

**Is lying ever justifiable?**

The effect of group membership on the perceived acceptance of lying

Laura W. J. Venhorst

University of Twente

1<sup>o</sup> begeleider: Elze Ufkes

2<sup>o</sup> begeleider: Sven Zebel

Studentnummer: 1188313

Bachelorthese Psychologie

Faculteit Gedragwetenschappen

Universiteit Twente

Enschede, 25 Juni 2014

### **Abstract**

The aim of this study was to investigate what the effect of the in-group versus out-group categorization is on the acceptance of lying. We expected that the acceptance of lying was greater when people told a lie to a member of the out-group than when they told a lie to a member of the in-group. These expectancies were all based on group norms and in-group favoritism. Eighty-five people filled in the survey used for this study. They were all coupled with a person from either the in-, out- or an unaffiliated group. The linking to another person was not real, the participants were told afterwards. The participants were presented with different statements, which were based on different aspects of the acceptance of lying. The acceptance of lying was split into two parts: the process of lying, consisting of a moral and a prudential domain, and the intention of lying. While the moral domain was focused on sympathy and respect for the other, the prudential domain focused on the self and its gaining of power by lying. The intention of lying laid its focus more on how difficult people find it to tell the lie against the other and if they intended to tell the lie if they had the choice. The results imply that the group membership of the recipient of the lie does not have any effect on the acceptance of lying with the teller of the lie. The manipulation check showed that the participants were not significantly influenced by the survey the way we wanted them to. Because the manipulation check was not successful, we cannot be certain that the results of this study are correct.

Lying happens every day (DePaulo, Kashy, Kirkendol, Wyer & Epstein, 1996). Numerous papers are written about this form of deception. An early study by DePaulo et al. (1996) report that most people tell at least one lie a day. Lying has been intergraded into this society for a long time; nowadays it is often seen as an everyday social interaction process (DePaulo et al., 1996). These findings by DePaulo et al. (1996) do not include the little white lies people tell to make themselves look better or to avoid hurting others. These white lies are judged far more acceptable than selfishly motivated lies (Perkins and Turiel, 2007). It seems to be acceptable to lie when telling the truth would result in hurting the feelings of others. The acceptance of lies also seemed to be different when lying occurred to different people. Adolescents found it less acceptable to lie to their friend than they did to their parents. Perkins and Turiel (2007) stated that the reason behind this difference is that underlying feelings for each group differs. Adolescents would consider deception more legitimate in relationships of inequality than in relationships of equality. Power and control of the parents play a big part in the acceptance of lying. The study of Perkins and Turiel (2007) focused on telling lies to people we are familiar with, our friends and our family. But this inequality of acceptance of lying does not only apply in these situations. This study shall focus on the influence of group membership of the recipient of the lie on the acceptance of lying for the teller of the lie. This study investigates what the effect of the in-group versus out-group categorization is on the acceptance of lying.

Identity is part of intergroup processes. An identity is seen as a shared set of meanings that defines an individual in particular roles in society or as members of specific groups in society and as persons having specific characteristics that makes them unique from others (Stets & Serpe, 2013; Ashforth & Mael, 1989). An identity consists of two components, a personal component and a social component. This social component is formed by the groups we are a member off, even if we don't identity with them strongly. According to the social identity theory, the person is not one personal self, but rather several selves that correspond to their group memberships (Tajfel, 1982). These associations we feel with groups creates an 'us', for example when we claim we have won the World Championship (soccer). Most of us have not played a single match, the team the country has sent has won, but we feel part of it, we are proud of our country. The way we perceive ourselves defines the "us" associated with any internalized group membership. Social identity theory asserts that group membership creates self-categorization and enhancement in ways that favor the in-group at the expense of the out-group (Tajfel, 1982). Three variables are particularly important for creating in-group favoritism. First of all the extent to which individuals identify themselves as member of the

in-group. Next is the extent to which the situations provide ground for comparison between groups. The third variable needed for creating in-group favoritism is the expected relevance of the comparison group. Favoritism is more likely when the individual sees the in-group as central to their self-definition.

