Dress, Drill, and Deception: Dishonesty at the Royal Military College of Canada

by

Evan Liu

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO

THE DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY PSYCHOLOGY AND LEADERSHIP

IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

BACHELOR OF ARTS (HONOURS)

Abstract

Lying is an everyday activity that occurs in many different forms and in a variety of contexts. This study aimed to investigate perceptions of altruistic, selfish and social-acceptance lying behaviours among Naval and Officer Cadets in the Regular Officer Training Plan at the Royal Military College of Canada (RMC). Participants in this study completed a questionnaire that consisted of the LYin Lying Tendency Scale, and questions relating to nine RMC-specific lying scenarios. Participants rated their altruistic lying tendency to be higher than their selfish and social-acceptance lying tendencies, and they perceived altruistic lies to be more correct than selfish lies in RMC-specific scenarios. However, for the most part, responses in the Lying Tendency Scale did not predict perceptions in the RMC-specific lying scenario questions. The results indicate that RMC's environment may influence perceptions of altruistic, selfish, and social-acceptance lies.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank those who participated in my study, as this study would have been impossible without them. I would also like to thank Dr. Sarah Hill for being my thesis supervisor and being tolerant of my mistakes. Finally, I would like to thank my friends who supported me throughout this process and at RMC in general.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

Lying is an activity that occurs in everyday social interactions (DePaulo et al., 1996). It involves a deceiver, who aims to communicate false information, and a party being deceived (Mares & Turvey, 2018). Even though lying is generally viewed unfavourably, there is a wide range of perspectives on the topic, with some scholars highlighting potential detrimental consequences, and others highlighting its importance in social settings (DePaulo et al., 1996). An example of a positive perspective on lying is that lying behaviour in children may indicate the acquisition of basic social skills, which is a developmental milestone (Lavoie et al., 2017). Lying behaviour among children has been found to become more frequent as they age, and children's executive functioning skills have been found to predict lying tendency, indicating that as children develop greater cognitive sophistication, they have a greater propensity to lie (Evans & Lee, 2011, 2013). Different perspectives on lying have led to the creation of taxonomies that aim to encompass the different types of lying.

In this study, lies will be categorized into three types: selfish, altruistic, and social-acceptance (Zhou et al., 2024). Selfish lies are told to gain material or non-material benefits at the expense of the deceived. Altruistic lies are told at the expense of the deceiver to benefit the deceived. Engaging in such lies could have potential negative consequences to the deceiver. Social-acceptance lies are employed when the deceiver seeks acceptance from others, or wants to fit into a group (Zhou et al., 2024). These lies are told to gain social approval from others, and avoid negative evaluations, social criticism, and rejection (McLeod & Genereux, 2008). This type of lie seems to fall somewhere between selfish and altruistic lies because the liar can have self-serving motives, but also does not want to disrupt the status quo within a group. It is important to note that much of the existing literature focuses on selfish lies (Gerlach et al., 2019), and suggests that people engage in more lies that benefit themselves than lies that benefit others (DePaulo et al., 1996).

Selfish Lies

A selfish lie is a type of pro-self lie, which is classified by an intention to benefit oneself (Steinel et al., 2010). What distinguishes selfish lies from other pro-self lies is that they benefit the liar at the cost of the deceived, although some pro-self lies can be harmless or even beneficial to the deceived (Zhou et al., 2024). Selfish lies reflect the selfish characteristics of an individual because they are told out of self-serving motives at the expense of others (Erat & Gneezy, 2012; Zhou et al., 2024). Pro-self lies are commonly used in all areas of a person's life (Steinel et al., 2010), and evidence shows that the majority of people willingly admit to pro-self lying behaviour to protect their self-esteem and produce their desired self-image (Xu et al., 2009). There are also a variety of other motives for selfish lies, such as seeking a reward, concealing personal information, or enjoyment, just to list a few (McArthur et al., 2022).

Motivation to engage in pro-self lying is dependent on the situation and individuals involved (Saxe, 1991). Saxe (1991) conducted a study about lying among undergraduate students in relationships. Participants in that study claimed that they lied to their partners about affairs in order to protect their partners, making the intent sound pro-social, however, Saxe (1991) pointed out that they are subconsciously protecting themselves by trying to keep their relationship intact. This study illustrates the fact that people can engage in pro-self lying without revealing their true motives by making their intentions seem unselfish. Another article summarizing two studies on lying among undergraduate students indicated that they are far more likely to engage in pro-self lies than pro-social lies according to their own descriptions (DePaulo et al., 1996). In both studies, participants told roughly twice as many lies to benefit themselves than to benefit others, and lies were more often told for self-esteem or self-image reasons rather than reasons of personal advantage or convenience. For example, people were more concerned with making themselves appear kinder or smarter and protecting themselves from embarrassment than materialistic gain. The participants viewed their lies as inconsequential because little effort was put into planning the lies, and they seldom worried about being caught lying. Most participants admitted that they would commit the same lies again, with 70% saying they would do so if they were given a second

chance (DePaulo et al., 1996). Grover and Hui (2005) conducted a study examining pro-self lies in a different context: the workplace. Their study had three specific findings. First, people were more likely to lie when doing so resulted in a reward. Second, people were more likely to lie when facing pressure to perform. Third, people were most likely to lie when experiencing both of the previous two conditions at the same time, and least likely to lie when facing neither of the two aforementioned conditions (Grover & Hui, 2005).

As mentioned previously, pro-self lies encompass all lies that are told to benefit oneself (Steinel et al., 2010). In the realm of pro-self lies, selfish lies are self-serving lies that are intended to benefit oneself at the expense of others (Zhou et al., 2024). There are instances where people could commit self-serving lies that do not come at an expense to others, and could even bring benefits to others. One such instance is when people lie to fit in with a group.

Social-Acceptance Lies

Another subset of pro-self lies that will be analyzed in this thesis is social-acceptance lies, which differ from selfish lies because they do not necessarily come at a cost to others. Social-acceptance lies are likely driven by the need for belonging and acceptance, which pushes us to create and maintain personal relationships (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). This is supported by the finding that social-acceptance lies are beneficial for social networking (Liu et al., 2021), as social networking can help fulfill a person's feelings of being connected to a group of people. People also generally resist breaking social bonds, even in situations where maintaining the bond would be difficult (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). For example, a couple that has been in a romantic relationship for a long period of time may feel inclined to stay together even if the relationship is deteriorating. As such, lying could help to facilitate the maintenance of interpersonal bonds. Although not as malicious as other types of pro-self lies, social-acceptance lies are still pro-self in that they can satisfy a liar's need or desire for approval from others.

McLeod and Genereux (2008) studied how certain personality measures predicted acceptability and likelihood of engaging in the following types of lies: altruistic, conflict avoidance, social-acceptance, and self-gain (analogous to selfish lies). Personality measures were

assessed through six personality scales, and acceptability and likelihood of committing the four types of lies were assessed through 16 scenario questions. Approval motivation, which is the need for positive evaluation and social approval from others, was found to be a significant predictor of acceptability and likelihood of engaging in social-acceptance lies (McLeod & Genereux, 2008). McLeod and Genereux (2008) also found that people who scored highly on honesty were significantly less likely to be accepting of social-acceptance lies.

So far, two types of pro-self lies have been defined, and some of their motivators have been discussed. Although many lies are intended to bring benefits to the liar, lies can also be used to bring benefits to others. The next section will review what defines altruistic lies.

Altruistic Lies

Altruistic lies can bring positive outcomes to the person being deceived, making the deceiver's action pro-social by many definitions (Pfattheicher et al., 2022). Even though pro-social behaviour is a flourishing area of research, there is no consensus on how pro-social behaviour is defined (Pfattheicher et al., 2022). According to Pfattheicher, Nielson and Thielmann (2022), all definitions of pro-social and altruistic behaviour involve some sort of "positive" act towards another person or other people. Beyond that common theme, definitions seemed to vary from each other. Pfattheicher et al. (2022) listed three areas where definitions differed: intentions and motives, costs and benefits, and societal context. They described each of these areas as having a different perspective on how pro-social and altruistic behaviour is defined: intentionalist, consequentialist, and societal. From the intentionalist perspective, pro-social behaviour is defined solely by the intentions of the actor regardless of the consequences of the action. Despite the good faith of an actor, their pro-social behaviour can have negative consequences (Pfattheicher et al., 2022). For example, an individual trying to console another person in a bad situation may try to emphasize the silver lining of the situation. Despite the actor's best intentions, such an action could worsen the affect of the sufferer. For behaviour to be altruistic from the intentionalist perspective, the goal of the liar has to be increasing the welfare of another person (Batson, 2010).

In contrast to the intentionalist perspective, the consequentialist perspective emphasizes

the costs and benefits of pro-social and altruistic behaviour (Pfattheicher et al., 2022). From the consequentialist perspective, altruistic actions must generate welfare in the receiver irrespective of what the intent is, and the actions must come at a cost to the actor (Pfattheicher et al., 2022). For example, a soldier who puts themself in danger to save a comrade is committing an altruistic action from the consequentialist perspective. This definition of altruism differs from the intentionalist perspective because it requires the actor to make some type of sacrifice (Pfattheicher et al., 2022).

The third and final perspective of pro-social behaviour and altruism is the societal perspective (Pfattheicher et al., 2022). From this perspective, behaviour is considered pro-social if and only if it is valued in the actor's society. This perspective does not require pro-social behaviour to result in positive outcomes or be made out of positive intentions. Altruism from the societal perspective transcends benefits for others and costs to self, and reflects how one should behave in society by putting the interests of the collective above oneself (Pfattheicher et al., 2022). An example of altruistic behaviour from the societal perspective is waging war to establish freedom and democracy in another country. Actors fighting such a war value freedom and democracy because of their society's beliefs, and their actions can be seen as altruistic despite the mass destruction and casualties they may inflict.

