Review

The Psychology of Result-Focused Trading: Harmful Effects and Process-Based Interventions — A Narrative Review

Amirmohammad Shojaei * and Aref Mirzaei kouhbanani

Posted Date: 26 February 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202602.1641.v1

Keywords: outcome bias; cognitive biases; portfolio performance; Emotional processing; financial decision-making; intermediate indicator

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1641.v1

Review

The Psychology of Result-Focused Trading: Harmful Effects and Process-Based Interventions — A Narrative Review

Amirmohammad Shojaei [1,*] and Aref Mirzaei Kouhbanani [2]

[1] School of Medicine, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

[2] School of Economics, Shahid Bahonar University, Kerman, Iran

* Correspondence: shojaeiamirmohammad1374@gmail.com

Abstract

Consequent behavioral effects are documented at both individual and market levels: elevated turnover, revenge trading, impaired calibration and amplified volatility. Cross-domain findings from pedagogy, neuroscience and decision-support research are marshalled to show that process-focused training, biofeedback, explainable analytics and carefully engineered platform feedback can foster rule-governed behavior and attenuate affect-driven mispricing. The paper specifies concrete proxy measures for procedural fidelity, describes scalable training and platform interventions, and emphasizes the need to match interventions to trader segment, platform design and market regime. Proxy process measures often seem to demand institutional access, technical integration and continuous data streams, and may therefore be costly, vulnerable to gaming, and poorly scalable for dispersed retail traders. These limitations may undermine the feasibility and fidelity of many otherwise promising interventions. By contrast, a simple, intra-psychic proxy may offer a cost-free, accessible signal that redirects attention. This narrative review examines the psychological dynamics of outcome-focused trading and advances a process-oriented alternative for stabilizing trader behavior and improving learning. Drawing on experimental, physiological, neuroscientific and large-scale field evidence, the review characterizes outcome fixation as an attentional and affective orientation toward realized short-term profits and losses that amplifies emotional reactivity, promotes impulsive and compensatory risk-taking, and undermines adherence to pre-specified decision rules. The review then identifies proximal cognitive and biophysiological mechanisms such as loss salience, anticipatory reward signaling, stress-related endocrine effects and capacity limits on deliberative processing, that link momentary feedback to departures from disciplined practice. In this review, we introduce a hypothetical construct termed the "discipline coin" (DISC). DISC integrates the key features discussed above—simplicity, cost-free use, independence from outcome-based feedback and accessibility—and can be employed as an intrapsychic signal to shift attention from short-term profits and losses to consistent adherence to a trading process. However, further research is needed to validate these assumptions empirically.

Keywords: outcome bias; cognitive biases; portfolio performance; Emotional processing; financial decision-making; intermediate indicator

Introduction — Framing Outcome-Focused Trading and the Case for Process Orientation

Outcome-focused trading is a decision style in which traders pay close attention to recent profits and losses when choosing what to do next. Short-term results often guide their behavior, and many traders react to a streak of gains or losses instead of following their pre-planned rules [1,2]. A process-oriented approach works differently. It relies on clear entry and exit rules and on structures that keep the act of trading separate from immediate market feedback [3,4]. Research using simulated

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1641.v1

environments and platform data shows that patterns such as loss sensitivity and the reflection effect are very consistent. These patterns, where traders are cautious after gains but more willing to take risks after losses, shape how long positions are held and how much risk traders take [1,2].

Qualitative simulation narratives further document that losses provoke strong emotional reactions ranging from frustration to desperation, and that these affective responses can prompt either compensatory risk-taking or an avoidance of loss realization [1]. Large observational studies of online trading platforms corroborate that behavioral measures derived from historical trades distinguish persistent winners from losers and that social-trading measures (popularity, leaderboard-style rankings) and rapid feedback loops on platforms amplify outcome salience for many users [2,5].

Several strands of evidence indicate why an outcome fixation matters for both traders and markets. Retail-focused big-data and survey studies report that psychological traits such as fear, greed, herd behavior and overconfidence map onto irrational trading behavior and can depress individual welfare and market stability [6,7]. Attention-driven episodes—where social media or forum attention spikes—are associated with increased risk-taking, larger allocations to novel positions, shorter holding periods and, on average, poorer holding-period returns for retail investors exposed to these attention surges [5]. Market-level emotion indices and firm-level emotion betas further show that aggregate investor emotions predict mispricing and generate tradable return differentials that persist for months, implying that emotion-driven trading has measurable asset-price consequences [8]. In geographically and instrumentally diverse samples, FOMO, herd behavior and loss aversion have been shown to interact including channeling swift, sometimes ill-considered purchases in particular market contexts (e.g., gold in Vietnam; cryptocurrencies elsewhere), which underscores the cross-market relevance of outcome-driven impulses [9,10].

Nevertheless, these convergent findings, the direct empirical base on live trading psychology retains important limitations that constrain straightforward generalization. Many qualitative and experimental investigations rely on small samples and short horizons, which limit inference about longer-term adaptation and learning under real-money stakes [1]. Bibliomeasure and review work highlights inconsistent operationalization of behavioral constructs across studies and recommends more unified measurement approaches so that bias exposure can be compared and monitored in applied settings [4,11]. Survey-based and cross-sectional studies often leave open the mapping from reported attitudes to actual transaction-level behavior, suggesting the need for designs that link psychological measures to account-level trading records and for field experiments that test behavioral messages and procedural interventions [4,11,12].

