

# Comparative Analysis of the Application of Behavioural Insights of 33 Worldwide Governments on the Landing Pages of their COVID-19 Official Websites and their Impact on the Growth Scale of the Pandemic

*Paola Cecchi-Dimeglio*<sup>1\*&</sup>, *David Luu*<sup>2#</sup>, *Yann Cabon*<sup>3#</sup>,  
*Raphaëla Kitson-Pantano*<sup>4&</sup>

1. Paola Cecchi-Dimeglio, J.D., LL.M.,MS.c, Ph.D., is a behavioural and data scientist. She is the chair of the Executive Leadership Research Initiative for Women and Minority Attorneys at Harvard Law School, a Senior Research Fellow at the Center for the Legal Profession and affiliated faculty at Harvard Kennedy School in the Women and Public Policy Program (WAPPP). She is the CEO and founder of the leading decision-making consulting firm People Culture Drive Consulting Group. She can be reached at [pcecchidimeglio@law.harvard.edu](mailto:pcecchidimeglio@law.harvard.edu). The first author declared to have no conflict of interest.
2. David Luu, MD, a cardiac surgeon, entrepreneur and philanthropist democratizing health. He is the CEO of Absolutys, a global healthcare platform, the founding president of the Heart Fund, a non-profit organization with the United Nations ECOSOS Special Consultative Status, fighting cardiovascular diseases and co-founder of Generous People, the first Chair of Micro-Philanthropy in France at Paris School of Business for the MBA International Business. He may be reached at [drluu@absolutys.com](mailto:drluu@absolutys.com)
3. Yann Cabon, Ph.D is leading the AI and data analytics department at People Culture Drive Consulting Group.
4. Raphaëla Kitson-Pantano, Ph.D. (Genetics), is the International Affairs Advisor of Absolutys. Dr. Kitson-Pantano was successively the Executive Director and then Vice-President of the European Association for the Promotion of Science and Technology. Formerly, Dr. Kitson-Pantano was the AXA Research Fund Life & Health Risks Research Officer and later became Head of International Health Relations at AXA Global Life. She can be reached at [dr.kitsonpantano@gmail.com](mailto:dr.kitsonpantano@gmail.com)

\*To whom correspondence should be addressed; E-mail: [pcecchidimeglio@law.harvard.edu](mailto:pcecchidimeglio@law.harvard.edu)

&These authors contributed equally to this work

#These authors also contributed equally to this work.

34

## 35 I. Abstract

36 The COVID-19 crisis has seen over a third of the world population locked down and this article  
37 has sought to understand human behaviour in response to a historical and unprecedented global  
38 pandemic. Through the analysis 18 behavioural mechanisms present on the landing pages of the  
39 websites of 33 institutional governments from March 1st til May 1st 2020 compared to the WHO  
40 data on the number of COVID-19 cases and deaths per million for each country, the authors show  
41 that a behavioural consensus was observed across all 33 countries and that Individual and Social  
42 nudges had no impact. Whilst the decisions in essentially every country on Earth, were taken with  
43 the same aim: to limit population movements and social life, two aggravating factors of the spread  
44 of the virus, only the environmental nudges effectively helped slow the virus growth scale. The  
45 authors explain the rationale behind these results and suggest that people seek information beyond  
46 governmental websites that they generally mistrust. They further suggest using Scientists as role  
47 models to encourage governmental website's traffic and designing recursive nudges to increase  
48 the impact of individual and social interventions. Together with the new phases of the spread of  
49 the virus will come new rules and guidance. Public health policies need to address behavioural  
50 change of the population on a global scale in a more targeted manner and it is hoped that this paper  
51 will provide some insight on how to do so.

52

## 53 II. Introduction

54 All human-beings on the planet share a 3 billion DNA code that differentiates them from other  
55 species; but the exact sequence of each, combined with individual life-experiences and behaviours  
56 makes every one of us unique. There are, on this planet, over 7 billion different humans!  
57 Understanding human behaviour has been the focus of many disciplines over the

58 centuries...anthropology, sociology, psychology, evolutionary biology, human behavioural  
59 ecology and so on. And indeed, the human species not only displays an extraordinary range of  
60 ecological settings but also exhibits enormous behavioural diversity [1]. “People vary in their  
61 social, mating and parental behaviour and have diverse and elaborate beliefs, traditions, norms and  
62 institutions” [2]. There are some behavioural characteristics unique to some populations and absent  
63 in others and there are those that are common in all populations, but exhibit variation in their  
64 expression [3]. For example, whilst language is common to all humans, there are a plethora of  
65 different ones. Further there are behavioural differences observed within populations themselves,  
66 depending on age, gender, social status etc. such that individuals from a same population develop  
67 different roles, rights and responsibilities [4]. “Behaviour also varies within individuals over the  
68 course of their lifetimes [5]. Despite these behavioural differences, at time of writing, over a third  
69 of the world population was locked down. Over two billion people were successfully ordered and  
70 accepted to stay at home in order to mitigate an invisible and nevertheless deadly threat. This  
71 article has sought to understand human behaviour in response to a historical and unprecedented  
72 global crisis. Through the analysis of the behavioural interventions used by 33 governments on the  
73 landing pages of their official COVID-19 websites, the authors show that the observed human  
74 reactions to this unexpected challenge was very different to what had been anticipated and thereby  
75 shed light on the relevant nudges to implement as the crisis continues to unfold until a vaccine or  
76 a cure can be developed.

77

### 78 ***The historical, unprecedented but expected COVID-19 pandemic***

79 In 2006, Morse *et al* published an article entitled “*Next Flu Pandemic: What To Do Until The*  
80 *Vaccine Arrives?*” that stated that “experts believed the world was overdue for influenza

81 pandemic” [6]. The COVID-19 pandemic is considered historical because very few of us today  
82 were alive when the last pandemic of similar scale (the Spanish flu) plagued the world. It is  
83 unprecedented because a pandemic in a globalized and interconnected world like the one we are  
84 currently living in has never occurred before [7]. However, this pandemic was expected and  
85 governments had prepared contingency plans. Nevertheless, Morse’s paper expressed the concern  
86 that “unless effective action against pandemic flu is taken now, we are in "dire straits,"” [8].  
87 Indeed, as immunization was the cornerstone of countries’ strategy, with antiviral agents as a  
88 backup, producing and distributing a vaccine was estimated to take at the very least 4 to 6 months.  
89 The contingency plans therefore focused on nonpharmacological interventions, such as hand  
90 washing, “respiratory etiquette,” face masks, school closures, and social distancing or isolation.  
91 However, the effectiveness of these measures was based on those used in 1918 and remained  
92 poorly understood [9].

93 As the COVID-19 virus emerged in December 2019, sparking an epidemic of acute  
94 respiratory syndrome in humans in China, within three months, the virus had spread to more than  
95 118,000 cases and caused 4,291 deaths in 114 countries, leading the World Health Organization  
96 to declare a global pandemic [10]. (*The number of cases, deaths and the dates detailed in this*  
97 *paper are the official numbers accessible by the authors at the time of writing. As the crisis*  
98 *continues to unfold and the COVID-19 disease continues to spread, these numbers and dates may*  
99 *be subject to change.*) On April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020, the total number of known cases was greater than 2.36  
100 million worldwide [11]. By then almost a third of the world’s population was under some form of  
101 lockdown. There is a lot of subject matter related to this COVID-19 crisis that is, and will remain,  
102 hard to assess (speed of transmission, likelihood of survival, economic consequences etc.). An  
103 important issue is how to communicate uncertainty and share information when so little is actually

104 known. The behavioural response to COVID-19 is unavoidably collective. Each person's chance  
105 of contracting the virus depends not only on their own behaviour, but also on the behaviour of their  
106 fellow citizens [12].

107 This paper proposes to review the published literature on the successful leveraging of  
108 behavioural insights during past epidemics and on the data available at time of writing on the  
109 current pandemic. Whilst countries response worldwide was predominantly national, how global  
110 leaders embraced the diversity of the behavioural insights specific to their own citizens to design  
111 the landing page of their governmental institutions' website will be assessed. It will be shown that  
112 far from expectations, the response to the sanitary crisis was very consensual with countries  
113 implementing 80% of the behavioural insights observed. The research shows that beyond this  
114 consensus, the individual and social nudges had no impact on the number of cases and deaths of  
115 COVID-19 observed and instead it was the environmental interventions that had a significant  
116 impact. What are the drivers that explain these results will be later discussed.

117

### 118 *The relevance of Behavioural Science insights in fighting a global pandemic*

119 Understanding a global population's response to a worldwide pandemic such as COVID-19 is not  
120 straightforward and requires rigorous analysis. Below are four putative applications of behavioural  
121 science that are relevant to understanding this. <sup>1</sup>Behavioural science can not only be used as a  
122 powerful tool to understand humans, <sup>2</sup>it is key to drafting impactful and targeted messages to  
123 support crisis communication techniques and to ensure that what is conveyed is heard and  
124 perceived as intended. <sup>3</sup>Behavioural science insights can help leverage the feeling of belonging  
125 and <sup>4</sup>finally can be used to direct human behaviours toward outcomes [13].

126 <sup>1</sup>Levering insights from behavioural science requires not only to focus the attention on the decision  
127 making and behaviour of citizens (the end users) but also to target the behaviour of those at the  
128 source of the process, the policy makers, who communicate down to the citizens, thereby  
129 addressing those people who design the process [14]. Indeed, whilst “end-use behaviour can  
130 determine what happens in a situation, design behaviour often determines the situation itself” [15].  
131 Behavioural science uses multiple behavioural levers such as social influence, convenience,  
132 prompts, and cues [16] all tools that can impact what is known as the “Behaviour Change Wheel”  
133 that suggests that change is only possible if capability, opportunity and motivation are aligned.  
134 “Individuals have to be psychologically or physically able to undertake the behaviour, the  
135 environment that surrounds them needs to facilitate the behaviour, and their own mental processes  
136 need to energise and direct the behaviour” [17]. Further, research demonstrates that behaviour  
137 change is more likely when the behaviour is made Easy, Attractive, Social and Timely [18].

