

UDC 159.96

Kazmirenko V. – Doctor of Psychology, Professor, Association KM-Core, Advisor of the President, Kyiv, Ukraine; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0567-2282>

Lies and Deception as a Means of Protecting Information which is Hidden

The article covers the psychological aspects of the phenomena of truth and falsehood. The essence and relation of the concepts of "lie" and "deception" are analyzed. Defined social functions of deception, its personal and situational determinants. The criteria are given for distinguishing truth from untruth. It is argued that the lie can be represented in three forms: involuntary (unconscious disinformation, when the objective picture of the world and the picture of the world of the communicator do not coincide), intentional (conscious misinformation, distortion of information) and half truth (the conscious message of only a certain part of information and the default is – the other). Scientists should first of all determine what is the essence of the concepts of "lie" and "deception" and how do they relate to each other? Despite the long history of coverage, this issue has not yet been unambiguously identified in scientific publications. With the simplest consideration, these concepts look like synonyms. Such a position, in particular, is defended by P. Ekman, F. Carson et al. R. Hopper and R. A. Bell, S. Bock consider cheating as a broader category than lies. According to V. V. Znakov, the lie is a conscious distortion of the facts; deception – this is some half-truth, aimed at deceptive expectations, in deception there is no lie; falsehood – the involuntary factual falsity of the message. We see that the statements of various authors are quite contradictory and this requires categorial ordering. In our opinion, the antipode of truth is false, which can be represented by three basic forms. All of them exist at the phenomenological level as a product of the thought-speech activity of the subject, which does not correspond to reality, that is, they constitute cognitive-emotional phenomena. The deception is a procedural (conative, behavioral) component of the lie, that is, an act or action. The deception is the transfer of unintentional and intentional lies, as well as half-truths. We do not consider the word "lie" as a scientific category. Lie is a household correlate of false, whose value varies widely and has a pronounced emotional-moral color, which does not allow for its methodologically correct study.

Keywords: true; false; deception; lie; determinants.

Actuality of theme. Understanding the possibilities and limitations of polygraph tests in various spheres of public life has led to an increase in the interest of scholars in the phenomenology of truth and its psychological antipode – falsehood, that is represented by two main varieties: lies and deception. These questions appeared in the field of attention of researchers of various specialties – philosophers, psychologists, pedagogist, lawyers and others. Their relevance became apparent due to the widespread dissemination of

these communicative phenomena in the space of social life, first of all, the growing influence of the media on the formation of public consciousness.

Degree of scientific development of the problem. Works of domestic and foreign researchers are dedicated to theoretical and methodological principles of the study of lies and deception: L. Auyavert, S. N. Bogomolova, V. V. Volkov, V. V. Znakov, M. Yu. Konovalenko, M. M. Kochenov, I. K. Melnyk, E. L. Nosenko, O. R. Luria, O. D. Sitkovska, L. B. Filonov, Yu. I. Shcherbatih, E. Donchin, P. Ekman, M. Falkenstein, L. A. Farwell, R. Johnson, J. P. Rosenfeld, A. Vrij and others. However, the analysis of psychological publications shows that there are almost no studies, devoted to studying the laws of understanding the truth and lies (lies and deception) in communication systems.

The purpose of the article – is to highlight the essence and the relation between the concepts of "lie" and "deception".

Presentation of the main material. The theoretical analysis carried out by us allows us to assert that the philosophical category "essence" is more general in relation to the concept of "truth".

Essence – the ultimate goal of knowledge, which implies the ability of the system of judgments to reflect objective, independent of the subject reality; confirmed by practice an adequate representation of the subject of objective reality. True – the attribute of the communication channel, a message that reflects the objective state of things.

Truth is based on essence. But in order for the message to be perceived as true in a concrete communicative situation, it is necessary, that it corresponds to a number of conditions: 1) objectively true fact becomes true if communicator and recipient believe that fact really took place; 2) subjects of communication perceive as true only those messages which they can comprehend possibilities of the mind; 3) only those statements, that meet the requirements of the current social norms are true. In other words, truth is determined not so much by the proximity of the reported information to the objective reality, but by its correspondence to the subjective perceptions of such a reality, that is, true facts can be perceived both as true and as false.

