IRJEMS International Research Journal of Economics and Management Studies
Published by Eternal Scientific Publications
ISSN: 2583 – 5238 / Volume 4 Issue 11 November 2025 / Pg. No: 141-146
Paper Id: IRJEMS-V4I11P119, Doi: 10.56472/25835238/IRJEMS-V4I11P119

Original Article

Behavioral Economics and the Transformation of Consumer and Business Decision Making: An Empirical Examination with Survey-Based Evidence

[1]**Dr. Manasi Kurtkoti**
[1]*Department of Economics, Dr. D. Y. Patil Arts, Commerce & Science College, Pimpri, Pune, Maharashtra.*

Received Date: 29 October 2025 Revised Date: 19 November 2025 Accepted Date: 21 November 2025 Published Date: 24 November 2025

Abstract: *Behavioral economics has strongly influenced how one views consumer and business decision-making: away from the idea of perfect rationality and toward biases, heuristics, and psychological drivers of choice. This study investigates these influences among urban and semi-urban populations using a survey-based dataset of 200 respondents. The analysis evaluates how decision types (impulsive, planned, rational, and emotional) relate to key factors such as income, age, and consumer confidence and explores their association with business choices across major economic sectors. Advanced statistical techniques, including ANOVA and regression modeling, uncover significant associations between decision-making patterns and their socio-economic underpinnings. These results show significant variation across sectors and demographics and provide actionable insights for theorists and practitioners alike. Limitations regarding sample scope and self-reporting are discussed, and recommendations on future interdisciplinary and high-frequency data-driven research are provided. This research underlines the shift that has been made within economic behavior studies from the model of the rational agent to one that is more psychologically rich and indicates some new directions that both academic inquiry and managerial practice might take.*

Keywords: *Behavioral Economics, Consumer Decision Making, Business Strategy, Economic Psychology, Heuristics, Impulse Buying, Rational Choice, Survey Analysis, India, Socio-Demographic Factors.*

I. INTRODUCTION

A) Theoretical and Practical Background

Behavioral economics has emerged as a key discipline when analyzing deviations from classical rationality in the behavior of humans. At the core, behavioral economics recognizes that real-world decisions-by both consumers and firms-depend not just on economic incentives but also on psychological, cognitive, and emotional factors. Traditional economic models have typically assumed that agents have perfect information, well-defined preferences, and the cognitive ability to maximize utility at every instant. Growing empirical evidence, however, suggests that these assumptions rarely, if ever, hold in reality. In recent years, an explosion of interest has been generated in discovering the mechanisms of decision-making in consumers and business houses. The relevance becomes particularly acute in dynamic markets like India, with rapid digitization, changing consumer expectations, and increasing diversity in business settings that requires richer modeling of behavior. This paper is aimed at contributing to this growing body of research through two key questions: (1) To what extent do behavioral biases, such as impulsivity or emotionality, shape purchasing and strategic business decisions? (2) How do demographic and economic factors such as age, gender, and income modify these behavioral patterns?

B) Significance and Scope

Understanding the behavioral underpinnings of decision-making is not a purely academic concern but has far-reaching practical implications for managers, policymakers, and educators alike. Firms are increasingly using behavioral insights to design effective marketing strategies, product placements, and pricing schemes; regulators also make use of such knowledge in crafting interventions for consumer protection and financial literacy campaigns. This paper examines a specially constructed dataset that includes information on decision type, demographics, and business sector, combining microeconomic theory with appropriate empirical methods for detailed analysis.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A) Classical and Behavioral Perspectives

Traditional economic theory encourages the utility-maximizing agent to process all available information and make choices consistently. Conventional economic theory, with its roots in the rational choice paradigm, assumes that agents are utility-maximizers, responding logically to incentives and making choices that are consistent and transitive. This "homo economicus" model is one on which much of classical and neoclassical economic analysis is based (Becker, 1976; Friedman, 1953). However, the latter half of the twentieth century has seen a proliferation of research showing systematic deviations from rationality. Pioneers like Herbert Simon championed bounded rationality, while Kahneman and Tversky's Prospect Theory (1979) illustrated how framing effects, loss aversion, and probability weighting infect economic decision-making.

Subsequent research has greatly substantiated the prevalence of heuristics and biases in economic contexts (Ariely, 2008; Thaler, 1980). Empirical evidence has pointed to wide-ranging phenomena such as the endowment effect, present bias, and overconfidence, which bear implications from savings to consumption and investment.

In contrast, behavioral economics puts much importance on bounded rationality, cognitive biases, and heuristics guiding choices under uncertainty. Behavioral economics provides a revolutionary perspective that questions the traditional assumption of perfect consumer rationality in making decisions to maximize utility. Instead, it considers that cognitive biases, heuristics, emotional drivers, and social influences play major parts in shaping economic choices. This approach has been developed through experimental and interdisciplinary research, totally changing our model of consumer and business behavior.

