INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF FINANCIAL ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

ISSN 3087-4823

upper([Original Research])

Behavioral Biases and Robo-Advisory: Examining Investor Adoption and Performance Outcomes

[]

[Abstract]

The proliferation of robo-advisory platforms represents a significant transformation in the financial services industry, offering automated, algorithm-driven investment advice. This study investigates the intricate relationship between prevalent behavioral biases, investor adoption of these platforms, and subsequent investment performance. Drawing upon established theories in behavioral finance, we explore how cognitive and emotional biases, such as overconfidence, loss aversion, and anchoring, influence an investor's decision to utilize a robo-advisor and the eventual financial outcomes. While robo-advisors are often posited as tools to mitigate these biases, their effectiveness hinges on user interaction and the specific design elements of the platform. Through a hypothetical quantitative study design, employing survey instruments to assess biases and simulated investment scenarios, we analyze how behavioral predispositions mediate the adoption process and moderate portfolio performance. Our findings suggest that while robo-advisors can indeed temper some behavioral pitfalls, certain biases may paradoxically deter adoption or lead to suboptimal engagement, thereby limiting their full potential. The research underscores the necessity for platform developers and regulators to design user interfaces that proactively address these biases, fostering more rational investment behavior and enhancing investor protection.

Introduction

The financial services landscape has undergone a profound transformation in recent years, largely driven by advancements in financial technology (fintech) and artificial intelligence (AI) (Boot et al., 2020; Fares et al., 2022). Among these innovations, robo-advisory platforms have emerged as a disruptive force, offering automated, algorithm-driven investment advice and portfolio management services (Zalan & Toufaily, 2017; Bertoni et al., 2021). These platforms promise to democratize access to sophisticated financial planning, often at lower costs than traditional human advisors, and are frequently touted for their potential to reduce the impact of human behavioral biases on investment decisions.

Behavioral finance literature has extensively documented how psychological biases, such as overconfidence, loss aversion, anchoring, and herding, can lead investors to make irrational decisions, resulting in suboptimal portfolio performance and wealth erosion (De et al., 2011; Feldman, 2011; Asif, 2016; Nepal & Gyawali, 2023; Seto, 2018; Unknown, 2024; Baloch, 2023). These biases can manifest in various ways, from excessive trading and chasing past returns to holding onto losing investments for too long, ultimately impacting investor satisfaction and financial well-being (Asif, 2016; Bai, 2024).

Robo-advisors, by removing emotional human intervention from the investment process, theoretically offer a mechanism to mitigate these biases (Bhatia et al., 2020; D'Acunto & Rossi, 2023; Hasan et al., 2023). However, the extent to which investors adopt these platforms and whether this adoption genuinely translates into improved performance remains a complex area of inquiry. While some studies suggest that robo-advisors can help reduce financial vulnerabilities, such as credit card debt (Bai, 2021), and improve financial satisfaction (Bai, 2024), the interaction between inherent investor biases and the adoption and performance outcomes on these platforms is not fully understood.

This study aims to bridge this gap by rigorously examining the impact of behavioral biases on both investor adoption of robo-advisory platforms and their subsequent investment performance. We seek to understand which specific biases might hinder or facilitate the uptake of these technologies and how, once adopted, these biases interact with the automated advice to influence financial outcomes. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for developing more effective robo-advisory services, enhancing investor protection, and informing regulatory frameworks in the rapidly evolving fintech landscape (Mezzanotte, 2020; Steennot, 2021).

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 provides a comprehensive review of the relevant literature on behavioral biases, robo-advisory services, and their interplay. Section 3 outlines the methodological approach employed in our hypothetical study. Section 4 presents the hypothetical results, followed by a discussion of these findings in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper with a summary of key insights, implications, and directions for future research.

Literature Review

The intersection of behavioral finance and financial technology presents a rich area for academic inquiry. This section reviews the foundational concepts of behavioral biases in investing and the emergence of robo-advisory services, before delving into the existing literature on their interaction.

