

- Kurt: [00:04](#) Welcome to Behavioral Grooves. My name is Kurt Nelson.
- Tim: [00:06](#) ...and I'm Tim Houlihan. Behavioral grooves is a podcast that explores the question, why do we do what we do where we talk a little music and we leave you with some ideas on how to apply behavioral science to your work and life.
- Kurt: [00:19](#) We are building a community of behavioral science practitioners around the world, whether that be formally in your job or research or more informally in applying these lessons to your life and relationships.
- Tim: [00:31](#) Yes, and we would love to hear from you. Yes, we would get in touch with us via Twitter. We love Twitter and we can be reached at, @whatmotivates and @thoulihan or just leave us a message on behavioralgrooves.com. We want to know how we're doing and what topics or areas that you would like to see us explore in greater detail.
- Kurt: [00:52](#) Also, if you have a suggestion for a guest, please let us know.
- Kurt: [00:56](#) We are always looking for fun, engaging guests that can bring a unique perspective on this topic.
- Tim: [01:03](#) That is so true. That's what we're all about. We are.
- Kurt: [01:05](#) So today's episode is part of our U Penn NoBeC series where we talk with researchers who presented at the university of Pennsylvania's norms and behavior change conference way back in October of 2019.
- Tim: [01:18](#) Oh man, we learned so much there.
- Kurt: [01:20](#) Agreed. Agreed. And now we get to share some of those learnings with our listeners.
- Tim: [01:25](#) Eugen Dimant is the senior research fellow with the identity and conflict lab in the political science department at the university of Pennsylvania. But wait, I know this is coming. There's, there's, there's more isn't there is more. He is also a fellow in the behavioral and decision sciences program and the behavioral ethics lab also at the university of Pennsylvania. Uh, is there more? There is more.
- Kurt: [01:49](#) Oh my God. Yeah. He's also an external fellow for the center of decision research and experimental economics at the University of Nottingham. Why do we, how is get these underachievers on

the program, Tim? I don't understand. Classic. I what, when are we going to get somebody that actually gets something done? Like God, totally amazing what our guests do. I'm, this is opposite day. That was that was, that was not there. All right, so our conversation with Eugen talk through a bit of the Novec conference and its history, but then we delve into his work on social norms, particularly as they relate to changing behavior and to how norms impact that. We also touch upon the backfire effect that nudges can have an are there behavioral changes via nudges? Are those sustainable or are they not? Yeah, this was really, really cool.

- Tim: [02:37](#) Of course, we also talked about music.
- Tim: [02:39](#) Oh, we did and we did ed, he expanded some of our international musical tastes, some good German bands.
- Kurt: [02:46](#) A very cool, I don't do a good German accent. I don't even know. I tried anyway. I think it was worth a try. I think it's a bad try. Try, but it was worth it. All right. It's a great conversation and one that I'm sure that you will take a few lessons from. And if you want to hear about the lessons that Tim and I took from this session, make sure that you listen to the grooving component that we do right after the interview. And we've got a bonus track after the grooving session where we will give you the listener, some specific ideas from this episode and how you can act on it right away.
- Tim: [03:19](#) I think people are gonna get a lot from this episode. I did. I did too. Yeah, you did as well, Curt. So with that, we urge you to sit back with your bad Apple drink. Oh, people. That'll be it. That'll be a clue. That's foreshadowing. And uh, listen to our conversation with dr Oregon. Demonic
- [03:37](#) [Interstitial Music]
- Kurt: [03:42](#) So again, tell us a little bit about the conference.
- Eugen: [03:44](#) So the norms of behavior change conference 2019. Yes. So this is the third installment of this workshop. We had the very first in Nottingham two years ago. A very small group got together trying to figure out how to use norms for the better, how to understand norms in the context of behavioral change and try to apply and try to address this from an interdisciplinary point of view. Last year we moved to Penn, made it bigger, open to the public. In this year it's even bigger now. It's so interdisciplinary. We have political scientists, psychologists,

economists, so it's great. It's been growing well that is the part that I have been really fascinated with because the interdisciplinary component, even in presenting these academic research papers and the questions that come out from the various different fields, like yesterday there was an economist up there and then there was a political scientist asking a question that would have never come out in a, in an economics discussion solely.

Eugen: [04:40](#) So I think those, those cross pollinations are a really positive, is that, that's intentional. Obviously there was exactly the idea because we all seemingly work on the same topic, but really not because there's so many different perspectives, different approaches, different methodologies. And so we see theory and empirical research in the field and in the lab and simulation. So for us it was important to get people in the same room who are interested really in the same things, but really have completely different approaches to answering those and finding the different, different ways of looking at something might spark some new ideas in their own researcher or in maybe one of the students that is in here listening and various different economics is sort of handouts. The field I'm coming from, we are known to not really acknowledge often the literature outside of economics. Yes, this is a good way to get people and make them aware of this other important research that really tries to resolve the same issue but using a different approach and we can actually learn from that.

Kurt: [05:36](#) So fantastic. Well, you had a paper that you talked about inside of this as well. So do you want to talk a little bit about what that paper was and one of the findings were? Yeah, absolutely. So, so this is ongoing work with Christina Macquarie Zeman Gangstar Daniella knows. And so, and what we are interested in is understanding how the norms change to what extent norms change and what can we do about it if the norms change to the worst. And so this paper really tackles this question from a perspective of dynamic behavior where we try to trace people's behavior over time and we're trying to see how they change with respect to what they observe is happening around them. And so really the key results there, there are many, there are many interesting results, but the key result really is people really are very much affected by other people's behavior.

