International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 352-361

To cite this article: Kajal Yadav (2025). RATIONAL MAN, IRRATIONAL FINANCIAL DECISIONS: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY, International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies (IJRCMS) 7 (5): 352-361 Article No. 509 Sub Id 917

RATIONAL MAN, IRRATIONAL FINANCIAL DECISIONS: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY

Kajal Yadav

Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Barkatullah University, Bhopal, & Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management and Commerce, SAM Global University, Raisen (M.P.), India.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.38193/IJRCMS.2025.7527

ABSTRACT

The paradox of the "rational man" making irrational financial decisions has been a persistent challenge for economics and finance. While classical and neoclassical theories assume that individuals act logically to maximize their utility, real-world evidence consistently reveals deviations from rationality. This paper examines the contradictions between rational choice theory and behavioral realities, emphasizing the role of cognitive biases, emotions, and social influences in shaping financial behavior. Through a critical review of literature, theoretical frameworks, and case studies such as the Dot-Com Bubble, the 2008 Financial Crisis, and the GameStop Short Squeeze, this study demonstrates how irrational decisions, though systematic, follow predictable patterns. The findings highlight the importance of integrating behavioral economics into traditional financial models, with implications for policymakers, financial institutions, and individuals.

KEYWORDS: Rational Man, Behavioral Economics, Irrational Decisions, Overconfidence, Herding Behavior, Loss Aversion, Financial Crises

INTRODUCTION

The assumption of rationality has long been central to economic and financial theories. From Adam Smith's (1776) classical notion of self-interest to the neoclassical models of perfect competition, individuals have been portrayed as rational agents, maximizing their utility through logical decision-making. This rational man, also called *homo economicus*, is considered to possess complete information, consistent preferences, and the ability to make optimal choices.

However, everyday financial behavior often contradicts these assumptions. Individuals purchase products impulsively, chase risky investments, follow market trends blindly, and exhibit strong emotional responses to gains and losses. Behavioral economists argue that these actions are not random but driven by systematic cognitive biases and psychological tendencies (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979).

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 352-361

The contradiction between rational models and irrational realities forms the basis of this research. By analyzing key theories and real-world evidence, this paper seeks to answer a fundamental question: *Why does a rational man make irrational financial decisions?* The answer lies in recognizing the limitations of rational choice theory and the growing relevance of behavioral economics in understanding human behavior.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of human behavior in economics has historically been divided between two schools of thought: classical rationality and behavioral perspectives. This section explores the contributions of key scholars and research findings that highlight the tension between the rational man model and the reality of irrational decision-making.

1. Classical and Neoclassical Foundations

Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* (1776) introduced the idea of rational self-interest as the driver of economic progress. Later, neoclassical economists formalized the concept of *homo economicus*—an individual assumed to have perfect rationality, consistent preferences, and the ability to maximize utility under given constraints. The Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH), developed by Fama (1970), also assumes rational investors and perfectly efficient markets where asset prices always reflect all available information.

While these models provided a solid theoretical foundation, they often failed to explain anomalies in real-world financial behavior. Events like speculative bubbles, stock market crashes, and under-saving for retirement contradicted the predictions of rational choice models.

2. Bounded Rationality

Herbert Simon (1955) challenged the notion of perfect rationality by introducing bounded rationality, which argues that humans do not optimize but "satisfice" due to cognitive limitations and incomplete information. This theory opened the door for understanding why individuals often settle for acceptable choices rather than the best possible ones.

3. Prospect Theory

The most significant challenge to rational choice theory came from Kahneman and Tversky's (1979) Prospect Theory, which highlighted how individuals evaluate gains and losses asymmetrically. According to their findings:

- People exhibit loss aversion, meaning they fear losses more strongly than they value equivalent gains.

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 352-361

- Decision-making is often context-dependent, shaped by *framing effects* rather than objective evaluation.
- Risk preferences change depending on whether outcomes are framed as gains or losses.

