IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Technology's Impact On Indian Retail Investors: Benefits And Risks

[1]Mohammed Arif Shaikh, [2]Kiran Rodrigues

[1]Student of Met Institute of PGDM, [2]Professor, MET Institute of PGDM

[1]Post Graduate Diploma In Management,

[1]Met Institute of Post Graduate Diploma In Management, Mumbai, India

Abstract: The Indian capital markets have undergone unprecedented transformation over the past decade, transitioning from a broker-intermediated system with substantial entry barriers to a digitally accessible marketplace available via mobile applications. This shift has facilitated mass participation among first-time investors attracted by zero-commission trading, expedited account activation, and real-time market information dissemination. Yet simultaneously, derivative market participants continue to experience persistent losses despite enhanced access to data and trading infrastructure. This research examines the paradox wherein technological advancement correlates with accessibility expansion while outcomes for many retail participants remain suboptimal. Drawing upon behavioral finance theory, market microstructure analysis, regulatory evidence, and platform design research, this study demonstrates that technology functions as an amplifier of existing investor behavioral patterns rather than as an independent determinant of outcome improvement. The implications suggest that sustainable retail participation requires integration of technological infrastructure with behavioral safeguards, investor education, and regulatory oversight incorporating choice architecture and friction mechanisms.

Index Terms **-** Retail investors, financial technology, behavioral biases, market accessibility, regulatory governance.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context and Motivation

The Indian equity market has undergone significant changes due to three main factors: widespread mobile connectivity, affordable broadband, and Aadhaar-linked e-KYC for digital identity verification. Between FY23 and FY25, transactions through India's Unified Payments Interface (UPI) surged by 49% annually, totaling 185.9 billion transactions by FY25, according to CareEdge Advisory (2025). This advanced payment system has eliminated barriers to market entry, facilitating a drastic increase in retail trading volumes. Traditional methods involving physical brokers and manual processes have been supplanted by direct-to-consumer digital platforms, enabling quick account creation and seamless trading. This transition has led to a rise in retail investor participation, especially among younger individuals and first-time entrants. However, the concept of "financial democratization," suggesting that easier market access improves investor outcomes, is challenged by regulatory data from the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), which reveals that about 91% of retail traders in equity derivatives incurred losses in fiscal year 2024-25, amounting to 1.06 trillion Indian rupees a 41% rise from the previous year (SEBI, 2025). This disparity between increased participation and ongoing underperformance necessitates further investigation.

1.2 Research Objective and Questions

This research interrogates the mechanisms through which financial technology impacts the retail investor experience and outcomes. Specifically, the study addresses three interconnected research questions:

1. How has technology modified the structural entry barriers and operational processes governing retail market participation?
2. To what extent does technological capability diffusion translate into improved decision-making outcomes among retail investors?
3. What institutional and regulatory frameworks are necessary to align technological advancement with investor welfare?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on technology-enabled retail investing reveals a central insight: although financial technology has significantly reduced entry barriers and expanded participation, it often exacerbates behavioral biases that negatively affect retail investor outcomes. Research encompassing behavioral finance, platform design, market microstructure, and India-specific regulatory evidence indicates that technology acts more as an amplifier of existing behavioral tendencies rather than a corrective mechanism.

Behavioral Biases and Excessive Trading

Foundational research in behavioral finance indicates that individual investors often stray from rational decision-making processes. Barber and Odean (2000) highlight that overconfidence leads to excessive trading, resulting in underperformance compared to passive investment strategies, independent of risk considerations. Odean (1999) further reveals that investors engage in more frequent trading than is optimal, stemming from overestimated informational advantages. A critical finding is that simply increasing the ease of trading does not enhance investment outcomes when behavioral biases are unchanged. The impact of loss aversion is exacerbated by digital trading, where Odean (1998) identifies the disposition effect where investors prematurely realize gains while retaining losses. This behavior aligns with prospect theory as proposed by Kahneman & Tversky (1979). Digital trading platforms amplify this bias by constantly showcasing unrealized losses, promoting impulsive decision-making rather than calculated strategies.

Platform Design and Behavioral Amplification

Recent research by Kellogg, Wolff, and Wolff (2023) reveals that the design of investing apps significantly amplifies behavioral biases among users. They assert that these platforms, characterized by simplified interfaces and shallow analytical features, lead to increased trading frequency and negatively impact investor performance. This research underscores that enhancements in user access and information often lead to overtrading rather than better decision-making. Additionally, the emergence of commission-free trading models, particularly seen with Robinhood, further intensifies these issues by promoting herding behavior and speculative trading trends among novice investors (Odean et al., 2021). Features that gamify the trading experience such as celebratory visuals, leaderboards, and trading challenges encourage risk-taking behaviors akin to gambling (FCA, 2022). Empirical evidence supports that these design elements contribute to higher volatility in portfolios and exacerbate speculative trading rather than fostering long-term investment performance.

