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This thesis concerns the development of the capacity to mentalise in those with borderline personality disorder. The concept of borderline disorder is reviewed. A model describing the effect of childhood experiences of abuse in developing the capacity of theory of mind is presented. The concept of lying is introduced. Understanding the concept of lying can be shown as depending on the capacity to mentalise. Based on the theory of prototypical analysis, the ‘Concept of lying’ scale was developed. It measures judgement of veracity and affective response to different conditions varied in their emotional charge.

Three main studies are described. In the first study, two groups consisting of 34 severely disturbed personality disorder patients (assessed by DSM AXIS-I and AXIS-II diagnoses) and 30 control subjects were assessed in their concept of lying. Results confirmed the hypothesis that borderline patients would manifest deficiencies in taking into consideration others’ minds. The results are discussed in terms of a cognitive-developmental theory maintaining that children firstly acknowledge others’ intentions and subsequently, others’ beliefs. In the second study the same 34 experimental subjects were compared with a new group consisting of 20 control subjects. We added the NART measure of IQ and the CECA measure of childhood experience of care and abuse. Results show that childhood experiences of sexual abuse are correlated with negative affective response ($r = .46$). It produces cognitive deficiencies in judging lying, especially in mentalising others’ beliefs ($r = .33$). These are correlated with the diagnosis of borderline personality disorder ($r = .27$). In the third study groups were interviewed about their concept of lying in relation to experiences of being lied to, or telling lies. In this study, 18 experimental subjects were compared with 14 control subjects. The results show a qualitative difference that is explained on the basis of patients’ deficiency in holding a mature concept of lying.

The general discussion examines four issues: the implications for understanding lying in neurotic patients and in individuals with borderline personality disorder; the theory of mind and borderline personality disorder; object relationships, lying and psychic functioning in borderline personality disorder; and clinical implications for therapy with abused individuals and with abused liars.
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INTRODUCTION

This dissertation attempts to establish the link between various concepts in different fields of thought, which explore the concept of lying. Philosophy, psychiatry, psychoanalysis, and developmental cognitive psychology aim to get a clearer understanding of a theory of mind, lying and the development of borderline personality disorder.

Our interest is in understanding cognitive-emotional deficits in severely disturbed individuals with personality disorders, especially those with borderline personality disorder (BPD). We assume that BPD individuals have deficiencies in their development of theory of mind (TOM). Lying is examined as an indicator to demonstrate the lack of capacity of theory of mind. We argue that in the normal sequence of human development TOM is achieved, together with the gradual achievement of awareness of the essential interpersonal process that constitutes the concept of lying. Deficits in the capacity to have TOM and in understanding lying might serve as a building block for the development of BPD.

Firstly, we explore the concept of lying from philosophical-epistemological and moral perspectives. This analysis equips us to use a general, widespread, common and clear practical conceptualisation of lying. This definition will be used in the empirical study. It is argued that three prototypical elements form the difference between telling lies or telling the truth. (1) The factuality of the statement, i.e., the proximity of the speaker’s statement to the actual truth; (2) The speaker’s intention to deceive, i.e., the speaker’s wish to manipulate another’s mind and behaviour of others; and (3) The speaker’s belief in her statement, i.e. her awareness of the difference between the statement and the actual truth.

Developmental psychologists have long dealt with moral development but rarely addressed lying as an interpersonal developmental process. We first focus on the leading theories that examine the development of moral judgements. Then by reviewing the research on children’s lying, we deal with the appearance of children’s lying.

Human development is also marked by the development of the capacity to pretend. This capacity is closely related to the development of a mature concept of lying. In pretend
play two mental representations, the reality and the imaginative, need to exist at the same time and space. The next section examines these ideas.

Then, we examine TOM as a vital process in the aspect of human development which lying is linked to. TOM is a theoretical construct examined through its manifestation in lying. It is recognised that lying deals with the causal relationship between mental states and behaviour, and that TOM, and presumably lying, are developmental processes through which the self is formed. As deception is considered to be a marker of a theory of mind, and as we presuppose a link between BPD, TOM, and lying, we also review the literature which includes deception in the investigation of the development of TOM.

Finally, BPD is discussed from a diagnostic point of view. We refer to recent findings that show that the development of borderline disorder is linked to early insufficient ‘good-enough’ parenting, and maintain that there is a connection between BPD, theory of mind, and the concept of lying. It is argued that following traumatic childhood experiences, BPD lack the capacity to develop theory of mind, and as a result their understanding of lying differs from others’ concept of lying, especially in highly emotional charged situations.

This thesis uses the female third person pronoun throughout.
CHAPTER 1: KNOWING TRUTH AND LIES

1.1 Truth, lies and deception: an overview

Any beings that can develop a language must have a basic concern for whether things that are said, are indeed so. People may not be concerned with truth on every occasion, but if they never were, there could be no understanding of things said, nor could anything be said at all.

What is truth? How does one define the difference between truth and falsehood and how does this relate to deceit. This chapter briefly reviews some distinguished philosophers’ ideas about the matter to pave the way for further discussion of the way psychologists have treated lying and deception. This review will be selective, not covering the extensive literature written on the subject. We chose to briefly outline those who dealt with external and internal realities leading us to analyse deception as representing layers of consciousness.

The etymological origin of the English word ‘true’ derives from Middle English ‘trewe’. Old English ‘treowe’ (loyal, trusty) appears to be connected to the Old English ‘treow’ (loyalty, fidelity) and with ‘treow’ and ‘tres’, the roots of our word ‘tree’, giving us the sense of as firm and straight as a tree (Bok, 1978).

Truth has an intimate relationship with knowing and perceiving things. Starting with the assumption that knowledge must be unchanging and has reality as its object, Plato developed the theory of ‘ideas’ in ‘The Republic’. Because the world of sense experience is constantly changing, it cannot be the object of knowledge and hence cannot be real. Since there is knowledge, there must be another unchanging realm that is the object of knowledge. This realm, consisting of Socratic definitions called ‘ideas’, can only be known by reason. For Plato, knowledge was having truth justified by an account (Butcharov, 1970). Platonic philosophy reflects the idea that the entire dialectic of truth is founded on the doubling, the splitting of appearance and reality.

The view that knowledge and perception are closely connected later led to two distinct positions. If perception is thought to be a subjective representation, or some sort of inner
picture, not itself a physical object, what results is an epistemological ‘dualism’, which faces the problem of explaining the relation between this mental entity, or perception, and the physical object. Dualism of this sort also encounters the problem of justifying any belief in physical objects, since it maintains that all the mind knows is its perceptions. If perceptions are thought to be objective, to be parts of external things rather than subjective entities, then a direct or naive ‘realism’ results. In this case, one faces the problem of explaining the nature of physical objects that are perceived by different observers as having contradictory qualities. This view also implies that when one looks down a road it actually does get narrower at the horizon.

St. Augustine conceived of lying as consisting in a doubling up, saying one thing in speech, and another in one’s heart (Forrester, 1997, p.8). This doubling conception indicated its affinities with Platonic philosophy, in which the entire dialectic of truth is founded on the doubling, the splitting of appearances and reality. The idea of the truth that lies behind is common both to Platonic conceptions of truth and to the Augustinian conception of lies. But the dialectic of concealing and revealing must stop somewhere, and its end is always on ‘the other side’, the side of reality, rather than appearances. The liar conceals the truth in his heart.

The creative function of lying is emphasised by Forrester (1997). He argued that when truth becomes hidden behind appearances, the world takes on a depth, becoming a series of layers. The primary and exemplary experience of depth may be that of deception: either that of being deceived by others, or that of deceiving others. Thus deception affirms the layers of consciousness. Sartre (1956, p.88) said that, “By means of the lie, consciousness affirms that it exists by nature as hidden from the other”. The depth of the consciousness created by the exercise of the art of deception is the first arena for the practice of dissimulation proper to the life of human intelligence. Karl Popper (1974) equated the capacity to lie with the capacity to imagine, the power to imagine things other, to negate, and thereby to create fiction, even hypothesise, and hence to create science.

“The moment when language became human was very closely related to the moment when a man invented a story, a myth in order to excuse a mistake he had made... I suggest that the evolution of specifically human language, with its characteristics means of expressing negation, of saying that something signalled is
not true, stems very largely from the discovery of systematic means to negate false report" (Popper, 1974, pp 1112-1113).

Thus, lying comes to appear not as a perversion of language, but as its perfection for pragmatic ends.

Pragmatism is another attempt to deal with the questions of epistemology, raising once again the question of the nature of knowledge. It is a set of philosophical views advocated in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century by C. S. Pierce, William James, and John Dewey. According to it an idea (that is any opinion, belief, and statement) is an instrument with a particular function. A true idea is one that fulfils its function, which works; a false idea is one that does not. It is claimed that the function of an idea is to discover reality and that a true idea is, therefore, one that succeeds in doing this. Truth is the agreement of an idea with reality. The function of hypotheses in science, for instance, is to consist not in telling us what reality is like but in making predictions and suggestions for investigation, which are acceptable as long as they work. The supposition is that things which are said, ideas, have various different functions and are, therefore, to be accepted or rejected on various different grounds (White, 1970). On these grounds lying is not treated as being a matter of dichotomy, of all or nothing. The most common way to approach lying is to think more in terms of ‘some lying’ rather than ‘everything is lies’.

Nietzsche (1967), for example, argued that truth telling is reserved for relations of equality or even for relations of intimacy and equality.

“One says what one thinks, one is truthful under certain conditions, namely that one is understood with good will. One conceals himself in presence of the unfamiliar, and he who wants to attain something says what he would like to have thought of him, but not what he thinks” (Nietzsche, 1967, p.204).

Many (for example, Ford, 1996; Forrester, 1997) cite Shakespeare to illustrate that etiquette, white lies, and lovers’ lies are the oil that keep the motor of our relations with others from seizing up:

When my love swears she is made of truth,
I do believe her though I know she lies.
That she might think me some untutored youth,
Unlearned in the world’s false subtleties.

......
Therefore I lie with her, and she with me,  
And in our faults by lies we flattered be.

Alike, is the necessity of exaggeration that is required to communicate the truth.

To summarise, the essential feature in all thoughts is that reality is construed from the interaction between ideas (cognition) and experience (perception and emotion). Barnes (1994) argued that it is only in contrast to lies and falsehoods that we are able to construct the concept of truth. He quotes Barwise and Perry in saying that,

"If people said only what they knew to be the case, then we would never notice truth as a property of some utterances and not others. It is because people sometimes violate the conventions of language that we come to recognise truth as a uniformity across certain utterance situations" (Barnes, 1994, p.4)

Deception is thus viewed as functional in that it exemplifies the layers of knowledge that one holds about oneself.

Most philosophers have given lying comparatively little attention, at least by comparison with the amount of scrutiny they have given to telling the truth (Bok, 1978). Where lying was examined, it was largely from a moral standpoint. In the next section we elaborate on the moral question of when it is permitted to lie.

1.2 The moral question

Many philosophers have dealt with the moral question of the circumstances in which it is permitted to lie. Plato used the expression noble lie for the fanciful story that might be told to the people in order to persuade them to accept class distinctions and thereby safeguard social harmony. According to this story, God himself mingled gold, silver, iron, and brass in fashioning rulers, auxiliaries, farmers, and craftsmen, intending these groups for separate tasks in a harmonious hierarchy. In other words, lying is excusable when undertaken for ‘noble’ ends by those trained to discern these purposes (Plato, 1941). Plato claimed also that not everything that is said could be either true or false. For example, what is said can express a wish that something might be so, a query whether something might be so, a decision to make something so, or an order to ensure that something is so. Only when of what is said can we state that this is how things are can it be either true or
false. That this is how things are is what we state, believe, claim, assume, presuppose, conjecture, and sometimes, hope or fear (Plato 1961). Aristotle viewed that lying is mean and culpable and that truthful statements are preferable to lies in the absence of special considerations. According to this view, initial negative weight is given to lies. It holds that they are not neutral. Lying requires explanation, whereas truth ordinarily does not (Bok, 1978).

To some of the philosophers this principle is supported by religious evidence, while for others, intuition supports it. St. Augustine (Bok, 1978) argued that God forbids all lies and that liars, then, endanger their immortal souls. He defined lying as having one thing in one’s mind and uttering another with the intention to deceive. Elsewhere he confessed that this definition left no room for justifiable falsehood and he allowed, therefore that there are great differences among lies and that some are more abhorrent than others.

"But every liar says the opposite of what he thinks in his heart with purpose to deceive. Now it is evident that speech was given to man, not that men might therewith deceive one another, but that one man might make known his thoughts to another. To use speech, then, for the purpose of deception, and not for its appointed end, is a sin. Nor are we to suppose that there is any lie that is a sin, because it is sometimes possible, by telling a lie to do service to another" (Bok 1978, p.32).

He illustrated it with examples of dissimulation and lying in the Bible (which made it difficult to object categorically to all lies) in such a way that he could continue to maintain that God forbade all lies, while distinguishing among lies according to the intention behind them and the harmfulness of their effects.

Kant, at the end of the 17th century said that:

"Truthfulness in statements which cannot be avoided is the formal duty of an individual to everyone, however great may be the disadvantage accruing to himself or to another" (Kant, 1949, p.347).

This is the absolutist position, prohibiting all lies, even those told for the best of purposes or to avoid the most horrible of fates. Kant defined a lie as merely an intentional untruthful declaration to another person. The only way out for Kant and others was to define lies in such a way that some falsehoods would not count as lies.

Some philosophers have held the contrary view, that there are times when truthfulness causes or fails to avert such great harm that a lie is clearly justifiable. In the nineteenth
century, Cardinal Newman argued, for example, that men of great rectitude, no matter what their faith was, might resort to a lie in extreme circumstances (Bok, 1978). Bok cited Samuel Johnson as stating that:

"The general rule is that truth should never be violated; there must, however, be some exceptions, such as when a murderer asks you which way a man has gone" (Bok 1978, p.40).

Cardinal Newman added that the first act would be to call out for the police, and next, if he were worsted in the conflict, he would not have given the ruffian the information he asked at whatever risk to himself. Bok (1978) stated that some thinkers developed the notion of the *mental reservation*, which, in some extreme formulations, can allow you to make a completely misleading statement, so long as you add something true to it in your own mind. Thus, if you are asked whether you have broken somebody's vase, you can answer 'no', adding in your own mind the mental reservation 'not in the last year' to make the statement a true one.

The utilitarian philosophers such as Sidgwick (1907) assumed that certain lies such as those told to invalids and children for their own good are necessary. The utilitarian philosophers say that in choosing whether or not to lie, we do weigh benefits against harm and happiness against unhappiness. We judge differently the lie to cover up fraud and the lie to camouflage a minor accounting error, and we judge both to be different from a sympathetic lie told to avoid hurting a child's feelings. As soon as more complex questions of truthfulness and deception are raised, the utilitarian view turns out to be unsatisfactory as well. Many have laboured to erect systems of principles, to find a method by which to judge moral choices, or a single principle from which judgements can be derived, or some hierarchy among principles so as to resolve complex judgements. These principles may be derived from some authority, such as God's will, a holy text, or natural law (Bok, 1978).

Bok summarised the judgement of moral choices.

"As uncertainty and imprecision beset hard moral choices, the more the intervening steps are multiplied and the more one thing can be explained in terms of another or derived from another, the more room is left for bias, self-deception. The methods advocated within many moral systems, moreover those who wish to arrive at solutions to concrete problems, are often so very rudimentary that any answer can emerge, depending on what values are introduced at the begin" (Bok, 1978, p.54).
CHAPTER 2: DEFINING DECEPTIVE COMMUNICATION

Upon being asked for an account of their activities and behaviours, people invariably report only a small subset of the relevant information. Miller (1993) counted two reasons for the inherent synopsis of communicative exchanges. The first concerns the limitations of memory. What is remembered and forgotten depends in part on the priorities and needs of the communicator. The second takes into account one’s own and the other’s state of mind. There are times when chunks of information are omitted on a mutually understood underlying rule. It is when both parties accept not to tell and hear a laborious, event by event, account of the matter. Miller (1993) assumed that virtually all-communicative exchanges are marked by the omission of information. Many who study deception and lying agree that conscious, deliberate intent to deceive is an integral defining aspect of deceptive communication. (Ludwig, 1965; Knapp and Comandena, 1979; Eckman, 1985).

A liar can choose whether or not to lie. Those with paranoid delusions, pathological liars, and those who for whatever reason believe their own misinformation should not be considered liars. Perhaps the most compelling reason for including the intent criterion in definitions of deceptive communications is the fact that it is central to ordinary language users’ meaning for the term. When people use such words as lie, liar, and deceptive they are not merely referring to the content of messages but also to the motives of communicators. The lie may be or may not be justified, in the opinion of the liar or the community. The liar may be a good or a bad person, liked or disliked. But the person who lies could choose to lie or to be truthful, and knows the difference between the two. Pathological liars who know they are being truthful but cannot control their behaviour do not meet this requirement. Nor would people who do not even know they are lying, those said to be victims of self-deceit. A liar may come over time to believe in her own lie. If that happens she would no longer be a liar.

Deceptive behaviour has been widely studied in nature. Mitchell (1986) presented one of the most comprehensive analyses of deceptive intent, and the four levels he described centred on discernible faculties. He began his discussion by constructing an embracing definition of deception. He concluded,
"...So deception occurs when the following is true: an organism R registers (or believes) something Y from some organism S, where S can be described as benefiting when R acts appropriately towards Y, because Y means X and it is untrue that X is the case" (Mitchell, 1986, p.21).

To elaborate upon this definition, the act or the process of deception requires two players; the deceiver (S) and the deceived (R). Consequently, passive conveyors of information (such as maps) could not sensibly be spoken of as being able to deceive (even if the reader believed false information displayed); only the one who generated the false information (e.g. the cartographer) could possibly be said to deceive. But deception must also have a sense of purpose (a mistaken cartographer does not deceive). Deception seems to be a term ascribed to the behaviour of agents, or perhaps systems, that appear to achieve beneficial outcomes by conveying misleading information to other agents (systems). So, at the most basic level, one hallmark of an act of deception is that it must be at least functionally meaningful for the system exhibits it. To put it simply, for an act to qualify as at all deceptive it must involve S transmitting false information with probability that it will be received by R as accurate information to the benefit of S. Mitchell sets this most basic level aside for those acts of deception that are programmed or designed by nature, but which are always on display and do not need to be activated. Level two deception applies when an organism is programmed 'to do p given that q is the case'. When the plover, for instance, has spied a predator approaching, she will fly away from the young in her nest and will act in a manner that suggests (to the human observer and, presumably, to the predator) that she has damaged her wing. The predator is attracted away from the young towards this 'easy catch', at which the plover can make a speedy exit, thus saving herself and her unnoticed offspring. At level three the behaviour is still controlled by a programme, but the programme is not innate but learned, and might be expressed as 'do any action p given that this has resulted in some desired consequence q in our past'. Instrumental, observational or trial-and-error learning might be sufficient to install this form of deceptive behaviour. These forms of deception may be intentionally activated to manipulate other's behaviour to the benefit of the sender; however, they need not involve an intention to manipulate other's belief. In the fourth level, deception requires a form of meta-programming, or thinking. It is worked out or planned. In this case the animal actually intends to deceive, to manipulate belief, and is able to generate novel and flexible strategies for doing so.
Thus, the ethological literature helps us to clarify the ways in which apparent deception need not even be a clearly intentional attempt to manipulate belief. It is only at Mitchell’s fourth level that genuine belief manipulation could be said to occur, with respect to planned acts of deception.

Eckman (1985) defined a lie or a deceit as a statement being made by a person who intends to mislead another, doing so deliberately, without prior notification of her purpose, and without having been asked to do so by the recipient. It is not just the liar that must be considered in defining a lie but the liar’s target as well. It would be odd to call actors liars, as their audiences agree to be misled, for a time.

We suggested that lying should not treated as being a matter of dichotomy, of all or nothing, as it represents layers of self knowledge composing various different functions. Based on this supposition, a comprehensive analysis in defining prototypes of lying was suggested by Coleman (1981). Prototypic analysis recognises no decisively defining features. It assumes that truth and lies are not a matter of dichotomy but are found at different locations on the same continuum. A statement could be more of a lie or less of it, and is determined by the common, gathered normative knowledge for each culture. Thus a white lie would be accepted as less a lie in certain social circumstances and more of it in others. This model was used in developing an empirical measure to define various statements as lies or truths. An extensive review of this prototypic analysis is described in chapter 7.

To summarise, lying is defined as a deliberate choice of communication aiming to mislead another person when no prior notification of the intention has been made, where the deceiver engages in either concealment or falsification, and is aware of the fact that she has done so.
CHAPTER 3: LYING AS A DEVELOPMENTAL TASK

3.1 The development of moral judgement: Developmental psychological theories

Traditionally, psychologists, as well as philosophers, have dealt with lying mainly as a moral issue, rather than examining the cognitive capacity that is a precondition to the development of lying behaviour. Moral development is analysed from three main theoretical perspectives: cognitive-developmental, social learning, and psychoanalytic theories. Leading theoreticians will be presented.

The leading models of the psychology of moral development are the cognitive-developmental models of Piaget and Kohlberg. Although moral development has been extensively studied since Piaget’s and Kohlberg’s contributions, we chose to only present their approach. Their approach is valuable in that they have emphasised that children do not simply internalise parental prohibitions, but actively construct their understanding of these principles.

According to Piaget (1965), morality involves a respect for rules, and moral development proceeds in two stages. In the first stage, the child’s respect of rules is a derivative of her respect for the authorities that teach the rules. In this ‘conformity’ stage, the child views rules as immutable and eternal. Authority is absolute, and actions, not intentions, determine culpability. In the second ‘autonomy’ stage (age 8-12), the child perceives rules as a product of social interaction and group choice. A mutual respect replaces the unilateral respect for adult authorities. Kohlberg described moral development in three levels of moral reasoning each comprised of two stages (Kohlberg and Kramer, 1969). In the ‘pre-conventional’ level, the child accepts labels of good and bad but interprets them in terms of the power that creates the rules or the hedonistic implications of actions (whether one will be punished or rewarded). In the first stage, the child is oriented toward punishment and obedience, and in the second, reciprocity emerges, but not of loyalty, gratitude, or justice. In the second, ‘conventional’ level, the person comes to value the moral code of her family or society in itself, regardless of hedonistic implications. In both the third and fourth stages, the child maintains rules and commands to which she tries to conform. The third stage involves ‘a good boy’/’good girl’ orientation and the fourth is
characterised by a ‘law and order’ emphasis. The third, ‘post-conventional’ level entails the belief in universal moral principles not tied to a particular authority or social group. In the fifth stage, a social contract prevails, and actions viewed as just are those with the greatest social utility; principles of democracy, legality, and contract predominate. In the final stage, morality involves universal principles: the individual chooses principles such as the greatest good for the greatest number, and she refuses to treat herself as an exception to those rules, even when expediency contradicts them. In this stage the person believes in equality and the value of individual liberty. Kohlberg’s theory has been widely criticised on methodological grounds, but mostly, on the basis of confounding processes with content (for example, Kurtines (1974). The result is a view of moral development with significant value bias. For example, Kohlberg found hedonism morally repulsive, and consequently relegates it to stage two in the development of morality, even though it frequently appears in late adolescence or early adulthood. In fact, this objection is fundamental in that it claims that in having a theory of moral development one cannot escape from the confusion between specific (social and cultural) values and the development of cognitive structures.

Another major approach to moral development is social learning theory. Mitchell (1976) argued that morality is defined as pro-social or altruistic behaviours, and is learned like any other kind of behaviour, through cognitively mediated conditioning and socially mediated learning, particularly modelling. The major criticism is that social learning theory, by definition, fails to answer the whole question of which behaviour is moral (Westen, 1985).

All major theories relate to maturation through some kind of relationships with significant others. Maturity is reached within several contexts. For Piaget, autonomy is reached so that the child perceives rules as a product of social interaction and group choice. For Kohlberg, mature morality involves universal principles.

3.2 The development of moral judgements: Psychoanalytic theories

Moral development is viewed by psychoanalysts in terms of the development of the superego. According to psychoanalytic theory, the superego arises as a precipitate of the
Oedipus complex through the process of identification. According to Freud (1933), the superego is the 'heir to the Oedipus complex'. The child, in the male case, suffers an object loss when he gives up his mother as a sexual object, and he replaces the object by massive identifications with his father. He does this defensively, as a result of a fear of castration. As maturity approaches, the ego ideal is developed (Freud 1933). The superego becomes less rigid and personalised, with internalised ideals and values substituting for internalised objects. The ego comes to assume many of the moral functions of the developmentally more primitive and punitive superego, though the mechanisms by which the ego comes to usurp moral authority is obscured.

Others emphasised the schematic developmental line of superego formation in pre-latency years. Melanie Klein (1958) postulated an archaic superego in the third to sixth month of life. Concurrent drive activity, ego functions and emerging object relations profoundly influence the gradual evolution of the superego. Through the synthesising function of the ego (Nunberg, 1931) the primitive multinuclear superego structure (Glover, 1943) is eventually unified. The infant's earliest experiences with the mother make important contributions to the superego-to-be. The soothing experience of being rocked, the evolving recognition of the mother's loving, angry, indifferent or depressed facial expressions in her mirroring role (Spitz, 1958; Winnicott, 1967) or the mother's interference with thumb-sucking (a 'physiological precursor' of a prohibitive superego), all leave affective imprints on gradually emerging and differentiating self- and object representations, later to be reflected in the qualities of the introjects and ideals.

In the process of forming mental representations, certain object representations become gradually invested with authority, gaining the status of introjects; the self-representation carries a representation of the expected role of the self in relation to that authority (Sandler, 1960; Sandler, 1981). The qualities of introjects are very different from simple replications of the external object (Jones, 1947), since they also embody the child's projections which exaggerate and distort prohibiting and threatening aspects of the parents. The qualities of the early mother-child relationship, the child's reactions to restriction and frustration, and the child's capacity to tolerate anxiety and frustration combine to determine the quality of introjects. Where there is tension, distress, anxiety,
or frustration, or when the infant’s tolerance of frustration is low, the child’s perception of
the parent becomes distorted, lending harsh and cruel aspects to the coalescing introject.

Ego-ideal formation parallels that of the introject. Early wishful images of an ideal state
of the self are based on early experiences of safety, pleasure, and comfort within the
mother-child dyad, forming the bedrock of the ideal self-representation. The child’s
enjoyment of felt omnipotence in the practising phase lends an additional active
pleasurable component to the ideal self-representation. Parents whom the child normally
views as wonderful, omnipotent, and perfect at this time, add to the ideal self-
representation and provide the basis of the ideal object representation. Parental directives
and admonitions lend substance to the child’s view of what his parents consider being a
model child. This ideal child representation forms alongside rudimentary ideal object and
ideal self-representations, and together they constitute the ego ideal. The toddler becomes
aware simultaneously of his pleasure in individuality and autonomy, and of his
dependence on the continued love and approval of his ideally viewed mother for the
maintenance of his sense of self-esteem, well being, and safety.

Yet, mother’s love increasingly carries conditions. The child begins to experience inner
conflict between his wish for mother’s love and other wishes which risk the loss of that
love, a form of developmental conflict (Nagera, 1966). Such conflict indicates the
growing presence of the introject evidenced when the child, in a kind of early imitation
and role play, says ‘no’ to himself, slaps his hand, or shows other identifications with the
prohibiting parent such as gestures, inflections, and facial expressions as preliminary
phases in superego development (Malmquist, 1968). Thus the child’s experience of
frustration may originate in either both the object’s non-fulfilment of the child’s wishes
and the child’s abstinence in efforts to resolve inner conflict while keeping mother’s love.

It becomes evident that seeing the parents as ideal is ordinarily a part of the child’s
learning to cope with his impulses, to delay gratification, and to build frustration
tolerance. These inner controls are built up utilising both ideals and interoject.