Self-disclosure is an important aspect for the differences people feel between their in-group and out-group. Self-disclosure is defined as the communication by one individual to another of information about himself or herself that otherwise is not directly observable (Herek, 1996). Self-disclosure is a normal part of our social interaction. In a conversation with another person, one often simply reveals a lot about himself. Telling about your marital status, occupation or giving your opinion about the simplest things are forms of self-disclosure. Self-disclosure is generally beneficial to make friendships and it is used to avoid loneliness and social isolation. Self-disclosure is also a reason why people tend to like their own in-group and dislike the out-group (Ensari and Miller, 2002). When a person's group membership is not specified, then self-disclosure happens more easily. Ensari and Miller (2002) state that by becoming more familiar with members of the out-group, the threatening aspects of interactions are reduced. One conversation is not enough, there must be a constant interaction between group members for the threatening aspects to be reduced. And still the feeling of belong to a different group remains (Ensari and Miller, 2002). Cues for category identity, the physical appearance or the accent for example, remain. This ensures that the in- and out-group remain to see them as different.

Seeing someone as a member of your in-group has certain consequences. Looking at in-groups we see that an in-group sets norms for itself (Hertel, Aarts and Zeelenberg, 2002). These group norms are important in the aspect of lying. Norms that are formed by groups to judge what is fair can also be used by what is acceptable for lying. Sometimes in-group norms are prescriptive norms, but more often a person derives norms by assessing the behavior of the majority of relevant group members. For judging what is fair, these derived norms are often used. The individual looks at what the other persons do in their in-group and judge what is fair by the actions taken by their in-group. Another factor for judging what is fair, is the perceived outcomes for self and others. In the context of intergroup actions, group norms influence decision-making because they define the means to acquire benefits and to avoid costs (Hertel, Aarts and Zeelenberg, 2002; Brewer, 1999). A study by van Prooijen and Lam (2007) shows that certainty plays a big part in the setting of norms for group members. When it comes to guilt, van Prooijen and Lam (2007) found that in-group members reacted

harsher against a member of the out-group than a member of the in-group even when there was a minimum amount of doubt that the person was guilty. These findings are consistent with the norm setting behavior. In-group members use different sets of norms for in-group members than for out-group members. The norms are often, if not always, in favor for their own in-group. If we look at these norms in relationship with the aspect of lying, then lying would be far less accepted when it is done to a member of the in-group than to a member of the out-group. The in-group member will judge whether it is acceptable to tell the lie based on the in-group norms this person has derived from the group for example fairness.

### **Current study**

This study focuses on the effect of the in-group versus out-group categorization on the acceptance of lying. The feeling of belonging to an in-group can be easily created, an example of this is the minimal group paradigm. Mere categorization can cause in-group favoritism and elicits social discrimination between groups (Otten & Wentura, 1999). People tend to positively distinct themselves from out-groups. This often creates a feeling of defining who we are in terms of 'we' rather than 'I'. Otten and Wentura (1999) claim that this is an automatically activated default reaction. This reaction happens with just the act of assigning a social category to the self. The forming of groups is integrated in our day-to-day lives. People identify themselves as the college student, the athlete or the businessman. Even something as simple as liking the same television show can be a cause for a group to be formed. For this study we used the identification with the in-group, to create the in-group bias.

Hertel, Aarts and Zeelenberg (2002) and Brewer (1999) state that the cost and benefits are important for the making of norms. This can also be found in lying. Perkins and Turiel (2007) used different domains in their study about lying. These domains are focused on different norms people have when it comes the lying. The domains included the moral domain and the prudential domain. While the moral domain was focused on sympathy and respect for the other, the prudential domain focused on the self and its gaining of power by lying. We expect that when it comes to the moral domain, people experience more difficulty with lying when they are lying against someone from their in-group than when they are lying against a member of the out-group. We expect this because based on the norms set by the in-group and in-group favoritism, people will have more sympathy and respect for an in-group member than for an out-group member and because the costs on this domain are higher with in-group member than out-group members. Within the prudential domain, we expect to see

that people want to gain more power by lying with out-group members than with in-group members. This is expected because the costs for lying against an out-group member are lower than with an in-group member. We added another category based on the acceptance of lying, the intention of lying. The intention of lying lays its focus more on how difficult people find it to tell the lie against the other and if they intended to tell the lie if they had the choice. We expect to see the people who have an assigned partner of the in-group to have more difficulty with lying and less intention if they had the choice than someone coupled with a partner from the out-group. Overall we expect that the acceptance of lying will be greater when people tell a lie to a member of the out-group than when they tell a lie to a member of the in-group.

