**Supplemental material**

**Sample size calculation**

In order to determine an adequate sample size, we conducted an a-priori sample size calculation for five correlations, tested one-tailed (bivariate normal model), with α = .05, power = .95, and under assumption of a medium effect size ρ = 0.3 using G\*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007; version 3.1.9.2). We assumed a medium effect size of the relation between Honesty-Humility and cheating as the size of this effect usually ranges between small-to-medium and medium-to-large across various cheating paradigms (see Table 7 in Hilbig & Zettler, 2015). We decided to derive an effect size on the basis of multiple studies using different cheating tasks because there were no earlier studies investigating the relation between Honesty-Humility and cheating, which have specifically used the dyadic die-rolling task. In line with our approach, it should be noted that a recent reanalysis of the relation between Honesty-Humility and dishonesty in economic games indicated a medium-to large effect size (OR = 0.53; Heck, Thielmann, Moshagen, & Hilbig, 2018).

While we planned to use t-tests and a one-way ANOVA to test the differences in cheating rates between conditions (see preregistration), the intended sample size was determined on the basis of the correlation analyses we were planning to conduct. The reason for this was that the sample sizes needed for a one-tailed independent t-test for the two A-conditions (see below) and for a one-way ANOVA (with two planned comparisons for the three B-conditions) with α = .05, power = .95, and a medium effect size *d* = 0.5 and *f* = 0.25 was *N* = 88 and *N* = 84 per group respectively, which in both cases was lower than the sample size needed for testing the correlation (*N* = 575, with *N* = 115 participants per group). We assumed a medium effect size to test of our hypotheses. The research plan and sample size calculation were preregistered, and are available in the Open Science Framework (masked for review, <https://osf.io/grejx/?view_only=a65c2cb91e44429083abc889c3079c32>).

**Statistical analysis rationale**

In our analyses, we employ a different strategy than that assumed in the preregistration, since residuals of the corresponding parametric models (*t*-test, ANOVA, and Pearson correlations) were not normally distributed (and data transformations failed to normalize them; Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). Furthermore, following general recommendations to choose parametric over non-parametric tests (e.g., to achieve higher statistical power; Judd, McClelland, & Ryan, 2017), we also rejected relying on the preregistered non-parametric tests.

As a solution, we concluded that hierarchical logistic regression was the most appropriate approach for the analyses of both differences in cheating rates between experimental conditions and of the link between personality traits and dishonesty across conditions. Logistic regression is tailored to analyzing discrete choices such as which number a participant reported in each die roll in our study (Sommet & Morselli, 2017). Moreover, the hierarchical modeling approach allowed us to analyze multiple, repeated trials of die-rolling by introducing a random effect for participants (the random-intercept models assume that trials are nested within participants). Ideally, we would use the modified logistic regression approach tailored specifically to estimating the probability of dishonesty (Moshagen & Hilbig, 2017). This method has the theoretical advantage of accounting for the base rate of honest responding (i.e., *p* = 1/6 for each outcome in a die roll), but the corresponding hierarchical model with random effects (Heck & Moshagen, 2018) was unstable and did not converge. Hence, the interpretation of the effect sizes (as odds ratios) reported in the following differs from the effect sizes reported in studies using the modified logistic regression approach (for a large-scale reanalysis, see Heck et al., 2018).

In order to test if participants cheated in each of the five conditions, we used the likelihood-ratio test (LRT) to calculate the G² statistic. Because the G² statistic, similarly to a logistic regression, is a model tailored to categorical data and has higher power than non-parametric tests, we decided that it fitted better to the rest of our analyses conceptually. However, although the analysis strategy reported in the following deviates from our preregistration, we report the results from all preregistered analyses (which resulted in substantively identical conclusions) in the Supplemental Material (Tables S6-S10).

