



APPLYING BEHAVIOURAL INSIGHTS IN PUBLIC POLICIES AIMED AT (BUSINESS) ORGANISATIONS: EVIDENCE AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

DOI: 10.33141/po.2023.01.04

Paulina Kubera

Organization Review, No. 1(996), 2023, pp. 28-36

www.przegladorganizacji.pl

© Scientific Society of Organization and Management (TNOiK)

Introduction

Public policy aims are pursued using a vast array of public policy instruments. They can involve coercion, incentivisation, or persuasion, but their ultimate aim is the same – to influence the behaviour of the target population in the desired direction. Findings from behavioural science research, i.e. behavioural insights (BI), can improve the effectiveness of public policy as they help policy makers to obtain a deeper understanding how and why people are behaving as they are, not always rationally, and affect people's behaviour accordingly. Behavioural insights have become increasingly entrenched in governments around the world, but there has been much less research done on their application to organisations, in particular business organisations.

Yet, businesses are expected to play their part in dealing with social grand challenges such as combating climate change or creating a fairer society. Thus, the main research question around which the article has been structured is: how far behavioural insights inform public policies aimed at organisations – what evidence can be found in this respect and what policy implications can be derived from it.

At the outset, it should be noted, however, that behavioural public policy has gone a long way since the seminal work of Thaler and Sunstein (2008) „Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness”. Hence, behavioural insights should not be associated only with nudging in the strict sense. Therefore, the paper's line of

argument unfolds in the following steps. First, the distinctive features of advanced behavioural public policy are discussed versus nudges. Secondly, the problem of applying behavioural insights into individual behaviour to influence organisational behaviour is examined. Behavioural insights have been traditionally directed at changing the individual behaviour, be it citizens, consumers and end-users, whereas a key area of interest for public policy makers are also organisations (Leets et al., 2020; Holz et al., 2020; OECD, 2020; Chapman et al., 2021). Thus, evidence for two alternative answers were searched for: we can use the same approaches and tools as towards individuals, except that we need to identify and target the right people in the organisation or/and the right number of them, or alternatively – different approaches and tools are needed in designing and implementing behavioural interventions aimed at organisations.

A systematic literature review has been conducted using the Web of Science and Scopus databases, supplemented by the review of two leading journals in the field and BI reports in order to identify and analyse the cases on the application of behavioural insights that either involve organisations or can inform behavioural public interventions at an organisational level. In order to eliminate potential biases that can occur when behavioural insights are used to improve the way government (public sector) itself operates – the focus was on business organisations as targets of behavioural public policy. The following three subsidiary research questions were asked: 1) what was the policy aim (the desired organisational behaviour),

2) what types of behavioural insights were used to businesses, and 3) with what effect? On this basis, conclusions have been drawn along with highlighting practical implications for public policy design and implementation as well as formulating directions for future research.

Behavioural insights in public policy: From nudging techniques to advanced behavioural public policy

The use of behavioural insights in public policy should not be perceived as a synonym for the use of nudging for achieving policy goals.

The common ground for nudging and current behavioural public policy is the rejection of rational choice theory, i.e. the assumption that people use rational calculations to make rational choices to achieve outcomes to their best interest (the ideal model). Instead public interventions are based on the recognition that people rely on mental shortcuts in certain circumstances, because of cognitive limitations, time pressure, the susceptibility of behavioural biases, etc. (the realistic model). They both rest on the recognition that this constitutes not only problems but also opportunities for public policy makers. However, advanced behavioural public policy is far more substantial and wide-ranging than nudging (Ewert 2020; Straßheim, Beck, 2019; Banerjee, John, 2021). The differences between behavioural insights as nudges and a more holistic notion of behavioural insights in current behavioural public policy are depicted in Table 1.

Table 1. Behavioural insights as nudges versus more holistic notion of behavioural insights (advanced behavioural public policy)

Conceptual features	Behavioural insights as nudges	More holistic notion of behavioural insights
Policy target	individuals (influencing individual behaviour)	individuals & organisations (influencing not only individual but also collective and organisational behaviour)
Type of the problem addressed by public policy	simple problems such as modification of choice architectures*, a limited range of behaviours where nudges can be applied	more complex problems requiring context-specific interventions, every policy issue can be examined through a 'behavioural lens'
Scope of the problem addressed by public policy	the limited approach; (focus only on behavioural while ignoring the systemic aspects of a policy intervention)	the 'whole system approach'; (more comprehensive policy approach that combines behavioural, regulatory and financial tools to achieve the policy goal)
Expected policy effects	simple and quick modification of human behaviours; „quick-wins” here and now	of interest are also wider and longer effects; i.e. spill-over effects, longer term effects
Policy input	behavioural economics and psychology	behavioural and social sciences (incl. but not limited to behavioural economics and psychology)
Type of evidence used	mainly scientific experiments based on randomised control trials	mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative methods)
Policy phase where behavioural insights are applied	implementation phase	behavioural insights inform the whole policy process