Lying can also happen against an unaffiliated group. With this we mean that a member of this group belongs to neither the in- or out-group. This is a third condition we added for this study. Valdesolo and DeSteno (2007) showed that individuals are far more ready to excuse members of their own group if they are not fair to others than out-group members when they make the same choice. The study also showed that members of an unaffiliated group fell somewhere in between the out-group and the in-group, when they were rated about their fairness. This can also be used for the acceptance of lying. There seem to be different norms for this unaffiliated group. Because the participant has no feeling in regard to the subject that does not belong to either one of the groups, the participant will see the subject as somewhere in between the in-group and out-group. When it comes to lying, people will have more difficulty lying to a member of the unaffiliated group than a member of the out-group, but they will have less difficulty lying to a member of an unaffiliated group than to the in-group. Thus lying will be less accepted when people lie against a member of the unaffiliated group than against a member of the out-group, but more accepted than when they lie against a member of the in-group.

## **Method**

### **Sample**

A total of 85 persons participated in the experiment. The sample consists of 57 women and 28 men from age 18 to 29 ( $M=21.54$ ,  $SD=1.90$ ). A part of this sample consists of students who received study credits required for completion of their psychology curriculum in return for their participation. The other participants were not rewarded in any form. All participants were German or Dutch, 32 participants were German and 53 were Dutch. Each participant was in one of the three conditions: 27 participants were in condition 1 (in-group), 32

participants were in condition 2 (out-group) and 26 participants were in condition 3 (unaffiliated).

### **Design and Procedure**

The design for this study was a 1 factor design with 3 conditions. For this study a self-report measurement was used in the form of an online survey. The survey consisted of three parts. First the participants were asked questions about their own country and their feelings about it. Participant could score these items from I disagree with this completely to I agree with this completely on a seven point Likert scale. These question were asked to create a feeling of belonging to their own country as well as to see if they see their own country as part of their identity and thus their in-group.

The second part of the survey was the main part of this study. All participants were randomly assigned a partner, who was either part of their in-group, out-group or the group the partner belong to was unknown to the participant. The in- and out-group chosen for this study were the nationalities of the participants. The assignment of a partner was not real, the participants were debriefed at the end of the survey. After the assignment of a partner, the participants were given three scenarios. All three on different subjects, namely study, sport and work. In all three scenarios the participants were told that they made the choice to lie and given a short reason why, often for the good of their own group. The participants were asked to actively imagine that there were in the situation presented to them.

An example of a situation:

Imagine yourself in the following situation: For your work you are paired with somebody from a different company. The person you are working with is the person you have just been introduced before. During the discussion about the detailed of the job you are both working on, you find out some information that could make your own company look bad. Your partner asks you if there is anything he should know before going further with the project. You make the choice to withhold this information from your partner and to lie about this fact you just discovered.

After shortly reminding them that they would lie to the assigned partner, the participants were asked to rate how much different statements influenced their choice to lie. These statements included their feeling of respect for the opposed partner or their own profit for example. Participant could score this from I disagree with this completely to I agree with this

completely on a seven point Likert scale. After rating these statements the participants were asked their feeling regarding the lie they told towards their partner, how difficult it was for them. Again, these statements could be rated on a seven point Likert scale. For every situation the same statements were given. The situations were presented in a random order to the participants.

The final part of this survey consisted of a few questions based on their feelings regarding the out-group and a control question to check if the manipulation worked. As a final question the participants were asked to choose between seven Venn diagrams. These Venn diagrams were used to determine the closeness they felt towards their assigned partner.

The survey concluded with a sort debriefing, telling that they were not coupled with an actual person.

## **Measures**

For the manipulation check the participants were presented with 7 sets of Venn diagrams based on the research of Schubert and Otten (2002). The participant was asked to choose the diagram that represented their feelings of overlap with the partner they were assigned to. After this the participant was asked the following statement on a 7 point likert scale: I saw many differences between me and my partner.