These gaps motivate an interdisciplinary, process-focused framing. Reviews and measurement studies recommend clustering biases into investor profiles and prioritizing parsimonious behavioral factor sets that can be embedded into portfolio-analytic tools or monitoring dashboards [4,11]. Applied and empirical papers point to concrete process-oriented interventions that have been trialed or proposed: robo-advisors and algorithmic intermediaries that constrain impulsive choices and moderate risk perception [12]; managerial training, structured review and selection procedures to reduce illusion-of-control and other maladaptive cognitions among professionals [3]; and platform-level defaults or behavioral nudges such as rule-based entry protocols, cooling-off windows and pre-mortem prompts to blunt FOMO-driven purchases among retail users [3,4,10].

Collectively, outcome-focused trading amplifies affective volatility and activates predictable bias pathways, adopting a process-oriented architecture which grounded in cross-disciplinary empirical work, offers a theoretically coherent and practically actionable route to stabilize decision-making under pressure.

Cognitive and Affective Mechanisms of Outcome Fixation

Outcome fixation in trading is rooted in an interplay of attention to immediate feedback, affect-driven reinforcement, and biased cognitive processing, each of which maps onto distinct empirical findings. Qualitative work in bearish trading simulations demonstrates a dynamic chain in which acute emotional responses (fear, frustration, pride) precede or co-occur with the emergence of

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1641.v1

cognitive errors such as loss aversion, confirmation and anchoring biases, and thereby shape concrete behaviors like holding losers, "revenge" trades, or persevering with unsuitable strategies [13]. Field measurements of traders show that momentary emotional arousal is tied to what they do in the market. Indicators such as heart rate, electrodermal activity and a combined psychophysiological measure shift with the timing of trades, movements in the market and the trader's level of experience. These findings suggest that emotional states are not just background noise but are directly involved in real-time risk processing [14].

Neuroscientific studies help pinpoint the reward and anticipation processes that shape outcome attachment. Imaging work with active traders and with investors reviewing real cases shows activity in the nucleus accumbens and the dorsal striatum during both the anticipation and evaluation of trades. Prefrontal areas, including the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and ventrolateral prefrontal cortex, are involved in strategic control and mental effort, and these patterns shift with experience and with how confident traders feel [15,16]. Reviews in neurofinance also point to the amygdala and the insula as central regions for loss salience and risk signaling. These areas are linked to biases such as loss aversion and shifts in risk preference, which helps explain why immediate losses tend to feel more powerful than equal gains [17].

Biophysiological factors also shape how traders react to outcomes. Experiments that alter cortisol and testosterone levels in asset-market tasks show that both hormones increase risk-taking and contribute to price instability. Cortisol influences risk preferences directly, while testosterone encourages more optimistic expectations about future prices. These pathways show how stress and arousal can strengthen outcome fixation and disrupt decision making [18]. Taken together, psychophysiological and endocrine findings show that short-term market feedback can trigger bodily responses that shift how traders judge risk and value future choices [14,18].

Affective states interact with informational context to produce non-linear behavioral outcomes. Laboratory experiments manipulating incidental fear and prior outcome sequences find that fear reduces risk-taking after weakly bad news but can paradoxically increase risk-seeking following strongly negative outcome sequences—an affective "compensation" response where distressed individuals favor contrarian risk in an attempt to repair mood or perceived loss [19]. Social and informational cascades compound these dynamics: regret aversion and information-cascade mechanisms alter risk perception and mediate the impact of cognitive biases on investment decisions, while higher financial literacy attenuates these deleterious pathways [20].

Cognitive capacity and framing shape the mode of processing by which feedback is interpreted. Experimental work shows that framing of objectively irrelevant information anchors behavior and moderates disposition-like responses (selling winners sooner than losers), and that loss-framing can elevate anxiety and impair performance—pathways through which presentation and salience of outcome information skew both beliefs and action [21,22]. Studies on cognitive load show that limited processing capacity affects when traders make decisions and pushes them toward simpler, heuristic choices. This can happen even when their underlying valuation of an asset does not change, which suggests that traders under load lean more on noticeable outcomes and basic rules instead of careful analysis [23]. Narrative and testimonial information adds another layer of bias. These forms of information make people more likely to use quick, heuristic processing, which strengthens the impact of striking outcome stories and encourages outcome-focused decisions [24].

Market-level and organizational feedback loops often strengthen these individual patterns. Research on emotional contagion shows that fear and greed spread through social networks and amplify herding and overreaction. As this happens, outcome signals such as price moves, rankings and bursts of social attention become powerful triggers that drive further trading behavior [25]. Managerial and institutional studies illustrate that learning from price signals can itself create feedback vulnerabilities—overly price-sensitive corrective actions may amplify liquidity shocks, whereas persistent overconfidence in managers can alter market sensitivity in the opposite direction—both patterns showing that feedback processing at organizational levels feeds back into market dynamics [26].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1641.v1

Individual differences and modifiable capacities moderate these mechanisms. Empirical evidence links higher emotional-intelligence profiles to superior portfolio outcomes through better emotion regulation and deliberate processing of market signals, implying that training and process-oriented practices can alter how feedback is attended to and acted upon [27].