Thus, the following components of the understanding of information can be singled out as true: reflexive – based on mutual

trust; instrumental – based on mutual understanding; moral – based on correlation with the values of justice.

Despite the importance of providing theoretical substantiation of the semantic antipodes of truth – lies and deception, in science there is still no clear answer to the basic question: "Are there any differences between the psychological essence of lies and deception, or are they simply synonymous?" [1, p. 243-268]. In the opinion of some, lies and deception – this is the same thing, others believe that it is a concept of different order, that is, they have different phenomenology.

It should be noted that attention to this problem has a long history. In Western European space, it begins with Aristotle and Plato, who tried to find out the essence of lies and deception in the moral and psychological aspects of these phenomena. So, Aristotle formulated the basic laws of formal logic, which was to prevent the spread of lies. In the new time, the phenomenon of lies was described by M. Montaigne, N. Machiavelli, J. Montesquieu et al., as well as by Russian philosophers V. Solovyov and M. Berdyaev, and others.

At that, the positions of the scientists were quite controversial. M. Voltaire considered the lie a supreme virtue if it does good, and it is not necessary to lie not timidly and from time to time, but courageously and always. A. Schopenhauer called the denial of the necessary lie "a pathetic patch on the clothes of the poor moral". The reverse position is rooted in Christian morals and considers lies as sin. Bishop Aurelius Augustine denied any form of lie, believing that it damaged the trust of people. I. Kant did not allow human right to lie, even in critical situations.

The well-known theologian Thomas Aquinas expressed a compromise position. He tried to link the justification of various types of lies with the moral factor, believing that the sin of lies is aggravated if the subject intends to lie to the detriment of another. The sin of lies decreases if it is aimed at good, because a person seeks to help another person or save him from harm.

The modern French researcher J. Dupra believes lies as a psycho-sociological, verbal act of suggestion, through which they deliberately try to "sow" some kind of positive or negative opinion opposite to the truth. In his opinion, a lie can be carried out verbally and nonverbally. Often, people are more likely to be misled by gestures, poses, facial expressions or cosmetics, makeup, clothing

and other means of transformation and masking, creating a false image or adding content of distorted information to non-verbal communication components [2].

According to the famous Russian scientist-logician S. I. Povarnin, the strategy of a liar can be both achievement and avoidance of any consequences. "A lie is a form of behavior that consists in deliberate distortion of reality in order to achieve the desired goal or the desire to avoid undesirable consequences. When falsehood becomes a habitual form of behavior, it is fixed and transformed into a personality's quality" [3].

Take the courage to assert that there is a lie, albeit a morally condemned but necessary element of social interaction. In the preface to the Russian edition of P. Ekman's book "The Psychology of Lies" prof. A. L. Svencytsky writes: "Imagine a world in which all people would speak the truth, regardless of personality and in general, would be extremely sincere with each other. So, one friend spoke to another: "Today you look very bad". When entering the work people would immediately declare disparaging discipline, the doctor would advise the patient not to spend on medicine, because his illness is incurable, the investigator would reveal his steps to the suspect in the crime, and the diplomat would share with his foreign colleagues all the plans of his government. It is unlikely that such a world could exist at all. From childhood we are entangled with a plurality of conventions accompanying our communication with other people" [4, p. 5]. Indeed, there are circumstances in which sincerity is inappropriate, because each one of us has feelings and thoughts that can not to be expressed openly, without causing the image or irritation of his interlocutor. In some cases, the very diverse communicative forms of injustice help our social, and sometimes, physical survival.

Hans Sachs, a poet of the Renaissance, describes in this context the situation when a person is forced to deceive in order to comply with the existing tellability principle in society. According to him, some things can only be talked about in the family, others can only be trusted to a doctor or priest, and so on.

