▪ Vol. 4, No. 4 (Fall 2023) ▪ p-ISSN: 2791-0245 ▪ e-ISSN: 2791-0229
▪ Pages: 191 – 202 ▪ DOI: 10.55737/qjssh.882102876

Open Access

QLANTIC JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

# The Behavioural Finance Revolution: Bridging the Gap between Numbers and Corporate Performance

Umair Khan [1] Umair Khalid [2] Amber Zafar [3] Usman Zahoor [4]

**Abstract:** *This conceptual paper investigates the interplay between cognitive biases, financial decision-making, and corporate governance within the framework of behavioral finance. By examining a range of cognitive biases, including overconfidence bias, confirmation bias, anchoring bias, disclosure bias, and framing bias, the paper explores the complexities of human behavior and its impact on financial outcomes, especially in developing countries. The paper aims to suggest an approach for researchers by proposing an overall framework that intricately connects the subjectivity of cognitive biases with empirical research. The integration of theoretical frameworks, such as prospect theory, bounded rationality theory, agency theory, framing theory, availability heuristic, and the endowment effect, provides a comprehensive understanding of deviations from rational expectations in financial decision-making. Furthermore, the paper highlights the relevance of cognitive biases in understanding corporate scandals and their implications for shareholder value creation and long-term sustainable growth. The findings contribute to both academic research and practical implications, offering insights for practitioners, policymakers, and researchers in their endeavors to enhance transparency, improve decision-making processes, and cultivate responsible corporate behavior within organizations.*

**Key Words:** Cognitive Biases, Behavioural Finance, Dark Personality Traits

## Introduction

Behavioral finance, a blend of psychology and economics, reconsiders rationality in uncertain decisions. As a revolutionary field, it merges insights from psychology with traditional economics to understand and explain how human emotions, biases, and cognitive processes impact financial decisions and markets (Mittal, 2022).

In the realm of financial research, behavioral finance stands as a beacon of significance, fundamentally reshaping our understanding of market dynamics by delving into human psychology. Pivotal historical moments vividly underscore its importance. The dot-com bubble's irrational exuberance highlighted how traditional finance theories struggled to explain market behavior, whereas behavioral finance unveiled cognitive biases like overconfidence and the "greater fool" mentality that shaped the bubble's trajectory (Fan, 2022). The 2008 global financial crisis revealed how emotions, particularly loss aversion, intertwine with financial decisions, challenging conventional models. In the 2021 GameStop frenzy, behavioral finance illuminated how digital connectivity and group dynamics reshape market landscapes (Hasso et al., 2022). These instances collectively emphasize that behavioral finance is not just a niche field but a transformative framework central to comprehending the intricate interplay of human behavior and financial systems.

Conventional finance theories have long rested upon the assumption of rational decision-makers operating within efficient markets. The advent of Behavioural Finance has punctuated this narrative with a profound realization: human behavior is far from perfectly rational. This realization is the crux of a paradigm shift that brings into focus the profound influence of cognitive biases – systematic patterns of

[1] Manager Accounting, Financial and Commercial Operations, Wateen Telecom Ltd., Pakistan.
[2] Faculty Member, Lahore School of Accountancy & Finance, The University of Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
[3] Senior Lecturer, Lahore School of Accountancy & Finance, The University of Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
[4] Senior Lecturer, Lahore School of Accountancy & Finance, The University of Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

▪ Corresponding Author: Umair Khan (mumairkh90@gmail.com)

▪ To Cite: Khan, U., Khalid, U., Zafar, A., & Zahoor, U. (2023). The Behavioural Finance Revolution: Bridging the Gap between Numbers and Corporate Performance. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(4), 191-202. https://doi.org/10.55737/qjssh.882102876

thinking that lead individuals to deviate from rational decision-making (Riccardi, (2008); Kapoor & Prosad, 2018). Cognitive biases, deeply rooted in the human psyche, are pivotal in unraveling the enigma of why individuals consistently make decisions that diverge from what standard economic theories would predict.

Understanding and measuring cognitive biases within the context of behavioral finance presents multifaceted challenges. Human decision-making, influenced by various psychological factors, poses difficulties in identifying and quantifying biases precisely (Ahmad, 2020). For instance, overconfidence bias varies across individuals, making standardized measurement complex. Moreover, biases often interact, complicating isolation and analysis as boards of directors have the responsibility to govern the companies they oversee. When making strategic decisions that can significantly impact the organization's future, board directors face complex challenges in an increasingly uncertain environment. However, decision-making by boards can be influenced by cognitive biases, which can have negative consequences (Água & Correia, 2021).

The theoretical challenge arises from the intersection of finance and psychology. Behavioral finance requires a framework that transcends psychological and financial theories. Traditional finance models, like the Efficient Market Hypothesis, struggle to explain anomalies caused by biases, such as the dot-com bubble. Relying solely on psychology might overlook economic context. A balanced framework integrating these realms of psychology and finance is less likely to stand the test of time when its philosophical roots are challenged rationally and empirically (Ahmad, 2022).

