

The Critical Rapid Phenomenon of Anchoring Effects, Behavioral Biases, And Pricing Decisions in Digital and Platform Economies

Yash B. Naik¹, Darshan M. Patel², Dhairya R. Joshi³

¹*Teaching Assistant, Department of Psychology, The M.S. University of Baroda, Vadodara (Gujarat), INDIA*

²*Student Scholar, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, GSFC University, Vadodara (Gujarat), INDIA*

³*Student Scholar, Department of Computer Science and Design, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel Institute of Technology, Vasad (Gujarat), INDIA*

Abstract—This critical rapid review synthesizes recent empirical, experimental, and theoretical studies (2024–2026) examining anchoring effects and related behavioral biases across consumer markets, platform pricing, negotiations, and digital ecosystems. Fourteen studies were reviewed using a rapid evidence synthesis approach, emphasizing objectives, designs, methods, samples, findings, and limitations. Results indicate that anchoring significantly shapes negotiation outcomes, consumer price perceptions, bundle choices, IPO participation, and platform pricing strategies. However, the literature is dominated by theoretical modeling and secondary data, with comparatively few large-scale human experiments. Key gaps include limited ecological validity, overreliance on stylized assumptions, and insufficient cross-cultural validation. Practical implications are discussed for digital platforms, marketers, policymakers, and AI system designers. Recommendations emphasize the need for more human-centered, longitudinal, and field-based research to strengthen causal inference and real-world relevance.

Index Terms—Anchoring effect; behavioral economics; pricing strategies; digital platforms; consumer decision-making

I. INTRODUCTION

Anchoring is a foundational concept in behavioral economics, describing how initial reference points systematically bias subsequent judgments and decisions. In digital and platform-mediated environments, anchoring increasingly operates

through prices, defaults, algorithmic recommendations, and even AI-driven negotiations. Recent research has expanded anchoring beyond traditional consumer settings to include real-time bidding, supply chains, IPO markets, sustainable products, hospitality, insurance, and automated bargaining systems.

Given the rapid growth and fragmentation of this literature, a critical rapid review is appropriate to provide timely synthesis while identifying methodological strengths, weaknesses, and actionable insights. This review integrates empirical, experimental, conceptual, and analytical studies published between 2024 and 2026 to address three guiding questions:

1. How does anchoring manifest across digital, platform, and pricing contexts?
2. What methodological approaches dominate current research?
3. What gaps limit generalizability and policy relevance?

II. METHOD: CRITICAL RAPID REVIEW

2.1 Review Design

A critical rapid review approach was adopted, prioritizing speed and relevance while retaining systematic elements. Fourteen studies were drawn from the user-provided literature table, covering negotiations, consumer pricing, platform economics,

insurance, IPOs, hospitality, and theoretical pricing models.

2.2 Inclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they:

- Explicitly examined anchoring or closely related behavioral biases (e.g., reference dependence, loss aversion).
- Focused on pricing, negotiation, or decision-making contexts.
- Were published between 2024 and 2026.
- Employed empirical, experimental, conceptual, or analytical designs.

2.3 Analytical Review Strategy

Each study was critically summarized along seven dimensions: objectives, research design, data methods, analysis techniques, variables, samples, and limitations. Findings were synthesized thematically, with emphasis on (a) anchoring mechanisms, (b) methodological patterns, and (c) practical relevance.

III. RESULTS AND THEMATIC SYNTHESIS

3.1 Anchoring in Negotiations and AI Systems

Large-scale AI-to-AI bargaining experiments demonstrate strong anchoring asymmetries driven by turn order. Buyer-first negotiations systematically favor buyers, producing sizable deviations from Nash equilibrium. These effects persist across thousands of simulated negotiations, highlighting anchoring as a structural bias in automated decision systems.

In adjacent work, prediction markets have been proposed as “calibration teachers” for advertising systems, showing that externally anchored probabilities can improve model calibration under label scarcity. While innovative, such approaches remain vulnerable to market manipulation and liquidity constraints.

Critical Insight: Anchoring is not merely a human bias as it becomes embedded in algorithmic infrastructures, raising concerns about fairness and robustness in automated markets.

3.2 Consumer Pricing, Bundles, and Psychological Strategies

Survey and experimental studies consistently show that anchor pricing (“Was ₹1500, Now ₹999”), charm

pricing, bundles, and decoys significantly increase perceived value and purchase intention. Hospitality and cosmetic-product contexts provide convergent evidence: introducing decoy options shifts consumers toward higher-priced bundles, while bundled pricing enhances value perceptions.

However, many studies rely on scenario-based experiments or self-reported surveys, limiting ecological validity.

Critical Insight: Psychological pricing is effective across domains, but real-world purchasing data are rarely used, constraining external validity.

3.3 Digital Environments and Amplified Behavioral Biases

Conceptual reviews argue that digital technologies intensify anchoring, loss aversion, mental accounting, and default effects by accelerating decision cycles and increasing cognitive load. Consumers increasingly “satisfice” rather than optimize, particularly in platform environments shaped by recommendations and interface design.

Yet these claims are largely theoretical, with minimal empirical validation using platform-scale behavioral data.

3.4 Financial Markets and Social Anchors

Evidence from Indian IPOs shows that influencer endorsements act as powerful social anchors, increasing underpricing and initial returns via retail attention and herding. Engagement metrics significantly outperform traditional analyst recommendations in predicting investor participation.