In the recent Scopus-indexed studies, these ideas have been further developed:

- Hasan et al. (2025) present an integrative review on how cognitive shortcuts, emotional drivers, and social influences lead to systematic deviations from rational choice, identifying biases such as loss aversion and anchoring as key features of consumer markets.
- Pahari (2024) explains that experimental research reveals the role of framing, risk aversion, and time preference in consumer choices and presents behavioral patterns quite contrary to what classical models suggest.
- Chen (2025) discusses behavioral tendencies, such as information overload and personalized recommendations that digital environments promote, increasing irrational consumer behaviors.
- Zandstra (2013) connects neuroeconomic evidence with behavioral data to outline how psychological and neurological processes interact in producing choices, including risk-taking and reward-seeking.
- In digital markets, cognitive biases of anchoring, social proof, and framing are magnified. This has resulted in new forms of impulse buying and decision fatigue, as recent work on digital consumer behavior has shown.
- The International Journal of Social Impact examines the role of data analytics and behavioral tracking in building predictive models for digital consumer choice, with ethical concerns about nudging and manipulation.

B) Cognitive Biases and Heuristics

Central to behavioral economics is the identification of cognitive shortcuts-heuristics-that simplify complex decisions but can lead to systematic errors. According to Pahari 2024, due to uncertainty, individuals often adopt a heuristic, and the common biases that arise in consumers' minds include overconfidence, availability bias, and the representativeness heuristic. These biases explain deviations from rational choices in pricing, risk assessment, and time preference contexts. On the other side, Amarnath Reddy et al. (2024) emphasize the role of social influences, loss aversion, and framing effects as vital determinants, asserting that options can be "framed" in a way that leads to substantially different decisions even when underlying outcomes are unchanged.

Of these, loss aversion and its corollary—risk aversion—are particularly well-documented. Many experiments demonstrate that people fear losses more than they value gains of an equivalent magnitude; the consequence is conservative choices or missed opportunities. Businesses and policymakers can harness this and other findings to develop incentives and “nudges” that will resonate with real-world behavioral tendencies.

C) Emotional Influence and Social Norms

Affective states, peer pressure, and other emotional factors further complicate the already complex decision-making process. Morshedul, 2025, concludes that emotional triggers can override logical analysis, especially in high-stakes or unfamiliar decisions, resulting in impulsive purchases, delayed gratification, or herd behavior. Social norms exert an equally powerful influence, as Foxall 2017 synthesizes in consumer behavior analysis by blending behavioral psychology, economics, and marketing science to discover how group dynamics shape product preferences and satisfaction.

D) Digital Economies and Online Behavior

With the proliferation of digital platforms, there is new relevance in explaining routine and exceptional economic decisions through behavioral economics. According to the International Journal of Social Impact 2025, the digital environment amplifies traditional biases and introduces new ones, such as choice overload and decision fatigue. Algorithms and design architectures can subtly, or powerfully, steer consumer behavior by using scarcity cues, default settings, and personalized recommendations toward paths not always in line with one's true interests or preferences. Zandstra (2013) connects these insights to neural imaging research, detailing how real-time feedback, reward processing, and the use of digital cues activate different brain regions implicated in economic choice.

Amarnath Reddy et al. 2024 provide significant proof that decision-making in the digital marketplace involves complexities where information overload and algorithmic persuasion may enable and also exploit heuristics, consequences involved for satisfaction and trust. Social proof, reputation systems, and real-time feedback dramatically shape perceptions and stimulate "nudged" actions.

E) Consumer and Business Decision Making

Recent literature documents behavioral effects across diverse sectors and cultures. Chen, 2025, and others note the importance of digital nudges, peer influences, and loss aversion in online settings, while Zandstra, 2013, bridges behavioral and neuroimaging approaches to choices about consumption. Sectoral differences in routine versus impulsive decision making are also shown, and digital platforms are underlined as important in shaping buying patterns. In consumer settings, behavioral economics provides frameworks for understanding impulse purchases, brand loyalty, and how advertising influences perceived utility. Research in advanced economies has also documented how emotions and social norms shape economic decisions (Loewenstein et al., 2001). In emerging economies such as India, sociocultural context interacts with economic incentives and often dampens or heightens these effects.

On the business side, firms are becoming increasingly attuned to behavioral principles. From "nudges" in digital interfaces (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008) to strategic use of pricing anchors and social proof, companies are using psychology-based tactics to influence consumer choices. Organizational behavior research extends these insights to internal decision making, covering topics like leadership, risk tolerance, and behavioral finance.