Delving into the fascinating terrain of Behavioural Finance, this paper bridges the gap between the overarching concept of Behavioural Finance and the underlying cognitive biases that infuse it with intrigue, shedding light on their influence within financial contexts. Through a comprehensive exploration of the interplay between human psychology, decision-making, and financial outcomes, this study endeavors to uncover the intricate tapestry of behavioral biases that significantly shape financial choices, thereby contributing to a deeper understanding of the dynamic relationship between human behavior and financial decisions (Sharma and Sarma 2022; Mittal, 2022). This paper attempts to propose an empirical approach that holistically evaluates the impact of cognitive biases on rational decision-making in light of appropriate conceptual and theoretical frameworks.

## The Dual Nature of Cognitive Biases

Although the first definition of biases in the dictionary is consistent with flawed cognitive reasoning or thinking, it is more consistent with poor reasoning that is impacted by feeling or emotion. Within the expansive landscape of cognitive biases, two primary categories emerge as pivotal: rational biases and emotional biases. Rational biases, rooted in the human tendency to employ cognitive shortcuts and logical heuristics, underpin a substantial portion of the decision-making processes in the fields of accounting and finance. This category of biases, which includes cognitive tendencies like confirmation bias and anchoring, significantly influences the judgments and decisions of professionals in these sectors. Simultaneously, emotional biases, such as loss aversion and herding behavior, play a vital role in shaping financial and accounting decisions by invoking powerful affective responses that can lead to deviations from rational, objective analysis (Akinkoye et al., 2020). However, when examining the empirical landscape, statistics reveal that a substantial proportion of financial errors and decision-making biases can be attributed to rational biases, with over 75% of accounting inaccuracies and financial misjudgments directly linked to cognitive tendencies rooted in these biases. This underscores the critical role of understanding and addressing rational biases in enhancing the accuracy and reliability of financial reporting, investment decisions, and risk management strategies. Nevertheless, recognizing the prevalence and interplay of both rational and emotional biases is instrumental in developing effective countermeasures and guidelines to mitigate their adverse effects, ultimately improving the quality and integrity of financial practices (Azouzi et al., 2012).

Behavioral bias or cognitive bias is characterized as a pattern of judgmental variation that happens in specific circumstances, which may occasionally result in perception alteration, erroneous judgment, illogical interpretation, or what is typically referred to as irrationality. Shefrin (1985) stated that prejudice is nothing more than a tendency towards mistake. Investors and their advisors may be able to achieve stated financial objectives and improve economic outcomes by being aware of how behavior biases affect the investment process. Finding behavioral biases early enough can protect the customer from eventual financial ruin (Mittal, 2022).

## Cognitive Biases and Corporate Governance

Cognitive biases wield a formidable influence over corporate governance measures, casting shadows of doubt over even the most well-intentioned regulations. Understanding and counteracting these biases within governance frameworks is not only imperative for maintaining transparency, accountability, and ethical conduct but also pivotal for safeguarding long-term corporate integrity. Global initiatives in corporate governance strive to counter the impact of cognitive biases through diverse strategies (Leković, 2020).

In the USA, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act proactively tackle overconfidence and self-serving biases, instituting robust accountability measures. The UK's Cadbury Report and successive iterations of the Corporate Governance Code meticulously counter confirmation bias by fostering transparency and mandating independent oversight. Simultaneously, the Turnbull Report bolsters the UK's approach by placing emphasis on internal control and risk management, addressing biases that might emerge from inadequate controls. Across the European Union, the Shareholder Rights Directive actively combats apathy bias, empowering shareholders to make informed decisions. In Japan, the Corporate Governance Code endeavors to mitigate groupthink through the promotion of board diversity and varied viewpoints. The Brazilian Governance Code prioritizes transparency to curtail the influence of anchoring bias. MiFID II resonates within the EU, instilling transparency safeguards against an array of biases. Meanwhile, the Global Reporting Initiative Standards stand as a bastion against framing bias by integrating sustainability concerns. Through the ISO 37001 Anti-Bribery Management Systems Standard, the menace of incentive-caused bias is confronted head-on.

Turning towards state-owned enterprises, the G20/OECD Principles of Corporate Governance for State-Owned Enterprises, adopted by emerging economies, effectively address undue influence and decision-making biases. Australia's Corporate Governance Principles and Recommendations steadfastly champion accountability, countering the illusion of control bias. Similarly, Japan's Corporate Governance Code takes on loss aversion bias by championing long-term value creation over short-term gains. In tandem, the Singapore Code of Corporate Governance advocates for unbiased decision-making through the implementation of effective risk management and internal controls. Collectively, these multifaceted endeavors stand as a testament to the global commitment to shielding corporate governance from the inadvertent distortions posed by cognitive biases.

## Significance of Behavioural Finance for Corporate Performance

In essence, cognitive biases are systematic deviations from rationality that affect how individuals perceive, interpret, and respond to information and situations. They often lead to patterns of decision-making that deviate from traditional economic models grounded in rationality. These biases introduce a layer of complexity into the realm of financial choices, highlighting the undeniable influence of human behavior on economic outcomes (Sharma and Sarma, 2022; Mittal, 2022; Berthet, 2022).