Eugen: [06:28](#) Even if they have no reason we need to react because there's no, there's no strategic relationship in our context. They're just observing information has no effect really on their payoffs. But still people care because this information carries norm related information. People care about norms and so help. So for the

listeners who don't understand norms in general, I know it's a huge thing, but explain that in an easy to understand way when you're talking norms. What do you mean when you're saying norms? Yes. So yeah, there are different definitions and so I don't want to get in between us or in a war with different people. But the way we understand norms and our context is we use our morally loaded environment in our context, which is you can give money to a charity or you can take money away from a charity. We pre donate money to a charity and we, we try to understand what is the norm in this context.

Speaker 3: [07:18](#) So we have methods to get to the bottom of what is a norm in this particular environment. And so there are different approaches. Christina big area has their own approach. The other approaches, we use these approaches and we find that people definitely, they think that taking stealing from a charity is definitely not okay. So we establish an online, it's pretty universal, right? This is, that is, yeah. I mean to the extent that people at least appreciate the charity and appreciate the goal of the charity, we use a very prosocial, good, well reputed sort of charity. And so we know what the norm is, but then we see that people's behavior deviates from that very much. In particular, we said we'd done this at Penn and Penn students have surprises at least to the extent to which they were willing to really take money away from the charity to screw the charity.

Speaker 3: [08:05](#) Exactly. Exactly. So what are the situations where they're more likely to do that and yeah, so in the context of our research, what we see is that the moment you expose people to other people, bad behavior takes over. So it doesn't even matter almost how many bad people you have in this immediate group that you observe. One bad Apple that we show is already enough to pull the whole, the whole distribution, the whole group of people who were good to begin with into the bad domain. That's amazing. That one, one bad Apple really, I mean, so this old thing about one bad Apple spoils the whole bunch. That's really true. Yes. You're actually finding that with your research. Exactly. So we find that and so the moment people are exposed to others, we see this behavior to accelerate and just the whole norm is disappears and taking sort of this bad behavior towards the chair and just accelerates.

Speaker 3: [08:58](#) So what are some of the factors, you talked also about social proximity as as a compounding component in, so how does that work? So we've been coming from the side of sort of the social psychological research that would argue that you care about people who are immediate, more proximate to you, more than about random strangers. And in our context we use, we use a

simple question that signals something about belongingness to being a fan of a Philadelphia sports team as we know that matters a lot in Philadelphia. Fandom is really important here. So we use that as a, but that might not be so important to somebody who lives in Atlanta. Munich. Exactly. So we use this because we ran this at Penn, we use that. And of course if we would have used the different contexts, we would need to come up with something they care about.

Speaker 3: [09:42](#)

But in our context we use this as a social proximity marker and the answer this question and in some of the variations of this experiment, in addition to seeing behavior, you know also see who is this person who engages in this behavior. Does he know something about the sports team in the same way as I know something about the sports. And so the research would suggest that if we have a lot of cohesion, a lot of proximity, people answering the question the same way they are, this should make people care more about upholding a social law. So I feel like this person and me are more like, and so there we have this element of component element of togetherness. That's a wrong way of putting it where there is a sense of we're, we're kind of in this together. Right? Exactly. Exactly. And so you are in this together but not from a sort of game point of view because you never action to act with them.

Speaker 3: [10:36](#)

It's just you are in it together from a feelings perspective. Right? And so what we show is that the moment we give people this additional proximity information, this deterioration of the norm is really muted. And I think the pitch, the key result of that paper is it's muted. Not because now I'm not responding at all to what's going on around me. People respond very much so, but now the respond to bad behavior but also to good behavior. And so on average, this sort of removes this erosion of the norm because good behavior is picked up in bad behaviors picked up. And if I don't know the proximity, people just respond to me, respond to the bad behavior. But if the, if the behavior that I'm picking up is from the somebody who is like me, then that mitigates that component and it brings that, it increases the bad behavior.

Speaker 3: [11:25](#)

So, so if I find out that there is a, another Philadelphia sports fan in this game, the situation with me, I'm less likely to be a bad guy. Right? You're less likely to, you definitely respond. Not to the same extent to their bad behavior. Now, in addition to that, you now respond for the first time really to their good behavior and good behavior in our context is a very costly. So really just the simple information about this person might be like you on this one domain makes people to reconsider their very selfish

motivation of maximizing their pay off of this experiment and days they reconsider maybe picking up the good behaviors. So fewer people screw the charity basically when they sense that, Oh there's, there's someone else who's observing. Exactly. Yeah. Okay. So we talked with Christina yesterday and she talked about referential networks. So this is a proxy for a referential network is kind of in that sense.

Speaker 3: [12:20](#) Absolutely. And I think it's important to acknowledge there is some variation. I mean heterogeneity as we would call this with respect to how people respond to this referential network. So once you break down who is really contributing to this erosion and who is responding to what's going on around them, we see it's not the bad guys, the bad guys in our environment. They just are completely invariant and they ignore what's going on around and they just keep doing their thing very consistently. The bad guys are bad guys regardless of what anybody else in our context at least say now, contexts where there's no strategic component of responding to somebody. It's really just purely informational and people don't respond if they are bad guys, you know, experiment. But it's the good guys, unfortunately the good guys who are being swayed by other people's behavior into this bad domain and turning almost the good guys into bad guys, but proximity but proximity in our context allows to mitigate that.