138 <sup>2</sup>Behavioural Science gives relevant insights on how best to address populations with life-  
139 changing news. Clarity in the messages that the governments convey is essential to ensure  
140 readability and understanding. Research has shown that clarity and certainty about timelines are  
141 both important [19] and that “messages linked to disgust tend to be more effective than messages  
142 that communicate social norms” [20]. Further, plans are easier to follow if they are time-specific  
143 and intentional, rather than general aspirations [21]. Co-operation is increased by clear statements,  
144 articulated by leaders and repeated by others, of a desired collective behaviour that is in the group  
145 interest. This can enhance trust, establish social norms and encourage individuals to commit to the  
146 behaviour [22]. Consequently, behavioural science helps design messages that elicit emotions  
147 other than fear such as ‘empathy appeals’ that can have positive impacts on behaviour change [23].  
148 Making communication sensitive to the demographics of the intended recipient helps people to

149 feel that society is more prepared. Further, behavioural science has shown that catchy phrases or  
150 mnemonics help children and families retain important public health information [24]. The content  
151 of the message needs to be further supplemented by the form the message takes. Bright infographic  
152 designs are more efficient at communicating a step-by-step procedure for thorough hand-washing  
153 and the best place to display this hand-washing procedure and instructions increases compliance  
154 to high quality hand-washing. Communication clarity increases the efficacy of taking action. When  
155 a crisis as devastating as the COVID-19 crisis hits, there is necessarily an information asymmetry  
156 between what the governments are receiving as data from scientists, experts and other governments  
157 worldwide and the information that can be communicated down to the population. In addition to  
158 the way the message should be conveyed, the way it will be perceived needs to be accounted for  
159 when drafting the message.

160 <sup>3</sup>Humans are social creatures and their desire to connect to people goes beyond wanting to  
161 interact with family, colleagues and friends. A fundamental human need is the feeling of  
162 belonging. Studies have shown that a sense of belonging is associated with numerous beneficial  
163 outcomes, whereas a broken sense of belonging increases the risk for psychological and physical  
164 dysfunction. Behavioural science has shown that community-spirited behaviour can be enhanced  
165 through communication, group identity and punishment [25]. Leaders who are perceived as ‘one  
166 of us’ and as ‘working for us’, rather than for themselves or for another group, tend to gain greater  
167 influence [26]. Building a strong sense of shared social identity can help coordinate efforts to  
168 manage threats and foster in-group commitment and adherence to norms [27]. The more people  
169 feel part of a group or community response, the more likely they are to make a selfless contribution.  
170 This finding is particularly true of responses to threats, which generate a stronger public response  
171 when framed in group rather than individual terms [28]. Co-operation is more likely when there is

172 transparency about individuals' contributions and punishment for those who do not pull their  
173 weight [29].

174 <sup>4</sup>Finally, insights from behavioural science can help change people's behaviours. Habits are a  
175 positive drive in our lives, designed to free up our minds to concentrate on other matters, "by  
176 definition, they operate mostly outside conscious awareness and are hence hard to break" [30].  
177 Even in acute healthcare environments, attempts to improve hand hygiene and other infection  
178 control behaviours through education and awareness have limited and short-term impacts [31].  
179 Behavioural science insights help develop interventions that attract attention and make compliance  
180 convenient [32]. People's behaviour is influenced by social norms such as what they perceive that  
181 others are doing or what they think that others approve or disapprove of [33]. Further, individuals  
182 struggle to perceive risks accurately and distort probability when making decisions, with  
183 substantial differences [34]. Appealing to fear leads people to change their behaviour if they feel  
184 capable of dealing with the threat, but leads to defensive reactions when they feel helpless to act  
185 [35]. Instead, exposure to celebrity advocacy messages can impact issue engagement, as long as  
186 the issue has previously been perceived as important and the celebrity has a favourable sympathy  
187 capital [36]. Research has shown that exposure to celebrities through the media can have an  
188 important influence on the public's health-related attitudes, beliefs, and behaviour [37].  
189 Involvement with a celebrity through media exposure is an important mediating variable in  
190 persuasive communication, and celebrities can effectively endorse health-related messages. When  
191 health rises up the priority ladder at the expense of all other considerations, as is the case in a  
192 Public Health crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic, this leads to the increase of difficult choices  
193 to be made. The average person makes an eye-popping 35,000 choices per day and in the time of  
194 crisis the ones that citizens will need to make will have an impact on their life but also on society

195 as a whole and on the global economy. Insights given by behavioural science will be impacted by  
196 the population the study has been conducted on and the cultures of those populations. Research  
197 has shown for example that Western European and North American cultures that endorse  
198 individualism and tend to positively value the expressivity of the self through kissing, hugging,  
199 and direct argumentation. Other cultures share a stronger commitment to collectives such as  
200 country, tribe and family the priority given to obligations and duties in Asian societies may  
201 motivate individuals to remain committed to social norms while suppressing personal desires [38].  
202 Behavioural science can help ensure that reactions are based on logic rather than reactance.  
203 Behavioural Science has shown that voluntary quarantine is instead associated with less distress  
204 and fewer long-term complications. Further it is important to emphasize the altruistic choice of  
205 self-isolating.

206

207 ***What behavioural science tells us about the response?***

208 Faced with an outbreak such as COVID-19, it is important to understand what influences people's  
209 behaviour in order to decrease the likelihood of infection, transmission, and disease severity. This  
210 understanding can inform communication strategies aimed at minimizing the impact and spread of  
211 the disease [39]. "Protective behaviours carried out in response to an influenza pandemic can be  
212 broadly classified into three types: preventive, avoidant, and management of disease behaviours"  
213 [40]. Hand washing and the use of alcohol hand sanitizers, coughing or sneezing into the elbow or  
214 the sleeve, cleaning surfaces are examples of preventive behaviours. Stay at home orders, social  
215 distancing and imposed teleworking are classed in the avoidant behaviours' category. Management  
216 of disease behaviours include widespread testing and taking antiviral medication. These  
217 behaviours may be the remit of the individual or decreed by law [41]. Since a vaccine and or a

218 treatment were not rapid enough solutions to the COVID-19 pandemic, governments worldwide  
219 focused on slowing down the viral transmission in order to limit the number of severely sick in  
220 hospitals and be able to attend to their medical needs in the most efficient way possible. In order  
221 to achieve this, significant shifts in behaviour were required but various aspects of social and  
222 cultural contexts influence the extent and speed of behaviour change [42]. A recent study based on  
223 a social media survey translated into 69 languages and addressing over 100 000 volunteers in 175  
224 countries reported that 91% of respondents did not attend any social gatherings, 89% washed their  
225 hands more frequently and 93% declared that they would have immediately informed people  
226 around them if they had experienced COVID-19 symptoms [43]. Despite these very encouraging  
227 results, the virus continues to spread at an impressive pace, decimating the world population in its  
228 tracks.

229 In order to understand what drives behavioural changes and how efficient these changes  
230 actually are, current research has focused on seven: (1) Hand Washing; (2) Face Touching; (3)  
231 Entering and Coping with Isolation; (4) Encouraging Collective Action; (5) Avoiding Undesirable  
232 Behaviour; (6) Crisis Communication; and (7) Risk Perception [44]. The importance of making  
233 handwash solutions readily available and placing them in full view together with impactful signage  
234 in central locations has been shown to be an effective contributor to encouraging a more rigorous  
235 and frequent hand washing habit than usual [45]. Interestingly, to the best of the authors  
236 knowledge, there has been no evidence of any behavioural insight having been successfully  
237 leveraged to reduce face touching. Similarly, companies that already had remote work guidelines  
238 in place were more prepared to support their employees and address the issues linked to isolation  
239 such as distress and mental health problems. Because the conditions of telework under the COVID-  
240 19 crisis were somewhat different to a “normal” remote day at home...due to the length of the stay

241 at home order and the perceived imprisonment of the quarantine, companies that actively  
242 connected with their employees on a regular basis were more successful at ensuring continued  
243 efficacy and productivity of their staff. Planning for the effects of social isolation can help  
244 individuals to cope. Plans may be put in place to remotely engage with social networks, via phone  
245 and video calls, or social media [46]. Research showed that Public-spirited behaviour was most  
246 likely when there was clear and frequent communication, strong group identity, and social  
247 disapproval for those who don't comply [47]. This was evidenced by the social media survey  
248 mentioned above that showed that 90% of respondents believed social distancing measures were  
249 effective and 70% felt that risky behaviours should be financially punished [48]. Research shows  
250 that authorities often overestimate the risk of panic [49], and whilst in some populations, for no  
251 logical reason, people overpurchased specific goods such as toilet paper, this was not the most  
252 common reaction. Further, this compulsive purchasing has been shown to be a psychological  
253 response to the need of being in control of something. "When deciding whether to engage with  
254 proposed health solutions, people consider not only their susceptibility to the threat and its severity,  
255 but how effective they perceive the solution to be and the nature of the required behaviour" [50].  
256 "One of the most effective arguments to promote compliance with isolation is that self-isolation  
257 in response to symptoms is the best way for all of us to prevent infecting each other" [51]. The  
258 impact of communication on the behaviour of people together with the perception of risk will be  
259 further addressed. Indeed, these are only two of the factors that can impact behavioural changes  
260 together with age, gender, ethnicity, education level, social norms to name but a few.