This study included 3 variables that were tested by 3 different scales. The first variable focused on the identification with their in-group. The scale designed for this was based on a study by Ray and Hall (1995). The study by Ray and Hall focused on the need for affiliation and group identification. For example Dutch participants were asked to rate how much the statement I see The Netherlands as 'home' applied to them. The reliability of the items proved to be high looking at both the Dutch participants ( $\alpha=0.87$ ) and German participants ( $\alpha =0.77$ ). Participants were asked to rate the given statements about their feelings toward their own in-group on a 7 point likert scale.

The second variable was the process of lying. This variable was measured three times by one scale. This scale was all based on the study by Perkins and Turiel (2007). The same set of items was presented after three different situations relatable to the participants. These included a school, work and sport situation. The participants were asked to rate 10 statements on a 7 point likert scale three times. These statements were based on different domains: moral and prudential. Within the moral domain one can think of preventing injustice or welfare



concerns. An example of an item used for this is: It will cause the other harm if I lie about this. The prudential domain includes statements based on success and welfare for the self. An example of an item used for this is: By lying, it is ensured that I get more out of it. Both the items for the moral domain ( $\alpha=0.84$ ) and the prudential domain ( $\alpha=0.90$ ) were highly reliable.

The third variable looked at the intention of lying. To measure this variable one scale was used. This scale was used with the same situation presented at the participants with the variable that measured the process of lying. An item that was used was for example: In this context, I would not mind lying. This scale was highly reliable ( $\alpha=0.82$ ).

## Results

### Manipulation Check

To test whether we were successful with the creation of the in-group favoritism and the group membership of the assigned partner, we first analyzed the items created for this. First of all we looked at the item that included the Venn Diagrams. This item measures how the participant felt about the closeness to the other person. The participant was coupled with a member of the in-group, out-group or an unaffiliated person. We suspect that, should the manipulation have worked, the participants coupled with an individual from the in-group scored higher, and thus felt closer, on this item, than the participants coupled with an individual from the out-group. The participants that were coupled with a person neither belonging to the in- or out-group should score somewhere in between. To test if there was a significant difference between these three groups an one-way ANOVA was used. There was a significant difference found between these three groups ( $F(2,82)=3.45$ ,  $p=0.04$ ). To make sure the manipulation was as expected, a post-hoc test was performed. Here we found a significant difference ( $p=0,01$ ) between the in-group ( $M=2.63$ ,  $SD=1.31$ ) and the unaffiliated group ( $M=3.73$ ,  $SD=1.85$ ). Unexpectedly the in-group scored higher than the unaffiliated group. We found a marginal significance when we look at the out-group ( $M=2.97$ ,  $SD= 1.51$ ) and the unaffiliated group ( $p=0.07$ ). This is as expected for the manipulation. The out-group scored significantly lower than the unaffiliated group. Lastly we have the difference between the in-group and the out-group. Between these two-groups no significant difference was found ( $p=0.40$ ). This implies that the manipulation has not worked.

The second item used to see if the manipulation has worked was the item asking the participants how much of a difference they saw between them and the person coupled with

the participant on a seven-point Likert Scale. If the manipulation was successful, a significant difference should be found within the three groups on how they scored on this item. The out-group should score the highest on this item, scoring both higher than the in-group and the unaffiliated group. The in-group should score the lowest and the unaffiliated group should score in between these groups. A one-way ANOVA was performed to see if there was a difference between the score on this item. There was no significant difference found between these three groups ( $F(2,82)=0.02$ ,  $p=0.98$ ). The scores of these three groups lay very close to each other.

With these two items for the manipulation check we can state that unfortunately the manipulation for this study did not work as expected.

### **Process and Intention**

For this study we expected to see a significant difference between the in-group, out-group and the unaffiliated group when it came to the acceptance of lying. To measure this we will look at different variables: process of lying and the intention of lying. For the process of lying, we have two domains the moral domain and the prudential domain. To see if there were indeed two different factors within the process of lying a factor analysis was performed. The factor analysis showed that there were two factors where different items gave a high loading on. This confirmed that there were indeed two factors.

