Exploring Personality, Age and Years of Teaching as Factors in the Levels of Honesty among Selected Philippine Public School Elementary Teachers

Dr. Frederick Edward T. Fabella
FEU Roosevelt, Cainta, Rizal, Philippines

Catherine B. Gonzaga
Dulongbayan Elementary School, San Mateo, Rizal, Philippines

Abstract:

This study was conducted to ascertain the existence of relationships between personality, age, years of teaching and the levels of honesty of selected public school elementary teachers. 41 teachers volunteered for this study. They answered the Short assessment of the Big Five and the Lying in Everyday Situations Scale Questionnaires. The findings revealed that the respondents in general appear to have neither high nor low neuroticism, neither high nor low extroversion, moderately high openness, moderately high agreeableness and moderately high conscientiousness. It was also found that they possess a moderately low score in relational lying and a very low score in antisocial lying. No significant relationships were found between the respondents' neuroticism, extroversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness and their relational lying and antisocial lying. In addition, no significant relationships were found between the respondents' neuroticism, extroversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness and their age. Moreover, no significant relationships were found between the respondents' neuroticism, extroversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness and their years of teaching. However, significant moderate positive relationships were established between the respondents' age, years of teaching and their antisocial lying. It can therefore be inferred that for the respondents of this study, age and years of teaching influence positively their antisocial lying.

Keywords: Personality, Honesty, Short assessment of the Big Five, Lying in Everyday Situations Scale, Teachers

INTRODUCTION

One of the key issues in international education is teacher quality. Based on the situation in which teachers are found, various interpretations have been made regarding how to assess teaching performance and its relationship to a teacher's personality. In a study on the Big Five Personality Traits and their link to teacher performance in the public high schools in the National Capital Region of the Philippines, descriptive-correlational research methodology was used. There were 457 responses in all, 339 of whom were female and 118 were male. The study included respondents that had been in the service for one to five years. Of the responders, 275 are Teachers 1 and their performance ratings range from very satisfactory to excellent. The results showed that agreeableness, in which most respondents scored highly, is most clearly present among the respondents. Conscientiousness, Openness, and Extraversion come next. The respondents' mean Neuroticism score was the lowest. However, the study found no correlation between any of the variables and the outcome of the performance evaluation when it comes to personality traits[1].

Unfortunately, some teachers fail to adapt their personalities to the task of teaching. The idea that learning should, at its core, be enjoyable is violated by the teacher who enters the classroom with a cheerless demeanor. If a subject is difficult, learning it the hard way doesn't always entail suffering through a gloomy lesson. When a teacher fails to inspire and motivate students, learning occurs not because of the teacher but despite him or her. However, personality goes beyond the appearance that one may present through neatness, a smile, friendliness, and even temperament. It calls for character and inner sturdiness. You cannot fake character. It is the end outcome of someone's gradual transformation. One cannot have character as a teacher if they view teaching as merely a means of livelihood rather than a calling. Instead, they will be frugal with their time and effort and will constantly look for the easiest way to carry out their tasks. It is stated that teachers only develop character once they have completely focused on their mission[2].

One study was conducted to learn more about the professional traits and instructional skills of Filipino teachers working in China and the Philippines. Regarding professional attributes, the majority of respondents in China and the Philippines hold a bachelor's degree, while many do so in the Philippines. The majority were certified teachers, and a sizable portion had 6 to 10 years of classroom experience. In the Philippines, teachers are paid less, and differences in their overtime pay, bonuses, and allowances, as well as their rights to leave and medical care, have been observed. Opportunities for professional growth were much more widespread in the Philippines than in China. All ten teaching abilities were greater among teachers in the Philippines. China has the greatest mean for providing a learning environment, whereas the Philippines has the highest mean for identifying students' needs and communicating with them. Finally, it was discovered that Filipino respondents had superior teaching competencies, particularly in terms of a variety of teaching tactics, teamwork, and devotion to the field[3].

