

**The Relationship Between Personality, Morality, and Lying in Undergraduate Students**

Savannah Jones

Department of Psychology and Neuroscience,  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**Author Note**

This paper was prepared in partial fulfillment of the requirements for PSYC 270. I have  
no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Correspondence concerning this paper should be directed to Savannah Jones, [savjones@unc.edu](mailto:savjones@unc.edu).

### **Abstract**

Understanding the human mind and the motivations that humans endure are explored to a new degree over time between psychological research studies. The idea behind this concept is the gaining of potential benefits that would come from knowing the reasons behind certain motivations and instincts we experience. Lying is a concept that researchers have tried to understand in an attempt to better understand the reason we are motivated to engage in this behavior by exploring the relationship between personality, morality, and lying. To assess personality type, participants completed the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and the Ten-Item Personality Inventory. To assess lying, participants completed the 16-Item Lie Scale. We aimed to see the relationship, if any, between certain personality trait predictors and the types of lies that are most frequently associated with said traits. We did not find complete support for our main hypothesis as our findings did not support the hypothesis that each type of lie would have a unique pattern of personality trait predictors due to no significant predictors of vindictive lies. Based upon our findings, we conclude that there are personality traits that can predict certain types of lies but unique sets of personality trait patterns for each type of lie have not yet been established.

*Keywords:* lying, personality, relationship, predictors

### **The Relationship Between Personality, Morality, and Lying in Undergraduate Students**

Lying is a common social behavior that can be used in everyday life by individuals throughout their interactions with others. Lying occurs when an individual conveys false information to another individual with the intention to mislead but can have a variety of different motives behind their deception. Several different types of lies are implemented in different circumstances. These types of lies include altruistic, vindictive, and self-serving lies, which are all used to serve a different purpose given the situation. Altruistic lies are made with the intent to benefit another individual rather than inflicting anguish. On the contrary, vindictive lies are used to purposely hurt another individual. Lastly, self-serving lies are implemented in situations that benefit the individual such as a mode of protection or capitalization (Hart et al., 2020). Along with the types of lies and the motives behind their use being studied, several studies have begun research to discover the potential correlation between personality and lying. We decided to focus our attention on studying the relationship between personality and the different types of lies told by undergraduate students, which allows us to replicate the study conducted by Hart et al. (2020). We intend to be able to see the relationship, if any, between certain personality trait predictors and the types of lies that are most frequently associated with said traits. This particular study displayed that certain personality traits can predict lying, but the specific combination of personality predictors varies on the type of lie being told. We believe that we will be able to replicate these results using data collected from undergraduate students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and that our findings will support the hypothesis that each type of lie will have a unique pattern of personality trait predictors.

### **The Literature Review**

Lying between individuals has received a large amount of attention from a variety of different research groups. Many studies have focused on the different aspects of lying and the implications that surround the situation, such as the success of telling lies or the ability to successfully catch a lie being told. However, there has not yet been a study to conclude the relationship between different personality trait predictors and the different types of lies available due to the specificity that the topic holds. That being said, using results from studies that do not exactly match the study we are following allows us to gain insight into the topic to use as preliminary knowledge, specifically about the frequency of certain lies that appear in daily dialogue. Using a study conducted by Ennis et al. (2008) as an example, their findings led to the conclusion that the occurrence of deception in social interactions is correlated to individuals' notions about both themselves and other individuals which further confirms our theory that lying is related to certain personality traits or self-impressions.

A study conducted by two psychologists aimed to discover the relationship between the occurrence of self-centered versus other-oriented lies and the different personality characteristics presented. Similar to Hart et al. (2020), this study hypothesized that personality traits can predict the type of lie that will most commonly be used. Their research led to the conclusion that individuals containing manipulative traits reported engaging in frequently more self-centered lies than other individuals with less expressive manipulative traits (Kashy et al., 1996). The study conducted by Hart et al. (2020) revealed that self-esteem, extraversion, and agreeableness were negatively correlated with lying, while self-doubt was positively correlated with lying which focuses on different personality trait predictors than Kashy et al. (1996). Both of these studies found personality traits that are associated with higher levels of lying, but their research focused

on different predictors (i.e., manipulateness versus self-esteem, extraversion, etc) and types of lies (i.e., lying in general versus self-serving lies).

