Scientific Research Publishing

Psychology, 2024, 15, 599-606
https://www.scirp.org/journal/psych
ISSN Online: 2152-7199
ISSN Print: 2152-7180

Introducing Psychoeconomics of Healthcare Decisions: Understanding the Why behind Our Choices

Matteo Maria Cati

Department of Economics, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy
Email: matteom.cati@gmail.com

How to cite this paper: Cati, M. M. (2024). Introducing Psychoeconomics of Healthcare Decisions: Understanding the Why behind Our Choices. *Psychology, 15,* 599-606.
https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2024.154036

Received: January 19, 2024
Accepted: April 26, 2024
Published: April 29, 2024

Abstract

We introduce Psychoeconomics of Healthcare Decisions, a novel interdisciplinary field that sheds light on the "why" behind our medical choices. This field explores the intricate web of psychological factors, economic considerations, and individual behaviors that influence healthcare decision-making. By examining the impact of cultural contexts and socio-economic environments, Psychoeconomics of Healthcare Decisions offers a deeper understanding of patient choices. This knowledge has the potential to revolutionize healthcare delivery by empowering patients, informing policy decisions, and ultimately promoting preventive care utilization and treatment adherence. This manuscript lays the groundwork for this nascent field, outlining its potential to improve public health outcomes.

Keywords

Psychosocial Factors, Economic Decision-Making, Behavioral Sciences, Financial Literacy, Multidisciplinary Approach

1. Introduction

Life's trajectory is shaped by a multitude of choices, but some choices hold profound implications for our well-being, particularly those related to healthcare. Unlike everyday choices, healthcare decisions are often fraught with complex medical terminology, emotional turmoil, and a stark interplay between optimal health outcomes and the often-daunting realities of cost and financial burden (Victoor et al., 2012; Bornstein et al., 2000). Understanding the factors influencing these healthcare decisions is crucial.

Traditional economic models, which assume perfect rationality (the idea that

people make perfectly logical decisions based on all available information), fall short in explaining these intricacies (Camerer et al., 2003). These models often fail to account for the emotional considerations, cognitive limitations, and socio-economic factors that significantly influence how we approach healthcare decisions (Campbell et al., 2011). Limited access to preventive care due to financial constraints can lead to poorer health outcomes, while treatment adherence relies not only on medical advice but also on the ability to afford medications and manage potential financial burdens.

This intricate dance between medical necessity and economic feasibility forms the core of an emerging field of study: Psychoeconomics of Healthcare Decisions. This manuscript aims to introduce and illuminate this interdisciplinary area of research.

Psychoeconomics of Healthcare Decisions delves into the psychosocial foundations of economic decision-making within the medical domain. It explores the intricate web of factors—individual behaviors, cultural contexts, and socio-economic environments—that intertwine to influence the choices we make regarding healthcare (Cranley et al., 2023; Ie et al., 2023).

By dissecting these influences, this research aims to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of healthcare decision-making. This knowledge can pave the way for targeted interventions, improved patient education, and ultimately, enhanced public health outcomes. Ultimately, by shedding light on the "why" behind our healthcare choices, we can empower individuals and healthcare systems alike to make informed decisions that promote optimal health and well-being.

2. Unveiling the Labyrinth of Healthcare Choices: A Psychoeconomic Approach

Navigating healthcare decisions can feel like traversing a labyrinth. Unlike everyday choices, they involve complex medical terminology, emotional considerations, and the often-daunting realities of cost. Traditional economic models, assuming perfect rationality (the idea that people make perfectly logical decisions based on all available information), fall short in explaining these intricacies. Psychoeconomics of Healthcare Decisions bridges this gap by incorporating insights from behavioral economics (BE) (Liu et al., 2023).

BE: Unveiling the Nuances of Human Decision-Making

BE is a field that seamlessly integrates insights from psychology into economic analysis. It acknowledges that human decision-making is not a sterile, emotionless calculation, but a process influenced by a multitude of factors. BE sheds light on these complexities by exploring concepts like:

- **Bounded Rationality:** Our cognitive abilities are limited. We can't process all available information perfectly, and so we often rely on heuristics (mental shortcuts) or satisfice (make reasonable choices based on limited information) instead of aiming for the absolute optimal choice. In healthcare, this

might explain why patients might choose a convenient (but potentially less effective) treatment option over a more complex but potentially more beneficial one (Ruissen et al., 2022).

- **Psychological Biases:** BE highlights how systematic biases in our thinking can influence healthcare decisions. Here are a few examples:
  - **Loss Aversion:** We fear losses more intensely than we value gains. This can lead to patients delaying preventive screenings due to a fear of a bad diagnosis, even though early detection can lead to better outcomes (Tversky & Kahneman, 1986).
  - **Framing Effects:** The way information is presented can influence our choices. For instance, framing a treatment option in terms of its survival rate (e.g., 80% chance of survival) might be more motivating than focusing on the potential mortality rate (e.g., 20% chance of death) (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981).
  - **Anchoring Bias:** We tend to rely too heavily on the first piece of information we receive when making decisions. This can be problematic in healthcare if patients fixate on an initial diagnosis or treatment suggestion without fully exploring all options (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974).