(* - the way in which the information and the options are presented)

Source: own elaboration based on: Ewert, 2020; Shephard, 2017; Sanders et al., 2018



It can be argued that behavioural public policy is in its essence about an understanding of how people think, choose, act and interact as they do and thereby improve the policy goals attainment. According to Ewert (2020, p. 337): „Behavioural Public Policy should be seen as a pluralist, non-deterministic and multi-purpose approach that allows the application of behavioural insights ‘throughout the policy process’ and in combination with regulatory policies.” It includes a wide spectrum of policy instruments from government simplification to reduce the cognitive burden on citizens, through risk-education programmes to behaviourally informed regulation to protect consumers from market manipulation. And nudging is probably the most widely known form of the use of behavioural insights.

The research problem and the methods

One of the challenges of the current behavioural public policy is to influence the behaviour of organisations as policy targets. Organisations operate through the actions of their members. It can be said that human behaviour underpins organisational behaviour. However, the interactions between individuals, the organisational culture and hierarchy all play a role in organisational decision making and implementation undermining the approach to draw conclusions on the whole (organisations) merely on the basis of its elements (human beings). Therefore, the question is, how far behavioural insights into individual behaviour can be applied to change the behaviour of entire organisations, with special emphasis on business organisations. There are two possible answers to this question. The first one is that we can use the same approaches and tools as towards individuals, except that we need to identify and target the right people in the organisation or/and the right number of them. The other is that, as behavioural mechanisms that affect individual decision-making can be muted in collective processes at organisational level and therefore different approaches and tools are needed in designing and implementing behavioural interventions aimed at organisations.

To find field and experimental research supporting one of the two hypothesis a systematic literature review has been conducted using the Web of Science (Core Collection) and Scopus databases. The following terms were searched for in titles, abstracts and keywords, using the Boolean logic: (TITLE-ABS-KEY (nudg* OR “behavio*ral insights” OR “choice architecture”) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (organi?ation* OR entrepreneur* OR business*) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (“public policy” OR “public intervention*” OR government*)). Additionally, the review has been conducted of all articles, not indexed in Scopus/WoS databases, that appeared in two journals explicitly devoted to behavioural research and its relevance to public policy: Journal of Behavioural Public Administration and Behavioural Public Policy. The review covered the years from the journals’ inception, i.e. from 2017 and 2018 respectively. In the next step, relevant cases for the review were searched for in behavioural policy practice, that is in the OECD Reports, „A Wealth of Behavioural Insights” reports and at OPSI Observatory of Public Sector Innovation.

The following three inclusion criteria have been applied: (1) a study contains field or experimental research, (2) behavioural insights are applied in public policy, and (3) the target are business organisations. Thus, publications that were of theoretical/conceptual nature, pertained to behavioural insights that were used by organisations to meet their commercial ends or organisations were not the target of behavioural insights but were nudge-agents have been excluded from the review. As a result, 40 studies were included in the review – see Table 2.

The identified cases were analysed through the prism of three research questions: 1) what was the policy aim (the desired organisational behaviour), 2) what types of behavioural insights (nudges) were used, and 3) with what effect?

Discussion of research results

The conducted literature review revealed that behavioural insights are rarely deployed by public policy makers to influence behaviour of organisations. Moreover, they are frequently used in tandem with regulatory measures. More

Table 2. Literature under review

Source	Records found	Studies that met inclusion criteria (excluding the recurring items)
Databases: Web of Science, Scopus	133	8
Additional specialised journals: Journal of Behavioural Public Administration, Behavioural Public Policy	195	3
Behavioural public policy practice – reports: OECD Reports A Wealth of Behavioural Insights OPSI (BI projects)	312	29
Literature under review – Total: 40		

Source: own elaboration

than half of the cases under investigation concern increasing compliant behaviour, i.e. the one which is required by law, in particular paying taxes and other regulation fees on time (11 cases), reducing the number of breaches of workplace regulations, such as safety rules and fair employment (5 cases), providing obligatory business data (3 cases), and ensuring transparency of contracts with consumers (2 cases). The second group is aimed at improving interaction between public institutions and businesses: increasing response rates from businesses (6 cases), increasing uptake of government programmes (2 cases), and reducing the number of the registration/application forms missing the necessary information (2 cases). Third group deals with promoting corporate social responsibility (6 cases). Three studies have been included in the review for informative purposes as they can shed some light on the effectiveness of behavioural insights applied to organisations. One of them investigates the attitudes of owners and senior managers of small and medium sized entrepreneurs towards nudges as their firm is a target of nudges and as their firm plays the role of a nudging agent and two articles on national and sectoral institutional constraints for nudge-like interventions (see: table 3).

