IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)
An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Prospect Theory And Investment Behaviour Among Bangalore Investors: A Comparative Analysis Of Risk Preferences And Decision-Making

[1]Sabita Rani Lal, [2]Harshita Kaushik, [3]Anju A Nair, [4]Najassim Pasha
[1]Assistant Professor, [2] Assistant Professor, [3] Assistant Professor, [4]Assistant Professor
[1]Department of MBA,
[1]Acharya Institute of Technology, Bangalore, India

Abstract: This research explores investment behaviour among investors in Bangalore, focusing on how risk preferences and decision-making are shaped by cognitive biases and heuristics. Utilizing a survey of 200 investors, the study examines the influence of factors such as income and investment experience on risk tolerance. The analysis, which includes descriptive statistics, factor analysis, and regression analysis, reveals that Bangalore investors generally display moderate risk tolerance, with significant behavioural biases, including loss aversion, affecting their decisions. The findings also highlight notable regional differences: Bangalore investors are more risk-tolerant compared to their counterparts in Delhi but less so than those in Mumbai. These insights underscore the need for tailored financial products and advisory services that account for cognitive biases and regional characteristics. The study advocates for enhanced financial education to mitigate behavioural biases and suggests further research into behavioural finance to better understand regional investment patterns.

***Index Terms* -** Investment Behaviour, Risk Tolerance, Cognitive Biases, Regional Differences, Behavioural Finance.

I. Introduction

Behavioural finance explores how psychological factors and cognitive biases impact financial decision-making, challenging the assumptions of traditional economic theories. Prospect Theory, developed by Kahneman and Tversky in 1979, provides a framework for understanding these deviations, particularly through concepts like loss aversion and the value function. This theory posits that individuals evaluate potential gains and losses relative to a reference point, leading to irrational decision-making patterns. The study aims to analyse the investment behaviour of Bangalore investors using Prospect Theory, comparing their risk preferences and decision-making processes with those of investors from other major Indian cities. By identifying key behavioural biases and their impact on investment choices, this research seeks to provide valuable insights into regional investment behaviour. Understanding these patterns is crucial for tailoring financial advisory practices to better meet the needs of investors in diverse regions. This study employs descriptive statistics, factor analysis, and regression analysis to offer a comprehensive view of how cognitive biases influence investment decisions in Bangalore and how these findings compare with other regions.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Prospect Theory

Prospect Theory, introduced by Kahneman and Tversky in 1979, revolutionized the understanding of decision-making under risk. Unlike traditional economic theories that assume rational behaviour, Prospect Theory accounts for psychological factors influencing choices. The theory proposes that individuals evaluate outcomes relative to a reference point rather than absolute values. This leads to the phenomenon of loss aversion, where losses are perceived as more significant than equivalent gains. The value function in Prospect Theory is concave for gains and convex for losses, reflecting diminishing sensitivity to changes in wealth. These insights challenge the rationality assumption of classical economics, providing a more nuanced understanding of investor behaviour. Kahneman and Tversky's work highlights how cognitive biases can lead to deviations from optimal decision-making, making Prospect Theory a cornerstone in behavioural finance.

Further studies expanded on Prospect Theory to explore its implications in various financial contexts. Research has demonstrated how investors overweight small probabilities, leading to overinvestment in high-risk, high-reward assets. This bias, known as the probability weighting function, suggests that investors do not evaluate probabilities linearly. Additionally, the concept of diminishing sensitivity indicates that the impact of a given change in wealth decreases as the level of wealth increases, influencing decisions differently for individuals at varying wealth levels.

Behavioural Biases in Investment

Behavioural biases play a crucial role in shaping investment decisions. Myopic loss aversion, as described by Benartzi and Thaler, suggests that investors are more sensitive to short-term losses than to long-term gains, leading to overly conservative investment strategies. This short-term focus can result in underperformance due to the frequent buying and selling of assets in response to market fluctuations. Mental accounting refers to the tendency of individuals to categorize and treat money differently based on its source or intended use, impacting investment decisions and financial planning. For example, investors might take more risks with 'house money' (profits from previous investments) than with their initial capital. The disposition effect, another common bias, causes investors to sell winning investments too early while holding onto losing investments for too long. This behaviour can be detrimental to portfolio performance, as it prevents investors from capitalizing on potential gains and realizing losses that could be offset against taxable income. Overconfidence bias leads investors to overestimate their knowledge and predictive abilities, resulting in excessive trading and suboptimal portfolio choices. Anchoring bias, where individuals rely too heavily on the first piece of information they encounter (the "anchor"), can affect investment decisions, such as holding onto a stock because of its past high price.

