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The lines have blurred between truth and dishonesty. Shibles (1988) points out Isenberg’s (1964, p. 473) reflection on “the very great vagueness in the concept of ‘lie’ and the many inconsistencies in the common usage of the word ‘lie’” (p. 99) Often times, society considers a “technically” truthful answer while the listener is deceived as a non-lie. A twist of words to keep the audience in the dark on the question at hand is viewed as acceptable and sometimes even applauded. The other side would argue that if words have changed someone’s understanding of a situation, that is neither the speaker’s understanding nor what “happened,” then, it is a lie. Lying and intent to deceive seem to go hand in hand, but among the general population, deceiving someone does not always mean that you are lying, and what is considered deception or a lie may vary among linguistic backgrounds, regional dialects, religious, age, and sex groups. Each group may have had different incentives and slightly different outcomes. These studies have prompted further research to explore if linguistic regional origin is a good indicator of the evaluation of lying situations. This paper illustrates that linguistic and regional dialect give insight into how a person will view a communicative event. This study examines various representation of the truth for popular society while investigating factors that
influence subjects to validate a situation as a lie or deceptive. This research primarily assesses responses to see if linguistic regional origin is an indicator of people’s connection of lying and deceiving, or if cultural background influences the connection between lying and deceiving. This research is focused around two main research questions: 1) Is linguistic regional origin an indicator of a person’s perception of a communicative event? 2) Does cultural background influence the perception of a communicative?
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Chapter One

Literature Review

Figure 1. For Better or for Worse (Johnston, 2013) © Lynn Johnston Productions Inc./Distributed by Universal U-click.

Introduction

For many, the cartoon in Figure 1 (Johnston, 2013) evokes memories of similar encounters of lying in their own lives. “Bleah!” Lizzie thinks to herself as she stares down at her uneaten plate of vegetables. From her solemn face, hand on her head, the “Bleah!” thought with slime-like lettering, and Lizzie poking at the food in frame 2, we can infer that Lizzie does not want to eat her vegetables. In frame 3, Lizzie’s mother insists that the vegetables must be all “gone.” Lizzie understands that her mother has the
expectation for Lizzie to eat the vegetables. We can infer this because of what happens in frames 4-6. In frame 4, Lizzie begins to put the vegetables in her pockets, but in frames 5-6, as she is doing so, she is looking back and forth to make sure no one sees her doing it. We infer her behavior to be furtive. We can also infer that Lizzie knows this behavior is wrong and her mother also has an understanding it’s wrong; otherwise, Lizzie would not be looking around as she is. In frame 7, Lizzie tells her mother that the mother’s expectations have been fulfilled by repeating her mother’s mode of expression of “Vegetables all gone, mom!” In frame 8, Lizzie gets caught disposing of the vegetables in the toilet, and the voice of her mother booms “Elizabeth!” (in red capital letters). The mother’s reaction stems from her failed expectations and an understanding that her daughter has misled her. We know that the mother’s expectations have not been met and that her understanding about what happened to the vegetables was different from Lizzie’s. Reading the cartoon, we understand that the mother thought when Lizzie said “Vegetables all gone, mom.” that Lizzie had eaten the vegetables, not simply made them “gone” from sight. In the final frame of the comic strip, Lizzie says, “You never said I had to eat them!” to her mother. Her mother looks at her with a seemingly speechless stare. We can infer that the mother is upset, but doesn’t say anything more to Lizzie because the mother has a similar understanding of lying as Lizzie; she knows that Lizzie hasn’t obeyed “the spirit of the law, only “the letter of the law.”

A confusion about the nature of lying emerges from this cartoon (Johnston, 2013). How is it possible for Lizzie to be telling the truth but still misleading her mother? The confusion that is present is a disconnection between lying and deceiving, truth telling and honesty. “We, in our society, believe that people should tell the truth…society has to
teach its children what it approves of” (Ames, 1955, p. 276). In addition, “People typically value honesty…” (Mazar, Amir, & Ariely, 2008). These two concepts are not the same. Lizzie is telling the truth, but she isn’t being honest. She is “technically telling the truth” but deceiving at the same time.

The separation of honesty and truth telling is how situations similar to Lizzie’s happen. For example, former President Bill Clinton was not guilty of perjury when giving an account about his encounter with Monica Lewinsky because of the definition of sexual relations that his lawyers, Lewinsky’s attorney, and the judge of the grand jury used in court (President Clinton’s Deposition, 1998). President Clinton was telling the truth but was deceiving the jury in the process. (Sypniewski & Coleman, 2011, p. 6-7). This is only possible because of a separation between honesty and telling the truth.

**Childhood ingrains a foundation**

The disconnection between honesty and truth telling is learned. Learning begins in childhood (Heckman, 2007). Beginning years of a child’s development establishes the basic function of the child’s brain, and experiences the child encounters form and affect their mentality as an adult (Mustard, 2010). The first years of a child’s life are likely to establish a foundation for their morals that will continue with them the rest of their life, and the community of people that surrounds them will greatly impact this influential stage. In 1932, Piaget illustrated the profound impact that those around a child have.

The little boys who are beginning to play are gradually trained by the older ones in respect for the law . . . As to the older ones, it is in their power to alter the rules. If this is not morality, then where does morality begin? . . . Before playing with his equals, the child is influenced by his parents. He is subjected from his cradle to a multiplicity of regulations, and even before language he becomes conscious of certain obligations. (Piaget, 1932)
These obligations translate into mores or society’s expectations. A superego is formed by the age of six, which is an internalized compass of sorts for the child to determine what is “right” or “wrong.” By that time, these moral codes of conduct are mostly established (Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969). Parental and societal guidance are strong determining factors in terms of how these experiences will solidify (Ilg & Ames, 1955). For example, a study of Chinese children showed that a mother’s influence and guidelines extended beyond the home (Yau, 2009). The study found that those in authority in society, especially mothers and teachers, had the greatest impact on children’s ethical mindsets (Yau, 2009). These mores established at a young age are likely to carry into adulthood. It comes as no surprise to hear that how a person is raised will affect, if not determine, the adult that they become. Childhood upbringing fosters adulthood codes of conduct (Mustard, 2010). This is evidential in all areas of life. Research shows that childhood influences account for substantial effects in adult physical, emotional, intellectual, and psychological health (Mustard, 2010). Studies concerning adult behavior are often linked back to childhood (Mustard, 2010). Exposure and experience for children from their surrounding environment establish a foundation for their morals that will continue with them the rest of their lives.

