

Honesty, Intelligence, and Race

Abstract

Research shows that honesty correlates positively with intelligence. Similarly, there are race differences in honesty, with Europeans being more honest than various other ethnic groups. It is currently unknown to which degree race differences in intelligence can explain the differences in honesty. We investigated this question using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Youth 1997 (NLSY97), a large American longitudinal dataset. We replicate prior findings that honesty correlated with measures of intelligence ($r = .37$, 95% CI $\{.33, .42\}$) and that Blacks ($d = -0.4$, 95% CI $\{-.49, -.32\}$) and Hispanics ($d = -0.34$, 95% CI $\{-.24, -.43\}$) are less honest than Whites, and this holds whether honesty is measured by self-report or by parent-reports. In addition, race differences in honesty remained between Blacks and Whites but not between Whites and Hispanics after controlling for intelligence.

Cross-national comparisons were made using national IQ data and Hofstede's cultural dimensions. Regression analysis suggests that individualism ($\beta = .48$, $p < .01$), national IQs ($\beta = .34$, $p = .013$), and masculinity ($\beta = -.31$, $p = .011$) predict differences in honesty between countries. Parking violations were predicted by both national IQs ($\beta = -.45$, $p < .001$) and cultural indulgence ($\beta = -.34$, $p < .001$). Implications and theories concerning these findings are discussed.

Introduction

Some of the earliest research on intelligence and honesty was done by T. H. Howells (1938), who studied the relationship between intelligence and cheating in two different types of exams: exams where cheating was assessed using wax paper and exams where cheating was assessed using chemical impression. Chemical impression was much harder for the students to detect than the wax paper method. Accordingly, cheating was more negatively correlated with intelligence when cheating was assessed with the wax paper method than with the chemical impression method. In fact, the correlation with intelligence was not significant ($r = -.08$, $n = 74$) when the test was made much harder and the chemical impression method was used. However, given the sample size is small, the power to detect this correlation is small. Other early research suggests that children with higher IQs cheat less on academic tests (Tuttle, 1931), though that could be simply because smarter children don't need to cheat to do well on tests.

Experimental evidence from soldiers and civilians in Israel also suggests that increased intelligence is associated with more honesty ($p < .01$) (Ruffle & Tobol, 2016). This study instructed Israeli soldiers and civilians to roll a die in private, and were told that each point on the die would lead to an increase of 30 minutes of early release on Thursday. More intelligent people reported a lower average roll than unintelligent people. However, differences in intelligence past the above-average level were not associated with increased honesty in civilians or soldiers, though this could potentially be a power failure ($n = 427$). A similar relationship has been found for some other measures, for instance, the relationship intelligence has with measures of personal failure (e.g. being on welfare

or being unemployed) decreases in strength as intelligence increases (Hegelund et al., 2018).

There are several potential reasons why there is a relationship between honesty and intelligence, even when controlling for various variables. The first is that intelligent people have a lower time preference, which causes them to be more honest. Another theory is that intelligence allows people to morally reason more effectively, which causes them to be more honest. Alternatively, intelligent people have an easier time succeeding, which decreases their need to lie. Lastly, intelligent people are less predisposed to psychopathy, which may cause them to lie less. The plausibility of these theories and the evidence supporting them are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The basis of the first theory regarding time preference is that the rewards of honesty are delayed, while the rewards for lying are not. For example, the benefits of lying to a police officer could be an increase in short-term reputation and lower stress levels. The drawback would be that it could be viewed as uncooperative behaviour in a criminal trial or increase the length of a sentence. A meta-analysis indicates that intelligence and higher time preference are correlated ($r = -.23$) (Shamosh & Gray, 2008).

Another potential reason intelligence is correlated with honesty is that intelligence enables individuals to use moral reasoning. Even within a highly selected gifted sample with a mean IQ of 126.5, IQ and moral reasoning assessed with the Defining Issues Test correlated at .14 ($p < .05$) (Karnes & Brown, 1980). Within that study, moral reasoning correlated somewhat higher with verbal IQ ($r = .25$) than performance IQ ($r = -.06$), and this difference passed statistical significance ($n = 208$, $p < .01$). Similar studies evaluating the relationship between intelligence and moral reasoning also corroborate these findings (Hanks, 1985);(Eisenberg-Berg, 1979).

There is a vast amount of literature suggesting intelligence is linked to various measurements of success (Strenze, 2015). Analysis that control for socioeconomic status or use sibling controls suggest that this effect is causal (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994; Murray, 2002; Hegelund et al., 2019; Marks, 2022). Our own analysis suggests that GPA relates to honesty independent of IQ. It is unclear whether this is an effect honesty has on GPA, an effect GPA has on honesty, or confounding with prosocial personality traits, so it is difficult to infer if success has an effect on honesty.