The interventions under review to encourage compliant behaviour of businesses do not differ substantially from the ones which are applied to individuals. They frequently took the form of redesigned letters, e-mails, other on-line tools or telephone scripts. It was assumed that the right person in the organisation would receive it and be able to initiate adequate organisational actions. The modified messages included the following nudges:

- simplification – simplified text and layout, inclusion of the concrete details of where, how and when

to act – a direct and detailed plan (e.g. Leets et al., 2020; WBI, 2019, pp. 36–37), making things easier for the firm to fill in the form (e.g. OECD, 2017, pp. 284–286), a pop-up to secure up-to-date business data that prompted the business owners to accept or change the current information about their company data as soon as they log into the system (OECD, 2017, pp. 381–383),

- personalisation to bolster a sense of accountability (addressing by name of a business entity, or name of a person to whom the officer spoke to, putting handwritten notes on the envelope (e.g. WBI, 2021, pp. 66–68; OECD, 2020; OECD, 2017, pp. 287–288); it is worth mentioning that in the light of OECD (2020) research – personalisation works best at organisational and not at individual level given the recent rise in privacy concerns,
- salience of potential penalties (e.g. creating a higher perceived probability of sanctions by mentioning former sanctions regarding similar non-compliant behaviour (OECD, 2017, pp. 110–111), the explicit description of potential penalties and announcing upcoming audits (Vainre et al., 2020), an urgency nudge in the form of a stamp” „Your accounts are due!” (Tilleard et al., 2021),
- social norms to encourage desired behaviours by indicating what others do and capitalising on peoples’ desire to fit in with others (e.g. by following mentions: „We are only waiting for you, the rest already did it” (OECD, 2017, pp. 284–286), or „96% of Foreign Domestic Worker employers pay their levies on time” (OECD, 2017, pp. 287–288).

Table 3. The targeted organisational behaviour

Policy aims/desired behaviour	Cases
<p>I. Encouraging compliant behaviour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • paying taxes and other regulation fees on time (11 cases) • reducing the number of breaches of workplace regulations (5 cases) • providing obligatory business data (3 cases) • ensuring transparency of contracts with consumers (2 cases) 	<p>Millane, Stewart, 2019; Petranova, Rysová, 2021; Vainre et al., 2020; Leets et al., 2020; Tilleard et al., 2021; WBI, 2019, pp. 34–45; OECD, 2017, pp. 287–288, 332–333, 354–355, 389–390; World Bank, 2021</p> <p>WBI, 2021, pp. 66–68; OECD, 2020; WBI, 2019, pp. 38–39, 64–65, 70–71</p> <p>OECD, 2017, pp. 284–286, 381–383; WBI, 2021, pp. 63–65</p> <p>OECD, 2017, pp. 110–111; WBI, 2017, pp. 14–15</p>
<p>II. Improving interaction between public institutions and businesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increasing response rates from businesses (6 cases) • increasing uptake of government programmes (2 cases) • reducing the number of the registration/application forms missing the necessary information (2 cases) 	<p>OECD, 2017, pp. 297–298, 301–302, 311–313, 319–321, 334–335; WBI, 2017, pp. 28–29</p> <p>OECD, 2017, pp. 294–296, 299–300</p> <p>OECD, 2017, pp. 307–310; WBI, 2019, pp. 74–75</p>
<p>III. Promoting corporate social responsibility (CSR) (6 cases)</p>	<p>Gunn, Mont, 2014; Hombach, Sellhorn, 2019; Tang, Demeritt, 2018; Lueg et al., 2019; SFOE, 2021; WBI, 2019, pp. 80–81</p>
<p>IV. Other (3 articles)</p>	<p>Schröder et al., 2014; Tikotsky et al., 2020; Self, Rothstein, 2021</p>