After the study conducted by Hart et al. (2020) revealed its findings, the results of this study were found to be similar to the results of previous studies that explicitly looked at the relationship between lying and personality traits in alternate circumstances. Williams et al. (2010) revealed consistent findings with Hart et al. (2020) that agreeableness and consciousness were negatively correlated with lying tendencies, which in the study conducted by Williams et al. (2010) was specifically focused on the tendency to cheat in a scholastic setting. Establishing the consistent findings between the study conducted by Hart et al. (2020) and previous studies further reinforces credibility within the findings by Hart et al. (2020) that certain personality traits can predict lying, but the specific combination of personality predictors varies on the type of lie being told.

## **Conclusion**

Although there has been research conducted on topics related to the relationship between personality, morality, and lying, our study is the next logical step in this realm of research because we are collecting data from undergraduate students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill by directing replicating the study conducted by Hart et al. (2020). While keeping in mind the consistent findings between the study conducted by Hart et al. (2020) and the findings in previous studies, such as those conducted by Ennis et al. (2008), Kashy et al. (1996), and Williams et al. (2010), the conclusion can be made that there are specific personality traits that are positively correlated with and can predict lying (i.e., self-doubt, manipulative traits) along with specific personality traits that are negatively correlated with the tendency to lie (i.e., agreeableness and consciousness). Our study will allow other researchers to gain knowledge

about the personality traits associated with specific types of lies told by undergraduate students and further confirm the findings that were discovered by Hart et al. (2020). We will examine different personality traits present in participants and measure the types of lies that are most directly associated with the specific personality predictor. We believe that we will be able to replicate these results using data collected from undergraduate students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and that our findings will support the hypothesis that each type of lie will have a unique pattern of personality trait predictors because of the research that was previously noted by Hart et al. (2020).

## **Methods**

### **Participants**

To conduct a replication design, a convenience sample was used to gather the data required to conduct the design as a settlement for an unrepresentative sample. The study collected data from 122 undergraduate students at a large public university enrolled in a research methods course for psychology majors, ranging from ages 18 to 39 with the average age being 19.91. As we look into the range and average age of the participants, we also know that there was a standard deviation of 2.12 with a median of 20.00 from the data that was collected. Of the participants, 101 identified as female, 16 identified as male, 4 participants identified as non-binary, and 1 participant preferred not to answer. Out of the 122 participants, 76 identified as White or Caucasian, 13 identified as Black or African-American, 20 identified as Asian, and 9 identified as Other. The participants gave their consent before participating in this study and assented to participation by agreeing to take part in the study. They were not provided any incentive to volunteer, discluding the motivation to contribute to our data collection allowing for further research to be conducted within this field. Furthermore, participants were given a debrief

form once the questionnaire was completed to inform the individuals of the study to which they gave their consent.

### **Design**

In this research study, which examined the relationship between personality type, morality, and lying, the survey “Data Analyses for Morality Project” was used as the research instrument. This survey was utilized to collect data regarding the relationships between various personality characteristics, morality, and lying. This “experiment” could be categorized as an observational study, as there were no manipulated variables involved. The main variables of interest were personality traits, morality, and lying. Since there were many variables examined within personality traits and morality, this study is representative of a multivariate correlation, which is when relationships between several variables are analyzed simultaneously. In the context of this study, a multivariate design would be necessary, as multiple traits have to be considered together to get an accurate representation of human personality, which is a complex variable.