Lastly, intelligence may correlate with honesty because intelligence negatively covaries with the p-factor (Kirkegaard & Nyborg, 2021), the general predisposition to psychopathological behaviour. This theory is evidenced by the fact that psychopathic factors such as Machiavellianism ($r = -.40$) and psychopathy ($r = -.45$) negatively correlate with the personality factor known as honesty-humility (Ashton et al., 2000). Because of this, intelligence and honesty should be negatively correlated independent of other variables. In addition, these correlations between intelligence and personality traits appear to be almost completely genetic (Bartels et al., 2012), indicating that the true relationship between intelligence and personality is pleiotropic or causal.

Besides the research on intelligence and honesty, there is also evidence that there are racial differences in honesty. One study distributed 17,303 wallets in 40 different countries to various institutions that were asked to return the wallets to the hypothetical owners (Cohn et al., 2019). There were large differences in honesty between countries, which are displayed in Figure 1.

Another experiment involved an incident where diplomatic immunity prevented UN diplomats from parking violations until 2002. There were clear national differences in the number of parking violations that diplomats from each nation accrued, with the most honest nations having under 1 violation per diplomat while the least honest nations had over 100 violations per diplomat (Fisman & Miguel, 2007). In general, countries with people of northern European ancestry had fewer parking violations than other countries.

In addition, various studies of scientific misconduct by country suggest that, compared to European countries, East Asian and Arab countries engage in much more scientific misconduct than European countries (Carlisle, 2020; Ataie-Ashtiani, 2017; Fanelli et al., 2019). There are national differences in corruption, where countries with people of Northwestern European descent tend to be less corrupt than others (2021 Corruption Perceptions Index, 2022). Lastly, there is evidence that within the USA, Blacks are more likely to lie about drug use than Whites (Fendrich, 2005), (Hughes, Heller & Marsden, n.d).


It is worth mentioning that there are differences in honesty between genetically similar nations, for instance, China is less honest than Korea and Japan. In most sources of data on scientific misconduct (Carlisle, 2020; Ataie-Ashtiani, 2017; Fanelli et al., 2019) China is the worst-performing of the 3 major East Asian nations. When comparing different foreign diplomats in NYC, Chinese diplomats had more parking violations per diplomat (9.6) than Japan (0) and South Korea (0.4) (Fisman & Miguel, 2007). Lastly, China performed worse than Japan and South Korea on measures of international corruption (2021 Corruption Perceptions Index, 2022).

There are various reasons why some races may be less honest than others. If some races are more intelligent than others, and intelligence is associated with honesty, then some races should be more honest than others. It has also been speculated that the unique psychological profile of Europeans can be traced back to social norms such as the prohibition of incest and polygamy in the middle ages (Henrich, 2020). This psychological profile involves emphasizing the importance of individuals over kin and engaging in more honest behaviour.

Some scholars have criticized this theory, pointing out that monogamy was prominent in Europe among early Christians and Roman Stoics (Duchesne, 2022) as well as among ancient Spartans, Romans, and Athenians (MacDonald, 2021), making the notion that Christian norms were the cause of monogamy tenuous. Lastly, Henrich does not consider that the social structures that are present in society can act as a selection pressure (Hanania, 2022). For example, it is possible that societies that prevent incest and monogamy also select for individuals who are willing to interact positively with humans outside their kin group.

It is important to have an operational definition of honesty, as the term can be easily confused with other concepts such as criminality and integrity. Dictionaries seem to agree that honesty relates to a consistency between held and expressed beliefs and a general fair conduct. For instance, The Britannica Dictionary (n.d.) defines honesty as “the quality of being fair and truthful : the quality of being honest” and The Cambridge Dictionary (n.d.) defines it as “telling the truth or able to be trusted and not likely steal, cheat, or lie”. Honesty does not encompass criminality, as a criminal who admits to his crimes is honest. However, in practice criminality and cheating tend to result in lying to prevent their actions from being uncovered.

Figure 1. Civic Honesty by Country (reproduced from Cohn et al., 2019)



Comparison between countries

Data

National IQ data was taken from David Becker (2019), and the combined results from scholastic achievement studies, geometric means, and sample-size weighted means were taken. National IQs are highly predictive of outcomes between countries (Lynn & Becker, 2019), and are a substantial cause of economic growth between countries (Francis & Kirkegaard, 2022).

Hofstede's cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 2016) were used to explore whether psychological differences between nations were predictors of honesty independent of intelligence. These dimensions are named Power Distance, Individualism, Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance, Long Term Orientation, and Indulgence. Individualism in particular was highlighted as a potential contributor, as humans in more individualistic cultures are relatively more reliant on their individual reputation than that of their clan or family ties. These measures come from an old dataset of IBM employees who may not be representative of the countries involved, though the results from these surveys seem to correspond somewhat well to surveys from other sources ($r = .6-.8$) (Hofstede, 2001). In addition, the individualism index has been found to correlate with other surveys, such as Schwartz conservatism ($r = -.55$) and the individual-social dimension of Smith ($r = .7$).

