Manuscript ID:
TIJCMBLIR-2026-030127

Volume: 3

Issue: 1

Month: February

Year: 2026

E-ISSN: 3065-9191

Submitted: 20 Jan 2026

Revised: 25 Jan 2026

Accepted: 10 Feb 2026

Published: 28 Feb 2026

Address for correspondence:
Dr. Malathy.K,
Associate Professor,Department of Commerce, Dr.P.Dayananda Pai P Satisha Pai Government First Grade College, CarStreet,Mangalore
Email: malathyk93@gmail.com

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18834169

DOI Link:
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18834169

Risk Aversion in Individuals and Corporations: Implications for Enterprise Risk Management

Dr. Malathy.K,
Associate Professor,Department of Commerce,
Dr.P.Dayananda Pai P Satisha Pai Government First Grade College, CarStreet,Mangalore

Abstract

Risk is inherent in all human and organizational activities, arising from potential threats to wealth, assets, or operations. Individuals exhibit risk aversion, a behavioural tendency to prefer certain outcomes over uncertain ones, which influences decisions such as purchasing insurance. The demand for insurance is affected by factors including premium loading, income and wealth, information on potential losses, alternative sources of indemnity, and the nature of losses. Corporate risk management, although shaped by individual owners, differs fundamentally due to the ability to diversify risks internally and the influence of shareholder diversification. Even for diversified shareholders, corporate insurance offers benefits such as access to loss control and claims processing services, reduced financing costs, improved investment capacity, mitigation of bankruptcy risks, and potential tax advantages. This paper explores risk aversion in individuals and corporations, the evolution and objectives of ERM, its distinctions from traditional risk management, the new competencies required, and the challenges it presents for effective implementation. By emphasizing a coordinated, enterprise-wide approach, ERM not only mitigates potential losses but also identifies opportunities to enhance organizational value and stakeholder confidence.

Keywords: *Risk Aversion, Enterprise Risk Management, Corporate Risk, Insurance Demand, Organizational Risk Strategy*

Introduction

Risk refers to the likelihood or possibility of experiencing harm, loss, liability, or other adverse events resulting from internal or external factors. Such risks can often be managed or reduced through proactive measures and preventive strategies. While all human endeavours involve some degree of risk, the nature and magnitude of risk vary across activities, prompting individuals to adopt strategies to reduce exposure. Risk aversion, a concept studied in psychology, economics, and finance, describes the behaviour of individuals—particularly consumers and investors—when faced with uncertainty, reflecting a preference for certain outcomes over uncertain alternatives with equivalent expected value. This behaviour motivates individuals to purchase insurance, even when premiums exceed expected claim costs, as a means of protecting wealth and minimizing potential losses. Although businesses are owned by individuals, corporate risk management differs fundamentally from individual risk management, as organizations are often structured to diversify risks internally, enabling more efficient mitigation of exposure. ERM is increasingly viewed as a strategic tool that goes beyond traditional risk management, addressing not only potential losses but also opportunities for value creation across the enterprise.

Objectives of study:

1. To describe why risk-averse individuals buy insurance.
2. To explain the main factors affecting individuals' demand for insurance.
3. To explain how business risk aversion can benefit shareholders even when shareholders hold diversified portfolios of investments.
4. To explain about what is enterprise risk management? Why it has been developed so quickly and how it differs from traditional risk management?
5. What new skills are involved in Enterprise risk management process & what challenge this approach
6. offers compared to prior techniques.

Literature Review:

- **Eeckhoudt, Fiori & Rosazza Gianin (2018)** in their research paper Risk Aversion, Loss Aversion, and the Demand for Insurance studied how individuals' risk preferences influence insurance choices.

How to Cite this Article:
K,, M. (2026). Risk Aversion in Individuals and Corporations: Implications for Enterprise Risk Management. The International Journal of Commerce Management and Business Law in International Research, 3(1), 135–140. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18834169

They found that higher risk aversion increases the demand for insurance, even when premiums exceed expected losses. Their work explains real-world behaviours such as over-insurance for modest risks. The study emphasizes the link between risk aversion and insurance uptake.

