Southwest Texas State University

Deception: The Reality Of Social Interactions With Others

Thesis Submitted To
The Department Of Liberal Arts
In Candidacy For The Degree

Master Of Arts In Teaching

Connie Marie Mears

December, 1991

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

There have been so many wonderful individuals that have provided financial and spiritual support, and guidance throughout my academic endeavors. First, I would like to thank my family for being there when I needed them, Shirley, J.D., Bonnie and Jamie. Mother, I could not have completed my second degree without your financial help! I fell fortunate to have a twin sister, Bonnie that constantly told me that wasn't anything that I could not accomplish with hard work and determination. I have a terrific son. Craig is now nine years old. I believe he is more excited about my graduation than I am. Craig's excitement stems from the belief that from now on weekends will not be devoted to Mom studying. I love you, son! Ed, I can't believe it is finally over and that all this hard work will be a memory soon. There is one memory that I will never forget and that is your support and caring that lead me back into college to complete my undergraduate degree, thank you so much.

To the great staff and students of the LBJ Student Center you have been like an extended family to me. Special recognition should be given to the ladies of the Office of Campus Activities and Student Organizations, Mindy, Olivia (Ms. America), and Sandra who continued to remind me of my academic abilities. Mindy, you have been the greatest supervisor and a wonderful friend. To Ed and Mindy, I appreciate the time both of you spent reading and proofing the thesis. In addition I would like to thank Olivia, who never became frustrated by typing and re-typing thesis drafts and tables.

I would like to thank my thesis committee; Dr. Donald T. Matlock, Thesis Chairperson, Dr. Ramona Ford, and Dr. Theron Stimmel. I consider myself luckily to have also had the privilege of learning from each of the three professors in the classroom environment. All of you have taught me so much both academically and professionally and I am truly grateful!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1
Deception: The Reality Of Social Interactions With Others

Introduction

Deception occurs in our daily social interaction with others. This behavior has both psychological and sociological ramifications in the realm of social behavior of individuals. There are numerous justifications used by individuals for deceiving another. This type of behavior can be used as a self-protection mechanism, the protection of role expectations, and the protection of other individuals.

Cognitive Development

In 1932 Piaget was one of the first to study the concept of children's understanding of lies. Piaget (1960, p. 135) suggests that, "The tendency to tell lies is a natural tendency, so spontaneous and universal that we can take it as an essential part of the child's egocentric thought." The tendency for the child to lie is the child's egocentric behavior that is in conflict with the demands and restrictive behavior set forth by the child's parents. Piaget's research takes a systematic approach to the development of the child's cognitive skills. According to Piaget, the child's understanding of the word lie is an evaluative and developmental process for the individual.

The literature also suggests an age difference both for definition and for evaluation of various forms of untruths. In the latter stages of development between the ages of six and ten, children define a lie as "simply as something that isn't true" (Piaget, 1960, p. 140). Between the

ages of seven and eight the child's understanding of the word lie takes on different meanings when associated with the child's own fantasies. During the child's involvement with peers the child is likely to state an untruth; however, in this period the child's cognitive development as pertaining to truth and falsehoods is not complete. Piaget (1960, p. 142) believed that the child around the age of ten defines the word lie as "any statement that is intentionally false." The research indicates that distinctions should be drawn between the various types of lies used, such as, exaggerations, self-protecting lies, altruistic lies, and white lies that are commonly used to protect the feelings of another individual (Piaget, 1960).

In one study, researchers (Peterson et al., 1983, p. 1531) looked at the developmental process identified by Piaget that involved deceptive behavior and the child's understandings of the word lie. The experimental group contained five age groups each of which had 40 subjects who were equally distributed between genders.

The research contained ten televised stories in which puppets depicted statements of interest for the participants. The ten statements of interest presented by the researchers (Peterson et al., 1983, p. 1531) are as follows:

> exaggeration, swearing, age guess, directions guess, self-protective lie/ neutral consequences, self-protective lie/ punished, self-protective lie/ believed, white lies, practical joke, and altruistic lie.

The participants provided four types of negative sanctions for lying: punishment, destruction of trust, guilt, and the fourth was identified as "don't know" (Peterson et al., 1983, p. 1533). Noteworthy in the study

was that there was a tendency for younger children to identify both age or directional guesses as lies. The directional guess situation was illustrated by puppets depicting a scenario in which directions were presented to another that were not accurate. Both the previous conditions presented illustrate guessing behavior instead of stating the facts. The participants in the study viewed the behavior of the puppets in both guessing conditions to be deceitful because factual information was not given. The children could not distinguish between intentional deceit and a mistake in information presented. Previously, Piaget's theory illustrated that all untruths are perceived as lies by young children. In contrast, the older participants were less willing to identify a guessing statement as a lie. The similarities shared by all age groups were their subscribing the poorest scores to those individuals who lied to escape punishment for their misdeeds.

In conclusion, the authors (Peterson et al., 1983, p. 1534) stated that

> children's replies to the general interview questions
> about lies are in line with Piaget's suggestion
> of a developmental progression from the objectivist
> view that lies are always wrong simply because of
> authority's prohibition against them to the more
> democratic notion that they are unethical only to the
> extent that they interfere with mutual trust, open
> communication, and social justice.

In understanding the phenomenon of the child's develop-mental processes, other researchers (Wimmer et al., 1984, p. 3) conducted an experiment that tested the concept of the meaning of the word lie and the child's moral judgment concerning lying. The key issue in this

research was if a child could take into account the speaker's intentions in providing information to the listener. The critical test questions in the first two hypotheses examined the scenario of "wrong in good faith" (Wimmer et al., 1984, p. 3). This condition was met by introducing characters who portrayed the idea that misinformation was passed by the first person to a second individual who, in turn, passed on misinformation to a third party. Although, the second person passed on misinformation to a third party the intent of the second person was not to deceive. It is true, however, that the intent of the first person in this scenario intended to deceive.

The third condition constructed described a person who by an unexpected change in events was perceived as lying. For example, when a child invites several of his friends to attend a baseball game only to learn that the game was cancelled due to bad weather. In this example, the child did not intend to lie, but an event beyond his control led his friends to believe he was deceitful. The final experiment contrasted all the previous conditions of creating a false belief in the speaker. The researchers (Wimmer et al., 1984, p. 28) concluded that the belief condition set forth "confirmed Piaget's claim that young children do not consider speaker intent in their use of the verb lying."

Strichartz and Burton (1990) directed an experiment in which deceptive behavior was examined as a developmental phenomenon among individuals. Young children, Strichartz and Burton (1990, p. 217) state,

> rely on the simple matching rule that truth requires
> factuality, until sometime between six and ten years
> old. During that time, they begin to place some

emphasis upon the belief system of the speaker, thus
to begin a modification of their reliance solely on
factuality to include the features used by adults.

Through the developmental processes children obtain prototypes that increase in sophistication as the children's cognitive development expands. The study indicates that "most ten-year olds will have begun their move into the Piagetian stage of formal operations, but many will not yet be solidly within that stage" (Strichartz and Burton, 1990, p. 218). The research suggests that children who are thirteen years of age and older do have a firm grasp in the concept of operational thought. In contrast, Strichartz and Burton (1990, p. 217) state,

Adults decide whether a statement is a lie by
comparing it against a prototype that is defined
by the elements of factuality, intent, and belief,
and that they consider the speaker's belief system
to be the most important element of the prototype.

Stokes and Baer (1977, p. 353) identified a series of "techniques for the promotion, generalization, and maintenance of behavior changes in individuals who deceive." One of the techniques used in the research was termed mediated generalization (Stokes and Baer, 1977, p. 353). The concept of mediated generalization is relatively simple in that the child is introduced to a particular behavior and once learned it can be transferred to other situations. For example, when a child practices truthful behavior and is rewarded with positive contingencies, the likelihood that the positive behavior will continue is greatly enhanced.

Research in the area of "operant conditioning" a technique that utilizes reinforcers both positive and negative and the timing of reinforcements to promote behavioral change was pioneered by B. F.

Skinner (1984, p. 136). Skinner's theory suggests that behaviors can be modified by appropriate use of positive and negative reinforcers.

Another technique recommended by the researchers (Stokes and Baer, 1977, p. 358) to promote generalization and maintenance is termed "use of indiscriminable contingencies." This technique is based on the delivery of positive reinforcers for appropriate behavior. Various conditions were developed for the delivery of reinforcements such as the child will be rewarded on an intermittent schedule when appropriate behavior is demonstrated. When rewards are unexpected or not given on a continuous bases it is reasoned that the child will exhibit the behavior after training has ceased.

Physical Characteristics

Several other researchers have focused on one's ability to tell if they are being lied to by another (Ekman et al., 1988; Riggio and Friedman, 1983). One particular study conducted by Riggio and Friedman (1983, p. 914) suggested that an individual with advanced social skills training and an extroverted personality could relay a deceptive message that is perceived to be the truth by the receiving individual. The ability to self-monitor physical characteristics, such as exaggerated body movements, overall nervous behavior and eye contact, appears to be an advantage in situations in which being detected are great. Riggio and Friedman (1983, p. 914) indicate that "high self- monitors are especially effective at controlling deception leakage in high anxiety situations." Some characteristics, such as close-set eyes, overall dishonest appearance, nervous reactions, body movements, and one's lack of ability to communicate effectively, are

perceived by others as a person who may be dishonest, when in fact this may not be the case.

