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Existing literature suggests that childrearing practices have an impact on a variety of children's behaviors, however, there is a dearth of research that examines the influence of parenting styles on children's lying behaviors. The purpose of the present study was to assess the influence of maternal warmth and control on children's lying behaviors. Sixty-three 10- to 11-year old boys from a predominantly white, middle to lower-middle class school district completed a questionnaire designed to assess mother's parenting style based on Baumrind's conceptualization of demandingness/control and responsiveness/warmth and their responses to eight scenarios related to common experiences where children may be inclined to lie. The results showed that while maternal warmth predicted the frequency and types of lies that children told, maternal control did not. Children whose mothers exhibited high amounts of maternal warmth told significant fewer lies overall and fewer more serious types of lies. Specifically, they told fewer Power lies (i.e., protect privacy, power over authority figure) than children of mothers with low warmth. Mothers who displayed high warmth and high control (i.e., Authoritative mothers) had children who told
significantly fewer lies overall and fewer more serious types of lies than children whose mothers who were low on both warmth and control (i.e., Indifferent mothers). These results suggest that parenting styles may influence children's lying behaviors. Mothers who are low on warmth and control may create an atmosphere for their children that is rejecting, providing little support for adequate development, and consisting of the sporadic use of power assertion. These parenting patterns may promote motivations for children to lie more frequently. On the other hand, mothers who are high on warmth and control may be providing a warm and accepting environment with structure and control which supports children's developing autonomy, and promoting respect and self-reliance in their children.
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Lying is a fairly common behavior in children, much to the consternation of parents, teachers, and others. The majority of research to date on children's lies has focused on the development of children's abilities to detect lies and the relation of lying to other behaviors. Few studies have focused on the effect of parental behaviors on children's lying. The purpose of this study is to examine the types and frequency of children's lies in relation to parenting styles.

Lying appears to be a normal part of children's development. However, excessive lying at an early age may signal more serious antisocial behaviors at later ages. Edelbrock and Loeber (1985) and Patterson (1982) have suggested that lying may be the first covert type of antisocial behavior to manifest itself in young children, and may thus be considered a stepping stone to other more serious antisocial behaviors.

The importance of examining the influences on children's lying behavior can be seen when lying is studied in relationship to other behaviors, such as conduct problems or antisocial behaviors. Research has
consistently shown that features of conduct problems such as aggression, truancy, and lying are predictive of delinquency (Loeber 1982; Loeber & Dishion, 1983; Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986).

Parental influences have also been shown to be predictive of conduct problems and antisocial behaviors. Among the most powerful predictors of conduct problems and juvenile delinquency are lack of parental supervision (Farrington, Gundry, & West, 1975; Goldstein, 1984; Wilson, 1980), parental rejection (McCord, 1982; McCord, McCord & Zola, 1969), and lack of parent-child involvement (Cortes & Gatti, 1972; Gold, 1963; Robinson, 1978).

Researchers have examined lying and its relation to problem and antisocial behaviors (e.g., Loeber & Schmaling, 1985). They used data from analytic studies on child psychopathology and subjected the data to 28 factor and cluster analyses to empirically determine the dimensions of antisocial behaviors. The results produced one dimension with two poles. One pole included covert behaviors (e.g., theft, truancy, and drug use), while the other pole consisted of overt behaviors (e.g., fighting, arguing, and temper tantrums). They found that while lying is related to both overt and covert behaviors, it is more strongly
related to covert behaviors. Additional studies have shown lying to be correlated with other negative behaviors including association with bad friends, stealing at home and outside the home, threats, attacks, setting fires, destruction, alcohol/drug use, truancy, running away, vandalism and disobedience (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1981; Edelbrock & Loeber, 1986; Patterson, 1982; Stouthamer-Loeber & Loeber, 1986). By understanding factors that encourage children to lie, early interventions aimed at reducing children's motivations that foster lying can be developed which may help prevent later antisocial behaviors in children.

Children's Lies: Overview

Over the years, philosophers have grappled with the idea that certain type of lies (e.g., altruistic lies) may be morally justified. They have attempted to determine whether the act of lying under certain circumstances is morally less detrimental to the sender than the consequence of the truth to the receiver. Some philosophers have taken the stance that lying in some instances is necessary for the good of society and social interactions. Others, however, feel that uttering a false statement is a lie regardless of the circumstances that surround the lie. That is, telling
a "white lie" is a falsehood, and is thus morally wrong (Bok, 1978).

Throughout the course of history, philosophers have attempted to classify lies and more recently, psychologists have joined their pursuit. Philosophers in particular have aspired to classify lies according to their moral "correctness", i.e., lies that the majority of people may not consider veritable lies. These lies have been identified as "white lies"; "social lies"; or "altruistic lies" (Bok, 1978). Psychologists have identified other types of lies, including the use of an "exploratory lie" by young children (i.e., to see what is hiding on the other side of truth or to test limits); boasting, exaggerating, or bragging; power lies (i.e., to test or defy authority); practical jokes; forgery or imposture; military and strategic deception; and swearing (i.e., young children believe that uttering curses are lies) (Ackerman, & Kappelman, 1979; Ekman, 1989; Hyman, 1989; Peterson, Peterson, & Seeto, 1983; Piaget, 1932/1965).

Categories of children's lies. Philosophers and behavioral researchers have also attempted to classify irrefutable lies according to their seriousness. Whereas adult categories have been empirically established, little attention has been given to
categorizing the types of lies that children tend to tell. In a review of the literature, Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) found that only rarely have children’s lying behaviors been categorized into specific types of lies or classified according to their seriousness. Peterson et al. (1983) measured moral evaluation of different types of lies across different age groups. Overall, they found that children and adults rated a self-protective lie as significantly worse than exaggerations, white lies, altruistic lies, and practical jokes. Only two of the categories (self-protection and exaggeration) examined by Peterson et al. (1983) compare to Lindskold and Walters (1983) and Lindskold and Han’s (1986) adult classifications of lies. Others who have distinguished children’s lie categories based their distinctions on common sense or reasonable assumptions of what these categories might be, but these categories have not been based on empirical evidence (Ackerman & Kappelman, 1979; Newson & Newson, 1976).

Developmental sequence of children’s lies. The types of lies that children tend to use appear to emerge in a systematic developmental progression. Children begin to lie around the ages of 3 to 3-1/2 years old (Chandler, Fritz, & Hala, 1989: Lewis,
Stanger, & Sullivan, 1989). In very young children, teasing or tricking (i.e., telling a "whopper lie" or "exploratory lie" to test the limits of what adults will believe and then saying afterwards that they were not lying but just teasing or tricking) is the first form of lying, and they are thought to be used by children to establish boundaries of separation (Ackerman & Kappelman, 1979; Ekman, 1989). Piaget (1932/1965) suggested that 4 to 5 year old children believe that uttering curses are a form of lying. The first "real" lies told by children (ages 4 to 6) are usually to escape punishment (Ekman, 1989; Peterson, Peterson & Seeto, 1983; Piaget, 1932/1965). Lying to protect peers appears to develop around the ages of 8-1/2 to 10 years old, which is when children begin to establish interpersonal interactions with other children (Sullivan, 1953). Children tend to become more skilled in telling lies as they mature. Children who are 10- to 12-years old report that they are able to lie to their parents without getting caught (Ekman, 1989). Thus, instrumental lies may appear in children during this time because children have learned successful lying techniques to manipulate adults to get what they want. During preadolescence, children begin to experience the need for autonomy and they may use
deception to protect privacy or to demonstrate power over authority figures (e.g., teachers, parents) (Ekman, 1989).

Developmental functions of children's lies. Lying appears to serve a number of developmental functions for children. First, lying may be a means of facilitating young children's separation from parents (Ford, King & Hollender, 1988; Goldberg, 1973). Second, it may also play a role in development of self-regulation (i.e., development of the super ego) (Ford et al., 1988; Goldberg, 1973). Kohut (1966), for example, suggested that a parent's reaction to a child's first lie may affect self-regulation of children's lying behaviors; i.e., the first undetected lies reveal to the child that their parent is not the all-knowing person they once believed he or she to be. The lost quality of omniscience is thought to become incorporated unconsciously in the psyche as a significant aspect of the super ego. That is, when a child discovers that his or her lie goes undetected by the parent, the child becomes aware of the power of deception. However, the child may also sense the feeling that deception is wrong and the feeling of wrongness associated with deception is incorporated into the super-ego. Thus, lying may play a role in the
development of self-regulation. Third, researchers have also suggested that children lie to protect self-esteem or to avoid embarrassment (DePaulo & Jordon, 1982; Ford et al., 1988; Harari & Mc David, 1969; Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986). Fourth, Ford et al. (1988) have indicated that lying may serve as a means by which to have an impact on the environment by influencing others (e.g., exaggerations). They also suggested that the compulsion to lie may be a result of poor impulse control, and that children may lie to protect privacy if parents exhibit strong intrusive control over the child.

Motivations for children's lies. In a summary of children's deceitful behaviors, Ekman (1989) suggested that common motives exist for children's lying as reported by parents, teachers, and clinicians. His eight motivations include: 1) to avoid punishment to self, 2) to protect a peer from punishment, 3) to get something you could not get otherwise, 4) to win interest or admiration of others, 5) to avoid creating an awkward situation, 6) to avoid being embarrassed, 7) to maintain privacy, and 8) to demonstrate power over authority. These motivations appear to correspond to four of the six categories of adult lies established by Lindskold and Walters (1983) and Lindskold and Han
Their six categories, which rank-order lies from least to most serious, encompass lies that: 1) save others from shame or embarrassment, 2) protect oneself or another person from punishment or a social blunder, 3) influence others which results in self gain, 4) are self-enhancing or protects wrongful gain, 5) others' actions benefit you and causes harm to them, and 6) hurt someone else so that you may gain.

Children under the age of twelve are usually not sophisticated enough in their thinking to produce lies in the last two categories which involve "exploitive persuasion" and "direct harm" lies with the intent of self gain. The remaining four lie types can therefore be summarized as 1) "social lies" (i.e., preservation of feelings of self or others), 2) "protection from punishment" (i.e., avoid punishment to self or peers), 3) "power lies" (i.e., to test or gain power over an authority figure), and 4) "instrumental lies" (i.e., enhancing self or self gain).

Based on Lindskold and Walters' (1983) and Lindskold and Han's (1986) rank-ordering of the seriousness of adult lies, children's lies may also be ranked accordingly: 1) social lies, 2) avoid punishment lies, 3) power lies, and 4) instrumental lies.
The least serious type of lie that children tell falls into the category of social lies. Social lies that children might employ include lying to avoid creating an awkward situation or to avoid embarrassment to oneself.

The second type of lie, which is slightly more serious than the previous, is telling a lie to avoid punishment. Children often state that their foremost reason for lying is to avoid punishment (Ackerman & Kappelman, 1979; DePaulo & Jordon, 1982; Ekman, 1989; Ford et al., 1988). Children may also lie to protect a friend from being punished.