Honesty measures were taken from the study (Cohn et al., 2019) that distributed wallets around multiple cities and reported the rates at which they were returned. Measures from the wallets with money and the wallets without were averaged.

Parking violation measures were taken from the study that compiled the parking violations that occurred per diplomat in each country (Fisman & Miguel, 2007). These violations occurred while diplomatic immunity protected diplomats from parking violations.

All measures were standardized at a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1.

Results

Correlational analysis displayed in Tables 1 and 2 suggested that national IQs ($r = .648$, $p < .001$), power distance index ($r = .603$, $p < .001$), and individualism ($r = .69$, $p < .001$) were correlated with honesty and that national IQs ($r = -.379$, $p < .001$) and indulgence ($r = -.349$, $p < .01$) were associated with less parking violations per diplomat.

Table 1. Correlation between national variables and honesty. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$

Variable	Correlation	N
National IQ	0.648***	35
Power Distance Index	-0.603***	33
Individualism	0.69***	33
Masculinity	-0.324	33
Uncertainty Avoidance	-0.118	33
Long-term Orientation	0.261	33
Indulgence	0.171	34

Table 2. Correlation between national variables and parking violations per diplomat.* = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$

Variable	Correlation	N
National IQ	-0.279***	140
Power Distance Index	0.188	58
Individualism	-0.246	58
Masculinity	-0.0254	58
Uncertainty Avoidance	0.0671	58
Long-term Orientation	-0.167	74
Indulgence	-.349**	74

Regression was used to determine whether cultural value indexes continued to have predictive validity independent of IQ. This analysis shown in Tables 3 and 4 suggests that individualism strongly predicted honesty ($\beta = .485$, $p < .01$). National honesty measurements were also predicted by national IQs ($\beta = .342$, $p = .013$) and masculinity ($\beta = -.307$, $p = .011$) as well. Parking violations per diplomat were predicted by national IQs ($\beta = -.452$, $p < .001$) and by national indulgence ($\beta = -.345$, $p < .001$).

Table 3. Regression models predicting national differences in honesty. Parameter estimates are standardized, t-values in parenthesis. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$.

Parameter	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
National IQ	0.458**	.378*	.622***	.642***	.691***	.64***	.342*
Power Distance Index	-.39**						-.0393
Individualism		.487**					.485**
Masculinity			-.286*				-.307*
Uncertainty Avoidance				.014			
Long-term Orientation					-.0861		
Indulgence						.131	
Adjusted R2	0.497	0.549	0.456	0.37	0.389	0.401	0.63
N	33	33	33	33	33	34	33

Table 4. Regression models predicting differences in parking violations per diplomat. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$.

Parameter	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
National IQ	-0.234	-0.192	-.272*	-.266*	-.555***	-.452***	-.325*	-.364*
Power Distance Index	.0756							
Individualism		-.131					-.106	
Masculinity			-.0354					
Uncertainty Avoidance				.0255				
Long-term Orientation					.188			-.104
Indulgence						-.345***	-.413**	-.397**
Adjusted R2	0.0438	0.0507	0.0405	0.0399	0.187	0.401	0.292	0.284
N	58	58	58	58	74	74	52	72

Comparison between individuals

Data

We used data from the National Longitudinal Study of Youth 1997 (NLSY97). This is a large American longitudinal study of 8,984 subjects that have been followed since ages 13-17, at semi-regular intervals. There are 19 waves of data. The dataset is broadly representative of Americans of these ages (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1997). The dataset is publicly available, and the subset used is also available in the study's supplementary materials, along with the analysis code. <https://osf.io/vw4sa/>, <https://rpubs.com/sebjenseb/979249>. The practical sample size was 2487 individuals as there were several missing values for honesty and intelligence measures.

For intelligence, the 1st principal component was extracted from the 12 ASVAB subtests that were administered by the NLSY. All subtests were corrected for their relationship with age at testing. This exam mostly tests mathematical ability, verbal ability, and knowledge, meaning that it is mostly a test of crystallized intelligence; the exceptions to this are a coding speed test and an assembling objects test. Crystallized intelligence has a g-loading that ranges from about 0.82-0.95 (Johnson et al., 2004; Weiss et al., 2010; Fenollar-Cortés & Watkins, 2018) depending on the test, so it is a good measurement of general intelligence.

General intelligence is responsible for the vast majority of the predictive validity of tests of mental ability (Jensen, 1998). However, there is some evidence that specific abilities can be responsible for some differences in outcomes. For instance, verbal ability tilt predicts a preference toward social sciences (Coyle, 2018) and mental illness (Rajagopal

et al., 2020). However, these should not be substantial sources of bias when evaluating the relationship with honesty, especially given that some other abilities were tested.