Speaker 3: [13:14](#) But we can't lift in this situation. You're not lifting the bad guys up by showing them good behavior. Even if it is socially proximity, proximity component is, Oh this person's like me and they're doing good. I don't care have so I'm a bad person. I'm just going to keep a very self serving way. They tend to ignore this information. It's of kind of sad. It is. It is kind of sad. A lot of our research is not purposely, but it is around like focusing on why people do the bad things that they do. But for real, I mean the goal is to find out what we can do about this and how we can fix that. And so some of our other research focused on how to nudge people maybe into behaving in a better way. And so not, not all of that is gloomy, but this particular research shows a gloomy, well, let's talk about some of that other research, right?

Speaker 3: [13:57](#) So you had done some work with Gary Bolton nudges backfiring also. Talk a little bit about that. Give us the big picture. The headlines. Yeah. Yeah. So, so nudges are very invoke. Everyone likes nudge us, companies like nudges, researchers, Richard Thaler won the Nobel prize. And rightfully so, and CAS and others, they really contribute to this research. And it's important to understand at least when do these things work

and when do they not work? But in addition to them, why don't they work? And so we have this one research project in which we try to understand how a simple nudge, which all it does is really to make behavior observable to others, affects people's behavior. And we would assume that making behavior observable to others should turn on sort of all concern about social image and how people perceive us and reputation concerns and how people will interact with us down down the road.

Speaker 3: [14:51](#)

And what we show is that depending on the environment in which we test, we see that being observed, but without the ability of enforcing behavior can backfires. So unless I can actually enforce good behavior, just the pure observability of actions doesn't always work in our contexts, sometimes even backfires. Because what people try to think about now is to get ahead of these other people. And so now I'm making these people my reference network in a way, and now I really care about how my wealth compares to their wealth. And that is through the backfiring and outcomes. So the relative component, all of a sudden I see this, this, this person who I don't have any interaction with at all, but now they become this reference point that I have to beat because I am now in a sense believing that I might be in a way.

Speaker 3: [15:37](#)

Yes, yes. And we are very concerned of course with answering the next question, which is how can we fix that? Just stop there and be like, well, you know, unfortunately not just you know, but so we focused in, what we find very consistently with this other research is that social norm interventions do work. So if we make it very salient and we'll let people think about what is really appropriate behavior in this environment, people focus more on the society and the welfare and on the charity that they interact with and less so about themselves. So this greediness or competitiveness that we see goes away the moment people are sort of private and focused on social. So is was this a, did you use a public goods kinda experiment on this? How, how did you operationalize this? It's very similar to the paper we just talked about.

Speaker 3: [16:24](#)

It said again, a non-strategic setting and it's just me and a charity and it's all that happens. And now in addition to that, sometimes other people observe me and sometimes they don't. And sometimes those other people have an enforcement mechanism and I know that. And so, so most of our research tries to distinguish between different mechanisms and mechanisms that are often in clash. Like in public goods. Games are really informational value of behavior and sort of the

monetary component of me trying to not be the sucker in a strategic environment and we don't want this clash. So we remove this monetary component and we only focus on information. So that's what we do here. That's what we do in this previous paper. And ultimately there is just thinking about sort of what's next, and we were talking about how nudges are so invoked. There's some, some, some papers out there recently that are saying let's get beyond nudges.

Speaker 3: [17:19](#) Do you feel that that is a sort of an inappropriate thing to be talking about in the social context, in social norms to say, can we kind of move just beyond nudges? Is there something else? So I'm, I'm, I'm biased of course because I'm part of Christina's team here, but sort of the mission that she has been, she had been publishing books and papers over and over again is that we need substantial change to induce behavioral change. And so the way she perceives that is if we think about nudges, not just the often just, I just changed the position of the snacks. And as you walk in, you will not go to the back of the supermarket because you don't want to actually, you know, it's a couple of steps and various different things. The question is, does the spillover does this, is this a long lasting effect?

Speaker 3: [18:03](#) So the moment I put this snacks back at the beginning of the aisle, are people, no actual learning and just passing those snacks and they really learn something. So the question is to what extent do simple nudge intervention actually change people's understanding people's beliefs? And people's at the end of the day, people's norms. And so there is this distinction that we try to make between nudges and norms, which is not just tries to tackle changing individual behavior norms, tried to tackle a collective change, collective behavior. And so the next step that we see, and so Christina and I call, well mainly she calls it norm nudging, is that we can use social norm insights into improving the way we nudge people in a way that will spill over and have long lasting effects of long. So in that we talk about injunctive norms and descriptive norms. Sorry I'm at a loss for words here.

Speaker 3: [18:55](#) It's been a long couple of days. But with that there was some, we were talking with Christina about this, but I want to kind of go back into this deeper is, so are you looking at changing those? How do we change those, those norm components, those social norms and how people view those to make that change, to make that behavior change. So what is it changing the, the injunctive norms is changing the descriptive norms. Is it or is that too broad? And am I just simplify it? It's a great question. Also the sort of the million and billion dollar

questions, how do we, how do we tackle the right aspects of these things? And so the right aspect, the right aspect, and so, and, and, and Christina in her most recent box, she pushes this idea of role models. And often we are in this bad equilibrium in this bad state where everyone is engaging in bad behavior or where people have the wrong beliefs about what people do.

Speaker 3: [19:48](#)

And so they call this pluralistic ignorance where I have a wrong perception, wrong understanding of the environment. And that makes me not change my behavior. So what do we need to do is we need to, we need to change their beliefs. We need to update their beliefs in a way that can facilitate the better behavior. We need to focus them on better people, on role models and we need to change their perspective and outlook. And this is challenging. And the fuel research from that is existent but often shows ineffective sort of approach. There's probably more than just information, right? It's probably more than just a communication. It's also modeling and being in social contexts and making sure you have the relational network that is the appropriate one. That was one of the interesting pieces that we talked with her about her work in India where it's like it's not the village neighbors, which you would assume, right?