The independent variable analyzed in this study was personality type, which was split into neuroticism, extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and openness. In the survey, the various personality traits used as the independent variable were used to depict an accurate representation of a person’s full personality. The dependent variable in this study was lying. Data regarding the independent variable was collected through a survey and analyzed against the dependent variable using a modified Likert 4-point scale and 7-point semantic differential scale.

### **Materials and Procedure**

The research instrument adopted for this study was a questionnaire. The questionnaire used in this study was titled 'Morality Research Group.’’ The sample was collected through an

online Qualtrics survey. The survey consisted of six main parts: a consent agreement, demographic information, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, the Ten-Item Personality Inventory, 16 Statement Lie Scale, and a debriefing form. The survey was intentionally divided into three main sections: demographics, personality traits, and classification of lies. The first section of the questionnaire (Appendix A) was outlined to gather data on the demographics of the respondents, which consisted of Age, Gender, and Race.

The second section of the questionnaire (Appendix B) aimed to determine respondents' personality traits. Respondents' personality traits were initially assessed through ten questions on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, where they indicated their responses on a modified four-point Likert scale of "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree." Within this scale, questions 2, 5, 6, 8, and 9 were reversed coded. The next part of this section (Appendix C) was also aimed at determining respondent's personality traits. These personality traits were measured on the Ten-Item Personality Inventory scale which was a seven-point semantic differential scale. The rating 1, correlated with "Disagree Strongly," while the rating 7, correlated with "Agree Strongly." Within this scale, questions 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 were reversed coded.

The final section of the questionnaire (Appendix D) included the 16-Statement Lie Scale; a seven-point semantic differential scale, to find participants' levels of agreement and disagreement relating to lying. These questions were aimed to determine the participants' perception of the classification of liars they are, if at all. Within this scale, questions 3, 8, 12, and 16 were reversed coded.

The data was collected via the Qualtrics survey, which was released through an email to all students in two sections of a research methods psychology course at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The email containing the survey was released by Dr. Ndidi Adeyanju,



the professor leading the research courses. The students who completed the survey were not involved in reproducing this research.

The link to the survey was first sent during the last 10 minutes of the course period, and many students completed the survey at that time. However, the link was still accessible following the class period, and others completed the survey at a later date. Participants were told the survey was not mandatory, and people were selected to complete the questionnaire, therefore the sample was not completely random. This survey took approximately 10 minutes to complete, and participants' information remained anonymous. The sample was a convenience sample because it was taken from students in both class sections replicating one of two research studies.

### Results

Replicating the work of Hart et al. (2020), we computed descriptive statistics, bivariate correlations, and multiple regression analyses for both personality and lying measures from participants' ( $N = 122$ ) responses. The means and standard deviations for these variables are located in Tables 1, 2, and 3. We formerly hypothesized that extraversion ( $M = 8.12$ ,  $SD = 3.29$ ) and self-serving lies would be negatively correlated ( $M = 2.70$ ,  $SD = 0.98$ ), that agreeableness ( $M = 10.83$ ,  $SD = 2.12$ ) and neuroticism ( $M = 8.24$ ,  $SD = 2.65$ ) would predict vindictive lies ( $M = 0.68$ ,  $SD = 0.85$ ), and that neuroticism ( $M = 8.24$ ,  $SD = 2.65$ ) would be positively correlated with self-serving lies ( $M = 2.70$ ,  $SD = 0.98$ ).

A correlation matrix was run to determine relationships between the variables and is presented in Table 4 below. Extraversion was negatively correlated with self-serving lies ( $r = -.222$ ,  $p = .014$ ), which supported our first hypothesis. A significant correlation between self-serving lies and neuroticism ( $r = .429$ ,  $p = <.001$ ) also was demonstrated by the correlation matrix, in line with the third hypothesis. Significant correlations were present between all

personality measures except for conscientiousness and openness ( $p = .426$ ). Agreeableness was not found to correlate with any of the other personality traits. The results of the bivariate correlations are shown in Table 3. The only significant correlation for lie-type was between altruistic and self-serving lies, found to be significant at the .001 level.