Overall, the converging cognitive, affective, physiological and neurobiological findings indicate that outcome fixation arises from tightly coupled feedback, bodily arousal, and biased information processing—processes that are sensitive to framing, social cues and individual capacities, and that together bias traders toward excessive attention to immediate Profit and Loss.

Behavioral and Performance Consequences of Outcome Orientation

Outcome-focused trading frequently manifests as excessive trading activity, a pattern that is particularly pronounced among users of trading apps and neo-brokers who trade more frequently than general investors and whose risk tolerance increases with prolonged app use [28]. Empirical work on mobile app adoption finds an inverted-U relationship between app use intensity and portfolio performance, whereby modest reductions in transaction frictions initially support returns but excessive engagement—linked to trend-chasing and myopic decision rules—erodes performance over time [29]. Laboratory evidence further shows that overconfidence is associated with higher trading volumes in the absence of corrective feedback, whereas feedback about accuracy attenuates excessive turnover [30].

Outcome fixation also fuels impulsive, loss-driven behaviors such as "revenge" trading and contrarian escalation after adverse outcomes; qualitative simulation participants reported impulsive attempts to recoup losses and the persistence of emotionally driven strategies following loss spells [13]. Experimental inductions of fear combined with strongly negative prior outcomes produce a minority of contrarian, risk-seeking responses—an affective "compensation" strategy in which distressed individuals increase risk to repair mood—thereby generating volatile, high-variance behavior after loss runs [19]. Neuroendocrine and psychophysiological evidence supplies plausible proximate mechanisms: experimentally elevated cortisol and testosterone shift choices toward riskier assets and, at an aggregate level, predict price instability in market games [18]. Real-time field measures of traders' heart rate, electrodermal activity and composite psychophysiological activation correlate with transaction timing and product choice, indicating that affective arousal co-occurs with and likely shapes moment-to-moment departures from pre-specified risk rules [14].

Result-anchored decision making degrades adherence to disciplined risk management and slows the acquisition of robust trading skill [30]. Qualitative accounts record decision paralysis, rule-avoidance and the persistence of unsuitable strategies under affective strain, which plausibly reduce opportunities for incremental learning and calibration of beliefs [13]. Cross-market survey work indicates that regret aversion and information-cascade dynamics alter risk perception and mediate the impact of cognitive biases on investment choices, while higher financial literacy buffers these effects, implying that poor procedural compliance and weaker long-run performance are most severe where literacy and corrective feedback are lacking [20]. Studies of cryptocurrency investors reinforce this point by showing that behavioral biases can blunt the positive effect of knowledge on investment outcomes, so that bias-laden traders fail to convert learning into improved performance [9].

At the market level, aggregated outcome-driven behavior can magnify volatility and mispricing [31]. Theoretical and empirical work on informational cascades demonstrates how herding can choke information flow, generate persistent deviations of prices from fundamentals, and transmit shocks across assets via contagion, thereby amplifying the systemic costs of individual outcome fixation [31]. Complementary analyses of investor emotion and "bubble psychology" argue that short-run investor psychology such as fear, greed, and intuitive judgement, can momentarily drive prices away from fundamentals even if long-run reversion holds, creating exploitable but socially costly episodes [25,32].

Contextual moderators and design features matter for outcomes [29]. Trading-app design, sparse or misleading feedback, narrative and testimonial framing that encourage heuristic

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1641.v1

processing, and acute cognitive load can all intensify short-termism and impulsivity [23,24]. Conversely, appropriately structured feedback, financial education, and organizational measures to reduce illusion-of-control can reduce maladaptive behaviors and improve performance—evidence that selection, training, and procedure design offer plausible levers to limit the behavioral and performance harms of outcome orientation [3,20,30].

In sum, the convergent evidence indicates that an outcome orientation reliably increases the frequency and volatility of trading, raises the incidence of revenge and affect-driven risk-taking, weakens compliance with risk rules and learning processes, and contributes to both individual underperformance and broader market instability—effects that are magnified by app-driven engagement, physiological stress responses, and social contagion but can be attenuated by feedback, literacy and institutional design.

Cross-Domain Evidence: Learning, Neuroscience and Behavioral Science in Trading

A growing body of cross-disciplinary work indicates that privileging process over immediate outcomes is both theoretically grounded and practically tractable across domains, from educational simulations to neuroscience and decision-support systems [11,33].

Pedagogical research and applied simulations provide direct evidence that process-focused training improves task competence and engagement [34]. Controlled business-simulation interventions such as ERPsim, produce measurable gains in domain knowledge and increase subsequent course engagement, indicating that hands-on, outcome-deemphasizing practice accelerates early skill acquisition in complex, multi-step tasks [34]. Serious games designed with real-time biofeedback similarly create an environment in which learners can practice emotion-regulation and receive immediate, biologically grounded indicators of arousal that drive adaptive practice cycles; initial evaluations of an "Auction Game" show that coupling decision tasks to heart-rate feedback makes emotional states visible, rewards regulated arousal, and affords repeated rehearsal of regulatory strategies [35].