We expected to see a significant difference between the three groups when we look at the process of lying. To test this we used a repeated measures ANOVA. We used this repeated measures ANOVA because the participants got the same set of items three times, within three different situations. The within-subject factors were the previously stated different situations the participants were placed in, in which they were to score their feeling about lying. These situations were school, work or sports. The between-subject factor chosen here was the group the participant was placed in. This could either be the in-group, out-group or an unaffiliated group. First we look at the moral domain. Within the different situations we see no significant effect ( $F(2,82)=0.56$ ,  $p=0.95$ ). The participants felt that the moral aspects behind lying were equal within each situation. There was no significant interaction effect found when looking at the situations in combinations with the groups they were placed in ( $F(2,82)=1.30$ ,  $p=0.27$ ). The most important test was that of the significance of the group. This test tells us whether the group the partner of the participant belonged to, has a significant

effect on the moral domain when it comes to the acceptance of lying. There was no significant effect found when we looked at the process of lying on the moral domain and the different groups they were placed in ( $F(2,82)=0.42$ ,  $p=0.66$ ).

The same repeated measures ANOVA was done for the prudential domain. Again, we expected to see a significant difference between the three groups when we look at the process of lying. The within-subject factor was the different situations the participants were placed in and the between-subject factor chosen was the group the participant was placed in. Unlike the moral domain, we see a marginal significant effect when we look at the different situations ( $F(2,82)=2.43$ ,  $p=0.095$ ). The participants scored higher on the work situation ( $M=4.04$ ,  $SD=1.01$ ) than both sport ( $MD=3.76$ ,  $SD=1.14$ ) and the school situation ( $MD=3.84$ ,  $SD=1.03$ ). There was no significant interaction effect found when looking at the situations in combinations with the groups they were placed in ( $F(2,82)=1.38$ ,  $p=0.24$ ). There was no significant effect found when we looked at the process of lying on the prudential domain and the different groups they were placed in ( $F(2,82)=1.01$ ,  $p=0.368$ ).

Finally, we looked at the intention of lying. For this we had the same expectations, we expected that there would be significant differences between the three groups. To test this we did a repeated measures ANOVA. The within-subject factor was the different situations the participants were placed in and the between-subject factor chosen was the group the participant was placed in. There was no significant effect found when we look at the different situations ( $F(2,82)=2.37$ ,  $p=0.10$ ). This means that the participants felt the intention behind lying was equally strong for each situation. There also was not found a significant interaction effect between the situation and the group ( $F(2,82)=1.53$ ,  $p=0.20$ ). The most important test was that of the significance of the group. There was no significant effect found when we looked at the intention of lying and the different groups they were placed in ( $F(2,82)=1.87$ ,  $p=0.161$ )

## Discussion

The objective of the present research was to investigate whether the influence of the group membership of the recipient of a lie makes a difference when it comes to the acceptance of lying by the liar. We divided the acceptance of lying in different categories: the process and the intention. The process of lying consisted of the moral domain and the prudential domain. While the moral domain was more focused on sympathy and respect for the other, the

prudential domain focused on the self and its gaining of power by lying. Both domains focused on the thoughts behind lying. The intention of lying laid its focus more on how difficult they found it to tell the lie against the other.

The results of this study show that there were no significant differences on the moral domain. We found no significant differences between the three situations presented to them. The participants felt that the moral aspect behind lying where equal within each situation, meaning that within each situation they had the same amount of respect and sympathy for the other. On the moral domain, we found no significant interaction between the situation and the group membership. People assigned a partner from either the in-, out- or unaffiliated group, did not score significantly higher on one situation than on another. The group membership of the assigned partner did not have a significant effect on the participant when it came to the moral domain of lying. People had the same amount of difficulty with moral obligations when they tell lies to both the in-, out- or an unaffiliated group. On the prudential domain we saw a marginal significant difference between the three situations. When we looked further into this we saw that the participants scored higher on the work situation than on the sport and school situation. The prudential domain focused on the self and its gaining of power by lying. The results show us that people felt that is was more acceptable to lie in a work situation when it came to the gaining of power. There was no significant interaction effect found between the situations and the group membership of the assigned partner. This difference between these situations was found within all the three different groups. Lastly, the group membership of the assigned partner did not have a significant effect on the participant when it came to the prudential domain of lying. People found that the gaining of power by lying was independent of the group membership of the people they were lying to. Finally, we looked at the intention of lying. We found no significant difference between the situations. The participants felt that the intention behind lying was equally strong for each situation. There was also no interaction effect found between the group and the situation. The group member ship of the assigned partner did not have a significant effect on the participants when it came to the intention of lying. People felt that they found it equally difficult to tell the lie regardless of the group membership of their assigned partner. We have not found a significant difference on both the process of lying and the intention.