Thus, in certain cases, the lie is a means of protecting and realizing the interests of an individual, group, people and state. D. I. Dubrovsky, a well-known Ukrainian psychologist, notes: "One of the most important social functions of deception is that it is able to provide the opportunity to preserve existing communicative

structures in conditions where interests do not coincide or are practically incompatible" [5].

Consequently, the phenomenon of lies is always in the context of the social environment. The meaningful component, the end result and the purpose of the subject acting by a lie are estimated from the standpoint of a specific society. The expediency of deception is determined by the specifics of certain types of professional activities such as diplomacy, politics, medical practice, martial arts, special services operations, some psychological experiments, etc., during which actors conceal their intentions, present goals, use various distortions and manipulate effects. Thus, the deception of the enemy in the war is a "military trick", concealing information from a patient by a doctor – "holy falsehood", secret operation of special services – "operative combination", concealing plans by statesmen from other colleagues or own people – diplomacy, politics, etc.

All of the above-mentioned actors act above their own interests, fulfill a certain social order and are based on social norms of society, for the sake of which the manipulation of the object of influence, including techniques and techniques of deceptive nature, is carried out. At the same time, in other situations, deception may be a manifestation of selfish personification, competition, the desire to achieve their interests and goals at the expense of others or contrary to the will of others.

All of the above-mentioned authors act above their own interests, fulfill a certain social order and are based on social norms of society, for the sake of which the manipulation of the object of influence, including techniques and techniques of deceptive nature. At the same time, in other situations, deception may be a manifestation of selfish personification, competition, the desire to achieve their interests and goals at the expense of others or contrary to the will of others.

According to one of the founders of forensic polygraphy Yu. I. Kholodny, a lie is an integral part of human existence, it is manifested in different situations, which causes a different interpretation of this concept. A falsehood in a mentally healthy, normally developed person, as a rule, is determined by real motives and is aimed at achieving specific goals. Therefore, complete sincerity is practically impossible and can be regarded as a mental pathology [6].

P. Eckman holds a similar position: "The lie is so natural that it can be attributed to almost all spheres of human activity. Some people may be affected by this assertion, because they consider a lie to be worthy of any kind of condemnation. I do not share that opinion. The assumption that no human relations should be false is too primitive. Also, I do not claim that any deception must necessarily be revealed" [7, p. 9].

It should be noted that, despite the different interpretation of the relation between the concepts of "lie" and "deception" the vast majority of authors are unanimous about the universality of the phenomenon of lies in human relationships.

Thus, another function of deception is secrecy, and this mystery may concern both an individual and a group of people, the collective as a whole and even the state.

Truth or falsehood of a particular judgment is evaluated regardless of who expresses them, that is, they relate not to the subject, but to the objective reality. S.I. Povarnin remarked, that truth would remain true, although her was spoke gang's; the correct proof will remain the correct proof, even if it was built by the "father" of lies.

In this context we choose to highlight the important issue, it is to determine the criteria for distinguishing truth from untruth, that is, situations in which a false message should not be considered a deception. In our opinion, this concerns the following options for communicative interaction:

1) a communicator is sure that the information provided by him is true ("true conviction");

2) a communicator is sincere, but not fully competent in this area ("unsuccessful advice");

3) a communicator is under the influence of painful experiences ("paranoid") or an intensive emotional state ("disorganization of consciousness");

4) a communicator behaves in accordance with its own notions of normative behavior ("etiquette", "ritual").

At the same time, there are certain categories of people who can lies so misleading even recognized professionals. These include, in particular, crime-sociopats. So, Ann Rull, who wrote five books about recidivists after work in the police, there was no suspicion about Theodore Bandy, with whom she worked for many years. Moreover, they were friends. Rull remembers: "Ted was able to speak in such a way that I could never understand the truth he

spoke or falsified ... Antisocial personality always seems sincere, and her manner of behavior is impeccable. I thought I knew perfectly well how to distinguish a criminal from a normal person, but Ted did not give me any reason for doubts" [8].