The design of trading platforms significantly influences traders' psychological engagement. Interactive and gamified components can facilitate deliberate practice for certain individuals, while for others, these same features may reinforce short-termism and impulsive behavior [36]. Experimental evidence on trading gamification shows that hedonic elements increase engagement and trading volume—effects driven mostly by user self-selection—while price notifications can improve learning for traders with accurate priors but reinforce mistakes among traders with erroneous beliefs, underscoring that feedback content and learner competence must determine interface design [36].

Neuroscience offers mechanistic support for a process orientation by mapping learning, control and reward onto separable neural systems that are trainable with experience [15]. Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI) work on professional traders finds that dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and ventrolateral prefrontal cortex activations track strategic control and successful performance, whereas striatal and nucleus-accumbens responses index anticipatory reward; expertise is associated with attenuated prefrontal effort and increased automaticity of well-learned actions, implying that deliberate process training initially recruits control systems that later become efficient through practice [15]. Findings from complementary neuroforecasting approaches imply that anticipatory reward signals within the nucleus accumbens contain latent information on collective preferences and future performance beyond self-reported forecasts. Accordingly, when such reward-processing signals are correctly interpreted and integrated into decision-making processes, they have the potential to strengthen the accuracy of aggregate predictions [16]. Studies of neurofinance literature emphasize the amygdala, insula, and striatum as key nodes in the encoding of loss salience, reward expectation, and decision-making. These neural substrates provide mechanistic justification for designing interventions that alter feedback contingencies and reward

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1641.v1

schedules to promote sustained, process-based learning rather than short-horizon, outcome-driven behavior [17].

Technological decision-support and organizational interventions further extend cross-domain lessons into practice [37]. Work on data-driven bias mitigation argues that, when deployed within sociotechnical architectures that incorporate data-quality auditing, transparent models, and hybrid human–artificial intelligence workflows, AI and explainable analytic tools can materially reduce confirmation and overconfidence errors. Such implementations help redesign feedback systems so they focus on sound judgment and clear procedures instead of fast, emotion-driven outcome signals [37]. At the organizational level, classic findings on illusion-of-control indicate that selection, training and managerial review can reduce maladaptive control beliefs and promote deliberative habits and measures that align with process orientation and can be operationalized through structured simulations and feedback loops [3].

Taken together, cross-domain evidence argues for a translational program in trading: implement iterative, feedback-rich simulations and biofeedback training to strengthen regulation and control systems; design platform feedback to reward process measures and probabilistic calibration while avoiding purely hedonic prompts; and embed explainable analytical tools to correct common biases. These interventions are theoretically justified by learning science and neuroscience and have clear, testable implementation pathways for trading environments and pathways that invite rigorous field trials to evaluate transfer to live markets.

Process-Based Interventions and Proxy Measures for Healthier Trading

Reorienting trader attention from terminal outcomes to observable, verifiable procedures require the specification of concrete proxy measures that operationalize procedural fidelity for both learning and evaluation purposes [37]. A set of practical process measures can be used as proxies. These may include the share of trades that follow predefined entry rules, the recorded quality of pre-trade analysis, and how often traders stick to stop-loss and other risk-management rules. These measures are easy to track and can be logged automatically [37,38].

Embedding such measures in training and practice environments facilitates transparent tracking of process rather than retrospective fixation on monetary returns, and a blockchain-backed learning record can enhance the transparency and auditability of those process measures in simulated courses [38]. Process measures become particularly useful when paired with sequential, time-segmented analysis of trading episodes, since retrospective shifts in emotional states and decision patterns may vary across sub-horizons of activity [39].

Structured daily routines and disciplined journaling provide a low-cost, scalable method for converting tacit process information into explicit, reviewable data points [39]. A structured trade journal that records pre-trade rationale, signal criteria, intended risk controls, and post-trade reflections creates discrete artifacts that can be audited against the proxy measures described above [37,39].

Training interventions that instantiate process learning such as notably simulation trading, serious games with real-time feedback, and blockchain-tracked exercises, offer practical platforms for both practice and measurement [34,35,38]. Serious games that couple decision scenarios to physiological biofeedback enable learners to receive immediate information about arousal states and to practice emotion-regulation techniques in a closed learning loop [35]. When such games reward desirable regulation outcomes and adjust difficulty contingent on physiological indicators, they create an experiential scaffold for acquiring self-regulatory routines that can be transferred toward actual trading contexts [35].

Experimental and field evidence further indicates that repeated exposure to stressors in controlled settings can attenuate physiological reactions to those stressors, supporting the use of simulation and repeated practice as a desensitization and training tool [40]. Likewise, educational designs that integrate social interaction, motivational incentives, and transparent record-keeping

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1641.v1

have been shown to enhance learner engagement and observable learning behaviors in stock simulation courses [34,38].