261 Research shows that whilst in some populations there are behavioural changes associated  
262 with age, the pattern of findings for age is not straightforward. The balance of evidence shows that  
263 increasing age is associated with a greater chance of carrying out behaviours, but overall, the

264 results are inconclusive [52]. Gender however has a strong impact on behaviour and research  
265 shows that women are consistently more likely than men to carry out the behavioural changes  
266 imposed in a time of pandemic [53]. “There is insufficient evidence to draw any firm conclusions  
267 about associations between ethnicity and pandemic-related behaviours” [54]. More educated  
268 people are likely to take protective and avoidant behaviour and a relationship has been found  
269 between avoidant behaviours and a higher perceived severity of the pandemic [55]. Social pressure  
270 has been shown to be associated with mask wearing and belief that the authorities are open with  
271 their communication is likely to impact the implementation of precautionary behaviours [56].

272 This article proposed to address the research question “*To what extent did the use of*  
273 *behavioural insights by governments on the landing page of their official COVID-19 websites*  
274 *affect the epidemic growth scale of COVID-19?*”. To do so the landing pages of 33 official  
275 COVID-19 websites were analysed as described below.

### 277 **III. Materials and Methods**

#### 278 *Data sets and parameters used*

279 The starting point for the dataset used herein is the landing pages of the websites of 33 institutional  
280 governments. The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research,  
281 authorship, and/or publication of this article. Further the WHO data was used in order to access  
282 the number of COVID-19 cases and deaths per million for each country and on specific dates [57].  
283 *(The dates the data was accessed were 1<sup>st</sup> March, 15<sup>th</sup> March, 1<sup>st</sup> April, 15<sup>th</sup> April and 1<sup>st</sup> May*  
284 *2020 for 33 countries: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, The Czech Republic,*  
285 *Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, , Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia,*  
286 *Lichtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain,*

287 Sweden, the UK, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland and the USA). The complete list of the  
288 websites accessed and the date when these were accessed can be found in the supporting  
289 documents.

290 For every country, the “total cases of COVID-19” curve was defined by an exponential  
291 spread of the disease at the start of the epidemic, followed by the stabilization changes seen in  
292 individuals or groups and then an exponential decrease of the curve as the spread of the disease  
293 progressively slowed down. In order to estimate the epidemic evolution as well as the growth, a  
294 logarithmic equation fitting the “epidemic cumulative cases” curve of the COVID-19 cases and  
295 deaths adjusted per million inhabitants was used. Adjustment were carried out in order to remove  
296 the effect of the country-size demographic relation with the epidemic spread.

297 In order to address the research question “*To what extent did the use of behavioural insights*  
298 *by governments on the landing page of their official COVID-19 websites affect the epidemic*  
299 *growth scale of COVID19?*”, the data was adjusted to account for the six dimensions of national  
300 culture of Hofstede *et al* [58]. The application of this research is used worldwide in both academic  
301 and professional management settings [59]. Their model suggests that cultural dimensions  
302 represent independent preferences for one state of affairs over another. Because we are all human  
303 and simultaneously all unique, cultural dimensions distinguish countries (rather than individuals)  
304 from each other. Further, the country scores on the dimensions are relative and therefore culture  
305 can only be used meaningfully by comparison. The model consists of the following six dimensions:

306 **1. Power Distance Index (PDI)**

307 This dimension addresses the extent to which the unequal distribution of power is accepted and  
308 expected by a population. A high level of PDI demonstrates that people accept the established  
309 hierarchical order and therefore do not question the fact that everyone has a set place that is

310 determined. Inversely a low level of PDI means the population seeks to distribute power and  
311 demands an explanation for the lack of equality [60].

## 312 **2. Individualism Versus Collectivism (IDV)**

313 High levels of IDV indicate a society driven by the feeling of Individualism. This is often  
314 associated with a loosely-knit social framework in which people care little for anyone beyond  
315 themselves and their immediate families. A low level of IDV is indicative of Collectivism, and a  
316 tightly-knit framework in which taking care of relatives is considered the norm and family loyalty  
317 is important. The difference between individualism and collectivism can be simplified to the  
318 dichotomy between “I” and “we” [61].

## 319 **3. Masculinity Versus Femininity (MAS)**

320 Populations that exhibit a preference for achievement, heroism, assertiveness, and material  
321 rewards for success demonstrate a high level of MAS and are generally more competitive. A low  
322 level of MAS instead indicates femininity defined by cooperation, modesty, caring for the weak  
323 and quality of life. This results in decisions being made in a more consensual fashion [62].

## 324 **4. Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI)**

325 A high level of UAI reflects the unease of a society with the concepts of uncertainty and ambiguity.  
326 To what extent does a population accept that the future cannot be controlled is revealed by the  
327 level of UAI. High levels of UAI are rooted in codes of belief and behaviour, and representative  
328 of an intolerance towards unorthodox behaviours and ideas. A low level of UAI indicates that the  
329 population cares more about practice rather than principles [63].

## 330 **5. Long Term Orientation Versus Short Term Normative Orientation (LTO)**

331 Not all societies welcome change and perceive it as a sign of progress. Populations that exhibit a  
332 low level of LTO tend to be rooted in their past and emphasize their traditions and norms as they

333 anticipate change with suspicion. Inversely, a high level of LTO is representative of a pragmatic  
334 approach. Populations with high LTO embrace the future and its challenges, prepare for it and  
335 educate the young in that respect. In business terms, this is known as the short term versus long  
336 term dichotomy [64].

## 337 **6. Indulgence Versus Restraint (IVR)**

338 Populations that score high for IVR tend to be more relaxed and encourage free gratification, the  
339 enjoyment of life and fun. Inversely, populations that score low on IVR are more focused on strict  
340 regulations and the emphasis of social norms [65].

341

### 342 *Method carried out*

343 Three levels of analysis were carried out: the individual level, the social level and the  
344 environmental level. For the individual level, two domains were analysed: 1 behaviour and 2. well-  
345 being and mental health. For the social level, the community spirit behaviour domain was assessed  
346 and for the environmental level, two further domains were 1. crisis communication and 2. risk  
347 perception. For each of the domains, actions were dissected: two for the behavioural domain at the  
348 individual level (1. handwashing and 2. face touching), and one for the well-being domain at the  
349 individual level, (isolation). For the social domain the action was incentives and for the  
350 environmental level, for both domains, the actions were the cues. In total, 18 mechanisms were  
351 observed, assessed and compared across the 33 countries. When the mechanisms were present on  
352 the website the value “1” was assigned, when they were absent, the value “0” was assigned.

353 The websites were accessed at a date  $t=0$  ( every two weeks from March 1<sup>st</sup> til May 1<sup>st</sup>) but  
354 the evolution of data 15 days beforehand and 15 days before that, all the way back to the 1<sup>st</sup> of

355 March was assessed in order to derive cumulative data sets and to identify the order in which the  
356 information came in.

357 Further, the authors wish to emphasise a major caveat of this study which is that whilst the  
358 results hold true at the time of writing, because the COVID-19 is an ever-evolving crisis that is  
359 ongoing, the results may differ as we progress in the crisis. Further, there are some websites that  
360 do not mention the date of their updates and don't update their information regularly. This has  
361 been accounted for in the mathematical models described below.

362 An additional caveat that makes epidemic data complex to analyse is that they are non-  
363 linear, time correlated and the date of first infection and following spread depend on a plethora of  
364 external factors. The initial exponential growth scale of an epidemic is an important measure of  
365 the virulence of the epidemic and is also closely related to the basic reproduction number.

366 Logarithmic equations are commonly used for these types of analysis and consequently  
367 were used to model the growth scale of the disease [66]. Governments' use of behavioural insights  
368 on the landing pages of their official COVID-19 websites were analysed to assess whether there  
369 was an effect on the epidemic spread of the disease. The model was adjusted by using the Hofstede  
370 scale in order to account for the impact of the different country cultures.

371 The mathematical model used looked at the epidemic growth. Epidemic curves are time  
372 series data of the number of cases per unit time. Common choices for the time unit include a day,  
373 a week, a month, etc. It is an important indication for the severity of an epidemic as a function of  
374 time. We used the common approach of a logistic model to assess the population growth dynamics.

375 The function of the model is as follows:

376 Let us define the cumulative number of cases  $Y$  over time  $t$ , with a growth scale  $s$  and a  
377 maximum case possible  $A$ .

378 The population evolution can be modelled with the following equation as

379 
$$\frac{dY}{dt} = \frac{Y}{s} \left( 1 - \frac{Y}{A} \right)$$

380 This definition is compliant with the limit hypothesis:

381 -  $\lim_{Y \rightarrow 0} \frac{Y}{A} \rightarrow 0$

382 -  $\lim_{Y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{Y}{A} \rightarrow 1.$

383 The parametric form of logistic equation is therefore

384 
$$Y = \frac{A}{1 + \exp((x_{mid} - t)/s)}.$$

385 The parameter  $A$  is the asymptotic value of the logistic equation.

386  $x_{mid}$  is the inflexion point of the epidemic evolution.

387  $s$  is the scale parameter, where the higher the value, the lower the epidemic growth.

388 Estimation of this nonlinear system was done with R 3.6.1 software and the SSlogits  
389 function. The parameter's initial value was automatically computed, and the parameters were  
390 estimated with a Gauss-Newton algorithm [67].

391 The aim of this study was to assess epidemic growth per country. The parameter conserved  
392 for the statistical analysis was therefore  $s$ .