In the scientific literature, both personal and situational (field-deceptive context) determinants of lies in communicative systems are defined. So, psychological researches show that subjects with low stress resistance, increased anxiety, neuroticity, and also asocial subjects often deceive; externalities tend to be more false than internals. No significant correlation between estimates of "scales of lie" of personal questionnaires and the level of intelligence and education has been established. Interestingly, the ability to successfully lie to others is not related to the ability to determine when they are lying to you.

Along with the personal characteristics of the subjects of communication, an essential role in the generation and understanding of lies is played by the situational factors discussed above. But at the same time, one should take into account the existence of a problem of moral justification of a lie. We have already mentioned that there are situations in which the lie is almost entirely due to circumstances, and those where the moral responsibility entirely relies on the deceiver. Of course, the deception of his enemies by the prisoners of war is morally completely justified by himself, and by his social environment, and even properly perceived by the opposite side; the deception of the priest, close friends – there is no justification. Specific life circumstances may not be so unambiguous, but they can also cause moral discomfort to a person who adheres to social norms.

R. Hopper and R. A. Bell notes, that cheating can be both verbal and non-verbal or behavioral (for example, underlined gentle treatment of his wife after meeting with his fancy woman). They also believe that not every deception involves the use of false information: the deceiver can express the truth, but in a way that provokes the interlocutor to erroneous conclusions about it (for example, a humorous explanation for his absence in the workplace).

It should be noted that in most of our publications analyzed there are no indications of the characteristic signs of lies and

deception, by which they can be diagnosed in communicative situations. This is entirely justified, since there are no separate signs of false communication, as pointed out by authoritative experts. To avoid overburdening the text, we quote only one quote: «There are no signs of deception as such – there is no facial expression or involuntary muscle contraction, which alone would in itself mean that a person is deceiving. There are only signs by which one can conclude that words are badly thought out or experiencing emotions that do not correspond to words. These features provide a snap of information. A person trying to find a lie should know how emotions affect speech, voice, body and face, how feelings that the liar tries to conceal, and what exactly this testifies to the falsity of the observed emotions can be manifested. And you also need to know what can testify to the unpreparedness of the line of conduct» [9, p. 47].

Scientists should first of all determine what is the essence of the concepts of "lie" and "deception" and how do they relate to each other? Despite the long history of coverage, this issue has not yet been unambiguously identified in scientific publications.

With the simplest consideration, these concepts look like synonyms. Such a position, in particular, is defended by P. Ekman, F. Carson et al. R. Hopper and R. A. Bell, S. Bock consider cheating as a broader category than lies. According to V. V. Znakov, the lie is a conscious distortion of the facts; deception – this is some half-truth, aimed at deceptive expectations, in deception there is no lie; falsehood – the involuntary factual falsity of the message.

Conclusions. We see that the statements of various authors are quite contradictory and this requires categorial ordering. In our opinion, the antipode of truth is false, which can be represented by three basic forms. All of them exist at the phenomenological level as a product of the thought-speech activity of the subject, which does not correspond to reality, that is, they constitute cognitive-emotional phenomena.

The deception is a procedural (conative, behavioral) component of the lie, that is, an act or action. The deception is the transfer of unintentional and intentional lies, as well as half-truths.

We do not consider the word «lie» as a scientific category. Lie is a household correlate of false, whose value varies widely and has a pronounced emotional-moral color, which does not allow for its methodologically correct study.