Every person has a unique personality, which influences their attitudes and behaviors. Personality will appear to a teacher as a concealed curriculum that influences how to instruct and educate. The purpose of this phenomenological study was to better understand the personality traits of character-building teachers. 17 teachers from Indonesia's nine districts who

teach in elementary, secondary, and high schools were interviewed this study. Purposive sampling was used to choose the participants, who are teachers with more than ten years of classroom experience. The ATLAS.ti program was used to analyze qualitative data. This study was able to identify 12 personality traits of teachers who are effective in enhancing character education. These traits include the ability to behave as friends, the ability to be role models, the ability to understand lessons, discipline, respect for students, and the willingness to pursue lifelong learning. They also include the ability to be patient, relaxed as well as the ability to master the skill of educating character. Character education in schools can be better understood and improved with an effective teacher personality[4].

A person can learn on his own, but in order to teach, a teacher needs a learner. This makes teaching special since it depends on interaction. The key to effective teaching is being aware of everything that goes into those relationships. Five separate "awarenesses"—awareness of oneself as a teacher, awareness of the teaching process, awareness of the learner, awareness of interaction, and awareness of context. They are all on a continuum, and teachers acquire them at different speeds. In general, teaching strategies and how to understand students as learners are the main topics of teacher preparation and professional development. But it is uncommon for teachers to be asked to examine their own identities. Perhaps the capacity to cultivate a strong sense of self in teaching roles is the personality trait that most contributes to successful teaching—as crucial as pedagogy, knowledge of students, and knowledge and enthusiasm for the subjects. The vitality observed in a great teacher may actually be a result of a skillful pedagogical approach, a highly developed awareness of the teacher's presence, emotions, and needs, as well as the diligence to attend to them[5].

Anyone who wishes to teach effectively, whether they want to teach in an elementary school or a university, needs to possess nine key common attributes. Any teacher can develop into a very good instructor with a sizable fan base if they have the following traits and qualities: (1) advanced communication abilities, (2) exceptional listening abilities, (3) extensive understanding of and enthusiasm for their subject, (4) the capacity to establish trusting bonds with students, (5) courtesy and approachability, (6) excellent planning and organizing abilities, (7) exemplary work ethic, (8) building community abilities and (9) high standards for everyone. These are the traits that all outstanding teachers share, even if they may also have other wonderful attributes (such as a sense of humor, charisma, adaptability, kindness, leadership, classroom management, a calm attitude, experience, and the capacity for multitasking)[6].

As character has been mentioned in the above articles, one of the 24 universal character traits is honesty. It involves being truthful to oneself and genuine with others. It entails telling the truth, appearing truthful, and being real. Someone who opens up about their vulnerabilities may exhibit this strength[7].

In one study, the connection between personality characteristics and the propensity to lie was investigated. It specifically looked at the relationships between different types of lying and the personality traits of neuroticism, extraversion, openness, conscientiousness, and self-esteem. A lie scale to measure the propensity for three different kinds of lies: self-serving, spiteful, and altruistic, was created. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, the Ten-Item Personality Inventory,

and the lie scale were all completed by 352 participants in total. It was found that lying was inversely connected with self-esteem, openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and agreeableness while favorably correlated with neuroticism[8].

Another study involved seventy-seven undergraduates and seventy members of the community representing a variety of demographics completed 12 individual-differences tests that were intended to predict the likelihood that people would tell lies in everyday situations. After that, participants kept a diary of all of their social interactions and the lies they told during those interactions for a week. In line with expectations, those who lied more frequently had higher levels of cunning, self-consciousness, and sociability. Less dishonest people had higher levels of socialization. People who were manipulative, less socially adept also tended to tell especially more self-serving falsehoods[9].