BE: A Beacon in the Labyrinth

By incorporating these insights from BE, Psychoeconomics of Healthcare Decisions offers a deeper understanding of the "why" behind our medical choices. It delves into this intricate web of individual behaviors, cultural contexts, and socio-economic environments. This knowledge empowers us to develop targeted interventions that address these cognitive limitations and biases (Kassahun & Zewdie, 2022). For instance:

- **Framing health information:** in a way that emphasizes potential gains rather than losses could encourage preventive screenings (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981).
- **Simplifying complex medical jargon:** can improve patient communication and understanding (Noordman et al., 2022).
- **Designing decision aids:** that guide patients through complex choices while mitigating the influence of biases (Walsh & Aboshady, 2016).
- **Tailoring interventions:** to specific cultural contexts and socio-economic backgrounds can ensure broader reach and effectiveness (Victoor et al., 2012).

Ultimately, by understanding the complexities of human decision-making through the lens of BE, Psychoeconomics of Healthcare Decisions aims to illuminate the path towards better health outcomes for all (Al-Anezi, 2022). This expanded version provides a more in-depth exploration of BE concepts and offers concrete examples of how BE can be applied in healthcare settings. It also emphasizes the potential benefits of Psychoeconomics of Healthcare Decisions in promoting better health outcomes. Absolutely, here's a different case study that highlights the application of Psychoeconomics in healthcare decisions.

3. Case Study: The Framing Effect and Medication Adherence

Medication adherence, the consistent taking of prescribed medication, is crucial for managing chronic conditions. However, adherence rates can be low, leading to negative health outcomes and increased healthcare costs (Jørgensen et al., 2021). This case study explores how psychoeconomics, specifically the concept of the framing effect, can be used to improve medication adherence.

3.1. The Framing Effect

The framing effect describes how the way information is presented can influence our choices. Psychoeconomics research suggests that people are more likely to avoid losses than to pursue gains (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981).

3.2. The Case

Patients with high blood pressure are often prescribed medication. When explaining the benefits of medication, doctors typically focus on preventing negative outcomes, such as heart attack or stroke.

3.3. The Intervention

This case study explores the effect of framing the benefits differently. Doctors could present the information by emphasizing the positive gains associated with medication adherence. For example, instead of saying, "Taking this medication will help you avoid a heart attack," they could say, "Taking this medication can help you live a longer, healthier life."

3.4. Evaluation

By randomly assigning patients to receive medication information framed either way, researchers can evaluate the impact on adherence. Measuring factors like prescription refill rates and blood pressure control can provide insights.

3.5. Potential Benefits

If framing medication benefits positively leads to improved adherence, it could have significant public health implications. This approach is relatively inexpensive and easy to implement (Barry & Edgman-Levitan, 2012).

3.6. Psychoeconomics in Action

This case study demonstrates how Psychoeconomics can inform healthcare decision-making. By understanding how people respond to information framing, healthcare professionals can tailor their communication strategies to promote positive health behaviors (Victoor et al., 2012).

3.7. Limitations and Comments

This is just one example, and the framing effect may not be equally effective for all patients or medications. Further research is needed to explore the generaliza-

bility of this approach (Noordman et al., 2022).

By incorporating psychoeconomic insights, we can develop interventions that nudge patients towards better healthcare choices. This case study highlights the potential of framing effects to improve medication adherence and ultimately enhance patient outcomes.

4. The Power of Shared Decision-Making: A Psychoeconomic Approach

Psychoeconomics of Healthcare Decisions doesn't just focus on individual choices. It also recognizes the importance of the interaction between patients and healthcare providers. Traditional doctor-patient interactions often involve a one-way flow of information, with the physician as the authority figure dictating treatment plans. This approach can be problematic when it fails to consider the patient's values, preferences, and understanding of their condition (Elliott et al., 2016).

Psychoeconomics emphasizes the concept of shared decision-making, where both the patient and the healthcare provider collaborate to arrive at a treatment plan. This approach acknowledges that patients are not passive recipients of care, but active participants in their own health journey (Gurmu, 2022). By incorporating psychoeconomic principles, shared decision-making can be enhanced in several ways:

- **Framing Treatment Options:** Healthcare providers can leverage framing effects to present treatment options in a way that resonates with the patient's priorities. For instance, for a patient who fears pain associated with a procedure, highlighting the long-term pain relief benefits might be more effective than solely focusing on the short-term discomfort (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981).
- **Addressing Biases:** The doctor can be mindful of potential biases that might influence the patient's decision-making. For example, if a patient exhibits loss aversion, the doctor can explain the potential consequences of delaying treatment to counterbalance the fear of a negative diagnosis (Ng et al., 2013).
- **Tailoring Communication:** Effective communication is crucial. Doctors can tailor their language to the patient's level of health literacy and ensure they understand the potential risks and benefits of various options (Lee et al., 2022).