- **Anton & Nucu (2020)** in their research paper Enterprise Risk Management: A Literature Review and Agenda for Future Research reviewed ERM adoption, implementation, and its impact on firm performance. They found that ERM improves risk oversight and strategic decision-making. However, gaps remain in empirical studies across industries. The study calls for further research on ERM effectiveness.
- **Kerraous (2020)** in his research paper Enterprise Risk Management and Value Creation: A Literature Review examined ERM's impact on firm value and shareholder wealth. The review shows mixed evidence: ERM can enhance value but may not always benefit diversified shareholders. The study highlights the need for more empirical research. It emphasizes ERM's role in integrating risk and strategic management.
- **Rapi et al. (2025)** in their research paper A Cross-Sectional Study of Risk Aversion and Life Insurance Demand at the Country Level analysed the effect of risk aversion on life insurance demand across countries. Results show that risk-averse individuals are more likely to buy insurance. Income positively impacts insurance demand, while higher education may reduce it. The findings confirm the role of risk aversion in insurance behaviour.

While existing studies have examined individual risk aversion and Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) separately, there is limited research that integrates both perspectives to understand how risk-averse behaviour influences insurance demand and corporate risk strategies. This study aims to fill this gap by analyzing why individuals purchase insurance, the factors affecting their demand, how corporate risk aversion benefits shareholders, and the development, skills, and challenges involved in implementing ERM,

Methodology adopted:

The information provided in the article is gathered from piecing together the materials from a variety of secondary sources like journals, textbooks, newspapers and internet.

Conceptual Framework, Discussion and Analysis:

Risk Aversion and Demand for Insurance by Individuals: Risk aversion appears to be a characteristic of most people as evidenced by their behaviour when faced with risky scenarios. Most people are willing to pay insurance premiums in excess of expected claim costs for insurance; that is, they are willing to pay a risk premium. Also, most people require additional compensation to induce them to accept or take on risk. For e.x., people require higher expected returns to induce them to invest in common stocks rather than government bonds, because stocks have greater risk.

Factors affecting an Individual's demand for Insurance:

1. **Premium loading**:
   Although risk-averse people generally desire insurance, the extent to which they will purchase insurance depends on the policy's premium loading. The premium loading is rarely zero because insurers must be compensated for their costs. A positive loading implies that the policyholder pays a premium in excess of the expected payments from the insurer. A risk-averse person may be willing to pay this additional amount (positive loading) because insurance reduces risk. However, the amount of coverage that risk-averse people will purchase generally will decline as the loading on the policy increases. That is, the demand for insurance follows the fundamental economic principle that the quantity demand decreases as the price increases. (Price in this context refers to the policy's loading). In the extreme, if the loading on an insurance policy is too high, then people will not purchase insurance.
2. **Income, Wealth and risk bearing ability:**
   Income and wealth are important determinants of insurance demand. Individuals with greater wealth generally, own more assets exposed to risk, which increases the need for insurance protection. In contrast, low-income individuals may be unable to afford adequate coverage, as most of their earnings are spent on necessities, resulting in higher risk retention. Wealth also influences risk-bearing capacity. Those with limited wealth are typically more sensitive to potential losses, as such losses represent a large proportion of their resources. Conversely, wealthier individuals can absorb smaller losses more easily and may demand relatively less insurance for minor risks. Additionally, under the principle of limited liability, individuals with minimal wealth may purchase lower levels of liability insurance due to restricted financial exposure.
3. **Information**:
   The extent to which a person seeks insurance coverage is largely influenced by the knowledge and perceptions he or she has regarding the likelihood and magnitude of potential losses. If an individual is unaware of a possible risk, or believes that the chance of loss is negligible, there will be little or no voluntary demand for insurance unless it is made compulsory. Furthermore, differences in the assessment of expected loss can affect the level of coverage demanded. When a person estimates the probable loss to be lower than the insurer's assessment, the demand for insurance tends to be reduced. On the other hand, if the individual overestimates the probability or severity of loss, this heightened

perception of risk may lead to the purchase of greater insurance protection.

