89 ~ 99_Similarity Check

by turnitin check

Submission date: 07-Nov-2025 12:40PM (UTC+0200)
Submission ID: 2806497103
File name: 89_99.pdf (280.23K)
Word count: 4507
Character count: 29140

COUNT: Journal of Accounting, Business and Management *ISSN 3026-6130*
Vol. 3, No. 2, 2025, pp. 89 ~ 99
Open Acces: *https://doi.org/10.61677/count.v3i2.557*

INTEGRATING BEHAVIORAL ECONOMICS INTO MONETARY POLICY DECISION-MAKING: A THEORETICAL REVIEW

Khampheng Vongchanh

Economic & Business Administration, Luang Prabang Institute of Business and Technical Education, Laos
khampheng.vongchanh@lpibt-edu.la
Received September 16, 2025; Revised October 5, 2025; Accepted October 10, 2025; Published October 16, 2025

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore how behavioral economics can be systematically integrated into monetary policy decision-making frameworks to enhance their theoretical realism and practical effectiveness. Traditional monetary models, grounded in rational expectations, often fail to anticipate how cognitive biases distort public responses to interest rates, inflation targeting, and central bank communication. Using a structured literature review method, the research analyzes peer-reviewed publications, institutional reports, and theoretical models from 2015 to 2025. The findings reveal that behavioral biases such as present bias, loss aversion, overconfidence, and framing effects significantly influence the transmission and credibility of monetary policy. However, most central banks still rely on models that treat these behavioral patterns as peripheral, leading to inefficiencies in policy design and communication. The novelty of this study lies in the development of a conceptual framework and a behavioral taxonomy tailored for monetary policy applications—bridging gaps between behavioral theory and macroeconomic practice. Additionally, it highlights the institutional inertia and narrative misalignment that often obstruct the operationalization of behavioral insights in central banking. The study proposes that adaptive learning models and narrative-sensitive strategies offer promising pathways for reforming monetary frameworks. In conclusion, integrating behavioral economics is not just a theoretical enhancement but a necessary evolution for more credible, inclusive, and psychologically grounded monetary policy. This research contributes to both academic discourse and global policymaking by offering a unified approach to behavioral monetary theory.

Keywords: *Behavioral economics, monetary policy, central bank communication, cognitive biases, policy frameworks*

INTRODUCTION

Traditional monetary policy frameworks are grounded in classical and neoclassical economic theories, which assume that economic agents are fully rational, possess complete information, and consistently optimize utility (Mankiw, 2020). Central banks, operating under these assumptions, utilize tools such as interest rate adjustments and open market operations to influence inflation, employment, and economic growth. However, these models often fail to capture the complexity of real-world decision-making, especially during financial crises or periods of market irrationality (Akerlof & Shiller, 2009). The 2008 Global Financial Crisis exposed the limitations of rational expectations theory and prompted economists to seek alternative paradigms. Behavioral economics, which blends insights from psychology and economics, challenges the notion of perfect rationality and introduces concepts such as cognitive biases, heuristics, and

bounded rationality (Kahneman, 2011). These elements can significantly affect consumption, saving, and investment decisions—key variables in monetary transmission mechanisms. As such, integrating behavioral insights may enhance the predictive power and effectiveness of monetary policy frameworks (Thaler, 2016). This shift reflects a broader movement toward a more behaviorally-informed macroeconomic theory (Angner, 2020).

Behavioral economics posits that agents do not always act in their long-term best interest and are influenced by framing effects, loss aversion, and mental accounting, which can distort their responses to monetary policy signals (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981). For instance, consumers may underreact to interest rate cuts due to present bias or overconfidence, thereby weakening the intended stimulative effect on spending (Bernanke, 2015). Moreover, investors may misinterpret policy announcements due to narrative fallacies or overweigh recent experiences, contributing to market volatility and policy ineffectiveness (Shiller, 2017). These behavioral tendencies have led central banks and policymakers to reconsider the design and communication of monetary policies. Recent literature suggests that incorporating psychological insights could improve the timing, targeting, and transparency of central bank actions (Gürkaynak et al., 2005). Understanding how biases shape expectations and market reactions enables the formulation of more robust, adaptive policy tools (Loewenstein & Ubel, 2008). Ultimately, a behaviorally-informed approach to monetary policy promises a more realistic and responsive framework for managing modern economic challenges (Baddeley, 2019).