Source: own elaboration based on the literature review



A similar mechanism (i.e. social influence) was used to encourage energy suppliers to provide consumers with detailed and transparent information on their energy contracts by targeting the three biggest suppliers first (OECD, 2017, pp. 110–111). They were invited separately for a meeting with the Netherlands Authority for Consumers and Markets (ACM) in the hope that once these firms complied, it would affect the behaviour of the smaller non-compliant firms that had a tendency to copy the behaviour of those larger ones. Furthermore, the branch organisation was involved in the ACM communication strategy. As a result, in a short period of a few months and with minimal use of formal instruments the intervention was successful in causing behaviour change within the sector. In another case (WBI, 2017, p.15), in order to boost compliance of car importers and their obligation to provide consumers with transparent price information the strategy called „naming & faming” was deployed, which is a variation of a better-known strategy „naming & shaming”. While the latter one entails public disclosure of the perceived wrongdoing or failure on the part of a person or institution, the former – involves the act of making publicly known someone on account of their notable achievements or desirable behaviours. In the said case, the ACM promised to give a positive mention to car importers in a press release if they complied with the rules before the stipulated deadline. Along with behaviourally informed letters and telephone calls the intervention was successful in prompting companies to provide transparent price information.

In order to reduce the number of breaches of workplace regulations several nudge techniques were deployed as an element of the inspection visits to businesses. In OECD (2020) messenger effect has been investigated which assumes that people process the same information differently depending on its source, e.g. from a trainer (a high status peer) or a regulator, personalisation – the use of specific information about the recipient and their needs, primacy – changing the order of inspections to focus attention on the most sensitive areas by placing them first and implementation intention. Implementation intentions entail making a concrete time-bound plan which specifies when and under what circumstances an action should be taken and this way enhancing commitment to action. In a similar vein, in WBI 2021, pp. 66–68 – self-persuasion, small steps and reminders were used to increase effectiveness of inspection visits to affect company’s safety culture. In most of the cases, businesses were offered assistance, received feedback, information on the relevant laws and how to self-monitor them in the form of information sheets, checklists and instruction videos (e.g. WBI 2019, pp. 38–39, 64–65, 70–71). Hence, it can be argued that in this sub-category the nudges that promote self-regulation prevailed.

In the vast majority of the cases encouraging compliant behaviour positive results of the behaviourally-informed interventions were reported. Exceptions concerning letter-based interventions aiming at paying taxes and other regulation fees on time are: Tilleard et al. (2021) and OECD (2017, pp. 354–355). The reasons for that are believed to be poor timing and context-specific factors. The invoices were

sent out at a different time and under different circumstances. Moreover, it could be that the targeted behaviour was too deeply entrenched (filing on paper versus filing on-line).

It has to be noted that regarding the compliant behaviour businesses can have different motivations to behave in a prescribed way. Hence the question is – what type of a motivational nudge is more effective – the one which appeals to extrinsic motivation (to behave in a given way to satisfy a legal requirement) or to intrinsic motivation (to behave in a given way because it is the right thing to do)? In one of the cases (WBI, 2021, pp. 63–65) three types of letters for uploading information of hazardous substances used by companies were sent to the obliged businesses. One letter was designed to appeal to extrinsic motivation, (providing information as a legal requirement: „Legal requirement: record your hazardous substances”), and the other – to intrinsic motivation (providing information as a case of the employees’ health and safety: „Protect your employees: tell us about your hazardous substances”). Third letter was a control letter in which no specific motivational paradigm was activated. However, contrary to the initial expectations that the intrinsic motivation letter would garner the highest response rate, followed by the extrinsic motivation letter and finally the control letter, no significant difference in response rates between the three types of letters was observed (WBI, 2021, pp. 63–65).

Further light on the effectiveness of behavioural insights applied to organisations sheds the OECD (2020) report. As the study, in principle, demonstrates supporting conclusions for applying behavioural insights to foster organisational safety culture and makes a case that behavioural insights can be applied to organisations through the people within them, it also revealed significant variations at the country level as well as at the inter – and intra-organisational level. There were different responses to behavioural insights depending on the country, as well as the type of organisation (regulator versus regulated entities) and occupational position in the organisation (frontline staff versus management staff). These findings suggest the need to adapt behaviourally-informed interventions to the national culture and specific setting of the intervention, by taking into account the following three factors: (a) the perceived level of safety culture of respondents (as the difference in perception influences how they respond to the message and to what types of behavioural insights they are more susceptible to); (b) the role and status of individuals within organisations (the study suggests that the messenger should be of higher status while being as socially close as possible); (c) the type and size of the organisation (different approaches are suggested for regulators and regulated entities). It was found that changing the messenger may be particularly effective for firm-based small-scale entities, while for larger ones – providing feedback from managers and regulators.

