Chapter 1

Introduction to Behavioral Economics

The section begins with a review of the literature on Behavioral Economics, exploring its historical roots and development over time. An overview is provided of the key concepts and main currents of thought within Behavioral Economics. Next, the fundamental principles of Nudging are explored, examining how small changes in the decision environment can influence Behavior without coercion. Concepts such as choice architecture, incentive and option design are explored. Case studies and practical applications of Nudging are examined, highlighting situations where this strategy has proven to have positive impacts on individuals' decisions.

Summary: 1.1. Historical Roots of Behavioral Economics. – 1.2. Behavioral Economics: Realities and Implications. – 1.3. From Behavioral Economics to Nudging. – 1.3.1. Fundamental Principles of Nudging and Practical Applications. – 1.4. Choice Architecture, Incentive and Option Design. – 1.4.1. Strategies of Choice Architecture. – 1.4.2. Incentives. – 1.4.3. Designing of Options. – *References*.

1.1. Historical Roots of Behavioral Economics

Behavioral Economics has its roots in the 1950s but established itself as a distinctive field mainly between the 1980s and 1990s. The first references to what could be considered the genesis of Behavioral economics could be found in the debate on the realism of assumptions in Friedman's famous essay (1953). Friedman proposed a clear distinction between positive and normative economics. Positive economics is concerned with the objective analysis of facts and causal relationships in the economic world, while normative economics is concerned with value judgements about how resources should be allocated or how economic institutions should function. Friedman argues that an economic theory must be judged by its ability to make predictions that can be tested and potentially falsified by

observable data. The ability of a theory to resist falsification makes it scientifically valid.

In 1955, Herbert Simon, to counter the assumption of complete rationality of traditional economic models with the concept of 'administrative man', introduced the concept of bounded rationality to emphasize that economic actors, instead of seeking to fully maximize utility in decisions, operate with limited cognitive resources.

The traditional model of the 'economic man' with comprehensive knowledge and rationality is being challenged, especially by developments in business theory. He argues that people are limited in their ability to process information and make optimal decisions.

This concept emphasizes the practical reality of people's cognitive limitations and information resources. Instead of trying to maximize utility comprehensively, economic actors operate with limited rationality, making decisions that are reasonable under the circumstances. Simon states that people use heuristics (approximate rules) to simplify the complexity of decisions. Furthermore, he emphasizes the importance of incremental learning to improve decision-making strategies over time. This concept indicates that people can adapt and improve their decisions through experience and learning from past outcomes.

These heuristics allow individuals to make decisions more efficiently, but they can also lead to systematic errors and lead to irrational decisions in financial contexts, as highlighted by the research of Kahneman and Tversky (1974). In fact, the authors themselves (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979), when presenting 'Prospect Theory', introduce key concepts that challenge the assumptions of traditional economic theory, emphasizing the often-irrational decisions, deviating from classical utility theory, in that people evaluate options in terms of gains and losses by relating them to a reference point, rather than in absolute terms. This reference point is called the 'status quo' or 'starting point'.

The analysis of cognitive biases, heuristics, and the role of the 'status quo' helps challenge the assumptions of traditional economic theory, with significant implications for Behavioral economics, as it emphasizes the need for more realistic models that reflect human decision-making dynamics.

This perspective suggests that people do not evaluate decisions objectively, but in relation to a personal frame of reference. This implies that a perceived loss may have a stronger emotional impact than a gain of the same magnitude, as it is evaluated in relation to the starting point.

In 'Prospect Theory', the authors argue that the marginal utility curve is concave for gains (loss aversion) and convex for losses (risk love). This implies that people are more sensitive to changes in losses than to gains of equal magnitude.

This asymmetry in the valuation of gains and losses suggests that people tend to be more risk-averse when it comes to gains but may be more willing to take risks when it comes to avoiding losses, and that, due to the certainty effect, people attribute a higher value to a gain or loss when it is certain than when it is probable. That is, individuals often place a higher value on a certain gain or loss than on an uncertain gain or loss, even though the expected values may be the same. This means that people are willing to sacrifice potential benefits or bear greater risks to avoid uncertainty. They also introduce the framing effect whereby the presentation of a decision may influence choices, even if the options are equivalent. Choices can be influenced by the way a problem is formulated or 'framed'. People tend to evaluate options in relation to a reference point, which may be presented in different ways. For example, the same decision may be presented in terms of gains (positive framing) or losses (negative framing), influencing individuals' preferences.

These effects highlight the importance of how options are presented and how certainty or probability, i.e., psychological, and contextual factors, influence decisions.

Kahneman and Tversky identified a further component in their model that relates to the duality of the decision-making process, the 'two-stage rule'. This rule suggests that the decision-making process can be divided into two distinct stages: the evaluation stage and the decision stage, the evaluation of options in terms of gains and losses and the decision based on these evaluations.