Using the self-esteem and TIPI variables, we ran three multiple regression analyses to determine the power of these variables in predicting lie-type. This information can be found in tables 5 through 7. The outputs for self-serving and altruistic regressions were significant ( $p = <.001$ ,  $p = .005$ ). The vindictive linear regression was not significant ( $p = .227$ ). Neuroticism was identified as a predictor of both self-serving ( $p = .008$ ,  $B = .109$ ) and altruistic lies ( $p = .001$ ,  $B = .173$ ). Additionally, agreeableness was a significant predictor for self-serving lies ( $p = .033$ ,  $B = -.086$ ). No significant predictors of vindictive lies were found, disconfirming our hypothesis that agreeableness and neuroticism would predict this type of lie.

### **Discussion**

Our study hypothesized that we would be able to replicate the findings produced by Hart et al. (2020) using data collected from undergraduate students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and that our findings would support the hypothesis that each type of lie will have a unique pattern of personality trait predictors. Our hypothesis that we would be able to replicate the findings produced by Hart et al. (2020) was partially confirmed as we found similar significant correlations between specific personality traits and types of lies. However, our results partially disconfirmed our hypothesis in the manner that we found no significant predictors of vindictive lies. Furthermore, our findings did not support the hypothesis that each type of lie would have a unique pattern of personality trait predictors as there were no significant predictors of vindictive lies.

While comparing the findings from our study in relation to the findings of studies prior, we found that agreeableness did not correlate with any other personality trait and consciousness did not present any significant correlations, which contradicts the findings by Williams et al. (2010) that agreeableness and consciousness would be negatively correlated with lying tendencies. However, the correlations that we found between various personality traits and types of lies allowed us to draw similar conclusions to Ennis et al. (2008), Hart et al. (2020), and (Kashy et al., 1996) that the occurrence of deception in social interactions is correlated to individuals' notions about both themselves and other individuals. Similar to Hart et al. (2020), we found that there was a significant correlation between neuroticism and self-serving lies and that extraversion was negatively correlated with self-serving lies. However, our results were not in line with Hart et al. (2020) in the manner that we found neuroticism to be the only significant predictor of altruistic lies, agreeableness to be a significant predictor of self-serving lies, and found no significant predictors of vindictive lies, as Hart et al. (2020) found that agreeableness and neuroticism would predict vindictive lies. The differentiation between results in our study and prior studies examining similar personality traits and types of lies could be attributed to the varied participant pools that each study collected data from, as our study collected data from undergraduate students at a large public university enrolled in a research methods course for psychology majors, ranging from ages 18 to 39, and the data collected by Hart et al. (2020) was from the general population, ranging from ages 18 to 60, which could be a cause behind differing results.

The findings that we were able to gather from our replication study indicate that undergraduate students from a large public university enrolled in a research methods course for psychology majors did not present a common pattern of personality traits that would lead to lies

being told intentionally to cause harm to others (vindictive lies), but did present the commonality that those who experience negative emotions (neuroticism) are more likely to lie for others' benefit (altruistic lies) and those who demonstrate both agreeableness and neuroticism are more likely to lie for the benefit of themselves (self-serving lies). We can interpret the correlation between these personality trait predictors and their respected type of lie to mean that vindictive lies are not as easy to foresee by looking at an individual's personality as altruistic or self-serving lies and that neuroticism is more of a common personality trait in lying than others that were examined due to the negative emotions that an individual would be experiencing.

