Cognitive and Neural Constructs Influencing Decision Making.

Thomas M. Kottoor

Abstract

Human decision-making is shaped by cognitive representations, emotional processes, and neural mechanisms that frequently diverge from rational models of choice. Classical work by Kahneman and Tversky demonstrated that decision outcomes vary dramatically depending on how identical problems are framed, revealing systematic biases rooted in mental shortcuts. This paper reviews key constructs including heuristics, loss aversion, mental accounting, and cognitive framing and integrates contemporary findings from behavioural science, neuropsychology, and machine behaviour research. Emerging evidence highlights the interaction of fast intuitive processes (System 1) and slower analytical processes (System 2), as well as the growing influence of AI-based decision architectures. The concept of "micro-reflection," a brief pause before action, is examined as a practical intervention to reduce bias. Understanding the neurocognitive foundations of decision-making has broad implications for psychology, clinical practice, public policy, and technologically mediated environments.

Keywords: decision making, framing, heuristics, neurocognition, loss aversion, behavioural science, micro-reflection, cognitive bias

Introduction

Decision-making is often perceived as a product of deliberate, logical reasoning. In everyday contexts choosing a healthcare provider, evaluating educational options, or selecting among online offers individuals assume they exercise conscious control over their choices. However, neuropsychological and cognitive research reveals that decisions are frequently influenced by emotional states, contextual cues, and mental heuristics rather than purely rational evaluation.

A central goal of neuropsychology is to understand the cognitive and neural processes underlying real-world problem solving. The representation or *frame* of a decision problem is now recognized as a critical determinant of choice. This manuscript synthesizes foundational and contemporary findings on how cognitive constructs and brain-based mechanisms shape decision-making behaviour.

Theoretical Background-Framing and the Foundations of Behavioural Decision Science.

Kahneman and Tversky's early work (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981; Kahneman & Tversky, 1982) challenged classical rational-choice theory by demonstrating that choices shift depending solely on how information is framed. Their research showed that mathematically identical scenarios can produce opposite decisions when presented as gains versus losses. This discovery provided the foundation for behavioural decision science and established framing as a central neurocognitive construct.

Illustrative Example: The General's Dilemma

The "General's Dilemma" illustrates framing effects vividly. When outcomes are framed in terms of lives saved, participants tend to choose risk-seeking options. When framed in terms of lives lost,

the majority shift toward risk aversion. Although both versions involve identical probabilities, emotional responses to "saving" versus "losing" shape neural valuation processes, triggering differential activation in regions associated with affective forecasting and loss sensitivity.

Key Cognitive and Neural Constructs -Heuristics and Cognitive Shortcuts:

Kahneman and Tversky (1982) identified several heuristics: simple rules the brain uses to reduce computational load:

- Representativeness: Judging outcomes based on similarity to prototypes, often leading to neglect of base rates.
- Availability: Estimating likelihood based on ease of recall, influenced by vividness and emotional salience.
- Base-rate neglect: Over-reliance on personal uniqueness or narrative reasoning instead of statistical information.
- Loss aversion: Losses evoke stronger neural and affective responses than equivalent gains (Kahneman, 2011).

These heuristics serve adaptive purposes but can mislead when statistical reasoning is required.

Mental Accounting

Individuals frequently categorize financial outcomes into separate "mental accounts." Identical economic outcomes such as losing cash versus losing a prepaid ticket elicit different behavioural responses. Neuroeconomic studies suggest that mental accounts reflect domain-specific encoding of value in prefrontal regions, interacting with emotional responses to perceived gains and losses.

Dual-Process Models:

Neuropsychological evidence supports dual-process theories (Kahneman, 2011):

- System 1: Automatic, fast, emotionally driven.
- System 2: Deliberate, slow, analytically demanding.

Many biases arise when System 1 dominates or when System 2 is insufficiently engaged due to cognitive load, stress, or time pressure.