Led by scholars like Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky, behavioral finance challenges notions of market efficiency. Applying these insights to corporate finance, notably under the guidance of Jeremy Stein at Harvard, reveals companies' role as arbitrageurs. Research by Malcolm Baker and Jeff Wurgler indicates that chief executives can issue shares when overvalued, benefiting from overoptimistic markets. While not endorsing market timing, this suggests executive officers have leeway during irrational market trends (Kapoor & Prosad, 2017; Shefrin et al., 2003; Costa et al., 2019)

In behavioral corporate finance, the focus shifts to executives' investment and financing decisions. Empirical studies by Antoinette Schoar and Marianne Bertrand show that CEO styles impact capital decisions, with cautious CEOs preserving cash reserves and aggressive ones pursuing growth through acquisitions. These paradigms have real consequences for corporate performance. Conservative CEOs yield lower returns, while aggressive ones achieve higher returns, except when acquisitions muddy the waters.

This research also underscores generational CEO variations. These insights challenge corporate governance and CEO compensation, questioning established norms. Though stock options were thought to align CEOs with firm interests, if CEOs operate under biases, incentives lose their efficacy. Boards must consider CEOs' experiential match and leadership style, shifting from rigid incentive structures (Guenzel and Malmendier, 2020).

Cognitive biases, as demonstrated by Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler (1991), can pose challenges for organizations in terms of divesting from unprofitable projects and managing resource allocation. CEO decision-making behavior is a widely studied aspect of corporate dynamics, with Finkelstein and Hambrick (1996) highlighting how a CEO's decision patterns, influenced by their unique cognitive base comprising experiences, values, personality traits, and knowledge, can significantly impact strategic choices and overall organizational outcomes. Despite the presence of clear governance guidelines, there are instances where CEO decision-making behavior may conflict with effective governance. Notably, charismatic or narcissistic CEOs, as observed by Chatterjee and Hambrick (2007), can wield considerable influence over boards, potentially leading to decisions that prioritize their self-interest over the broader interests of the firm.

These biases can lead investors to deviate from rational strategies, resulting in suboptimal decisions, market anomalies, and even bubbles. By acknowledging and studying these cognitive biases, Behavioural Finance seeks to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors driving financial decisions (Berthet, 2022).

Cognitive biases, including overconfidence, self-serving bias, and anchoring, have been identified in studies as influential factors in CEOs' strategic decision-making, impacting financial performance as well (Malmendier & Tate, 2005; Bertrand & Schoar, 2003). These biases can also erode the transparency and objectivity of corporate governance decision-making (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). McCabe (2016) suggests that measures such as independent boards, gender diversity, and robust compensation policies can mitigate cognitive bias tendencies and enhance decision-making. Finkelstein and Hambrick (1996) have extensively explored how a CEO's decision patterns, rooted in their cognitive base comprising experiences, values, personality traits, and knowledge, can exert substantial influence on strategic choices and organizational outcomes.

These systematic patterns of deviation from rationality have been found to exert substantial influence on both the financial performance and risks of corporations, potentially leading to catastrophic outcomes (Wiesenfeld et al., 2008). A myriad of cognitive biases, such as confirmation bias, overconfidence, and anchoring, can significantly distort the judgments and choices made by individuals within organizations, affecting everything from investment decisions to risk assessments. For instance, the collapse of Enron in 2001 can be attributed, in part, to the overconfidence bias that fuelled aggressive and risky accounting practices, ultimately resulting in one of the most notorious corporate scandals in history (Prentice, 2002). Likewise, the global financial crisis of 2008 was exacerbated by the anchoring bias, as market players clung to outdated housing price references, underestimating the risks associated with mortgage-backed securities. These illustrative examples underscore the imperative for heightened awareness and mitigation strategies concerning cognitive biases within corporate financial management, as their unbridled influence has the potential to precipitate devastating corporate disasters (Leković, 2020).

This article proposes a taxonomy of specific biases and emphasizes the importance of identifying and being aware of these biases. For instance, the Enron scandal stands as a glaring example of confirmation bias, where executives ignored warning signs and believed in their unsustainable financial schemes, ultimately leading to the company's collapse. Similarly, the Volkswagen emissions scandal illustrates the detrimental effects of groupthink, where collective decision-making led to the manipulation of emissions tests and a significant breach of ethical conduct. The WorldCom scandal of 2002 exemplifies how over-optimism bias influenced executives to manipulate financial data, overstating company performance and leading to bankruptcy (Avgouleas, 2008). The Wells Fargo Scandal of 2016 highlighted incentives caused by aggressive sales targets being met with the creation of unauthorized accounts. The Theranos Fraud's downfall in 2018 can be attributed to an overconfidence bias, where the company claimed to have developed breakthrough blood-testing technology. The Tyco International scandal in 2012 was driven by the illusion of control bias, resulting in financial misconduct and corporate fraud.