As with many other psychological studies, our study experienced limitations that resulted as shortcomings within our data. Because our participant pool consisted of undergraduate students at a large public university enrolled in a research methods course for psychology majors, all participants were inadvertently made aware that their responses to questions regarding personality traits may be used as a correlation to a type of lie. With this in the participants' minds, regardless of an individual's intentionality, while filling out the questionnaire, participants may not have answered the questions in the questionnaire to the most honest extent in order to enhance their character. It is difficult to ask an individual to be honest about their lying tendency and history, especially with the knowledge that their responses could correlate to a type of lie. The presence of inadvertent awareness could have affected our results by creating stronger or weaker correlations between personality traits and types of lies due to participants being disingenuous about their lying tendencies.

Regarding the relationship between personality, morality, and lying, the next logical step in future research would be to shift the focus more on the motivation that is used to engage in certain types of lies that are caused by personality traits. While we have established in our study

and in prior research that specific personality traits are correlated with specific types of lies, we have not yet established the motivating factors to lie that these personality traits present. If further research is conducted to uncover the motivating factors to lie, it would benefit the psychology field to know the intricate motives that specific personality traits contain and the likeliness that a specific type of lie would be the result.

Because lying is a common social behavior that can be used in everyday life by individuals throughout their interactions with others, it is crucial that researchers attempt to fully understand the motives and personality traits that specific types of lies correlate with to better understand the general population. Gaining knowledge within this field would allow researchers to establish concrete answers with evidence to how the human brain operates in situations that would provoke lying. While an increase in knowledge relating to the relationship between personality, morality, and lying would benefit the psychology field, it would better serve the general population because individuals would be able to learn more about each other along with gaining a better understanding of themselves.

### References

- Ennis, E., Vrij, A., & Chance, C. (2008). Individual differences and lying in everyday life. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 25(1), 105-118.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407507086808>
- Hart, C.L., Lemon, R., Curtis, D.A. & Griffith, J.D. (2020). Personality traits associated with various forms of lying. *Psychological Studies*, 65, 239–246. DOI 10.1007/s12646-020-00563-x
- Kashy, D. A., & DePaulo, B. M. (1996). Who lies?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(5), 1037.
- Williams, K. M., Nathanson, C., & Paulhus, D. L. (2010). Identifying and profiling scholastic cheaters: Their personality, cognitive ability, and motivation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 16(3), 293–307. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020773>

**Table 1***Self-Esteem Descriptives*

	M	SD	Median	Min.	Max.
Self-Esteem	18.52	5.43	18.00	6	30

**Table 2***Personality Trait Descriptives*

	M	SD
Openness	10.88	1.96
Conscientiousness	10.87	2.15
Extraversion	8.16	3.29
Agreeableness	10.83	2.12
Neuroticism	8.24	2.65



**Table 3***Lie-Type Descriptives*

	M	SD
Self-serving	2.70	0.98
Altruistic	3.69	1.19
Vindictive	0.68	0.85

**Table 4***Correlation Matrix*

	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness	Self-Esteem	Self-Serving Lies	Altruistic Lies	Vindictive Lies
Extraversion	— —								
Agreeableness	0.028 (0.761)	— —							
Conscientiousness	0.183* (0.043)	0.004 (0.964)	— —						
Neuroticism	-0.332*** ( $<0.001$ )	-0.134 (0.141)	-0.259** (0.004)	— —					
Openness	0.334*** ( $<0.001$ )	0.172 (0.058)	0.073 (0.426)	-0.381*** ( $<0.001$ )	— —				
Self-Esteem	0.496*** ( $<0.001$ )	0.283** (0.002)	0.276** (0.002)	-0.655*** ( $<0.001$ )	0.506*** ( $<0.001$ )	— —			
Self-Serving Lies	-0.222* (0.014)	-0.260** (0.004)	-0.175 (0.054)	0.429*** ( $<0.001$ )	-0.243** (0.007)	-0.405*** ( $<0.001$ )	— —		
Altruistic Lies	-0.041 (0.656)	-0.021 (0.816)	-0.012 (0.896)	0.347*** ( $<0.001$ )	-0.031 (0.731)	-0.215* (0.018)	0.339*** ( $<0.001$ )	— —	
Vindictive Lies	-0.074 (0.419)	-0.156 (0.087)	-0.119 (0.191)	-0.034 (0.707)	-0.104 (0.254)	-0.115 (0.208)	0.123 (0.177)	-0.058 (0.522)	— —