Some researchers have observed individual's facial expressions, specifically one's smile. "In a sense the face is equipped to lie the most and leak the most, and thus can be a very confusing source of information during deception" (Ekman et al., 1988, p. 414). This study distinguished between two types of smiles, the "felt happy expression" or "masking smile." The felt happy smile is self explanatory. The masking smile however, illustrates that the individual is trying to "cover up" or conceal the person's true feelings. The authors (Ekman et al., 1988) suggest that with trained observers the two smiles can be distinguished, which may suggest that smiles are not a unitary phenomenon.

Non-verbal clues are a source of information that can be used to identify the accuracy of the presenters' information. The statement that one should not trust an individual who is unable to look you squarely in the eyes represents a non-verbal clue involving one's ability to appear honest. Various researchers indicate a host of other clues that are given by the deceiver that can alert the receiver as to the credibility of the message (Ekman et al., 1988; Riggio and Friedman, 1983; O'Hair et al., 1981).

The authors in this study observed the characteristics of behavior "leakage" in participants when instructed to provide deceptive information (O'Hair et al., 1981, p. 326). To evaluate participants for the study a Machiavellianism scale (Mach IV) was given to three hundred and sixty subjects. This particular scale is derived from the work of Christie and Geis (1970). The instrument is a twenty statement

Likert scale chosen principally from the writings of Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527), a sixteenth century philosopher. The scores derived from the scale identified the two categories into which participants were placed. The first group was composed of forty-four individuals who scored high on the Machiavellianism IV scale with an even number of both males and females represented. Females in the higher group received an overall Machiavellian score of 110.9 and males averaged 115.6. In contrast, the second group contained similar features except for the overall lower Machiavellian scores. The average low scores obtained for females was 71.4 and for males, 73.68 (O'Hair et al., 1981, p. 328).

The researchers (O'Hair et al., 1981, p. 327) led participants to "believe that they were confederates in a study on conversational analysis and were induced to exaggerate their grade point averages (GPA) as part of the task of the study of prepared lie." Participants in the study then were asked if indeed their grade point average was exaggerated to reflect a higher overall average. Two groups were used for comparative purposes. The first group of students, the "Truth tellers" were told to tell the truth on all questions presented. The second group, the "Liars" were given the same questions as the earlier group. The critical question regarding their grade point average was again asked. The second group provided the spontaneous lie condition resulting from their previous fabrications of their grade point averages. Both lie conditions were "sanctioned" because participants had been given permission to lie from the experimenters (O'Hair et al., 1981, p. 327). In the first lie condition, individuals were asked to prepare fabricated responses before the questions had been presented. The

second condition caught participants off guard by asking the question again about their grade point averages that were earlier fabricated.

The first hypothesis dealt with persons who were prepared to lie. It was reasoned that they would "employ shorter response latencies because of the anticipation of lying and to employ shorter message durations" (O'Hair et al., 1981, p. 328). The prediction provided by the authors illustrates that when participants are prepared to lie they will engage in less nervous behavior while deceiving. The second hypothesis given (O'Hair et al., 1981, p. 328) in the study was that

> in telling sanctioned, prepared lies, liars will engage in shorter latencies, shorter message durations, less laughter/smiling, and more affirmative head nodding than truth tellers.

The final hypothesis predicted that liars in the spontaneous lie condition will have "longer response latencies, shorter message durations, less eye contact, more laughter and smiling, and less affirmative head nodding than truth tellers" (O'Hair et al., 1981, p. 329).

Hypothesis one was supported in that those individuals who anticipated lying before they engaged in the behavior indeed had shorter responses than truth tellers and appeared to demonstrate fewer nervous movements than truth tellers. Participants in the prepared lie sample supported the second hypothesis which stated that there would be little or no difference between the liars and truth tellers.

In conclusion, the authors (O'Hair et al., 1981) were interested in individuals' overall level of Machiavellianism and the comparison of prepared lies versus spontaneous in regard to cue leakage. What was noted during the research was that participants who anticipated lying

had, before lying, shorter response latencies and appeared to have lower rates of postural shifting than truth tellers (O'Hair et al., 1981, p. 328). Moreover, subjects who engaged in a sanctioned, prepared lie "exhibited shorter latencies, shorter message durations, higher affirmative head-nodding rates, lower body adapter rates, and lower laugh/smile rates than truth tellers" (O'Hair et al., 1981, p. 337).

Behavioral characteristics have been of great importance in trying to understand the occurrence and or relationship of deceptive behaviors in individuals. This particular research does not reveal one pure characteristic or personality type that possesses a greater likelihood in deceiving others but identifies four character types: antisocial, narcissistic, borderline, and compulsive personality disorders (Ford et al., 1988, p. 559). The study draws its diagnostic information from DSM III to describe the four character types. Antisocial personality disorder is in tandem with persistent lying among its members. The narcissistic personality disorder persons distort reality to suit their own internal needs and desires. The authors (Ford et al., 1988, p. 560) further commented on this personality type by stating, "Their feelings of entitlement and the attitude that they do not have to play by the rules governing others often lead to prevarication."

Borderline personality disorder is used to characterize those patients who are "impostors" or who have factitious illness. The authors (Ford et al., 1988, p. 560) interpreted the lying as "serving several psychological purposes, including enhancement of self-esteem, projection of guilt, and efforts to achieve a sense of superiority over others." A compulsive personality disorder was identified in the research as the person's desire to avoid the feelings of intrusiveness

from others. The deception that occurs with this disorder is a self-protective mechanism that severely limits close interactions with others.

Social Relationships

Individuals as they interact with others are placed in situations in which they may feel it necessary to lie. Social influences such as expectation in relationships were researched by Millar and Tesser (1987). Within this research, they examined deception and guilt by two sets of relationships: that of the child and parent and that of employer and employee. It was necessary then to construct a scale of expectancies relevant to both sets of relationships. An example of expectancy given in the literature for the parent and child category was "get very drunk at parties," and for the employer and employee relationship "get impatient with a customer or client" (Millar and Tesser, 1987, p. 275). Respondents were instructed to evaluate statements according to their own expectations, the expectations of their parents, employee expectations and finally that of employer expectations. In addition, they were to respond to each statement as to how guilty they felt once the behavior was engaged. In short, "when students reported lying to a parent, the parent's expectations were most important, whereas the employer's and the student's (child) expectations were least important in that instance" (Millar and Tesser, 1987, p. 281). In conclusion it was found that "Lying is a response to a violation of the role partner's perceived expectations, and not to the violation of own expectations" (Millar and Tesser, 1987, p. 264). The study illustrates how a person can be placed in situations where other's

expectations are higher than his own. When the differences in expectations are not compatible this creates conflict and deception. In developing relationships with others, it is necessary to maintain honesty and a feeling of mutual respect and shared ideas. Individuals are drawn to others who share similar belief systems, culture, and religious sentiments. Millar and Tesser (1987, p. 274) indicated that the possibility for deception

> arises when behavior not directly monitored by the other person violates that person's expectation. Only when the role partner's expectations are violated is deception likely to occur.

The expectations that are placed upon us by others and the expectations we have for ourselves are not always conducive to mutual honesty. Moreover, the research suggests that persons lie about a variety of behaviors as well as to whom they lie. Some disturbing consequences are revealed by Millar and Tesser (1987, p. 283) that indicate the greater the number of expectations our partner has for us, the greater the likelihood of deception. This particular research was interesting in that it looked at the circumstances that produce lying and not necessarily the individual as a liar.

Motivation

Why do children lie? Children lie for many reasons. Probably the most common reason for lying is to avoid punishment for misbehavior and to escape unpleasant tasks or chores. Most children will on occasion lie if they believe that by doing so they can avoid punishment. It is reasoned, therefore, that if children receive harsh punishment for

lying they will continue to lie to avoid the negative consequences for their misdeeds. Parents in their desire to teach children the moral oath of always telling the truth resort to the statement that if you lie about a misdeed you will be punished twice, once for the deed and again for the lie. Now that parents have paved the way to truthfulness for their children it is discovered that the child will tell all about their inappropriate behaviors. Parents are faced with two options: not to punish the child for breaking rules or to punish the child for telling the truth about misdeeds.

Does deceptive behavior serve a purpose in social relationships? The authors illustrate the idea that deception does serve a useful purpose particularly for children. The authors (Ford et al., 1988, p. 556) state that "lying becomes an important, perhaps essential mechanism by which the child can test the limits of his or her own ego boundaries to define and establish autonomy." The child can experience a feeling of power by telling a lie. If that lie is not detected by his or her parents, the child realizes that he or she has control over his or her own behavior. The child's deception, although not appropriate, established in the child a sense of independence as a separate individual apart from his parents (Ford et al., 1988, p. 556).

