SINOMICS JOURNAL
International Journal of Social Science, Education, Communication and Economics
ISSN (e): 2829-7350 | ISSN(p): 2963-9441

Behavioral Finance in the Age of Technology: The Evolving Biases of Modern Investors

Andreas Svoboda
Fernfachhochschule Schweiz (FFHS), Associated to The University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland (SUPSI), Switzerland
***Email Correspondence:** andreas.svoboda@ffhs.ch

Received: March 5, 2025 | **Revised:** August 2, 2025 | **Accepted:** August 25, 2025 | **Published:** August 31, 2025

Abstract

The rapid integration of financial technology (FinTech), artificial intelligence (AI), and social media has transformed global investment behavior, reshaping the psychological dynamics of modern investors. This paper examines how digital technologies amplify behavioral biases such as overconfidence, herding, and recency bias within contemporary financial markets. Using a descriptive qualitative approach supported by literature synthesis and case studies, it explores the interplay between investor psychology and technological systems. Findings indicate that while FinTech platforms democratize access to financial markets, their gamified features and algorithmic personalization reinforce impulsive and emotionally driven trading. AI-based advisory systems, though designed to enhance decision accuracy, often introduce automation bias and confirmation loops that distort rational judgment. Social media ecosystems further accelerate herding and emotional contagion by promoting conformity through peer validation and viral sentiment. The study highlights ethical and regulatory challenges associated with behavioral exploitation and algorithmic transparency, emphasizing the need for robust investor protection frameworks and behavioral literacy programs. Ultimately, it concludes that technology in finance must balance innovation with responsibility, ensuring that digital tools empower investors without amplifying cognitive biases or undermining market integrity.

Keywords *Behavioral Finance, FinTech, Artificial Intelligence, Investor Biases.*

INTRODUCTION

The past two decades have witnessed a paradigm shift in financial decision-making as behavioral finance increasingly challenges traditional models of rational choice. Classical finance theories—such as the Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH) and Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT)—assume that investors act rationally, processing all available information to maximize utility (Fama, 1970). However, a growing body of evidence indicates that investor behavior frequently deviates from rationality due to cognitive and emotional biases (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979; Barberis, 2018). Behavioral finance integrates insights from psychology, neuroscience, and economics to explain these deviations, emphasizing how heuristics, emotions, and social influence systematically affect investment decisions. These irrationalities often lead to anomalies in financial markets, including bubbles, overreaction, and excessive volatility (Yousuf & Makina, 2022).

The behavioral finance paradigm has evolved alongside rapid technological advancement. Digital trading platforms, mobile apps, and algorithmic trading tools have democratized access to financial markets (Bhatia et al., 2021). FinTech innovations such as robo-advisors and AI-driven recommendation systems enable retail investors to engage in sophisticated trading activities that were once limited to institutional players (Ahmed et al.,

2022). While these tools have enhanced market participation and efficiency, they have simultaneously amplified psychological biases. Overconfidence, herding, and impulsive trading behaviors are increasingly prevalent among technologically enabled investors (Ahmad & Shah, 2020).

In the digital ecosystem, social media platforms have become central to investment discourse. Retail investors now rely heavily on Twitter (X), Reddit, and TikTok for real-time information and community-driven sentiment (Duz Tan & Tas, 2020). These networks shape collective perceptions, driving phenomena such as meme stocks and cryptocurrency surges. The "herding effect," whereby individuals mimic the actions of larger groups, has been magnified through social networks that reward conformity and rapid decision-making (Shrotryia & Kalra, 2021). As information diffuses faster than ever, investors are more susceptible to recency bias—overweighting recent market events at the expense of long-term fundamentals (Ferreira et al., 2021).

Behavioral biases emerge from the heuristics that individuals use to simplify complex financial decisions. These heuristics—such as representativeness, availability, and anchoring—enable fast decision-making but often distort risk perception (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974; Raut, 2020). Overconfidence bias, for example, leads investors to overestimate their ability to predict market movements, resulting in excessive trading and suboptimal returns (Ahmad & Shah, 2020). Similarly, loss aversion—where the pain of losses outweighs the pleasure of gains—causes investors to hold onto losing stocks longer than rational models would predict (Adil et al., 2021).