Attention Constraints, Social Dynamics, and Herding

Limited attention is another critical constraint affecting retail investors. Barber and Odean (2008) demonstrate that investors disproportionately purchase attention-grabbing stocks those with extreme returns, high volume, or media visibility rather than engaging in systematic evaluation. Mobile trading environments intensify this effect through constant notifications, “top movers” lists, and real-time alerts. The integration of social media into trading ecosystems further amplifies herding behavior. Yoon et al. (2022) find strong associations between social media sentiment spikes and coordinated retail trading, particularly during periods of uncertainty. In the Indian context, messaging platforms and social video channels serve as informal advisory networks, rapidly disseminating trading ideas among inexperienced participants. Evidence from commission-free platforms shows that retail investors disproportionately concentrate holdings in socially popular stocks, reinforcing volatility and collective mispricing (Odean et al., 2021).

Market Microstructure and Structural Asymmetries

At the market structure level, the rise of algorithmic trading has produced uneven effects across market segments. While algorithmic activity has improved liquidity and narrowed spreads in large-cap stocks, it has increased volatility in smaller-cap segments where retail participation is concentrated (NSE, 2024). This asymmetry disproportionately disadvantages retail investors, who are more likely to trade volatile, attention-driven securities.

In India, the integration of payment systems with trading infrastructure introduces an additional microstructure dimension. Evidence indicates that UPI-enabled trading reduces funding friction but simultaneously facilitates rapid order clustering and herding in small-cap stocks, exposing retail investors to adverse selection and execution risk (NSE, 2024). These dynamics operate at timescales beyond retail investors' awareness, creating structural disadvantages that information access alone cannot resolve.

India-Specific Regulatory Evidence

Regulatory data from the Securities and Exchange Board of India provides direct evidence of technology's uneven impact on retail outcomes. SEBI (2025) reports that approximately 91% of individual traders in the equity derivatives segment incurred net losses in FY 2024–25, with aggregate losses exceeding ₹1.06 trillion. Notably, these outcomes persisted despite regulatory interventions such as higher margins and contract restrictions, indicating that access controls and disclosures alone are insufficient to counteract behavioral amplification in frictionless trading environments.

Robo-Advisors and Behavioral Mitigation

Not all technological interventions exacerbate behavioral biases. Research on robo-advisors demonstrates that automation can reduce excessive trading and improve risk-adjusted outcomes when explicitly designed to enforce discipline. Das and Banerjee (2023) find that Indian robo-advisor users significantly reduced trading frequency, while Rossi (2024) documents lower volatility and improved portfolio efficiency among adopters. However, adoption remains limited due to trust deficits, algorithm aversion, and preference for perceived control (Luo et al., 2024; Mohapatra et al., 2025). These findings suggest that behavioral mitigation requires not only tool availability but also explainability, coaching, and institutional trust.

Research Gap

Across behavioral finance, platform design studies, market microstructure analysis, and regulatory evidence, the literature converges on a consistent conclusion: technology amplifies existing behavioral patterns rather than correcting them. While disciplined investors benefit from lower costs and improved execution, inexperienced and behaviorally vulnerable participants experience accelerated losses. Despite extensive research in developed markets, limited work examines how these dynamics unfold in emerging markets like India, where first-time participation, integrated payment systems, and high derivatives exposure intersect. Moreover, regulatory scholarship on behavioral design interventions such as friction mechanisms and choice architecture remains underdeveloped in the Indian context. This study addresses these gaps by examining how technological design, behavioral constraints, and institutional frameworks interact to shape retail investor outcomes in rapidly digitizing capital markets.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Analytical Approach

This research employs a qualitative synthesis framework integrating quantitative evidence from regulatory disclosures, trading data aggregates, and academic studies. Rather than relying on primary survey data or individual investor interviews, the methodology leverages regulatory datasets capturing behavior patterns across millions of market participants, thereby mitigating selection bias and individual recollection errors.

3.2 Thematic Organization

Evidence was systematically organized across five thematic dimensions: (1) platform experience and market access; (2) behavioral outcomes and decision patterns; (3) technology utilization and capability gaps; (4) market microstructure and structural asymmetries; and (5) regulatory evolution and framework adaptation.