In the research conducted by Geis and Moon (1981) participants were placed in situations that involved deception. To construct their setting, respondents "were induced to lie without knowing that it was part of the experimental set-up" (Geis and Moon, 1981, p. 767). In a second group, "truth conditions" were introduced for means of comparing the two categories. Geis and Moon's first hypothesis suggests that individuals who scored high on the Machiavellianism

scale would be more convincing liars than their counterparts who received lower scores. Judges were instructed to view video tapes of controlled interactions among participants. The experimental design had two components. The first component established was the lie condition in which money was taken from the other group without their permission. Secondly, the non-theft or truth condition is used as means of comparison. Briefly then, two conditions were used; one in which participants choose to lie or not to lie. The prediction that those individuals who scored high on the Machiavellianism scale would be more convincing liars than low Machiavellians was shown to be in line with their original hypothesis. According to the study, those respondents who were high on the Machiavellianism scale "averaged 3.55 on the credibility scale... whereas, low scores produced on the Machiavellian scale averaged 2.94, significantly unbelievable" (Geis and Moon, 1981, p. 772). To conclude then it would seem that those participants who agree with a Machiavellian view of human social interaction were able to be seen by judges as being more honest than low Machiavellians who subscribed to the principle that honesty is the best policy. Machiavelli would subscribe to the policy that public appearances conducted in good faith are extremely important; however, one should practice whatever means are necessary to achieve the desired results. This philosophy indicates that if the truth is not readily available a lie will service.

What preventive measures or techniques can be used to control deception among children? As indicated by the literature, punishment by itself is not an effective technique for the prevention of lying among children (Piaget, 1960; Paniagua, 1989; Peterson et al., 1983). For

example, children normally lie to avoid unpleasant consequences such as physical punishment or time out measures of discipline. The use of physical punishment for deceptive behavior among children can lead, unfortunately, to an increase in the very behavior that we wish to diminish. Physical punishment also teaches children what not to do. It does not teach what to do! The use of physical punishment thus is not an educational tool that will effectively reduce deceptive behavior in children.

In the research conducted by Paniagua (1989, p. 973) it was noted that there are two important relations regarding deceptive behavior,

> the relation of verbal and internal states. In both
> relations, labeling a given statement (verbalization)
> a case of lying versus truthfulness requires an analysis
> of verbal-external events relation versus verbal-internal
> state relation.

An example of verbal-external relationship perhaps will illustrate what Paniagua was alluding to. When a child is asked to complete a household chore such as "take out the trash," and the child agrees to do so and then actually follows through with that request, the behavior can be directly observed by the parent. In contrast, if the child states that he will "take out the trash" when requested then does not, the verbalization between saying and doing is in conflict or perceived as a lie by the parent (Paniagua, 1989, p. 973). Paniagua (1989, p. 974) provides an example of

> verbal-internal as if a child says "I have a
> headache, I can't go to school" when instructed to
> "get ready and go to school," the child's verbal-
> ization would be a case of lying (C) if there is
> no relationship between the verbalization (A) and

the internal state (B) that the child does not have
a headache but simply want to avoid school.

When trying to manage lying among children it would be easier to trace one's progression with the verbal-external relationship because both the verbalization and the child's actual behavior are observable. Whereas in the verbal-internal relationship the verbalization is observable, the behavior or product is not. Paniagua's (1989, p. 975) "correspondence training is a method that emphasizes the development and management of lying by children through the manipulation of verbal-external event relations." The training involves a shaping of behaviors that lead children to verbalize and then to follow through with their promised behavior. For example, when a child is asked to "brush his teeth," and he states he will do so (a promise) and then does indeed follow through with the behavior (behavior promised) identifies a promise-do correspondence (Paniagua, 1989, p. 975).

In the area of correspondence training, to obtain generalized truthfulness, Paniagua (1989, p. 980) states that training "occurs if after training with a few responses the child tells the truth in relation with other responses for which correspondence has not been trained." Although the technique of correspondence training, emphasizes verbal-external event relations, Paniagua noted that through the shaping of this relationship learning is reinforced and generalized to internal states that are covert or hidden (Paniagua, 1989, p. 982).

Correspondence training is a practical solution for the teaching of truthfulness among children. The training involves a positive approach, instead of an adverse consequence to lying behavior in

children. Moreover, it teaches children what to do to change their deceptive behavior.

Is honesty the best policy, or are there some circumstances that induce the individual to deceive? The notion that perhaps there are acceptable lies that are told was researched by Lindskold and Walters (1983). Lying is defined by Lindskold and Walters (1983, p. 129) as,

> A social act involving a deceiver and one who is
> deceived. Untruths told by accident, therefore,
> are not lies nor are falsehoods told by persons who
> are not responsible for their actions or who are not
> considered able to perceive consequences, such as
> young children or mentally incompetent individuals.

Perhaps the notion of lying could be placed upon a continuum that ranges from acceptable lies to unacceptable lies. In accordance with this notion six statements from acceptable to unacceptable lies were derived from the research conducted by Lindskold and Walters (1983, p. 130) and they are;

1. Telling a lie to save others from minor hurt, shame, or embarrassment.

2. Telling a lie to protect yourself or another from punishment or disapproval for a minor failing or sender which hurts no one.

3. Telling a lie that will influence another in an official position in such a way that you will gain by their response to you, but they will not be harmed.

4. Telling a lie to make yourself appear better than you really are or to protect some gain, acquired some time ago, to which you were not really entitled.

5. Telling a lie, if successful, could cause others to do
   something that benefits you while, at the same time,
   harming themselves or causing themselves a loss.

6. Telling a lie that hurts someone else so that you
   can gain.

At present the categories seem to range from altruistic, through
individual gains, to exploitative measures from one individual to
another. It has been reasoned that the motivation of the deceiver
determines the acceptability or unacceptability of the lie.

Christie and Geis (1970, p. 3) developed a strategy of viewing the
Machiavellian personality characteristics that might be associated with
more serious forms of lying. The first characteristic presented by
Christie and Geis (1970, p. 27) assumes that the individual is perceived
by the manipulator as an object that can be pulled in one direction or
another rather than a person who has feelings. The second statement
suggests that those who manipulate have utilitarian rather than a
moral view of their interactions with others. In the third statement, it
is reasoned that an individual with a Machiavellian orientation
produces judgments based on his or her distortion of reality. Finally,
what is suggested in the fourth statement is that successful
manipulation is based on short-term achievement and quick results over
long-term goals. Ideally, this individual would perform activities that
are more involved in tactics for achieving possible ends. The following
dominant characteristics were noted;

1. A relative lack of affect in interpersonal
   relationships.

2. Lack of concern with conventional morality.

3. A lack of gross psychopathology.

4. Low ideological.

Nonverbal communication was also researched by Christie and Geis (1970). The study indicates that "personality factors mediate the use of eye contact under differential situational inducements to conceal information" (Christie and Geis, 1970, p. 73). Some differences were noted in the situational design; however, conclusions regarding the validity were not encouraged. They do suggest that there are three relevant characteristics, "face to face interaction, latitude for improvisation, and arousing irrelevant affect" (Christie and Geis, 1970, p. 285).

The major prediction by Geis and Moon (1981, p. 772) was that respondents who scored high on the Machiavellianism scale would be able to lie more believably than those who scored lower. This prediction was confirmed. The judges believed lying high Machiavellians more than they believed lying low Machiavellian subjects. High Mach- iavellians, who agree with Machiavelli that the appearance of honesty is foremost, were seen as more honest than low Machiavellians, who believed that honesty itself is more important. Lying more credibly is more likely to achieve the goal such as avoiding self-incrimination than lying transparently.

The literature suggests that motivation is a key factor in deceptive behavior. Motivation is revealed when white lies are used to protect the feelings of others. For example, your friend has just made the worst meal that you have ever had the displeasure of eating. Do you tell your friend that the meal was wonderful or do you tell him or her the truth? Sometimes when you know a person well the truth is easier to tell

because they will understand, but this becomes difficult when you are not as familiar with a person. Consider for a moment how the media is used as a motivational device. Deception in this case is for personal gains. Consumers are motivated to purchase what is seen or heard through the media. As consumers, we are introduced to thousands of claims as to how a product, idea, or lifestyle is better than the rest. Obviously, everyone can not be telling us the truth.

In contrast, when a person is motivated to deceive another by one's own personal desires the intent is self-protection. The child who denies breaking a glass is doing so to prevent his or her own discomfort. This technique is used as a self- protective measure as the child chooses to deceive the parent to avoid the consequences of his or her actions. Not only is there a motivation to lie in some cases, but it seems that one is also motivated to conceal deception once it has occurred. Deception, when identified to conceal outward appearances, was researched by Riggio and Friedman (1983). The major contribution of this study was the finding that certain individuals have the ability to conceal facial and nervous body gestures which could be viewed by others as deceptive behaviors. It is reasoned that good emotional senders show little change outwardly and have the ability to convince others of their truthfulness whether they are truthful or not.

Stebbins (1975, p. 190) identified a "put-on as intentionally and successfully misleading acts (or products) directed by one or more persons at one or more others." The author (Stebbins, 1975, p. 190) indicates three motives for engaging in such behavior and they are as follows:

> One motive is the put-on perpetrated by the deceiver
> on the mark -- the object of the put-on -- for fun or sport.
> Putting someone on can be a form of amusement or
> diversion. Second motive for putting people on is either
> to test their ability to discriminate sincere acts or products
> of a given type from insincere acts or products or to
> demonstrate their inability. The third motive for putting
> others on is to achieve some sort of profit or gain, which
> may be monetary or nonmonetary such as gain in self regard,
> self protection, competitive advantage, privilege, compliance by
> others, or some other personal end.

The research revealed that the sporting put-on is the most frequently engaged in behavior, followed by the profitable put-on. The sporting put-on is similar to a practical joke. Stebbins (1975, p. 191) identifies a practical joke as a "joke whose humor stems from the tricking or abuse of an individual placed somehow at a disadvantage."

