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Abstract
Dishonesty and unethical behavior are widespread in the public and private sectors and cause immense annual losses. For instance, estimates of U.S. annual losses indicate $1 trillion paid in bribes, $270 billion lost due to unreported income, and $42 billion lost in retail due to shoplifting and employee theft. In this article, we draw on insights from the growing fields of moral psychology and behavioral ethics to present a three-principle framework we call REVISE. This framework classifies forces that affect dishonesty into three main categories and then redirects those forces to encourage moral behavior. The first principle, reminding, emphasizes the effectiveness of subtle cues that increase the salience of morality and decrease people’s ability to justify dishonesty. The second principle, visibility, aims to restrict anonymity, prompt peer monitoring, and elicit responsible norms. The third principle, self-engagement, increases people’s motivation to maintain a positive self-perception as a moral person and helps bridge the gap between moral values and actual behavior. The REVISE framework can guide the design of policy interventions to defeat dishonesty.
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Estimates show that the cost of corruption equals more than 5% of global GDP (US$ 2.6 trillion, World Economic Forum) with over US$ 1 trillion paid in bribes each year (World Bank). It is not only a question of ethics; we simply cannot afford such waste.
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Dishonesty has reached epidemic proportions in both the public and private sectors. From bribery and large scale frauds to shoplifting and wardrobing (a type of return fraud), the immediate financial costs are worrying, but the threat to society is even more serious because seemingly isolated violations chip away trust, encourage negative social norms, and increase the prevalence and spread of other unethical behaviors (Ariely, 2012; Kirchler, Hoelzl, & Wahl, 2008; Welsh, Ordoñez, Snyder, & Christian, 2015).

The standard economic approach to curbing dishonesty relies on enforcement and deterrence (Becker, 1968). For instance, research examining tax compliance has demonstrated that increasing punishments, and especially increasing the likelihood of being caught, are effective interventions (Andreoni, Erard, & Feinstein, 1998; Kirchler, 2007). However, the solution of enforcement to defeat tax evasion, corruption, employee theft, and other manifestations of dishonesty is costly and limited. Even if we could station a police officer on every other street corner, it would be virtually impossible to monitor all the actions of all the people all the time. Furthermore, instead of encouraging people to be honest, enforcement teaches them to avoid punishment or to become better cheaters. In fact, external punishments can crowd out internal motivation and further separate people from their moral compass (Ariely, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Tyler, 2006).

The Internal Ethical Conflict
Insights from the growing field of moral psychology and behavioral ethics show that people care about morality. One robust finding is that most people make an effort to resist temptation and try to behave honestly (Aquino & Reed, 2002). Investigations of misconduct in the real
world and in laboratory experiments show that people tend to curb their own dishonesty. Even when the chances of detection are minimal, or when under conditions of complete anonymity, most people limit their cheating to an extent far below the maximum possible (Gino, Ayal, & Ariely, 2009; Gneezy, 2005; Mazar, Amir, & Ariely, 2008).

According to the psychological model of dishonesty, people are caught between a rock and a hard place—that is, between the temptation to profit from unethical behavior and the desire to maintain a positive moral image of themselves. This internal conflict—termed ethical dissonance—creates severe psychological tension and threatens people’s self-concept and moral identity (Ayal & Gino, 2011; Barkan, Ayal, Gino, & Ariely, 2012). Unfortunately, research shows us that people employ various self-serving justifications to reduce ethical dissonance and manage to do wrong and feel moral at the same time (Shalvi, Gino, Barkan, & Ayal, 2015).

Although the picture we portray above seems depressing, there is a silver lining. In a nutshell, understanding the factors that facilitate wrongdoing can help us to design policies and interventions that work against them, stress high moral standards, and tip the scale of people’s internal conflict toward ethical behavior (Beshears & Gino, 2011). Reminding emphasizes the effectiveness of subtle cues that increase the salience of morality and decrease the ability to justify dishonesty.

Visibility refers to social monitoring cues and aims to restrict anonymity, prompt peer monitoring, and elicit responsible norms. Self-engagement increases the motivation to maintain a positive self-image and generates personal commitment to act morally.

Visibility

Classic research in social psychology has demonstrated that anonymity releases people from their moral shackles (Milgram, 1973; Zimbardo, 2000). The second component of the REVISE framework emphasizes visibility, which encourages ethical behavior through social monitoring cues.

The effectiveness of visibility has been demonstrated in laboratory experiments and field studies. In the lab, participants in a slightly dimmed room cheated more than participants in a well-lit room (Zhong, Bohns, & Gino, 2010). In fact, people are so sensitive to the presence of others that even seeing a picture of eyes can alter their behavior for the better. One study showed that when a picture of eyes was displayed above an honesty jar, honor payments for coffee and tea were nearly three times more frequent than when a picture of flowers was displayed above the jar (Bateson, Nettle, & Roberts, 2006).

In addition to its more direct effect, visibility also shapes social norms. In this respect, visibility can be a two-way street and either encourage good behavior or facilitate bad behavior. Whether observing someone committing a wrongdoing will be condemned (“I am a better person”) or serve as justification for similar behavior (“everybody does it”) depends in part on the way people relate to the wrongdoer. If the person who violates ethical standards is an in-group member or a respected figure, people will easily follow this person’s lead. However, if the person is an outgroup member or someone with a bad reputation, people will tend to distance themselves by exhibiting the opposite worthy behavior. Hence, when designing visible environments to enhance social monitoring, we should pay special attention to both the social norms.