3.3 Evidence Sources

Primary evidence sources include:

- SEBI regulatory reports and market surveillance data (2024-2025)
- Academic research on behavioral finance, platform design, and fintech effects
- National Stock Exchange (NSE) order book and market microstructure analysis
- Fintech regulatory frameworks (RBI, SEBI, FCA)
- Payment system data (NPCI, CareEdge Advisory)

Regulatory documents and policy disclosures

4. FINDINGS

The analysis reveals that technological advancement in India's retail investing ecosystem has produced asymmetric outcomes, benefiting a subset of disciplined investors while systematically disadvantaging a majority of behaviorally vulnerable participants. Rather than uniformly improving investor welfare, technology has reshaped participation patterns, decision-making processes, and market dynamics in ways that amplify existing behavioral and structural weaknesses.

4.1 Reduction of Entry Barriers and Expansion of Participation

Digital infrastructure particularly Aadhaar-enabled e-KYC, mobile trading applications, zero-commission pricing models, and UPI integration has dramatically reduced barriers to market entry. Account opening timelines have compressed from weeks to minutes, and transaction costs have approached zero. These changes have enabled widespread participation across younger demographics, geographically dispersed populations, and individuals with relatively small capital allocations.

This accessibility transformation represents a genuine achievement in financial inclusion. Retail participation has expanded beyond traditional urban and high-income segments, integrating investing into everyday financial behavior. For investors with pre-existing discipline and long-term orientation, technology has improved efficiency by enabling automated investments, seamless portfolio monitoring, and low-cost execution.

However, the findings indicate that accessibility expansion has outpaced the development of investor capability. Market participation has increased rapidly without a commensurate improvement in financial literacy, particularly in relation to complex and leveraged instruments.

4.2 Elimination of Friction and Behavioral Intensification

A critical finding reveals that eliminating traditional frictions such as manual order placement, settlement delays, and broker-mediated execution has transformed the temporal nature of retail decision-making. Digital platforms facilitate instantaneous trading, compressing decision cycles to seconds. This shift notably impacts derivatives trading, where complex instruments are presented through simplified interfaces, leading to a mismatch between ease of access and risk comprehension. Behavioral data indicates that retail traders often increase frequency following losses, demonstrating loss-chasing behavior. The immediate feedback and simplified execution can spur emotional responses, resulting in repetitive, suboptimal decisions, while removing friction diminishes necessary reflective pauses..

4.3 Capability Gaps and Uneven Use of Advanced Tools

Despite the availability of advanced tools like algorithmic strategies and backtesting, retail investor utilization remains low, predominantly relying on heuristic decision-making. This creates a divide where a small, sophisticated group effectively uses structured tools while most others depend on simplified interfaces, lacking the skills for advanced features. The key challenge lies not in technology itself but in the mismatch between technological advancements and investor understanding, leading to an illusion of empowerment without actual skill development.

4.4 Market Microstructure Effects and Retail Vulnerability

At the market structure level, technology has had varying impacts on asset segments. Large-cap stocks show improved liquidity and execution quality, benefiting retail investors, while small- and mid-cap stocks, where retail participation is higher, face increased volatility and herding risks. Algorithmic trading exacerbates adverse selection for these investors, especially during periods of rapid order clustering facilitated by UPI-enabled funding. This situation illustrates the uneven benefits of technological advancements, resulting in deteriorating outcomes for many retail investors.

4.5 Technology as a Conditional Enabler

Technology's impact on investor outcomes is conditional, depending on investor discipline, financial capability, and platform design. For disciplined investors, it allows low-cost, systematic participation, while for vulnerable investors, it may increase losses by facilitating emotional engagement. The findings suggest that technology amplifies both strengths and weaknesses, and without appropriate behavioral safeguards and education, greater access does not guarantee improved investor welfare.

5. ANALYSIS: TECHNOLOGY AS A BEHAVIORAL AMPLIFIER

The findings indicate that the impact of financial technology on retail investors is neither uniformly beneficial nor inherently harmful. Instead, technology operates as a **behavioral amplifier**, magnifying existing investor tendencies rather than reshaping them. This amplification effect explains why identical technological infrastructure generates sharply divergent outcomes across the **retail investor population.**

5.1 Bifurcated Outcome Distribution

Technology-enabled investing has produced a dual outcome distribution among retail participants. Investors with pre-existing discipline those who follow systematic investment strategies, rebalance periodically, and resist impulsive trading benefit materially from digital platforms. For this group, technology reduces costs, improves execution efficiency, and enables consistent implementation of long-term strategies.