4. **Other sources of Indemnity:**
   The availability of other sources of indemnity, such as government assistance or assistance from society at the time catastrophe occurs also influences the decision of an individual to buy insurance.
5. **Non-monetary losses**:
   People generally do not purchase insurance against non-monetary losses like pain and suffering from physical injuries and grief when a loved one dies. However, insurance against nonmonetary losses is often provided implicitly by the court system (and by liability insurance) when injured parties receive compensation for pain and suffering.

Risk aversion by Corporations and demand for insurance:

Today one of the fundamental functions of the stock market is to allow investors in corporations to diversify risk. When shareholders are well diversified, corporate insurance still can benefit shareholders in different ways. The various benefits of insurance are the following:

1. **Insurer services**:

Insurers frequently provide loss control services and almost always provide claims processing services; the promise to pay claims. So, a firm would not be purchasing insurance to reduce risk for shareholders but to obtain claims processing and loss control services at the lowest cost.

2. Reducing the Expected Cost of financing losses:
The failure to reduce risk implies that there is a greater likelihood of large losses that must be paid either from the firm's internal funds or if internal funds are not available, by raising new funds through borrowing or issuing new securities. Significant costs can be incurred if new securities have to be issued. Thus, firms that are not likely to have the internal funds to finance losses might prefer to purchase insurance to reduce the likelihood of incurring the costs associated with issuing new securities to pay for losses.

3.**Reducing Financing Costs for New Investment Opportunities**:
Another reason for reducing risk by purchasing insurance is to increase the likelihood that the firm will have sufficient internal funds to adopt new investment projects. Without insurance, the firm's internal funds could be used to pay losses that occur, in which case the firm will have to raise new funds to pay for new investment projects. But since external funds generally are more costly than internal funds, their use reduces the profitability of new investment projects net of financing costs. In some cases, the additional costs from raising external funds can cause the firm to pass up new investment projects that would have been profitable had the firm had the internal resources to pay for the project. By purchasing insurance to cover losses, a firm can reduce the likelihood that costly external capital will be needed for new investment opportunities and thereby increase the profitability of new projects.

4.Reducing the likelihood of financial distress and improving contractual terms:
If a firm does not have internal funds to pay losses that occur and cannot convince banks or investors to provide new funds, then it will be forced into bankruptcy. When this occurs, the firm either must liquidate or reorganize so that it can continue to operate. Substantial legal costs can be incurred when a firm liquidates or reorganizes. By reducing the probability of bankruptcy through insurance a firm reduces the likelihood of incurring these costs. When a firm is in financial distress, other claimants besides shareholders typically are harmed. Employees, suppliers and customers also incur costs when their relationships with a firm are interrupted due to financial distress. Insurance can decrease the likelihood that a firm will experience financial distress and thereby improve the terms at which these other claimants are willing to contract with the firm

5.Reducing Expected Tax payments:
Another reason risk reduction can benefit diversified shareholders is that it can reduce expected tax payments when corporate tax rates are progressive. Progressivity in tax rates implies that tax rates increase as a firm makes higher profits. With progressivity in tax rates firms can lower the expected value of taxes paid by reducing variability in their profits. Insurance purchases also can reduce expected tax payments for three other reasons. One tax benefit arises because insurance companies are taxed differently than noninsurance companies. Another tax benefit arises from the tax treatment of depreciated property. Finally, reducing risk through insurance can allow a firm to borrow more than otherwise would be optional, which increases the tax shield from interest payments.
Thus, risk aversion through insurance benefits both individuals and corporations.

