

**RESEARCH ARTICLE | OPEN ACCESS****Behavioral Accounting: Analyzing How Cognitive Biases affect Financial Decisions and Reporting****Prof. Egiyi, Modesta Amaka^{*1} and Nneka R. Ogbodo²**¹Department of Accounting, Godfrey Okoye University, Enugu²Department of Entrepreneurship, University of Benin, Edo State***Corresponding Author****I. Introduction**

Behavioral accounting is a branch of accounting that considers employee behavior in addition to traditional accounting knowledge. It also deals with how the attitudes and behavior of employees can be impacted by accounting decisions within a firm (Birnberg, 2011a). Behavioral accounting attempts to correct and enrich traditional approaches to accounting theory where preparer and user perceptions, attitudes, values, and behaviors are under-emphasized (Özen & Grima, 2020; Bloomfield, 2010).

Understanding human behavior in accounting and financial decisions is significant for several reasons. First, it can help to explain and predict how people process information, make judgments, and choose among alternatives in different accounting situations or contexts (Coşkun & Karakoç, 2020). Second, it can help to improve the quality and reliability of accounting information by identifying and reducing the effects of cognitive biases, such as overconfidence, anchoring, framing, and confirmation bias (Kutluk, 2017). Third, it can help to enhance the performance and motivation of employees by designing appropriate accounting systems, incentives, and feedback mechanisms (Birnberg, 2011a).

Aim: To examine the role and impact of cognitive biases in managerial financial decisions and reporting within the realm of behavioral accounting, and to propose actionable solutions to mitigate these biases.

ABSTRACT

In the complex world of accounting, the human element plays a significant role in shaping financial decisions and reports. Behavioral accounting delves deep into how cognitive biases sway these decisions. Managerial biases in budgeting and forecasting can have profound implications on firm strategy and performance. For instance, overly optimistic forecasts might hamper a company's ability to swiftly adapt to market changes, while persistent biases can erode stakeholders' trust. However, acknowledging these biases is just the beginning. By understanding their potential pitfalls, managers can strategize to reduce their effects. One effective method is actively seeking feedback. Diverse perspectives can challenge ingrained assumptions and illuminate areas where biases may be skewing judgment. Additionally, adhering to professional standards set by regulatory bodies ensures that managers maintain the quality and consistency of their financial planning. In the age of technology, leveraging analytical tools is indispensable. Techniques like sensitivity analysis and Monte Carlo simulations can refine the accuracy of forecasts by factoring in uncertainty. Such tools allow for rigorous testing of assumptions and spotlight the key factors driving financial outcomes. Lastly, the dynamic nature of the business world necessitates frequent reviews and revisions of budgets and forecasts. Regular updates, aligned with the changing business environment and actual performance metrics, can help managers remain grounded in reality. In conclusion, while human biases are innate, they don't have to dictate financial decisions. By recognizing these biases, employing diverse feedback mechanisms, adhering to established standards, using advanced analytical tools, and committing to regular reviews, managers can foster a more objective and robust financial decision-making environment.

Keywords: Behavioral Accounting; Cognitive Biases; Financial Decision-making; Budgeting and Forecasting; Managerial Strategies

Citation: Egiyi, M. A. & Ogbodo, N. R. (2023). Behavioral Accounting: Analyzing How Cognitive Biases affect Financial Decisions and Reporting. *European Journal of Finance and Management Sciences* 7(3), 20-30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8278753>

Copyright: © 2023 The Authors. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Objectives:

1. **Understanding the Linkage:** To explore the relationship between cognitive biases and managerial decisions in the context of financial reporting and budgeting.
2. **Identifying Key Biases:** To identify prevalent cognitive biases that influence managerial decisions in the accounting process, using both historical cases and contemporary examples.
3. **Assessing the Impact:** To analyze the consequences of these biases on the accuracy, reliability, and efficacy of financial decisions and reports.
4. **Recommendation Development:** To propose and evaluate strategies, tools, and guidelines that can help managers recognize and counteract their biases, ensuring more accurate and efficient financial decision-making.
5. **Feedback Mechanism:** To emphasize the importance of regular review, feedback, and consultation in refining and improving the budgeting and forecasting processes.

II. Background**Historical Development of Behavioral Accounting**

The origins of behavioral accounting can be traced back to the early 20th century, when some accountants and psychologists began to explore the human aspects of accounting practice and education. For example, in 1914, John R. Commons published a book titled *The Distribution of Wealth*, which discussed the psychological and sociological factors that influence the valuation of assets and liabilities (Basel, 2013). In 1924, George O. May published a paper titled *The Psychology of Accounting*, which examined the effects of personal bias, habit, and emotion on accounting judgments (Coşkun & Karakoç, 2020).