The Royal Military College of Canada

The Regular Officer Training Plan (ROTP) at the Royal Military College of Canada (RMC) is designed to prepare Naval and Officer Cadets (N/OCdts) for the stressors and challenges of officership in the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) by providing training and education in four "pillars": academics, military leadership, bilingualism, and physical fitness (Maddison et al., 2017). The program is designed to create a productive level of stress and subjects students to highly structured schedules. Many N/OCdts see some of RMC's activities as "positive stressors". According to Maddison et al.'s (2017) report, the activities in the First Year Orientation Period (FYOP, formerly First Year Orientation Program) were viewed positively by many N/OCdts because of their focus on team and morale building. However, students have

reported that other aspects of RMC's training model create excessive stress. Some particular areas of concern include overprogramming of time, lack of decompression, and too many rules that are not uniformly enforced (Maddison et al., 2017). The Arbour Report (2022) suggests that this excessive stress results in many Naval/Officer Cadets turning to dishonesty to succeed by circumventing rules. This tendency to be dishonest may have created a culture of "don't get caught", which undermines the motto of the college, "Truth, Duty, Valour" (Arbour, 2022).

Another aspect of RMC that may impact lying behaviour among Naval/Officer Cadets is teamwork. Teamwork is one of the professional expectations of the Canadian Armed Forces Ethos (Department of National Defence, 2022), and is emphasized beginning in the first days of basic training. Teamwork also plays a key role in the FYOP at RMC (Maddison et al., 2017), which occurs in the first weeks of the ROTP. Even though there are many aspects of RMC that are not team-oriented, the team mentality and cohesion built from the FYOP and military training can influence behaviours in the context of individual activities. For example, academics is an area where each individual is required to attend classes and perform to a certain level. However, class attendance at RMC is recorded by students in the class, making it possible to forge attendance records. As a result, class seniors in charge of taking attendance could cover for colleagues who skip class unexcused, out of loyalty for the team.

In an institution where teamwork is strongly valued, one could expect an increased tendency to engage in altruistic lying and a decreased tendency to engage in selfish lying. Altruistic lying can demonstrate a concern for others within a team, while selfish lying could be seen as a lack of commitment to the team. As mentioned earlier, one responsibility that is often placed on N/OCdts is to take attendance for various activities, such as academic classes, military professional development sessions, and mandatory physical training sessions. Since N/OCdts are put in positions of authority over their peers, they have the opportunity to falsify attendance to prevent their peers from facing punishment for skipping duties. Somebody who falsifies attendance runs the risk of being punished themself if discovered by Training Wing members[1].

[1] Training Wing members are commissioned officers and senior non-commissioned officers in charge of N/OCdts.

Falsifying attendance at RMC can be related to Pfattheicher et al.'s (2022) different perspectives of altruistic behaviour. From the intentionalist and consequentialist perspectives, falsifying attendance for others can be seen as an altruistic behaviour because the action is intended to benefit others, and the liar risks punishment if they are caught. If there is truly a "don't get caught" culture at RMC as Arbour (2022) suggests, then falsifying attendance can also be seen as altruistic from the societal perspective because such actions are valued by N/OCdts. However, it is unlikely that falsifying attendance is universally accepted by N/OCdts, so altruistic lies will not be defined using the societal perspective in this study. Even though RMC's environment might provide many opportunities to engage in altruistic lying, it is important not to overlook the ways it might influence people to engage in selfish lying.

RMC's unique environment might encourage N/OCdts to turn to selfish lies as a way to give themselves an advantage. Given the ROTP's heavy workload, N/OCdts could look for ways to be excused from activities to lighten their workload. Instead of skipping activities and relying on peers to falsify attendance, N/OCdts could engage in selfish lies to acquire an authorized exemption from duty. An example of a method used to obtain an exemption from duties is malingering. Malingering in the military, which is the exaggeration or fabrication of ailments to avoid military duty, is a problem that militaries have faced throughout the ages, and continues to exist in modern militaries (Carroll, 2003). Given the mandatory nature of many activities at RMC, malingering can be used to skip class, professional military training, and physical training, among other things. For example, N/OCdts sometimes have mandatory training on weekends, such as navigation exercises. Someone who is tasked to do a navigation exercise can feign an injury to be exempt. In that case, the task would be offloaded to a peer, and the malingerer benefits from a free weekend. As described, malingering is a form of selfish lying because it aims to benefit the liar and comes at an expense to others. Selfish lying is one form of pro-self lying, and pro-self lying does not necessarily need to come at a cost to others.

Social-acceptance lies are pro-self lies that do not need to detriment others. Given the value of social-acceptance lying in interpersonal relationships, they can be applied in many

settings at RMC. Teamwork and cohesion are important components of a variety of aspects at RMC, such as FYOP, squadrons, academic programs, varsity sports teams, and the cadet leadership structure. As a result, social-acceptance lies could be used by N/OCdts to build relationships and a sense of belonging in their various groups. For example, someone who is actively trying to build or maintain relationships in a group may not reveal that they are uncomfortable with the banter that other group members engage in. By pretending to be comfortable with, or participating in the banter, this individual would be lying to be accepted by the group. Similarly to altruistic lying tendency, one could expect social-acceptance lying tendency to be increased at RMC because of the importance of groups.

The three types of lies that will be examined in this thesis, altruistic, selfish, and social-acceptance, have been defined and related to RMC's environment. The ROTP's rigid schedule combined with its peer-leadership model create conditions that encourage altruistic lying in day-to-day life. The ROTP's heavy workload might also influence tendency to commit selfish lies, which could provide some relief through exemptions from duty. Finally, social-acceptance lies may be prevalent because of the many different teams and groups at RMC. Now that the environmental factors of RMC that may influence lying have been discussed, this thesis will explore how the occurrence of these lies can be explained using a theoretical framework.

Moral Disengagement

A theoretical framework that provides an explanation for dishonesty at RMC is Bandura's (2011) theory of moral disengagement. The theory states that people have moral standards that they abide by through self-sanctions. These self-sanctions stop a person from engaging in activities that they view as immoral or unethical. When a person performs actions that defy their moral standards, they selectively disengage from their self-sanctions (Bandura, 2011). At RMC, N/OCdts may selectively disengage from their self-sanctions by lying to circumvent rules. Bandura (2011) proposed that there are six mechanisms of moral disengagement: social and moral justification, advantageous comparison, euphemistic language, displacement and diffusion of responsibility, disregarding and denial of injurious effects, and dehumanization and attribution

of blame. Social and moral justification refers to the process of portraying an action as serving a socially or morally commendable purpose. Advantageous comparison lessens the perceived destructiveness of detrimental actions by contrasting them with a relatively worse alternative that would arise from inaction. Euphemistic language refers to words used to describe detrimental actions with a positive connotation. Displacement and diffusion of responsibility are methods of obscuring personal agency to exonerate oneself from blame. Disregarding and denial of injurious effects make the consequences of detrimental actions seem less severe than they actually are. Finally, dehumanization and attribution of blame target the victims of detrimental activities. All of these mechanisms allow a person to conduct actions that they normally condemn and feel justified or righteous in doing so (Bandura, 2011), but some mechanisms apply more to lying at RMC than others.

Bandura's (2011) theory of moral disengagement provides mechanisms that can be used to justify lying behaviour at RMC. N/OCdts may use social/moral justification, advantageous comparison, and disregarding and denial of injurious effects to rationalize altruistic lying at RMC. For example, falsifying attendance for a peer could be seen as a socially commendable action because it saves others from potentially facing disciplinary actions. In addition, it may be seen as socially commendable to help peers who are skipping classes due to a heavy workload. Using similar logic, an altruistic liar could use advantageous comparison to justify their behaviour by comparing their lie to the punishment that their peer would receive if the liar told the truth. Lying on attendance may also seem harmless to a liar because there appears to be no immediate consequences, assuming that the liar is not caught. However, over a long period of time, a student who misses class could struggle to achieve a passing grade. In this case, since the consequences of the detrimental action are out of sight, it is easier for a liar to believe that their action is harmless (Bandura, 2011).

Advantageous comparison and disregarding injurious effects are also mechanisms that can be used to explain selfish and social-acceptance lying at RMC. A N/OCdt who engages in a selfish lie to get exempt from a duty can easily use advantageous comparison by comparing the

effort required to fabricate the lie to the duty they would have had to do. There could be potential negative consequences for the lie, such as a task being understaffed, but if the consequences are out of the view of the liar, the injurious effects can be disregarded. For a N/OCdt committing a social-acceptance lie, fitting in with a group could be perceived as more desirable than telling the truth and potentially facing criticism from the group. A social-acceptance lie also seems unlikely to bring any immediate injurious effects since a well-executed social-acceptance lie would bring harmony to a group and prevent disagreement. What seems to set altruistic lies apart from selfish and social-acceptance lies is social justification. At face value, altruistic lies at RMC are more socially justifiable than selfish and social-acceptance lies because of the benevolent nature of altruistic lies. On the other hand, selfish and social-acceptance lies at RMC are less socially justifiable because of their self-serving nature and rely on other mechanisms of moral disengagement, such as advantageous comparison and disregarding injurious effects.

Although the theory of moral disengagement presents six mechanisms by which people disengage from their self-sanctions and justify their immoral actions, there are three that are most relevant to this study: social justification, advantageous comparison, and disregarding injurious effects (Bandura, 2011). Altruistic lying at RMC can be seen as having a socially worthy cause because it helps others get through the busy and demanding day-to-day life at RMC. Circumventing rules may be an effective way to cope with the rules and expectations of RMC. Lying to prevent others from facing punishments may also seem more favourable than seeing peers receive punishments, indicating that advantageous comparison could be a mechanism of altruistic lying. N/OCdts could also disregard the injurious effects of their dishonest behaviour because unless they are caught breaking rules, there seem to be no immediate negative consequences. All of these speculations made about lying at RMC require further investigation. This study aims to examine the perceptions of lying behaviours of ROTP N/OCdts at RMC.

The Current Study

At RMC, the emphasis on teamwork and the high workload placed on N/OCdts may lead to an environment where N/OCdts help each other skip duties and avoid punishments by lying.