4. Behavioral Finance Developments

Building on these insights, behavioral finance emerged as a distinct discipline. Barber and Odean (2001) showed how overconfidence bias leads investors to trade excessively, often reducing returns. Banerjee (1992) studied herding behavior, where individuals imitate the majority, contributing to bubbles and crashes. Thaler (1999) introduced concepts like mental accounting and present bias, which explain why people mismanage savings and spending.

5. Empirical Evidence

Real-world studies provide further evidence of irrationality:

- Shiller (2000) demonstrated how investor psychology fueled the Dot-Com Bubble.
- The 2008 Global Financial Crisis highlighted how financial institutions, driven by overconfidence and herd mentality, engaged in unsustainable lending practices.
- Recent phenomena like the GameStop short squeeze (2021) showcase the power of social influence and collective irrationality in financial markets.

6. Gaps in Literature

Despite these advances, the literature still struggles to reconcile rational choice with behavioral deviations. While traditional models focus on efficiency and optimization, behavioral models highlight predictably irrational patterns. A hybrid approach, combining rational and behavioral insights, appears necessary to explain financial behavior comprehensively.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this study is grounded in the intersection of rational choice theory and behavioral economics. While rational choice theory assumes logical, utility-maximizing individuals, behavioral economics acknowledges the limitations of human cognition and the systematic biases that influence decision-making. This dual framework provides the lens through which irrational financial behavior can be analyzed.

1. Rational Choice Theory

Rational choice theory is based on three fundamental assumptions:

1. Completeness – Individuals have consistent preferences for all available choices.
2. Transitivity – If an individual prefers A over B and B over C, they must prefer A over C.

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 352-361

3. Utility Maximization – Individuals choose the option that maximizes their satisfaction or payoff.

This framework has been essential in developing models of consumer choice, portfolio management, and financial market behavior. However, it overlooks the psychological, emotional, and contextual factors that influence real-world decisions.

2. Bounded Rationality

Herbert Simon (1955) introduced the concept of bounded rationality, which acknowledges that individuals have limited cognitive resources. Rather than optimizing, people make decisions that are "good enough" given the constraints of time, information, and mental capacity. This notion bridges the gap between idealized rationality and observed behavior.

3. Prospect Theory

Kahneman and Tversky's Prospect Theory (1979) provides a behavioral alternative to rational choice by highlighting:

- Loss Aversion: Losses loom larger than equivalent gains.
- Framing Effects: Decisions depend on how choices are presented (gain vs. loss frames).
- Probability Weighting: People overestimate small probabilities and underestimate large probabilities.

This theory explains why individuals may reject a fair gamble, hold losing investments too long, or prefer insurance even when it has negative expected value.

4. Heuristics and Biases

Behavioral economics also emphasizes the role of heuristics—mental shortcuts that simplify decision-making but often lead to errors. Common heuristics include:

- Anchoring: Relying too heavily on initial information.
- Availability: Judging likelihood based on recent or memorable events.
- Representativeness: Assuming outcomes resemble stereotypes rather than probabilities.

These heuristics systematically shape irrational financial decisions, leading to predictable deviations from rationality.

5. Integrative Framework for this Study

For this research, an integrative framework is adopted:

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 352-361

- Rational choice theory serves as the baseline, offering the idealized assumption of how decisions should be made.
- Behavioral economics provides the realistic corrective, identifying where and why individuals deviate from rationality.

Together, this framework allows us to analyze irrational financial decisions not as random mistakes but as structured, predictable patterns influenced by psychological, emotional, and social factors.

Behavioral Biases in Financial Decisions

One of the key contributions of behavioral economics is the identification of systematic biases that distort financial decision-making. These biases explain why individuals, despite having rational intentions, often make irrational financial choices.

1. Overconfidence Bias

Overconfidence occurs when individuals overestimate their knowledge, abilities, or control over outcomes.

- In investing, overconfident investors trade excessively, believing they can time the market, which often reduces returns (Barber & Odean, 2001).
- In corporate finance, managers may overestimate their ability to generate profits, leading to risky acquisitions or overinvestment.
- Example: Many retail investors in the 1990s dot-com era believed they had superior knowledge, leading to inflated valuations.