For race, 3 methods were used to classify individuals by race. The first is to categorize them using a variable provided by the NLSY staff that was based on household information and the race of the biological parents. If this information was not available, self-reports of racial ancestry were taken from the Round 6 questionnaire. If participants were still unclassified, interviewer responses from the Round 5 questionnaire were used to classify race. The individuals were then grouped into 3 main categories: White, Hispanic, or Black. Among individuals explicitly judged as White, Black, or Hispanic by the household data or the self-reports, accuracy of racial identification was 97.6% for Whites, 99.7% for Blacks, and 97.7% for Hispanics. Due to concerns about sample size and the grouping of different races into one variable, Asians, Pacific Islanders, mixed-race individuals, American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts were excluded from this analysis.

For honesty, there were two variables available: self-reported and parent-reported honesty. For self-reported honesty, youth were prompted with the phrase “you lie or cheat.”, and were instructed to respond that this statement was “not true”, “somewhat/sometimes true”, or “often true”. For parent-reported honesty, Parents were prompted with the question “[their child] lies or cheats.”, and were instructed to respond that this statement was “not true”, “somewhat/sometimes true”, or “often true”. Both individuals were instructed to restrict their responses to behaviour that occurred within the last 6 months. The correlation between self-reported and parent-reported honesty was very low, only .23. This indicates that either one or both of the variables are of low validity. To increase the quality of the honesty measurement, the variables were standardized and added to create a general honesty metric.


For parental social status, we used the first principal component of income, assets, paternal education, and maternal education. Filling missing values did not substantially decrease the validity of the measurement, as the correlation with child IQ with no filled values (.467) was almost identical to that with filled values (.453).

Grade point average (GPA) was initially considered as a potential mediator, where intelligence could impact school grades, which could impact the desire to cheat, as modeled in Figure 2. Alternatively, it could also be possible that honesty is causally related to GPA because honesty causes students to cheat less, which causes them to fail less.

All of the quantitative metrics were standardized with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1, Besides IQ which was normed relative to the White mean.

The term IQ will be used to refer to the factor scores derived from the first principal component of the ASVAB, while *g* or general intelligence will be used to describe the latent variable that is underlying cognitive ability.

Figure 2. Proposed model involving *g*, GPA, and Honesty



Results

Race differences in general honesty were replicated in the study, shown in Figure 3. The same holds for the relationship between honesty and intelligence, which is displayed in Figure 4. There were race differences in honesty for both parent-reports and self-reports, as shown in Table 6 and Table 7.

Figure 3. Race differences in general honesty. 95% confidence intervals displayed.




Table 5. General honesty by race, relative to the White (n=1,646) mean.

Race	Cohen's d	p-value	95% CI
Black (n=807)	-0.404	p < .001	[-0.49, -0.32]
Hispanic (n=616)	-0.337	p < .001	[-0.43, -0.24]


Table 6. Self-reported honesty by race, relative to the White (n=2,676) mean.

Race	Cohen's d	p-value	95% CI
Black (n=1388)	-0.179	p < .001	[-0.24, -0.11]
Hispanic (n=1097)	-0.237	p < .001	[-0.31, -0.17]

Table 7. Parent-reported honesty by race, relative to the White (n=1,686) mean.

Race	Cohen's d	p-value	95% CI
Black (n=829)	-0.432	p < .001	[-0.52, -0.35]
Hispanic (n=645)	-0.247	p < .001	[-0.34, -0.16]

Figure 4. Scatterplot of intelligence and honesty. Blue - restricted cubic spline, Black - linear regression.



The difference in R between the linear and non-linear model was negligible (nonlinear -> .246, linear -> .245) and the difference in residuals did not pass statistical significance ($F = 1.3$, $p = .183$). This finding conflicts with the prior observation that differences in intelligence above the average did not correspond to increased honesty (Ruffle & Tobol, 2016), indicating that this was likely due to a power failure ($n = 427$).

In addition, both IQ and parental SES were correlated with honesty measurements, as displayed in Table 8. Correlations were assessed with structural equation models which can address measurement error better than the Pearson correlation coefficient. These were run using diagonally weighted least squares estimations, which increased the fit due to the non-normality of the data. Due to this adjustment for measurement error, correlation between intelligence and honesty rose from .245 to .374 after using an SEM.

Table 8. Correlations between various variables of interest in the dataset.

Variable 1	Variable 2	Latent Correlation	p-value	RMSEA	CFI
g	Self reported honesty	0.099	$p < .001$	0.064	0.986
g	Parent reported honesty	0.287	$p < .001$	0.059	0.988
g	General honesty	0.374	$p < .001$	0.056	0.988
Parental SES	Self reported honesty	0.044	$p < .01$	0.000	1.000
Parental SES	Parent reported honesty	0.160	$p < .001$	0.000	1.000
Parental SES	General honesty	0.219	$p < .001$	0.000	1.000
Parental SES	g	0.460	$p < .001$	0.071	0.983

A potential issue with the way the SEMs are set up is that parent-reported honesty is about 3-4 times more valid than self-reported honesty. Latent variables constructed with measurements of vastly differing quality can be issues (Branwen, 2019), as the inability of one of the measurements can cause an upwards bias in the correlation estimate. However, when one compares the correlation between parent-reported honesty and general honesty, the correlation does not increase dramatically (.287 -> .374).

