

EMPIRICAL EXAMINATION OF GENDER-BASED RISK AVERSION IN INVESTMENT DECISION-MAKING: A BEHAVIORAL FINANCE FRAMEWORK

Linh Pham

Department of Business Analytics, Da Nang University of Science and Technology, Da Nang, Vietnam

ABSTRACT

This study investigates gender-based differences in risk aversion within investment decision-making through the lens of behavioral finance. The research synthesizes theoretical and empirical insights to evaluate whether women exhibit higher risk aversion than men and how such behavioral disparities influence investment outcomes. Drawing on established experimental and survey-based literature, the study constructs a behavioral framework integrating psychological, demographic, and institutional determinants of risk preferences. Evidence from prior studies suggests that gender significantly influences financial decision-making, with women generally demonstrating more conservative investment behavior compared to men, often attributed to overconfidence effects in male investors and higher loss sensitivity among female investors (Barber & Odean, 2001; Eckel & Grossman, 2008). The analysis further explores how professional environment and contextual factors moderate these differences, particularly in investment teams and organizational settings (Niessen & Ruenzi, 2007). The study employs a conceptual synthesis methodology, systematically integrating findings from experimental economics, financial psychology, and empirical investment studies to build a comprehensive behavioral interpretation model. Results indicate that gender-based differences in risk aversion are consistent but not absolute, as contextual, cultural, and experience-based variables significantly mediate investment behavior. The paper contributes to behavioral finance literature by refining the understanding of gendered financial decision-making and offering implications for portfolio management, financial advisory systems, and policy formulation.

KEYWORDS

Gender-based risk aversion, behavioral finance, investment decision-making, overconfidence bias, portfolio behavior, financial psychology, risk tolerance, empirical finance, investment behavior, institutional context.

INTRODUCTION

Investment decision-making is fundamentally influenced by risk perception, cognitive biases, and behavioral predispositions. Within behavioral finance, risk aversion is recognized as a central determinant shaping how individuals allocate financial resources under uncertainty. One of the most extensively studied dimensions of

risk behavior is gender-based difference, where empirical and experimental research has consistently suggested that men and women may differ in their willingness to take financial risks.

The relevance of this inquiry has increased significantly due to the growing participation of women in financial markets and professional investment environments. Despite increasing financial inclusion, gender disparities in portfolio choice, risk tolerance, and investment strategies remain observable across global markets (Ayaa & Peprah, 2021). Prior research indicates that male investors often exhibit higher levels of overconfidence, leading to more frequent trading and riskier portfolio allocations, while female investors tend to adopt more conservative investment strategies aimed at capital preservation (Barber & Odean, 2001). These behavioral patterns have been widely attributed to psychological and socialization differences in risk perception.

The core problem addressed in this study is whether women are inherently more risk-averse than men in investment decision-making, or whether observed differences are primarily shaped by contextual and institutional influences. This distinction is critical because it determines whether gender differences are structural (biological or psychological) or situational (environmentally induced).

Research in behavioral finance suggests that risk aversion is not a fixed trait but a dynamic construct influenced by framing effects, evaluation periods, and social context (Gneezy & Potters, 1997). Furthermore, experimental findings demonstrate that gender differences in risk-taking behavior may reduce or even disappear under certain controlled conditions, indicating that environment plays a moderating role (Charness & Gneezy, 2012).

The significance of this study lies in its attempt to integrate fragmented findings into a unified behavioral finance framework. By synthesizing empirical evidence, the study aims to provide a structured understanding of how gender interacts with cognitive biases, institutional settings, and financial experience in shaping investment decisions.

A key theoretical foundation for this investigation is provided by Croson and Gneezy (2009), who argue that gender differences in preferences are observable across multiple domains, including risk, competition, and social preferences. Similarly, Eckel and Grossman (2008) highlight that while women generally appear more risk-averse in experimental settings, such differences are context-dependent rather than absolute.

Additionally, Niessen and Ruenzi (2007) emphasize that professional settings significantly shape behavioral outcomes, suggesting that gender differences in risk-taking may be amplified or reduced depending on organizational structure and incentives. Their findings are particularly relevant in understanding how institutional environments influence financial decision-making behavior, reinforcing the need for contextualized analysis of gender-based risk preferences (Niessen & Ruenzi, 2007).

Objectives of the Study

The primary objectives of this research are:

1. To analyze empirical evidence on gender-based differences in risk aversion in investment decision-making.
2. To evaluate behavioral finance theories explaining risk-taking differences between men and women.
3. To develop a conceptual framework integrating psychological and institutional determinants of investment behavior.
4. To identify gaps in existing literature and propose directions for future research.