Several authors have recognised the importance of the mother’s empathy and consistency
during this phase for eventual superego development (Furer, 1967; Winnicott, 1971). If
the mother can empathetically adapt her demands to the child’s capacities and not
acquiesce once demands are made, conformity, rather than being felt as frustrating or
humiliating, can be experienced as mother’s and child’s shared pride in successful impulse control. Mother can then be experienced as a stable, comforting, and loving authority figure, and the child, by identification with her non-punitive control, gains confidence in his impulse control while building frustration tolerance. This contributes to the formation of a superego, which will be nurturing and protective (Schafer, 1960).

With normal development, the idealised and the persecutory pre-oedipal superego precursors are gradually toned down and neutralised, which in turn facilitates internalisation of the idealised and prohibitive aspects of the advanced oedipal superego. The integration of the pre-oedipal and oedipal levels of superego formation then facilitates the consolidation of the post-oedipal superego with its characteristic abstraction, individuation, and depersonification (Jacobson, 1964).

Thus, in the course of development, the growth of both introjects and ideals can be inferred from the child’s greater capacity to tolerate ambivalent feelings towards objects, and to comply with the wishes of the object. As greater representational abilities facilitate elaboration of thought and fantasy, the governing influence of the introject and the efforts to achieve the standards of the inner ideal extend progressively more to the times of the parents’ absence. At this early stage superego functions are not stable or organised, and the external object is needed to insure compliance. However, with growing stability and elaboration of introjects and ideals, the functions of self-observation, self-judgement, and self-punishment or reward begin to operate. When the child fails to meet introject demands or ideal expectations, punishment by a lowering of self-esteem follows. Sensitive intervention may be necessary to counterbalance excessively high introject and ideal expectations and to modify the ensuing punishment.

To illustrate how superego development is related to psychopathology we present a further psychoanalytic view for classification. Based on Jacobson’s comprehensive analysis of normal and pathological stages of superego development, Kernberg (1970) suggested employing psychoanalytic criteria for differential diagnoses among different types and degrees of severity of character pathology.

The classification assumes that a relatively well integrated although excessively severe superego characterises the ‘higher’ level of organisation of character pathology. The forerunners of this superego are determined by too sadistic impulses, bringing about a
harsh, perfectionistic super ego. The ego, too, is well integrated, a stable representational world being well established. Excessive defensive operations against unconscious conflicts centre on repression. The character defences are largely of an inhibitory or phobic nature, or they are reaction formations against repressed instinctual needs. The patient has fairly deep, stable object relationships and is capable of experiencing guilt, mourning, and a wide variety of affective responses. His sexual and/or aggressive drive derivatives are partially inhibited, but these instinctual conflicts have reached the stage where the infantile genital phase and oedipal conflicts are clearly predominant.

At the intermediate level, the excessively punitive nature of the patient's superego is even stronger than that of the higher level disorders, but the superego is less integrated. His superego tolerates contradictory demands between sadistic, prohibitive superego nuclei on the one hand, and rather primitive (magical, over-idealised) forms of the ego ideal on the other hand. These latter, primitive types of internal demands to be great, powerful, and physically attractive coexist with strict demands for moral perfection. Deficient superego integration can also be observed in the partial projections of superego nuclei (as expressed in the patient's decreased capacity for experiencing guilt and in paranoid trends), contradictions in the ego’s value systems, and severe mood swings. The poor integration of the superego, which is reflected in contradictory unconscious demands on the ego, also explains the appearance of pathological character defences combining reaction formations against instincts with a partial expression of instinctual impulses. At this level, the patient has fewer inhibitory character defences than the person at the higher level, his character traits are infiltrated by instinctual strivings as seen in dissociated expressions of unacceptable sexual and/or aggressive needs, and a 'structured impulsivity' in certain areas. Object relationships at this level are still stable in the sense of a capacity for lasting, deep involvement with others, and of a capacity to tolerate the markedly ambivalent and conflictual nature of such relationships.

At the lower level, the patient's superego integration is minimal and his propensity for projection of primitive, sadistic superego nuclei is maximal. His capacity for experiencing concern and guilt is seriously impaired, and his basis for self-criticism constantly fluctuates. The individual at this level commonly exhibits paranoid traits, stemming both from projection of superego nuclei and from the excessive use of rather
primitive forms of projection, especially projective identification as one major defensive
mechanism of the ego. The synthetic function of the patient's ego is seriously impaired,
and he uses primitive dissociation or splitting as the central defensive operation of the ego
instead of repression. The mechanism of splitting is expressed as contradictory ego states
alternating with each other and the patient’s use of denial, projective identification, and
unconscious fantasies of omnipotence reinforce this dissociation. His pathological
character defences are predominantly of an ‘impulsive,’ instinctually infiltrated kind;
contradictory, repetitive patterns of behaviour are dissociated from each other, permitting
direct release of drive derivatives as well as of reaction formations against these drives.
Lacking an integrated ego and the capacity to tolerate guilt feelings, such patients have
little need for secondary rationalisations of pathological character traits.

To summarise, in this section we have presented psychoanalytic thinking regarding
superego development: from Freud’s theory stressing that the superego is the ‘heir to the
Oedipus complex’, to Kleinian object relations theory which has contributed to the
understanding the pre-genital superego development, and to a useful classification of
character pathology.

The next section examines lying as a developmental task in which the child achieves
maturity at the stage of understanding it as a deliberate choice of communication aiming
to mislead another person, engaging in either concealment or falsification, and being
aware of the fact that she is misleading the other.

3.3 The developmental sequence in achieving a mature concept of lying

Surprisingly, little systematic cognitive, dynamic, or psychoanalytic developmental
research has addressed the sequence of developing the capacity to deceive in children. In
the few early scientific analyses of child’s lying, distinctions based on the criterion of
truthfulness and hence intentionality were made but not emphasised as important to the
definition of lying. Leonard (1920), for example, organised a number of children’s lies
into three general types. ‘Intellectual deflection from the truth’ such as childish
imaginings and exaggerations, deceptions due to ‘emotional impulses’ such as fear of
physical punishment or of being deprived of some desired thing, and ‘wilful inventions
which lack the emotional intensity and which were more premeditated’. Krout (1931a;
1931b) was the first to try and outline the cognitive factors underlying the apparent deception of children. He distinguished three levels of complexity in childhood deception, of which only the highest level he considered being genuinely deceptive. His guiding theory was that the child develops selfhood through the realisation that her behaviour is meaningful (for both self and other). The self is defined in relation to the other, and this distinction is mediated by understanding of communication in which gestures have the same meaning for self and other. Misrepresentation is the first level. It reflects the verbalisation of mechanical errors of early childhood judgement, or the misapplication of verbal definitions; mistakes rather than intentional falsehoods. The second level, prevarication, reflects the child’s growing skill at projecting her experience despite still lacking an appreciation of the significance of her communicative behaviour; thus prevarication represents confusion of facts and fantasy, somewhat intentionally false representations, without a comprehension of the significance of falsehood. At this stage the child is assumed to be unable to draw any distinction between dream life and waking consciousness; it is the stage of make believe play. Finally, genuine deception is enabled as the child arrives at a mature conception of the mind of self and other. She becomes able to engage in the conscious substitution of ‘fancied for real’. The child is conscious of independent meanings, and is able to manipulate communication appropriately in her ‘struggle for freedom in action and the struggle for achievement of status’.

Piaget (1965) was the first who studied systematically young children’s concepts of lying. He suggested that children were largely egocentric before the age of seven or eight. He used the term pseudo-deception to explain the apparent deception of these egocentric children. Piaget believed that the young child is not interested in truth, per se, but instead is a creative thinker who merely entertains possibilities. Piaget reported three studies. In the first one, children were asked what a lie is. Six-year-olds and older answered that lying was saying something that was not true. In the second study, a story was told in which the speaker was ignorant about some true state of affairs, and said something wrong, or the subjects themselves were trapped into saying something wrong by being asked to estimate the experimenter’s age. Some of the 6-7-year-olds called these wrong statements lies, even though they were mere mistakes of ignorance without any deceptive intentions. In the third experiment children were told moral dilemma stories in which two
characters were untrusted. One of them had no intention to misinform but produced severe distortions of the truth because of, for example, wishful thinking. The other character wanted to deceive but deviated from the truth only to a minor degree. The results showed that 6-7-year-olds judged the ‘severe distortionist’ as naughtier, while at 10 years old they judged the one with deceptive intentions as naughtier. Thus, Piaget distinguished between two different developmental styles of moral reasoning. Until the age of 8, ‘moral objectivity’ is a style which focuses on the visible, the external events and sanctions. As such, curses, mistakes, and other remarks were equated with lies, being assessed in proportion to their uncomfortable consequences. The mature style, ‘moral subjectivity’, focuses on inner processes such as the liar’s intention to deceive.

Few other studies have been carried out to investigate the developmental changes in children’s understanding of the concept of lying. Peterson, Peterson and Seeto (1983) presented to their subjects ten televised stories in which puppets act out scenarios depicting 10 different sorts of events leading to a statement that could be categorised either as the truth or a lie. They included statements that consist of exaggeration, age guess, direction guess, white lie, practical joke, altruistic lie, swearing, self-protective lies with 3 consequences: punished, believed, and neutral lie. They have found that 5-year-olds clearly understood some concept of lying as adults do, but tended to confuse these with moral prohibitions. For instance, 90% of the 5-year-olds equated protective lies and directions guesses as lies, 95% of the them equated altruistic lies as lies, similarly to the percentage of older children and adults. Whereas, 90% of 5-year-olds defined directions guesses as lies, in comparison to 69% of 8-year-olds, and only 30% of adults. Strichartz and Burton (1990) explained these results by saying that people do not use a simple definitional rule that allows a dichotomised groups classification of lies or truth.

Wimmer, Gruber and Perner (1984) investigated whether 4-10-year-old children take into account the speaker’s intention in their use of the verb lying, or fail to do so. They present a series of experiments with an information chain of three characters that included exhaustive combination of transferring misleading information. The results show that young children’s definition of a lie is based on the actual falsity of the statement. Wimmer, Gruber and Perner concluded that acquisition of a correct adult usage of the verb ‘to lie’ occurs somewhere between the ages of 4 and 7. That meaning of the verb ‘to
lie' is first based on objective facts and then the progressive mental states and intentions of the speaker are integrated.

Strichartz (1990) applied Coleman’s (1981) paradigm defining a lie on the basis of the falsity of the statement, the speaker’s intention to deceive, and the speaker’s belief in his statement. They investigated different age groups (nursery school, pre-school, grade 1, grade 5, and adults) in the use of these three elements in judging whether a statement was a lie or the truth. They have found that pre-schoolers and first graders clearly dichotomised their answers based solely on factuality. Fifth graders began to consider belief as well as factuality when labelling a statement as a lie. For truth, they weighed factuality most heavily. For adults the belief system of the speaker overrode both the factuality of the statement and the intent of the speaker.

Meares and Orlay (1988) examined the young child’s comprehension of secrecy. They considered that the child’s knowledge that others do not know what she knows is of prime importance to the ability to lie. They were interested in when children come to distinguish between “self” and ‘not self’, and argued that when children demonstrate the concepts of secrecy and deception it is clear that such a distinction is being made. They concluded that the concept of secrecy and the ability to lie is developed in the fifth year. They added “These findings suggest that at the beginning of the fifth year of life, the large majority of children know that it is possible to avoid getting into trouble, disapproval or punishment by lying. The fact, however, that some children lie earlier than this may not necessarily indicate the achievement of the ‘inner-outer’ distinction. Although the behaviour of some children might have been based on the knowledge that their thought was not accessible to others, other children may have adopted the strategy through imitation of an older sibling” (Meares and Orlay, 1988, p.309).

To conclude, following Piaget, research has confirmed the developmental sequence. Firstly children define lying according to the degree of distortion of perceived reality, then they reason their definition on internal mental states (beliefs and intentions). It seems that the change occurs somewhere in latency. Research in theory of mind (TOM) may add theoretical and experimental background in understanding the processes the concept of deception. Research on TOM produced another answer to the question of when children start to acquire the mental capacity of lying.
CHAPTER 4: DECEPTION AS A MARKER OF THEORY OF MIND

4.1 Theory of mind

Lies differ in their complexity and sophistication. Leekham (1992) proposed three levels of lying. She described the first level as manipulating the behaviour of another person without the intention (or even the idea) of influencing the other’s beliefs. Leekham suggested that small children who may deny misbehaviour to avoid punishment or falsely claim to have done something good to get a reward tell such lies. These are generally ‘learned’ strategies, employed without understanding that saying something untrue can affect the listener’s beliefs. These simple lies often fail because small children tend to lie at the wrong time or neglect important issues such as covering their tracks. The second level of lying takes into account the liar’s awareness of the listener’s beliefs. The liar must now keep in mind that the false statement may manipulate the listener’s beliefs, that the listener will evaluate the statement as being true or false, and that the listener will, on the basis of the new belief (if the lie has been accepted), evaluate future statements in the light of the new belief. Liars who have reached this level of developmental sophistication are much more effective at deception than the first level liars. On reaching the third level of lying competence, the liar recognises not only the effects of the words spoken on the listener’s beliefs but also that the listener may be evaluating the liar’s own beliefs about the words - in other words, how sincere the liar is. Thus, skilled lying involves convincing the listener that the speaker believes what he or she is saying and has a truthful intention. A skilled liar also continuously ‘reads’ the listener’s non-verbal behaviour and, in response to feedback from the listener, adjusts both verbal and non-verbal communications to be more credible. This skill markedly enhances one’s capacity to manipulate other people’s beliefs and behaviours.

Children’s capacity to develop lying skills has been experimentally studied with connection to the theory of mind. Theory of mind is a capacity to be developed through interpersonal relations between the child and caregivers. It is a process by which the child conceives of himself as having a mind different from others in so far as he has his own feelings, thoughts, beliefs, and so on, and other people have theirs.
Premack and Woodruff (1978) argued that acts of deception would be a good indicator of the presence of a TOM in the deceiver, on the ground that deception involves the manipulation of others’ behaviour by influencing their beliefs about reality. They state that to hold a theory of mind is to subscribe to a special sort of explanatory framework, according to which we construe people in terms of internal mental states such as their beliefs, desires, intentions and emotions.

They gave chimpanzees problems to solve concerning the plight of the human actor represented. Each video showed the actor engaged in a particular form of behaviour. For example, shivering in front of an unlit heater. The chimps were presented with two pictures, only one of which represented the solution to the problem (e.g. a lit wick for the heater). The fact that these trained chimpanzees tended to choose the pictures reflecting solutions to the actor’s problems was taken as evidence that they understood the actor’s purpose or intention in each situation, and that the solution would fulfil this intention. If this were true, then presumably it would imply an extremely complex and sensitive understanding of others. It seems to go beyond the level of tracking observable behavioural contingencies to the level of inference from a theory about minds (that control behaviour).

Essentially, Premack and Woodruff were describing ‘folk psychology’, the way in which people explain behaviour of others by referring to what these others might think or feel. Folk psychology also goes by the name of ‘belief desire psychology’, as these two components of mind seem to capture its essence. Thus if one knows what a person desires, and what she believes about the object of her desire, one has sufficient knowledge to make an educated guess about how she will behave. For example, if I know that you desire chocolate, and that you believe that there is chocolate in a nearby cupboard, then the reasonable prediction would be that you would go to the cupboard to get the chocolate. In the case of the above experiments one might explain the chimpanzees’ performances by saying that they understood the actor’s desire to be warm.

To generalise, our everyday understanding of people in these terms has a notable coherence. Since an actor has certain beliefs and desires he or she engages in certain intentional actions, the success of which result in certain emotional reactions. The supposition is that this understanding guides all social action and interaction.
Wellman (1990) claimed that there are two intuitive aspects of our understanding of the mental states of self and other: ontological and causal. The ontological aspect picks out mental contents, states, and processes as a domain to consider, and distinguishes that mental world from the real world of physical objects or behavioural processes. The essence of the ontological aspect, therefore, is our understanding of the difference between thoughts or ideas on the one hand and objects or behaviour on the other. For example a thought about a house is not the same sort of thing as a picture of a house. The contents of states of the mind are internal, mental, and subjective, whereas the contents and states of the world are external, substantial, and objective. The essence of the causal aspect is that states of the mind (thoughts, beliefs, ideas, emotions, and desires) are also causally related to that physical-behavioural world. Causal influence goes from the mind to the world and from the world to the mind. Mental states cause actions in the world and the world causes mental states.

Developmental researchers have been occupied by the question of when children first appear competent to hold to any such beliefs about beliefs, and what should count as evidence for or against such an emerging TOM.

Dennett (1978) argued that understanding false belief might constitute a discriminative test of a TOM, in that it becomes possible to distinguish unambiguously between the child’s (true) belief and the child’s awareness of someone else’s different (false) belief. Wimmer and Perner (1983) published a seminal study of three- and four-year-olds’ understanding of false belief. In the task, a character named Maxi put some chocolate in a cupboard, and then left the scene. In Maxi’s absence, his mother moved the chocolate to a new location, a drawer. Adults, and even 4-year-olds, understand that Maxi’s belief, that his chocolate is in the cupboard, is now false, since it has now been moved without his knowledge. Three-year-olds, however, do not seem to understand that people can have false beliefs. For example, they claim that Maxi thinks the chocolate is in its new location, the drawer, even though he has no access to that fact. Many studies have replicated these findings (Flavell et al., 1990; Gopnik and Slaughter, 1991; Lillard and Flavell, 1992).

Chandler, Fritz and Hala (1989) criticised Wimmer and Perner’s procedure on the ground that their task conflated the active capacity to entertain beliefs about beliefs with a
different ability to comment verbally upon this understanding, and that the task was tortuous and more computationally complex than necessary. They developed a more direct study of 2-4 year old children’s abilities to act deceptively. A treasure was hidden by a puppet, which left visible tracks to the hiding place. The child’s task was to make it difficult for another person to find the treasure. They have not found any significant relations between age and use of different deceptive strategies, whereas the most sophisticated strategy was not restricted to older children, and the older and more verbal of these groups were better able to justify their deceptive acts.

Sodian, Taylor, Harris and Perner (1991) replicated the findings that such young children could be brought to wipe out telltale tracks, but only after massive prompting. They noted that the mere enjoyment in the activity of wiping out tracks might cause the effects. To test this interpretation they added another condition to Chandler, Fritz and Hala’s task, in which the objective was to make it easy for a friendly person to find the treasure. In the other condition, the child had to make it difficult for the other person, presented to the child as an opponent who would keep the treasure if he found it. Children could either wipe out the tracks, or reinforce their clarity by adding an extra line. It has been found that few three-year-olds did choose the right strategy, whereas all four-year-olds applied the strategy of reinforcing and wiping out tracks in the correct selective way. Hence, these findings show that three-year-olds can be lead to learn to apply deceptive techniques, but they show no clear understanding of their effect. Russel, Mauthner, Sharpe and Tidswell (1991) replicated the findings of this kind of competitor-cooperator paradigm.

Peskin (1992) investigated the development of the ability to conceal, as part of the process of lying. She described an event in which a 3-year-old asked his mother to go out of the kitchen so he could take a cookie. Peskin explained that in this case the child did not realise that it had been the mother’s informational state that would prevent the taking of the cookie, and not her actual lack of presence. Her experiments were new in the sense that children needed to hide information about their own preferences, and not hide objects. In the paradigm, a puppet (‘bad’) character, to the young child’s disappointment, always chose the sticker that the subjects wanted. The only way to avoid the bad puppet taking the child’s much wanted sticker was to conceal the information about which sticker was desired, either by misinforming or by refusing to inform the puppet when asked. A
second puppet (‘good’) character also participated, but he always ensured that he did not choose the child’s desired sticker. Peskin reported a marked development between the ages of 3 and 5 years in children’s ability to conceal information. In a situation of high affect involvement, 3-year-olds did not know to misinform or withhold information from the competitor, whereas 87% of them knew to physically exclude the competitor. She concluded that the success of the older children in concealing information indicated their newly acquired representational understanding that to influence another’s behaviour, one must influence that person’s mental state.

Thus far, research in understanding the concept of lying has shown that the capacity, as a cognitive developmental task, is achieved during latency years, in 8- and 9-year-olds according to Piaget, and 10-and 11-year-olds according to Strichartz and Burton. TOM research findings, as mentioned previously, have found that it is just at 4 years old that children can be classified as having a TOM. Thus, understanding the concept of lying, in terms of taking into account other’s mind, as adults do, is achieved later than acquiring a TOM. It is clear that the task of verbally defining lying, as discussed in the previous sections, is much more complex for children to operate. Tapping the concept of lying directly by asking children to define statements or situations displayed in the laboratory is much more complicated than tapping it through game-like procedures. The acquisition of a mature concept of lying requires the child to reflect upon her thoughts and behaviour, to sort and distinguish different types of lying. She needs to structure within her own mind the knowledge about actions, and to process her own experiences of lying or being lied to, together with the accompanying moral elements, and to verbalise it in an abstract way (Whiten 1996). It is explicit mind reading in the sense of awareness of others’ desires and beliefs, as we explicitly recognise and differentiate states of mind, states that have specific labels, like beliefs and desires.

How does one arrive at a concept of a self who is both comparable to and differentiated from other selves who share the vital characteristic of having minds? How does an infant become aware that he is like others in having mind, yet different from others in so far as he has his own feelings, thoughts, beliefs, and so on, and other people have theirs? Over the last decade philosophers and psychologists have raised the issue of how these theory of mind abilities develop. The debate is between theory-theory and simulation views (for
recent extensive review see Carruthers, 1996). Fodor (1987; 1992) in particular, has proposed that our knowledge of folk-psychological theory is innate, developing in the child through a process of maturation rather than learning. Gordon (1986) and Heal (1986) each proposed a simulationist alternative according to which what lies at the root of our mature mind reading abilities is not any sort of theory, but rather an ability to project ourselves imaginatively into another person’s perspective, simulating their mental activity with our own.

The empirically elusive and conceptually complex problem of developmental continuity (Kagan, 1982; Emde, 1988) has led developmentalists towards psychoanalytic constructs of object relations theory (Bretherton, 1985; Sroufe, 1989; Westen, 1990; Bretherton, 1992). Increasingly, work in developmental psychiatry and psychology is focusing on the pathways through which internal representations of early experiences with the primary figures in childhood come to have an impact upon the formation of relationships in later childhood and adulthood and culminate in the types of relationships disorders and psychopathological conditions that appear across the life span (Cole and Putnam, 1992; Westen and Cohen, 1993; Manley et al., 1994).

Parental mirroring of the infant’s mental states has long been regarded by psychoanalytic theorists as a central mechanism of early psychic development (Winnicott, 1965; Bion 1967; Mahler, 1975; Kohut, 1977). The child’s growing recognition of the existence of mental states (feelings, beliefs, desires and intentions) arises through the shared understanding of her own mental world and that of the caregiver. The caregiver reflects upon the infant’s mental experience and represents it to her. Parental mirroring provides a kind of feedback for the infant. Winnicott (1965) claimed that the mother is looking at the baby and what she looks like is related to what she sees there.

Research on adult attachment has begun documenting the relationship between the mother’s attachment status (the security of her attachment to her mother) and the attachment status of her child (Haft and Slade, 1989; Main and Hesse, 1990; Ainsworth and Eichenberg, 1991; Bus, 1992; Bus, 1996; van IJzendoorn and Bakermans-Kranenburg, 1996). The present phase in the study of attachment is identified with an increasingly widespread interest in representational processes (Bretherton and Waters, 1985). The move to the level of mental representation in attachment theory and research
implies an emphasis on the cognitive organisation and reconstruction of childhood attachment experiences in line with the cognitive sciences. Main (1991) proposed that differences in attachment organisations during childhood are strongly linked to the quality of meta-cognition in the parent, and that incoherent adult narratives indicating poorly structured multiple models of attachment relationships are a key cause of the child’s insecure pattern of attachment. Main (1991) further argued that the absence of meta-cognitive capacity, the inability to “understand the merely representational nature of their own (and others’) thinking” (p.128), makes infants and toddlers vulnerable to the inconsistency of the caregiver’s behaviour. They are unable to step beyond the immediate reality of experience and grasp the distinction between appearance and reality, between immediate experience and the mental state that might underlie it. Thus it is not just maternal sensitivity and care giving that might be reliable predictors of the quality of the parent-child relationship. No less important is the mother’s meta-cognitive capacity, her understanding of mental states and her readiness to contemplate these in a coherent manner, which should predict secure attachment. Fonagy uses the term ‘reflective’ or ‘psychological self-function’ to describe the intra-psychic and the interpersonal developmental achievement which emerges fully only in the context of a secure attachment relationship (Fonagy et al., 1993; Fonagy et al., 1994).

Fonagy (1993) assumed that the role of the caregiver is to provide a creative social mirror, which can capture for the infant aspects of his activity and then add an organising perspective, i.e. the presumption that a person’s behaviour can be understood in terms of mental states. ‘Good-enough mental mirroring’ (Winnicott, 1967) is a mental process which facilitates the understanding that one’s own, as well as the object’s actions are driven by a mind with feelings, wishes, attitudes, and beliefs, and that this process depends on observation of the other. Fonagy (1991) claimed that we familiarise ourselves with the other’s mind and, consequently, we are getting to know our own minds. It is through the growth of the representation of the mental states of the other, that similar states in the self can be included, generalised and elaborated.

Meta-cognitive monitoring is biologically pre-programmed and will spontaneously emerge unless its development is inhibited by the dual disadvantage of the absence of a safe relationship and the experience of maltreatment in the context of an intimate
relationship. It is because the theory of mind and reflective self-function evolve in the context of intense interpersonal relationships that the fear of the mind of another can have such devastating consequences on the emergence of social understanding. Fonagy (1995) applied the Adult Attachment Interview to explore the intergenerational nature and origins of the BPD and its association with experience of childhood maltreatment. Not surprisingly there was a highly significant difference in the distribution among the three principal types of attachment pattern (secure-autonomous, dismissive, and entangled-preoccupied) between psychiatric and control groups. More than half of the patients (60%) were rated as preoccupied, compared to only 16% in the control group. The increased number of preoccupied classification appears to be a characteristic of the entire psychiatric group. Borderline patients were, however, differentiated by a combination of three characteristics: (1) higher prevalence of sexual abuse reported in the Adult Attachment Interview; (2) significantly lower ratings on the reflective self-function scale; (3) a significantly higher rating on the lack of resolution of abuse. These findings are consistent with the view that individuals with experience of severe maltreatment in childhood, who respond to the experience by an inhibition of reflective self-function, are less likely to resolve this abuse and are more likely to manifest borderline psychopathology. The findings are consistent with the model originally proposed by Fonagy (1991), namely that manifestations of the borderline personality disorder may be understood as a voluntary forgoing of the capacity to represent the mental state of self and others as part of an adaptation to maltreatment by an attachment figure whose mental state toward the child was frankly malevolent. Since the capacity to mentalise or to acquire a ‘theory of mind’ is based on free exploration of the mental state of the other, the normal social and emotional development of these children is profoundly disrupted. They develop along an ‘unusual pathway’ (Claverely et al., 1994) leading to pathology. They go on to disrupt defensively their own meta-cognitive monitoring processes in all subsequent intimate relationships. They unconsciously, but deliberately, limit their capacity to depict feelings and thoughts in themselves and in others.

It is now generally accepted that the infant is from the start an active perceiving and learning organism with early representational capacities and preparedness for the structure of the physical and social world around it (Stern 1985). Observational studies show dialogue-like interactions between child and caregiver in which infants reveal great
sensitivity to the expressions and, with development, to the intentions of others (Emde, 1981; 1988).

In fact, TOM must be a prerequisite for the definition of lying as it constitutes the sheer meta-knowledge about one’s own thinking and the differences between facts, intentions and beliefs. Children younger than 8 years old use lying procedures. Thus, the question is what is happening in the younger children’s minds when they lie. Does it that these children use lying procedures without a complete understand of the concept? Do they lie without considering others’ beliefs and intentions? As mentioned earlier, research has not reached a definite conclusion.