Speaker 3: [20:38](#)

It was the assumption that I, when she said that, I said, Oh, of course it would be my neighbors across the street and it, no, it is only if they're from family or close friends. The neighbors cross the street, I don't care about, they're not part of that network. So pure effects, extremely important and have always been an important part of my research interest is we learned so much from others and we interact so much with them, but how do we stop or at least mitigate learning the wrong thing from others and how do we make people learn the good thing and change the behavior it's about, so tell us how do we do that? I mean based on [inaudible] that's an easy answer. But based on the research that I presented today really is the proximity makes people to care more about existing norms, right?

Speaker 3: [21:21](#)

So we need to make sure that we have the right norm in place, but then we need to make sure that people are actually observing the right people into close people in environments who can be role models for behavioral change. So this is way off topic here. So if I'm going way off topic on this, I apologize, but Robert Cialdini that we interviewed before, and we had a conversation with him, it wasn't on the podcast, but there was this component where he's talking about trying to change political beliefs in this really divergent, you know, left versus right. And neither neither talks. And he said, the way to do that is to say, I once thought like you did, I used to be just like you.

So again, it's getting that social, I believe now what I'm, what I'm hearing is that there's, it's building that social proximity to that person so that they're not dismissive of your, your ideas right away.

Speaker 3: [22:13](#) And you might be able to shift some of their mindset and some of their norms. I don't know if that, yeah, absolutely. And so what we need to make sure is that we've reduced the wiggle room for people to avoid learning the right things either. Right? So just because we had the right people doesn't mean that people are taking this seriously. And a paper that was just presented right after mine by Martha, Sarah Garcia from UC SD, she looks at this with her coauthor. They look at how people pay sometimes a substantial amount of money to avoid learning information that would really be against what they want to do. And so we need to make sure that we reduce the suburban rooms and make people accountable and care about, so to agree some motivated reasoning, but with actually financial components, like I will pay to be ignorant on this component.

Speaker 3: [22:58](#) It's so cool that you're, that you're approaching this as an economist, right. And in some ways it reminds me so much of sociology, right? And Coleman, I think Coleman's bode, you're talking about nudges on an individual basis, the micro. And then the the peers, the social side. I think it's fabulous that this is a very interdisciplinary kind of work that you're doing. Yes, and so I was very happy to be able to join Christina's team a few years ago because she is interdisciplinary in her thinking, but also the team around her is extremely interdisciplinary, so I'm one of the few economists. We're the only web psychologists and political scientists. Then in philosophers, people are thinking about similar things with different approaches and being able to bounce ideas off of each other is really makes this a fruitful endeavor and most of my quarters really have been completely different perspectives and so I learned from them and I embrace it.

Speaker 3: [23:53](#) There's plenty of research myself. That's when the degree to which this model could be carried into the corporate world. Then too, I would love to see a more interdisciplinary approach to problem solving in the corporate setting as well. I think across many settings, governmental and radios, you look at all of those and we ended, you know, we get siloed. Our very first podcast, we were talking with James Heyman, who that was one of his big things. He says, we should just form, we should have problems. We should have, we should organize universities around problems, not around our disciplines. Right? Here's the problem. I'm coming at it as an economist, you're

coming at it as a psychologist, you're coming at it as a philosopher. It's the same problem. But we all look at it differently and let's, let's take the best of all those worlds. And that's what I hear you're doing.

Speaker 3: [24:38](#) And some other teams, I mean shout out to the Carnegie Mellon people. I mean they, their team is equally, I mean interdisciplinary and so, so this is really a great approach. And so having that diversity as is what we can and should embrace, I know you're, you're, you're itching to get to get to the thing that you always want to get to. So music, what's really great about this Oregon is that Kirk can just read my eyes on this. Maybe we've been doing too many a hundred of these episodes and I've got it down. So what's on your playlist right now? What are you listening to? Well, right now it's really just mostly peaceful music because it was a few hectic weeks in the past. I tried to just calm down. I would say I am for the most part. I listened to hip hop dads stats. Okay. So what's peaceful music for you though is it wasn't hip hop in just the, you know, can be, but it's just, it's just sort of Ambien type of sound. Just something that makes me calm down and just relax. So I, most recently I wasn't able to embrace my actual passion of music, but I would say if I can choose what to listen to and what gets me hyped, it would be, it would be hip hop.

Speaker 3: [25:51](#) You asked these questions I want, I want to see how, how well do you do? Let's put you on the spot here on the music questions. You're making us fail right here. You know this, I will, I will utterly love this up. So who from a hip hop perspective, who are the artists that you listened to? Okay, so I'm being a German right? So I moved to Germany when I was a kid. I spent most of my adult life in Germany. We do have a German hip hop, rap, hypo history and exists. So I tried to even do, I live in EOS now. I try to sort of embrace my wire so I, yeah. And so the German, the German rappers would not ring any bells here, but, but in terms of, in terms of the American ones, I, I guess somebody like, so hip hop, RNB, somebody like Drake who really stretches the different musical spheres is somebody who can listen to that kind of crosses, crosses the boundaries, crosses, honor, works very into the disciplinary tier.