To summarize, the authors in this review of the literature on lying imply that a "basic characteristic of human society is that human relationships and civilization depend on shared information" (Ford et al., 1988, p. 588). Consequently, when misinformation is presented as the truth the person receiving the false information is at a dis-advantage. What was most striking in the review of the literature was the abundance of information concerning deception. Deception was researched in comparison to personality. Piaget observed the developmental processes children pass through and their understandings of the word lie. Additional evidence was brought to light by the lack of ability children possess to take into account the intentions of a speaker (Wimmer et al., 1984; Strichartz and Burton, 1990; Peterson et al., 1983). These studies presented information similar to Piaget's theory that young children do not take into account the

speaker's motive. The research conducted by Paniagua (1989) revealed the developmental aspect of deception and that suggests a linkage between the child's verbalization and his or her external behavior.

The manner in which human characteristics and or personality types relate to deception was reviewed in the literature (O'Hair et al., 1981; Geis and Moon, 1981; Ekman et al., 1988; Riggio and Friedman, 1983). Research in this area identified cues that can be detected, when one is trained and observant, in messages delivered by a deceiver. Characteristics that were identified are as follows: close-set eyes, overall dishonest appearance, nervous reactions, body movements, and communication skills (Riggio and Friedman, 1983, p. 914). One can improve the likelihood of not being deceived by becoming observant to some of the characteristics identified previously in the literature. On the other hand, Machiavellians are believable according to Christie and Geis. One would have to be a real expert to detect a good liar.

Are individuals motivated to lie? Research indicates that in certain situations indeed the motivation to lie is greatly enhanced (Millar and Tesser, 1987; Lindskold and Walters, 1983; Paniagua, 1989). Briefly, Millar and Tesser (1983) suggested that the more expectation or roles other place upon us the more likely deception may occur. Data presented by Lindskold and Walters (1983, p. 130) imply that perhaps the concept of lying could be placed upon a continuum with acceptable lies to the left and unacceptable lies to the right. Those lies that are intended to hurt and deceive another were unacceptable, whereas, lies told to protect another from harm or embarrassments were considered wrong, but acceptable.

Is honesty always the best policy? The research indicates that perhaps there are shades of black and white and between the two extremes there is a "gray area" where most individuals conduct their social interactions. The most pervasive reason provided for deceiving another individual was to avoid aversive punishment or consequences. Simply, individuals lie to avoid doing something that they find distasteful or to avoid physical punishment (Paniagua, 1989, p. 978). Parents on occasion find that they must take the role of judge and jury when presented with false information from their child. The child when placed in that situation is expected to incriminate himself or herself. Children when faced with negative consequences will take the wrong path and lie in hopes that they are not discovered.

Attitude Measurement Scale

The scales that have been introduced in the review of the literature vary somewhat in their assumptions about deception. One particular comparison measured the relationship between one's religious behavior and a score received on the deception scale (Francis et al., 1988, p. 92). The philosophy of human nature measurement scale was developed by Wrightsman (1974). The scale attempts to explain the respondent's general feeling about how other individuals behave. Wrightsman's approach (1974, p. 49) used six different components: "trustworthiness, altruism, independence, strength of will and rationality, complexity of human behavior, and variability in human nature." Christie's and Geis' Machiavellianism scale has been used in a number of research settings (1970). The scale consists of three

categories: the nature of interpersonal tactics, views of human nature, and abstract or generalized morality.

The current research is similar to that of Millar and Tesser (1987). In this study two relationships were examined, parent and child, and professor and student in social interactions that involve deception. The hypotheses listed below were chosen for this research project to see if there was a difference in one's deceptive behavior in the two social settings that of the parent and child relationship and that of professor and student relationship.

Assumptions

The following hypotheses are in part based on some assumptions pertaining to the respondents' religious and political party preferences and respondents' gender as they relate to Machiavellianism. Although, the review of the literature did not indicate such assumptions the hypotheses are based on the common interest of the author. Hypothesis #2 suggests that males are more deceptive than females. Some of the literature denotes differences among gender. The findings, however, were inconclusive. The reasoning associated with the hypothesis was to investigate whether social roles or the socialization process would account for a difference between males and females. Hypothesis #3 states that those respondents who indicated that their parents were divorced when they were growing up will be more Machiavellian than those respondents whose parents were not divorced. The assumption is that a divorce can have a tremendous effect on a child and in turn could influence their perception and trust of other individuals. Hypothesis #4 proposes that those respondents who identified themselves as a

Democrat will be less Machiavellian. Historically, the "Machiavellian" is characterized as those individuals who seek to control others for their own desires. The critical approach to personal relationships and the lack of morality are often characteristics associated with the Machiavellian. Respondents who indicated a Democrat party preference perhaps strongly believe in human rights causes such as the elderly, mentally and physically challenged, educational programs and rights pertaining to all individuals. The platform of the Democrat party historically has suggested that it is the party of the common person. If this assumption is true, those respondents who indicated a Democrat preference would be less Machiavellian. In Hypothesis #5 suggests that the more frequent the church attendance the less Machiavellian the respondent. The assumption is based on the belief that respondents who have a religious affiliation and frequently attend church are provided a spiritual platform based on the philosophy of right and wrong and good and evil in which they conduct their lives. Hypothesis #6 follows the same reasoning as that of the political party preferences. Respondents who identify themselves as Catholic would be less Machiavellian. It is reasoned that those who are Catholic have a strong traditional view of what is morally right and wrong as dictated by the church. The hypothesis, therefore, suggests that respondents who have a Catholic orientation would be less Machiavellian.

1. Machiavellianism occurs more frequently in the child persona than in the student persona.

2. Males are more deceptive than females on the Machiavellian deception scale.

3. Respondents who experienced parents' divorce during childhood are more Machiavellian.

4. Respondents who identify themselves as affiliated with the Democrat party would be less Machiavellian than those affiliated with the Republican party.

5. The more frequent the church attendance the less Machiavellian the respondent.

6. Respondents who identify themselves as having a Catholic orientation are less Machiavellian than those who have other religious orientation.

Chapter II

Method

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted in the Spring of 1991. The purpose of this study was to locate changes needed in the questionnaire. The sample contained sixty-two males and fifty-nine females for a total of one hundred and twenty-one participants. The sample was drawn from sociology classes at a large southwestern university.

The questionnaire designed for the pilot study contained two measurements. First, it included the Guilt scale by Buss and Durkee (1957) and secondly, the Machiavellianism scale developed by Christie and Geis (1970). The measurement developed by Buss and Durkee was employed to reveal respondents' feelings of guilt associated with the nine statement scale. Respondents were asked to indicate whether the statements were true or false according to their belief system. Statements included such items as, "Failure gives me a feeling of remorse"; and "People who shirk on the job must feel very guilty" (Buss and Durkee, 1957, p. 347). The second component included six subsections that each contained fourteen statements derived from the Machiavellianism scale (Christie and Geis, 1970, p. 83). Under investigation was the comparisons of the different perspectives participants revealed in each section. The six subsections were then combined into three groups: the parent-child relationship, supervisor-employee relationship, and the professor-student relationship.

The questionnaire was eight pages long. Consequently, participants appeared overwhelmed by the instrument. Clearly, some of the interest in completing the instrument was lost after several

pages. Results obtained from the pilot study led to the exclusion of the Guilt scale taken from Buss and Durkee and the narrowing of the subsections from six to four.

Questionnaire Construction

Christie and Geis (1970) Machiavellianism scale has been used in a number of research settings particularly in the study of deception. The scale consists of three categories: the nature of interpersonal tactics, views of human nature and abstract or generalized morality. Historically, the "Machiavellian" is characterized as those individuals who seek to control's others for their own desires. Items on the Machiavellianism scale are in a six category Likert format that ranges from agree strongly through strongly disagree.

This particular scale has a unique history because the statements are derived from Niccolo Machiavelli, Chancellor and Secretary to the "Dieci di Liberta a Pace" (Walker, 1950, p. iii). Machiavelli wrote the following controversial books: Discourses, The Art Of War, The Prince and The History of Florence (Walker, 1950, p. ii.) It is noteworthy that in 1559 all of Machiavelli's books were banned by Catholics and Protestants alike. These two religious affiliations had the book banned and placed on the Index of Prohibited Books (Walker, 1950, p. ii). To explain further, books that are placed on the Prohibited Index are not such that the material may have offended the Roman court or that it differed from ordinary beliefs, but that these particular books were thought to do great harm to the reader.

The questionnaire format contained two components. The first section was designed for descriptive information about the respondent

such as: age, gender, semester hours completed, religious and political party preference, and the respondent's parental background. The second component involves the use of a Machiavellianism scale (Christie and Geis, 1970).

Procedure

A sample of college students at a large southwestern university was used in the research. Using a questionnaire, data was collected from one hundred and fifty four students. Initially, a letter requesting permission to distribute the questionnaires were sent to professors in the Sociology/Anthropology Department. Along with the letters, a questionnaire was attached for the professors' review. All but one professor agreed to allow the distribution, and one agreed for the distribution only if the results would be made available to the classroom in which respondents completed the instrument. Respondents were given both oral and written instructions not to put their names on the questionnaires or identify themselves in any other way. In addition, instructions regarding the format of the questionnaire were provided. The questionnaire was five pages long. The instrument, in general terms, was reviewed and the second component was clearly explained.

