The Dual Impact of Loss Aversion on Insurance Decision-Making: Mechanisms and Behavioral Interventions

Yiling Jiang

University of Toronto, Toronto, M5S 3G8, Canada

yiling.jiang@utoronto.ca

Abstract. Loss aversion, a cornerstone concept in behavioral economics, profoundly influences insurance decision-making by amplifying individuals' sensitivity to potential losses over equivalent gains. This study investigates the bidirectional effects of loss aversion across diverse risk scenarios—public health crises, natural disasters, and cybersecurity threats—and proposes behavioral interventions to reconcile its dual role as both a driver of risk mitigation and a source of cognitive bias. Through integrating prospect theory with empirical case analyses, this finding demonstrate that loss aversion leads to irrational insurance demand surges (e.g., a 58% increase in health insurance purchases during COVID-19 despite a 0.3% severe illness rate) while simultaneously causing underinsurance in imperceptible risks (e.g., only 17% of small businesses purchasing cyber insurance despite a 22% attack probability). Behavioral strategies such as default options, framing effects, and risk visualization tools are shown to optimize decision efficiency by recalibrating loss aversion's psychological weight. This research contributes to both theoretical advancements in behavioral economics and practical applications for insurance product design and policy implementation.

Keywords: Loss aversion, Insurance Decision-making, Prospect Theory, Behavioral Interventions, Risk Perception.

1. Introduction

1.1. Research Background

In the field of risk decision making, loss aversion, as a cornerstone concept of behavioral economics [1], reveals that human aversion to loss often exceeds pursuit of equal return [2]. This phenomenon is particularly significant in the insurance market: consumers are not insured solely on the basis of rational risk assessment, but are influenced by the psychological weight of potential losses [3]. Existing studies have shown that when people suffer from sudden risk events (such as public health crisis or natural disaster), it will significantly change individuals' risk perception model, and then affect their demand for insurance [4, 5]; At the same time, some groups also fall into the dilemma of inadequate security due to underestimating low-probability risks [6]. These paradoxical phenomena highlight the complex role of loss aversion in insurance decision making, which can drive risk avoidance behavior and may lead to irrational choice due to cognitive bias. How to systematically explain this bidirectional influence mechanism and optimize decision efficiency through behavioral intervention has become a common challenge for academia and industry.

1.2. Research Purpose and Significance

This paper aims to solve two core questions: First, how does loss aversion affect insurance decisions differently in different risk scenarios? Second, can intervention strategies based on behavioral economics (such as framework design and choice architecture) effectively reconcile the "double-edged sword" effect of loss aversion? In theory, psychological explanations of irrational insurance behavior can be deepened by integrating prospect theory [1] with insurance decision models. In practice, it provides a scientific basis for designing "booster" insurance products and improving the efficiency of risk management. For example, the "default option" mechanism proposed by Thaler and Sunstein [2] has been shown to significantly improve decision quality, but its potential for use in insurance scenarios still needs to be further explored.

1.3. Paper Structure

The following sections of this paper are organized as follows:

Section 2 analyzes the bidirectional impact of loss aversion on insurance decision-making through three types of cases (public health emergencies, natural disasters, small enterprises neglected by network security), and reveals its situational dependence by combining empirical data.

Section 3 shows that the prospect theory [1] and loss aversion coefficient model [2] are introduced to construct the psychological explanation framework of insurance decision making.

Section 4 presents optimization strategies based on behavioral economics, including frame effect design, default option mechanisms, and risk visualization tools, and discusses their feasibility in the context of business cases such as Progressive Insurance's risk simulator.

Section 5 summarizes the research findings and points out future research directions.

2. Loss aversion in Insurance Decision-making

2.1. Case Description

In insurance decision-making, the impact of loss aversion can be revealed by systematic comparison of different risk scenarios [7]. Although the triggering mechanism of each scenario is different, its core reflects the dominant role of loss aversion on insurance behavior.

In the case of public health emergencies, surges in demand for health insurance highlight the "probability-weighted distorting" effect of loss aversion. Qian's study [4] shows that health insurance premiums in China increased by 58% year on year during the COVID-19 pandemic, which is seriously out of step with the objective risk level-the actual severe illness rate is only 0.3%, but consumers have amplified the subjective probability estimate to 3% due to fear of loss. According to prospect theory [1], individuals systematically overestimate their psychological weight when evaluating low probability loss events. For example, the actuarial pricing of a health insurance product is based on a 0.3% incidence of severe illness, but consumers are driven by loss aversion and are willing to pay 10 times the reasonable premium. This bias directly reflects the asymmetry of the value function: loss is about 2-2.5 times more painful than gain satisfaction.

