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Overview

- Key Questions:
  - How can we use lessons from behavioral economics to encourage the reporting of misconduct?
  - How can we use lessons from behavioral economics to encourage witnesses to be more honest once we’re investigating?

- "Traditional" Economics
  - Assumes that where markets are fair and information is freely available, the "Rational Economic Actor" will behave in such a way as to maximize utility, i.e. get the most out of every dollar spent and avoid unnecessary costs.
  - However, not all actors behave rationally—at least not all the time.

- Behavioral Economics
  - Recognizes that individuals do not always behave rationally.
  - This irrationality is itself often predictable.
  - Can be anticipated and even manipulated.
  - Places a greater reliance on psychology and the study of human behavior.
Overview

- Social Norms Define Your Corporate Culture
  > Misconduct, Rationalization, and Culture go Hand in Hand (in Hand)
- Choice Architecture
  > Improve Your Defaults
- Priming for Honesty
  > Thinking About Honesty Obligations at Key Moments

The Fraud Triangle

Pressure
Motivation to Commit Fraud

Rationalization
Justification of Dishonest Actions

Opportunity
The Knowledge and Ability To Carry Out Fraud

MITIGATION = INTERNAL CONTROLS

The Honest Truth About Dishonesty – Dan Ariely

- Most of us like to think of ourselves as honest people (and we'd like others to think of us that way as well)
- However, most of us will also cheat just a little bit when given the chance
  > We will cheat right up to the point when the cheating begins to make us question whether we are honest people
- The delta between these two points is the "fudge factor"
The Fudge Factor

- The fudge factor and rationalization are closely linked
  - Cultural conditions may allow the fudge factor to increase as the employee is able to rationalize more and more misconduct
    - Not a cost-benefit analysis
    - It is a function of social norms
  - For that reason, a corporate culture which stresses honesty and integrity will decrease the fudge factor because the employee will have a harder time rationalizing misconduct

Rationalization and Culture – Example 1

- Group honesty check: one pen vs. a case of pens
  - "No big deal" vs. "crossing a line." Why?
  - Answer: Social acceptability.

Example 2: The Matrix Experiments

- Ariely's team conducted experiments in which subjects took math tests together in a room and were paid for the number of correct answers
  - Control condition (no-cheating possible): Average was 7/20 correct
  - Test condition (cheating possible): Average was 12/20 correct
  - Actor (in-group peer) flagrantly cheats: 15/20 correct
  - Actor (out-group peer) flagrantly cheats: 9/20 correct
Social Norms, (cont’d)

- In summary, social norms are critical
- Of paramount importance is the cultural message that employees receive about honesty and integrity
  - Social and cultural cues influence notions of what is and is not acceptable, and therefore affect the “fudge factor”
  - If employees see their peers behaving ethically and with integrity, they are far more likely to do so themselves
  - Regular reminders about honesty and the expectation of integrity substantially drive down dishonest behavior
  - A culture of integrity and honesty makes it much more difficult for employees to rationalize bad behavior

Appeal to Social Norms

- Idea 1 - Appeal to Social Norms: Tell Them What Others are Doing
  - Increasing Awareness of a Norm Increases Compliance With the Norm
    - “90% of your fellow Minnesotans have already complied with the new tax law.”
    - “Most Montana teens (70%) are tobacco free.”
  - Reporting Mechanisms – Let Them Know That Others Use the Process
    - “125 of your colleagues raised concerns via the Hotline last year, and 546 more asked questions.”
    - People are more likely to use it if they think others do, too
    - Reduces the risk that they won’t seem like a team player for reporting a concern

Appeal to Social Norms (cont’d)

- Idea 1 – Social Norms (cont’d)
  - Witness Interviews - Phrasing Tips
    - No – “Compliance received a complaint through the Hotline.”
    - Yes – “One of our colleagues was concerned about an issue, and felt so strongly that s/he contacted my office so see if we could look into it.”
  - Other possibilities
    - “Several people have already spoken to me and provided helpful information.”
    - “All of the team members to whom I have spoken have been very cooperative.”
    - “Based on my conversations with other team members, others are concerned about this issue as well and want to help make sure we get it resolved.”
  - CAVEAT – Don’t breach confidentiality, may need to strike a balance
Choice Architecture

- Choice Architecture is the practice of influencing choice by changing the manner in which options are presented to people.
- Of critical importance is the “default” option
  - School cafeteria
  - Your company’s 401(k) plan
  - Your smartphone

Choice Architecture (cont’d)

- Idea 2 - Choice Architecture and Defaults: Make It Easy
  - Most reporting processes place the burden on the employee to affirmatively raise and report issues (i.e. deciding there is an issue worth reporting, finding the hotline, submitting the concern, etc.)
  - This alone can be enough to stop an employee who feels overworked or is otherwise sitting on the fence from raising an issue
  - Direct solicitation of the employee about misconduct might only happen annually (e.g. Code of Conduct Attestation, COI Questionnaire, etc.)
  - Alternatives:
    - Increase the frequency of direct solicitation – Quarterly? Monthly?
    - Embed a question in a more frequent process (e.g. boot-up of computer, weekly pop-up window, etc.)

Priming

- Priming describes how ideas prompt other ideas later on without an individual’s conscious awareness.
- Once people begin thinking about honesty, they tend to stop cheating
  - Matrix experiment - When students were asked to sign a statement before the test acknowledging that the test fell under the school’s Honor Code, the number of correct results reported was the same as the control (non-cheating) condition (7/20)
  - Insurance industry experiment - Customers who signed an honesty attestation before completing annual mileage attestation declared driving 15% more miles than those who signed the attestation at the bottom of the form.
Priming (cont'd)

- Idea 3 - Priming: Prompting Honesty at Key Moments
  - At the start of the interaction with the employee, inform him/her of honesty obligations, under the Code of Conduct, Investigation Policy, etc.
  - Witnesses Interviews – At the start of the interview, have them sign a witness form which sets out the honesty obligations
    - Or, let them know at the start of the interview that they will be expected to sign such a statement at the end
  - Annual Code of Conduct Attestation or Conflicts of Interest Disclosure form
    - Typically structured so that they sign at the end; move it to the start
    - If all else fails, belt and suspenders—sign in both places

Conclusion

- "Corporate Culture" is another way of saying "Social Norms in the Workplace"
  - People are more inclined to do what they see others doing
- Use Choice Architecture to your advantage
  - Adjust the default options to encourage contacts from employees
- Prime your workforce for honesty at key moments
  - Remind them of their honesty obligations before they need to be honest

Questions
Encouraging Reporting and Honesty (cont’d)

- Idea 4 – Highlight the Risk and Impact of Dishonesty
  - Emphasize the risk and impact of fraud or dishonesty on the company, as well as the individual
    - Fines, settlements, and lost business might seem abstract, but if you can translate that into lost bonuses or a dip in the stock price, you might make headway
    - If the business area still has to meet its targets while it is bogged down in a government investigation or remediation for an issue that didn’t get disclosed, that will likely mean a lot more work for everyone
  - Explain the risks of remediation as well as the consequences for those caught being dishonest
    - It’s not the crime, it’s the cover-up—people are often fired for lying about conduct that itself would have merited a much lower level of discipline