However, behavioral accounting did not gain much attention until the 1950s and 1960s, when several researchers conducted empirical studies on various topics related to accounting behavior, such as budgeting, performance evaluation, decision making, information processing, and motivation. Some of the pioneers of this field include Robert N. Anthony, Richard V. Mattessich, Yuji Ijiri, William J. Bruns Jr., Charles T. Horngren, and Joel S. Demski (Birnberg, 2011b).

Behavioral accounting continued to develop and expand in the 1970s and 1980s, as more researchers from different disciplines joined the field and applied various theories and methods from psychology, sociology, economics, and other social sciences to accounting problems. Some of the influential scholars of this period include Robert H. Ashton, Jacob G. Birnberg, Robert Libby, H. Thomas Johnson, Robert S. Kaplan, Anthony G. Hopwood, and David T. Otley.

In the 1990s and 2000s, behavioral accounting research became more diverse and sophisticated, as researchers explored new topics and issues related to accounting behavior, such as ethics, culture, cognition, emotion, personality, neuroscience, and behavioral finance. Some of the prominent researchers of this era include Mark W. Dirsmith, Steven E. Salterio, Theresa Libby, Jane Kennedy, Mark Nelson, Lisa Koonce, Donna Bobek Schmitt, and Robert Bloomfield.

Traditional Accounting vs. Behavioral Accounting

Traditional accounting is based on the assumption that accounting information is objective, reliable, and relevant for decision making. It also assumes that decision makers are rational, consistent, and unbiased in their use of accounting information. Traditional accounting focuses on the technical aspects of accounting practice and theory, such as measurement methods, reporting standards, auditing procedures, and analytical tools (Kindig, 2019).

Behavioral accounting challenges these assumptions by recognizing that accounting information is subjective, contingent, and influenced by human behavior. It also acknowledges that decision makers are often irrational, inconsistent, and biased in their use of accounting information. Behavioral accounting emphasizes the human aspects of accounting practice and theory, such as psychological processes, social interactions, organizational contexts, and ethical issues (Grossman & Strawser, 1978).

The main difference between traditional and behavioral accounting is their perspective on the role of human behavior in accounting. Traditional accounting views human behavior as a source of error or noise that should be minimized or controlled. Behavioral accounting views human behavior as a source of insight or signal that should be understood or explained (Basel & Dalla Via, 2014).

Another difference between traditional and behavioral accounting is their approach to research. Traditional accounting relies mainly on deductive reasoning, quantitative methods, and normative models to test hypotheses and generate generalizable results. Behavioral accounting uses both deductive and inductive reasoning, qualitative and quantitative methods, and descriptive and prescriptive models to explore phenomena and generate context-specific results (Basel & Dalla Via, 2014).

III. Cognitive Biases in Financial Reporting

Definition and Classification of Cognitive Biases

Cognitive biases are systematic deviations from rationality or normative standards in judgment and decision making. They are often caused by heuristics, which are mental shortcuts or rules of thumb that simplify complex problems or situations. Cognitive biases can affect how people perceive, process, interpret, and use information, leading to errors, distortions, or biases in their choices and actions (Nikolopoulou, 2022).

Cognitive biases can be classified into different types based on their causes, effects, or domains. For example, one common classification is based on the dual-process theory of cognition, which distinguishes between two modes of thinking: System 1 and System 2 (Nikolopoulou, 2022). System 1 is fast, intuitive, automatic, and emotional, while System 2 is slow, analytical, deliberate, and logical. System 1 relies more on heuristics and is more prone to cognitive biases than System 2 (Nikolopoulou, 2022).

Another common classification is based on the functions or stages of decision making, such as information acquisition, information processing, information evaluation, and information use (Berthet, 2022). For example, confirmation bias is a bias that affects information acquisition and evaluation, as it refers to the tendency to seek and interpret evidence that confirms one's existing beliefs or hypotheses. Anchoring bias is a bias that affects information processing and evaluation, as it refers to the tendency to rely too much on the first piece of information received when making judgments or estimates. Overconfidence bias is a bias that affects information use and action, as it refers to the tendency to overestimate one's own abilities, knowledge, or accuracy (Berthet, 2022).

Impact of Biases Like Overconfidence, Anchoring, Confirmation Bias, and Others on Financial Reporting

Financial reporting is the process of preparing and disclosing financial statements and other relevant information to external users, such as investors, creditors, regulators, or the public. Financial reporting involves various judgments and decisions by managers, accountants, auditors, analysts, and users. These judgments and decisions can be influenced by cognitive biases that may impair the quality, reliability, and usefulness of financial reporting (Costa et al., 2017).

