Proceedings of ICMRED 2025 Symposium: Effective Communication as a Powerful Management Tool
DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/184/2025.BL23234

Loss Aversion from the Perspective of Behavioral Finance and Its Application in Corporate Strategies: A Comparative Study of Apple Care and Tesla's Extended Warranty

Yinxi Hong

Business School, Beijing Language and Culture University, Beijing, China
Hongyx017@163.com

Abstract: Loss aversion, as a core concept in behavioral finance, posits that individuals prefer to avoid losses rather than acquiring equivalent gains. This psychological bias has become a strategic asset for companies. This article examines the operational models of Apple Care and Tesla's extended warranty services to reveal how enterprises capitalize on cognitive biases. Through "active frame construction," companies amplify loss aversion, while "pseudo-passive transparency" leverages technology for algorithmic control. Research findings reveal that the essential difference between the two lies in the explicitness or implicitness of the exploitation form. Apple directly monetizes users' fears through an explicit framing effect, while Tesla creates a new form of 'data exploitation' through algorithmic black boxes under the guise of data transparency. The research suggests that a regulatory framework that links "transparency" and "accountability" should be established to prevent companies from transforming loss aversion from a profit tool into a engine for social welfare.

Keywords: Loss Aversion, Behavioral Finance, Business Ethics, Behavioral Exploitation, Transparency Empowerment

1. Introduction

In recent years, the rise of behavioral finance has reshaped traditional finance's reliance on "rational man" hypothesis. The theory of loss aversion has evolved from a psychological concept to a core paradigm affecting business practice. Prospect theory shows individuals are about 2-2.5 times more sensitive to losses than to gains. a bias that reshapes the decision-making model of investors and gives rise to new business models in technology-intensive industries [1]. In the two major fields of intelligent hardware and new energy vehicles, Apple Care and Tesla have built up a multi-billion dollar extended warranty service market by applying the principles of economics. Such technology monopolies are transforming cognitive biases into business tools, creating a coexistence of strategic innovation and ethical controversy that requires further investigation.

By comparing the typical cases of two technology-intensive industries, this paper analyzes how enterprises realize the capitalization operation of loss aversion through the strategies of "active framework construction" and "pseudo-passive transparency". Apple Care and Tesla's extended warranty service were selected for their comparable technical barriers, user stickiness, and pricing strategies, yet divergent applications of behavioral economics. The study expands behavioral

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/184/2025.BL23234

finance's application in technology-intensive industries and provides theoretical basis for consumer protection policy-making and ethical strategy design.

2. Theoretical basis

2.1. Core mechanism of loss aversion

Loss aversion reveals humans' disproportionate sensitivity to losses compared to equivalent gains. This asymmetry manifests in risk preferences: when anticipating gains, individuals exhibit risk aversion, but seek high-risk solutions when confronting losses. This behavioral pattern fundamentally contradicts expected utility theory's rational risk-assessment premise. Based on this, Kahneman and Tversky proposed prospect theory, which provides a new perspective and theoretical framework for explaining human behavior in risk decision making [1]. Prospect theory indicates that individuals' perceptions of loss and gain are asymmetrical. In the face of the same amount of gain and loss, the psychological impact brought by loss is more intense, which is often more difficult for people to accept. This cognitive bias has adaptive significance from an evolutionary perspective, but it can easily be exploited by enterprises in modern business contexts. Kahneman's dual-process theory explains how intuitive thinking dominates decision-making, intensifying loss aversion in risk scenarios [2]. These insights are critical for designing cognitive-aware service strategies.

2.2. Behavioral financial instruments of enterprises

Transforming behavioral finance theories into practical tools involves a systematic application of cognitive biases. According to the theory of choice architecture, enterprises can effectively guide user behavior by designing "choice architecture" in the decision-making environment [3]. Enterprises typically employ the following tools derived from behavioral finance theory: presetting default options and leveraging "status quo bias" to reduce decision-making costs. For example, financial institutions check e-billing service by default in the account opening process. Adjusting the expression of information to form a framing effect affects the decision-making tendency, such as labeling health food packaging as "90% lean meat" instead of "10% fat". Using social proof mechanisms can strengthen the herd mentality, such as the online course platform showing that "100000 students have joined". These tools effectively guide user behavior by systematic design choice architecture.