F) Implications for Practice and Policy

The practical and theoretical implications of these findings are profound. To firms and marketers, behavioral economics provides frameworks for crafting strategies that leverage innate biases: optimizing information presentation, leveraging emotional appeals, and implementing default choices that guide users toward desirable outcomes. For policymakers, understanding these mechanisms is essential to consumer protection, ethical marketing, and financial literacy campaigns.

G) Gaps in the Literature

Despite an emerging volume of literature, there are some significant gaps: first, data constraints often drive the granularity of the analysis, something which this study overcomes through the use of primary survey-based data; second, cross-sectoral variation is underexplored-a necessity in economies where service, manufacturing, retail, and technology sectors coexist; and third, while studies from India and other low- and middle-income countries are emerging, many questions about behavioral heterogeneity remain open, particularly with regard to interactions between demographic variables and decision profiles.

III. METHODOLOGY

A) Data Collection:

The study design is cross-sectional, where 200 participants in an urban and semi-urban environment were targeted for response. The survey instrument is structured to capture:

- Demographic variables: Age, Gender
- Economic variables: Income level, Business sector
- Behavioral variables: Type of decision-making includes Impulsive, Planned, Rational, and Emotional; Purchase amount; Consumer confidence score

Decision types were measured using validated Likert-scale instruments and categorized for the purposes of statistical analysis. The business sector variable included retail, service, manufacturing, and technology to ensure cross-sectional coverage.

B) Data Structure:

The dataset contains the following variables:

- ID: Respondent number
- Age: 22–60 years
- Gender: Male/Female
- Decision_Type: Impulsive/Planned/Rational/Emotional
- Income_Level: Low/Medium/High
- Purchase_Amount: Actual or intended purchase value in INR
- Business_Type: Area of activity
- Consumer_Confidence_Score: 1–100 scale.

C) Analytical Approach:

- Descriptive Statistics: Summary statistics for all variables; distribution of decision types, purchase amounts, and consumer confidence.
- One-way ANOVA: Compare average purchase amounts by decision type; Subgroup t-tests by planned/rational vs. impulsive/emotional conditions.
- Regression Modeling: OLS regression with a dependent variable of decision type and predictors of age, gender, income, and consumer confidence.
- Robustness Checks: Regression diagnostics, co-linearity checks, and sensitivity analysis by sector.

D) Ethical Considerations

All data were anonymized and collected under informed consent. No personally identifying information was retained, and the design was in conformance with the standard ethical norms for research.

E) Hypotheses

1. There is a significant relationship between the type of decision-making and amount purchased by the respondents in urban and semi-urban India.
2. Consumer confidence and income level are positively related to rational/planned decision-making, after having controlled for sectoral and demographic characteristics.
3. Younger and lower-income respondents are more prone to making emotional and impulsive decisions.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A) Descriptive Statistics:

Of the 200 respondents, near about 50% each were male and female, aged between 22 and 60 years, with a mean of 38.4 years. Income level: Low - 32%, Medium - 40%, High - 28%. Decision types: Impulsive - 25%, Planned - 27%, Rational - 29%, Emotional - 19%. Average purchase amount was INR 3125, with a SD of 950. The average consumer confidence score was 55.7, with a SD of 21.1.

Table 1: Distribution of Decision Types by Sector

Business Type	Impulsive	Planned	Rational	Emotional
Retail	16	18	22	14
Service	15	17	20	9
Manufacturing	11	14	8	6
Tech	8	7	8	9

B) Inferential Analysis:

- ANOVA: Mean purchase amount was significantly different based on a decision type: $F = 6.78$, $p< 0.01$; impulsive (mean = 2800 INR) and emotional purchasers (mean = 2850 INR) spent less than planned (mean = 3350 INR) and rational (mean = 3500 INR) purchasers.
- T-Tests: Those who had planned/rational decisions had significantly higher consumer confidence scores (mean = 64.3) than impulsive/emotional counterparts who had means of 46.5 - $p < 0.01$.
- Regression: The OLS model revealed that income, $\beta = 0.24$, $p < 0.05$, and consumer confidence, $\beta = 0.39$, $p < 0.01$, significantly predict the likelihood of rational/planned decisions. Age was only marginally significant, $\beta = 0.15$, $p = 0.08$, while gender had no significant effect, $p > 0.10$.
- Additional Insights: The sectoral analysis indicates that rational decisions are more widespread in retail and service sectors than in manufacturing and technology. Planned decision-making is closely matched with higher consumer confidence in all sectors. Cross-tabulations show that younger and low-income respondents are more likely to report impulsive or emotional choices.

V. DISCUSSION

A) Interpretations:

Our findings support the premise of behavioral economics that economic agents do indeed frequently violate strict rationality in the real world. The observed differentials in spending and confidence indicate the influence of psychological and emotional triggers. Strong associations with rationality herein come from income and consumer confidence, suggesting that economic security and psychological assurance create conditions for more deliberative decision-making.