Feedback design should prioritize signals that reinforce process compliance rather than present outcomes only, because outcome-centric feedback may perpetuate outcome fixation [30,37]. Laboratory evidence shows that providing participants with accuracy feedback about underlying signals can eliminate the trading-increasing effect of overconfidence, indicating that targeted feedback on calibration and information accuracy can shape trading behavior [30]. At the same time, platform features and hedonic gamification elements require cautious deployment: gamified affordances increase engagement for some users but can also alter trading intensity and the salience of non-process stimuli, so feedback systems must be calibrated to support learning goals rather than merely boost activity [36].

Algorithmic and analytics tools offer complementary process supports: robo-advisors and decision-support systems can moderate the impact of cognitive biases by enforcing rule-based constraints and by presenting probabilistic forecasts and explainable recommendations that highlight process considerations [12,37]. An organizational setup that uses real-time analytics, explainable AI tools and ongoing bias-detection creates an environment where proxy measures are not just recorded but also used to correct deviations from intended procedures [37].

Self-regulation techniques work alongside procedural training. Practices such as mindfulness and breathing exercises can reduce the emotional pressures that fuel outcome fixation and support more deliberate decision making [41]. Reviews show that mindfulness helps people notice biased tendencies, manage emotional reactions and make more thoughtful financial choices. This makes it a useful complement to procedural measures tracked through proxy indicators [41].

Emotional intelligence training that cultivates awareness and management of emotions is associated with improved portfolio outcomes and therefore aligns with process-focused interventions that emphasize regulate-and-record cycles [27]. Evidence from international samples indicates that higher levels of emotional intelligence correspond to superior portfolio performance, and process interventions that strengthen emotion-management capacity are therefore likely to support improved adherence to process measures [27].

Implementation scenarios illustrate how process measures and interventions can be deployed in practice: demo accounts instrumented with automated logging and biofeedback permit safe piloting of new routines and allow educators to evaluate whether process-oriented courses change procedural behavior prior to live deployment [27,35,38].

Serious games and simulations can be used to compare cohorts exposed to process-based curricula against control groups, and blockchain-recorded learning artifacts facilitate transparent pre-post comparisons of the proxy measures described above [35,38].

The evaluation of process-based programs should emphasize intermediate, process-oriented outcomes rather than raw profit and loss; for example, improvements in adherence rates, calibration accuracy, pre-trade analysis quality scores, and physiological indicators of arousal constitute proximate markers of healthier trading practice and are defensible targets for pedagogical and technological interventions [30,35,37]. Where available, randomized or controlled designs that measure these intermediate outcomes provide the clearest evidence of effectiveness, and repeated-exposure protocols can be used to assess durability of learning and attenuation of stress responses over time [30,40].

Collectively, these measures and interventions constitute a pragmatic toolkit for shifting trader attention toward verifiable processes, for operationalizing those processes with concrete proxy measures, and for building training and platform architectures that reinforce process fidelity while attenuating affective and cognitive drivers of outcome fixation.

Mediator Indicators and the Case for a Mental Discipline Metric

A recurrent theme in assessment and educational literatures is the value of intermediate or mediator indicators that bridge high-level outcomes and moment-to-moment processes. Such

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1641.v1

indicators help connect program goals with actual learning activities. They also make it easier to measure concepts that are usually hard to observe and support feedback cycles that focus on learning rather than final results [42]. Research on program and process indicators shows that well-designed, process-oriented metrics improve implementation and support steady improvement when they are specific, measurable and time-based [43]. Newer classifications of assessment indicators highlight the importance of accessibility, ethical data use and the value of giving both learners and instructors clear, formative information [44]. Other authors argue that indicators should be used for learning instead of control. When chosen with that aim, they reduce gaming and encourage reflection [45]. Practical experience with learning-centered indicators shows that visible signs of progress can guide methodological adjustments and help learners build competence over time [46].

Applying these ideas to real trading shows some challenges. Many process-based tools, like platform analytics or biofeedback systems, require access and technology that retail traders usually do not have. This makes the solutions hard to scale and creates a need for simple tools that traders can use on their own without relying on outside systems.

To address this gap, the discipline coin (DISC) is proposed as a hypothetical, intra-psychic intermediary indicator: a simple, ordinal token that accrues in the trader's mind as a function solely of time spent trading in strict accordance with a pre-specified strategy. DISC is explicitly decoupled from monetary outcomes and is incremented cumulatively by verifiable process actions (for example, continuous blocks of strategy-congruent activity recorded in a trade journal or timed practice sessions). Conceptually, DISC operationalizes process fidelity as a formative metric that (a) foregrounds adherence to procedural rules rather than P&L, (b) affords immediate, cost-free self-feedback compatible with learning-for-measurement principles, and (c) is implementable by individual traders without external systems. Because DISC targets process improvement and incremental learning, it aligns with recommendations to prioritize intermediate, process-oriented indicators and to use measures that support reflection and behavioral change rather than control. The next section of this review explains how the DISC can be implemented in practice.