Apart from enhancing compliance – behavioural insights were applied to improve interactions between public institutions and businesses. In order to improve response rates from businesses, be it – to maximise business response rates for the surveys, other letters from public institutions or to increase the number of businesses

Table 4. Types of behavioural insights implemented to affect organisation behaviour

Types of organisational behaviour	Behavioural insights applied:
I. Encouraging compliant behaviour:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • paying taxes and other regulation fees on time 	redesigned letters, e-mails and telephone scripts that include, in particular: simplification, personalisation, salience of potential penalties, and social norm
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reducing the number of breaches of workplace regulations 	several nudge techniques were deployed as an element of the inspection visits to businesses: messenger, primacy, personalisation, implementation intention; self-persuasion, small steps and reminders; an information package with a checklist for self-monitoring, social benchmarking/ feedback, social norm
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing obligatory business data 	framing the earlier not-filling in as a deliberate choice, disrupt-then-reframe-technique, simplification, social norm, messages designed to appeal to intrinsic (the employees' health and safety) and extrinsic motivation (legal requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring transparency of contracts with consumers 	salience of penalty, social norm, naming & faming
II. Improving interaction between public institutions and businesses:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improving response rates from businesses 	personalisation, simplification, salience of the most important information, social norm, reminders, entrepreneurial identity priming, promotion priming and prevention priming
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increasing uptake of government programmes 	promotion priming and prevention priming, social norm, ego – informing businesses that they had been chosen to receive information about the programme
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reducing the number of the registration/application forms missing the necessary information 	changing the layout of the form, simplification, using a checklist, adding compulsory tick boxes to provide success feedback and play upon loss aversion
III. Promoting corporate social responsibility (CSR)	
	public disclosure – targeted corporate transparency, choice editing, social influence, salience of benefits of energy savings measures

Source: own elaboration based on the literature review

opening and clicking through on the content of emails sent by public institutions the following nudges were implemented: personalisation (OECD, 2017, pp. 319–321, 334–335), appealing to the self-image as entrepreneurs in order to make the message appear more personally relevant to them (OECD, 2017, pp. 297–298), simplification (WBI, 2017, pp. 28–29; OECD, 2017, pp. 301–302), salience – highlighting key pieces of information (OECD, 2017, pp. 311–313), using the word „free” in the subject line of the email, or „new” to attract attention of the reader (OECD, 2017, pp. 297–298, 319–321), as well as social norm (OECD, 2017, pp. 301–302) and reminders (OECD, 2017, pp. 301–302, 334–335). The effects of the behavioural insights were mostly positive. It was also examined which one – promotion priming or prevention priming can yield better results (OECD, 2017, pp. 297–298). The former entails framing the message in terms of positive effects of action, the latter – framing the message in terms of the negative effects of inaction. Applying promotion priming to the email content turned out to be more effective. Similar types of nudges were applied to increase uptake of government programmes – to improve the number of applications to the Growth Vouchers programmes (OECD, 2017, pp. 299–300) and the number of small businesses participating in mentoring schemes (OECD, 2017, pp. 294–296). Also with generally positive

effect. However, equally positive effects were not found in cases where behaviourally-informed intervention was aimed at reducing the number of the registration/application forms missing the necessary information (OECD, 2017, pp. 307–310; WBI 2019, pp. 74–75). Despite of several changes introduced to the forms such as changing the layout, simplification, using a checklist, or adding compulsory tick boxes to provide success feedback and play upon loss aversion no or small effects were reported. Presumably, because the nudges used were not sufficient to solve more complicated problems.

The last category of organisational behaviours at which behavioural insights were targeted at – promoting corporate social responsibility, is significantly different from the previous two and so were the types of behavioural insights applied. Most of them rest on the idea of public disclosure and more specifically – targeted transparency and social influence (Hombach, Sellhorn, 2019; Lueg et al., 2019; Tang, Demeritt, 2018). The core assumption around which the policy tools were designed is that mandatory disclosure concerning firms' policies, risks and outcomes related to environmental and social matters will encourage firms to change their business activities in socially desirable way (Hombach, Sellhorn, 2019; Tang, Demeritt, 2018). Firms are expected to go further because of the pressure exerted by business stakeholders (via their



transactions with the firm) or society at large (public opinion and social pressure). What is interesting is that cases under investigation dealing with firms' targeted transparency provide mixed results. This implies that the effectiveness of corporate targeted transparency as a policy measure cannot be taken for granted. It involves a complex chain of actions, in which such issues as: the quality of information and the format in which it is provided, the channel of information, the type of information users or the type of the disclosing firm matters (see, for example Fung, Graham and Weil's (2007) targeted transparency action cycle, or Wolniak (2015) on corporate social responsibility reporting and a greenwashing phenomenon).