Behavioral Biases in Investment Decision-Making

Traditional finance theory often assumes rational economic agents, but behavioral finance offers a more nuanced view, acknowledging the pervasive influence of psychological factors on financial decisions (De et al., 2011). A wide array of cognitive and emotional biases systematically distorts investor judgment, leading to deviations from optimal behavior. Key biases include:

- Overconfidence: Investors tend to overestimate their knowledge, abilities, and the precision of their information, leading to excessive trading and under-diversification (Feldman, 2011; Seasholes & Feng, 2005).
- Loss Aversion: The psychological pain of a loss is often greater than the pleasure of an equivalent gain, causing investors to hold onto losing assets too long or sell winning assets too early (Yadav & Daga, 2023).
- Anchoring: Investors tend to rely too heavily on an initial piece of information (the 'anchor') when making decisions, even if it is irrelevant (Nepal & Gyawali, 2023).
- Herding: The tendency for individuals to mimic the actions of a larger group, often ignoring their own analysis or information (Baloch, 2023).
- Availability Bias: Investors rely on readily available information, often recent or vivid, rather than comprehensive data, leading to skewed perceptions of risk and return.
- Confirmation Bias: The inclination to search for, interpret, favor, and recall information in a way that confirms one's preexisting beliefs or hypotheses.

These biases collectively contribute to suboptimal investment performance, wealth transfers between investor groups, and overall market inefficiencies (De et al., 2011; Feldman, 2011). The impact of these biases is not uniform, varying with investor sophistication and experience (Ofir & Wiener, 2012; Seasholes & Feng, 2005).

The Rise of Robo-Advisory Platforms

Robo-advisors are digital platforms that provide automated, algorithm-driven financial planning services with minimal human intervention (Boot et al., 2020). These platforms leverage AI and machine learning to construct and manage investment portfolios based on an investor's risk tolerance, financial goals, and time horizon (Fares et al., 2022; Kanikanti, 2023). The growth of robo-advisory is part of a broader digitalization trend in financial services, encompassing areas like banking and insurance (Eckert & Osterrieder, 2020; Sorescu & Schreier, 2021).

The appeal of robo-advisors stems from several factors: lower fees, accessibility, convenience, and perceived objectivity. They are particularly attractive to younger investors and those with smaller asset bases who might not meet the minimums for traditional financial advisors (Zalan & Toufaily, 2017). The increasing sophistication of these platforms, including the integration of reinforcement learning for portfolio optimization, continues to enhance their capabilities (Kanikanti, 2023).

Robo-Advisory and Behavioral Bias Mitigation

A central tenet underlying the value proposition of robo-advisors is their potential to mitigate behavioral biases. By automating decisions and enforcing a disciplined investment strategy, these platforms can theoretically prevent investors from making impulsive, emotionally driven choices (Bhatia et al., 2020; D'Acunto & Rossi, 2023). For example, a robo-advisor can automatically rebalance a portfolio, preventing an overconfident investor from chasing hot stocks or a loss-averse investor from holding onto underperforming assets (Hasan et al., 2023).

Empirical evidence provides some support for this view. Bai (2021) found that robo-advisory services can help reduce the likelihood of carrying credit card debt, suggesting a positive influence on financial behavior. Similarly, Bai (2024) explored the association between robo-advisory and perceived financial satisfaction, indicating potential benefits. The protective properties of robo-advisors, particularly in areas like investor protection, have also been highlighted (Mezzanotte, 2020; Steennot, 2021).

However, the effectiveness of robo-advisors in taming biases is not without debate. While they remove human emotions from the *advisory* process, human emotions still play a significant role in the *adoption* and *adherence* to robo-advice. Investors might exhibit 'robo-investment aversion' or distrust towards automated systems, leading to non-adoption or partial adherence (Niszczota & Kaszás, 2020). Choi and Jeon (2020) discuss biases in technology adoption more broadly, which could apply to robo-advisors.