This rule highlights how the evaluation of options can be influenced by emotional and cognitive factors, which can in turn impact the actual choice.

Prospect Theory could represent the transition from the traditional approach of neoclassical economics, based on perfect rationality, to Behavioral economics that takes cognitive constraints into account.

In 2002, Jones and Shleifer again addressed the topic of information asymmetry in financial markets, focusing on the transparency and efficiency of financial costs and the presence of financial costs that are not easily recognized or understood by investors. These costs can result from non-transparent complexities and structures, generating uncertainty that can affect investors' decisions. Transparency is essential to instill confi-

dence among investors. When costs are clear and accessible, investors feel more confident in their decisions, promoting a more stable market environment.

Information asymmetry indicates a situation in which one of the parties involved in an exchange has more information than the other. In the financial context, this can occur when investors do not have a clear and complete understanding of the costs associated with financial instruments.

The article suggests that a lack of transparency on financial costs can lead to market inefficiencies. Investors may not be able to correctly assess the real return on investment when costs are obscured, leading to biased decisions.

Behavioral economics deals with how psychological factors influence economic decisions. In this context, the lack of transparency in financial costs can, therefore, be analyzed through different Behavioral lenses, such as:

– Heuristics and Biases: Investors may be subject to heuristics and cognitive biases, which may distort their assessment of costs. For example, they may underestimate hidden costs or fail to notice certain expenses.

– Framing: The presentation of costs can influence investors' decisions. If costs are presented unclearly or misleadingly, investors may make decisions based on framing information rather than on actual data.

– Overconfidence: investors may be overconfident in their own ability to evaluate investments. Lack of transparency can fuel this overconfidence, leading to uninformed decisions.

In conclusion, the lack of transparency in financial costs, analysed through the prism of Behavioral Economics, underlines how psychological factors can contribute to market inefficiencies and influence investors' decisions. Promoting transparency therefore becomes a key element in mitigating the negative effects of such irrational Behavior. Transparency is presented as a key element in instilling trust among investors. When costs are clear and accessible, investors feel more confident in their decisions. Transparency not only benefits investors, but also helps foster a more stable market environment. This statement suggests that clarity and understandability of costs can reduce market volatility and improve market efficiency. This concept is supported by the financial literature, which recognizes transparency as a critical factor for market stability.

1.2. Behavioral Economics: Realities and Implications

Thaler (2015), inspired by the observations of Kahneman and Tversky, contributed to the widespread use of nudging in the public and private sectors. Nudging represents a form of light intervention, which aims to influence people's Behavior without prohibiting or coercing. Thaler points out that while traditional policies assume of perfect rationality and self-control, nudging accepts the reality of irrational Behavior and proposes to work with it rather than against it.

The author introduces the concept of 'free man' (libertarian paternalism), suggesting that people should be free to make the choices they prefer, but that it is possible to guide their Behavior in the desired direction through small nudges (nudges). The idea is to maintain individual freedom of choice while providing guidance that improves well-being.

Thaler and Sunstein (2008) outline three fundamental characteristics of nudging:

– Individuals can always choose to ignore the nudge.
– Nudges should not limit the options of choice.
– Nudges should be designed to improve people's well-being.

The aim of nudging is, therefore, to improve people's decision-making process, helping them to make choices that are more in line with their goals and well-being. This approach is based on the realisation that people do not always act rationally and that small nudges can help them overcome their Behavioral weaknesses.

Thaler and Sunstein (2008) also present the concept of 'choice architecture'; this concept refers to the way in which options are presented or structured to influence decisions. The design of options can have a significant impact on people's choices and nudging exploits this knowledge to improve the quality of decisions.

The nudging approach has been successfully applied in various areas, including public health, personal finance, and environmental sustainability. For example, Thaler and Sunstein (2008) cite an example of nudging in retirement planning, where employees are automatically enrolled in a pension plan but have the freedom to opt out if they wish. This approach has led to a significant increase in participation in pension plans, improving the overall financial well-being of employees.

Nudging has become a key tool for public and private decision-makers seeking to improve people's Behavior without resorting to drastic measures or restrictions on choices.

This idea has, in fact, been implemented in public policies and organisations to improve people's decisions, showing how the design of choices can influence Behavior without restricting individual freedom.

Thaler discusses several cognitive biases, including the 'sunk cost fallacy', which represents the tendency of people to persist in a Behavior or course of action just because they have already invested resources in it, even if it is logically no longer convenient.

Indeed, cognitive bias analysis helps to understand how people's decisions can be influenced by distorted perceptions of reality.

Thaler sees Behavioral economics as a bridge between economics and psychology, integrating psychological principles into economic models.