Conclusions

The evidence on actual implementation of behavioural insights targeted at business organisations is scanty. Not only in scientific journals but also in behavioural policy practice (i.e. reports of behavioural insights units). Moreover, these are mainly experiments, rather than actual policies. As this certainly poses limitations for our research, several interesting conclusions can be drawn from the conducted review.

First, the review revealed that when behavioural insights are applied to businesses usually it is done to encourage compliant behaviour. Thus, not alone but in tandem with regulatory measures. The following categories of compliant organisational behaviour at which behavioural insights were targeted have been identified: paying taxes and other regulation fees on time, reducing the number of breaches of workplace regulations, providing obligatory business data and ensuring transparency of contracts with consumers. Applying behavioural insights to encourage compliant behaviour rests on the idea that obliged entities, e.g. taxpayers, behave in a „contingent' way depending, to a large degree, on: the opportunities available to them, i.e. the perceived cost and difficulty of compliance – on the one hand, and probability and severity of sanction for non-compliance – on the other, as well as the behaviours of peers. The interventions in most of these cases took the form of redesigned letters, e-mails, other on-line tools or telephone scripts and include typical nudges that are applied to individuals. However, as regards influencing firms' behaviour towards healthier and safer workplace – the use of various prompts and reminders prevailed enhancing firms' self-regulation. Not only have they proved effective but in light of the research by Tikotsky et al. (2020) reminders, nudges that provide information and promote self-regulation are those policy tools that enjoy high level of support among owners and senior managers of small and medium-sized businesses. Thus, it is desirable to consider their application on a larger scale as well as other settings, in particular in reference to smaller businesses lacking professional assistance.

Secondly, with respect to other organisational behaviours (i.e. not mandatory) at which nudges were targeted, they concentrated on: improving interactions between public institutions and businesses in terms of increasing response rates from businesses, increasing their uptake of government programmes, or reducing the number of the registration/

application forms missing the necessary information. In this case – 'standard' non-deliberative nudges prevailed, which mostly yielded positive effects when targeted at one-off, simple behaviour. It can be argued that regarding especially small businesses, where organisational behaviour is primary influenced by a small number of individuals, many behavioural insights into individual behaviours are still relevant in the context of small and medium-sized companies. However, the scope of application of behavioural insights to businesses does not stop here. As stipulated in the introduction, the advanced behavioural policy takes a step further beyond simplifying messages to business, reducing the costs of businesses gathering information or encouraging businesses to participate in government schemes. Making businesses more socially and environmentally responsible requires difficult, context-specific trade-offs to be made by businesses, that implies more deliberate and dynamic choice environment. Choice editing – voluntary eliminating by retailers the option of buying products with a poor environmental or social record (Gunn, Mont, 2014), food hygiene barometers (Self, Rothstein, 2021), and other targeted transparency tools which were used in the cases under investigation require proper social underpinning (see: Van der Linden, 2018). One of the major criticisms of nudges is their narrow focus on reducing cognitive load and effort, changing the physical context in which decision is made, whereas cultural and institutional context remains very often unrecognised. Straßheim (2020, p. 117) makes a point saying that: „...it is necessary to break free from the microfocus proposed by BPP to pay more attention to the institutional and cultural constellations in which decisions are made.” Cases under investigation confirm that postulate.

It can be concluded that applying behavioural insights to organisations may take the form of influencing specific individuals in businesses to cause organisation-wide effects or intervening more directly on organisational routines, policies and procedures. Some behavioural interventions under investigation targeted organisations as a whole whereas others addressed certain individuals within organisations who perform certain functions (e.g. WBI 2019, pp. 80–81). As businesses as a policy target differ substantially, identifying different archetypes of firms (listed multinational corporations, cooperatives, family businesses, innovative start-ups, SME, self-employed entrepreneurs – see: PwC, 2018) that characterise their decision-making units, relevant stakeholders and trusted sources can be instrumental for designing and implementing behaviourally-informed interventions aimed at business organisations. A next frontier of behavioural science will be a move from isolated experiments on one-off decisions toward altering the choice architecture of the complex systems those occur in. Avenues for further research pertain to social interactions as well as human-machine interactions. Technology becomes part of our decision-making and there is no plausible expectation for this emerging trend to reverse. Self-tracking applications, automated decision-support systems, the economy increasingly dominated by artificial intelligence open up new opportunities and pose new challenges for applying behavioural insights in pursue of public and private actors' goals.