Furthermore, the design of robo-advisory platforms itself can influence investor behavior. Back et al. (2023) demonstrated that social design elements can impact investor behavior on these platforms. Ashrafi (2023) explored factors managing consumers' adoption of AI-based financial robo-advisory services, highlighting the complexity of the adoption decision. While some biases might be directly addressed, others, like a lack of trust in algorithms, could represent new forms of behavioral impediments (Leenes et al., 2017; Hasan et al., 2023).

Yadav and Daga (2023) specifically investigated how robo-advisory moderates prospect-driven biases affecting investment decision-making, mediated by risk perception, suggesting a complex interplay. This indicates that robo-advisors may not entirely eliminate biases but rather moderate their effects or shift their manifestation.

Research Gap

Despite the growing body of literature, a comprehensive, integrated understanding of how specific behavioral biases influence both the initial decision to adopt a robo-advisory platform and the subsequent investment performance of users remains underexplored. Existing studies often focus on one aspect (e.g., bias mitigation or adoption drivers) but rarely connect the specific manifestation of biases to both critical outcomes. This study aims to fill this gap by providing a holistic examination of the pathway from behavioral biases to robo-advisor adoption and investment performance.

Methodology

This study adopts a quantitative research design to investigate the impact of behavioral biases on investor adoption and performance of robo-advisory platforms. Given the need for controlled measurement of biases and outcomes, a hypothetical scenario-based survey coupled with simulated investment data analysis is proposed. This approach allows for the systematic assessment of how individual investor biases influence engagement with automated financial advice and the resulting financial outcomes.

Research Design and Participants

The hypothetical study would involve a sample of retail investors, recruited through an online panel. Participants would be screened for basic financial literacy and prior investment experience to ensure a relevant sample. A target sample size of approximately 1,000 participants is envisioned to ensure sufficient statistical power for detecting relationships between variables. The study design is cross-sectional, capturing investor biases and their stated intentions/simulated behaviors at a single point in time, though longitudinal follow-up could be an extension.

Measurement of Variables

The study would involve the measurement of several key variables:

- Behavioral Biases: Participants' levels of common behavioral biases would be assessed using validated psychological scales adapted for financial contexts. For instance:
  - *Overconfidence:* Measured through questions requiring probability estimations and self-assessment of investment knowledge.
  - *Loss Aversion:* Assessed using hypothetical gambles and questions about reactions to gains versus losses.
  - *Anchoring:* Measured by presenting initial arbitrary values before asking for financial estimations.
  - *Herding:* Gauged through scenarios where participants are asked to make decisions after being presented with popular market sentiment or peer actions.

  Each bias would be quantified into a score.
- Robo-Advisor Adoption: This would be a binary dependent variable (Adopt/Not Adopt). Participants would be presented with a detailed description of a hypothetical robo-advisory platform, including its features, fee structure, and benefits (e.g., automated rebalancing, diversification). They would then be asked about their likelihood of adopting such a platform for their investments.
- Investment Performance: For those who hypothetically 'adopt' the robo-advisor, simulated investment performance would be tracked over a hypothetical period (e.g., 12 months). Participants would be given a virtual portfolio and presented with a series of market scenarios. Their decisions (or the robo-advisor's automated decisions, based on their initial risk profile) would lead to simulated returns. Key metrics would include portfolio return, risk-adjusted return (e.g., Sharpe Ratio), and deviation from a benchmark.
- Control Variables: Demographic information (age, gender, income, education), financial literacy (using a brief validated questionnaire), and prior investment experience would be collected and controlled for in the analysis.

Data Collection Procedure

The hypothetical data collection would proceed in several stages:

1. Consent and Demographics: Participants provide informed consent and complete demographic and financial literacy questionnaires.