Scope and Significance

This study focuses on behavioral and experimental financial literature related to individual and institutional investors. It does not conduct primary data collection but instead relies on structured synthesis of peer-reviewed empirical studies. The findings are relevant for portfolio managers, financial advisors, policy makers, and behavioral economists aiming to improve investment decision systems and reduce behavioral inefficiencies in financial markets.

Literature Review

The literature on gender differences in financial risk-taking is extensive and multidisciplinary, encompassing behavioral finance, experimental economics, and financial psychology. A central theme across studies is that gender influences both risk perception and investment behavior, although the magnitude and consistency of this effect vary across contexts.

Barber and Odean (2000) provide foundational evidence demonstrating that individual investors often underperform due to excessive trading, with men exhibiting significantly higher trading frequency than women. This behavior is linked to overconfidence bias, which is more prevalent among male investors. In a subsequent study, Barber and Odean (2001) further reinforce this argument by showing that male investors are more likely to engage in speculative trading, resulting in lower net returns compared to female investors.

Experimental studies by Charness and Gneezy (2012) provide strong evidence that gender differences in risk-taking are observable under controlled conditions, with women generally exhibiting more cautious behavior. However, these differences are not uniform across all experimental designs, suggesting that framing and contextual variables play a significant role.

Croson and Gneezy (2009) extend this discussion by examining gender differences in preferences across

multiple domains. Their synthesis indicates that women tend to be more risk-averse in financial decisions but may also exhibit higher social sensitivity, which influences decision-making in group settings. This multidimensional perspective challenges simplistic interpretations of gender-based risk differences.

Eckel and Grossman (2008) further support the existence of gender differences in risk aversion through experimental evidence, concluding that women are statistically more risk-averse in lottery-based and investment-choice experiments. However, they also emphasize that such differences are sensitive to methodological design and participant framing.

Gneezy and Potters (1997) highlight the role of evaluation periods in shaping risk-taking behavior, demonstrating that longer evaluation horizons encourage greater risk-taking. This finding is particularly relevant in understanding gender differences, as time perception may interact differently with male and female decision-makers.

Hibbert et al. (2008) question the universality of gender-based risk aversion, suggesting that contextual and situational factors may explain observed differences more effectively than inherent gender traits. Their analysis contributes to a growing body of literature that views risk behavior as adaptive rather than fixed.

In professional contexts, Niessen and Ruenzi (2007) provide critical evidence that gender differences in risk-taking persist even in professional settings but are significantly moderated by organizational structure and incentives. Their study demonstrates that female professionals in investment environments may adopt different risk strategies depending on team composition and institutional norms, reinforcing the importance of environmental context in shaping financial behavior (Niessen & Ruenzi, 2007).

Ajabnoor and Faisal (2023) focus on working women in metropolitan contexts and find that investment patterns among women are influenced by income stability, financial literacy, and household responsibilities. Their findings indicate that risk aversion among women may be partially explained by external constraints rather than intrinsic preferences.

Ayaa and Peprah (2021) provide evidence from Ghana, showing that gender differences in investment decisions are present in emerging markets as well, although cultural and economic conditions influence the degree of disparity.

Johnson and Powell (1994) further contribute by analyzing decision-making behavior in managerial roles, concluding that gender differences in risk perception exist but are often mediated by professional experience and organizational hierarchy.

Mathew et al. (2020) emphasize that working women's investment decisions are shaped by long-term

financial security considerations, often resulting in more conservative portfolio allocations. Their study highlights the importance of behavioral expectations regarding future financial needs.

Terjesen and Singh (2008) expand the discussion to corporate governance, demonstrating that female representation on boards influences organizational risk culture, often leading to more cautious strategic decisions.

Watson and McNaughton (2007) examine retirement planning and find that women tend to adopt lower-risk investment strategies, which may affect long-term financial outcomes.

Research Gap

Despite extensive literature, several gaps remain. First, many studies isolate gender as a binary variable without accounting for contextual moderators such as professional environment or financial literacy. Second, there is limited integration between experimental findings and real-world investment behavior. Third, the interaction between behavioral biases and institutional frameworks remains underexplored. This study addresses these gaps by developing a unified behavioral finance framework incorporating both psychological and environmental determinants of risk aversion.

Methodology

This study adopts a conceptual-empirical synthesis methodology grounded in behavioral finance theory. Since the objective is not to collect primary data but to critically integrate and interpret existing empirical evidence, the methodology emphasizes structured literature synthesis, comparative analysis, and framework development.

Research Design

The research follows a qualitative systematic review design with interpretive synthesis. The selected studies are analyzed to identify recurring behavioral patterns, theoretical explanations, and contextual moderators influencing gender-based risk aversion in investment decision-making.

The analytical approach is structured into three layers:

1. Behavioral Layer – psychological traits such as risk perception, overconfidence, and loss aversion
2. Contextual Layer – institutional environment, professional settings, and cultural norms
3. Decision Layer – investment outcomes, portfolio choices, and trading behavior

This layered approach allows a multi-dimensional understanding of investment behavior rather than a purely statistical interpretation.

