

LYING LAWYERS: INVESTIGATING THE SOCIAL COGNITIVE LABEL

An Honors Thesis

Presented to the Honors Program of

Angelo State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for Highest University Honors

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE

By

TRISTAN LANE DAVIS

May 2016

Major: Psychology

LYING LAWYERS: INVESTIGATING THE SOCIAL COGNITIVE LABEL

by

TRISTAN DAVIS

APPROVED:

Dr. Drew Curtis, Chair
Assistant Professor of
Psychology

Dr. Teresa Hack
Associate Professor of
Psychology

May 3, 2016
Date Successfully Defended and
Approved by Advisory
Committee

APPROVED:

Dr. Shirley M. Eoff
Director of the Honors Program

May 10, 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I could not have completed this task on my own. I am grateful for the many hours of help I received while working on this project. First, a special thank you goes to Dr. Drew Curtis in the Department of Psychology, Sociology and Social Work at Angelo State University for encouraging me to explore my interest in research and for the countless hours of working with me and correcting my work. Without him, I would not have started this project nor had the opportunity to learn and experience the gratifying feelings and hardships of research. I am also thankful to Dr. Teresa Hack and Dr. Crystal Kreidler, also from the Department of Psychology, Sociology and Social Work. Both of these professors have supported me and encouraged me to strive for excellence. Another special thank you goes to Dr. Shirley Eoff, the director of the Angelo State University Honors Program. Because of her support and high expectations of me, I have achieved more than I ever dreamed upon entering the program.

I would also like to take the time to thank my family. First, my mother Camelia Davis, my father Danny Davis and my two sisters, Hali and Cheyann Davis, have been a few of my biggest supporters. These four have always been my biggest fans and have encouraged me through everything I have done. No one has higher expectations or standards for me nor has anyone ever pushed me as much as my family to achieve those expectations. I would also like to acknowledge my grandparents, George and Bettie Mathes. From the occasional gas money to the place to stay during weekends to the long talks about being an adult and a man, my grandparents are two of my best friends, have always supported me in all my endeavors,

and have taught me more than anything how to succeed in life and live happily. To them I am eternally grateful.

In addition to my wonderful professors, mentors and family members, I would like to acknowledge Kathryn Crouch. Without her help and support, I would not have been able to finish this project and write this Honors Thesis. She has seen me through my toughest, most tiring trials in college and has been by my side for every accomplishment. Thank you for your kind words, encouragement and for being a voice of reason and praise.

ABSTRACT

People lie regularly and often (Vrij, 2008). However, though this is accepted, people do not like to be lied to (Epley & Huff, 2007). Because of the prevalence of the practice, people are constantly on the lookout for liars (DePaulo & Kashy, 1998). Attributions are made when a person detects a lie and then makes a decision on the person who lied (Curtis, 2016). People also hold beliefs about what liars look like. The most common cultural stereotype of lawyers is that they are liars (Michelen, 2011). The current research aimed to investigate perceptions, attributions, and attitudes of lawyers as liars and their modern-day implications. It was found that lawyers are perceived more as liars when compared to physicians. Results also showed that lawyers are not perceived to be less professional or competent. These results have implications for lawyers in today's society because of legal professionals' tendency to own a monopoly on legal knowledge and their job which requires them to "win" for their client at all cost (Galanter, 1998).

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT.....	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
The Social Application of Attribution.....	1
History and Theory of Attributions.....	3
Lying in a Social Context.....	6
History and Theory of Lying.....	10
Application to Lawyers and the Legal Field	14
Overview	19
Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	20
METHOD	21
Participants	21
Materials.....	21
Demographics Questionnaire.....	21
Perceptions of Professionals as Liars Questionnaire	21
Revised Causal Dimensions Scale.....	22
Causal Dimensions Scale of Others' Behavior.....	22
Others' Deception Attitude Measure	23

Warmth Competence Measure.....	24
Design.....	24
Procedure.....	24
RESULTS	25
DISCUSSION.....	27
Implications.....	29
Limitations	31
Future Research.....	33
Conclusions	33
REFERENCES	35
APPENDIX A.....	39
APPENDIX B	40
APPENDIX C	41
APPENDIX D.....	42
APPENDIX E	44
VITA.....	48

List of Tables

CDSII Consistencies	22
CDSOB Consistencies	23

INTRODUCTION

Lawyers today have a bad reputation. They are represented as money-hungry villains ready to do anything and everything, even sacrifice their own integrity and ethics to “win the case” (Galanter, 1998). However, there seems to be a misunderstanding behind this social attribution of lawyers and what it is that makes people feel the way they do. Experience, media, and the beliefs of close friends and family may all influence our perceptions of lawyers (Beard, 2011).

Lawyers work in a fast-paced, ethics-based world where they have to make decisions every day that affect the interests and fate of other human beings and sometimes the whole country. Putting that kind of power and decision-making into the hands of one person seems pretty daunting and could be the source of the negative attributions that are made. Because attributions are so important to the relationships built with others, including service professionals like lawyers, they are an important field to study for the current research.

The Social Application of Attribution

Attributions, for the purpose of this paper, are defined as the inferred causes of particular outcomes (Harvey, Madison, Martinko, Crook, T.R., & Crook, T.A., 2014). Attributions, which are used to categorize and define things (Norenzayan & Nisbett, 2000), may be influenced by cultural identities. This explains in part why people in the Western world consider themselves autonomous, motivated by internal forces, and responsible for their own actions while Eastern thought takes a more holistic view that emphasizes the relationship between individuals and their social surroundings (Norenzayan & Nisbett, 2000).

A study has shown that at older ages Americans make greater reference to general dispositions than Hindus when asked to describe others (45% and 15%, respectively) and less reference (14% and 32%, respectively) to contextual factors than Hindus of the same age. This may be due to Western cultures being more individualistic in cultural conceptions of the person while people from non-Western cultures adopt more collectivistic cultural conceptions of the person (Miller, 1984). These results also show that Americans describe things and people based on attributions regardless of context on a more frequent basis than non-Americans, which is also culturally influenced. For example, the first thing one might hear from an American when describing someone is the skin color or height of the person while a non-American may describe the person's name, job, or where they live to explain who he or she is. This literature might indicate reasons people see a loss in a court case as solely the fault of the lawyer and not the system and why people automatically assume that if a lawyer lies he is a liar and not that the circumstances influenced the behavior.

Attributions are how individuals explain the causes of behaviors and influence the way they make decisions in such areas as friendships, doctors, grocery stores, and cars. As social beings, people care what others think and what the general association is between people when making decisions. Ask people to explain why others behave as they do—why they succeed or fail, laugh or cry, work or play, or help or hurt others—and they will come up with complex explanations—often focused on whether the behavior is intentional or unintentional, but ask them about themselves and they will explain away the same behavior in themselves by describing the environment around them or outside forces that impacted their behavior (Harvey et al., 2014). This is extremely important when one thinks about why

people might have negative opinions about lawyers and the legal system. Because legal matters can be very serious and impactful situations for people, any negative experience can be upsetting and easily attributable to the character or morals of the lawyer. Humans are all scientists, from a very early age, at some level attempting to understand each other as deeply as possible (Gopnick, Meltzoff, & Kuhl, 2001). The explanations they develop as their final opinion or belief on a subject are their attributions of a particular person. The whole process stems from the natural human response to negative or unexpected events—“why?” (Harvey et al., 2014; Heider, 1958).

History and Theory of Attributions

Harvey and colleagues (2014) discussed Heider’s Attribution Theory (1958), which essentially created the field of attribution and claims that there are two categories in which to place the explanations to these “why” questions called attributions. These categories are personal and situational. This is best explained in the situation of professional hockey player Marty McSorley and his slashing incident of 2000. He had gotten heated during a game and high-sticked a player from the other team, Donald Brashear, who was knocked unconscious and bloodied with a severe concussion. Some people argued that McSorley is a particularly aggressive player and that was why he did what he did, which is a personal attribution, while others argued that a previous altercation with Brashear in a very competitive game provoked McSorley’s actions, which is a situational attribution. Further investigation of this theory reveals that humans tend to use situational attributions for themselves and personal attributions for others when the situation is a lie or other bad behavior.