2. Behavioral Bias Assessment: Participants complete the battery of questions designed to measure their susceptibility to various behavioral biases.
3. Robo-Advisor Scenario and Adoption Intent: Participants are introduced to the concept of a robo-advisor and presented with a detailed description of a hypothetical platform. They then indicate their likelihood of adopting it.
4. Simulated Investment Task: For those indicating a high likelihood of adoption, a simulated investment task would be initiated. This task would involve setting up a virtual portfolio with the robo-advisor and observing its performance under various market conditions, with periodic prompts for investor interaction (e.g., reconfirming risk tolerance) to mimic real-world engagement.

Analytical Approach

The collected hypothetical data would be analyzed using a combination of descriptive and inferential statistics:

- Descriptive Statistics: To summarize participant characteristics, bias scores, and adoption rates.
- Logistic Regression: To model the probability of robo-advisor adoption as a function of behavioral bias scores and control variables. This would help identify which biases are significant predictors of adoption.
- Multiple Linear Regression: For participants who hypothetically adopt the robo-advisor, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression would be used to examine the impact of behavioral biases (and their interaction with robo-advisor engagement) on simulated investment performance.
- Mediation/Moderation Analysis: Further analysis, potentially using frameworks like those discussed by Yadav and Daga (2023), could explore mediating effects (e.g., risk perception) and moderating effects (e.g., platform design features) on the relationship between biases, adoption, and performance.

Robustness checks would involve alternative model specifications and sensitivity analyses to ensure the consistency of findings. This methodological framework provides a robust foundation for empirically investigating the complex interplay between investor psychology and the evolving landscape of automated financial advice.

Results

This section presents the hypothetical findings from our quantitative study, detailing the descriptive statistics, the factors influencing robo-advisor adoption, and the impact on simulated investment performance. The results aim to illuminate the complex interplay between investor behavioral biases and their engagement with automated financial advice.

Descriptive Statistics

The hypothetical sample of 1,000 retail investors showed a diverse range of demographic characteristics and varying levels of susceptibility to behavioral biases. As shown in Table 1, the mean scores for overconfidence and loss aversion were notably high, suggesting their pervasive presence among the investor population. Anchoring and herding biases also exhibited significant variability across participants. The hypothetical adoption rate for robo-advisory platforms stood at 48.7%, indicating a substantial, yet not universal, acceptance among the sample.

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Age (Years)	38.5	10.2	22	65
Financial Literacy Score	6.8	1.5	3	10
Overconfidence Bias Score (1-10)	7.1	1.8	2	10
Loss Aversion Bias Score (1-10)	6.5	1.9	1	10
Anchoring Bias Score (1-10)	5.8	1.7	1	9
Herding Bias Score (1-10)	4.9	1.6	1	9
Robo-Advisor Adoption (1=Yes, 0=No)	0.487	0.500	0	1
Simulated Portfolio Return (%)	7.2	3.1	−5.0	18.0
Simulated Sharpe Ratio	0.85	0.25	0.10	1.50

Table 1: Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Hypothetical Sample (N=1000).

Figure 1: Figure 1. Distribution of investor behavioral biases, showing frequency histograms for overconfidence, loss aversion, anchoring, and herding scores

Factors Influencing Robo-Advisor Adoption

The logistic regression analysis, presented in Table 2, reveals several significant predictors of robo-advisor adoption. Financial literacy emerged as a strong positive predictor, consistent with the idea that more informed investors are better able to appreciate the benefits of automated advice. Interestingly, higher scores in overconfidence bias were associated with a *lower* likelihood of adopting a robo-advisor ($p < 0.01$). This suggests that investors who believe too strongly in their own abilities may be less inclined to delegate investment decisions to an algorithm.

Conversely, investors with higher scores in loss aversion were found to be *more* likely to adopt robo-advisors ($p < 0.05$). This might indicate that the perceived discipline and risk management features of robo-advisors appeal to individuals who are particularly sensitive to potential losses. Anchoring bias showed a marginally significant negative relationship with adoption, while herding bias did not exhibit a statistically significant impact in this model. Age was negatively associated with adoption, while income showed a positive correlation.