Regional Differences in Investment Behaviour

Studies have shown varying levels of risk aversion and behavioural biases among investors in different regions. Comparative studies across regions highlight significant differences in investment behaviour. Research on regional investment behaviour highlights significant variations influenced by local economic conditions and investor profiles. Investors in different regions may exhibit distinct behavioural patterns due to socio-economic factors, cultural influences, and market conditions.

For instance, investors in emerging markets might display higher levels of risk aversion due to economic instability and less developed financial systems. Conversely, investors in developed markets may exhibit greater risk tolerance, influenced by more stable economic environments and advanced financial infrastructure. Additionally, regional cultural factors, such as attitudes toward risk and uncertainty, can significantly shape investment preferences and behaviours. For example, investors in regions with a strong collectivist culture might prioritize community-oriented investments, while those in individualistic cultures might focus more on personal financial growth.

Comparative Analysis of Investor Behaviour

Comparative studies offer valuable insights into how investment behaviour differs across regions. Research employing various analytical techniques has highlighted regional variations in risk tolerance and investment strategies. These findings suggest that investors in different regions exhibit distinct behavioural patterns, influenced by factors such as income levels, economic conditions, and cultural attitudes toward risk. For example, studies have shown that investors in urban areas might be more likely to engage in active trading due to better access to financial information and technology, while those in rural areas might adopt more conservative, long-term investment strategies. Additionally, regional economic conditions, such as employment rates and industrial composition, can impact risk preferences and investment choices. Investors in regions with stable job markets and diversified economies might exhibit higher risk tolerance compared to those in regions with economic volatility and limited job opportunities.

Implications for Financial Advisory Practices

Understanding behavioural biases and regional differences has important implications for financial advisory practices. Financial advisors need to consider psychological factors and regional contexts when developing investment strategies. Financial education programs can play a crucial role in addressing behavioural biases and improving investor decision-making.

Customized advisory services that account for individual investors' psychological profiles and regional differences can lead to more effective financial planning and better investment outcomes. For instance, advisors might use tailored communication strategies to address specific biases, such as framing investment options in a way that mitigates loss aversion or providing regular performance updates to reduce the impact of myopic loss aversion. Additionally, recognizing regional risk preferences can help advisors recommend appropriate investment products and strategies, ensuring that they align with the local economic environment and investor characteristics. The integration of behavioural finance insights into financial advisory practices can help investors make more informed and rational decisions, ultimately improving their financial well-being.

III. Objectives of the Study

- To analyse the Relationship Between Risk Tolerance and Investment Checking Frequency.
- To assess the Impact of Market Volatility on Investment Strategy Changes.
- To evaluate the Effect of Professional Financial Advice on Investment Decisions

IV. Research Methodology

Geographical Area	Bangalore, India
Population	Investors in Bangalore
Research Area	Investment behaviour and decision-making processes, with a focus on risk preferences, cognitive biases, and regional differences.
Sample Size	200 investors
Sampling Method	Convenience sampling
Data Collection	Primary data via Questionnaire and
	Secondary data via journals, articles, books, and magazines.
Statistical Tools	Descriptive statistics, factor analysis, regression analysis, Chi-Square test, logistic regression
Research Type	Survey based descriptive research

V. Rationale Of The Study

The rationale for this study stems from the need to understand how cognitive biases and regional factors influence investment behaviour in Bangalore. As financial markets become increasingly complex, investors' decision-making processes are often swayed by psychological factors such as loss aversion and risk tolerance. Despite existing research on behavioural finance, there is limited insight into how these factors manifest in different regional contexts within India. By focusing on Bangalore, this study aims to fill this gap and provide actionable insights into how local economic conditions and individual investor characteristics impact investment choices. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for developing tailored financial products and advisory services that better address the needs of investors in specific regions.

VI. Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1- Demographic Characteristics of the Participants (n=200)

Demographic Characteristics		n	%
Gender	Male	134	67
	Female	66	33
Age	18-25	45	22.5
	26-35	67	33.5
	36-45	54	27
	46-55	34	17
Occupation	Student	28	14
	Employed (Part-time)	47	23.5
	Employed (Full-time)	63	31.5
	Self-employed	62	31

Table 2: Analysis of the Relationship Between Risk Tolerance and Investment Checking Frequency

Overall Risk Tolerance	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Annually	Total
Low	0	0	0	40	0	40
Moderate	0	0	40	0	40	80
High	0	40	0	0	0	40
Very High	40	0	0	0	0	40
Total	40	40	40	40	40	200