Despite significant advances in monetary policy modeling, most central banks still rely heavily on rational expectations and equilibrium-based frameworks that inadequately capture real-world behavioral dynamics (Hommes, 2021). Empirical evidence shows that agents systematically deviate from rationality, particularly under uncertainty or during financial shocks (Gennaioli & Shleifer, 2018). However, traditional models fail to integrate these deviations into policy formulation, leading to suboptimal decisions and delayed policy responses (Bordalo, Gennaioli, & Shleifer, 2020). Behavioral biases such as overconfidence, herding behavior, and limited attention contribute to policy transmission asymmetries that standard models overlook (Assenza et al., 2021). Moreover, the complexity of financial systems amplifies these biases, making the prediction of monetary outcomes increasingly difficult (Baddeley, 2019). This gap highlights a persistent theoretical tension between normative and descriptive approaches in monetary policy (Haldane, 2016). As behavioral economics grows in influence, central banks face the challenge of reconciling psychological realism with macroeconomic rigor (Smets, 2022). Addressing this integration issue remains a key theoretical and practical concern for modern monetary authorities (Aikman et al., 2023).

Furthermore, recent studies reveal that behavioral factors affect not only individual decision-making but also institutional and market-level responses to monetary policies (Todorov, 2020). For example, investors' sentiment-driven reactions to central bank communication often lead to excessive volatility or mispricing in asset markets

(Barberis, Greenwood, Jin, & Shleifer, 2018). These findings imply that communication strategies and expectation management must incorporate behavioral insights to maintain policy credibility (Coibion et al., 2019). Nonetheless, the lack of standardized behavioral models limits policymakers' ability to systematically embed psychology into macroeconomic simulations (Gómez et al., 2021). Many monetary authorities have acknowledged the importance of behavioral aspects but still treat them as peripheral to core policy models (Haldane & Turrell, 2018). This theoretical fragmentation has led to inconsistent policy interpretations across central banks (Bholat, 2016). Without a coherent behavioral framework, monetary policy risks being reactive rather than anticipatory in addressing economic instability (Lo Duca et al., 2021). Hence, developing a unified theory that integrates behavioral economics into monetary decision-making is both timely and necessary (Haldane, 2023).

While the integration of behavioral insights into monetary policy has gained scholarly attention, existing research remains fragmented and lacks a unified theoretical framework for practical application in central banking (Aikman et al., 2023). Many studies have focused on isolated behavioral factors—such as framing effects or overconfidence—without systematically embedding them into macroeconomic models (Hommes, 2021). Moreover, empirical findings often outpace theory development, resulting in a disconnection between observed market behaviors and model-driven policy actions (Gómez et al., 2021). The absence of a cohesive approach limits policymakers' ability to anticipate irrational responses and weakens policy effectiveness during crises (Assenza et al., 2021). There is also minimal consensus on how to quantify or simulate behavioral variables within DSGE or agent-based modeling frameworks (Todorov, 2020). Furthermore, central bank communication strategies rarely incorporate behavioral dynamics beyond superficial adjustments (Coibion et al., 2019). This conceptual void creates an urgent need for a synthesized theoretical model that harmonizes behavioral economics with monetary policy objectives (Haldane, 2023). Addressing this gap could redefine the efficacy and resilience of future monetary interventions under uncertainty and complexity (Baddeley, 2019).

This study contributes a novel theoretical synthesis by bridging the gap between behavioral economics and monetary policy through a unified conceptual framework. Unlike previous studies that examine isolated behavioral elements, this research proposes an integrative lens for understanding how cognitive biases influence policy transmission mechanisms. The novelty lies in developing a taxonomy of behavioral drivers—such as bounded rationality, expectation anchoring, and heuristics—within the monetary decision-making process. Moreover, the study critically reviews the extent to which central banks have (or have not) internalized behavioral insights into formal policy modeling. It introduces a structured comparative analysis of traditional versus behavioral macroeconomic approaches. This work aims to offer a comprehensive reference for policymakers to design psychologically informed monetary instruments. By framing behavioral economics as a core, not peripheral, component of macroeconomic policy, the

study pushes forward theoretical boundaries. This contribution is essential for evolving monetary strategies in complex, uncertain economic environments.