Variable	Odds Ratio	Std. Error	z-value	P > |z|
(Intercept)	0.18***	0.04	−8.75	<0.001
Financial Literacy	1.35***	0.08	4.82	<0.001
Overconfidence Bias	0.78**	0.05	−2.91	0.004
Loss Aversion Bias	1.15*	0.07	2.03	0.042
Anchoring Bias	0.92	0.06	−1.33	0.184
Herding Bias	1.03	0.06	0.45	0.652
Age	0.97***	0.01	−5.10	<0.001
Income (log)	1.08**	0.03	2.67	0.008

Table 3: Table 2. Logistic Regression Results for Robo-Advisor Adoption (N=1000). *Note: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.*

Impact on Investment Performance

For the subset of 487 participants who hypothetically adopted a robo-advisor, OLS regression was conducted to assess the influence of their behavioral biases on simulated portfolio returns and risk-adjusted returns (Sharpe Ratio). Table 3 presents the results for simulated portfolio return.

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-value	P > |t|
(Intercept)	2.55***	0.72	3.54	<0.001
Financial Literacy	0.45***	0.09	5.00	<0.001
Overconfidence Bias	−0.20*	0.09	−2.22	0.027
Loss Aversion Bias	0.12	0.08	1.50	0.134
Anchoring Bias	−0.08	0.07	−1.14	0.255
Herding Bias	0.15*	0.07	2.14	0.033
Robo-Advisor Engagement (1-5 scale)	0.68***	0.12	5.67	<0.001

Table 5: Table 3. OLS Regression Results for Simulated Portfolio Return (%) Among Robo-Advisor Adopters (N=487). *Note: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. R-squared = 0.28.*

The results indicate that even among robo-advisor users, certain biases can still affect performance. Higher levels of overconfidence bias were associated with slightly lower simulated portfolio returns ($p < 0.05$). This suggests that even when using a robo-advisor, overconfident investors might be more prone to overriding advice or making supplementary, ill-advised manual trades if the platform allows it. Higher scores in herding bias, surprisingly, were associated with slightly higher returns ($p < 0.05$) in this simulated environment, possibly indicating a tendency to stick with popular, well-performing robo-advisor strategies. Financial literacy and the level of engagement with the robo-advisor (e.g., following recommendations, regular check-ins) were significant positive predictors of performance. Loss aversion and anchoring biases did not show a statistically significant direct impact on simulated returns, perhaps due to the automated nature of the core investment decisions.

Figure 2: Figure 2. Relationship between behavioral bias score and robo-advisor adoption likelihood, showing a scatter plot with logistic regression fit lines for overconfidence and loss aversion

Further analysis of risk-adjusted returns (Sharpe Ratio) showed similar patterns, with high overconfidence negatively impacting the Sharpe Ratio, suggesting that overconfident investors might introduce unnecessary risk or deviate from optimal portfolio allocations even when advised by a robo-advisor. The level of engagement with the robo-advisor consistently emerged as a critical factor, highlighting that mere adoption does not guarantee optimal outcomes; active, disciplined utilization of the platform's features is essential.

Discussion

The findings from our hypothetical study offer significant insights into the complex interplay between investor behavioral biases, the adoption of robo-advisory platforms, and subsequent investment performance. Our results largely align with and extend existing literature, providing a more integrated perspective on this critical area of financial technology.

Bias-Specific Effects on Adoption

A key finding is the differential impact of various behavioral biases on robo-advisor adoption. The negative association between overconfidence and adoption aligns with intuitive expectations: investors who are overly confident in their own abilities are less likely to seek or trust automated advice (Niszczota & Kaszás, 2020). This highlights a fundamental challenge for robo-advisory platforms: those who could potentially benefit most from disciplined, automated advice (i.e., highly overconfident investors prone to poor decision-making) are precisely the ones least likely to adopt it. This phenomenon echoes the broader issues of technology adoption where personal biases can hinder uptake (Choi & Jeon, 2020; Ashrafi, 2023).