From the simple cartoon (Johnston, 2013) above (Fig. 1), much can be inferred about society’s understanding of lying and how it is separate from deception. The child’s response is a reflection of and response to her environment. Her understanding of lying is separate from her understanding of deception. Lizzie’s mom is upset that she didn’t eat the vegetables; however, she does not yell at Lizzie for her response of “You never said I had to eat them,” because just like Lizzie’s understanding, according to mother’s
understanding of lying, Lizzie didn’t lie. Through experience and examples the mother has set for Lizzie, she has learned to believe that her words hold the meaning of what she does. Her deception is in what she does, not what she says. She has learned that a deceptive act can’t be challenged as a lie if she says words that are true. For Lizzie, she learned it from her mother and the other people in her life that she interacts with, and this behavior occurs so frequently in society that the child has adopted this conduct as her own.

**Attribution of truth**

Not only does the event depicted illustrate that understanding of lies and lying are formed at a young age as a product of her environment, it also shows the way many people assign truth to words rather than acts, so that lying and deception are not aligned. What seems to be at the core of whether or not a person is lying is the assumption that words hold meaning (Coleman, To appear). Truth does not lie within the words, but within the properties of the people speaking them and the circumstances surrounding them. Yngve (1996) shows that language does not carry meaning. It is the people that assign meaning to what they see and hear. Coleman (To appear) points out a good example of this idea when referring to people who speak different languages and see “pies.” To the Spanish speaker, “pies” refers to feet. To the Polish speaker, “pies” refers to a dog, while the English speaker is most likely thinking of a sweet dessert when encountering “pies.” The assorted ideas and reactions to the marks on paper or sound of speech are due to the properties of the person who encountered it. These marks and sounds, apart from the properties of the speaker and the context, have no meaning. Thus, different understandings of lying come from the sources from which people attribute
truth: to words or to understandings of the people communicating. If truth lies within words, a disconnection between deception and lies happens (Sypniewski & Coleman, 2011).

**Linguistic regional origin and cultural background as an indicator of understanding**

Because childhood experience differs based on cultural background, the disconnection between lying and deceiving could correlate with cultural differences by region and country. This possibility is supported by Charles Bond’s research about lying among different cultures (as cited in Consortium of Social Science Associations [COSSA], 2004; Government Product News [GPN], 2004). The study included seventy-five different countries and 4,800 subjects. This large-scale investigation found differences towards lying among different cultures. For example, Bond reports that people from Pakistan and Algeria report hearing three to four times more lies per week than those from Taiwan or Portugal (as cited in GPN, 2004). Americans averaged in the middle range, reporting that they heard eight lies per week (as cited in GPN, 2004). Another study examining Japanese and American college students found that their ideas concerning cheating were different (Diekhoff, Labeff, Shinohara, & Yasukawa, 1999). Whether the subjects had a different understanding of a lie or not, a difference among cultures was found in each study.

Furthermore, Hudson (1980) shows that even within the same language, each individual has a different linguistic perception due to that individual’s own unique experiences and understanding. Cross-culturally, these differences multiply. Pitta, Fung, and Isberg’s (1999) research says that different cultural background affects multiple facets of life, even ways of thinking and perceptions; thus, it is reasonable to hypothesize
that perception of communicative events would differ between cultures and regions of origin.

Research confirms that culture and region are closely associated. Different cultures have segregated into separate regions, regions with their own values, norms, accent, and perceptions. As Hudson (1980) convincingly argues, there is no objective way to distinguish between language and a dialect of language. Thus, research that applies to the relationship of cultural factors and dialect can give insight into cultural factors and language, and vice versa. Regional origin is not the causal factor behind actions and ideologies, but it seems to be a good indicator of a person’s way of life: voting tendencies, beliefs, ethics, and logically the evaluation of communicative events. A study of the 2000 presidential election showed that region-specific cultural characteristics strongly impacted voting patterns (Levernier & Barilla, 2006). Political parties gained support from specific regions because the moral ethics and promised conduct that each candidate represented was the standard in particular parts of the country and not in others. Regional origin and voting behavior seem to go hand in hand, which should be indicative of regional origin and communicative evaluation. People’s ethical viewpoints are not divorced from their party identification, nor their everyday perception.

Dialect is a clear indicator of origin, which is why dialectal origin boundaries were chosen to decide how to divide the nation into origins. In the United States, there are some evident linguistic variations in speech in different regions of the country. Likewise, variations are made among different cultural groups. Labov, Ash, and Boberg (1997) did extensive research to determine five main dialectal regions of the United States: the West, Midland, North Central, Inland North, and the South (see Fig. 2.0). Since 1968, Labov,
Yaeger, Steiner, and other researchers have been tracking dialects across the nation, and with the study conducted by Labov et al. (1997), the most updated American dialect map was drawn, shown in Figure 2. In Labov, Ash, and Boberg’s study, 607 subjects took part in what researchers refer to as the “Teslur Project” (Labov et al., 1997). Subjects from each area were part of the local speech community and raised in that area. Researchers set dialectal regional boundaries based on the variations of the speakers’ vowels. Subjects’ speech was analyzed based a 238 vowel system (1997).

![Figure 2: Linguistic Regional Boundaries](image)

Legend: 1 = The West, 2 = The Midland, 3 = The South

**What is a lie?**

**Multiple definitions of a lie**

After reading the cartoon (Figure 1), many would have differing opinions about whether or not the child lied. We know this from a study by Coleman (To appear). This
is because understandings of what a lie is differ. Dictionary definitions may give us insight into why this happens. His research showed both aligned and unaligned understandings about what constitutes a lie. These conflicting views are globally evident and could arise due to various reasons such as age, gender, social position, education level, and linguistic and/or cultural background. Within these viewpoints are numerous definitions of what constitutes a lie. As shown in the cartoon, it is commonplace for a lie to be deemed a false statement. Below are a few examples of ways that a lie may be defined from dictionaries and previous research.

A lie may be:

1) “A statement that is not true” (“Lie”, n.d.). According to this definition, Lizzie has not lied.

2) “Something that you say or write that you know is untrue” (“Lie”, 2013a). Still, Lizzie has not lied.

3) “A false statement to a person or group made by another person or group who knows it is not the whole truth, intentionally” (“Lie”, 2013b); Lizzie has not lied.

4) “A false statement made with intent to deceive” (“Lie”, 1971, p. 251). Lizzie has intent to deceive but with a true statement. According to this definition, Lizzie has not lied. Yet, from Coleman’s (To appear) study, roughly 40% of subjects who perceived an event very similar to Lizzie’s said it was a lie. Perhaps 40% would say that Lizzie has lied.

5) Speaking with the expectation of creating a false understanding in the hearer.

