

AI Sentiment Tools: A Shield Against Emotional Errors

TRISHA SHARMA

24GSOB2150050

UJJWAL SAXENA

24GSOB2150305

Under The Guidance Of

Ms Viveka Rohilla

School of Finance & Commerce

GALGOTIAS UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates the role of Artificial Intelligence (AI)-powered sentiment analysis tools in mitigating behavioral biases that distort rational investment decision-making. Financial markets are significantly influenced by investor psychology, with well-documented biases such as loss aversion, overconfidence, and herd mentality leading to suboptimal portfolio outcomes. The study examines how Natural Language Processing (NLP)-based sentiment tools—capable of processing news feeds, social media data, and analyst reports in real time—can serve as an objective corrective mechanism against these cognitive distortions.

The research employs a mixed-methods approach combining a structured survey of approximately 100 retail investors and financial professionals in the Delhi-NCR region with a review of existing empirical literature. Hypotheses were tested to determine whether AI sentiment tools significantly reduce susceptibility to behavioral biases and whether their adoption leads to improved investment outcomes. Findings reveal that investors who use AI-driven sentiment analytics demonstrate measurably lower bias-driven decision errors and report higher confidence in their investment process. The thesis concludes with strategic recommendations for broader integration of AI sentiment tools in investment practice and proposes directions for future research.

Keywords: AI Sentiment Analysis, Behavioral Finance, Loss Aversion, Overconfidence Bias, Herd Mentality, NLP, Investment Decision-Making.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The modern financial landscape is shaped not only by macroeconomic fundamentals but also by the psychological tendencies of market participants. Behavioral finance, a discipline that integrates cognitive psychology with classical economic theory, has established that investors consistently deviate from rational choice models. Seminal contributions by Kahneman and Tversky (1979) through Prospect Theory, and Thaler's (1985) work on mental accounting, demonstrated that human beings are loss-averse, overconfident, and susceptible to social influence—tendencies that generate market anomalies such as asset bubbles, momentum crashes, and excessive volatility.

Concurrently, the proliferation of big data and advances in machine learning have given rise to sophisticated AI tools capable of analyzing vast textual datasets—news articles, earnings call transcripts, Twitter feeds, Reddit threads, and financial blogs—to extract market sentiment in near real time. These NLP-powered systems offer a quantitative, emotion-free perspective that can supplement or challenge the instinctive judgments of human investors.

1.2 Problem Statement

Despite the theoretical promise of AI sentiment tools, empirical evidence on their practical efficacy in reducing behavioral biases among retail and institutional investors in the Indian context remains limited. Most existing studies are confined to U.S. or European markets. This research seeks to address the gap by examining the adoption and impact of AI sentiment tools among investors in Delhi-NCR—a region representative of India's growing retail investor base.

1.3 Significance of the Study

India's capital markets have witnessed unprecedented retail participation post-pandemic, with SEBI reporting over 110 million active demat accounts by 2024. This surge amplifies the consequences of behavioral biases at a systemic level. Tools that can objectively quantify market sentiment and alert investors to potential cognitive traps hold significant value for individual wealth creation and broader market stability.

1.4 Research Scope and Limitations

The study is geographically limited to Delhi-NCR and is based on self-reported survey data, which may be subject to social desirability bias. The primary focus is on retail investors and entry-level financial professionals; institutional fund managers are outside the scope. The findings are indicative rather than generalisable to the broader Indian market.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The study pursues the following specific objectives:

- i. To examine the nature and prevalence of behavioral biases—specifically loss aversion, overconfidence, and herd mentality—among retail investors in the Delhi-NCR region.
- ii. To assess the current level of awareness and adoption of AI sentiment analysis tools among the surveyed investor population.
- iii. To determine whether the use of AI sentiment tools is associated with a statistically significant reduction in behavioral bias-driven investment errors.
- iv. To evaluate the self-reported impact of AI sentiment tool usage on investment confidence and portfolio performance.
- v. To provide evidence-based recommendations for individual investors, financial advisors, and fintech developers on integrating AI sentiment analytics into the investment workflow.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Foundations of Behavioral Finance

Classical finance rests on the Efficient Market Hypothesis (Fama, 1970), which posits that asset prices fully reflect all available information, making it impossible to consistently outperform the market. However, extensive empirical evidence has challenged this paradigm. Kahneman and Tversky's (1979) Prospect Theory established that individuals evaluate outcomes relative to a reference point and are disproportionately sensitive to losses compared to equivalent gains—a tendency termed loss aversion. Shiller (2000) demonstrated that market prices exhibit excess volatility inconsistent with rational valuation models, attributing this to investor irrationality and social contagion.

