

UCD Geary Institute for Public Policy

RESEARCH | ANALYSIS | EVIDENCE



A MINDSPACE for ethics: It has become rather easy to design effective nudge interventions relying on behavioural science frameworks such as MINDSPACE and EAST. It is still difficult to evaluate the ethical acceptability of nudges. We present a "MINDSPACE for Ethics".

Bridging the gap: We hope that FORGOOD can help bridging the gap between the debate on the ethics of nudging and the real-world applications of nudges. Our aim is to reduce unintentional mis-usages of behavioural science by encouraging ethical reflection in a systematic way. We view FORGOOD as a nudge for practitioners to apply behavioural science ethically, i.e. a nudge to "nudge for good".

It is the start: We appreciate that further require changes to the developments will framework welcome and comments, adaptations improvements on the and framework.

NUDGE FORGOOD An ethics framework for nudging

Leonhard K. Lades and Liam Delaney (University College Dublin) Leonhard.Lades@ucd.ie, Liam.Delaney@ucd.ie

Summary: Insights from the behavioural sciences are increasingly used by governments and other organisations worldwide to "nudge" people to make better decisions. Furthermore, a large philosophical literature has emerged on ethical considerations on nudging human behaviour that has presented key challenges for the area but is regularly omitted from discussion of policy design and administration. We present and discuss FORGOOD, an ethics framework that synthesizes the debate on the ethics of nudging in a memorable mnemonic.

7 Ethical Dimensions	Key questi befor
Fairness	Does the behavio redistr
Openness	Is the behavioural ma
Respect	Does the policy re dignity, freedor
Goals	Does the behavio legit
Opinions	Do people accept the beh
Options	Do better poli w
Delegation	Do the policy-mak ability to nudge us



ions to consider re nudging

oural policy have undesired ributive effects?

l policy open or hidden and anipulative?

respect people's autonomy, m of choice and privacy?

oural policy serve good and itimate goals?

the means and the ends of havioural policy?

licies exist and are they warranted?

akers have the right and the sing the power delegated to them?



Discussion: Did we capture all relevant dimensions? Are the dimensions we list too broad? How should we think of trade-offs across ethical dimensions? What about the trade-off between uptake and complexity? How should the framework be used?

Important references: Barton, A., & Grüne-Yanoff, T. (2015). From libertarian paternalism to nudging—and beyond. Review of Philosophy and Psychology, 6, 341–359. Blumenthal-Barby, J. S., & Burroughs, H. (2012). Seeking better health care outcomes: the ethics of using the "nudge." The American Journal of Bioethics, 12, 1-10. Bovens, L. (2009). The ethics of nudge. In Preference change (pp. 207-219). Springer. Bubb, R., & Pildes, R. H. (2014). How behavioral economics trims its sails and why. Harvard Law Review, 127, 13-29. Clavien, C. (2018). Ethics of nudges: A general framework with a focus on shared preference justifications. Journal of Moral Education, 47, 366–382. Fabbri, M., & Faure, M. (2018). Toward a "constitution" for behavioral policy-making. International Review of Economics, 1-30. Grüne-Yanoff, T. (2012). Old wine in new casks: libertarian paternalism still violates liberal principles. Social Choice and Welfare, 38, 635-645. Hagman, W., Andersson, D., Västfjäll, D., & Tinghög, G. (2015). Public views on policies involving nudges. Review of Philosophy and Psychology, 6, 439–453. Hausman, D. M., & Welch, B. (2010). Debate: To Nudge or Not to Nudge*. Journal of Political Philosophy, 18, 123–136. Nys, T. R., & Engelen, B. (2017). Judging nudging: Answering the manipulation objection. Political Studies, 65, 199-214. Rebonato, R. (2012a). Taking liberties: A critical examination of libertarian paternalism. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. Saghai, Y. (2013). Salvaging the concept of nudge. Journal of Medical Ethics, 39, 487-493. Sugden, R. (2017). Do people really want to be nudged towards healthy lifestyles? International Review of Economics, 64, 113-123. Sunstein, C. R. (2014). Why Nudge?: The Politics of Libertarian Paternalism. Yale University Press. Sunstein, C. R. (2017). Misconceptions about nudges. Sunstein, C. R. (2019). On Freedom. Princeton University Press. Sunstein, C. R., & Reisch, L. A. (2019). Trusting Nudges: Toward a Bill of Rights for Nudging. Routledge. Sustein, C. R. (2015). The ethics of nudging. Yale J. on Reg., 32, 413. Thaler, R. H. (2018). Nudge, not sludge. Science, 361, 431-431. Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness. Yale University Press. Vugts, A., Hoven, M. V. D., Vet, E. D., & Verweij, M. (2018). How autonomy is understood in discussions on the ethics of nudging. *Behavioural Public Policy*, 1–16.

Acknowledgments: We thank everybody who gave feedback on the framework. Leonhard Lades has been supported by a grant from the Irish Environmental Protection Agency via EnvEcon (Project name: Enabling Transition; Project number: 2017-CCRP-FS.32).



EnvEcon Decision Support