This interdisciplinary approach recognises that psychological and social factors influence economic choices and that a more comprehensive analysis requires collaboration between disciplines.

Thaler discusses irrational Behavior in financial markets, opposing the market efficiency hypothesis.

This challenges the idea that market prices always reflect accurate information and suggests that investors may be irrational in a systematic way.

Even prior to Thaler's (2015) study, irrational Behavior in financial markets has been the subject of extensive studies questioning the market efficiency hypothesis.

Already Mandelbrot (1963) contributes to the debate by showing that changes in share prices do not follow a normal distribution, challenging the market efficiency hypothesis.

Subsequently, Shleifer, A. (1986) introduced the concept of 'noise' in financial markets, pointing out how irrelevant information or valuation errors can contribute to irrational Behavior and market inefficiencies. In a later article, Shleifer and Vishny (1997) highlighted how the constraints and costs associated with arbitrage can contribute to the persistence of market inefficiencies, emphasising the presence of irrational Behavior.

Shiller, winner of the Nobel Prize in Economics, has also played a key role in the field of Behavioral finance. In his 1995 work, Shiller examines how irrational Behavior can influence financial markets, offering a critical perspective on the market efficiency hypothesis.

In 2013, Hargreaves, in a contribution of his own, highlights the fundamental shift in economic epistemology since the late 1970s from generalised characterisations of human Behavior to experimentally verifiable

empirical statements (Hargreaves Heap, 2013), recalling the debate on the realism of economic hypotheses and emphasising Friedman's role in presenting an 'as if' theorisation in a Millian tradition. He argues that, despite challenges and tensions with the dominant rational model, Behavioral economics has managed to find a relevant space in the economic discipline, suggesting that implications centered on individual autonomy could be a significant contribution.

The article addresses the complexity of human preferences and how people make decisions, providing a critical perspective on the dominant model of rational choice and highlighting the key role of Kahneman and Tversky in providing systematic experimental evidence that challenges the normative ideal of expected utility theory. The article raises a critical issue regarding the application of Behavioral insights to the exploration of social phenomena, such as the Behavior of markets. The use of 'as if' models of rational choice is criticised for limiting the impact of Behavioral approaches in the interpretation of broader social phenomena.

Indeed, Behavioral insights suggest that public policy should be less concerned with forms of preference satisfaction and more with individual autonomy.

Camerer et al. and other authors (Camerer et al., 2003; Loewenstein et al., 2007), in a public policy design context, proposing the application of asymmetrical paternalism, advance an innovative perspective on Behavioral economics-based regulation. The study emphasises how the understanding of human fallibility, highlighted by Behavioral economics, should influence the design of public policies to make them more effective. Camerer, for instance, referring to the heuristics and cognitive biases identified by Behavioral economics as key elements in understanding human decision-making, focuses on how this, in light of the aforementioned asymmetry, can inform the design of public policies; or, as already analysed, Kahneman and Tversky's prospect theory introduced concepts such as the evaluation of losses and gains in an asymmetrical manner, challenging the rationality assumption and showing how people can deviate from traditional predictive models.

Hargreaves (2013) proposes a critical perspective towards the Behavioral approach, in particular 'nudging,' emphasising the importance of an alternative focus on individual autonomy and raises a critical question regarding the application of Behavioral insights to the explication of social phenomena, such as the Behavior of markets.

However, in emphasising their contribution to the explication of social phenomena, such as the Behavior of markets, he points out that the use of

'as if' models of rational choice may limit the impact of such Behavioral approaches in the explication of social phenomena.

The author argues that people do not always have well-defined preferences, but to act they cling to 'reasons' that make their actions understandable and predictable, even if not in a sense of rational choice or maximisation of subjective utility and suggests that more attention should be given to conditions that promote individual autonomy.

This perspective challenges the assumption of stable and well-defined preferences by pointing out how these Behavioral approaches may seem at odds with traditional economic theory and the dominant model of rational choice or subjective expected utility. It also highlights how the most significant influence is in the prescriptive advice generated by economics, particularly in welfare economics, provoking a lively debate on what a Behavioral normative economy should look like.

This contrast emphasises the importance of considering more realistic Behavioral models and the need to integrate a more accurate understanding of human Behavior into economic models This proposal reflects a concern for the role of individual freedom in decision-making, emphasising that individuals should be guided towards better choices without compromising their freedom.

In 2016, in a further contribution (Hargreaves Heap, 2016), he emphasises the role of Thaler and philanthropic foundations in the consolidation of Behavioral economics in the mainstream. At the same time, he expresses a criticism of the narrative that places Thaler in too central a role, suggesting that some key elements and context within the discipline have been overlooked (Hargreaves Heap, 2013). The author distinguishes between the importance of the substance of Behavioral economics, highlighting the evidence on Behavior, and the role of methodology, with the use of experiments contributing to its acceptance in the mainstream. The persistence of the use of rational choice hypotheses is emphasised, not as an exact explanation, but as generating useful insights into markets, highlighting the tension between Behavioral economics and 'as if' explanation (Hargreaves Heap, 2013).