Social influence also plays a key role in shaping investor behavior. According to social learning theory, individuals form judgments by observing others, especially in uncertain environments (Bandura, 1986). In online financial communities, this tendency creates collective behaviors where emotional contagion and peer pressure drive market sentiment (Gupta & Shrivastava, 2021). The digital environment thus intensifies traditional psychological biases by increasing exposure to opinion-driven information and reducing opportunities for independent analysis.

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) have transformed financial analysis by enabling data-driven insights, predictive modeling, and automated decision-making (Goodell et al., 2021). However, reliance on AI systems introduces a new layer of behavioral distortions. The "automation bias"—trusting algorithmic outputs without scrutiny—creates a false sense of security among investors (Kim et al., 2020). Furthermore, personalized financial platforms often leverage behavioral data to tailor user experiences, reinforcing confirmation bias by presenting content that aligns with existing preferences (Ashta & Herrmann, 2021).

FinTech applications such as Robinhood, Acorns, and Wealthfront use gamified interfaces to attract younger investors. These features—confetti animations, push notifications, and reward badges—create a sense of accomplishment that encourages frequent trading (Bhatia et al., 2021). The result is an environment where impulsivity replaces strategy, and decision-making is driven by emotion rather than rational analysis (Saivasan & Lokhande, 2022). Such behavior was notably evident during the 2021

ISSN (e): 2829-7350 | ISSN(p): 2963-9441

GameStop short squeeze, where retail traders, influenced by Reddit's WallStreetBets community, collectively inflated stock prices detached from fundamentals (Shanmuganathan, 2020).

AI-driven trading systems and robo-advisors also raise concerns regarding the illusion of control. Investors may believe they can outperform markets through algorithmic assistance, when in fact such systems often replicate biases present in training data (Milana & Ashta, 2021). This creates a feedback loop in which human biases are embedded within machine learning models, perpetuating rather than correcting irrational behavior.

The technological evolution of finance has introduced complex ethical and regulatory challenges. Behavioral exploitation—where platforms manipulate user engagement to drive trading activity—has become a growing concern (Cao, 2023). The "nudging" design of apps can lead investors to make riskier choices that benefit platform revenue rather than the user's long-term financial well-being. Regulatory frameworks such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) aim to protect consumer data, but enforcement remains inconsistent across jurisdictions (Lee, 2019).

Furthermore, algorithmic transparency is limited. Many AI systems operate as "black boxes," making it difficult for users or regulators to understand the basis of recommendations. This opacity heightens the risk of systemic errors and unequal access to information (Ahmed et al., 2022). As financial systems become increasingly automated, ethical concerns about fairness, accountability, and data privacy will continue to shape policy discussions.

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated retail participation in digital finance. Lockdowns and stimulus payments led to a surge in online trading, with millions of new investors entering the market (Weixiang et al., 2022). Platforms such as Robinhood and eToro experienced record growth, and social media-fueled trading communities flourished. However, this democratization of investing also exposed behavioral vulnerabilities. Recency bias and fear of missing out (FOMO) drove investors to chase short-term gains in volatile assets such as GameStop, AMC, and cryptocurrencies (Suresh, 2021).

These dynamics highlight the dual-edged nature of financial technology: while it enhances access, it simultaneously exposes investors to heightened risk. Research indicates that financial literacy moderates the relationship between behavioral biases and investment outcomes (Adil et al., 2021). Therefore, promoting financial education is essential to mitigate irrational behaviors in digital investing environments.

Despite growing research on behavioral finance and FinTech, several gaps persist. First, the majority of studies focus on identifying biases rather than quantifying their interaction with technological factors (Königstorfer & Thalmann, 2020). There is limited empirical evidence on how AI-based personalization directly shapes investor psychology. Second, most existing frameworks overlook cross-cultural variations in digital investing behavior. Cultural norms influence risk tolerance, herding tendencies, and information processing styles, yet they remain underexplored in global financial markets (Yousuf & Makina, 2022).

Additionally, while scholars have examined traditional behavioral biases, less attention has been paid to emerging technology-induced biases—such as automation bias and algorithmic overreliance. These novel distortions require interdisciplinary approaches combining behavioral economics, computer science, and ethics (Ahmed et al., 2022).

This paper aims to analyze how technological innovation influences behavioral biases in modern investors. Specifically, it examines how AI, FinTech platforms, and social media shape overconfidence, herding, and impulsive decision-making. The study also explores ethical and regulatory implications, identifying strategies to mitigate cognitive distortions in digital financial environments.