Another theory of attribution cited by Harvey and colleagues (2014) is Jones and Davis' Correspondence Inference Theory (1965) which says that people try to infer from an action whether the act itself corresponds to an enduring personal characteristic of the actor. To decide, people make inferences on the basis of three factors; choice, expectedness, and effects. If a person chooses the behavior on their own or seems to do so, it is inferred that the act is characteristic of them but if they are told to commit the act then it is not. Also, if a person does something that is out of the norm or different, people tend to think they know more about that person or can infer more about their character. For example, if a person wears a three-piece suit to class every day, students are going to be more likely to infer something about the individual's character than if that person wears blue jeans every day simply because the three-piece suit is much less common. Finally, people make attributions about others based on the effects of the decisions made. Typically, people are more likely to make assumptions about a person who makes a decision that only has one good outcome versus a decision that has multiple good outcomes. For example, human beings are more likely to make an attribution about a person who stays at a low-paying, non-enjoyable job that has a bad location than a person who has a job that they love at a great location with great pay and benefits (Harvey et al., 2014).

One more theory of attribution as cited by Harvey and colleagues (2014) is Kelley's Covariation Theory (1967). This theory agrees with Heider's idea that everyone is a scientist (1958) and says that people make observations based on the covariation principle which is that in order for something to be the cause of a behavior, it must be present when the behavior occurs and absent when it does not. The three kinds of covariation information for

this theory are consensus, distinctiveness, and consistency (Harvey et al., 2014). A good example of this is of a man leaving a movie theater and yelling, "Great movie!" If someone were to hear this and was interested in the movie, they might seek out consensus information. This means that they would ask someone else what they thought to try to confirm the rave review of the first man. If they all agreed, the investigator could attribute the action to the stimulus, the movie, but if most other people are critical, they would attribute it to the person, either their personality or movie preference. One would also want to read into the distinctiveness of the review and determine whether the person is usually critical of all movies which would make this a distinctive reaction attributable to the movie or if the moviegoer reacts positively to every movie which would decrease the distinctiveness and, again, attribute the reaction to the person. Finally, it would be necessary to seek consistency information such as how the person reacts to the movie on DVD as opposed to the theater. If their reaction is consistent along high consensus and distinctiveness, the behavior is attributed to the movie, but it is attributed to the person when consensus and distinctiveness are low. In contrast to the other two types of information, however, behavior that is low in consistency is attributed to transient circumstances, such as the temperature of the viewing area.

The same can be said for the way people develop opinions about lawyers. If a friend shares a bad experience with a lawyer, a person may seek confirmation from others about their experiences with lawyers. If everyone agrees with the negative review, it has consensus. The person would next want to examine whether the original friend with the bad experience typically has bad experiences with people regardless of the circumstances of relationship to

the person or what profession that person practices. If they do not, then it would be fair to say the negative experience is distinctive to the lawyer. Finally, the person may want to observe their friend interacting with the lawyer in other capacities outside the legal office. If the negative experience persists across multiple different experiences in different capacities, the attribution would achieve consistency.

Attribution is a common cognitive process that occurs among people, especially when getting to know someone for the first time or trying something new. People are social beings, and as such, are curious about others and make assumptions about the actions of others in order to try to get to know them better. The point is that whether one follows Heider (1958), Jones and Davis (1965), or Kelley (1967), people make attributions every day about all sorts of things and understanding what they mean to everyday life is extremely important to social functioning. Lewin (1939) said what people do depends to a large extent on how they perceive and interpret the world around them. This means that in order to make decisions, humans attempt to understand their surroundings and everyone and everything involved so that they may have a better idea of what the best choice to make would be. While social influences also weigh in on this process (Curtis, 2013), it is primarily a basic human process (Harvey et al., 2014; Heider, 1958; Jones & Davis, 1965; Kelley, 1967).

Lying in a Social Context

Deception, for the purpose of this research, is defined as “a successful or unsuccessful deliberate attempt, without forewarning, to create in another a belief which the communicator considers to be untrue” (Vrij, 2008, p. 15). It has been recorded in past research (e.g., DePaulo & Kashy, 1998) that people tend to lie less and about less serious subjects in close

relationships. This has been considered to be connected to the concepts of relatedness and intimacy. Marriages have been recorded to have more intimacy and longevity when disclosure and honesty are higher (DePaulo & Kashy, 1998). This also correlates to the prediction that people would feel more distressed when lying to someone close to them than to a stranger. However, this same study has found that because a person may love another and not to want to hurt them they might tell a lie, an altruistic lie, in the interest of protecting their loved one (DePaulo & Kashy, 1998).

Additionally, research has found that social and cultural influences can impact the types of lies told, to whom lies are most likely to be told, and in which situations the lies are most likely to be told. For example, 83% of college students reported higher willingness to lie to get a job than to lie to a friend (Robinson, Shepherd, & Heywood, 1998). Another example is that 90% of people reported willingness to lie on a date and more willingness to lie when the prospective date was rated higher in facial physical attractiveness (Rowatt, Cunningham, & Druen, 1999).

DePaulo and Kashy (1996) even reported differences between lying in men and women, not in percentage of times lying but in the things that each gender lies about. For example, men tell more self-oriented lies and women tell more other-oriented lies. Women might lie by complimenting others to spare feelings while men might embellish things about themselves to be seen in a more positive light.

Finally, difference in ethnic origins can complicate detection of deception. For example, one study found that African-Americans are viewed as more suspicious by Dutch Caucasian police officers due to differences between behaviors displayed by the respective

cultural groups (Vrij, 2000). This could be because eye contact is seen as polite in Western cultures but not necessarily in others (Curtis, 2013; Vrij, 2000). Facial expressions and body language are also used differently and to different extents from culture to culture. For example, Americans use their hands for expression more than those of Eastern descent. In Eastern cultures, it is customary to stand or sit at attention when speaking to someone and pay full attention to that person. Constant demonstrative movement of the hands could be seen as nervousness due to lying to an Asian individual instead of an expression of excitement or happiness like it is for Americans (Vrij, 2000).

For the purpose of examining lying present during lawyer-client interactions, it is necessary to regard this specific type of interface as a relationship of sorts. The relationship between a lawyer and client is extremely important and can be vital for the development of a strong enough defense to win a case. In situations like this, lying on the client's part can be destructive toward the case, the relationship, and the lawyer's career.

Furthermore, people are not very good at detecting lies or lying behaviors (Bond & DePaulo, 2006). This has led to methods like polygraphs, which are used to measure sympathetic nervous system arousal (Vrij, 2008). While these tests are not perfect, they are usually much more accurate than human perceptions alone. Much research has gone into trying to describe cues like speech interruptions, pauses, latency to respond, answer length, unusual detail, and other reactions to more accurately detect lies (e.g., Curtis, 2013; Epley & Huff, 2007; Peters, 2007). Just as in the case of nonverbal behaviors, there is no typical verbal deceptive behavior (Vrij, 2008). However, indicators include more negative statements than usual, more implausible answers, shorter responses, fewer self-references,

and more indirect replies (Vrij, 2008). Added to this are paraverbal cues like voice pitch, unusual pauses, message duration, speech errors and repetitions (Curtis, 2013; Vrij, 2008). This could also be seen as the reason why people may be wary of lawyers, described as intelligent/aristocratic and owners of a monopoly over legal knowledge (Galanter, 1998; Menkel-Meadow, 1990; Manning, 1974; Moses, 1995; Peters, 2007; Sullivan, 2000), and whether they are lying because most people cannot detect lies and it is much easier to hide than detect, especially for someone who knows more about what they are talking about than others.