Behavioral Economics thus offers a realistic approach to human decision-making, enriching understanding in the human decision-making context and suggesting future directions for research.

1.3. From Behavioral Economics to Nudging

Behavioral Economics, as a field of study, has developed to examine how people make economic decisions in the real world, considering cognitive limitations and emotions. In contrast to the traditional approach of neoclassical economics, which assumes completeness of information and perfect rationality, Behavioral economics is based on the understanding that people can be limited in their decision-making processes by factors such as lack of information, emotions, and cognitive biases.

Behavioral economics has been influenced by the findings of cognitive psychology and has tried to integrate the results of such research into economic models.

The move from Behavioral economics to nudging represents a further development that puts the principles of Behavioral economics into practice. Nudging is an approach that builds on the results of Behavioral economics to design lightweight interventions that influence people's Behavior. Whereas Behavioral economics focuses on understanding the factors that influence decisions, nudging aims to use this understanding to improve decision-making.

The term 'nudging' was coined by Thaler and Sunstein in their book 'Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness' (2008). Nudging is based on the concept of 'free man' or 'libertarian paternalism', which suggests that people should be free to make the choices they prefer, but that it is possible to guide their Behavior in the desired direction through small nudges. The aim is to maintain individual freedom of choice while providing guidance that improves well-being. Nudges can take various forms, such as changes in choice architecture, incentives, and option design. The key idea is that small changes in the decision environment can have a significant impact on people's Behavior without limiting their options.

According to Thaler and Sunstein, a nudge is "any aspect of choice architecture that predictably alters people's Behavior without prohibiting any options or significantly altering their economic incentives".

Nudging has been successfully applied in several areas, from public health to personal finance. For example, a common nudge is the preselected option in enrolment forms for programs or services. When an option is pre-selected, people are more likely to keep it rather than change it, taking advantage of the tendency to retain default options.

1.3.1. Fundamental Principles of Nudging and Practical Application

The introduction of nudging represents a step forward in the practical application of Behavioral economics principles. While Behavioral economics provides a theoretical understanding of the factors that influence decisions, nudging brings this understanding into the real world, offering a way to actively improve decision-making through light, well-designed interventions.

The effective implementation of Nudging is based on key principles. The study by John et al. (2011) provides a detailed outline of guiding principles for the design and implementation of nudging strategies. These principles include consideration of ethics, transparency, and adaptability to the specific context.

Specific successful examples include the use of visual alerts to promote healthy choices in the workplace (Chandon & Wansink, 2002) and the application of contextual reminders to improve productivity in corporate environments (Milkman et al., 2011). These examples demonstrate how Nudging can be successfully applied in different contexts. The aim of this section is to provide an in-depth analysis of the basic principles of Nudging, based on key scientific contributions. The exploration of case studies and practical applications can highlight the potential of Nudging in shaping Behavior without resorting to coercive measures, underlining its relevance in business decision-making.

Behavioral economics has, therefore, radically transformed the landscape of understanding human economic decision-making, highlighting the limitations of the traditional rational model (Kahneman & Tversky, 1974) and, by moving away from the traditional rational model towards a more realistic view of human Behavior, consequently, outlining new perspectives in understanding economic decisions. Precisely with a view to new perspectives, Thaler and Sunstein (2008), in the background context that is Behavioral economics, with the theory of nudges, make a key contribution by demonstrating how small changes in the choice architecture can have significant impacts on people's individual decisions in a predictable manner, without prohibiting options or significantly changing preferences. Indeed, nudges theory, an innovative response to the findings of Behavioral economics, represents a significant advance in the attempt to guide people's decisions without compromising individual freedom, Thaler and Sunstein (2008) define nudges to shape people's deci-

sions without imposing significant constraints on their options. This perspective adopts the concept of 'benevolent freedom of choice', seeking to guide people towards better decisions without forcing them. By introducing the concept of 'libertarian paternalism', the authors emphasise the importance of guiding people towards better choices without forcing them, respecting individual freedom. The nudges, with a well-articulated analysis, rely on key principles such as 'default', suggesting that the default choice should be geared to benefit the majority, exploiting the human tendency to maintain the status quo (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). 'Warned choices' provide clear and understandable information to positively influence decisions, while 'incentive' uses rewards or sanctions to promote desired Behavior. Nudges have found significant applications in public policy and the private sector, e.g., increasing membership rates in retirement programs (Thaler & Benartzi, 2004) and exploring the application of Behavioral economics to increase savings among employees. By applying 'theory' in retirement savings, an attempt is made to understand and improve the financial decisions of individuals. The proposed approach is 'future planning', which allows employees to voluntarily agree today to increase their savings rates in the future, e.g., in conjunction with salary increases and without reducing their current salary. The objective, based on evidence of how people often delay saving decisions, thus missing out on opportunities for financial growth, is to overcome Behavioral barriers to saving and develop a plan that encourages employees to save more over time, adapting to the human tendency to procrastinate financial decisions.