Enterprise risk management:

Over the past decade, the nature of organizational risk has become more multifaceted, spanning financial exposures, operational disruptions, strategic uncertainties, and various external hazards. This complexity has underscored the importance of adopting a holistic risk governance structure that extends across the entire organization. Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) has therefore evolved as a structured and integrated approach that consolidates different categories of risk into a unified system. By promoting coordinated risk identification, evaluation, and response mechanisms, ERM not only mitigates potential threats but also supports sustainable performance, organizational adaptability, and stronger stakeholder confidence.

In the present dynamic and uncertain business environment, organizations are exposed to various types of risks, including financial, operational, strategic, and environmental risks. The increasing complexity and interrelationship among these risks have made traditional risk management approaches inadequate. This has created the need for a comprehensive and organization-wide system of risk management. Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) has therefore emerged as a structured and integrated framework that enables organizations to manage different categories of risk in a coordinated manner. By systematically identifying, assessing, and responding to risks, ERM not only minimizes potential losses but also supports improved decision-making, sustainable growth, organizational stability, and enhanced stakeholder assurance.

Organizations today face diverse and interconnected risks, including financial, operational, strategic, and environmental challenges. Traditional risk management approaches are often insufficient to address this complexity. Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) provides an integrated framework to identify, assess, and manage all types of risks systematically. By covering operational and strategic threats, ERM enhances decision-making, strengthens resilience, and builds stakeholder trust.

A key principle of Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) is managing the organization's risks collectively rather than in isolation. Risk is treated not just as a threat to avoid but also as a potential source of value. Decision-making responsibility shifts from traditional risk managers, who focus on controlling risks, to senior leadership or the board, who consider both risk and opportunity. In contrast, traditional risk management primarily addressed insurable, "pure" risks, reflecting its origins in the insurance industry.

In many organizations, the role of risk managers was often limited to purchasing insurance. Another reason for focusing on pure risks was that they posed the most immediate threats to the company's financial stability. For example, risks such as fire could be managed through prevention measures, contingency planning, or insurance coverage to protect the business and compensate owners for potential losses, making these actions clearly advantageous for the organization.

Finally, there were simply not a lot of reasons or options for dealing with financial risks such as interest rate changes, foreign exchange rate movements or equity market fluctuations, when this field was first developing. At the time the field of risk management first emerged, interest rates were stable, foreign exchange rates were intentionally maintained within narrow bands and inflation was not yet a concern to most corporations. Therefore, financial risks did not pose a significant concern for most businesses. Indeed, the field of finance was primarily institutional at the time. The primary risks of the time were hazard risks: the risk of fire, windstorm or other property damage, or liability. Environmental risks had not yet developed into significant losses. At that time, pensions were neither assured nor subject to regulation.

The primary risks facing businesses were hazard risks, the initial focus of risk management was on these types of risks.

Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) versus Traditional Risk Management:

Every organization encounters risks that can threaten its operations and objectives. Successful firms are employing best practice and a cohesive team and infrastructure to address the strategic, financial, operational and hazard risks that they face.

In a conventional risk management framework, risk-handling activities are typically divided among different departments and mainly concentrate on hazard-related risks. This method seldom involves assessing how different risks relate to each other or analysing their combined impact on the organization. Conversely, in an ERM environment, there is a senior executive or Chief Risk Officer (CRO) who compares and evaluates all of the risks the organization faces in a more holistic way.

Key Differences:

Enterprise Risk Management builds upon traditional risk management but expands its scope and approach in several ways:

1.Strategic application: An ERM approach is integrated into an organization's business decisions. Because the effort is enterprise-wide, it supersedes any departmental or functional autonomy to encourage continuous review and support the organization's most value-based objectives.

2.Scope of Risk: ERM addresses every risk that could impact an organization's ability to achieve its objectives, without limiting attention to any specific type of risk.

3.**Performance metrics:** ERM emphasizes result-based performance measurement throughout the organization. Outcomes show whether a particular risk management approach contributed to accomplishing business objectives, such as improving return on investment or enhancing return on assets. All forms of risk management, including ERM, are intended to minimize the adverse effects of missed opportunities and losses. The specific benefits of ERM include maximizing the possible opportunities for growth, minimizing the expected organizational losses and therefore increasing the expected income and asset value, and reducing the residual uncertainty in all areas of the enterprise.