In contrast, investors exhibiting behavioral vulnerabilities such as overconfidence, loss aversion, and impulsivity experience accelerated deterioration in outcomes. Frictionless execution, rapid feedback loops, and engagement-driven design elements enable these investors to trade more frequently and react emotionally to short-term price movements. The same infrastructure that empowers disciplined investors thus enables faster and more repeated loss realization for undisciplined participants.

This divergence demonstrates that technology does not independently improve decision quality. Rather, it intensifies the behavioral framework investors bring into the market.

5.2 The Accessibility–Literacy Mismatch

A central analytical insight is the widening gap between market accessibility and investor preparedness. Digital platforms have expanded access to sophisticated financial instruments at a pace far exceeding the development of financial literacy and risk comprehension. As a result, many retail participants engage with complex, leveraged products without adequate understanding of probability, drawdowns, or risk asymmetry.

Empirical patterns suggest that this mismatch is not driven by information scarcity educational resources are widely available but by cognitive and interpretive limitations. Abstract risk disclosures and probabilistic explanations fail to translate into behavioral restraint when execution is effortless and losses can be immediately followed by re-entry. The result is a form of participation that is technically enabled but cognitively unsupported.

This accessibility–literacy gap represents a structural weakness in the current retail investing ecosystem, undermining the assumption that access alone constitutes meaningful financial inclusion.

5.3 Information Salience and Attention Compression

Digital trading environments significantly alter how information is processed by retail investors. Constant notifications, price alerts, and "top movers" features heighten information salience, directing attention toward volatility rather than value. Decision-making is compressed into narrow time windows, favoring emotional responses over analytical evaluation.

In such environments, visibility becomes a proxy for importance. Stocks that move sharply or trend on social platforms attract disproportionate attention, regardless of fundamentals. The notification itself often functions as the trading signal, replacing deliberate assessment. This attention-driven distortion reduces the likelihood of reflective decision-making and increases susceptibility to short-term noise.

The analysis indicates that while real-time transparency improves informational access, it simultaneously erodes deliberative capacity, especially among inexperienced investors.

5.4 Payment Integration and Behavioral Escalation

India's integration of UPI with trading platforms introduces a uniquely powerful amplification mechanism. By embedding funding, execution, and monitoring within a single digital ecosystem, payment integration removes the final friction separating decision from action. Investors can respond to losses instantly by funding additional trades without exiting the platform or disengaging psychologically.

This structural design intensifies loss-chasing behavior. Traditional funding frictions such as transfer delays or manual intervention previously served as natural pauses that limited escalation. UPI integration eliminates these pauses, enabling continuous engagement and rapid repetition of high-risk behavior. The findings suggest that payment integration transforms episodic trading into a continuous behavioral loop, increasing both trading frequency and cumulative losses.

5.5 Design Intent and Conditional Impact of Technology

The analysis reinforces a critical distinction: technology's effects depend on design intent. Platforms optimized for engagement and transaction volume amplify behavioral biases, while platforms designed to enforce discipline such as robo-advisory systems demonstrate measurable improvements in investor behavior and outcomes. This distinction explains why technology yields positive outcomes in some contexts and harmful ones in others. Automation, constraint-based design, and structured decision frameworks can mitigate biases, but these features are often optional and underutilized. In contrast, engagement-enhancing features are prominent, default, and continuously reinforced.

Consequently, the core issue is not technological capability but incentive alignment. When platform revenue is tied to trading activity rather than investor outcomes, design choices predictably favor engagement over discipline.

5.6 Technology as Amplifier, Not Corrective Force

Synthesizing these insights, the analysis confirms that technology functions as an amplifier rather than a corrective mechanism. It accelerates decision-making, intensifies emotional responses, and magnifies both competence and error. Without embedded behavioral safeguards, expanded access simply scales existing patterns of success and failure. This amplification framework provides a coherent explanation for the coexistence of unprecedented retail participation and persistent underperformance. It also underscores the limitation of policy approaches that assume access and information are sufficient to improve outcomes. Effective intervention must account for behavioral realities and incorporate design-based constraints that restore deliberation within technologically accelerated environments.

6. Regulatory Framework and Sustainable Participation

6.1 Current Regulatory Approaches

SEBI has enacted various regulations to protect retail investors, including leverage caps and contract restrictions. However, these measures have not effectively mitigated persistent losses associated with derivatives, as they overlook the impact of frequent trading. While regulations aim to reduce loss magnitudes, they fail to address excessive trading behaviors, which contributes to high loss rates among retail investors.