These instances, alongside others such as the Lehman Brothers bankruptcy driven by overconfidence bias, the Barings Bank collapse in 1995 influenced by overconfidence bias, and the HealthSouth accounting scandal of 2002 driven by the anchoring bias, underscore how cognitive biases can result in misaligned incentives, misguided strategies, and compromised ethical standards within corporate governance. The subtle yet potent influence of cognitive biases significantly permeates the decision-making fabric of executives, notably CEOs and CFOs, thereby profoundly impacting the trajectory of their organizations. Among the pantheon of these biases, the overconfidence bias emerges as a pivotal player, leading executives to gravely underestimate latent risks while embracing overly ambitious projections, a tendency that played a role in the downfall of Kodak when digital photography disrupted the industry. Meanwhile, confirmation bias, another potent force, propels these decision-makers to selectively seek out information that aligns with their preconceived notions, thereby fostering dangerous myopia in strategy formulation, as exemplified by Blockbuster's dismissal of the streaming revolution despite contrary indicators. Anchoring bias, with its insidious allure, entices executives to unswervingly tether their judgments to initial data points, often at the expense of pertinent, real-time information, as witnessed in Nokia's inability to pivot from its dominant position in mobile phones to the smartphone era. The illusion of control bias, a close companion, emboldens executives with an unwarranted perception of mastery over uncontrollable variables, occasionally steering them into hazardous terrain, contributing to the downfall of Borders, which underestimated the transformative power of e-commerce. Additionally, the omnipresent grip of groupthink can effectively stifle diverse perspectives and impede critical evaluation, perpetuating a culture of complacency that led to the mismanagement of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster in 2011.

Cognitive biases have left an indelible mark on corporations and organizations across the globe, transcending boundaries and affecting diverse economies. Their impact is palpable on a global scale, where they've shaped the decision-making processes of multinational corporations, financial institutions, and international bodies. Asian countries, in particular, are not immune to the sway of cognitive biases, affecting everything from trade negotiations to labor policies. By delving into the nuanced interplay of cognitive biases in these distinct contexts, it becomes evident that a thorough understanding of these cognitive pitfalls is essential for organizations worldwide to mitigate their adverse effects and foster more rational decision-making processes. In developed economies, cognitive biases often manifest as overconfidence, anchoring, and confirmation bias, leading to skewed investment strategies, executive decision-making, and product development. Meanwhile, emerging economies grapple with these cognitive pitfalls as they seek to navigate the complexities of globalization, hampering their ability to capitalize on global markets.

## Impact of Cognitive Biases in Emerging Economies

Research on cognitive biases is of paramount importance in developing countries, particularly within the context of corporate entities, for several compelling reasons. Firstly, the economic landscape of developing nations often features a dynamic interplay of emerging markets, evolving regulatory frameworks, and diverse sociocultural factors. In such an environment, the potential for cognitive biases to influence decision-making is heightened as executives grapple with multifaceted challenges and uncertainties. By conducting research on cognitive biases in developing countries such as Pakistan, we gain crucial insights into the intricate ways in which biases may impact strategic choices, governance practices, and financial stability, ultimately shaping the nation's economic trajectory. Additionally, as Pakistan continues to foster its position in the global business arena, it becomes imperative to nurture a culture of informed and rational decision-making. Research in this domain serves as a vital tool for promoting ethical governance, robust risk management, and sound corporate practices, ultimately contributing to sustainable economic growth and global competitiveness. Consequently, understanding and addressing cognitive biases in Pakistani companies not only enhances their own resilience and prosperity but also bolsters the broader economic development of the nation.

In the world of corporate misconduct within Pakistan, a series of scandals have stirred contemplation concerning the sway of cognitive biases amidst the upper echelons of corporate leadership. This ordeal shines a stark light on potential biases, notably overconfidence and the siren call of confirmation bias, wherein executives exhibited a propensity to excessively repose trust in their own determinations while diligently seeking affirmations of their preconceived convictions, all at the expense of judicious scrutiny. The shattering collapse of KASB Bank, while not exclusively beholden to cognitive biases, suggests inklings of overconfidence and an unbridled optimism bias that led executives to entertain an unduly sanguine view of the bank's financial well-being, culminating in decisions riddled with imprudence and a dearth of astute risk evaluation (Hussain, 2015). In a parallel vein, the unsettling PARCO scandal, characterized by allegations of fiscal mismanagement and corruption, raises the specter of cognitive biases, specifically the self-serving bias, wherein individuals lay claim to their successes but readily apportion failures to external factors, potentially acting as a rationalization for unethical conduct among top executives (Ahmadani, 2013). These harrowing episodes serve as a clarion call for the imperative to address and mitigate the pervasive influence of cognitive biases in the hallowed corridors of corporate decision-making. Furthermore, the annals of Pakistan's corporate world, replete with other ignoble episodes including stock market manipulations and governance conundrums, beckon scrutiny of biases like anchoring and the illusory belief of control. Here, executives may tether their judgments to predetermined stock prices and fall prey to the illusion that they possess an unwarranted degree of influence over market outcomes, ultimately underscoring the need for vigilant introspection and a resolute stance against these cognitive pitfalls.

In 2017, the Habib Bank Limited (HBL) money laundering case raised concerns about compliance and due diligence, potentially shaped by the illusion of control, wherein executives overestimated their ability to manage risks and inadvertently overlooked red flags in the bank's operations (Authority, 2013). Karachi Electric (K Electric) has recurrently grappled with power crises, perhaps exacerbated by confirmation bias, as management was reluctant to acknowledge the scale of the issues, potentially delaying vital investments. Finally, Dewan Group's financial troubles in the 2010s highlight the sunk cost fallacy, where executives persisted in investing in an unprofitable venture due to previously committed resources despite mounting evidence of economic imprudence. These cases underscore the need for heightened awareness and mitigation of cognitive biases in corporate decision-making processes to ensure responsible and informed governance (Kamal et al., 2009).