The insurance behavior of those who experienced natural disasters further verified the experiential dependence of loss aversion. Rufat's study [5] on flood disasters showed that the directly affected group was 82% more likely to be insured (model 1 coefficient $\beta=0.82$) and more likely to take flood control measures (model 3 coefficient $\beta=0.67$) than those who had not experienced them. This phenomenon stems from the "subjective probability anchoring" mechanism in prospect theory: disaster survivors reassess flood risk as a high-probability event, even though the objective data has not changed significantly. For example, unaffected groups may set flood probability estimates at 1% based on historical data, while survivors raise them to more than 5%, triggering a stronger incentive to take out insurance.

Contrast this with the cybersecurity insurance decisions of small businesses. According to Rahmonbek [6], only 17% of small businesses purchase cyber insurance, while the actual annual attack probability is as high as 22%. Due to the lack of loss aversion, this group underestimates the psychological weight of potential losses (the subjective probability estimate is only 0.1%), resulting in a serious shortage of insurance demand. According to the nudge theory of Thaler and Sunstein [2], when an individual cannot effectively perceive loss, its decision will deviate from the optimal equilibrium. Business owners, for example, misjudge their exposure to risk, reflecting another extreme form of probability weighting distortion-systematic neglect of high probability risks.

2.2. Theoretical Analysis

As one of the core theories of behavioral economics, loss aversion is based on the Prospect Theory proposed by Kahneman and Tversky [1]. The theory challenges the assumption of "rational man" in traditional economics, pointing out that individuals make risk decisions not based on absolute wealth

level, but based on reference points, and carry out asymmetric psychological assessment of gains and losses. The core mechanism of prospect theory is embodied in the unique shape of value function: in the loss region below the reference point, the slope of the value function curve is significantly steeper than that in the gain region above the reference point. Specifically, the same amount of loss caused about 2 to 2.5 times the intensity of psychological distress than the satisfaction of gain. For example, if a consumer faces the risk of losing $100,000 in potential medical expenses, the loss of psychological utility will be equivalent to the negative feelings of giving up $200,000 to $250,000 in earnings. This asymmetry directly explains the underlying driving force of insurance demand-the willingness of individuals to pay to avoid losses far exceeds the pursuit of gains, even when premiums are priced above actuarial fairness.

To quantify the impact of loss aversion on insurance decisions, behavioral economists introduce the concept of loss aversion coefficient (λ). The loss aversion coefficient is defined as the ratio of an individual's change in the marginal utility of loss to gain. When the coefficient is greater than 1, it indicates that individuals have a tendency of loss aversion, and the higher the coefficient value, the more significant the loss avoidance behavior [7]. In insurance purchasing decision, loss aversion coefficient directly affects consumers' balance between insurance premium and potential loss. Take an insurance product as an example, if a consumer needs to pay a premium of 10,000 yuan to cover the risk of loss of 100,000 yuan, its decision-making logic is not simply a comparison of the objective amount of premium and loss, but a subjective assessment based on psychological utility. Since the psychological utility loss caused by loss is much higher than the satisfaction of the same income, when the loss aversion coefficient reaches or exceeds 2, consumers will be more inclined to choose insurance, even if the premium price appears high in actuarial terms. This mechanism reveals the critical effect of loss aversion: an individual's psychological bias may deviate his decision making from the traditional rational model, triggering irrational insurance or risk ignoring behavior [2].

Based on the above theory, behavioral intervention strategies in the insurance market can optimize consumer choice by adjusting the decision-making framework. For example, Thaler and Sunstein's Nudge Theory [2] emphasizes that loss aversion can be leveraged to increase participation rates by reconstructing "choice architectures" (such as making cost-effective insurance options the default option). The setting of default options implies the implicit framework of "deviating from the status quo means facing potential losses", thus activating consumers' instinctive response to loss avoidance. This strategy does not need to change the actual cost or coverage of the product, but can guide the decision to the social optimal level only through psychological anchoring effect. For example, in the auto insurance market, making comprehensive insurance a default check can significantly increase participation rates, because consumers tend to view "unchecking" as an active waiver of coverage, creating an incentive to avoid losses.

2.3. Behavioral Optimization

In insurance decision-making, the psychological mechanism of Loss Aversion can be effectively guided by behavioral intervention strategies to optimize consumers' risk response choices. The use of the Framing Effect is one of the core strategies. Tversky and Kahneman's disease prevention framework experiment [3] showed that when insurance information is presented in the form of "loss avoidance" rather than "gain acquisition", the insurance coverage rate can be significantly improved. For example, describing health insurance as "$1 per day to avoid $100,000 in medical expense losses" can activate the Loss Avoidance instinct of consumers by emphasizing potential economic losses rather than future guaranteed gains. This design makes direct use of Prospect Theory's Value Function asymmetry-the psychological pain caused by loss is about 2 to 2.5 times that of equivalent gain satisfaction [1], thus making individuals more inclined to pay a premium for risk avoidance.

Default Option design is another key strategy. Thaler and Sunstein's Nudge Theory [2] suggests that preset options can significantly reduce decision-making resistance through "Status Quo Bias". Johnson and Goldstein's seminal study [8] demonstrated that default options increased organ donor registration rates from 4% to 82%, providing empirical validation for insurance choice architecture.