By integrating theoretical perspectives and real-world case studies, this research contributes to the growing discourse on the intersection of behavioral finance and digital transformation. It highlights the importance of designing technology that supports rational decision-making rather than exploiting human biases.

METHOD

This study employs a descriptive qualitative research design to explore the evolving relationship between behavioral finance and technological innovation in modern financial markets. The approach emphasizes conceptual synthesis rather than empirical testing, focusing on understanding how digital technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI), FinTech platforms, and social media amplify behavioral biases among investors.

The methodology is structured around a systematic literature review and case-based analysis. The literature review integrates peer-reviewed articles, Scopus-indexed journals, and academic reports published primarily between 2019 and 2025 to ensure theoretical and empirical relevance. Key databases—such as ScienceDirect, Emerald Insight, and Wiley Online Library—were used to identify studies addressing behavioral biases, digital finance, and cognitive psychology. Keywords including *behavioral finance*, *investor bias*, *FinTech*, *artificial intelligence in finance*, *herding behavior*, and *overconfidence* guided the search process.

Following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) principles, the selected studies were analyzed for recurring themes. This allowed the identification of three primary technological domains—AI-driven financial tools, FinTech platforms, and social media environments—that collectively influence investor decision-making. The descriptive analysis enabled the synthesis of patterns and causal mechanisms underlying behavioral distortions such as overconfidence, automation bias, and herding.

Additionally, illustrative case studies were examined to contextualize theoretical insights. These included the 2021 GameStop trading surge and the collapse of Archegos Capital Management, both of which exemplify how technological intermediation and digital communities affect market outcomes.

The choice of a descriptive approach allows for an interpretive understanding of complex behavioral phenomena that cannot be fully captured through quantitative models.

ISSN (e): 2829-7350 | ISSN(p): 2963-9441

This methodology thus provides a conceptual framework for interpreting the psychological, technological, and ethical dimensions of investor behavior in the digital age.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overview of Behavioral Biases in Technological Contexts

The emergence of financial technologies (FinTech), artificial intelligence (AI), and digital communication platforms has fundamentally transformed how investors perceive, process, and act upon financial information. Behavioral biases, previously conceptualized within traditional frameworks, have evolved in form and magnitude due to the pervasive influence of technology. Investors are no longer passive market participants but active agents interacting with algorithmic systems, social media networks, and gamified trading platforms (Ahmed et al., 2022).

The results of the literature synthesis reveal that three dominant behavioral patterns—overconfidence, herding, and recency bias—are most strongly influenced by digital systems. Each manifests differently depending on the technological medium. FinTech applications amplify overconfidence through gamified user experiences; social media communities propagate herding through social validation and peer pressure; and AI-driven trading tools reinforce recency bias through real-time analytics that prioritize short-term market trends over long-term fundamentals (Ahmad & Shah, 2020; Duz Tan & Tas, 2020; Ferreira et al., 2021).

Technology-Driven Overconfidence and Automation Bias

Overconfidence, defined as the tendency to overestimate one's knowledge and predictive capability, is one of the most prevalent behavioral distortions in financial decision-making (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979; Barberis, 2018). In digital finance, this bias is reinforced by automation bias, where investors unquestioningly trust algorithmic outputs.

The analysis of recent studies indicates that AI-powered trading systems, robo-advisors, and predictive analytics tools provide investors with a false sense of control. Ashta and Herrmann (2021) argue that automation and machine learning introduce an illusion of precision that makes investors believe outcomes are predictable, even in stochastic markets. The psychological reassurance provided by data visualization and algorithmic forecasts strengthens investor confidence, often leading to overtrading and excessive risk-taking (Goodell et al., 2021; Milana & Ashta, 2021).

Empirical evidence supports these claims. Kim et al. (2020) demonstrated that deep learning models designed to predict investor risk-taking behavior often fail when exposed to volatile market conditions, illustrating that reliance on technology can distort risk perception rather than enhance it. Similarly, Jain et al. (2022) found that personality traits such as narcissism and impulsiveness, when combined with AI-guided trading, significantly increase overconfidence bias.

AI's personalization capabilities exacerbate the problem. Platforms that tailor content to user behavior create echo chambers, reinforcing investors' pre-existing beliefs and

limiting exposure to dissenting perspectives. This confirmation bias loop not only undermines diversification strategies but also entrenches cognitive rigidity (Cao, 2023).