This implies that the group membership of the recipient of the lie does not have any effect on the acceptance of lying with the teller of the lie. These findings are surprising. The

literature showed that there should be a significant difference when it comes to lying and the group membership of the recipient. Literature showed that people use different norms when it comes to the in- and out-group and their members. People are more lenient against their own group and show in-group favoritism. People tend to have more sympathy and respect for an in-group member than for an out-group member. Also the costs for lying should be lower when someone lies against a member of the out-group, resulting in more acceptance for lying against an out-group member. All these were not found in this study.

### **Limitations**

The manipulation check showed that the participants were not significantly influenced by the survey the way we wanted them to. For the manipulation check to be successful, there should be found a significant difference in score on the items relating the self to the other. The participants coupled with a member of the in-group showed a low score on these items, lower than both the participants coupled with a member of the out-group and the unaffiliated group. The literature showed that for a person to feel closer to a member of the in-group he should feel like he has a lot in common with that person, a lot more than with a member of the out-group. Because the participants felt less closeness with a member of the in-group, it is doubtful that the participants saw their partner as part of the in-group. This would explain the results of this study. The findings in the literature do not apply to this group, because they did not see their partner as part of their in-group. Because the manipulation check was not successful, we cannot be certain that the results of this study are correct.

### **Further research**

This study is important to give insight into the relationships between groups when it comes to the aspect of lying. Because lying happens very often and on numerous occasions, as the literature shows us, it is an aspect of our day to day lives. The feeling of belonging is very important for the forming of the self and the results of this are more than clear when it comes to certain aspects of interaction with other. We set norms for the groups that are part of us, even if we don't associate with them strongly. The same can be told for lying. The same lie told to two different people, one of the in-group and one of the out-group, can create a whole different feeling with the teller of that lie, because we set different norms. If we know more about these aspects on the acceptance of lying, we can use it to our benefit when conflicts need to be solved between groups for example, or when interventions between

groups are needed. Because research for these intergroup conflicts is so important, we do propose to a follow-up study focusing on the aspects of lying. The variables and items used for this study have shown to be highly reliable, so for a follow-up study we propose to lay the focus on a better manipulation of the participants. One can think of face-to-face interaction between the in- and out-group to create the feeling of belonging to their own group better. The literature tells us that it is not easy to forget that a person belongs to the out-group, when they are constantly reminded by this fact because the person opposite of them has a different appearance or accent. When the manipulation is better, then the results should give more insight in the acceptance of lying between the in- and out-group.

## References

- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of management review*, *14*(1), 20-39.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate?. *Journal of social issues*, *55*(3), 429-444.
- Cohen, T. R., Gunia, B. C., Kim-Jun, S. Y., & Murnighan, J. K. (2009). Do groups lie more than individuals? Honesty and deception as a function of strategic self-interest. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*(6), 1321-1324.
- DePaulo, B. M., Kashy, D. A., Kirkendol, S. E., Wyer, M. M., & Epstein, J. A. (1996). Lying in everyday life. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *70*(5), 979.
- Ensari, N., & Miller, N. (2002). The out-group must not be so bad after all: the effects of disclosure, typicality, and salience on intergroup bias. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *83*(2), 313.
- Herek, G. M. (1996). Why tell if you're not asked? Self-disclosure, intergroup contact, and heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Out in force: Sexual orientation and the military*, 197-225.
- Hertel, G., Aarts, H., & Zeelenberg, M. (2002). What do you think is 'fair'? Effects of ingroup norms and outcome control on fairness judgments. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *32*(3), 327-341.
- Otten, S., & Wentura, D. (1999). About the impact of automaticity in the Minimal Group Paradigm: Evidence from affective priming tasks. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *29*(8), 1049-1071.
- Perdue, C. W., Dovidio, J. F., Gurtman, M. B., & Tyler, R. B. (1990). Us and them: social categorization and the process of intergroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*(3), 475.