\* $p < .05$ \*\* $p < .01$ \*\*\* $p < .001$

**Table 5***Self-Serving Lies*

Variable	B	SE	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	p	95% CI
(Constant)	3.636	.925		3.928	<.001	[1.802, 5.469]
RSES	-.020	.023	-.111	-.862	.390	[-.066, .026]
Agreeableness	-.086	.040	-.184	-2.148	.034	[-.165, -.007]
Conscientiousness	-.026	.039	-.058	-.675	.501	[-.104, .051]
Extraversion	-.014	.028	-.046	-.484	.629	[-.070, .043]
Openness	-.012	.048	-.024	-.253	.801	[-.107, .083]
Neuroticism	.109	.040	.293	2.696	.008	[.029, .188]

**Table 6***Altruistic Lies*

Variable	B	SE	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	p	95% CI
(Constant)	.844	1.195		.706	.481	[-1.523,3.211]
RSES	-.022	.030	-.101	-.738	.462	[-.082, .037]
Agreeableness	.019	.051	.034	.375	.709	[-.083, .121]
Conscientiousness	.051	.051	.092	1.008	.315	[-.049, .151]
Extraversion	.028	.037	.076	.753	.453	[-.045, .100]
Openness	.078	.062	.128	1.258	.211	[-.045, .200]
Neuroticism	.173	.052	.383	3.323	.001	[.070, .276]

**Consent Form**

**The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill**

**Consent to Participate in a Research Study**

**Adult Participants**

**Title of Study:** The Relationship Between Personality, Morality, and Lying in Undergraduate Students

**Principal Investigator:** UNC-Chapel Hill PSYC 270 Students

**Principal Investigator Department:** Psychology & Neuroscience

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Ndidi Adeyanju

**Contact Information:** [psyc270adeyanju@unc.edu](mailto:psyc270adeyanju@unc.edu)

**CONCISE SUMMARY**

This is a research study conducted by a Psychology 270 undergraduate class to see the relationship, if any, between certain personality trait predictors and the types of lies that are most frequently associated with said traits.

Shortly, you will be asked to fill out a short Qualtrics questionnaire. By filling out this survey of questions, you will be helping our Psychology 270 class identify the different demographics present among our participants, along with the various personality and lying discrepancies between participants.

If you are interested in learning more about this study, please continue reading below.

**What are some general things you should know about research studies?**

You are being asked to take part in a research study in which participation is completely voluntary. You may decline to participate, or withdraw your consent to be in the study, for any reason, at any point, without penalty.

Research studies are designed to obtain new knowledge that may be beneficial to future populations. In this case, the present study will help our Psychology 270 class learn about the research and design method. You will not receive any direct benefit from being in the research study. There may be risks associated with participating in research studies, although we do not anticipate risks in this specific study. Deciding not to be in the study or leaving the study before it is complete will not affect your relationship with the researchers, your professors, or your affiliation with the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.

Details about this study are discussed below, and you must understand this information to make an informed choice about participating in this research study. Questions you have at any time should be directed to Dr. Ndidi Adeyanju. Email: [psyc270adeyanju@unc.edu](mailto:psyc270adeyanju@unc.edu).

**What is the purpose of this study?**

The purpose of this study is to replicate previous findings collected by researchers using data collected from Undergraduate students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and confirm or disconfirm that our findings will support the hypothesis that each type of lie will have a unique pattern of personality trait predictors.

**How many people will take part in this study?**

We expect that we will receive around 150 people to take part in this study.

**How long will your part in this study last?**

Your part in this study will last until you complete the survey, approximately 10 minutes.