In the case of the UK trade union Insurance scheme, when Comprehensive Insurance was set as the auto-checked Default Option, the participation rate jumped from 32% to 89%. Its internal logic lies in that consumers regard the "active cancellation of default protection" as the active abandonment of existing rights and interests, which triggers the Loss Aversion reaction. In the Auto Insurance market, similar strategies are widely used. For example, a cost-effective Comprehensive Insurance plan is set as the default checkbox, and consumers' fear of "deviation from the status quo means they face losses" is utilized to reduce the problem of insufficient protection caused by inertia or delay.

The introduction of Risk Visualization Tools optimizes decisions by enhancing the visibility of losses. The Accident Probability Calculator developed by Progressive Insurance Company [9] is a typical case. The tool converts abstract, low-probability events into concrete, numerical expectations by inputting driving behavior data and generating personalized risk reports (e.g., "Probability of a car accident in the next 5 years: 17%"). This visual intervention helps consumers overcome the "Probability Neglect" tendency [10], allowing them to more intuitively weigh the cost of premiums against potential losses. For example, young drivers' insurance Aversion increased by 41% after learning that their accident probability was higher than average, confirming the strengthening effect of Loss Aversion after risk visualization.

In addition, the Simplification of Complex Choices can alleviate irrational behavior caused by Choice Overload. Will insurance products according to the level of risk stratification (such as "Basic/Advanced/Comprehensive") can reduce the consumer's cognitive burden. For example, the "Basic" of Health Insurance only covers the risk of Critical Illness, while the "Comprehensive" includes Hospitalization Allowance and Outpatient Reimbursement, this classification design makes it easier for consumers to identify their own risk exposure points, thus matching the protection level based on the strength of Loss Aversion. At the same time, Automatic Renewal Mechanism reduces guarantee interruption by exploiting Status Quo Bias. Data show that when the renewal process is set to automatic by default, the Policy Termination Rate decreases by 62% [2] because consumers frame "active surrender" as a loss of existing coverage, triggering an incentive to avoid it.

The common goal of these strategies is to calibrate the strength of Loss Aversion from irrational bias to driving force of Rational Risk Management by reconstructing decision framework, simplifying selection process and enhancing risk perception.

3. Conclusion

In summary, this research thoroughly examines the dual-edged role of loss aversion in insurance decision-making from both theoretical and practical perspectives. By analyzing various risk scenarios such as public health emergencies, natural disasters, and small businesses' cybersecurity insurance decisions, we uncover the bidirectional impact of loss aversion. On one hand, it prompts individuals to purchase insurance to avoid losses; on the other hand, it may lead to irrational choices like over-insurance or under-insurance due to cognitive biases.

Theoretically, this study combines prospect theory and the loss aversion coefficient model to provide a comprehensive psychological explanation for irrational insurance behavior. It quantifies the influence of loss aversion on insurance decisions and deepens our understanding of the psychological mechanisms behind insurance-related choices.

Practically, the research demonstrates that behavioral-based optimization strategies, such as frame effect design, default option mechanisms, risk visualization tools, and simplifying complex choices, are highly effective. For instance, the framing effect can significantly boost insurance uptake by emphasizing loss avoidance; default options can leverage status quo bias to increase participation rates; risk visualization tools can help consumers better assess risks and make more informed decisions; and simplifying choices can alleviate decision-making difficulties caused by information overload.

However, there are still areas for further exploration. Future research could refine behavioral intervention strategies and expand their application in different insurance contexts. It's also worth

investigating how to balance the influence of loss aversion and other psychological factors in insurance decision-making. Overall, this research not only contributes to the theoretical development of behavioral economics in the insurance field but also offers practical guidance for designing more effective insurance products and improving risk management efficiency.

References

[1] Kahneman D, Tversky A. Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 1979, 47 (2): 263-292.

[2] Thaler R H, Sunstein C R. Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

[3] Tversky A, Kahneman D. The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. Science, 1981, 211 (4481): 453-458.

[4] Qian Y. Behavioral dynamics of health insurance demand during COVID-19. Journal of Risk and Insurance, 2021, 88 (3): 745-768.

[5] Rufat S. Post-disaster insurance behavior: Evidence from flood zones. Risk Analysis, 2023, 43 (5): 1023-1041.

[6] Rahmonbek N. Cybersecurity insurance gaps in small enterprises. Journal of Cybersecurity, 2025, 11 (1): 1-18.

[7] Barberis N. Thirty years of prospect theory in economics: A review and assessment. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 2013, 27 (1): 173-196.

[8] Johnson E J, Goldstein D. Do defaults save lives?. Science, 2003, 302 (5649): 1338-1339.

[9] Progressive Insurance. Risk simulator technical report. (2023-05-12) [2024-07-20]. https://www.progressive.com/risk-simulator.

[10] Hsee C K, Weber E U. A fundamental prediction error: Self–others discrepancies in risk preference. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 1997, 126 (1): 45-53.