3.2 Key Behavioral Biases

Overconfidence bias, extensively studied by Barber and Odean (2001), leads investors to overestimate their informational advantage, resulting in excessive trading and below-average net returns. Herd mentality, documented by Bikhchandani, Hirshleifer, and Welch (1992) in their seminal work on informational cascades, describes the tendency of investors to mimic the actions of peers, often triggering momentum-driven bubbles. Representativeness heuristic (Kahneman & Tversky, 1972) causes investors to over-weight recent performance data, while anchoring (Tversky &

Kahneman, 1974) results in excessive reliance on an initial reference price.

3.3 Sentiment Analysis in Finance

The extraction of sentiment from textual data as a predictive signal for financial markets gained academic traction with Tetlock's (2007) finding that negative media sentiment predicts downward market returns. Subsequent work by Bollen, Mao, and Zeng (2011) demonstrated that Twitter mood states—calm, alert, kind, vital, sure, vital—predict Dow Jones Industrial Average movements with high accuracy. Loughran and McDonald (2011) developed a finance-specific lexicon for sentiment scoring of 10-K filings, which has become a widely adopted benchmark.

3.4 AI and NLP in Investment Practice

Modern AI sentiment systems go beyond simple keyword counting. Transformer-based models such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) and its finance-specific adaptations (FinBERT by Araci, 2019) achieve significantly higher classification accuracy on financial texts. These models capture contextual nuance, double negation, and domain-specific language ('margin expansion' versus 'margin compression'). Applied studies by Chen et al. (2019) show that NLP-derived sentiment scores from earnings call transcripts predict post-announcement drift and abnormal returns, while work by López de Prado (2018) demonstrates the integration of alternative text data into quantitative trading strategies.

3.5 Research Gap

Despite rich international evidence, literature specifically examining the impact of AI sentiment tools on the behavioral biases of Indian retail investors is sparse. Studies by Sahi et al. (2013) and Mittal and Vyas (2011) document the existence of behavioral biases in Indian markets but predate the widespread availability of AI sentiment tools. This thesis contributes to the literature by empirically testing the de-biasing potential of such tools in the Indian context.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design

The study employs a descriptive and analytical research design, combining quantitative survey data with a qualitative review of secondary literature. A cross-sectional survey was conducted between January and March 2025 among retail investors and junior financial professionals in the Delhi-NCR region. The mixed-methods approach allows triangulation of findings and provides both breadth and depth of insight.

4.2 Sampling

A convenience sampling technique was adopted, targeting individuals with at least one year of active investment experience in equity markets. The final usable sample comprised 100 respondents, including 67 retail investors and 33 financial professionals (sub-brokers, financial planners, and equity analysts). Of the total sample, 38% were female and 62% male, with ages ranging from 22 to 51 years. The average portfolio size was approximately ₹4.2 lakh.

4.3 Data Collection Instrument

A structured questionnaire with 32 Likert-scale items (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) was developed covering four constructs: (a) Behavioral Bias Susceptibility (10 items across loss aversion, overconfidence, and herding sub-scales); (b) AI Sentiment Tool Awareness (4 items); (c) AI Sentiment Tool Usage Frequency (4 items); and (d) Self-Reported Improvement in Decision Quality (8 items). The questionnaire was pretested on 15 respondents and refined for clarity. Cronbach's alpha for the full scale was 0.83, indicating strong internal consistency.

4.4 Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested:

H₁₀: The use of AI sentiment analysis tools has no significant effect on reducing loss aversion in investment decisions.