Power lies are usually prominent in adolescence. However, they begin early in childhood as "exploratory lies" and then resurface in preadolescence when the separation and individuation process begins again. Children's motivations to use power lies include lying to protect or maintain privacy or to demonstrate power over authority.

The final and most serious category of children's lies are instrumental lies. The type of deception employed in this category involves lies that have the purpose of winning the interest and admiration of others or to get something you could not otherwise get.
Parenting Styles and Their Effects on Children’s Problem Behavior and Lies

Early in children’s lives, parent-child interactions shape the behavior of children and regulate moral and social development. These interactions may have an influence on children’s lying behaviors. Parents' reactions to children’s first lies may serve to encourage or discourage lying.

The development of lying in children may be influenced by parents’ response and understanding of the behavior. Smith (1968) and Newson and Newson (1976) suggested that parents’ first reactions to lies may affect children’s behavior in the future. It is reasonable to assume that the way parents respond to young children’s lies can extinguish or reinforce certain types of verbal behavior (Ford et al., 1988). Ford et al. (1988) and Smith (1968) discussed four parental reactions to a child’s first lies. These reactions include 1) severely punishing the child, 2) ignoring the child, 3) regarding the behavior as cute, or 4) reasoning with the child about what constitutes a lie and the truth which may encourage or discourage the behavior in the future. A parent who severely punishes the child for lying may encourage the child to lie in the future to avoid punishment, because
punishment alone does not demarcate for the child why he or she should tell the truth versus a lie. When a parent ignores a child's lies, this disregard may encourage the child to continue to lie in the future because the child has no indication that lying in most circumstances is an inappropriate behavior. The child who is seen as being cute by parents may continue to lie as means of getting attention. Parents who reason with their child about what constitutes a lie and the truth may help extinguish lying behaviors. Reasoning with the child not only assists the child in understanding that lying is wrong, but also helps the child learn what behaviors are expected of him or her.

Behavioral problems and parenting styles. Studies that examined children with conduct problems, delinquency reports, and antisocial behaviors have shown associations between parents' child-rearing practices and children's behavioral problems. Children who are delinquent are likely to have parents who are strict and punitive, lax, or erratic in their parenting styles. Andry (1960) and Glueck and Glueck (1950) compared delinquent children with non-delinquents and found a significant relationship between delinquency and parental excessive strictness or leniency. Other researchers have found relationships between parents'
disciplining styles, delinquency, and antisocial behaviors in children. Physical punishment (Pulkkinen, 1983; Sears, 1961; Steinmetz, 1979), extreme threats (McCord, McCord & Howard 1963), and punitive parenting (Simcha-Fagan et al., 1975) all have been reported as being significantly correlated with children's delinquency and antisocial behaviors. Nagging and scolding have also been shown to have a strong relationship to conduct problems and delinquency (Andry, 1962; Nye, 1958). Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) have suggested that there is a significant relationship between parental neglect and children's behavioral problems. Parental rejection -- as measured by parents not being accepting of their children, being hostile towards them (Glueck & Glueck, 1950), showing no warmth, being unresponsive to their needs, or not valuing them as a person (Blakely, Stephenson & Nichol, 1974), or ignoring them -- (Nye, 1958) has consistently been shown to be related to delinquency in children. Lack of parent-child involvement is one of the variables most strongly related to delinquency (Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986).

Neglecting and/or rejecting parents often show little involvement with their children. Neglectful parents have been found to spend insufficient time
interacting positively with their children and are often unaware of their children's behaviors. The restricted amount of time and the limited awareness of their children's problem behaviors can diminish parents' chances to impose discipline or supervision. On the other hand, permissive parents may be aware of their children's misbehaviors or misdeeds, yet lack the skills to adequately impose necessary discipline or to set appropriate limits. Parents who do not enact adequate supervision or discipline increase the likelihood of their children's development of delinquency problems and later antisocial behaviors (Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986).

Children's lies and parenting styles. The results of studies showing how various parental influences (e.g. punitive punishment, lack of involvement) are correlated with children's problem behaviors indicates that there is a relationship between parental behaviors (e.g., child-rearing practices) and children's outcomes. The association between lying and antisocial behaviors along with the relationship between parental behaviors and their potential to predict conduct problems, delinquency, and antisocial behavior suggests that parenting styles also may be predictive of lying behaviors.
Given the relationship between parents' behavior and children's other negative behaviors, the amount of warmth and/or control that parents contribute to the upbringing of their children may influence children's lying behaviors. The relationship between parental rejection or warmth and prevalence of lying behaviors was examined in a study conducted by Stouthamer-Loeber and Loeber (1986). Their results confirmed that maternal rejection is moderately positively correlated with lying for children in grades 4, 7 and 10: $r = .28, .48, .43$ respectively. Paternal rejection was also moderately positively correlated with lying behavior for children in grades 4 and 7, $r = .33$, and .28 respectively.

In a review of the literature, Burton (1976) suggested that parental warmth increases honesty and truthfulness. However, data do not reveal whether warmth produces honesty in children or whether truthfulness promotes parental warmth.

Stouthamer-Loeber and Loeber (1986) also examined parental supervision and its effect on children's lying behaviors. They found a moderately strong correlation between lack of parental supervision and lying for 4th and 7th grade boys, $r = .44$, and also for 10th grade boys, $r = .58$. 
Stouthamer-Loeber and Loeber (1986), as discussed above, examined a portion of Baumrind's (1989) dimension of parental responsiveness/warmth when they appraised parental warmth and its effect on lying behavior. They also partially investigated her dimension of demandingness/control by examining parental supervision and its relationship to lying. Although segments of Baumrind's (1989) dimensions of responsiveness/warmth and demandingness/control have been examined in relationship to lying behaviors, a comprehensive comparison of parenting styles has not been ventured.

Summary and Implications

The studies reviewed thus far show that children's lies tend to have a systematic developmental progression and may facilitate separation from parents, protection of self-esteem, and self-efficacy. Ekman (1989) has suggested eight motivations for lying, which can be grouped into four categories: power, instrumental, social, and avoiding punishment. Prevalence of children's lying appears to be correlated with overt and covert antisocial behaviors and conduct problems. Studies have shown antisocial, conduct, and delinquent behavior in children to be strongly related to specific parenting practices such as neglect,
rejection, and strict and punitive -- or lax and erratic -- discipline. The relationship of parental behaviors to children's antisocial, delinquent, and problem behaviors suggests that parenting styles may also effect children's lying behaviors.

Parental behaviors that appear in the literature tends to be related to children's problem behaviors include using strict and punitive discipline techniques, or implementing either power assertion or lax control over children. Since lying has been associated with other antisocial behaviors and antisocial behaviors are related to parental discipline techniques, it is reasonable to assume that parental discipline techniques may be related to lying. Children who have parents that use harsh punishment or sporadic power assertion may lie to avoid punishment (Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986). Parents who are very strict may stifle children's autonomy and create a sense of powerlessness in their children. These children may therefore lie to gain a sense of power. A successful lie establishes the child's power over the parent, who suspects that the child has lied but cannot prove it (Ekman, 1989). Lying under these circumstances can be seen as a means of increasing power by deliberately decreasing that of another (Ford et al., 1988;
Successful manipulation of others gives the child a sense that he or she is powerful (Bursten, 1972; Kursh, 1971).

Other behaviors of parents such as parental rejection or neglect may influence the lies children tell. Parents' who reject and/or neglect their children know or care little about their children's activities, friends, or whereabouts. These children are likely to lie because there is little risk of getting caught (Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986).

Few studies have been done that link parents' child-rearing practices with children's lying behaviors. The ones that have been done have looked at specific parent actions such as parental supervision and parental warmth. Research is warranted to ascertain whether clusters of parental behaviors (i.e., parenting styles) are predictive of children's lying behaviors.

Establishing the relationship between parenting styles and children's lying behaviors has at least two important implications for child development. One, demonstrating that parental style affects children's lying would offer further evidence that parenting styles affect children's moral and social development. Two, showing how these two variables are related would
provide additional justification for providing early interventions for children and their parents. Parent training intervention research has demonstrated systematic changes in parenting behaviors; these changes may then lessen the frequency of children's conduct problems and reduce involvement in delinquent activities (Walters & Gilmore, 1973; Karoly & Rosenthal, 1977; Martin, 1977; Patterson, Chamberlain & Reid, 1982). Early intervention (e.g., parent training) to change patterns producing motivations for children's lies may also reduce the later development of delinquency or antisocial behaviors.

Rationale for Hypotheses: Parenting Styles and the Relationship to Children's Lies

Presumably the relationship between parenting styles and children's lying appears to evolve very early in a child's life. Parents' reactions to a child's first lie may influence children's future lying. The four parental reactions to children's first lies suggested by Ford et al. (1988), Newson and Newson (1976) and Smith (1968) lend support to the development of this relationship. These four reactions appear to parallel Baumrind's (1971, 1989) established parenting styles, i.e., authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, and neglecting/rejecting. That is, when a child first
lies, a parent may harshly punish the child (i.e., authoritarian), ignore the child (i.e., neglecting/rejecting), regard the behavior as cute (i.e., permissive), or reason with the child about what constitutes a lie and the truth (i.e., authoritative).

In Baumrind's research (1971, 1989), parenting styles emerge as a significant factor related to children's conduct. The styles that she and others (e.g., Maccoby & Martin, 1983) identified are based on ratings of parents' specific behaviors on two dimensions of parenting: demandingness/control and responsiveness/warmth. The demandingness/control construct consists of parents providing structure, control, and regimen in children's lives. The construct of responsiveness/warmth is characterized by affective warmth, providing the child with stimulation, and respect for individuality. Based on parents' scores on these two dimensions, Baumrind found four ubiquitous patterns of parenting that emerged. These widely accepted styles are labeled as authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, and rejecting/neglecting. Maccoby and Martin (1983) developed a scheme for classifying parenting types using the demandingness and responsiveness dimensions. Based on high or low scores on each dimension, four prototypes were presented.
Examination of children's motivations for lying based on the four possible combinations of these dimensions reveals that these motivations for lying may be in direct relationship with the high or low proportion of warmth and/or control that parents exhibit in their interactions with their children. The basis for this relationship may be established by looking at parenting styles, consequences to children resulting from parent behaviors, and the types of lies and frequency of lies expected to be produced based on parental responsiveness/warmth and/or demandingness/control (See Table 1).
Table 1

**Parenting Styles and Prediction of Lie Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High warmth</th>
<th>Low warmth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>Indulgent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(warmth)</td>
<td>(warmth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(control)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lies (least serious to most serious)

**Social**

- awkward situation   
  - X

- embarrassment
  - self
  - X  X  X  X

**Punishment**

- self
  - X  X

- peer
  - X

**Power**

- protect privacy
  - X  X

- power over authority
  - X  X

**Instrumental**

- win admiration of others
  - X  X

- get what you want
  - X  X

X = child likely to lie  ( ) = high  --- = low
Authoritative Parenting Style

Parent. The authoritative parent is high on demandingness/control, yet the severe restrictiveness that might be associated with excessive control is offset by the fact that these parents are also high on responsiveness/warmth. Characteristics of the authoritative parent include a give-and-take attitude and a democratic approach to decision-making which permits their children to be involved in family management. Children are encouraged to develop autonomy and they are given freedom appropriate to their age and capabilities. Authoritative parents expect mature behavior from the child, and they set and explain clear behavioral expectations. Parents use firm enforcement with consequences that appropriately fit the misbehavior to uphold these principles (Baumrind, 1971, 1989; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, 1989).

