CS 007: SESSION 2 PERSONAL FINANCE FOR ENGINEERS



DESIGNHACKS.CO · CATEGORIZATION BY BUSTER BENSON · ALGORITHMIC DESIGN BY JOHN MANOOGIAN III (JM3) · DATA BY WIKIPEDIA

CS 007 PREDICTABLY IRRATIONAL

*"Predictably Irrational" is the title of a book by Dan Ariely * <u>DesignHacks.co</u>: 188 Known Cognitive Biases



COGNITIVE BIAS CODEX



Creative () () attribution · share-alike



BEHAVIORAL FINANCE How many of you think you are rational with your money? (show of hands)







MENTAL ACCOUNTING GAMBLER'S FALLACY **CONFIRMATION &** HINDSIGHT BIAS





OVERCONFIDENCE **OVERREACTION &** AVAILABILITY BIAS





YOU ARE NOT RATIONAL



LOSS AVERSION

WHY BEHAVIORAL ECONOMICS?

- A number of economic frameworks assume that humans evaluate financial decisions consistently & rationally
- Daniel Kahneman & Amos Tversky (1960s)
- 2002 Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences
- Prospect Theory





THREE THEMES IN BEHAVIORAL ECONOMICS

• Heuristics

Humans make a vast majority of their decisions using mental shortcuts or rules of thumb.

• Framing

Humans use anecdotes & stereotypes to understand & respond to events

Market Inefficiencies
 Mis-pricing or non-rational decision making





- People estimate answers to new & novel problems with a bias towards reference points
- Tversky & Kahneman (1974) (quick multiplication)
- **Dan Ariely** • (social security numbers & prices)
- Common examples: •
 - Price you bought a stock at
 - High point for a stock

ANCHORING





MENTAL ACCOUNTING

- Money is fungible, but people put it into separate "mental accounts"
- Also known as "bucketing"
- Example: Lost Movie Tickets
- Example: "Found Money"
- Real world problems:
 Vacation Fund & Credit Card Debt





CONFIRMATION & HINDSIGHT BIAS

- Very different biases, but often conflated with each other.
- **Confirmation Bias** We selectively seek information that supports pre-existing theories, and we ignore / dispute information that challenges or disproves them.
- **Hindsight Bias** We overestimate our ability to predict the future based on the "obviousness" of the past.
- Combination of the two is particularly bad.







i've heard the ... jackpot rhetoric from both sides... time to do my own research on Googie hotly debated topic Found 80,000 results. Literally the first link that the real truth agrees with what you already believe Completely supports your viewpoint without challenging it in any way Another link on't worn, about this

CHAINSAWSUIT.COM



- We see patterns in independent, random chains of events.
- We believe that, based on a series of previous events, an outcome is more likely than odds actually suggest.
- Example: Dinner Party & Coin Flips
- Real odds might be 51/49, but we tend • to jump to 80/20.
- Likely cause: the rarity of "independent events" in day-to-day experience.



- We have a tendency to mimic the actions of • the larger group
- **Example: Building Psych Experiment**
- Example: Empty Supermarket
- Crowd psychology may be a contributor to bubbles.
- Bucking the crowd creates stress & fatigue. It gets harder, not easier.
- Easier to be "wrong with everyone" than "right and alone"
- No gets fired for buying IBM?



OVERCONFIDENCE

- In "Behaving Badly" (2016), 74% of investment managers believed that they deliver above-average performance.
- Dunning-Kruger Effect. The more poorly you perform, the more you over-estimate your performance.
- Capability in one domain can lead to overconfidence in others.
- Humility is a virtue.



@2013 Behavior Gap



RECENCY & AVAILABILITY BIAS

- Recency Bias
 We overreact to recent events
- Example: Celebrity Illness
- Availability Bias
 We assume that the data we have been provided is representative of the entire data set.
- The combination is particularly bad.
- Studies show checking stock prices daily leads to more trading & worse results on average.
- Worse for engineers, because we are immersed in "game changers" & "it is different this time"

THE AVAILABILITY HEURISTIC



JamesClear.com



YOU HAVE \$1,000 AND YOU MUST PICK ONE OF THE FOLLOWING GAMES



You have a 50% chance of gaining \$1,000, and a 50% chance of gaining \$0.



You have a 100% chance of gaining \$500.

OR

NOW, YOU HAVE \$2,000 AND YOU MUST PICK ONE OF THE FOLLOWING GAMES



You have a 50% chance of losing \$1,000, and a 50% chance of losing \$0.



OR

You have a 100% chance of losing \$500.



Loss

- We hate losses more than we love winning •
- Average loss aversion across multiple studies is between 2:1 and 3:1
- Affects our views on a wide range of situations, including career decisions, dating, purchasing, investing and taxes.
- We even hate being responsible for • decisions that could result in a loss
- Example: "Sunk Cost" mistakes with investments
- **Currently under debate!***

* https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/why-the-most-important-idea-in-behavioral-decision-making-is-a-fallacy/?amp



IT'S OK TO NOT BE RATIONAL



IT'S OK TO NOT BE RATIONAL

- As Dan Ariely beautifully put it, the key is that humans are predictably irrational
- Know your own flaws, and you can set up systems to help account for them
- Self awareness is key (yes, my Mom is a psychologist)





ADDITIONAL COURSES & MATERIAL

- Econ 178: Behavioral Economics
- Econ 278: Behavioral & Experimental Economics
- ACCT 618 (GSB): Market Efficiency & Informational Arbitrage
- Coursera / Duke: Behavioral Finance https://www.coursera.org/learn/duke-behavioral-finance

HGOStantord

CS 007 QUESTIONS

NEXT WEEK: GETTING PAID

- Compensation •
- Different models & methods
- Public vs. Private Companies •
- Stock Options vs. Restricted Stock •
- **Understanding Equity Compensation** •
- Taxes •