## Measuring Cognitive Biases

Measuring cognitive biases for the purpose of establishing meaningful relationships within research presents a multifaceted challenge that demands meticulous consideration. The inherent intricacies of cognitive biases, deeply rooted within the realm of human psychology, introduce complexities that can confound straightforward measurement. One primary hurdle lies in the subtlety and subjectivity of these biases, often manifesting in subtle shifts of perception and judgment. These elusive manifestations necessitate sensitive and reliable measurement tools that can capture the nuances of biased thinking without inducing further bias in the assessment process. Moreover, cognitive biases often operate within a context-dependent framework, wherein their influence can be contingent on situational factors. The dynamic nature of biases adds an additional layer of complexity, requiring researchers to account for various contextual variables that may influence the bias-outcome relationship. In the realm of research, navigating the practical landscape of empirically measuring cognitive biases presents both a challenge and an opportunity to unravel the intricate fabric of human decision-making. Engaging in this endeavor requires a strategic fusion of methodologies that capture the elusive nature of biased cognition within real-world contexts. One avenue worth exploring is the controlled experimental approach. By constructing scenarios mirroring authentic decision-making situations, researchers can manipulate variables to elicit responses influenced by cognitive biases. This method facilitates the observation of bias-induced deviations from rational behavior, shedding light on their potential implications within specific domains, such as finance or consumer behavior.

Supplementing this approach, surveys and questionnaires stand as valuable tools in gauging individuals' perceptions and attitudes. By collecting data directly from participants, researchers gain insight into cognitive inclinations that might sway decision-making in tangible ways. These instruments prove particularly useful when investigating biases that manifest through nuanced shifts in perception or judgment, allowing for a nuanced exploration of the link between biases and real-world actions.

Moreover, in the quest for empirical insight, the integration of neuroscientific techniques provides a window into the neural underpinnings of biased cognition. Technologies like functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) enable the examination of brain activity during decision-making, offering a tangible connection between cognitive biases and neurophysiological processes. This multidisciplinary approach grants researchers the ability to delve into the biological substrates that underlie biased decision-making, thereby enriching the understanding of the intricate interplay between cognition and behavior.

The utilization of archival data analysis further contributes to the empirical arsenal. By examining historical records and real-life scenarios, researchers can uncover instances where cognitive biases may have influenced outcomes. This retrospective approach provides a valuable lens into the long-term effects of biases, offering insights into their potential ramifications within various contexts.

Table

| Approach | Description |
|---|---|
| Linguistic Analysis | Use natural language processing techniques to analyze the textual content of annual reports. Employ sentiment analysis and positive/negative language identification, and assess if companies selectively present information that confirms their biases. Identify indicators of personality traits (e.g., narcissism) or potential disorders (e.g., language disorders). |
| Word Frequency Analysis | Conduct a word frequency analysis to identify specific words or phrases that indicate cognitive biases. Search for words related to positive/negative outcomes and examine their frequency in the reports. Identify indicators of personality traits (e.g., narcissism, overconfidence) or potential disorders (e.g., language disorders). |
| Topic Modeling | Employ topic modeling algorithms (e.g., LDA) to identify latent topics within annual reports. Analyze the distribution of topics across reports to assess if companies tend to focus on specific subjects or biases. Identify indicators of personality traits (e.g., overconfidence) or potential disorders (e.g., emotional disorders). |
| Metadata Analysis | Analyze metadata from annual reports, such as report length, order/prominence of sections, or timing of disclosures. Assess if these factors provide insights into cognitive biases, such as framing or anchoring effects. Identify indicators of personality traits (e.g., overconfidence) or potential disorders (e.g., language disorders). |
| Event Study Analysis | Conduct an event study analysis around specific events mentioned in annual reports that trigger biases. Examine the market's reaction to those announcements to assess the presence of biases. Identify indicators of personality traits (e.g., overconfidence) or potential disorders (e.g., emotional disorders). |
| Machine Learning Approaches | Utilize machine learning algorithms (e.g., SVM, random forests) to train models predicting the presence of cognitive biases based on features extracted from annual reports. Features can include linguistic patterns, tone, sentiment, or topic distributions. Identify indicators of personality traits (e.g., narcissism, overconfidence) or potential disorders (e.g., emotional disorders). |

From the perspective of a company, there are several forms of data that could be used for measuring cognitive biases. For instance, the incorporation of cognitive bias metrics derived from annual reports enriches financial analysis by providing a novel lens through which to interpret corporate behavior and its potential impact on financial performance. Traditional financial metrics often fail to capture the intricate nuances of managerial psychology and their implications for decision-making. Cognitive biases, such as narcissism, influence strategic choices, risk appetite, and even financial reporting practices. Thus, incorporating these metrics augments the understanding of underlying motivations, leading to more informed assessments of a firm's future prospects and risk profile. Beyond traditional financial metrics, annual reports contain a wealth of textual and visual information that can reveal cognitive biases within organizations.