2. Herding Behavior

Herding is the tendency of individuals to mimic the actions of a larger group, often disregarding their own information.

- In markets, this behavior amplifies bubbles and accelerates crashes (Banerjee, 1992).
- Example: The housing market boom before the 2008 crisis was fueled by herding, as households followed others in buying property, assuming prices would keep rising.
- Herding reduces diversity in decision-making, increasing systemic risks.

3. Loss Aversion

Loss aversion refers to the psychological phenomenon where losses hurt more than equivalent gains feel good.

- Impact on investing: Investors hold onto losing stocks longer (disposition effect) because they want to avoid realizing a loss.

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 352-361

- Risk behavior: Individuals may avoid profitable opportunities due to the fear of potential losses.
- Example: During stock market downturns, many investors withdraw money prematurely from retirement funds, locking in losses instead of staying invested for recovery.

4. Present Bias (Hyperbolic Discounting)

Present bias is the preference for immediate rewards over larger, delayed benefits.

- In personal finance, it explains why individuals spend excessively instead of saving for retirement (Laibson, 1997).
- In credit use, consumers accumulate debt because they prioritize present consumption over future repayment burdens.
- Example: Credit card debt and payday loans reflect how short-term gratification often overrides long-term financial health.

5. Other Relevant Biases (briefly noted)

- Anchoring: Relying on irrelevant reference points (e.g., past stock prices) when making investment decisions.
- Mental Accounting: Treating money differently depending on its source or intended use (e.g., tax refunds spent freely vs. salary saved).
- Status Quo Bias: Preference for maintaining current financial choices, even when better alternatives exist.

Case Studies

To illustrate how biases translate into large-scale financial phenomena, this section examines three major case studies: the Dot-Com Bubble (1995–2000), the Global Financial Crisis (2008), and the GameStop Short Squeeze (2021). Each demonstrates how collective irrational behavior shaped financial markets.

1. The Dot-Com Bubble (1995–2000)

The late 1990s witnessed an unprecedented boom in internet-based companies. Investors, driven by overconfidence and herding behavior, poured money into technology stocks regardless of profitability or business models.

- Many companies with little or no revenue achieved multi-billion-dollar valuations.
- The media hype and belief that the internet would transform everything led to unrealistic expectations.

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 352-361

- When reality set in around 2000, the NASDAQ Composite Index lost nearly 80% of its value, causing massive losses.

Key Biases at Play: Overconfidence, Herding, Anchoring (valuations based on hype rather than fundamentals).

2. The Global Financial Crisis (2008)

The 2008 financial crisis was rooted in the U.S. housing market but had global repercussions.

- Households, encouraged by easy credit, purchased homes at inflated prices, assuming housing prices would only rise.
- Financial institutions packaged risky subprime mortgages into complex securities, ignoring underlying risks due to overconfidence and short-term incentives.
- Herding behavior among banks and investors amplified the crisis, as everyone followed the trend of mortgage-backed securities.

When housing prices fell, the entire financial system collapsed, leading to a worldwide recession.
Key Biases at Play: Herding, Overconfidence, Present Bias (short-term profit focus), Illusion of Safety.

3. The GameStop Short Squeeze (2021)

In early 2021, GameStop, a struggling video game retailer, became the center of one of the most famous stock market events in recent history.

- A large group of retail investors on Reddit's *WallStreetBets* forum collectively bought GameStop shares to drive up its price, targeting hedge funds that had shorted the stock.
- Driven by herding, social identity, and even emotional satisfaction (defiance against Wall Street), the stock surged over 1,500% in weeks.
- This rally was disconnected from fundamentals, as the company's financial performance did not justify such valuations.

While some investors made huge gains, many who joined late suffered losses when the price corrected.
Key Biases at Play: Herding, Overconfidence, Emotional Decision-Making, Loss Aversion (fear of missing out).

Lessons from Case Studies

These cases demonstrate that financial irrationality is not limited to individual mistakes but can scale up into systemic risks. Bubbles, crashes, and market anomalies often stem from predictable behavioral biases rather than random events. Recognizing these patterns is crucial for investors, regulators, and policymakers.