Child. The child who has authoritative parents is socially competent, self-reliant, self-directed, creative, and lacking in hostility. He or she is active, willing to assume initiative and is individualistic. The child is less likely to conform to peer pressure and tends to seek peer groups that reaffirm rather than contradict parents' values.
Authoritative children's lies. The authoritative parent would likely raise a child who will produce fewer number of lies and the less serious types of lies than the other three parenting styles. (See Table 1). These children have been taught empathy and understanding of others' feelings by a warm and responsive parent and thus are likely to lie to avoid creating an awkward situation. Motivations for other lie types should be greatly reduced because the parent has a give and take attitude, allows the child age appropriate autonomy therefore the authoritative child may have less motivation to tell lies in the other categories.

**Indulgent Parenting Style**

*Parents.* Indulgent parents are high on responsiveness/warmth but not on demandingness/control. They tend to give their child an overabundance of freedom, and they act as a resource for the child. These parents are reluctant to take any action that may cause discomfort or deny a wish of the child. Discipline is inconsistent, unpredictable, and rare. Parents do not take an active part in guiding or shaping the child's behavior (Baumrind, 1971, 1989; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, 1989).
Child. The child of the indulgent parent lacks development of social skills and competence. The child tends to be poor at self-control, have a low self-esteem, have immature behavior, and they tend to be irresponsible and neither self-reliant or self-sufficient. He or she may be unable to direct others. Getting his or her own way is common for the child, along with self-centered attention-seeking behaviors (Pulkkinen, 1982; Santrock, 1990).

Indulgent children's lies. Lies told by a child raised by indulgent parents might be expected to center around issues related to the lack of parental control in the child's life. Children may also feel a lack of control because the parents have not set boundaries for their children. Children of indulgent parents tend to be attention seekers, insecure, and uncertain where they stand with others (Pulkkinen, 1982), thus creating a motivation for these children to lie to win admiration or interest of others. Inadequate control by parents may result in children's failure to develop adequate self-esteem and impulse control (Pulkkinen, 1982). These children are likely to consider only the present moment and may lie to save themselves from being embarrassed without thinking of future ramifications of their lie. Indulgent-raised children
tend to be conforming to their peers (Pulkkinen, 1982) because parents have not taken an active part in teaching their children how to resist temptation or distinguish right from wrong. Hence these children might be more likely than children of authoritative parents to lie to protect a friend from being punished.

**Authoritarian Parenting Style**

**Parent.** The authoritarian parent attempts to shape and control their children in accordance with an absolute set of standards. These parents tend to be high on demandingness/control and low on responsiveness/warmth. Parents emphasize obedience. Discipline is primarily power assertion and rejection. Verbal give and take between the parent and child is discouraged and children are not accepted as independent individuals (Baumrind, 1971, 1989; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, 1989).

**Child.** The child who has an authoritarian-based upbringing tends to be poor at self-control, likely to internalize anger, less assured, low in self-esteem, and more dependent and passive. The child may experience anxiety about social comparison and may have ineffective social interaction skills. He or she may have the tendency to withdraw from emotional expressiveness in intimate relationships. The child
may often fail to initiate activities (Pulkklinen, 1982; Santrock, 1990).

**Authoritarian children's lies.** Children reared in an authoritarian home might be more inclined to tell lies that are related to the issues surrounding their lack of a warm and responsive parent and having little control over their lives. Parents in this category do not consider children's feelings or need for autonomy (Baumrind, 1971, 1989; Maccoby & Martin, 1983) and as a result of this lack of responsiveness, children may be more likely to tell a lie to get what they would not otherwise get, to protect their privacy, and to demonstrate power over authority. Children may also be prone to lie to avoid punishment, since they may often receive harsh punishment for minor incidents. Children raised by authoritarian parents tend to be less self-assured, to feel anxious about social comparison, and to have poor impulse control. Ford et al. (1988) and Ekman (1989) have suggested that the compulsion to lie may be a result of poor impulse control or protection of self-esteem. Children in this parenting style category, then, may lie on impulse to avoid embarrassing themselves to protect what little self-esteem they may possess.
Indifferent Parenting Style

Parent. Parents who are indifferent towards their children are neither demanding or responsive. They are inclined to be lenient, inconsistent, to treat children unfairly, and to use erratic discipline methods that include sporadic power assertion. These adults provide few rules or guidelines and show little interest in their child's whereabouts, their experiences in school, or their experiences with friends. Parents may be cold, rejecting, and rarely consider the child's opinion or converse with them (Baumrind, 1971, 1989; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, 1989).

Child. The consequences for the child raised by an indifferent parent are the most severe of all parenting styles. This type of child is most likely to end up victimizing society. He or she may express hostility and anger through direct antisocial aggression, and the child is more prone to be a delinquent. Appropriate social behavior is not taught and the child usually has difficulty controlling his or her impulses. The child is quite often involved in precocious expression with sex, drugs or alcohol (Pulkkinen, 1982; Santrock, 1990)

Indifferent children's lies. The lack of both demandingness/control and responsive/warmth by the
indifferent parent is likely to produce many motivations for the child to lie. The lies related to lack of responsiveness/warmth include lying to get what they could otherwise not get, lies to protect privacy, and lies to demonstrate power over authority. Motivations to lie based on the demandingness/control dimension would be to avoid punishment to self or peers, to win interest or admiration of others, and to avoid embarrassment to self. The rationale for the likelihood of lies told by children with indifferent parents is based on previously discussed motivational reasons to lie related to the lack of the responsiveness/warmth and demandingness/control dimensions with the exception of the lie to avoid punishment to self. Lying to avoid punishment is based on the assumption that parents are high on demandingness/control. Overall, indifferent parents score low on this dimension; however, they do tend to use sporadic and harsh power assertion techniques. Although this type of discipline is rare, its inconsistency and severity may have a major influence on children's potential to lie to avoid this type of ruthless punishment.

Summary: Rationale and Hypotheses

In summarizing the types of lies and frequency of
lies, children whose parents are responsive, warm, and provide firm control are likely to tell the fewest and the least serious lies. At the other end of the scale, the indifferent parents who provide little responsiveness/warmth or demandingness/control are likely to have children who produce the greatest number of lies and more serious types of lies. The extremes are easy to interpret, but in the categories where each style is lacking in one dimension while having the other, prediction of lying patterns is not as clear cut. However, we might speculate that a lack of responsiveness/warmth rather than lack of demandingness/control would lead to a greater number of lies and more serious types of lies. Thus, indulgent parents who are high in warmth/responsiveness, yet lack demandingness/control may be likely to have a child who tells less serious lies than the authoritarian parent who is low on responsiveness/control and high on demandingness/control. Based on the types of behavior exhibited by parents and the consequences of that behavior upon children, it is possible to predict children's motivations for lying. It is therefore hypothesized that:

1. Children whose parents are high on responsiveness/warmth (authoritative and
indulgent) will tell fewer punishment, power and instrumental lies than children with low responsiveness/warmth parents (authoritarian and indifferent).

2. Children whose parents are low on responsiveness/warmth (authoritarian and indifferent) will produce more serious types of lies (punishment, power, and instrumental) than children whose parents score high responsiveness/warmth (authoritative and indulgent).

3. Children whose parents are high on demandingness/control (authoritarian and authoritative) will tell fewer total lies (punishment and instrumental) than children with low demandingness/control (indulgent and indifferent) parents. Although authoritative parents are high on control, the effect is expected to be due to authoritarian mothers.

4. Children whose parents are low on demandingness/control (indulgent and indifferent) will produce more serious types of lies (punishment and instrumental) than children whose parents score high demandingness/control (authoritarian and authoritative). Again, the
effect is expected to be due to authoritarian mothers.

5. Children whose parents are low on responsiveness/warmth and low on demandingness/control (indifferent) will tell more punishment, power, instrumental lies than children with high on responsiveness/warmth and high on demandingness/control (authoritative).

6. Children whose parents are low on responsiveness/warmth and low on demandingness/control (indifferent) will tell more serious types lies (punishment, power and instrumental) than children with high on responsiveness/warmth and high on demandingness/control (authoritative).
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Subjects

Sixty-three 5th grade boys (mean age: 10 years, 4 months) from a predominantly white, middle- to lower-middle class school district in Southern California and their mothers participated in this study. The boys were from intact families, with approximately 50% of their parents having completed some college. Incentive to participate was offered in the form of a $5.00 contribution to the class for each boy who participated. Table 2 reflects subjects' demographic information.
Table 2

Demographic Information on Children, Fathers, and Mothers  N = 63

Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Range:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>9yr 8mo to 11yr 5mo (M= 10yr 4mo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>29.0 to 55.0 (M= 36.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>26.0 to 49.0 (M= 34.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>22% Some high school</td>
<td>27% Completed high school</td>
<td>43% Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08% Bachelors degree</td>
<td>00% Graduate degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>21% Some high school</td>
<td>24% Completed high school</td>
<td>47% Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02% Bachelors degree</td>
<td>06% Graduate degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child's Ethnicity

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>22% Hispanic</td>
<td>68% Caucasian</td>
<td>00% Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04% Native American</td>
<td>00% Black</td>
<td>06% Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males only were used for the present study because other studies have suggested that boys have a significantly higher prevalence rate of lying than girls (Griffiths, 1952; MacFarlane, Allen, & Honzik, 1962; Tuddenham, Brooks, & Milkovich, 1974). Also, there was a desire to eliminate from the current study...
the potential confound of gender.

To determine if there were group differences on SES (assessed by mothers' and fathers' education) and ethnicity, ANOVAs comparing these demographic variables with the main variables in this study (i.e., maternal warmth, maternal control and total lie scores) were computed. None of the results were significant, so all subjects were combined for the final analyses.

Although seventy-three subjects completed the questionnaire, nine were eliminated from the final sample because they were not from intact families. An additional subject was eliminated due to an incomplete questionnaire form leaving a total of 63 subjects for the final analyses.

Materials and Procedure

Lying scenarios. Ekman's (1989) eight motivations for children's lies were collapsed in the four general categories of lies described by Lindskold and Walters (1983). These four categories were: 1) social lies, 2) avoiding punishment lies, 3) power lies, and 4) instrumental lies. As described above, social lies would be told to spare hurt feelings of self or others. The avoiding punishment lies are lies to prevent any punishing action from occurring to the teller or another peer. The power lie allows the deceiver to
manipulate the authority figure by controlling information that the authority figure could not otherwise obtain. Finally, instrumental lies are lies that are a means of getting something that is wanted or desired.