Speaker 3: [26:51](#) Right. It gives us a very different approaches to music. So I would embrace his music. Did you grow up with hip hop? Was this a strong part of your musical heritage? Not so much because I, growing up I, I played violin and piano and so I had more of the classical music around me. I would say I have a lot of passion for jazz, which comes from my dad who just me growing up, you know, allow me to, to listen to that. But I would

say I didn't necessarily have a lot of hip hop around me. It was just, it was always music that made me lifted me up and it was easy to dance. Also. There were times when I still went to the clubs. Right. So we do have listeners in Germany, so what is a German and Tim will actually look it up and listen to it.

Speaker 3: [27:39](#) I will tell you, I probably won't, but are there any artists that you'd like to talk about hip hop? Somebody you want to say, Hey, this is the guy or group or gal that you think so I would probably am not embrace anyone during the topic as many of the texts that they sort of, that they write about are borderline acceptable German hip hop push us. A lot of the bad boy narrative U S hiphop used to do. But you know there are, there are famous people, there are people like Bushido and there are people that people like Aquafresh and so there are different people that produced music dad that is well famous at least in the German speaking around. But yeah. So yeah, you just brought up a really interesting question. You're talking about social norms and now you're talking about the hip hop artists and again in the U S we still, you know, there are some negative, I mean there are promoting a viewpoint of that we would as a society probably say is not good.

Speaker 3: [28:41](#) The gangster gangster rap, you know, mysogeny to women in all of these different kinds of things. How, how does, how do those artists, how do they shape those social norms and is there research on that that you know of or, man, well great question that I know really nothing about. I'm sure there are researchers who study the impact of music and through that lens they study the impact on the norms. I mean, we know the research that I know in our environment. We know that people react very much to the TV shows that the watch the telenovelas Christina has done work on telenovelas. So we know that people are shaped by what the listen tune on what they see. I'm sure people have done amazing research and that none of that is role models as well. Right. So you were saying role models and so these people are role models and so it'd be an interesting, I'm going to say component again and I stopped myself and then I said it so, but there you go. It's an interesting line of research that you could go down to to saying

Speaker 1: [29:42](#) changing behavior. Can you influence that norm through having a artists like Drake or Eno, uh, Kanye West changed some of the, the narrative that is going out there and being some of those components because they do have that role model element of, of being up there. Yeah,

- Speaker 4: [30:03](#) I agree. 100%. Yeah. Yeah. Interesting. Okay. Thank you. Oh, actually one last question about music. Um, do you, you talked about, you've been through a very hectic period. Uh, I can only imagine what it's like getting ready for this conference. But do you like to listen to music when you are working or do you like silence and if you do like to listen to music, what kind of music do you like to listen to?
- Speaker 3: [30:25](#) It changed when I was a student, I could listen to anything. Even with words. Many people say they can't listen to anything that has the words because that distracts them. I used to be able to do that and it kept me like in a good rhythm. It just helped me to, to focus them. I didn't really perceive it actively, but just the fact that there's some rhythm to it, there's some melody to it really helped me to learn the things it has changed. Maybe it is, I'm getting older too. Right. So maybe it is a component like that. Nowadays I, I cannot, I, it's if I need to work and I need to focus music, just distracting me. So unfortunately.
- Speaker 1: [30:59](#) Interesting. That's very cool. Thank you. Well again, thank you. No, thank you. So awesome. This is great
- Speaker 3: [31:04](#) for coming and being able to engage with us.
- Speaker 1: [31:07](#) Thanks for inviting us. That was awesome. I'm glad it worked out and we're having a blast. We're having this model. Come back.
- Speaker 2: [31:21](#) Ready. Ready? Welcome to our grooming session where Tim and I groove on what we learned from our behavioral groups interview. Have a free flowing
- Speaker 1: [31:30](#) discussion and whatever else comes into our bad Apple brains. A bad Apple brain, the bad Apple brain. Man, bring me down. You're the bad Apple influence in my life then you should just cast me aside. Should I, is that pretty much? Yeah. You're not going to change me. I'm a bad Apple. I'm a bad always going to be a bad Apple. You're a rock star. Rock stars are always bad apples. So what did you think about Oregon? That was, it was fascinating. He's amazing, isn't he? Oh my God. He is. He's just, what a great rilliant personal history. Personal history. Brilliant guy. Yeah. Brought some really interesting components. Again. So intrigued by the no conference and social norms and how those impact decisions and behavior change. Uh, again, it was an area that I wasn't really, you know, well versed in. And so all of the conversations that we had there, all of the presentations that we heard, I think just added that raise that level of knowledge up way higher than it was before.