Theoretical Framework Development

The study builds on behavioral finance theory, integrating Prospect Theory and risk preference models. According to Prospect Theory, individuals evaluate gains and losses asymmetrically, leading to systematic deviations from rational decision-making.

Gender-based differences are interpreted through three behavioral constructs:

(a) Risk Aversion Construct

Risk aversion refers to the tendency to prefer lower uncertainty outcomes. Prior research suggests that women exhibit higher sensitivity to potential losses, leading to conservative investment strategies (Eckel & Grossman, 2008).

(b) Overconfidence Bias Construct

Men are more likely to exhibit overconfidence in financial forecasting, resulting in excessive trading and higher portfolio turnover (Barber & Odean, 2001). This bias increases exposure to market volatility.

(c) Contextual Moderation Construct

Behavioral differences are not fixed; they are moderated by institutional and professional environments. Organizational structure and team composition significantly influence risk-taking behavior (Niessen & Ruenzi, 2007).

Data Source and Selection Criteria

The study relies exclusively on peer-reviewed journal articles, experimental studies, and academic working papers listed in the provided references. Selection criteria include:

- Relevance to gender and investment decision-making
- Empirical or experimental foundation
- Publication in recognized journals or academic repositories
- Focus on behavioral finance or investment psychology

Analytical Technique

A comparative thematic analysis approach is applied. Each study is evaluated based on:

- Risk behavior outcomes (high/low risk preference)
- Gender differences observed
- Contextual variables influencing outcomes

- Methodological approach (experimental, survey, observational)

Findings are then synthesized into a unified interpretive model that explains how gender-based risk aversion operates across different financial environments.

Conceptual Model Specification

The proposed behavioral finance framework suggests:

Gender → Cognitive Biases (Overconfidence / Loss Aversion) → Risk Perception → Investment Decision

This relationship is moderated by:

- Professional environment (Niessen & Ruenzi, 2007)
- Financial literacy levels
- Market experience
- Cultural and institutional settings

The model assumes that gender does not directly determine investment behavior but influences intermediate cognitive and behavioral processes.

Results / Findings

The synthesis of literature reveals several consistent patterns in gender-based risk aversion in investment decision-making. First, across multiple empirical and experimental studies, women generally demonstrate higher levels of risk aversion compared to men. This pattern is consistently observed in both controlled experiments and real-world investment data (Eckel & Grossman, 2008; Barber & Odean, 2001).

However, the findings also indicate that gender differences are not absolute or biologically fixed. Instead, they are significantly influenced by contextual and behavioral factors. For instance, experimental evidence shows that when decision-making environments are structured differently—such as altering evaluation periods or framing outcomes—gender differences in risk-taking behavior may reduce or become statistically insignificant (Gneezy & Potters, 1997).

Second, male investors tend to exhibit higher overconfidence bias, leading to more frequent trading and increased exposure to market volatility. Barber and Odean (2001) demonstrate that this overconfidence results in lower net returns for male investors compared to female investors, despite higher activity levels in trading behavior.

Third, institutional and professional environments play a crucial role in shaping risk behavior. Niessen and Ruenzi (2007) show that gender differences in risk-taking persist in professional investment settings but are

moderated by organizational structures. In environments with strong accountability mechanisms, gender differences in risk behavior tend to narrow.

Fourth, cultural and socio-economic factors also influence gender-based investment decisions. Studies from emerging markets, such as Ghana (Ayaa & Peprah, 2021), indicate that while gender differences exist, they are partially shaped by financial inclusion levels and access to investment knowledge.

Fifth, working women in urban environments often display constrained risk-taking behavior, influenced by household responsibilities, income stability considerations, and long-term financial security concerns (Ajabnoor & Faisal, 2023). This suggests that risk aversion is not purely psychological but also structurally induced.

Overall, the findings support a moderated behavioral hypothesis, where gender influences investment decisions indirectly through cognitive biases and is significantly shaped by external environmental conditions. The evidence strongly suggests that women are not inherently risk-averse in all contexts, but rather respond differently to uncertainty based on situational and institutional constraints.

Discussion

The findings of this study provide strong support for behavioral finance theories that reject the traditional assumption of fully rational investors. Instead, investment decision-making is shown to be systematically influenced by psychological biases and socio-institutional contexts.

A key theoretical implication is the reinforcement of Prospect Theory, which suggests that individuals evaluate risk based on perceived losses and gains rather than objective probabilities. The consistent observation that women exhibit higher risk aversion aligns with the idea that loss sensitivity plays a dominant role in financial decision-making (Eckel & Grossman, 2008).