The behavioral contract theory proposed by Gneezy et al. suggests that enterprises can transform behavioral deviations into value creation tools through "transparency commitment" [4]. Tesla's dynamic extended warranty system ostensibly conforms to this theoretical framework, but the existence of its algorithmic black box weakens the credibility of the promise, forming a new type of "data contract" exploitation. In summary, loss aversion not only affects individual decisions, but is also skillfully used by firms to maximize profits. The following case comparison will deeply analyze Apple Care and Tesla's extended warranty service, and explore how they implement these theories to influence consumer decisions.

3. Case comparison

3.1. Apple Care: the "fear tax" of loss aversion

Apple Care, Apple's extended warranty service for iphones, Macs and other products, uses a behavioral economics framework to turn users' anxiety about device failures into profits. In the case of the iPhone 16 Pro Max, the cost of repairing a broken screen is as high as $379, while the service fee is only $29 after purchasing Apple Care + [5]. Although third-party repair platforms offer only 1/5

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/184/2025.BL23234

to 1/3 of the official price, Apple makes consumers more inclined to choose official services through brand trust and technology monopoly. This strategy is controversial because users pay not only for repairs but also a fear premium of "non-official repairs causing damage to the equipment".

To effectively capitalize on loss aversion, Apple amplifies the perceived loss from high maintenance costs. The company directly compares the out-of-warranty repair price (such as $379) with the cost of Apple Care+ ($199 / two years) through the official website, and uses the loss perception coefficient of prospect theory ($\lambda \approx 2$) to amplify the potential loss psychology of users to $758, thus stimulating preventive purchase [1].

Second, Apple employs a scarcity tactic by imposing a time limit on the purchase of Apple Care+. Customers can only buy it within 60 days of device activation. After this period, repurchase is not allowed. Neuroscience studies have shown that time pressure can activate emotional responses in the amygdala and inhibit rational decision-making in the frontal lobe, prompting users to accept a premium driven by emotion [6].

Third, the service subtly suggests invisible losses. Apple Care+ includes additional services such as free battery replacement ($119 without warranty), suggesting that users will face additional costs if they do not buy, and use the free service to strengthen psychological security. This framework takes advantage of users' aversion to sunk costs and reinforces the incentive to buy.

3.2. Tesla's extended warranty: dynamic control of hidden "data exploitation"

Tesla's extended warranty service takes "technology empowerment" as the narrative core, using real-time vehicle monitoring and dynamic pricing model to seemingly eliminate the information asymmetry typical of traditional warranties. However, its essence is to transform user behavior data into "behavioral surplus" through algorithmic black boxes, forming the implicit exploitation of technology mediation [7]. The specific performance is as follows. First, technology trust replaces anxiety marketing. Under the guise of vehicle data transparency, the algorithm can conceal the substantial deprivation of users' decision-making rights. Second, there is false empowerment. Users can reduce premiums by improving driving behavior, but the power to set parameters of the scoring system is completely controlled by the enterprise, forming a "controlled non-freedom".

Tesla's pricing strategy relies on data monopoly and algorithmic control, including the following mechanisms. First, the closed-loop pricing of behavioral risk. Tesla generates a "risk coefficient" by building a driving scoring system that includes many parameters such as the number of times users slow down sharply and charging habits, but the logic of weight allocation is not made public. Second, the risk premium strategy of time dimension. The extended warranty price adopts a stepped-up Model, and the extended premium for 1-year, 2-year, and 3-year Model Y all-wheel drive versions is 15,000 RMB, 16,100 RMB, and 23,000 RMB respectively, which strengthens users' loss aversion to future uncertainties through stepped-pricing [8]. Third, sunk cost locking effect. Tesla's surrender penalty (a prorated refund of 5% of the fee, e.g., 60% after 1 year) takes advantage of loss aversion and traps users in a long-term commitment to avoid perceived wasted expenses.

Under the framework of "anti-vulnerability", Tesla's extended warranty strategy presents an ethical paradox of technology empowerment. First, data feeds the closed loop. Through vehicle data authorization, Tesla can access user driving and fault data, optimize the extended warranty pricing model, and reverse improve the vehicle design to reduce the cost of parts with high failure rates. Large users cannot obtain fairness verification of data feeding. Second, mental accounting reset occurs when the extended premium is framed as "vehicle life cycle cost" [9]. For example, presenting maintenance cost as 10,000 RMB compared to the total extended warranty price of 8,000 RMB weakens users' perception of additional expenditure on extended warranty and strengthens the stop-loss psychology. Third, moral objectification takes place as, while technology tools ostensibly

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/184/2025.BL23234

give users control, they actually domestize behavior through algorithms, alienating autonomous decision-making into passive compliance [10].