Capalbo et al. (2017) measured the narcissism of CEOs by comparing the ratio of first-person pronouns used by CEOs in analyst conferences to the ratio of total pronouns. Rijsenbilt (2011) suggests a scoring approach by investigating the five determinants of CEO behavior, namely compensation, power, media exposure, perquisites, and growth. Kalbuana1 et al. (2023) measure narcissism using picture sizes of CEOs in annual reports and allocate a score to the size of the picture in proportion to the page. Similarly, Wang et al. (2022) use CEO signature size to allocate a value to CEO narcissism derived from the annual report of the subject year. Han and Kim (2013) measure self-attribution bias by coding the transcripts of CEO interviews on CNBC for words and phrases that indicate the CEO is attributing their company's success to their own abilities. Malmendier and Tate (2005). This paper measures self-attribution bias by coding the transcripts of CEO earnings calls for words and phrases that indicate the CEO is attributing their company's success to their own abilities. Iqbal et al. (2019) measure self-attribution bias by coding the annual reports of banks for words and phrases that indicate the CEO is attributing the bank's success to their own abilities. Cambell (2011) measures self-attribution bias by coding the transcripts of CEO speeches for words and phrases that indicate the CEO is attributing their company's success to their own abilities.

Press releases offer another avenue for measuring cognitive biases. The overconfidence bias can be assessed by analyzing the language used in these releases. Companies prone to overconfidence might use overly positive language, exaggerating achievements and understating risks. This biased communication can impact investor perceptions and influence market reactions. Earnings calls are platforms where executives communicate with investors and analysts. Here, confirmation bias can be measured by analyzing the tendency to focus selectively on information that confirms pre-existing beliefs. Executives might emphasize positive developments while downplaying negative aspects, thereby shaping investor expectations and biases. Financial forecasts, whether in annual reports or investor presentations, can reflect anchoring bias. This bias occurs when decision-makers rely heavily on the first piece of information encountered (the "anchor") to make subsequent judgments. If a company consistently provides optimistic forecasts, it might anchor investor expectations to unrealistically high levels, potentially leading to misaligned valuations. Regulatory filings, like Form 10-K or 10-Q, offer insights into disclosure bias. This bias manifests when firms selectively disclose information to manipulate perceptions. For instance, companies might emphasize favorable events while minimizing unfavorable ones, which can distort investor judgments and decision-making. Merger announcements provide opportunities to examine framing bias. How companies present merger rationale and benefits can influence stakeholders' perceptions. Framing a merger as a strategic opportunity might lead to different market reactions compared to framing it as a defensive maneuver against market challenges.

## Theoretical Frameworks

Constructing a robust theoretical framework that harmonizes the rationality of behavioral finance with the intricate influence of cognitive biases poses a pivotal yet challenging task for researchers. Integrating theories from psychology, economics, and decision-making necessitates a delicate balance to comprehensively capture the complexities of human behavior within financial contexts. The first challenge lies in reconciling the rational expectations theory with cognitive biases that inherently challenge the concept of complete rationality. Prospect theory, as elucidated by Kahneman and Tversky, offers a compelling bridge in this endeavor. By elucidating how individuals evaluate potential gains and losses, it provides a nuanced lens through which to examine investment behavior in the presence of biases such as loss aversion. The incorporation of prospect theory enhances empirical research, offering a solid foundation to explain deviations from rational expectations.

Furthermore, the bounded rationality theory, pioneered by Herbert Simon, unearths how human cognitive constraints can impede optimal decision-making. Integrating this theory within the framework enables researchers to explore the implications of cognitive biases on financial choices while acknowledging the limitations of human cognition. For instance, delving into the impact of overconfidence bias on traders' decisions within the framework of bounded rationality unveils not only the bias itself but also how cognitive constraints amplify its effects.

In the realm of corporate governance, the agency theory, a mainstay in principle-agent relationships, offers a lens to scrutinize the influence of cognitive biases. By examining biases like confirmation bias within the agency theory, researchers can elucidate the intricate dynamics between executives and shareholders, where biases may sway decisions away from optimal shareholder interests. This integration can dissect the role of biases in shaping executive compensation structures and their subsequent impact on corporate performance.

Additionally, the framing theory, rooted in cognitive psychology, plays a pivotal role in behavioral finance. How information is presented or framed can significantly shape decisions. By infusing framing theory into the framework, researchers can probe how cognitive biases like anchoring or framing effects lead investors to make disparate choices based on information presentation. For instance, investigating investment decisions across different framing contexts can illuminate the extent to which biases alter financial outcomes.

Moreover, the availability heuristic, another cornerstone of behavioral finance, merits integration. This theory posits that individuals rely on readily available information when making decisions, often leading to biases in judgment. Within the theoretical framework, the availability heuristic can offer insights into how cognitive biases influence financial choices based on the ease with which certain information is recalled. Analyzing investment decisions influenced by the availability heuristic would underscore how biases skew perceptions of risks and opportunities.

The endowment effect, derived from psychology and behavioral economics, also warrants inclusion in the theoretical framework. It highlights how individuals tend to overvalue items they already possess, affecting financial decisions such as holding onto depreciating assets. By coupling the endowment effect with empirical studies, researchers can delve into the sway of biases on asset retention and evaluate its impact on financial portfolios.

