



Janina Florczykiewicz

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3917-3112>

Siedlce University of Natural Sciences and Humanities, Poland; e-mail: [janina.florczykiewicz@uph.edu.pl](mailto:janina.florczykiewicz@uph.edu.pl)

Lesław Pytka

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9255-741X>

Siedlce University of Natural Sciences and Humanities, Poland; e-mail: [leslaw.pytka@uph.edu.pl](mailto:leslaw.pytka@uph.edu.pl)

## **The Lie as an Indicator of Social Maladjustment of Young People**

<http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/PBE.2020.021>

### **Abstract**

The aim of the study was to compare views and attitudes towards lies held by Polish teenagers who were properly socialized and socially maladjusted (179 people). The diagnostic survey method and the questionnaire technique were used. It has been established that socially adapted youth better recognize lies, more often use altruistic and manipulative lies, more often lies to parents and teachers. Also, being lied to more often, they react with breaking contact with the liar and experience disappointment and anger; moreover, in the situation of being caught lying, they experience shame more often. In turn, socially maladjusted young people use destructive lies that aim to hurt someone. It was also found that the use of a lie, views on the admissibility of a lie and the tendency to justify it are independent of social adaptation.

**Keywords:** lie, notorious lie, social maladjustment, youth, young people.

### **Introduction**

Lie is a common social phenomenon. Although it is judged to be morally wrong, there is social consent for some of its varieties. Among others, altruistic and polite lies are seen as strategies to help build social relationships; adults

support prosocial lies (Lee & Ross, 1997) and regularly use them (DePaulo & Bell, 1996; DePaulo & Kashy, 1998). Lies are considered to be an indispensable element of social interactions (DePaulo & Kashy, 1996) and communication – behavior analysis showed that 61, 5% of conversations contain lies (Turner et al., 1975).

It was determined that the daily frequency of using a lie ranges from 1.5 to 3 (Hample, 1980; DePaulo & Kashy, 1996). Adults and teenagers lie every day (DePaulo et al., 1996; DePaulo & Kashy, 1998; Jensen et al., 2004). The most frequently used lies are courtesy and altruistic lies, caused by the desire not to embarrass, sadden, or hurt another person; the motive of the sense of intentional and deliberate misinformation of the other person is also used by children (Malewska & Muszyński, 1960; Lewis et al., 1989; Ekman, 1991; Talwar & Lee, 2002). They utilize lies to avoid punishment (Malewska & Muszyński, 1960; Talwar & Crossman, 2011; Crossman & Talwar, 2012). The lies may concern the concealment of evil deeds (Newton et al., 2000; Wilson et al., 2003), result from the desire to receive a prize, protect others from avoiding punishment (Crossman & Talwar, 2012), protect the feelings of another person – so-called polite lies (Ning & Crossman, 2007) or result from the tendencies to fantasize (Malewska & Muszyński, 1960). Motives for lying are analogous in children and concealment adults (Newton et al., 2000; Wilson et al., 2003).

The type and frequency of lies depends on the emotional relationship of the liar with the deceived person. Lying is more often used in relationships with loved ones, usually motivated altruistically or dictated by the pursuit of autonomy (DePaulo & Kashy, 1998; Jensen et al., 2004). Young people lie more often (DePaulo et al., 1996) than adults, using a lie in relationships with their parents regardless of their beliefs about its acceptability. The tendency to cheat one's parents is related to age, gender, educational environment and personality traits (Jensen et al., 2004). Young people accept altruistic lies to a greater extent (Lindsfold & Waters, 1983; Keltikangas-Jarvinen & Lindeman, 1997), while they do not accept lies meant as a revenge (Jensen et al., 2004). The respondents with weaker relationships with people of the same gender use egoistic lies more often, whereas people with better relationships use lies of a different kind (DePaulo et al., 1996). In the face of those who are "insignificant," lie is utilized less frequently, but then the egoistic lie is more frequent (DePaulo & Kashy, 1998).

Another trend in lie research concerns the personal determinants of the tendency to lie and the skills of its recognition (DePaulo et al., 1996; Cauffman et al., 2000; Feldman et al., 2000; Jensen et al., 2002; Ekman, 2007).

An early lie is a predictor of crime and other forms of maladjustment occurring in adulthood (Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986). In adolescents, lying is strongly correlated with other behavioral disorders such as: brawls, thefts, truancy, home escape, arson, vandalism, drinking, smoking, and drug use (Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986; McGhee & Short, 1991; Clarizio, 1992a, 1992b). It is considered a symptom of social maladjustment (Pytka, 2001).