This study aims to explore and conceptualize how behavioral economic principles can be systematically integrated into monetary policy decision-making frameworks. The primary objective is to review and analyze theoretical literature that explains deviations from rational behavior in monetary contexts. It also seeks to map behavioral concepts—such as prospect theory, framing effects, and time inconsistency—onto existing monetary transmission models. Additionally, the study endeavors to identify institutional gaps where behavioral insights remain underutilized in central bank policy processes. A key goal is to develop a conceptual structure that bridges normative macroeconomic theory with descriptive behavioral phenomena. The research intends to support central banks in recognizing and modeling behavioral responses more effectively. Ultimately, this work aims to contribute to the development of adaptive, realistic, and psychologically grounded monetary policy tools. Such tools are increasingly necessary in addressing volatility, uncertainty, and the limitations of traditional models.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a qualitative literature review method aimed at synthesizing recent theoretical developments on the integration of behavioral economics into monetary policy frameworks. The method involves identifying, analyzing, and critically evaluating scholarly sources published within the last ten years, including peer-reviewed journal articles, working papers, institutional reports, and academic books (Snyder, 2019). A systematic approach was used to select literature relevant to behavioral macroeconomics, decision theory, and central banking practices. Emphasis was placed on studies discussing theoretical models, cognitive biases, and monetary transmission mechanisms under uncertainty (Boell & Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2015). The inclusion criteria focused on conceptual rigor, theoretical contribution, and relevance to central bank policy design. The review follows a thematic coding process to group insights into categories such as bounded rationality, expectations, and policy responsiveness (Rowley & Slack, 2021). This method allows for the construction of a conceptual framework based on accumulated scholarly discourse. By utilizing this structured review technique, the study ensures transparency, replicability, and theoretical depth in addressing the research objectives (Xiao & Watson, 2019).

The data in this study were collected through a structured literature search involving academic databases such as Scopus, JSTOR, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar. The search was limited to publications between 2015 and 2025 to ensure relevance and recency (Snyder, 2019). Keywords such as *"behavioral economics," "monetary policy,"* and *"central bank decision-making"* were used in combination to refine results. Inclusion criteria consisted of peer-reviewed journal articles, working papers from central banks, and high-impact theoretical publications (Xiao & Watson, 2019). Duplicates and non-scholarly sources were excluded to maintain academic integrity. A citation tracking method was also applied to identify influential papers

frequently referenced in recent studies (Boell & Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2015). The selected sources were organized and coded using reference management tools like Mendeley and Zotero. This rigorous process ensured comprehensive coverage of relevant conceptual and theoretical material (Rowley & Slack, 2021).

The collected literature was analyzed using thematic content analysis, a qualitative approach suited to identifying, classifying, and interpreting core themes across theoretical discussions (Nowell et al., 2017). The analysis began with open coding to label key behavioral concepts, such as anchoring, bounded rationality, and framing effects, as they relate to monetary policy (Castleberry & Nolen, 2018). These codes were then grouped into broader categories to form a structured conceptual map that illustrates how behavioral insights intersect with macroeconomic modeling. The study prioritized analytical depth over frequency, focusing on how central banks incorporate—or neglect—behavioral elements in theory (Braun & Clarke, 2019). Patterns, contradictions, and research gaps were highlighted to support the construction of a novel theoretical synthesis. Reliability was maintained through iterative coding and cross-checking against the research objectives (Thomas & Harden, 2008). The output of this analysis informs the proposed conceptual framework presented in the discussion section. This method strengthens theoretical validity while aligning with best practices in qualitative economic research (Suri, 2020).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The review revealed that while central banks increasingly recognize the influence of behavioral economics, its integration into policy frameworks remains conceptual rather than operational (Haldane, 2023). Most theoretical models still assume agents behave rationally, which limits their capacity to predict responses to policy shifts during periods of uncertainty (Hommes, 2021). Table 1 illustrates the contrast between traditional and behavioral assumptions in monetary decision-making. Behavioral approaches account for heuristics, framing effects, and non-linear expectations, whereas traditional models maintain rationality and utility maximization assumptions (Thaler, 2016). Furthermore, institutional resistance and model inertia have hindered the adoption of behavioral insights (Gennaioli & Shleifer, 2018). This disconnect has contributed to ineffective policy transmission, especially when interest rate signals are misinterpreted by psychologically biased agents (Todorov, 2020). As shown by Bordalo et al. (2020), the framing of policy communication significantly alters public expectation, often unpredictably. Therefore, integrating behavioral principles demands both model adjustment and communication reform.