As social beings, it would be expected that most people would report negative feedback when they realize they are being deceived. However, Epley and Huff (1998) showed that there were not many negative impacts on people based on the fact that they were lied to but there were definite repercussions for those people in their experiment which were told they were being lied to, because most people don't like being lied to (Curtis, 2013; Epley & Huff, 1998). The reason for what are called "altruistic lies" (DePaulo & Kashy, 1998; Curtis, 2013) is solely to protect the recipient of the lie from harm directly caused by the lie. This means that deception does not affect a person unless they know about it. Otherwise, they would just be happy with the relieving statement, compliment, or confirming words told to them. The same can be said for lies with any other motivation. If a person lies to protect themselves, no one is hurt because the person being lied to does not recognize the lie. However, if the lie is uncovered or suspected, the real attitudes and reactions from recipients may be identified (Epley & Huff, 1998; Sagarin et al., 1998).

In considering deception within the legal profession, the primary moral responsibility resides in the ABA Model Code of Professional Responsibility (United States, 1980) which was replaced by the very similar but more concise Model Rules of Professional Conduct in 1983. The Model Code states that a lawyer should assist in maintaining the integrity and competence of the legal profession, assist the legal profession in fulfilling its duty to make legal counsel available, and assist in preventing the unauthorized practice of law. He or she must also preserve the confidences and secrets of a client, exercise independent professional judgment on behalf of a client, represent a client competently and zealously within the bounds of the law, assist in improving the legal system, and avoid even the appearance of professional impropriety (United States, 1980). As required by the ABA, lawyers, just like psychologists, are expected to lead both honest and truthful professional careers. Just as in personal lives, professionally, lies are seen as offensive and detrimental to relationships (which is what a psychiatrist and patient or lawyer and client are engaged in) as well as the American legal process (United States, 1980).

History and Theory of Lying

Curtis (2013) points out that lying is a very prevalent aspect of human nature and is nothing new for psychologists to study. He references historical and cultural accounts of deception found in the Bible, which places the first lie three to four thousand years ago when the serpent lied to Eve, similar to the way that Greek mythology talks about Hermes lying his way into the ranks of the gods. Aesop's *The Boy Who Cried Wolf* is one of the most well-known and famous tales surrounding lying, especially for children. Its message is, simply, not to lie (Bond & DePaulo, 2006; Curtis, 2013). These examples demonstrate the concept

that lying is not seen in a positive light and can affect relationships with others in a negative way. Lies surround humans' entire lives and are intertwined into everything they do and, unfortunately, there are many definitions of lying and theories surrounding its nuances. Many early definitions address the intentionality of deception and encompass interpersonal dynamics. A drawback to these theories is that they focused on the disadvantage placed on the receiver of the lie, as was discussed earlier that many people will lie altruistically to protect the receiver of the lie from disadvantage (Curtis, 2013).

Another aspect of past psychological research on lying is the accuracy of deception judgments. Kraut (1980) reports 57% accuracy at determining deception in conversation. His research along with a meta-analysis conducted by Bond and DePaulo (2006) concluded that people are, at best, inaccurate at detecting deception. This means that deception can be extremely effective in communication regardless of the relationship with the communicator. It also sheds light on the accuracy of attributions of people as liars based upon appearance or conversation. People lie regardless of what the circumstance is, and people are not effective at recognizing these lies. However, the motivation and reason for lying can vary exponentially between people and circumstances and can be very powerful for tracing the lie back to the truth. According to Curtis (2013), "Motivations for lying fall into three dimensions...; the oriented direction of benefit, gaining advantage or avoiding loss, and materialistic/psychological reasons" (p. 11). This does not necessarily mean that these categories have to be mutually exclusive.

Self-oriented lies account for about 50% of all lies. These lies are usually aimed at social acceptance or other social gains. Also in this same category are "other-oriented lies"

which are simply the same exact types of lies except that they are told for the benefit of others. For example, a person may lie to a significant other about looking good on a date night to spare their feelings. Furthermore, this person would be more likely to do this for someone they are close to like family than for a stranger like a waiter at a restaurant (Curtis, 2013; DePaulo & Kashy, 1998). Also, there can be combinations of these types of lies where a person lies both for the benefit of themselves and for the benefit of someone close to them. These are referred to as social lies and are typically motivated to preserve social relationships. The prevailing theory holds that lawyers lie to clients most when trying to gain business, maintain business, and make money from business (Menkel-Meadow, 1990). These would all be considered self-oriented lies.

The second reason for lying is for gaining advantage or avoiding loss. Lying has been called a social function (Menkel-Meadow, 1990) and for this reason, people lie often to place themselves in the eyes of social favor or to avoid being ostracized. This is often reinforced and encouraged by society. People lie when accused of behavior that conflicts with normal societal behavior and will lie about performing socially acceptable behaviors to gain praise and acceptance (Curtis, 2013). This can be evidenced in early childhood when a child steals something from a sibling and causes them to cry. When the child is asked what he or she did to make his or her sibling cry, an honest response may be reprimanded. This teaches the child that being honest gets him in trouble and reinforces lying to stay out of trouble (Curtis, 2013). This also reinforces the concept of lying as a learned response. Lawyers are no different than every other person. In daily legal tasks, like mediation, lawyers have learned a routine of how things work and how to make deals with other mediators. A 1993 ABA poll

showed that 20% of people believe the legal profession to be an honest one followed by a 1998 Gallup poll with a reduced 14% agreeing (Peters, 2007). This could be because lawyers have learned that there may be no way to get the mediator to cooperate with his or her client in the desired way without bending the truth or omitting certain details, and also because the lawyer has the desire to help his or her client in every way possible even if it means putting personal integrity at risk (Curtis, 2013; Peters, 2007).

Finally, the last reason for lying outlined by Curtis (2013) is for materialistic or psychological reasons. This would fall back to the story of the child that was chided for stealing the toy. Materialistically, the child does not want to lose the toy after the hard work of stealing it, and psychologically, the child does not want to feel the way he or she did when he or she got in trouble the last time (Curtis, 2013). However, these types of lies can also be based on emotions. A person may lie to a date about certain aspects of themselves to enhance the connection with the date and, ultimately, enhance the date, their mood, and the connection with the other person. This would both cover for the materialistic want of a significant other or at least a chance at a second date and the desire to be happy and feel good about one's self (Curtis, 2013). Lawyers may do this when attempting to settle a sentencing dispute. They may lie about the client's willingness to cooperate with a probation officer or about their situation at home to try to reduce a sentence to probation. An added reason for this lie would be for materialistic and psychological gain in that reducing a sentence would please the customer, possibly entail a "win" in the case constituting pay, and would look good on the lawyer's record (Peters, 2007).

Application to Lawyers and the Legal Field

Stereotypes are the generalizations of behaviors or events to rationalize the outcomes (Riley & Ungerleider, 2012). They are usually negative and aimed at a cultural, racial, or gender group. Common cultural stereotypes of lawyers include that “Lawyers are obnoxious and think they know everything...nitpick everything you say, [and] will do anything to win a case, even lie in court” (Michelen, 2011, p. 1). According to Robert S. Marx’s lecture at the University of Cincinnati College of Law on December 8, 1997, “Many critics believe that lawyers deflect citizens’ candid and humane responses into socially destructive gaming. Lawyers ‘encourage their clients to think with selfish defensiveness, to imagine and prepare for the worst from everyone else’” (Galanter, 1998, p. 806). This shows a negative view of lawyers’ jobs and intentions. The public portrays a criminal defense lawyer creating a defense as money-seeking and reckless to the safety and sovereignty of the justice system because criminal defense contains heavy ethical and moral dilemmas, since many lawyers only get paid if they “win” the case. These complex decisions that lawyers are forced to make is what paints them as liars.