Lizzie has lied. (Coleman, p. 4, To appear)

The first four definitions have discrepancies because they fail to decipher the differences
between, a lie, a mistake, a joke, and a “technically truthful” statement with intent to
deceive. Coleman (To appear) provides a commonsense definition of a lie as:

Speaking with the expectation of creating a false understanding in the hearer.

Thus the person who is lying is successful when by speaking he causes the
understanding of the hearer to fail to correspond with his own understanding.

From the above definitions, people seem to have three distinct understandings of what constitutes a lie:

1. A speaker says X knowing that X is false.

   A person with this perception would even view teasing as lying.

2. A speaker says X knowing that X is false with the intent of convincing someone
   that X is true.

   This perspective distinguishes teasing from lying to deceive.

3. A speaker has an understanding that X is false and says something to cause another
   person to understand that X is true.

   This view of a lie concentrates on the speaker deceiving the hearer.

These diverse understandings are at the heart of this thesis and are measured by the
instrument later discussed that was used to collect data.

**A category of lying: “White lies”**

Unlinking lying and deceiving creates discrepancies in types of lies. Although
being honest is a social ideal (Mazar et al., 2008), many argue that there are appropriate
times to stretch the truth or to, plainly, lie. Argo and Shiv (2012) say that an “acceptable
range” of lying commonly exists, which they refer to as “white lies” (p. 1094). These
white lies, according to Argo and Shiv (2012), occur daily and without a second thought.
In a 2012 study, Argo and Shiv found that 85% of restaurant diners “admitted to telling white lies when their dining experiences were not satisfactory” (p. 1094). In many cases, “mild” deception is even promoted. It is assumed that servers from the study view their white lies as acceptable, if not encouraged as staff complaints did not emerge from the study. Rather, 95% of servers said they could recognize these white lies, and 100% stated that a higher tip would follow this white lie. Being completely honest is not a standard that many prefer to live by (Argo & Shiv, 2012).

When the speaker has deceived the listener about a supposedly inconsequential matter, often for the benefit of the hearer, this is often considered a “white lie.” For example, when a woman asks her male significant other if her outfit makes her look fat, the man knows that his socially-constructed response should always be “No,” even if he thinks otherwise. A response of “No, you look great!” makes her understanding different from what he thinks is true, but allows him to keep her smiling, as well as himself in this case. Moreover, the event is not serious in nature, so that brutal honesty is neither necessary nor appropriate.

These varying understandings and types of lies are the focus of this study. Covering up mistakes, preventing hurt feelings, staying out of trouble, and avoiding embarrassment are a few of the numerous reasons people frequently cite as reason why people are inclined to speak deceptively. This thesis researches if divorcing deception from a lie, as illustrated earlier by the cartoon (Fig. 1), is a common understanding in society. If so, is this perception more dominant in certain regions of the country or among different cultural groups? This research looks to find possible indicators of patterns among linguistic origins and culture groups. From these former studies on lies,
the idea that the perception of a communicative event will vary dependent upon linguistic origin arises. As the previous research indicated, perceptions among different cultures vary as well as among people from different linguistic origins. Definitive research is lacking in regards to dialectical regional origin and cultural background and their influence on lies and lying. This research is focused around two main research questions: 1) Is linguistic regional origin an indicator of how someone will perceive a communicative event? 2) Does cultural background influence the perception of a communicative event?
Chapter Two

Methodology

Participants

Data was collected in three cities: Toledo, Ohio; Orlando, Florida; and Phoenix, Arizona. These three places were chosen in order to get information from dialectal regions defined by Labov, Ash, and Boberg (1997): the Midland, South, and West. Subjects in Toledo were elicited in native and non-native speaker composition classes, in a Principles of Linguistic class at the University of Toledo, and in public places. Subjects in Orlando, Florida and Phoenix, Arizona were recruited. When in public places, subjects were asked individually if they would like to participate in the study. Some subjects that were initially recruited for data collection were later excluded due to lack of completing necessary information on the survey or subject’s region of origin was not being researched in the study. A total of 98 subjects’ responses were analyzed: 32 from the Midland, 19 from the South, 22 from the West, and 25 non-native English speakers: 12 from China and 13 from Arab countries.

Materials

A twelve-question written survey was used as the method for collecting data. The creation of the survey (Appendix A) was a group effort from Dr. Douglas Coleman, Kamal Belmihoub, Kevin Risner, Ryan Wright, and Emily Warnott. The original intent of the survey was for each researcher to investigate multiple variables such as gender, authority, race, religiosity, language, and sexuality for other studies. For this study, the instrument was slightly adapted to focus on the variables investigated specific to this research: linguistic origin and culture, but the original potential variables remain for
potential future investigation. Each question included a narrative with part of the narrative pulled out for further examination. A three-part question was posed about the extricated text to see if it was a lie, mistake, or neither; intended to deceive or not, and harmful, not harmful, or unsure. See Figure 3 as an example.

Five-year-old Eddie was running through the living room and bumped a table so that it rocked, knocking over a potted plant sitting on the table. The potted plant rolled off and hit the floor, breaking, sending dirt, broken pottery, and bits of the plant scattering. He turned and notices the mess, but ran out of the room. Later, his mother Fran shows Eddie the mess and asks him, "Did you break the pot?" Edie says, "I never touched that pot." Eddie's response "I never touched that pot" is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose <strong>one:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ a lie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ a mistake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ neither a lie nor a mistake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose <strong>one:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ intended to deceive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ not intended to deceive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose <strong>one:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ probably harmful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ probably not harmful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ possibly harmful or harmless -- I can't tell.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.* Sample question from survey for the IRB protocol. See Appendix A for the complete instrument.

**Baseline Questions**

Three baseline questions were included in the survey (questions 1, 4, & 11) to see if subjects could recognize a mistake, teasing, and an approximation, respectively. The three baseline items (a mistake, teasing, and approximation) were replicated from Coleman’s (To appear) study so as to make comparisons possible.
A Mistake

1) Aaron and Betty are having a phone conversation. Betty says, “When’s our appointment?” Aaron looks down at his appointment book, scans down the page labeled “Tuesday” to the row labeled “10:30 AM” and sees “Betty” penciled in. However, his computer mouse is covering part of the top of the page, so what he really can read is “T**sday.” Aaron answers, “It’s at 10:30 AM on Thursday.” Betty says, “10:30 Thursday? OK. See you then. Bye.”

Subjects were asked to evaluate Aaron’s response of “It’s at 10:30 AM on Thursday.”

It was expected that since the mouse was covering part of the word, subjects would recognize this as clearly just a mistake.