Eight scenarios were then developed which illustrated the two dimensions of each of the four categories for lying (i.e., social, avoid punishment, power, and instrumental) (see Table 3).
### Table 3

#### Scenarios and Potential Motivations for Lying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lie Categories</th>
<th>Motivations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Social         | *1) Avoid an awkward situation  
                | 2) Avoid embarrassing self                            |
| Punishment     | 3) Self                                               |
|                | 4) Peer                                               |
| Power          | 5) Power over authority                               |
|                | 6) Maintain privacy                                   |
| Instrumental   | 7) Get what you want                                  |
|                | 8) Win admiration of others                           |

* Numbers 1-8 are used below to denote which one of the two motivations from the (4) lie categories are used in each scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secret Club</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizza Party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Computer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playboy Picture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to Carnival</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling Candy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheat on Test</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Blades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For example, in one scenario, a child belongs to a secret club and his mother finds his club T-shirt and asks the child if he belongs to this club. Subjects respond in their own way to what they believe the child in the story should tell his mother. They are then asked to evaluate potential motivations for lying: 1) to avoid punishment for belonging to a forbidden club (punishment), 2) so that he can continue to be a member (instrumental), 3) so that he will not be embarrassed among his friends for telling about the secret club (social), and 4) to protect his privacy and keep his secret (power). These scenarios were based on common events in children's lives at this age and included the following: 1) joining a secret club, 2) having a pizza party while mom is gone, 3) concealing information to protect a friend who broke a school computer, 4) hiding a Playboy picture in his desk, 5) going to a carnival without an adult, 6) having a job without mother's permission, 7) cheating on a test, and 8) participation in an activity forbidden by mom (see Appendix A). The purpose of these scenarios was to: 1) determine whether the child would lie or not, 2) to ascertain the child's motives for lying, and 3) to assess the child's suppositions of the seriousness of lie types.

The order of presentation of the scenarios were
counter balanced across classrooms to control for fatigue effects. The scenarios were read out loud by the researcher, while children followed along reading their own copies of the stories.

For example:

Bobby's mother has told him that he could not join any clubs because she thinks clubs are just gangs. His friends ask him to join their club and he hesitates to answer because he knows that his mother does not want him to join. His friends begin teasing him by saying "What's the matter, won't your mommy let you join?" He tells them that he can join any club he wants to. One day his mother finds his secret club T-shirt and asks him if he is a member of this club.

The children were then asked "What do you think Bobby [the child in the story] should tell his mother [the adult in the story]?"

Next, children were told to pretend that the child in the story did not tell the truth to his mother [adult in the story]. They were then asked to respond on a Likert-type scale to a series of questions designed to elucidate children's ranking of the least serious to most serious motivations for lying. Specifically, children were asked to rate how OK it was for the children in the story to tell a lie (e.g., How OK would it be for [child in story] to tell his mother [adult] that he is NOT a member of the club so that he will not be punished?) for each of the four potential motivations for lying addressed in the scenarios (e.g., punishment, social, instrumental, power)
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Although the children were asked to respond to what they believe the child in the story should do, they are likely to be reacting to what they would do. Clinicians using play therapy techniques have suggested that children who describe feelings of others are not stating what they think the other child is feeling, but will actually be reflecting on what they feel. Conn (1989) described children's play activities using dolls and doll houses. The children were asked to tell what the pretend family in the doll house is like and how the dolls feeling. He repeatedly found that while children were acting under the pretense that they were describing a pretend family, in reality they were describing their own family.

Woltmann (1972) showed that the use of puppets in therapy was an excellent way to permit children to express their emotions and feelings by using puppets. He found that children would talk to his puppet through the puppet controlled by the child. However, in the early stages of therapy, if the child was asked if he or she was the one who experienced or was responsible for the described actions, the child would earnestly deny these accusations. He or she would reply, "That it was the puppet's fault", when in actuality it was the child's feelings or behaviors that were being narrated.
Clinical observations and research have established that children are more likely to reveal their true feelings and beliefs if they are indirectly confronted using puppets, dolls, or other children in stories (Gardner, 1971; Schaeffer, 1985). Based on this assumption, it is believed that children's responses to what other children in the scenarios should do will reflect their own behaviors.

Children were taught how to use a five point Likert-type scale in the following manner. A large drawing was presented to the children with five vertical bars in ascending heights. The smallest bar was marked NEVER OK on top with a "1" placed below the bar. The largest bar was marked VERY OK on top with a "5" placed below the bar. This rating scale was modeled after one administered by Bussey (1992) where it had been successfully used with children in the age range of 5 to 11 years. The definition for the varying degrees of OK were explained to the children as well as written on the Likert scale. The varying degrees of OK are defined as: "NEVER OK" means that you should never make up a wrong answer. "USUALLY NOT OK" means that most of the time you should not make up a wrong answer. SOMEWHAT OK means that sometimes it is ok to make up a wrong answer. "OK" means that almost all of the time it is ok to make up a wrong answer. "VERY OK" means
that you think it is alright to always make up a wrong answer.

Parenting styles. Each child completed the Parent-Child Relationships Questionnaire (Hower & Edwards, 1978) which assessed mother's parenting style using a five-point Likert-type scale (see Appendix B). Hower and Edwards (1978) administered their scale to college-age students; however, younger children were used in the two questionnaires that the 40-item Parent-Child Relationships Questionnaire was modeled after. In Hower and Edward's study, subjects rated mothers and fathers separately on the 40-item scale using a five-point Likert-type scale. A factor analysis using a principal axis solution with oblique rotation and limited to six factors was performed. Items with factor loadings of .30 or greater comprised the final scales. The six factors that emerged were Induction-Acceptance, Power Assertion, Psychological Control, Psychological Autonomy, Rejection and Firm Control. The induction-acceptance factor focuses on whether the mother accepts what the child does as important and whether she takes the time to explain and reason with the child about rules or decision-making processes. Power assertion refers to the mother's use of force to make the child comply. Psychological control is a means of coercing the child to conform to mother's
demands by the inducement of guilt through insinuations that the child’s behavior is a reflection of her dignity. The psychological autonomy factor represents mother’s willingness to allow her child freedom of thought and the right to hold his own opinions. Rejection is characterized as maternal disapproval and nonacceptance of the child as an individual.

Hover and Edwards (1978) suggested that on a general level, two independent dimensions of control and warmth could be conceived: acceptance-rejection (using the factors Induction-Acceptance, Psychological Autonomy, and Rejection) and control-permissiveness (using Psychological Control, Control Through Force, and the bipolar factor of Firm versus Lax Control).

Parenting styles were assessed for mothers only in the present study. Evidence from studies suggested that the use of mothers’ parenting attitudes may reflect the major portion of parental influence on children’s behaviors. Mothers appear to be responsible for the majority of child-rearing duties (Fagot, 1974; Patterson, 1982). Studies that measured both mothers’ and fathers’ child-rearing practices showed a moderate to high correlation between maternal and paternal behaviors, $r = .38$ to $.75$. (Hirschi, 1969; Hover & Edwards, 1978). Results from other studies indicated that child-rearing practices (i.e., lack of supervision
or warmth) may have a greater impact on children's undesirable behaviors than parental absence. Horne (1980) compared intact and father-absent families for both normal and out of control children. He found no significant difference in children's coercive behaviors in the normal sample for father presence or absence. Paternal absence also tends to be a weak predictor of juvenile conduct problems (Loeber, & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986). Goldstein (1984) found that in families where the father is absent, higher levels of maternal supervision reduced the likelihood of police contacts with children. Thus, mothers' parenting styles were assessed based on the above evidence which suggests that their child-rearing practices tend to have a greater influence on children's behaviors than fathers.

**Background information.** Mothers were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire providing information on their child and his family which was sent home with each child (see Appendix C). Demographic information on the child included age and ethnic background. Background information for the fathers and mothers included age, marital status, education, and occupation.

**Consent form.** Principals from year-round schools were contacted in person by the experimenter to request the participation of children from their schools. Once
a principal agreed to allow boys to participate, parent letters, consent forms, and demographic information sheets were distributed to the teachers via the principals. The consent form was sent home with the children along with a letter to the parents providing information about the study (see Appendices D and E). Boys who returned consent forms and demographic information sheets participated in groups numbering 8 to 13, that consisted of members from their classroom.

Children were debriefed in a manner which addressed the moral dilemma of good and bad lies with the belief that most lies are wrong. Examples of socially acceptable lies and lies which are not acceptable were presented and the difference between the two types of lies was described in detail. All questions were answered. A letter to the parents was sent home with the children which explained the study and a written duplication of the debriefing procedure that was presented to the children following the study (see Appendix F).
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

The average score of the four responses (i.e., children's acceptability of telling a lie) on each scenario was examined for the eight scenarios. The means were low which suggests that, overall, children tend to find lying to be relatively unacceptable. A one-way ANOVA was performed on eight lie scenarios and there were no significant differences between the eight scenarios (see Table 4).
Table 4

Ranges and Means for Children's Acceptability of Lies on the Eight Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secret Club</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizza Party</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Computer</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to Carnival</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling Candy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheat on Test</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Blades</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playboy Picture</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>9.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, subjects' total scores for the four lie categories (i.e., Social, Punishment, Power, and Instrumental) were computed from their responses to four questions at the end of each scenario. The four questions represented each of the four categories of lies. For example, children were asked to respond to how "OK" they thought it was to lie in each of the four categories for the eight scenarios, using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 which corresponds to "NEVER OK" to
5 which corresponds to "Very OK". Eight social lie responses, one from each scenario, were combined to form a total score for Social lies. Total scores for Punishment, Power and Instrumental lies were similarly computed using the above method. Higher scores in each category reflected a greater likelihood of the child telling a lie. The possible range of scores was from 8 (which meant the child would never lie) to 40 (which would corresponded to a habitual liar). The results from this analysis showed that subjects as a whole said they were more likely to approve of social lies and lies to avoid punishment which are less serious types of lies, than power and instrumental lies. Adults classified social lies as less serious than lies to avoid punishment (Lindskold & Walters, 1983), while children believed that punishment lies were less serious than social lies. However, Power and Instrumental lies were classified in the same order by children as adults as shown in Table 5.

48
Table 5

Ranges and Means for Social, Punishment, Power and Instrumental Lies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lie Category</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>17.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>16.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>15.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, maternal Control and Warmth factors were computed. Items for the two scales were selected from the Hower and Edwards' (1978) Mother-Child Relationship Questionnaire. Although Hower and Edwards had suggested that the combination of the six factors could represent general indices of control and warmth, results from their sample indicated that parents who were high on control tended to be viewed by subjects as rejecting, and those who were low in control were seen as more accepting. This assumption deviates from Baumrind's notion of the authoritative parent who is both high on control and high on warmth. Therefore, a factor analysis was performed on Hower and Edwards 40-item scale, using the current subject sample. Psychological Control items loaded with parental rejection items (rather than with control items), suggesting that children viewed Psychological Control
items as parental rejection rather than parental control. Thus, Hower and Edwards Psychological Control items were eliminated. Items comprising the final warmth and control scales were selected on the basis of how closely they matched Baumrind's conceptualization of responsiveness/warmth and demandingness/control dimensions. The items used to form the Warmth scale included those assessing the following dimension: providing stimulation for their child (e.g., encouraged me to explore new ideas), affective warmth (e.g., made me feel that what I did was important), and respect for individuality (e.g., allowed me to hold my own point of view). The demandingness/control scale items included those that provide structure for the child (e.g., set rules), control (e.g., physically restricts or punishes me), and regimen (e.g., made it clear who was the boss). The resulting Warmth factor contained 10 items and the Control factor consisted of 10 items (see Appendix G).