Table S1

*Fixed-effects parameters when fitting separate models for each A-condition*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A-honest condition | | | | |  | A-brazen condition | | | | |
| *Beta* | *SE* | *P-value* | OR | 95% CI |  | *Beta* | *SE* | *P-value* | OR | 95% CI |
| Intercept | -0.66 | 0.16 | **<.001** | 0.52 | [0.38, 0.71] |  | 1.36 | 0.33 | **<.001** | 3.88 | [2.04, 7.40] |
| H | -0.43 | 0.18 | **.009** | 0.65 | [0.46, 0.93] |  | -1.04 | 0.35 | **.002** | 0.35 | [0.18, 0.70] |
| E | 0.08 | 0.16 | .637 | 1.08 | [0.78, 1.49] |  | -0.41 | 0.28 | .144 | 0.67 | [0.39, 1.15] |
| X | 0.24 | 0.19 | .205 | 1.27 | [0.88, 1.85] |  | 0.91 | 0.36 | **.011** | 2.50 | [1.23, 5.04] |
| A | 0.27 | 0.17 | .113 | 1.32 | [0.94, 1.85] |  | 0.28 | 0.34 | .416 | 1.32 | [0.68, 2.58] |
| C | 0.11 | 0.19 | .554 | 1.12 | [0.77, 1.64] |  | 0.13 | 0.38 | .738 | 1.14 | [0.54, 2.41] |
| O | -0.13 | 0.15 | .406 | 0.88 | [0.65, 1.19] |  | 0.29 | 0.30 | .333 | 1.33 | [0.74, 2.39] |

*Note*. Each hierarchical, binary logistic regression model included a random intercept for participants and all six HEXACO traits as covariates to predict whether participants in the A-conditions reported a match. H = Honesty-Humility, E = Emotionality, X = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, O = Openness to Experience. Please note that p-values presented for Honesty-Humility are one-tailed.

Table S2

*Fixed-effects parameters when fitting separate models for each B-condition*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | B-honest | | | | |  | B-brazen matching | | | | |  | B-brazen signaling | | | | |
| β | *SE* | *P-value* | OR | 95% CI |  | β | *SE* | *P-value* | OR | 95% CI |  | β | *SE* | *P-value* | OR | 95% CI |
| H | -0.18 | 0.11 | .062 | 0.84 | [0.67, 1.05] |  | -0.34 | 0.16 | **.014** | 0.71 | [0.52, 0.96] |  | -0.35 | 0.21 | **.047** | 0.71 | [0.47, 1.06] |
| E | -0.17 | 0.10 | .091 | 0.84 | [0.69, 1.03] |  | -0.15 | 0.15 | .320 | 0.86 | [0.64, 1.16] |  | -0.07 | 0.22 | .768 | 0.94 | [0.61, 1.44] |
| X | 0.09 | 0.12 | .413 | 1.10 | [0.88, 1.38] |  | -0.10 | 0.15 | .491 | 0.90 | [0.67, 1.21] |  | 0.70 | 0.24 | **.003** | 2.02 | [1.27, 3.21] |
| A | -0.09 | 0.11 | .393 | 0.91 | [0.74, 1.13] |  | 0.20 | 0.15 | .175 | 1.23 | [0.91, 1.65] |  | 0.01 | 0.22 | .981 | 1.01 | [0.65, 1.55] |
| C | -0.06 | 0.12 | .623 | 0.94 | [0.74, 1.20] |  | 0.08 | 0.14 | .565 | 1.08 | [0.83, 1.41] |  | -0.07 | 0.24 | .780 | 0.93 | [0.58, 1.51] |
| O | 0.07 | 0.11 | .509 | 1.07 | [0.87, 1.32] |  | -0.00 | 0.14 | .980 | 1.00 | [0.76, 1.32] |  | -0.37 | 0.23 | .115 | 0.69 | [0.44, 1.09] |

*Note.* Each hierarchical, ordered logistic regression model included a random intercept for participants and all six HEXACO traits as covariates to predict the reported number in the B-conditions. H = Honesty-Humility, E = Emotionality, X = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, O = Openness to Experience. Please note that p-values presented for Honesty-Humility are one-tailed.
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Table S3

*Fixed-effects parameters when fitting models including the interaction of HH and condition*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Predictor | A-conditions (binary logistic) | | | | |  | B-conditions (ordered logistic) | | | | |
| β | *SE* | *P-value* | OR | 95% CI |  | β | *SE* | *P-value* | OR | 95% CI |
| (Intercept) | -0.58 | 0.25 | **.019** | 0.56 | [0.35, 0.91] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HH | -0.26 | 0.24 | .278 | 0.77 | [0.48, 1.23] |  | -0.23 | 0.16 | .151 | 0.80 | [0.58, 1.09] |
| A-brazen | 1.54 | 0.35 | **<.001** | 4.68 | [2.37, 9.25] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HH x A-brazen | -0.39 | 0.34 | .235 | 0.68 | [0.35, 1.32] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B-brazen signaling |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.28 | 0.22 | **<.001** | 3.59 | [2.31, 5.58] |
| B-brazen matching |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.38 | 0.22 | .077 | 1.47 | [0.96, 2.24] |
| HH x B-brazen signaling |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.07 | 0.22 | .739 | 0.93 | [0.61, 1.42] |
| HH x B-brazen matching |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.06 | 0.23 | .795 | 0.94 | [0.61, 1.47] |

*Note.* The reference group was A-honest in the binary logistic regression for the A-condition, and B-honest in the ordered logistic regression for the B-conditions. Each hierarchical logistic regression model included a random intercept for participants. HH = Honesty-Humility.