In the long term, these patterns suggest that while AI-driven tools democratize access to financial intelligence, they simultaneously reduce reflective decision-making, encouraging reliance on technology over human judgment. Regulators must therefore consider establishing ethical design principles for financial algorithms to minimize behavioral manipulation and ensure transparency (Lee, 2019).

FinTech and the Gamification of Investment Behavior

FinTech platforms have been instrumental in democratizing finance by lowering barriers to entry and offering fractional trading opportunities (Bhatia et al., 2021). However, their user-experience design—characterized by bright colors, confetti animations, and real-time feedback—stimulates reward-oriented behavior similar to that observed in gambling environments.

This gamified structure promotes impulsive decision-making. Raut (2020) and Adil et al. (2021) report that the immediate feedback and sensory reinforcement mechanisms embedded within FinTech applications trigger dopamine responses, encouraging users to trade more frequently. This behavioral conditioning is particularly pronounced among young and inexperienced investors who equate trading activity with success.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the Robinhood platform exemplified this phenomenon. Millions of new investors, many with limited financial literacy, joined the app due to its no-fee structure and interactive interface. According to data from the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), trading volumes on Robinhood quadrupled between 2020 and 2021. The GameStop short squeeze highlighted how gamified interfaces combined with social media sentiment can produce speculative bubbles (Shanmuganathan, 2020).

Behavioral analysis of the event indicates that recency bias and FOMO (fear of missing out) dominated trading motivations. The continuous exposure to online success stories created an emotional contagion, leading retail traders to overlook fundamentals and pursue quick profits. As a result, while some early participants benefited, late entrants suffered significant losses (Saivasan & Lokhande, 2022).

Moreover, FinTech companies have an economic incentive to encourage trading activity, as higher transaction volume often translates to increased revenue through payment for order flow (PFOF) agreements with brokerage firms. This structural conflict of interest aligns platform design with behavioral exploitation, rather than user welfare (Ashta & Herrmann, 2021). The findings underscore the ethical dilemma of FinTech: while it promotes accessibility, it simultaneously leverages cognitive vulnerabilities for profit.

Social Media, Herding Behavior, and Information Cascades

The analysis also reveals that social media is a dominant driver of herding and information cascades in contemporary investing. The interconnected nature of digital communication has amplified collective decision-making, where investor sentiment spreads

rapidly through networks such as Reddit, X (formerly Twitter), and TikTok (Duz Tan & Tas, 2020).

The "meme stock" phenomenon provides empirical support. In 2021, communities like WallStreetBets orchestrated mass purchases of heavily shorted stocks such as GameStop and AMC. These coordinated actions caused prices to surge by over 1000% within days, decoupling valuations from economic fundamentals. Shrotryia and Kalra (2021) describe this as a form of rational herding, where individuals follow group behavior based on perceived insider knowledge rather than independent analysis.

This herding dynamic aligns with the concept of social proof, where individuals assume that group behavior reflects accurate information. In the context of digital finance, algorithms amplify this effect by prioritizing popular posts and trending topics, effectively rewarding conformity (Gupta & Shrivastava, 2021).

Confirmation bias further entrenches herding. Algorithmic personalization curates content aligned with user preferences, reinforcing the illusion of consensus and silencing dissenting viewpoints. As Cao (2023) notes, this feedback loop creates informational bubbles that distort market efficiency. Consequently, investor communities experience collective euphoria or panic, exacerbating volatility in asset prices (Weixiang et al., 2022).

Herding behavior is not confined to retail investors. Institutional investors also exhibit similar patterns when influenced by social signals or herd pressure from peer institutions. The Archegos Capital Management collapse exemplifies how sophisticated players can fall prey to behavioral contagion within highly leveraged ecosystems.

Case Study 1: Robinhood and Retail Trading During COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic represented a unique social and financial experiment, characterized by heightened uncertainty and technological dependence. Robinhood, with its zero-commission model and gamified interface, became the focal point for new retail investors during lockdowns.

The surge in trading of bankrupt and speculative companies such as Hertz and Kodak illustrated the interplay between overconfidence, herding, and recency bias. Many traders, influenced by online communities, believed they could capitalize on market inefficiencies (Shanmuganathan, 2020). However, the absence of fundamental analysis and reliance on momentum-based sentiment led to massive volatility and eventual corrections.