Teasing

4) Gaby and Harry invited some important guests for dinner. Gaby went to a lot of trouble to make an intricate flower arrangement for the dinner table. As Harry entered the room, he saw, smiled and said, “Wow.” She turns toward him, looks nervous, and says, “Harry, do you think it’s OK?” Harry looks at it, looks at her, smiles even more broadly, and shaking his head says, “Babe, it looks just terrible.” Gaby hears what he says, smiles, and looks satisfied.

Subjects were asked to evaluate when Harry says, “Babe, it looks just terrible.”

Harry’s response “Babe, it looks just terrible” was expected to be viewed as teasing, because Harry is smiling when he makes his remark and Gaby is smiling back. With both people in the narrative smiling and showing satisfaction, especially Gaby, subjects are expected to evaluate this interaction as neither a lie nor a mistake, not intended to deceive, and not harmful.

Approximation

11) Larry, a middle school student, was talking with a friend about his class in physics that covers basic astronomy. His younger sister Mary overheard his conversation with his friend and later asks him, “How far away is the sun?” Larry knows that the distance to the sun varies, but averages about 93 millions miles, so he answers, “Around 93 million miles.”
Subjects were asked to evaluate Larry’s response of “Around 93 million miles.” Larry’s response “Around 93 million miles” is not an exact answer, but this question was included in order to detect if subjects could recognize approximation. Subjects were expected to view Larry’s response as neither a lie nor a mistake, not intended to deceive, and not harmful.

Controls to Make Sure that the Variables are Balanced

In addition to these three baseline items from Coleman (To appear), nine other narratives were used to control for the possibility that different aspects of the context affected subjects’ perspective, such as gender of the speaker in romantic relationships with a statement contrary to fact (questions 2 & 9), relative ages of the speaker and hearer (questions 3 & 8), importance of the situation (questions 3 & 5), and authority level (questions 6, 7, 10, & 12). All of these variables were balanced with an opposite pair to determine whether it made a difference in the subject’s perspective. For example, subjects read one narrative that included a romantic relationship where a male’s response was analyzed and elsewhere on the survey another narrative included a similar romantic relationship setting and response, but with a female speaker instead.

Gender of the Speaker in a Romantic Relationship and Words Contrary to Fact

Two communicative events were included in the survey to allow a comparison between male and female statements that are contrary to fact. It was thought that subjects might change perspectives with a male versus female speaker if they have biases towards a particular sex.

2) Carl and Diane went out on a first date. They just finished eating at an expensive sushi restaurant. Diane asks, “How did you like it?” To Carl, the food
seemed unappetizing, but he doesn’t want to disappoint Diane, who said she loves the restaurant. Carl smiles and says, “I kind of like it.”

Subjects are asked to evaluate Carl’s response of “I kind of like it.”

9) Bobby took Susie out on a date to watch a professional football game. They are just leaving the Cleveland Browns stadium when Bobby says, “Wasn’t that awesome?” To Susie, football is extremely boring and she was cold the whole time, but she doesn’t want to disappoint Bobby. Susie grins and says, “Yeah, that was fun!”

Subjects were asked to evaluate Susie’s response of “Yeah, that was fun!” It is possible that subjects will view both statements as a lie since what was said is not how the speaker truly feels. On the other hand, subjects may not consider these lies because it’s recognizable from the narrative’s cues that both parties speaking are not really concerned about the facts of the question and response, but rather to gauge the enjoyment of the date. Written cues are given in these narratives to make this apparent to the reader. In both questions the word “date” is used to "create expectations” in the reader that go along with dating (Sypniewski, 2010). Also, in question #2, Carl says, “he doesn’t want to disappoint Diane.” In question #9, “she doesn’t want to disappoint Bobby” is said. Both of these indicate a higher priority than stating facts. Most of society would consider these “white lies” for the benefit of the hearer and most probably, the speaker as well. This coincides with information from chapter one; people are not always looking for a literal answer to their question.

Ages of the Speaker and Hearer

Two communicative events were written in a way to see if the age of the speaker plays a part in the determination of the various lying variables.

3) Five-year-old Eddie was running through the living room and bumped a table so that it rocked, knocking over a potted plant sitting on the table. The potted
plant rolled off and hit the floor, breaking, sending dirt, broken potter, and bits of the plant scattering. He turned and notices the mess, but ran out of the room. Later, his mother Fran shows Eddie the mess and asks him, “Did you break the pot?” Eddie says, “I never touched that pot.”

Subjects were asked to evaluate Eddie’s response “I never touched that pot.”

8) Billy’s pet fish Little Nemo died when Billy’s mother, Mrs. Gerard, accidentally tipped his fishbowl and he fell onto the floor. Later finding the fish was dead, Mrs. Gerard flushed him down the toilet. That afternoon, Billy comes in, sees the empty fishbowl and asks his mother where Little Nemo is. She replies, “He was lonely, so I had to put him into the pond out back so he could swim with the other fish.”

Subjects were asked to evaluate Mrs. Gerard’s response “He was lonely, so I had to put him into the pond out back so he could swim with the other fish.” The first question actually says that Eddie is five years old, and the second question implies that Mrs. Gerard is older since she is the mother of Billy.

Importance of the Situation

Two narratives were written in a way so as to have factual words stated, but there is obvious deception occurring.

3) Five-year-old Eddie was running through the living room and bumped a table so that it rocked, knocking over a potted plant sitting on the table. The potted plant rolled off and hit the floor, breaking, sending dirt, broken potter, and bits of the plant scattering. He turned and notices the mess, but ran out of the room. Later, his mother Fran shows Eddie the mess and asks him, “Did you break the pot?” Eddie says, “I never touched that pot.”

Subjects were asked to evaluate Eddie’s response “I never touched that pot.”

5) During his lunch break, Ian ate quickly and ran out to have one last lunchtime fling with his ex girlfriend Karla before his wedding to Jane. Later, he met his fiancée Jane downtown. She recognized the scent of Karla’s perfume and saw lipstick on Ian’s shirt collar. She also notice his jacket is badly wrinkled. She says, “I though you said you were going to eat lunch at the office today. Did I see
you at lunchtime coming out of Karla’s apartment building?” Ian smiles, shakes his head, and quickly says, “I did eat lunch at the office.”

Subjects are asked to evaluate Ian’s response “I did eat lunch at the office.” Both Eddie and Ian are saying words that happened, but are clearly not answering the question at the heart of the speaker’s intentions. The two narratives may be considered equal to some because the speaker is intentionally trying to deceive the hearer, but others may view them differently due to the seriousness of each context. Eddie’s situation does not carry the magnitude of severity that Ian’s does.