Shared decision-making, informed by psychoeconomic principles, empowers patients to take ownership of their healthcare. This can lead to increased satisfaction with the decision-making process, improved treatment adherence, and ultimately, better health outcomes (Kon, 2010).

5. Nudging Behavior for Positive Change

Another exciting application of Psychoeconomics in healthcare is the concept of nudges. Nudges are subtle interventions designed to influence behavior without

restricting choices. They are based on the understanding that people's decisions can be swayed by predictable patterns of thinking (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008; Halpern, 2015).

Here are some examples of nudges in healthcare:

- **Appointment Reminders:** Sending text message reminders phrased to emphasize the importance of preventive care can encourage patients to attend appointments (Chan et al., 2021).
- **Default Opt-In Programs:** Automatically enrolling patients in preventive screening programs can increase participation rates compared to an opt-out system (Johnson & Goldstein, 2003).
- **Salient Choice Architecture:** Designing healthcare websites and forms to make healthy choices the easiest option (e.g., pre-selecting healthy food options in a cafeteria) can nudge individuals towards healthier behaviors (Glasdam et al., 2015).

Nudges are a powerful tool for promoting positive health behaviors. By understanding the psychological factors that influence our choices, Psychoeconomics can inform the design of nudges that encourage individuals to make choices that benefit their long-term health (Huang et al., 2021).

6. Conclusion: A Brighter Future for Healthcare

Psychoeconomics of Healthcare Decisions is a rapidly evolving field with the potential to revolutionize healthcare delivery. By shedding light on the "why" behind our choices, it empowers patients, informs policy decisions, and paves the way for the development of effective interventions (Liu et al., 2023). By integrating psychoeconomic principles into shared decision-making, communication strategies, and nudge design, we can move towards a future where informed choices lead to better health outcomes for all (Fattori et al., 2020). This multifaceted approach holds immense promise for creating a healthcare system that is not just effective but also patient-centered and empowers individuals to take charge of their well-being.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

Al-Anezi, F. M. (2022). Factors Influencing Decision Making for Implementing E-Health in Light of the COVID-19 Outbreak in Gulf Cooperation Council Countries. *International Health, 14, 5*3-63. https://doi.org/10.1093/inthealth/ihab003

Barry, M. J., Edgman-Levitan, S. (2012). Shared Decision Making—Pinnacle of Patient-Centered Care. *The New England Journal of Medicine, 366,* 780-781. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1109283

Bornstein, B. H., Marcus, D., & Cassidy, W. (2000). Choosing a Doctor: An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing Patients' Choice of a Primary Care Doctor. *Journal of Eval-*

uation in Clinical Practice, 6, 255-262. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2753.2000.00256.x

Camerer, C. F., Loewenstein, G., & Rabin, M. (2003). *Advances in Behavioral Economics*. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400829118

Campbell, C. L., Williams, I. C., & Orr, T. (2011). Factors That Impact End-of-Life Decision Making in African Americans with Advanced Cancer. *Journal of Hospice & Palliative Nursing, 41,* 277-278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2010.10.189

Chan, E., Frisina, C., & Gaebler-Spira, D. (2021). A Resource Guide to Understanding Cerebral Palsy: Commentary on Collaboration to Support Health Literacy and Shared Decision Making. *Journal of Pediatric Rehabilitation Medicine, 14,* 173-182. https://doi.org/10.3233/PRM-210026

Cranley, L. A., Yeung, L., Tu, W., & McGillis, Hall, L. (2023). Healthcare Aide Involvement in Team Decision-Making in Long-Term Care: A Narrative Review of the Literature. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 32,* 4217-4227. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.16573

Elliott, J., McNeil, H., Ashbourne, J., Huson, K., Boscart, V., & Stolee, P. (2016). Engaging Older Adults in Health Care Decision-Making: A Realist Synthesis. *Patient, 9,* 383-393. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40271-016-0168-x

Fattori, F., O'Donnell, D., Rodríguez-Martín, B., & Kroll, T. (2020). Which Instruments Are Used to Measure Shared, Supported and Assisted Healthcare Decision-Making between Patients Who Have Limited, Impaired or Fluctuating Capacity, Their Family Carers and Healthcare Professionals? A Systematic Review Protocol. *HRB Open Research, 23,* 19. https://doi.org/10.12688/hrbopenres.12932.2