**What will happen if you take part in the study?**

In this study, you will be an addition to the data we are using to determine if each type of lie will have a unique pattern of personality trait predictors by completing several measures of personality and lying.

**What are the possible benefits of being in this study?**

The possible benefits of being in this study are contributing to our data collection which will allow for further research to be conducted and the establishment that there is or is not a correlation between each type of lie and a unique pattern of personality trait predictors.

**What are the possible risks or discomforts involved in being in this study?**

There are no possible risks involved in being in this study, but the potential discomfort in answering questions about personality, lying, and self-esteem.

**How will information about you be protected?**

Your information will be protected through anonymity, meaning the researchers will not link your response with your identity.

Although every effort will be made to keep research records private, there may be times when federal or state law requires the disclosure of such records, including personal information. This is very unlikely, but if the disclosure is ever required, UNC-Chapel Hill will take steps allowable by law to protect the privacy of personal information. In some cases, your information in this research study could be reviewed by representatives of the University, research sponsors, or government agencies (for example, the FDA) for purposes such as quality control or safety. Additionally, if you would like your data to be destroyed and not included in the sample, you may select that option before debriefing.

**What if you want to stop before your part in the study is complete?**

If you want to stop before your part in the study is complete, you may quit the study at any time.

**Will you receive anything for being in this study?**

If you complete this study, you will receive the satisfaction of knowing you are aiding researchers in discovering links between each type of lie and the unique pattern of personality trait predictors, which will be publicly acknowledged.

**Will it cost you anything to be in this study?**

It will not cost you anything to participate in this study.

**What if you are a UNC student?**

Students may choose to be in the study or choose not to be, but their decision will not impact their GPA or any other academic association.

**What if you are a UNC employee?**

UNC employees may participate if they are an undergraduate student.

**What if you have questions about this study?**

If you have questions about this study, you may contact Dr. Ndidi Adeyanju using her e-mail:

[psyc270adeyanju@unc.edu](mailto:psyc270adeyanju@unc.edu).

**What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?**

All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, or if you would like to obtain information or offer input, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at 919-966-3113 or by email at [IRB\\_subjects@unc.edu](mailto:IRB_subjects@unc.edu).



## Appendix A

### Demographic Questions

1. Please select the age range you belong to

1. 0-17 years old
2. 18-25 years old
3. 26-45 years old
4. 46-65 years old
5. Older than 65
6. Prefer not to answer

2. What is your race? (Select all that Apply)

1. White or Caucasian
2. Black or African American
3. Latinx
4. Asian
5. Middle Eastern
6. Native American
7. Pacific Islander
8. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

3. What is your sex?

1. Female
2. Male
3. Intersex

4. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Prefer not to answer

## Appendix B

### **10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale**

Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. At times I think I am no good at all.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. I certainly feel useless at times.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

**Appendix C****Ten-Item Personality Inventory**

1 = Disagree strongly

2 = Disagree moderately

3 = Disagree a little

4 = Neither agree nor disagree

5 = Agree a little

6 = Agree moderately

7 = Agree strongly

I see myself as:

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Extraverted, enthusiastic.

2. \_\_\_\_\_ Critical, quarrelsome.

3. \_\_\_\_\_ Dependable, self-disciplined.

4. \_\_\_\_\_ Anxious, easily upset.

5. \_\_\_\_\_ Open to new experiences, complex.

6. \_\_\_\_\_ Reserved, quiet.

7. \_\_\_\_\_ Sympathetic, warm.

8. \_\_\_\_\_ Disorganized, careless.

9. \_\_\_\_\_ Calm, emotionally stable.

10. \_\_\_\_\_ Conventional, uncreative.