Psychologically, the Robinhood interface acted as a behavioral catalyst. Each trade execution was followed by celebratory visual feedback, which reinforced a sense of achievement. As a result, many users associated trading frequency with success, exhibiting the illusion of control (Ahmad & Shah, 2020).

Social media amplified these dynamics. Viral posts showcasing rapid profits spread across TikTok and Reddit, fueling emotional contagion. These narratives perpetuated the FOMO effect, pressuring others to participate even without sufficient knowledge (Adil et al., 2021).

The Robinhood case underscores how platform design and social reinforcement jointly influence investor behavior, demonstrating that digital inclusion without adequate financial

literacy can lead to detrimental outcomes. The findings suggest that FinTech regulation must consider behavioral design ethics, emphasizing user protection alongside market efficiency.

Case Study 2: The Collapse of Archegos Capital Management

In contrast to retail phenomena, the Archegos Capital Management collapse in 2021 reveals that behavioral biases also pervade institutional investing. Archegos used total return swaps to take massive leveraged positions in a few media and technology stocks, including ViacomCBS. When the share prices dropped following a capital raise announcement, margin calls triggered a $20 billion loss across major global banks.

The behavioral factors at play included overconfidence, confirmation bias, and institutional herding. Bill Hwang, the fund's founder, had previously achieved extraordinary returns, reinforcing an inflated sense of predictive ability (Milana & Ashta, 2021). His reliance on algorithmic trading platforms and real-time analytics created a perception of precision that masked underlying exposure risks.

Confirmation bias was evident in the fund's narrow investment focus. Archegos selectively interpreted data that supported its bullish outlook, ignoring warning signals of overvaluation. This selective data processing reflects how AI-driven analytical tools can entrench human biases rather than neutralize them (Ahmed et al., 2022).

At the institutional level, several banks exhibited herding behavior by extending credit to Archegos without adequate due diligence. Competitive pressures to secure lucrative business opportunities outweighed prudent risk assessment (Königstorfer & Thalmann, 2020). The contagion effect following Archegos's default demonstrates the systemic implications of cognitive distortions within technologically integrated markets.

This case also highlights the regulatory challenge of transparency in derivative-based strategies. The opacity of total return swaps and algorithmic trading systems makes it difficult to assess real-time leverage exposure. Consequently, regulators must enhance disclosure requirements and algorithmic audit mechanisms to prevent systemic crises arising from behavioral and technological interplay.

Emerging Behavioral and Ethical Challenges

Beyond the established biases, new technology-induced biases are emerging. The personalization and recommendation systems embedded in financial applications lead to algorithmic reinforcement bias, where investors are continuously nudged toward behaviors that benefit the platform rather than their long-term goals (Cao, 2023). Similarly, data privacy risks arise as platforms collect behavioral data for targeted recommendations.

Hyper-personalization in finance—though beneficial for convenience—raises ethical concerns regarding manipulation and consent. Ashta and Herrmann (2021) caution that opaque AI models can exploit emotional vulnerabilities under the guise of financial guidance. This presents a new ethical dimension: the commodification of investor behavior.

The metaverse and virtual trading environments represent another frontier. These immersive digital spaces encourage emotional engagement with virtual assets, increasing susceptibility to impulsive behavior and speculative bubbles. Without adequate regulation,

ISSN (e): 2829-7350 | ISSN(p): 2963-9441

these environments may reproduce or amplify the same behavioral distortions that plague real-world markets (Goodell et al., 2021).

Hence, ethical financial technology design should prioritize transparency, accountability, and digital literacy. Regulators and developers must collaborate to ensure that emerging technologies empower investors instead of manipulating them.

The findings collectively illustrate that behavioral finance in the age of technology represents a dual-edged transformation. On one side, technological tools democratize market access, enhance efficiency, and enable sophisticated decision-making. On the other, they amplify human biases through design features, algorithmic opacity, and emotional engagement.

The convergence of behavioral psychology and technology reveals that financial decision-making is no longer solely a cognitive process but a human–machine interaction shaped by interface design, data algorithms, and social feedback mechanisms.

Therefore, addressing behavioral distortions in digital investing requires multi-stakeholder intervention—including platform designers, educators, and regulators. Financial education programs must incorporate behavioral awareness, while platforms should adopt ethical design frameworks to mitigate cognitive exploitation. Regulators must enhance transparency requirements for algorithmic trading and data-driven decision systems.