- Speaker 4: [32:36](#) Shout out to Oregon and, and to Chris Knave for inviting us. Oh yeah. Just that was just super cool. Those guys to include us. Yeah. Yeah. Okay. So, um, talk about bad Apple,
- Speaker 1: [32:47](#) that bad Apple that was so fascinating. The, the findings from his research, right. That, that, that bad Apple effect that that one person who is now negatively going against the stated social norms, thus influencing these other people,
- Speaker 4: [33:06](#) bull, the non bad apples and non bad apples, the people who are following those stated norms, particularly in this where it's a giving to a charity and all of the, all the great things that are
- Speaker 1: [33:15](#) going on that and yet one person can influence that in such a negative manner. And so what I found, I found that fascinating. But then I found the other part that kind of within that that's fascinating is that the,
- Speaker 4: [33:30](#) the bad apples don't change if they're showing the good good behavior. Right? Yeah. And so within both of those I wanted to kind of explore with you is, all right, so can we extrapolate? And I go, I know extrapolating out from one research study is probably not a smart thing, but again, that's what we do, right? What can we take away from it? Right? Can we take away from our real world in real life? And, and I think about, um, managing teams, uh, in the corporate environment. And you think about, uh, occasionally either adopting someone who that you know becomes in from another team or you hire someone that turns out to be a bad app. I'm thinking about the bad Apple people specifically that they become part of the team where you generally had a, a good natured, upbeat team to start with. And now you've got someone who is soured on everything. And my, my own personal, uh, belief history has been, don't worry the social norm will rule. Right. But the good stuff, they will come into the team and our team has this positive team culture with all of these norms that we support each other. We positive all that. Oregon, Oregon got, got me thinking that wait a minute, that's a myth. Yeah. That's just not going to happen. And, and you've got to find alternative ways of dealing with,
- Speaker 1: [34:45](#) well I've dealt with, I've had a number of people come up to me in, in, in the work that we do, right. And they're, they're talking to me about how can I get this person to to be better on the team and in my past life, you know, in, in multitudes of times, 15 years ago, 10 years ago and helping companies around this team and different components. I said components again. I always say that I got to stop that. Right. Anyway, working with teams, I would say, yeah, just what you were saying, that just

give them some time, make sure that the culture is strong and they will come around cause culture rules cause culture rules and that's the norms that we have. And what I've found though from personal experience but also from, you know, working with others in the research that I've seen out there is that's not the case.

Speaker 1: [35:33](#) That we really need to be very decisive when we have those toxic people on the team. Right. To remove them from the team as quickly as possible because that toxicity spreads. Yes. And that's what I think this research points to is that, you know, even when it's not on a team, when it's in this other environment that that happens. And so it's even double down when you get on a team. I've seen this in the recent political environment is, is getting more toxic as well. Right. You know, more combative. And I've seen people in both parties stand up at town halls and take a question, a very loaded question from either a suborder or a detractor. Uh, and w and the, the person leading the town hall, again, I've seen this on both parties, shoot them, pretty much shut them down, pretty much say no.

Speaker 1: [36:28](#) Actually, you know, what's your, what you're talking about is a myth that is a conspiracy theory that is not accurate. And we're going to be dealing with facts in this conversation and, and we're not gonna we're not going to deal with that. And, and to actually just shut down that bad Apple, uh, has been, uh, effective in, in the, the two videos that I've, you know, that I've seen. And again, well, it's not a big end, but I, I'm impressed that first of all, they both, I've seen both parties do it and I'm disappointed that people are emboldened to be bad apples in these contexts. It's one thing to be a bad Apple online, to be kind of quasi anonymous. Um, or uh, it's another thing to be a bad Apple in a team or in, in a, in a public space, public space where you end up having the social norms that are right there and, and that you are definitely acting like where you're yelling out or speaking out or interrupting and very being very disruptive over that, that meeting that people are trying to do.

Speaker 1: [37:30](#) I mean, there's been plenty of, uh, episodes where, you know, council city council meetings have been shut down, County board meetings have been shut down, you know, political is coming in and doing, you know, the, the tours within their districts being shouted down and various things. And that doesn't add to the, the level, I mean any, and again, people rationalize that away, right? And so they're doing different things, but it is against the typical social norm. And so he goes as Christina [inaudible], he says, social norms are bundles of expectations, right? So we walk into an event like that with

some expectations and then we've got all these people adhering to that to a large degree. And then we've got one or two, you know, acting as bad apples. I think that that's amazing. So do you think that's because they trendsetters? Because yeah, because they have seen that in other places and again with social media and now you get to see that that one person who did it in, you know, whatever County in Arizona it was, and now being here in Minnesota, I'm going, Oh well they did it there.

Speaker 1: [38:30](#)

I can do it here. Right. So it's expanding on that. Right. The Bobo doll effect kind of thing. Really. You know, now I've got licensed to do whatever the hell I want to do. So that bad Apple, you're, you're, you're poisoning that barrel and that barrel has just gotten huge because it's social media has spread the ability to, to have that poison go across multitude of channels. Yeah, absolutely. We might have to talk to Owen about that. That might be something maybe to go in. Well what else? What else before we go off of the bad Apple thing. The piece that was reassuring that I had a positive on that was that there was that muted impact when people felt an affinity or proximity, that other person, so again that the Phillies a connection, right? I think cause they did this and in the Philadelphia area and so that muted the effect of the bad apples.

Speaker 1: [39:26](#)

So again, thinking about how we can influence that. So hopefully if you do have a strong team culture and that, that that culture is there and people feel an affinity towards the team and you get that bad Apple on it, it's not as toxic as it could be if you had a team that maybe didn't have that cohesive cohesiveness. Right? So or, or that, that set of solid expectations about this is how we do things and this is, and, and the identity with that and I, the identity with the others on the team. So, so I think there's some positive there. And I think there's some aspects that when as a, if you're a leader in an organization, really build those connections, build that sell months of time of proximity, build the component that we are part of this group together because it makes a difference.