Honesty-Humility has not only been negatively linked to cheating, but also positively linked to different forms of cooperation such as Dictator Game giving (e.g., Hilbig & Zettler, 2009), contributions to public goods (Hilbig, Zettler, Heydasch, 2012), and cooperation in the Prisoner’s Dilemma (Zettler, Hilbig, & Heydasch, 2013). Thus, one could argue that for people high in Honesty-Humility the inclination towards behaving honest is at odds with the inclination towards behaving collaboratively when it comes to corrupt collaboration. Perhaps for people very high in Honesty-Humility, the tendency to cooperate might overshadow the willingness to behave honest, while people very low in Honesty-Humility might behave dishonest even though it requires cooperation. Therefore, we test from an exploratory perspective whether there is a U-shaped link between Honesty-Humility and cheating in the sequential dyadic die-rolling task. As a part of the exploratory analysis, we investigated whether there was a curvilinear relation between Honesty-Humility and cheating. However, in none of the A- or B- conditions there was support for such a curvilinear pattern (see Table S4).

Table S4

*Fixed-effects parameters when fitting models including the quadratic term of Honesty-Humility*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Predictor | A-conditions (binary logistic) | | | | |  | B-conditions (ordered logistic) | | | | |
| β | *SE* | *P-value* | OR | 95% CI |  | β | *SE* | *P-value* | OR | 95% CI |
| (Intercept) | -0.51 | 0.28 | **.065** | 0.60 | [0.35, 1.03] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HH | -0.45 | 0.16 | **.006** | 0.64 | [0.46, 0.88] |  | -0.26 | 0.09 | **.003** | 0.77 | [0.65, 0.92] |
| A-brazen | 1.52 | 0.34 | **<.001** | 4.57 | [2.36, 8.81] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B-brazen signaling |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.24 | 0.22 | **<.001** | 3.45 | [2.23, 5.36] |
| B-brazen matching |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.39 | 0.21 | .072 | 1.47 | [0.96, 2.24] |
| HH x HH | -0.06 | 0.13 | .646 | 0.94 | [0.73, 1.21] |  | 0.13 | 0.07 | .070 | 1.14 | [0.99, 1.31] |

*Note.* The reference group for the conditions was A-honest in the binary regression, and B-honest condition in the ordered regression. Each hierarchical logistic regression model included a random intercept for participants. HH = Honesty-Humility.

Table S5

*Fixed-effects parameters when fitting models including conditions, Honesty-Humility, Gender, and Age*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Predictor | A-conditions (binary logistic) | | | | |  | B-conditions (ordered logistic) | | | | |
| β | *SE* | *P-value* | OR | 95% CI |  | β | *SE* | *P-value* | OR | 95% CI |
| (Intercept) | -0.18 | 0.67 | .787 | 0.83 | [0.22, 3.12] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender | 0.00 | 0.35 | .991 | 1.00 | [0.51, 1.96] |  | 0.36 | 0.17 | **.038** | 1.43 | [1.02, 2.01] |
| Age | -0.01 | 0.02 | .519 | 0.99 | [0.96, 1.02] |  | -0.01 | 0.01 | .475 | 0.99 | [0.98, 1.01] |
| HH | .0.41 | 0.18 | **.021** | 0.66 | [0.47, 0.94] |  | -0.25 | 0.09 | **.006** | 0.78 | [0.65, 0.93] |
| A-brazen | 1.51 | 0.34 | **<.001** | 4.51 | [2.32, 8.77] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B-brazen signaling |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.29 | 0.22 | **<.001** | 3.63 | [2.34, 5.61] |
| B-brazen matching |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.39 | 0.21 | .070 | 1.47 | [0.97, 2.24] |

*Note.* The reference group for the conditions was A-honest in the binary regression, and B-honest condition in the ordered regression. Each hierarchical logistic regression model included a random intercept for participants. The reference group for gender is females. HH = Honesty-Humility.