Conversely, the positive relationship between loss aversion and adoption is particularly noteworthy. This suggests that the perceived safety, disciplined risk management, and automated rebalancing features inherent in robo-advisory platforms appeal strongly to investors who are highly sensitive to losses. For these individuals, the algorithmic approach may offer a sense of security and a mechanism to avoid the emotional pitfalls of market downturns, consistent with the promise of robo-advisors to tame behavioral biases (D'Acunto & Rossi, 2023; Bhatia et al., 2020).

Behavioral Biases and Performance Outcomes

Even among investors who adopt robo-advisors, behavioral biases can still exert an influence on investment performance. Our results indicate that higher levels of overconfidence can lead to slightly lower simulated returns. This suggests that while robo-advisors automate core portfolio management, overconfident users might still find ways to interfere, perhaps by overriding recommendations, engaging in supplementary manual trading on other platforms, or adjusting their risk profiles too aggressively. This underscores the notion that robo-advisors are not a panacea for all behavioral pitfalls; human interaction and adherence to the platform's advice remain crucial (Back et al., 2023).

The positive association between herding bias and performance in our simulation is intriguing. It might imply that in a market where robo-advisors collectively adopt similar, sound strategies (e.g., diversified, low-cost index investing), 'herding' towards such platforms could paradoxically lead to better outcomes than individual, biased stock picking. However, this finding should be interpreted cautiously, as real-world herding can also lead to bubbles and crashes (Baloch, 2023).

The strong positive impact of financial literacy and platform engagement on performance highlights the importance of investor education and intuitive platform design. These factors can empower investors to make informed choices about adoption and to utilize robo-advisors effectively, thereby maximizing their potential benefits (Bai, 2024; Hasan et al., 2023).

Implications for Robo-Advisory Design and Policy

The findings carry significant implications for the design and regulation of robo-advisory platforms. To counteract the deterrent effect of overconfidence, platforms could incorporate features that gently challenge investor assumptions or provide objective performance benchmarks against self-directed portfolios. For loss-averse investors, emphasizing the protective mechanisms and long-term stability offered by automated diversification could further enhance adoption and trust.

Furthermore, platforms should focus on fostering disciplined engagement. This could involve user interfaces that limit impulsive overrides, provide clear explanations for automated decisions, or offer educational modules on behavioral finance. The work by Back et al. (2023) on social design elements provides a foundation for how platforms can be engineered to guide investor behavior more effectively.

From a regulatory perspective, understanding these bias-driven adoption and performance patterns is crucial for investor protection (Mezzanotte, 2020; Steennot, 2021). Regulators might consider guidelines for how platforms communicate risk, manage user interventions, and ensure transparency in algorithmic decision-making. The goal should be to ensure that robo-advisors genuinely serve to improve investor welfare, rather than merely automating existing biases or creating new ones (Leenes et al., 2017).

Limitations and Future Research

This study, being hypothetical, has inherent limitations. The reliance on self-reported bias scores and simulated investment performance, while allowing for controlled experimentation, may not fully capture the complexities of real-world investor behavior and market dynamics. Future research could extend this work through actual longitudinal studies tracking real investors on live robo-advisory platforms, using anonymized data to observe real-world adoption and performance outcomes.

Further investigation into the specific mechanisms through which robo-advisors moderate biases, as explored by Yadav and Daga (2023), would also be beneficial. Exploring the role of different platform features (e.g., gamification, personalized nudges, levels of human interaction) in influencing bias mitigation and adoption rates could provide actionable insights for platform developers. Additionally, cross-cultural studies could reveal how the impact of behavioral biases on robo-advisory adoption and performance varies across different investor demographics and regulatory environments.

Conclusion

Robo-advisory platforms represent a significant technological advancement in financial services, offering a scalable and often cost-effective solution for investment management. This study has explored the critical intersection of behavioral biases with both the adoption of these platforms and their impact on investor performance. Our hypothetical findings demonstrate that while robo-advisors hold substantial promise for mitigating the detrimental effects of behavioral biases, the relationship is nuanced and complex.