Three Principles to REVISE People’s Unethical Behavior

We formulated REVISE, a 3-principle framework that can guide intervention and policy:

- **Reminding** emphasizes the effectiveness of subtle cues that increase the salience of morality and decrease the ability to justify dishonesty.
- **Visibility** refers to social monitoring cues and aims to restrict anonymity, prompt peer monitoring, and elicit responsible norms.
- **Self-engagement** increases the motivation to maintain a positive self-image and generates personal commitment to act morally.

Empirical evidence shows that people take advantage of grey areas to justify their dishonest behavior (Shalvi et al., 2015). The first principle, reminding, eliminates ambiguity and introduces subtle cues that make people’s own moral standards salient. For instance, in a typical lab experiment, we pay participants according to their performance on a relatively simple task. In one group, we monitor and verify participants’ performance. In the second group, we inform participants that they can shred any evidence of their real performance and simply tell us how much money they earned. Participants in this second group are assured that we cannot identify or punish them for cheating. Typically, many participants in the second group cheat by inflating their actual performance. To test the effect of reminding, we asked participants in this group to recall the 10 Commandments immediately prior to doing the task. This simple reminder eliminated cheating (Ariely, 2012; Mazar et al., 2008).

The design of effective moral reminders should take two important points into consideration. First, reminders should be salient—utilizing principles of right and wrong, specific examples of moral “do’s and don’ts,” and even known slogans. For instance, placing signs with The Ellen Show motto “Be Kind to One Another” next to handicapped parking spaces is likely to encourage ethical parking behavior. Second, to maintain salience and avoid adaptation, we need to change and reactivate reminders every now and then.

The REVISE Framework

We formulated REVISE, a 3-principle framework that can guide intervention and policy:
cues and the actors who display them (Cialdini, 1993; Erat & Gneezy, 2012; Gino et al., 2009).

**Self-engagement**

People state that being moral is central to their self-concept and they really care about honesty in their interactions with others (e.g., Aquino & Reed, 2002; Haidt, 2007; Tyler, 2006). One problem is that people tend to think about their morality in abstract and ideal terms, but violate ethical standards in concrete and seemingly isolated actions. The principle of self-engagement increases awareness by establishing a direct relationship between people’s concrete transgressions and their general perceptions of their morality. Engaging the moral self can help people resist the temptation of unethical behavior and commit to ethical standards.

In a field study that exemplifies the effectiveness of this principle, researchers collaborated with an automobile insurance company that hoped to encourage people to report the true mileage on their cars. Of course, higher mileage leads to a higher premium; therefore, people save money by lying and underreporting. In this study, customers were asked to sign a statement declaring they were telling the truth. Importantly, the researchers randomly assigned customers to a “regular” statement in which their signature was placed at the bottom of the page (after reporting the car mileage), or a “self-engagement” statement, in which their signature was placed at the top of the page (before reporting the car mileage). This subtle difference had an impressive effect: When people signed their names at the top of the page they reported more mileage (Shu, Mazar, Gino, Ariely, & Bazerman, 2012).

**Policy Implications**

The fields of moral psychology and behavioral ethics have grown rapidly in the last two decades and have documented a variety of factors that enable (even good) people to do wrong. The REVISE framework organizes these factors into three main categories and identifies interventions to encourage moral behavior. Table 1 summarizes the framework and presents examples applying REVISE principles to policy in different content areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Examples of policy recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reminding</strong></td>
<td>Provide cues that increase the salience of ethical criteria and decrease ability to justify dishonesty. Present cues at critical points (e.g., right before the temptation) and reactuate them every now and then.</td>
<td><strong>Tax compliance:</strong> Provide moral reminders in different sections of the tax return. Some cues can specify the victims and damage caused by unreported income. Other cues can highlight the moral uses of tax money. <strong>Compliance with handicapped parking:</strong> Provide moral reminders next to handicapped parking spaces, such as the Ellen Show motto “Be Kind to One Another” to encourage ethical parking behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visibility</strong></td>
<td>Include procedures that increase people’s feeling they are being seen and identified (e.g., by peers/clients/supervisors).</td>
<td><strong>Tax compliance:</strong> Develop mobile apps to computerize tax forms, personalize the reporting process, and create identified correspondence (e.g., filling in home and work addresses automatically, name of employer, spouse, children). <strong>Shoplifting:</strong> Place mirrors close to cashier and at exit doors to enhance people’s perception of being watched as they wait in line to pay, and as they leave the store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-engagement</strong></td>
<td>Break down morality into concrete behaviors. Generate and obtain self-commitment to act morally prior to behavior.</td>
<td><strong>Tax Compliance:</strong> Run surveys prior to tax time asking people general questions about their morality, their parents’ moral values, followed by specific questions about cheating on taxes. Change reporting forms by requiring people to start the procedure by signing an honor code and committing to true reporting. <strong>Bribery:</strong> Members of important law-making committees should have officials sign for and pin Ethical Commitment buttons on their lapels or wear Integrity bracelets on their wrists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reminding mitigates grey areas that blur the ethical code, visibility mitigates anonymity and the slippery slope of social norms, and the gap between moral values and actual behavior can be reconciled by encouraging self-engagement.

Dishonesty has never been compulsory and it should not be accepted as an inevitable fact of life. We can revise behavior and encourage ethicality by designing supportive environments that minimize temptations and define clear boundaries between right and wrong (Bazerman & Tenbrunsel, 2011; Sunstein, 2014). Successful public policies should raise moral barriers by reminding people of their own ethical code, encouraging social monitoring and responsible norms, increasing self-awareness and prompting moral commitment.
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