Table S6

*One-tailed one sample t-tests comparing the distribution of outcomes assuming full honesty to the cheating rates across the five conditions*

|  | N |  |  |  | | Last 18 trials | | | |  |  | | 20 trials | | | |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *df* |  | *M* | *SD* | | *T* | *CI[LB]* | *P-value* |  | *M* | *SD* | | *T* | *CI[LB]* | *P-value* |  |
| A-honest  A-brazen  B-honest  B-brazen matching  B-brazen signaling | 93  105  97  107  97 | 92  104  96  106  96 |  | 6.71  10.26  3.87  4.08  4.53 | 5.03  6.84  .75  .90  1.09 | | 7.12  10.88  4.80  6.67  9.35 | 5.84  9.15  3.74  3.94  4.35 | **<.001**  **<.001**  **<.001**  **<.001**  **<.001** |  | 7.38  11.30  3.87  4.06  4.47 | 5.55  7.54  .74  .87  1.04 | | 7.03  10.84  4.98  6.60  9.21 | 6.42  10.08  3.75  3.92  4.29 | **<.001**  **<.001**  **<.001**  **<.001**  **<.001** |  |

Note. The cheating rates in the A-honest and the A-brazen conditions were calculated as the number of reported matching outcomes, while in the B-honest, B-brazen signaling, and B-brazen matching conditions as the mean of the reported numbers. The number of matching outcomes assuming full honesty equals 3 for 18 trials and 3.33 for 20 trials, while the mean of reported numbers assuming full honesty equals 3.5 for both 18 and 20 trials. Please note that presented p-values are one-tailed, and only lower-bound confidence intervals are presented.

Table S7

*One tailed independent t-tests comparing the A-honest and the A-brazen conditions on the number of reported matches*

|  | *N* |  | Last 18 trials | | | | |  |  | | 20 trials | | | |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *M* | *SD* | *T* | *df* | *CI[LB]* | *P-value* |  | *M* | *SD* | *T* | *df* | *CI[LB]* | *P-value* |
| A-honest  A-brazen | 93  105 | 6.71  10.26 | 5.03  6.84 | 4.19 | 189.78 | 2.15 | **<.001** |  | 7.38  11.30 | 5.55  7.54 | 4.21 | 189.9 | 2.38 | **<.001** |  |

Note. Please note that presented p-values are one-tailed, and only lower-bound confidence intervals are presented.

Table S8

*Planned comparisons for (1.) the B-honest and the two B-brazen conditions and (2.) t-test between the two B-brazen conditions on the means of reported numbers*

|  |  | Last 18 trials | | | | | | | | | 20 trials | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *N* |  | *M* | *SD* | *T* | | *P-value* | | *CI [LB]* | | *M* | *SD* | *T* | | *P-value* | | *CI [LB]* | |
|  | 2. | 3. | 2. | 3. | 2. | 3. | 2. | 3. | 2. | 3. | 2. | 3. |
| 1. B-honest | 97 |  | 3.87 | .75 | 1.65 | 5.01 | .051 | **<.001** | -0.04 | 0.40 | 3.88 | .74 | 1.49 | 4.67 | .069 | **<.001** | -0.06 | 0.35 |
| 2. B-brazen matching | 107 |  | 4.08 | .90 |  | 3.21 |  | **<.001** |  | 0.22 | 4.06 | .87 |  | 3.04 |  | **<.001** |  | 0.19 |
| 3. B-brazen signaling | 97 |  | 4.53 | 1.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.47 | 1.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note. Please note that the comparisons between B-brazen signaling and B-brazen matching conditions were conducted as an additional test, and are therefore not independent from the comparison between B honest condition with B brazen conditions. Please note that presented p-values are one-tailed, and only lower-bound confidence intervals are presented.