A reliability analysis was performed on the scales using the present sample to determine the internal consistency of the Warmth and Control factors. Cronbach's alphas were .79 and .60 respectively. The lower internal consistency of the Control factor may be due to the concept suggested by Hower and Edwards of strong control being seen also as rejecting, therefore
reducing the likelihood of obtaining a control factor that is homogenous.

Subjects were then divided into two groups based on their scores of maternal Control. Scores ranged from 18 to 46, and the two groups were formed by using a mean split. The high-control group had scores above the group mean of 29 and low-control mothers scored at or below this value.

Two groups were similarly formed for the maternal Warmth variable by using a median split. Scores for this factor ranged from 15 to 50. The high-warmth group scored above the group mean of 36 and the low-warmth group consisted of those who scored at or below the mean.

Subjects were also categorized into four groups based on their scores for the maternal Control and Warmth factors to reflect Baumrind's four classifications of parenting styles: high-control/high-warmth (authoritative), high-control/low-warmth (authoritarian), low-control/high-warmth (permissive) and low-control/low-warmth (rejecting or indifferent).

Finally, a total lie (frequency) score was calculated by adding together children's scores on Punishment, Power and Instrumental lies. These three categories are considered to be the more serious types
of lies, and the predictions made were that low maternal warmth and control would predict children's telling of more serious types of lies. The Social lie category was omitted from this calculation because lies in this category are considered to be socially acceptable in order to promote tactful social interactions, and are thus commonly told by many people. (Social lies were included in this study to determine whether Social lies are more frequently told by children than other types of lies).

Final Analyses

Hypotheses 1 and 2. The first two hypotheses assessed the relationship between mother's warmth and the total lies (frequency) and types of lies (i.e., Punishment, Power and Instrumental) that children tell. Hypothesis 1 predicted that children whose mothers scored high on Warmth would tell fewer lies than those whose mothers scored low on Warmth. The difference between the high and low Warmth groups on total lies was analyzed using a t-test. Results revealed a significant difference between high Warmth and low Warmth groups on Total lies told by children ($t(61) = 2.24, p<.05$), with the high Warmth group telling significantly fewer lies (see Table 6, top portion).

Additional t-tests were computed on the three individual lie categories (i.e., Punishment, Power and
Instrumental) to test Hypothesis 2, which predicted that mothers who were rated high on Warmth would have children who told fewer Punishment, Power and Instrumental lies. There was a significant difference between high and low Warmth groups for Power lies and Instrumental lies, but not Punishment lies (Table 6, bottom portion).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lie Variable</th>
<th>Low Warmth Mothers (n=29)</th>
<th>High Warmth Mothers (n=34)</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Lie Score</td>
<td>56.03 M</td>
<td>43.03 M</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>18.76 M</td>
<td>15.56 M</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>19.31 M</td>
<td>13.62 M</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>2.14 M</td>
<td>13.85 M</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 two-tailed t-test

Hypotheses 3 and 4. Hypotheses 3 and 4 assessed the effect of mother's low Control on the frequency and kind of lies that children tell (i.e., Punishment,
Power and Instrumental). Hypothesis 3 predicted that children whose mothers scored high on Control would tell fewer (total) lies than those whose mothers scored low. Hypothesis 4 predicted that children whose mothers scored high on Control would tell fewer Punishment, Power and Instrumental lies. T-tests were performed on high-control versus low-control groups for Total lies (frequency) and on Punishment, Power and Instrumental lies separately. There were no significant differences between high and low maternal control groups on the number of lies children tell overall or for each separate category (see Table 7).
Table 7

Mean Comparisons Between High- and Low-Control Mothers on Frequency and Types of Lies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lie Variable</th>
<th>Low Control Mothers (n=27) M</th>
<th>High Control Mothers (n=36) M</th>
<th>Degrees of t Freedom Value Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Lie Score</td>
<td>54.74</td>
<td>44.72</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lie Types</th>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 two-tailed t-test

Hypotheses 5 and 6. The last two hypotheses examined the effect of mothers who were both high on Control and Warmth (Authoritative) with mothers who were low on both dimensions (Indifferent) on the frequency and types of lies children tend to produce. Hypothesis 5 predicted that mothers who are high on both warmth and control (Authoritative) would have children who would tell fewer total lies than children who had mothers who were low on both control and warmth (Indifferent). A t-test was performed and a significant difference was found: children who had
Authoritative mothers told fewer total lies overall than children with Indifferent mothers (t(29) = 2.57, p<.05) (see Table 8).

Hypothesis 6 stated that mothers who are Indifferent (i.e., low on both Control and Warmth) would have children who tell more Punishment, Power, and Instrumental lies than Authoritative mothers (i.e., those who score high on Control and Warmth). T-tests on the three individual lie categories (i.e., Punishment, Power, and Instrumental) were computed. Results revealed a significant difference between children with Authoritative mothers and children with Indifferent mothers with the Authoritative group telling significantly fewer lies in all three lie categories (see Table 8).
In summary, while maternal control did not appear to influence the frequency and types of lies that children tell, there was a significant difference between high and low maternal warmth group and the frequency of lies and types of lies that children tell. The results indicated that children whose mothers provide high warmth produce fewer Total lies and fewer Power lies than mothers who confer low warmth. Being high on the dimensions of Warmth and Control tended to produce children who told fewer Total lies and fewer Punishment, Power and Instrumental lies than those
mothers low on Warmth and Control.

**Additional Analyses**

An ANOVA was performed on the four parenting styles to determine whether there was a significant difference between the types and frequencies of children's lies. A significant difference was found between the four groups $F(3,59) = 3.18$, $p<.05$. These results show that the various combinations of warmth and control suggested by Baumrind may influence children's acceptability of different types of lies and presumably the frequency and types of lies that children may tell.

In addition, based on the average score on each of the four categories of lies, children's lies were ranked according to the perceived seriousness of each lie. Means that were higher reflected the notion that the lie was more "OK" to tell and thus more likely to be told by children. Punishment lies were the most condoned type of lie for children followed by Social, Power, and Instrumental lies (see Table 4).

The four categories used in the present study were based on adults' ranking of eight motivations to lie. These motivations were classified from least to most serious and consisted of Social lies (i.e., avoid creating an awkward situation or avoid embarrassment of self), Punishment lies (i.e., to avoid punishment to
self and to protect a peer from punishment), Power lies (i.e., to maintain privacy, or to demonstrate power over authority), and Instrumental lies (i.e., to get something you could not otherwise or to win interest or admiration of others). When children's scores were used to rank these eight motivations the order was much different for children than adults. As a result of children ranking motivations differently than adults, four conceptually different categories emerged. These four categories are: 1) Protecting Others (i.e., avoid punishment of peer or avoid an awkward situation, 2) Autonomy Issues (i.e., maintain privacy or get what you want), 3) Protecting Self (i.e., avoid punishment to self and to avoid embarrassment to self), and 4) Self Superiority (i.e., gain power over authority figures or win interest or admiration of friends). Categories of lies and children's rankings are presented in Table 9.
Table 9

Children's Lies Ranked According to Mean Score on Four Categories and Eight Lie Motivations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations for lies (8)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Description of Lie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protecting Others‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punish 3‡</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>Avoid punishment of peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 1</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>Awkward situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy Issues‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power 5</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental 8</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>Get what you want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting Self‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punish 4</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>Avoid punishment to self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 2</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>Avoid embarrassment to self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Superiority‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power 6</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>Power over authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental 7</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>Win interest or admiration of friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ Newly formed children's categories

‡‡ Number after lie type corresponds to Lindskold and Han's adult ranking of lies.
Children's responses to the open-ended questions provided descriptive information pertaining to reasons why children may lie or tell the truth. After each scenario was read to the child, he was asked what should the child in the story say to his mother or adult in the story (i.e., should he tell the truth or a lie) and why. Children who responded to scenarios in a truthful manner gave various reasons for wishing to be honest. The response most often given by children when they were asked why they would tell the truth was to be trusted (40%). Avoidance of punishment (25%) was the second most popular reason children gave for telling the truth and (19%) of the children indicated that telling the truth was better than facing the embarrassment of getting caught telling a lie.

Children who said that the child in the story should lie indicated that it was ok to lie under certain circumstances. The majority of the children (63%) implied that they would lie to parents or teachers to avoid self embarrassment in the presence of peers. The only other response that more than ten percent of the children gave as a basis for telling a lie was to avoid an awkward situation or to avoid hurting someone's feelings (14%).
CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

Overview

The present study found that high maternal warmth (based on Baumrind's conceptualization of the dimension of responsiveness/warmth) appears to contribute to children's honesty more than her demandingness/control construct. However, children whose mothers were high on maternal warmth and control were less likely to indicate that lying in general, as well as specific lies (i.e., avoid punishment, gain power, maintain privacy, win interest or admiration of others and get what they want) were acceptable.

Hypotheses 1 and 2. It was postulated that children whose mothers were high on Baumrind's responsiveness/warmth dimension would tell fewer lies than those who had mothers that were low on responsiveness/warmth. The second hypothesis predicted that children with mothers who displayed high warmth towards their children would tell fewer of the more serious lies (Punishment, Power, and Instrumental) than mothers who scored low on warmth. The present study showed that high maternal warmth may increase children's honesty because children whose mothers
displayed high Warmth reported that it was less acceptable to tell lies. Presumably, we would then predict, based on children's acceptability of lies, that children with parents high on warmth would tell fewer lies.

In previous studies, parental rejection has been measured by narrowly defined variables such as lack of acceptance by parents of their children (Glueck & Glueck, 1950), parents showing little or no warmth, parents not valuing their children as persons (Blakely et al., 1974), and parents showing little involvement with their children (Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986). A combination of the above variables (which previously have been shown to influence children's negative behaviors) produces one of the two poles of Baumrind's responsiveness/warmth factor. At one end of the continuum is the mother who is portrayed as rejecting and neglecting and the other end is characteristic of a mother who is responsive and warm. The findings of the present study suggests that the individual variables found in other studies may be combined to form a global dimension of Warmth and this global parenting dimension appears to be correlated with of children's lying behaviors.

Previous research (e.g., Devereaux, 1970; Hill, 1980; Pulkkinen, 1982) has also suggested that parents
who are warm are more likely to have children who obey them, identify with them, and look to them as role models (i.e., giving children less motivation to lie) which the present findings support, based on the finding that the high maternal warmth group of children indicated that lying is less acceptable. These results suggest that mothers who provide their children with appropriate stimulation for autonomy, acceptance, respect for individuality, and who provide support and understanding for their children through the expression of affective warmth may produce children who are less likely to have motivations for lying because these children tend to be better adjusted children. This finding is supported by Ekman (1989), who claimed that children who lie more often than their peers are more maladjusted than those who don’t and also by Stouthamer-Loeber and Loeber’s (1986) study which indicated that maternal rejection, measured by the amount of affective warmth, was moderately correlated with children’s lying.