393 To assess the efficacy of behavioural insights and country specifications over the epidemic,  
394 growth scale was computed with a linear quadratic regression. Adjustment on Hofstede's scale  
395 was done to adjust behavioural insights regarding population behaviour using a linear model on  
396 the criteria ( $s$ ). These models included Hofstede variables as interactions of the linear model.  
397 Interactions represent the combined effect of two variables over the studied one.

398 Data was presented as mean ( $\mu_x$ ) and standard deviation ( $\sigma$ ) of the estimate. Estimates were  
 399 computed with the maximum likelihood framework. Significance of the model was taken at  
 400  $p < 0.05$ . Normality was assessed with residual plots due to the size of the sample.

401

#### 402 **IV. Results**

403 In order to compare accurately the use by governments of behavioural insights on the landing  
 404 pages of their official COVID-19 websites, the data was adjusted to account for cultural differences  
 405 [68]. The six dimensions of national culture of Hofstede *et al* were used. Table 1 shows for each  
 406 of the dimensions the mean result for all countries where data was available (N-NA's) together  
 407 with the minimum and maximum values for each dimension. Table 1 also shows the mean use of  
 408 individual, social and environmental factors as well as the mean growth scale.

409 **Table 1: Descriptive Quantitative Data (I)**

	Mean (Sd)	(Min.; Max.)	NA's	N
Growth scale (lower is better)	7.59 (2)	(4.2; 14.2)	0	33
PDI	49.9 (20.7)	(11; 104)	3	33
IDV	60.4 (18.0)	(27; 91)	3	33
MAS	46.4 (25.7)	(5; 110)	3	33
UAI	69.2 (22.6)	(23; 112)	3	33
LTO	55.4 (17.9)	(24; 83)	2	33
IVR	46.8 (19.8)	(3; 78)	1	33
Individual factors	6.4 (2)	(2; 8)	0	33
(Cumulative )				

	Mean (Sd)	(Min.; Max.)	NA's	N
Social factors (Cumulative)	2 (2)	(0; 4)	0	33
Environmental factors (Cumulative)	3.3 (1)	(1; 5)	0	33

410

411 The results are based on the growth scale estimate with the logarithmic equation for each country  
412 as presented previously. A high value of growth scale means a low spread of the disease in the  
413 population and a low value of growth scale means a higher spread of the disease.

414 For each of the six dimensions of national culture, looking at the mean values gives an  
415 appreciation of the cultural biases of the countries under analysis. For instance, a PDI mean value  
416 of 49.9 indicates that half of the countries accept and expect that power is distributed unequally.  
417 The top six countries accepting a hierarchical order, in which everybody has a place, are  
418 unsurprisingly Slovakia, Romania, Croatia, Slovenia, Bulgaria and the Czech Republic. These  
419 eastern European countries were until recently a part of the USSR and whilst their opening and  
420 joining of the EU has broadened their horizons, the cultural biases are still very present.

421 The mean value for IDV is 60.4 indicating that most countries under analysis in this study  
422 are majoritarily more individualistic, with a preference for a loosely-knit social framework in  
423 which individuals are expected to take care of only themselves and their immediate families, than  
424 collective. The USA and the UK are the top two countries exhibiting this cultural trait.

425 Whilst almost half of the countries display more masculinity and therefore are more  
426 competitive, the five countries where a more consensus-oriented society (femininity) is the highest  
427 are Denmark, the Netherlands, Latvia, Norway and Sweden.

428 As could be expected in view of the context, the highest mean value is for the Uncertainty  
 429 Avoidance Index dimension which reasserts that the majority of countries were uncomfortable  
 430 with the uncertainty of the COVID-19 pandemic.

431 Further table 1 shows that of the 9 Individual factors that were analysed, the majority of  
 432 countries implemented on average 80% of them (mean = 6.4 out of maximum 8). Note here that  
 433 the maximum value is 8, not 9, because for one of the factors, all 33 countries implemented it and  
 434 it was therefore removed from the comparison between countries. In contrast, only half of the  
 435 social factors mechanisms on average were implemented. Lastly, on average 66% of the  
 436 environmental factors were implemented across the 33 countries.

437 Table 2 is a more detailed quantitative analysis of the usage by governments of behavioural  
 438 insights on the landing pages of their official COVID-19 websites of each of the 18 mechanisms  
 439 observed.

440 **Table 2: Descriptive Quantitative Data (II)**

Variables Factors	Yes (%)	No (%)	N
<b>Individual Factors (Behavioural change)</b>			
- Handwashing & Education	82%	18%	33
- Handwashing & Information	88%	12%	33
- Handwashing & Feeling eliciting “disgust”	0%	100%	33
- Handwashing & Feeling eliciting “shift in social norms”	100%	0%	33
- Encourage a specific change in social acceptability*	82%	18%	33
- Encourage self-isolation	100%	0%	33
- Provide help with an COVID19 support Hot line	88%	12%	33

- Provide help in planning with isolation coping	85%	15%	33
- Provide guidance for maintain aspects of routine	18%	82%	33
<i>*e.g. perhaps that scratching with a sleeve is fine, just as it is now advised to sneeze or cough into the elbow or upper arm rather than the hand</i>			
<b>Social Factors (Incentives change)</b>			
- Foster cooperation by engaging population via communication medium (SMS/ push notifications)	27%	73%	33
- Transparency & individuals' contributions	64%	36%	33
- Punishment "financial fine"	48%	52%	33
- Inclusive language ("We" versus "I" or "you")	61%	39%	33
<b>Environmental Factors (Social Information Processing Cues change)</b>			
- Cues eliciting emotions other than fear such 'empathy appeals', 'responsibility appeals'	100%	0%	33
- Cues eliciting protection of vulnerable group (older, pregnant women...)	42%	58%	33
- "Availability heuristic"	64%	36%	33
- "Hindsight bias"	70%	30%	33
- "Framing effect "	58%	42%	33

442 Two results are particularly significant. First, not one country used the mechanism of disgust to  
443 encourage handwashing. All 33 countries encouraged handwashing through alternative  
444 mechanisms but none resorted to making their citizens feel disgusted by the fact of having dirty  
445 hands contaminated with the virus. A second result that is common to all countries is that all 33  
446 countries used social norms to encourage handwashing. Similarly, all 33 countries encouraged  
447 self-isolation and designed their websites to elicit emotions such as empathy and responsibility.  
448 None of the websites assessed among the 33 countries used mechanisms to elicit the feeling of fear  
449 or shame [69].

450 Whilst 29 out of 33 countries all provided information about the importance of  
451 handwashing and provided a hotline help number, the Netherlands did not provide any information  
452 about the significance of handwashing and Slovenia did not provide a hotline access. Further,  
453 Lithuania, Cyprus and Croatia provided neither.

454 Interestingly, the six countries that did not provide any education on how to wash hands  
455 appropriately to minimize contamination with the COVID-19 virus, were the same six countries  
456 whose Public health authorities did not encourage a specific change in social acceptability, perhaps  
457 that scratching with a sleeve is fine, just as it is now advised to sneeze or cough into the elbow or  
458 upper arm rather than the hand. These countries were Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Greece  
459 and the Netherlands.

460 All in all, three countries stand out through the fact that they neither promoted education,  
461 information or any feeling of disgust in handwashing and solely relied on the social norms' aspect  
462 of the mechanism. These were the Netherlands, Cyprus and Croatia.

463 Additionally, Austria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark and Lithuania were the five countries  
464 that did not provide help to support the coping of self-isolation through social networks, phone  
465 and video calls or social media.

466 In particular Lithuania and Croatia stand out because they were the two only countries that  
467 did not provide help to support the coping of self-isolation through social networks, phone and  
468 video calls or social media or provide a hotline access.

469 Only six countries (Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Norway, Switzerland and the USA) out  
470 of 33 provided guidance for maintaining aspects of routine during self-isolation and two thirds of  
471 those countries, all but Iceland and the USA, also promoted communication enhancing cooperation  
472 (via what's app number ) together with five other countries (UK, Sweden, Portugal, Liechtenstein  
473 and Germany). But for both these mechanisms the countries who used these on their websites were  
474 by far a minority.

475 Interestingly, Norway and Switzerland adopted the exact same behaviours for all 18  
476 mechanisms. The USA did the same as well with the exception of one mechanism...the USA did  
477 not use the communication enhancing cooperation (via what's app number). All the others were  
478 the exact same as for Norway and Switzerland.

479 At the individual level, six countries used the exact same mechanisms for every action  
480 under every domain. These were Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Romania and Slovakia.  
481 Further Estonia and Hungary were also aligned on the exact same mechanisms for every action  
482 under every domain of the environmental level.

483 Another five countries used the exact same mechanisms for every action under every  
484 domain at the individual level, although different from the previous six. These were France, Italy,  
485 Malta, Portugal and Spain.

486 Next, how the cumulative use by governments of behavioural insights such as individual  
 487 factors, social factors and environmental factors on the landing pages of their official COVID-19  
 488 websites affected the growth scale of the pandemic was assessed. Table 3 shows these results.

489

490 **Table 3: Epidemic scale growth with factors analysis**


<b>Factors &amp; Epidemic scale growth</b>		<b>Estimate</b>	<b>p-value</b>
		<b>Mean (Sd)</b>	
<b>Environmental factors</b>			
	(Intercept)	9.34(0.72)	0 **
	Environmental	-0.54(0.2)	0.01*
<b>Individual factors</b>			
	(Intercept)	6.92(1.36)	0 **
	Individual	0.1(0.21)	0.64
<b>Social factors</b>			
	(Intercept)	7.99(0.51)	0 **
	Social	-0.22(0.21)	0.29

491 Table 3 shows that the use of individual factors and social factors had no effect on the epidemic  
 492 scale growth (p= 0.64 for individual factors and p=0.29 for social factors). However, the use of  
 493 environmental factors affected the growth scale (epidemic logarithmic equation growth). This  
 494 suggests that countries applying more environmental behavioural insights demonstrate a lower and  
 495 slower growth of the COVID-19 pandemic.