Still another study looked at connections between the motivations for lying and the personality factors HEXACO (honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, openness). Participants filled out questionnaires evaluating lying frequency, lying motivations, and HEXACO traits (257 individuals were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk). The likelihood of lying was inversely connected with honesty, humility, and diligence. Altruism, secrecy, and the need to escape criticism were the three most prevalent reasons people lied. Comparatively fewer people disclosed lying out of obsessive or protective tendencies, for fun, to get anything in return or out of carelessness. It was discovered that HEXACO variables were related to both self- and other-centered justifications for lying. These findings show that people lie for a variety of reasons, and personality factors may contribute to variations in lying behavior[10].

For purposes of this study, commonplace lying and pathological lying need to be distinguished from each other. Making a false statement with the goal to deceive another person is referred to as lying. Nonpathological lying is frequent and not a symptom of any illness. A pathological liar will tell lies compulsively and for no apparent reason other than to profit oneself. There have been several attempts to describe how a pathological lie differs from a nonpathological lie, but further study is required to draw the proper conclusions. A pathological lie's lack of a clear motive is one of its defining characteristics. In most cases, the motivation for a lie can be identified, such as self-interest or the desire to escape an awkward or unpleasant social circumstance, but pathological lying happens for no apparent reason and doesn't appear to be in the person's best interests[11].

Based on the aforementioned literature, it is clear that the teacher's personality plays a significant role in his or her effectiveness as a teacher, a coworker and a school employee. It has also been shown that the teacher's character, particularly the value of honesty is an important professional trait. Therefore, this study sought to explore the possible connection between personality and honesty among selected government school elementary teachers.

Specifically, this study sought to address the following research questions:

1. What is the personality of the respondents with respect to
a. Neuroticism;
b. Extroversion;
c. Openness;
d. Agreeableness and
e. Conscientiousness?
2. What are the scores of the respondents in terms of Relational lying and Antisocial lying?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' five personality elements of Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and their Relational Lying and Antisocial Lying scores?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' age and their five personality elements of Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and their Relational Lying and Antisocial Lying scores?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' years of teaching and their five personality elements of Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and their Relational Lying and Antisocial Lying scores?

METHODOLOGY
41 elementary teachers who came from the same public school in Rizal, Philippines volunteered to be the respondents of this study. Two were males while thirty-nine were females. Their ages ranged between 26 to 59 with a mean of 41.44 years. They were asked to answer the Short assessment of the Big Five[12], a 15-item, 7-point Likert scale instrument that measures Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. The nature of these five personality traits are best understood by looking at the items in Tables 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. They were also asked to answer the Lying in Everyday Situations Scale[13], which is a 14-item, 7-point Likert scale instrument that measures Relational Lying and Antisocial Lying. The difference between these two types of lying become more apparent when looking at Tables 10 and 11.

RESULTS
The following tables present the data gathered and the statistical treatments used to address the study's research questions.

Table 1. Marital status of the respondents

Marital status	Frequency
Single	9
Married	29
Separated	2
Spouse is deceased	1

Table 2. Years working as a teacher of the respondents

Years working as a teacher	Frequency
1-3	2
4-6	1
7-9	5
10-12	10
13-15	6
16-19	6
20-22	5
23 or more	6

Table 3. Scale of Interpretation for the Short assessment of the Big Five and Lying in Everyday Situations Scale Item Weighted Means

Range of the Item Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1.000 – 1.857	Strongly disagree
1.858 – 2.715	Disagree
2.716 – 3.573	Slightly disagree
3.574 – 4.431	Neutral
4.432 – 5.289	Slightly agree
5.290 – 6.147	Agree
6.148 – 7.000	Strongly agree

Table 4. Scale of Interpretation for the Short assessment of the Big Five Total and Lying in Everyday Situations Scale Total Weighted Means

Range of the Total Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1.000 – 1.857	Very low
1.858 – 2.715	Moderately low
2.716 – 3.573	Somewhat low
3.574 – 4.431	Neither high nor low
4.432 – 5.289	Somewhat high
5.290 – 6.147	Moderately high
6.148 – 7.000	Very high