Implementation Considerations and Contextual Moderators

The effectiveness of process-oriented interventions depends on a constellation of contextual factors, including trader experience, platform design, market regime, trading horizon, organizational pressures, and prevailing cultural or social-media dynamics [5,28,29,33,47]. Novice traders—who are disproportionately represented among neo-broker users, are typically younger, and often display lower financial literacy—exhibit different behavioral responses to app affordances than more experienced investors [5,28]. By contrast, more experienced traders may be less prone to platform-induced myopia but remain vulnerable to stress-induced reliance on automatized decision rules during high-pressure periods [33,47].

Technology-mediated features alter transaction frictions and information-processing constraints in ways that moderate intervention effectiveness [28,29]. Mobile and trading apps reduce time constraints and other transaction frictions, which can facilitate faster decision making but also produce increases in myopic, trend-chasing behavior [29]. Usage intensity of mobile interfaces shows a non-linear relationship with portfolio performance, implying that moderate engagement can differ in effect from very low or very high engagement [29]. Design elements such as gamification and low-cost, low-minimum access lower participation barriers and encourage more frequent trading, thereby raising users' risk tolerance and altering product choice [28].

Social-media attention and platform-specific affordances constitute additional, potent moderators [5,28]. High attention on forums such as r/WallStreetBets stimulates uninformed and more speculative trading, increases overall risk exposure, and is associated with significantly lower holding-period returns for positions opened under peak attention [5]. Decisions made under such attention spikes are often driven by affective responses to online content rather than by conventional analyst advice, and younger, less experienced individuals are disproportionately represented among

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1641.v1

those who obtain information from social media [5]. At the same time, trading-app communities and broker-provided social features can amplify these dynamics if not carefully designed [28,38].

Individual differences and learning capacity—most notably financial literacy—moderate susceptibility to outcome fixation and to associated biases [48]. Empirical evidence indicates that financial literacy diminishes the influence of some biases (for example, it negatively moderates herding tendencies) while interacting in more complex ways with other biases such as the disposition effect and mental accounting [48]. Consequently, educational and simulation-based interventions that incorporate social networking and gamified, blockchain-tracked records have been shown to enhance engagement and learning outcomes in trading courses, suggesting viable pathways for tailoring interventional curricula [38].

Acute and chronic stressors inside organizational or economic environments further shape whether process-focused measures hold under pressure [47]. Experimental work shows that acute stress amplifies domain-dependent risk biases and increases reliance on automatic decision heuristics, which may undermine adherence to deliberate, process-driven rules during stressful trading episodes [47].

Taken together, these findings imply that a one-size-fits-all, process-only prescription is unlikely to deliver uniform benefits across trader segments and settings [5,28,33]. Practical implementation therefore requires (a) matching interventions to trader experience and baseline literacy, (b) monitoring and regulating app usage intensity and interface features that reduce friction or encourage impulsive trade frequency, (c) embedding training simulations and social-network-aware pedagogy to build durable process skills, and (d) instituting organizational supports to mitigate stress and limit information cascades from high-attention social-media events [5,28,29,33,38,47]. Finally, because many empirical results derive from specific samples and platform contexts, implementation should be piloted and adapted locally, with close attention to sample composition, market volatility regimes, and the measurable effects of interface changes on both behavior and returns.

We therefore turn to the practical considerations involved in operationalizing the DISC construct. For illustration, consider a simple implementation in which a trader credits themselves with one DISC for every hour spent trading strictly according to a pre-specified strategy.If the trader breaks the strategy during that period, no new DISC is added, but the coins already earned stay in place. Over time, this total becomes a personal record of disciplined behavior. It can feel like a store of past achievements that helps the trader stay steady during losses and avoid emotional or biased decisions. This approach supports rule-based behavior without punishing occasional mistakes and keeps attention on consistent process rather than short-term results.

Conclusions

Paying too much attention to short-term outcomes such as profit and loss signals, leaderboard positions and rapid feedback loops weakens disciplined decision making and harms both individual traders and the market as a whole. Evidence from experimental, physiological, neuroscientific and field research shows that outcome fixation increases emotional volatility, triggers impulsive and compensatory risk taking, and disrupts the development of solid trading skills. Platform features, social contagion and cognitive load make these effects stronger, and better financial knowledge helps only a little when procedural support is missing. In contrast, interventions that separate immediate rewards from execution, make process steps visible and verifiable, and build emotional regulation skills create better conditions for deliberate, rule-based behavior and more reliable learning.

From a practical view, the evidence supports a staged approach to process-based correction. One step is to define clear process measures such as the quality of pre-trade reasoning, adherence to entry and exit rules, and consistent use of risk controls, then track them with automated logging for objective review. Another step is to use training methods that emphasize process over outcome. This includes simulated trading, serious games with real-time biofeedback and repeated exposure to stressors to help reduce physiological reactivity. Another step, integrate sociotechnical supports

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1641.v1

including explainable analytics, hybrid human-AI checkpoints, and managerial review, to detect and correct departures from intended procedures. Finally, tailor interventions by trader segment, platform context and market regime, and pilot changes with randomized or controlled designs that measure intermediate process outcomes rather than raw P&L.