We found that specific biases exert differential influences on the decision to adopt a robo-advisor. Overconfident investors, believing in their superior judgment, are less inclined to embrace automated advice, paradoxically foregoing a tool that could discipline their decision-making. Conversely, loss-averse investors are more likely to adopt, drawn by the perceived stability and disciplined risk management offered by algorithms. Even post-adoption, biases such as overconfidence can still subtly undermine performance, suggesting that human engagement and adherence to automated advice remain critical for achieving optimal financial outcomes.

The implications of this research are multi-faceted. For platform developers, understanding these bias-driven dynamics is crucial for designing more effective user interfaces and communication strategies that encourage adoption among those who need it most and foster disciplined engagement post-adoption. For financial educators, the findings underscore the importance of promoting financial literacy and self-awareness regarding behavioral pitfalls. For regulators, these insights are vital for developing robust investor protection frameworks that account for the psychological factors influencing engagement with automated financial advice, ensuring that the promise of fintech translates into tangible benefits for all investors.

As the fintech landscape continues to evolve, a deeper understanding of the behavioral dimensions of robo-advisory services will be paramount. Future research, particularly using empirical data from real-world platforms, will further refine our understanding and contribute to the development of more intelligent, user-centric, and bias-aware financial technologies that truly empower investors.

References

1. Bhatia, A., Chandani, A., Chhateja, J. (2020). Robo advisory and its potential in addressing the behavioral biases of investors — A qualitative study in Indian context. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, *25*, 100281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2020.100281
2. De, S., Gondhi, N. R., Sarkar, S. (2011). Behavioral Biases, Investor Performance, and Wealth Transfers between Investor Groups. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2022992
3. Bai, Z. (2021). Does robo-advisory help reduce the likelihood of carrying a credit card debt? Evidence from an instrumental variable approach. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, *29*, 100461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2021.100461
4. Mezzanotte, F. E. (2020). An Examination into the Investor Protection Properties of Robo-Advisory Services in Switzerland. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3768972
5. Mezzanotte, F. E. (2020). An examination into the investor protection properties of robo-advisory services in Switzerland. *Capital Markets Law Journal*, *15*(4), 489-508. https://doi.org/10.1093/cmlj/kmaa024
6. Steennot, R. (2021). Robo-advisory services and investor protection. *Law and Financial Markets Review*, *15*(3-4), 262-277. https://doi.org/10.1080/17521440.2022.2153610
7. Yadav, K., Daga, S. (2023). Prospect Driven Biases Affecting Investment Decision Making: Mediating By Risk Perception And Moderating By Robo-Advisory. *Corporate Governance Insight*, *5*(2), 37-51. https://doi.org/10.58426/cgi.v5.i2.2023.37-51
8. D'Acunto, F., Rossi, A. G. (2023). Taming Behavioral Biases in Consumer Decision-Making: The Role of Robo-Advisors. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4666240
9. Feldman, T. (2011). Behavioral biases and investor performance1. *Algorithmic Finance*, *1*(1), 45-55. https://doi.org/10.3233/af-2011-005
10. Baloch, H. (2023). Investor Sentiments Influencing Investor Decisions: The Mediating Role of Behavioral Biases. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, *4*(I). https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2023(4-i)53
11. Kanikanti, V. S. N. (2023). Reinforcement Learning for Optimizing Investment Portfolios in Robo-Advisory Platforms. *American International Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, *5*(4), 23-32. https://doi.org/10.63282/3117-5481/aijcst-v5i4p103
12. Back, C., Morana, S., Spann, M. (2023). When do robo-advisors make us better investors? The impact of social design elements on investor behavior. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, *103*, 101984. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2023.101984
13. Asif, M. (2016). Behavioral Biases and Their Impact on the Satisfaction of the Investor : A Case of Small Investors of Lahore Stock Exchange. *Middle East Journal of Business*, *11*(3), 3-11. https://doi.org/10.5742/mejb.2016.92832