In the research conducted so far on the lies of youth, the following issues were discussed: frequency, type, determinants and abilities to recognize lies, personality traits of lying persons, while the phenomenon of lying in relation to social maladjustment was not examined.

The subject of the presented research are the differences in views and attitudes towards lies in case of adolescents who are either socially well-adapted or maladjusted.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

The research was conducted in Poland. It involved 179 people, including 80 Polish high school and first-year university students (44.7% of respondents) who Correctional facilities were classified as socially well-adapted (43 women and 37 men), and 99 pupils of *Zakłady poprawcze* [Youth Detention Centre]<sup>1</sup> and *Młodzieżowe ośrodki wychowawcze* [Youth Educational Centers]<sup>2</sup> (55.3 %) who represented the socially maladjusted persons – socially maladjusted people are directed to these institutions (32 women, 67 men). The age of the respondents ranged from 14 to 22 years ( $M = 18.2$  years,  $SD = 2.0$ ).

### **Hypotheses**

The object of the research was the act of lying. Its understanding, assessments and reactions to it were examined in two groups of young people: socially well-adapted and socially maladjusted. Lie is an indicator of social maladjustment (Pytka, 2001), and, as it was previously indicated, it co-occurs with other antisocial behaviors, and is perceived as a threat to the moral structure of society (Bok, 1978). On this basis, it is assumed that assessments and views on lying,

---

<sup>1</sup> Demoralization are directed, who have committed a criminal act and other educational measures have turned out to be ineffective or do not promise rehabilitation.

<sup>2</sup> A rehabilitation and educational facility or a rehabilitation and revalidation facility intended for socially maladjusted children and adolescents who require special organization of learning, methods of work, education and rehabilitation.

as well as the scope of its application represented by socially maladjusted young people will differ from those of well-adapted youth. The socially maladjusted youth is characterized by a lower level of moral development, which is revealed, *inter alia*, in the represented system of values and respected norms. It is assumed that truthfulness as a norm is less valued by socially maladjusted youth, however, due to the universality of lie and its ambivalent assessments, it can be predicted that adolescents who are socially well-adapted and maladjusted use it with the same frequency. Differences, however, may refer to the nature of lies and the way they are justified.

The following research hypotheses were formulated:

1. There are differences between the way in which young people are socially well-adapted and socially maladjusted. Young people who are socially adapted present a broader definition.
2. There are differences in the assessment of the acceptability of a lie made by socially well-adapted and socially maladjusted youth. Young people who are socially maladjusted accept the use of a lie to a greater extent than socially well-adapted youth.
3. Socially well-adapted and maladjusted youth make use of lying comparably often, regardless of its assessment. It is assumed that the differences will result from the character of lies and the people who are deceived.
4. Socially well-adapted and maladjusted youth make the same motives of lying.
5. Young people who are socially maladjusted accept the use of a lie to a greater extent than well-adapted adolescents, and less often experience the social feelings of shame and guilt in connection with lies.

## **Procedure**

The diagnostic survey method and the questionnaire technique were used. An anonymous questionnaire was conducted among the respondents, the questions of which related to the opinion on lying, its admissibility, motives and the assessment of a lie and reaction to it.

Definition indicators were adopted (Nowak, 2012). The occurrence of the studied variables was inferred on the basis of the respondents' answers to the questions in the questionnaire, with several indicators used for the identification of the variables (*indicatum*). In semi-open and closed questions, a dichotomous scale was used with answers: yes / no.

The way of structuring the indicators can be traced on the example of a variable “the way of defining a lie by youth”. The way of defining a lie by youth was examined on the basis of the criteria contained in literature, i.e. incompatibility of the message with the conviction, awareness and intentional act of lying involving both misleading as well as retaining information, i.e. concealment (Bakwin & Bakwin, 1972; Antas, 1999; Derrida, 2005; Ekman, 2007; Vrij, 2009). Four indicators were distinguished to diagnose the method of defining a lie: 1) intentional speaking of untruth, 2) intentional concealment of information, 3) manipulation of information, 4) unintentional speaking of untruth. Their occurrence was estimated based on the answers to two questions in the questionnaire: the first open question “What is a lie?”, the second semi-open question with a dichotomous scale of yes/no questions: “Which of the below listed behaviours do you classify as a lie?” a) deliberate (purposeful) telling untruth, b) unwitting telling untruth, c) deliberate concealment of information which is important to the case, d) unwitting omission of facts, e) manipulating the information, f) other (what?).