Research on TOM carried out on chimpanzees explores the dilemma whether they possess some form of mind-reading ability or whether they are very clever behaviourists (Smith, 1996) learning behaviour patterns from prior contingencies. Others regard this dilemma as a developmental sequence in the acquisition of the capacity to lie (Mitchell, 1986; Leekham, 1992). When integrating theories and research dealing with the acquisition of the concept of deception and TOM a general sequence is discerned. The exact age at which each phase occurs is still under debate. Theory and research on deception in nature, like Mitchell’s (1986), allocated four developmental phases. First, passive deception, where the misleading information is always on display. Second, pre-programmed deception, ‘do p given that q is the case’. Third, learned programming, ‘do any action p given that this has resulted in some desired consequences q in the past’. Fourth, a form of meta programming - deception is worked out and planned. These phases are implemented somewhat more widely into Leekham’s (1992) model (mentioned in chapter 4). She described the first level as manipulating the behaviour of another person without the intention (or even the idea) of influencing the other’s beliefs. These can be regarded as generally ‘learned’ strategies, employed without understanding that saying something untrue can affect the listener’s beliefs. Her second level of lying takes into account the liar’s awareness of the listener’s beliefs. The liar must now keep in mind that the false statement may manipulate the listener’s beliefs, that the listener will evaluate the statement as being true or false, and that the listener will, on the basis of the new belief, evaluate future statements in the light of the new belief. Liars who have reached this level of developmental sophistication are much more effective at deception than the first level
liars. On reaching the third level of lying competence, the liar recognises not only the effects of the words spoken on the listener's beliefs but also that the listener may be evaluating the liar's own beliefs about the words.

Our proposed classification of mature and immature lying assumes that individuals having relatively well integrated self who acquired a capacity of TOM would operate mature lying. Immature lying reflects the presence of varying degrees of lack of integrated self, where the concept of self and other is blurred and the capacity to have TOM is impaired. Leekham's (1992) analysis of the development of deception constitutes the basis for this proposition.

Anna Freud (1965) differentiated between fantasy and delinquent lies. Insofar as the child attempts to remove threats perceived by his non-integrated self, he may respond by what seems to be a genuine denial. In accord with simulationists' views and along with psychoanalytical terms it has been proposed that in the case of 'good-enough' parenting (in Winnicott's terms), if parents respond adequately to the child's needs, she gradually develops a capacity of TOM (Fonagy 1991). We propose that concurrently, the child may use lying as a facilitative mechanism in developing TOM. In that case, she finds herself on the positive and normal path in developing a distinct self. In cases, where threats are overwhelming, when parents tend not to consider their child's needs for separation, lying procedures can not be developed similarly. The wish to escape from intolerable physical or psychic pain brings the child to learn to affirm the 'not real' occurrences (fantasy lying). Since the capacity of having a TOM has not been achieved yet, lying is used in a rather primitive manner. Learned-programmed deception is developed as a result of the need to alleviate the threat, and by repeated internalisation of telling lies accompanied by feeling comfort. Through instrumental learning, the child uses deception without being able to assimilate the concept of mature lying, and without the capacity to generalise its facilitative quality (in achieving a separate self). In that sense, lying is completely instrumental, without comprehension of its complex construct linking between facts, one's and the other's beliefs and intentions.

What are the benefits of telling lies from the perspective of the developing self? We argue that lying forms an essential part in the development of the child's developing self, and that it is carried out further into adult life. We assume that acquiring a mature concept of
lying is a task which implicitly facilitates the child’s awareness of herself as having her own beliefs and intentions, beliefs and intentions which might be different from others’. Moreover, the child, at the same time, and as a consequence of making this distinction, understands that she can manipulate other’s mind and hence, other’s behaviour. She learns to conceive of the relations between mental states and behaviour by applying the mechanism of lying in interpersonal relations.

Most developmental researchers who have been occupied by the question of when children first appear competent to hold to any such beliefs about beliefs, and what should count as evidence for or against such an emerging TOM agree that this capacity is fully reached towards the end of the fourth year of life.

To sum up, research on TOM explores our everyday understanding of people in terms that have a notable coherence. It is our explicit understanding that since an actor has certain beliefs and desires he or she engages in certain intentional actions, the success of which result in certain emotional reactions. The supposition is that this understanding guides all social action and interaction. The capacity to understand lying is reached later and the capacity of TOM is proposed to constitute the building blocks of this understanding. Lastly, we come to assume immature and mature lying following the path from learned behaviour to understanding others’ minds.

Another domain that explores the child’s developmental capacity to differentiate between internal and external states, and may shed more light on the issue, is theory and research in pretend play, with which the next section is concerned.

4.2 Theory of mind and the capacity to pretend

Pretend-play will be referred to as a developmental prerequisite for the acquisition of a mature concept of lying, as lying is defined as a communicative device, trying to mislead others.

Pretend play can be analysed as a derivative of TOM. Hobson (1993) argued that the individual’s understanding of minds is interpersonal in nature. He stated that in order to acquire knowledge of the nature of persons with minds, an individual need to have experience of reciprocal, affectively patterned relations with others. In this context, the
studies on pretend play may add to our understanding of the distinction between what is perceived as real and not-real. In pretence we deliberately distort reality.

Austin’s (1979) analysis is an example of the link between understanding the concept of lying and being truthful or deceptive. He referred to the limits between pretence, ‘real feelings’, and behaviour.

“...The contrast in the cases of a man who is angry and another, behaving in a similar way, who is only pretending to be, is that the former feels angry, whereas the latter does not, but in any case it is not this that constitutes the differences between the fact that the one is angry and the fact that the other is only pretending to be. Pretence is always insulated, as it were, from reality. This limit may be vague, but it must exist. It is a not unimportant point that it is usually obvious when someone is pretending. If a man who is behaving as if he were angry goes so far as to smash furniture or commits assault, he has passed the limit. He is not pretending and it is useless for him to protest afterwards that he did not feel angry. Far from this statement being proof that he was not angry, it would be discounted even if it were accepted as true. The claim that ‘he was angry but he did not feel angry’ is not self-contradictory, although it is normally false. It seems that we want more evidence of the same kind, not a special piece of evidence of a different kind. But, it is also common enough for someone who is really angry to behave in no way violently” (Austin 1979, p.173).

Austin (1979) defined pretence as any activity that involves stretching one ‘reality’ over another, or holding “one thing in front of another in order to protect or conceal or disguise it” (Austin 1979, p.175) as opposed to a play in which activities are rather for the purpose of fun.

Piaget (1962) developed a cognitive model, which explained the nature of pretend play. He described phases of children’s playing as roughly analogous to stages of cognitive development: the sensory-motor play in the sensory-motor period, the symbolic or pretend-play in the pre-operational period, and games with rules in the concrete operational period. He argued that pretend-play is an extreme form of assimilation (assimilation is the activity of taking in and changing new information to ‘fit’ into previously established mental schemata). A present object that is vaguely comparable to an absent one can evoke a mental image of it and be assimilated to it, resulting in the creation of a symbol. Thus, the ability to pretend depends on this capacity to represent absent objects and situations. Lillard (1993) introduced five features that contribute to the construction of pretence. A pretender; a reality; a mental representation that is different
from reality (a child assumes a teaspoon as a hammer, she represents a hammer, rather than a teaspoon); a layering of the representation over reality, in such way that they exist within the same space and time; awareness on the part of the pretender of components 2, 3, and 4. In pretence, there is a need to have the capacity to keep separately the real and the pretend situations. There are clearly two separate worlds, one layered and projected over the other. The pretend world is not expected to seep into the real world (one does not expect the teaspoon to become a real hammer in real life), nor is the real world is expected to adopt features of the pretend one (one does not expect to use a hammer as a teaspoon, in real life). For Leslie (1987), the child’s pretend play involves any of three features. (1) Object substitution - has the child pretended a shell was a cat? (2) Attribution of pretend properties - has the child pretends the dolly’s clean face is dirty? (3) Imaginary objects - has the child pretended that a spoon is there when it is not?

Leslie (1987) argued that pretence is an area in which children show early competence for understanding mental representations. He divided the capacity for representation into two distinct types of representations. Primary representation is related to the basic evolutionary and ecological point of representing aspects of the world in an accurate, faithful, and literal way (these representations are the major source of the infant’s stored knowledge). Secondary representations are freed from their usual meaning, so that one object can substitute for a different object without the child’s confusing of the actual semantic relations. According to him, the process that brings the child to develop another type of representational system for the use of pretence, is the same as the one used to understand mental states, and pretence is an early manifestation of that. Lillard (1993) claimed that no experimental evidence had supported Leslie’s theory.

Hobson (1990) introduced his own theory according to which.

“The forms of pretence are as they are simply because pretending involves the exercise of the child’s awareness of the relations that exist between human beings and the world” (Hobson 1990, p.116).

In his view, only through an early pre-reflective capacity to perceive the orientations of others, by experiencing interpersonal relations which involve reciprocally co-ordinated feelings between two or more people, do children later come to recognise their own capacity for holding multiple representations of given objects, and thereby achieve the
capacity to pretend. Once infants have perceived that another person can have a different orientation toward a shared situation, they can construe the world as if they were someone else or as if the world meant something else. Hobson introduced some experiments, but neither is specifically directed to validate his assumptions.

Developmental research has continued to support the idea of early play emerging in the matrix of the caregiver-child relationship, both in the sense of mastery of return of the caregiver in games and in terms of what is shared through repeated experiences. For recent review of research see Emde (1997).

It seems that in pretend-play there is a clear causal relation between mental states and behaviour. In pretend play, specifically, the relations are contradictory, so that, for example, when a child pretends the plastic apple is real, she will not go so far as to actually eat it. In order to understand mental representations one must first understand that one mental entity can represent another, and that an object or situation can be interpreted in many ways. Hence, the ability to see one object (in reality) comprising of two properties at once is a precondition for developing theory of mind and pretence.

When do children acquire the ability to pretend? Lillard (1993), in a comprehensive review of studies on pretend play, has shown that pretend object substitution usually emerges by twenty four months of age, but over the next two years children become increasingly able to substitute objects whose function and appearance are clearly different from the objects for which they are being substituted. Two-year-olds can pretend a toothbrush with a pencil but not with a cup. They also may be able to use a block but not a toy car as a telephone, whereas four-year-olds are able to use a toy car as a telephone. Recently, Emde (1997) also observed that the world of reality at two years of age often involves a variety of repeated experiences and routines with alternative imaginary worlds that are to some extent practised and have shared meanings with parents.

Flavell, Green and Flavell (1987) study is in accord with Vygotsky’s (1978) suggestion that pretend play is a ‘zone of proximal development’, so that in this mode the child might generally be able to operate at a cognitive level higher than that at which she operates in non-pretence context. Flavell, Green and Flavell (1987) studied the capacity to apply two identity labels to the same object. Children had to identify whether a candle apple (which the experimenter identified as a candle and pretended to eat) looked like an apple or
looked like a candle, and whether that thing was really and truly an apple or a candle. Their results showed that a child younger than 4-year-olds tend either to claim the object looks like and is an apple, or both looks like and is a candle. Kuczaj (1981; 1981) also confirmed Vygotsky’s assertions. In Kuczaj’s study, children were better able to reason hypothetically about fantasy characters than about their own parents. They were better able to answer ‘what would have happened if Bingo (a toy dragon) had played football yesterday?’ than to answer ‘what would have happened if your mother had played football yesterday?’ Hence, thinking in terms of pretence seem to be more flexible than thinking in terms of the real world.

Another subject of investigation is the use of two labels for the same object. In applying object labels, children are biased against using two labels to refer to one and the same object, but paradoxically, 3-year-olds, in pretend-play, willingly and without hesitation claim that ‘blocks are cookies, sand piles are cakes, and bananas are telephones, while not trying to eat block cookies or sand cakes’ (Lillard 1993).

It seems that pretend-play appears to be an area of rather advanced skill, being performed before emergence of the knowledge about the relations between real and pretend identities.

Our interest is in understanding the ability to represent other’s mental representations. To play another character, one must represent the world as that person represents it. No studies have examined children’s pretend-play with respect to the level of meta-representational knowledge they show in their character portrayals (Lillard 1993). Some theorists have suggested the link between pretend-play and social-cognitive development (Flavell et al., 1990). It is not clear whether the capacity for pretend-play is a training ground for social-cognitive skills or vice versa (Lillard, 1993). Socio-dramatic play emerges around 3 years of age (Fein, 1981), but not until around 5 years of age do children genuinely intercoordinate their actions and easily incorporate other players’ unexpected inventions, and add their own variations to the characters they play (Mathews, 1977). Most of the studies of pretence did not investigate the way in which children understand the representational component of pretence. Lillard (1992) carried out a study to test the hypothesis that children first understand pretending only as action, and only later, come to see it as involving mental representations. She found that 4-year-olds
seemed to interpret pretence as the action alone, and failed to consider it as a mental representational state. Lillard (1993) concluded that,

“Contrary to what many have supposed, young children may not mentally represent other’s mental representations even in pretend situations. They may, instead, simply think of pretending as acting in a certain way... Children’s socio-dramatic play does not indicate that they understand meta-representation at 3 years of age” (Lillard, 1993, p.366).

Recently, Emde (1997) referred to imaginative psychic reality as a future-oriented mental activity that may involve in coming up with new possibilities and practising them in an imaginative way in future scenarios. He also concluded that pretence is a form of imaginative activity occurring earlier in development than the child’s ability to imagine other mental states.

Thus far, summarising theories and research on pretend-play, we conclude that pretend-play functions as a process by which the child practices and develops concept of a clear causal relation between mental states and behaviour, between psychic reality and psychic imagination. It is the arena where emergence of the knowledge about the relations between real and pretend identities occurs. The question of the effect of pretend-play and development of the capacity of TOM remains open, although we have observed that the distinction between reality and imagination in pretend-play occurs earlier than having some concept of others’ minds.

Before exploring possible links between borderline personality disorders, deficiencies in achieving TOM and acquiring a mature concept of deception, a brief description of the normal and pathological motives for lying is outlined.
CHAPTER 5: MOTIVES FOR LYING

Earlier we referred to the creative function of lying (Forrester, 1997). Intentional lying is a conscious goal-directed activity. In this chapter we classify lying vis-a-vis conscious, subconscious and unconscious motives. In reviewing the psychoanalytic and psychiatric literature covering deception, one finds various aspects such as lying in children, delinquent aspects of lying, and the psychopathology of lying. Lying in itself is not a symptom of mental disorder, nor necessarily a negative attribute.

Following Ford’s (1996) classification we suggest four basic sources for lying. Autonomy can be categorised under perhaps the most important developmental task of the growing infant. The others, namely, control, denial - repression, and wish-fulfilment, are protective utilities.

(a) Autonomy - Bok (1978), in a sociological analysis, revealed that those who have been lied to on important matters such as affection of caregivers or spouse may look back on their past beliefs and actions in the new light of the discovered lies. When they understand that they were manipulated, that the deceit made them unable to make choices to themselves according to the most adequate information available, they might be unable to act as they would have wanted to act had they known all along. In such cases they might decide to abandon choosing for themselves and let others decide for them - as guardians, financial advisors, etc.

At what point do one’s own self-boundaries end and others’ begin? From the child’s perspective the question is whether her parents can read her mind.

Lying becomes an important and essential mechanism by which the child defines her autonomy. One feature of lying is keeping secrecy. Yung (1953) gave an example of the significance for him of a secret he kept as a child. He describes ‘a little mannequin’ that he carved at age ten, making for it a small bed and woollen coat in his pencil case, adding ‘a smooth blackish stone from the Rhine, and hiding the whole in the attic,

“No one could discover my secret and destroy it. I felt safe, and the tormenting sense of being at odds with myself was gone... This possession of a secret had a very powerful formative influence on my character: I consider it the essential fact of my boyhood” (Yung 1953, p.21).
Tausk (1933) stated that the striving for the right to have secrets from which the parents are excluded is one of the most powerful factors in the formation of the ego. Woolf (1949) was perhaps the first to investigate lying developmentally. He stated that the child couldn’t lie before she is 4 years old because she does not know the truth. He claimed that it is just after age 5 that the concept of lying becomes clear and there is a greater ability to distinguish reality from fantasy. Ekstein and Caruth (1972) referred to the concept of intimacy as a mature psychic capacity to simultaneously maintain and share secrets. Smith (1968) suggested that the differentiation process of the self (‘I-not I’, in his terms) is the indicator of the first lie. He gave an example.

“Johnny has discovered that pulling the cat’s tail is a fascinating experience. He is not interested in why it is a fascinating experience nor, presumably, is the average parent. It just is. He is told, “No, no,” or “Bad boy” and various punishments are administered. However the behaviour continues, modified only to the extent of becoming slightly surreptitious. Then one day from his upstairs bedroom comes a mighty meow, followed immediately by the sound of shattered glass. Mother rushing up, passes the cat rushing down, and upstairs she meets Johnny’s sidewise, guilty look as he edges slowly away from the scene of the crime. A glance at the bedroom reveals a broken lamp on the floor, dislodged from its customary place, it is clear, by a cat bent on escape. Searching helplessly for an appropriate reaction, the mother says, “Johnny, did you pull the cat’s tail?” The question is really rhetorical - merely a bit of distracted maternal monologue in the face of the obvious. However, something in Johnny’s stance and strained expression indicates that he is taking the question seriously. Her son making his first agonising decision confronts the mother, now silent. The moment culminates in a “No” as frightened, as it is stubborn. The look between them at that point says clearly that both know that he is lying, but this silent knowledge is shared across a new gulf between them, maintained by his steadfastness in the overt expression of lie” (Smith, 1968, p.65).

This gulf is not merely the distance created by a child’s guilt. This act of deciding bears witness to separateness accomplished, and at the same time is a decisive step into separateness and autonomy. Kohut (1966) suggested that the undetected lie of the child reveals a shortcoming in the idealised omniscient parent. Hence, achieving parent’s representation other than the idealised omniscient is part of the process of separation from the parents (or other dominant caregivers).

In adolescence, this issue is often reactivated as a result of the psychic stress that contributes to the fragmentation of the self. The adolescent’s struggles over separation
and individuation often reactivate behaviours such as secrecy and deceit in an effort to become an autonomous person (Goldberg, 1973).

(Two) Control - Bok (1978) stated that both violence and deception are means not only to unjust coercion, but also are used as defences. She argued that,

"Deception, like violence, can be used for sheer survival. Choices depend on an estimate of what is the case. Lies distort this information and therefore the perceived situation, as well as one's choices. Lies affect the distribution of control and power. They add to that of the liar, and diminish that of the deceived. A lie may misinform so as to obscure some objective, something the deceived person wanted to do or obtain. It may make the objective unattainable or no longer desirable. Lies may also eliminate or obscure relevant alternatives. At times, lies foster the belief that there are more alternatives than is really the case; at other times lies may lead to the unnecessary loss of confidence in the best alternative... The degree of uncertainty in how one looks at one's choices can be manipulated through deception. Deception can make a situation falsely uncertain as well as falsely certain. It can affect the objectives seen, the alternative believed possible. Such a manipulation of the dimension of certainty is one of the main ways to gain power over the choices of those deceived. Just as deception can initiate action that a person otherwise would never have chosen, so it can prevent action by obscuring the necessity of choice. This is the essence of camouflage and of the cover-up, the creation of apparent normality to avert suspicion" (Bok, 1978, pp.18-20).

It is logical to estimate that persons who feel a lack of power would resort to lying in an attempt to gain greater control of their environment. If their initial efforts are successful, the behaviour can be reinforced. Even though this behaviour is self-destructive, it is maintained, because of the short-term rewards (Ford et al., 1988).

Lying can serve also as a way to devalue another person. Adler (1964) regarded lying as a compensation to keep the inferiority feeling from manifesting itself. He thinks that a person either lies out of fear or in order to appear superior. Kernberg (1975) analysed patients' lying in early stages of treatment. He said that patients tend to project their own attitude regarding moral values onto the psychotherapist, and to conceive him as being dishonest and corrupt. He explained that a patient may lie because he wishes to assert his superiority over the therapist and defeat his efforts, exert control over him, and protect himself from the dangerous retaliation that he fears from the therapist, should the therapist know about matters the patient wishes to hide. More recently Kernberg (1992; 1993) claimed that deceptiveness might serve the purpose of protection against real or fantasised aggression from the other, and of hiding or
keeping under control one's own aggression against the other. Deceptiveness is in itself, of course, a form of aggression. It may be a reaction against feared attacks from the other, which in turn may be realistic or reflect the projection of superego features.

(c) Repression or denial - Fenichel (1954) argued that lying is a mechanism that facilitates repression and/or denial. An untruth told repetitively over a period of time may become increasingly believable and acceptable as a fact to both the person who tells it and the person who is told. That is, what is known to be untrue seems real and believable. If that which is untrue seems real, then that which seems true may be untrue. Thus, painful memories may be reassessed as untrue or merely imaginary.

Lying is defined by conscious and wilful activities, thus it only facilitates regression or denial. Unconscious processes may substantially influence lying. The lie may serve to displace or disguise conscious awareness of conflict. Blum (1983) reported an analysis in which the patient postponed beginning his analysis with a lie (later on revealed to the analyst) that his mother had just died. The lie was simultaneously an unconscious confession. The truth was that his father was dead and his mother alive. The inner truths, unknown to the patient, were his representation of his mother as already dead in her depressive withdrawal, and her perpetual mourning. In fabricating his mother’s death, he denied the meaning and finality of his father’s death with his unresolved oedipal guilt. Marcos’s (1983) analysis of lies revealed that patients’ lies are defensive, and their function is to preserve the compartmentalisation of the threatening conflict.

“To intentionally negating, concealing conflicting ideas or feelings, the patient seeks to escape the exploration and subsequent consciousness of unpleasant facts, painful realities, or proscribed wishes” (Marcos, 1983, p.199).

Fonagy (1991) described an analysis of a borderline patient. His patient said that,

“Most people could just ignore suffering by looking away and living a lie.”

Then, revealing his secret, he said that,

“It was I who saw my father doing it (playing sexual games) to my sister and afterwards everybody pretended that nothing had happened, we just lived as if we were an ordinary family” (Fonagy, 1991, p.647).

People use rationalisation to explain their behaviour or responsibility for certain outcomes, thus disguising from themselves and others the true nature of their
underlying wishes, needs and abilities. A young woman who experienced conflict about her sexuality might explain her sexual behaviour the previous night by saying she was caught up in a romantic love or had drunk too much alcohol. Explanations like this help to disguise her consciously unacceptable wish for sexual gratification.

Kernberg (1993) analysed conflicts in the couple's relationship and suggested that deceptiveness may also serve to protect the other from pain, narcissistic lesion, jealousy, and disappointment. Deceptiveness can be a defence against underlying paranoid fears, and paranoid behaviour may in turn be a defence against deeper depressive features.

(Three)Wish-fulfilment - Anna Freud (1965) differentiated between fantasy and delinquent lies. For her,

“One kind is the response to the arousal of unpleasure. The child copes with intolerable realities by means of regression to infantile forms of wishful thinking (fantasy lying). Another kind is manifested in children who are well advanced in ego development and have other than developmental reasons for avoiding or distorting truth. This child lies in order to escape from punishment, or for material advantage, or out of fear from authority (delinquent lying)” (Freud, 1965, p.21).

Peskin (1992) stated that the child who denies a misdeed may be engaging merely in a form of wishful thinking, and lying is a means of realising a desire. Kohut (1977) explained that one of the aetiologies for lying might be a pressure from the grandiose self, resulting in the liar ascribing great achievements to himself. He also stated that because of the need for an idealised parent image, a person may attribute great achievements and abilities to another person. This false attribution may be motivated by the need for narcissistic sustenance from an aggrandised self-object or by guilt resulting from surpassing the idealised person in accomplishments.

During the fifties and the sixties, some literature examined the phenomenon of being an impostor. Deutsch (1955) described a treatment of a 'typical young psychopath', whom she named as the impostor. Deutsch called it a treatment rather than psychoanalysis because of the difficulties in managing real psychoanalysis. She referred to his pretence and stated that all impostors assume the identities of others not because they themselves lack the ability for achievement, but because they have to hide under a strange name to materialise a more or less reality-adapted fantasy. The
patient assumed many careers: a ‘gentleman’ farmer, a ‘great’ writer, a movie producer, and an inventor. In the latter, her patient’s pretense, that he was a genius was often so persuasive that others were taken in for a short time, and his self-esteem was inflated. To Deutsch it seemed that this patient’s ego, as expressed by the true name, is devalued, guilt-laden. So, such impostors have to use the names of individuals who fulfill the requirements of their own magnificent ego ideal. They behave as if their ego ideals were identical with themselves and expect every one else to acknowledge this to be the case. This mechanism, according to Deutsch, may operate also in ‘normal’ personalities. In the complex development of a ‘normal’ individual, there are certain irregularities, and only rarely can a successful harmony be attained. As one’s ego ideal can never be completely gratified from within, we direct demands to the external world, pretending that we actually are what we would like to be. Greenacre (1958) interpreted imposture states as sado-masochistic excitement that give a heightening of sensation and perceptiveness with strong narcissistic libidinal investment. Thus, imposture is the acting out of an attempt to achieve a sense of identity. Finkelstein (1974) pointed out that the central defects in the impostor character appear largely in the area of his narcissism or regulations of her self-esteem. Finkelstein claimed that the impostor appears as a type of narcissistic character who has unrealistic, idealised self-representations. Since the impostor is prey to severe anxieties and painful states of awareness of his own defects and weaknesses, and since his defective ego lacks the ability to delay and tolerate frustration, he is ill equipped realistically to attain these idealised goals. He must resort to pathological means to convince himself that he has achieved them. These include the use of denial, rationalisation, and splitting, as well as considerable talents for acting and mimicry in order to deceive her audience.

Thus, the preceding exploration of the reasons people lie leads us to conclude that: (1) people lie for overtly clear external reasons that will benefit or protect themselves or others; (2) there are lies aimed at regulating self esteem which are closely related to self deception; (3) lies may protect the sense of an autonomous self, helping to differentiate oneself from experienced disintegrated or symbiotic relationships; (4) lying may serve to control or attack reflecting conscious or unconscious sadistic impulses; (5) lies aims to obtain vicarious gratification (wish-flies).
In next chapters we explore the possible links between borderline personality disorders, deficiencies in achieving TOM and acquiring a mature concept of deception.
CHAPTER 6: BORDERLINE PERSONALITY DISORDER, EARLY TRAUMA, AND THEORY OF MIND AND LYING

6.1 Review of literature: The borderline personality disorder

Our interest is in borderline disorder, in which we assume deficiencies in the development of theory of mind and lying may play a major role.

Borderline was a term first used in 1938, but it was only in Knight's (1986) paper that the term ‘borderline’ found its place in psychiatric diagnosis. Borderline personality disorder refers to a profound disturbance in interpersonal relations. Essentially, there are three types of descriptive accounts: symptomatic and behavioural observations, psychodynamic formulations, and psychological test findings.

In their overview, Gunderson and Singer (1986) summarised the main characteristics of borderline patients: (1) social adaptiveness - good functioning at work; (2) intense affect - of anger to a variety of targets; (3) impulsive behaviour - broad range of behaviours whose result is self-destructive although their purpose is not; (4) brief psychotic experience - although the borderline syndrome is a stable personality disorder, they may develop psychotic thought processes such as ideas of reference, fear of being controlled and other paranoid tendencies; (5) psychological test finding - good performance on the WAIS and pervasively odd Rorschach records: connecting unrelated percepts illogically, over-elaborating on the affective meaning of the percepts, and giving unpleasant associations to the Rorschach inkblots; (6) interpersonal relationships - many authors have pointed to borderline patients’ style of relatedness as the most distinguishing feature of this group: they maintain superficial and transient relationships; their relationships with others can be described as ‘plastic’ and as showing ‘mimicry’; absence of real emotional responsiveness leads to repeated dissolution of relationships; they are prone to vacillate between transient, superficial relationships and intense, engulfing, clinging, and rarely reciprocal relationships; devaluation, demandingness, and manipulation are common characteristics of the quality of relations they form.
The interest of the current study is mainly in the interpersonal relationship. Several studies have tested the relevance of object relations to BPD. For example, Clarkin, Widiger, Frances, Hunt and Gilmore (1983) demonstrated that subjects who meet the DSM-III criteria for BPD showed unstable and/or intense relationships and chronic feelings of boredom. Emptiness appears to be the most specific and sensitive to BPD. Bell, Billington, Cicchetti, and Gibbons (1988) showed that BPD has a clearly identifiable pattern of object relations’ deficits, in terms of alienation, insecure attachment, egocentricity, and social incompetence.