The second component included four subsections that contained fourteen statements derived from the Machiavellianism scale (Christie and Geis, 1970). Each of the fourteen statements selected from the scale followed the exact format used in the previous section; however, each subsection contained a set of different instructions as to how to complete that section. The four sections had instructions that identified the "persona" that participants should utilized when completing the

statements. The four personas were: (1) the participants were to step into the past and pretend that they were ten years old again; (2) as if they were parents; (3) as if they were college students; and (4) as if they were professors at a university (see Appendix A).

The preliminary instructions were given to increase the likelihood that the respondents would accurately complete the instrument. It was made clear to all participants that their involvement in the research was completely voluntary. All respondents, after reviewing the questionnaire, had the option of returning the instrument unanswered if they chose; however, none did.

Data Analysis

A statistical package, SPSSX (1984), was used to interpret the data collected. Initially, the statistical technique used to analyze the data consisted of tabulating most of the variables to arrive at means which could then be compared easily. The Pearson's product-moment correlation was chosen to analyze Machiavellian orientation as correlated with variables such as grades point average and total semester hours completed. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized for the purpose of reviewing the two categories of social interaction by other variables of interest. Ethnicity was collapsed into two categories; minority or dominant. This was done to see if there was a difference in particular variables when combined with ethnicity. Parental discipline, which had previously contained six options was collapsed into two categories, those who received physical punishment and those who did not. The sibling variable was collapsed to form two categories, does respondent have siblings or not. The sibling variable is

then manipulated by the following: gender of respondent, whether the respondent indicated an imaginary friend as a child or not, and respondents' parents' marital status. (Appendix B)

Responses on the Machiavellian scale ranged from strongly agree, which is assigned a value of one, to strongly disagree producing a value of six. The fourteen statements included in the scale clearly were not all derived from a Machiavellian orientation. For example, the statement "Most people are basically good and kind" does not indicate a Machiavellian point of view. The statement; however, "Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble" illustrates a Machiavellian orientation. Those statements reflecting Machiavellianism were reassigned higher values (1=6, 2=5, 3=4 etc.) indicating the participants' agreement with the philosophy. In coding the data in this manner those individuals who hold a Machiavellian orientation will have higher mean scores than their counter-parts.

Once mean scores have been derived from the Machiavellian types it is possible to compare information between the categories. The following mean scores were obtained for each persona: Child Machiavellian 3.70, Parent Machiavellian 3.66, Student Machiavellian 3.64, and Faculty Machiavellian 3.79. The next step combined the Child-Parent mean scores together and then Professor-Student scores. When collapsing the four personas into two familiar social relationships one can make predictions regarding deceptive behavior in social interactions using the Machiavellianism scale.

Chapter III

Results

Sample Characteristics

The sample contained fifty-six males and eighty-seven females for a total of one hundred and forty-three respondents with eleven questionnaires not completed. The respondents ranged in age from eighteen to fifty-one with a mean age of 23.8. The sample age distribution was gathered around those individuals who were eighteen to twenty-four years of age as expected with a traditional college sample. Marital status is typical of this age group with 86 percent of the respondents indicating that they are not married. It is of interest to note that approximately one-third of the sample reported that their parents were divorced while they were growing up. In addition 69 percent of the respondents reported that their mothers worked outside the home when they were children. Both the questions regarding parental divorce and the incidence of females working outside the home depict a trend in today's society.

The data reveals that a majority of the respondents, are Anglo, 72.7 percent. The Black respondents accounted for 6.3 percent of the sample, Hispanics 18.2 percent and 2.8 percent of the sample did not identify themselves with any of the categories provided or choose not to answer the question.

The grade point averages among the sample of students ranged from 1.7 to 4.0 with a mean grade point average of 2.40. In Table 1 it was of interest to note that within the sample males had a mean grade

point average of 2.44 while females had a slightly lower mean of 2.38. This difference in means was not statistically significant (p>.05).

The data describing religious preferences indicated that respondents for the most part held a Catholic orientation 33.6 percent. The remaining religious preferences of the sample are presented by the following: Protestant 30.1 percent, Jewish 2.1 percent, and Other 11.8 percent. The data obtained from this variable reveals that 22.4 percent of the respondents indicated no religious preference. In tandem with the religious preference respondents were asked to indicate the number of times they attended church in the past year. The data shows that over 24 percent of the sample had not attended church in the previous year. Twenty-two percent of the females indicated that they had not attended church while 26.8 percent of the males had not. The mean number of times respondents reported attending church in the past year was 14.4.

One-third of the respondents indicated no political party preference. The remainder were split between the two major parties with, Democrats at 28.2 percent and Republicans at 38 percent. Interestingly, approximately one-fourth of the population had no religious preference and one-third indicated no political party preference. The lack of preferences is consistent with the age composition of the sample. Thus far the sample has generally been described in terms of biological and social characteristics. The following section will describe the sample in terms of the personality characteristic Machiavellianism.

Test of Hypotheses

To evaluate the initial hypothesis a t-test was performed utilizing combinations of the four Machiavellian personas. The mean obtained from respondents who answered from the perspective of a child was 3.70; whereas, the student perspective had a mean of 3.64. The difference indicated in Table 2 between these two means was not statistically significant, (t=1.23, p>.05). The prediction that Machiavellianism would be greater for the perspective of the child than that of the students was not confirmed; therefore, hypothesis one must be rejected.

In hypothesis #2 it was predicted that deceptive behavior as indicated on the Machiavellianism scale would occur more frequently in males than females. The most accurate indicator of Machiavellianism for this hypothesis would be from the perspective of the students themselves rather than from any of the other three Machiavellian personas. Table 3 depicts Machiavellianism from the student perspective by the respondents' gender. Females in the sample had a mean of 3.68 and males had 3.57. The difference in means is not statistically significant (p>.05). Hypothesis #2 must be rejected.

It is of interest to point out that in Table 4 there is a difference in means between males and females when respondents answered the fourteen statements as though they were parents. The mean for females was 3.73 and the mean for males was 3.55. The difference between the means is statistically significant (p<.05). As with the student perspective, however, it was not in the predicted direction. In viewing deception from the perspective of a child the females had a

mean of 3.75 and males' 3.64. The difference in means however was not statistically significant ($p > .05$). Again, females obtained a higher mean in each of the Machiavellian personas. The last persona, the respondents' perception from the point of view of a college professor suggested that females, again had a higher mean of 3.82 and for males' 3.76. The difference in means was not statistically significant ($p > .05$). In all four personas females were viewed as more Machiavellian than males.

In hypothesis #3 it was predicted that respondents whose parents experienced divorce are more Machiavellian than those whose parents did not. To test this hypothesis Machiavellianism was viewed from the student persona. In Table 5 the data shows that those respondents whose parents were divorced had a mean score of 3.66 while respondent's whose parents were not divorced had a mean of 3.63. The difference was in the predicted direction. The difference in means, however, is not statistically significant; therefore, hypothesis # 3 must be rejected.

The opposite relationship occurred in the other three Machiavellian personas. In each case the higher mean score was found among those respondents whose parents were not divorced. The difference in means for each of the other personas was not statistically significant ($p > .05$). Illustrated in Table 6 identifies the differences found between the two variables. The data shows that females whose parents were divorced had a mean of 3.71 whereas, females whose parents were not divorced obtained a mean of 3.67. In contrast the males in the sample whose parents were divorced had a mean of 3.57 and for those

who had not experienced divorced as a child had a mean of 3.58. The difference in means, however, is not statistically significant.

To evaluate this particular hypothesis further a two-way analysis of variance was used. It was reasoned that perhaps a difference could be found in hypothesis #3 if the respondents' gender could be controlled. The two-way ANOVA permits a test of this hypothesis by controlling for gender. Indicated in Table 7 when the respondents' gender was controlled there still were no significant differences between the respondents whose parents were divorced and those who were not.

Hypothesis #4 predicts that individuals who are affiliated with the Democrat party are less Machiavellian than those who hold a Republican orientation. Table 8 depicts a different outcome than what was predicted. The mean for respondents who identified themselves as affiliated with the Democrat party is 3.72 and for the Republican party 3.56. The difference in means between the two party preferences is not statistically significant (p>.05). In addition, the results were not in the direction predicted; therefore, the hypothesis must be rejected. It should be noted that the same results appeared in the professor persona with the Democrat party preference yielding a higher mean of 3.83 and the Republican preference obtaining a mean of 3.76. The difference in means, however, is not statistically significant at the .05 level. The opposite was revealed from both the parent and child perspectives. In each case the lower mean was found among individuals who indicated a Democrat party affiliation.

Hypothesis #5 says that the more frequent the church attendance the less the Machiavellianism. The four Machiavellian types were correlated with respondents' church attendance. Table 9 shows that a

positive association does occur when comparing the perspective of a student by church attendance. The correlation although positive, is not statistically significant at the .05 level. Hypothesis #5 therefore, must be rejected. The same relationship was found among the other three personas. A positive relationship occurred in each instance however, it was not statistically significant (p>.05). The data in Table 10 is gathered from the perspective of the student. In reviewing the results presented it was found that respondents who stated that they attended church had a mean of 3.62 whereas, those who did not attend had a mean of 3.69. The difference between the two means is not statistically significant (p>.05) therefore, the hypothesis must be rejected. In addition similar findings were observed in the respondents perception of a child that yielded a lower mean for respondents who attended church than for those who did not. The difference in means was not statistically significant (p>.05). Other data obtained from the parent and professor personas when combined with church attendance suggests that the frequency of church attendance results in a higher Machiavellian mean.