The motives of lying were related to four categories of lies, mentioned in the literature on the subject: 1) egotistic lies, motivated by the achievement of psychological benefits, e.g. positive self-presentation, self-esteem elevation; 2) altruistic, including so-called courtesy lies, resulting from concern for the good of another person, 3) destructive lies, caused by revenge or hostility, the purpose of which is to hurt another person, 4) manipulative lies, whose purpose is to conceal one’s own actions and avoid punishment. A fifth category was also designated: lying as a way of being.

The following statistical measures were applied: the frequency was determined by percentage, while the dependencies between the groups were determined using the  $\chi^2$  independence test.

## **Results**

### **Defining a Lie**

Most of the respondents recognize a lie in accordance with its accepted understanding. Most of the respondents identify it with: deliberate misleading, manipulation of information and concealment of information. A low percentage of respondents identify a lie with unintentional misinformation. The socially adapted youth better cope with the definition of a lie, as evidenced by the higher percentage of respondents from this faction indicating the relevant definitional categories ( $\chi^2$  values in the examined categories are statistically significant at the level of  $p < .05$  (Table 1).

Table 1. Defining a lie, N=179

definitional criteria	adapted		maladjusted		total		statistic value	
	n	% of the fraction	n	% of the fraction	n	% of total	$\chi^2$	phi
intentional utterance of untruth / misleading	73	91.3	73	73.7	146	81.6	9.024**	.225
unintentional utterance of untruth / misleading	8	10.0	27	27.3	35	19.6	8.392**	-.217
deliberate concealment of information	63	78.8	57	57.6	120	67.0	8.978**	.224
manipulation of information	63	78.8	58	58.6	121	67.6	8.213**	.214

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\* p < .001.

Source: Authors' research.

### Views on the admissibility of a lie, N=179

Views on the admissibility of a lie are comparable in both groups;  $\chi^2(2, 158) = 3.676$  (statistically insignificant). The largest number of respondents (55.7%) allow for a situational use of a lie, as evidenced by the choice of the answer: "In some circumstances a lie is better than truth." A small percentage of respondents see no harm in a lie. The respondents, regardless of their adaptation;  $\chi^2(2, 158) = 0.008$  (statistically insignificant); agree on the punishing for lying-69.7% of respondents are in favor of punishing a lie (Table 2)

Table 2. Admissibility of a lie, N=179

	adapted		maladjusted		total	
	n	% of the fraction	n	% of the fraction	n	% of total
You should never lie	35	44.3	25	31.6	60	38.0
In some circumstances, lies are better than truth	41	51.9	47	59.5	88	55.7
I see nothing wrong with lying	3	3.8	7	8.9	10	6.3
One should be punished for lying	56	70.0	68	69.4	124	69.7

Source: Authors' research.

## Making Use of a Lie

The vast majority of respondents make use of lies. This is confirmed by declarations about overt lying, the existence of people who notoriously lie in their social environment and about admitting to being caught in a lie. Adaptation does not differentiate the respondents in terms of the analyzed categories (statistically insignificant  $\chi^2$  in all three categories – Table 3).

Table 3. Making use of a lie, N=179

	adapted		maladjusted		total		statistic value	
	n	% of the fraction	n	% of the fraction	n	% of total	$\chi^2$	phi
Do you sometimes openly lie?	59	75.6	73	74.5	132	75.0	.031	-
Have you ever been exposed as a liar?	43	56.6	40	64.5	83	60.1	.897	-
Do you know people who notoriously lie?	56	70.0	68	69.4	124	69.7	.008	-

for individual items, the number of respondents was (in order): 134, 97, 136 due to missing data;

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\* p < .001

Source: Author's research.

Regardless of social adaptation, the youth lie to their friends ( $\chi^2$  statistically insignificant). Also, irrespective of the degree of social adaptation, they lie to the police, albeit rarely ( $\chi^2$  statistically insignificant). Socially adapted young people more often lie to people close to them (parents, relatives, friends) and teachers ( $\chi^2$  statistically significant) compared to socially maladjusted youth (Table 4).