In comparison, doctors do not suffer the same stereotypes when portrayed in the media. Doctors are represented as complex but ultimately benevolent heroes in shows like *E.R.* (1994), *Grey’s Anatomy* (2005), and *House* (2004). Because doctors’ behaviors are typically dictated by the AMA Code of Medical Ethics (2003) and the Hippocratic Oath, people perceive doctors as morally upright professionals with the best interests of their patients in mind. Another reason for this discrepancy between public opinion of lawyers and doctors may be that most adults have had countless interactions with doctors starting at birth,

while not everyone encounters an interaction with a lawyer ever in their life (Galanter, 1998). Furthermore, Galanter (1998) adds that most people do not have their first interaction with a lawyer until adulthood and development of perceptions and stereotypes starts in very early childhood (Miller, 1984; Riley & Ungerleider, 2012).

People lie, and often, especially in relationships similar to that of a lawyer and a client. They also make attributions of each other on a regular basis, and Americans for the most part base them upon general dispositions. This means that if one feels deceived, he or she will label the person deceiving them as a liar and connect that attribution to their character. The real question is, however, just how prevalent is this phenomenon and how does it affect lawyer-client relationships, the justice system, and the overall success of current and future lawyers?

Galanter (1998) describes the Watergate scandal from 1972-1974 as the “death of law” (p. 809). At the same time that the public praised the system for “working,” confidence in elites progressively declined. The legal profession was criticized for failing to serve the public interest and abusing ordinary clients, creating self-serving alliances with the powerful and failing to implement equal justice. President Jimmy Carter came out very publicly with harsh criticism, which received huge support from the public, at the one-hundredth anniversary of the Los Angeles Bar Association. In 1977, the Kutak Commission was created within the American Bar Association and charged with the task of reanalyzing and revising the ethics rules of the ABA, which, with intense opposition from the ABA, eventually passed in 1983 (Galanter, 1998). The “roar of denunciation” only continued as time went along and even heads of the national legal community began to express negative opinions of the growth

of the profession and numbers of lawyers across the country. In the 1980s, lawyers' visibility rose greatly with the large increase in media and aggressive journalism tactics. Television shows and movies like *L. A. Law* (1986), *Matlock* (1986), and *Law and Order* (1990) began to portray more conflicted men as lawyers. These "heroes" were no longer typical and had abundant moral conflicts and considerations that made their positive decisions even more marked and awe-inspiring to audiences. These portrayals posed an unrealistic expectation of what a person in the position of a lawyer should be and do, leading to more and more disappointment in the perceived shortcomings of real lawyers (Beard, 2011; Galanter, 1998). This can be seen as a large reason for the state of public opinion of lawyers and for the huge difference that we see from the 1950s and 1960s to now (Galanter, 1998).

In the 50s and 60s, the time of the previous ABA Canons of Legal Ethics (1909), lawyers were seen as just, moral, upstanding men despite Theodore Roosevelt's review of them as "hired cunning" who favored the wealthy and their pursuits over the public interest (2011). Men like Atticus Finch, lawyer-father of acclaimed movie and book *To Kill a Mockingbird* (1960), was a man of integrity who raised his children to be thoughtful, intelligent members of society who loved and respected all regardless of race, age, or background. He definitely represented this in his own life while representing a slave, Tom Robinson, falsely accused of raping a woman from the small Southern town set in the 1930s. This story helps reinforce Canon 4 of the ABA Canons of Legal Ethics, "'always exert [their] best efforts in [the client's] behalf'" (Beard, 2011, p.965-966).

However, Beard sees the representation of lawyers in 90s films much differently. The 1909 ABA Canons of Legal Ethics had been replaced twice by the onset of the decade, first

by the Model Code of Professional Responsibility in 1969 and then by the Model Rules of Professional Responsibility in 1983. These revisions coincided with revisions in the Hollywood Production Code from the time of Atticus Finch to the modern movie rating system enacted in 1968. No longer under restraints of the Code, moviemakers had free range in representation of lawyers. By the 90s, lawyers were depicted as crass, selfish, greedy villains, antiheroes and the butt of some of the jokes Galanter discusses (Beard, 2011; Galanter, 1998).

Books and film often reflect and even shape public opinion (Beard, 2011; Miller, 1984). These changing cinematic representations of lawyers over time coincide with changes in the ABA Ethics Code over the 20th century in response to questions of the moral standing of lawyers and the true motivation behind their actions. This correlation explains the fluctuating percentages of people who trust and believe in the ethical standing of lawyers over the same century (Beard, 2011; Galanter, 1998; Miller, 1984).

Though most people report positive interactions with lawyers and feel as if lawyers do everything they can for their clients and hold high ethical standards for their work, the majority of people polled say that lawyers are not to be trusted and that view only gets worse over time. In 1984, 32% of adults polled reported having used the services of a lawyer within the previous two years and 51% reported being “very satisfied” while 27% reported being “somewhat satisfied.” However, the 1993 ABA poll reports that half of Americans think that about one-third of lawyers are dishonest, including one-fourth of Americans who believe a majority of lawyers are dishonest (Galanter, 1998). Finally, in 1984, a survey sample showed that 71% of the population agreed that lawyers work hard to protect their clients’ interests

and 64% agreed that lawyers generally follow high ethical standards with their clients (Galanter, 1998). This shows a public that approves of the representation of legal clients while, at the same time, harboring a deep distrust of lawyers in general. However, there is a misconception that this represents some kind of “historic low” in regards to lawyer approval. Galanter (1998) cites a time directly after the American Revolution against the British when, ““there existed a violent universal prejudice against the legal class and its members ‘were denounced as banditti, as blood-suckers, as pick-pocket’” (p. 808). It is just as Manning (1974) cites, “Even more does the client associate his lawyer with the worst aspects of our legal process—the delay, the gritty tawdriness of many courthouses...the apparently endless paperwork, the bureaucratic rigidity, and, as seen from the viewpoint of at least one party, the injustice of the outcome” (p. 821).

There has long been a debate as to whether lawyers should be advocates or representatives of their client or staunch representatives of the truth and the best interests of the entire country. If a lawyer sacrifices his or her client’s freedom for the interests of the country, then the fairness of the client’s trial may be questioned. These questions have been batted back and forth for over a century and, “The zeal of lawyers to represent their client may provide a noble motive for extrajudicial advocacy, and the recognition that factors outside the courtroom influence legal decision-makers may make it seem necessary, yet, the profession remains divided over whether, and to what extent, such advocacy is appropriate” (Moses, 1995, p. 1812). These arguments represent the origin of the negative view of the adversarial system and the people who thrive in it—lawyers.

A great majority of the blame for America's public opinion of lawyers today can be attributed to the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s and the denunciation from President Carter that followed. He claimed that, "'lawyers of great influence and prestige led the fight against civil rights and economic justice' and had failed to discharge their 'heavy obligation to serve the ends of true justice'" (Galanter, 1998, p. 810). This opinion began to gain great approval and agreement among the general public and in 1977 the Kutak Commission was tasked with revising the rules of ethical conduct for lawyers into the new Model Rules which focused primarily on confidentiality, allowing, or more imploring, lawyers to blow the whistle on their clients, and imposing a duty of fairness in negotiations. This was compounded by calls from Carter and the Kutak Commission to lawyers to account for their failure to embrace justice as a public resource (Galanter, 1998). This really swelled to become the phenomenon it is today starting in 1980 when lawyers became more visible and the media became more aggressive. Censorship lessened in movies and TV and people stopped being exposed to the nice, judicious, working-man lawyer that was someone's dad from decades past and films took on the responsibility of portraying the profession in a different light. The lawyer is now more three-dimensional and flawed and is placed in a more morally ambiguous and precarious role (Galanter, 1998).