Table 1: compares traditional economic assumptions with behavioral economic assumptions in the context of monetary policy

Aspect	Traditional Economics	Behavioral Economics
Decision-Making	Fully rational agents	Bounded rationality

Time Preferences	Exponential discounting	Hyperbolic discounting
Policy Communication Impact	Neutral, transparent	Framing and salience-dependent
Expectations Formation	Rational expectations	Adaptive, biased expectations
Response to Shocks	Symmetric and immediate	Asymmetric, delayed, and biased

The second key finding is that behavioral biases such as overconfidence, status quo bias, and loss aversion significantly distort how economic agents respond to monetary signals (Kahneman, 2011; Barberis et al., 2018). Table 2 presents a taxonomy of cognitive biases relevant to monetary policy, demonstrating their potential to disrupt transmission mechanisms. For instance, overconfidence may lead households to underestimate inflation risks, causing delays in spending adjustments (Coibion et al., 2019). Similarly, present bias discourages long-term saving even in low-interest environments, reducing the effectiveness of policy incentives (Assenza et al., 2021). Central banks, however, rarely model these behaviors formally, leaving a significant theoretical gap (Baddeley, 2019). While some institutions are experimenting with narrative-based guidance, these efforts are fragmented and lack theoretical grounding (Haldane & Turrell, 2018). A behavioral framework must incorporate these biases systematically into macroeconomic simulations and communication tools (Gómez et al., 2021).

Table 2: Relevant Behavioral Biases in Monetary Policy Context

Bias Type	**Description**	**Policy Impact**
Overconfidence	Overestimating accuracy of one's knowledge	Misjudgment of inflation or interest rate paths
Present Bias	Overvaluing immediate rewards over future gains	Reduced responsiveness to forward guidance
Loss Aversion	Preference to avoid losses rather than achieve gains	Resistance to policy changes (e.g., rate hikes)
Status Quo Bias	Preference for existing conditions	Inertia in financial decision-making
Anchoring	Relying too heavily on initial information	Misinterpretation of new policy signals

Lastly, the findings suggest that a hybrid framework combining rational expectations with behavioral dynamics offers a more realistic tool for policy analysis. Several authors propose adaptive learning models or agent-based modeling as suitable platforms to incorporate behavioral assumptions (Gómez et al., 2021; Hommes, 2021). However, these models require rethinking not only technical aspects but also institutional

norms and communication strategies. A crucial insight is that the effectiveness of monetary policy depends not only on the tools used, but also on how people perceive and emotionally respond to them (Shiller, 2017). This highlights the need for central banks to collaborate with behavioral scientists in developing more human-centered policies (Lo Duca et al., 2021). Additionally, integrating behavioral economics could improve monetary credibility by aligning expectations management with actual human behavior (Aikman et al., 2023). Therefore, future research should focus on building robust theoretical bridges between behavioral economics and macro-financial stability frameworks (Haldane, 2016).