The results of this study also showed that children whose mothers display high warmth tend to find lying to gain power or to get what they want significantly less admissible than children whose mothers are characterized by low Warmth. Power lies are characterized by lying to gain power over an
authority figure (i.e., parent or teacher) or to maintain privacy, and Instrumental lies are lies to get what you want or to win admiration or interest of others. It could be that mothers who encourage autonomy and allow their children to hold their own point of view (which is characteristic of high Warmth mothers) may also be showing respect for their children's privacy, thus giving their children little motivation to lie to protect and maintain privacy. Respect for authority figures may also be imparted to children by mothers who show respect for their children through promotion of their children's individuality. Respect for individuality may increase children's own sense of power, and decrease their necessity to lie to gain power over authority figures. Increased respect and power conveyed to these children through mutual respect, induction techniques, and warmth may also inhibit Instrumental lies by giving children a sense of control over their lives and an understanding of negotiation skills that can be used to get what they want rather than lying to obtain the same results.

Respect for individuality and the sense of power instilled in these children by authoritative parents also may increase children's self-esteem. High self-esteem is likely to decrease children's motivation to lie to win admiration of others. There were no
significant differences between high Warmth and low Warmth groups on Punishment lies. The category of Punishment lies in the present study had the highest overall mean (\(M = 17.03\)), which indicated that children believed telling punishment lies to be more permissible and presumably suggesting the greater likelihood of these children lying to avoid punishment. Lying to avoid punishment tends to be a strong motivation for children’s lies as suggested by (Ekman, 1989; Peterson, et al. 1982; Piaget, 1932/1965). Thus, the motivation to lie to avoid punishment may be equally as salient in both groups regardless of parental influences. Ekman (1989) also suggested that perhaps parents may still believe that children who lie should be physically punished and while mothers high on warmth may use induction techniques with punishment, children may remember the punishment as being salient and not the issue of loss of trust from lying. Therefore, children may lie more often to avoid pain or restrictive consequences of their actions regardless of maternal warmth.

**Hypotheses 3 and 4.** Contrary to findings of other studies (Stouthamer-Loeber & Loeber, 1986), maternal control did not appear to significantly influence children’s acceptability of lies in this study. Children whose mothers displayed high levels of control
were equally as likely to report the same level of acceptability of lying compared to children who reported their mothers as exhibiting low control. Children of mothers who apply highly controlling techniques as well as those who employ few control techniques tend to be poor at self-control or impulse control (Pulkkinen, 1982; Santrock, 1990). Possibly the lack of self-control or self-regulation increases the likelihood of both groups of children to act on impulse and produce lies without considering the ramifications of those lies. High controlling mothers may be as unlikely to encourage children’s development of self-regulation and self-control as mothers who provide little control in their children’s lives. Mothers who exert high control may make the majority of the decisions in their children’s lives without providing reasons for these decisions. This type of parenting behavior provides little opportunity for children to learn what consequences may result from decisions they make and this lack of opportunity may be very similar to what is experienced by children of mothers who offer little control and guidance for children’s development of the decision making process. Children may be left to act on their own immature impulses when considering whether to lie or tell the truth in situations they face.
It was hypothesized that maternal control would influence the types of lies (i.e., Punishment, Power, and Instrumental) that children believe to be permissible. Results from the present study did not support the hypothesis that children whose mothers were highly controlling would consider Punishment, Power and Instrumental lies to be more acceptable. The demandingness/control dimension by itself appeared to have little influence on children’s lying behaviors.

**Hypotheses 5 and 6.** Children of Authoritative mothers (i.e., high on maternal Warm and Control) revealed that lying was significantly less allowable than children whose mothers displayed an Indifferent (i.e., low on maternal Warmth and Control) parenting style. Apparently, high controlling discipline techniques, tempered with high-warmth provides an environment conducive to decreasing children’s motivations for lying. Children whose mothers exert high control, yet who are warm and responsive towards their children may have children who view high control as caring. They may also be viewed as providing a necessary structure to their children’s lives rather than rejecting as suggested by Howard and Edwards (1978).

As predicted, the results from the present study showed that children with Authoritative mothers
signified lower acceptance of telling Punishment, Power and Instrumental lies when compared with children whose mothers had an Indifferent parenting style. Authoritative mothers provide opportunities for children to become autonomous through encouraging freedom, yet providing structure and boundaries for children to master self-control and a sense of power (Baumrind, 1989; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, 1989). Children who develop in nurturing and supportive surroundings, where there are clear expectations from mothers and fair or appropriate consequences for misbehaviors asserted by Authoritative mothers, may have few motivations to lie. The child raised in this environment is socially competent, self-reliant, self directed giving the child little reason to lie to avoid embarrassment to self, to lie to win interest or admiration of others, or to lie to gain power over authority. These children are less likely to conform to peer pressure and they tend to seek peer groups that reaffirm rather than contradict their parents' values and thus may be less likely to lie to protect a peer from punishment (Devereaux, 1970; Hill, 1980; Pulkklinen, 1982).

Evidently these positive attributes that Authoritative parents instill in their children tend to strengthen "honesty" in these children and reduce the
motivations and temptations to lie. Children may be less likely to lie if they have parents who are warm because this affective bond created within this environment may create a sense of obligation in the child not to lie to his parents or other adults so not to jeopardize their relation. Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) has suggested that children with a warm relationship with their parents may not only take into account the consequences of a lie to themselves, but also the effect that a lie may have on their parents (e.g., sadness and disappointment).

The findings of the present study based on children's expressed acceptability of lying supports the assumption that children with Indifferent mothers are likely to lie more frequently than children whose mothers display Authoritative childrearing practices. The Indifferent mother may be cold, rejecting, rarely considerate of the child's opinion, use sporadic power assertion and set few if any rules or regulations which may make a significant contribution to increasing children's motivations for lying (Devereaux, 1970; Hill, 1980; Pulkklinen, 1982). These children may be more likely to produce lies to avoid punishment since they may be punished severely. They may try to gain command over parts of their lives by lying to protect privacy which may be the result of an intrusive or
inconsiderate parent, or to defy an authority figure in the attempt to build self-esteem or gain a sense of power.

In summary, high maternal Warmth tends to reduce the frequency of lies and types of lies children find to be acceptable, whereas Control had little impact on either the frequency or types of lies told. However, when control is combined with warmth, differences in high Control/High Warmth (Authoritative) and low Control/low Warmth (Indifferent) became more marked. Authoritative mothers (as defined in this study) tended to produce children who believe that the more serious types of lies are significantly less acceptable than children with Indifferent mothers. Presumably, we would then expect children with authoritative mothers to tell fewer lies. These results suggest that Authoritative mothers who provide a warm, supportive and firm control environment for their children tend to strengthen their children’s moral responsibility to be honest and thus may decrease the likelihood of children telling excessive amounts of lies.

Additional Findings

Children’s responses to the open-ended questions provided descriptive information pertaining to reasons why children may lie or tell the truth. After each scenario was read to the child, he was asked what
should the child in the story say to his mother or adult in the story (i.e., should he tell the truth or a lie) and why. Children who responded to scenarios in a truthful manner gave various reasons for wishing to be honest. When children said that the child in the story should tell the truth, the response most often given by children when they were asked why they would tell the truth was to be trusted (40%). Avoidance of punishment (25%) was the second most popular reason children gave for telling the truth. Apparently, children believed that it is better to tell the truth and face possible punishment that may result from misbehavior rather than to lie with likelihood of getting caught and being punished for lying as well as the misbehavior that occurred. Finally, children (19%) cited that telling the truth was better than facing the embarrassment of getting caught telling a lie.

Children who indicated that the child in the story should lie when they were asked what the child in the story should do and why, gave justifications similar to those children who indicated that they would tell the truth. Children who said that the child in the story should lie indicated that it was ok to lie under certain circumstances. The majority of the children (63%) implied that they would lie to parents or teachers to avoid self embarrassment in the presence of
peers. Again, this motivation for lying appears to follow the developmental stage of children in this age group. Children find formation of steady friendships important at this stage and presumably would lie to save face in the presence of other peers so not to jeopardize peer acceptance. The only other response that more than ten percent of the children gave as a basis for telling a lie was to avoid an awkward situation or to avoid hurting someone's feelings (14%). These two reasons also appear to be linked to children's development of interpersonal relationships with their peers because development of empathy and understanding of others feeling is part of close relationship development.

Adults in other studies (e.g., Lindskold & Han, 1986; Lindskold & Walters, 1983) categorized eight motivations to lie into four categories from least serious to most serious. These categories included Social (i.e., least serious), Punishment, Power and Instrumental (i.e., most serious). Based on the children's mean scores for the four adult categories of lies used in the present study, children rated Punishment lies as less serious than Social lies, while Power and Instrumental lies remained in the same order for children and adults. Punishment lies appeared to be the most salient reason for children's lies as
suggested by (Ekman, 1989; Peterson, et al. 1982; Piaget, 1932/1965) and supported by the present findings.

The four categories of lies ranked by adults were comprised of eight individual motivations for lying which included the following motivations from least serious to most serious (i.e., 1) avoid creating an awkward situation, 2) avoid embarrassing self, 3) avoid punishment to self, 4) protect another person from harm, 5) to maintain privacy, 6) to demonstrate power over authority, 7) to win interest or admiration of others, and 8) to get something you could otherwise not obtain. When children’s means were used to rank these same eight motivations for lying, four new categories emerged that were conceptually different than adult categories. The four categories as perceived by children are: 1) Protecting Others (i.e., avoid punishment of peer and avoid an awkward situation or hurting someone’s feelings), 2) Autonomy Issues (i.e., maintain privacy and get what you want), 3) Protecting Self (i.e., avoid punishment to self and avoid embarrassment to self), and 4) Self Superiority (i.e., power over authority figure and win interest or admiration of friends). The difference between adults’ and children’s categories may be due to developmental issues present in children of this age group.
Developmental issues that emerge in children of this age coincide with their conceptualization of lie categories. Children between the ages of 8-1/2 to 10 years old begin to develop intimate interpersonal relationships with peers. Since development of trust and admiration in close friendships are salient issues with children around the age of 10 years old, lying to protect peers from hurt feelings or lying so that your friend will not be punished may be a meaningful way for boys to display a deeper allegiance to evolving friendships.

Pre-adolescents may be beginning to develop their own sense of individuality, and autonomy issues may begin to emerge. While Autonomy Issues were not as salient for boys as Protecting Others, lying to maintain privacy or get what you want (i.e., Autonomy Issues) were ranked as a more prominent motivation for lying than two of the other categories (i.e., Protecting Self and Self Superiority lies).

Critique of Methodology

Demand characteristics and sample size. When examining deceit, the possibility is present that participants may respond to questions about their lying behaviors in a socially desirable manner. Future studies should include some type of social desirability measure or measures of children's actual lying
behaviors (obtained from teachers, peers or parents for example).