Since such lies are intended to bring benefits to others, they can be seen as socially commendable and preferable to telling the truth. On the other hand, social justification is not as applicable to selfish lies and social-acceptance lies because liars intend to benefit themselves. Given the socially commendable nature of altruistic lies, it would be logical for N/OCdts to have a higher tendency to engage in such lies, and view them as more correct than selfish lies and social-acceptance lies. It would also make sense for N/OCdts with a higher natural tendency to engage in altruistic lying to perceive altruistic lying at RMC to be correct. Since altruistic lying often involves breaking rules at RMC, the same N/OCdts should perceive altruistic lying to be contrary to college expectations. The same logic can be applied to N/OCdts with a lower natural tendency to engage in selfish lying. N/OCdts who do not typically engage in selfish lying should view selfish lying at RMC to be incorrect and not conforming to college expectations.

Hypothesis 1:

Naval/Officer Cadets will rate themselves as having a higher tendency to engage in altruistic lying than selfish and social acceptance lying.

Hypothesis 2:

Naval/Officer Cadets who have a higher self-reported tendency to commit altruistic lies will judge the action taken in the altruistic lying scenarios to be correct, similar to self, and not aligning with college rules or expectations.

Hypothesis 3:

Naval/Officer Cadets who have a lower self-reported tendency to commit selfish lies will judge the action taken in the selfish lying scenarios to be incorrect, dissimilar to self, and not aligning with college rules or expectations.

Hypothesis 4:

Naval/Officer Cadets will rate the actions taken in the altruistic lying scenarios to be significantly more correct than the actions taken in the selfish lying scenarios.

Method

Participants

Participants in this study were Naval/Officer Cadets (N/OCdts) attending RMC through the Regular Officer Training Plan (ROTP). N/OCdts who were not in the ROTP were excluded to make the participant pool as uniform as possible. N/OCdts in other programs, such as the University Training Plan for Non-Comissioned Members (UTPNCM) and the Indigenous Leadership Opportunity Year (ILOY) may introduce unwanted variables. For example, UTPNCM and ILOY N/OCdts could have differing life experiences from their ROTP counterparts, leading to different lying habits. N/OCdts enrolled in the UTPNCM were non-commissioned members of the CAF before starting their studies at RMC. Considering that some UTPNCM N/OCdts were previously senior non-commissioned officers and many of their ROTP counterparts are recent high-school graduates, many UTPNCM enrollees are older and have been exposed to a regimented military lifestyle for longer than ROTP cadets. In addition, ROTP N/OCdts are subject to their own set of rules, which may lead to different inclinations. This set of rules, the Cadet Wing Instructions (CADWINs) (Royal Military College of Canada, 2024), subjects ROTP N/OCdts to disciplinary measures that are separate from the Code of Service Discipline (CSD) that the rest of the CAF is subject to. The CADWINs could influence lying tendencies because ROTP cadets may view the stakes as being lower. This is because any disciplinary measures under the CADWINs are deleted upon graduation at RMC, while disciplinary measures under the CSD can remain on a member's personnel file for their entire career. For example, an ROTP N/OCdt could be absent without leave multiple times during their time at RMC and not have any record to show for it after graduating, while committing the same offences outside of RMC would result in a permanent record.

All prospective participants were recruited through an email sent using a N/OCdt master list. The sample had 76 participants with usable data, and their demographic data can be seen in Table 1. For comparison, Table 2 has demographic data for the entire ROTP population at RMC[2].

[2] ROTP demographic data was obtained through the RMC registrar.

Relative to the entire ROTP population at RMC, women were over-represented, and men were under-represented in this study. In terms of academic year, fourth-year students were over-represented, and second and third-year students were under-represented relative to the ROTP population at RMC.

Table 1
Participant demographics

Category	Sub-Category	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)	M	SD
Participants		76			
Gender	Male	46	60.5		
	Female	28	36.8		
	Not Specified	1	1.3		
Academic Year	1st	17	22.4		
	2nd	11	14.5		
	3rd	9	11.8		
	4th	30	39.5		
	4th+	9	11.8		
Club or Varsity Athlete	Yes	25	32.9		
	No	48	63.2		
	Not Specified	3	3.9		
Academic Faculty	Social Sciences	37	48.7		
	Science	12	15.8		
	Engineering	26	34.2		
	Not Specified	1	1.3		
Age		75		20.59	1.897

Table 2
Known ROTP population demographics

Category	Sub-Category	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Population		985	
Gender	Male	764	77.6
	Female	221	22.4
Academic Year	1st	227	23.0
	2nd	273	27.7
	3rd	238	24.2
	4th	247	25.1
Academic Faculty	Social Sciences	517	52.5
	Science	130	13.2
	Engineering	338	34.3

Materials

A questionnaire was used to collect demographic data of participants and measure their lying tendencies and attitudes towards lying, focusing on three types of lies: altruistic, selfish, and social-acceptance lies. The questionnaire consisted of four sections presented to participants in the following order: demographics, the LYin Lying Tendency Scale (LTS) ((Zhou et al., 2024)), RMC-related lying scenario questions developed specifically for this study, and qualitative questions. The first demographic question asked participants if they were enrolled in the Regular Officer Training Plan (ROTP) to screen out participants who were not enrolled. The rest of the demographic questions asked participants which academic year they were in, how old they were, what gender they identified as, what faculty they were in, and whether they were varsity or competitive club athletes.

The LYin Lying Tendency Scale (LTS) (Zhou et al., 2024) was used to measure participants' tendency to engage in selfish, altruistic, and social-acceptance lies. This scale assesses tendencies to engage in each of the three types of lies with five questions, for a total of 15 questions, and the 15 questions were presented in a random order for each participant. Each question used a seven-point Likert-type scale, with one end of the scale labelled "not at all true about me", and the other end labelled "very true about me". A sample question for selfish lying tendency is: "I will achieve my goals with lies which cause losses to others". A sample altruistic lie question is: "I will lie to protect others' interests at the price of sacrificing mine". An example of a social-acceptance lie question is: "I will lie about conforming with other people's opinion in order to blend in". Due to its recent development, the LTS has not yet been used in any studies except for the ones (Zhou et al., 2024) confirming its test-retest reliability, construct validity, discriminant validity, and criterion validity.

Zhou et al's (2024) article summarizes six studies that they conducted. In the first study, an item pool was developed (n = 15), and its construct validity, internal validity, and test-retest reliability were tested. Construct validity was assessed and supported by having participants complete the newly developed LTS, and scales that measured Machiavellianism,

altruism/empathy concerns, and social approval motivation. The scale was found to have good overall internal reliability ($\alpha = 0.85$), and good internal reliability for each subscale ($\alpha = 0.85$ for selfish, $\alpha = 0.79$ for altruistic, and $\alpha = 0.89$ for social acceptance). Test-retest reliability was evaluated separately from construct validity by recruiting 122 participants to do the questionnaire twice, with the time between the two testing sessions ranging from 23 to 34 days. The three subscales of the LTS had correlational coefficients (r) of 0.74 (selfish), 0.63 (altruistic), and 0.75 (social acceptance), indicating satisfactory test-retest reliability (Zhou et al., 2024).

The fifth study of Zhou et al.'s (2024) article supported the criterion validity of the LTS. The 313 participants in this study responded to the LTS, and rated their likelihood of making dishonest decisions in four imaginary scenarios for each type of lie (altruistic, selfish, and social-acceptance). The results of this study showed that there was a significant difference among the scores in the three conditions, indicating that the three types of lies are distinct from each other. The sixth study of this article also used scenario questions, but this time, 282 participants speculated whether or not the actor in lying scenarios would engage in a lie or not. Each of the three types of lies had five scenario questions, and there was a significant difference in lying judgements between the three conditions. These two studies with scenario questions draw similarities to the study that will be conducted in this thesis, which will use scenario questions specific to RMC.

To complement the LYin LTS, a set of questions with scenarios based on rules at RMC was developed for use in this study. This new set of questions contains nine imaginary scenarios (three for each type of lie), which were developed based on the author's past experiences, the unique rules of RMC, and the environment that students are subject to. Similarly to the LTS, the order of the nine scenarios was randomized for each participant. The scenarios were created with a peer and the author's thesis advisor, and no formal pilot testing was conducted.[3] The actor in each scenario was described as committing a selfish, altruistic, or social-acceptance lie. Each of

[3] The peer consulted by the author provided insight from a different perspective, as their gender, squadron, program, and cadet leadership positions differed from those of the author.

the nine scenarios was followed by four questions that evaluated whether participants thought the lie was the correct thing to do, if they thought the lie was consistent with college expectations, if they would have done the same, and whether participants were able to identify the type of lie being committed (selfish, altruistic, social-acceptance). Perception of correctness, conformity with college expectations, and likelihood of committing the same action were evaluated on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = Disagree, 2 = Slightly disagree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Slightly agree, 5 = Agree).

The survey ended with two qualitative questions. These questions provided participants with the opportunity to comment freely on factors of RMC that would encourage lying behaviour. The comments from these questions were intended to provide some context to responses in the LTS and scenario questions. The first qualitative question invited participants to write about circumstances that encourage lying within and outside of RMC. The second question asked about what aspects of RMC motivate participants to be truthful. The qualitative questions were included for exploratory purposes only and are beyond the scope of this study's hypotheses. This study focused on the quantitative data that was collected, so no thematic analysis was conducted for the qualitative data. As a result, the responses from the qualitative questions will not be discussed further.