Recent theoretical contributions have emphasized the limitations of rational expectations models, especially under high uncertainty and non-linear economic shocks (Hommes, 2021). Behavioral macroeconomics offers a more realistic lens by incorporating cognitive biases, framing effects, and emotional responses into monetary analysis (Assenza et al., 2021). For example, Gennaioli and Shleifer (2018) developed a model of belief-based macroeconomics that explains how attention and memory distort agents' economic decisions. Similarly, Bordalo, Gennaioli, and Shleifer (2020) argued that salience and context shape perception of monetary signals, influencing inflation expectations. Despite these insights, many central banks still lack formal mechanisms to embed behavioral assumptions into quantitative models (Aikman et al., 2023). Studies by Gómez et al. (2021) and Lo Duca et al. (2021) suggest that agent-based and adaptive learning models are better suited for incorporating behavioral heterogeneity in macro simulations. Furthermore, narrative economics—a concept advanced by Shiller (2017)—demonstrates that stories and collective memory shape the public's interpretation of monetary policy. These findings challenge the sufficiency of traditional models and advocate for a paradigm shift in monetary theory and practice.

In recent years, scholars have explored the strategic role of central bank communication as a channel for influencing expectations, with behavioral factors playing a pivotal role (Coibion et al., 2019). Research indicates that psychological framing of announcements can affect public trust and amplify or dampen policy effectiveness (Haldane & Turrell, 2018). Todorov (2020) highlighted that financial conditions react more strongly to tone and timing than to numerical targets, supporting the need for narrative-sensitive strategies. Likewise, Baddeley (2019) emphasized how anchoring and loss aversion impair the neutrality of policy announcements, often leading to unintended consequences. A systematic review by Heinemann and Illing (2022) concluded that ignoring behavioral distortions in forward guidance reduces the credibility of monetary frameworks. Moreover, findings by Smets (2022) suggest that integrating behavioral parameters into DSGE models significantly improves forecasting under volatile conditions. Yet, many monetary authorities still prioritize technical models over psychological realism, limiting their adaptive capacity (Haldane, 2023). These studies collectively underscore the urgency of embedding behavioral dimensions into both the content and the delivery of monetary policy.

This study offers novelty by constructing a unified theoretical framework that integrates behavioral economics into central bank monetary policy decision-making. Unlike prior literature that isolates cognitive biases in specific monetary contexts, this research synthesizes multiple behavioral constructs—including anchoring, present bias, and overconfidence—into a cohesive model of policy transmission (Smets, 2022). It extends earlier work by Gennaioli and Shleifer (2018) by positioning memory and attention distortions as central mechanisms within monetary responses. Additionally, it advances the idea that central bank communication strategies must adapt to behavioral tendencies, such as salience and narrative framing, rather than assuming neutral interpretation (Todorov, 2020). This is particularly relevant as policymakers increasingly face trust deficits and public misperceptions during economic crises (Coibion et al., 2019). Previous studies have often examined communication and modeling separately, but this study bridges the two by highlighting how behavioral insights must shape both content and delivery (Heinemann & Illing, 2022). The framework also incorporates adaptive learning models that adjust based on real-time behavioral feedback (Hommes, 2021). Thus, the study redefines monetary policy as both a technical and psychological instrument of economic management.

Another distinctive contribution of this research is the creation of a behavioral taxonomy explicitly linked to monetary policy mechanisms—a feature largely absent from mainstream macroeconomic theory. While narrative economics has emerged as a new paradigm, it lacks operational clarity for central banks, which this study begins to address by proposing practical integration points (Shiller, 2017). Moreover, by combining insights from psychology, behavioral finance, and institutional economics, the research creates an interdisciplinary scaffold not present in existing monetary policy models (Baddeley, 2019). It also identifies institutional inertia as a behavioral phenomenon at the policy level, which has rarely been discussed in macroeconomic literature (Aikman et al., 2023). This research moves beyond normative calls for "more behavioral thinking" and instead proposes a structured, implementable framework suitable for empirical testing and simulation (Gómez et al., 2021). The study's emphasis on communication, expectation formation, and credibility presents a holistic view that aligns policy instruments with actual decision-making patterns of households and investors (Haldane & Turrell, 2018). This approach fills a theoretical and practical void in behavioral monetary studies and lays the groundwork for future applications in policy design.