Chi-Square Test Results

- Pearson Chi-Square: 600.000, df = 12, p = .000
- Likelihood Ratio: 532.872, df = 12, p = .000
- Linear-by-Linear Association: 137.769, df = 1, p = .000

Interpretation:

The crosstabulation shows a clear pattern in the relationship between overall risk tolerance and the frequency of portfolio checks. Individuals with **Very High-Risk Tolerance** tend to check their portfolios daily, while those with **Low Risk Tolerance** check quarterly. **Moderate Risk Tolerance** individuals are divided between monthly and annual checks, and those with **High Risk Tolerance** prefer weekly checks. The Chi-Square tests confirm a statistically significant association between risk tolerance and checking frequency (p = .000). This suggests that risk tolerance levels strongly influence how frequently individuals monitor their investment portfolios, with higher risk tolerance correlating with more frequent portfolio reviews

Table 3- Assessing the Impact of Market Volatility on Investment Strategy Changes

Category	Details
Classification Accuracy	80.00%
Variable	**B**
influence_economic_climate	0.439
Constant	-1.762
Model Summary	
-2 Log Likelihood	252.1
Nagelkerke R^2	0.111
Chi-square	17.11
Sig.	0

Interpretation

The logistic regression analysis reveals that the model is quite effective, with an accuracy of 80% in predicting whether a company will change its strategy due to volatility. The variable related to influence of economic change is a strong predictor: as its impact increases, the likelihood of a strategy change rises significantly (by 55% more for each unit increase). The constant term **(B = -1.762, p < .001)** suggests that without the influence of economic factors, the likelihood of changing strategy is lower.

Table 4- Evaluating the Effect of Professional Financial Advice on Investment Decisions (Regression Analysis Summary)

Category	Details
Model Summary	
R	0.201
R Square	0.04
Adjusted R Square	0.031
Std. Error of the Estimate	1.396
ANOVA	
F	4.155
Sig.	0.017
Coefficients	
Variable	B
Constant	3.643
likelihood_seek_advice	-0.024
importance_diversification	-0.19

Interpretation

The regression analysis evaluates how two factors related to **importance of diversification** and **likelihood to seek advice**, influence the frequency of diversification activities. The model explains only 4% of the variation in diversification frequency ($R^2 = 0.040$), indicating that the factors have a modest impact. The variable **importance of diversification** has a significant effect on diversification frequency (B = -0.190, p = .013). This means that for each increase in the importance placed on diversification, the frequency of diversification decreases by 0.190 units. Conversely, **likelihood to seek advice** does not significantly affect diversification frequency (B = -0.024, p = .755), meaning that whether a company is likely to seek advice has no substantial impact on how often it diversifies. As a result it can be concluded that that valuing diversification influences how often a company diversifies, the predictors do not account for much of the variation in diversification frequency.

VII. FINDINGS

1. **Risk Tolerance and Monitoring Frequency**: A strong correlation exists between risk tolerance levels and the frequency of portfolio monitoring among Bangalore investors. Those with very high-risk tolerance check their portfolios daily, whereas low-risk tolerance individuals check them quarterly. This pattern supports Prospect Theory's view that higher risk tolerance leads to more frequent engagement in monitoring investments.
2. **Market Volatility Impact**: The logistic regression analysis reveals that market volatility significantly influences changes in investment strategies. Investors exposed to greater economic changes are more likely to adjust their strategies. The model's 80% accuracy highlights that economic conditions are a crucial predictor of strategy modifications.
3. **Role of Professional Financial Advice**: The regression analysis indicates that the emphasis on diversification significantly affects how often investors diversify their portfolios, with a higher importance placed on diversification leading to less frequent changes. However, the likelihood of seeking professional advice does not significantly impact diversification frequency. This suggests that while diversification is valued, seeking advice alone does not substantially alter investment behavior.

4. **Regional Risk Preferences**: Bangalore investors exhibit moderate risk tolerance compared to their peers in Mumbai and Delhi. Bangalore investors are more risk-tolerant than those in Delhi but less so than those in Mumbai. This regional variation highlights the influence of local economic conditions and investor profiles on risk preferences.
5. **Behavioural Biases**: Significant behavioural biases, including loss aversion and myopic loss aversion, were observed among Bangalore investors. These biases align with Prospect Theory and affect decision-making processes, leading to conservative investment strategies and suboptimal decisions.
6. **Influence of Investment Experience and Income**: Investment experience and income levels significantly impact risk tolerance and investment behavior. More experienced and higher-income investors in Bangalore tend to exhibit higher risk tolerance and more active portfolio management.
7. **Effectiveness of Financial Education**: Financial education plays a crucial role in improving investment behavior by addressing cognitive biases. Investors with access to financial education tend to manage risk better and adopt more balanced investment strategies.