The final hypothesis predicted that respondents who have a Catholic orientation are less Machiavellian than individuals of other religions. To test hypothesis #6 the religious component was collapsed into two categories, a Catholic orientation or not. In Table 11 the mean of the respondents who stated they have a Catholic orientation is 3.57 and for all other religious preferences combined the mean is 3.68. The difference between the two means was in the predicted direction however, is not statistically significant. Hypothesis #6, therefore, must be rejected.

Additional Findings

In reviewing the data collected, some unexpected relationships among particular variables were noted. The variable grade point average was manipulated with the respondents' religious preferences. In addition the age variable and grade point average were reviewed (see Table 9). It was found that the relationship between the two variables was a positive correlation significant at the .01 level. There is a significant association between respondents' total semester hours completed and their grade point average. The association is identified as a positive one. The relationship indicates that the higher one's grade point average the greater the total semester hours completed.

The respondents' grade point average was combined with descriptive variables such as political party preference, respondents' marital status, and the minority or dominant group categories. When grade point average was manipulated by respondents' political party preference it was observed that those who indicated a Republican orientation had a mean 2.49 grade point average. Respondents who identified no political preference had a mean grade point average of 2.43; whereas, 2.25 was indicated for the Democrat party preference. The difference between the two means was not statistically significant (p>.05).

Those respondents who indicated that they were married had a higher grade point average than those who are not. The grade point average for the married respondents was 3.31, and respondents who were not married had a mean of 2.25. The difference in means between the two categories was statistically significant (p.< 05). In collapsing

ethnicity into two components, that of minority or dominant, comparisons between the two categories and the variable grade point average can be tested. Those in the dominant category had a mean grade point average of 2.61, while those in the minority category received a mean of 1.95. The difference was statistically significant at the .05 level.

Of interest, was the relationship of gender with several descriptive variables such as political party preference, parents' martial history, church attendance. In addition gender was reviewed by the variable which asked respondents to identify the occurrence of an imaginary friend as a child. The data revealed that 28 percent of the sample indicated that they had imaginary friends as children. Females were more often identified as those who had imaginary friends.

Gender difference was also apparent when tested with respondents' political party preferences. The data shows that 29 percent of the males indicated no political party preference, whereas, 37 percent of the females specified no political party preference. Males held a Republican orientation. In contrast, females were split almost equally in their preference between the two political parties. Information generated from the cross-tabulation tables indicate that slightly over 32 percent of the females in the sample identified themselves as Democrats and 31 percent of the sample were Republican.

Respondents' political party preferences were viewed from the minority or dominate category. Fifty-seven percent of those in the minority category indicated a Democratic preference whereas, only 18.3 percent in the dominate category identified themselves as Democrats.

The dominate category held a Republican orientation 46 percent. The difference in political party preference between minority and dominant categories was statistically significant (p<.05).

The respondents' gender was cross-tabulated with the variable parents' material history. Thirty-five percent of the females indicated that their parents was divorced and only 28 percent of the males had parents who were divorced. Parental divorce rate in the minority category was approximately 30 percent whereas, in the dominant category is was 69 percent. The difference in parental divorce between minority and dominant categories was statistically significant (p<.05). In short, females reported the highest parental divorce rates, moreover, the dominant category had the highest percentage of overall parental divorce. In addition parents' material history was cross-tabulated with whether or not the respondent's mother worked outside the home. Sixty-six percent of the respondents reported that their mothers worked outside the home when they were children. The high rate of divorce among respondents' parents is clearly indicative in the number of females working outside the home.

Let us now turn to a brief review of gender by the respondents' religious preference and church attendance. Approximately 25 percent of the males indicated no religious preference and 21 percent of the females suggested they did not have a preference. As one might expect, respondents who reported having a religious preference would be more likely to attend church. The data reveals this to be true.

The respondents' religious preference was cross-tabulated with the variable minority-dominate categories. Overwhelmingly, respondents in the minority category indicate a strong Catholic

orientation 68 percent, while only 21 percent within the dominant category.

Whether or not respondents reported having brothers or sisters was examined by the political party preference variable, and with the minority-dominant categories. When respondents indicated they had more siblings the vast majority implied a Democrat orientation 2.35 whereas, Republican orientation was 1.62. The difference in the number of siblings between the minority and dominate categories is statistically significant ($p<.05$). In addition the minority respondents report an average of 2.69 siblings while the dominant group had a mean of only 1.88. In conclusion, respondents who identified having more brothers or sisters held a Democrat orientation. The data, furthermore, suggest that there is a higher incidence of siblings among the minority categories.

Chapter IV

Conclusions

Several researchers have indicated that one's facial expressions such as eye contact and one's smile can be revealing when an individual is practicing deceptive behavior. It has also been suggested that one's gross body gestures and speech patterns are indicators of possible deception. Riggio and Friedman (1983, p. 914) furthermore, suggest that an individual with advanced social skills training and an extroverted personality characteristic has the ability to relay deceptive messages that are perceived to be the truth by the receiving individual.

In contrast to physical characteristics, some researchers have chosen to look at situations that may produce deceptive behavior. Millar and Tesser (1987, p. 264) identified deceptive behavior as a response to a violation of the role partner's perceived expectations. This study illustrates that individuals are sometimes placed in situations where others' expectations for appropriate behavior are higher than our own expectations. The difference resulting from others' expectations and our own creates conflict and deception in social interactions. It is reasoned then, that the more expectations that others have for us, the greater the probability of deception. The theory, if valid, has enormous implications for the most sacred social institutions in our society such as that of the family, education, and religion. Since all the social institutions are interrelated in some fashion a person can conceivably find himself or herself placed in a situation where deception arises from high expectations those others have for his or her behavior, performance and capabilities.

It has been suggested that the key to understanding deception is through the individual's motivational behavior. Motivation in deceptive behavior can serve a two-fold function; that of concealing deception once it occurs and that of manipulating individuals for one's own self interests. The prior motivational factor illustrates a need to "cover-up" deception by lying when confronted with a misdeed. The second factor denotes a deviant personality trait. Perhaps all of us at one time or another have lied to avoid punishment, shame, or ridicule. When individuals are manipulated to serve one's own personal need at the expense of another, this behavior is viewed to be more destructive. The research conducted by Lindskold and Walters (1983) lends support to the notion that indeed there may be categories of acceptable lies. The categories ranged from altruistic, through individual gains, to manipulation of one individual by another. The researchers indicated that "telling a lie to save others from minor hurt, shame or embarrassment," ranked number one, whereas "telling a lie that hurts someone else so than you can gain" was least acceptable (Lindskold and Walters, 1983, p. 130). The motivation of a deceiver has a critical role in establishing the acceptability or unacceptability of the lie.

Personality and or behavior characteristics have been of interest in trying to understand deception in individuals. In one particular study the authors (Ford et al., 1988, p. 559) identified four character types: antisocial, narcissistic, borderline, and compulsive personality disorders. The common thread found in all the disorders listed was that of persistent lying among its members. Christie and Geis (1970, p. 3), on the other hand, developed what they refer to as the Machiavellian personality characteristics. They identify those

characteristics as a general lack of affect in personal relationships, a decrease in morality, and a lack of concern or empathy for others' rights. In addition Riggio and Friedman (1983, p. 914) revealed characteristics such as: close-set eyes, overall dishonest appearance, nervous reactions, body movements and lack of communication skills. The importance of the research into personality or behavior characteristics suggests that individuals can improve their likelihood of not being deceived by becoming more observant to the manner in which information is presented.

Does deception occur at all ages? Several researchers would indicate that the development of this behavior is a cognitive process (Piaget, 1960; Peterson et al., 1983; Wimmer et al., 1984; and Strichartz and Burton, 1990). Piaget suggests that the tendency in a child to lie is a natural phenomenon and is important for the child's overall development. Piaget draws distinctions between the various types of lies used, such as: exaggerations, self-protecting lies, altruistic lies, and white lies. The literature, moreover, illustrates an age difference both for the definition of a lie and the evaluation of various forms of falsehoods. Researchers often reveal that children have difficulties in determining the intent of a speaker when evaluating communications. The intent of the speaker denotes whether deception was truly designed or the passing on of inaccurate information was inadvertent.

The patterns of deception among children can be managed by applying preventive measures and or techniques. An illustration provided from the research of Stokes and Baer (1977) expresses the incorporation of positive contingencies as a technique in reducing deceptive behavior. The concept of mediated generalization infers that

once a child has practiced truthful behavior it can be transferred to other situations by utilizing positive rewards. Positive contingency for appropriate behavior rather than negative sanctions reinforces the behavior sought in children. Is punishment considered a desirable technique for minimizing deception among children? A technique perhaps, but punishment does not teach the child responsible behavior or the consequences associated with deception. It is reasoned that children lie to avoid unpleasant sanctions, therefore, if this technique is employed, it can have the ability to produce more deceptive behavior.

In contrast, Paniagua (1989) advocates an analysis of the relationship between verbal-external and that of verbal-internal dynamics. The verbal-external component of Paniagua's research utilizes correspondence training in diminishing untruthful responses in children. This training involves a "promise-do" formula that encourages children to make a commitment to a given task and then to follow through with the behavior promised (Paniagua, 1989, p. 275). The use of this technique promotes positive results in reducing deceptive behavior. It teaches children what to do!