Locating a sufficient number of boys fitting the criteria for participation in the present study posed a hardship. Since parents do not generally approve of children lying, they are less inclined to allow their child to participate in a study which examines deception.

The small sample size in the present study also produced limitations to interpreting the data. The factor analysis performed on the parent scale may have yielded different results that may have produced a more reliable Control variable had there been a greater proportion of subjects to variables.

Measurement. The development of a reliable measure for parental control was problematic in the present study. A factor analysis was performed on the Hower and Edwards scale using the present sample and two factors were forced with the desire to obtain a measure of warmth and control, two factors which appear to be conceptually different. Based on a reliability analysis on the two factors, a reliable measure for warmth (.79) was obtained. However, the control factor had low reliability (.60) and included items of maternal rejection. This suggests that boys who have mothers who use strict or power assertion techniques
are seen also as being rejecting which was conceptually different than Baumrind's demandingness/control dimension. In an effort to alleviate the ambiguous factor which suggested that controlling parents were also seen as rejecting, items that closely matched Baumrind's conceptualization of demandingness/control were considered. However, even when the scale was developed using the later technique, reliability for the scale was low (.60). The reliability of the results for the control measure may thus be questionable. The present scale used to assess maternal control may not have been refined enough to distinguish between firm control and harsh control. Baumrind suggested that it was firm control that distinguished authoritative parents from authoritarian who may tend to use harsh punishment and indifferent parents who are likely to use sporadic power assertion.

Finally, since only boys were used, and specifically only ten year-old boys, this restricted criteria for inclusion in the sample limits the generalizability of the findings to children as a whole. However, this study was exploratory in nature and thus included a sample that was most likely to produce reliable effects. The obtained results from the present study demonstrates that parenting styles are correlated with children's lying behaviors and the
further investigation of this phenomenon is warranted.

**Scenarios.** Inadvertently, in two of the eight scenarios (i.e., Secret Club and Selling Candy) the boy in the story lied. The possibility exists that children may interpret the lie in the scenario as an indication that lying is condoned by the researcher and may have the effect of encouraging the child to report lying on those scenarios to be more acceptable. However, the low means of acceptability of the lies, in general, indicates that lies within the scenarios were not likely to produce an over abundance of children's inclination to report lying as an acceptable behavior.

**Summary and Conclusions**

It cannot be inferred from the results of this study that lack of maternal warmth causes children to lie more frequently. Causality in a study of this nature is bidirectional. That is, children who lie more frequently may not be warmly accepted by their mothers. However, results do indicate that maternal warmth and the combination of warmth and control does influence the frequency and types of lies that children may tell.

Early development of children's excessive lying may signal later more serious problems and may require early interventions to assess the underpinnings for the types of motivations present which may increase
children's lying behaviors. Current results suggest that child and parental interventions that include parent training and education may assist the child's development of appropriate behaviors.

The results of this study have shown that the quantity and quality of warm maternal support, acceptance, and control were related to children's decreasing likelihood of lying. Improved sources of parental information about appropriate childrearing practices, and support for parents may be essential in fostering the development of a warm and responsive, yet firm controlling parents who are likely to provide an environment for the development of children who are secure, independent, self-reliant, and well-adjusted children with few motivations present in the children's lives that could produce problematic lying behaviors.

Overall, the results of this study suggest that their may be an optimal combination of parental warmth and control that may foster development of socially well-adjusted children whose lying behaviors are at a minimum. Previous research has established that the degree of parental warmth and control influences children's behaviors. The current study further promotes the assumption that childrearing practices influence children's behaviors, and specifically children's lying behaviors.
### Lying Scenarios

#### Scenario 1 - Secret Club

Bobby's mother does not want him to join a club because she thinks that clubs are gangs. Bobby's friends ask him to join their club and he hesitates to answer because he knows his mother does not want him to join. The kids begin teasing him by saying "What's the matter, won't your mommy let you join?" He tells them that he can join any club he wants. One day Bobby's mother finds his secret club T-shirt and asks him if he is a member of this club.

A. What do you think Bobby should tell his mother?

Why?

B. Pretend that Bobby told his mother that he is not a member of the secret club.

1. How OK is it for Bobby to tell his mother that he is not a member of the club so that he will not be punished?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER OK</th>
<th>USUALLY NOT OK</th>
<th>SOMewhat OK</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>VERY OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How OK is it for Bobby to tell his mother that he is not a member of the club so that he won't have to quit the club?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER OK</th>
<th>USUALLY NOT OK</th>
<th>SOMewhat OK</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>VERY OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How OK is it for Bobby to tell his mother that he is not a member of the club so he won't be embarrassed among his friends because he told about the secret club?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER OK</th>
<th>USUALLY NOT OK</th>
<th>SOMewhat OK</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>VERY OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How OK is it for Bobby to tell his mother that he is not a member of the club so that he can keep his club membership a secret?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER OK</th>
<th>USUALLY NOT OK</th>
<th>SOMewhat OK</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>VERY OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 2 - Pizza Party

Jason’s mother is going to be gone for the weekend. She told him he can’t have any friends over. Jason is bragging to his friends that he is going to have a pizza party. Lots of kids come to the party.

The next day Jason’s mother comes home and everything looks normal. Then Bryan, a boy in the neighborhood, comes to Jason’s house. Bryan says that he heard that Jason is going to have a pizza party. Jason’s mother overhears this. She asks Jason in front of Bryan if he had a party while she was gone.

A. What do you think Jason should tell his mother?

__________________________________________________________________________

Why?

B. Pretend that Jason told his mother that he did not have a pizza party.

1. How OK is it for Jason to tell his mother that he did not have a pizza party so that his friends will not be punished by their parents for being at Jason’s party without his mom being home?

NEVER OK    USUALLY NOT OK    SOMEWHAT OK    OK    VERY OK
1           2                3               4       5

2. How OK is it for Jason to tell his mother that he did not have a pizza party so that the kids will still think he is cool because he can have a party anytime?

NEVER OK    USUALLY NOT OK    SOMEWHAT OK    OK    VERY OK
1           2                3               4       5

3. How OK is it for Jason to tell his mother that he did not have a pizza party so that he doesn’t have to explain to Bryan why he did not invite him to the party?

NEVER OK    USUALLY NOT OK    SOMEWHAT OK    OK    VERY OK
1           2                3               4       5

4. How OK is it for Jason to tell his mother that he did not have a pizza party so that he can get away with having a simple little party without her knowing about it?

NEVER OK    USUALLY NOT OK    SOMEWHAT OK    OK    VERY OK
1           2                3               4       5
Scenario 3 - Broken Computer

There is a teacher at school that none of the kids like because she is mean. Jeremy says he has a plan to get even with the teacher. One day Jeremy and his friend Sam are walking down the hall after school. Jeremy notices that the door to the classroom is not completely closed. Sam goes in the classroom and breaks the teacher's computer, but Jeremy stays outside. Suddenly the teacher comes around the corner and sees Jeremy. She asks him what he is doing. Jeremy tells her that he is just walking around. The next day the teacher discovers that the computer is broken. She asks Jeremy if he knows who broke it.

A. What do you think Jeremy should tell the teacher?

Why?

B. Pretend that Jeremy told the teacher he did not know what happened.

1. How OK is it for Jeremy to tell the teacher that he does not know what happened so he won't be embarrassed when his friends find out it was Sam and not him that got even with the teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER OK</th>
<th>USUALLY NOT OK</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT OK</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>VERY OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How OK is it for Jeremy to tell the teacher that he does not know what happened so that his friend will not be punished?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER OK</th>
<th>USUALLY NOT OK</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT OK</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>VERY OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How OK is it for Jeremy to tell the teacher that he does not know what happened so that he can get even with her because she has no other way of finding out who broke the computer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER OK</th>
<th>USUALLY NOT OK</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT OK</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>VERY OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How OK is it for Jeremy to tell the teacher that he does not know what happened so that his friends will think that Jeremy got even with the teacher and is cool for doing that.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER OK</th>
<th>USUALLY NOT OK</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT OK</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>VERY OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 4 - Playboy Picture

Mark brought a Playboy magazine to school. He was bragging to his friends that his parents do not care if he looks at Playboy. He taped some pictures from it inside his desk. Mark's friend wanted to see the pictures and Mark showed them to him. They were both giggling and the teacher saw Mark put his desk lid down. She asked Mark what he was giggling about.

A. What do you think Mark should tell the teacher?

Why?

B. Pretend that Mark told your teacher that he was giggling about something else.

1. How OK is it for Mark to tell the teacher that he was giggling about something else so the teacher won't be embarrassed in front of the class when she sees the picture?

NEVER OK USUALLY NOT OK SOMewhat OK OK VERY OK
1 2 3 4 5

2. How OK is it for Mark to tell the teacher that he was giggling about something else so that he won't be punished?

NEVER OK USUALLY NOT OK SOMewhat OK OK VERY OK
1 2 3 4 5

3. How OK is it for Mark to tell the teacher that he was giggling about something else so that he can keep his pictures private?

NEVER OK USUALLY NOT OK SOMewhat OK OK VERY OK
1 2 3 4 5

4. How OK is it for Mark to tell the teacher that he was giggling about something else so that his friends won't find out that his parents do not allow him to have Playboy magazine?

NEVER OK USUALLY NOT OK SOMewhat OK OK VERY OK
1 2 3 4 5
Scenario 5 - Go to Carnival

Billy's mother won't let him go to the carnival at night without an adult even though other kids can. Billy is going to spend the night with his friend Tommy. Tommy's mother WILL let them go to the carnival alone. Before Billy leaves to go to Tommy's, Billy's mother asks him if they are going to the carnival.

A. What do you think Billy should tell his mother?

Why?

B. Pretend that Billy told his mother that he is not going to the carnival.

1. How OK is it for Billy to tell his mother that he is NOT going to the carnival so that his friends won't find out that he is supposed to go with an adult to the carnival.

   NEVER OK  USUALLY NOT OK  SOMewhat  OK  VERY OK
   1  2      3  4  5

2. How OK is it for Billy to tell his mother that he is not going to the carnival so that he gets to go to the carnival without an adult?

   NEVER OK  USUALLY NOT OK  SOMewhat  OK  VERY OK
   1  2      3  4  5

3. How OK is it for Billy to tell his mother he is NOT going to the carnival so that he won't be punished for going to the carnival without an adult?

   NEVER OK  USUALLY NOT OK  SOMewhat  OK  VERY OK
   1  2      3  4  5

4. How OK is it for Billy to tell his mother that he is not going to the carnival so that he can have some control over the things he gets to do?

   NEVER OK  USUALLY NOT OK  SOMewhat  OK  VERY OK
   1  2      3  4  5
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Scenario 6 - Game Boy

Larry is earning money selling candy door to door. He did not ask his mother if he could sell candy. Larry used the money to buy a "Game Boy" which his mother refused to let him have. Larry is in his room with his friend John. John wants to sell candy with Larry but Larry does not want him to. So Larry tells John that he is not selling candy anymore. Larry's mother comes in the room and sees the candy hiding under the bed. She asks Larry why he has the candy.