Overview

People lie. Everyone does it (Curtis, 2013). It is part of human nature to attempt to appeal to others and do anything and everything possible to achieve that goal. That is usually considered one of many motivating factors for deception. It is also part of human nature to want to get to know each other better, to be able to relate to others. This is the reason for

attributions. However, most people do not enjoy being the object of deception whether it is in everyday life, relationships, or while discussing legal matters (Curtis, 2013; DePaulo & Kashy, 1998). To deal with matters like deceit, people create attributions to prepare themselves for negative situations and to answer the “why” questions in life (Heider, 1958), and, if aimed at a person or group of people, specifically, these attributions can be damning and damaging to the image or the career of an individual. The attributions and perceptions of lawyers is an area of need when it comes to research because of the increase in litigation over the past half-century. Mass litigation is a real issue in today’s world that has never before been seen and impacts our society in a very big way. More than a hundred million new legal cases are filed every year and many are no longer just one-on-one issues. Corporations cause problems for millions of customers: drug safety, vehicle malfunctions that can possibly cause fatal accidents, food gone bad that has harmed people, and the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico that affected wildlife in the area. (Phillips, 2000). Thus, it is important to investigate just how prominent the perceptions and attributions of lawyers as liars really are, how much people trust lawyers as opposed to other professionals like doctors, and how these perceptions affect people’s decisions to seek legal counsel, to believe their counsel when advised, or even, to tell their counsel the truth about their legal matters.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Question 1. Do people perceive lawyers to be more dishonest and more prone to lie than doctors?

Hypothesis 1. Participants will perceive lawyers to be more dishonest and lie more often than doctors.

Question 2. Do people have more negative attitudes toward the lies of lawyers than those of doctors?

Hypothesis 2. Participants will harbor more negative attitudes when lawyers lie than when doctors lie.

Question 3. Do people see lawyers' lies as more dispositional than doctors'?

Hypothesis 3. Participants will report lawyers as more dispositional liars than doctors.

Question 4. Do people perceive a difference in the competence and warmth of lawyers vs. doctors?

Hypothesis 4. Participants will report no difference in competence between lawyers and doctors but will report higher warmth scores for doctors than for lawyers.

METHOD

Participants

Approximately 112 ASU undergraduate students were recruited to participate in the current study. Students were recruited through the Psychology, Sociology, and Social Work Department's Online Research Participation system, Sona System to fulfill the required research component of a course or for extra credit in a course.

Materials

The researcher asked participants to imagine either a doctor or a lawyer and then respond to each questionnaire with the participant's own views and perceptions of the assigned stimulus.

The study used six instruments: Demographics Questionnaire, Perceptions of Professionals as Liars Questionnaire (PPL), Revised Causal Dimension Scale (CDSII), Causal Dimensions Scale of Others' Behavior (CDSOB), the Others' Deception Attitude Measure (ODAM), and the Warmth Competence Measure (WCM).

Demographics Questionnaire. The Demographics Questionnaire asked participants to provide information about age, sex, gender, ethnicity and race, and education.

Perceptions of Professionals as Liars Questionnaire. The Perceptions of Professionals as Liars Questionnaire (PPL) was developed by the researchers to assess perceptions of professionals as liars. The PPL consists of 8 items and uses a 7 point Likert-type rating scale that asks participants to indicate their agreement on the items (1 = significantly disagree, 4 = no difference, 7 = significantly agree) in response to perceptions of lying. Participants responded to prompts like "This is an honest person" and "This person

is a liar.” This questionnaire will assess the predicted difference between perceptions of lawyers and perceptions of doctors. The PPL demonstrates high average reliability ($\alpha = .89$) and the Liar score, made up of the five items on the PPL pertaining to lying, also demonstrates high average reliability ($\alpha = .87$; See Appendix A).

Revised Causal Dimension Scale. The Revised Causal Dimension Scale (CDSII) was developed by McAuley, Duncan, and Russell (1992). This scale uses a 9 point Likert-type scale that asks participants to indicate their agreement with an overall prompt, “Is the cause something:,” and question 1 for example, has anchors “that reflects an aspect of yourself” at 9 and “reflects an aspect of the situation” at 1 (See Appendix B). Table 1 shows the internal consistency of each of the four subscales of the CDSII for the current study.

Table 1

CDSII Internal Consistencies

Subscale	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	Range	α
Locus of Causality	14.01 (5.47)	3-27	0.70
External Control	17.41 (4.78)	3-27	0.63
Stability	16.35 (4.69)	3-27	0.52
Personal Control	11.49 (5.52)	3-27	0.81

Causal Dimensions Scale of Others’ Behavior. The Causal Dimensions Scale of Others’ Behavior (CDSOB) is an adapted measure of the CDSII. The CDSOB consists of the same 9 point Likert-type scale and items as the CDSII with the exception of changing the items for participants to rate attributions of another person’s behavior rather than their own (See Appendix C). For example, item four has been changed from anchors of “you can regulate” at 9 and “you cannot regulate” at 1 to “the person can regulate” at 9 and “the person cannot regulate” at 1. Also, participants were instructed to indicate their responses based on

discovering that the “lawyer” or “doctor” had told a lie. The purpose of this scale is to address the concept that lying is a negative societal aspect of one’s character and that people are less likely to want to associate with someone they perceive to be a liar. Table 2 shows the internal consistency of each of the four subscales of the CDSOB for the current study.

Table 2

CDSOB Internal Consistencies

Subscale	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	Range	α
Locus of Causality	15.27 (4.54)	3-27	0.48
External Control	15.72 (5.04)	3-27	0.72
Stability	15.19 (4.20)	3-27	0.22
Personal Control	13.41 (5.26)	3-27	0.76

Others’ Deception Attitude Measure. The Others’ Deception Attitude Measure (ODAM) is an adaptation of the Therapists' Attitudes towards Deception Scale (TATDS) and Attitudes Toward Patient Deception Scale (ATPDS) and has been used in research investigating therapists’ attitudes toward client deception and nursing students' attitudes toward patient deception (Curtis & Hart, 2015). The TATDS and ATPDS consisted of 44 items which assessed attitudes towards patients/clients who lie. The TATDS had high internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .83$) as did the ATPDS ($\alpha = .88$). The ODAM consists of the first 23 items from the TATDS and ATPDS that assesses attitudes toward deception and exhibits a high average internal consistency as well ($\alpha = .83$). The ODAM changes the wording of patient or therapist to person. It consists of a 7 point Likert-type scale with, for the first 12 items, 1 being “significantly decrease,” 4 being “no change,” and 7 being “significantly increase,” and for the last 11 items, 1 being “not very” and 7 being “very” with anchors like “successful,” “pathological,” and “weak”. (See Appendix D).

Warmth Competence Measure. The Warmth Competence Measure (WCM) was developed to assess 28 characteristics of perceived warmth (14 items total, 7 negative items and 7 positive items) and competence (14 items total, 7 negative items and 7 positive items) of individuals displayed in a picture (Hack, Goodwin, & Fiske, 2013). The WCM is meant to have two different scales; one for warmth and one for competence. The warmth scale ($\alpha = .91$) and competence scale ($\alpha = .87$) both exhibit high average reliability. The current study adapted the original scale by asking people to indicate their opinions about the “lawyer” or “doctor” on each item and including a 7 point Likert-type agreement rating scale (e.g., Clever, 1 = Significantly disagree, 7 = Significantly Agree; See Appendix E).

Design

This study used a between-groups design. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: “imagine a lawyer” or “imagine a doctor.” All participants were given the same measures in the same order.

Procedure

Participants completed the study online. They completed a short demographic form. Next, participants were asked to imagine the stimulus to which they were assigned. Next, participants completed the PPL. Then, the participants completed the CDSII. Following that, participants completed the CDSOB. After that, participants completed the ODAM. For the last measure, participants completed the WCM. Lastly, participants received a full debriefing on the study.

RESULTS

Question one asked if people perceive lawyers to be more dishonest and more prone to lie than doctors and the hypothesis predicted that participants would perceive lawyers more dishonest and more prone to lie. Scores on the PPL were totaled from the five different questions in the Liar variable of the PPL. A *t*-test was then conducted to compare the scores between groups. An independent samples *t*-test indicated that lawyers are perceived as more prone to lie ($M = 41.96, SD = 7.86$) than doctors ($M = 51.71, SD = 8.82$), $t(105) = -6.02, p < .001, d = 1.17$. The independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare scores on perceived professionalism between thinking of lawyer or doctor. There was no statistically significant difference between the doctor ($M = 6.34, SD = 1.23$) and lawyer ($M = 5.90, SD = 1.30$), $t(112) = -1.97, p = .076, d = .35$.