Table 4. People deceived through lies, N=179

	adapted		maladjusted		total		statistic value	
	n	% of the fraction	n	% of the fraction	n	% of total	$\chi^2$	phi
Friends	19	23,8	20	20,6	39	22,0	0,250	-
Relatives	32	40,0	11	11,1	43	24,0	20,232***	-0,336
Teachers	22	27,5	11	11,3	33	18,6	7,548**	-0,207
Police	10	12,5	20	20,4	30	16,9	1,966*	-

Types of lies: [E] – egotistic, [A] – altruistic, [D] – destructive, [M] – manipulative

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\* p < .001.

Source: Authors' research.

## Motives for Lying

Regardless of social adaptation, young people most often indicate manipulative lies – fear of punishment, as well as egotistical lies – striving to create a specific image of themselves as motives of lying. What is interesting are the views regarding the use of destructive lies, the intention of which is to hurt the other person. While regardless of social adaptation a little lie motivated by causing distress to another person is declared in the expression “to spite someone,” the willingness to hurt the other person is more often indicated by socially adapted people – the value of  $\chi^2$  is statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$ . In comparison to socially maladjusted youth, the socially well-adapted youth also more often indicate the use of manipulative lies: in order to please, to achieve a goal or benefit, to hide misdeeds –  $\chi^2$  values are statistically significant as well as altruistic lies: striving to protect another person ( $\chi^2$  statistically significant), unwillingness to cause distress to another person ( $\chi^2$  on the level of tendency,  $p = .073$ ). Slightly over 1/3 of respondents, regardless of the level of their social adaptation, treat lying as a way of being, a variation of the strategy used in social contacts (Table 5).

Table 5. Views of the youth on the motives of lying, N=179

	adapted		maladjusted		total		statistic value	
	n	% of the fraction	n	% of the fraction	n	% of total	$\chi^2$	phi
Fear of punishment [M]	67	83.8	77	77.8	144	80.4	.003	-
Striving to create a specific self-image [E]	48	60.0	50	50.5	98	54.7	1.610	-
Striving to protect another person [A]	43	53.8	33	33.3	76	42.5	7.549 **	.205
Unwillingness to cause the distress of another person [A]	63	78.8	66	66.7	129	72.1	3.209	-
Striving to anger another person [D]	43	53.8	46	46.5	89	49.7	.939	-
Striving to hurt another person [D]	52	65.0	42	42.4	94	52.5	9.043**	.225
Striving to achieve one's goals [M]	63	78.8	48	48.5	111	62.0	17.204***	.310
Striving to get endear oneself to another person [M]	62	77.5	52	52.5	114	63.7	11.933**	.258



Table 5. Views of the youth on the motives of lying, N=179

	adapted		maladjusted		total		statistic value	
	n	% of the fraction	n	% of the fraction	n	% of total	$\chi^2$	phi
Striving to hide one's evil deeds [M]	57	71.3	52	52.5	109	60.9	6.515*	.191
Lying is a way of being	21	26.3	28	28.3	49	27.4	.092	-

Types of lies: [E] – egotistic, [A] – altruistic, [D] – destructive, [M] – manipulative.

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\* p < .001; ~ tendency.

Source: Authors' research.

Motives for lying indicate the type of lies used by the respondents. Among the motives of lying, the respondents most often indicate the desire to prevent distress or unpleasantness (an altruistic lie). Well-adapted youth indicate them more often than maladjusted youth ( $\chi^2$  at the level of a tendency, p=.056). Equally often, regardless of social adaptation, fear of punishment (manipulative lie) is indicated. The difference in the use of destructive lies has been marked, while the lie “to spite someone” is declared independently of social adaptation, the “willingness to hurt another person” is declared more often by socially maladjusted people (the value of  $\chi^2$  is statistically significant at the level of p<.05).

Table 6. Motives for lying, N=179

	adapted		maladjusted		total		statistic value	
	n	% of the fraction	n	% of the fraction	n	% of total	$\chi^2$	phi
Fear of punishment [M]	44	55.0	50	50.5	94	52.5	.358	-
Striving to create a specific self-image [E]	16	20.0	31	31.3	47	26.3	2.925	-
Desire not to hurt another person [A]	51	63.8	49	49.5	100	55.9	3.647	.178
Striving to spite someone [D]	21	26.3	28	28.3	49	27.4	0.092	-
Desire to hurt another person [D]	5	6.3	16	16.2	21	11.7	4.198*	-.153
Striving to endear oneself to another person [M]	9	11.3	18	18.2	27	15.1	1.660	-
Striving to hide one's misdeeds [M]	31	38.8	30	30.6	61	34.3	1.295	-
Lying is a way of being	4	5.0	20	20.2	24	13.4	8.807**	-.222

Types of lies: [E] – egotistic, [A] – altruistic, [D] – destructive, [M] – manipulative.