Although the validity of the diagnostic concept has been widely criticised, Tarnopolsky and Berelowitz (1987), in their review of the research conducted since 1979, concluded that in spite of existing unclear issues, the balance is tipping in favour of the validity of borderline personality. They came to their conclusion using three diagnostic systems: (1) DIB (Gunderson et al., 1981), a semi-structured interview which examines social adaptation, impulse/action patterns, affects, psychotic phenomena, and interpersonal relationships; (2) DSM-III eight-item checklist: impulsivity/unpredictability, affective instability, inappropriate anger, interpersonal relationships, emptiness/boredom, self-damaging acts, intolerance/aloneness; (3) Kernberg’s (1977) definition that the borderline personality organisation is defined by: absence of stable sense of identity, use of primitive defence mechanisms - splitting and projective identification, partial retention of reality testing.

Psychoanalytic theorists generally understand psychopathology as resulting either from developmental deficits or from conflicts originating in particular developmental stages. Either explanation of psychopathology suggests that diagnostic assessment requires articulation of developmental theory (Stuart et al., 1990). Drive theory, anchored in psychobiological maturation, originally described the sequential unfolding of the psychosexual stages through bodily zones, which acted as organisers for fantasy elaboration. Tension reduction was the primary need, and helplessness was the primary fear, which arose from stimulus overload without adequate discharge mechanisms. Object relations theory is anchored in psychobiological development through stages of relational fit, and originally gave greater emphasis to the attachment or bonding to the object itself as a primary psychological need and motivation for action (Fairbairn, 1954; Bowlby,
1958). ‘Object Relations’ refers, most broadly, to enduring patterns of interpersonal behaviour, and to cognitive and affective processes mediating functioning in close relationships. In conceptualising the structure of the psychopathology along classic lines, emphasis is placed on component constructs within a relatively closed, yet highly dynamic and vital system. Conflict between the major inter-systemic organisations establishes an internal danger situation necessitating repression and regressive alteration of drive derivatives. If it fails, super-ego-induced signal anxiety, depression, and neurotic symptoms may ensue or be transformed into distortions of character (Arlow, 1963; Brenner, 1979).

Psychoanalytical theorists have given a central role to the relational dimension of BPD. In the thirties and the forties the emerging literature on character disorders, with its focus on ego functions, appropriately viewed BPD as residing somewhere in the middle of the pathological continuum from psychotic to neurotic (Westen, 1990). The inference, that severe character pathology must be pre-oedipal, stemming from conflicts or deficits arising after the first years and before the fourth and fifth, is manifest in all object relations theories, such as in Kernberg’s (1975).

Kernberg’s (1975) seminal work is an attempt to integrate insights from object relations’ theory and ego psychology into psychoanalytic thinking without abandoning the structural model. The basic logic of development is from a total lack of awareness to self-object differentiation of object-self representations based on affect (bad-good), to mature object representations that integrate ambivalent feelings. Kernberg (1977) differentiated neurotic, psychotic and borderline ‘intra-psychic organisations’. He argued that among other consequences, lack of self differentiation frequently causes borderline patients to present deficiencies in the capacity for experiencing feelings of concern for objects, as well as lacking the capacity to mourn over good, lost objects and regret towards themselves and others.

Several studies have been carried out to examine the deficiency in BPD object representation. Urist (1980) suggested that, object-relational development, as reflected in mental representations of self and others can be evaluated on the basis of object representations’ richness and complexity, the extent to which they portray differentiated, individuated beings, and the extent to which they portray individuals as autonomous
beings, capable of involvement in mutually enhancing relationships with one another. Researchers have used the traditional Rorschach scores to assess object relational maturity. Diversity in diagnostic techniques and inconsistent findings decreased the validity and generalisability of those studies. Nearly all the studies compared BPD with schizophrenic patients. Blatt, Brenneis, Schimek, and Glick (1976) introduced a system to assess four aspects of object representations: differentiation (of whole human objects from quasi-human objects and part objects), accuracy (of object-representational percepts), articulation (of an object's physical and functional attributes, i.e., degree of elaboration), and integration (of an object into its context of action and interaction with other objects). They found that BPD produced Rorschach responses of higher overall developmental level than their schizophrenic counterparts. Lerner and Peter (1984) analysed Rorschach records of neurotic, borderline and schizophrenic patients. They found that schizophrenic patients produced significantly fewer accurate responses and portrayed realistic human figures at lower developmental levels than other groups, and that this impairment in the representation of objects serves as a distinguishing factor between schizophrenic and borderline patients. They concluded that.

"The results permit the borderline to be conceptualised along a continuum of severity, as differences in the developmental level of the concept of the object, the quality of reality testing, and the regressive potential successfully distinguished the hospitalised from the non-hospitalised borderline patients" (Lerner and Peter, 1984, p.77).

Stuart et al. (1990) findings added to our understanding of the qualitative aspect of BPD object representation. They compared BPD, major depressive disorder, and normal subjects. Their findings suggested that borderlines construe the object-relational world differently from how the other groups construe it.

BPD individuals experience relationships with others as fraught with malevolence. Hence, what distinguishes object relations in depressive and normal is not simply a lack of object-relational sophistication, resulting from arrested object-relational development. Borderlines tend to understand human action as more motivated and human interaction as more malevolent in nature. The authors suggested distinguishing between cognitive and affective components of object relations, rather than referring globally to object-relational development. It was also suggested, that
“What renders object-relational development in borderline and borderline’s experience of the object world is not a cognitive deficit in the development of the object representation but rather an overwhelming tendency to construe interpersonal relations as malevolent. Often this construct of object relations entails cognitively sophisticated but distorted attributional processes” (Stuart et al., 1990, p.313).

Object relations theorists have come to focus on the impact of real deprivation in early infancy, and its influence on the development of certain psychopathologies. Winnicott (1971) focused on failures in maternal responsiveness. Bowlby (1969) implicated disruptions in the attachment relationship. Singer (1979) viewed the cardinal features which are the core borderline dilemma are feelings of being unreal, inanimate, non-human, empty, or dissolving away associated with desperate clinging, intolerance of being alone, and agonising loneliness. In the long-term treatment of two borderline patients, Singer (1988) summarised that

“In addition to being based and organised on trauma that occurred at early developmental levels, it involved superego pressures and inter-systemic oedipal conflicts of enormous proportions... Likewise, repression and higher order defences, rather than being absent, were actually so massively in force that they remained inaccessible, allowing visibility and full sway only to the second level of interactionally based defences” (Singer, 1988, p.57).

6.2 Aetiology of borderline personality disorder: childhood traumas

Although no definitive conclusions regarding the aetiology of BPD can be drawn from the correlation based on retrospective data, the hypothesis that childhood abuse has a major formative role in the development of the disorder is strongly supported by several studies. Generally, these findings have been accepted to be valid as the internal consistency of the material presented, and the manner of presenting it (including anxiety, tears, and affective liability) made the histories believable.

Many psychological symptoms have been associated with childhood maltreatment, particularly sexual abuse. Perhaps foremost amongst the formal diagnoses which recent research has identified as statistically significantly associated with severe neglect and abuse is BPD (Gross et al., 1980-1981; Bryer et al., 1987; Herman et al., 1988; Zanarini et al., 1989; Ogata et al., 1990; Westen et al., 1990; Brown and Anderson, 1991).

Bryer, Nelson and Miller (1987), for example, found that female patients who had been sexually abused or physically victimised as children were more likely to be given a
borderline diagnosis than those who had not been so victimised. Ogata, Silk, Goodrich, Lohr, Westen and Hill (1990) explored childhood abuse in hospitalised BPD. They found that BPD reported significantly higher rates of childhood sexual abuse than depressed patients, while physical neglect, and physical abuse were relatively frequent in both groups. The sexual abuse was reported to be perpetrated not only by parents, but also by siblings, relatives, and non-relatives. Multiple abuse occurred with sixty-seven percent of the abused BPD. Herman (1988) compared patients with BPD and those with other personality disorders, looking especially for experiences of childhood trauma. Histories of physical and sexual abuse and the witnessing of serious domestic violence characterised the borderline patients. Links (1988) studied in-patients with confirmed BPD and those with borderline traits. The BPD cases experienced more separations, family breakdown, foster placement, and physical and sexual abuse. Nigg (1991) used projective measures to study the quality of childhood experiences in sexually abused borderline adults. They found that early memories of subjects were particularly malevolent and unpleasant. Brown (1991) studied the childhood abuse (physical and sexual) histories of nearly 1000 patients admitted to a military centre. An increase in the proportion of patients with borderline personality disorder was noted with increasing level of reported abuse; 3% of non-abused patients, 13% of either type abuse, and 29% of those who had suffered both types of abuse had BPD. Borderline personality disorder accounted for nearly 50% of the personality disorder diagnoses in the abused group.

These findings support the theory that BPD individuals are brought up in disturbed families who do not protect their members, where chaos and lack of psychical and physical boundaries are manifested. These traumas are pathogenic in nature for these children who do experience their self as unprotected, defenceless, vulnerable, exposed and fragile.

To conclude, BPD is viewed as a distinct classification. Psychoanalysts think that lack of care, accompanied by abuse, mainly sexual abuse, and chaos in families of BPD serve as an important source for their malfunctioning in interpersonal relations.

The link between abusive family environment and the development of theory of mind as a possible aetiology of BPD is discussed in the next section.
6.3 Borderline personality disorder, TOM and lying

Fonagy (1991) suggested that borderline patients lack the capacity of having TOM, probably largely in highly emotional circumstances, with significant others. In such cases, they show deficiencies in the capacity to take into account one's own and others' mental states, and in understanding and predicting others' behaviour. Fonagy (1991) used the term, the capacity to 'mentalise', to define a specific cognitive and psychic potential by which a child develops her equipment for the establishment of differentiation between inner and outer reality, thus founding the boundaries of the self.

Mentalisation normally comes about through the child's experience of her mental states being reflected on, prototypically through interaction with her caregivers. The caregiver gives the child's ideas and feelings a link with reality, by indicating their existence outside the child's mind. The capacity to reflect on feelings and thoughts is built up through an inter-subjective process between infant and parent. The robustness of this capacity determines not just the nature of psychic reality for the individual, but also the quality and coherence of the reflective part of the self (Target and Fonagy, 1996). The parent fosters the child's sense of her mental self through complex linguistic and interactional processes, mainly through behaving towards the child in a way that leads her eventually to share the assumption that her own behaviour, and that of others, may be understood in terms of ideas and beliefs, feelings and wishes. The sensitive mother approaches the crying child with a question in her mind: 'Do you want your nappy changed? Are you hungry? Are you feeling tired? Lonely?' She addresses the situation with the child's feelings in mind, so is unlikely to say to herself, 'Is your bottom wet?' or, 'Are you by yourself?'

Thus, at the heart of the child's relationship lies the object's capacity to create a world for the child in which she may experience herself as feeling, wanting, thinking, and being. Winnicott (1965) postulated that this process depends on the availability of mature egos that can provide the framework for this task. Kleinian analysts use the term 'healthy projective identification' to describe this phenomenon (Bion, 1962; Rosenfeld, 1971).

We assume that traumatic events, especially sexual and/or physical abuse, contribute to the pathological path, to an inability to develop the capacity of TOM. Mentalising is
expected to be underdeveloped in cases where traumatic events concerning one or other of the parents compel the child defensively to disregard perceptions related to the thoughts and feelings of the primary objects.

As discussed earlier, TOM is related to lying. Understanding lying implies the knowledge that wishes, thoughts, beliefs, and feelings are owned by the self and might be different from the object. If a person having BPD lacks the capacity of TOM, then she is also unable to use lying maturely, i.e., knowing that lying involves primarily manipulating object’s mind, and then, object’s behaviour. She is lying without understanding that saying something untrue can affect the listener’s beliefs and, as a consequence, the listener’s behaviour.

In general, borderline patients lie. Only few papers have dealt with borderline patients’ lying (O’Shaughnessy, 1990; Fonagy, 1991; Kernberg, 1992; Ford, 1996). These papers are extensively presented as they clarify the unconscious drives together with the kinds of deception borderlines usually manifest.

Ford (1996) described the style of deception as one aspect of the personality. He and his colleagues have identified five specific personality disorders in which lying is a frequent occurrence, and BPD is among them. He described a typical BPD patient, Barbara, who after three weeks of marriage was unsuccessful in hiding from her husband that she was having a normal menstrual period. For the preceding months she had skillfully avoided revealing these facts to her husband. Six weeks previously, during one of their many quarrels, her husband had indicated that it was time to end their tumultuous relationship. In response Barbara had made a tearful ‘confession’ that she was pregnant but indicated that because of her love for her friend she would carry the baby to term regardless of what he wanted to do. In response her friend offered to marry her. At the time of her marriage, Barbara was 29 years old, acutely aware of her age and her increasing tendency to gain weight easily. Barbara’s relationship history showed a repetitive quality. Relationships had always begun with intense infatuation on her part. Each new person in her life was seen as the person who would be able to love and support her. Then Barbara would increase her demands until her companion resisted. She would then angrily attack him for not caring enough about her. After several fights the relationship would inevitably end and she would complain to all that would listen about having once again been abused. On
one occasion after a break-up with a lover Barbara made a dramatic suicide gesture with an overdose of Valium. Her pattern of lying had been noted at an early age, when she fabricated stories to schoolmates about her home life. The stories were in sharp contrast to her real life. Her father was a salesman who was perpetually bitter that he was repeatedly passed over for promotion to assistant manager. He would drink to excess, become belligerent, and verbally and occasionally physically abuse his wife and daughter. Her mother would periodically remind her that it had been lucky for her that abortion used to be illegal.

Barbara’s communications may be more fantasy than fact. She may use this fantasy as a way of soothing herself and the fantasy becomes more real if it is communicated to another person who responds to it as if it were true. The other’s role is to mirror the fantasy and to turn it to a reality. Through such communications Barbara may construct fantasies that are communicated to others as facts. As a child she used this mechanism to create a fantasy about a rich and kindly uncle, both to soothe herself in reference to her bleak reality and to make her feel more important to her friends. At first sight it appears that Barbara lies about the pregnancy to maintain the relationship with her mate. But it also may be interpreted as a way of alleviating her fear of gaining weight easily, fantasising that it is due to her being pregnant. It might serve also as a self-deception mechanism, quite similar to her childhood fantasy lying. Her lies are also part of splitting, in the sense that various ideas and feelings are split apart from one another and poorly integrated. The many internally contradictory aspects are kept separate to reduce the physical discomfort.

Kernberg (1992) viewed the borderline patient’s lying as a deliberate deceptive communication aiming to mislead the assessment of the patient’s emotional state of reality. The first patient he portrayed is an example of a patient who withholds significant information, who is deceptive by omission. He discussed a young male patient whose antisocial behaviour was presented by lying and manipulativeness at home and at school. Initially the patient showed what impressed the analyst as a false friendliness, a tendency to fill the sessions with trivial information about his daily life. After sharing with the patient the impression that he had been constantly suppressing the most important aspects of his life, the patient accused the analyst of having a ‘policeman’ attitude similar to that
of his father. His fantasy was that the analyst had the task of extracting the truth from him and delivering it to his father’s wrath. The patient responded to the analyst’s reassurance that in any case he would be well informed about the analyst’s thoughts and any planned actions by asserting that attempting to differentiate his relationship with the analyst from his relationship with his father, was lying. At that point the analyst asked the patient whether he really believed that he was lying, to which the patient flatly said yes.

What did the patient mean by saying that the analyst was lying? What for him constituted a lie? Did he think that the analyst was trying to manipulate his mind when lying on his father’s orders? Moreover, was the analyst the father’s agent, not having a mind of his own, serving just as a courier?

A young female, another patient who was presented by Kernberg (1992) was working as a call girl with a select of upper- and middle-class clientele consisting mostly of businessmen. During her early childhood her father, a chronic alcoholic abandoned his family after many extramarital affairs. Conflicts with her mother led her to leave home after graduation from high school. She gave a history of promiscuous sexual behaviour from early adolescence on, in the context of bitter fights with her mother who was helplessly trying to control her. No deception was detected during the patient’s analysis. However, at one point, the analyst was struck by her saying that she had recently told one of her clients that she really loved him and that he was the only man in her life, and, only a few days later, saying exactly the same thing to another man with whom she had spent considerable time. He added that:

“This was the first time that I was aware of having observed her as lying, and I expressed my surprise. She responded that she had not been lying at all, that she had meant what she said in both instances. She was completely honest, she said, and if these men extrapolated from her statement that her feeling would last forever, that was their problem. She said this in such a natural way, obviously not trying to be provocative, that I found it hard to respond without sounding moralistic. I asked her whether she did not believe that, in the relationship between men and women, some more stable feelings might evolve, so that a statement such as ‘You are the man of my life’ would be assumed to have the meaning of a commitment. Miss B smiled in a derogatory way and said that this was certainly true of the movies but not of real life. She added that she did not believe a relationship was ever anything but a commercial transaction, and that was fine with her” (Kernberg, 1992, p.18).
Miss B’s lying can be analysed as an outright lie in that she deliberately wanted to manipulate her client’s mind to think that she was committed to the relationship with him aiming to get some expected behaviour, such as, promise not to leave her. On the other hand her lying could be viewed as immature in the sense of lacking the capacity to manipulate her clients’ mind, just their behaviour, as Miss B. was cited: “Everybody is trying to get the most out of everybody else, and feelings don’t count” (ibid., p.19). It is more likely to incorporate the belief that human interactions are manipulative in essence, but internal states such as feeling, wishes, thoughts, do not count. For instance, when commenting to the analyst’s assertion that there is a belief, that in the relationship between men and women some more stable feelings might evolve, Miss B. responded by saying that “This was certainly true of the movies but not of real life” (ibid., p.18).

O’Shaughnessy (1990) shared the widespread analytical view that BPD individuals’ manifest lying, generally serves as a defence against the intrusion of primary objects. She claimed that although lying presents itself in speech, it might seem to be a relatively mature pathology. In fact, analytic investigation reveals that the fundamental problem the habitual liar is bringing to analysis by lying is primitive, and primarily involves not the truth and falsity of propositions, but the truth and falsity of his objects - their genuineness or deceitfulness. She described a patient whose lying was linked to his deep doubts about communication, which he feared must overwhelm him and his objects and express lies rather than truth. The patient’s material showed the primitive nature of a liar, and the pervasiveness of a liar’s predicament. His lie started at the preliminary interview with his polite false facade intended to charm the prospective analyst, whom he suspected, was a fraud that would reject him. He suspected and feared that, like his internalised primary object, the analyst would pretend, but would not be able honestly to know him or bear the relationship he would make with her. Once the analysis started, the patient lied with excitement and externalised from his inner world his primary object relations. Intensely needy and very anxious, he invaded and agitated his object, which received his intensities and anxieties, but lacked the capacity to modify or contain them. No equilibrium is therefore obtained in the patient or his object, which tries to mask its inner state, by a split between an outer facade and inner turmoil.
O'Shaugnessy ideas were based on the grounds of the theory of Bion (1970) and Klein (1952) who stated that an infant has an innate preconception of a good object, which will feed, clean, warm her, etc., and also receive and transform for the better her communications, that is, understand her. Then, if actual experience falls too far short of expectation, the infant may doubt if the object is a true realisation of her innate preconception. The analyst becomes, in one of O'Shaugnessy's phrases, “Only a ‘pretension’ that makes him despair. His fear that he had only a ‘pretension’ and not a real analyst was the emergence in the transference of his anxiety that his primal object was not a genuine or true one” (O'Shaughnessy 1990, p.188).

The patient's lying emerged openly in the analysis. He asked the analyst to change his Thursday time a fortnight away, saying his cousin was arriving from abroad and he wished to meet her plane. A few sessions later he repeated his request, saying the woman was coming to England for an abortion. She was the sister of an old university friend, who knew no one here and he needed to meet and assist her. O'Shaugnessy noticed 'the cousin' had become 'the sister of an old university friend and she also suddenly remembered that, in the first week of his analysis, she had changed the Thursday time agreed at the interview for a different hour. She suggested that his wanting a time change might have to do with her having asked him in the first week of the analysis to change his Thursday time. The patient was silent. The next day he repeated his request in a threatening tone, adding that the woman who wanted an abortion had only one leg and people wouldn't think it nice that a one-legged woman came to London for an abortion. He proceeded with laughter to do correct calculations of driving times to and from London Airport. By then the analyst was bewildered. She questioned herself as to whether there was a real cousin or not. Was it all lies? Was it a confusing mixture of fantasy and reality?

It seems clear that the patient’s lying was not aiming at changing his analyst’s mind and that such lying is immature in the sense of not taking into account the other’s mind, i.e., thoughts, beliefs and feelings. Lying in the transference was viewed as a way to convey to the analyst the patient’s own experience. O'Shaugnessy explained this pattern of interaction originating in the child’s awareness of the contrast between the appearance of her parent and her perceptions, emotions, or inner reality. For instance, sensing the
agitated mother on the one hand, and watching and hearing her wishes to hold him, on the other hand; being witness to sexual abuse in the family (maybe even being subject to abuse) while living a lie (or a pretence) in an aloof atmosphere created by the parents, and behaving as if nothing had happened.

Fonagy (1991) described an analysis with a borderline patient who was brought up by an abusive father, a depressed mother, and having a sense of living a lie in this family. The patient’s mother was deeply depressed throughout his childhood, and was intermittently given to thoughts of suicide and suicidal impulses. He had a sister three years his senior and a brother two years younger. His father, a Ministry of Works inspector, was an extremely violent man who was frequently away from home. The patient remembered him as humourless and brutal and as regularly subjecting him to violent beatings. To give a picture of the cruelty of his father, he told that on one of the few Christmases when he received any presents at all, his father gave him a small pair of boxing gloves. In the ‘play’ boxing that followed, father put on his sheepskin gloves and hit his 6-year-old son so hard that he knocked him unconscious. Even more horrifying was the realisation that the scars on his back which, incidentally he knew nothing about until their discovery by his girlfriend were probably the result of early abuse. Medical examination of the scars revealed that repeated beating, in the first years of his life, with a thin, sharp object, such as a cane, was the most likely cause. He remembered his mother screaming at him that if he did not stop crying, she would ‘give you something to cry about’. One of the most remarkable aspects of listening to the patient was what his words revealed about his thought processes. His associations lacked the qualities of depth, resonance and evocativeness. For the analyst it was like listening to computer-generated speech, an impression he confirmed when his associations led him to childhood identification with powerful but destructive alien robots from a children’s television programme. It was not just his expressionless voice and matter-of-fact, harsh way of speaking but also the content of his utterances that left the analyst with a sense of emptiness which he gradually realised was an echo of something that the patient himself experienced. What did become clear was that he experienced himself as non-human. Over the course of his analysis, it became increasingly clear that his experience of his mental self as empty, his experience of the analyst as non-human and his apparent inability to conceive of the analyst’s mental state to a degree that might permit communication could be understood as an inhibition of
and defence against conceiving of his own or his objects’ mental functioning. The roots of this patient’s pathology lie in the context of living a lie. About four years into the analysis he came into his session visibly shaken. He told a dream that terrified him. In association with the dream he recounted the time he decided to give up on his family. He went to Los Angeles, at the time that a scandal broke about a residential primary school where children were sexually abused. It came out because a boy’s mother had found a red spot on the child’s pants. The patient could not understand why the children had stayed silent about the abuse for so long. The analyst responded saying that perhaps there were things between his sister and him that he had remained silent about because he was afraid that he would be punished. After crying uncontrollably, he said,

“You know, you were wrong (some months ago) when you said that you thought my father found my sister and me playing sexual games. It was I who saw my father doing it to my sister ... And afterwards, everybody pretended that nothing had happened. We just lived as if we were an ordinary family”.

Subsequently he was able to tell that bringing out the material about his sister’s sexual abuse was in some ways a trial, much like ‘people who go to the doctor may say I’ve got a friend who has a problem’. It seems clear now that his father, probably on several occasions, anally assaulted him. Tragically it occurred on one occasion when he went to seek refuge in his father’s bed following a terrifying nightmare (Fonagy, 1991, pp.642-649).

This borderline patient, in an attempt to protect himself from identification with the thoughtless state of the original abusers, tended not to conceive of himself as person with various feelings and thoughts, and could not tolerate others thinking about him. It seems that the parents’ abuse undermines the child’s theory of mind. Fonagy (1991) argued that

“As it is no longer safe for the child to think about wishing, if this implies a contemplation of the all too real wishes of the parent to harm the child. Individuals that grow up in such an environment find the contemplation of the contents of the mind of the object unbearable. Overwhelmed by the intolerable aggression from within and from without, this individual desperately seeks comfort in a regressive lack of differentiation with the object” (Fonagy, 1991, p.650).

The distinction between reality and mental representation is essential in lying. Lying involves the need to keep different entities together, the ‘real’ and the ‘not-real’, the ‘me’ and the ‘not-me’, the self and the other, while at the same time keeping in mind their
distinction. When one lies one has to hold one's false statement ('I enjoyed your dinner very much') together with the real belief ('I did not enjoy that dinner at all'), while being aware that these entities are not the same. Generally, we assume that patients with borderline psychopathology do not always comprehend, interpret and apply lying as others do. Their lying reflect a primitive process, which is related to the genuineness and deceitfulness of objects rather than the truth and falsity of propositions.

We think that as long as lack of differentiation with the object is maintained, the BPD patient can not keep distinct the boundaries between reality ('me') and mental representation ('not me') at the same time. Feeling threat, experienced as anxiety, and overwhelming aggression, they might affirm the 'not real' (or what an observer might perceive as 'not true') while not knowing the real, and appear to lie. They may be lying objectively more frequently because they may affirm the 'non reality' at far less cost than the non BPD individuals who are less pained by the simultaneous pressure of both ideas in their mind. The tendency to alleviate psychic pain by maintaining the 'not real' turns out to be a rewarding mechanism, hence the BPD instrumentally learns to apply this mechanism. Keeping their track on the pathological path they fail to develop the capacity of having a TOM.

We have decided to focus our analysis on the concept of lying as manifested in BPDs. We excluded studying forms of lying in the wide range of antisocial personality disorders. Likewise, we excluded individuals displaying habitual and pathological liars.

Antisocial personality disorder incorporates severe distortions of morality. The antisocial personality may be considered a subgroup of the narcissistic personality. Antisocial personality structures present the same general constellation of traits\(^1\) in combination with additional severe superego pathology. Some antisocial behaviour in the broadest sense is seen quite frequently in patients with borderline personality organisation, for example, antisocial activities, such as stealing, habitual lying, parasitism, or exploitiveness. Their superego integration personalities is poor, mainly

---

\(^1\) Haughty, grandiose, and controlling behaviour is a defence against paranoid traits related to the projection of oral rage, presenting a remarkable absence of object relationships, their interactions reflect very intense, primitive, internalised object relationships of a frightening kind and an incapacity to depend on internalised good.
containing derivatives of primitive, aggressive, distorted parental images without the normal integration of aggressive forerunners with ideal self and ideal object images, and without the later phase of superego depersonalisation and abstraction. However, there is a group of patients who present antisocial behaviour out of an unconscious sense of guilt and may not present a borderline personality organisation at all but a neurotic personality organisation.

Theory of mind is basically a cognitive capacity unfolded through interaction with other persons’ minds. Beyond the scope of this thesis is analysis of the association between TOM and the complex structures leading to the lack of integrated self-concept as well as integrated superego. We are mainly concerned with the concept of normal lying, where the superego is integrated.

To conclude, in the introduction we established a conceptual framework to understand how the concept of lying may be operated in BDP individuals. We believe that on the grounds of early childhood experiences of abuse, which impair the child’s capacity to be engaged in thinking about her caregivers’ minds, she would be less able to construe an enduring sense of others’ mental states. In such cases lying as a mechanism aims at practising the differentiation between the ‘me’ and the ‘not me’, would be less operative, less employed in the mature sense of its development, and would more likely be consciously understood as mainly operating to manipulate others’ behaviour, and not others’ minds.