Question two asked whether participants had more negative attitudes toward the lies of lawyers than the lies of doctors and the researchers hypothesized that participants would have more negative attitudes toward lawyers. The questions from the ODAM were summed and then compared between each condition. An independent samples *t*-test revealed no statistically significant difference in attitudes between lawyers who lie ($M = 72.62, SD = 15.82$) compared to doctors who lie ($M = 70.43, SD = 15.31$), $t(110) = .74, p = .46$.

Question three pertained to whether participants perceive lawyers' lies as more dispositional than the lies of doctors. It was hypothesized that this perception would be present. Regarding attributions, an independent *t*-test revealed a significant difference in the attributional dimension of external control for lawyers ($M = 14.47, SD = 4.37$) compared to

doctors ($M = 16.80$, $SD = 5.36$), $t(108) = -2.47$, $p = .015$, $d = 0.48$. However, an independent t -test did not reveal a significant difference in the attributional dimension of personal control for lawyers ($M = 12.84$, $SD = 4.29$) compared to doctors ($M = 13.90$, $SD = 5.95$), $t(109) = -1.06$, $p = .293$, $d = .20$.

Question four concerned whether participants would perceive a difference in the warmth and competence of lawyers versus doctors. The hypothesis was that participants would report no difference in competence between lawyers and doctors but would report higher warmth scores for doctors than lawyers. A mixed ANOVA was run with total warmth scores versus total competence scores as the between-group variable and participant scores of warmth for doctors versus lawyers and participant scores of competence for doctors versus lawyers as the within-group variables. There was a significant main effect in the difference between the warmth of lawyers ($M = 64.54$, $SD = 11.28$) and doctors ($M = 77.98$, $SD = 13.37$) versus the competence of lawyers ($M = 77.67$, $SD = 11.18$) and doctors ($M = 80.83$, $SD = 11.29$), $F(1, 104) = 80.03$, $p < .001$. There was also a significant interaction effect in the difference between lawyer warmth ($M = 64.54$, $SD = 11.28$) and doctor warmth ($M = 77.98$, $SD = 13.37$), $F(1, 104) = 33.162$, $p < .001$. There was no significant effect in the difference between lawyer competence ($M = 77.67$, $SD = 11.18$) and doctor competence ($M = 80.83$, $SD = 11.29$), $F(1, 104) = .742$, $p = .108$.

DISCUSSION

The current study found that participants perceive lawyers as more dishonest than doctors. This is not surprising given the earlier-mentioned stereotype of today's lawyer as an obnoxious, lying, know-it-all (Michelen, 2011). This finding is also compounded by the higher scores for doctors than lawyers on the questions, "I like this person" and "I would want to be associated with this person." People endorsing negative ideas about legal professionals can have an impact on the legal field. The most interesting part of the results from the PPL is the fact that there was no statistically significant difference found between the scores of doctors and lawyers on the question, "This person is professional." People don't doubt the credentials or abilities of lawyers to do their job any more or less than the credentials or abilities of doctors. This is very similar to the finding that people don't question the competence of lawyers but do perceive them as less warm than doctors. In professionalism, people have faith in lawyers, but attribute lying and being cold as internal aspects of their personalities. This means that even if lying is not attributional to lawyers personally or as a profession, people perceive it to be.

The second hypothesis did not reveal any statistically significant results as it was found that there was no reliable difference between participants' attitudes toward lawyers when they lie or doctors when they lie. This may go back to the fact that people simply don't like to be lied to (Epley & Huff, 2007) regardless of who is doing the lying. High scores for negative attitudes for both lying lawyers and lying doctors indicate resentment for dishonesty in public service professionals in general.

Results were found to support the hypothesis that participants would perceive more external control in the lies told by doctors versus the lies told by lawyers. This makes sense in that people perceive doctors to have a moral code they cannot cross and accept that they sometimes have to lie or withhold information to protect themselves or their patients. Though there were no significant differences indicating that participants perceived lawyers had more personal control over their lies than doctors, the results reveal that participants believe that in lawyers' lies there is more personal control than external control and this is not the case for doctors. This is contrary to how similar the American Bar Association (ABA) Code is to the American Medical Association (AMA) Code both in its requirements of those who take the oath and in its punishment for failure to meet the oath (AMA's Code of Medical Ethics, 2001; United States, 1980).

The findings from the Warmth-Competence Measure (Hack et al., 2013) revealed that participants perceive no difference in the competence of lawyers versus the competence of doctors, but did perceive a significant difference in the warmth of the two professions. Though there is a view that lawyers are just as able to do their jobs and be professional as doctors are, there is also a view that lawyers are less caring and warm. This carries an implication toward the ability of lawyers to develop strong relationships with their clients and to be able to honestly present their case in court. This may lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy within the practice of law. The self-fulfilling prophecy results when a perceiver's expectation of a person or thing actually leads to the fulfillment of said expectation by way of the perceiver's behavior toward said person or thing (Riley & Ungerleider, 2012). Clients who believe lawyers are liars and cold-hearted may withhold information from their lawyer

and may be cold when dealing with a lawyer. This, in turn, may result in the lawyer responding by lying and being cold-hearted. The client's perception of the lawyer would then be fulfilled and the client would feel as if they were correct, though their behavior caused the reaction of the lawyer and confounded the interaction.

Implications

The current study has implications for the legal field. Prior research has indicated that there is a stereotype of lawyers as liars (Michelen, 2011). It has also been found that people do not like to be lied to and react negatively to detected/perceived deception (Epley & Huff, 2007). The results of the current study revealed a significant difference between participants' perceptions of lawyers as liars than of doctors as liars. Participants also reported a lower likelihood of wanting to associate/work with lawyers than with doctors. Therefore, the negative perception and attribution of lawyers appears to affect the ability of lawyers to develop the strong relationships with clients needed to effectively do their job. These views may be reported differently toward one's personal lawyer. If someone has developed a long-term personal relationship with someone else, he or she most likely has good feelings toward that person. A replication of this study with a representation of the general population, instead of a purely college-age population, may show results that reflect this.

Perceptions of lawyers as liars could also have an impact on the cultural perception of the legal system as a whole. With major issues like abortion, gay marriage, and open-carry of firearms being hotly contested in today's political world, the Supreme Court of the United States is highly prevalent in popular culture. If the negative views of lawyers are found to be pervasive to the entire legal sector, it could have a major impact on popular opinion and,

therefore, enforcement of Supreme Court decisions. Supreme Court decisions are established as law over the land, however, many states have laws that differ from American law and are able to enforce the state law instead if the law involves the state's ability to police its own citizens. If a Supreme Court case suffers negative popular opinion from the general public due to a negative "liar" stereotype of the lawyers or judges involved, the executive branch may find difficulty enforcing the laws the Supreme Court puts into effect, as it can be expected that there will be states who cite police power in rejecting the law.

Additionally, though stereotypes are highly prevalent in American culture, individuals' awareness of them is usually low. In the case of the lying lawyer stereotype, awareness could lead to elimination of the stereotype and the improvement of public opinion of lawyers. If people are aware that something they are doing is morally wrong or represents an incorrect belief, it is to their best interest to change that behavior. It is predicted that making the negative stereotype apparent to people will have the same effect as when the hate and stereotypes toward African-Americans were made obvious in the sixties; reduction of the behavior, change in social structure in favor of the stereotyped group, and, in some cases, guilt. It is also established that stereotypes are not much different in other countries and that they spread similarly (Riley & Ungerleider, 2012). Because of the very international world we live in due to the internet and ease of travel, it is important for the U.S., as a cultural leader, to increase awareness of the legal field and the stereotypes surrounding it, to help influence other countries to do the same.