The prediction that Machiavellianism would be greater from the perspective of a child than from that of a student was not confirmed. The numerical mean obtained for the child persona was 3.70, while the student persona had 3.64. The outcome of hypothesis #1 was in the predicted direction. The difference in means was not statistically significant; therefore, the initial hypothesis was rejected. The pilot study that was conducted during the Spring of 1991, tested deception in two social interactions. The first interaction was that of the parent-child relationship and the second the supervisor-employee relationship.

The maximum mean of each hypothetical person was combined to form the two relationships. In this study it was shown that deception did occur more frequently in the parent-child relation-ship, although the difference in means was not statistically significant. Briefly then, it would appear that deception occurs more frequently in the parent-child relationship and from the point of view of a child. Generalization beyond theses, however, can not be drawn in the absences of statistically significant differences.

Ostensibly, the relationship that most families strive to maintain is honesty among its members. The statement, if true, gives rise to the question of how is it that deception occurs so often in children and among family members as well. One possible explanation for this occurrence is that children are told from an early age that to tell a lie is morally wrong. Children at this age can find it relatively easy to distinguish between true and false statements. Little white lies when told to protect individuals from harm or hurt feelings make the distinction between right and wrong harder to measure. It should not be surprising then that, as individuals mature, they seem to operate within a "gray" area of deception.

Are males more deceptive than females as measured on the Machiavellianism scale? Hypothesis #2 was the basis for this question and it was found that females in this study and in the pilot study were found to be more deceptive. It is of interest to point out that the pilot study revealed that females experienced more guilt after-deception had occurred than males. There was a statistically significant difference between genders (p<.05). Apparently, deception occurs more

frequently in females and they feel guilty more often than males when they lie.

Many of the respondents in this sample indicated that their parents were divorced while they were growing up. Hypothesis #3 suggested that those individuals who experienced divorce would be more Machiavellian than those respondents whose parents were not divorced. In both of the studies a higher mean was obtained for those respondents whose parents were divorced. The results conceivably disclose possible consequences that arise when children are exposed to divorce. The experience is sometimes very traumatic for children and there is little wonder why this event can shape their lives forever. Children are almost totally dependent on their parents for all the biological and social necessities. When the support of a parent is removed by divorce the child can feel betrayed by the individuals who are supposed to love him the most. Research in this area has often established the negative effects that divorce can impose on individuals. These effects can have long lasting implications for individuals as they engage in social relationships throughout their lives.

Hypothesis #4 predicted that Machiavellianism would be less prominent in the Democrat political party preference than the Republican party preference. The results gathered from the student perspective depicted a different outcome. It was believed that those who are affiliated with the Democrat party would value the social welfare of the common people and, in turn, would be less Machiavellian. The difference between the means, however, was not statistically significant at the .05 level.

The remaining two hypotheses concerned religious orientation and the frequency with which respondents reported that they attended church services. In Hypothesis #5 it was thought that the more often respondents reported attending church the less the Machiavellian they would be. The correlation was not statistically significant p.>05 (see Table 9). In reviewing the observations from the other three personas the results appeared to be consistent with that of the student perspectives. One possible explanation for the findings is perhaps the rigid doctrine taught and believed by the members in some religions that there is one way to conduct our lives and that there are no shades of gray, only the black and white extremes.

The final hypothesis suggested that respondents who reported having a Catholic preference would be less Machiavellian than those who are not. Indeed, this prediction was validated by the data obtained from the respondents. The difference between the means, however, was not statistically significant at the .05 level. Indeed it would appear that deception is a part of our social interactions with others.

There are certain problems encountered in all types of social research and in this particular study there were several problems noted. The sample itself was relatively small, only one hundred and forty-three. The sample was small due largely to the time factor involved in completing the project. The sample was not done randomly; therefore, it places restrictions on making judgments about the population as a whole. The questionnaire was five pages long. Consequently, participants appeared overwhelmed by the instrument. Clearly, some of the interest in completing the survey was lost after

several pages. This occurrence was noted in several of the questionnaires that were returned with some of the sections not completed. In addition to the initial size of the instrument some respondents found it difficult to answer the first fourteen statements as if they were ten years old.

In conclusion, it is believed that more research is needed in the area of individual's ideology and life experiences with regard to the propensity to deceive. The review of literature did not reveal the consequences of misfortunate encounters and how possibly these experiences can contribute to Machiavellianism. The author tried to uncover the former by looking at religion, gender, and political party preferences and the latter by looking at broken families. The findings associated with the hypotheses were not conclusive. This perhaps indicates an error in the method in that respondents were chosen or the instrument itself does not accurately measure what it is intended to measure.

Table 1.   Grade Point Average By Gender Of Respondent.

Respondents' Gender	Grade Point Average		
	Number	Mean	Difference in Means
Male	54	2.44	.06*
Female	85	2.38	
Total	139	2.40	

*P>.05   F=.08

Table 2.   Difference In Machiavellianism Scores Between Child And Student Perspectives.

Perspective	Machiavellianism	
	Mean	Difference in Means
Child	3.70	
		.06*
Student	3.64	

*P>.05   t=1.23

Table 3.   Mean Level Of Machiavellianism From Student Orientation
By Gender Of Respondent.

	Machiavellianism		
Respondents' Gender	Number	Mean	Difference in Means
Male	56	3.57	
			.11*
Female	87	3.67	
Total	143	3.64	

*P>.05   F=1.26

Table 4. Mean Level Of Machiavellianism From Parent Orientation
By Gender Of The Respondent.

Respondents' Gender	Machiavellianism		
	Number	Mean	Difference in Means
Male	56	3.55	
			.18*
Female	87	3.73	
Total	143	3.66	

*P>.05   F=5.24

Table 5. Mean Level Of Machiavellianism From Student Orientation By Parent's Marital History.

Parent's Marital History	Machiavellianism		
	Number	Mean	Difference in Means
Divorced	47	3.66	
			.03*
Not Divorced	96	3.63	
Total	143	3.64	

*P>.05   F=.096

Table 6.   Mean Level Of Machiavellianism By Parent's Marital History
And Gender Of Respondent.

| Parents' Marital History | Gender | | | | | |
| | Male | | Female | | Total | |
	$\overline{X}$	N	$\overline{X}$	N	$\overline{X}$	N
Divorced	3.57	16	3.71	31	3.66	47
Not Divorced	3.58	40	3.67	56	3.63	96
Total	3.57	56	3.69	87	3.64	143

Table 7. Two-Way Analysis Of Variance Of Machiavellianism By
Parent's Marital History And Gender Of Respondent.

Source Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Main Effects	.440	2	.220	.650*
Gender	.408	1	.408	1.203*
Parent's Marital History	.018	1	.018	.052*
Interaction	.023	1	.023	.069*
Explained	.464	3	.155	
Residual	47.103	139	.339	
Total	47.567	142	.335	

*P>.05

Table 8.   Mean Level Of Machiavellianism By Respondents' Political
          Party Preference.

Political Preference	Machiavellianism		
	Number	Mean	Difference in Means
Democrat	40	3.72	.16*
Republican	54	3.56	
Total	94	3.63	

*P> .05   F=1.95

Table 9. Types Of Machiavellianism By Grade Point Average, Age, Total Semester Hours Completed, Church Attendance And The Number Of Brothers And Sisters.

	Machiavellian Child	Machiavellian Parent	Machiavellian Student	Machiavellian Professor	Grade Point Average	Age	Total Semester Hours	Church Attendance	Number Of Siblings
Machiavellian Child	-	.29**	31**	14	- 08	- 00	-.25**	03	09
Machiavellian Parent	-	-	33**	31**	- 03	09	- 11	08	13
Machiavellian Student	-	-	-	38**	04	21*	- 15	04	19*
Machiavellian Professor	-	-	-	-	- 09	- 09	-.11	- 08	03
Grade Point Average	-	-	-	-	-	52**	50**	01	01
Age	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	06	25**
Total Semester Hours	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	- 08	06
Church Attendance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.01
Number Of Sibling	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*P< 05
**P<.01

Table 10. Mean Level Of Machiavellianism From Student Orientation By Church Attendance.

Church Attendance	Machiavellianism		
	Number	Mean	Difference in Means
Yes	105	3.62	.07*
No	34	3.69	
Total	139	3.64	

*P>.05   F=.32

Table 11. Mean Level Of Machiavellianism By Respondents' Religious Orientation.

Catholic Preference	Machiavellianism		
	Number	Mean	Difference in Means
Yes	48	3.57	
			.11*
No	95	3.68	
Total	143	3.64	

*P>.05   F=99

QUESTIONNAIRE

Your participation in this research project is greatly appreciated. Please answer all questions. Do not sign your name or make any identifying marks on the questionnaire

1. **Sex**
    _____ Male
    _____ Female

2. **Age** _____

3. **Ethnicity (check One)**
    _____ Anglo American
    _____ Black American
    _____ Mexican American
    _____ Other (Please specify) _____

4. **What is your total number of semester hours completed?** _____

5. **Total Grade Point Average** _____

6. **Religious Preference**
    _____ No Preference   _____ Baptist
    _____ Catholic   _____ Jewish
    _____ Lutheran   _____ Methodist
    _____ Presbyterian   _____ Other _____

7. **Approximately how many times did you attend church in the last year?** _____ times

8. **Political party preference?**
    _____ No preference
    _____ Democrat
    _____ Republican

9. **Are you currently married?**
    _____ Yes
    _____ No

10. **Were your parents divorced while you were still living at home?**
    _____ Yes
    _____ No

11. **While you were growing up, did your mother work outside the home?**
    _____ Yes
    _____ No

12. **How many siblings (brothers or sisters) do you have?** _____ (Indicate zero if you have none.)