496 This is further illustrated in Figure 1 that shows how the growth scale of the COVID-19  
497 pandemic is impacted by the use of environmental factors behavioural insights by governments on  
498 the landing page of their official COVID-19 websites.

499

500 **Figure 1: Environmental & Growth Scale**



501

502 The horizontal axis represents the cumulative number of environmental factors behavioural  
503 insights used by governments on the landing page of their official COVID-19 websites. The growth  
504 scale is derived from the logarithmic equation model. The higher the value of the growth scale the  
505 slower the disease was spreading and the lower the number of cases. Inversely a low value of  
506 growth scale means a high increase of the spread of the disease and of the number of cases. The  
507 blue line represents the linear estimate of the relation between growth scale and environmental  
508 behaviour application. What is observed is that the growth scale decreases per 0.06 per

509 environmental behaviour applied. Environmental factors behavioural insights application tend to  
510 reduce the spread of COVID-19 and the increase in number of cases.

511 Whilst every one of the 18 mechanisms was adjusted to account for the six dimensions of  
512 Hofstede, only one mechanism showed a significant result ( $p < 0.05$ ) as shown in Table 4.

513 **Table 4: Growth scale adjusted on *IVR***

	Estimate	
	Mean (Sd)	p-value
(Intercept)	11.42(1.31)	0 **
“hindsight bias” – No	-4.13(1.54)	0.01*
IVR	-0.06(0.03)	0.02*
“hindsight bias” – No & IVR	0.06(0.03)	0.05.

514  
515 Table 4 shows that when the mechanism “hindsight bias” is not used by governments on the  
516 landing page of their official COVID-19 websites a higher epidemic growth can be observed in  
517 the country. -4.13 is representative of a higher epidemic growth in the country.

518 When the Hofstede variable “IVR” was further modelized with the mechanism “hindsight bias”  
519 an almost significant result ( $p\text{-value} \approx 0.05$ ) was observed and showed a lower epidemic growth  
520 of 0.06 per million of inhabitants in the country. This is a significant decrease, because it means  
521 that simply by using an environmental factor mechanism on the landing pages of their official  
522 COVID-19 websites, governments can reduce the spread of the disease and the number of cases.  
523 Inversely, when the “hindsight bias” mechanism is not used countries score high in the IVR  
524 variable, and there is a higher epidemic growth in the country.

525

## 526 V. Discussion

527 In essentially every country on Earth, central government authorities directed and ran the response  
528 to the COVID-19 crisis which became a global pandemic within months [70]. In Europe, despite  
529 most countries being a part of the EU, all member and non-member states reacted at the national  
530 level and differently to one another. Very strict containment measures were implemented in  
531 France, Spain and Italy [71] and tighter movement controls were introduced in Germany, the  
532 Czech Republic, Slovakia, Denmark, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Cyprus, sometimes  
533 going as far as completely closing their borders [72]. In the USA, the federal government lead the  
534 national response to COVID-19 and state and local health departments stood on the front lines  
535 [73]. All the decisions were taken with the same aim: to limit population movements and social  
536 life, two aggravating factors of the spread of the virus [74]. Controlled studies have shown the  
537 effectiveness of handwashing in removing viruses from the hands and as such this was promoted  
538 widely on the landing page of the governments' official COVID-19 websites under analysis [75].  
539 Nevertheless, countries differed in their responses as evidenced by the variation of the “look and  
540 feel” of the 33 websites assessed in this study. This includes variation in colour, in font, in the  
541 amount of text, the use of pictures and videos and so on [76]. This study sought investigate these  
542 differences further by analysing the alternative uses of behavioural insights and their impact on  
543 the number of cases and deaths of COVID-19.

544 The landing pages of the websites of 33 institutional governments were compared to the WHO  
545 data on the number of COVID-19 cases and deaths per million for each country. In order to address  
546 the cultural differences in each country, the six dimensions of national culture of Hofstede *et al*,  
547 were used PDI, IDV, MAS, UAI, LTO and IVR. Three levels of analysis were carried out: the

548 individual level, the social level and the environmental level. In total, 18 mechanisms were  
549 observed, assessed and compared across the 33 countries from March 1<sup>st</sup> til May 1<sup>st</sup> 2020, every  
550 fifteen days.

551

552 *A behavioural consensus was observed across all 33 countries*

553 What was observed is that there was a behavioural consensus across all 33 countries in the way  
554 they handled the sanitary crisis. As could be expected in view of the context, the majority of  
555 countries were uncomfortable with the uncertainty of the COVID-19 pandemic and displayed  
556 individualistic cultural traits rather than collective ones. Half of the countries accepted and  
557 expected that power was distributed unequally and displayed more competitiveness. Further of the  
558 9 Individual factors that were analysed, the majority of countries implemented on average 80% of  
559 them and on average 66% of the environmental ones. Not one country used the mechanism of  
560 disgust to encourage handwashing and instead all 33 countries used social norms to do so. All 33  
561 websites elicited emotions such as empathy and responsibility and none the feeling of fear or  
562 shame [77]. Further none of the countries used the behavioural insight of positive reinforcement  
563 or reward giving [78].

564 The majority (29 out of 33 countries), all provided information about the importance of  
565 handwashing and provided a hotline help number, but two countries (Lithuania and Croatia) did  
566 not provide help to support the coping of self-isolation through social networks, phone and video  
567 calls or social media or provide a hotline access. Interestingly, Norway and Switzerland adopted  
568 the exact same behaviours for all 18 mechanisms. At the individual level, two groups of  
569 respectively six and five countries used the exact same mechanisms for every action under every  
570 domain.

571

572 *Individual and Social nudges have no impact, environmental nudges can help slow the virus*  
573 *growth scale*

574 There was therefore a great level of consensus in the choice of behavioural insights used. However,  
575 when looking at the impact of the use of these with the number of cases and deaths, the results  
576 show that the use of individual factors and social factors had no effect on the epidemic scale  
577 growth. Inversely, the use of environmental factors affected the growth scale. This suggests that  
578 countries applying more environmental behavioural insights demonstrated a lower a slower growth  
579 of the COVID-19 pandemic. Our results show that simply by using an environmental factor  
580 mechanism on the landing pages of their official COVID-19 websites, governments could reduce  
581 the spread of the disease and the number of cases.

582 These results demonstrate that irrespective of the framing of the behavioural insight  
583 depending on the culture, the use of individual and social nudges has no impact. It has been  
584 previously documented that people find it quite hard to wash their hands effectively and  
585 consistently [79] to such an extent that faecal bacteria was found on the hands of 28% of people  
586 tested in a 2008 study [80]. Lack of awareness about the effectiveness of soap, water, and  
587 scrubbing [81], practical barriers to handwashing such as difficult access to water and soap,  
588 hygiene fatigue are only a few of the reasons that have been reported to attempt to explain why  
589 people don't wash their hands despite dozens of studies showing that it can reduce the spread of  
590 infections by around 15% to 20% [82]. Additionally, the impact of a population taking some  
591 protective measures may be negative on others and wearing a mask could make people feel  
592 sufficiently protected such that they don't make the effort to further wash their hands [83].

593

594 ***Explanation of the divergence between the observed and expected results***

595 In this paper, the authors suggest that in the case of the COVID-19, the lack of impact of the  
596 individual and social nudges stems from the fact that there is a disconnected dissonance with  
597 reality, meaning that everybody has a different perception and experience of the threat [84]. Hand-  
598 washing can prevent life-threatening diseases, and even save lives [85], but if people are not  
599 directly exposed to the threat and don't visually see its impact on their own family or community,  
600 they may feel an "optimism bias" that leads them to underestimate the risk [86]. An  
601 "overconfidence effect" can also be a cause for not spending the appropriate amount of time  
602 washing one's hands thoroughly [87]. As indicated by the levels of LTO, a reluctance to change  
603 may mean people display a "status quo bias," [88] or exhibit a "present bias," which suggests that  
604 the short term consequences bear more importance than the long term ones [89]. Because not  
605 everyone abides by the rules, those people who are more concerned by the threat may fear being  
606 mocked, ostracised or ridiculed by their peers and this could explain why people don't follow the  
607 guidance. The impact of religious beliefs can mean that some populations may believe that the  
608 virus is a divine punishment and therefore resign themselves and alternatively others may dismiss  
609 COVID-19 in the light of more visibly dramatic challenges such as millions of refugees living in  
610 camps [90].

611 Similarly, because the stay at home order were implemented reasonably quickly, the social  
612 nudges did not carry any impact because people were alone at home. Their reality of society was  
613 disconnected to what was being suggested by the governments on the landing pages of the COVID-  
614 19 websites. Inversely, the environmental nudges were impactful because people perceived  
615 themselves as an *us*, a new *we*, based on a feeling of common fate, which motivated care and

616 concern for others [91]. Faced with danger, a new sense of social identity develops among  
617 populations that tend to focus more on the *we* rather than *me* thinking [92].

618

### 619 ***People seek information beyond governmental websites***

620 This study focused on the behavioural insights used on 33 governmental websites but a recent  
621 survey showed that to the question, “what is the most relied upon source of information”, only  
622 40% answered National government sources, 34% Global health organizations like the WHO and  
623 29% National health authorities like the CDC [93]. Deceived by governments, journalists and even  
624 scientists, people turned to social media where everything and anything was posted. People relayed  
625 false messages on how the virus spread and killed. Studies showed that the start of the lockdown  
626 was paired with a very strong activity on social networks, with high peaks and a record number of  
627 original publications, likes and retweets[94]. Undeniably social media is an extensive source of  
628 information, albeit uncurated [95]. Further a large-scale survey covering 58 countries and over  
629 100,000 respondents between late March and early April 2020 showed that the perception of  
630 citizens was that their government and public response was weak and that fellow citizens were not  
631 doing enough [96]. People tend to overestimate small risks and underestimate large ones and as  
632 such their average confidence in their knowledge is wrongly exacerbated. This human irrationality  
633 means governmental communication tends to be paternalistic and consequently often ill-perceived  
634 by the citizens [97].