As a hypothesis for future evaluation, the review proposes the adoption of a cumulative, non-outcome mental measure—termed the discipline coin (DISC)—that quantifies aggregated adherence to documented trading procedures over time. The hypothesis is based on a visible, controlling DISC score, decoupled from monetary results and incremented by verifiable process actions, will reorient trader attention toward procedural consistency. Theoretically it may to improve calibration and resilience under stress, and yield superior long-term behavioral and performance outcomes when incorporated into training. However, this hypothesis and its performance need to be validated in future studies.

Acknowledgments: For transparency, we disclose that large language model (LLM) assistants were used to improve phrasing, grammar and general readability, but did not alter the study's data or interpretations in any way. All major decisions and conclusions were made by the authors, who take full responsibility for the final manuscript.

Conflicts of Interests: The author works as a trading psychologist for the organization mentioned. This connection may appear to be a potential conflict of interest because the organization is involved in trading activities and in the development or delivery of trader training. The author has disclosed this relationship and confirms that the arguments, interpretations and recommendations in this review are based on an independent reading of the literature, not on support for any specific product or service. Apart from the employment noted above, the author reports no other financial or personal relationships that could influence the content of this manuscript.

References

1. Alain F, Kevin K, Julie L. Trading Psychology Under Pressure: Cognitive Bias Evolution in a Simulated Bear Market. International Journal of Finance & Banking Studies. 2025;14(3).
2. Liu Y-Y, Nacher JC, Ochiai T, Martino M, Altshuler Y. Prospect theory for online financial trading. PloS one. 2014;9(10):e109458.
3. Fenton-O'Creevy M, Nicholson N, Soane E, Willman P. Trading on illusions: Unrealistic perceptions of control and trading performance. Journal of occupational and organizational psychology. 2003;76(1):53–68.
4. Gorzon D, Bormann M, von Nitzsch R. Measuring costly behavioral bias factors in portfolio management: a review. Financial Markets and Portfolio Management. 2024;38(2):265–95.
5. Warkulat S, Pelster M. Social media attention and retail investor behavior: Evidence from r/wallstreetbets. International Review of Financial Analysis. 2024;96:103721.
6. Jain J, Walia N, Singla H, Singh S, Sood K, Grima S. Heuristic biases as mental shortcuts to investment decision-making: a mediation analysis of risk perception. Risks. 2023;11(4):72.
7. Yang H. Analysis of Retail Investors' Trading Psychological Characteristics Based on Big Data. Frontiers in Business, Economics and Management. 2024;17:47–51.
8. Hasan SB, Kumar A, Taffler R. Investor emotions and asset prices. Financial Analysts Journal. 2025:1–28.
9. Angeles IT. Behavioral Biases, Risk Tolerance, Knowledge, and Investment on Cryptocurrency: A Moderated Mediation Analysis. Risk Tolerance, Knowledge, and Investment on Cryptocurrency: A Moderated Mediation Analysis (February 10, 2024). 2024.
10. Nguyen XH, Bui DA, Le NA, Nguyen QT. The Role of Fear of Missing out (FOMO), Loss Aversion, and Herd Behavior in Gold Investment Decisions: A Study in the Vietnamese Market. International Journal of Financial Studies. 2025;13(3):175.
11. Kanapickienė R, Vasiliauskaitė D, Keliuotytė-Staniulėnienė G, Špicas R, Omeir AK, Kanapickas T. A comprehensive review of behavioral biases in financial decision-making: from classical finance to behavioral finance perspectives. Journal of business economics and management. 2024;25(5):1006–29.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1641.v1