However, ethical questions arise on the fine line between assistance in choice and manipulation. Transparency and the possibility of abuse by authorities are open topics of discussion. The transition from cognitive bias to nudges represents a pragmatic perspective in dealing with the findings of Behavioral economics.

The analysis of the criticism of the nudge's theory, including the accusation of paternalism and interference with individual freedom, is comprehensive and reflects a considered approach. It is essential to further explore the ethical and practical challenges, carefully balancing the intention to improve decision-making with respect for individual freedom (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). The call to further explore ethical and practical challenges emphasises the need for a careful balance between the intention to improve decisions and respect for individual freedom.

From the study by Hansen and Jespersen (2013), the importance of preserving individual freedom of choice and autonomy emerges as a piv-

otal principle. By defining responsible nudges as distinct from manipulative practices, the authors offer a critical analysis of the responsible use of nudges in public policy. The article recognises that although nudging has the potential to produce benefits, it is crucial to balance these benefits with attention to ethical and social risks. A possible criticism could be the subjectivity in the definition of 'manipulation' and the challenge in applying this concept consistently.

Oliver's (2013) essay explores the application of behavioral economics in the design of public sector policies considering context-specific and Behavioral influences. Oliver proposes the term 'budging' to reflect a broader approach that goes beyond the concept of nudging and incorporates a more comprehensive understanding of human Behavior. He argues that the concept of budging reflects a more holistic approach to policy design, incorporating the complexity of human Behavior. Unfortunately, the lack of specific empirical evidence and case studies could be a shortcoming and emerge as a critical element to the author's arguments.

Thaler (2015), following the evolution of behavioral economics as a discipline from initial scepticism to its growing acceptance in the mainstream, explores the limitations of the traditional rational model, highlighting irrational Behaviors that challenge classical economic expectations. The research shares successful cases where insights from behavioral economics have been used to improve decisions in real-world settings, such as in pensions and healthcare.

In 2016, Sunstein, in his book 'The Ethics of Influence' (Sunstein, 2016), brings together topics he addresses in other works and places 'nudges' in the context of Public Choice concerns to answer some common objections. In this publication, Sunstein's ideas and important concepts of Public Choice are differentiated from concepts such as Buchanan's 'status quo' and the role of experts in confronting Hayek's knowledge problem. The author discusses the ethics of 'nudging', a key concept inspired by choice architecture, and examines the importance of choice architecture in shaping people's Behavior, highlighting how the way in which options are presented influences decisions.

Sunstein challenges the idea that nudges are tantamount to propaganda, emphasising that non-intervention creates an unwarranted bias that requires further ethical evaluation, and argues that they act by providing information, reducing decision-making costs, and structuring the context of choice to achieve desirable outcomes. He emphasises that the decision between maintaining the 'status quo' or adopting an alternative is not predetermined by nature but is influenced by ethical underpinnings. He

questions the value of autonomy, reducing the weight given to individual choice when it contradicts the choice architect's decision, arguing that although autonomy is inherently good, the choice that undermines well-being is less desirable.

The study (Sunstein, 2016) offers an in-depth analysis of the ethical implications of 'nudges' by exploring the delicate balance between ethical influence and the ethics of individual freedom in the era of Behavioral science and the use of Behavioral science in public policy, proposing ethical guidelines for such use and emphasising the need for transparency, accountability, and respect for individual freedom. and Behavioral science in policy.

He introduces the theory of 'behavioral market failures', resulting from individual irrationalities, and develops the four core values of welfare, autonomy, dignity, and self-governance. The author, known for developing the concept of 'liberal paternalism', a concept based on the idea of guiding people towards better choices without restricting their freedom, addresses the ethical dilemma between respect for individual freedom and the need to guide people towards better decisions, arguing that paternalism can be compatible with freedom.

Sunstein defends paternalism as an ethical justification through aggregate cost-benefit analysis. His challenge to John Stuart Mill's ideas on paternalistic coercion emphasises the correction of Behavioral bias.

Although it raises important issues, it is subject to discussion and further analysis, especially considering political developments since its publication.