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\* p < .001; ~ tendency.

Source: Authors' research.

## Reactions to a Lie

The most frequent reaction when one is lied to is to break one's ties with the liar. Socially well-adapted youth react in this way more often (the value  $\chi^2$  is statistically significant). Equally frequent reaction is the pursuit of confrontation, while more rarely a lie triggers a desire for retaliation in the deceived. These reactions are demonstrated by respondents regardless of social adaptation (see Table 7).

Table 7. Reactions to a lie, N=179

	adapted		maladjusted		total		statistic value	
	n	% of the fraction	n	% of the fraction	n	% of total	$\chi^2$	phi
I want confrontation	42	52.5	45	45.5	87	48.6	.879	-
I am looking for an opportunity to retaliate	21	26.3	37	37.4	58	32.4	2.500	-
I break contact with the person who lied to me	52	65.0	45	45.5	97	54.2	6.809**	.195
I make known that a person is a liar	15	18.8	23	23.2	38	21.2	0.532	-

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\* p < .001.

Source: Authors' research.

The most frequent emotional reactions in a situation of being deceived are disappointment and anger. Socially adapted youth ( $\chi^2$  statistically significant) experience them more often. Sadness and sense of injustice are experienced less often, and social adaptation does not differentiate the results ( $\chi^2$  statistically insignificant). A low percentage of respondents declares that they do not care about being lied to (Table 8).

Table 8. Emotional reactions to a lie, N=179

	adapted		maladjusted		total		statistic value	
	n	% of the fraction	n	% of the fraction	n	% of total	$\chi^2$	phi
Bitterness, disappointment	69	86.3	56	57.1	125	70.2	17.846***	0.317
Anger, hatred	59	73.8	59	59.6	118	65.9	3.946*	0.148

Table 8. Emotional reactions to a lie, N=179

	adapted		maladjusted		total		statistic value	
	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Sadness	41	51.3	45	45.5	86	48.0	0.595	-
Feeling of injustice	24	30.0	27	27.3	51	28.5	0.162	-
I do not care	14	17.5	20	20.2	34	19.0	0.210	-

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\* p < .001.

Source: Authors' research.

## Experiencing Shame and Justifying Lies

The respondents were also asked about emotional reactions in a situation when a person is caught in a lie. People who are socially well-adapted experience emotions of shame more often ( $\chi^2$  statistically significant) compared to people who are socially maladjusted. Slightly less than half of respondents, regardless of their level of social adaptation, think that a lie can be justified (Table 9).

Table 9. Experience of shame and justification of lies, N=179

	adapted		maladjusted		total		statistic value	
	n	% of the fraction	n	% of the fraction	n	% of total	$\chi^2$	phi
Experiencing shame	36	45.0	28	28.3	64	35.8	5.383*	-.173
Justification of lies	38	47.5	36	36.4	74	41.3	2.285	-

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\* p < .001.

Source: Authors' research.

## Discussion

The presented research provides preliminary data on the differences in views and responses to the lies of adolescents who are either socially well-adapted or socially maladjusted.

It was established that the subjects define a lie by taking into account both its essence, that is, telling an untruth and concealing information, and the intentionality of the act classified as a lie. These findings coincide with the existing results of research on lies (Bakwin & Bakwin, 1972; Antas, 1999; Derrida, 2005; Ekman, 2007; Vrij, 2009). Lie is better recognized by socially well-adapted youth, who more often indicate relevant definition categories in comparison to socially maladjusted youth. In the description of a lie, the well-adapted

adolescents more often indicate intentional telling an untruth, concealing information and manipulating information in order to gain benefits, whereas less often uttering untruths unknowingly is classified as a lie – negative dependence indicates discrepancies in the assessment of this category in the studied groups. The presented findings allow us to confirm the hypothesis regarding the differences between the way in which young people are socially well-adapted or maladjusted. These differences should be combined with a higher level of moral development (Witkowski, 2002), which results in deeper moral reflection and a higher level of cognitive development in the socially well-adapted (Ross & Fabiano, 1985; Machel, 2003).