In conclusion, the integration of these theories—prospect theory, bounded rationality theory, agency theory, framing theory, availability heuristic, and the endowment effect—forges a comprehensive theoretical framework that interlaces the rationality of behavioral finance with the intricate tapestry of cognitive biases. Through this integration, researchers navigate the intricate terrain of empirical finance research, bridging the chasm between theoretical constructs and real-world financial behaviors. Ultimately, this interdisciplinary approach advances our understanding of the multifaceted interplay between human psychology and financial decision-making, offering a potent toolset for comprehending and navigating the complexities of financial landscapes.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, this conceptual paper has delved into the intricate crossroads of cognitive biases, financial decision-making, and corporate governance within the realm of behavioral finance. By unraveling the subtleties of biases and their ramifications, scholars glean invaluable insights into the intricate dimensions of human conduct, thereby enabling a more encompassing comprehension of financial outcomes. The scrutiny of diverse cognitive biases, encompassing overconfidence bias, confirmation bias, anchoring bias, disclosure bias, and framing bias, has illuminated the inherent constraints of human cognition and choice. Demonstrably, these biases wield substantial influence over financial decisions, culminating in market anomalies, suboptimal judgments, and potential disruptions to corporate governance protocols.

Additionally, the assimilation of theoretical paradigms, including prospect theory, bounded rationality theory, agency theory, framing theory, availability heuristic, and the endowment effect, has erected a solid bedrock for explicating and construing the intricate dynamics of financial choice under the sway of cognitive biases. These frameworks have unveiled the latent mechanisms and cognitive processes that underpin deviations from rational expectations, underscoring the imperative of infusing behavioral facets into financial models and analyses. Remarkably, transposing these insights onto the corporate governance realm empowers scholars to spotlight the reverberations of cognitive biases on executive decision-making, risk management, and the augmentation of shareholder value. Understanding biases within the context of agency theory and their pertinence to executive compensation structures, alongside their potential reverberations on corporate performance, can foster the evolution of more efficacious governance mechanisms, harmonizing the interests of executives and stakeholders. The study also suggests that reducing the effects of biases can be achieved through group or organizational consciousness. Furthermore, the exploration of biases within communication and information assimilation has unveiled the pronounced role enacted by cognitive biases in molding financial decisions. Framing theory and the availability heuristic vividly depict how biases influence the perception of risks and opportunities based on information presentation and recollection, consequently leaving an imprint on investment choices and financial outcomes.

By and large, the all-encompassing investigation of cognitive biases ensconced within the framework of behavioral finance bequeaths an opulent mosaic of insights that not only enrich academic comprehension but also reverberate with pragmatic ramifications. By acknowledging and ameliorating these biases, policymakers, practitioners, and researchers stand poised to nurture more transparent, robust, and streamlined financial markets, concurrently fostering judicious corporate conduct and enduring value creation.

This paper presents a critically possible framework with far-reaching implications for a diverse array of stakeholders, extending well beyond investors, financial practitioners, and corporate governance advocates. Regulators and tax authorities, as guardians of financial stability, should recognize the omnipresence of cognitive biases, including overconfidence and confirmation bias, in financial decision-making. To leverage the transformative potential of this insight, they are encouraged to craft tailored regulations that directly address and mitigate the adverse impacts of these biases. Implementing stringent disclosure requirements, for instance, can be a formidable defense against disclosure bias, nurturing a culture of transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

Auditors, the vigilant sentinels of financial integrity, also stand to gain immense value from this research. Armed with a comprehensive understanding of how cognitive biases affect decision-making, they can adapt their auditing processes to provide more effective checks and balances, reducing the likelihood of bias-induced errors or misrepresentations.

Investors and financial practitioners, as architects of the financial future, have access to a wellspring of insights. In a world where cognitive biases wield considerable influence, comprehending their role is paramount to making informed and resilient decisions. Investors can enhance their decision-making processes by conducting meticulous research, thus fortifying themselves against the grip of anchoring bias and unfounded valuations. Moreover, by embracing behavioral finance theories, practitioners have the opportunity to innovate investment products that seamlessly align with investors' behavioral inclinations, championing more robust, customized investment outcomes.

The implications of this research cascade across industries, benefiting a multitude of stakeholders. Corporate boards, as the vanguards of responsible decision-making, are urged to recognize the transformative effects of cognitive biases and the necessity of their mitigation. In response, boards can proactively stimulate diverse perspectives and independent evaluations, serving as a powerful antidote to confirmation bias and rekindling a culture of impartial decision-making.

In summary, this paper offers a transformative framework poised to enhance decision-making in the realms of finance, governance, regulation, auditing, and numerous other sectors. Leveraging the insights from behavioral finance, stakeholders can craft adaptive policies, exercise judicious investment strategies, cultivate transparent corporate governance climates, and bolster the integrity of auditing procedures. In essence, the findings of this conceptual work expand the ever-evolving landscape of behavioral finance knowledge, emphasizing the pivotal role of cognitive biases in financial decision-making and corporate governance. This study not only serves as a launching pad for future empirical investigations but also germinates practical strategies to mitigate the adverse effects of biases, ultimately contributing to more robust decision-making processes, fortified financial systems, and elevated corporate governance standards.

## References

Ahmad, F. (2020). Personality traits as predictor of cognitive biases: Moderating role of risk-attitude. *Qualitative Research in Financial Markets*, *12*(4), 465-484. https://doi.org/10.1108/qrfm-10-2019-0123

Authority, F. C. (2013). Anti-money laundering annual report 2012/13. no. July.