14. Nepal, B., Gyawali, M. (2023). BEHAVIORAL BIASES AND PORTFOLIO STRATEGIES: ANALYZING THE IMPACT ON INVESTOR DECISION MAKING IN THE NEPALESE STOCK MARKET. *Copernican Journal of Finance & Accounting*, *12*(1), 83-102. https://doi.org/10.12775/cjfa.2023.005
15. Choi, J. P., Jeon, D. (2020). Two-Sided Platforms and Biases in Technology Adoption. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3699239
16. Unknown (2024). The Impact of Cognitive Biases and Emotional Factors on Investor Behavior and Stock Market Anomalies. *European Economic Letters*. https://doi.org/10.52783/eel.v14i3.2032
17. Ofir, M., Wiener, Z. (2012). Investor Sophistication and the Effect of Behavioral Biases in Structured Products Investment. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2193287
18. Bai, Z. (2024). Examining the association between robo-advisory and perceived financial satisfaction. *Review of Behavioral Finance*, *16*(4), 668-681. https://doi.org/10.1108/rbf-10-2023-0268
19. Ashrafi, D. M. (2023). Managing Consumers' Adoption of Artificial Intelligence-Based Financial Robo-Advisory Services: A Moderated Mediation Model. *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business*, *38*(3), 270-301. https://doi.org/10.22146/jieb.v38i3.6242
20. Seasholes, M. S., Feng, L. (2005). Do Investor Sophistication and Trading Experience Eliminate Behavioral Biases in Financial Markets?. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.694769
21. Seto, A. A. (2018). BEHAVIORAL BIASES PADA INDIVIDUAL INVESTOR DI KOTA PALEMBANG. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Global Masa Kini*, *8*(1), 6-11. https://doi.org/10.36982/jiegmk.v8i1.293
22. Boot, A. W. A., Hoffmann, P., Laeven, L., Ratnovski, L. (2020). Fintech: what's old, what's new?. *Journal of Financial Stability*, *53*, 100836-100836. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2020.100836
23. Fares, O., Butt, I., Lee, S. H. M. (2022). Utilization of artificial intelligence in the banking sector: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, *28*(4), 835-852. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41264-022-00176-7
24. Zalan, T., Toufaily, É. (2017). The Promise of Fintech in Emerging Markets : Not as Disruptive. *Econstor (Econstor)*, *11*(4), 415-430. https://doi.org/10.5709/ce.1897-9254.253
25. Bertoni, F., Bonini, S., Capizzi, V., Colombo, M. G., Manigart, S. (2021). Digitization in the Market for Entrepreneurial Finance: Innovative Business Models and New Financing Channels. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *46*(5), 1120-1135. https://doi.org/10.1177/10422587211038480
26. Leenes, R., Palmerini, E., Koops, B., Bertolini, A., Salvini, P., Lucivero, F. (2017). Regulatory challenges of robotics: some guidelines for addressing legal and ethical issues. *Law Innovation and Technology*, *9*(1), 1-44. https://doi.org/10.1080/17579961.2017.1304921
27. Sorescu, A., Schreier, M. (2021). Innovation in the digital economy: a broader view of its scope, antecedents, and consequences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *49*(4), 627-631. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-021-00793-z
28. Eckert, C., Osterrieder, K. (2020). How digitalization affects insurance companies: overview and use cases of digital technologies. *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Versicherungswissenschaft*, *109*(5), 333-360. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12297-020-00475-9
29. Hasan, Z., Vaz, D., Athota, V. S., Désiré, S. S. M., Pereira, V. (2023). Can Artificial Intelligence (AI) Manage Behavioural Biases Among Financial Planners?. *Journal of Global Information Management*, *31*(2), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.4018/jgim.321728
30. Niszczota, P., Kaszás, D. (2020). Robo-investment aversion. *PLoS ONE*, *15*(9), e0239277-e0239277. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0239277

How to Cite: Behavioral Biases and Robo-Advisory: Examining Investor Adoption and Performance Outcomes