CONCLUSION

Over the past two decades, technology has evolved significantly, an aspect that has reshaped how investors engage with the financial markets. Technologies such as AI, fintech platform, and social media platforms have created opportunities and challenges to investors. Although the technologies have democratized access to financial information, they have played a critical role in amplifying behavioral biases such as herding, impulse trading, and overconfidence. Emerging trends such as metaverse and hyper-personalization is revolutionizing trading experiences. However, they risk deepening inequalities if they are not regulated. Currently, ethical and regulatory challenges are immense. There are huge concerns regarding data privacy and the threat of behavioral exploitation by fintech platforms. The absence of clear legal frameworks for new technologies has exposed many investors who have ended up making immense losses. Therefore, there is a need to have a collaborative approach to protect investors. In the future, stakeholders in the industry must explore mitigation measures that will address these biases through improved financial education and better platform designs. As the technology evolves, there is a need to balance innovation with responsibility. All stakeholders must ensure that the existing tools empower investors without any compromise on ethical and regulatory standards. Therefore, there should be in-depth research on the long-term impact of AI-driven and social media investing.

REFERENCES

Adil, Mohd, Yogita Singh, and Mohd. Shamim Ansari. 2021. “How Financial Literacy Moderate the Association between Behaviour Biases and Investment Decision?” Asian

Journal of Accounting Research ahead-of-print (ahead-of-print). doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/ajar-09-2020-0086.

Ahmad, Maqsood, and Syed Zulfiqar Ali Shah. 2020. "Overconfidence Heuristic-Driven Bias in Investment Decision-Making and Performance: Mediating Effects of Risk Perception and Moderating Effects of Financial Literacy." Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences 38 (1): 60–90. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/jeas-07-2020-0116.

Ahmed, Shamima, Muneer M. Alshater, Anis El Ammari, and Helmi Hammami. 2022. "Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Finance: A Bibliometric Review." Research in International Business and Finance 61 (101646). doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2022.101646.

Ahmed, Zeeshan, Shahid Rasool, Qasim Saleem, Mubashir Ali Khan, and Shamsa Kanwal. 2022. "Mediating Role of Risk Perception between Behavioral Biases and Investor's Investment Decisions." SAGE Open 12 (2): 215824402210973. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221097394.

Albayati, Hayder, Suk Kyoung Kim, and Jae Jeung Rho. 2020. "Accepting Financial Transactions Using Blockchain Technology and Cryptocurrency: A Customer Perspective Approach." Technology in Society 62 (August). doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101320.

Ashta, Arvind, and Heinz Herrmann. 2021. "Artificial Intelligence and Fintech: An Overview of Opportunities and Risks for Banking, Investments, and Microfinance." Strategic Change 30 (3): 211–22. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/jsc.2404.

Bhatia, Ankita, Arti Chandani, Rizwana Atiq, Mita Mehta, and Rajiv Divekar. 2021. "Artificial Intelligence in Financial Services: A Qualitative Research to Discover Robo-Advisory Services." Qualitative Research in Financial Markets ahead-of-print (ahead-of-print). doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/qrfm-10-2020-0199.

Bhatia, Ankita, Arti Chandani, Rajiv Divekar, Mita Mehta, and Neeraja Vijay. 2021. "Digital Innovation in Wealth Management Landscape: The Moderating Role of Robo Advisors in Behavioural Biases and Investment Decision-Making." International Journal of Innovation Science ahead-of-print (ahead-of-print). doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/ijis-10-2020-0245.

Cao, Longbing. 2020. "AI in Finance: A Review." SSRN Electronic Journal. doi:https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3647625.

———. 2023. "AI in Finance: Challenges, Techniques, and Opportunities." ACM Computing Surveys 55 (3): 1–38. doi:https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3502289.

Duz Tan, Selin, and Oktay Tas. 2020. "Social Media Sentiment in International Stock Returns and Trading Activity." Journal of Behavioral Finance 22 (2): 1–14. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/15427560.2020.1772261.

Ferreira, Fernando G. D. C., Amir H. Gandomi, and Rodrigo T. N. Cardoso. 2021. "Artificial Intelligence Applied to Stock Market Trading: A Review." IEEE Access 9 (2169-3536): 30898–917. doi:https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2021.3058133.