635

### 636 ***Using Scientists as role models may encourage governmental website’s traffic***

637 This crisis is characterized by psychological uncertainty due to the limited and potentially  
638 inconsistent answers available. Further, behavioural science shows that if the amount of

639 information is perceived as overwhelming, people tend to disengage [98], and therefore do not  
640 receive the valuable information buried in the noise [99]. 45% of respondents to a recent survey  
641 said that “It has been difficult for me to find reliable and trustworthy information about the virus  
642 and its effects” [100]. Governments websites need to be seen as trustworthy and reliable. And since  
643 85% of respondents of the same survey expressed the wish “to hear more from scientists and less  
644 from politicians” [101] to what extent could scientists be engaged to recommend accessing the  
645 governmental websites? As discussed previously, exposure to celebrity advocacy messages can  
646 impact issue engagement, and can have an important influence on the public's health-related  
647 attitudes, beliefs, and behaviour [102]. Involvement of a scientist-celebrity through media  
648 exposure could effectively promote health-related messages. Scientists are coming out of their  
649 ivory towers and it is recommended to use them as role models in a society that is asking for more  
650 trustworthy public speakers.

651

### 652 ***Designing recursive nudges will increase the impact of individual and social interventions***

653 A nudge, in the words of economist Richard Thaler and legal scholar Cass Sunstein, is “any aspect  
654 of the choice architecture that alters people's behaviour in a predictable way without forbidding  
655 any options or significantly changing / their economic incentives” [103]. As discussed previously,  
656 in order for a behavioural intervention to be impactful, the targeted population needs to be  
657 psychologically or physically able to undertake the behaviour and the environment needs to  
658 facilitate it [104]. Further, co-operation requires clarity, repetition and as shown in this paper a  
659 sense of collectiveness that demonstrates that the behaviour is in the group's interest. Establishing  
660 norms and building trust encourages individuals to commit to a behaviour. A recursive nudge  
661 means that its impact will snowball over time [105]. For handwashing to become part of the

662 collective subconscious, repetition needs to be built in over time. It starts when individuals are  
663 children...schools need to teach the importance of washing hands regularly during the day, before  
664 and after specific tasks. There are nudges that have become an integral part of our collective  
665 memory because they were both recursive and precise thereby psychologically targeting our  
666 individual or group's behaviour [106]. The individual and social nudges that were used on the  
667 government's websites need to be reiterated at every level of the individuals' life, not just affixed  
668 onto a website. Permanent, visual and human nudges need to be designed [107]. This could include  
669 engaging neighbour's in supporting each other by regular visits to enquire as to whether they are  
670 washing hands and following the governments advice. Visual cues should be omnipresent in public  
671 transports, in shops, at work and so on. The visual impact of children is also a significant  
672 psychological driver and having a little boy or little girl ring your doorbell once a week to enquire  
673 as to whether you are safe, are staying at home and washing your hands regularly would not only  
674 drive down the relevance and importance of the message but further reassert the feeling of  
675 community, which as demonstrated by these results increases abidance to the guidance [108]. It's  
676 important that policymakers, rather than seeing groups as problems to be overcome, leverage the  
677 fact that people in groups help one another. Humans are a social species and we rely on each other  
678 for happiness and survival. It has never been more important to realize that we are stronger together  
679 [109]. Leveraging people's intrinsic feelings of unity is a behavioural nudge that will help reduce  
680 the spread of the disease [110].

681

## 682 **VI. Conclusion**

683 At the time of writing the COVID-19 crisis is still a daily concern for millions of individuals  
684 around the world and for their respective governments. Countries are starting to lift the lockdown

685 measures, whilst others are seeing a surge in the amount of cases and deaths and scientists are  
686 discussing a putative second wave of the spread of the epidemic. This paper sought to take a  
687 snapshot at a specific time point of the behavioural nudges used by 33 governments on the landing  
688 page of their official COVID-19 websites in order to attempt to understand the behavioural  
689 response of a subset of the 7 billion individuals impacted by this pandemic. We showed that the  
690 nudges were mostly unsuccessful irrespective of their framing and suggested that in order for them  
691 to foster impact they should not only be more precise but importantly recursive. It is not enough  
692 to affix behavioural interventions on websites and expect citizens to abide by them. Further, this  
693 research has demonstrated the importance of environmental nudges and suggested that framing  
694 individual and social ones in a broader context that reemphasizes the feeling of collectiveness is a  
695 key to success. Together with the new phases of the spread of the virus will come new rules and  
696 guidance. Public health policies need to learn from the success and failures of these past few  
697 months and address behavioural change of the population on a global scale in a more targeted  
698 manner. It is hoped that this paper will provide some insight on how to do so.

699

## 700 **VII. Acknowledgments**

701 We declare that this manuscript is original, has not been published before and is not currently being  
702 considered for publication elsewhere.

703 We know of no conflicts of interest associated with this publication, and there has been no financial  
704 support for this work that could have influenced its outcome. The manuscript has been read and  
705 approved for submission by all the named authors.

706

## 707 **VIII. References**

- 708 1. Brown GR, Dickins TE, Sear R and Laland KN, Evolutionary accounts of human  
709 behavioural diversity. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 2011; 366, 313–324  
710 doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0267
- 711 2. Brown GR, Dickins TE, Sear R and Laland KN, Evolutionary accounts of human  
712 behavioural diversity. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 2011; 366, 313–324  
713 doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0267
- 714 3. Brown GR, Dickins TE, Sear R and Laland KN, Evolutionary accounts of human  
715 behavioural diversity. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 2011; 366, 313–324  
716 doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0267
- 717 4. Brown GR, Dickins TE, Sear R and Laland KN, Evolutionary accounts of human  
718 behavioural diversity. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 2011; 366, 313–324  
719 doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0267
- 720 5. Brown GR, Dickins TE, Sear R and Laland KN, Evolutionary accounts of human  
721 behavioural diversity. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 2011; 366, 313–324  
722 doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0267
- 723 6. Morse SS, Garwin RL, Olsiewski PJ, Next Flu Pandemic: What to Do Until the Vaccine  
724 Arrives? *Science*, 2006; 314:10 929
- 725 7. COVID-19 Tracker. 2020. Available from: <http://www.covid19tracker.co.in/research/>
- 726 8. Morse SS, Garwin RL, Olsiewski PJ, Next Flu Pandemic: What to Do Until the Vaccine  
727 Arrives? *Science*, 2006; 314:10 929
- 728 9. Morse SS, Garwin RL, Olsiewski PJ, Next Flu Pandemic: What to Do Until the Vaccine  
729 Arrives? *Science*, 2006; 314:10 929

- 730 10. Bavel JJV, Baicker K, Boggio PS, Capraro V, Cichocka A, Cikara M *et al*, Using social  
731 and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nat Hum Behav*, 2020;  
732 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z>
- 733 11. Datta S, Responding to COVID-19 in the Developing World. *Behavioral Scientist*. 2020  
734 Apr 20. Available from: [https://behavioralscientist.org/responding-to-covid-19-in-the-](https://behavioralscientist.org/responding-to-covid-19-in-the-developing-world/)  
735 [developing-world/](https://behavioralscientist.org/responding-to-covid-19-in-the-developing-world/)
- 736 12. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
737 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 2020;  
738 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 739 13. Barnett M, To Achieve Sustainability, We Need to Go Upstream in the Design Process.  
740 *Behavioral Scientist*. 2020 Apr 20. Available from: [https://behavioralscientist.org/to-](https://behavioralscientist.org/to-achieve-sustainability-we-need-to-go-upstream-in-the-design-process/)  
741 [achieve-sustainability-we-need-to-go-upstream-in-the-design-process/](https://behavioralscientist.org/to-achieve-sustainability-we-need-to-go-upstream-in-the-design-process/)
- 742 14. Barnett M, To Achieve Sustainability, We Need to Go Upstream in the Design Process.  
743 *Behavioral Scientist*. 2020 Apr 20. Available from: [https://behavioralscientist.org/to-](https://behavioralscientist.org/to-achieve-sustainability-we-need-to-go-upstream-in-the-design-process/)  
744 [achieve-sustainability-we-need-to-go-upstream-in-the-design-process/](https://behavioralscientist.org/to-achieve-sustainability-we-need-to-go-upstream-in-the-design-process/)
- 745 15. Barnett M, To Achieve Sustainability, We Need to Go Upstream in the Design Process.  
746 *Behavioral Scientist*. 2020 Apr 20. Available from: [https://behavioralscientist.org/to-](https://behavioralscientist.org/to-achieve-sustainability-we-need-to-go-upstream-in-the-design-process/)  
747 [achieve-sustainability-we-need-to-go-upstream-in-the-design-process/](https://behavioralscientist.org/to-achieve-sustainability-we-need-to-go-upstream-in-the-design-process/)
- 748 16. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
749 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 2020;  
750 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>

- 751 17. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
752 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
753 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 754 18. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
755 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
756 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 757 19. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
758 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
759 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 760 20. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
761 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
762 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 763 21. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
764 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
765 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 766 22. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
767 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
768 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 769 23. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
770 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
771 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>