6.2 Emerging Framework: Behavioral Design Principles

Sustainable retail participation requires a shift from access-centered regulations to approaches integrating behavioral safeguards in technology design. Effective friction mechanisms, like mandatory confirmation for high-risk instruments and specified waiting periods for derivatives trading, can maintain market access while minimizing harm. These mechanisms follow behavioral design principles, ensuring technology aids human deliberation. Regulatory mandates, such as confirmation periods for derivative transactions, provide essential friction for thoughtful assessment without substantially restricting access for disciplined investors.

Mandatory Cooling-Off Periods: Regulatory precedent exists in commodity derivatives with 15-minute cooling periods after circuit-breaker breaches. Similar mechanisms for derivatives positions could include: (1) 30-minute cooling period before first options trade, requiring explicit confirmation after review period; (2) 15-minute period before closing profitable positions to reduce premature profit-taking driven by loss aversion; (3) Progressive cooling-off periods based on loss history (longer periods if trader has experienced losses exceeding threshold). These mechanisms could be incorporated without substantially restricting access for disciplined investors.

Decision Confirmation and Explicitness: Rather than single-click trading, platforms could require explicit acknowledgment of specific risks for derivatives. For example: "I understand I can lose more than my margin deposit" with mandatory numerical entry (e.g., "Maximum loss: ₹____" must be filled, with verification against actual maximum risk). This converts abstract risk acknowledgment into concrete numerical consideration, forcing engagement with actual exposure.

Robo-Advisory Integration: Mandating or incentivizing adoption of structured robo-advisory tools for retail derivatives traders could reduce behavioral biases. Research evidence shows reductions in overtrading when technology is designed to enforce discipline. This approach preserves technology's benefits while enforcing behavioral constraints.

Algorithmic Transparency Requirements: Retail investors should explicitly understand that platforms operating under PFOF models earn revenue from trading activity, creating misaligned incentives. Transparency about these incentive structures enables informed choice: use PFOF-funded platforms (with their incentive structures) or use fee-based alternatives (where platform profits align with user outcomes).

Gamification Restrictions: Regulatory concern about gamification's documented behavioral effects could be reflected in SEBI guidelines. Specific restrictions on leaderboards, celebratory animations, and daily trading challenges for derivatives accounts would preserve engagement mechanics for equities while addressing documented harms in derivatives.

6.3 Educational and Behavioral Coaching Framework

Beyond regulatory design, sustainable participation requires substantial expansion of financial literacy and behavioral coaching frameworks. Research indicates that even with access to rational, data-driven advice, investors often override systematic recommendations due to emotional biases. This suggests that behavioral mitigation requires not merely tool availability but behavioral coaching, explainability, and scaffolded learning.

Effective frameworks might include:

Mandatory Financial Literacy Certification: Derivatives trading could require baseline financial literacy certification (similar to insurance agent licensing in many jurisdictions), ensuring minimum understanding of leverage, probability, and risk before access to complex instruments.

Behavioral Coaching Through Platforms: AI-driven interventions could detect behavioral red flags (e.g., loss-chasing patterns, overtrading frequency relative to historical performance) and deliver behavioral nudges explaining patterns and consequences.

Transparent Loss Communication: Platforms could display not just loss magnitude but frequency-adjusted annual rates: "Last 30 days: 8 losing trades, 2 winning trades, net -₹15,000, annualized rate if continued: -240% return." This converts abstract frequency into concrete annual outcome projection.

Referral to Alternative Products: When behavioral patterns indicate individuals are not suited for active derivatives trading, platforms could recommend referral to robo-advisory services or mutual fund products with structural constraint**s preventing behavioral amplification.**

7. Conclusion

India's retail broking environment has undergone a digital change that has greatly increased market accessibility, encouraged participation in the capital market among previously marginalized groups, and reduced transaction costs. Mobile connectivity, Aadhaar-based digital identities, zero-commission models, and UPI integration are important developments that support financial inclusion. But technology by itself does not improve investor results; rather, it magnifies behaviors, rewarding disciplined investors and penalizing less sophisticated ones. The study emphasizes how important platform design intent is: engagement-focused platforms exacerbate behavioral biases, while discipline-enforcing platforms enhance results. This suggests that rather than just increasing transparency, regulatory measures should shift to design-based strategies that emphasize behavioral coaching and incentive alignment.