The hypothesis concerning the differences in opinions regarding the acceptability of lies expressed by socially well-adapted and socially maladjusted young people has not been confirmed. Young people, regardless of social adaptation, display ambivalent attitudes towards using a lie. Views that deny the lie and punitive attitudes compete with views about the situational acceptability of a lie. The largest percentage of respondents are in favor of a situational use of a lie, claiming that “in some circumstances a lie is better than the truth.” This view definitely wins with the statement: “you should never lie.” At the same time, a small percentage of respondents positively evaluate a lie, which, combined with the conviction expressed by the majority of respondents about the need to punish for telling lies, suggests that young people do not judge a lie in morally positive terms. This can be explained by the feeling of guilt – it was established that people feel uncomfortable and unpleasant in the situation of lying, feel grief and avoid looking in the face (DePaulo et al., 1996). However, explanations of the expressed view of the admissibility of a lie can be found in references to the so-called altruistic (pro-social) lies – it has been shown in numerous studies (Sweetser, 1987; Nyberg, 1993; DePaulo & Bell, 1996; DePaulo & Kashy, 1998) that this kind of lies is socially accepted.

The hypothesis about the use of a lie by young people was confirmed. Despite the negative assessment of lies, young people make use of them – this result corresponds to the findings of research carried out by DePaulo and Kashy (1996) on the use of a lie in which its universality in a college community was confirmed and the frequency of 1.5 lies per day was determined. Kashy and DePaulo found that more socialized people lie less often than people who are focused on self-presentation and showing manipulative tendencies. Moreover, their lies are less often egotistical, manipulative or destructive. Another study (DePaulo et al., 1996) found that older people (members of the college community) lie less often than younger people (college students), and the fact of lying

less frequently lies is associated with responsibility. The thesis about the less frequent use of a lie by socially well-adapted people has not been confirmed in the conducted studies. The results obtained indicate that a significant proportion of youth use lies, the frequency of which is not differentiated by their social maladjustment.

Social maladjustment differentiates the respondents because of the people they deceive. Young people who are not socially adapted are less likely to lie to relatives and teachers in comparison to socially adapted people. Friends and police are lied to with the same frequency, regardless of social adjustment. Findings concerning deceiving the police by socially maladjusted young people raise doubts due to the fact that their contacts with the police and participation in investigations are much more frequent. It cannot be excluded that their answers were untrue.

Lies which are most commonly used are manipulative, motivated by the desire to avoid punishment, egotistical, connected with achieving positive self-presentation and altruistic, resulting from the desire to protect another person from distress. This result corresponds in part to the findings of research carried out under DePaulo's direction, which indicated that most of the respondents lied more often for psychological reasons (these were the image-enhancing and self-presenting lies) than due to personal benefits or convenience. (DePaulo et al., 1996). It has been established that destructive lies (to spite someone) are used less frequently, moreover, very rarely teenagers use a manipulative lie associated with the desire to create a good impression of themselves.

The results regarding altruistic lies have been confirmed. More often than maladjusted people, the socially well-adapted lie not to hurt others. In the case of other types of lies, respondents from both groups use them with comparable frequency. The resulting difference in the use of destructive lies in both groups can be explained by referring to the style of criminal thinking in socially maladjusted people (Walters, 1990), including "attitudes, beliefs, and rationalizations that offenders use to justify and support their criminal behavior" (Walters, 2012, p. 272). This style can be considered responsible for hostility towards others, which in this case reveals itself in the motives of lying – the desire to hurt another person. The differences in responding to a lie concern the breaking of contacts with a liar – this behaviour is more often declared by socially well-adapted youth. In the remaining reactions, no differences were revealed. The majority of respondents strive for confrontation, slightly less for retaliation or discrediting a liar.

A lie causes emotional reactions in the form of disappointment, anger, sadness, and a feeling of injustice. The low percentage of respondents declaring

that they do not care about being lied to shows that for young people the experience of being lied to is not indifferent. Disappointment and anger are more often experienced by the socially adapted youth. This fact can be associated with upbringing and development of morality, which influence a better understanding of the social situation of being lied to. Emotions are also experienced in the situation of being caught in a lie. The socially adapted youth experience the emotions of shame more often. The obtained results correspond with the view that in an individual with an undisturbed sphere of emotions lies generate social emotions, including shame and guilt, which are the consequence of upbringing and development of morality (Witkowski, 2002). In DePaulo's study (De Paulo et al., 1996) participants registering their lies assessed the interactions related to lying as less pleasant and less intimate.