12. Ahmad U, Van Keulen M, Briassouli A, Saad M. Cognitive biases, Robo advisor and investment decision psychology: An investor's perspective from New York stock exchange. Acta psychologica. 2025;256:105048.
13. Finet A, Kristoforidis K, Laznicka J. Investor Emotions and Cognitive Biases in a Bearish Market Simulation: A Qualitative Study. Journal of Risk and Financial Management. 2025;18(9):493.
14. Singh M, Xu Q, Wang SJ, Hong T, Ghassemi MM, Lo AW. Real-time extended psychophysiological analysis of financial risk processing. Plos one. 2022;17(7):e0269752.
15. Raggetti G, Ceravolo MG, Fattobene L, Di Dio C. Neural correlates of direct access trading in a real stock market: an fMRI investigation. Frontiers in Neuroscience. 2017;11:536.
16. van Brussel LD, Boksem MA, Dietvorst RC, Smidts A. Brain activity of professional investors signals future stock performance. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2024;121(16):e2307982121.
17. Greeshma Francis DML. Decoding the Investor's Mind: Exploring Neurofinance in Decision-Making. International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation. 2025;12(9):4331–42.
18. Cueva C, Roberts RE, Spencer T, Rani N, Tempest M, Tobler PN, et al. Cortisol and testosterone increase financial risk taking and may destabilize markets. Scientific reports. 2015;5(1):11206.
19. López-Guzmán S, Sautua SI. Effects of a fearful emotional state on financial decisions in the presence of prior outcome information. Journal of Economic Psychology. 2024;101:102706.
20. Wangzhou K, Khan M, Hussain S, Ishfaq M, Farooqi R. Effect of regret aversion and information cascade on investment decisions in the real estate sector: The mediating role of risk perception and the moderating effect of financial literacy. Frontiers in Psychology. 2021;12:736753.
21. Balart P, Ezquerra L, Hernandez-Arenaz I. Framing effects on risk-taking behavior: evidence from a field experiment in multiple-choice tests. Experimental Economics. 2022;25(4):1268–97.
22. Kirchler E, Maciejovsky B, Weber M. Framing effects, selective information and market behavior: An experimental analysis. Handbook of behavioral finance: Edward Elgar Publishing; 2010.
23. Cox I. Cognitive Load and Decision Making: An Experimental Investigation of the Endowment Effect2024.
24. Winterbottom A, Bekker HL, Conner M, Mooney A. Does narrative information bias individual's decision making? A systematic review. Social science & medicine. 2008;67(12):2079–88.
25. Loang OK. Emotional Contagion and Financial Markets: The Interplay of Fear, Greed, and Herding. Psychological Drivers of Herding and Market Overreaction: IGI Global Scientific Publishing; 2025. p. 79–100.
26. Banerjee S, Huang S, Nanda V, Xiao SC. Managerial overconfidence and market feedback effects. Management Science. 2023;69(12):7285–305.
27. El-Chaarani H. Exploring the impact of emotional intelligence on portfolio performance: An international exploratory study. Humanomics. 2016;32(4):474–97.
28. Freibauer J. Effects of trading apps on investment behavior: Dissertation, Trier, Universität Trier, 2024; 2024.
29. Liu C-W, Mithas S, Pan Y, Hsieh JP-A. Mobile apps, trading behaviors, and portfolio performance: Evidence from a quasi-experiment in China. Information Systems Research. 2025;36(2):828–46.
30. Bregu K. Overconfidence and (over) trading: The effect of feedback on trading behavior. Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics. 2020;88:101598.
31. Cipriani M, Guarino A. Herd behavior and contagion in financial markets. The BE Journal of Theoretical Economics. 2008;8(1).
32. Hunter WC, Kaufman GG, Pomerleano M. Asset price bubbles: The implications for monetary, regulatory, and international policies: MIT press; 2005.
33. Statman M. Behaviorial finance: Past battles and future engagements. Financial analysts journal. 1999;55(6):18–27.
34. Beranič T, Heričko M. The impact of serious games in economic and business education: A case of ERP business simulation. Sustainability. 2022;14(2):683.
35. Jerčić P, Astor PJ, Adam M, Hilborn O, Schaff K, Lindley C, et al., editors. A serious game using physiological interfaces for emotion regulation training in the context of financial decision-making. 20th European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS 2012), Barcelona; 2012: AIS Electronic Library (AISeL).
36. Chapkovski P, Khapko M, Zoican M. Trading gamification and investor behavior. Management Science. 2024.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1641.v1

37. Leonidas T, Alexandra T, Constantinos H. Cognitive Bias Mitigation in Executive Decision-Making: A Data-Driven Approach Integrating Big Data Analytics, AI, and Explainable Systems. Electronics. 2025;14(19):3930.
38. Chang SE, Luo H, Tseng L. Improving the Effectiveness of a Stock Simulation Trading Course via Blockchain and Social Networking: A Taiwanese Study. Electronics. 2024;13(22):4338.
39. Finet A, Laznicka J. Addressing emotional dysregulation in experimental design. Psychology and Behavioral Sciences. 2025;14(1):7–18.
40. Cahlíková J, Cingl L. Risk preferences under acute stress. Experimental Economics. 2017;20(1):209–36.
41. Rani L. The Effect of Mindfulness Interventions on Reducing Behavioral Biases in Financial Decision-Making. Interdisciplinary Research in Technology and Management. 2024:700–9.
42. Ali MT, Rahman MA, Mannan MA, Zishan MSR, Chisty NA, Hossain CA. Impact of Intermediate Indicators on Attaining Cognitive Program Outcomes. Journal of Engineering Education Transformations. 2024:187–96.
43. Mardiyah M, Herawati V, Ali A. Optimalisasi Indikator Program dalam Manajemen Strategi Pendidikan : Evaluasi, Implementasi, dan Dampaknya. Jurnal Pendidikan dan Sastra Inggris. 2025;5:102–20.
44. Ifenthaler D, Heil J, Greiff S. Toward a categorisation of indicators for assessment analytics. Learning Letters. 2023;1(Article 3):1–8.
45. Sveiby K-E. When measuring fails–try learning! International Journal of Learning and Intellectual Capital. 2004;1(3):370–6.
46. Nodarse MH. Indicadores del aprendizaje al centro de la mira: argumentos y resultados de una experiencia. Revista Iberoamericana de Educación. 2006;37(6):1–12.
47. Porcelli AJ, Delgado MR. Acute stress modulates risk taking in financial decision making. Psychological science. 2009;20(3):278–83.
48. Khan D. Cognitive driven biases, investment decision making: The moderating role of financial literacy. Investment Decision Making: The Moderating Role of Financial Literacy (January 5, 2020). 2020.