Table 5. Personality - Neuroticism Item Weighted Means

Item	Weighted Mean N=41	Verbal Interpretation
1. I see myself as someone who worries a lot	5.049	Slightly agree
2. I see myself as someone who gets nervous easily	4.634	Slightly agree
3. I see myself as someone who remains calm in tense situations {reverse}	2.878	Slightly disagree
Total weighted mean	4.187	Neither high nor low

Table 6. Personality - Extroversion Item Weighted Means

Item	Weighted Mean N=41	Verbal Interpretation
4. I see myself as someone who is talkative	4.561	Slightly agree
5. I see myself as someone who is outgoing, sociable	4.512	Slightly agree
6. I see myself as someone who is reserved {reverse}	2.781	Slightly disagree
Total weighted mean	3.951	Neither high nor low

Table 7. Personality - Openness Item Weighted Means

Item	Weighted Mean N=41	Verbal Interpretation
7. I see myself as someone who is original, comes up with new ideas	5.268	Slightly agree
8. I see myself as someone who values artistic, aesthetic experiences	5.732	Agree
9. I see myself as someone who has an active imagination	5.585	Agree
Total weighted mean	5.528	Moderately high

Table 8. Personality - Agreeableness Item Weighted Means

Item	Weighted Mean N=41	Verbal Interpretation
10. I see myself as someone who is sometimes rude to others {reverse}	4.390	Neutral
11. I see myself as someone who has a forgiving nature	5.902	Agree
12. I see myself as someone who is considerate and kind to almost everyone	5.829	Agree
Total weighted mean	5.374	Moderately high

Table 9. Personality - Conscientiousness Item Weighted Means

Item	Weighted Mean $N=41$	Verbal Interpretation
13. I see myself as someone who does a thorough job	5.732	Agree
14. I see myself as someone who tends to be lazy {reverse}	4.683	Slightly agree
15. I see myself as someone who does things efficiently	5.610	Agree
Total weighted mean	5.342	Moderately high

Table 10. Relational Lying Item Weighted Means

Item	Weighted Mean $N=41$	Verbal Interpretation
1. I lie in order to escape conflicts or disagreements with other people.	2.659	Disagree
2. I lie to hide the bad things I've done.	2.220	Disagree
3. I tell lies so I will not have confrontations with people.	2.220	Disagree
4. I lie in order to hide shameful things about myself.	2.171	Disagree
5. I lie to stay out of arguments with people.	2.415	Disagree
6. I lie in order to be friendly and cordial with others.	1.756	Strongly disagree
7. I tell lies in order to spare another's feelings.	2.366	Disagree
Total weighted mean	2.258	Moderately low

Table 11. Antisocial Lying Item Weighted Means

Item	Weighted Mean $N=41$	Verbal Interpretation
8. I lie in order to punish people.	1.342	Strongly disagree
9. I lie in order to take people down.	1.268	Strongly disagree
10. I lie for revenge.	1.366	Strongly disagree
11. I use lies to attack people I don't like.	1.293	Strongly disagree
12. I tell lies in order to hurt, annoy, or upset others.	1.293	Strongly disagree
13. I lie because it is exciting.	1.268	Strongly disagree
14. I lie to people because it is amusing.	1.317	Strongly disagree
Total weighted mean	1.307	Very low

Table 12. Personality - Neuroticism and Relational lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 171.667 Mean = 4.187 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 30.011 Y Values ∑ = 92.571 Mean = 2.258 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 53.193	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = -2.596 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = -2.596 / √((30.011)(53.193)) = -0.065 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = -0.065
The P-Value is .68639. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 13. Personality - Extroversion and Relational lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 162 Mean = 3.951 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 27.68 Y Values ∑ = 92.571 Mean = 2.258 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 53.193	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 2.659 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 2.659 / √((27.68)(53.193)) = 0.0693 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.0693
The P-Value is .666809. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 14. Personality - Openness and Relational lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 226.667 Mean = 5.528 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 35.328 Y Values ∑ = 92.571 Mean = 2.258 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 53.193	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 6.413 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 6.413 / √((35.328)(53.193)) = 0.1479 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.1479
The P-Value is .356099. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 15. Personality - Agreeableness and Relational lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 220.333 Mean = 5.374 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 26.71	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 1.285 R Calculation