Some examples of cognitive biases that can affect financial reporting are:

1. Overconfidence bias: This bias can lead managers to overstate their earnings forecasts, overinvest in risky projects, underestimate the likelihood of negative events or outcomes, or delay the recognition of losses or impairments (Aren & Nayman Hamamci, 2021).
2. Anchoring bias: This bias can lead managers to base their accounting estimates or valuations on irrelevant or arbitrary anchors, such as historical costs, initial offers, industry averages, or round numbers (Hofmann, 2022). It can also lead auditors to accept management's estimates without sufficient skepticism or adjustment (Hofmann, 2022).
3. Confirmation bias: This bias can lead managers to manipulate earnings or engage in earnings management to confirm their prior expectations or targets (Costa et al., 2017). It can also lead auditors to collect and evaluate evidence that supports management's assertions without considering alternative explanations or contradictory evidence (Costa et al., 2017).

4. Hindsight bias: This bias can lead managers to rationalize their past decisions or actions after observing their outcomes, or to claim that they predicted them correctly (Berthet, 2022). It can also lead auditors to judge the appropriateness of management's estimates or judgments based on subsequent events or information, or to blame management for not foreseeing them (Berthet, 2022).

Case Studies Illustrating the Impact of These Biases

The following are some case studies that illustrate the impact of cognitive biases on financial reporting:

1. Enron Corporation: Enron was one of the largest energy companies in the world until it collapsed in 2001 due to accounting fraud and bankruptcy. Enron's managers exhibited overconfidence bias by inflating their earnings projections, hiding their debts and losses, and engaging in complex and risky transactions (Frueh, 2022). They also exhibited confirmation bias by ignoring or suppressing any warning signs or dissenting voices that challenged their optimistic views (Frueh, 2022). Enron's auditors, Arthur Andersen, exhibited anchoring bias by relying too much on Enron's management representations and internal controls, and confirmation bias by failing to exercise professional skepticism and due diligence in verifying Enron's financial statements (Frueh, 2022).
2. Lehman Brothers: Lehman Brothers was one of the largest investment banks in the world until it filed for bankruptcy in 2008 due to its exposure to subprime mortgages and other toxic assets. Lehman's managers exhibited overconfidence bias by expanding their leverage and risk-taking activities, underestimating the volatility and liquidity of the market, and overstating the value of their assets (Nortje, 2020). They also exhibited anchoring bias by basing their valuations on historical prices or models that did not reflect the current market conditions. Lehman's auditors, Ernst & Young, exhibited confirmation bias by accepting Lehman's accounting practices and assumptions without challenging them or seeking independent verification (Nortje, 2020).
3. Theranos: Theranos was a health technology company that claimed to have developed a revolutionary blood-testing device that could perform hundreds of tests with a few drops of blood. Theranos raised billions of dollars from investors and partnered with major pharmacies and hospitals until it was exposed as a fraud in 2015. Theranos's founder and CEO, Elizabeth Holmes, exhibited overconfidence bias by exaggerating her credentials, achievements, and capabilities, and by persisting in her vision despite the lack of scientific evidence or validation (Henderson, 2022). She also exhibited confirmation bias by dismissing or silencing any criticism or feedback that contradicted her claims or expectations (Henderson, 2022). Theranos's investors and partners exhibited confirmation bias by believing in Holmes's charisma and story without conducting proper due diligence or testing (Henderson, 2022).

IV. Investor Behavior

Psychological Factors influencing Investor Behavior

Investor behavior is the study of how investors make decisions and act on them in the financial markets. Investor behavior is influenced by various psychological factors, such as cognitive biases, emotions, personality traits, and social influences. These factors can affect how investors perceive, process, interpret, and use information, leading to errors, distortions, or biases in their choices and actions (Warekar, 2021).

Some of the common psychological factors that influence investor behavior are:

1. Overconfidence bias: This is the tendency of investors to overestimate their abilities and the accuracy of their predictions. This can lead to excessive trading and unnecessary risk-taking (Warekar, 2021).
2. Loss aversion: This is the tendency of investors to feel the pain of a loss more intensely than the pleasure of an equal gain. This can result in an overly conservative investment strategy and missed opportunities (Warekar, 2021).
3. Confirmation bias: This is the tendency of investors to seek out information that confirms their pre-existing beliefs while ignoring contradictory evidence. This can result in poor investment decisions based on incomplete or biased information (Warekar, 2021).

4. Anchoring bias: This is the tendency of investors to rely too heavily on an initial piece of information, such as a stock's past performance, when making decisions. This can lead to irrational decision-making as investors fail to consider relevant new information (Warekar, 2021).
5. Herd mentality: This is the tendency of investors to follow the crowd, often resulting in irrational market behavior. This can lead to market bubbles and crashes (Warekar, 2021).