Table S9

*One-tailed Pearson correlations between the HEXACO-60 factors and cheating rates across the last 18 trials.*

|  | A-honest | A-brazen | B-honest | B-brazen  matching |  | B-brazen  signaling |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Honesty-Humility | **-.18 (.044)** | **-.21 (.017)** | **-.22 (.016)** | **-.20 (.021)** |  | -.15 (.071) |  |  |
| Emotionality | -.04 (.735) | **-.21 (.029)** | -.19 (.056) | -.12 (.217) |  | -.06 (.573) |  |  |
| Extraversion | .15 (.138) | **.29 (.003)** | .08 (.441) | .06 (.541) |  | **.28 (.005)** |  |  |
| Agreeableness | .12 (.248) | .09 (.386) | -.10 (.325) | .12 (.217) |  | .03 (.777) |  |  |
| Conscientiousness  Openness to Experience | .01 (.888)  -.09 (.383) | .04 (.684)  .11 (.257) | -.09 (.358)  .05 (.625) | .02 (.854)  -.03 (.756) |  | .05 (.632)  -.10 (.324) |  |

Note: Values in brackets next to correlation coefficients represent p-values. Due to preregistered analyses, p-values presented for Honesty-Humility are one-sided. Confidence intervals for tables S9-S11 are available in the Open Science Framework material (masked for review, https://osf.io/t7r3h/?view\_only=d42456d15a3c4cefaf58d446d26ea4b0)

Table S10

*One-tailed Pearson correlations between the HEXACO-60 factors and cheating rates across all 20 trials.*

|  | A-honest | A-brazen | B-honest | B-brazen  matching |  | B-brazen  signaling |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Honesty-Humility | **-.20 (.027)** | **-.22 (.013)** | **-.22 (.016)** | **-.20 (.018)** |  | -.16 (.062) |  |  |
| Emotionality | -.04 (.701) | **-.22 (.026)** | **-.23 (.023)** | -.12 (.209) |  | -.06 (.592) |  |  |
| Extraversion | .16 (.137) | **.30 (.002)** | .09 (.357) | .07 (.443) |  | **.28 (.005)** |  |  |
| Agreeableness | .09 (.385) | .08 (.393) | -.08 (.434) | .12 (.219) |  | .03 (.779) |  |  |
| Conscientiousness  Openness to Experience | .01 (.925)  -.10 (.325) | .03 (.738)  .11 (.263) | -.10 (.312)  .06 (.585) | .02 (.848)  -.03 (.784) |  | .06 (.583)  -.10 (.339) |  |

Note: Values in brackets next to correlation coefficients represent p-values. Due to preregistered analyses, p-values presented for Honesty-Humility are one-sided.

Table S11

*Intercorrelations and Cronbach alpha scores (on the diagonal) of the HEXACO-60 factors.*

|  | *M(SD)* | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. H | 3.50 (.79) | .79 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. E | 3.02 (.80) | -.01 (.764) | .83 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. X | 3.19 (.87) | .06 (.215) | **-.21 (<.001)** | .88 |  |  |  |  |
| 4. A | 3.35 (.76) | **.30 (<.001)** | **-.14 (.002)** | **.33 (<.001)** | .84 |  |  |  |
| 5. C | 3.88 (.66) | **.31 (<.001)** | -.02 (.604) | **.34 (<.001)** | **.22 (<.001)** | .81 |  |
| 6. O | 3.64 (.82) | .07 (.098) | -.02 (.671) | **.25 (<.001)** | **.13 (.005)** | **.17 (<.001)** | .84 |

Note: Values in brackets next to correlation coefficients represent p-values. H = Honesty-Humility, E = Emotionality, X = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, O = Openness to Experience.

# Comment on the preregistration

Please note that due to a copy-pasting mistake, in the preregistration (masked for review, <https://osf.io/grejx/?view_only=a65c2cb91e44429083abc889c3079c32>) we included a sample size calculation for a t-test twice (point 3 and 4 of the “Other” section) while we intended to include the sample size calculation for both a t-test and one-way ANOVA with three planned comparisons. Below please find the protocol from the sample size calculation for the ANOVA:

F tests - ANOVA: Fixed effects, special, main effects and interactions

Analysis: A priori: Compute required sample size

Input: Effect size f = 0.25

α err prob = 0.05

Power (1-β err prob) = 0.95

Numerator df = 2

Number of groups = 3

Output: Noncentrality parameter λ = 15.6875000

Critical F = 3.0322126

Denominator df = 248

Total sample size = 251

Actual power = 0.9507037
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**Open practices statement**

The experiment was preregistered (see <https://osf.io/grejx/?view_only=a65c2cb91e44429083abc889c3079c32>), and all used materials are available at the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/t7r3h/?view_only=d42456d15a3c4cefaf58d446d26ea4b0>). The dataset is available upon request via e-mail to the first author.