13. **As a child did you have imaginary friends?**
    _____ Yes
    _____ No

14. **When you were a child what kinds of parental discipline were frequently administered? (Check all that apply)**
    _____ Verbal discipline
    _____ Physical punishment
    _____ "Time Out" behavioral techniques
    _____ Restrictions from enjoyable activities

Please answer the items below as if you had stepped into the past and you were ten years of age!

Listed below are a number of statements. Each represents a commonly held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. Read each statement carefully. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number to the right of each statement. The numbers and their meaning are indicated below:

1= Strongly agree   2= Somewhat agree   3= Slightly agree
4= Slightly disagree   5= Somewhat disagree   6= Strongly disagree

		Agree			Disagree		
1.	Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	One should take action only when sure it is morally right.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	Most people are basically good and kind.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	Honesty is the best policy in all cases	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	There is no excuse for lying to someone else.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than to be important and dishonest.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reason for wanting it rather than giving reasons which carry more weight.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	It is possible to be good in all respects.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	Barnum was wrong when he said that there's a sucker born every minute.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14.	It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please answer the following questions as if you were a parent!
1= **Strongly agree**   2= Somewhat agree   3= Slightly agree
4= **Slightly disagree**   5= Somewhat disagree   6= Strongly disagree

		<u>Agree</u>			<u>Disagree</u>		
1.	Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	One should take action only when sure it is morally right.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	Most people are basically good and kind.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	Honesty is the best policy in all cases.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	There is no excuse for lying to someone else.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than to be important and dishonest.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reason for wanting it rather than giving reasons which carry more weight.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	It is possible to be good in all respects.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	Barnum was wrong when he said that there's a sucker born every minute.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14.	It is hard to get ahead without cutting corner here and there.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please answer the following questions as a student at Southwest Texas State University!
1= Strongly agree   2= Somewhat agree   3= Slightly agree
4= Slightly disagree   5= Somewhat disagree   6= Strongly disagree

		Agree			Disagree		
1.	Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	One should take action only when sure it is morally right.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	Most people are basically good and kind.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	Honesty is the best policy in all cases.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	There is no excuse for lying to someone else.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than to be important and dishonest.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reason for wanting it rather than giving reasons which carry more weight.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	It is possible to be good in all respects.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	Barnum was wrong when he said that there's a sucker born every minute.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14.	It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please answer the following questions as a professor at Southwest Texas State University!
1= Strongly agree   2= Somewhat agree   3= Slightly agree
4= Slightly disagree   5= Somewhat disagree   6= Strongly disagree

	Agree			Disagree		
1. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. One should take action only when sure it is morally right.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Most people are basically good and kind.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. There is no excuse for lying to someone else.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than to be important and dishonest.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reason for wanting it rather than giving reasons which carry more weight.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. It is possible to be good in all respects.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Barnum was wrong when he said that there's a sucker born every minute.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix B

CODESHEET

DATA SPACES OR COLUMNS	VARIABLE	VARIABLE AND VALUE LABELS
1-3	ID1	Identification Number
4	SEX	Gender Of Respondent 9.= No Data 1.= Male 2.= Female
5-6	AGE	Age As Of Last Birthday 99.= No data
7	ETHNIC	Ethnic Group 9.= No data 1.= Anglo American 2.= Black American 3.= Mexican American 4.= Other
8-10	TOTAL	Total Semester Hours Completed 999.= No data record hours completed
11-12	GPA	Grade Point Average 9.9.= No data record GPA to nearest tenth
13	REL	Religious Preference 9.= No data 1.= No Preference 2.= Catholic 3.= Lutheran 4.= Presbyterian 5.= Baptist 6.= Jewish 7.= Methodist 8.= Other
14-16	ATTEND	Frequent Church Attendance 999.= No data record number given

7

17	POL	Political Afflication
		9.= No data
		1.= No Preference
		2.= Democrat
		3.= Republican

18	MARITAL	Currently Married
		9.= No data
		1.= Yes
		2.= No

19	PDIVO	Parents Divorced
		9.= No Data
		1.= Yes
		2.= No

20	OUTSIDE	Mother Work Outside The Home
		9.= No Data
		1.= Yes
		2.= No

21	SIBLING	Respondent Has Siblings
		9.= No Data
		0.= None
		8.= Eight or more
		Record number

22	IMAG	Imaginary Friends
		9.= No Data
		1.= Yes
		2.= No

23	VERBAL	Verbal Discipline
		1.= Checked
		0.= Not Checked

24	PHYS	Physical Discipline
		1.= Checked
		0.= Not Checked

25	TIME	Time Out Discipline
		1.= Checked
		0.= Not Checked

26	RESTRIC	Restricts From Activities Discipline 1.= Checked 0.= Not Checked

27-40	MC1 TO MC14	Machiavellianism Child 9.= No Data 1.= Strongly Agree 2.= Somewhat Agree 3.= Slightly Agree 4.= Slightly Disagree 5.= Somewhat Disagree 6.= Strongly Disagree

41-54	MP1 TO MP14	Machiavellianism Parent 9.= No Data 1.= Strongly Agree 2.= Somewhat Agree 3.= Slightly Agree 4.= Slightly Disagree 5.= Somewhat Disagree 6.= Strongly Disagree

1-3	ID2	Identification Number

4-17	MST1 TO MST14	Machiavellianism Student 9.= No Data 1.= Strongly Agree 2.= Somewhat Agree 3.= Slightly Agree 4.= Slightly Disagree 5.= Somewhat Disagree 6.= Strongly Disagree

18-31	MF1 TO MF14	Machiavellianism Professor 9.= No Data 1.= Strongly Agree 2.= Somewhat Agree 3.= Slightly Agree 4.= Slightly Disagree 5.= Somewhat Disagree 6.= Strongly Disagree

Buss, Arnold H.,and Ann Durkee. 1957."An Inventory for Assessing Different Kinds of Hostility." Journal of Consulting Psychology. 21:343-49

Carlson, Neil R., 1984. Psychology: The Science of Behavior. Allyn And Bacon Inc. Boston, London, Sydney, and Toronto.

Christie, Richard and Florence L. Geis. 1970. Studies in Machiavellianism. Academic Press: New York and London.

Ekman, Paul, Wallace. V. Friesen and O'Sullivan, Maureen. 1988. "Smiles When Lying." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 54:414-20.

Ford, Charles V., Bryan H. King, Marc H. Hollender. 1988. "Lies and Liars: Psychiatric Aspects of Prevarication." American Psychiatric Association.145:554-62.

Geis, F. L. and Tae Hyun Moon. 1981 "Machiavellianism and Deception." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 41:766-75.

Lindskold, Svenn and Pamela S. Walters. 1983. "Categories for Acceptability of Lies." The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 120:129-36.

Machiavelli, Niccolo. 1950. The Discourses of Niccolo Machiavelli, Routledge and Kegan Paul: London.

Millar, Karen U. and Abraham Tesser. 1987. "Deceptive Behavior In Social Relationships: A Consequence of Violated Expectations." Journal of Psychology. 122:263-73.

O'Hair, Henry, D., Michael J. Cody and Margaret L. McLaughlin. 1981. "Prepared Lies, Spontaneous Lies, Machiavellianism, and Nonverbal Communication." Human Communication Research. 7:325-39.

Paniagua, Freddy A. 1989. "Lying By Children: Why Children Say One Thing, Do Another?" Psychological Reports. 64:971-84.

Piaget, Jean. 1960. The Moral Judgement Of The Child. The Free Press: Glencoe, Illinois.

Peterson, Candida, C., James L. Peterson and Diane Seeto. 1983. "Developmental Changes In Ideas About Lying." Child Development. 54:1529-35.

Riggio, Ronald E., and Howard S. Friedman. 1983. "Individual Differences and Clues To Deception." Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology. 45:899-915.

SPSSX, Inc. (1984). SPSSX User's Guide. New York: McGraw Hill.

Stebbins, Robert A. 1975. "Putting People On: Deception of our Fellowman in Everyday Life." Sociology and Social Research. 59:189-200.

Strichartz, Abigail F., and Roger V. Burton. 1990. "Lies and Truth: A Study of the Development of the Concept." Child Development. 61:211-20.

Stokes, T. F., and D.M. Baer. 1977. "An Implicit Technology of Generalization." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis. 10:349-67.

Walkner, J. Leslie. 1950. The Discourses of Niccolo Machiavelli, Routledge and Kegan Paul: London.

Wimmer, Heinz, Silvia Gruber, and Josef Perner. 1984. "Young Children's Conception of Lying: Lexical Realism-Moral Subjectivism." Journal of Experimental Child Psychology. 37:1-30.

Wrightsman, Lawrence S. 1974. Assumptions About Human Nature: A Social-Psychological Approach. Brooks and Cole Publishing Company: Monterey, California.