Given that there are race differences in intelligence and parental SES, it would be appropriate to see if these race differences in honesty remain after controlling for IQ and parental SES. To assess this, linear regression was used to examine what the effect of race was independent of parental SES and IQ. Based on the results from the 5 models displayed in Table 9, the effect of race on honesty diminishes but does not disappear after intelligence is controlled for. The influence of parental SES diminishes greatly in models where IQ was included, indicating that the relationship between parental SES and honesty is wholly or mostly due to the correlation parental SES has with IQ.

Table 9. Linear Regression models predicting general honesty. Racial reference group is Whites, non-racial parameter estimates are standardized, t-values in parenthesis. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$ *** , = $p < .001$.

Parameter	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
SES	0.019 (0.91)		0.0871 (4.7)***	0.0098 (0.46)	
IQ	0.242 (10.6)***	0.221 (9.6)***		0.217 (8.8)***	
Black		-0.14 (2.7)**	-0.332 (7.5)***	-0.137 (2.6)**	-0.396 (9.4)***
Hispanic		-0.0908 (1.7)	-0.238 (4.8)***	-0.0847 (1.5)	-0.325 (7)***
Adjusted-R2	0.0594	0.0616	0.0397	0.0613	0.0331

There may be differences in what influences parent-reported vs self-reported honesty. For example, it could be possible that intelligence can influence the way somebody reports their honesty, but not how their parents report their honesty. To clarify questions like these, the same models used in Table 9 were also used to predict self-reported honesty in Table 10 and parent-reported honesty in Table 11.

Table 10. Regression models predicting self-reported honesty. Racial reference group is Whites, non-racial parameter estimates are standardized, t-values in parenthesis. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$ *** , = $p < .001$.

Parameter	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
SES	-0.013 (0.76)		0.00373 (0.25)	-0.0268 (1.5)	
IQ	0.105 (5.8)***	0.0766 (4.2)***		0.0868 (4.5)***	

Black		-0.0759 (1.8)	-0.176 (5.1)***	-0.0841 (2)*	-0.178 (5.4)***
Hispanic		-0.128 (2.9)**	-0.229 (5.9)***	-0.145 (3.2)**	-0.232 (6.5)***
Adjusted-R2	0.00893	0.0108	0.00996	0.0111	0.0101

Table 11. Regression models predicting parent-reported honesty. Racial reference group is Whites, non-racial parameter estimates are standardized, t-values in parenthesis. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$ *** , = $p < .001$.

Parameter	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
SES	0.0278 (1.4)		0.112 (6.1)***	0.0278 (1.4)	
IQ	0.269 (12.3)***	0.26 (11.8)***		0.248 (10.5)***	
Black		-0.191 (2.7)**	-0.338 (7.8)***	-0.127 (2.5)*	-0.42 (10.1)***
Hispanic		0.0009 (0.01)	-0.125 (2.6)**	-0.0184 (0.34)	-0.236 (5.2)***
Adjusted-R2	0.0779	0.0799	0.0431	0.0802	0.032

Models were also run to determine if GPA was a mediating variable in Table 12. The reason for doing this is that intelligence could influence grades, and then grades could impact the desire to cheat, which impacts self-reports and parent-reports. The model using IQ and racial variables was judged to be the best model, as these were the variables most consistently associated with the outcome variables. While the impact of intelligence did decrease, the variable still reached significance in the 2 models.

Table 12. Regression models predicting general honesty. Racial reference group is Whites, non-racial parameter estimates are standardized, t-values in parenthesis. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$ *** , = $p < .001$.

Parameter	Dependent: general honesty	Dependent: parent-reported honesty	Dependent: self-reported honesty
GPA	0.113 (4.1)***	0.137 (5.2)***	0.0573 (2.5)*
IQ	0.133 (4.1)***	0.166 (5.5)***	0.0411 (1.6)
Black	-0.181 (2.8)**	-0.196 (3.3)**	-0.0606 (1.2)
Hispanic	-0.0163 (0.24)	0.0386 (0.61)	-0.0768 (1.4)
Adjusted-R2	0.0616	0.0948	0.00885

According to the regression models in Table 12., being Hispanic does not seem to be associated with Honesty independent of GPA and IQ. However, being Black still is associated with Honesty even after controlling for GPA and IQ. Both GPA and IQ are associated with honesty after adjusting for controls in the two models with the least predictive error. Another notable result is that parent-reported honesty is significantly easier to predict than self-reported honesty. This is likely because it is a more valid metric, as the idea of dishonest people accurately reporting their honesty is dubious.