- 772 24. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
773 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
774 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 775 25. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
776 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
777 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 778 26. Bavel JJV, Baicker K, Boggio PS, Capraro V, Cichocka A, Cikara M *et al*, Using social  
779 and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. Nat Hum Behav, 2020;  
780 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z>
- 781 27. Bavel JJV, Baicker K, Boggio PS, Capraro V, Cichocka A, Cikara M *et al*, Using social  
782 and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. Nat Hum Behav, 2020;  
783 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z>
- 784 28. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
785 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
786 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 787 29. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
788 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
789 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 790 30. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
791 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
792 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>

- 793 31. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
794 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
795 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 796 32. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
797 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
798 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 799 33. Bavel JJV, Baicker K, Boggio PS, Capraro V, Cichocka A, Cikara M *et al*, Using social  
800 and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. Nat Hum Behav, 2020;  
801 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z>
- 802 34. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
803 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
804 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 805 35. Bavel JJV, Baicker K, Boggio PS, Capraro V, Cichocka A, Cikara M *et al*, Using social  
806 and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. Nat Hum Behav, 2020;  
807 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z>
- 808 36. Becker AB, Engaging celebrity? Measuring the impact of issue-advocacy messages on  
809 situational involvement, complacency and apathy. Journal Celebrity Studies, 2012, 3:2  
810 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2012.679462> Available from:  
811 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19392397.2012.679462>
- 812 37. Becker AB, Engaging celebrity? Measuring the impact of issue-advocacy messages on  
813 situational involvement, complacency and apathy. Journal Celebrity Studies, 2012, 3:2  
814 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2012.679462> Available from:  
815 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19392397.2012.679462>

- 816 38. Bavel JJV, Baicker K, Boggio PS, Capraro V, Cichocka A, Cikara M *et al*, Using social  
817 and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nat Hum Behav*, 2020;  
818 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z>
- 819 39. Bish A and Michie S, Demographic and attitudinal determinants of protective behaviours  
820 during a pandemic: A review. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 2010, 15: 797-824.  
821 doi:10.1348/135910710X485826
- 822 40. Bish A and Michie S, Demographic and attitudinal determinants of protective behaviours  
823 during a pandemic: A review. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 2010, 15: 797-824.  
824 doi:10.1348/135910710X485826
- 825 41. Bish A and Michie S, Demographic and attitudinal determinants of protective behaviours  
826 during a pandemic: A review. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 2010, 15: 797-824.  
827 doi:10.1348/135910710X485826
- 828 42. Bavel JJV, Baicker K, Boggio PS, Capraro V, Cichocka A, Cikara M *et al*, Using social  
829 and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nat Hum Behav*, 2020;  
830 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z>
- 831 43. Fetzer T, Witte M, Hensel L, Jachimowicz JM, Haushofer J, Ivchenko A *et al*, Global  
832 Behaviors and Perceptions at the Onset of the COVID-19 Pandemic. NBER Working Paper  
833 No. 27082  
834 Issued in May 2020 Available from: <https://www.nber.org/papers/w27082>
- 835 44. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
836 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 2020;  
837 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>

- 838 45. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
839 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
840 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 841 46. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
842 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
843 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 844 47. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
845 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
846 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 847 48. Fetzer T, Witte M, Hensel L, Jachimowicz JM, Haushofer J, Ivchenko A *et al*, Global  
848 Behaviors and Perceptions at the Onset of the COVID-19 Pandemic. NBER Working Paper  
849 No. 27082 Issued in May 2020 Available from: <https://www.nber.org/papers/w27082>
- 850 49. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
851 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
852 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 853 50. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
854 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
855 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>
- 856 51. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using Behavioural  
857 Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2020;  
858 Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : <https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147>

- 859 52. Bish A and Michie S, Demographic and attitudinal determinants of protective behaviours  
860 during a pandemic: A review. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 2010, 15: 797-824.  
861 doi:10.1348/135910710X485826
- 862 53. Bish A and Michie S, Demographic and attitudinal determinants of protective behaviours  
863 during a pandemic: A review. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 2010, 15: 797-824.  
864 doi:10.1348/135910710X485826
- 865 54. Bish A and Michie S, Demographic and attitudinal determinants of protective behaviours  
866 during a pandemic: A review. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 2010, 15: 797-824.  
867 doi:10.1348/135910710X485826
- 868 55. Bish A and Michie S, Demographic and attitudinal determinants of protective behaviours  
869 during a pandemic: A review. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 2010, 15: 797-824.  
870 doi:10.1348/135910710X485826
- 871 56. Bish A and Michie S, Demographic and attitudinal determinants of protective behaviours  
872 during a pandemic: A review. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 2010, 15: 797-824.  
873 doi:10.1348/135910710X485826
- 874 57. Beltekian D, Gavrillov D, Hasell J, Macdonald B, Mathieu E, Ortiz-Ospina E et al, Data on  
875 COVID-19 (coronavirus) by Our World in Data. *owid/covid-19-data* 2020. Available  
876 from: <https://github.com/owid/covid-19-data/tree/master/public/data>
- 877 58. Hofstede G, Hofstede GJ, Minkov M *et al*, National culture. Hofstede Insights. 2020.  
878 Available from : <https://hi.hofstede-insights.com/national-culture>
- 879 59. Cecchi-Dimeglio P, How to react to a biased performance review and prevent them in the  
880 future. *HBR Guide for Women at Work*, 2018, 70-84

- 881 60. Hofstede G, Hofstede GJ, Minkov M *et al*, National culture. Hofstede Insights. 2020.  
882 Available from : <https://hi.hofstede-insights.com/national-culture>
- 883 61. Hofstede G, Hofstede GJ, Minkov M *et al*, National culture. Hofstede Insights. 2020.  
884 Available from : <https://hi.hofstede-insights.com/national-culture>
- 885 62. Hofstede G, Hofstede GJ, Minkov M *et al*, National culture. Hofstede Insights. 2020.  
886 Available from : <https://hi.hofstede-insights.com/national-culture>
- 887 63. Hofstede G, Hofstede GJ, Minkov M *et al*, National culture. Hofstede Insights. 2020.  
888 Available from : <https://hi.hofstede-insights.com/national-culture>
- 889 64. Hofstede G, Hofstede GJ, Minkov M *et al*, National culture. Hofstede Insights. 2020.  
890 Available from : <https://hi.hofstede-insights.com/national-culture>
- 891 65. Hofstede G, Hofstede GJ, Minkov M *et al*, National culture. Hofstede Insights. 2020.  
892 Available from : <https://hi.hofstede-insights.com/national-culture>
- 893 66. Jia L, Li K, Jiang Y *et al*, Prediction and analysis of Coronavirus Disease  
894 2019. arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.05447, 2020
- 895 67. Bates DM and Watts DG, Nonlinear Regression Analysis and Its Applications, 1988. Wiley
- 896 68. Cecchi-Dimeglio P, Designing Equality In The Legal Profession: A Nudging Approach.  
897 Harvard Negotiation Law Review, 2019; 24:1 2-26
- 898 69. Cecchi Dimeglio P and Honorable Brenneur B, (eds.) Interdisciplinary Handbook of  
899 Dispute Resolution / Manuel Interdisciplinaire sur les Modes de Prévention et Règlement  
900 des Différends: Regards Croisées. Bruylant - Larcier, 2015, pp. 1500
- 901 70. Kitson-Pantano R, To What Extent is the EU just as Federal as the USA? EuropaNova,  
902 2020. Available from : [https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-](https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa)  
903 [the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa](https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa)

- 904 71. Kitson-Pantano R, To What Extent is the EU just as Federal as the USA? EuropaNova,  
905 2020. Available from : [https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-](https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa)  
906 [the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa](https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa)
- 907 72. Kitson-Pantano R, To What Extent is the EU just as Federal as the USA? EuropaNova,  
908 2020. Available from : [https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-](https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa)  
909 [the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa](https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa)
- 910 73. Kitson-Pantano R, To What Extent is the EU just as Federal as the USA? EuropaNova,  
911 2020. Available from : [https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-](https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa)  
912 [the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa](https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa)
- 913 74. Kitson-Pantano R, To What Extent is the EU just as Federal as the USA? EuropaNova,  
914 2020. Available from : [https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-](https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa)  
915 [the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa](https://www.europanova.eu/actualites/covid-19-to-what-extent-is-the-eu-just-as-federal-as-the-usa)
- 916 75. Hallsworth M, Handwashing Can Stop a Virus—So Why Don't We Do It? Behavioral  
917 Scientist. 2020 Mar 4. Available from: [https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-](https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/)  
918 [stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/](https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/)
- 919 76. Cecchi Dimeglio P, How Gender Biases Corrupts Performance Reviews, And What To do  
920 About It. Harvard Business Review. 2017, April 2:8
- 921 77. Cecchi Dimeglio P and Honorable Brenneur B, (eds.) Interdisciplinary Handbook of  
922 Dispute Resolution / Manuel Interdisciplinaire sur les Modes de Prévention et Règlement  
923 des Différends: Regards Croisés. Bruylant - Larcier, 2015, pp. 1500
- 924 78. Cecchi Dimeglio P and Honorable Brenneur B, (eds.) Interdisciplinary Handbook of  
925 Dispute Resolution / Manuel Interdisciplinaire sur les Modes de Prévention et Règlement  
926 des Différends: Regards Croisés. Bruylant - Larcier, 2015, pp. 1500