The development of the capacity to mentalise, and understanding lying in borderline personality disorder, has not been studied empirically yet. The object of this study is to investigate the relations between experience of abuse in childhood, the concept of lying, BPD, and their social functioning.
CHAPTER 7: DEVELOPMENT OF A MEASURE FOR THE DEFINITION OF DECEPTION

This chapter has two main aims. The first is to outline the theory that brings about a practical definition of lying and truth telling. The second is to present a study, which developed a questionnaire that applied this definition. A questionnaire consisting of different situations in which subjects were asked to define a target sentence as either ‘a lie’ or ‘the truth’ is described. This questionnaire served as a measure to investigate differences between normal subjects and severely disturbed personality disorder patients\(^1\) in their understanding lying and truth telling.

The distinction made by Fenichel (1954) who stated that when we undertake to deceive others intentionally, we communicate messages meant to mislead them, meant to make them believe what we ourselves do not believe. This distinction has been investigated by using prototypic analysis (Coleman and Kay, 1981). Prototypic analysis recognises no decisively defining features. A prototypic view of word meaning attempts to account for the obvious pre-theoretical intuition that semantic categories frequently have blurry edges and allow degrees of membership. The applicability of a word to a thing is in general not a matter of ‘yes’ or ‘no’, but rather of ‘more’ or ‘less’, (e.g. Labov, 1973). Coleman and Kay (1981) have extended prototypic analysis to the concept of lying in an empirical investigation. According to prototypic analysis the first characteristic of a lie is the question whether an utterance is untrue in terms of factuality. The second characteristic of a lie is in cases where the speaker does not try to induce the hearer to believe something that is not true. For instance, as in cases of metaphorical speech (‘He is a pig’, ‘it is so cold that you could freeze your ice cream on the sidewalk’, ‘he is a real genius’). This is being referred to as ‘intention’. The third characteristic of a lie concerns statements about things that are not true, but are not always called ‘lies’. Such cases occur where the speaker does not believe that her statement is false (contrastingly, she believes it is true, although in fact it is not). For instance, when a speaker is sincerely trying to convey what she believes to be true in, and makes an honest mistake or an innocent misinterpretation.

\(^1\) Throughout the thesis subjects in the normal group will be referred as ‘control group’ and patients as ‘experimental group’
The prototypic lie is then characterised by (a) falsehood statement (b) with which the speaker intends to deceive the dupe, and (c) does not believe it. Notions that have all three elements would be considered outright lies. Utterances which lack one or more of the elements might still be classified as lies, but less clearly so. Utterances, which do not have all three elements, would be considered genuinely true utterances. Coleman and Kay (1981) found a general rule where the more prototypical elements a story contained, the higher it scored on the lie scale; the more prototypical elements present in a statement, the more likely subjects labelled ‘a lie’. The subjects’ judgements revealed that they weighed the elements differentially in their ‘lie’ - ‘not lie’ decision. It was ranked from most important to least important so that the speaker’s belief in the statement was highly ranked, speaker’s intent to deceive was ranked intermittently, and it was just at the end that the objective falsity of the statement was counted.

We adopt this model and will define a statement more as a lie the more deceitful elements it contains, consisting of the three prototypical elements: falsehood of statement, speaker’s intentionality, and her awareness of the deceptive message which was stated.

The aim of the first study was to develop a measure for a definition of lying based on the model proposed by Coleman (1981) which would then be used to examine differences between the control and the experimental groups. Our hypotheses are that the scale would be proved as valid if: (1) Subjects comments would show face validity and would also clearly understand the situations depicted and the required task; (2) If subjects respond considering the embedded prototypical elements. For example that the condition of facts matching reality would contribute to more ‘the truth’ responses and that the condition where facts do not match reality would contribute to more ‘a lie’ responses.

7.1 Method

7.1.1 Subjects

Two groups of subjects were participated in this study. In the first pilot study, a group of seventeen M.Sc. Clinical Psychology students at UCL volunteered. They filled in the questionnaires and gave their comments regarding the difficulties in understanding and
responding to the required task. The new version was examined by a new group of 10 M.Sc. Clinical Psychology students who unanimously agreed that the stories were comprehensible. The final study was done employing the modified questionnaire that was filled in by another group of subjects. This new group consisting of thirty M.Sc. Clinical Psychology students and staff at UCL filled in the modified questionnaire (mean age = 32, sd = 7.85, range 24-52; 12 males. mean age = 35, sd = 8.83 range 25-52; 18 females, mean age = 30, sd = 6.61, range 24-49).

7.1.2 Measures

The Concept of Lying Questionnaire was developed adopting the model of Coleman and Kay (1981). All combinations of prototypical elements are shown in Table 7.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker’s statement matches the truth facts</th>
<th>Speaker’s statement does not match the truth facts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker believes statement true</td>
<td>Speaker does not believe statement false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker does not intend to deceive</td>
<td>Speaker believes statement true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker does not believe statement true</td>
<td>Speaker does not believe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker intends to deceive</th>
<th>Omission by confusion</th>
<th>Outright lie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slip of the tongue</td>
<td>Omission by confusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine truth 1</td>
<td>Omission by confusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission by confusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White lie 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1. Definition of cells used in story construction

Cells 1 to 4 represent plots in which the speaker’s statement matches the truth. Cells 5 to 8 represent plots in which the speaker’s statement does not match the truth. Odd cells represent plots where the speaker believes her statement. Even cells represent plots where the speaker does not believe her statement. Cells 1, 2 and 5, 6 represent plots where the
speaker does not intend to deceive. Cells 3, 4 and 7, 8 represent plots where the speaker intends to deceive.

Utterances that did not have all three elements were considered as true utterances. Utterances which lack one or more of the elements were still classified as lies, but less clearly so. Utterances that have all three elements were considered as outright lies.

Two sets consisting of eight short plots were composed. Strichartz and Burton (1990) presented a series of eight short puppet plays that systematically varied the presence and absence of the three prototypical elements. They composed a basic plot involving three characters: a child named Chris, Chris's mother, and Chris's sibling, Lee, or Chris's dog, Spot. In our study eight stories were composed applying all exhaustive prototypical combinations suggested by Coleman and Kay (1981). Each plot ended up with a target statement that could be judged as either true, false, or neither. In all plots at least two characters were involved: the speaker who stated the target sentence and the recipient. In some cases the narrator introduced representation of the actual truth.

For example the genuine truth (plot in cell 1):

Dick, Selma and Richard are playing golf. Richard steps on Dick’s ball. When Dick arrives and sees his ball pushed into the turf, he asks: ‘Selma, did you step on my ball?’ Selma replies: ‘No, I did not.’

Two different sets of plots were composed to study the differences between statements told by relatively non intimate figures depicting typical situation in everyday life, and intimate others representing closer relationship by nature (family members) or by proximity (close friends), involving more conflictual situations. Eight of the plots depicted common, daily situations. These plots were considered less emotionally charged. Additional eight stories depicted high emotionally charged situations. The plots comprised of emotionally charged situations described themes of social conflict in which aggression, resentfulness, possessiveness, insecurity, mistrust, rivalry, suspicion, harm, attraction, and affection were prominent. Plots are depicted for each cell (plot in cell 8) in the emotionally charged condition:
Karen returns home from school. Her father, in an outburst, swears at and humiliates her in front of her mother, Barbara. Later on, Karen tells this to grandma. Grandma asks her daughter, Barbara, whether it is true that her husband swore at and humiliated Karen. Barbara, trying to her husband’s bad behaviour, answers that Karen made it up.

Subjects had to answer three questions. Firstly, whether the target sentence that had been told was a lie, the truth or neither. Secondly, they were requested to indicate how sure they were in taking their decision. Thirdly, they had to justify their choice. The plots involving normal condition are shown in Appendix 7.1. The plots involving emotionally charged condition are shown in Appendix 7.2.

For each plot an ‘Affect Scale’ was added. Subjects were asked to mark their feelings towards the protagonist. Positive (friendliness, affection, sympathy, happiness and pride) negative (anger, disgust, hatred, sadness, dislike, envy and shame) or neutral (indifference, no reaction, apathy and no feeling) emotions were presented. The ‘Affect Scale’ is shown in Appendix 7.3.

In the pilot study a group of students filled in the questionnaires and made their comments. Their comments brought about some alterations. Subjects were generally perplexed by two specific cell contents in both uncharged and charged stories. These plots (cell 2 and 7) were replaced. The narrative in both stories appeared to be too complicated. Subjects found it difficult distinguishing between the three prototypical elements (factuality, intent, belief). Making these alterations forced us to divert from Coleman and Kay’s model. In cell 2, the logical contradiction between telling true facts, not intending to deceive, and not believing the utterance was solved by creating a character who found herself to be in a semi-confused state. This character omitted parts of the truth but could tell other parts of the truth. Her utterance could be defined as lying (or telling the truth) by omission. In cell 7 the logical contradiction between telling false facts, intending to deceive, and believing in the utterance was resolved similarly. It was achieved by creating a character that found herself in a semi-confused state so that she omitted some parts of the truth but was also able to tell other parts of it. It implied that in cells 2 and 7, the protagonist had been slightly aware of the fact that her statement was just partly true (or

2 Cells are presented in Table 7.1. Cell 1 accounts for the condition where the speaker's statement matches the truth, she does not intend to deceive, and she believes her story. Cell 8 accounts for the condition the speaker's statement does not match the truth, she intends to deceive, and she does believe her story.
partly false). Plot in cell 3 (mistake) in the emotionally uncharged condition was also replaced. Subjects’ responses showed that the story was highly emotionally charged. This plot was allocated to the emotionally charged set of stories.

The new version was examined by a new group of 10 M.Sc. Clinical Psychology students, who unanimously agreed that the stories were comprehensible, clear, common and familiar.

In each set half of the target sentences were uttered by a male figure and the other half by a female figure. These sets were further divided into two versions counterbalanced for gender. Stories in one version, where the protagonist was a male figure were altered in the other version, so that the protagonist was a female figure, and vice versa. In each version, for each story, new names were given, so that a name appeared only once. Sixteen stories were randomly sorted for each subject so that the order of the cells appeared randomly.

7.1.3 Design

Two groups by five dichotomous within-factor variables: emotional-charge × affect × factuality of statement × speaker’s intent to deceive × speaker’s belief of statement. Each emotional-charge condition consisted of eight plots depicting all possible combinations of the other three within-subjects variables, each plot evaluated for its affect-charge. Two dependent variables were measured: (1) Judgement of statements (‘the truth’, ‘a lie’, ‘neither’); (2) Affective response (positive, negative, neutral).

7.1.4 Procedure

MSc Clinical students at UCL were informed by their tutors about the research project. The researcher then explained the study and its aims. They were told that.

The aim of this questionnaire is to find out how people define lying. This questionnaire is part of a research investigating the relations between having deficits in theory of mind and having been diagnosed as borderline patients. The theoretical framework is established on the theory that lying may become an important and essential mechanism by which the child defines her autonomy. When the child lies and the parent acts as if the child is truthful, it is evident, to the child that her parent cannot control or know her thoughts. Thus, lying may serve as a
mechanism by which the child can test the limits of her ego boundaries, and can form a distinct identity.

Subjects were given the concept of lying questionnaire to fill in, in their own time and space. A short description of the task and the instructions were introduced on a front page (Appendix 7.4). The following week, thirty students (out of sixty-two students who picked out the questionnaires) returned them filled in.

7.1.5 Coding

The scoring system adopted yields a numerical judgement, for each subject's rating, of each story, on a seven-point scale from 1 (very sure, non-lie) to 7 (very sure, lie) as indicated in Figure 7.1.

Subject circles:

not a lie can't say lie

very fairly not too sure sure sure

not too fairly very sure sure sure

Subject circles:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Figure 7.1. Scoring system

A coder scored subjects' justification for their choice into seven categories: factuality, intent, belief, partly fact, white lie, idiosyncratic and none. ‘Factuality’ was scored if the subject referred to what actually had occurred in the story. For example: ‘Selma really stepped on Dick’s ball’. ‘Intent’ was coded if the subject noted the speaker’s intent to deceive (or not to deceive). For example: ‘Liz wasn’t trying to convince anyone that she enjoyed the party’. Mistake was also categorised as intent. ‘Belief’ was scored if the
subject referred to the speaker’s belief system, that is, whether the speaker knew or believed the statement to be true. For example: ‘It was what he believed at the time’.

Three additional codings were established. ‘Partly fact’ was scored when the subject referred to the fact that the speaker told just part of what was the true state of affairs. For example: ‘He did not tell the whole truth but just part of it’. It was later added to the statistical analysis as ‘factuality’. It was also decided to recode all data consisting of ‘white lie’ categories. When subjects stated that the utterance was a lie, the coder found it difficult to distinguish among the three components since all three elements were inherently involved in forming a white lie. White lie was assumed to be defined based on the logic that factually the utterance was false, the speaker did not believe in her story and had a ‘positive’ intention not to harm the duped. It seemed that the positive intention was the significant element to distinguish between ‘a lie’ and ‘the truth’. White lie was scored when the subject clearly stated that the speaker’s utterance was a white lie. White lies were recoded later as ‘intent’. ‘Idiosyncratic’ was scored for all explanations that were bizarre. For example, ‘I chose to tick ‘the truth’ because his mother is so complicated’. Coder scored responses ‘none’ when the subject could (or would) not verbalise reasons for the label. Only if statements could be clearly broken into separate units were they coded into more than one category. While a statement of belief often implied factuality (e.g., ‘Tom knew that he had no fever’) the coder scored only belief unless the subject explicitly stated both elements (e.g., ‘Tom knew that he had no fever, and he really had no fever’).

Four points on the ‘Affect Scale’ (not at all, slightly, strongly, very strongly) were collapsed into a dichotomy (not at all and slightly, strongly and very strongly).

7.1.6 Results

Two coders each scored results for half of the cases, and another one coded all cases. When the coders disagreed, the third coder (ID) scored the plot. The codes used in the analysis were those agreed upon by two of the three coders. (which was always possible).
Inter-rater reliability using Kappa measure of agreement between the initial pair of raters ranged from .485 to 1, median = .9, mean = .87.

Analysis of variance of the three prototypical elements (factuality, intention, and belief) for all subjects was adopted as a post-hoc analysis examining the lying questionnaire’s content validity. It was assumed that if subjects became sensitive to each of three elements they would respond accordingly. For example, the condition of facts matching reality (cells 1, 2, 3, and 4) would contribute to more of ‘the truth’ response, and the condition when facts do not match reality (cells 5, 6, 7, and 8) would contribute to more of ‘a lie’ response. Subjects’ responses were transformed into three dichotomous variables according to the label (lie, true, neither) given by the subject to each of 16 target statements. This was done by counting the number of times a cell received a particular label versus the number of times that cell was given any other label. Thus all the data were sorted in three ways. Repeated measures analysis was performed using the SPSS MANOVA program.

Significant interactions were found between ‘the truth’ - ‘a lie’ responses and prototypical elements embedded in plots (see Table 7.2). In plots where factuality was positive, i.e., when facts matched reality (cells 1, 2, 3 and 4) subjects tended to define target sentence as ‘the truth’ more than as ‘a lie’. Conversely, in plots where factuality was negative, i.e., when facts did not match reality (cells 5, 6, 7, and 8), subjects tended to define the target sentence as ‘a lie’ more than as ‘the truth’ (F = 83.21, df = 1,29, p < .001). In plots where belief was positive, i.e., when the speaker believed in her statement (cells 1, 3, 5, and 7) subjects tended to define the target sentence more as ‘the truth’ than as ‘a lie’. Conversely, in plots where belief was negative, i.e., when the speaker did not believe in her statement (cells 2, 4, 6, and 8), subjects tended to define the target sentence more as ‘a lie’ than as ‘the truth’ (F = 52.47, df = 1,29, p < .001).

Results for the intention element were in the opposite direction from that that was expected. In plots where intention was positive, i.e., when the speaker did not intend to deceive (cells 1, 2, 5, and 6) subjects tended to define the target sentence more as ‘a lie’ than as ‘the truth’. Conversely, in plots where intention was negative, i.e., when the speaker intended to deceive (cells 2, 4, 6, and 8), subjects tended to define the target sentence more as ‘the truth’ than as ‘a lie’ (F = 21.89, df = 1,29, p < .001).
Table 7.2: Relationships between prototypical elements and 'the truth' or 'a lie' responses

Analysis of all prototypical combinations reveals that plots 5 (mistake) and 6 (white lie) where intention was positive (no intention to deceive) but facts were negative (facts did not match reality) contributed to the subjects’ definition. Thus they were either not attuned to the positive intention or gave more weight to the factuality element or they judged the intention as negative. Cell 6 represents a white lie where there is an intention not to harm the dupe, but obviously there is an intention not to tell the truth. It was assumed that this confusion brought subjects to give more weight to false facts being told. The target statement in Cell 5 represents a mistake where the speaker is in a confused...
state, telling a factual lie without being aware to this fact and without a manifest wish to
tell a lie. In this condition, it was assumed that when subjects decided to define ‘a lie’
they weighed more the untrue state of events being told.

To examine ‘Affect Scale’ reliability for positive, negative, and neutral clusters, an alpha
coefficient was produced. For positive affects alpha = .9273, for negative affects alpha =
.9433, and for neutral affects alpha = .9708. Thus affects are well clustered.

Since each cluster included unequal items (5 positive, 7 negative, and 4 neutral affects)
new affect variables were produced by dividing each affect by the sum of neutral, positive
and negative affects, for each plot separately, thus getting a new fraction representing
weighed product. A repeated measure analysis of variance with 4 factors (affect charge,
factuality, intent, belief) was conducted (using Manova - SPSS for windows). Main effect
for positive affect (F = 27.11, df = 1.29, p < .001) and negative affect (F = 74.62, df =
1.29, p < .001) was found. Target sentences in plots that were composed as less
emotionally charged were rated by subjects as loaded with positive affects (mean = .364,
sd = .19) more than in plots that were composed as more emotionally charged (mean =
.204, sd = .11). Target sentences in plots that were composed as more emotionally
charged were rated by subjects as loaded with negative affects (mean = .171, sd = .12)
more than in plots that were composed as less emotionally charged (mean = .393, sd =
.16).

The assumption that plots would evoke different reactions was proved.

7.2 Discussion

The model of Coleman and Kay (1981) was adopted and a new questionnaire was
developed. When we try to define lying the first thing that comes to mind is probably the
idea of saying something untrue. This, however, is not adequate, since people frequently
say things that are not true but which nonetheless are not called lies. Honest mistakes and
innocent misrepresentations occur frequently, where the speaker is sincerely trying to
convey what she believes to be true information. The standard social lie is frequently
uttered in situations where it might be true. The speaker usually knows quite well that the
statement is false. Almost any situation in which politeness requires some sort of remark may produce a social lie. The model used consisted of three elements: *factuality*, *speaker's intention* and *belief*. Plots were composed for each combination. The main finding was that unanimously subjects' justifications for their decision referred to the three-prototypical properties of lies. Lies are reprehensible acts, and subjects' judgements regarding facts (true or false), motives (good or ill), and the speaker's belief in her statements, entered into their thinking about how to score the stories. The experimental task was not artificial.

Two methods were used to validate the questionnaire. Firstly, it was subjects' comments about stories' plausibility and comprehensibility. Secondly, we compared the differential use of elements in each cell. Apart from two cells (5 - a mistake and 6 - a white lie), in all other cells subjects tended to apply the prototypical elements as expected. In cells where facts matched reality they judged the target sentence as 'the truth' but when facts did not match reality they judged it as 'a lie'. In cells where the speaker believed his statement they judged it as 'the truth' and when the speaker did not believe his statement they judged it as 'a lie'. In the third condition, when intentions were positive, subjects tended to judge it more as 'a lie' than 'the truth'. Coleman and Kay (1981) used the same plot in their study and their sample defined the target statement more as 'a lie' than 'the truth', the same trend as in our sample.

Strichartz and Burton (1990) explored age differences. The adult group in their study reached the same conclusion. Generally, subjects' comments showed their apperception of the intention element but decided to define it differently from what the model had predicted. The moral consideration might be a possible explanation. Intention implies making a moral choice between 'good' or 'bad'. For the majority of subjects a white lie was interpreted as morally not accepted; they thus defined it as a lie, stressing both the speaker's intention and the falsity of the statement. Cell 5, an untruth being told mistakenly, was defined more as 'a lie'. Coleman and Kay (1981) explained the same results, saying that it had occurred that the consequences resulting from such a mistake might bias people towards classifying it as 'a lie'. In fact some subjects commented that the speaker should have been blamed for making that mistake.
The findings raise some methodological issues. It appeared that subjects tended to read additional real-world information into the stories. We tried to get the appropriate configuration of elements in each plot but people subtracted or added presupposed information. For example, many commented in cell 2 (omission by confusion) that it was irrelevant whether or not the fair had actually moved. In other words, the facts of the real world did not, in most cases, increase the likelihood that the utterance in cell 2 would be considered a lie. Moreover, one source of variance in the data was the fact that people interpreted situations within the context of what they consider likely in the real world. For instance, there were comments in cell 4 from subjects who wrote that they themselves tended to get sick before a test. One could suspect that many people gave the speaker the benefit of the doubt: who would want to accuse a sick child of wrongdoing? Furthermore, many people have been in such situation at one time or another - not wanting to go to school to undergo a test - and hence are more apt to have sympathy with the protagonist. Sometimes self-reference seemed to play a major role in the definition of lying. Subjects’ comments showed that their own experience had affected their understanding of the reality and thus their definition. The Affect Scale that proved to be valid and differentiated between uncharged and charged plots was developed to explore this internal component. The prediction is that subjects’ affect response would show instability and relativity in a lie-truth definition and that personal history would affect both the regulation of affect and the definition of lying.

Coleman and Kay (1981) pointed out another source of noise, that is, the problem of making up a set of paradigmatically contrasting stories. The story in which a character is saying something which she believes to be untrue, but without intent to deceive, which turns out to be untrue, is difficult to deal with in the real world, where such situations seem rare. It may be significant that people often wanted to change the stories to make them accord better with their experience.

Another source is the possibility that people are, consciously or otherwise, modifying their responses to appear moral, broadminded, sympathetic, and perspicacious or the like.

One may also raise the question of the model’s applicability in generalising people’s linguistic response to their behaviour in a natural setting. Another criticism might raise the issue that lying is an inherently social act, hence the question whether investigation of
the word ‘lie’ might lead naturally into a full-scale investigation of communicational and interactional applicability. Can a tenable distinction be drawn between the meaning of a word and all the knowledge of the word that is connected with the use of that word? This is still an open question. Some researchers prefer indeed to study lying in people’s natural environment. It is particularly in developmental studies that such observations are more feasible (Newton, 1994; Dunn, 1996). Both Coleman and Kay (1981) and Strickhart and Burton (1990) studies proved that experimentally the model predicted people’s definition of lying in various conditions. Following Coleman and Kay (1981), we have adopted the distinction between linguistic meaning and language use, and that between knowledge of language and knowledge of the world.

Nonetheless, the data and analysis presented above appear to duplicate previous studies and to establish that: (1) ‘a lie’ is a word whose definition does involve a prototype; (2) the prototype probably contains the three elements considered; (3) subjects fairly easily and reliably assign the word ‘lie’ to reported speech acts in a more-or-less, rather than all-or-nothing fashion; (4) subjects agree fairly generally on the relative weights of the elements of the semantic prototype of ‘a lie’.

Having established the Concept of Lying measure in a normal sample, we decided to conduct it on new experimental and control groups. Chapter 8 explores the next study, which compares the normal sample and the patients’ response to the task of defining lying, and estimates their affective reaction to the stimuli.
CHAPTER 8: JUDGEMENT OF TRUTH IN PERSONALITY DISORDERS AND CONTROLS

In the introduction we put forward the hypothesis that as lack of differentiation with the object is maintained, the BPD patients could not keep the boundaries between reality ('me') and mental representation ('not me'). Following the developmental model suggested by Leekham (1992) we defined mature lying as a process by which the subject aims to create an impression in somebody else's mind that differs from reality. The liar manipulates the object's mind and, therefore, the object's behaviour.

Our hypothesis is that patients with BPD have deficits in their capacity to understand others' minds thus when lying, to a layman it would seem that their lies are mature, in the sense that they are trying to manipulate others' minds, whereas in fact they tend to lie without having an integral awareness of their and the others' mental states. They are lying without understanding that saying something untrue can affect the listener's beliefs and, as a consequence, the listener's behaviour.

We assume that borderline patients do not always have access within their own minds to what is an accurate representation of their truth and of the object's representation of the truth. Lying is thus examined as primitive in nature. A basic mode of lying is proposed. The most common is lying without taking into consideration the other's mind. In this type, the patient has learned to apply an instrumental chain of associations. She knows, for example, that if she says 'a' then a certain reward is expected, or if she says 'b' a certain punishment is avoided. As proposed earlier, we claimed that when she feels threat (sensed by her as anxiety), and overwhelmed by aggression, she affirms the 'not real' (or what an observer might perceive as 'not true') while not knowing the real, and appears to lie. Borderlines may be lying objectively more frequently because they may affirm the 'non reality' at far less cost than the non BPD individuals who are more pained by the simultaneous pressure of both ideas in their mind. The tendency to alleviate psychic pain by maintaining the 'not real' turns out to be a rewarding mechanism, hence the BPD instrumentally learns to apply this mechanism.

The development of the capacity to mentalise and understanding lying in borderline personality disorder has not been studied empirically yet. The objective of next section of
this study is to explore the differences between normal subjects and borderline patients in responding to the Concept of lying scale, which measures both external (factuality) and internal (intention, belief) references to the definition of lying. As we assume that the borderline patients limit their capacity to depict feelings and thoughts in themselves and in others, we hypothesise that they will tend to use the factuality element more than the controls, whereas the controls will apply more to the internal elements, intention and belief. As this is an exploratory study we also may expect other patterns, such as equal employment of intention in the definition of lying (for example, taking into account the BPD tendency to be engaged in persecutory ideation).

8.1 Method

8.1.1 Subjects

The same group studied in the previous study served as the control group, i.e. thirty M.Sc. Clinical Psychology students and staff at UCL (mean age 32, sd = 7.85, range 24-52; 12 males, mean age 35, sd = 8.83, range 25-52; 18 females, mean age 30, sd = 6.61, range 24-49). Thirty-two subjects in the experimental group (mean age 33, sd = 7.26, range 22-48; 4 males, mean age 30, sd = 3.61, range 26-33; 19 females, mean age 34.5, sd = 7.62, range 22-48) who volunteered to participate in the study were drawn from two psychiatric hospitals. Fourteen patients were drawn from the Halliwick Day Hospital in St. Ann’s Hospital. It is a psychoanalytically informed day hospital located in the London Borough of Haringey, forming part of the general psychiatric service in that Borough. It is a specialist day hospital, offering twenty-five places to patients found difficult to treat. Most patients fulfil criteria for borderline personality disorder with history of self-harm, violence, use of alcohol or drugs and had been subject to sexual or physical abuse in their childhood. Eighty per cent of referrals are from in-patient wards. The treatment is intensive psychotherapy within the therapeutic milieu of a day hospital setting. The treatment differs from that in a therapeutic community in that patients do not take over staff functions. Patients are encouraged to attend on a daily basis, and participate in small and large analytic groups. They are offered an individual therapy session on a once-weekly basis. Eighteen patients were drawn from The Cassel Hospital Adult’s Unit
located in Richmond, London. The unit consists of up to seventeen patients. Patients are allocated to one of two different treatment programmes. One consists of a year’s in-patient treatment within the therapeutic community. The second is a six-months’ stay, followed by a six-month outreach nursing and a year’s twice-weekly psychoanalytical group psychotherapy. Most patients fulfil criteria for borderline personality disorder with history of self harm, violence, use of alcohol or drugs and had been subject to sexual or physical abuse in their childhood. They are drawn from all over the country. Unlike the Halliwick Day Hospital, patients at the Cassel hospital are engaged in the psychotherapy programme as well as in the running of the hospital and its community. Patients on the adult unit have twice-weekly individual psychotherapy sessions. They participate in small groups (firm meeting with staff members to discuss issues such as weekends, reviews, activities and particular difficulties and relationships on the unit) and in community meetings (the staff and patients from all three units meet to talk about issues concerning the community).