- Perkins, S. A., & Turiel, E. (2007). To lie or not to lie: To whom and under what circumstances. *Child Development, 78*(2), 609-621.
- van Prooijen, J. W., & Lam, J. (2007). Retributive justice and social categorizations: The perceived fairness of punishment depends on intergroup status. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 37*(6), 1244-1255.
- Ray, J. J., & Hall, G. P. (1995). Need for affiliation and group identification. *The Journal of social psychology, 135*(4), 519-521.
- Stets, J. E., & Serpe, R. T. (2013). Identity theory. In *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 31-60). Springer Netherlands.
- Schubert, T. W., & Otten, S. (2002). Overlap of self, ingroup, and outgroup: Pictorial measures of self-categorization. *Self and identity, 1*(4), 353-376.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual review of psychology, 33*(1), 1-39.
- Valdesolo, P., & DeSteno, D. (2007). Moral hypocrisy social groups and the flexibility of virtue. *Psychological Science, 18*(8), 689-690.



## Appendix A

### Liegen in intergroepscontext

Q1.1 Beste deelnemer, Alvast bedankt voor het meedoen aan dit onderzoek. Deze vragenlijst zal gaan over liegen in intergroepcontexten. Het invullen van deze vragenlijst zal ongeveer 10 minuten duren. Je gegevens worden anoniem verwerkt. De vragenlijst moet in een keer gemaakt worden, je kan ondertussen niet de vragenlijst weg klikken. Met het starten van de vragenlijst geef je aan dat je akkoord gaat om aan het onderzoek deel te nemen. Je behoudt daarbij het recht om op elk moment zonder opgave van redenen jouw deelname aan dit onderzoek te beëindigen.

Q1.2 'Ik verklaar hierbij op voor mij duidelijke wijze te zijn ingelicht over de aard en methode van het onderzoek. Mijn vragen zijn naar tevredenheid beantwoord. Ik stem geheel vrijwillig in met deelname aan dit onderzoek. Ik behoud daarbij het recht deze instemming weer in te trekken zonder dat ik daarvoor een reden hoeft te geven en beseft dat ik op elk moment mag stoppen met het experiment. Indien mijn onderzoeks-resultaten gebruikt zullen worden in wetenschappelijke publicaties, dan wel op een andere manier openbaar worden gemaakt, zal dit volledig geanonimiseerd gebeuren. Mijn persoonsgegevens zullen niet door derden worden ingezien zonder mijn uitdrukkelijke toestemming. Als ik nog verdere informatie over het onderzoek zou willen krijgen, nu of in de toekomst, kan ik me wenden tot Laura Venhorst. Voor eventuele klachten over dit onderzoek kunt u zich wenden tot de secretaris van de Commissie Ethiek van de faculteit Gedragwetenschappen van de Universiteit Twente, mevr. J. Rademaker (telefoon: 053-4894591; e-mail: j.rademaker@utwente.nl, Postbus 217, 7500 AE Enschede)."

Q1.3 Ik ga akkoord met bovenstaande tekst.

- Ja (1)
- Nee (2)

Q2.1 Als u, als deelnemer, niet akkoord gaat, kunt u helaas niet deelnemen aan dit onderzoek. Toch bedankt voor de tijd!

Q3.1 Geslacht

- Man (1)
- Vrouw (2)

Q3.2 Leeftijd



Q5.1 Voor dit onderzoek wordt je gekoppeld aan iemand anders. Het is de bedoeling dat je de vragen beantwoordt met de andere in je gedachten. Degene waar aan je gekoppeld bent zal hetzelfde doen. Een momentje geduld, je wordt nu gekoppeld. Het is een groot onderzoek, dus dit zal niet langer dan een halve minuut duren.



Q6.1 Voor deze opdracht ben je gekoppeld aan een ander persoon. Jij bent gekoppeld aan Jana Neuenhaus, een Duitse psychologie studente. Jullie beantwoorden de vragen over elkaar.

Q7.1 Voor deze opdracht ben je gekoppeld aan een ander persoon. Jij bent gekoppeld aan Anne Kuipers, een Nederlandse psychologie studente. Jullie beantwoorden de vragen over elkaar.

Q8.1 Voor deze opdracht ben je gekoppeld aan een ander persoon. Jij bent gekoppeld aan een willekeurig persoon. Jullie beantwoorden de vragen over elkaar.



zijn groot (9) Ik doe de andere pijn als ik hierover lieg (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### Q9.3 Hoe zou je je in deze situatie voelen?