cognizancejournal.com
Dr. Frederick Edward T. Fabella *et al*, Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, Vol.3, Issue.7, July 2023, pg. 239-256
(An Open Accessible, Multidisciplinary, Fully Refereed and Peer Reviewed Journal)

ISSN: 0976-7797

Impact Factor: 4.843

Index Copernicus Value (ICV) = 76.35

Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 92.571	r = 1.285 / √((26.71)(53.193)) = 0.0341
Mean = 2.258	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 53.193	r = 0.0341
The P-Value is .832376. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 16. Personality - Conscientiousness and Relational lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 219	N = 41
Mean = 5.341	∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = -8.705
∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 21.22	R Calculation
Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 92.571	r = -8.705 / √((21.22)(53.193)) = -0.2591
Mean = 2.258	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 53.193	r = -0.2591
The P-Value is .102016. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 17. Personality - Neuroticism and Antisocial Lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 171.667	N = 41
Mean = 4.187	∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 2.84
∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 30.011	R Calculation
Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 53.571	r = 2.84 / √((30.011)(21.37)) = 0.1121
Mean = 1.307	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 21.37	r = 0.1121
The P-Value is .485304. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 18. Personality - Extroversion and Antisocial Lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 162	N = 41
Mean = 3.951	∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 1.47
∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 27.68	R Calculation
Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 53.571	r = 1.47 / √((27.68)(21.37)) = 0.0605
Mean = 1.307	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 21.37	r = 0.0605
The P-Value is .7071. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 19. Personality - Openness and Antisocial Lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 226.667 Mean = 5.528 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 35.328 Y Values ∑ = 53.571 Mean = 1.307 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 21.37	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 2.023 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 2.023 / √((35.328)(21.37)) = 0.0736 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.0736
The P-Value is .647443. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 20. Personality - Agreeableness and Antisocial Lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 220.333 Mean = 5.374 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 26.71 Y Values ∑ = 53.571 Mean = 1.307 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 21.37	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = -2.606 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = -2.606 / √((26.71)(21.37)) = -0.1091 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = -0.1091
The P-Value is .497529. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 21. Personality - Conscientiousness and Antisocial Lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 219 Mean = 5.341 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 21.22 Y Values ∑ = 53.571 Mean = 1.307 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 21.37	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = -3.007 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = -3.007 / √((21.22)(21.37)) = -0.1412 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = -0.1412
The P-Value is .379225. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 22. Age and Neuroticism

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 1699 Mean = 41.439 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 2756.098	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 13.967 R Calculation

Y Values	r = $\sum((X - M_y)(Y - M_x)) / \sqrt{((SS_x)(SS_y))}$
$\sum$ = 171.667	r = 13.967 / $\sqrt{((2756.098)(30.011))}$ = 0.0486
Mean = 4.187	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
$\sum(Y - M_y)^2$ = SSy = 30.011	r = 0.0486
The P-Value is .762845. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 23. Age and Extroversion

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
$\sum$ = 1699	N = 41
Mean = 41.439	$\sum(X - M_x)(Y - M_y)$ = -37.789
$\sum(X - M_x)^2$ = SSx = 2756.098	R Calculation
Y Values	r = $\sum((X - M_y)(Y - M_x)) / \sqrt{((SS_x)(SS_y))}$
$\sum$ = 162	r = -37.789 / $\sqrt{((2756.098)(27.68))}$ = -0.1368
Mean = 3.951	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
$\sum(Y - M_y)^2$ = SSy = 27.68	r = -0.1368
The P-Value is .396525. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 24. Age and Openness