Several studies failed to distinguish between in-patients with borderline and non-borderline personality disorders (Kolb and Gunderson, 1980; Kroll et al., 1981; Kroll et al., 1982). It has to be noted that since the early 1980’s the DSM-III has become more refined. Nevertheless, when the DSM-III and DSM-III-R were compared with ‘expert criteria’ on the same sample, the DSM found to be ‘over-inclusive’ and the expert criteria restrictive (Stangl et al., 1985). The author suggests that the DSM criteria may identify non-specific type of severe character pathology. Nunberg (1991), using DSM-III-R, reached a similar conclusion. Berelowitz and Tarnopolsky (1993) conclude that when using the term according to the DSM-III-R criteria, it should be considered as a more general measure of severe character pathology, a notion which fit with psychoanalytic views such as those of Kernberg (1967). The difficulty in distinguishing borderline personality disorder from other personality disorders, brought us to include all patients in the experimental group and to treat them as having borderline personality organisation. Firstly, in both hospitals, patients are referred as having borderline personality disorder on the basis of history of self harm, violence, use of alcohol or drugs and they had been subjects to sexual or physical abuse. Secondly, subjects in the control group were not properly diagnosed. We tentatively refer to this group as a control group thus we decided to use an over-inclusive criteria for the experimental group. Thirdly, this is a preliminary
study and we prefer to include all cases and thereafter to decide whether to use other criteria. Throughout we refer to the experimental group as having borderline personality organisation and to BPD as having borderline personality organisation.

All subjects in the control group filled in the questionnaire. Out of thirty-seven patients, five were reluctant to fill it in. Another three found this task difficult to complete individually, so they gave their response verbally after the interviewer's assistance in reading the plots.

8.1.2 Measures

The Concept of Lying Questionnaire was administered, as described in chapter 7.

8.1.3 Design

Two groups by four dichotomous within-factor variables: emotional-charge × factuality of statement × speaker's intent to deceive × speaker's belief of statement. Each emotional-charge condition consisted of eight plots depicting all possible combinations of the other three within-subjects variables, each plot evaluated for its affect-charge. Three dependent variables were measured: judgement of statements ('the truth', 'a lie', 'neither'); use of prototypical elements ('factuality', 'intent', 'belief'), affective response (positive, negative, neutral).

We predict that the experimental group will tend to use 'factuality' element more than the control group, whereas the control group will apply more to the internal elements, 'intent' and 'belief'. This tendency will be greater in the charged condition. Experimental subjects will respond to the Affect Scale marking higher levels, especially in the charged condition.

8.1.4 Procedure

In both hospitals patients were involved in an ongoing outcome study. The interviewer was participating as a member of the research teams and interviewed the patients for the current study adding his measures. Subjects were sent a letter describing the study
After getting their approval to participate, they were informed about the research. They were told that:

The researcher is a postgraduate student in Psychology, currently employed as Hon. Research Assistant at the Cassel Hospital (or a researcher at the Halliwick Day Hospital). As a part of a research project we are investigating relations between care and abuse in childhood and the subsequent development of different psychological problems. All current and future patients referred to the hospital are invited to participate. The research will involve 5-6 interview sessions which last for about 2 hours (each) during which you will be asked to fill in and answer questions about yourself and your past experiences. You will be free to withdraw from the study at any time, without having to give a reason and without this affecting your present and/or future treatment at the Cassel Hospital (or the Halliwick Day Hospital).

Patients were told that in addition to being interviewed about their difficulties, history, and functioning, they would also be asked about the experience of lying and being deceived in their childhood, and would be required to fill in a questionnaire about deception. It was clarified that the interview and the questionnaire about deception were not part of the current outcome study. The subjects were asked to be recorded (on a tape recorder) throughout sessions. They were informed that this procedure would facilitate our analysis of the data. They were reassured that the content of the interviews were confidential, that no one in the hospital would have access to this material, and that their name would not be mentioned anywhere. A personal code was allocated to each subject to ensure that. All written material and recorded tapes were labelled accordingly. The researcher answered questions concerning the aim, content and process of the research.

After getting subjects’ written consent (Appendix 8.2) the researcher gathered demographic information. Another appointment was set for the following week. In the first five sessions, patients were interviewed about their current and past psychiatric conditions followed by interviews about their experience of care and abuse in childhood. In chapter 10 we will present the data obtained from these interviews.

The current chapter includes only analysis of the Concept of Lying, which patients filled in after the fifth session. They were asked to fill in the questionnaires at their own time and space. The description of the task was introduced on the front page (Appendix 7.4). They filled in the questionnaire prior to being interviewed about their experience of deception in childhood. As many patients found difficult to fill in the questionnaire, an additional session was dedicated to fill it in with the interviewer’s assistance. The
interviewer read each plot and then asked the questions. In several cases the researcher had to reread the plots, as patients were unable to concentrate. Three patients could not finish this task even after getting the interviewer’s assistance. In few cases, when patients were confused about the content of the plots, mainly having difficulties in comprehending stories, the researcher clarified it without adding further explanations to the protagonist’s or other characters’ thoughts, beliefs or feelings. Usually, this procedure took an entire session. The session was recorded and subsequently transcribed. In the following session patients were asked to recall childhood experiences of being deceived by others or deceiving others. These interviews will be discussed in chapter 10.

Subjects in the control group filled in only the Concept of Lying questionnaire. The procedure for the control group was discussed in chapter 7.

8.2 Results

8.2.1 Relative selection of labels

Firstly, groups were compared in the definitions (‘the truth’, ‘a lie’, ‘neither’) in each cell.

8.2.1.1 Emotionally uncharged cells

Figure 8.1 shows the relative application of any label (‘the truth’, ‘a lie’, or ‘neither’) for cells 1-4. Figure 8.2 shows the relative application of any label (‘the truth’, ‘a lie’, or ‘neither’) for cells 5-8. Genuine truth (cell 1) and slip of the tongue (cell 3) were labelled by the majority of subjects in both groups as ‘the truth’, and an outright lie (cell 8) was labelled as ‘a lie’ by all subjects.

Omission by confusion (cell 2) was defined as ‘the truth’ by 43.4% of subjects in the control group and by 37.5% of subjects in the experimental group, and as ‘a lie’ by 16.8% of subjects in the control group and by 12.5% of subjects in the experimental group. ‘Neither’ was defined by 36.8% of subjects in the control group and by 50% of subjects in the experimental group. Table 8.1 shows that a significant difference was found for omission by confusion (cell 2) just for the experimental group where ‘a lie’ was labelled
fewer times than other choices. Patients were more likely to define it as ‘the truth’ or ‘neither’. In this cell the speaker tells the truth while at the same time she does not believe her story, as a result of her confused mental state. Half of the subjects in each group defined it as partly ‘the truth’.

Slip of the tongue (cell 3) was judged significantly more as ‘the truth’. 90% in the control group and 82.8% in the experimental group defined it as ‘the truth’. Cell 3 represents a state where facts match the truth and the speaker believes her story, but intends to deceive (this rare condition was created by letting the speaker inattentively tell the factual truth). Subjects appeared to skip the line ‘Chris doesn’t want Niko to know that they have forgotten to buy a present’; thus Chris’s primary intention has not been taken into account.

Figure 8.1. Uncharged cells (1 to 4) - % subjects in each cell using any label

White lie (cell 6) and omission by confusion (cell 7) were defined by the majority of subjects as ‘a lie’ (white lie - cell 6: 63.3% of control subjects and 64% of experimental subjects, significant difference between labels; omission by confusion - cell 7: 50% of control subjects and 79.6% of experimental subjects; significant differences between labels, see Table 8.1) Cell 6 represents a white lie (there is no intention to deceive, facts
do not match reality, speaker believes her statement). Thus in the white lie condition, intention did not contribute much to subjects’ choice. Cell 7 represents an intentional lie in a confused state where the protagonist omits some facts (but still believes her sentence). We assume that belief did not play a significant role in labelling this cell.

Cell 4 (undefined) was significantly labelled ‘a lie’ by the control group more than otherwise (see table 8.1). Although not significant, the same pattern was observed in the experimental group. This cell describes an exceptional situation where the speaker intends to deceive, does not believe her statement but still is telling the truth. The plot is about a child staying at home since he has got a test for which he has not studied, feeling slightly sick, knowing that it is not a sufficient excuse for not going to school. In the end it appears that he has got a fever, developing the measles. It seems that subjects failed to significantly consider the factual element, which in the end appeared to be true. The factual element in this plot is the protagonist’s emotional and physiological condition (being slightly sick) which probably contributed to subjects’ discarding of the factuality element.

![Figure 8.2. Uncharged cells (5 to 8) - % subjects in each cell using any label](image-url)
Mistake (cell 5) was labelled ‘neither’ by the majority of all subjects (86.7% of control subjects and 71.9% of experimental subjects; significant differences among labels, see Table 8.1). This cell represents a mistake where the speaker does not intend to deceive, believes her statement but factually utters an untrue account of events. It seems that in this cell subjects equally weighed all elements; thus they could not reach a conclusive solution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Experimental group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Chi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1. Differences of given labels in each cell for each group

To summarise, on the overall cells 1, 2, and 3 (genuine truth, omission by confusion and slip of the tongue) were labelled more times as ‘the truth’ and cells 4, 6, 7, and 8 (undefined, white lie, omission by confusion and outright lie) more times as ‘a lie’. Mistake (cell 5) was labelled mainly as ‘neither’.

To sum up, cells 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8 were judged in both groups as expected by Coleman’s model. Cells 1 and 3 were judges more as ‘the truth’, cell 5 more as ‘neither’ and cells 6 and 8 more as ‘a lie’. Cells 2, 4, and 7 were less differentiating between prototypical elements and were not defined in any consistent pattern.

8.2.1.1.1 Analysis of differences between groups in labelling cells

The next section explores the difference between groups in labelling cells.
Figure 8.3 shows differences between groups in labelling a sentence 'the truth'. A significant difference was found only for omission by confusion (cell 7) (Pearson $\chi^2 = 6.58$, df = 2, $p < .037$).

![Graph showing differences between groups in labelling 'the truth'.]

Figure 8.3. Uncharged cells - % subjects in each cell using label 'the truth'

None of the experimental subjects defined this cell as 'the truth' while 16.7% of subjects in the control group did so.

Figure 8.4 shows differences between groups in labelling 'a lie'. In the analysis of differences between groups in labelling cells, a significant difference was found for mistake (cell 5), (Pearson $\chi^2 = 7.166$, df = 2, $p < .025$). Subjects in the experimental group defined mistake (cell 5) more as 'a lie' than subjects in the control group. Particularly noticeable is the finding that none of the control subjects defined mistake (cell 5) as 'a lie', and 18.7% of experimental subjects defined it as such. Cell 5 represents a mistake. Those patients who labelled it 'a lie' must have primarily considered the utterance itself (which did not match facts) rather than the internal elements (mental states). It is also assumed that they failed to examine other prototypical elements.

Another significant difference was found also for omission by confusion (cell 7) (Pearson $\chi^2 = 5.93$, df = 2, $p < .05$). In the experimental group, 79.6% of subjects defined
it as 'a lie' while only 50% of control subjects did the same. Apparently, patients were more alert to either the negative intention or the false statement.

Figure 8.4. Uncharged cells - % subjects in each cell using label 'a lie'

Figure 8.5 shows differences between groups in labelling 'neither'.

Figure 8.5. Uncharged cells - % subjects in each cell using label 'neither'
The graph in Figure 8.5 shows that cells 2, 4, 6, and 7 (omission by confusion, undefined, white lie) were labelled as ‘neither’ by nearly 25% of all subjects, and mistake (cell 5) was labelled as such by almost 70% of all subject. As expected, in cells where three elements were contradictory, some subjects decided not to decide, thus ambivalently defining them as ‘neither’.

No significant differences were found between groups in labelling cells.

To sum up, in uncharged condition, mistake (cell 5) and omission by confusion (cell 7) were treated differently by control and experimental subjects (see Figure 8.2).

Mistake (cell 5) was defined as ‘a lie’ by some experimental subjects but by none of the control subjects. Subjects in the control group largely tended to define mistake as ‘neither’. This cell represents a mistake where the speaker does not intend to deceive, believes her statement but factually utters an untrue account of events. It depicts a plot about a solicitor’s secretary who mistakenly confuses two cases. Four patients labelled it ‘a lie’. Subject No. 120 said:

"By switching the information, she told a lie, but not on purpose”.

Subject No. 202:

“Debra knew in her mind that Mr. Smith’s case was about a building society and Mr. Green’s case was about inheritance therefore when she said the opposite to the solicitor, she was telling a lie. Maybe Debra did not like those two clients or she had some other reason for confusing their cases to the solicitor. However she knew which client had which case and yet she said the opposite. That is not the truth”.

Subject No. 214 justified her labelling it as ‘a lie’ saying:

“Debra lied to get herself out of a tricky situation, rather than making the effort to find out which case belonged to whom”.

The fourth patient did not give any justification for her choice. It is most likely that patients’ tendency to project their own thoughts, feelings and beliefs brought them to define mistake (cell 5) as ‘a lie’.

Omission by confusion (cell 7) represents a condition where although the speaker believes her statement, she intends to deceive and tells a lie. In this condition subjects need to perceive and give priority to the protagonist’s state of mind. The protagonist is
semi-aware of external events, and under the condition of daydreaming she intentionally tells an untrue statement. For example, subject No. 10 explained his decision saying:

"How could he have anticipated the fair was closing down or moving on? Given it was his intention to visit the fair (initially) we must assume he was answering truthfully, even though he ended up at the pool hall".

Subject No. 22 said:

"It was the truth in the context of what she thought was true. She thought the fair was there and did not notice that it had moved and therefore she did not consciously lie".

Nevertheless, the general tendency, in the uncharged condition, was to equivalently define cells in both groups.

8.2.1.2 Emotionally charged cells

Figure 8.6 shows the relative selection of the labels ‘the truth’, ‘a lie’, or ‘neither’ for cells 1-4. Figure 8.7 shows the relative selection of the labels ‘the truth’, ‘a lie’, or ‘neither’ for cells 5-8. Genuine truth, slip of the tongue and mistake (cells 1, 3, 5) were mainly labelled ‘the truth’ in both uncharged and charged conditions (significant result, see table 8.2). An outright lie (cell 8) was almost unanimously labelled ‘a lie’ whereas cell 4 (undefined) in the uncharged condition and a white lie (cell 6) in the charged condition were labelled ‘a lie’ (significant result, see table 8.2). Omission by confusion represented in both cells 2 and 7 were generally labelled indiscriminately ‘the truth’, ‘a lie’, or ‘neither’. Genuine truth, slip of the tongue and mistake (cells 1, 3, 5) were labelled by the majority of the subjects in both groups as ‘the truth’ (Genuine truth - cell 1: 93.3% of subjects in the control group, 92.1% of subjects in the experimental group; Slip of the tongue - cell 3: 83.2% of subjects in the control group, 59.6% of subjects in the experimental group; Mistake - cell 5: 73.3% of subjects the control group, 79% of subjects in the experimental group).
Unexpectedly, three control subjects labelled genuine truth (cell 1) as ‘neither’. One subject explained that the speaker made her guess at what she thought might have happened (subject 23). Another meticulous subject asserted that:

“Waking up is not the same as oversleeping as it’s less accidental” (subject No. 61).

The third subject (number No. 950) said:

“Sally cannot be sure that Edward overslept, and he may have decided to avoid Sally because of the row. This means that Sally could only tell Bruce what Edward told her, which may or not be the truth”.

The only experimental subject who labelled genuine truth (cell 1) ‘neither’ justified it by saying:

“Again Helen hasn’t told the whole story - i.e. about their row” (subject No. 211).
It seems that the emotional and conflictual condition embedded in this plot took its toll on these four subjects, so their attention was shifted, and they were mainly focused on the protagonist’s assumed mental state. A decision was made to include all four subjects in all analyses, assuming that their choice was not due to reading or comprehension difficulties. Furthermore, it was our prediction that in the charged version, subjects would respond slightly differing from the uncharged version. It occurred even in genuine truth (cell 1) which supposed to be a clear-cut judgement.

Slip of the tongue (cell 3) represents a state where facts match the truth and so the speaker believes her story, but intends to deceive (this rare condition was created by letting the speaker inattentively tell the factual truth). In the charged condition subjects appeared to skip the line telling ‘Arthur doesn’t want Gina to know that he had a date with Audrey last night’, similar to the pattern subjects labelled slip of the tongue (cell 3) in the emotionally uncharged condition, thus Arthur’s primary intention was not taken into account.
Cell 5 represents a mistake where the sentence did not match facts, there was no intention to deceive and the speaker believed her statement. Unlike subjects’ response in the uncharged condition (the majority labelling it as ‘neither’), in the charged condition subjects mainly labelled the statement as ‘the truth’. Thus they probably appeared to be less confused with the contradiction amongst ‘false statement’, ‘no intention to deceive’, and ‘believing one’s own statement’. For example:

“I think that Gloria was mistaken (not intentionally) to say that she thought she saw her old boyfriend; maybe the person looked similar in appearance. I also wonder if unconsciously she was thinking about her boyfriend at the time” (subject No. 218, experimental group).

Or:

“Gloria thought it was Paul and that’s what she told Martin. The fact that late it was discovered that it wasn’t Paul doesn’t matter beshe didn’t know that at the time” (subject No. 11, control group).

A white lie, undefined and outright lie (cells 4, 6, 8) were labelled ‘a lie’ by the majority of subjects in both groups (cell 4 - undefined: 56.7% of subjects in the control group, 48.4% of subjects in the experimental group; a white lie - cell 6: 100% of subjects in the control group, 86.5% of subjects in the experimental group; an outright lie - cell 8: 100% of subjects in both the control group and the experimental group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Experimental group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Chi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2. Differences of given labels in each cell for each group
Cell 4 (undefined) describes a rare condition where the speaker intends to deceive, does not believe her statement but is telling the truth. The plot depicts a person who sleeps with his best friend’s girlfriend thinking that he was seducing her while in fact it is mentioned that it was she who seduced him. Being fearful of his girlfriend, although not wanting to admit his cheating on her, he confesses his sin. Those who responded to this statement as ‘a lie’ considered the belief and/or the intention:

“Ben thinks he seduced Patricia – thus for him that is the truth, because he believes it” (No.109, experimental subject).

Or

“Because, from Harvey’s perspective, he was the one who seduced Emma, and when faced with having to explain this to his girlfriend he purposefully tried to her by telling her it was Emma who had seduced him” (No. 12, control subject).

Omission by confusion (cell 2) was defined as ‘the truth’ by 40% of subjects in the control group and by 17.1% of subjects in the experimental group, and as ‘a lie’ by 40% of subjects in the control group and by 35.9% of subjects in the experimental group. ‘Neither’ was defined by 20% of subjects in the control group and by 47% of subjects in the experimental group. In this cell the speaker tells part of the truth while at the same time as a result of her confused mental state she does not believe her story. Controls as well as experimental subjects were scattered in their definitions.

Omission by confusion (cell 7) was labelled significantly by the majority of the control subjects as ‘neither’ (see table 8.2), whereas experimental subjects’ labelling was evenly scattered among three possibilities (see Figure 8.7). These results differ from the preceding findings, which revealed that in the uncharged condition the majority of subjects in both groups defined the statement as ‘a lie’.

To sum up, cells 1, 3, 6, and 8 (genuine truth, slip of the tongue, mistake, outright lie) were judged by both groups as expected. Cells 1 and 3 were defined more as ‘the truth’, cells 6 and 8 more as ‘a lie’. Unexpectedly, but logically (based on Coleman’s model), mistake (cell 5) was judged as ‘the truth’. The responses to omission by confusion (cells 2 and 7) were largely scattered.
8.2.1.2.1 Analysis of differences between groups in labelling cells

Figure 8.8 shows the differences in labelling a sentence ‘the truth’.

The same pattern as observed in the uncharged condition was obtained in the charged condition, apart from the response to a mistake (cell 5, see also Figure 8.3). No significant difference was found in the analysis of labelling cells between groups.

Figure 8.8. Charged cells - % subjects in each cell using label ‘the truth’

Figure 8.9. Charged cells - % subjects in each cell using label ‘a lie’
Figure 8.9 shows differences between groups in labelling a sentence 'a lie'. No significant result was found in the analysis of differences between groups.

Figure 8.10 shows differences between groups in labelling a sentence 'neither'.

![Bar chart showing differences between groups.](image)

(*p < .05)

Figure 8.10. Charged cells - % subjects in each cell using label 'neither'.

Analysis of the difference between groups found that groups differed significantly in omission by confusion (cell 7, Pearson $\chi^2 = 8.18$, df = 2, p < .017). More subjects in the control group than in the experimental group defined it 'neither'.

In omission by confusion (cell 7) the prototypical combination consists of a false fact, an intention to deceive, and the speaker's belief. The plot describes a perpetrator of abuse who is feeling ashamed of his behaviour thus even when somebody else is known to be the cause of an abusive behaviour, he inattentively admits he had done it.

Claudia is married to Eric. They have a son, called David. James, Claudia's brother, lives with them. One day Claudia returns home drunk. She goes into David's room, screaming and shouting at him, with no good reason. She goes out of the room. James believes that David has taken money from his purse. He goes into David's room and injures him seriously. Then, he goes out to calm down. Eric hears David's weeping and asks Claudia whether she has hit David again. Being drunk, Claudia is sure that she has hit David. She doesn't want to admit it to Eric.
However, *a slip of the tongue* gives her away and she tells Eric that she has hit David”.

Significant difference was found in employing ‘belief’ (using one-way analysis of variance). Subjects in the experimental group employed less ‘belief’ than control subjects (control: N = 36, mean = .94, sd = .41; patients: N = 25, mean = .72, sd = .46; F = 4.01, df = 1,59, p < .05). Thus, subjects in the control group tended to weigh up two or more elements before coming to their conclusion, while subjects in the experimental group mainly chose to focus on just one of two elements, and were less likely to include ‘belief’ in their decision. For example, control subject (No. 32) replied:

“She said what she believed to be true, even though she may not have wanted to say it, (alcohol acting as a ‘truth-drug’). But it’s not true - James hit David”.

Experimental subject (No. 219) said:

“James hit David so she lied to cover up James hitting David”.

Or another experimental subject (No. 222) said:

“Because it is coming from him, he is saying what he thinks is the truth. So as far as he is concerned, he is telling the truth, although it isn’t the truth really, but he feel it is because he feels he must have done it”.

8.2.2 Analysis of differences between conditions: factuality, intent, belief, and emotional-charge

The relative significance of the prototypical elements in the groups is most clearly observed by plotting the percentage of subjects within each cell who exclusively applied each of the labels separately.

The participants’ responses were transformed into three dichotomous variables according to the label (‘a lie’, ‘the truth’, ‘neither’) given by the subject to each of sixteen target statements. This was done by counting the number of times a cell received a particular label versus the number of times that cell was given any other label. Thus all the data were sorted in three ways. Repeated measure analysis was conducted using the SPSS MANOVA. The four dichotomous within-factor variables corresponded to the elements
outlined in Table 7.1: factuality of statement, speaker’s intention to deceive, speaker’s belief of statement, and stories mode (non-emotionally charged or emotionally charged).

8.2.2.1 Defining the target sentence as ‘the truth’

For truth, main effect for group (F = 4.48, df = 1,60, p < .038, see Figure 8.11) was found. Subjects in the control group judged more cells as ‘the truth’ than did subjects in the experimental group (see table 8.3 for means and standard deviations).
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Figure 8.11. Defining ‘the truth’ by group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.067</td>
<td>.6103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.781</td>
<td>2.537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.3. Mean, standard deviation, and number of subjects for the definition of ‘the truth’ - by group

For truth, a significant interaction between group and factuality was found (F = 4.48, df = 1,60, p < .038, see Figure 8.12 and table 8.4 for means and standard deviations).
When fact smatched reality, control subjects were more likely to judge target sentences as ‘the truth,’ whereas when facts did not match reality both groups judged it correspondingly. Did control subjects use ‘factuality’ more when facts did not match reality? To examine these questions, one-way analysis of variance was conducted, comparing the mean number of times a choice of each prototypical element had been made when labelling a sentence ‘the truth’ between groups, for factuality-positive and factuality-negative conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facts</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.4. Mean, standard deviation, and number of subjects for the definition of ‘the truth’, group by fact

For cells 1,2,3, and 4 (fact positive) subjects in the control group used ‘factuality’ to justify their answer more than subjects in the experimental group (control: N = 30, mean
= 4.5, sd = 1.48; patients: N = 32, mean = 3.4, sd = 1.81; F = 6.73, df = 1,60, P < .012).

For cells 1,2,3, and 4 (fact positive) control subjects used ‘belief’ more than experimental subjects (control: N = 30, mean = 1.4, sd = 1.13; patients: N = 32, mean = .47, sd = .62, F = 16.39, df = 1,60, P < .001).

Notable was the finding that not just ‘factuality’ but also control employed ‘belief’ more when facts matched reality.

A significant interaction of group and emotional-charge by factuality was found. (F = 5.51, df = 1,60, p < .022, see Figure 8.13 and table 8.5 for means and standard deviations).

Table 8.5. Mean, standard deviation, and number of subjects for the definition of ‘the truth’, group by load by fact
When facts did not match reality, subjects from both groups tended to judge cells less often as ‘the truth’. In the uncharged condition this tendency was greater, fewer subjects judged sentences as ‘the truth’. Figure 8.7 shows that cells 2,3,4, and 5,6,7 account for this difference. Fewer experimental subjects labelled cells 2, 3, and 4 as ‘the truth’, and more of them labelled cells 5,6, and 7 as ‘the truth’. Were control subjects more attuned to factuality elements in cells 2,3, and 4? Did subjects in both groups tend to consider all elements equally, while in the final weighing up, each group came to a different conclusion?

To examine these questions, one-way analysis of variance was conducted, comparing the mean number of times a choice of each prototypical element had been made when labelling a sentence ‘the truth’ between groups, for factuality-positive and factuality-negative conditions. For cells 1,2,3, and 4 (fact positive), in uncharged condition subjects in the control group used ‘belief’ to justify their answer more than subjects in the experimental group (control: N = 30, mean = .47, sd = .63; patients: N = 32, mean = .009, sd = .296; F = 9.108, df = 1,60, p < .004). For cells 1,2,3, and 4 (fact positive) in charged condition control subjects used ‘factuality’ element more than experimental subjects (control: N = 30, mean = 2.17, sd = .87; patients: N = 32, mean = 1.53, sd = 1.01, F = 6.929, df = 1,60, p < .011). No significant differences were found for cells 5,6,7,8 (fact negative) in uncharged conditions. In charged condition control subjects employed more ‘belief’ than experimental subjects (control: N = 30, mean = .233, sd = .504; patients: N = 32, mean = 0, sd = 0, F = 6.87, df = 1,60, p < .011). Thus, these findings show that subjects in the control group use prototypical elements more than experimental subjects in three conditions. Belief is employed in facts positive, uncharged, and facts negative, charged conditions, and factuality is employed in facts positive, charged condition. Applying belief brought subjects in the control group to define statements as ‘the truth’. Do subjects in the experimental group, manifest in these conditions a diminished capacity to load and process the belief element?

8.2.2.2 Defining target sentence ‘a lie’

The interaction between group and belief is significant (F = 5.95, df = 1,60, p < .018, see figure 8.14 and table 8.6 for means and standard deviations).
More subjects in the experimental group judged the statements as 'a lie' when the speaker believes her utterance. When the speaker did not believe her utterance, fewer subjects in the experimental group defined it 'a lie'. Figure 8.4 shows that cells 5 and 7 account for the difference in 'belief-positive' condition, and Figure 8.9 shows that cells 2, 4, and 6 account for the difference in 'belief-negative' condition.