Halpern's study (Halpern et al., 2018), although with the limited empirical evidence presented, fits into the broader context of the literature on the practical application of Behavioral (nudging) concepts in organisations. Aiming to examine the practical implementation of nudging initiatives in multiple sectors, the research provides a practical analysis of Behavioral science-based (nudging) initiatives. The paper explores specific strategies that can be effective in applying nudging concepts, taking into consideration complex business and decision-making contexts. The author highlights the crucial role of stakeholder engagement in the implementation of nudging initiatives and, in conjunction, the importance of understanding the specific context in which Behavioral initiatives are implemented, emphasising that there is no single solution. Furthermore, the need to adapt nudging strategies to the specific needs and dynamics of the context emerges as a crucial point.

1.4. Choice Architecture, Incentive and Option Design

Nudge Theory, coined by Thaler and Sunstein (2008), represents an innovative approach to influencing Behavior Choice architecture refers to the way in which options are presented or structured to influence people's decisions. The design of the decision-making environment can have a significant impact on Behavior, as people are susceptible to the details of how options are presented. Some key principles of choice architecture include:

– Default Option: The pre-selected choice that appears when an individual does nothing. The default option can have a significant impact on people's decisions, as many tend to stay with the default option rather than make an active change. Nudgesses often exploit this tendency by setting a beneficial option as the default.

– Organisation of Options: The arrangement and organisation of options can influence decisions. For example, highlighting an option or presenting options in a specific order may lead to a higher probability that it will be chosen.

– Simplification of Options: Too much complexity can make decision-making difficult. Simplifying options, for example, by limiting the number of choices or providing clear information, can facilitate decision-making.

– Clear Presentation of Information: The clarity and accessibility of information is crucial. Presenting information in a transparent and easily understandable manner can positively influence perceptions and choices.

Thaler and Sunstein (2008) argue that the presentation of options can significantly shape people's Behavior. For example, in the corporate context, prominently positioning healthy options can incentivise consumers to make choices that are more beneficial to their health. This principle is anchored in the perspective that small nudges, or 'nudges', in the decision-making environment can have major impacts.

Johnson's 'Beyond nudges: Tools of a choice architecture' (Johnson et al., 2012) explores the tools available to 'choice architects', those who present decision options to people. The authors divide these tools into two categories: those used to structure the decision task and those used to describe decision options.

Tools for structuring the decision-making task address the idea of what to present to decision-makers, while tools for describing options ad-

dress the idea of how to present them. The article discusses implementation challenges in the use of these tools, including individual differentials and errors in evaluating decision outcomes. Some applications are also presented that illustrate the positive effect that choice architecture can have on real-world decisions.

The authors point out that the presentation of a choice influences what the decision-maker will choose and emphasise the significant influence of 'choice architects' in determining decision-making Behavior.

Tools for structuring the decision-making task include reducing the number of alternatives, the use of decision-support technologies and tools, decision inertia using predefined settings, myopic procrastination, limited time windows and segmentation of the decision-making process. Option description tools include naïve allocation, attribute overload control, translation, and rescaling of non-linear attributes.

1.4.1. Strategies of Choice Architecture

Choice architecture strategies may vary depending on the objectives. A company might adopt an attractive visual presentation for options, use persuasive signposting or labelling, or focus on simplifying complex choices (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). The goal is to create an environment that encourages desired Behavior without constraining individual choices.

Several empirical studies have confirmed the effectiveness of choice architecture. Studies by Thaler and Sunstein (2008) themselves, together with Milkman et al. (2011), illustrated how small changes in the presentation of options can positively influence Behavior, for example, by promoting healthier choices in the workplace.

Despite the benefits, it is crucial to consider the ethical implications of the choice architecture. The design of options raises questions about individual autonomy and possible manipulation of decisions. Therefore, an ethical approach requires transparency and respect for individual freedoms (Sunstein, 2016).

Choice architecture seeks to use these principles to guide people's Behavior in the desired direction without restricting their freedom of choice. A practical example of choice architecture is the setting of the organ donation option as the default on driver's license forms. In many jurisdictions, the donation option is pre-selected, and those who do not wish to donate organs must take an active action to change the choice. This approach has significantly increased the number of organ donations.

In conclusion, choice architecture is a key element of Nudge Theory that can shape individual Behavior. The continuous development of ethical and conscious strategies is essential to maximise the benefits of this approach without compromising individual autonomy.

1.4.2. Incentives

Incentives are another key element in the application of nudging. Incentives can take various forms, including rewards, discounts, recognition, or other benefits that motivate desired Behavior and can positively influence individual Behavior. Thaler and Sunstein (2008) point out that small incentives can lead to significant changes in decisions and actions, without resorting to coercive measures.

Some important principles related to incentivisation include:

– Rewards and Sanctions: Rewards can increase the likelihood that a Behavior will be repeated, while sanctions can discourage it. The design of incentives must consider how people respond to rewards and sanctions.