H₂₀: The use of AI sentiment analysis tools has no significant effect on mitigating overconfidence bias.

H₃₀: The use of AI sentiment analysis tools has no significant effect on reducing herd mentality-driven investment

behavior.

4.5 Statistical Tools

Data were analyzed using SPSS v26. Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency distribution) profiled the sample. Independent samples t-tests compared bias scores between AI tool users and non-users. Pearson correlation analysis examined relationships between tool usage frequency and decision quality scores. Multiple linear regression identified the relative predictive weight of each bias type on overall decision quality.

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.1 Descriptive Profile

Of the 100 respondents, 54% reported awareness of at least one AI sentiment analysis platform (e.g., Bloomberg Sentiment, Reuters Eikon NLP, Refinitiv, or domestic tools such as Tickertape). However, only 31% reported using such tools with any regularity (at least once per week), and merely 12% indicated daily usage. This suggests that while awareness is growing, habitual integration into the investment process remains nascent.

The mean behavioral bias susceptibility score for the full sample was 3.41 out of 5.00 ($SD = 0.62$), indicating moderate-to-high susceptibility. Loss aversion emerged as the dominant bias (mean = 3.68), followed by overconfidence (mean = 3.44) and herd mentality (mean = 3.12).

5.2 Hypothesis Testing

H₁ – Loss Aversion: An independent samples t-test comparing loss aversion scores between AI tool users ($n = 31$) and non-users ($n = 69$) yielded $t(98) = 3.24$, $p = 0.002$. The mean loss aversion score for users (2.89) was significantly lower than for non-users (3.72), supporting rejection of H₁₀. AI sentiment tools appear to reduce the emotional weight investors attach to potential losses by providing an objective market sentiment benchmark.

H₂ – Overconfidence Bias: The t-test for overconfidence yielded $t(98) = 2.87$, $p = 0.005$. AI tool users (mean = 3.01) demonstrated significantly lower overconfidence scores compared to non-users (mean = 3.68). Qualitative responses suggested that real-time sentiment divergence alerts—notifications when individual investor sentiment deviates markedly from the aggregated market—were particularly effective in prompting self-reflection.

H₃ – Herd Mentality: Results for herd mentality were in the expected direction but weaker: $t(98) = 1.96$, $p = 0.053$. The marginal significance suggests a trend toward reduced herding among tool users, though this hypothesis could not be rejected at the conventional $\alpha = 0.05$ threshold. This finding may reflect the fact that AI sentiment tools themselves aggregate crowd data, potentially reinforcing rather than countering social proof signals.

5.3 Correlation and Regression Analysis

Pearson correlation analysis revealed a significant negative relationship between AI tool usage frequency and overall bias susceptibility score ($r = -0.41$, $p < 0.001$), confirming that more frequent use is associated with lower bias levels. Additionally, tool usage frequency showed a significant positive correlation with self-reported decision quality ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$).

Multiple regression with decision quality as the dependent variable and the three bias sub-scores plus tool usage frequency as predictors produced an adjusted R^2 of 0.52, indicating that the model accounts for 52% of the variance in decision quality. Tool usage frequency ($\beta = 0.34$, $p = 0.001$) and loss aversion ($\beta = -0.28$, $p = 0.004$) were the strongest independent predictors.

5.4 Additional Findings

Respondents who used AI sentiment tools reported a mean investment return satisfaction score of 3.62 versus 3.14 for non-users (on a 5-point scale). Qualitatively, 72% of tool users agreed

that sentiment dashboards helped them 'step back from panic selling during volatile phases,' and 65% indicated that divergence alerts had prompted at least one portfolio reallocation they considered advantageous in retrospect. These subjective assessments, while not equivalent to verified return data, are directionally consistent with the quantitative findings.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Summary of Findings

This thesis set out to examine whether AI sentiment analysis tools can serve as an effective de-biasing mechanism for retail investors. The empirical evidence from the Delhi-NCR sample provides meaningful support for this proposition. AI tool users exhibited significantly lower loss aversion and overconfidence scores than non-users, and more frequent tool usage was strongly correlated with higher self-reported decision quality. While the evidence for reduction in herd mentality was not statistically conclusive, the directional finding is promising and warrants follow-up with a larger sample.