Interplay between Investor Behavior and Market Movements

Investor behavior and market movements are interrelated and influence each other in various ways. Investor behavior can affect market movements by creating demand and supply pressures, generating price fluctuations, and inducing feedback effects. Market movements can also affect investor behavior by providing signals, feedback, and incentives for investors to adjust their expectations, beliefs, and actions (Domonkos Vamossy & Skog, 2021).

Some examples of how investor behavior and market movements interact are:

1. Investor sentiment: This is the overall mood or attitude of investors towards the market or a specific asset. Investor sentiment can affect market movements by creating bullish or bearish trends, driving prices up or down. Market movements can also affect investor sentiment by reinforcing or reversing investors' moods or attitudes (Domonkos Vamossy & Skog, 2021).
2. Market efficiency: This is the degree to which market prices reflect all available information. Market efficiency can be affected by investor behavior, as rational investors tend to incorporate new information quickly and accurately into prices, while irrational investors tend to create noise and mispricing. Market efficiency can also affect investor behavior, as efficient markets tend to discourage active trading and speculation, while inefficient markets tend to encourage them (Domonkos Vamossy & Skog, 2021).
3. Market volatility: This is the degree of variation or uncertainty in market prices. Market volatility can be influenced by investor behavior, as emotional or impulsive investors tend to create more price fluctuations than calm or rational investors. Market volatility can also influence investor behavior, as high volatility tends to increase risk and uncertainty, while low volatility tends to reduce them (Domonkos Vamossy & Skog, 2021).

Practical Implications for both Individual and Institutional Investors

The understanding of investor behavior and its impact on market movements has practical implications for both individual and institutional investors. By being aware of the psychological factors that influence their own and others' behavior, investors can improve their decision-making process and avoid common pitfalls. Some of the practical implications are:

1. Individual investors: Individual investors are individuals investing on their own behalf, usually through an online broker, bank, or a mutual fund. They invest to meet their individual investment goals, such as to save for retirement, a child's education fund, or to build wealth generally (Haegele, 2022). Some of the practical implications for individual investors are:
 - a. Individual investors should be aware of their own cognitive biases and emotions that may impair their judgment and decision-making. They should also seek out diverse perspectives and challenge their beliefs to overcome confirmation bias (Raheja & Dhiman, 2020).
 - b. Individual investors should adopt a long-term perspective and focus on their overall investment goals rather than short-term fluctuations. They should also diversify their portfolio across different asset classes, sectors, and regions to reduce risk and smooth returns (Barton & Wiseman, 2014).
 - c. Individual investors should avoid following the crowd or being influenced by market sentiment or attention-grabbing events. They should develop their own investment strategy based on their risk tolerance and financial goals rather than following the latest trends (Haegele, 2022).
2. Institutional investors: Institutional investors are large organizations that invest money on behalf of others. These investors come in many forms, such as pensions, mutual funds, banks, hedge funds, insurance companies, and more. Some of the practical implications for institutional investors are:

- a. Institutional investors should be aware of the behavioral biases and emotions that may affect not only themselves but also their clients, counterparts, competitors, and regulators. They should also monitor the market sentiment and psychology to anticipate potential opportunities or threats (Li et al., 2009).
- b. Institutional investors should leverage their advantages over individual investors, such as access to more information, resources, and expertise. They should also use sophisticated tools and techniques, such as quantitative models, algorithms, and artificial intelligence, to enhance their decision-making and performance (Li et al., 2009).
- c. Institutional investors should be responsible and ethical in their investment activities, as they have a significant impact on the market and society. They should also comply with the relevant regulations and standards that govern their industry and profession (Li et al., 2009).

V. Auditor Judgment and Decision Making

Overview of the Auditor's Role

An auditor is a person or a firm that performs an audit on an organization's financial statements, internal controls, and financial reporting processes. An audit is a structured, methodical process that involves examining and verifying the financial records and reports of an organization to ensure that they are accurate, complete, valid, and comply with the relevant laws and regulations (CFI Team, 2023). Auditors are required to maintain a high level of professional standards and ethics, and to adhere to the guidelines set forth by professional accounting organizations and regulatory bodies (CFI Team, 2023).

The primary role of an auditor is to provide an independent and objective assessment of an organization's financial statements, internal controls, and financial reporting processes. Auditors perform a range of tasks, such as reviewing financial documents, interviewing employees and management, testing internal controls, and verifying the accuracy of financial statements. They are also responsible for identifying areas of potential financial risk and making recommendations for improvements to the organization's financial processes and procedures.