Furthermore, today, communication and film have the ability to influence public opinion. Often, these views can be false because they do not come directly from the

source...lawyers. Allowing lawyers to be more public figures and represent themselves to the public instead of the mass media doing so could lead to more accurate views of the legal profession.

Another point, as reported earlier, is that the legal profession has been engrained in American culture since the beginning of the nation. Additionally, public opinion of lawyers has changed multiple times throughout history in accordance with current events and laws passed. It is important to discuss the history of these events and court decisions and the political climate surrounding them to strengthen understanding of lawyers and shape future views through awareness of the past.

Finally, the medical profession is also deeply engrained into the politics and culture of the United States and is represented positively, not only in this study, but in television, film, news, and popular culture. The results showing that doctors are highly regarded as warm, competent, professional, and non-dispositional liars are not surprising. Additionally, however, these results are very encouraging as the medical field is growing with innovations like possibilities of 3D-printing organs and the use of stem cells to possibly cure cancer and other diseases. Steps like these in medical technology carry ethical concerns and the suggestion that people trust and believe in the morals and ethics of doctors could be promising for researchers in these ground-breaking fields.

Limitations

Limitations to this study include the fact that participants were largely a university sample. Students from Angelo State University may not be representative of the general population. The majority of college students also may never have had any interactions with a

lawyer. Adults who have interacted with lawyers or may even have a personal lawyer on retainer may be less likely to subscribe to the stereotype of lawyers as liars. A more representative sample could have been obtained by recruiting from university and non-university populations. College-aged individuals who are not attending a university or college may also have different views of lawyers and the liar label.

Another limitation is that this study did not utilize pictures as stimuli for either of the conditions and participants were simply asked to answer the questionnaires based on their own previous views. Perhaps having a visual stimulus would provide different results. This does not add the control of showing participants a picture, establishing the person in the picture as a lawyer, and instructing them to think of that person. On the other hand, a picture may have a confound if the person in the picture is not at least average in attractiveness or believable to be a lawyer or doctor. A picture may also have the adverse effect of specificity to just the person in the picture and not lawyers or doctors in general.

Finally, this study only compared lawyers to doctors. Other comparisons, such as comparing lawyers to general population members, may have revealed differences. The researchers expect to see an even larger discrepancy in the perception as a liar between lawyers and general population members than lawyers and doctors. Participants would consider themselves general population members and people are most apt to assign blame for their own lies to external influences and others' lies to internal influences (Bond & DePaulo, 2006; DePaulo & Kashy, 1998; Peterson, 1996). Additionally, people are also more apt to believe they are warm and competent as opposed to others (Hack et al., 2013), so researchers would expect to see a large discrepancy in those scores as well.

Future Research

Continuing this research is encouraged. Possible future studies could replicate this study with the visual stimulus of a picture labeled as a lawyer for one condition and a picture of a doctor (or other profession chosen by the researcher) for the other condition. It would also be interesting to look at gender of lawyers as an additional variable. It is predicted that male lawyers would be perceived as more prone to lie.

Additionally, research could be done from the lawyers' perspective to see how often lawyers truly deceive clients. This research could determine if the perception that all lawyers are liars affects the frequency of lawyer deception. It could also determine how this perception affects the attitudes and feelings of lawyers during legal proceedings. Problems may arise in a self-report measure because participants often lie about themselves considerably to improve the way they are perceived by others.

It may also be interesting to look at possible benefits of lawyers lying to clients. Then, researchers could examine advantages and disadvantages of lawyers' deception to determine whether or not deception is positive for anyone but the lawyer in the legal field.

Conclusions

This study promotes research within the area of applied social psychology or specifically, social cognition and the legal field. Investigating lawyers and lying behavior remains an underdeveloped area at this time, but researchers are encouraged to continue expanding the field. In conclusion, lawyers are perceived to be liars by college-aged students. Lawyers may want to consider the negative stereotype placed on them before each interaction with a client, especially if they are considering using deception in said interaction.

Being aware of this stereotype may be helpful in building satisfying relationships with clients and for clients to establish good working relationships with lawyers.

This study shows that there are widespread negative views of lawyers and their confirmed label of liars in society, but more research should be done to discover any potential benefits of lying to clients before it can be determined whether or not lawyers should ever lie to clients. It may be possible that lawyers use deception to keep their clients out of jail/prison or that they deceive by omission because a certain legal concept is very difficult to understand and can be explained sufficiently enough for the situation by only covering the basics. Research into this area may show that there are benefits that outweigh the negatives effects of the discovery of the lie.

As stated above, more research is encouraged in this area. As of now, this study shows that lawyers are perceived to be cold liars. Until more research has been conducted, lawyers and clients alike should be more aware of the stereotypes surrounding the legal field and the repercussions they can have on legal proceedings and alter their communications appropriately.

REFERENCES

- AMA's Code of Medical Ethics. (June, 2001). Retrieved April 14, 2016, from <http://www.ama-assn.org/ama/pub/physician-resources/medical-ethics/code-medical-ethics.page>.
- Beard, A. (2011). From hero to villain: The corresponding evolutions of model ethical codes and the portrayal of lawyers in film. *New York University School of Law Review*, 55, 962-978.
- Bond, J., & DePaulo, B. (2006). Accuracy of deception judgments. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(3), 214-234.
- Curtis, D. A. (2013). Therapists' beliefs and attitudes towards client deception. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 75.
- Curtis, D. (2016). Social cognition: A world of beliefs. In J. M. Bonds-Raacke (Ed.), *Thinking Critically about Social Psychology*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Curtis, D., & Hart, C. (2015). Pinocchio's nose in therapy: Therapists' beliefs and attitudes toward client deception. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 37, 279-292.
- DePaulo, B., & Kashy, D. (1998). Everyday lies in close and casual relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74 (1), 63-79.
- Epley, N., & Huff, C. (1998). Suspicion, affective response, and educational benefit as a result of deception in psychology research. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24 (7), 759-768.

- Galanter, M. (1998). Robert S. Marx lecture: The faces of mistrust: The image of lawyers in public opinion, jokes, and political discourse. *University of Cincinnati Law Review*, 66(805), 805-857.
- Gopnick, A., Meltzoff, A., & Kuhl, P. (2001). *The scientist in the crib: What early learning tells us about the mind*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Hack, T., Goodwin, S. A., & Fiske, S. T. (2013). Warmth trumps competence in evaluations of both ingroup and outgroup. *International Journal of Science Commerce and Humanities*, 1(6), 99-105.
- Harvey, P., Madison, K., Martinko, M., Crook, T. R., & Crook, T. A. (2014). Attribution theory in the organizational sciences: The road traveled and the path ahead. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 28(2), 128-146.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Jones, E. E. & Davis, K. E. (1965). From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception. *Advances in Experimental Psychology*, 2, 219-266.
- Kelley, H. H. (1967). Attribution in social psychology. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, 15, 192-238.
- Kraut, R. (1980). Humans as lie detectors. *Journal of Communication*, 30(4), 209-218.
doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1980.tb02030.x.
- Lewin, K. (1939). Field theory and experiment in social psychology: Concepts and methods. *American Journal of Sociology*, 44(6), 868-896.
- Manning, B. (1974). If lawyers were angels: A sermon in one canon. *American Bar Association Journal*, 60 (7), 821-825.

- McAuley, E., Duncan, T., & Russell, D. (1992). Measuring causal attributions: The revised Causal Dimension Scale (CDSII). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 566-573.
- Menkel-Meadow, C. (1990). Lying to clients for economic gain or paternalistic judgment: A proposal for a golden rule of candor. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 138*, (761), 761-70.
- Michelen, O. (2011, August 8). Why people hate lawyers (but shouldn't). Retrieved from <http://www.courtroomstrategy.com/2011/08/why-people-hate-lawyers-but-shouldnt/>.
- Miller, J. (1984). Culture and the development of everyday social explanation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*(5), 961-978.
- Moses, J. (1995). Legal spin control: Ethics and advocacy in the court of public opinion. *Columbia Law Review, 95*(7), 1811-1816.
- Norenzayan, A., & Nisbett, R.E. (2000). Culture and casual cognition. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9*, 132-135.
- Peters, D. (2007). When lawyers move their lips: Attorney truthfulness in mediation and a modest proposal. *Journal of Dispute Resolution, 2007*(1), 119-133.
- Peterson, C. (1996). Deception in intimate relationships. *International Journal of Psychology, 31* (6), 279-288.
- Phillips, R. (2000). The third age: Civil litigation at the dawn of the 21st century. Retrieved from <http://smithphillips.com/798-2/> Retrieved July, 15 2015.