## Conclusion

Research on lies presented here includes basic descriptive findings. They deal with fundamental issues concerning the definition method, the types of lies, motives and the assessment and emotions generated in the situation of lying. These issues determine the directions of further research. They constitute only an introduction to further studies on the scope, understanding, evaluation and utilization of this adaptation strategy by socially maladjusted youth. As the research of this phenomenon in the context of maladjustment was not conducted so far, the above study outlines a new research area.

## References

- Antas, J. (1999). *O kłamstwie i kłamaniu. Studium semantyczno-pragmatyczne* [On Lies and Lying. Semantic-Pragmatic Study]. Kraków: TAIWPN „Universitas”.
- Bakwin, H., & Bakwin, R.M. (1972). *Behaviour Disorders in Children*, 4th ed. Philadelphia: W B Saunders Co.
- Bok, S. (1978). *Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life*. Vintage Books: New York.
- Cauffman, E., Feldman, S.S., Jensen, L.A., & Arnett, J.J. (2000). The (Un)acceptability of Violence Against Peers and Dates Among Adolescents and Young Adults. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 15, 672–693, doi: 10.1177/0743558400156003.
- Clarizio, H.F. (1992a). Social Maladjustment and Emotional Disturbance: Problems and Positions: I. *Psychology in the Schools*, 29, 131–140, doi: 10.1002/1520-6807(199204)29:2%3C131::AID-PITS2310290207%3E3.0.CO;2-I.

- Clarizio, H.F. (1992b). Social Maladjustment and Emotional Disturbance: Problems and Positions: II. *Psychology in the Schools*, 29, 331–341, doi: 10.1002/1520-6807(199210)29:4%3C331::AID-PITS2310290406%3E3.0.CO;2-4.
- DePaulo, B.M., & Bell, K.L. (1996). Truth and Investment: Lies are Told to Those Who Care. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 71, 703–716, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.71.4.703.
- DePaulo, B.M., & Kashy, D.A. (1998). Everyday Lies in Close and Casual Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 63–79, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.63.
- DePaulo, B.M., & Kashy, D.A. (1996). Who Lies? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 1037–1051, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.70.5.1037.
- DePaulo, B.M., Kashy, D.A., Kirkendol, S.E., Wyer, M.M., & Epstein, J.A. (1996). Lying in Everyday Life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(5), 979–995, doi: 1037/0022-3514.70.5.979.
- Derrida, J. (2005). *Historia kłamstwa. Prolegomena. Wykład warszawski* [History of the Lie: Prolegomena. Warsaw Lecture]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.
- Draheim, S.E. (2004). *Makiaweliczna osobowość niepełnoletniego świadka* [Machiavellian Personality of Adolescent Witness]. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Ekman, P. (2007). *Kłamstwo i jego wykrywanie w biznesie, polityce i małżeństwie*. [Telling Lies: Clues to Deceit in the Marketplace, Politics and Marriage]. Warszawa: PWN.
- Ekman, P. (1991). *Why Kids Lie*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Feldman, S.S., Cauffman, E., Jensen, L.A., & Arnett, J.J. (2000). The (Un)acceptability of Betrayal: A Study of Late Adolescents' Evaluations of Sexual Betrayal by a Romantic Partner and Betrayal of Friend's Confidence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 29, 499–523, doi: 10.1023/A:1005166627678.
- Hample, D. (1980). Purpose and Effects of Lying. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 46, 33–47, doi: 10.1080/10417948009372474.
- Jensen, L.A., Arnett, J. J., Feldman, S.S., & Cauffman, E. (2002). It's Wrong, but Everybody Does it: Academic Dishonesty Among High School and College Students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 27, 209–228, doi: 10.1006/ceps.2001.1088.
- Jensen, L.A., Arnett, J.J., Feldman, S.S., & Cauffman, E. (2004). The Right to Do Wrong: Lying to Parents Among Adolescents and Emerging Adults. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 33(2), 101–112, doi: 10.1023/B:JOYO.0000013422.48100.5a