REFERENCES

1. Znakov, V.V., & Ekman, P. (1999). Posleslovie. Zapadnye i russkie tradicii v ponimanii lji: razmishleniia rossijskogo psihologa nad issledovaniiami Pola Ekmana [Afterword. Western and Russian traditions in the understanding of lies: reflections of the Russian psychologist on the research of Paul Ekman]. *Psihologija lji - Psychology of Lies*. S.Pb.: Piter [in Russian].
2. Diupra, J. *Pochemu ljudi vrut [Why do people lie]*. Retrieved from <http://Dbar-music.com/?audio> [in Russian].
3. Povarin, S.I. Spor. O teorii i praktike spora [Dispute. On the theory and practice of the dispute]. Retrieved from <http://Dbar-music.com/?audio> [in Russian].
4. Svencickii, A.L., & Ekman, P. (1999). Predislovie [Preface]. *Psihologija lji - Psychology of Lies*. SPb.: Piter [in Russian].
5. Dubrovskii, D.I. (1994). *Obman. Filosofsko-psihologicheskii analiz [Cheating. Philosophical and psychological analysis]*. Retrieved from <http://www.coob.ru> [in Russian].
6. Holodnii, Iu.I. (2017). Nekotorye aspekty praktiki i tehnologii kriminalisticheskikh issledovaniy s primeneniem poligrafa [Some aspects of the practice and technology of forensic research using a polygraph]. *Rassledovanie prestuplenii - Investigation of crimes*, 4 (18). Moscow [in Russian].
7. Ekman, P. (1999). *Psihologija lji [Psychology of lies]*. SPb.: Piter [in Russian].
8. Rull, E. (1988). *Neznakomec riadom so mnoi [Stranger next to me]*. Retrieved from [http:// https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JZKtM8uSiuA](http://https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JZKtM8uSiuA) [in Russian].
9. *Metodika vyavleniia psihologicheskikh priznakov dostovernosti / nedostovernosti informacii, soobschaemyi uchastnikami ugolovnogo sudoproizvodstva (po videomaterialam sledstvennyh deistvii i operativno-rozysknyh meropriatii) [Methods of identifying psychological signs of reliability / inaccuracy of information reported by participants in criminal proceedings (from video materials of investigative actions and operational search activities)]*. (2017). Moscow [in Russian].

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 06.08.2018

Казміренко В. П. – доктор психологічних наук, професор, радник президента об'єднання KM-Core, м. Київ; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0567-2282>

Брехня та обман як способи захисту інформації, що приховується

Висвітлено психологічні аспекти феноменів правди та неправди. Обґрунтовано, що відносно поняття «правда» більш загальною є філософська категорія «істина». Істина – кінцева мета пізнання, що передбачає здатність системи суджень відобразити об'єктивну, незалежну від суб'єкта реальність; підтверджене практикою адекватне відображення суб'єктом об'єктивної дійсності. Правда – атрибут каналу комунікації, тобто повідомлення, що відображає об'єктивний стан речей. Проаналізовано сутність і співвідношення

понять «брехня» та «обман». Аргументовано, що антиподом правди є неправда, що може бути представлена трьома формами: неумисна (несвідома дезінформація, коли об'єктивна картина світу й картина світу комунікатора не збігаються), умисна (свідома дезінформація, викривлення інформації) та напівправда (свідоме повідомлення лише певної частини інформації й замовчування іншої). Усі вони існують на феноменологічному рівні як продукт мисленнєво-мовленнєвої діяльності суб'єкта, що не відповідає дійсності, тобто становлять когнітивно-емоційні феномени. Обман – це процесуальний (конативний, поведінковий) компонент неправди, тобто дія або вчинок. Обман полягає в передаванні неумисної та умисної неправди, а також напівправди. Натомість слово «брехня» не є науковою категорією; це – побутовий корелят будь-якої неправди, значення якого коливається в досить широких межах і має виражене емоційно-моральне забарвлення, що не дає змоги здійснювати його методологічно коректне дослідження. Визначено особистісні та ситуативні детермінанти обману. До перших належить низька стресостійкість, підвищена тривожність, невротичність, а також схильність до вчинення антисоціальних дій; у екстерналів більше виражені тенденції до брехні, ніж в інтерналів. Не встановлено значущих кореляційних зв'язків між оцінками за «шкалами брехні» особистісних опитувальників, рівнем інтелекту й освітою. Ситуативними чинниками визнано конкретні життєві обставини.

Ключові слова: правда; неправда; обман; брехня; детермінанти.