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
$\sum$ = 1699	N = 41
Mean = 41.439	$\sum(X - M_x)(Y - M_y)$ = -7.512
$\sum(X - M_x)^2$ = SSx = 2756.098	R Calculation
Y Values	r = $\sum((X - M_y)(Y - M_x)) / \sqrt{((SS_x)(SS_y))}$
$\sum$ = 226.667	r = -7.512 / $\sqrt{((2756.098)(35.328))}$ = -0.0241
Mean = 5.528	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
$\sum(Y - M_y)^2$ = SSy = 35.328	r = -0.0241
The P-Value is .881598. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 25. Age and Agreeableness

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
$\sum$ = 1699	N = 41
Mean = 41.439	$\sum(X - M_x)(Y - M_y)$ = 11.268
$\sum(X - M_x)^2$ = SSx = 2756.098	R Calculation
Y Values	r = $\sum((X - M_y)(Y - M_x)) / \sqrt{((SS_x)(SS_y))}$
$\sum$ = 220.333	r = 11.268 / $\sqrt{((2756.098)(26.71))}$ = 0.0415
Mean = 5.374	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
$\sum(Y - M_y)^2$ = SSy = 26.71	r = 0.0415
The P-Value is .796698. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 26. Age and Conscientiousness

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 1699 Mean = 41.439 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 2756.098 Y Values ∑ = 219 Mean = 5.341 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 21.22	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 39.854 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 39.854 / √((2756.098)(21.22)) = 0.1648 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.1648
The P-Value is .303168. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 27. Age and Relational Lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 1699 Mean = 41.439 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 2756.098 Y Values ∑ = 92.571 Mean = 2.258 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 53.193	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = -24.498 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = -24.498 / √((2756.098)(53.193)) = -0.064 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = -0.064
The P-Value is .690973. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 28. Age and Antisocial Lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 1699 Mean = 41.439 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 2756.098 Y Values ∑ = 53.571 Mean = 1.307 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 21.37	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 121.624 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 121.624 / √((2756.098)(21.37)) = 0.5012 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.5012
The P-Value is .000844. The result is **significant** at p < .05.	

Table 29. Years of Teaching and Neuroticism

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 208 Mean = 5.073 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 150.78	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 14.439 R Calculation

cognizancejournal.com
Dr. Frederick Edward T. Fabella *et al*, Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, Vol.3, Issue.7, July 2023, pg. 239-256
(An Open Accessible, Multidisciplinary, Fully Refereed and Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN: 0976-7797
Impact Factor: 4.843
Index Copernicus Value (ICV) = 76.35

Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 171.667	r = 14.439 / √((150.78)(30.011)) = 0.2146
Mean = 4.187	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 30.011	r = 0.2146
The P-Value is .17786. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 30. Years of Teaching and Extroversion

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 208	N = 41
Mean = 5.073	∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 0.146
∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 150.78	R Calculation
Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 162	r = 0.146 / √((150.78)(27.68)) = 0.0023
Mean = 3.951	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 27.68	r = 0.0023
The P-Value is .988613. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 31. Years of Teaching and Openness

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 208	N = 41
Mean = 5.073	∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = -7.252
∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 150.78	R Calculation
Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 226.667	r = -7.252 / √((150.78)(35.328)) = -0.0994
Mean = 5.528	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 35.328	r = -0.0994
The P-Value is .538012. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 32. Years of Teaching and Agreeableness

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 208	N = 41
Mean = 5.073	∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 3.878
∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 150.78	R Calculation
Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 220.333	r = 3.878 / √((150.78)(26.71)) = 0.0611
Mean = 5.374	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 26.71	r = 0.0611
The P-Value is .704326. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 33. Years of Teaching and Conscientiousness