![Graph showing the mean of 'A lie' by belief](image)

**Figure 8.14.** Defining 'a lie' - group by belief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Belief positive</th>
<th>Belief negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.6.** Mean, standard deviation, and number of subjects for the definition of 'a lie', group by belief

To examine the relative importance of prototypical elements in each group, one-way analysis of variance was conducted, comparing the mean number of times a choice of each prototypical element has been made when labelling a sentence as 'a lie' in each group, between belief-positive (cells 1,3,5,7) and belief-negative (cells 2,4,6,8). No
significant difference was found in the condition where the speaker believes her statement. In the other condition, when the speaker did not believe her statement, subjects in the control group employed more ‘factuality’ (control group: N = 30, mean = 3.833, sd = 1.39; patients: N = 32, mean = 2.84, sd = 1.55, F = 6.978, df = 1,60, p < .011) and ‘belief’ (control group: N = 30, mean = 2.37, sd = 1.27; patients: N = 32, mean = 1.562, sd = 1.43, F = 5.42, df = 1,60, p < .023).

To sum up, the definition of a lie is affected by the extent to which the speaker believes her statement. In the condition where the speaker believes her statement more patients defined it ‘a lie’, and subjects in both groups employed relatively the same prototypical elements. This tendency was changed in the condition where the speaker did not believe her statement. Controls defined it more as ‘a lie’ than experimental subjects using mainly the distinction between facts and beliefs. Subjects in the experimental group tended to take into consideration the speaker’s belief less, thus failing to define it ‘a lie’.

8.2.2.3 Defining target sentence as ‘neither’

The interaction group and fact was significant (F = 16.98, df = 1,60, p < .001, see figure 8.15 and table 8.7 for means and standard deviations).

![Figure 8.15. Defining 'neither' - group by load by fact](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fact positive</th>
<th>Fact negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  Mean   sd</td>
<td>Mean  sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>30  1.1   .923</td>
<td>2.37  1.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>32  1.594 1.864</td>
<td>1.344 1.451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.7. Mean, standard deviation, and number of subjects for the definition of 'neither', group by fact

When facts matched reality subjects in the experimental group defined sentences more as 'neither' than subjects in the control group. This tendency was reversed when facts did not match reality so that subjects in the control group defined sentences as 'neither' more than subjects in the experimental group.

To examine the relative use of prototypical elements in each group, one-way analysis of variance was conducted, comparing the mean number of times a choice of each prototypical element was made when labelling a sentence as 'neither', between fact-positive (cells 1,2,3,4) and fact-negative (cells 5,6,7,8). In fact-positive, subjects in the control group employed more 'belief' than subjects in the experimental group (control group: N = 30, mean = 2.03, sd = 1.61; experimental group: N = 32, mean = 1, sd = 1.02, F = 9.274, df = 1,60, p < .003). In fact-negative, subjects in the control group employed more 'factuality' and 'intention' elements than subjects in the experimental group (factuality: control group: N = 30, mean = 2.0, sd = 1.46; patients: N = 32, mean = .843, sd = 1.02, F = 13.182, df = 1,60, p < .001; belief: control group: N = 30, mean = 1.97, sd = 1.38; patients: N = 32, mean = 1.28, sd = .99, F = 5.109, df = 1,60, p < .003) Nearly significant was the finding that subjects in the control group employed more 'belief' (control group: N = 30, mean = 2.6, sd = 1.04; experimental subjects: N = 32, mean = 1.875, sd = 1.04, F = 7.788, df = 1,60, p < .007). When the speaker gives an untrue statement, control subjects weighed up almost all elements to reach their conclusion, whereas experimental subjects seemed to establish their decision using all elements together to a lesser extent. Interestingly, when facts match reality it is the speaker’s belief itself that determined the control group judgement of 'neither'. For example, subject No. 44 (control group) responded to plot 4 (which was about a supposedly sick child who does not go to school and later on finds out that he has developed the measles) thus:
"... Intended to mislead and what he said was not what he believed to be the case".

The interaction group and belief was significant ($F = 21.61$, df = 1,60, $p < .001$, see figure 8.16 and table 8.8 for means and standard deviations).

Figure 8.16: Defining 'neither' - group by belief

When the speaker believed her statement subjects in the control group defined sentences more as 'neither' than subjects in the experimental group. This tendency was reversed when the speaker did not believe her statement so that subjects in the experimental group defined sentences as 'neither' more than subjects in the control group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Belief positive</th>
<th>Belief negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.8. Mean, standard deviation, and number of subjects for the definition of 'neither', group by belief

To examine the relative use of prototypical elements in each group, one-way analysis of variance was conducted, comparing the mean number of times a choice of each prototypical element has been made when labelling a sentence as 'neither', between belief-positive (cells 1,3,5,7) and belief-negative (cells 2,4,6,8). When the speaker
believes her statement, subjects in the control group employed more ‘factuality’, ‘intention’ and ‘belief’ than subjects in the experimental group (factuality: control group: N = 30, mean = 5.17, sd = 1.51; experimental group: N = 32, mean = 3.72, sd = 1.73, F = 12.278, df = 1,60, p < .001; intention: control group: N = 30, mean = 2.63, sd = 1.59; experimental group: N = 32, mean = 1.82, sd = 1.51, F = 4.352, df = 1,60, p < .041; belief: control group: N = 30, mean = 3.2, sd = 1.27; experimental group: N = 32, mean = 2.03, sd = 1.15, F = 14.459, df = 1,60, p < .001). When the speaker does not believe her statement, subjects in the control group employed more ‘belief’ than subjects in the experimental group (control group: N = 30, mean = 1.43, sd = 1.14; experimental group: N = 32, mean = .84, sd = .85, F = 5.42, df = 1,60, P < .023). The general tendency shown was that control subjects employed more prototypical elements, especially when the speaker believes her statement.

8.2.2.4 Prototypical elements between groups

So far the results have shown that in various conditions subjects in the control group employed more prototypical elements than the experimental subjects did. To analyse it systematically, one-way analysis of variance was performed to compare the mean of factuality, intention, and belief separately and jointly. One subject from the experimental group was omitted from analysis because of having missing data.

Table 8.9 shows that subjects in the control group made up their judgement considering more prototypical elements altogether in charged condition and when combining both charged and uncharged conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncharged</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.9. Over all use of prototypical elements (df = 1,59)
Table 8.10. Use of prototypical elements (df = 1.59)

Table 8.10 shows that subjects in the control group made up their judgement considering more prototypical elements than experimental subjects. In both uncharged and charged conditions and inclusively, subjects in the control group employed more ‘factuality’ and ‘belief’ than subjects in the experimental group. Interestingly, both groups employed the element of ‘intention’ comparatively equally.

8.2.2.5 Affective responses between groups

A repeated measures analysis of variance between 2 factors (the control and experimental groups) with 4 within factors (affect charge, factuality, intent, belief) was conducted (using Manova - SPSS for windows) to look for the differences in response to the ‘Affect
Scale'. Main effect for negative affect (F = 25.06, df = 1,55, p < .001) was found, but not for positive affect. Subjects in the experimental group felt negative emotions towards the protagonist more than subjects in the control group (control group mean = 1.129, experimental group mean = 1.837).

8.3 Discussion

Our aim was to explore the differences in judging lying and truth in control and experimental subjects in emotionally uncharged and charged conditions.

The findings show that:

1. Generally, groups did not differ in their judgements of the target sentence when compared in each cell separately. When the accumulative effect was analysed, considering the response to target sentences in all plots, we found that subjects in the control group tended to judge more target sentences as 'the truth' than did subjects in the experimental group, especially when facts matched reality.

2. More subjects in the experimental group judged statements as 'a lie' when the speaker believes her utterance (across conditions).

3. When facts matched reality subjects in the experimental group defined sentences more as 'neither' than subjects in the control group. This tendency was reversed when facts did not match reality so that subjects in the control group defined sentences as 'neither' more than subjects in the experimental group.

4. When the speaker believed her statement subjects in the control group defined sentences more as 'neither' than subjects in the experimental group. This tendency was reversed when the speaker did not believe her statement so that subjects in the experimental group defined sentences as 'neither' more than subjects in the control group.

5. Subjects in the experimental group felt negative emotions towards the protagonist more than subjects in the control group.
In uncharged and charged conditions, separately and inclusively, subjects in the control group employed more ‘factuality’ and ‘belief’ than subjects in the experimental group. Interestingly, both groups employed the element of ‘intention’ comparatively equally.

The first four findings presented will be discussed jointly. These findings show the variance in judging target statements as the truth, lies, or neither. ‘The truth’ was a predominant response in the control group. Judgements of ‘a lie’ and ‘neither’ seemed to be allocated more randomly. It implies that subjects in the control group tended to consider and experience object relations from the perspective of judging lying as more benevolent. Patients’ response in the ‘Affect Scale’ showed a similar positive affective response but higher negative affective response. We could predict that borderlines would judge statements less as the truth and more as lies, as they are prone to experience the object world as malevolent. Unexpectedly, no difference between groups was found for ‘a lie’ response. Furthermore, Kernberg (1971) noted that

“It is widely accepted that the predominance of splitting and other related primitive defences in the ego is a landmark of borderline personality organisation. The presence of generalised splitting of internalised self- and object images into ‘good’ and ‘bad’ ones, the persistent primitivisation and aggressive infiltration of interpersonal relationships, the emotional turmoil, the characteristic over involvement as well as withdrawal and protective shallowness, all reflect the generally serious pathology of internalised object relationships of patients with borderline personality organisation” (Kernberg, 1971, p.608).

These characteristics could have led us to assume that the experimental subjects would attribute object’s propositions as representing a split between ‘the truth’ and ‘a lie’. Moreover, ‘neither’ was marked similarly between groups. These findings suggest that in our sample splitting did not play a major role, not affecting patients’ responses, thus the outcome of judging lying was similar between groups. It suggests that patients’ concept of lying is generally intact, similar to the normative concept of lying as represented by the control group response. Analysis of the prototypical elements that were considered in the judgement process may shed more light on these findings.

The most significant finding was that patients with severe personality disorders employed fewer prototypical elements altogether to reach their decision in all judgements, when the target sentence was defined ‘the truth’, ‘a lie’ or ‘neither’. Controls had access to operate all elements in the process and were also capable of employing the necessary mental
effort to operate alternatives when asked deal with the task of judging lies. Patients with severe personality disorders who were asked to perform the same task did not have the same access to prototypical elements. It is also reasonable to assume that they were not capable of processing these constructs altogether.

The fact that in both emotionally uncharged and charged conditions the factuality of the statement and the speaker’s belief were applied significantly more by subjects in the control group shows that the speaker’s awareness of the differences between real and ‘unreal’ accounts of events and the analysis of the distinction between both constructs are cognitively and emotionally more accessible to them. Intention was not proved to be differently employed between groups. Thus, patients are as capable as normal subjects to accessing, processing and considering other’s intentions to lie. What is the difference between the object’s intentions and belief systems, as both of them represent internal mental states?

Adults commonly explain what an actor does by invoking constructs such as the actor’s wishes, fears, beliefs, expectations, and doubts. These constructs can be roughly divided into beliefs (the actor’s knowledge, convictions, suppositions, ideas and opinions) and desires (the actor’s wants, wishes, goals, hopes, and aspirations). In order to explain intentional actions, it is necessary to appeal to beliefs and desires (Davidson, 1963) because to do something intentionally is to have desire and to engage in the act because you believe it will help satisfy your desire. We generally explain why people do what they do in terms of their desires, or goals, and their beliefs both about these goals and about various possible means to their goals. While beliefs and desires are different sorts of mental states or attitudes, they both include an attitude and a content. For this reason they are sometimes termed a propositional attitude and a content. This terminology reflects the notion that beliefs are about some content, a content that can be stated as a proposition (Wellman, 1988). For instance, one might believe that ‘the tea is hot’ or guess that ‘Jane’s party is on Wednesday’. Similarly, desires can be construed as propositional desires, fears, or wishes: that is, they are desires that a proposition be realised. For example, one might desire that ‘one will drink tea’ or fear that ‘one will get burnt’.
Beliefs and desires involve two facets: (a) the nature of the mental attitude, state or process (belief, hope, doubt, desire, etc.) and (b) the proposition or content to which the attitude pertains. Beliefs can result from other beliefs and desires can cause other desires. For example: Why does she go to college? She thinks it will enhance her earning power (and she wants to make a lot of money). Why? She thinks that most high-paying jobs require a college degree. Why? She knows that a degree is required to be a medical doctor and she thinks that sort of example is representative of lots of jobs. One action can be believed to be (or desired as) a sub-goal to another (which may be only a means to another). Beliefs, desires and intentions relate to representations of reality, not to reality itself. This relationship is different for beliefs and for desires and intentions. The difference between representation and reality is in terms of the direction of the fit and the direction of causation (Searle, 1983). For belief, the mind has to fit the world that is beliefs are true if representation matches reality. If the representation does not match reality the belief is changed, and thus events in the world cause our beliefs. On the other hand, for desires and intentions, the direction of fit is from the world to the mind, for example, desires are fulfilled if the world come to match the representation, and it is our desire which causes changes in the world. Thus beliefs, desires and intentions are alike in involving representational relations to reality, but they differ in the nature of that relationship.

In our naive psychology perception causes beliefs. Basic emotions and/or physiological states such as deprivation and arousal cause desires. Thus, perception as well as physiology and basic emotions provide input to the mind from extra-mental sources. Perception tells us about the external world of real objects, spaces and events. One's knowledge (justified belief) is thus forged in part from perceptions, from seeing, hearing, or feeling various states of affairs. Physiology and basic emotions also provide input to the mind. While this input is external to the mind, it is internal to the body. The input from these sources fuels desires, whereas perceptions fuel belief. The distinction between desires (want, wish, would like to) and basic emotions (hate, love, anger, fear, anguish) is imprecise. Potential confusion over specific desires and particular emotions is evident in everyday conceptions of the broad scope of the generic term 'feeling'. One could 'feel' that 'getting an award would be nice' (a desire) but one can also 'feel hungry' (physiology) and 'feel sad' (basic emotion), and so forth. 'Feeling that something would
be nice' counts as a desire because of its propositional-attitude nature. Emotions such as love, pleasure, sadness, and so forth cause and ground one’s propositional desires but do not constitute such desires themselves. Thus, emotions influence action through their role in forming desires. Wellman (1988) proposed a model based on the above propositions (see figure 8.17).

![Figure 8.17. Wellman's model](image)

Wellman investigated in several studies the age at which, and the manner in which children engage in reasoning of this sort. The question of when and how children understand belief-desire terms reflects a mentalistic interpretation of action rather than a behaviouristic or a physicalistic one. Piaget (1965) suggested that young children are 'moral realists', judging acts only on their external, non-intentional features. In his studies Wellman showed that children’s explanations of action indicate that most children by the age of three construe human actions as the product of mental states of belief and desire, and can reason about a person’s beliefs as well as desires. Three years is just about the earliest age at which children understand belief and thus can participate in belief-desire reasoning. In a rather unique method of longitudinal he examined 400,000 children’s utterances and their first use of desires terms, such as want and wish, and beliefs terms, such as think and know. He found that genuine psychological uses of want, think and know occurred amongst all children. Genuine reference to a character’s desire via the term want begins quite early and is well established even before the second birthday. Reference to belief via the terms think and know begins much later, just before the third birthday. More impressively, each individual child’s data substantiate this general pattern.
In every case (1) reference to desire preceded reference to belief and (2) reference to desire was already evident by two years, but (3) reference to belief was evident at just about three years.

Judgements of control and experimental subjects comprised of intention evenly, whereas factuality and belief were used significantly more by controls. Earlier, we suggested that patients suffering from severe personality disorders, especially those having borderline organisation would exhibit deficiencies in theory of mind, that is, they would lack the capacity to assume causal relations between wishes, beliefs and actions, particularly in relation to highly attached figures. Theory and research in desire-belief development might clarify, and yield a possible explanation of these findings.

If those patients who are lacking the capacity to have theory of mind, or if in certain circumstances this capacity is impaired, then others’ mental states such as the object’s intention and belief would be less accessible to cognitive processing. Research on desire-belief development shows that intent precedes belief, thus cognitively belief as a mental representation is more complex than intention. The widely accepted assumption is that there is a continuum of development and a continuum of pathology. The common assumption of object-relations theories is that the origin of severe character pathology lies in the first three years of life, in the relation between infant and mother. Object-relations theorists reason that if psychosis is infantile and neurosis is oedipal, then severe character pathology must be pre-oedipal, stemming from conflicts or deficits arising after the first year and before the fourth or fifth.

This logic is manifested in all object relations theories, such as Kernberg’s (1975; 1976). They explain levels of personality organisation in terms of disturbances and fixations at sequentially arranged developmental junctures. For Kernberg the index of a patient’s developmental level which distinguishes borderline from neurotic character organisation is the extent to which representations are poorly integrated and splitting predominates in the clinical picture. In Kohut’s (1971) view, for example, failures of maternal empathy and mirroring, particularly in the periods during which crucial structures such as the grandiose self and the idealised parent imago are formed, can generate defective structures and hence narcissistic pathology. In Masterson’s (1976) view, a mother who has tremendous difficulties with separation issues will present her child with barriers to
separation-individuation in the rapprochement stage. Rewarding the child's clinging dependency and punishing its age-appropriate strivings towards autonomy in the pre-oedipal years, the mother may produce a child who has difficulty integrating object-relational part-units into mature representations and is vulnerable to abandonment depression. Ways of experiencing the self and others in infancy and early childhood are obviously the foundation upon which subsequent wishes and expectations are built. Longitudinal research on attachment (Bretherton, 1985; Belsky and Nezworski, 1987) clearly documents the long-standing impact of patterns of infantile attachment at least through early childhood (Main, 1984).

The findings showed that more subjects in the experimental group judged the statement when the speaker believed her utterance as 'a lie' than subjects in the control group. When the speaker did not believe her utterance, fewer subjects in the experimental group define it as 'a lie'. In this condition 'belief' was used more by controls which inevitably brought them to their judgement. It clearly indicates that when judging lies patients were less able to understand or maintain others' belief. Possibly it was mainly using the element of intention which caused them to fail in assigning statements that were not believed by the speaker to be 'a lie'.

Generally both groups used intention comparatively the same, which means that patients are as able as controls to judge lies processing the speaker's intention. Understanding intention as a mental representation of one's own and the other's mental entity provides patients with significant explanatory resources, allowing them to predict and understand a variety of actions and emotional reactions as stemming from the actor's internal desire states, rather than from the actor's internal belief states.

The finding that factuality was used significantly more by controls when defining a statement as 'the truth' or 'a lie' was quite unexpected. Factuality is a construct representing the true account of events. Developmentally, children's first reasoning about lying is based on factuality. This tendency was less significant in the uncharged condition (p < .07) while highly significant in the charged condition (p < .005). It is probable that the charged cells lifted patients' sensitivity to the speaker's intention thus they gave priority to this element rather than to factuality. The pattern of splitting and projection...
may also amplify thinking processes in highly charged human interactions and conflicts in terms of intention (bad or good) rather than facts.

The fact that overall, controls employed more elements means that they are more able to judge lying utilising more mental effort.

There was almost no difference between the uncharged and the charged conditions. Some alternative explanations are provided. Firstly, that it reflects the real state of affairs, i.e. that no difference in fact exists. Secondly, one could argue that the charged conditions are less charged for patients since they are more habituated to such incidents. Lying in an atmosphere of abuse constitutes part of their real life experiences. Habituation and familiarity to such conditions desensitise those patients to harmful, hurtful, immoral and tormenting situations where they suffer maltreatment and indignities. Thirdly, it is also probable that the highly charged plots turned to be similar to the uncharged plots because patients tended to project internal states such as their own feelings, intentions, beliefs, or thoughts on the characters involved. This rationale seems somehow more founded since patients frequently used intention as an explanation of the concept of lying.

To sum up, the most interesting finding was the difference between groups in using belief to justify the concept of truth and lying. This tendency emerged throughout all conditions and plots. This consistency strengthens the validity of our hypothesis and findings. The questionnaire gave us some cues about severe personality disorders’ conceptualisation of truth and lying.

In the next chapter we investigate possible links between the experience of abuse, the concept of lying and developing a borderline psychopathology.
CHAPTER 9: CHILDHOOD EXPERIENCE OF CARE AND ABUSE AND ITS RELATION TO LYING

9.1 Does personal experience of abuse predispose to attitude to truth and falsehood?

The aim of the following study is to explore the relations between childhood experiences of antipathy, neglect, physical, psychological and sexual abuse, the concept of lying and a diagnosis of BPD.

Earlier (in chapter 6) we mentioned studies exploring abuse as a potential etiological explanation for BPD. All studies are based on retrospective recall of childhood events. We are unaware of any prospective studies of sexually and physically abused children that demonstrate the development BPD. However, the retrospective nature of the above work does not invalidate it. All papers were investigating persistent patterns of maltreatment neglect, rather than one-off incidents. They therefore lend substantial support to the idea that the breeding ground for borderline personality disorder is a childhood environment which combines neglect and instability, marital discord, physical and sexual abuse, and the absence of a good relationship which will buffer the effects of the adverse environment.

Hitherto, we have found that the control and the experimental group differed in their use of 'belief' to justify the concept of truth and lying. When judging lies patients were less able to understand or maintain other’s belief. This tendency emerged throughout conditions and plots.

The first object of the current study is to replicate the findings that the experimental group employs less 'belief'. Secondly, we explore specific links between various experiences of maltreatment and BPD. Thirdly, we study the effect of these childhood experiences on the concept of lying.

We suggested that research on desire-belief development show that intent precedes belief, thus belief as a cognitive-mental representation is more complex than intention. We assumed that the BPD individuals’ use of belief was impaired as a result of their malevolent childhood experiences. We refer to the use of belief as an indicator of
mentationalisation, which in essence is the product of a cognitive capacity and of emotional maturity.

One of the most striking features of BPD is the intensity of their emotional reactions, the changeability of their moods. They may abruptly shift from a pervasive depressed mood to anxious agitation or intense anger. Linehan (1993) suggested that the core pathology is a combination of emotional vulnerability and the inability to regulate affect. The key element in the development of the borderline's emotional dysregulation derives from what she termed as an 'invalidating environment'. Perry (1993) argued that the capacity to experience and modulate affect must develop in an environment that provokes extreme feelings of terror and rage that does not provide reliable soothing. Stuart (1990) suggested distinguishing between cognitive and affective components of object relations, rather than referring globally to object-relational development.

“What renders object-relational development in borderline and borderline’s experience of the object world is not a cognitive deficit in the development of the object representation but rather an overwhelming tendency to construe interpersonal relations as malevolent. Often this construct of object relations entails cognitively sophisticated but distorted attributional processes” (Stuart et al., 1990, p.313).

In Stuart’s view, affect precedes and induces cognitive deficit.

Is the concept of lying shaped by affective components of object relations? Does the use of ‘belief’ decline as a consequence of deficiency in affect regulation? Stuart and colleagues (1990, p.682) examined extensive research on measures of understanding borderlines’ social causality, complexity and accuracy of causal attributions. They concluded that,

“Borderlines are prone to experience the object world as malevolent and to experience and consider relationships and moral questions in need-gratifying ways. That these patients also tend to attribute the causes of people’s behaviour, thought and feeling in idiosyncratic ways that are probably sometimes developmentally ‘primitive’, resembling the pre-operational causality of young children described by Piaget, and sometimes simply abnormal, distorted by motivational and defensive processes and by defective cognitive structures and procedures. That they also tend to represent the self and others in pathological ways, sometimes blurring the perspectives of self and others as young children do, sometimes failing to integrate representations of more than one affective valence as latency-age children (and furious or rapturous adults and adolescents) do, and sometimes infusing their representations with so many fantasy elaborations as to render their understanding of the self and others complex but highly distorted. That borderlines are also
particularly sensitive to separation, loss and abandonment” (Stuart et al., 1990, p. 682)

We assume that the tendency to develop and to get overwhelmed by negative emotions affects the process of lying. ‘Belief’ represents, in our view, a precursor of TOM. Thinking about others’ beliefs is partly an evidence of having a mature concept of lying. When borderlines are overwhelmed with negative emotions they are more likely to blur the perspectives of self and others. We think that when telling a lie the borderline’s concept of lying is blurred by distorted causal attributions, or in our previous study, by the emphasis on the object’s assumed intentions.

The hypothesis is that childhood experiences of care and abuse impels individuals to experience the object world as malevolent, to develop deficiencies in achieving a mature concept of lying and thus to develop a borderline psychopathology.

9.2 Method

9.2.1 Subjects

The group of experimental subjects studied in the previous analyses combined with two additional subjects who were drawn from the control group consisted of the current experimental group (34 subjects, mean age 32, SD 7.63, range 22-51; 4 males, mean age 28, SD 4.96, range 22-33; 30 females, mean age 33, SD 7.83, range 22-51). Subjects in the control group were recruited from two sources, a General Practitioner and the university. Flyers were put in GP’s reception and were hung in the Department of Clinical Psychology at UCL (Appendix 9.1). People who fulfil the requirement (not having a history of mental illness) were asked to fill in two questionnaires and were offered £25 for filling in two questionnaires and for attending the interview. Those who volunteered received a general description, followed by a letter. Attached was a thorough explanation of the research, its aims and requirements, a consent form, a pre-stamped envelope for returning material (see Appendix 9.2). Thirty-one subjects were interested in being interviewed, of whom only nineteen filled in the questionnaires, and were interviewed. Two of them were assigned to the experimental group on the basis of their rating on the psychiatric diagnostic measure (SCID-I & SCID-II). Both were diagnosed as having
multiple personality disorders. Subject number No. 226 was diagnosed as avoidant, dependent, schizotypal and schizoid personality disorder and subject No. 227 was diagnosed as histrionic and narcissistic personality disorder. In the end the control group consisted of 17 subjects (mean age 30, SD 7.48, range 22-48; 3 males, mean age 28, SD 4.16, range 25-33; 14 females, mean age 30, SD 8.1, range 22-48).

9.2.2 Measures

9.2.2.1 The Concept of Lying questionnaire

The Concept of Lying questionnaire is described in the previous study (see chapter 3). It explores cognitive processes in judging truth or lies. The Affect Scale was added to validate the differences in plots’ emotional load. This scale classifies positive, negative and neutral emotions felt towards the protagonists’ assertions. This scale will be used as a measure to indicate subjects’ emotional valence felt toward the protagonist, the lying object. Positive feelings will be regarded as a benevolent representation of the object and negative feelings as a malevolent representation of the object.

9.2.2.2 Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-III-R

A standardised diagnostic interview schedule was used, axes-I and -II of the Structured Clinical Interview for the DSM-III-R; SCID-I and SCID-II, respectively (Spitzer et al., 1987). A research clinical psychologist who was trained to administer and code the measure assessed both groups.

Disorders were coded on a dichotomous continuum collapsing the 3-point-scales scored on the data sheets. A rating of ‘1: present’ for ‘2: sub-threshold’, and ‘3: threshold or true’ and a rating of ‘0: absent’.

SCID-I constitutes of: (1) Mood disorders - bipolar, other bipolar, major depression and dysthymia disorders. (2) Psychoactive substance use disorders - alcohol, sedatives, cannabis, stimulants, opioids, cocaine, hallucinogens and other drug abuse disorders. (3) Anxiety disorders – panic disorder, agoraphobia, social and simple phobia, obsessive-compulsive disorders and generalised anxiety disorder. (4) Somato-form disorders -
somato-form disorder, somato-form pain disorder, undifferentiated somato-form disorders and hypochondriasis. (5) Eating disorders - anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa. (6) Adjustment disorder. Coding were given also to 5 clusters: mood disorders, psycho-active substance use disorders, anxiety disorders, somato-form disorders and eating disorders. A rating of '1: present' was given to each cluster if at least one of the disorders ascribed to this specific cluster was rated '1' and a rating of '0: absent' was given to each cluster if none of the disorders ascribed to this specific cluster was rated '1'.

SCID-II constituted of avoidant, dependent, obsessive-compulsive, passive-aggressive, self-defeating, paranoid, schizotypal, schizoid, histrionic, narcissistic, borderline and antisocial personality disorders. Paranoid, schizoid and schizotypal personality disorders constitute cluster A. Histrionic, narcissistic, borderline and antisocial personality disorders constitute cluster B. Avoidant, dependent, obsessive-compulsive, passive-Aggressive and self-defeating personality disorders constitute cluster C.