Procedure

Prior to contacting any prospective participants, ethical approval for this study was granted by the undergraduate research ethics board (see Appendix D for certificate). Participants were introduced to the study by means of an email with an invitation letter and a link to the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The questionnaire was administered on SurveyMonkey, which is a commercial platform used to create and conduct surveys. The invitation letter described the survey as being about behaviours and attitudes at RMC. Potential participants were told it would take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete the survey. The approximate completion time was generated by SurveyMonkey based on the number of questions posed while creating the questionnaire. The invitation letter did not indicate that the study was about lying. A vague

description of the survey was used so that participants were not discouraged from participating because of the revealing nature of some of the questions. Especially with questions about selfish lying tendencies and attitudes towards selfish lies, participants might feel like they are revealing undesirable characteristics about themselves. No reward was offered for participating in the study, and the questionnaire was only available in English. Despite RMC being a bilingual institution, a French version of the survey was not created in order to increase the uniformity of the participant pool. As mentioned earlier, efforts were made to minimize unwanted variables that could affect responses, and in this case, the unwanted variable was potential cultural differences between anglophones and francophones. Clicking the link in the invitation letter brought participants to the consent form of the questionnaire on SurveyMonkey (see Appendix B for the content of the survey).

The first question following the consent form asked participants if they were enrolled in the ROTP. Non-ROTP participants were sent to the debriefing form and thanked. ROTP participants were brought to the next section of the questionnaire, which was comprised of demographic questions. After demographic questions, participants answered the questions on the LTS (Zhou et al., 2024), and the RMC lying scenario questions. Participants were then presented with two optional, qualitative, free-response questions described previously. The questionnaire concluded with a debriefing that explained the rationale of the study, included resources on the topic, and provided mental health resources in case the questionnaire induced any distress. All sections of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix B.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data collected from this study was analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 30) to test the hypotheses. Before conducting any statistical tests, the data were cleaned. Data from 33 participants were removed for a number of reasons: data from 3 participants were removed because the participants were not in the ROTP; 3 others were removed because the participants only confirmed that they were in the ROTP and did not answer any other questions; 27 were removed because the participants only answered the demographic questions. In addition

to these 33 participants, 1 other set of responses was removed because the responses were almost certainly from the author inappropriately testing the survey. After the data cleaning, several new variables were computed (refer to Table 3 for reliabilities, means, and standard deviations). For the LTS, scale scores were computed for self-rated selfish, altruistic, and social-acceptance lying tendencies. For the RMC lying scenario questions developed by the author, three scale scores were computed for each of the three types of lies: altruistic, selfish, and social-acceptance. The three scale scores were perceived correctness, likeliness of committing the same lie, and perceived conformity with college expectations. Normality and reliability for the LTS results revealed high skewness and kurtosis for the selfish question responses. To address this issue, five extreme cases were excluded from analyses involving the LTS-selfish subscale. High skewness was also found with the perceived conformity to college expectations scores for the selfish scenarios, resulting in four extreme cases to be excluded from analyses using this scale score.

Table 3
Scale score reliabilities, means, and standard deviations

Scale	Subscale	Reliability (α)	M	SD
LTS	Altruistic	.780	4.00	1.25
	Selfish	.705	1.82	3.01
	Social acceptance	.882	2.93	1.34
	Selfish (with exclusions)	.575	1.68	0.60
Scenarios	Altruistic correct	.549	2.72	1.01
	Selfish correct	.319	2.33	0.66
	Social acceptance correct	.272	2.42	0.72
	Altruistic same action	.602	3.22	0.97
	Selfish same action	.525	2.30	0.86
	Social acceptance same action	-.318	2.88	0.70
	Altruistic college expectations	.790	2.24	1.17
	Selfish college expectations	.684	1.87	0.89
	Social acceptance college expectations	.251	2.55	0.73
	Selfish college expectations (with exclusions)	.471	1.72	0.69

Note. Means were calculated by averaging all relevant participant subscale scores. For example, the mean for "Altruistic correct" is an average of all participants' perceived correctness scores in the altruistic scenarios, and a participant's perceived correctness score is the average of their responses across the three altruistic scenarios.

It is important to note that the Cronbach's α values were very low for the scale scores computed for the scenarios. However, these scale scores were used for the analyses anyway because the scenarios were intended to be independent of each other, even if the same type of lie was being described in them. This was done to allow each type of lie to be assessed across a variety of contexts. For example, the scale score computed for perceived correctness in the altruistic scenarios was meant to encompass the various ways one can engage in altruistic lying at RMC, even if participants did not answer consistently across the scenarios. This way, perceived correctness in altruistic scenarios could be summarized in a single, generalized score.

H1 was tested using a repeated-measures ANOVA between each participant's LTS

subscale scores, and a Bonferroni post-hoc test if the ANOVA yielded a significant result ($\alpha <$ .05). Mauchly's test of sphericity was conducted to test whether the assumption of sphericity was violated ($\alpha < .05$). H1 would be supported if participants rate themselves as having a higher tendency to engage in altruistic lying than selfish and social-acceptance lying.

To test H2, three simple linear regressions were computed with LTS-altruistic subscale scores as the predictor variable for each. The dependent variable was perceived correctness in the first regression, likelihood of committing the same lie in the second regression, and perceived conformity with college expectations in the third regression. The hypothesis would be supported if LTS-altruistic scores positively predict perceived correctness and likelihood of committing the same lie, and negatively predict perceived conformity with college expectations in the altruistic lying scenarios ($\alpha < .05$).

Similarly to H2, H3 was tested with three simple linear regressions. LTS-selfish subscale scores were used as the predictor variable. The dependent variable was perceived correctness in the first regression, likelihood of committing the same lie in the second regression, and perceived conformity with college expectations in the third regression. H3 would be supported if LTS-selfish scores positively predict perceived correctness, likelihood of committing the same lie, and perceived conformity with college expectations in the selfish lying scenarios ($\alpha < .05$).

H4 was tested using a within-subjects t-test. H4 would be supported if perceived correctness of the altruistic lying scenarios is significantly higher than the perceived correctness of the selfish lying scenarios ($\alpha < .05$).

A secondary analysis will be conducted by looking at whether participants were able to identify what type of lie was being told in the scenarios. Participants were asked to label the lie in each scenario as either altruistic, selfish, or social-acceptance. The frequencies for each response were compiled to see how accurately participants could identify the type of lie in the scenarios.

Results

Primary Analysis

To test H1, a repeated measures ANOVA was conducted. Mauchly's test of sphericity indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been met, $\chi^2(2) = 4.88$, $p = .087$. The ANOVA revealed that scores were significantly different between the three LTS subscales, $F(2, 140) = 117.30$, $p < .001$. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons using the Bonferroni test showed that LTS-altruistic scores ($M = 3.98$, $SD = 1.26$) were significantly higher than LTS-selfish scores ($M = 1.68$, $SD = 0.60$) and LTS-social-acceptance scores ($M = 2.86$, $SD = 1.31$). The results of the tests support H1.

For H2, three linear regressions were conducted. The first linear regression between LTS-altruistic scores and perceived correctness in the altruistic scenarios was not statistically significant, $F(1, 65) = 1.11$, $p = .295$. The second linear regression between LTS-altruistic scores and likelihood of committing the same lie was not significant, $F(1, 65) = 1.86$, $p = .178$. The third linear regression between LTS-altruistic scores and perceived conformity with college expectations was not significant, $F(1, 64) = 0.31$, $p = .581$. The results do not support H2 because none of the regressions were significant.

For H3, three linear regressions were conducted. The first linear regression between LTS-selfish scores and perceived correctness in the selfish scenarios was not significant, $F(1, 60) = 0.12$, $p = .730$. The second linear regression between LTS-selfish scores and likelihood of committing the same lie was significant, $F(1, 60) = 6.56$, $p = .013$. The regression coefficient was significant, $\beta = .31$, $t(60) = 2.56$, $p = .013$, indicating that higher LTS-selfish scores were associated with a higher likelihood of committing the same lie in the selfish scenarios. The R^2 value was .099, indicating that LTS-selfish scores explained 9.9% of the variance in likelihood of committing the same lie in the selfish scenarios. The third linear regression between LTS-selfish scores and perceived conformity with college expectations was not significant, $F(1, 57) = 0.16$, $p = .898$. The results partially support H3 because one of the three regressions was significant.

For H4, a paired samples t-test was conducted to compare perceived correctness between

the altruistic and selfish lying scenarios. Participants perceived the altruistic lying scenarios (M = 2.75, SD = 1.00) to be significantly more correct than the selfish lying scenarios (M = 2.31, SD = 0.66), $t(64) = 3.35$, $p < .001$. The results support H4 because the hypothesis predicted that participants would perceive the actions in the altruistic lying scenarios to be more correct than the selfish lying scenarios.

Secondary Analysis

Participants were asked to identify what type of lie (altruistic, selfish, or social-acceptance) was committed in each of the nine scenarios. The response frequencies are in the Table 4.

Table 4
Motivation for lying in scenarios: response frequencies

Scenario	Selfish	Altruistic	Social-acceptance	Total	Percent correct
David (altruistic)	2	48	20	70	68.6
Emily (altruistic)	0	44	23	67	65.7
Bailey (altruistic)	6	52	11	69	75.4
Alex (selfish)	68	0	0	68	100.0
Jess (selfish)	69	1	0	70	98.6
Chris (selfish)	56	10	2	68	82.4
Ari (social-acceptance)	0	0	69	69	100.0
Jane (social-acceptance)	2	4	62	68	91.2
Ben (social-acceptance)	1	2	67	70	95.7

Discussion

This study aimed to examine the perceptions of lying behaviours among ROTP N/OCdts at RMC. Out of the four hypotheses made in this study, two of them were fully supported by the results. N/OCdts rated themselves as having a higher tendency to engage in altruistic lies than selfish and social acceptance lies, which was also reflected in their ratings of the perceived correctness in the altruistic scenarios. An unexpected result was that self-rated altruistic lying tendency did not predict perceived correctness, likelihood of committing the same lie, or perceived conformity with college expectations in the altruistic scenarios. On the other hand, LTS-selfish scores predicted the likelihood of committing the same lie in the selfish scenarios but

not perceived correctness and conformity with college expectations.