- Lee, K., & Ross, H. (1997). The Concept of Lying in Adolescents and Young Adults: Testing Sweetser's Folkloristic Model, *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 43, 255–270.
- Lewis, M., Stanger, C., & Sullivan, M.W. (1989) Deception in 3-Year-Olds. *Developmental Psychology* 25(3), 439–443, doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.25.3.439.
- Lindskold, S., & Waters, P. S. (1983). Categories for Acceptability of Lies. *Journal Social Psychology*, 120, 129–136, doi: 10.1080/00224545.1983.9712018.
- Machel, H. (2003). *Więzenie jako instytucja karna i resocjalizacyjna* [Prison as a Penal and Resocialization Institution]. Gdańsk: Arche.
- McGhee, R., & Short, R. (1991). The Prevalence of Social Maladjustment Among School-Aged Children. *Psychology in the Schools*, 28, 285–289, doi: 10.1002/1520-6807(199110)28:4%3C285::AID-PITS2310280402%3E3.0.CO;2-9.
- Malewska, H., & Muszyński, H. (1962). *Kłamstwo dzieci* [Children's Lie]. Warszawa: PZWS.
- Newton, P., Reddy, V., & Bull, R. (2000). Children's Everyday Deception and Performance on False-Belief Tasks. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 18, 297–317, doi: 10.1348/026151000165706.
- Ning, S.R., & Crossman, A. M. (2007). We Believe in Being Honest: Examining Subcultural Differences in the Acceptability of Deception. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 2130–2155, doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00254.x.
- Nowak S. (2012). *Metodologia badań społecznych* [Methodology of the Social Sciences]. Warszawa: PWN.
- Nyberg, D. (1993). *The Varnished Truth: Truth Telling and Deceiving in Ordinary Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pytka, L. (2001). *Pedagogika Resocjalizacyjna. Wybrane aspekty teoretyczne, metodyczne i diagnostyczne* [Pedagogy of Resocialization. Selected Theoretical, Methodological and Diagnostic Aspects]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo APS.
- Ross, R.R., & Fabiano, E. A. (1985). *Time to Think: a Cognitive Model of Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation*. Johnson City, Tennessee: Institute of Social Sciences and Arts.
- Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1986). Lying as a Problem Behavior in Children: A Review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 6 (4), 267–289, doi: 10.1016/0272-7358(86)90002-4.
- Sweetser, E.E. (1987). The Definition of Lie: An Examination of the Folk Models Underlying a Semantic Prototype. In: D. Holland (Ed.), *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Talwar, V., & Crossman, A. (2012). Children's Lies and Their Detection: Implications



- for Child Witness Testimony. *Developmental Review*, 32, 337–359, doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2012.06.004.
- Talwar, V., & Crossman, A. (2011). From Little White Lies to Filthy Liars: The Evolution of Honesty and Deception in Young Children. In: J. Benson (Ed.), *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, vol. 40 (pp. 139-179). Burlington: Academic Press.
- Talwar, V., Crossman, A., Gulmi, J., Renaud, S.J., & Williams, S. (2009). Pants on Fire? Detecting Children's Lies. *Applied Developmental Science*, 13(3), 119–129, doi: 10.1080/10888690903041519.
- Talwar, V., & Lee, K. (2002). Development of Lying to Conceal a Transgression: Children's Control of Expressive Behaviour During Verbal Deception. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 26, 436–444, doi: 10.1080/01650250143000373.
- Turner, R.E., Edgely, C., & Olmsted, G. (1975). Information Controls in Conversation: Honest is Not Always the Best Policy. *Kansas Journal of Sociology*, 11, 69–89.
- Ulatowska, J. (2005). Deklarowana wiedza „ekspertów” i „laików” na temat przejawów kłamstwa [Declared Knowledge of «Experts» and «Laymen» About the Manifestations of Lies]. *Psychologia jakości życia*, 4, 175–180.
- Walters, G.D. (1990). *The Criminal Life Style. Patterns of Serious Criminal Conduct*. London and New Delhi: Sage Publications, Newbury Park.
- Walters, G.D. (2012). Criminal Thinking and Recidivism: Meta-Analytic Evidence on the Predictive and Incremental Validity of the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS). *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(3), 272–278, doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2012.02.010.
- Wilson, A. E., Smith, M.D., & Ross, H.S. (2003). The Nature and Effects of Young Children's Lies. *Social Development*, 12, 21–45, doi: 10.1111/1467-9507.00220.
- Witkowski, T. (2002). *Psychologia kłamstwa. Motywy – strategie – narzędzia* [Psychology of Lies. Motives-Strategies-Tools.]. Wałbrzych: Oficyna Wydawnicza UNUS.
- Vrij, A. (2009). *Wykrywanie kłamstw i oszukiwania* [Detecting Lies and Deceit: the Psychology of Lying and the Implications for Professional Practice]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.