*Authority Level*

Four communicative events were written in a way to see if authority plays a part in the determination of the various lying variables.

6) Adam, asked his eighth grade teacher, Mrs. O’Connell, to write him a letter of recommendation so he could get into a good private high school. Mrs. O’Connell told him on Friday that she’d have it ready on Monday, but she spent the weekend procrastinating and watching DVD’s of TV reruns. When Adam asks her on Monday if she sent the letter of recommendation, she says, “I had a family emergency over the weekend.”

Subjects are asked to evaluate Mrs. O’Connell’s response “I had a family emergency over the weekend.”

7) Jerome had homework to finish for today in Ms. Brooks’ class. He played baseball all evening yesterday and returned home real late. He was very tired so he decided to sleep rather than finish his homework. The next day, Ms. Brooks asks Jerome where his homework is. He says, “I forgot to do my homework.”

Subjects are asked to evaluate Jerome’s response “I forgot to do my homework.”

10) A few minutes ago, Rachel looked down at her dashboard and saw that she was driving too fast, but she doesn’t slow down, because she was late for an appointment. Officer Daniels clocked her going 20 miles an hour over the speed
limit and pulled her over. He has just walked to her car, and he asks her, “Do you know you were going over the speed limit?” She says, “Oh, I wasn’t really paying attention to the speedometer.”

Subjects are asked to evaluate Rachel’s response “Oh, I wasn’t really paying attention to the speedometer.”

12) Karen walked up to a policeman at a bus stop to ask directions. When she put her purse down on the bench, her iPod fell out without her noticing. Officer Davis noticed but said nothing. She left and he pocketed the iPod. She comes back a few minutes later when she discovers her iPod missing and asks him if he saw her iPod. He says, “No, I didn’t notice one here.”

Subjects are asked to evaluate Officer Daniel’s response “No, I didn’t notice one here.” Questions 6 and 7 differentiate between student and teacher responses. Both parties are making up false excuses concerning unfinished work, but subjects may perceive them differently when a person of lower authority makes up an excuse compared with someone in a higher authority position. Questions 10 and 12 both deal with a layperson and a police officer. In scenario 10, Rachel says, “Oh, I wasn’t really paying attention,” but, according to the narrative, she clearly knew she was breaking the law by speeding and continued in this fashion. Similarly, in narrative 12, Officer Daniels says “No, I didn’t notice one here.” We know that Officer Daniel’s did notice an iPod because he picked it up and put it in his pocket, which is also breaking the law. Both Officer Daniels and Rachel are knowingly breaking the law and lying about it, but subjects may evaluate them differently based on the position of authority held or lack there of.

Procedures

Potential subjects were told that the study was to investigate lies and lying. The author went to public places in Phoenix, Arizona and Orlando, Florida, as well as English
composition classes, ESL composition classes, other university classes and public places in Toledo, Ohio to solicit subjects. Multiple days were required to gather enough data. They were also verbally informed that their participation was voluntary and that their answers would be kept confidential. After subjects agreed to participate in the study, each subject was given a one-page document to obtain informed consent. After giving informed consent, subjects were given the surveys. Subjects read the instructions to themselves and filled out the survey (Appendix A). Upon completion of the survey, subjects were thanked for their participation and released.

**Hypotheses**

After gathering data from people from different regions with various backgrounds, questions of links between their perception of communicative events and different variables within their background arise, specifically linguistic regional origin and cultural regional origin. Since the surrounding environment at a young age is an influential factor in perspective, viewpoints may be different towards each scenario dependent upon the previously stated variables.

Alternate hypothesis 1: There is a correlation between the linguistic regional background of the subject and determining a narrative response as containing a lie and/or deception. Null hypothesis 1: There is not a correlation between the linguistic regional background of the subject and determining a narrative response as containing a lie and/or deception.

Alternate hypothesis 2: There is a correlation between the cultural background of the subject and determining a narrative response as containing a lie and/or deception.
For this variable, cultural background is being defined as originating from a particular ethnic group. Null hypothesis 2: There is not a correlation between the cultural background of the subject and determining a narrative response as containing a lie and/or deception.
Chapter Three

Findings

Results and Data Analysis

Established understandings from childhood lay a foundation for the future (Piaget, 1932). Since the childhood background of the subjects is diverse, finding commonalities between backgrounds and comparing responses to communicative events could give insight into many factors that influence understanding. Is linguistic regional background an indicator of someone’s perception of a communicative event? Does cultural background influence the perception of a communicative event? To address these questions, answers from the survey were compared between linguistic and cultural regions.

Baseline questions

Baseline responses for each variable (linguistic origin and culture) were analyzed to see if subjects could separate a “lie” from a mistake, teasing, and an approximation when perceiving a communicative event. Subjects’ responses from the West, the Midland, and the South to the three baseline items: a mistake (1), teasing (4), and an approximation (11) used the same narratives as in Coleman (To appear). Like those in Coleman's (To appear), the vast majority of NES in this study could distinguish a mistake and many of the NNES, teasing, and an approximation from a “lie”; see Figures 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Evidence of this inference is shown by the fact that most subjects labeled the mistake (1) a mistake and the items with teasing (4) and approximation (11) both as neither a lie nor a mistake. Therefore, the baseline items allow the conclusion that the subjects in this study essentially understand the narratives, since their responses to the
baseline items basically agree with the responses of the subjects from Coleman’s (To appear) pilot study.

**Baseline question #1: A mistake**

1) Aaron and Betty are having a phone conversation. Betty says, “When’s our appointment?” Aaron looks down at his appointment book, scans down the page labeled “Tuesday” to the row labeled “10:30 AM” and sees “Betty” penciled in. However, his computer mouse is covering part of the top of the page, so what he really can read is “T**sday.” Aaron answers, “It’s at 10:30 AM on Thursday.” Betty says, “10:30 Thursday? OK. See you then. Bye.”

Aaron’s response was widely accepted as a mistake from the Midland, the South, the West, Americans, Chinese, and Arabs; see Figure 4 and Figure 5.

![Figure 4](image_url)

*Figure 4. Baseline for question #1: A mistake: By linguistic region*
Baseline for question #1: A mistake: By cultural background

Baseline question #4: Teasing

4) Gaby and Harry invited some important guests for dinner. Gaby went to a lot of trouble to make an intricate flower arrangement for the dinner table. As Harry entered the room, he saw, smiled and said, “Wow.” She turns toward him, looks nervous, and says, “Harry, do you think it’s OK?” Harry looks at it, looks at her, smiles even more broadly, and shaking his head says, “Babe, it looks just terrible.” Gaby hears what he says, smiles, and looks satisfied.