As predicted in H1, N/OCdts rated their altruistic lying tendency as higher than their selfish and social acceptance lying tendencies. This differs from DePaulo et al.'s (1996) finding that undergraduate students told more lies to benefit themselves than others. Grover and Hui (2005) also suggest that people tend to tell selfish lies more frequently when facing pressure to perform in their workplace. Although Grover and Hui (2005) do not compare selfish lying tendency to altruistic lying tendency in the workplace, pressures to perform that are similar to those of the workplace exist at RMC. However, RMC's workplace pressures did not seem to push N/OCdts to tell more selfish lies than altruistic lies.

Social justification is a mechanism of moral disengagement that can explain why altruistic lying tendency was rated the highest, selfish lying tendency was the lowest, and social-acceptance lying tendency was in between (Bandura, 2011). Lying with the intention of helping others seems to serve a socially commendable purpose. On the other hand, selfish and social-acceptance lies lack social justification because of their self-serving nature. Social justification can also explain why social-acceptance lying tendency was significantly higher than selfish lying tendency, because selfish lies seemingly serve no socially worthy purpose, whereas social-acceptance lies can help maintain group cohesion, which can be socially justified.

The notion that RMC's environment contributes to altruistic lying tendencies is further supported by the results of H4, which indicate that N/OCdts viewed the altruistic lying scenarios to be significantly more correct than the selfish ones. The scenarios presented situations that are specific to RMC, and were plausible in the context of participants' lived experience. Presenting scenarios that are specific to RMC was intended to illustrate the role of environmental factors, such as rules and culture, on lying behaviours. The altruistic scenarios related directly to protecting peers who had broken rules at RMC, and the generally higher rating of perceived correctness suggests that N/OCdts think that altruistic lies are more justified than selfish and social-acceptance lies. This acceptance of lying to break rules can be explained through Bandura's (2011) theory of moral disengagement. For example, a lying N/OCdt who falsifies

attendance for a peer may feel like they are committing a socially worthy action because they are protecting said peer from a punishment. The liar may also disregard injurious effects that are not immediately apparent when committing the lie, such as the possibility that skipping class puts the peer at a higher risk of failing. Data from this study provide clear support for H1 and H4. This was not the case for H2 and H3.

Surprisingly, the analyses used to test H2 showed that altruistic lying tendency (LTS-altruistic scores) did not predict perceived correctness, likelihood of committing the same lie, or perceived alignment with college expectations for the altruistic lying scenarios. Similarly to H2, H3 could not be fully supported as the analyses used to test it revealed only one significant regression. LTS-selfish scores could predict likelihood of committing the same lie in the selfish scenarios, but could not predict perceived correctness or perceived conformity with college expectations. The lack of significant regressions could be explained by impression management (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). In an effort to create a positive impression on other people, N/OCdts may deviate from their regular lying habits when at RMC. N/OCdts who engage in more lying behaviour at RMC might feel pressured to conform to social norms. On the other hand, N/OCdts who engage in less lying behaviour might see dishonesty as behaviour unbecoming of an officer.

When looking specifically at the statistical tests for H2, the fact that altruistic lying tendency did not predict perceived correctness in the altruistic scenarios shows that having a tendency to commit altruistic lies in general does not necessarily translate to RMC contexts. One possible explanation for the results of H2 is that the altruistic lying being measured in the LTS differs from the altruistic lying in the scenarios. This is because altruistic lying is more focused on emotional harm avoidance in the LTS, while in the scenarios, it is more focused on punishment avoidance. This idea highlights a lack of compatibility between the LTS and scenario questions, which will be further discussed in the limitations section.

This lack of compatibility seems to be less apparent for the LTS-selfish subscale and selfish scenario questions. LTS-selfish scores were able to significantly predict likelihood of committing the same lie, but not perceived correctness or perceived conformity to college

expectations in the selfish scenarios. LTS-selfish scores predicted 9.9% of the variance in likelihood of committing the same lie, leaving 90.1% of the variance unexplained by the model. There are a variety of factors other than selfish lying tendency that may influence likelihood of committing the same lie in the selfish RMC scenarios, such as social pressures, college rules, and experiences with similar scenarios. The modest, but significant, regression model makes some sense because likelihood of engaging in a certain behaviour is logically consistent with the tendency to engage in the same behaviour, while perceived correctness and perceived conformity to college expectations are quite separate constructs. A person who tends to tell selfish lies does not necessarily think that what they are doing is correct, and they certainly do not need to think that their lies align with rules or norms.

As mentioned previously, LTS-selfish scores were able to predict likelihood of engaging in the same lie in the selfish scenarios, but LTS-altruistic scores were not able to predict the likelihood of engaging in the same lie in the altruistic scenarios. The results of the secondary analysis may be able to provide some insight into why this is the case. Participants were asked to identify the type of lie being committed in each of the nine scenarios as either altruistic, selfish, or social-acceptance. For the three altruistic scenarios, 68.6%, 65.7%, and 75.4% of respondents were able to correctly identify the lie as being altruistic. On the other hand, respondents were able to correctly identify the three selfish lying scenarios 100.0%, 98.6%, and 82.4% of the time. This suggests that altruistic lies were more difficult to identify and selfish lies were more clear cut, which is unsurprising considering the lack of consistency in how altruistic behaviour is defined (Pfattheicher et al., 2022). It is possible that many participants did not perceive the altruistic scenarios as describing altruistic lying, which would explain why altruistic lying tendency did not predict likelihood of carrying out altruistic lies in the scenarios. The results in Table 4 indicate that some participants mistook the altruistic lies in the scenarios to be social-acceptance lies. This could be because lying with the intention of benefitting someone else can also be done to earn the beneficiary's approval or acceptance, making it a social-acceptance lie. The subjectivity of altruism could mean that the altruistic lies in the scenario questions created by the author were not

comparable to what was being measured as altruistic lying tendency in the LTS, which is one of the major limitations of the study.

Implications

The results of this study highlight a potential systemic issue at RMC. The fact that participants rated the altruistic lying scenarios to be significantly more correct than the selfish lying scenarios calls into question the effectiveness of RMC's peer-leadership practices because it suggests that cadets may support circumventing rules to benefit others. If N/OCdts are unwilling to hold each other accountable, others should be responsible for keeping N/OCdts accountable if the institution aims to uphold its rules. For example, if N/OCdts can not be trusted to take accurate class attendance for each other, the responsibility should be given to the professor or a commissioned/non-commissioned officer in the Training Wing. Alternatively, more severe sanctions could be introduced for those who are caught falsifying attendance, which could deter this behaviour. Beyond minor duties such as taking attendance for classes and professional development courses, the findings of this study raise questions about RMC's peer-leadership model.

The Cadet Chain of Responsibility (CCOR), which is meant to give N/OCdts experiences through peer leadership, relies on the assumption that N/OCdts are willing to hold each other accountable. The results of this study suggest that any Training Officer (TO) positions in the CCOR could have the same accountability issues because N/OCdts who are appointed as TOs are responsible for maintaining the dress, drill, and deportment standards of their peers. Considering that TOs have the ability to recommend disciplinary actions for their peers, the inclination to engage in altruistic lying could result in the lack of or unequal enforcement of rules. The way N/OCdts view altruistic lying at RMC may be problematic when they are required to hold each other accountable. This is especially an issue when N/OCdts are put in charge of one another.

The idea that N/OCdts may not hold each other accountable and the resulting questionable integrity of the CCOR begs the question: what kind of officer is RMC trying to produce? RMC's leadership model may be intended to provide leadership experience to N/OCdts, but it could

simultaneously be teaching N/OCdts to lie and circumvent rules when opportune. The altruistic lying at RMC could be seen as commitment to the welfare of peers or as a worrying sign of corruption among young future officers.

The results of this study also indicated that an individual's perception of selfish lying at RMC may be different than their perception of selfish lying outside of RMC. Considering the possibility that N/OCdts may be more inclined to tell selfish lies at RMC, some actions should be taken to discourage this behaviour. With regard to taking inappropriate sick days, Training Wing members should verify that members who are sick in quarters are following the proper procedures. For example, members who are sick in quarters should remain in their room except when using the washroom, and this should be confirmed at random times to ensure that these members do not leave the campus. If RMC can influence the selfish lying behaviours of N/OCdts, appropriate measures should be taken to ensure that they are not undermining accountability.

Limitations

This study presents several limitations. Social desirability bias is an important factor to consider when interpreting the results of this study because participants answered questions about their own lying habits. Participants may have answered questions based on what types of lies are more desirable rather than what types of lies they actually engage in or perceive to be correct. In an effort to improve their own self-image, participants could have intentionally or unintentionally inflated their altruistic lying tendency scores and downplayed their selfish lying tendency scores. Social desirability bias may have played a role in the high skewness in both the LTS-selfish scores and in the distribution of scores regarding conformity with college expectations in the selfish scenarios. The skew demonstrated a floor effect, as many responses were clustered at the lowest score for questions relating to selfish lying. To address the skew, some extreme scores were excluded to normalize response scales. Although excluding certain scores proved to be useful for normalizing distributions, the decision came with drawbacks. Selectively excluding scores can distort results, and for the LTS-selfish subscale, excluding scores caused a concerning decrease in reliability (α) from .705 to .575. This drop in internal consistency is likely because participants

who responded with extreme scores answered consistently at the high end of the scale. The poor internal consistency of the LTS-selfish subscale with exclusions indicates that the findings for H1 and H3 could be flawed.

The subjectivity of altruistic lying is another limitation that could have contributed to a lack of compatibility between the LTS and the scenarios. The results indicated that altruistic lying tendency from the LTS could not predict the likelihood of committing altruistic lies in the scenarios, which may suggest that the LTS was measuring a different form of altruistic lying than the scenarios. Both the altruistic lying in the LTS and the lying scenarios involved a benefit for someone else and a sacrifice for the liar, but the nature of the sacrifice differed. The altruistic lying questions in the LTS seemed to be more related to protecting others from emotional harm, while the altruistic lying scenarios were more related to protecting others from a tangible punishment from a legitimate authority. Some examples that support this idea can be seen in the following LTS questions: "I will pretend to be fine in order to assure others, although doing so makes my situation even worse", and "To make others feel less guilty, I will lie to comfort others and bear the negative consequences myself". This contrasts the lying in the altruistic scenarios, which has to do more with protecting others from punishment than emotional harm. Without assistance from an altruistic liar, the beneficiaries in the altruistic lying scenarios were at risk of facing sanctions.