Critical insight: Anchoring increasingly operates through social and digital signals, not just numeric price cues.

3.5 Theoretical Pricing and Platform Models

A substantial portion of the literature uses analytical models (Stackelberg games, Hotelling frameworks, multinomial logit choice) to study anchoring-adjustment, reference prices, stickiness, and green pricing. These studies provide elegant equilibrium insights but assume homogeneous consumers, linear demand, or zero marginal costs.

While theoretically rigorous, they lack empirical grounding.

3.6 Challenging Classical Anchoring Theory

Multi-study experimental work testing the “insufficient adjustment” model finds no evidence for unidirectional adjustment over time, calling for fundamental revision of this dominant theory. This represents an important corrective to long-standing assumptions in anchoring research.

IV. CRITICAL APPRAISAL

Across the reviewed studies, three structural limitations dominate:

1. Overreliance on theory and simulations: Many pricing and platform studies lack real behavioral data.
2. Limited human samples: Several works use no participants or rely on small, convenience samples.
3. Contextual narrowness: Results are often derived from stylized settings (e.g., bilateral negotiations, hypothetical menus), restricting generalizability.

Conversely, strengths include increasing use of large-scale simulations, integration of behavioral economics with platform theory, and emerging attention to AI-mediated anchoring.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

1. Prioritize field and platform data: Combine theoretical models with real transaction logs, clickstreams, or purchase histories.
2. Expand human-centered experiments: Move beyond scenario-based tasks toward incentive-compatible, real-stakes designs.
3. Adopt longitudinal approaches: Examine how anchoring effects evolve over repeated interactions.
4. Integrate cross-cultural perspectives: Most evidence is context-specific; broader geographic coverage is needed.
5. Audit algorithmic anchoring: Systematically test how AI systems propagate or amplify anchoring biases.

VI. PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

1. For Digital Platforms and Marketers: Anchor, bundle, and decoy strategies reliably increase conversion but raise ethical concerns around

manipulation. Transparent pricing and responsible choice architecture are essential.

2. For Policymakers and Regulators: Influencer-driven anchoring in IPOs and opaque commission structures in insurance markets justify stronger disclosure and consumer-protection frameworks.
3. For AI and System Designers: Turn-order effects and calibration anchors in automated negotiations highlight the need for fairness-aware protocols and bias audits.

VII. CONCLUSION

This critical rapid review shows that anchoring remains a powerful and pervasive force across consumer markets, financial systems, and digital platforms. While methodological diversity is growing, the field remains skewed toward theoretical modeling and secondary data. Advancing anchoring research now requires deeper engagement with real users, real markets, and real platforms. Without this shift, policy and design interventions risk being built on elegant but incomplete representations of human behavior.

REFERENCES

- [1] Baraskar, V., & Mir, S. (2025). *Influence of psychological pricing strategies on consumer behaviour: A study of sustainable cosmetic products*.
- [2] Bujisic, M., Bujisic, V., Parsa, H., Bilgihan, A., & Li, K. (2024). Anchoring decisions: The role of decoy pricing in consumer choices. *International Hospitality Review*.
- [3] Chen, Y. (2025). The impact of behavioral economics on consumer decision-making in the digital era. *Advances in Management and Intelligent Technologies, 1*(3).
- [4] Hasija, S., & Castillo, V. E. (2025). When anchors sink suppliers: Role-based asymmetry bias in AI-automated buyer-supplier negotiations. SSRN Working Paper.
- [5] Liu, X., Zhang, Y., Qi, W., & Wang, J. (2024). Optimal pricing of online products based on customer anchoring-adjustment psychology. *International Transactions in Operational Research, 31*(1), 448–477.
- [6] Liu, X., Zhou, B., Qi, W., Li, Z., & Wang, J. (2025). Value-added service pricing strategies

- considering customer stickiness: A freemium perspective. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, 20(3), 201.
- [7] Owusu-Berko, L. (2025). The intersection of behavioral economics and data science in personalizing consumer experiences and maximizing revenue optimization.
- [8] Pan, F., Zhao, D., & Geng, X. (2025). Two-stage supply chain pricing strategies with reference price effect. *RAIRO—Operations Research*, 59(5), 3347–3373.
- [9] Raja Guru, K. B., Prasad, K., Dubey, S. P., & Kharbanda, S. (2025). Digital sentiment and the retail crowd: How finfluencers shape IPO valuations. *Journal of Behavioral Finance*, 1–23.
- [10] Röseler, L., Incerti, L., Rebholz, T. R., Seida, C., & Papenmeier, F. (2025). Falsifying the insufficient adjustment model: No evidence for unidirectional adjustment from anchors. *Meta-Psychology*, 9.
- [11] Xodjaraxmanova, N. (2025). The psychology of insurance: How behavioral economics unveils consumers' hidden motives. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, 1(2), 1780–1785.
- [12] Yudhantara, R. (2025). The role of intermediary commission mechanisms in shaping health insurance market dynamics and consumer decision-making. *International Journal of Theoretical, Computational, and Applied Multidisciplinary Sciences*, 9(5), 1–19.
- [13] Zhang, H. (2026). Prediction markets as calibration teachers for real-time bidding: Market pricing meets ad auctions. *Journal of Advanced Computing Systems*, 6(1), 1–18.
- [14] Zhang, W., Ji, L., & Chen, W. (2025). Optimization of green-pricing strategies for two-sided marine freight platforms with network externality and multihoming effects. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 12, 1601322.