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 208 Mean = 5.073 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 150.78 Y Values ∑ = 219 Mean = 5.341 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 21.22	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 7.642 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 7.642 / √((150.78)(21.22)) = 0.1351 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.1351
The P-Value is .399687. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 34. Years of Teaching and Relational Lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 208 Mean = 5.073 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 150.78 Y Values ∑ = 92.571 Mean = 2.258 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 53.193	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = -15.774 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = -15.774 / √((150.78)(53.193)) = -0.1761 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = -0.1761
The P-Value is .271019. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 35. Years of Teaching and Antisocial Lying

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 208 Mean = 5.073 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 150.78 Y Values ∑ = 53.571 Mean = 1.307 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 21.37	X and Y Combined N = 41 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 22.937 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 22.937 / √((150.78)(21.37)) = 0.4041 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.4041
The P-Value is .008786. The result is **significant** at p < .05.	

DISCUSSION

Table 5 presents the item weighted means of the Personality – Neuroticism scores of the respondents. It can be observed that the total weighted mean yielded was 4.187, which has a verbal interpretation of *neither high nor low*. Table 6 shows the item weighted means of the Personality – Extroversion scores of the respondents. It can be seen that the resulting total weighted mean was 3.951, which has a verbal interpretation of *neither high nor low*. Table 7

cognizancejournal.com
Dr. Frederick Edward T. Fabella *et al*, Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, Vol.3, Issue.7, July 2023, pg. 239-256
(An Open Accessible, Multidisciplinary, Fully Refereed and Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN: 0976-7797
Impact Factor: 4.843
Index Copernicus Value (ICV) = 76.35

presents the item weighted means of the Personality – Openness scores of the respondents. It can be observed that the total weighted mean yielded was 5.528, which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately high*. Table 8 shows the item weighted means of the Personality – Agreeableness scores of the respondents. It can be seen that the resulting total weighted mean was 5.378, which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately high*. Table 9 presents the item weighted means of the Personality – Conscientiousness scores of the respondents. It can be observed that the total weighted mean yielded was 5.342, which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately high*.

Table 10 shows the item weighted means of the Relational Lying scores of the respondents. It can be seen that the resulting total weighted mean was 2.258, which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately low*. Table 11 shows the item weighted means of the Antisocial Lying scores of the respondents. It can be observed that the total weighted mean yielded was 1.307, which has a verbal interpretation of *very low*.

Tables 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 show the Pearson r computations between the respondents' Personality – Neuroticism, Personality – Extroversion, Personality – Openness, Personality – Agreeableness, Personality – Conscientiousness and their Relational Lying scores, respectively. The r values produced had p values that indicated no significant relationships between all of them.

Tables 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 present the Pearson r computations between the respondents' Personality – Neuroticism, Personality – Extroversion, Personality – Openness, Personality – Agreeableness, Personality – Conscientiousness and their Antisocial Lying scores, respectively. The r values that resulted had p values that revealed no significant relationships between all of them.

Tables 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 show the Pearson r computations between the respondents' age and their Personality – Neuroticism, Personality – Extroversion, Personality – Openness, Personality – Agreeableness, Personality – Conscientiousness scores, respectively. The r values yielded had p values that indicated no significant relationships between all of them.

Table 27 and 28 show the Pearson r computations between the respondents' age and their Relational Lying and Antisocial Lying, respectively. No significant relationship was found between the former. But an r value of 0.5012 resulted between the respondents' age and Antisocial Lying scores with a p value that indicated that there is a significant moderate positive relationship between the two.

Tables 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33 show the Pearson r computations between the respondents' years of teaching and their Personality – Neuroticism, Personality – Extroversion, Personality – Openness, Personality – Agreeableness, Personality – Conscientiousness scores, respectively. The r values produced had p values that indicated no significant relationships between all of them.

Table 34 and 35 show the Pearson r computations between the respondents' years of teaching and their Relational Lying and Antisocial Lying, respectively. No significant relationship was found between the former. But an r value of 0.4041 resulted between the respondents' years of teaching and Antisocial Lying scores with a p value that indicated that there is a significant moderate positive relationship between the two.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the respondents of this study in general appear to have neither high nor low neuroticism, neither high nor low extroversion, moderately high openness, moderately high agreeableness and moderately high conscientiousness.