While many organizations have qualified representatives who can manage their individual functional risks, it is the unique and highly profitable organization that manages risk across the entire enterprise.

Enterprise Risk Management Process:

Steps in the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Process:

1.**Context Setting:** Understand the organization's internal and external environment, including its objectives, operational conditions, and the overall risk management framework.

2. **Risk Identification:** Recognize and document key threats that could hinder the organization's goals, as well as opportunities that could provide a competitive advantage.

3**. Risk Analysis:** Evaluate each identified risk by estimating its likelihood and potential impact, and, where possible, develop probability distributions or other quantitative measures.

4. **Risk Integration:** Combine individual risk assessments to capture interdependencies and overall portfolio effects and express the results in terms of the organization's critical performance indicators.

5**. Risk Evaluation and Prioritization:** Determine the relative significance of each risk within the overall risk profile and rank them according to urgency and potential impact.

6.**Risk Response:** Formulate strategies to manage risks effectively, including mitigation, avoidance, transfer, or, where appropriate, exploiting opportunities for organizational gain.

7.**Monitoring and Review:** Continuously track the risk landscape, assess the effectiveness of risk management actions, and update strategies as necessary to adapt to changing circumstances.

Objectives of ERM:

1.Delivering a Comprehensive View of Risk to Stakeholders:

Organizations inherently deal with various risks and often have multiple departments responsible for identifying and managing specific types of risk. These individual risk functions, however, differ in their effectiveness, and coordinating them across the organization can be difficult. The primary aim of Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) is to enhance both the efficiency of these risk functions and their coordination, so that the organization can consolidate information and present a clear, unified view of all risks to stakeholders, ultimately strengthening overall risk management

2.**Setting up of strategy to achieve organizational goals**: ERM is a strategy designed by an entity's board of directors, management and other personnel to identify potential events that may affect the entity and manage them to provide reasonable assurance regarding the achievement of entity objectives.

3.Ensuring operational efficiency: Effective and efficient use of resources is the benchmark of ERM which ensures operational efficiency.

4. **Financial Reporting system**: Developing reliable operational and financial reporting system in the organization is another important objective highlighted in ERM.

5.**Compliance with applicable laws and regulations**: Strictly adhering to the laws and regulations of the government is a part of ERM.

Departmental Risk Responsibilities within an ERM Framework:

Within an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) framework, various departments of an organization play distinct but interconnected roles in managing risks effectively. Strategic planning is responsible for identifying external threats and competitive opportunities, and for formulating initiatives that guide the organization toward its long-term objectives. The marketing function focuses on understanding target markets to ensure that products and services are aligned with customer requirements and preferences. Compliance and ethics departments oversee adherence to organizational codes of conduct and direct investigations into potential misconduct or fraud, ensuring integrity throughout the organization. Similarly, accounting and financial compliance functions maintain the reliability and accuracy of financial reporting, providing a solid foundation for informed decision-making.

The legal department manages litigation matters and monitors emerging regulatory and legal trends that could affect organizational operations. Insurance management ensures that adequate coverage is in place to protect the organization from potential losses. Treasury functions monitor liquidity requirements and manage financial exposures related to commodities, currencies, and other market fluctuations. Operational quality assurance teams verify that outputs meet established standards and tolerances, while operational management ensures smooth day-to-day operations and addresses any obstacles that may hinder performance.

Credit management evaluates the creditworthiness of customers, ensuring that any credit extended aligns with repayment capacity and minimizes financial risk. Customer service plays a vital role in promptly addressing complaints and communicating systemic issues to operations for resolution, contributing to overall organizational performance. Finally, internal audit provides an independent evaluation of all risk management activities across departments, assessing their effectiveness and recommending improvements where necessary. Together, these departmental functions form an integrated system that supports the organization in identifying, managing, and leveraging risks to achieve strategic objectives while maintaining resilience and operational stability.