Two structural equation models were considered to determine the direction of the relationship between GPA and general honesty. While GPA was initially considered as a

mediator in the relationship between IQ and honesty, it is just as plausible that honesty or personality traits associated with it positively impact GPA by decreasing the likelihood they fail due to getting caught cheating. These SEM models were run based on the information gained from the multiple regression analysis, and are shown in Figures 5 and 6. Table 13 shows the model fit statistics.

Figure 5. SEM with GPA as a mediating variable (GPA Mediator Model). Honesty is a latent variable derived from parent and self-reports, g is a latent variable derived from 12 ASVAB subtests. * = $p < 0.05$, ** = $p < 0.01$ ***= $p < 0.001$.




Figure 6. SEM with Honesty as a mediating variable (Honesty Mediator Model). Honesty is a latent variable derived from parent and self-reports, g is a latent variable derived from 12 ASVAB subtests. * = $p < 0.05$, ** = $p < 0.01$ ***= $p < 0.001$.




Table 13. Comparison of fit statistics between the two models

Model	CFI	RMSEA
GPA Mediator Model	0.986	0.058
Honesty Mediator Model	0.986	0.058

Both models have identical fits in terms of quality, and it is unclear what the relationship between honesty and GPA is. Given that both models have an equal number of parameters, a nested model comparison cannot be done.

Discussion

We replicated prior results that intelligence, honesty, and race are related, with intelligence and race having clear relationships with honesty. Hispanics ($d = -0.337$) and Blacks ($d = -0.404$) were less honest than whites and g and honesty were positively correlated (latent correlation = .374). Linear regression analysis indicated that the relationship between honesty and parental SES greatly diminished when IQ was controlled for, being Black had a negative relationship with honesty, and intelligence was positively related to honesty. Being Hispanic does not seem to be related to Honesty independent of GPA and IQ. It is unlikely that social desirability bias is causing Blacks and Hispanics to be more willing to admit that they or their child lies or cheats, as Blacks reported their drug use less accurately than Whites (Fendrich, 2005), (Hughes, Heller & Marsden, n.d.).

GPA was a predictor of honesty independent of race and intelligence. It is worth noting that this finding is vulnerable to measurement error confounding (Westfall & Yarkoni, 2016). Imperfect validity and reliability of the intelligence measure would cause any covariate to gain the remaining covariation. As GPA and intelligence correlated strongly ($r = .52$ in this dataset), this is potentially a problem. However, the relationship IQ and GPA had with parent-reported or general honesty were about equivalent in strength, indicating that the imperfect validity or reliability of the IQ measurement did not cause this finding.

Two structural equation models were run to compare the two different mediation hypotheses: IQ->Honesty->GPA (Honesty Mediation Model) and IQ->GPA->Honesty (GPA Mediation Model). Both models have identical fits. Alternatively, GPA could also be reflective of the student's overall personality (e.g. prosociality, conformity) and these personality measures could be the ones that are truly related to honesty.

Between countries, Honesty was predicted by Hofstede's individualism dimension ($\beta = .485, p < .01$), national IQs ($\beta = .342, p = .013$), and masculinity ($\beta = -.307, p = .011$). Parking violations per diplomat were predicted by national IQs ($\beta = -.452, p < .001$) and cultural indulgence ($\beta = -.345, p < .001$). It is not surprising that individualism strongly predicts honesty, as it is what would be expected concerning psychological theory. Alternatively, this relationship could be genetic in nature, where nations with individualistic norms select for honest individuals, but there is no environmental causal effect of the norms on the honesty of the individuals.

In addition, it is surprising that cultural indulgence negatively predicted the amount of parking violations that diplomats obtained. It is possible that diplomats in countries that are more restrictive are more likely to lash out by violating international parking laws, while diplomats in indulgent cultures do not feel this need.

No association between long-term orientation and honesty independent of intelligence was found. This is evidence against the theory that intelligence and honesty are related because of time preference, though the sample size of countries is small ($n = 33$), so it is still possible that there is a small effect that cannot be detected in this dataset.

Data from 226 dutch university students found that conscientiousness ($\beta = 0.28, p < .01$) and honesty-humility ($\beta = 0.19, p < .05$) still predicted GPA after controlling for the other HEXACO personality traits and gender (de Vries et al., 2011). In addition, counterproductive academic behaviour assessed with a 25-item scale was negatively related to conscientiousness ($\beta = -0.36, p < .01$) and honesty-humility ($\beta = -.36, p < .01$) when controlling for the same confounders. Conscientiousness and humility were weakly correlated ($r = .21, p < .01$). While the relationship between GPA and honesty mirrors the one obtained from our analysis, this data is not able to determine the nature of the relationship between GPA and Honesty.