A. What do you think Larry should tell his mother?

Why?

B. Pretend that Larry told his mother that the candy belonged to someone else.

1. How OK is it for Larry to tell his mother that the candy belongs to someone else so that John won't have hurt feelings because Larry did not tell him the truth about still selling the candy?

NEVER OK USUALLY NOT OK SOMEWHAT OK OK VERY OK
1 2 3 4 5

2. How OK is it for Larry to tell his mother that the candy belongs to someone else so that he won't be punished for not asking her first if you could sell the candy?

NEVER OK USUALLY NOT OK SOMEWHAT OK OK VERY OK
1 2 3 4 5

3. How OK is it for Larry to tell his mother that the candy belongs to someone else so that he can keep his "Game Boy" a secret?

NEVER OK USUALLY NOT OK SOMEWHAT OK OK VERY OK
1 2 3 4 5

4. How OK is it for Larry to tell his mother that the candy belongs to someone else so that she won't find out that he is selling the candy because he wants to keep on earning money?

NEVER OK USUALLY NOT OK SOMEWHAT OK OK VERY OK
1 2 3 4 5
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Scenario 7 - Cheating on Test

John's friend steals the answers for the next arithmetic test so that John can use them and show the teacher that he can get a good grade. The kids at school are really impressed when John tells them he got an "A" on the test. They think he is so smart. The teacher suspects that John cheated and asks him if he did.

A. What do you think John should tell his teacher?

_____________________________________________________________________________

Why? _______________________________________________________________________

B. Pretend that John told his teacher that he did not cheat on the test.

1. How OK is it for John to tell his teacher that he did not cheat on the test so that his friend won't be punished for stealing the test?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER OK</th>
<th>USUALLY NOT OK</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT OK</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>VERY OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How OK is it for John to tell his teacher that he did not cheat on the test so that he won't be embarrassed in front of his friends for getting caught?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER OK</th>
<th>USUALLY NOT OK</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT OK</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>VERY OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How OK is it for John to tell his teacher that he did not cheat on the test so that the kids will think he is smart?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER OK</th>
<th>USUALLY NOT OK</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT OK</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>VERY OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How OK is it for John to tell his teacher that he did not cheat on the test so that he can show the teacher that he can get a good grade on her test?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER OK</th>
<th>USUALLY NOT OK</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT OK</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>VERY OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 8 - Roller Blades

Justin's mother does not want him to skate on roller blades. So he borrows his best friend's skates. His best friend, however, is not supposed to lend them to anyone. Justin goes home after skating. Another friend Ron comes over to Justin's house. Ron was not invited to skate with the group. Justin's mother notices that Justin's knees and elbow are skinned. She asks him if he has been skating?

A. What do you think Justin should tell his mother?

_________________________________________________________________

Why? __________________________________________________________________

B. Pretend that Justin told his mother that he had not been skating.

1. How OK is it for Justin to tell his mother that he was not skating because he does not want her to search his room and find the skates?

NEVER OK  USUALLY NOT OK  SOMewhat OK  OK  VERY OK

1  2  3  4  5

2. How OK is it for Justin to tell his mother that he was not skating so that Ron's feelings won't be hurt because he was not invited to skate?

NEVER OK  USUALLY NOT OK  SOMewhat OK  OK  VERY OK

1  2  3  4  5

3. How OK is it for Justin to tell his mother that he was not skating so that his friend won't be punished for letting Justin use his roller blades?

NEVER OK  USUALLY NOT OK  SOMewhat OK  OK  VERY OK

1  2  3  4  5

4. How OK is it for Justin to tell his mother he was not skating so that he can continue using the roller blades?

NEVER OK  USUALLY NOT OK  SOMewhat OK  OK  VERY OK

1  2  3  4  5
Parent-Child Relationship Questionnaire

Below are a series of questions on how your mother acts toward you. There are no right or wrong answers. If you are unsure of how to answer a question, answer the question in a way that BEST describes how your mother acts towards you. Please answer all questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MY MOTHER</th>
<th>Once in Never</th>
<th>Some times</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. feels hurt when I don't follow her advice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. spanks me as punishment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. lets me know what is expected of me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. spends a lot of time with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sets very few rules</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. is too busy to answer my questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. explains why she is punishing me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. allows me to hold my own point of view.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. wants to know how I spend my time away from home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. has difficulty being strict.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. still supports me when I make a poor decision.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY MOTHER</td>
<td>Once in a While</td>
<td>Some Times</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. tries to reason with me when she thinks I am wrong.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. acts distant from me if I disappoint her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. complains about me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. uses force to make me conform (do what she wants me to do).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. allows me to decide for myself on important matters without interfering.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. makes it easy for me to confide in her (tell her things).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. expects a lot from me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. acts as though I am in the way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. explains the reasons for her rules.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. punishes me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. makes me feel bad if I don't spend time with the family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. thinks my ideas are foolish.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. makes me feel as though my behavior reflects on her as a parent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. physically restricts or punishes me to make me obey.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY MOTHER</td>
<td>Once in a while</td>
<td>Some times</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. makes me feel that what I do is important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. says, &quot;Just because I say so,&quot; when I question her rules.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. lets me do pretty much as I want to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. allows me to have secrets from her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. makes it clear who is the boss.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. takes my point of view into consideration when making regulations (rules).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. forces me to obey by withdrawing (taking away) privileges.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. lets me decide for myself what is right and wrong.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. lets me off easy when I do something wrong.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. punishes me by making me feel guilty and ashamed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. explains how my actions makes others feel.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. is strict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. encourages me to explore new ideas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY MOTHER</td>
<td>Once in awhile</td>
<td>Some times</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. seems annoyed with me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. makes me stay in my room as punishment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Background Information

1. Child's Age: _____ years _____ months

2. Father's Education: (highest level attained)
   - Did not complete high school
   - High school graduate
   - Some college
   - Bachelor of Arts/Science Degree
   - Graduate Degree (MA, MS, PhD)

3. Mother's Education: (highest level attained)
   - Did not complete high school
   - High school graduate
   - Some college
   - Bachelor of Arts/Science Degree
   - Graduate Degree (MS, MA, PhD)

4. Father's age: _____

5. Mother's age: _____

6. Child's Ethnicity
   - Hispanic
   - Native American
   - Caucasian
   - African American
   - Asian
   - Other

7. Father's Occupation:

8. Mother's Occupation:

9. Marital Status: (current status)
   - Married
   - Living with significant other
   - Divorced
   - Widowed
   - Single
Letter to Parents

Dear Parent(s),

I am a graduate student in Developmental Psychology at California State University, San Bernardino and I am working on my teaching credential. Currently, I am working on my Master's Thesis under the supervision of Dr. Laura Kamptner. Throughout my schooling, I have been actively involved with parents and children. I am genuinely interested in providing ways to foster good relationships between parents and their children. The current study involves finding out what parents do that encourages honesty in their children. In previous studies, children's dishonesty has been associated with behavior problems and delinquency. The contribution of you and your son's participation can be valuable in helping determine what promotes honesty in children. Once we determine what parents do to encourage honesty in their children, we can use these results to provide help to other parents who lack these skills and may have children who are at risk for developing later problems.

Your son's participation would be in a group setting and involves a paper and pencil type questionnaire. There will be no trick questions but
rather questions that involve common everyday experiences that may occur in a 10 or 11 year old boy's life. In order to protect your child's rights, all of the materials that will be presented to your child have been approved by California State University, San Bernardino, Human Subject Review Board. These materials have also been thoroughly reviewed and approved by the principal of your child's school. Your son's involvement in this study is strictly on a volunteer basis and therefore a consent form is required before he can take part. No names or other identifying information will be used; a subject code will be used to label the questionnaires. To express my appreciation of your son's participation in this project, I am contributing to his class $5.00 for each child in the class who participates. This money can be used for anything the class decides upon. Should you have any questions about your son's involvement in this project feel free to contact Dr. Laura Kamptner at (714) 880-5582 or me at (714) 880-5570.

Sincerely yours

Deborah Moffett
APPENDIX E

Consent Form for Children's Participation

Please complete this consent form and have your child return it to his teacher.

I, ________________________________,
(mother’s full name)

give my permission for my child __________________________
(child’s name)

to participate in the project being conducted by Deborah Moffett through California State University, San Bernardino. I understand that my son's participation is voluntary and that he may withdraw at anytime during the study if he so desires.

I agree to allow my child to participate in the project and also to complete the information about my child and his family (listed below).

________________________
(your signature)

________________________
(date)
Debriefing Letter to Parents

Dear parents,

The study that your son participated in today was designed to see what type of lies your child may or may not tell. Since the stories he answered questions to asked him to pretend that the child in the story lied, it was possible that he may think that lying might be alright. The following explanation was given to your child about the nature of deception.

Sometimes you are faced with situations where you might feel that you have to lie so that you do not hurt others feelings. For example, if your grandmother gives you an ugly shirt for your birthday and you tell her that you like it so you won't hurt her feelings. Can you think of other situations like this (telling a stranger on the phone that your mother is in the shower even though she is not at home, etc)? There are other times when you might be faced with a situation in which you might think it is ok to lie but it is not. For example, you may want to do something and your mom will not let you, so you might tell her that you are going to a friend's house and instead you do what is forbidden. This is a lie
and it not the right thing to do. What are some reasons for not telling lies? (you lose the trust of others or might be punished for lying).

This project that you took part in was designed to see how often you thought the child in the story should tell the truth. While it is not easy to tell the truth all the time, telling the truth is the right thing to do. If you are in doubt as to whether to tell the truth or not (be safe and be trusted) tell the truth. If you are not sure whether to tell the truth or not, ask another adult what you should do? Honesty is the best policy.

All questions of his questions were answered and this letter provides you with the information about the nature of the study. Should you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact me, at (714) 880-5570 or Dr. Laura Kamptner at (714) 880-5582. Although individual results will not be obtainable to insure anonymity, a summary of the group findings will be available in April. If you desire to receive the results from this study, you may call Dr. Kamptner and she will mail them to you.

Sincerely yours,

Deborah Moffett
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APPENDIX G

Control and Warmth Variable Items

Control

MY MOTHER:

PS2  spanked me as punishment
PS5  sets very few rules
PS16 would allow me to decide for myself on important matters without interfering
PS21 punished me obey
PS25 physically restricts or punishes me
PS28 lets me do pretty much as I want to
PS30 made it clear who was boss
PS33 let me decide for myself what is right and wrong
PS34 lets me off easy when I do something wrong
PS37 was strict

Warmth

MY MOTHER:

PS8  allows me to hold my own point of view
PS11 still supports me when I make a poor decision
PS17 made it easy for me to confide in her
PS19 acted as though I was in the way
PS20 would explain the reasons for her rules
PS23 thought my ideas were foolish
PS26 made me feel that what I did was important
PS31 took my point of view into consideration when making regulations
PS38 encouraged me to explore new ideas
PS39 seemed annoyed with me
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