However, the study also highlights that gender-based differences are context-dependent rather than universal. The evidence provided by Niessen and Ruenzi (2007) is particularly important in this regard, as it demonstrates that professional environments can significantly moderate behavioral differences. In structured investment teams, gender differences in risk-taking are reduced, suggesting that institutional design can influence behavioral outcomes.

Another important implication is the role of overconfidence bias in male investors. Barber and Odean (2001) show that excessive trading driven by overconfidence reduces investment performance. This challenges the assumption that higher risk-taking is always associated with better financial outcomes.

From a policy perspective, these findings suggest that improving financial literacy and decision-support

systems could reduce behavioral inefficiencies across genders. Instead of targeting gender differences directly, interventions should focus on reducing cognitive biases and improving investment decision frameworks.

Nevertheless, several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the study is based on secondary data and does not include primary empirical validation. Second, cultural and regional differences across studies may introduce heterogeneity in findings. Third, behavioral finance models cannot fully capture all socio-economic variables influencing investment decisions.

Despite these limitations, the integrated framework developed in this study provides a comprehensive explanation of how gender interacts with behavioral and institutional factors in shaping risk aversion.

Conclusion

This study examined gender-based risk aversion in investment decision-making using a behavioral finance framework. The analysis confirms that women generally exhibit higher risk aversion than men; however, this difference is not absolute and is significantly influenced by cognitive biases, institutional settings, and socio-economic conditions.

The study contributes to existing literature by developing a unified framework that integrates psychological constructs such as loss aversion and overconfidence with contextual moderators such as professional environments. The findings challenge simplistic interpretations of gender differences and emphasize the importance of environmental and institutional design in shaping financial behavior.

Future research should focus on primary empirical validation using cross-country datasets and advanced econometric modeling. Additionally, further exploration of digital investment platforms and algorithmic trading environments may provide deeper insights into how gender-based behavioral differences evolve in modern financial systems.

REFERENCES

1. Ajabnoor N, Faisal S. Assessment of Risk Tolerance and Investment Pattern of Working Women a Pragmatic Approach within Metropolitan Cities. *Int J Res Publ Rev.* 2023;4:2474–82.
2. Alemany L, Scarlata M, Zacharakis A. How the Gender Balance of Investment Teams Shapes the Risks They Take. *Harvard Business Review.* 2020;
3. Ayaa MM, Peprah WK. Gender Difference in Investment Decision Making: Evidence from Ghana. *Int J Econ Commerce Manag.* 2021;7:253–70.
4. Barber B, Odean T. Boys will be boys: Gender, Overconfidence, and Common Stock Investment. *The Qu J*

Econ. 2001;116(1):261–92.

5. Barber B, Odean T. Trading is Hazardous to Your Wealth: The Common Stock Investment Performance of Individual Investors. *The Journal of Finance*. 2000;55(2):773–806.
6. Charness G, Gneezy U. Strong Evidence for Gender Differences in Risk Taking. *J Econ Behaviour*. 2012;83(1):50–8.
7. Chen J. Gender Differences in Risk Taking: Are Women More Risk Averse?; 2008.
8. Croson R, Gneezy U. Gender Differences in Preferences. *J Econ Literature*. 2009;47(2):448–74.
9. Eckel CC, Grossman PJ. Men, Women and Risk Aversion: Experimental Evidence. *Handbook Experimental Econ Res*. 2008;1(113):1061–73.
10. Gneezy U, Potters J. An Experiment on Risk Taking and Evaluation Periods. *The Q J Econ*. 1997;112(2):631–45.
11. Hibbert A, Lawrence E, Prakash R, A. Are Women Really More RiskAverse than Men?; 2008.
12. Jain A. An Empirical Study on the Investment Behaviour of Female Investors in the city of Howrah, West Bengal. *Int J Sci Res Pub*. 2021;11:1–36.
13. Johnson JEV, Powell PL. Decision Making, Risk and Gender: Are Managers Different? *Brit J Manag*. 1994;5:123–38.
14. Mathew N, Joseph S, Joseph C. An Empirical Analysis on Investment Behavior among working Women: Are Women Taking the right Investment Decisions for their Future? *Indian Institute OF Management Kozhikode 04th International Conference on Marketing, Technology & Society 2020 Peer-review under responsibility of the 04th ICMTS 2020 ISBN; 2020*.
15. Niessen A, Ruenzi S. Sex Matters: Gender Differences in Professional Setting; 2007.
16. Powell M, Ansic D. Gender Differences in Risk Behaviour in Financial Decision-Making: An Experimental Analysis. *J Economic Psychol*. 1997;18:605–28.
17. Terjesen S, Singh V. Female Presence on Corporate Boards: A Multi-Country Study of Environmental Context. *J Business Ethics*. 2008;83(1):55–63.
18. Watson J, Mcnaughton M. Gender Differences in Risk Aversion and Expected Retirement Benefits. *Fin Anal J*. 2007;63(4):52–62.