It can further be surmised that the respondents possess a moderately low score in relational lying and a very low score in antisocial lying.

No significant relationships were found between the respondents' neuroticism, extroversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness and their relational lying and antisocial lying.

In addition, no significant relationships were found between the respondents' neuroticism, extroversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness and their age.

Moreover, no significant relationships were found between the respondents' neuroticism, extroversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness and their years of teaching.

However, significant moderate positive relationships between the respondents' age, years of teaching and their antisocial lying were established. It can therefore be inferred that for the respondents of this study, age and years of teaching influence positively their antisocial lying.

It is recommended that further investigation be conducted with larger populations where the Pearson r computations between the five personality domains and relational lying and antisocial lying yielded higher r values but were not found to be significant. Research should also be undertaken to confirm the findings of the present study concerning age and years of teaching as factors in antisocial lying and their underlying reasons.

Ethical Considerations

The researchers declare that they strictly adhered to the ethics of research. Informed consent was obtained, freedom to withdraw at any time from the study was made known to the participants, their identities were anonymized, the participants were not exposed to any physical, psychological or social harm and the results were used for research purposes only. The researchers further ensured steps to prevent bias in their interpretation of the data. Lastly, there was no conflict of interest in the conduct of the study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

1. Gonzales, J. V., & D. Rosales, Ma. J. (n.d.). *Big five personality traits and its relationship to teachers' performance evaluation in the Public High Schools*. European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences: Proceedings. https://european-science.com/eojnss_proc/article/view/6415

2. *Developing the teachers' personality*. TeacherPH. (2020, February 23). https://www.teacherph.com/developing-teachers-personality/#google_vignette

3. Bagapuro, A., & Delos Santos, M. R. H. (2021). Professional characteristics and teaching competencies of Filipino teachers in China and Philippines: A comparative study. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 10*(6), 63-76. https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2021.4

4. Lukman, L., Marsigit, M., Istiyono, E., Kartowagiran, B., Retnawati, H., Kistoro, H. C., & Putranta, H. (2021). Effective teachers' personality in strengthening character education. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE), 10*(2), 512. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i2.21629

5. Sacks, A. (2019, September 25). *What makes a great teacher: Pedagogy or personality? (opinion)*. Education Week. https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/opinion-what-makes-a-great-teacher-pedagogy-or-personality/2019/09

6. Meer, S. H. (2022, June 13). *Top 9 characteristics and qualities of a good teacher - owlcation*. Owlcation. https://owlcation.com/academia/Characteristics-Of-A-Good-Teacher

7. *VIA Character Strength Spotlight: Honesty*. VIA Character Strength Spotlight: Honesty | Communications Center | Ball State University. (2020, September 21). https://commcenter.bsu.edu/message/via-character-strength-spotlight-honesty

8. Hart, C.L., Lemon, R., Curtis, D.A. *et al.* Personality Traits Associated with Various Forms of Lying. *Psychol Stud* **65**, 239–246 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-020-00563-x

9. Kashy, D. A., & DePaulo, B. M. (1996). Who lies? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(5), 1037–1051. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.5.1037

10. 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

11. MediLexicon International. (2019, August 7). *Pathological liars: Everything you need to know*. Medical News Today. https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/pathological-liars#summary

12. Lang, F. R., John, D., Ludtke, O., Schupp, J., & Wagner, G. G. (2011). Short assessment of the Big Five: robust accros survey methods except telephone interviewing. Behavior Research Methods, 43, 548-567.

13. Christian L. Hart, Jelisa M. Jones, John A. Terrizzi, Drew A. Curtis. (2019). Development of the Lying in Everyday Situations Scale. The American Journal of Psychology, 132 (3), 343-352. doi: https://doi.org/10.5406/amerjpsyc.132.3.0343.