Auditors can be classified into two types: internal auditors and external auditors. Internal auditors work in the organization as employees, and as part of their role, they audit certain procedures within the organization, such as its recordkeeping. External auditors, on the other hand, are public accountants who perform an audit on an organization from an independent standpoint. They are employed by an accounting firm, not by the organization. They examine the organization's financial statements, internal controls, and financial reporting processes to provide an opinion on whether they present a true and fair view of the organization's financial position, performance, and cash flows (CFI Team, 2023).

The auditor's results from their analysis are known as the auditor's opinion. The auditor's opinion can be classified into four types: unqualified opinion, qualified opinion, adverse opinion, and disclaimer of opinion. An unqualified opinion means that the auditor has found no material misstatements or errors in the financial statements, and that they comply with the applicable accounting standards. A qualified opinion means that the auditor has found some material misstatements or errors in the financial statements, or that they do not comply with some accounting standards. An adverse opinion means that the auditor has found pervasive material misstatements or errors in the financial statements, or that they do not comply with the accounting standards in a significant way. A disclaimer of opinion means that the auditor is unable to express an opinion on the financial statements due to a lack of sufficient evidence or a limitation on the scope of the audit (Ng, 2021).

Common Biases in Auditor Judgment

Auditor judgment is the process of making decisions and forming conclusions based on evidence and professional standards in the context of an audit. Auditor judgment can be influenced by various psychological factors, such as cognitive biases, emotions, personality traits, and social influences. These factors can affect how auditors perceive, process, interpret, and use information, leading to errors, distortions, or biases in their choices and actions (Hojatifard et al., 2019).

Cognitive biases are systematic deviations from rationality or normative standards in judgment and decision making. They are often caused by heuristics, which are mental shortcuts or rules of thumb that simplify complex problems

or situations. Cognitive biases can affect how auditors evaluate evidence, assess risks, estimate probabilities, and make judgments (Chang & Luo, 2019).

Some of the common cognitive biases that can affect auditor judgment are:

1. **Availability bias:** This is the tendency to rely on information that is most easily recalled or accessible when making judgments. This can lead auditors to overestimate the frequency or importance of certain events or outcomes based on their recent experience or exposure.
2. **Anchoring bias:** This is the tendency to rely too much on an initial piece of information when making judgments or estimates. This can lead auditors to be influenced by irrelevant or arbitrary anchors, such as prior expectations, preliminary estimates, or round numbers.
3. **Confirmation bias:** This is the tendency to seek out and interpret information that confirms one's existing beliefs or hypotheses while ignoring or discounting information that contradicts them. This can lead auditors to be biased towards management's assertions or explanations without sufficient skepticism or corroboration.
4. **Overconfidence bias:** This is the tendency to overestimate one's own abilities, knowledge, or accuracy. This can lead auditors to be overconfident in their judgments, assessments, or opinions, and to underestimate the likelihood of errors, misstatements, or fraud.
5. **Hindsight bias:** This is the tendency to view past events as more predictable or obvious than they actually were at the time. This can lead auditors to rationalize their decisions or actions after observing their outcomes, or to claim that they predicted them correctly.

Methods to Counteract Biases in Auditing

The understanding and awareness of cognitive biases and their impact on auditor judgment can help auditors to improve their decision-making process and avoid common pitfalls. Auditors can take several steps to counteract or reduce the effects of cognitive biases in auditing, such as:

1. **Seeking feedback and consultation:** Auditors can seek feedback and consultation from their peers, supervisors, or experts to obtain different perspectives and opinions on their judgments and decisions. This can help auditors to challenge their own assumptions, identify potential biases, and correct their errors (Griffith et al., 2020).
2. **Applying professional skepticism:** Auditors can apply professional skepticism, which is an attitude that includes a questioning mind, a critical assessment of evidence, and a willingness to investigate contradictory or inconsistent information. This can help auditors to avoid accepting management's assertions or explanations at face value, and to seek sufficient and appropriate evidence to support their judgments and conclusions (IFAC, 2012).
3. **Using analytical procedures:** Auditors can use analytical procedures, which are evaluations of financial information through analysis of plausible relationships among financial and nonfinancial data. This can help auditors to identify unusual or unexpected fluctuations or trends in the financial statements, and to investigate the causes and implications of such variations (IFAC, 2009).
4. **Performing mental simulations:** Auditors can perform mental simulations, which are mental exercises that involve imagining alternative scenarios or outcomes that could have occurred but did not. This can help auditors to overcome hindsight bias, as it forces them to consider the uncertainty and complexity of the audit situation at the time of the decision or action (Cole et al., 2021).
5. **Reviewing and documenting judgments:** Auditors can review and document their judgments and decisions, including the evidence, assumptions, methods, and rationale that support them. This can help auditors to enhance their accountability, transparency, and quality of their audit work, as well as to facilitate feedback and learning from their experience (Goldman et al., 2017).