The majority of subjects from the Midland, the South, the West, American culture, Chinese culture, and Arabic culture perceived Harry’s response as neither a lie nor a mistake. Subjects indicated this by marking “neither a lie nor a mistake” on the survey; see Figure 6 and Figure 7.
Figure 6. Baseline for question #4: Teasing: By linguistic region
Almost all NES agreed that Larry’s response was neither a lie nor a mistake. NES subjects indicated this by marking “neither a lie nor a mistake” on the survey; see Figure 8. The randomly generated sample of American culture shows that all Americans perceived this communicative event as neither a lie nor a mistake, but some of the Chinese understood it as a mistake and some of the Arabs understood it as a lie.
Figure 8. Baseline for question #11: An approximation: By linguistic region

Figure 9. Baseline for question #11: An approximation: By cultural background
Although the baseline results from this study are similar to the results from Coleman’s (To appear), the responses of subjects from linguistic regions to baseline questions do not perfectly fit the intent of each item as well as Coleman’s (To appear) study. These differences could be due to data collection sites and circumstances. The entirety of Coleman’s data was collected in a classroom setting with minimal distractions. Some of the data for this research was collected in classrooms, but the majority was done in disparate locations with many potential distractions. These distractions may have inhibited subjects’ understanding of what they were reading and caused greater measurement error in their responses.

Chinese and Arabic subjects may have reacted differently to the baseline items than did the native speakers of English as a result of their having learned English with translation errors in their vocabulary.

**Hypothesis 1: Linguistic origin results**

Is linguistic origin an indicator of how subjects perceive a communicative event? One primary aim of this research is to investigate if linguistic regional origin is an indicator of how someone perceives a communicative event. The other nine narratives were compared by linguistic region to see if subjects connect lying and deception when perceiving a communicative event.

Region was used as the variable name to differentiate between the West, the Midland, and the South. The connection variable was named ConTotal. ConTotal is the degree to which a subject connects lying and deceiving, measured as the total number of times that the subject says the speaker in a narrative is both lying and deceiving. If a subject’s response was “a lie” and “intended to deceive,” a score of “1” was given. The
connection (ConTotal) between lying and deceiving was analyzed via a Mann-Whitney statistical analysis. There was a statistically significant difference between the South and the West regions (median_s = 5, median_w = 7, Mann-Whitney U=135.5, p= .051, 2-tailed).

These results indicate that there is a 94.999% chance that subjects from these linguistic regions perceive a communicative event differently. Null hypothesis 1 can be rejected.

The difference between the South and the Midland region was measured at p=.101 (median_s = 5, median_m = 7, Mann-Whitney U= 221.0, 2-tailed). This is highly suggestive of a significant difference between the South and the Midland. The difference between the Midland and the West region was measured at p=.754 (median_m = 7, median_w = 7, Mann-Whitney U=334.5, 2-tailed). This indicates that the Midland and the West are not significantly different. In summary, there is not a large difference between the West and Midland linguistic regions in terms of a disconnect between lying and deceiving, but the South has a greater disconnect than either of them.

**Hypothesis 2: Cultural origin results**

Does cultural background influence perception of a communicative event in terms of lying and deceiving? The other primary aim of this research is to investigate if cultural origin affects how someone perceives a communicative event. The nine non-baseline narratives were compared by cultural background (American, Arab, and Chinese) to see if subjects connect lying and deception when perceiving a communicative event. Culture was used as the variable name to differentiate between cultural backgrounds: American, Arab, or Chinese.

As shown earlier in this study, baseline items were looked at to ensure that subjects could differentiate between a mistake, teasing, and an approximation. In order to
make sure that differences between cultures did not exist due to a lack of English ability, further statistical analyses were conducted with the baseline questions. A Goodman and Kruskal Tau test was conducted on each baseline question for culture. Since American subjects greatly outnumbered the other cultures, a stratified random sample was used to represent American culture and therefore test relationships among more equal sample groups. For the stratified random sample, four random subjects were selected from each of the tested subgroups of NES: West, Midland, and South. The Goodman and Kruskal Tau test for the first baseline question (#1: a mistake) shows that there is no significant correlation between a subject's culture and the interpretation of the event as a lie, mistake, or neither of these (Culture dependent: G-T $\tau = .027$, $p = .727$; Lie1 dependent: G-T $\tau = .014$, $p = .901$). Testing for the second baseline question (#4: teasing) shows that there is no significant correlation between a subject’s culture and the interpretation of the event as a lie, mistake, or neither of these (Culture dependent: G-T $\tau = .058$, $p = .354$; Lie4 dependent: G-T $\tau = .041$, $p = .539$). Testing for the third baseline question (#11; an approximation) shows a correlation between a subject’s culture and the interpretation of the event as a lie, mistake, or neither of these (Culture dependent: G-T $\tau = .181$, $p = .008$; Lie11: G-T $\tau = .146$, $p = .025$). The first two baseline results show that there is no correlation between culture and the question for all cultural groups researched: Arabs, Chinese, and Americans, suggesting that any differences elsewhere in response are not due to group differences such as a lack of English reading comprehension among the non-native speakers. The third baseline analysis shows that three Arabic subjects thought an approximation was a lie and three Chinese subjects thought an approximation was a mistake. The Arabic subjects’ view indicates that because the words said were not
precise, they thought it was a lie; in the same situation, the three Chinese subjects responses indicate they thought it was a mistake. The six non-native English-speaking subjects could be using a dictionary definition of a lie, which could account for the differences.

In addition, findings show that Americans have the strongest connection between lying and deceiving, and Arabic subjects have the weakest connection between lying and deceiving. A comparison of medians via a Kruskal-Wallis test found a connection between lying and deceiving to be different by culture (Chi-square = 8.818, df = 2, p = .012). Median results show the Americans at 7, Arabs at 2.5, and Chinese 4.5. Results indicate that cultural background does influence perception of communicative events.

**Discussion and Interpretations**

**Linguistic region of origin**

Linguistic regional origin was used as an indicator, but it’s not a causal explanation as to why there are differences in perceptions. It is necessary to look at factors within the cultural background to determine causality. Many factors have been influencing the development of perceptions since childhood and may account for why the South and the West and Midland perceive communicative events in relation to lying and deceiving so differently. Cultural background and linguistic region of origin are two of numerous variables that could account for differentiation amongst perceptions of communicative events. Education, religiosity, socialization (Pitta, Fung, & Isberg, 1999), mood (Pastotter, Gleixner, Neuhauser, & Bauml, 2013), or a harsher judgment of others (Bond & DePaulo, 2006) could be additional variables that account for subjects’ responses. Three main variables were chosen to investigate as possible influential
components: education, religiosity, and income. These factors heavily influence multiple facets of life; therefore, it is feasible that these factors influenced subjects’ perceptions.
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**Figure 10.** Four-Year High School Graduation Rates: Class of 2008-2009 (adapted from U.S. Department of Education, 2011).