Glasdam, S., Oeye, C., & Thrysoee, L. (2015). Patients' Participation in Decision-Making in the Medical Field—"Projectification" of Patients in a Neoliberal Framed Healthcare System. *Nursing Philosophy, 16,* 226-238. https://doi.org/10.1111/nup.12092

Gurmu, Y. (2022). Patient Preferences in Shared Decision Making During Healthcare and Associated Factors among Adult Admitted Patients at Public Hospitals of West Shoa Oromia, Ethiopia. *Patient Preference and Adherence, 16,* 1781-1786. https://doi.org/10.2147/PPA.S376600

Halpern, D. (2015). *Inside the Nudge Unit: How Small Changes Can Make a Big Difference*. Random House.

Huang, C., Lam, L., Zhong, Y., Plummer, V., & Cross, W. (2021). Chinese Mental Health Professionals' Perceptions of Shared Decision-Making regarding People Diagnosed with Schizophrenia: A Qualitative Study. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing, 30,* 189-199. https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12771_1

Ie, K., Machino, R., Albert, S. M., Tomita, S., Kushibuchi, M., Hirose, M., Matsuda, T., Okuse, C., & Ohira, Y. (2023). Deprescribing as an Opportunity to Facilitate Patient-Centered Care: A Qualitative Study of General Practitioners and Pharmacists in Japan. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 20,* Article 3543. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20043543

Johnson, E. J., & Goldstein, D. (2003). Do Defaults Save Lives? *Science, 302,* 1338-1339. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1091721

Jørgensen, L., Jacobsen, H. R., & Pedersen, B. (2021). To See or Not to See—Or to Wait and See: Clinical Decisions in An Oncological Emergency Telephone Consultation. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences, 35,* 1259-1268. https://doi.org/10.1111/scs.12944

Kassahun, A., & Zewdie, A. (2022). Decision-Making Autonomy in Maternal Health Service Use and Associated Factors among Women in Mettu District, Southwest Ethiopia: A Community-Based Cross-Sectional Study. *BMJ Open, 12,* e059307.

https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-059307

Kon, A. A. (2010). The Shared Decision-Making Continuum. *JAMA, 304,* 903-904. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2010.1208

Lee, P. Y., Cheong, A. T., Ghazali, S. S., Rashid, A. A., Ong, S. C., Ong, S. Y. et al. (2022). Barriers of and Strategies for Shared Decision-Making Implementation in the Care of Metastatic Breast Cancer: A Qualitative Study among Patients and Healthcare Professionals in an Asian Country. *Health Expectations, 25,* 2837-2850. https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13590

Liu, Y. Q., Guo, Y. L., Xu, J., Geng, W. J., Li, Z. Z., Jia, M., Liu, Y. D., & Zhao, H. (2023). Shared Decision-Making in Hemophilic Arthropathy Rehabilitation: A Qualitative Study. *Patient Preference and Adherence, 17,* 249-257. https://doi.org/10.2147/PPA.S394095

Ng, C. J., Lee, P. Y., Lee, Y. K. et al. (2013). An Overview of Patient Involvement in Healthcare Decision-Making: A Situational Analysis of the Malaysian Context. *BMC Health Services Research, 13,* Article No. 408. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-13-408

Noordman, J., Roodbeen, R., Gach, L., Schulze, L., Rademakers, J., Van den Muijsenbergh, M., Boland, G., & Van Dulmen, S. (2022). 'A Basic Understanding'; Evaluation of a Blended Training Programme for Healthcare Providers in Hospital-Based Palliative Care to Improve Communication with Patients with Limited Health Literacy. *BMC Medical Education, 22,* Article No. 613. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03685-0

Ruissen, M. M., Sont, J. K., Van Vugt, H. A., Kunneman, M., Rutten, G. E. H. M., & De Koning, E. J. P. (2022). Key Factors Relevant for Healthcare Decisions of Patients with Type 1 and Type 2 Diabetes in Secondary Care According to Healthcare Professionals. *Patient Preference and Adherence, 16,* 809-819. https://doi.org/10.2147/PPA.S354686

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. Yale University Press.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science, 185,* 1124-1131. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The Framing of Decisions and the Psychology of Choice. *Science, 211,* 453-458. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.7455683

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1986). Rational Choice and the Framing of Decisions. *Journal of Business, 59,* S251-S278. https://doi.org/10.1086/296365

Victoor, A., Delnoij, D. M., Friele, R. D., & Rademakers, J. J. (2012). Determinants of Patient Choice of Healthcare Providers: A Scoping Review. *BMC Health Services Research, 12,* Article No. 272. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-12-272

Walsh, K., & Aboshady, O. (2016). *Education in Shared Decision Making*. MedEdPublish. https://doi.org/10.15694/mep.2016.000082