Paulina Kubera, Ph.D.
Poznań University of Technology
Faculty of Engineering Management
ORCID: 0000-0002-6246-6952
e-mail: Paulina.Kubera@put.poznan.pl

References

- [1] Banerjee S., John P. (2021), *Nudge Plus: Incorporating Reflection into Behavioral Public Policy*, „Behavioural Public Policy”, First View, pp. 1–16.
- [2] Chapman G., Milkman K., Rand D., Rogers T., Thaler R. (2021), *Nudges and Choice Architecture in Organizations: New Frontiers*, „Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes”, Vol. 163, pp. 1–3.
- [3] Ewert B. (2020), *Moving Beyond the Obsession with Nudging Individual Behaviour: Towards a Broader Understanding of Behavioural Public Policy*, „Public Policy and Administration”, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 337–360.
- [4] Fung A., Graham M., Weil D. (2007), *Full Disclosure: The Perils and Promise of Transparency*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [5] Gunn M., Mont O. (2014), *Choice Editing as a Retailers’ Tool for Sustainable Consumption*, „International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management”, Vol. 42, No. 6, pp. 464–481.
- [6] Holz J., List J., Zentner A., Cardoza M., Zentner J. (2020), *The \$100 Million Nudge: Increasing Tax Compliance of Businesses and the Self-Employed using a Natural Field Experiment*, „National Bureau of Economic Research”, Working Paper No. 27666, <https://www.nber.org/papers/w27666>, access date: 10.10.2022.
- [7] Hombach K., Sellhorn T. (2019), *Shaping Corporate Actions Through Targeted Transparency Regulation: A Framework and Review of Extant Evidence*, „Schmalenbach Business Review”, Vol. 71, No. 2, pp. 137–168.
- [8] Leets L., Sprenger A., Hartman R., Kohn N., Thomas J., Vu C., Aguirre S., Wijesinghe S. (2020), *Effectiveness of Nudges on Small Business Tax Compliance Behaviour*, „Journal of Behavioral Public Administration”, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 1–12.
- [9] Lueg K., Krastev B., Krastev R. (2019), *Bidirectional Effects between Organizational Sustainability Disclosure and Risk*, „Journal of Cleaner Production”, No. 229, pp. 268–277.
- [10] Millane E., Stewart M. (2019), *Behavioural Insights in Tax Collection: Getting the Legal Settings Right*, „eJournal of Tax Research”, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 500–535.
- [11] OECD (2017), *Behavioural Insights and Public Policy. Lessons from Around the World*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://www.oecd.org/gov/regulatory-policy/behavioural-insights-and-public-policy-9789264270480-en.htm>, access date: 10.09.2022.
- [12] OECD (2020), *Behavioural Insights and Organisations: Fostering Safety Culture*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://www.oecd.org/gov/regulatory-policy/behavioural-insights-and-organisations-e6ef217d-en.htm>, access date: 10.09.2022.
- [13] Petranova D., Rysová A. (2021), *Behavioural Approaches in Public Policies. European*, „Journal of Science and Theology”, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 65–77.
- [14] PwC (2018), *Applying Behavioural Insights in Policies Aimed at Businesses*, Final Report for the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy, Government of the Netherlands, <https://www.binnl.nl/kennisbank/publicaties/publicaties+oude+opmaak/HandlerDownloadFiles.ashx?idnv=2057442>, access date: 10.09.2022.
- [15] Sanders M., Snijders V., Hallsworth M. (2018), *Behavioural Science and Policy: Where Are We Now and Where Are We Going?* „Behavioural Public Policy”, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 144–167.
- [16] Schröder H., Muller-Camen M., Flynn M. (2014), *The Management of an Ageing Workforce: Organisational Policies in Germany and Britain*, „Human Resource Management Journal”, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 394–409.
- [17] Self D., Rothstein H. (2021), *Institutional Constraints on ‘Nudgestyle’ Risk Rating Systems: Explaining why Food Hygiene Barometers Were Rolled-out in the UK but Abandoned in German*, „Journal of Risk Research”, Vol. 24, No. 11, pp. 1465–1481.
- [18] SFOE (2021), *Behavioural Insights in Energy Policy. Final report*, Swiss Federal Office of Energy, <https://www.bfe.admin.ch/bfe/de/home/news-und-medien/publikationen.html>, access date: 10.09.2022.
- [19] Shephard D. (2017), *Applying Behavioural Insights to Organisations: Global Case Studies*, OECD, European Commission, https://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/Shepard_Applying-Behavioural-Insights-to-Organisations_Case-Studies.pdf, access date: 10.09.2022.
- [20] Straßheim H., Beck S. (2019), *Handbook of Behavioural Change and Public Policy*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham.
- [21] Straßheim H. (2020), *The Rise and Spread of Behavioral Public Policy: An Opportunity for Critical Research and Self Reflection*, „International Review of Public Policy”, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 115–128.
- [22] Tang S., Demeritt D. (2018), *Climate Change and Mandatory Carbon Reporting: Impacts on Business Process and Performance*, „Business Strategy and the Environment”, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 437–455.
- [23] Thaler R., Sunstein C. (2008), *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- [24] Tikotsky A., Pe’er E., Feldman Y. (2020), *Which Nudges do Businesses Like? Managers’ Attitudes towards Nudges Directed at Their Business or at Their Customers*, „Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization”, Vol. 170, pp. 43–51.
- [25] Tilleard R., Bremner G., Middleton T., Turner E., Holdsworth D. (2021), *Encouraging Firms to Adopt Beneficial New Behaviors: Lessons from a Large-scale Cluster-randomized Field Experiment*, „Journal of Behavioral Public Administration”, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 1–22.
- [26] Vainre M., Aaben L., Paulus A., Koppel H., Tammsaar H., Telve K., Koppel K., Beilmann, K., Uusberg A. (2020), *Nudging towards Tax Compliance: A Fieldwork-informed Randomised Controlled Trial*, „Journal of Behavioral Public Administration”, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 1–10.
- [27] Van der Linden S. (2018), *The Future of Behavioral Insights: On the Importance of Socially Situated Nudges*, „Behavioural Public Policy”, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 207–217.