3.3. Comparative analysis

Table 1: Comparative analysis of Apple Care and Tesla's extended warranty

Dimension	Apple Care	Tesla's Extended Warranty
Strategy core	Explicit framing effect (fear amplification)	Implicit algorithmic control (risk transparency appearance)
Pricing logic	Fixed high premium + time scarcity	Dynamic data-driven pricing + behavioral gaming
User decision-making rights	Limited selection (Buy/don't buy)	False empowerment (data transparency but algorithmic black box)
Ethical controversy	Direct exploitation of cognitive vulnerability (the "fear tax")	Technology-mediated exploitation (capitalization of "behavioral surplus")
Technology dependence	Closed ecology (hardware-software binding)	Real-time data monopoly (driving-fail-pricing loop)

Table 1 shows the comparison between Apple Care and Tesla's extended warranty in several key dimensions. Both of them are capitalized through behavioral deviation, but the forms of exploitation are dominant and recessive. Apple relies on strong brand influence and technology monopoly, and realizes short-term profit maximization through standardized fear manufacturing. User decision chain is simple and direct, users only face limited choices to buy or not to buy, and the decision-making process is strongly influenced by the fear atmosphere created by Apple. In contrast, Tesla relies on the advantages of data and algorithms to build a dynamic behavior adjustment system and transform user autonomy into "controlled non-freedom" [7]. Although users can obtain certain data, they are difficult to truly control the key factors behind the decision, guiding them towards purchasing extended warranty consumption.

3.4. Comparison of ethical boundaries

The ethical controversy of corporate financial instruments focuses on the binary paradox of "exploitation-empowerment". Through the framing effect, Apple shapes the maintenance risk as an "unbearable loss", which is essentially the "irrational exploitation" to charge a "fear tax" by exploiting users' cognitive weaknesses [11]. This kind of explicit exploitation directly transforms the loss aversion of users into premium profits through the strategy of high maintenance cost comparison and time pressure.

Although Tesla's dynamic pricing model claims to be transparent, its algorithm black box leads to opaque maintenance cost prediction, resulting in the "technology-mediated exploitation" criticized by Zuboff [7]. Through the closed loop of data collection-behavior prediction-price discrimination, enterprises transform user behavior into tradable "behavior surplus", but user decision-making power is actually ill-used, while the weight parameters of the driving scoring system remain undisclosed, the scope of data collection continues to expand (such as in-car cameras and bio-metrics), which essentially deprive user autonomy.

This technology empowerment strategy presents a double paradox. First, there is the illusion of empowerment. Both claim to "enhance user control", such as Apple's "flexible maintenance" and Tesla's "transparent terms", but the essence is to compress user choice space through

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/184/2025.BL23234

technology-contract binding. Second, there is a shift of responsibility. The cost of risk is transferred from the enterprise to the user, but the profit is rationalized in the name of "service innovation".

4. Policy implications

4.1. Algorithm transparency mandatory disclosure mechanism

To construct an algorithm transparency disclosure mechanism to crack the "pseudo-transparency" data exploitation of enterprises, its core lies in restricting the black-box operation of algorithms and establishing an interdisciplinary supervision framework.

First, the filing system of dynamic pricing algorithm should be implemented, forcing enterprises to disclose key parameters of the extended warranty pricing model, including core algorithm elements such as driving behavior score weight, maintenance cost calculation formula (such as component failure rate × market average price), and implementing filing review of key algorithms with reference to the requirements of Article 12 of the EU Digital Market Act [12]. Second, third-party compliance audits should be established. An independent Consumer Technology Audit Office should conduct annual algorithmic fairness reviews, particularly assessing parameter alignment with actual failure rates. Third, a tiered penalty system should be implemented, imposing 2% prior-year warranty revenue fines for first nondisclosure/algorithmic manipulation violations and service license suspensions for repeat offenses.

4.2. Ethical hierarchical management of behavioral intervention

In terms of regulation of explicit exploitation behavior, taking Apple Care as an example, it is suggested to implement a mandatory disclosure system of risk probability, requiring enterprises to mark the actual failure rate of products in a significant way in the extended warranty agreement. For example, Apple needs to display the breakage probability of iPhone screen with the error range not exceeding ±0.5%; At the same time, for complex technology products such as smart cars, the cooling-off period of consumer decision-making will be extended from the current 14 days to 90 days, and a "zero-loss surrender within the cooling-off period" system will be established.