6.2 Theoretical Implications

The findings contribute to the behavioral finance literature by providing empirical evidence—albeit from a limited Indian sample—that technology-mediated sentiment information can attenuate cognitive biases. This extends the de-biasing literature beyond classical interventions (nudges, checklists, mandatory cooling-off periods) to include algorithmic information tools as a viable category of bias correction mechanism.

6.3 Practical Recommendations

For individual investors: incorporating a daily sentiment dashboard review into the pre-trade routine can serve as a structured 'second opinion,' reducing the influence of emotional impulses. For financial advisors and wealth management firms: AI sentiment modules should be integrated into client-facing portfolio review platforms to trigger automated behavioral alerts. For fintech developers and SEBI: standardized disclosure of AI sentiment signal inputs and backtested accuracy metrics would increase investor trust and enable informed tool selection. Educational initiatives—particularly within NISM certification programs—should introduce modules on interpreting AI sentiment scores and understanding their limitations.

6.4 Limitations and Future Research

This study is limited by its sample size, geographic scope, and reliance on self-reported data. Future research should employ longitudinal tracking of actual portfolio returns for tool users versus non-users to establish causal efficacy. Comparative studies across Indian cities, and cross-country comparisons with emerging markets such as Brazil or Vietnam, would enhance external validity. Additionally, examining the differential impact of various AI architectures (LSTM vs. transformer models) on investor bias reduction would enrich the technical dimension of this research agenda.

6.5 Concluding Remarks

Behavioral biases are not merely academic curiosities; they impose real and measurable costs on investor wealth. As AI sentiment tools become more accessible and sophisticated, they represent a scalable, low-cost intervention capable of improving the quality of retail investment decisions. The evidence presented in this thesis suggests that these tools are more than marketing innovations—they are practical instruments of financial discipline. With thoughtful design, appropriate regulation, and investor education, AI sentiment analytics can meaningfully contribute to a more behaviorally intelligent investment culture in India and beyond.

REFERENCES

- Araci, D. (2019). FinBERT: Financial sentiment analysis with pre-trained language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10063.
- 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.
- Bikhchandani, S., Hirshleifer, D., & Welch, I. (1992). A theory of fads, fashion, custom, and cultural change as

informational cascades. *Journal of Political Economy*, 100(5), 992–1026.

Bollen, J., Mao, H., & Zeng, X. (2011). Twitter mood predicts the stock market. *Journal of Computational Science*, 2(1), 1–8.

Chen, Q., Estrada, F., & Jiang, W. (2019). Earnings call sentiment and post-announcement drift: Evidence from NLP analysis. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 134(2), 394–420.

Devlin, J., Chang, M. W., Lee, K., & Toutanova, K. (2019). BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT 2019*.

Fama, E. F. (1970). Efficient capital markets: A review of theory and empirical work. *The Journal of Finance*, 25(2), 383–417.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1972). Subjective probability: A judgment of representativeness. *Cognitive Psychology*, 3(3), 430–454.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–291.

López de Prado, M. (2018). *Advances in financial machine learning*. Wiley.

Loughran, T., & McDonald, B. (2011). When is a liability not a liability? Textual analysis, dictionaries, and 10-Ks. *The Journal of Finance*, 66(1), 35–65.

Mittal, M., & Vyas, R. K. (2011). Personality type and investment choice: An empirical study. *The IUP Journal of Behavioral Finance*, 8(3), 6–22.

Sahi, S. K., Arora, A. P., & Dhameja, N. (2013). An exploratory inquiry into the psychological biases in financial investment behavior. *Journal of Behavioral Finance*, 14(2), 94–103.

Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). (2024). *Annual report 2023–24*. SEBI Publications.

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

Tetlock, P. C. (2007). Giving content to investor sentiment: The role of media in the stock market. *The Journal of Finance*, 62(3), 1139–1168.

Thaler, R. H. (1985). Mental accounting and consumer choice. *Marketing Science*, 4(3), 199–214.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124–1131.