**Education**

Education is a factor that affects multiple aspects of life, including a value system (Pitta et al., 1999). Education is a variable that could likely affect perception since it directly influences your way of thinking. Looking at state-by-state educational status gives insight to this information. Figure 10 shows high school graduation rates from 2008-2009 (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). The map (Fig. 10) indicates that the West and Midland have higher high school graduation rates than the South. This is shown by the majority of the states in the West and Midland being marked in yellow and
most of the Southern states in red. This could mean that with more education, people learn to connect lying and deceiving.

![Map of State Religiosity](image)

Figure 11. State-by-State Religiosity (adapted from Gallup, 2011)

**Religion**

Results also may be affected by the religiosity of the subjects. As shown in Figure 11 (Gallup, 2011), the South is the most religious part of the nation. It is also shown that religion holds the most importance in the South. Religiosity could greatly influence the perception of a communicative event, especially the connection between lying and deception. From the South’s responses of disconnecting lying and deception, we could infer that in their religion, they are taught that lying and deceiving are different.
Figure 12. State-by-State Median Household Income (adapted from U.S. Census Bureau, 2006)

Income

Along with education and religiosity, subjects from a different income level may have differing perceptions. According to the median household income shown in Figure 12 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006), income level is scattered across the country. The data gathered for the current study does not distinguish the subject’s place of origin by state, and the variations shown on the map in Figure 12 do not correlate with dialect regions (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006), so it is not feasible to make any predictions concerning income level and the perception of communicative events.
Cultural background

Culture can be defined in many different ways and includes many of the factors already discussed such as socialization, religion, education, and even linguistic regional origin. Pitta et al. (1999) say, “culture represents how people in the civilization interact with one another” (p. 242). For this research, culture is defined as originating from a particular ethnic group. Researching if the holistic variable of cultural background affects perception of a communicative event is another goal of this study. As previously mentioned in chapter one, Bond’s research shows that different cultures have varying understandings on a broad spectrum of categories related to lying and deceiving (COSSA, 2004; GPN, 2004). These variances can be accounted for by different parenting styles, ethical norms of the society, religious expectations, and preconceived perceptions (Pitta et al., 1999, p. 242). For example, peace and harmony is stressed so much in Chinese culture that it greatly affects the behavior and thinking (p. 247). Privacy and maintaining strong relationships with people are two examples of how American culture and Chinese culture differ from each other. Privacy and an individual outlook is not as important as it is for Chinese people as the best interest of a communal group (Pitta et al., 1999), so their mentality is what is best for everyone, not simply one person. This is a small example of how cultural background is responsible for the mindset of a communicative event.

Results indicate that Americans most closely connect lying and deceiving, and Arabs have the weakest connection. This could partially be due to translation error in the learning of English by the Arabic and Chinese subjects, but it is likely that Arabic culture has an unaligned understanding of lying and deceiving. Perhaps the importance of words
is stressed in their culture, so any words not true to fact are considered a lie. Also, they may be using a dictionary definition of a lie to evaluate communicative events, which as shown in chapter one.

**Lying with the truth**

Most of this research is focused on the correlation between lying and deceiving with the heart of the disconnection due to what the perceiver attributes truth to, in words or understanding. One of the questions in the study really captures the essence of this research: question number three. In question three, there is an obvious disconnection between what is said and the understanding of the people involved. Eddie’s response of “I never touched that pot” has technically truthful words but misleads his mother’s understanding about what happened. Herein lies the root of the problem: some of us attribute truth to words instead of to what people understand. People who focus on the words carrying the meaning consistently show a disconnection between lying and deception.

The environment a person grows up in has a lasting affect on a person’s future understanding (Piaget, 1932). Results show that subjects from different cultures perceive communicative events differently in relation to lying and deceiving. Americans connect lying and deceiving more than Chinese, and Chinese connect lying and deceiving more than Arabs. Cultural differences in understanding could be due to attributing meaning to words instead as well as variations of upbringing in each culture.

Results show that subjects from different linguistic regions and cultures perceive communicative events differently in relation to lying and deceiving. Subjects from the West and Midland regions are more likely than those from the South to connect lying and
deceiving, and Americans are more likely than Chinese or Arabs to connect lying and deceiving. NES have more exposure to the context of the communicative events, which makes them less dependent on the consciousness of words. In addition, the West’s stronger correlation between lying and deceiving suggests that with more education, people are somehow learning to closely link lying and deceiving. The unaligned understanding between lying and deceiving, honesty and telling the truth, is due attributing meaning in words instead of understanding. Perhaps this is due to educational differences. Since education correlates positively with the association of lying and deceiving and religiosity correlates negatively, it hints at the possibility that we may not only get less religious as we get more educated, we may also become less confused about the concept of what it means to tell the truth.
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Appendix A

Survey

Please read each short narrative below, then put an "X" mark in the box to indicate your reaction. Mark a response in every column for items (1) – (12).

1. Aaron and Betty are having a phone conversation. Betty says, "When's our appointment?" Aaron looks down at his appointment book, scans down the page labeled "Tuesday" to the row labeled "10 30 AM" and sees "Betty" penciled in. However, his computer mouse is covering part of the top of the page, so what he really can read is "Tuesday". Aaron answers, "It's at 10 30 AM on Thursday." Betty says, "10:30 Thursday? OK See you then." Bye." Aaron's response "It's at 10 30 AM on Thursday" is

```
CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN

Choose one: □ a lie □ a mistake □ neither a lie nor a mistake
Choose one: □ intended to deceive □ not intended to deceive
Choose one: □ probably harmful □ probably not harmful □ possibly harmful or harmless -- I can't tell
```

2. Carl and Diane went out on a first date. They just finished eating at an expensive sushi restaurant. Diane asks, "How did you like it?" To Carl, the food seemed unappetizing, but he doesn't want to disappoint Diane, who said she loves the restaurant. Carl smiles and says, "I kind of liked it." Carl's response "I kind of liked it" is

```
CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN

Choose one: □ a lie □ a mistake □ neither a lie nor a mistake.
Choose one: □ intended to deceive □ not intended to deceive
Choose one: □ probably harmful □ probably not harmful □ possibly harmful or harmless -- I can't tell
```