One of our findings is that the relationship between race and honesty decreases significantly after controlling for IQ, suggesting that some of the race differences in honesty are due to the difference in intelligence. If genetic differences cause differences in intelligence between the races, then it likely follows that these genetic differences in intelligence are associated with genetic differences in honesty. This is because most of the association between personality variables and intelligence is driven by genetic causes, based on twin studies (Bartels et al., 2012).

Implications for further research

Currently, the most plausible theory concerning the association between intelligence and honesty is that it is driven by the negative relationship intelligence has with the p-factor. It

should be fairly easy to test whether this is the most influential variable, with this method being to gather self-reports and parent-reports of honesty and personality along with measurements of intelligence. Using this information, it could be examined whether the p-factor is driving the relationship between intelligence and honesty through regression analysis. A similar design can be used to test the theory that moral reasoning or success mediate the relationship IQ has with honesty.

References

- 2021 Corruption Perceptions Index. (2022, January 25). Transparency International.
<https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2021>
- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & Son, C. (2000). Honesty as the sixth factor of personality: Correlations with machiavellianism, primary psychopathy, and social adroitness. *European Journal of Personality, 14*(4), 359–368.
[https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0984\(200007/08\)14:4<359::aid-per382>3.0.co;2-y](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0984(200007/08)14:4<359::aid-per382>3.0.co;2-y)
- Ataie-Ashtiani, B. (2017). World map of scientific misconduct. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 24*(5), 1653–1656. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-017-9939-6>
- Bartels, M., van Weegen, F. I., van Beijsterveldt, C. E. M., Carlier, M., Polderman, T. J. C., Hoekstra, R. A., & Boomsma, D. I. (2012). The five factor model of personality and intelligence: A twin study on the relationship between the two constructs. *Personality and Individual Differences, 53*(4), 368–373.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.02.007>

- Becker, D. (2019). *The NIQ-dataset (V1.3.3)*. Chemnitz, Germany.
- Branwen, G. (2019). *How should we critique research?* Gwern.
<https://www.gwern.net/Research-criticism>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d.). *honest*. Definition in the Cambridge English Dictionary.
Retrieved January 10, 2023, from
<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/honest>
- Carlisle, J. B. (2020). False individual patient data and zombie randomised controlled trials submitted to Anaesthesia. *Anaesthesia*, 76(4), 472–479.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/anae.15263>
- Cohn, A., Maréchal, M. A., Tannenbaum, D., & Zünd, C. L. (2019). Civic honesty around the globe. *Science*, 365(6448), 70–73. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau8712>
- Coyle, T. (2018). Non-g Factors Predict Educational and Occupational Criteria: More than g. *Journal of Intelligence*, 6(3), 43.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence6030043>
- de Vries, A., de Vries, R. E., & Born, M. Ph. (2011). Broad versus narrow traits: Conscientiousness and honesty–humility as predictors of academic criteria. *European Journal of Personality*, 25(5), 336–348. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.795>
- Duchesne, R. (2022). Europeans have always been WEIRD: Critical reflections on Joseph Henrich’s [i]the weirdest people[i]. *Mankind Quarterly*, 62(4), 712–763.
<https://doi.org/10.46469/mq.2022.62.4.8>
- Eisenberg-Berg, N. (1979). Relationship of prosocial moral reasoning to altruism, political liberalism, and intelligence. *Developmental Psychology*, 15(1), 87–89.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0078081>
- Fanelli, D., Costas, R., Fang, F. C., Casadevall, A., & Bik, E. M. (2019). Testing hypotheses on risk factors for scientific misconduct via matched-control analysis of papers containing problematic image duplications. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 25(3), 771–789. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-018-0023-7>

- Fendrich, M. (2005). Race/Ethnicity differences in the validity of self-reported drug use: Results from a household survey. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 82(2_suppl_3), iii67–iii81.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jurban/jti065>
- Fenollar-Cortés, J., & Watkins, M. W. (2018). Construct validity of the Spanish Version of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children Fifth Edition (WISC-VSpain). *International Journal of School & Educational Psychology*, 7(3), 150–164.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21683603.2017.1414006>
- Fisman, R., & Miguel, E. (2007). Corruption, norms, and legal enforcement: Evidence from diplomatic parking tickets. *Journal of Political Economy*, 115(6), 1020–1048.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/527495>
- Francis, G., & Kirkegaard, E. O. W. (2022). National intelligence and economic growth: A bayesian update. *Mankind Quarterly*, 63(1), 9–78.
<https://doi.org/10.46469/mq.2022.63.1.2>
- Gaspar, H. A., & Breen, G. (2018). *Probabilistic ancestry maps: A method to assess and visualize population substructures in genetics*. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/362343>
- Gaygisiz, E., & Lajunen, T. (2021). Cultural values, national personality characteristics, and intelligence as correlates of corruption: A nation level analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3946125>
- Hanania, R. (2022). How monogamy and incest taboos made the West. *Richard Hanania's Newsletter*.
<https://richardhanania.substack.com/p/how-monogamy-and-incest-taboos-made>
- Hanks, R. (1985). Moral reasoning in adolescents: A feature of intelligence or social adjustment? *Journal of Moral Education*, 14(1), 43–55.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0305724850140106>
- Hegelund, E. R., Flensburg-Madsen, T., Dammeyer, J., & Mortensen, E. L. (2018). Low IQ as a predictor of unsuccessful educational and occupational achievement: A