Ahmadani, A. (2013, January 24). PSO, Parco MDs pressing police to avoid investigation. The Nation. https://www.nation.com.pk/24-Jan-2013/pso-parco-mds-pressing-police-to-avoid-investigation

Akinkoye, E. Y., & Bankole, O. E. (2020). Effect of emotional biases on investor's decision making in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management Future*, *4*(1), 33-39. https://doi.org/10.46281/ijbmf.v4i1.548

Azouzi, M. A., & Anis, J. (2012). CEO emotional bias and investment decision, Bayesian network method. *Management Science Letters*, *2*(4), 1259-1278. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2012.02.012

Iqbal. (2019). Managerial self-attribution bias and banks' future performance: Evidence from emerging economies. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 12*(2), 73. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm12020073

Água, P. B., & Correia, A. (2021). Mind bias behind board decision-making. Corporate Governance: Fundamental And Challenging Issues In Scholarly Research, 15-20. https://doi.org/10.22495/cgfcisrp2

Bertrand, M., & Schoar, A. (2003). Managing with style: The effect of managers on firm policies. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *118*(4), 1169-1208. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355303322552775

Berthet, V. (2022). The impact of cognitive biases on professionals' decision-making: A review of four occupational areas. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.802439

Capalbo, F., Frino, A., Lim, M. Y., Mollica, V., & Palumbo, R. (2017). The impact of CEO narcissism on earnings management. *Abacus*, *54*(2), 210-226. https://doi.org/10.1111/abac.12116

Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2007). It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *52*(3), 351-386. https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.52.3.351

Costa, D. F., Carvalho, F. D., & Moreira, B. C. (2018). Behavioral economics and behavioral finance: A bibliometric analysis of the scientific fields. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, *33*(1), 3-24. https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12262

Fan, Y. (2022). Dissecting the dot-com bubble in the 1990s NASDAQ. arXiv preprintarXiv:2206.14130. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.14130

Finkelstein, S., & Hambrick, D. (1996). Strategic Leadership: Top Executives and Their Effects on Organizations. *Australian Journal of Management, 22*(2), 221. https://doi.org/10.2307/259414

Guenzel, M., & Malmendier, U. (2020). Behavioral corporate finance: The life cycle of a CEO career (No. w27635). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w27635 0

Husain, K. (2015, May 2). Analysis: The little bank that couldn't. Dawn. https://www.dawn.com/news/1179441

Hasso, T., Müller, D., Pelster, M., & Warkulat, S. (2022). Who participated in the GameStop frenzy? Evidence from brokerage accounts. *Finance Research Letters*, *45*, 102140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2021.102140

Kim, Y. H. (2011). Self-serving attribution bias and CEO turnover: Evidence from CEO interviews on CNBC. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1970868

Kalbuana, N., Taqi, M., Uzliawati, L., & Ramdhani, D. (2023). CEO narcissism, corporate governance, financial distress, and company size on corporate tax avoidance. *Cogent Business & Management*, *10*(1), https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2167550

Kamal, R., & ALI, S. E. (2009). A Star That Collapsed Into A Blackhole: Case Study On Pakland Cement Limited. *Market Forces*, *5*(1),

Kapoor, S., & Prosad, J. M. (2017). Behavioural finance: A review. *Procedia Computer Science*, *122*, 50-54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.11.340

Leković, M. (2020). Cognitive biases as an integral part of behavioral finance. *Economic Themes*, *58*(1), 75-96. https://doi.org/10.2478/ethemes-2020-0005

Malmendier, U., & Tate, G. (2005). Are CEOs born or made? Evidence of selfattribution bias in corporate takeovers. *The Journal of Finance, 60*(6), 2067-2099.

MALMENDIER, U., & TATE, G. (2008). Who makes acquisitions? CEO overconfidence and the market's reaction☆. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *89*(1), 20-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2007.07.002

Malmendier, & Tate. (2008). found that overconfident CEOs undertake more value-destroying mergers and investments due to biased self-perception.

Mittal, S. K. (2019). Behavior biases and investment decision: Theoretical and research framework. *Qualitative Research in Financial Markets*, *14*(2), 213-228. https://doi.org/10.1108/qrfm-09-2017-0085

Prentice, R. (2002). Enron: A brief behavioral autopsy. *American Business Law Journal*, *40*(2), 417-444. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-1714.2002.tb00851.x

Rijsenbilt, A. (2011). CEO narcissism: Measurement and impact (No. EPS-2011-238-STR). https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2011.65869634

Shefrin, H., & Statman, M. (2003). The contributions of Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky. *Journal of Behavioral Finance*, 4(2), 54-58. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427579jpfm0402_01

Sharma, D. J., & Sarma, N. N. (2022). Behavioural finance –A study on its bases and paradigms. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, *10*(03), 3157-3170. https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsrm/v10i3.em3

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

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, *185*(4157), 1124-1131. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124

Wiesenfeld, B. M., Wurthmann, K. A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2008). The stigmatization and devaluation of elites associated with corporate failures: A process model. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*(1), 231-251. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2008.27752771

Ricciardi, V. (2008). Risk: Traditional finance versus behavioral finance. *Handbook of Finance*. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470404324.hof003002