VI. Management Decision-Making

Management decision-making is the process of choosing among alternative courses of action to achieve the goals and objectives of an organization. Management decision-making involves various aspects, such as planning, organizing, directing, controlling, and evaluating. Management decision-making can be influenced by various factors, such as information, resources, environment, stakeholders, and biases (Islami et al., 2020).

Role of Managerial Biases in Budgeting and Forecasting

Budgeting and forecasting are important managerial activities that involve planning and estimating the future financial performance and resource allocation of a firm. Budgeting and forecasting can help managers to set goals, evaluate alternatives, allocate resources, monitor progress, and control outcomes (Kurtz et al., 2021). However, budgeting and forecasting are also subject to various managerial biases that can impair the quality and accuracy of the process and the results. Managerial biases are systematic deviations from rationality or objectivity in judgment and decision making that are influenced by psychological factors, such as cognitive heuristics, emotions, motivations, and social influences (Zott & Amit, 2008).

Some of the common managerial biases that can affect budgeting and forecasting are:

1. **Optimism bias:** This is the tendency of managers to overestimate the likelihood of positive events or outcomes and underestimate the likelihood of negative events or outcomes. This can lead to unrealistic or inflated budgets and forecasts that do not reflect the true risks and uncertainties of the business environment (Anwar & Hasnu, 2016).
2. **Anchoring bias:** This is the tendency of managers to rely too much on an initial piece of information, such as a historical figure, a target, or a benchmark, when making judgments or estimates. This can lead to insufficient or inadequate adjustments of budgets and forecasts to account for new or relevant information or changes in the business environment (Koller et al., 2018).
3. **Confirmation bias:** This is the tendency of managers to seek out and interpret information that confirms their existing beliefs or hypotheses while ignoring or discounting information that contradicts them. This can lead to selective or biased use of data and evidence to support budgets and forecasts that are consistent with managers' preferences or expectations (Zheng et al., 2020).
4. **Escalation of commitment:** This is the tendency of managers to continue investing in a project or a course of action despite evidence of poor performance or negative outcomes. This can lead to persistent or excessive adherence to budgets and forecasts that are no longer viable or optimal (Schmidt, 2023).

Implications for Firm Performance and Strategy

Managerial biases in budgeting and forecasting can have significant implications for firm performance and strategy. Managerial biases can affect the quality and reliability of financial information that is used for decision making, performance evaluation, resource allocation, and communication with stakeholders. Managerial biases can also affect the alignment and coordination of goals, actions, and incentives among different levels and units of the organization. Managerial biases can ultimately impact the profitability, growth, competitiveness, and sustainability of the firm (Malmendier et al., 2022).

Some examples of how managerial biases in budgeting and forecasting can affect firm performance and strategy are:

1. Optimism bias can result in overinvestment in unprofitable or risky projects, underestimation of costs or contingencies, overstatement of revenues or profits, under provision of reserves or buffers, and failure to anticipate or respond to threats or opportunities (Anwar & Hasnu, 2016).
2. Anchoring bias can result in rigidity or inertia in budgeting and forecasting processes, resistance to change or innovation, neglect of environmental scanning or market analysis, misalignment of budgets and forecasts with strategic objectives or priorities, and loss of competitive advantage or market share (Koller et al., 2018).

3. Confirmation bias can result in distortion or manipulation of data and evidence, suppression or dismissal of dissenting views or feedback, reinforcement of groupthink or tunnel vision, and deviation from ethical standards or best practices (Zheng et al., 2020).
4. Escalation of commitment can result in sunk cost fallacy, loss aversion, cognitive dissonance, and reduced flexibility or adaptability (Schmidt, 2023).