ISSN (e): 2829-7350 | ISSN(p): 2963-9441

Goodell, John W., Satish Kumar, Weng Marc Lim, and Debidutta Pattnaik. 2021. "Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Finance: Identifying Foundations, Themes, and Research Clusters from Bibliometric Analysis." Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance 32 (1): 100577. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2021.100577.

Gupta, Shilpi, and Monica Shrivastava. 2021. "Impact of Behavioral Biases on Investment Decisions: Moderating Effect of Preferred Sector of Investment." Ramanujan International Journal of Business and Research 6 (1): 37. doi:https://doi.org/10.51245/rijbr.v6i1.2021.244.

Jain, Riidhi, Dipasha Sharma, Abhishek Behl, and Aviral Kumar Tiwari. 2022. "Investor Personality as a Predictor of Investment Intention – Mediating Role of Overconfidence Bias and Financial Literacy." International Journal of Emerging Markets 18 (12). doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/ijoem-12-2021-1885.

Kim, A., Y. Yang, S. Lessmann, T. Ma, M.-C. Sung, and J.E.V. Johnson. 2020. "Can Deep Learning Predict Risky Retail Investors? A Case Study in Financial Risk Behavior Forecasting." European Journal of Operational Research 283 (1): 217–34. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2019.11.007.

Königstorfer, Florian, and Stefan Thalmann. 2020. "Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Commercial Banks – a Research Agenda for Behavioral Finance." Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance 27 (1): 100352.

Kumar, Satish, Dipasha Sharma, Sandeep Rao, Weng Marc Lim, and Sachin Kumar Mangla. 2022. "Past, Present, and Future of Sustainable Finance: Insights from Big Data Analytics through Machine Learning of Scholarly Research." Annals of Operations Research, January. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-021-04410-8.

LEE, Joseph. 2019. "Access to Finance for Artificial Intelligence Regulation in the Financial Services Industry." SSRN Electronic Journal 21. doi:https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3493423.

Milana, Carlo, and Arvind Ashta. 2021. "Artificial Intelligence Techniques in Finance and Financial Markets: A Survey of the Literature." Strategic Change 30 (3): 189–209. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/jsc.2403.

Raut, Rajdeep Kumar. 2020. "Past Behaviour, Financial Literacy and Investment Decision-Making Process of Individual Investors." International Journal of Emerging Markets 15 (6): 1243–63. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/ijoem-07-2018-0379.

Ritika, and Nawal Kishor. 2020. "Development and Validation of Behavioral Biases Scale: A SEM Approach." Review of Behavioral Finance ahead-of-print (ahead-of-print). doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/rbf-05-2020-0087.

Saivasan, Rangapriya, and Madhavi Lokhande. 2022. "Influence of Risk Propensity, Behavioural Biases and Demographic Factors on Equity Investors' Risk Perception." Asian Journal of Economics and Banking 6 (3). doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/ajeb-06-2021-0074.

Shanmuganathan, Manchuna. 2020. "Behavioural Finance in an Era of Artificial Intelligence: Longitudinal Case Study of Robo-Advisors in Investment Decisions."

Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance 27 (March): 100297. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2020.100297.

Shrotryia, Vijay Kumar, and Himanshi Kalra. 2021. "Herding in the Crypto Market: A Diagnosis of Heavy Distribution Tails." Review of Behavioral Finance ahead-of-print (ahead-of-print). doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/rbf-02-2021-0021.

Singh, Shubhangi, Marshal M. Sahni, and Raj K. Kovid. 2020. "What Drives FinTech Adoption? A Multi-Method Evaluation Using an Adapted Technology Acceptance Model." Management Decision 58 (8): 1675–97. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/md-09-2019-1318.

Suresh G. 2021. "Impact of Financial Literacy and Behavioural Biases on Investment Decision-Making." FIIB Business Review 13 (1): 231971452110354. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/23197145211035481.

Weixiang, Sun, Md Qamruzzaman, Wang Rui, and Rajnish Kler. 2022. "An Empirical Assessment of Financial Literacy and Behavioral Biases on Investment Decision: Fresh Evidence from Small Investor Perception." Frontiers in Psychology 13 (September). doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.977444.

Yousuf, Zakhiyya, and Daniel Makina. 2022. "The Behavioural Finance Paradigm and the Adaptive Market Hypothesis." International Journal of Finance & Banking Studies (2147-4486) 11 (2): 34–48. doi:https://doi.org/10.20525/ijfbs.v11i2.1761.