and loss aversion. The research by Kahneman, Knetsch, & Thaler

and Knetsch & Wong highlights the need to consider psychological factors in financial markets [10, 12]. Future research should focus on exploring the endowment effect across different cultural and economic contexts, and on developing strategies to mitigate its impact on investment behavior. Further investigation into the interaction between the endowment effect and other behavioral biases could also yield valuable insights.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, this exploration of key behavioral finance phenomena - loss aversion, market anomalies, the framing effect, and the endowment effect - underscores the complexity of financial decision-making. By illuminating the divergences from traditional rational-choice theory, this analysis reveals the nuanced ways in which investor behavior, market dynamics, and psychological factors interplay. It emphasizes the importance of acknowledging and understanding these behavioral biases to make more informed, rational financial decisions. Future research should continue to delve deeper into these phenomena, particularly in diverse market contexts, to further refine our understanding of behavioral finance and its practical applications.

The research in behavioral finance, while insightful, has certain limitations. Firstly, much of the research is context-specific, often conducted in controlled environments that may not accurately reflect real-world market dynamics. Future studies should focus on real-world data and diverse market environments to enhance the applicability of findings. Secondly, there is a need for greater integration of behavioral finance theories with traditional financial models, which could lead to more comprehensive frameworks for understanding market behavior. Lastly, research should explore the cumulative effects of multiple behavioral biases on financial decision-making, as investors are often influenced by a complex interplay of biases. Additionally, cross-cultural studies in behavioral finance would provide valuable insights into how cultural contexts influence investor behavior.

References

- [1] 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.
- [2] Novemsky, N., & Kahneman, D. (2005). *The boundaries of loss aversion*. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 42(2), 119–128.
- [3] Merkle, C. (2019). *Financial loss aversion illusion**. *Review of Finance*, 24(2), 381–413.
- [4] Jegadeesh, N. and Titman, S. (2002). *Momentum*, *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, 3(1), 493–509.
- [5] Moskowitz, T. J., Ooi, Y. H., & Pedersen, L. H. (2012). *Time series momentum*. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 104(2), 228–250.
- [6] De Bondt, W. F. M., & Thaler, R. H. (1985). *Does the stock market overreact?* *The Journal of Finance*, 40(3), 793–805.
- [7] Gutierrez, R. C., & Prinsky, C. A. (2007). *Momentum, reversal, and the trading behaviors of institutions*. *Journal of Financial Markets*, 10(1), 48–75.
- [8] Kelly, B. T., Moskowitz, T. J., & Pruitt, S. (2021). *Understanding momentum and reversal*. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 140(3), 726–743.
- [9] Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). *The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice*. *Science*, 211(4481), 453–458.
- [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] Strahilevitz, M., & Loewenstein, G. (1998). *The effect of ownership history on the valuation of objects*. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25(3), 276–289.
- [12] Knetsch, J. L., & Wong, W. (2009). *The endowment effect and the reference state: Evidence and manipulations*. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 71(2), 407–413.