Constraints in the Adoption of Enterprise Risk Management Practices:

Implementing Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) presents several practical and structural challenges for organizations. One of the initial difficulties lies in securing strong leadership support and appointing senior-level champions who can drive the ERM initiative across the enterprise. Organizations must also develop a standardized risk terminology to ensure consistency in communication and clearly articulate their overall risk appetite to guide decision-making. Creating a comprehensive risk register and designing a systematic approach to assess and prioritize risks across departments can be complex. In addition, establishing a dedicated risk governance structure—such as a risk committee and a Chief Risk Officer (CRO)—is essential for coordinated oversight. Clearly assigning accountability for identified risks and corresponding responses further strengthens the framework.Beyond structural issues, organizations must justify the value of ERM by demonstrating that its benefits outweigh the associated costs. This requires the formulation of clear action plans, integrated reporting mechanisms tailored to various stakeholders, and continuous monitoring of risk mitigation efforts. Ensuring adequate and coordinated risk coverage by internal auditors and other evaluators is equally important. Finally, developing a robust technological infrastructure that supports secure collaboration, including participation by third parties and remote employees, remains a significant implementation challenge.

Companies increasingly focusing on ERM:

It is evident that organizations view Enterprise Risk Management as a key priority for effective management. This is demonstrated through the prominence assigned to ERM within organizations and the resources devoted to building ERM capabilities. Various surveys conducted reveal that ERM serves the purposes for which it has been designed.

Conclusion:

In the earlier stages of organizational risk practices, different risk-related functions operated independently, using their own terms, tools, and areas of emphasis. Although all these functions aimed at protecting the organization from uncertainty, their efforts were fragmented. Considerable attention was given to minimizing risk in order to safeguard stakeholder interests. Gradually, organizations recognized that handling risks separately was inefficient and that a coordinated system would produce better results. The positive outcomes achieved in managing hazard and financial risks motivated managers to extend similar structured approaches to other forms of risk. The success of this broader model depends largely on collaboration among various risk functions and their willingness to align their processes. Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) therefore represents a comprehensive view of risk, where all uncertainties are addressed collectively rather than selectively. This broader orientation enables risk professionals to apply established practices across the entire organization, thereby strengthening overall risk governance.

Acknowledgement

I express my sincere gratitude to all those who have supported and guided me in the completion of this research paper titled “Risk Aversion in Individuals and Corporations: Implications for Enterprise Risk Management.”

I am especially thankful to the management and colleagues of Dr. P. Dayananda Pai – P. Satisha Pai Government First Grade College, Mangalore for providing the academic environment and encouragement necessary to carry out this study.

I extend my heartfelt appreciation to fellow researchers and authors whose scholarly works in the field of risk management and Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) have significantly contributed to the development of this paper.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper

References:

1. Anton, S. G., & Nucu, A. E. A. (2020). Enterprise risk management: A literature review and agenda for future research. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 13(11), 281. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm13110281
2. Eeckhoudt, L., Fiori, A. M., & Rosazza Gianin, E. (2018). *Risk aversion, loss aversion, and the demand for insurance*. **Risks, 6**(2), 60. https://doi.org/10.3390/risks6020060
3. Enterprise risk management. (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved February 17, 2026, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Enterprise_risk_management
4. Harrington, S. E., & Niehaus, G. R. (2004). *Risk management and insurance* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
5. Kerraous, E. M. (2020). *Enterprise risk management and value creation: A literature review*. Revue du Contrôle, de la Comptabilité et de l’Audit, 2(3). https://www.revuecca.com/index.php/home/article/view/194
6. Rapi, K., Priyarsono, D. S., Jahroh, S., & Bakhtiar, T. (2025). *A cross-sectional study of risk aversion and life insurance demand at the country level*. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 18(3), 121. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm18030121
7. Udayachandra, P. N. (2017) (n.d.). *Insurance and risk management*. United Publishers