Sustainable development of India's retail investing ecosystem requires integration of three complementary dimensions:

1. **Continued technological innovation** enabling efficient market access and analytical capability, but with explicit design principles prioritizing user outcomes over engagement metrics
2. **Substantial expansion of financial literacy and behavioral coaching frameworks**, recognizing that technology alone cannot overcome cognitive limitations without educational scaffolding
3. **Regulatory safeguards incorporating behavioral design principles** friction mechanisms, choice architecture interventions, and incentive transparency that enable deliberation without substantially restricting access for disciplined investors

The future trajectory will be determined not by technology capability alone but by institutional capacity to align technological capability with behavioral reality and investor welfare imperatives. Financial inclusion encompasses not merely market access but informed, sustainable participation capable of generating long-term wealth accumulation.

India stands at a critical juncture: the retail investment infrastructure is in place; the participation is surging; the outcomes are deteriorating. The next phase must shift from celebrating "access" to demanding "outcomes." This requires recognizing that technology's role is conditional: it can enable either financial inclusion or financial extraction, depending on how it is designed and regulated. The policy choice is not between technology and tradition, but between technology-for-outcomes and technology-for-engagement.

8. References

- Barber, B. M., & Odean, T. (2000). Trading is hazardous to your wealth: The common stock investment performance of individual investors. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 55(2), 173–211.
- Barber, B. M., & Odean, T. (2008). All that glitters: The effect of attention on the buying behavior of retail investors. *Review of Financial Studies*, 21(2), 785–818.
- CareEdge Advisory. (2025). *India's retail payments revolution: Digital dominance & future implications*. CARE Ratings.
- Das, S., & Banerjee, A. (2023). The role of robo-advisors in reducing behavioral biases: Evidence from Indian retail investors. *Journal of Financial Services Research*, 64(3), 412–428.
- D'Acunto, F., Prabhala, N. R., & Rossi, A. G. (2019). The promises and perils of robo-advising. *Review of Financial Studies*, 32(5), 1805–1837.
- Eaton, G. W., Green, T. C., Roseman, B., & Val, Y. (2021). Zero-commission individual investors, high frequency traders, and stock market quality. *Review of Financial Studies*, 34(11), 5039–5086.
- Financial Conduct Authority. (2022). *FCA concerned about problem behaviours linked to trading app design*. FCA Press Release.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–292.

- Kellogg, D., Wolff, J., & Wolff, P. (2023). Design patterns of investing apps and their effects on investing behaviors. *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–15.
- Luo, X., Mohapatra, S., Zhang, Y., & Li, S. (2024). Trust, transparency, and technology adoption: Evidence from robo-advisory adoption studies. *Journal of Financial Technology*, 8(2), 145–162.
- Mohapatra, S., Chen, L., Kumar, A., & Singh, N. (2025). Explainable AI and algorithmic aversion in robo-advisors: Implications for emerging market adoption. *Journal of Behavioral Finance*, 26(1), 78–92.
- National Stock Exchange. (2024). *Algorithmic trading in India's retail-dominated markets: Impact on liquidity and volatility*. NSE Research Report.
- Odean, T. (1998). Are investors reluctant to realize their losses? *The Journal of Finance*, 53(5), 1775–1798.
- Odean, T. (1999). Do investors trade too much? *American Economic Review*, 89(5), 1279–1298.
- Odean, T., Barber, B. M., Huang, X., & Zhu, N. (2021). How Robinhood's trading app spurs investors' herding instincts. *Berkeley Haas Working Paper*.
- Quispe-Torreblanca, E. (2025). Attention utility: Evidence from individual investors. *Review of Economic Studies*, 92(1), 145–172.
- Remolina, N. (2024). Regulatory approaches to consumer protection in the fintech era. *Journal of Banking and Finance Regulation*, 31(2), 267–289.
- Rossi, A. G. (2024). Robo-advisors and investor behavior: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Financial Services Research*, 65(1), 89–107.
- Securities and Exchange Board of India. (2025). *Study on profit and loss of individual traders in equity derivatives segment (FY 2024–25)*.
- Sharmila, V. P. (2025). The role of robo-advisors in enhancing investor literacy: Evidence from behavioral finance integration. *International Journal of Research in Social Science Studies*, 12(3), 234–251.
- Yoon, J., Park, S., Han, Y., & Lee, K. (2022). Investor herding behavior in social media sentiment: Machine learning evidence. *Frontiers in Physics*, 10, 1023071.