– Sensitivity to Context: The effectiveness of incentives may depend on context and situation. This means that it is important to adapt incentives to the specific situation in which one is trying to influence Behavior.

– Timing: The temporality of incentives is crucial. Immediate incentives can be more effective than those delayed in time, as people tend to give more weight to immediate rewards.

Perception of Fairness: The perception of fairness in the allocation of incentives is important. If people perceive fair treatment, they are more likely to respond positively to incentives.

Gneezy et al. (2011) conducted studies showing that even small incentives can have large impacts on decisions, pushing people towards desired Behavior. Incentives can be used in various contexts, from improving business productivity to promoting healthy consumer choices.

Incentive strategies can take different forms, from financial incentives to non-monetary rewards. The design of incentives must consider the psychological characteristics of individuals and adapt to the specific context (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). Customising incentives can increase their effectiveness in driving desired Behavior.

Studies by Gneezy et al. (2011) have shown how incentives can influence individual preferences, demonstrating the relevance of considering

reward-related Behavior patterns. In corporate contexts, the implementation of incentive programs has been shown to improve employee motivation and performance.

Sunstein (2016) emphasises the importance of addressing ethical issues related to the use of stimulation. The manipulation of stimuli raises concerns about individual autonomy and the possibility of unethically directing choices. Furthermore, it is important to consider limitations such as the duration of the effects of incentives and the possibility of adaptation over time. In conclusion, incentive emerges as a fundamental pillar in Nudge Theory. Its potential in shaping Behavior opens new perspectives for the ethical and effective application of this theory. For the future, further research can explore new incentive strategies and evaluate the long-term impacts of such approaches.

1.4.3. Designing of Options

Option design is a central element in Nudge Theory (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008), an innovative approach that aims to influence people's Behavior without resorting to coercion. This treatise examines the concept of option design in detail within the context of Nudging, analysing its components, application strategies and practical implications.

Option design refers to the arrangement and structuring of available alternatives to influence individual decisions. Thaler and Sunstein (2008) point out that the presentation of options plays a crucial role in shaping people's choices, without substantially altering freedom of choice.

Choice architecture, related to option design, emphasises the importance of presenting alternatives in a way that favors desired outcomes (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). For example, placing healthy options prominently on a menu may encourage healthier food choices.

The design of options must consider individual diversity. Thaler and Sunstein (2008) state that customising options, adapting them to the preferences and characteristics of individuals, can increase the effectiveness of nudging. This implies a flexible and context-oriented approach.

In the corporate context, option design can be used to influence consumer decisions. For example, Thaler and Benartzi (2004) argue that the presentation of predefined savings options can increase participation in retirement programs.

Studies conducted by Chandon and Wansink (2002) in the field of marketing examined how product layout influences consumer choice.

Empirical research has shown that the careful design of options can significantly affect purchasing Behavior.

Iyengar and Kamenica (2010) raise ethical questions about option limitation. Option design, if not carefully balanced, could be perceived as manipulative. Moreover, its effectiveness may vary in different situations and contexts (Iyengar & Kamenica, 2010). In conclusion, option design emerges as a powerful lever in Nudge Theory. Its application requires a thorough understanding of decision-making dynamics and individual preferences.

Research by Milkman et al. (2011) highlighted the success of nudge interventions in promoting healthy Behavior in the workplace. Chandon and Wansink (2002) examined the application of nudges in pricing strategies, demonstrating how small changes can influence consumer choice.

As Sunstein (2016) points out, it is important to consider the ethical issues involved in the use of Nudging. The manipulation of choices raises concerns about individual autonomy, requiring careful consideration in the application of these techniques. Furthermore, there are limitations related to the effectiveness of Nudging in different situations, as highlighted by Iyengar and Kamenica (2010).

In conclusion, Nudge Theory offers an innovative approach to influence Behavior without resorting to coercive measures. However, it is crucial to balance effectiveness with ethical considerations and to recognise the limitations of this theory. For the future, further research should explore new application contexts and refine Nudging strategies to maximise its effectiveness.

References

Bénabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2006). Incentives and prosocial behavior. *American Economic Review*, 96(5), 1652-1678.

Buchanan, J.M. (2004). *Public Finance in Democratic Process: Fiscal Institutions and Individual Choice*. UNC Press Books.

Camerer, C.F., Issacharoff, S., Loewenstein, G., O'Donoghue, T., & Rabin, M. (2003). Regulation for conservatives: Behavioral economics and the case for "asymmetric paternalism". *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 151(3), 1211-1254.

Chandon, P., & Wansink, B. (2002). The biasing health halos of fast-food restaurant health claims: Lower calorie estimates and higher side-dish consumption intentions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28(4), 505-518.