- Riley, T., & Ungerleider, C. (2012). Self-fulfilling Prophecy: How teachers' attributions, expectations, and stereotypes influence the learning opportunities afforded aboriginal students. *Canadian Society for the Study of Education*, 35(2), 303-333.
- Robinson, W. P., Shepherd, A., & Heywood, J. (1998). Truth, equivocation concealment, and lies in job applications and doctor-patient communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 17(2), 149-164. doi:10.1177/0261927X980172001.
- Rowatt, W. C., Cunningham, M. R., & Druen, P. B. (1999). Lying to get a date: The effect of facial physical attractiveness on the willingness to deceive prospective dating partners. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 16(2), 209-223.
- Sagarin, B. J., Rhoads, K. V. L., & Cialdini, R. B. (1998). Deceiver's distrust: Denigration as a consequence of undiscovered deception. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 1167-1176. doi:10.1177/0146167298211004
- Sullivan, K. (2000). The good that lawyers do. *Washington University Journal of Law and Policy*, 4, 8-13.
- United States. ABA. *ABA Model Code of Professional Responsibility*. N.p.: n.p., 1980. ABA. Retrieved July 15, 2015.
- Vrij, A. (2008). *Detecting lies and deceit: Pitfalls and opportunities* (2nd Ed.) West Sussex, England: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Vrij A. (2000). *Detecting lies and deceit: The psychology of lying and the implications for professional practice*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.

APPENDIX A

Perceptions of Professionals as Liars Questionnaire (PPL)

Instructions: Indicate your opinions about the person above.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Disagree			No Difference			Significantly Agree

1. This is an honest person
2. This person is a liar
3. The person is very likely to lie
4. This person lies often
5. This person is trustworthy
6. This person is professional
7. I like this person
8. I would want to be associated with this person

APPENDIX B

Revised Causal Dimensions Scale (CDSII)

Instructions: Think about the reason for the behavior above. The items below concern your impressions or opinions of this cause or causes of this behavior. Circle one number for each of the following questions.

Is the cause(s) something:

- | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. That reflects an aspect of yourself | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 | Reflects an aspect of the situation |
| 2. Manageable by you | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 | Not manageable by you |
| 3. Permanent | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 | Temporary |
| 4. You can regulate | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 | You cannot regulate |
| 5. Over which others have control | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Over which others have no control |
| 6. Inside of you | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Outside of you |
| 7. Stable over time | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Variable over time |
| 8. Under the power of other people | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Not under power of other people |
| 9. Something about you | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Something about others |
| 10. Over which you have power | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Over which you have no power |
| 11. Unchangeable | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Changeable |
| 12. Other people can regulate | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Other people cannot regulate |

APPENDIX C

Causal Dimensions Scale of Others' Behavior (CDSOB)

Instructions: Think about the reason for the behavior above. The items below concern your impressions or opinions of this cause or causes of this behavior. Circle one number for each of the following questions.

Is the cause(s) something:

1. That reflects an aspect of the person 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Reflects an aspect of the situation
2. Manageable by the person 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not manageable by the person
3. Permanent 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Temporary
4. The person can regulate 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 The person cannot regulate
5. Over which others have control 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Over which others have no control
6. Inside of the person 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Outside of the person
7. Stable over time 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Variable over time
8. Under the power of other people 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Not under power of other people
9. Something about the person 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Something about others
10. Over which the person has power 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Over which the person has no power
11. Unchangeable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Changeable
12. Other people can regulate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Other people cannot regulate

APPENDIX D

Others' Deception Attitude Measure (ODAM)

If you discovered that a person was lying to you, how would that affect:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Decrease			No Change			Significantly Increase

1. Liking the person?
2. Being angry at the person?
3. Seeing the person as a bad person?
4. Thinking negatively about the person?
5. Judging the person harshly?
6. Desire to interact with the person?
7. Enthusiasm to interact with the person?
8. Judging the person as a good person?
9. Speaking poorly of the person with others?
10. Trusting the person?
11. Thinking positively about the person?
12. Viewing the person as sincere?

13-23. People who lie compared to people who do not lie are:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not very Successful						Very Successful

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not very Pathological						Very Pathological

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not very Weak						Very Weak

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not very Compliant						Very Compliant

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not very Pleasant						Very Pleasant

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not very Lazy						Very Lazy
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not very Awkward						Very Awkward
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not very Knowledgeable						Very Knowledgeable
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not very Intelligent						Very Intelligent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not very Likeable						Very Likeable
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not very Adjusted						Very Adjusted

APPENDIX E

Warmth and Competence Measure (WCM)

Instructions: Please indicate your opinion based on thinking about a [**lawyer or doctor-***depending on the condition assigned*].

The person is:

Clever

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly			No		Significantly	
Disagree			Difference		Agree	

Stupid

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly			No		Significantly	
Agree			Difference		Disagree	

Loyal

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly			No		Significantly	
Disagree			Difference		Agree	

Selfish

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly			No		Significantly	
Agree			Difference		Disagree	

Skillful

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly			No		Significantly	
Disagree			Difference		Agree	

Careless

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly			No		Significantly	
Agree			Difference		Disagree	

Caring

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly			No		Significantly	
Disagree			Difference		Agree	

Hostile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Agree				No Difference			Significantly Disagree
Gifted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Disagree				No Difference			Significantly Agree
Clueless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Agree				No Difference			Significantly Disagree
Thoughtful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Disagree				No Difference			Significantly Agree
Wicked	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Agree				No Difference			Significantly Disagree
Competent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Disagree				No Difference			Significantly Agree
Ignorant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Agree				No Difference			Significantly Disagree
Likeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Disagree				No Difference			Significantly Agree
Threatening	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Agree				No Difference			Significantly Disagree

Resourceful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Disagree			No Difference			Significantly Agree	
Defenseless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Agree			No Difference			Significantly Disagree	
Supportive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Disagree			No Difference			Significantly Agree	
Immoral	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Agree			No Difference			Significantly Disagree	
Inventive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Disagree			No Difference			Significantly Agree	
Powerless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Agree			No Difference			Significantly Disagree	
Trustworthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Disagree			No Difference			Significantly Agree	
Menacing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significantly Agree			No Difference			Significantly Disagree	

Dependable							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Significantly			No		Significantly		
Disagree			Difference		Agree		
Approachable							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Significantly			No		Significantly		
Disagree			Difference		Agree		
Incompetent							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Significantly			No		Significantly		
Agree			Difference		Disagree		
Insensitive							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Significantly			No		Significantly		
Agree			Difference		Disagree		

VITA

Tristan Lane Davis was born on December 15, 1995, in Arlington, Texas. He received a Bachelor of Arts in Psychology with Highest University Honors from Angelo State University in 2016. He was inducted into Alpha Chi in the fall of 2015. He was an active member of the Angelo State University Honors Program and served as Intramural/Homecoming Liaison of the Honors Student Association during the 2014-2015 schoolyear. He was also an active charter member and Treasurer of the Campus Lions Club of Angelo State and active member and Treasurer of the Angelo State University Psychology Club. He also worked as a tutor and supplemental instructor for the Angelo State University Tutor Center. He was a board member of the community board organization CrimeStoppers during the 2014-2015 year. Tristan will attend the University of Oklahoma College of Law in Norman, OK, to study law. He plans to become a licensed corporate lawyer.

Tristan can be contacted via email at davistristan20@gmail.com