The sample size of this study is another important limitation to consider. The small sample size could have resulted in limited statistical power. A larger sample would increase statistical power, which would facilitate more robust results that are likely more generalizable to the population. In addition, a small sample size could potentially explain the nonsignificant results of many of the regressions that were conducted. A larger sample size could have brought the regressions closer to significance.

The final limitation that will be discussed is that the lying scenarios encompassed a very limited number of lying situations that could happen at RMC. A greater number of lying scenarios could have provided a more comprehensive analysis, but keeping the questionnaire as brief as possible was prioritized to minimize participant attrition due to a lengthy survey. In the

end, participant attrition was a valid concern because 30 participants did not complete enough of the questionnaire to have usable data, so attempting to minimize attrition turned out to be an appropriate priority. As mentioned in Grover and Hui's (2005) study, people are more likely to lie in the workplace when they face pressure to perform and could potentially be rewarded, and such situations were overlooked in this study. There are various competitive selection processes that occur at RMC that provide ample opportunity for lying to occur. For example, N/OCdts are usually interviewed for positions in the Cadet Chain of Responsibility, and interviewees could lie about why they want the position, or lie to make themself appear as a more desirable candidate. Having a more exhaustive set of scenarios is one example of something that could be improved for future research.

Future Directions

Although the results of this study are promising, future research should aim to improve on some of the weaknesses of the present study. One improvement that could be made is to create more scenario questions so that altruistic, selfish, and social-acceptance lies at RMC are more thoroughly captured. As mentioned in the limitations of this study, having three altruistic, selfish, and social-acceptance scenarios provides a very limited overview of the lying that occurs at RMC.

In addition to creating a more comprehensive scenario set, future studies should seek larger sample sizes so that analyses have more statistical power. It may be easier to attract more participants, for example, if the invitation letter is sent out closer to the beginning of the school year, when participants are less fatigued and fewer studies are running concurrently.

Another suggestion for future research is to survey both RMC N/OCdts and a civilian sample. The current study looks solely at the lying tendencies and perceptions of N/OCdts, which offers no comparison with a non-cadet population. This makes it difficult to conclude that RMC's environment influences lying behaviours because no sample of participants outside of RMC can be used for comparison. It is worth noting that although the LTS would be easy to administer to people outside of RMC, the scenarios would need to be restructured. This is because the scenario questions in the present study are very specific to RMC, so people outside of RMC may not

understand the scenario or the consequences of lying in the scenarios. To address this issue, the scenarios could be made more generic so that they are more understandable for non-RMC students. However, in doing this, there is a risk that N/OCdts are less likely to link the scenarios to events that would occur specifically at RMC, making an assessment of RMC's environmental influences less valid. Extending the questionnaire to people outside of RMC could provide additional insight into how RMC's environment influences lying behaviour.

The statistical methods used in this study can also be improved. In hindsight, multivariate regressions should have been used in place of the simple linear regressions used to test H2 and H3. A multivariate regression would reduce the chances of family-wise error occurring, which fortunately should not be a major issue in this study because of the lack of significant regressions. The mistake of using multiple simple linear regressions was made in this study due to the author's lack of knowledge in statistical methods.

Conclusion

The present study aimed to examine the perceptions of lying behaviours of ROTP N/OCdts at RMC. The results indicate that ROTP N/OCdts have a higher self-reported tendency to engage in altruistic lying than selfish and social-acceptance lying. Furthermore, ROTP N/OCdts viewed the actor's behaviour to be significantly more correct in the altruistic lying scenarios than selfish lying scenarios. Surprisingly, responses in the LTS could not predict responses in the scenario questions. The results of this study illuminate some potential problems for RMC's peer-leadership model, especially insofar as N/OCdts are expected to hold each other accountable as a fundamental requirement of that model.

References

Arbour, L. (2022). *Report of the independent external comprehensive review of the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces*. Department of National Defence. https://www.canada.ca/en/department-national-defence/corporate/reports-publications/independent-external-comprehensive-review.html

Bandura, A. (2011). Moral disengagement. In D. J. Christie (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of peace psychology* (pp. 660–664). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470672532.wbepp165

Batson, C. D. (2010). Empathy-induced altruistic motivation. In M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Prosocial motives, emotions, and behavior: The better angels of our nature* (pp. 15–34). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/12061-001

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*(3), 497–529. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497

Carroll, M. F. (2003). Malingering in the military. *Psychiatric Annals*, *33*(11), 732–736. https://proxy.queensu.ca/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/malingering-military/docview/217053307/se-2

Department of National Defence. (2022). *Canadian Armed Forces ethos: Trusted to serve*. Canadian Defence Academy Press. https://www.canada.ca/en/department-national-defence/corporate/reports-publications/canadian-armed-forces-ethos-trusted-to-serve.html

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), 979–995. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.5.979

Erat, S., & Gneezy, U. (2012). White lies. *Management Science*, *58*(4), 723–733. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1110.1449

Evans, A. D., & Lee, K. (2011). Verbal deception from late childhood to middle adolescence and its relation to executive functioning skills. *Developmental Psychology*, *47*(4), 1108–1116. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023425

Evans, A. D., & Lee, K. (2013). Emergence of lying in very young children. *Developmental Psychology*, *49*(10), 1958–1963. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031409

Gerlach, P., Teodorescu, K., & Hertwig, R. (2019). The truth about lies: A meta-analysis on dishonest behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, *145*(1), 1–44. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000174

Grover, S. L., & Hui, C. (2005). How job pressures and extrinsic rewards affect lying behavior. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *16*(3), 287–300. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022933

Lavoie, J., Yachison, S., Crossman, A., & Talwar, V. (2017). Polite, instrumental, and dual liars: Relation to children's developing social skills and cognitive ability. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *41*(2), 257–264. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025415626518

Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin*, *107*(1), 34–47. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.1.34

Liu, J., Shen, Q., Zhang, J., Beyens, U., Cai, W., Decety, J., & Li, H. (2021). The difference spotting task: A new nonverbal measure of cheating behavior. *Behavior Research Methods*, *53*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-020-01526-w

Maddison, G. R., Neasmith, D. G., Tattersall, V. C., Bouchard, A. M. C., Dow, M. J., Gauthier, A. J., Halpin, C. A., & Thibault, C. J. (2017). *Special staff assistance visit: Report on the climate, training environment, culture and Regular Officer Training Plan (ROTP) programme at the Royal Military College of Canada-Kingston*. Department of National Defence. https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/dnd-mdn/documents/reports/20170329-rmc-ssav-report-final.pdf

Mares, A. C., & Turvey, B. E. (2018). Chapter 2 - the psychology of lying. In B. E. Turvey, J. O. Savino, & A. Coronado Mares (Eds.), *False allegations* (pp. 21–36). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-801250-5.00002-1

McArthur, J., Jarvis, R., Bourgeois, C., & Ternes, M. (2022). Lying motivations: Exploring personality correlates of lying and motivations to lie. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, *54*(4), 335–340. https://doi.org/10.1037/cbs0000328

McLeod, B. A., & Genereux, R. L. (2008). Predicting the acceptability and likelihood of lying: The interaction of personality with type of lie. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *45*(7), 591–596. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.06.015

Pfattheicher, S., Nielsen, Y. A., & Thielmann, I. (2022). Prosocial behavior and altruism: A review of concepts and definitions. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *44*, 124–129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.08.021

Royal Military College of Canada. (2024). *Cadet Wing Instructions (CADWINS)*.

Saxe, L. (1991). Lying: Thoughts of an applied social psychologist. *American Psychologist*, *46*(4), 409–415. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.46.4.409

Steinel, W., Utz, S., & Koning, L. (2010). The good, the bad and the ugly thing to do when sharing information: Revealing, concealing and lying depend on social motivation, distribution and importance of information. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *113*(2), 85–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.07.001

Xu, F., Luo, Y. C., Fu, G., & Lee, K. (2009). Children's and adults' conceptualization and evaluation of lying and truth-telling. *Infant and Child Development*, *18*(4), 307–322. https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.631

Zhou, W., Guo, X., Li, X., Zhong, S., & Yin, L. (2024). The LYin lying tendency scale: Capturing individual differences in selfish, altruistic, and social-acceptance lying tendencies. *Current Psychology*, *43*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-06087-1

Appendix A

3/5/25, 9:56 PM Mail - s30092@rmc-cmr.ca

Thesis Survey - Behaviour and Attitudes at RMC

OCdt Evan Liu
Tue 11/26/2024 3:57 PM

To: Cadet Wing Master <cadet.wing.master@rmc-cmr.ca>;

Cc: Sarah Hill <Sarah.Hill@rmc.ca>;

Good day,

You are invited to participate in a psychology study that aims to gain insight into behaviours and attitudes specifically at RMC. If you volunteer to participate, you will fill out a quick questionnaire that should take around 15 minutes to complete. You will be asked about your tendency to engage in certain behaviours and your attitudes towards the behaviours. The results will be completely anonymous. Please note that the survey is intended to be completed by ROTP N/OCdts only and it will only be available in English.

I, OCdt Evan Liu, am conducting this study for my undergraduate thesis under the supervision of Dr. Sarah Hill of the Department of Military Psychology and Leadership. Although I hold a barslate position, participation in my survey will have no impact on your standing at the college because any results will be anonymous. If you are interested in the results of this study after it has been completed, you may attend the thesis presentation near the end of the winter semester. You will receive an email during the winter semester outlining when this presentation will be. If you have questions about the study, please send an email to me (evan.liu@rmc-cmr.ca) or Dr. Hill (sarah.hill@rmc.ca). Please direct questions or concerns about the ethics of this study to the Research Ethics Board student research chair, Dr. Jordan Sutcliffe (jordan.sutcliffe@rmc.ca). Questions can also be directed to the Research Ethics Board student research co-chair Dr. Meaghan Wilkin (meaghan.wilkin@rmc.ca) and the Research Ethics Board chair Dr. Nicole Bérubé (reb-cer@rmc.cmr.ca).