Chandon, P., & Wansink, B. (2002). When Are Stockpiled Products Consumed Faster? A Convenience-Salience Framework of Postpurchase Consumption Incidence and Quantity. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39(3), 321-335.

Chetty, R., et al. (2012). Does Indivisible Labor Explain the Difference between Micro and Macro Elasticities? A Meta-Analysis of Extensive Margin Elasticities. NBER Working Paper No. 1998.

DellaVigna, S. (2009). Psychology and economics: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 47(2), 315-372.

Dolan, P., Hallsworth, M., Halpern, D., King, D., Metcalfe, R., & Vlaev, I. (2012). Influencing Behavior: The mindspace way. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 33(1), 264-277.

Friedman, M. (1953). *Essays in positive economics*. University of Chicago press.

Friedman, M. (1953). *The methodology of positive economics*, Cambridge University Press.

Gneezy, U., et al. (2011). Paying to avoid what others want: Testing the reference-dependent model of preferences. *Experimental Economics*, 14(1), 47-74.

Gneezy, U., Meier, S., & Rey-Biel, P. (2011). When and why incentives (don't) work to modify behavior. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 25(4), 191-210.

Halpern, D., Bates, C., Mulcahy, G., & Raconteur. (2018). *Inside Nudging: Implementing Behavioral Science Initiatives.* Raconteur.

Hansen, P.G., & Jespersen, A.M. (2013). Nudge and the manipulation of choice: A framework for the responsible use of the nudge approach to Behavior change in public policy. *European Journal of Risk Regulation*, 4(1), 3-28.

Hargreaves Heap, S. (2016). *Behavioral Economics: A History*, Cambridge University Press.

Hargreaves Heap, S.P. (2013). What is the meaning of Behavioral economics?. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 37(5), 985-1000.

Hausman, J.A., & Welch, B. (2010). Debate: To nudge or not to nudge. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 18(1), 123-136.

Hayek, F.A. (1988). *The Fatal Conceit: The Errors of Socialism*. University of Chicago Press.

Iyengar, S.S., & Kamenica, E. (2010). Choice proliferation, simplicity seeking, and asset allocation. *Journal of Public Economics*, 94(7-8), 530-539.

John, L.K., Loewenstein, G., & Prelec, D. (2011). Measuring the prevalence of questionable research practices with incentives for truth telling. *Psychological Science*, 23(5), 524-532.

Johnson, E.J., Shu, S.B., Dellaert, B.G., Fox, C., Goldstein, D.G., Häubl, G., ... & Weber, E.U. (2012). Beyond nudges: Tools of a choice architecture. *Marketing Letters*, 23(2), 487-504.

Jones, C.M., & Shleifer, A. (2002). Known Unknowns: The Inefficiency of Hiding the Cost of Finance. *Journal of Finance*, 57(4), 1617-1630.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking*, *Fast and Slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124-1131.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263-291.

Loewenstein, G., Brennan, T., & Volpp, K.G. (2007). Asymmetric paternalism to improve health behaviors. *Jama*, 298(20), 2415-2417.

Mandelbrot, B. (1963). *Stock prices: Their arithmetic average is not their expected value. Operations Research*, 11(3), 345-379.

Milkman, K.L., Rogers, T., & Bazerman, M.H. (2011). I'll have the ice cream soon and the vegetables later: A study of online grocery purchases and order lead time. *Marketing Letters*, 22(3), 223-234.

Mill, J.S. (2009). *On Liberty*. Oxford University Press.

Oliver, A. (2013). From Nudge to Budging: Using Behavioral Economics to Inform Public Sector Policy. *Journal of Social Policy*, 42(4), 685-700.

Oliver, T.R. (2013). The politics of public health policy. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 34, 33-49.

Rothstein, B., & Uslaner, E.M. (2010). The roots of social capital. In E. Lesser (Ed.), Knowledge and social capital (pp. 11-31). Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Shiller, R.J. (1995). *Behavioral finance: Insights into irrational minds and markets.*

Shleifer, A. (1986). *Noise. Journal of Financial Economics*, 17(2), 231-264.

Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R.W. (1997). *The limits of arbitrage. The Journal of Finance*, 52(1), 35-55.

Simon, H.A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 99-118.

Sunstein, C.R. (2016). *The Ethics of Influence: Government in the Age of Behavioral Science.* Cambridge University Press.

Thaler, R.H. (2015). *Misbehaving: The Making of Behavioral Economics.* W.W. Norton & Company.

Thaler, R.H. (2016). Behavioral Economics: Past, Present, and Future. *American Economic Review*, 106(7), 1577-1600.

Thaler, R.H., & Benartzi, S. (2004). Save More Tomorrow™: Using Behavioral Economics to Increase Employee Saving. *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(S1), S164-S187.

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

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124-1131.

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