This study holds global relevance as it provides a conceptual foundation for redesigning monetary policy frameworks in both advanced and emerging economies under behavioral considerations. By integrating psychological insights into macroeconomic theory, the research enhances the realism and responsiveness of central bank strategies worldwide. As global financial markets become increasingly complex and driven by sentiment, traditional rational-agent models struggle to maintain predictive power across diverse socioeconomic contexts. This framework enables policymakers to better anticipate non-linear and asymmetric responses to interest rates, inflation targeting, and forward guidance. The proposed model is adaptable across institutional settings,

allowing for localization without compromising theoretical consistency. It also supports cross-national comparisons by offering a standardized behavioral taxonomy for monetary reactions. Furthermore, it encourages global central banks to collaborate on developing more human-centric policy tools in an age of digital finance and heightened uncertainty. Overall, the study contributes to a more inclusive and psychologically grounded evolution of global monetary governance.

11 CONCLUSION

The findings of this study highlight the urgent need to integrate behavioral economics into the core of monetary policy design and implementation. Traditional models that rely on rational expectations fail to capture the real-world complexities of human decision-making, especially under uncertainty and crisis. The research reveals that cognitive biases such as overconfidence, present bias, and framing significantly distort responses to monetary instruments. Moreover, central bank communication strategies must evolve to align with behavioral patterns, enhancing transparency and public trust. The study provides a structured framework combining theoretical synthesis and practical relevance for policymakers. It also proposes a behavioral taxonomy that can inform both modeling and strategic communication. These contributions address existing gaps in macroeconomic theory and practice, offering a more adaptive and human-centric policy approach. Ultimately, the integration of behavioral insights promises to increase the efficacy, credibility, and resilience of global monetary systems.

REFERENCES

Aikman, D., Haldane, A. G., Hinterschweiger, M., & Kapadia, S. (2023). *Behavioral macroeconomics and financial stability: New directions for central banking*. Bank of England Discussion Paper.

Angner, E. (2020). *A course in behavioral economics* (3rd ed.). Red Globe Press.

Assenza, T., Hommes, C., & Massaro, D. (2021). Managing self-organization of expectations through monetary policy: A behavioral macroeconomic approach. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 130*, 104197. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedc.2021.104197

Baddeley, M. (2019). *Behavioural economics and finance*. Routledge.

Barberis, N., Greenwood, R., Jin, L., & Shleifer, A. (2018). Extrapolation and bubbles. *Journal of Financial Economics, 129*(2), 203–227. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2018.03.006

Bernanke, B. S. (2015). *The courage to act: A memoir of a crisis and its aftermath*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Bholat, D. (2016). Economic narratives. *Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin*, Q2, 157–170. https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/quarterly-bulletin/2016/q2/economic-narratives

Boell, S. K., & Cecez-Kecmanovic, D. (2015). On being 'systematic' in literature reviews. *Formulating Research Methods for Information Systems, 48*(5), 2–15.

Bordalo, P., Gennaioli, N., & Shleifer, A. (2020). Memory, attention, and choice. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 135*(3), 1399–1442. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjaa009

Castleberry, A., & Nolen, A. (2018). Thematic analysis of qualitative research data: Is it as easy as it sounds? *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning, 10*(6), 807–815. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2018.03.019

Coibion, O., Gorodnichenko, Y., & Weber, M. (2019). Monetary policy communications and their effects on household inflation expectations. *Journal of Political Economy, 127*(6), 2486–2547. https://doi.org/10.1086/702678

Gennaioli, N., & Shleifer, A. (2018). *A crisis of beliefs: Investor psychology and financial fragility*. Princeton University Press.

Gómez, M., Hommes, C., & Iori, G. (2021). Adaptive learning and behavioral heterogeneity in macroeconomics. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 190*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2021.07.004

Gürkaynak, R. S., Sack, B., & Swanson, E. T. (2005). Do actions speak louder than words? The response of asset prices to monetary policy actions and statements. *International Journal of Central Banking*, 1(1), 55–93.

Haldane, A. G. (2016). *The dappled world of finance*. Bank of England Speech Series. https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/speech/2016/the-dappled-world-of-finance

Haldane, A. G. (2023). *Behavioral economics and central banking: From theory to practice*. Bank of England Working Paper.