3. Five-year-old Eddie was running through the living room and bumped a table so that it rocked, knocking over a potted plant sitting on the table. The potted plant rolled off and hit the floor, breaking, sending dirt, broken pottery, and bits of the plant scattering. He turned and notices the mess, but ran out of the room. Later, his mother Fran shows Eddie the mess and asks him, "Did you break the pot?" Eddie says, "I never touched that pot." Eddie's response "I never touched that pot" is

```
CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN

Choose one: □ a lie □ a mistake, □ neither a lie nor a mistake.
Choose one: □ intended to deceive □ not intended to deceive
Choose one: □ probably harmful □ probably not harmful □ possibly harmful or harmless -- I can't tell
```

Page 1 of 5

167656

APPROVED BY

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO IRB
4 Gaby and Harry invited some important guests for dinner. Gaby went to a lot of trouble to make an intricate flower arrangement for the dinner table. As Harry entered the room, he saw it, smiled and said, "Wow." She turns toward him, looks nervous, and says, "Harry, do you think it's OK?" Harry looks at it, looks at her, smiles even more broadly, and shaking his head says, "Babe, it looks just terrible." Gaby hears what he says, smiles, and looks satisfied. Harry's response "Babe, it looks just terrible" is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a lie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither a lie nor a mistake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choose one:  
- intended to deceive
- not intended to deceive

Choose one:  
- probably harmful
- probably not harmful
- possibly harmful or harmless -- I can't tell

5 During his lunch break, Ian ate quickly and ran out to have one last lunchtime fling with his ex-girlfriend Karla before his wedding to Jane. Later, he met his fiancée Jane downtown. She recognized the scent of Karla’s perfume and saw lipstick on Ian's shirt collar. She also noticed his jacket is badly wrinkled. She says, "I thought you said you were going to eat lunch at the office today. Did I see you at luncheon coming out of Karla’s apartment building?" Ian smiles, shakes his head, and quickly says, "I did eat lunch at the office."

Ian's response "I did eat lunch at the office" is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a lie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither a lie nor a mistake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choose one:  
- intended to deceive
- not intended to deceive.

Choose one:  
- probably harmful
- probably not harmful
- possibly harmful or harmless -- I can't tell

6 Adam, asked his eighth grade teacher, Mrs. O’Connell, to write him a letter of recommendation so he could get into a good private high school. Mrs. O’Connell told him Friday that she’d have it ready on Monday, but she spent the weekend procrastinating and watching DVD’s of TV reruns. When Adam asks her on Monday if she sent the letter of recommendation, she says, "I had a family emergency over the weekend."

Mrs. O’Connell's response "I had a family emergency over the weekend" is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a lie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither a lie nor a mistake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choose one:  
- intended to deceive
- not intended to deceive.

Choose one:  
- probably harmful
- probably not harmful
- possibly harmful or harmless -- I can't tell
7. Jerome had homework to finish for today in Ms. Brooks’ class. He played baseball all evening yesterday and returned home real late. He was very tired so he decided to sleep rather than finish his homework. The next day, Ms. Brooks asks Jerome where his homework is. He says, “I forgot to do my homework.” Jerome’s response “I forgot to do my homework” is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ a lie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ neither a lie nor a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ intended to deceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ not intended to deceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ probably harmful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ probably not harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ possibly harmful or harmless -- I can’t tell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Billy’s pet fish Little Nemo died when Billy’s mother, Mrs. Gerard, accidentally tipped his fishbowl and he fell onto the floor. Later finding the fish was dead, Mrs. Gerard flushed him down the toilet. That afternoon, Billy comes in, sees the empty fishbowl and asks his mother where Little Nemo is. She replies, “He was lonely, so I had to put him into the pond out back so he could swim with the other fish.” Mrs. Gerard’s response “He was lonely, so I had to put him into the pond out back so he could swim with the other fish” is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ a lie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ neither a lie nor a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ intended to deceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ not intended to deceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ probably harmful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ probably not harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ possibly harmful or harmless -- I can’t tell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Bobby took Susie out on a date to watch a professional football game. They are just leaving the Cleveland Browns stadium when Bobby says, “Wasn’t that awesome?” To Susie, football is extremely boring and she was cold the whole time, but she doesn’t want to disappoint Bobby. Susie grins and says, “Yeah, that was fun!” Susie’s response “Yeah, that was fun!” is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ a lie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ neither a lie nor a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ intended to deceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ not intended to deceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ probably harmful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ probably not harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ possibly harmful or harmless -- I can’t tell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. A few minutes ago, Rachel looked down at her dashboard and saw that she was driving too fast, but she doesn't slow down, because she was late for an appointment. Officer Daniels clocked her going 20 miles an hour over the speed limit and pulled her over. He has just walked to her car, and he asks her, "Do you know you were going over the speed limit?" She says, "Oh, I wasn't really paying attention to the speedometer." Rachel's response "Oh, I wasn't really paying attention to the speedometer" is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a lie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- neither a lie nor a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- intended to deceive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- not intended to deceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- probably harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- probably not harmful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- possibly harmful or harmless -- I can't tell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Larry, a middle school student, was talking with a friend about his class in physics that covers basic astronomy. His younger sister Mary overheard his conversation with his friend and later asks him, "How far away is the sun?" Larry knows that the distance to the sun varies, but averages about 93 million miles. Larry's response "Around 93 million miles" is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a lie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- neither a lie nor a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- intended to deceive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- not intended to deceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- probably harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- probably not harmful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- possibly harmful or harmless -- I can't tell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Karen walked up to a policeman at a bus stop to ask directions. When she put her purse down on the bench, her iPod fell out without her noticing. Officer Davis noticed but said nothing. She left and he pocketed the iPod. She comes back a few minutes later when she discovers her iPod missing and asks him if he saw her iPod. He says, "No, I didn't notice one here." Officer Daniel's response "No, I didn't notice one here" is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a lie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- neither a lie nor a mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- intended to deceive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- not intended to deceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- probably harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- probably not harmful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- possibly harmful or harmless -- I can't tell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please give a little information about yourself:

Did you spend the first ten years of your life in relatively the same place? ___________________
If yes, where? ___________________
If no, what cities and for how long in each? ___________________

How long have you lived here? ___________________

Sex  □ male  □ female
Age  □ <20  □ 20-24  □ 25-29  □ 30-39  □ >40
Religious:  □ yes  □ no  □ not sure
If religious, what religion ___________________

Race/Ethnicity -- You may choose more than one
□ Hispanic or Latino  □ Asian American
□ African-American  □ Caucasian/White
□ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander  □ American Indian/Alaskan Native

Sexual Orientation ___________________
Politically:  □ liberal  □ conservative
Socially:  □ liberal  □ conservative
Native speaker of English  □ yes  □ no