- 927 79. Hallsworth M, Handwashing Can Stop a Virus—So Why Don't We Do It? Behavioral  
928 Scientist. 2020 Mar 4. Available from: [https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-](https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/)  
929 [stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/](https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/)
- 930 80. Hallsworth M, Handwashing Can Stop a Virus—So Why Don't We Do It? Behavioral  
931 Scientist. 2020 Mar 4. Available from: [https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-](https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/)  
932 [stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/](https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/)
- 933 81. Hallsworth M, Handwashing Can Stop a Virus—So Why Don't We Do It? Behavioral  
934 Scientist. 2020 Mar 4. Available from: [https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-](https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/)  
935 [stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/](https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/)
- 936 82. Hallsworth M, Handwashing Can Stop a Virus—So Why Don't We Do It? Behavioral  
937 Scientist. 2020 Mar 4. Available from: [https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-](https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/)  
938 [stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/](https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/)
- 939 83. Hallsworth M, Handwashing Can Stop a Virus—So Why Don't We Do It? Behavioral  
940 Scientist. 2020 Mar 4. Available from: [https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-](https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/)  
941 [stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/](https://behavioralscientist.org/handwashing-can-stop-a-virus-so-why-dont-we-do-it-coronavirus-covid-19/)
- 942 84. Cecchi Dimeglio P, Système de gestion de cooperation dans la période d'exploitation des  
943 Partenariats public-privé dans le secteur de la santé. *Revue d'arbitrage et de médiation /*  
944 *Journal of Arbitration and Mediation*, 2013, 35-58
- 945 85. Lopez G and Belluz J, Wash your damn hands. Vox.com. 2020 Apr 14. Available from:  
946 <https://www.vox.com/2020/2/28/21157769/how-to-prevent-the-coronavirus>
- 947 86. Innovation and Youth Teams at the UNDP Regional Hub for the Arab States, Nudge  
948 Lebanon, and B4 Development, Using behavioural insights to respond to COVID-19.  
949 United Nations Development Programme. 2020 May 7. Available from:

- 950 [https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-respond-to-covid-19-.html)  
951 [respond-to-covid-19-.html](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-respond-to-covid-19-.html)
- 952 87. Innovation and Youth Teams at the UNDP Regional Hub for the Arab States, Nudge  
953 Lebanon, and B4 Development, Using behavioural insights to respond to COVID-19.  
954 United Nations Development Programme. 2020 May 7. Available from:  
955 [https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-respond-to-covid-19-.html)  
956 [respond-to-covid-19-.html](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-respond-to-covid-19-.html)
- 957 88. Innovation and Youth Teams at the UNDP Regional Hub for the Arab States, Nudge  
958 Lebanon, and B4 Development, Using behavioural insights to respond to COVID-19.  
959 United Nations Development Programme. 2020 May 7. Available from:  
960 [https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-respond-to-covid-19-.html)  
961 [respond-to-covid-19-.html](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-respond-to-covid-19-.html)
- 962 89. Innovation and Youth Teams at the UNDP Regional Hub for the Arab States, Nudge  
963 Lebanon, and B4 Development, Using behavioural insights to respond to COVID-19.  
964 United Nations Development Programme. 2020 May 7. Available from:  
965 [https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-respond-to-covid-19-.html)  
966 [respond-to-covid-19-.html](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-respond-to-covid-19-.html)
- 967 90. Innovation and Youth Teams at the UNDP Regional Hub for the Arab States, Nudge  
968 Lebanon, and B4 Development, Using behavioural insights to respond to COVID-19.  
969 United Nations Development Programme. 2020 May 7. Available from:  
970 [https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-respond-to-covid-19-.html)  
971 [respond-to-covid-19-.html](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-respond-to-covid-19-.html)

- 972 91. Davies J, We Aren't Selfish After All. Nautilus, 2020. Apr 29. Available from:  
973 [http://nautil.us/issue/84/outbreak/we-arent-selfish-after-](http://nautil.us/issue/84/outbreak/we-arent-selfish-after-all?mc_cid=172dc11cc2&mc_eid=0e40a038f3)  
974 [all?mc\\_cid=172dc11cc2&mc\\_eid=0e40a038f3](http://nautil.us/issue/84/outbreak/we-arent-selfish-after-all?mc_cid=172dc11cc2&mc_eid=0e40a038f3)
- 975 92. Davies J, We Aren't Selfish After All. Nautilus, 2020. Apr 29. Available from:  
976 [http://nautil.us/issue/84/outbreak/we-arent-selfish-after-](http://nautil.us/issue/84/outbreak/we-arent-selfish-after-all?mc_cid=172dc11cc2&mc_eid=0e40a038f3)  
977 [all?mc\\_cid=172dc11cc2&mc\\_eid=0e40a038f3](http://nautil.us/issue/84/outbreak/we-arent-selfish-after-all?mc_cid=172dc11cc2&mc_eid=0e40a038f3)
- 978 93. Edelman Trust Barometer 2020. 2020 Available from:  
979 <https://www.edelman.com/trustbarometer>
- 980 94. Kitson-Pantano R, The Consequences of Poor Communication. Absolutys, 2020. Available  
981 from: <https://www.absolutys.com/institute>
- 982 95. Kitson-Pantano R, The Consequences of Poor Communication. Absolutys, 2020. Available  
983 from: <https://www.absolutys.com/institute>
- 984 96. Fetzer T, Witte M, Hensel L, Jachimowicz JM, Haushofer J, Ivchenko A *et al*, Global  
985 Behaviors and Perceptions at the Onset of the COVID-19 Pandemic. NBER Working Paper  
986 No. 27082 Issued in May 2020 Available from: <https://www.nber.org/papers/w27082>
- 987 97. Gigerenzer G, The irrationality paradox. Behavioral And Brain Sciences, 2004; 27:3 336-  
988 338
- 989 98. Sagara N, Dagogo Jack T, Galak J, Behavioral Science Insights Amidst the Covid-19  
990 Outbreak. IPSOS. 2020. Apr 6. Available from: [https://www.ipsos.com/en-](https://www.ipsos.com/en-us/knowledge/consumer-shopper/behavioral-science-insights-amidst-the-covid19-outbreak)  
991 [us/knowledge/consumer-shopper/behavioral-science-insights-amidst-the-covid19-](https://www.ipsos.com/en-us/knowledge/consumer-shopper/behavioral-science-insights-amidst-the-covid19-outbreak)  
992 [outbreak](https://www.ipsos.com/en-us/knowledge/consumer-shopper/behavioral-science-insights-amidst-the-covid19-outbreak)
- 993 99. Sagara N, Dagogo Jack T, Galak J, Behavioral Science Insights Amidst the Covid-19  
994 Outbreak. IPSOS. 2020. Apr 6. Available from: [https://www.ipsos.com/en-](https://www.ipsos.com/en-us/knowledge/consumer-shopper/behavioral-science-insights-amidst-the-covid19-outbreak)

- 995 us/knowledge/consumer-shopper/behavioral-science-insights-amidst-the-covid19-  
996 outbreak
- 997 100. Edelman Trust Barometer 2020. 2020 Available from:  
998 <https://www.edelman.com/trustbarometer>
- 999 101. Edelman Trust Barometer 2020. 2020 Available from:  
1000 <https://www.edelman.com/trustbarometer>
- 1001 102. Becker AB, Engaging celebrity? Measuring the impact of issue-advocacy messages on  
1002 situational involvement, complacency and apathy. *Journal Celebrity Studies*, 2012, 3:2  
1003 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2012.679462> Available from:  
1004 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19392397.2012.679462>
- 1005 103. Innovation and Youth Teams at the UNDP Regional Hub for the Arab States, Nudge  
1006 Lebanon, and B4 Development, Using behavioural insights to respond to COVID-19.  
1007 United Nations Development Programme. 2020 May 7. Available from:  
1008 [https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-respond-to-covid-19-.html)  
1009 [respond-to-covid-19-.html](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/stories/using-behavioural-insights-to-respond-to-covid-19-.html)
- 1010 104. Lunn P, Belton C, Lavin C, McGowan F, Timmons S and Robertson D, Using  
1011 Behavioural Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. *Journal of Behavioral Public*  
1012 *Administration*, 2020; Vol. 3 No. 1 Available from : [https://journal-](https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147)  
1013 [bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147](https://journal-bpa.org/index.php/jbpa/article/view/147)
- 1014 105. Cecchi-Dimeglio P, *Diversity Dividend*, MIT Press Forthcoming 2020
- 1015 106. Cecchi-Dimeglio P, *Designing Equality In The Legal Profession: A Nudging Approach*.  
1016 *Harvard Negotiation Law Review*, 2019; 24:1 2-26

- 1017 107. Cecchi-Dimeglio P, Designing Equality In The Legal Profession: A Nudging Approach.  
1018 Harvard Negotiation Law Review, 2019; 24:1 2-26
- 1019 108. Cecchi Dimeglio P, Système de gestion de cooperation dans la période d’exploitation des  
1020 Partenariats public-privé dans le secteur de la santé. Revue d'arbitrage et de médiation /  
1021 Journal of Arbitration and Mediation, 2013, 35-58
- 1022 109. Cecchi Dimeglio P, Système de gestion de cooperation dans la période d’exploitation des  
1023 Partenariats public-privé dans le secteur de la santé. Revue d'arbitrage et de médiation /  
1024 Journal of Arbitration and Mediation, 2013, 35-58
- 1025 110. Davies J, We Aren’t Selfish After All. Nautilus, 2020. Apr 29. Available from:  
1026 [http://nautil.us/issue/84/outbreak/we-arent-selfish-after-](http://nautil.us/issue/84/outbreak/we-arent-selfish-after-all?mc_cid=172dc11cc2&mc_eid=0e40a038f3)  
1027 [all?mc\\_cid=172dc11cc2&mc\\_eid=0e40a038f3](http://nautil.us/issue/84/outbreak/we-arent-selfish-after-all?mc_cid=172dc11cc2&mc_eid=0e40a038f3)

Submission URL