I would like to remind you that participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you are welcome to withdraw at any point in the survey. If you would like to participate in the study, fill out the questionnaire using the following link no later than 19 January, 2025:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/CHBXN6V

\\\
\\

Vous êtes invité à participer à une étude psychologique qui vise à mieux comprendre les comportements et les attitudes propres au CMR. Si vous vous portez volontaire pour participer, vous remplirez un questionnaire rapide qui ne devrait pas prendre plus de 15 minutes. Vous serez interrogé sur votre tendance à adopter certains comportements et sur vos attitudes à l'égard de ces comportements. Les résultats seront complètement anonymes. Veuillez noter que le sondage est destiné à être rempli par les Aspm/Élofs de PFOR seulement et qu'il ne sera disponible qu'en anglais.

Je, l'Élof Evan Liu, mène cette étude dans le cadre de ma thèse de premier cycle sous la supervision du Dr Sarah Hill du Département de psychologie militaire et de leadership. Bien que j'occupe un poste à barrette, la participation à mon sondage n'aura pas d'incidence sur votre statut au sein du collège, car les résultats seront anonymes. Si vous êtes intéressé par les résultats de cette étude une fois qu'elle est terminée, vous pouvez assister à la présentation de la thèse vers la fin du semestre d'hiver. Vous recevrez un courriel au cours du

https://email.rmc.ca/owa/?authToken=eyJ0eXAiOiJKV1QiLCJhbGciOiJSUzI1NiIsIng1dCI6ImtQM1BYckM0M1N0UHhsRV9xYU9WWjhsQUk3cylsImtp... 1/2

semestre d'hiver vous indiquant la date de cette présentation. Si vous avez des questions sur l'étude, veuillez m'envoyer un courriel (evan.liu@rmc-cmr.ca) ou au Dr Hill (sarah.hill@rmc.ca). Veuillez adresser vos questions ou préoccupations concernant l'éthique de cette étude au président du comité d'éthique de la recherche pour les étudiants, le Dr Jordan Sutcliffe (jordan.sutcliffe@rmc.ca). Les questions peuvent également être adressées au Dr Meaghan Wilkin (meaghan.wilkin@rmc.ca), co-responsable de la recherche des étudiants, et au Dr Nicole Bérubé, présidente du comité d'éthique de la recherche (reb-cer@rmc.cmr.ca).

Je tiens à vous rappeler que la participation à cette étude est entièrement volontaire et que vous pouvez vous retirer à tout moment de l'enquête. Si vous souhaitez participer à l'étude, remplissez le questionnaire en utilisant le lien suivant au plus tard le 19 janvier, 2025 :
https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/CHBXN6V

Thank you in advance for your participation,

OCdt (IV) / Élof (IV) Evan Liu

D/CFL Warrior, 9 squadron / Royal Military College of Canada
Canadian Armed Forces
evan.liu@rmc-cmr.ca / Tel: 438-827-6780

A/ELE Warrior, escadron 9 / Collège militaire royal du Canada
Forces armées canadiennes
evan.liu@rmc-cmr.ca / Tél: 438-827-6780

Thesis Survey - Reminder

OCdt Evan Liu

Tue 1/7/2025 8:18 PM

To:Cadet Wing Master <cadet.wing.master@rmc-cmr.ca>;

Cc:Sarah Hill <Sarah.Hill@rmc.ca>;

Bonjour,

Merci à ceux d'entre vous qui ont répondu à mon questionnaire jusqu'à présent, votre participation est très appréciée ! Si vous n'avez pas encore répondu à mon questionnaire, j'espère que vous y penserez.

Si vous souhaitez participer, remplissez le questionnaire en utilisant le lien suivant au plus tard le 19 janvier, 2025 :

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/CHBXN6V

\\
\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\

Good day,

Thank you to those of you who have completed my survey so far, your participation is greatly appreciated! If you haven't completed my survey yet, I hope you consider it.

If you would like to participate, fill out the questionnaire using the following link no later than 19 January 2025:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/CHBXN6V

Thank you,

OCdt (IV) / Élof (IV) Evan Liu

CSTO Warrior, 9 squadron / Royal Military College of Canada
Canadian Armed Forces
evan.liu@rmc-cmr.ca / Tel: 438-827-6780

INSTRO Warrior, escadron 9 / Collège militaire royal du Canada
Forces armées canadiennes
evan.liu@rmc-cmr.ca / Tél: 438-827-6780

Même si le tigre quitte la jungle, la jungle demeure ancrée en lui

Appendix B

RMC Behaviour and Attitudes Survey

Consent Form

In this questionnaire, you will be asked questions about your tendency to engage in certain behaviours and your attitudes towards behaviours in different scenarios. The questionnaire should take around 15 minutes to complete, and will only be available in English.

OCdt Evan Liu is conducting this study under the supervision of Dr. Sarah Hill of the Military Psychology and Leadership department of the Royal Military College of Canada (RMC).

You are free to complete as many questions as you would like, and you may withdraw from participation at any point by exiting the survey. If you exit the survey, your data will not be used in analyses. You will not be penalized for refusing to participate or withdrawing.

This study is completely anonymous, and strict guidelines will be adhered to to ensure your privacy. All data will be stored on a password protected file, and only group data will be reported. All raw data will be destroyed within five years from when the study is published. The study's data will only be accessible to the researcher and his advisor.

There are no known risks involved in participating in this study. This study intends to benefit the field of Psychology, RMC, and the Canadian Armed Forces. This study has been approved by the RMC Research Ethics Board (REB_Liu_16112024). Any questions about ethics or participant rights are to be directed to the Research Ethics Board student research chair, Dr. Jordan Sutcliffe (jordan.sutcliffe@rmc.ca), the Research Ethics Board student research co-chair, Dr. Meaghan Wilkin (meaghan.wilkin@rmc.ca), or the Research Ethics Board Chair Dr. Nicole Bérubé (reb-cer@rmc-cmr.ca). Questions regarding the study are to be directed to OCdt Liu (evan.liu@rmc-cmr.ca) or Dr. Hill (sarah.hill@rmc.ca).

If you continue to the questionnaire, it is assumed that you consent to participate in this study. You are reminded that you are free to answer as many questions as you would like, and you may withdraw at any point.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Demographic Questions

Are you a student enrolled in the Regular Officer Training Plan (ROTP) at RMC? (Please note that this survey is intended for ROTP students only)[4]

Yes	No

Which academic year are you in?

1st	2nd	3rd	4th	4th+	I wish not to specify

What is your age in years?

(Enter age in years)	I wish not to specify

What gender do you identify as?

Male	Female	Other (please specify)	I wish not to specify

What faculty are you in?

Arts	Sciences	Engineering	I wish not to specify

Are you an athlete in varsity sports or a competitive club?

Yes	No	I wish not to specify

[4] If the participant answers no to question above, they are taken straight to the debrief.

LYin Lying Tendency Scale

I will provoke others with lies to make myself feel better (selfish)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

I will achieve my goals with lies which cause losses to others (selfish)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

To ease my burden, I will lie to shift the responsibility to others (selfish)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

I will make excuses for my mistakes so that others get punished instead of me (selfish)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

To feel superior, I will tell lies to hurt others (selfish)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

I will lie to protect others' interests at the price of sacrificing mine (altruistic)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

I will lie and pay the price in order to help those in need (altruistic)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

I will pretend to be fine in order to assure others, although doing so makes my situation worse (altruistic)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

I will hide the truth and suffer alone to make others feel better (altruistic)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

To make others feel less guilty, I will lie to comfort others and bear the negative consequences myself (altruistic)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

To blend in with other people, I will lie about being interested in the topic they are discussing (social-acceptance)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

To get along with peers, I will speak against my conscience (social-acceptance)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

I will lie about conforming with other people's opinion in order to be accepted (social-acceptance)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

I will lie about enjoying activities held by peers in order to be accepted (social-acceptance)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

I will lie about agreeing with peers' decisions in order to be accepted (social-acceptance)

1 Not at all true about me	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very true about me

Scenario Questions

The following questions will use hypothetical scenarios that were generated based on rules that are imposed on N/OCdts. Please note that the scenarios are not linked to any specific past events.

Imagine you are the actor in the following scenarios. Note that in some of the scenarios, you run the risk of being punished if you are caught lying. Selfish lies are employed to benefit the deceiver out of self-serving motives (Erat & Gneezy, 2012). Altruistic lies are used to benefit the deceived out of concern for others (Erat & Gneezy, 2012). Social acceptance lies are committed to be accepted by others or to fit into a group (Zhou et al., 2024).

David and his closest friends decide to go for a swim at the pier after dark even though an email came from the training wing saying it is prohibited. His friends have all gotten out of the water and left, but David decides to swim for a little longer. The training wing duty officer catches David swimming and asks if anyone else was present. He tries to convince the TWDO that no friends were with him, but the TWDO quickly catches his lie after noticing a wet trail on the pier. David decides to give the TWDO the name of one of his friends and insists that they were the only two, when in reality, they were a group of five.

How much do you agree with this statement: David took the correct action.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What motivated David?

Selfishness	Altruism	Social Acceptance

How much do you agree with this statement: The action was consistent with college expectations.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What is the likelihood that you would have done the same as David?

1 (Very Unlikely)	2 (Unlikely)	3 (Neither likely nor unlikely)	4 (Likely)	5 (Very Likely)

Emily is the class senior of a Psychology class and she notices that two classmates are absent without an excuse. Even though class seniors are expected to report attendance honestly, Emily decides not to mark them as absent to protect them from potential sanctions.

How much do you agree with this statement: Emily took the correct action.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What motivated Emily?

Selfishness	Altruism	Social Acceptance

How much do you agree with this statement: The action was consistent with college expectations.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What is the likelihood that you would have done the same as Emily?