- [28] WBI (2017), *A Wealth of Behavioural Insights: 2017 Edition*, Behavioural Insights Network Netherlands, <https://bin.nl.nl/home++en/knowledge/publications/default.aspx>, access date: 10.09.2022.
- [29] WBI (2019), *A Wealth of Behavioural Insights: 2019 Edition*, Behavioural Insights Network Netherlands, <https://bin.nl.nl/home++en/knowledge/publications/default.aspx>, access date: 10.09.2022.
- [30] WBI (2021), *A Wealth of Behavioural Insights: 2019 Edition*, Behavioural Insights Network Netherlands, <https://bin.nl.nl/home++en/knowledge/publications/default.aspx>, access date: 10.09.2022.
- [31] Wolniak R. (2015), *Raportowanie społecznej odpowiedzialności biznesu a zjawisko greenwashingu*, „Przeгляд Organizacji”, Nr 2, s. 8–14.
- [32] World Bank (2021), *Increasing Tax Compliance for SME in Indonesia*, <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/206281616476835926/pdf/Increasing-Tax-Compliance-for-SMEs-in-Indonesia.pdf>, access date: 10.09.2022.

Wykorzystanie wiedzy behawioralnej w polityce publicznej skierowanej do organizacji (biznesowych): dowody i implikacje polityczne

Streszczenie

Wiedza behawioralna (behavioural insights) jest w coraz większym stopniu wykorzystywana w polityce publicznej na całym świecie. Brakuje jednak badań na temat jej wykorzystania w odniesieniu do organizacji, w szczególności biznesowych. Stąd pytanie: w jakim stopniu

wiedza behawioralna wpływa na kształtowanie polityk publicznych skierowanych do przedsiębiorstw – jakie dowody z badań można znaleźć w tym zakresie i jakie implikacje dla polityki można na ich podstawie sformułować. Przeprowadzono systematyczny przegląd literatury w celu zidentyfikowania i przeanalizowania przypadków interwencji behawioralnych, w których przedsiębiorstwa stanowiły grupę docelową albo które mogą dostarczyć istotnych spostrzeżeń w zakresie wykorzystania wiedzy behawioralnej do interwencji publicznych adresowanych do organizacji. Stwierdzono, że wiedza behawioralna jest wykorzystywana w odniesieniu do przedsiębiorstw głównie, aby: (a) skłonić je do zachowania zgodnego z prawem, (b) poprawić interakcję (komunikację) między instytucjami publicznymi a przedsiębiorstwami, a także (c) zachęcić przedsiębiorstwa do większej odpowiedzialności społecznej i środowiskowej. W zależności od celu interwencji zastosowano różne podejścia od ‘standardowych’ zachęt behawioralnych, tzw. nudges, które wykorzystują ludzkie skrzywienia poznawcze, przez zachęty informacyjne i przypomnienia, czy też zwiększenie transparentności działań przedsiębiorstwa. Podczas gdy niektóre z nich okazały się równie skuteczne, gdy adresowane były do konkretnych osób w przedsiębiorstwie, inne wymagają większego uwzględnienia kontekstu instytucjonalnego i kulturowego podejmowanych decyzji.

Słowa kluczowe

behawioralna polityka publiczna, podejście behawioralne, nudges, organizacja jako adresat polityki publicznej