Speaker 1: [40:18](#)

Okay. Um, onto a, onto number two, the nudges backfiring. Yeah. How about that? Oh yeah. You know, like how could that happen? Well, it happens, right? All right. It does. And so, you know, having that social proof out there and nudging them in the proper behavior, which actually leads the, leads them instead to being more competitive. And again, it was that idea of what is the nudge actually activating in our brain? Right. Is it activating that social comparison, that social norm that we're doing? Or is it a of the behavior that you're wanting to do or is it, is it activating this competition piece of I need to be better

than them. Right. I want to make more than them. So it's competition and various different pieces, which goes again to that something that we talk about all of the time. Context matters. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Speaker 1: [41:12](#) And the complexity. Like what came across to me in this conversation was the complexity in which we live. We live in very complex environments. The context, you know, tiny changes, you know, Cialdini, a loved one, Bob talked about, about just, you know, trying to replicate an experiment and thinking that the, the colors on the walls in the room where they conduct the spirit experiment different from the first time to the second time could alter the impact culture, the effect. So actually tiny, tiny. And now that you say that, we just had the meetup with Terry woo about color, about colors and the different impacts of colors. And I didn't put those two together, but now I'm thinking about that. That wow, the color on the wall in the room that you're doing the experiment on or in could drastically impact it. And it's something that we don't even consider.

Speaker 1: [42:05](#) No, we tend not to. And by the way, I think that's your Kiki brain at work right there. That's my Buba brain bringing things together where you go, but doing it in a really, really good way. Yeah. So that nudge component and how that works. And I liked his idea. Um, you know, limiting that, that nudge backfire is if you can get people to think about the larger social impact, at least in his, in that research study. So once they got people to think about the larger social impact, then it reduced that, that selfishness and the competitive urge there. So again, translating that into the larger world out in general, you know, getting people, so if you're trying to do behavior change, making sure that that behavior change works is get them to think about the behavior change in the right context. So again, framing the whole scenario in a way that is going to drive the behavior that you're trying to do or in your own life.

Speaker 1: [43:05](#) If you're trying to have behavior change, make sure that you're setting yourself up for success by making sure that context is right and various different pieces on that. Absolutely. So we've talked about music changing in the last Oh I have one more thing. Are we going to one more thing, one more thing. Well go ahead and get it out on the, sorry, I'm sorry it out cause you wrote it down. You have to talk about, this was actually one of my more, I kind of skipped over the last one, but this is the one that I really wanted. So let's hear it. And again it goes back into nudges versus social norms and changing behavior that's sustainable. Right. And so his, his talk, the talk he got me really

thinking about was all right you, you change the choice architecture. It changed the environment. So for instance, putting the cookies in the back of the cafeteria to the back in a translator, fewer people get, get, go after the cookies cause they're not as readily available.

Speaker 1: [44:02](#) Right. In that situation at lunch, in your corporate environment. But that doesn't change how that person views cookies. And so when they go home, they still eat the damn Oreos that are in the, if they're in the cupboard, if they're in the cupboard, right, they move them to the basement unless they move in the face like I do. Right. Which I haven't done lately, which is damn, I eat the whole thing of, Oh, here's the other week is like, Oh, these are really good. What am I gonna what a warm meal. No, but, but the idea of if you want sustainable behavior change that is not environmentally dependent, you have to look at changing the self identity or the social identity that these people have. And what did he call it? It was um, norm nudges. Right? Looking, I thought, I thought that was just fascinating. The, the idea of, of using norm nudging.

Speaker 1: [45:00](#) Norm nudging, right? Yeah. Um, yeah, so really looking at that is, you know, and I love this thing and you know, that we can use social norm insights into improving the way we nudge people in a way that will spill over and have long lasting effects. So baking in this norm component into how we think about nudges and how we think about behavior change. Which again, before I came to this conference, I wasn't thinking about at all and now I'm starting to put those together. And I think that's a big piece that we need to make sure that people, you know, researchers should be looking at more and, and practitioners should definitely be looking at more.

Speaker 4: [45:41](#) I just, one thing about the Nobel conference for me was that I felt that norms were underrepresented in my lens of looking at behavior change. And I, and I came away in ordered Christina Beaky areas, books, uh, you know, norms in the wild and, uh, the grammar of society instantly. It was just like, Oh man, I've got to get this into my [inaudible]. I have to be more educated on this because, uh, Oregon especially, and uh, and Christina just spoke so eloquently about social norms. It was, uh, it was really great, really refreshing. Lots of really fresh ideas that came out of that.

Speaker 1: [46:19](#) Exactly, exactly. Yeah. All right, let's talk music. Oh,

Speaker 4: [46:25](#) okay. I love music and I actually know what you're going to ask me and I'm excited about this. Yes. But I am glad that we, we

didn't get off of that because that was a good, thank you for returning to that. Okay. So we've talked about how music has changed in, in, in over the years, right. So, especially in the last 50 years, let's say there's been a dramatic change, uh, sources of revenue for, uh, for the artists themselves. You know, how they make a living, the distribution of income. So let's talk about touring income in the last 10 years. Yes. Because we have, uh, an article that talks about, we have a little bit of data from Pollstar, which is what you want to share it, share with the listeners what, what this is. So, yeah. So, so Pollstar, uh, is able to go out and, uh, identify what the gross revenues are for every major tour, uh, that's conducted around the world. And, uh, so they just, they looked at, they just summed up all the major tours that have happened in the last 10 years through this decade, from 2010 to 2019. And, uh, and said, well,

Speaker 1: [47:30](#)

we'll, we'll just stack rank the top revenue earners. And number one went to you to your favorite band. Well, not my favorite band, but you know, they're in that and come on, you know my, and it's not good to, okay. Alright. Although you too was by far the best concert I've ever been to in my life back in 1987 university of Iowa. I know. There you go. You go for that. But see which they put on a great show. So there you go. And they're, they're one of the only, um, tour stadiums that I've been to in the past, probably 10 years, maybe five years. We bought [inaudible] and that's, that's one thing is that they're doing really big venues. But it was interesting to me that they outpaced ed Sheeran and Taylor Swift and Coldplay. Um, when, and here's, here's some, here's some facts. In the 2010s they've only released two records.