**Appendix D****16-Item Lie Scale**

1 = Disagree strongly

2 = Disagree moderately

3 = Disagree a little

4 = Neither agree nor disagree

5 = Agree a little

6 = Agree moderately

7 = Agree strongly

I lie in order to avoid shame \_\_\_\_\_

If I am suspected of doing something wrong, I lie to hide my wrongdoing \_\_\_\_\_

I tell the truth even if it brings my wrongdoings to light \_\_\_\_\_

To avoid embarrassment, I lie \_\_\_\_\_

I lie to others in order to conceal my misdeeds \_\_\_\_\_

I lie to avoid disapproval from others \_\_\_\_\_

I lie in order to make myself seem better than I actually am \_\_\_\_\_

I am truthful when confronted about my social transgressions \_\_\_\_\_

I lie in order to make people feel better \_\_\_\_\_

I tell white lies in order to make people feel better \_\_\_\_\_

I lie to relieve others' burdens \_\_\_\_\_

I do not tell lies in order to spare another's feelings \_\_\_\_\_

I lie in order to cause harm to others \_\_\_\_\_

I tell lies in order to hurt, annoy, or upset others \_\_\_\_\_

I lie for revenge \_\_\_\_\_

I do not lie in order to intentionally harm people \_\_\_\_\_

**Debriefing Form**

**Title of Study:** The Relationship Between Personality, Morality, and Lying in Undergraduate Students

**Principal Investigator:** UNC PSYC 270 Students

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Ndidi Adeyanju

**Faculty Advisor Email Address:** [psyc270adeyanju@unc.edu](mailto:psyc270adeyanju@unc.edu)

Thank you for your participation in this research study. For this study, we had to withhold some information and aspects of the study from you to ensure that the results were as unbiased as possible. Now that your participation is completed, we will describe what we withheld from you and why it was important, answer questions, and provide you with the opportunity to decide whether you would like to have your data included in this study.

**What you should know about this study?**

During this study, you completed a Qualtric questionnaire. In short, we were interested in each participant's results after taking a measure of the Five-Factor personality domains, a measure of self-esteem, and a measure of one's lying behaviors in hopes of seeing a correlation between measure results.

While we did not deceive you about the content of this study, we could not provide you with all the information relevant to this study before completing it to avoid changes in behavior and bias in responses. This is a replication of a study done by Hart et al., 2020. They found “that there are specific personality traits that predict lying, and the precise combination of personality predictors



depends on the specific type of lie one is considering.” We could not tell you this information before completing the study because it could have affected how you responded, therefore reducing the validity of our results.

### **What is the purpose of this study?**

The purpose of this research is to help students in our Psychology 270 class analyze if each type of lie that exists would have a unique pattern of personality trait predictors.

We are looking to have a variety of individuals participate in this study in order to get information on different individuals. By participating in this study, you would allow us to expand our range of participants. This study will help in expanding knowledge of the relationship between personality traits and lying.

When interpreting the results, we will compare our findings to the findings of Hart et al. to see if the results are replicable across a different population. Replication of the findings of Hart et al. would suggest that the findings are generalizable to a greater population.

### **Incentive to Participate**

Outside of aiding our replication study to further understand personality trait predictors concerning the types of lies, there is no incentive to participate in this study. You may choose to complete the survey or not at any point in the process and it will not impact you. Regardless of if you complete the study or not, please do not disclose research procedures and/or purpose to anyone who might participate in this study in the future as this could affect the results of the study.

### **Right to Withdraw Data**

You may choose to withdraw the data you provided before debriefing without penalty.

### **Mental Wellbeing**

If you feel upset after having completed the study or find that some questions or aspects of the study were distressing, talking with a qualified clinician or counselor may help. If you feel you would like assistance, please contact UNC Psychological and Counseling Services (Phone: 919-966-3658; Email: [caps@unc.edu](mailto:caps@unc.edu)).

### **Results**

Final Report: If you would like to receive a copy of the final report of this study when it is completed, please feel free to contact the researcher.

### **If you have questions**

If you have questions, you may contact Dr. Ndidi Adeyanju via the contact information provided above.