In view of the regulation of hidden exploitation behavior, taking the Tesla model as an example, a technology publicity guarantee mechanism should be established to force car companies to open vehicle diagnosis interfaces and allow third-party maintenance institutions to obtain fault code data by referring to the EU Vehicle Type Approval Regulations [13]. At the same time, data portability rules are implemented, requiring car companies to provide standardized driving data interfaces to support users to migrate data to third-party insurance platforms, so as to break data monopoly barriers and prevent algorithm hegemony.

4.3. Regulatory process

To establish an efficient regulatory process, enterprises should first disclose the core parameters and decision logic of the algorithm. An independent third-party organization should audit and verify the data security and compliance. Simultaneously, companies should create an open platform interface that supports users in achieving data portability through standardized protocols. The regulatory authorities implement a dynamic compliance review mechanism, requiring companies to regularly update transparency reports and accept public supervision. Enterprises that fail to meet the standards will be subject to graded penalties, including fines, business restrictions and forced rectification. Through a chain transparency mechanism and dynamic governance, this regulatory framework forms a closed-loop management covering algorithm design, data flow and application effects, providing an institutional guarantee for balancing technological innovation and consumer rights protection.

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/184/2025.BL23234

5. Conclusion

By comparing the cases of Apple and Tesla, this paper reveals the intergenerational evolution logic of loss aversion instrumentalization in the digital age, transitioning from explicit framework exploitation (Apple's "fear tax") to implicit algorithmic control (Tesla's "data hegemony"). The study finds that companies employ technology empowerment narratives (such as transparent pricing) to construct a veneer of legitimacy for new forms of exploitation, which are exacerbated by the invisibility of technology black boxes. This evolution challenges the regulatory effectiveness of traditional consumer protection laws and underlines the necessity for an interdisciplinary regulatory framework. Traditional laws find it difficult to handle the technical complexity of algorithmic pricing. New regulations must target both the exploitation of cognitive bias and the risk of algorithmic black boxes, thus balancing behavioral science and algorithmic transparency.

This study has limitations. For instance, it doesn't consider the impact of cultural variables on the capitalization path of loss aversion. In collectivist cultures like those in Asian markets, extended warranty bundling may show different traits because of diverse social norms. Future research could expand the theoretical scope via cross-cultural comparisons and multi-industry case analyses.

In the era of rapid development of artificial intelligence, the future industries will accelerate the use of artificial intelligence to accurately capture the loss aversion of users, predict user anxiety, and achieve more accurate "invisible marketing". Supervision needs to be more deeply integrated with the review of the behavioral science budget law, prevent technology from being disguised as "user care", build a comprehensive and multi-level supervision system, and effectively protect the rights and interests of consumers.

References

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

[2] *Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.*

[3] *Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness. Yale University Press.*

[4] *Gneezy, U., Meier, S., & Rey-Biel, P. (2011). When and why incentives (don't) work to modify behavior. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 25(4), 191–210.*

[5] *Apple Inc. (2025, March 17). AppleCare+ service plan. https://www.apple.com.cn/legal/sales-support/applecare/applecareplus/2503/250304_applecareplusch.pdf*

[6] *Loewenstein, G. (1996). Out of Control: Visceral Influences on Behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 65(3): 272-292.*

[7] *Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power. PublicAffairs, 95-128,252,441,342.*

[8] *Tesla, Inc. (2025, March 18). Pure electric vehicles, solar energy, and clean energy. https://www.tesla.cn/*

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

[10] *Verbeek, P. -P. (2006). Materializing morality: Design ethics and technological mediation. Science, Technology & Human Values, 31(3), 361–380.*

[11] *Ariely, D. (2008). Predictably irrational: The hidden forces that shape our decisions (Rev. & expanded ed.). HarperCollins.*

[12] *European Parliament & Council. (2022). Regulation (EU) 2022/1925 on contestable and fair markets in the digital sector (Digital Markets Act). Official Journal of the European Union, L 264/1. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32022R1925*

[13] *European Parliament & Council. (2018). Regulation (EU) 2018/858 on the approval and market surveillance of motor vehicles and their trailers. Official Journal of the European Union, L 151/1 https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018R0858&from=EN*