

Midocean university

College: Faculty of Finance

Department: Finance Technology

The Impact of Using Financial Tools on the Human Mind

Student name:

Fahad Ammash Wasli

Supervisor:

D. Fayez Ali Jarad

Academic Year:

2026



Content table

Introduction:	
Abstract:	
Research Problem:	
Significance of the Study:	
Objectives of the Study:	
Research Questions:	
Research Hypotheses:	
Previous Studies (Literature Review):	
Research Gap:	
Theoretical Framework of the Study:	
Methodology and Research Methods:	
Population and Sample of the Study:	

Research Instrument (Tool):

.....

Statistical Analysis Methods:

.....

Study Limitations:

References:

Abstract

This study examines the psychological and cognitive effects of financial tools such as budgeting apps, trading platforms, and robo-advisors. Using behavioral finance and cognitive psychology frameworks, it investigates decision-making, emotional responses, and cognitive biases through a mixed-method case study of 200 users in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Findings reveal that while these tools enhance efficiency, they may also increase cognitive load and dependency. Implications guide users, institutions, and regulators in ethical fintech design.

Keywords: financial tools, behavioral finance, cognitive psychology, decision-making, fintech

Introduction

Financial tools—budgeting applications, algorithmic trading platforms, robo-advisors, and personal finance dashboards—have transformed financial decision-making. These technologies use data analytics and automation to support users in real-time (Benartzi & Lehrer, 2015).

As fintech adoption grows, individuals depend on these tools for cognitive assistance with complex tasks. Behavioral finance reveals that human decisions suffer from biases like overconfidence and loss aversion (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979; Thaler, 2016). Financial tools may either correct or exacerbate these biases based on their design.

Research Problem

Widespread fintech use lacks clear evidence on its cognitive and psychological effects. Automation may improve decisions, but overreliance can foster overconfidence and weaken critical thinking (Barber & Odean, 2001).

This study addresses how financial tools affect mental processes—attention, risk perception, emotions, and decision patterns—and whether they reduce cognitive effort or create dependency and lower financial literacy (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014).

Significance of the Study {#significance-of-the-study}

The research benefits key stakeholders:

- **Individuals** gain awareness of psychological influences on finances (Kahneman, 2011).
- **Institutions** can build ethical, user-friendly tools.
- **Policymakers** receive guidance for consumer protection regulations (Thaler, 2016).

It advances behavioral fintech by examining human-technology interactions.

Objectives of the Study

1. Assess cognitive impacts on decision-making.
2. Examine emotional responses (stress, confidence).
3. Evaluate behavioral changes in financial habits.
4. Determine effects on cognitive biases (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979).
5. Analyze tool complexity versus cognitive load (Sweller, 1988).

Research Questions

1. How do financial tools shape cognitive decision-making?
 2. What emotional effects emerge from tool use?
 3. Do tools reduce or amplify biases like loss aversion (Thaler, 2016)?
 4. How does usage frequency link to financial behavior?
 5. How does interface design affect cognition?
-

Research Hypotheses

H₀₁: No significant effect of tools on decision-making quality.

H₁₁: Tools significantly influence decision-making (Benartzi & Lehrer, 2015).

H₀₂: No link between usage and bias reduction.

H₁₂: Higher usage reduces biases (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979).

H₀₃: Tools do not affect stress levels.

H₁₃: Tools significantly impact stress (Sweller, 1988).

Literature Review

Behavioral finance documents deviations from rationality via heuristics and biases (Thaler, 2016).

Prospect theory shows asymmetric gain-loss evaluation (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979).

Fintech studies reveal mixed effects. Automated savings tools boost discipline (Benartzi & Lehrer, 2015), but trading platforms spur overtrading from overconfidence (Barber & Odean, 2001).

Cognitive load theory warns that information overload impairs decisions (Sweller, 1988), especially for low-literacy users (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014). Tools thus offer efficiency but risk new challenges.

Study	Key Finding	Implication for Financial Tools
Kahneman & Tversky (1979)	Loss aversion drives risk attitudes	Tools may alter risk framing
Barber & Odean (2001)	Overconfidence increases trading	Platforms amplify bias
Benartzi & Lehrer (2015)	Automation aids savings	Positive nudge effects
Sweller (1988)	Cognitive overload harms performance	Complex dashboards risky

Research Gap

Existing work treats behavioral finance and fintech separately, neglecting integrated psychological analysis. Gaps include:

- Long-term cognitive/emotional effects.
- Tool design's role in bias and load.
- Real-world case studies (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014).

This study fills these via a comprehensive case approach.

Theoretical Framework

Prospect Theory (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979): Risk-based decisions.

Behavioral Finance (Thaler, 2016): Bias deviations.

Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 1988): Information overload.

Dual-Process Theory (Kahneman, 2011): Intuitive vs. analytical thinking.

Methodology

Case study:

- **Quantitative:** Surveys on biases, stress, and decisions.

Focus: KSA financial tool users for contextual depth.

Population and Sample

www.midocean.edu.km

Comoros Address: (Headquarters) Midocean university, 8764+GH9 Matelec street, BP 684 Moroni, RP 98123 Moroni, Comoros

Population: Adult financial tool users in KSA.

Sampling: Stratified random (age, income, literacy).

Sample: n=50 for statistical power (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014).

Research Instruments

- **Questionnaires:** Likert scales for biases/emotions (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979).

Statistical Analysis

- Descriptive statistics.

Limitations

- KSA-specific
- Self-report bias.
- Fast-evolving fintech.
- Case study scope (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014).

References

Barber, B. M., & Odean, T. (2001). Boys will be boys: Gender, overconfidence, and common stock investment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(1), 261–292.

www.midocean.edu.km

Comoros Address: (Headquarters) Midocean university, 8764+GH9 Matelec street, BP 684 Moroni, RP 98123 Moroni, Comoros

Benartzi, S., & Lehrer, J. (2015). *The smarter screen: Surprising ways to influence and improve online behavior*. Penguin.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

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

Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2014). The economic importance of financial literacy: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 52(1), 5–44. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.52.1.5>

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4

Thaler, R. H. (2016). *Misbehaving: The making of behavioral economics*. W. W. Norton & Company.