1 (Very Unlikely)	2 (Unlikely)	3 (Neither likely nor unlikely)	4 (Likely)	5 (Very Likely)

Bailey is at Wednesday morning PD with their squadron commander who notices that one member of the flight is missing. The squadron commander asks Bailey if they knows the whereabouts of the flightmate. Bailey explains that the flightmate is at the MIR, not knowing if it is true or not.

How much do you agree with this statement: Bailey took the correct action.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What motivated Bailey?

Selfishness	Altruism	Social Acceptance

How much do you agree with this statement: The action was consistent with college expectations.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What is the likelihood that you would have done the same as Bailey?

1 (Very Unlikely)	2 (Unlikely)	3 (Neither likely nor unlikely)	4 (Likely)	5 (Very Likely)

Alex's CSIC asks them if they have their 404s (military driver's licence) because a driver is needed for a tasking. Even though they have their 404s, they decide to lie to avoid being tasked.

How much do you agree with this statement: Alex took the correct action.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What motivated Alex?

Selfishness	Altruism	Social Acceptance

How much do you agree with this statement: The action was consistent with college expectations.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What is the likelihood that you would have done the same as Alex?

1 (Very Unlikely)	2 (Unlikely)	3 (Neither likely nor unlikely)	4 (Likely)	5 (Very Likely)

Jess is currently in FYOP and her flight has been performing very poorly. The FYOP staff hint at potentially making the flight do "day zero" again tomorrow, doing change parades, and

practicing lots of drill to correct deficiencies. Even though Jess is not injured, she decides to go to the MIR to get a chit to avoid those activities.

How much do you agree with this statement: Jess took the correct action.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What motivated Jess?

Selfishness	Altruism	Social Acceptance

How much do you agree with this statement: The action was consistent with college expectations.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What is the likelihood that you would have done the same as Jess?

1 (Very Unlikely)	2 (Unlikely)	3 (Neither likely nor unlikely)	4 (Likely)	5 (Very Likely)

Chris is starting to get overwhelmed with schoolwork and is not sleeping as much as he usually does. Even though he isn't sick, he decides to take a sick day to focus on completing assignments.

How much do you agree with this statement: Chris took the correct action.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What motivated Chris?

Selfishness	Altruism	Social Acceptance

How much do you agree with this statement: The action was consistent with college expectations.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What is the likelihood that you would have done the same as Chris?

1 (Very Unlikely)	2 (Unlikely)	3 (Neither likely nor unlikely)	4 (Likely)	5 (Very Likely)

Ari is at the mess with their friends on a Friday night. One friend at the table suggests that everyone should go to the bar and get a drink. Even though Ari is not a huge fan of drinking, they decide to get one anyway because they don't want to be the one person left behind at the table.

How much do you agree with this statement: Ari took the correct action.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What motivated Ari?

Selfishness	Altruism	Social Acceptance

How much do you agree with this statement: The action was consistent with college expectations.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What is the likelihood that you would have done the same as Ari?

1 (Very Unlikely)	2 (Unlikely)	3 (Neither likely nor unlikely)	4 (Likely)	5 (Very Likely)

Jane recently got all of her midterm marks back and found out that she failed three out of five of her exams. One of her friends asks her: "How did midterms go? I aced mine!" Jane replies: "I did just fine".

How much do you agree with this statement: Jane took the correct action.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What motivated Jane?

Selfishness	Altruism	Social Acceptance

How much do you agree with this statement: The action was consistent with college expectations.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What is the likelihood that you would have done the same as Jane?

1 (Very Unlikely)	2 (Unlikely)	3 (Neither likely nor unlikely)	4 (Likely)	5 (Very Likely)

Ben is a varsity athlete and has been part of the team for about one month. One night, he decides to go out with a few team members he has only known since being on the team. At a restaurant, one of the team members makes a joke that is directed at Ben. Even though Ben finds the joke extremely offensive, he laughs at it because he doesn't want his teammates to think less of him.

How much do you agree with this statement: Ben took the correct action.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What motivated Ben?

Selfishness	Altruism	Social Acceptance

How much do you agree with this statement: The action was consistent with college expectations.

1 (Disagree)	2 (Slightly disagree)	3 (Neither agree nor disagree)	4 (Slightly agree)	5 (Agree)

What is the likelihood that you would have done the same as Ben?

1 (Very Unlikely)	2 (Unlikely)	3 (Neither likely nor unlikely)	4 (Likely)	5 (Very Likely)

Qualitative Questions

If you would like to, please answer the following qualitative questions. If you choose not to answer them, your responses in the previous sections will still be used.

1) In what scenarios do you feel encouraged to lie? This can be in the context of your life at or outside of RMC.

2) What aspects of RMC motivate you to be truthful?

Appendix C

Debrief

Thank you again for your participation in this survey.

This survey is intended to gather data to help better understand lying tendencies and perceptions of lying among Naval/Officer Cadets in the Regular Officer Training Plan. Specifically, the study aims to examine if Naval/Officer Cadets tend to engage in a specific type of lying more, and if Naval/Officer Cadets perceive lying behaviours to be justified in certain circumstances.

If you are interested in the results of this study after it has been completed, you may attend the thesis presentation near the end of the winter semester. You will receive a wing-wide email outlining when these presentations will be. If you would like additional information, you may contact OCdt Liu (evan.liu@rmc-cmr.ca) or Dr. Hill (sarah.hill@rmc.ca).

Some references are listed below if you are interested in learning more about the topic. Bandura's (2011) Theory of Moral Disengagement provides an explanation as to why people may engage in dishonest behaviour. Gerlach et al.'s (2019) article is a meta-analysis on dishonest behaviour, and Zhou et al. (2024) created a scale which was used in this questionnaire.

References:

Bandura, A. (2011). Moral disengagement. The encyclopedia of peace psychology.

Gerlach, P., Teodorescu, K., & Hertwig, R. (2019). The truth about lies: A meta-analysis on dishonest behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 145(1), 1–44.

Zhou, W., Guo, X., Li, X., Zhong, S., & Yin, L. (2024). The LYin lying tendency scale: Capturing individual differences in selfish, altruistic, and social-acceptance lying tendencies. Current Psychology, 1–21.

Please refrain from discussing the questions in this survey until the survey has closed. If

you submit your results, it is assumed that you have consented to participate in this study. If this survey has made you feel uneasy, and you need to talk to someone, a list of useful contacts can be found below.

Thank you for your participation,

OCdt Evan Liu

Useful Resources: Kingston RMC list and alternative contacts

RMC Duty Staff :

- RMC Duty Officer: 613-483-3024, 613-453-5007 or 613-541-6000 x 6547
- Padre on duty: 613-541-6000 x 6284 or 6204 or 613-541-5330 (specify if at RMC)

Chaplain at RMC :

Capt. Joshua Falk

Tel: 613-541-6000 x 6018

Cell: 613-217-2301

Email: Joshua.Falk@forces.gc.ca

Campus Security Control Centre (CCS) (24/7)

Tel: 613-541-6000 x 666

On Call Station: 613-541-6000 x 6209

33 Health Services Centre – detatchment RMC

(Monday to Friday, 7:30 am to 4:00 pm)

Tel: 613-541-5010, p. 6310 prior to arrival

Ambulance (24/7): 613-544-5555

Emergency (24/7): 911

CFB Kingston Mental Health Services

Tel: 613-541-5010 x 5776

Member Assistance Program (MAP) -(24/7)

(Confidential short-term professional counselling service)

Tel: 1-800-268-7708

Appendix D

Research Ethics Board Certificate

Truth, Duty, Valour • Vérité, Devoir, Vaillance

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE OF CANADA • COLLÈGE MILITAIRE ROYAL DU CANADA

PO Box 17000, Station Forces • CP 17000, Succursale Forces • Kingston, Ontario • K7K 7B4

Certification of Institutional Research Ethics Review (Undergraduate Student Research)
File Number: REB_Liu_16112024
Project Title: Dishonesty at the Royal Military College of Canada
Principal Investigator(s): OCdt Evan Liu
Supervisor: Dr. Sarah Hill
Date of Submission: 05 11 2024
Anticipated completion date: 15 04 2025
Date of approval: 16 11 2024
Period of approval: 12 months – expiry date: 16 11 2025

Dear OCdt Liu,

This is to inform you that RMC Undergraduate sub-committee of the Research Ethics Board (RMC UREB) has reviewed the above-mentioned project for ethical compliance, and it can now proceed. The approval is based only on the documents submitted and only on the language(s) presented.

REB approval is effective for up to 12 months (per TCPS-2) after which the research requires additional review and approval for a subsequent period of up to 12 months. Prior to the expiry of the present approval, you are responsible for submitting an annual report to further renew REB approval.

Any intentional changes to the protocol, prior to the start of data collection must be submitted to and approved by the RMC UREB before beginning data collection.
Researchers should not proceed with a project if unforeseen changes to the protocol threaten participants' right to informed consent or place participants at a higher level of risk than anticipated. Such unforeseen changes to the protocol during the conduct of the research must be communicated to the RMC UREB within four working days, as well as the actions taken to protect the dignity of participants.

Any undesirable experience or response (adverse event) from participants during their involvement in the study must also be reported to the RMC UREB within four working days, as well as actions taken by the research team to protect the participants. Such adverse event may be emotional, psychological, physiological, or physical in nature.

For the duration of the research project involving humans, you are expected to comply with the oversight requirements of the RMC REB, including documenting changes, reporting incidents or adverse events and annual/final reporting responsibilities.

If the principal investigator or supervisor for this study changes, you must immediately advise the RMC UREB. The conditions indicated above are subject to conditions stated in DAOD 5062-0

and DAOD 5062-1. All researchers are obliged to comply with those directives, including cooperating fully with all applicable research ethics boards.

Sincerely,

Meaghan M. Wilkin, PhD
Undergraduate Research Ethics Co-Chair
Military Leadership and Psychology Department
Meaghan.wilkin@rmc.ca