	Helemaal niet mee eens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Ik zou het moeilijk vinden om in deze situatie te liegen (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In deze context zou ik het niet erg vinden om te liegen (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik heb geen probleem met liegen als dit voordelig is voor mijn eigen groep (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q10.1 Stel je voor dat je in de volgende situatie bevindt. Jij speelt met je team in de halve finale tegen het team van degene aan wie je net gekoppeld bent.. Tijdens het spel gebeurd er iets waardoor jullie sterkste speler niet meer mee kan spelen. Jij bent de enige die gezien heeft wat er precies gebeurde. Je team vindt dat de schuld ligt bij de tegenstanders. Jij zag dat het eigenlijk helemaal niet de schuld was van de tegenstanders maar dat het eigenlijk jullie



zijn groot (9) Ik doe de andere pijn als ik hierover lieg (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

## Q10.3 Hoe zou je je in deze situatie voelen?

	Helemaal niet mee eens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Ik zou het moeilijk vinden om in deze situatie te liegen (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In deze context zou ik het niet erg vinden om te liegen (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik heb geen probleem met liegen als dit voordelig is voor mijn eigen groep (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q11.1 Stel je je voor dat je in de volgende situatie bevindt. Op je werk word je gekoppeld aan iemand van een ander bedrijf. Degene met wie je samenwerkt is de persoon aan wie je gekoppeld bent hiervoor. Tijdens het bespreken van de klus, kom je achter informatie die







Q12.1 Geef op onderstaande schaal aan hoeveel de volgende statements op jou van toepassing zijn

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Ik zie mezelf als Duitser (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik ben trots op mijn eigen land (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik zie Duitsland als 'thuis' (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik ben tevreden over Duitsland (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De cultuur in Duitsland past bij mij (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q13.1 Voor deze opdracht ben je gekoppeld aan een ander persoon. Jij bent gekoppeld aan Jana Neuenhaus, een Duitse psychologie studente. Jullie beantwoorden de vragen over elkaar.

Q14.1 Voor deze opdracht ben je gekoppeld aan een ander persoon. Jij bent gekoppeld aan Anne Kuipers, een Nederlandse psychologie studente. Jullie beantwoorden de vragen over elkaar.





Q17.3 Hoe zorgvuldig heeft u de vragen gelezen?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	8 (8)	9 (9)	10 (10)
Zeer onzorgvuldig: Zeer zorgvuldig (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q17.4 Werd u tijdens deze studie afgeleid? Geef u hieronder a.u.b. aan welke afleidingen van toepassing waren.

- Geen afleiding (1)
- Het lezen van E-mail (2)
- Bezoek van een Sociale Media website (3)
- Bezoek van een andere website (4)
- Telefoon gehekt en/of beantwoord (5)
- Televisie stond op de achtergrond aan (6)
- Muziek stond op de achtergrond aan (7)
- Gestoord door een ander persoon (8)
- Er was een andere afleiding die hier niet bij staat (9)

Q17.5 (Optioneel). We zouden het waarderen als u nog feedback heeft over deze studie. Als u een reactie wilt geven over het onderwerp van de studie, de studie zelf, of het scenario kunt u dat hieronder doen.

Q18.1 Ontzettend bedankt voor het deelnemen aan dit onderzoek! De gegevens worden anoniem verwerkt. De koppeling aan een ander persoon was niet echt en alleen gedaan voor dit onderzoek. Dit onderzoek richt zich op de acceptatie van liegen binnen groepen en culturele verschillen. Als je meer informatie wilt hebben over dit onderzoek kun je contact opnemen met de onderzoeker via [l.w.j.venhorst@hotmail.com](mailto:l.w.j.venhorst@hotmail.com). Vergeet niet op volgende te drukken, anders worden de antwoorden niet verwerkt.

Q18.2 Als je deelnemer bent via SONA kun je hieronder je SONA code invullen

## Appendix B

**Table 1 Correlations between variables**

	In-group			Out-group			Unaffiliated Group		
	Moral	Prudential	Intention	Moral	Prudential	Intention	Moral	Prudential	Intention
Moral	1	0.58	0.65	1	0.45	0.52	1	0.83	0.43
Prudential	0.58	1	0.57	0.45	1	0.63	0.83	1	0.52
Intention	0.65	0.57	1	0.52	0.66	1	0.43	0.52	1