Solutions and Recommendations for Mitigating Bias in Managerial Decisions

The understanding and awareness of managerial biases and their impact on budgeting and forecasting can help managers to improve their decision-making process and avoid common pitfalls. Managers can take several steps to mitigate or reduce the effects of managerial biases in budgeting and forecasting, such as:

1. Seeking feedback and consultation: Managers can seek feedback and consultation from their peers, supervisors, or experts to obtain different perspectives and opinions on their budgets and forecasts. This can help managers to challenge their own assumptions, identify potential biases, and correct their errors (Sharma, 2015).
2. Applying professional standards and guidelines: Managers can apply professional standards and guidelines that are established by accounting bodies, regulatory agencies, or industry associations to ensure the quality and consistency of their budgets and forecasts. This can help managers to follow best practices, comply with rules and regulations, and benchmark their performance (Tippett, 2019).
3. Using analytical tools and techniques: Managers can use analytical tools and techniques, such as statistical methods, scenario analysis, sensitivity analysis, or Monte Carlo simulation, to enhance the accuracy and reliability of their budgets and forecasts. This can help managers to incorporate uncertainty and variability into their estimates, test the robustness and validity of their assumptions, and identify the key drivers and risks of their outcomes.
4. Reviewing and revising budgets and forecasts: Managers can review and revise their budgets and forecasts on a regular basis, such as monthly, quarterly, or annually, to reflect the changes in the business environment, the actual performance, and the feedback received. This can help managers to update their information, adjust their expectations, and improve their learning (Wolf, 2014).

References

- Anwar, J., & Hasnu, S. (2016). Business strategy and firm performance: a multi-industry analysis. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 9(3), 361–382. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jsma-09-2015-0071>
- Aren, S., & Nayman Hamamci, H. (2021). Biases in Managerial Decision Making: Overconfidence, Status Quo, Anchoring, Hindsight, Availability. *Journal of Business Strategy Finance and Management*, 3(1-2), 08-23. <https://doi.org/10.12944/jbsfm.03.01-02.03>
- Barton, D., & Wiseman, M. (2014, January 1). *Focusing Capital on the Long Term*. Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/2014/01/focusing-capital-on-the-long-term#:~:text=Define%20long-term%20objectives%20and%20risk%20appetite%2C%20and%20invest>
- Basel, J. S. (2013). A Brief History of Decision-Making Research in Accounting. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2244363>
- Basel, J. S., & Dalla Via, N. (2014). Behavioral Aspects and Decision-Making Research in Accounting: History, Recent Developments, and Some Future Directions. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2244363>
- Berthet, V. (2022). The Impact of Cognitive Biases on Professionals' Decision-Making: A Review of Four Occupational Areas. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.802439>
- Birnberg, J. G. (2011a). A Proposed Framework for Behavioral Accounting Research. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 23(1), 1–43. <https://doi.org/10.2308/bria.2011.23.1.1>
- Birnberg, J. G. (2011b). Robert N. Anthony: A Pioneering Thinker in Management Accounting. *Accounting Horizons*, 25(3), 593–602. <https://doi.org/10.2308/acch-50025>

- Bloomfield, R. J. (2010, April 27). *Traditional vs. Behavioral Finance*. Papers.ssrn.com. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1596888
- CFI Team. (2023, January 13). *Auditor*. Corporate Finance Institute. <https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/management/auditor/>
- Chang, C. J., & Luo, Y. (2019). Data visualization and cognitive biases in audits. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 36(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1108/maj-08-2017-1637>
- Cole, S. N., Smith, D. M., Ragan, K., Suurmond, R., & Armitage, C. J. (2021). Synthesizing the effects of mental simulation on behavior change: Systematic review and multilevel meta-analysis. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 28(5), 1514–1537. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-021-01880-6>
- Coşkun, A., & Karakoç, M. (2020). A Conceptual Framework for Behavioral Accounting. *Uncertainty and Challenges in Contemporary Economic Behaviour*, 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80043-095-220201007>
- Costa, D. F., Carvalho, F., Moreira, B. C., & Prado, J. W. (2017). Bibliometric analysis on the association between behavioral finance and decision making with cognitive biases such as overconfidence, anchoring effect and confirmation bias. *Scientometrics*, 111(3), 1775–1799. https://ideas.repec.org/a/spr/scient/v111y2017i3d10.1007_s11192-017-2371-5.html
- Domonkos Vamossy, & Skog, R. (2021). *EmTract: Extracting Emotions from Social Media*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2112.03868>
- Frueh, S. (2022). *Disrupting the Impacts of Implicit Bias*. Nationalacademies.org. <https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2021/05/disrupting-the-impacts-of-implicit-bias>
- Goldman, A. Z., Landes, C. E., & Mayes, C. R. (2017, June). *Audit documentation: Tips for getting it right*. Journal of Accountancy; Journal of Accountancy. <https://www.journalofaccountancy.com/issues/2017/jun/audit-documentation.html>
- Griffith, E. E., Kadous, K., & Proell, C. A. (2020). Friends in low places: How peer advice and expected leadership feedback affect staff auditors' willingness to speak up. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 87, 101153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2020.101153>
- Grossman, S. D., & Strawser, R. H. (1978). Accounting and Behavioral Concepts: A Classroom Approach. *The Accounting Review*, 53(2), 495–500. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/245910>
- Haegele, B. (2022, July 14). *Individual Investors Vs. Institutional Investors: How They Differ*. Bankrate. <https://www.bankrate.com/investing/individual-investors-vs-institutional-investors/>
- Henderson, S. (2022, March 16). *There's More to AI Bias Than Biased Data, NIST Report Highlights*. NIST. <https://www.nist.gov/news-events/news/2022/03/theres-more-ai-bias-biased-data-nist-report-highlights>
- Hofmann, A. (2022). *The Ten Commandments of Risk Leadership*. Springer Nature.
- Hojatifard, H., Pourheidari, O., & Baharmoghadam, M. (2019). The Auditor's Professional Judgment Process. *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, 23(2). <https://www.abacademies.org/articles/the-auditors-professional-judgment-process-8239.html>
- IFAC. (2009). *International standard on auditing 520 analytical procedures (effective for audits of financial statements for periods beginning on or after*. <https://www.ifac.org/flysystem/azure-private/publications/files/A026%202013%20IAASB%20Handbook%20ISA%20520.pdf>
- IFAC. (2012). *STAFF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS PROFESSIONAL SKEPTICISM IN AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS*. <https://www.ifac.org/flysystem/azure-private/publications/files/IAASB%20Professional%20Skepticism%20QandA-final.pdf>
- Islami, X., Mustafa, N., & Latkovikj, M. T. (2020). Linking Porter's Generic Strategies to Firm Performance. *Future Business Journal*, 6(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-020-0009-1>