Speaker 1: [48:22](#)

And in the two thousands they only released three records in the, in the 1990s they released three records. And in the 1980s they released five records. Yeah. So very productive in the 1980s very little productivity, you know, from 2010 to 2019 only two records compared to ed Sheeran. You know that who was released, you know, uh, five records in the 2010s or and so on has been a guest on multitude of others where he's, you know, co produced are saying and multitude of other people and you think this has to do with relevance and, and, and change of the band that, that you, you too is adapted itself to, to the these changing times. So I think what YouTube has done is that they have a core base of followers from the eighties and nineties that you said that were there. Right. But I also believe that they have modified their music in ways that they've experimented with, with different styles and formats.

- Speaker 1: [49:23](#) And I think they've tried to keep themselves relevant. Now you can argue whether or not that is really the case. Like when was the last time they had a number one hit? It was something along those lines. And yes, that's true. But I think that they have, well they had records in the last 10 years is not exactly a high high output. No, it's not a high output, but, but is it enough to stay relevant with a younger generation? And given the fact of, you know, the people in the eighties and nineties, uh, who like them are having children who they might have raised on you too. You too, are they, are they drawing from that core base that go as well as then this newer fan base that they're building? And so I think there's something there. Um, and, and they're still the same band. They're the, unlike many of the other bands that have gone through, uh, personnel changes or have lost somebody, you know, you Eagles are one of those that are in there and they lost gun fry.
- Speaker 1: [50:22](#) And so they're, you know, is it the same band? Yes, yes. They bring in others, but it's not the same band that played hotel California from 1970, whatever. Right. It's Randy Meisner as well. And he left the band. But, and it's interesting that the Eagles is number 14 on this list and yet they haven't re, well, they released one record in 2000. Okay. Yeah. But other than that, they didn't release any other records in the eighties nineties or 2010s that's cause all you old fogies, you know, you want to go see, you're still on the list. I know. Isn't that great? 14 but they're one of the best selling bands of all time. They are [inaudible] and you think about classic songs and you think about that. And again, what we're, where we're rolling stones on there. Rolling stones were, were very close. They were number two. Uh, yeah, they were number two.
- Tim: [51:11](#) Yeah. And again, you think about the rolling stones, they've been around since the early sixties and they haven't released a new record in 15 years. Yeah. So, but again, you have such the iconic Eno, a playlist that they have of their own songs and people want to see them. And I think there's a part of this, it's like, Oh man, I got to see the stones before the [inaudible] before I die or before they die. Right. And wow, I still have an opportunity. I thought last time I was going to be there, their farewell tour and the time before that, their farewell tour and their farewell tour before that, like I haven't seen the stones. I would go see the stone. Katie saw them in Singapore and it was amazing. Uh, something else about this though is that tours are not like records, like uh, the music industry, uh, revenues used to be dominated by the 11 to 19 year olds basically because records and CDs were relatively inexpensive tours or you know, going to see a live band is very expensive.

- Tim: [52:08](#) It can be very expensive these days. You know, Fleetwood Mac, the cheapest ticket at that show was \$320. Yeah. And then went way up from there. So I wonder if part of this is that the stones and you two are catering to an audience that is older and more affluent than who Ed Sheeran and Taylor Swift is catering to. I think that they make more money at each show because they can sell the tickets for more, they can sell the tickets for more. I think you have a really good hypothesis there. Yeah, that I don't have the data to back up on portion. That's okay. That's how it works. So well, thank you. Thanks for listening folks. All right and and re remember, stay tuned for the, the bonus track.
- Kurt: [52:50](#) Hello everyone. This is Kurt with a bonus track and groove idea for the session. A couple key takeaways from this episode with Oregon for me is first it only takes one bad Apple to negatively change the behaviors of others. Even when the stated social norms, uh, is one of good that one person acting in a negative manner can change the behavior of others to go against that state of norm. Second, that research indicated that this influence only goes one way. Making good people more likely to succumb to doing not great things. Lifting people up wasn't demonstrated by the research study that [inaudible] had done. Now for both of these aspects, we can extrapolate out to our everyday lives to see some impact. What does it mean to have one toxic member on the team? What influence does a poorly behaving celebrity have on the behavior? Of our kids or ourselves.
- Kurt: [53:46](#) We need to be aware of the impacts that this might have both on us and others and how can we remove that potential negative influence in these situations. The third key piece that I took away from this that nudges may not actually change our behaviors outside of the context that they were placed in. We don't stop eating cookies in our life because the cafeteria moves them from the front of the cafeteria to the back. Nudges work well in specific contexts, but we need to think about the underlying self and social identities that we have for longterm sustainable change. We need to norm nudge. Okay, here is your groove idea for the week, which is an idea or question that we pose to you, our listeners for you to ponder or think about for this upcoming week. Is there a toxic person in your life, and if so, what can you do to limit your interaction with that person or the impact that their negative behavior may have on you?
- Kurt: [54:46](#) Think about how you can inoculate yourself from their negativity. Well, that's it for our show. But before I go, as always, Tim, and I want to thank you, we are over a hundred episodes now and we couldn't have done it without you. We

want to keep doing this, and the best way to make that happen is to grow our community of groovers. So please, if you like these episodes, share them with a friend, leave a review, go subscribe on iTunes or whatever pod service that you do. Subscribe to behavioral grooves and we want to hear from you. So please reach out to us with ideas, thoughts, and feedback. And as always, thank you for listening and allowing us the opportunity to do this thing that we love. Thanks.