- register-based study of 1,098,742 men in Denmark 1968–2016. *Intelligence*, 71, 46–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2018.10.002>
- Hegelund, E. R., Flensburg-Madsen, T., Dammeyer, J., Mortensen, L. H., & Mortensen, E. L. (2019). The influence of familial factors on the association between IQ and educational and occupational achievement: A sibling approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 149, 100–107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.05.045>
- Henrich, J. (2020). *The WEIRDest People in the World: How the west became psychologically peculiar and particularly prosperous*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (2010). *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. Simon and Schuster.
- Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. A. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. SAGE.
- Hofstede, G. (2016). *The dimension scores in the Hofstede model of national culture can be downloaded here*. Geert Hofstede.
<https://geerthofstede.com/research-and-vsm/dimension-data-matrix/>
- Howells, T. H. (1938). Factors influencing honesty. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 9(1), 97–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1938.9921677>
- Hughes, A., Heller, D., & Marsden, M. E. FEATURE PAPER: The Validity of Self-Reported Tobacco and Marijuana Use, by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Age. *SESSION 1: EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND SURVEILLANCE*, 87
- Jensen, A. R. (1998). *The G factor: The science of mental ability*. Praeger Pub Text.
- Johnson, W., Bouchard, T. J., Jr., Krueger, R. F., McGue, M., & Gottesman, I. I. (2004). Just one g: Consistent results from three test batteries. *Intelligence*, 32(1), 95–107. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0160-2896\(03\)00062-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0160-2896(03)00062-x)
- Karnes, F. A., & Brown, K. E. (1980). Moral development and the gifted: An initial investigation. *Roeper Review*, 3(4), 8–10.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02783198109552540>

Kirkegaard, E. O. W., & Nyborg, H. (2021). Intelligence and general psychopathology in the Vietnam Experience Study: A closer look. *Mankind Quarterly*, 61(4), 792–819.

<https://doi.org/10.46469/mq.2021.61.4.2>

Lynn, R., & Becker, D. (2019). *Intelligence of nations*. Ulster Institute for Social Research.

MacDonald, K. (2021). Understanding western uniqueness: A comment on Joseph Henrich's *the weirdest people in the world*. *Mankind Quarterly*, 61(3), 723–766.

<https://doi.org/10.46469/mq.2021.61.3.20>

Marks, G. N. (2022). Cognitive ability has powerful, widespread and robust effects on social stratification: Evidence from the 1979 and 1997 US National Longitudinal Surveys of Youth. *Intelligence*, 94, 101686.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2022.101686>

Murray, C. (2002). IQ and income inequality in a sample of sibling pairs from advantaged family backgrounds. *American Economic Review*, 92(2), 339–343.

<https://doi.org/10.1257/000282802320191570>

Rajagopal, V. M., Ganna, A., Coleman, J. R. I., Allegrini, A. G., Voloudakis, G., Grove, J., Als, T. D., Horsdal, H. T., Petersen, L., Appadurai, V., Schork, A., Buil, A., Bulik, C. M., Bybjerg-Grauholm, J., Bækvad-Hansen, M., Hougaard, D. M., Mors, O., Nordentoft, M., Werge, T., ... Demontis, D. (2020). *Genome-wide association study of school grades identifies a genetic overlap between language ability, psychopathology and creativity*. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.09.075226>

Ruffle, B. J., & Tobol, Y. (2015). Clever enough to tell the truth. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2656755>

Shamosh, N. A., & Gray, J. R. (2008). Delay discounting and intelligence: A meta-analysis. *Intelligence*, 36(4), 289–305.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2007.09.004>

- Strenze, T. (2015). Intelligence and success. In *Handbook of Intelligence* (pp. 405–413). Springer New York. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1562-0_25
- Tuttle, H. S. (1931). Honesty trends in children. *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 5(4), 233. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2960849>
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1997, August 7). *CPS: AGE BY RACE-ETHNICITY*. U.S. Bureau of the Census. <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/demo/tables/hispanic-origin/1997/1996-cps/tab01-1.txt>
- Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., Coalson, D., & Raiford, S. E. (2010). *WAIS-IV clinical use and interpretation: Scientist-Practitioner perspectives*. Academic Press.
- Westfall, J., & Yarkoni, T. (2016). Statistically controlling for confounding constructs is harder than you think. *PLOS ONE*, 11(3), e0152719. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0152719>