- Kindig, A. (2019). *Historical Development of Accounting*. Bizfluent. <https://bizfluent.com/about-4731157-historical-development-accounting.html>
- Koller, T., Lovallo, D., & Sibony, O. (2018, September 28). *Budget based anchoring bias example* | McKinsey. <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/bias-busters-being-objective-about-budgets>
- Kurtz, H., Hanelt, A., & Firk, S. (2021). Digital Business Strategy and Firm Performance: An Empirical Investigation. *Lecture Notes in Information Systems and Organisation*, 606–624. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-86800-0_42
- Kutluk, F. A. (2017). Behavioral Accounting and its Interactions. In www.intechopen.com. IntechOpen. <https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/55289>
- Li, W., Rhee, G., & Wang, S. S. (2009). Differences in Herding: Individual vs. Institutional Investors in China. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1342209>
- Malmendier, U., Pezone, V., & Zheng, H. (2022). Managerial Duties and Managerial Biases. *Management Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2022.4467>
- Ng, J. (2021, November 15). *Disclaimer Audit Opinion*. Harbourfront Technologies. <https://harbourfronts.com/disclaimer-audit-opinion/>
- Nikolopoulou, K. (2022, November 11). *What Is Cognitive Bias? | Definition, Types, & Examples*. Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.com/research-bias/cognitive-bias/>
- Nortje, A. (2020, August 5). *Cognitive Biases Defined: 7 Examples and Resources*. PositivePsychology.com. <https://positivepsychology.com/cognitive-biases/>
- Özen, E., & Grima, S. (2020). *Uncertainty and challenges in contemporary economic behaviour*. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Raheja, S., & Dhiman, B. (2020). How do emotional intelligence and behavioral biases of investors determine their investment decisions? *Rajagiri Management Journal*, 14(1), 35–47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ramj-12-2019-0027>
- Schmidt, J. (2023, March 9). *Forecasting*. Corporate Finance Institute. <https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/valuation/forecasting/>
- Sharma, P. (2015, December 2). *Forecasting : Roles, Steps and Techniques | Management Function*. Your Article Library. <https://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/management/forecasting/forecasting-roles-steps-and-techniques-management-function/70032>
- Tippett, E. C. (2019, October 21). *10 Ways to Mitigate Bias in Your Company's Decision Making*. Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/2019/10/10-ways-to-mitigate-bias-in-your-companys-decision-making>
- Warekar, T. (2021, July 4). *Institutional Investor Vs Individual Investor - Key differences every investor must know* | Assetmonk. AssetMonk. <https://assetmonk.com/articles/smart-investors/institutional-investor-vs-individual-investor/>
- Wolf, R. F. (2014, August 7). *How to Minimize Your Biases When Making Decisions*. Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/2012/09/how-to-minimize-your-biases-when>
- Zheng, H., Malmendier, U., & Pezone, V. (2020, August 14). *Managerial Duties and Managerial Biases*. The Harvard Law School Forum on Corporate Governance. <https://corpgov.law.harvard.edu/2020/08/14/managerial-duties-and-managerial-biases/>
- Zott, C., & Amit, R. (2008). The fit between product market strategy and business model: implications for firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.642>