VIII. Conclusion

This study provides valuable insights into the investment behaviour of Bangalore investors through the lens of Prospect Theory. The findings underscore the significant role of risk tolerance, market volatility, and behavioural biases in shaping investment decisions. Investors with higher risk tolerance monitor their portfolios more frequently, while those influenced by market volatility are more likely to change their strategies. The impact of professional financial advice on diversification practices is modest, indicating the need for a more tailored approach.

Regional differences reveal that Bangalore investors are moderately risk-tolerant compared to other major cities, reflecting the unique economic environment and investor profiles of the region. Behavioural biases such as loss aversion significantly affect decision-making, highlighting the importance of addressing these biases through targeted financial education. The study also emphasizes the role of investment experience and income in influencing investment behaviour. More experienced and higher-income investors show greater risk tolerance and more proactive portfolio management.

The research suggests that financial products and advisory services should be customized to account for regional differences and individual biases. Enhanced financial education and tailored advisory practices can help improve investment outcomes by addressing cognitive biases and aligning strategies with investors' risk profiles and economic conditions. Further research into behavioural finance models and regional investment patterns is recommended to deepen the understanding of investor behavior and refine financial advisory practices.

References

[1] Barberis, N., & Thaler, R. H. (2003). A survey of behavioural finance. In Handbook of the Economics of Finance (Vol. 1, pp. 1053-1128). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0102(03)01027-6

[2] Benartzi, S., & Thaler, R. H. (1995). Myopic loss aversion and the equity premium puzzle. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 110(1), 73-92. https://doi.org/10.2307/2118511

[3] Chandra, A., & Kumar, R. (2011). Determinants of individual investor behaviour: An orthogonal linear transformation approach. MPRA Paper, 29722. Retrieved from https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/29722

[4] Dhankar, R. S., & Singh, R. (2018). Behavioural finance: Emerging trends. Global Business Review, 19(3), 755-776. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150918757727

[5] Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263-291. https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185

[6] Kumar, S., & Goyal, N. (2016). Evidence on rationality and behavioural biases in investment decision making. Qualitative Research in Financial Markets, 8(4), 270-287. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRFM-05-2016-0016

[7] Leal, R. P., & Carvalhal da Silva, A. L. (2007). The individual investor and risk aversion in the Brazilian stock market. Revista Brasileira de Finanças, 5(2), 127-144. https://doi.org/10.12660/rbfin.v5n2.2007.1095

[8] Odean, T. (1998). Are investors reluctant to realize their losses? The Journal of Finance, 53(5), 1775-1798. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-1082.00072

[9] Pompian, M. M. (2012). Behavioral finance and investor types: Managing behavior to make better investment decisions. John Wiley & Sons.

[10] Rabin, M. (2000). Risk aversion and expected-utility theory: A calibration theorem. Econometrica, 68(5), 128

[11] Ritter, J. R. (2003). Behavioral finance. Pacific-Basin Finance Journal, 11(4), 429-437. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-538X(03)00048-9

[12] Shefrin, H. (2009). Behavioralizing finance. Now Publishers Inc.

[13] Shiller, R. J. (2003). From efficient markets theory to behavioral finance. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 17(1), 83-104. https://doi.org/10.1257/089533003321164967

[14] Statman, M. (2019). Behavioral finance: The second generation. CFA Institute Research Foundation.

[15] Thaler, R. H. (1985). Mental accounting and consumer choice. Marketing Science, 4(3), 199-214. https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.4.3.199

[16] Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1992). Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. Journal of Risk and Uncertainty, 5(4), 297-323. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00122574

[17] Wang, M., Keller, C., & Siegrist, M. (2011). The less you know, the more you are afraid of—A survey on risk perceptions of investment products. Journal of Behavioral Finance, 12(1), 9-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427560.2011.548760

[18] Weber, E. U., & Milliman, R. A. (1997). Perceived risk attitudes: Relating risk perception to risky choice. Management Science, 43(2), 123-144. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.43.2.123

[19] Wurgler, J. (2000). Financial markets and the allocation of capital. Journal of Financial Economics, 58(1-2), 187-214. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-405X(00)00070-2

[20] Yates, J. F., & Stone, E. R. (1992). The risk construct. Risk-Taking Behavior (pp. 1-25). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-4401-9_1