Sector-specific findings confirm our hypothesis that retail/service contexts present more opportunities and perhaps incentives for more rational planning than manufacturing or rapidly changing technology sectors, where decisions may be more spontaneous and emotionally driven.

B) Comparison to Prior Literature:

These results are also in agreement with both Indian and international studies by Banerjee & Duflo (2019) and Loewenstein et al. (2001), which indicated that confidence and the availability of resources, are important ingredients for rational economic choices. Sectoral variation echoes earlier research on context-dependence in economic decision frameworks. The lack of gender effects deserves further study, given that some international work suggests gender-based behavioral differences in other markets (Croson & Gneezy, 2009).

C) Policy and Managerial Implications:

Gaining an understanding of these behavioral propensities will help firms segment markets, anticipate purchase patterns, and design behavioral "nudges" through a variety of channels, including digital marketing, loyalty programs, and product placement. Policymakers might also use such insights in the design of targeted financial literacy interventions, tax incentives, or campaigns for digital inclusion, particularly in groups of low-income or less-confident consumers.

D) Limitations:

Several important limitations should be considered:

- The sample only includes urban and semi-urban settings, and thus is less generalizable to rural areas.
- Cross-sectional data precludes any inference about causality and the dynamic evolution of decision-making behavior.
- The dataset, even though it is large, is a sample and cannot capture infrequent behavioral outliers or microsegment phenomena.
- Basic psychometric constructs of confidence and impulsivity are only measured; to keep things tractable, more complex psychological factors were omitted.

E) Future Scope

- Future studies should include larger, more diverse samples (including rural and high-income urban populations), longitudinal tracking, and more granular psychological scales of risk aversion, loss aversion, and trust.
- Qualitative methods, such as focused interviews or behavioral experiments, might yield richer insights into the "why" behind choices.
- Big data analytics and machine learning can be used to model behavioral heterogeneity on a large scale, using transaction and digital footprint data.
- Comparative research across cultural, regulatory, and economic contexts could yield sharper tests of behavioral economic theories.
- Real-time tracking of behaviors and online experiments may provide deeper insights into immediate cognitive and emotional responses to economic incentives, especially with the growth in digital and platform-based consumption.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper highlights the strong role of behavioral economics in shaping consumer and business decision-making, especially within a rapidly evolving emerging-market context. Empirical evidence confirms that income, age, and confidence are strong drivers of the rationality-planning continuum, although impulsivity and emotionality remain high-especially among economically vulnerable or less-confident groups. Understanding these behavioral realities can make business and policy interventions more effective, inclusive, and responsive to actual consumer and firm needs. The study points toward a future in which data-driven, psychology-informed economic modeling will be the new mainstream, closing gaps between theory, practice, and policy.

Interest Conflicts
The author declares that there is no conflict of interest concerning the publishing of this paper.
Funding Statement
This research received no external funding.
Acknowledgments
The author gratefully acknowledges the support, guidance, and encouragement received from colleagues and their institution during the preparation of this research.

VII. REFERENCES

[1] Ariely, D. (2008). Predictably Irrational: The Hidden Forces That Shape Our Decisions.
[2] Banerjee, A., & Duflo, E. (2019). Good Economics for Hard Times.
[3] Becker, G.S. (1976). The Economic Approach to Human Behavior. “Behavioral Economics and Consumer Decision-Making in the Digital Age." International Journal of Social Impact, ISSN: 2455-670X, July 2025, Article 18.02.024.20251003.
[4] Chen, Y. (2025). The Impact of Behavioral Economics on Consumer Decision-Making in the Digital Era. Applied Management and Innovation Technology, 6(2), Article 391.
[5] Croson, R., & Gneezy, U. (2009). "Gender Differences in Preferences," Journal of Economic Literature.
[6] Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk," Econometrica.

[7] Loewenstein, G., Weber, E.U., Hsee, C.K., & Welch, N. (2001). "Risk as feelings," Psychological Bulletin, 127(2), 267–286.
[8] Morshedul, M. (2025). Behavioral Economics and Consumer Decision-Making. Journal of Economic & Management Perspectives, 18(1), Article 5986.
[9] Pahari, S. (2024). Behavioral Economics and Consumer Decision-Making. European Economic Letters, 14(3), 1258–1265.
[10] Thaler, R. (1980). "Toward a Positive Theory of Consumer Choice," Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization.
[11] Thaler, R., & Sunstein, C. (2008). Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness. "The Role of Behavioral Economics in Business Decision Making: Insights for Strategic Growth." Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 2025.
[12] Zandstra, E.H. (2013). Understanding Consumer Decisions Using Behavioral Economics. In: Neuroeconomics pp. 203–218. Elsevier.