# Loss framing and social norms nudges to encourage enrollment in an employee wellness program: A pragmatic trial

Henri C. Santos, PhD<sup>1</sup>; Amir Goren, PhD<sup>1</sup>; Michelle N. Meyer, JD, PhD<sup>1,2</sup>; & Christopher F. Chabris, PhD<sup>1,3</sup> <sup>1</sup>Behavioral Insights Team, Steele Institute for Health Innovation, Geisinger Health System, Danville, PA <sup>2</sup>Center for Translational Bioethics & Health Care Policy, Geisinger Health System, Danville, PA <sup>3</sup>Autism & Developmental Medicine Institute, Geisinger Health System, Lewisburg, PA

#### Background

We examined whether using loss framing or social norms can increase enrollment in an employee wellness program at a large, mostly rural health system.

- Although wellness programs have the potential to reduce health risks and encourage healthy behavior among employees, not everyone takes advantage of them.
- Presenting social norms can increase behaviors like vaccination<sup>1</sup> and hand washing.<sup>2</sup>
- Although evidence is mixed on the comparative effectiveness between gain and loss framing, both can be equally persuasive when there is low motivation to process the information.<sup>3</sup>
- We separately examined people who previously enrolled in the program and those who have never enrolled in the program, as different appeals might work for those groups (e.g., endowment effect for those who previously got the program's benefits<sup>4</sup>).

1. N. Bellé, P. Cantarelli, Nudging public employees through descriptive social norms in healthcare organizations. Pub. Admin. Rev. (2021). 2. H. Mobekk, L. Stokke, Nudges emphasizing social norms increased hospital visitors' hand sanitizer use. Beh. Sci. Policy. 6, 51-57 (2020). 3. X. Nan, K. Daily, Y. Qin, Relative persuasiveness of gain-vs. loss-framed messages: a review of theoretical perspectives and developing an integrative framework. Rev. Commun., 18, 370-390 (2018). 4. D. Kahneman, J.L. Knetsch, R.H. Thaler, (1991). The endowment effect, loss aversion, and status quo bias: Anomalies. J. Econ. Perspect. 5 (1), 193-206 (1991).

Geisinger

## For those who previously enrolled in the program, any email led to greater Study 1

We sent reminder emails to employees who had not yet enrolled in the program in 2019 (n = 5,697), comparing four conditions:

- No email
- Standard reminder email (typically sent by health system)
- Loss frame email ("throwing away" around \$2,000 in savings)
- Social norms email ("78% of your colleagues" enrolled in 2018)

We separately examined people who previously enrolled and never enrolled in the program.

#### For new hires (never enrolled), loss frame and Study 2 standard emails did not differ significantly.

We sent reminder emails to	
newly-hired employees in 2019	30%
( <i>n</i> = 831), comparing two conditions:	20%
<ul> <li>Standard reminder email</li> </ul>	10%
<ul> <li>Loss frame email</li> </ul>	0%

### For those who previously enrolled, loss frame Study 3

We examined the loss frame	40%
effect from Study 1 with a larger	30%
sample of employees who have	
not yet enrolled in the program in	20%
2020 ( <i>n</i> = 13,546), comparing two	10%
conditions:	
<ul> <li>Standard reminder email</li> </ul>	0%

- Stanuaru reminuer eman
- Loss frame email

We thank Jason Gibson for coordinating strategic design, collaborating on the development and sending of the emails, and data gathering. Preregistrations and protocols for these studies are available on ClinicalTrials.gov. Study 1: <u>NCT03965754</u>. Study 2: <u>NCT04047342</u>. Study 3: <u>NCT04289623</u>. Contact: <u>hsantos@geisinger.edu</u>