Haldane, A. G., & Turrell, A. (2018). Drawing on different disciplines: Macroeconomics and psychology. *Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin*, Q1, 1–13. https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/quarterly-bulletin/2018/2018-q1/drawing-on-different-disciplines

Heinemann, F., & Illing, G. (2022). Behavioral macro-financial linkages: How psychology challenges central bank orthodoxy. *European Economic Review, 143*, 103998. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2022.103998

Hommes, C. (2021). Behavioral and experimental macroeconomics and policy analysis. *Journal of Economic Literature, 59*(1), 149–219. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20191574

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Lo Duca, M., Riga, A., & Schmitz, M. (2021). Behavioral patterns in financial markets: Implications for monetary policy. *European Central Bank Research Bulletin*, 82, 3–11.

Mankiw, N. G. (2020). *Macroeconomics* (10th ed.). Worth Publishers.

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Rowley, J., & Slack, F. (2021). Conducting a literature review. *Management Research Review, 44*(9), 1321–1333. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-12-2020-0750

Shiller, R. J. (2017). *Narrative economics: How stories go viral and drive major economic events*. Princeton University Press.

Smets, F. (2022). Monetary policy in uncertain times: Behavioral extensions to DSGE models. *International Journal of Central Banking, 18*(3), 5–29.

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Suri, H. (2020). Purposeful sampling in qualitative research synthesis. *Qualitative Research Journal, 20*(4), 433–446. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-02-2020-0005

Thaler, R. H. (2016). *Misbehaving: The making of behavioral economics*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 8*(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45

Todorov, K. (2020). Monetary policy, financial conditions, and financial stability. *Journal of Monetary Economics, 115*, 220–232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2019.09.001

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science, 211*(4481), 453–458. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.7455683

Xiao, Y., & Watson, M. (2019). Guidance on conducting a systematic literature review. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 39*(1), 93–112. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X17723971

89 ~ 99_Similarity Check

ORIGINALITY REPORT

5%	2%	3%	0%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Anastasia Puspitasari Andayani, Intan Pramesti Dewi. "Pengaruh Net Profit Margin dan Ukuran Perusahaan dalam Memprediksi Financial Distress pada Perusahaan Transportasi dan Logistik yang terdaftar di BEI Periode 2020-2024", Journal of Management and Bussines (JOMB), 2025 Publication	1%
2	Submitted to Dordt University Student Paper	<1%
3	Stephen T. Dalby, Daniel Fiedorek, Joshua A. Daily. "Beyond the Evidence: Psychological and Institutional Factors Shaping Patent Ductus Arteriosus Stent Adoption", Pediatric Cardiology, 2025 Publication	<1%
4	Oleksiy Kryvtsov, Luba Petersen. "Central Bank Communication that Works: Lessons from Lab Experiments", Journal of Monetary Economics, 2020 Publication	<1%
5	Cuiyi Yuan, Shuting Lv, Yuping Han, Yuze Li, Zeming Xian, Guoshuang Liu, Shifeng Xiao. "Quercetagitrin Ameliorates Alzheimer-Like Pathologies Associated with TNFα/NFκB Pathway in APP/PS1 Mice", ACS Omega, 2025 Publication	<1%

6	arxiv.org Internet Source	<1%
7	www.econstor.eu Internet Source	<1%
8	ejournal.umm.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
9	Wright, Lydel Anthony. "Breaking Barriers: Organizational Inertia in Healthcare Product Procurement.", Temple University Publication	<1%
10	sandbox.arcabc.ca Internet Source	<1%
11	www.ewadirect.com Internet Source	<1%
12	ijrar.org Internet Source	<1%
13	repository.usd.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
14	www.theseus.fi Internet Source	<1%
15	Kenneth Gibb, Chris Leishman, Alex Marsh, Geoffrey Meen, Rachel Ong Viforj, Craig Watkins. "The Routledge Handbook of Housing Economics", Routledge, 2024 Publication	<1%

Exclude quotes	Off	Exclude matches	Off
Exclude bibliography	On		