Neural and Emotional Influences:

Ramachandran (2011) emphasizes that decision-making integrates logical cognition with emotional circuitry shaped by evolutionary pressures. The involvement of limbic structures, prefrontal regions, and reward pathways suggests that decisions reflect complex neurobiological interactions rather than purely cognitive computations:

Contemporary Directions in Neuropsychology and Behavioural Sciences.

-Nudge Theory and Choice Architecture:

Thaler and Sunstein (2008) showed that altering the “architecture” of choices—such as default enrolment or environmental cues can guide individuals toward healthier or more economically sound decisions without limiting autonomy.

-Large-Scale Behavioural Interventions-

Mega-studies by Milkman et al. (2021) demonstrate that behavioural interventions can significantly influence public health, savings behaviour, and prosocial action when applied at scale.

-AI, Algorithms, and Machine Behaviour.

AI systems increasingly inform decisions related to healthcare, finance, and social environments. Rahwan et al. (2019) argue that understanding “machine behaviour” is essential because algorithms can both mitigate and inadvertently amplify human biases.

Micro-Reflection as a Corrective Mechanism:

A recent editorial in *Frontiers in Psychology* (2025) highlights micro-reflection—a brief, deliberate pause before action—as an emerging tool to reduce impulsive or biased decisions. Three simple practices show promise:

1. Identify the frame: Recognizing whether information is presented as a gain or loss.

2. Check the heuristic: Distinguishing emotional reactions from objective evaluation.

3. Reframe the choice: Considering alternative perspectives to reveal structural equivalence.

These strategies align with neuropsychological evidence that activating reflective processes can counterbalance the influence of rapid, intuitive responses.

Discussion

Decision-making emerges from a dynamic interplay between cognitive representations, emotional responses, and neural mechanisms. Framing effects demonstrate how the mind constructs subjective meaning, altering valuation processes in predictable ways. Heuristics, while adaptive, can produce systematic biases that endure across contexts and populations. Contemporary research links these cognitive phenomena to identifiable neural correlates, reinforcing the view that decision-making is neither purely rational nor purely emotional but an integrated neurocognitive process.

The expansion of behavioural science into public policy and AI-mediated environments heightens the importance of understanding these mechanisms. As algorithms increasingly shape the architecture of human choice, both human cognitive biases and machine-induced biases require careful scrutiny.

Conclusion

Decision-making is shaped by cognitive frames, heuristics, neural valuation systems, and contextual cues rather than strict rationality. Recognizing these influences enables individuals, clinicians, and policymakers to design environments and interventions that promote more balanced and deliberate choices. As the boundaries between human cognition and AI-guided decision processes continue to blur, a neuropsychological understanding of decision-making remains essential for fostering ethical, effective, and human-cantered systems.

References

Buelow, M. T., Okdie, B. M., & Kowalsky, J. M. (2024). Ecological validity of common behavioral decision-making tasks: Evidence across two samples. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 46, 187–206.

Crivelli, D., Acconito, C., & Balconi, M. (2024). Emotional and cognitive "route" in decision-making process: The relationship between executive functions, psychophysiological correlates, decisional styles, and personality. *Brain Sciences*, 14(7), 734. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci14070734

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1982). *Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Milkman, K. L., Gromet, D. M., Ho, H., Kay, J. S., Lee, T. W., Pandiloski, P., … Duckworth, A. L. (2021). Megastudies improve the impact of applied behavioural science. *Nature*, 600(7890), 478–483.

Rahwan, I., Cebrian, M., Obradovich, N., Bongard, J., Bonnefon, J. F., Breazeal, C., … Wellman, M. (2019). Machine behaviour. *Nature*, 568(7753), 477–486.

Ramachandran, V. S. (2011). *The Tell-Tale Brain: Unlocking the Mystery of Human Nature*. Noida, India: Random House.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211(4481), 453–458.

(*The author, Dr. Thomas M . Kottoor is a Senior Lecturer in Psychology (retd), B.C.M College, Kottayam, Kerala, India.)*

www.college.ac.in/retired-faculty-member