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 352-361

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of behavioral theories, empirical studies, and case examples demonstrates a central paradox: while individuals aspire to act rationally in financial matters, systematic cognitive and emotional biases frequently override logical decision-making.

1. Rational Aspirations vs. Behavioral Reality

Traditional economic theory assumes that people act as rational agents maximizing utility. However, the reviewed evidence shows that investors often:

- Rely on mental shortcuts (heuristics) rather than careful analysis.
- Exhibit loss aversion, valuing potential losses more heavily than equivalent gains.
- Follow herding behavior, leading to bubbles and crashes.
- Succumb to overconfidence, underestimating risks and overestimating personal knowledge.

Thus, rational man is more a theoretical construct than an accurate description of human financial behavior.

2. Emotional Influence on Financial Choices

Findings confirm that emotions play a dominant role in financial markets.

- Fear and panic trigger sell-offs during downturns (e.g., 2008 crisis).
- Euphoria and greed inflate asset prices (e.g., dot-com bubble).
- Social identity and community pressure drive collective action (e.g., GameStop event).

Emotional decision-making often overrides financial literacy, leading to choices inconsistent with long-term goals.

3. Cultural and Social Dimensions

The discussion also highlights that financial irrationality is not uniform across societies.

- Collectivist cultures may show stronger herding due to community influence.
- Developing economies with lower financial literacy may be more vulnerable to scams and speculative bubbles.
- Media and digital platforms now amplify herd behavior at unprecedented scales.

Thus, irrational decisions are shaped by both individual psychology and societal context.

4. Systemic Implications

The irrational decisions of individuals aggregate into system-wide vulnerabilities.

- Bubbles and crashes are collective expressions of biases.

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 352-361

- Financial institutions, despite expertise, are not immune—overconfidence and incentive-driven short-termism played major roles in 2008.
- Regulators often underestimate the speed at which collective irrationality spreads through modern, digital markets.

This challenges the Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH), suggesting that markets are not always self-correcting but can be destabilized by predictable human errors.

5. Bridging the Gap: Behavioral Interventions

The findings also reveal promising solutions:

- Nudges and choice architecture can guide individuals toward better decisions (e.g., automatic retirement savings plans).
- Financial education helps reduce but cannot eliminate biases.
- Regulatory frameworks must incorporate behavioral insights to prevent systemic risks.

Therefore, rather than assuming investors are rational, financial systems must be designed with human irrationality in mind.

Key Insight

The phrase "Rational Man, Irrational Financial Decision" captures a structural reality: humans are rational in intention but bounded by psychology, emotions, and social pressures. Recognizing this paradox is essential for building more resilient financial systems, designing effective policies, and empowering individuals to make wiser financial choices.

REFERENCES

1. Adam Smith. (1776). *The wealth of nations*. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd.
2. Banerjee, A. V. (1992). A simple model of herd behavior. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 107*(3), 797–817. https://doi.org/10.2307/2118364
3. Barber, B. M., & Odean, T. (2001). Boys will be boys: Gender, overconfidence, and common stock investment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 116*(1), 261–292. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355301556400
4. Fama, E. F. (1970). Efficient capital markets: A review of theory and empirical work. *The Journal of Finance, 25*(2), 383–417. https://doi.org/10.2307/2325486
5. Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

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

7. Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1984). Choices, values, and frames. *American Psychologist, 39*(4), 341–350. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.39.4.341

8. Laibson, D. (1997). Golden eggs and hyperbolic discounting. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 112*(2), 443–478. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355397555253

9. Shiller, R. J. (2000). *Irrational exuberance*. Princeton University Press.

10. 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

11. Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 69*(1), 99–118. https://doi.org/10.2307/1884852

12. Statman, M. (2019). *Behavioral finance: The second generation*. CFA Institute Research Foundation.

13. Thaler, R. H. (1999). Mental accounting matters. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 12*(3), 183–206. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0771(199909)12:3<183::AID-BDM318>3.0.CO;2-F

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

15. Von Neumann, J., & Morgenstern, O. (1944). *Theory of games and economic behavior*. Princeton University Press.