9.2.2.3 National Adult Reading Test (NART)

To control for intelligence levels, the NART questionnaire was administered (Nelson, 1982). The NART was developed and is widely used as a technique for estimating pre-morbid intelligence levels. It measures familiarity with words. It comprises a list of 50 words printed in order of increasing difficulty. The subject reads aloud down the list of words and the number of errors made is recorded. WAIS verbal, performance and full-scale IQs can be predicted from this reading error score by inserting it into the appropriate formulae. For list of words and Table of IQ predicted scores see Appendix 9.3.

The following instructions were given:

“I want you to read slowly down this list of words starting here.' Indicate ACHE. ‘After each word please wait until I say ‘next’ before reading the next word. I must worn you that there are many words that you won’t probably recognise, in fact most people don’t know them, so just have a guess at these, O. K.? Go ahead”.

The subject is encouraged to attempt every word. All responses are reinforced. As the subject reads the words, the tester records the actual errors made.

9.2.2.4 Childhood Experience of Care and Abuse - CECA
The standard CECA is a semi-structured interview covering a range of experience of care and abuse before age 17 (Bifulco et al., 1993). All experiences are recorded in terms of their severity, using predetermined criteria, on a 4-point scale with '1': marked for most negative and '4': little or none for least negative experience.

**Parental Antipathy**

Antipathy reflects criticism, dislike, coldness, rejection or hostility shown by either parent in the household towards the child. It is rated separately for each parent or surrogate parent. Indicators for antipathy include: general statements that the relationship was a hostile or disapproving one; statements that the parent was hard to please or critical of the subject; specific indicators of the parent's dislike or hostility towards the child (e.g. exclusion of the subject and favouritism of other siblings; examples that the parent was cold, distant or rejecting to the child).

A typically rating of '1: marked' antipathy might involve angry rejection, distance and detachment, scapegoating, cold ignoring. A typical '2: moderate' antipathy rating would involved inferred rejection, irritability with the child, general ignoring, parents high standards of expectations. A rating of '3 some' antipathy typically involved both less severe and pervasive antipathy, indicators appear less frequently, for example, minor criticism or favouritism of siblings. A rating of '4: little/none' antipathy obtained when there is no indication of dislike and antipathy.

**Parental Indifference/Neglect**

Neglect from parents or surrogate parents is a global assessment of disinterested behaviour in terms of material care for the child, emotional availability when the child was distressed, interest in the child’s friendships, school work or career. The severity of neglect was rated on the pervasiveness of lack of interest in the child’s well being. Thus a typically rating of '1: marked' neglect might involve material and emotional neglect as evidenced by the child not being fed or clothed adequately as well as lack of interest in the child’s school and social life. A typical '2: moderate' neglect rating would involve parental lack of interest of somewhat less severity but in a number of relevant domains, such as lack of attention when the child is distressed or lack of interest with the child’s school work and social life. A rating of '3: some' neglect typically involved both less
severe and pervasive disinterest, for example, either emotional distance without behaviour neglect or indifference in one circumscribed area such as school work. A rating of ‘4: little/none’ neglect obtained when parents showed concern in all areas.

**Parental Discipline**

Discipline encompasses the enforcement of rules of behaviour by the parents on the child with the view to socialising the child and providing boundaries of behaviour, creating a structure and routine to the family life. Questions deal with parents’ attitudes to the child’s manners, dress and make up, contact with friends, including boyfriends, smoking and drinking. The way that discipline is imposed is also relevant. The consistent on reasonable reinforcement of rules of behaviour represents discipline at a desirable or ‘average’ level and is rated a ‘2: moderate’. Heavy restrictions placed on the child, often but not necessarily accompanied by high punitive represents high discipline and are rated a ‘1: high’. If one or both parents make little attempt to make or reinforce rules of behaviour then the discipline is rated a ‘3: lax’. If a parent varies between high and lax discipline on several occasions then the behaviour is rated ‘4: variable’.

**Parental Supervision**

Supervision of the child involves providing a safe environment and monitoring the child’s actions sufficiently to ensure that she is not in danger. A high rating of supervision indicates overly controlling behaviour and may be due to anxious and domineering parenting. The desirable ‘average’ degree of supervision is rated ‘2: moderate’. This assures the child’s safety but does not overly restrict her movements. Allowing the child too little freedom to explore is rated ‘1: close supervision’. If the parents do not oversee the child’s activities at all and therefore expose the child to possible danger and accidents the rating is ‘3: lax’. As in discipline ratings, ‘4: variable’ is rated only if the parent often varies styles between close and lax.

**Physical Abuse**

Physical abuse is assessed for all household members including mother, for surrogate parents, siblings and any other adults living in the home. Abuse from different perpetrators was rated separately. The scale reflects both the severity of attack (e.g. the weapon/implement used and the number of hits), the frequency of attacks during childhood and other relevant information about injuries sustained, threats invoked and the
degree to which the perpetrator was uncontrolled and the hitting arbitrary. A rating of '1: marked' typically involved repeated, violent and uncontrolled beatings. A rating of '2: moderate' involved the child being hit repeatedly with an implement such as belt or stick but in more controlled, less violent and less frequent manner. A rating of '3: mild' usually involved a single hard hit across the head with an open hand on a few occasions in childhood. A rating of '4: little/no abuse' was rated for at most only minor incidents such as being shoved or slapped across the legs.

**Sexual Abuse**

All sexual abuses were rated regardless of relationship to perpetrator, but with a distinction made between perpetrators who were household members and those who were not. Physical sexual contact with an adult was usually involved, and severity took into account age and abuse, the degree of intrusiveness of contacts, its frequency and the relationship of the child to the perpetrator. Thus '1: marked' sexual abuse usually involved sexual intercourse or repeated abuse involving some form of physical sexual contact by a household family member such as father or brother. A rating of '2: moderate' involved touching of genitals on repeated occasions by an adult usually known to the child and '3: mild' usually involved single incidents of touching of genitals, often by strangers. A rating of '4: little/no abuse' was rated if none was reported or only non-contact by stranger, for example seeing an exhibitionist. Since sexual abuse could occur from more than one perpetrator, ratings were made for each abusive experience.

Coding: The 4-point scale rating was collapsed into 2-point scale. Ratings of '1' and '2' were recoded to '1' and '3' and '4' to '0'. Thus ratings '1' and '2' were considered as 'prevalent abuse' and '3' and '4' were considered as 'little/none abuse'.

Each adversity was assessed for all household members including mother, father or surrogate parents and any other adults living in the home. Since few prevalent ratings were coded for each member, the data was collapsed into two ratings: (1) parents (including mother and/or father) and others (including stepparents and/or others); (2) all perpetrators. A rating of '1' was considered as 'prevalent abuse' and a rating of '0' was considered as 'no/little abuse'.
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The validity of adults' memories of childhood abuse

The controversy about the validity of adults' memories of childhood abuse is divided into clinicians and survivors who maintain that such memories are historically accurate and experimental psychologists who agree that recovered memories are usually introduced by suggestion (Fonagy and Target, 1998). The arguments against the CECA methodology (Bifulco et al., 1993) follow that: (1) Although perceptual qualities of memory are not indicators of accuracy, vivid imagery reflects the neural structures in common between perception and memory, rather than showing authenticity of recall (Minsky, 1980); (2) Recollections of vivid memories are subjectively indistinguishable from memories of real events (Johnson and Suengas, 1989); Individuals (patients and therapists) may be predisposed to see experiences of abuse as causal of their disturbances, thus memories may be induced by therapeutic suggestion. The arguments for Bifulco's (1993) approach follow that: (1) Trauma-induced memory loss is relatively rare, amnesia for traumatic events is unusual, and in general the more stressful the experience, the better it remembered (Fonagy and Target, 1998); (2) Direct denial or minimisation of a traumatic event fostered by the parents may induce an intense sense of the patient's 'not knowing' (Fonagy and Target, 1998), thus Bifulco's approach counterbalances the effect of suggestion.

Bifulco (1993) advised two techniques to overcome validity problems: (1) The use of intensive semi-structured face to face interviews, a technique which reduces the incidence of under-reporting and facilitates the possibility in returning to contradictory or unclear episodes in childhood for clarification; (2) Obtaining objective information by asking for examples and details of experiences in order to 'unpack' more general statements about childhood and trigger additional memories (pp. 5-6). Bifulco's obtained substantial agreement on the various scales between sisters in her sisters' study (Kappa = .67 - .78).

The validity of methods that measure childhood memories of abuse is controversial. Yet we find that a semi-structured interview such as the CECA is a valid measure, especially when considering its clear and adamant assessment of abuse.
9.2.3 Design

To the basic design presented in chapter 8 (two groups by four dichotomous within-factor variables: emotional-charge × factuality of statement × speaker’s intent to deceive × speaker’s belief of statement) another 3 sets of within group cluster of variables were added. The first set was comprised of all diagnoses assessed by SCID-I disorders (mood syndromes including major depression, bipolar depression; psychoactive substance use disorders including alcohol dependence and abuse, sedatives, cannabis, stimulants, opioids, cocaine, hallucinogens and others; anxiety disorders including panic disorder, agoraphobia, social phobia, simple phobia, obsessive-compulsive and generalised anxiety disorder; somato-form disorders including somato-form disorder, somatoform pain disorder, undifferentiated somato-form disorders and hypochondriasis; eating disorders including anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa; adjustment disorder) and SCID-II disorders (avoidant, dependent, obsessive-compulsive, passive-aggressive, self-defeating, paranoid, schizotypal, schizoid, histrionic, narcissistic, borderline and antisocial personality disorders).

The second set comprised of the 7 CECA domains (antipathy, neglect, supervision, control, physical, psychological and sexual abuse) by 2 groups of perpetrators (parental, non-parental).

The third variable was the NART IQ quotient.

We predict a path leading to BPD diagnosis by which experience of abuse (physical or sexual) will lead to increased emotional charge in response to protagonists lying sentences which in itself will bring about decrease in the use of 'belief'.

9.2.4 Procedure

The procedure of administering of the Concept of Lying questionnaire is presented in chapter 8. Subjects in the experimental group were interviewed in several sessions, usually once a week for an hour. After signing the consent form, demographic and psychiatric information were gathered following the guidelines serving as an initial screening as advised by the SCID-I & SCID-II manual. Firstly, the SCID-I & SCID-II
semi-structured interviews were administered. Secondly, the CECA, during which, the Concept of Lying questionnaire was conducted. Thirdly, the interview covered experiences of being lied to and telling lies was conducted (described in chapter 10). Lastly, the NART was conducted.

Subjects from the experimental group who volunteered received a general description of the study over the telephone that was followed by a letter stating:

Thank you for your interest in the research project. The aim of the study is to find out the effect of various childhood experiences on the personality. Although relations between childhood experiences and modes of functioning have been widely acknowledged, only a few studies have been carried out to examine the links between them. In our study, we look for specific experiences (such as care, affection, or maltreatment in childhood) with relations to specific modes of functioning (for example, inclination to avoid social interactions or preference to be the centre of attention). Another objective is to understand the impact of early experiences of deception on the child’s development.

The study is divided into two phases. Firstly, you are asked to fill in two questionnaires consisting of:

1. Short demographic questionnaire and set of questions portraying your personality.
2. Sixteen short stories depicting various social interactions aiming at getting your definition of lying.

The questionnaires will be sent to you. Then we will proceed to the next phase, in which you will be invited to the interview. The interview covers various childhood experiences and many interviewees, from our experience, find the interview quite stimulating and enriching. It will be conducted at University College London (located close to Goodge St. underground station, Tottenham Court Road, W1) and it lasts about 2-2½ hours. After concluding the interview you will be entitled to receive £25. If you do not want to proceed to the second phase you will still be eligible to receive £5 which will be mailed to you.

Enclosed are the questionnaires, and a stamped envelope. (See Appendix 9.2).

After getting and coding the questionnaires the researcher set an appointment with the subjects. Subjects in the experimental group were interviewed in one session (usually it lasted for 3 hours). Following the introduction including gathering demographic information, the SCID-I & SCID-II were administered, followed by the CECA, interview of experiences of being lied to and telling lies, and the NART.
9.2.5 Coding

The interviewer was especially trained in conducting and scoring the SCID-I & SCID-II and the CECA measures. All interviews (SCID-I & SCID-II, CECA, experience of lying and the NART) were tape-recorded. Experiences of lying interviews were transcribed.

SCID-I & SCID-II scores were obtained as advised by the manual. SCID-I scores were collapsed into a dichotomies. Rating of ‘2: sub-threshold’ and ‘3: threshold or true’ were collapsed into rating ‘1’ and ‘0’ remains ‘absent’. Two main scores were calculated: (1) score for each syndrome; (2) DSM Axis-I sum of scores. Thus, mood, substance abuse (including alcohol), anxiety, somato-form and eating disorders were scored separately. SCID-II scores were originally obtained on dichotomous scale. Scores for each psychiatric diagnosis in DSM Axis-I & Axis-II were calculated and the diagnosis was achieved when scores reached the criteria.

CECA scores were done after listening to the tape recordings. Scale scores, coded for some subjects, were presented to the scales’ developer (Dr. Bifulco) who accepted the coder’s evaluations. Agreement was achieved for all scales for all protocols presented.

NART scores were obtained using the table of IQ predicted scores (Appendix 9.4)

9.3 Results

9.3.1 SCID I & II profiles

SCID-I: Subjects in the experimental group were diagnosed predominately as having mood and anxiety disorders. Half of the subjects were diagnosed as having substance abuse. Somato-form and eating disorders were manifested among less than 40% of the subjects (see Figure 9.1). In the control group 10% to 20% of subjects were diagnosed as having mood, anxiety or eating disorders.
Significant differences were found for mood\(^1\), substance abuse and anxiety (for all \(\chi^2 p < 0\)).

![Figure 9.1. Frequencies of DSM Axis-I disorders between groups](image)

A sum of scores for all DSM Axis-I disorders was calculated. In the comparison between groups, using one-way-analysis of variance, a significant difference was found (mean score for experimental group = 2.72. sd = 1.22; mean score for control group = .71. sd = .91; F = 3.86, df = 1, p < .001).

Differences between groups in DSM Axis-II are shown on Figure 9.2. Groups differed in avoidant disorder (\(\chi^2 = 11.326, df = 1, p < .001\)), paranoid disorder (\(\chi^2 = 9.773, df = 1, p < .002\)), schizotypal disorder (\(\chi^2 = 6.555. d = 1, p < .01\)) and BPD (\(\chi^2 = 15.168, df = 1, p < .001\)).

Cluster analysis for all personality disorders revealed one main factor outlined in table 9.1. BPD was grouped with avoidant, self defeating, paranoid and schizotypal personality disorders. In the group of BPD, 100% of subjects were also diagnosed as having mood disorders, 70% - substance abuse and anxiety disorders, 45% - eating disorders, 60% - avoidant or paranoid disorders.

\(^1\) A subject received a score for 'mood' when the mood syndrome was either prevalent in the past or currently.
Figure 9.2. Frequencies of DSM Axis-II-disorders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONALITY DISORDER</th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsessive-compulsive</td>
<td>.1875</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-aggressive</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-defeat</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid</td>
<td>.9375</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizotypal</td>
<td>.5625</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizoid</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histrionic</td>
<td>.3125</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissistic</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td>.8125</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social</td>
<td>.3125</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.1. Cluster analysis - Axis-II
A total score for all DSM Axis-II-personality-disorders was calculated. In the comparison between the groups, using one way analysis of variance, a significant difference was found (mean score for experimental group = 3.44, sd = 1.87; mean score for control group = 1.18, sd = 1.13; F = 3.86 d f= 1,40, p < 001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnoses</th>
<th>Pearson corr.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mood disorder</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety disorder</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somato-form</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating disorder</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant PD</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent PD</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCD PD</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-aggressive PD</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-defeat PD</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid PD</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizotypal PD</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizoid PD</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histrionic PD</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissistic PD</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial PD</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2. Correlations - BPD with Axis-I and Axis-II diagnoses
To sum up, groups differed both in DSM Axis-I and Axis-II disorders (although the control group showed relatively high prevalence in obsessive-compulsive personality disorders, not significantly different from experimental group). BPD is present in half of experimental subjects, while none of control subjects were diagnosed as such.

Another important characteristic of the experimental group was the occurrence of more than one diagnosis of personality disorder per subject. The mean number of personality disorder diagnoses in the experimental group was 3.44 (sd = 1.87). Thus multi personality disorder diagnoses were prevalent and characterised the severe personality disturbances in the experimental group.

We also analysed comorbidity between diagnosis of BPD and all other Axis-I and Axis-II diagnoses (conducting Pearson correlations). Findings are shown on table 9.2.

Axis-I mood disorder, and to a lesser degree, anxiety disorder constitute the affective disorders which are significantly correlated with BPD. Substance abuse was also significantly correlated. Axis-II avoidant, dependent, paranoid and antisocial disorders were significantly correlated with BPD.

9.3.2 Differences in IQ level (NART)

In both groups 11 subjects did not complete the NART. Some were diagnosed as dyslexic, for others the English language was not their mother-language, and still others could not maintain their concentration throughout the test. To extrapolate NART score for all missing data, a common procedure was executed. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated, entering all variables to computation. In the end, simple phobia, cluster C and stimulants abuse, were put into a linear regression analysis. Simple phobia proved to be the only variable to significantly predict NART score. New NART scores were calculated by setting the regression equation.

No significant difference between groups was found (mean IQ, experimental group = 114.9, sd = 8.15; mean IQ, control group = 116.17, sd = 6.46; F = .317 df = 1,51, p < .576). The same results were obtained in analysing IQ differences between BPD
individuals and all others (BPD individuals = 113.9, sd = 8.53; mean IQ, other personality disorders and control group = 116.2, sd = 6.98; F = 1.224, df = 1.51, p < .274).

Groups did not differ in their IQ levels.

9.3.3 The Concept of Lying

No differences between groups were found in labelling cells as 'lies', 'the truth' or 'neither', using repeated measure analysis with four dichotomous within-factor that corresponded to: factuality of statement; speaker’s intent to deceive; speaker’s belief of statement; stories’ condition (non-emotionally-charged or emotionally-charged). In both groups the judgement of lying was alike, so that the end product of their analysis using the various prototypical elements was the same.

So far, the results have shown that in various conditions subjects in the control group employed more prototypical elements than experimental subjects. To analyse the difference in employing prototypical elements, one-way analysis of variance was performed to compare the mean of factuality, intention, and belief separately and jointly.

Three subjects in the experimental group did not fill in the Concept of Lying questionnaire and were excluded from this analysis.

Table 9.3 shows that subjects in the control group made their judgement considering more prototypical elements altogether in the charged condition and when combining both the charged and the uncharged conditions.

| Condition  | Control |  | Experiment |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------|---------|  |------------|  |  |  |  |  |
|            | Mean    | SD | Mean       | SD | F  | Sig.  |
| Uncharged  | .52     | .14 | .45        | .14 | 3.223 | n.s. |
| Charged    | .54     | .10 | .44        | .14 | 6.745 | .012 |
| All        | .53     | .11 | .45        | .13 | 5.696 | .021 |

Table 9.3. Over all use of prototypical elements (df = 1.48)

Table 9.4 shows that in the charged condition, subjects in the control group employed more 'factuality'. When the mean of prototypical elements was computed in both charged
and uncharged conditions, ‘factuality’ almost reached significant level, and ‘belief’ was significant. Subjects in the control group made their judgement using ‘belief’ more than subjects in the experimental group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotionally Uncharged</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factuality</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotionally Charged</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factuality</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of prototypical elements</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factuality</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.4. The use of prototypical elements in uncharged, charged and both conditions (df = 1.48)

When comparing the sum use of all elements, results show that subjects in the control group used more prototypical elements in the charged condition and also jointly, when uncharged and charged conditions were added (see table 9.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncharged</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of all</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.5. Over all use of prototypical elements in uncharged, charged and both conditions (df = 1.48)
The same pattern was observed when analysing the data of the same experimental group with the previous control group (see chapter 8). We may conclude that 'belief' was highly used by control subjects. These findings confirm the theory presented in chapter 8 that disturbed patients (from whom many underwent abuse in their childhood) would be less likely to employ 'belief' but not 'intention'.

An analysis of the differences in the Affect Scale was also conducted. Since each cluster included unequal items (5 positive, 7 negative, and 4 neutral affects) new affect variables were produced by dividing each affect by the sum of neutral, positive and negative affects, for each plot separately, thus getting a new fraction representing the weighed product. A mean score was computed for uncharged, charged and all plots. One way analysis of variance was conducted for each condition. Eight cases were omitted because of missing data. Groups did not differ in their positive affect reaction. A main effect for negative affect ($F = 4.645$, $df = 1,43$, $p < .036$) was found. Subjects in the experimental group rated plots as more negatively affectively charged (control group mean = .28, $sd = .13$; experimental group mean = .43, $sd = .13$). In the uncharged condition, subjects in the experimental group rated plots negatively more than subjects in the control group ($F = 15.312$, $df = 1,43$, $p < .001$; control group mean = .16, $sd = .14$; experimental group mean = .35, $sd = .16$). In the charged condition, subjects in the experimental group also rated plots negatively more than subjects in the control group ($F = 4.181$, $df = 1,43$, $p < .047$; control group mean = .4, $sd = .17$; experimental group mean = .51, $sd = .16$). Thus, the protagonists who told lies affected experimental subjects to be affected more negatively. This pattern was not observed when plots positively affected them. These findings will be discussed later.

In the previous study we decided to include all patients in the experimental group on the grounds that: (1) In both hospitals, patients were referred as having BPD on the basis of history of self harm, violence, use of alcohol or drugs and they had been subjected to sexual or physical abuse; (2) Subjects in the control group were not properly diagnosed and we tentatively referred to this group as a control group. We decided to use an over-inclusive criteria for the experimental group; (3) This was a preliminary study and we preferred to include all cases and thereafter to decide whether to use other criteria. In this study, in contrast with the study presented in chapter 8, where the control subjects did not
undergo a psycho-diagnostic assessment, controls were diagnosed. In the current study groups found to be significantly and distinctly diagnosed on both DSM Axis-I and Axis-II disorders. Further steps were taken to find out whether the above findings could be also validated with a more defined diagnosis. Analyses were done comparing subjects assessed just as having BPD with a new control group, consisting of all previous control subjects and all other non-BPD subjects.

Generally, the same results were obtained. One-way analysis of variance was performed to compare the mean of factuality, intention, and belief separately and jointly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Emotionally Uncharged</th>
<th></th>
<th>Emotionally Charged</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>BPD</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>BPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factuality</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factuality</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>3.427</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.6. The use of prototypical elements in uncharged, charged and both conditions (df = 1,48)
Table 9.6 shows that subjects in the control group made up their judgements considering more prototypical elements than patients. In charged conditions subjects in the control group employed more ‘belief’. When the mean of prototypical elements was computed using both charged and uncharged conditions, ‘factuality’ and ‘belief’ reached a significant level. Subjects in the control group made their judgement using both prototypes more than subjects in the experimental group. The difference from the analysis done on the entire experimental group compared with controls is that in the current groups, in charged condition, BPD scored low on ‘belief’ and not on ‘factuality’. But still, previous findings were validated, implying that even when we compare BPD with all other patients and controls the same pattern remains. This probably indicates that this group was dominant in contributing to the variance in ‘belief’ in the patients’ sample. This hypothesis will be examined later.

When comparing the sum use of all elements, results show that subjects in the control group used more prototypical elements in the charged condition but not jointly, when uncharged and charged conditions were combined (see table 9.7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>BPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncharged</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of all</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.7. Over all use of prototypical elements in uncharged, charged and both conditions (df = 1.48)

The Affect scale was also analysed with the new groups. One way analysis of variance was conducted to investigate differences in affective responses. Eight cases were omitted because of missing data. Correspondingly with the previous analysis, groups were not differed in positive affect responses. When negative affect responses were analysed, in the uncharged condition, BPD individuals rated plots negatively more than subjects in the control group (F = 4.281, df = 1.43, p < .045; control group mean = .25, sd = .16; mean = .36, sd = .18). This result differs from results obtained in the previous analysis on groups
consisted of all patients and the control group. In the previous analysis, differences were found for negative responses, both in uncharged and in charged condition and on the overall score. When classifying the entire experimental group into its different personality disorders and conducting a correlation coefficient analysis between different personality disorders and affective responses we found that the paranoid personality disorder was the only sub-group that contributed to this result. Paranoid disorder was highly correlated with affective responses in both uncharged and charged conditions ($r = .299 \ p < .04$ in uncharged condition, $r = .445 \ p < .002$ in charged condition and $r = .425 \ p < .004$ in both conditions). The reason they were affected immensely in both conditions is explained by their tendency to project and to be engaged in persecutory ideation, thus not differentiating between uncharged and charged conditions. It implies that for them every interaction was a-priori negatively charged. As BPD are assumed to be affected by malevolent childhood experiences and with malevolent present experiences (as will be shown in the next section) they were probably less susceptible to highly charged human relations. Controls, who presumably not routinely encounter such interactions, perceived them as more acute and malevolent. BPD individuals projected 'negative' thoughts and emotions onto the other only in the uncharged condition and they became highly emotionally involved in these situations. Considering the fact that in the charged condition both controls and BPD individuals means of negative affects were the highest, it is also probable that a ceiling effect occurred in the charged condition for both BPD and control individuals.

### 9.3.4 Childhood experience of care and abuse and its relation to affect regulation, to concept of lying and to BPD

The scores on five CECA domains (antipathy, neglect, control, discipline, physical abuse, psychological abuse, and sexual abuse) were compared between groups using $\chi^2$ statistics. Results are shown on Table 9.8.

As expected, groups differed in the main three domains of: physical, psychological and sexual. Antipathy and neglect also prevailed in the experimental group. Interestingly, control and discipline were not found to differentiate between groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% and (N) in Experimental group</th>
<th>% and (N) in Control group</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antipathy 77.8% (28)</td>
<td>17.6% (3)</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect 55.6% (20)</td>
<td>11.8% (2)</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 69.4% (25)</td>
<td>70.6% (12)</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline 77.8% (28)</td>
<td>58.8% (10)</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse 33.3% (12)</td>
<td>5.9% (1)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological abuse 36.1% (13)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse 44.4% (16)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.8. Experience of care and abuse between groups (df = 1)

When comparing BPD and non-BPD on CECA domains, significant differences were found just for antipathy and neglect. No direct associations were observed between childhood experiences of abuse and having a diagnosis of BPD (see table 9.9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% and (N) in BPD</th>
<th>% and (N) in Control group</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antipathy 80% (16)</td>
<td>45.5% (15)</td>
<td>6.121</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect 60% (12)</td>
<td>30.3% (10)</td>
<td>4.523</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 65% (13)</td>
<td>72.7% (24)</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline 75% (15)</td>
<td>69.7% (23)</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse 30% (7)</td>
<td>21.2% (6)</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological abuse 30% (7)</td>
<td>21.2% (6)</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse 40% (8)</td>
<td>24.2% (8)</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.9. Experience of care and abuse between control and BPD individuals (df = 1)
No differences were found for comparisons between BPD individuals and other non-controls. It indicates that antipathy and neglect are highly associated with definite diagnosis of BPD and severe personality disturbances. It also indicates that experiences of abuse are not associated with BPD diagnosis. It follows that the sample drawn from both hospitals represent a group of patients suffered from severe childhood experiences of abuse. The fact that BPD is not directly associated with specific abuse will be examined later, to detect for potential intervening variables that underly the association between BPD and abuse.

Subsequent analyses aimed to detect a causal model to account for the association between abuse and BPD. Firstly we analysed the link between 'belief' and CECA. Secondly, between 'belief', SCID-I and SCID-II disorders. Thirdly, between negative affective response, SCID-I and SCID-II disorders. Fourthly, between negative affective response and CECA. Finally path analysis was conducted to validate the hypothesised causative model.

The subsequent analysis aims to investigate the link between abuse and the concept of lying. Hitherto, we had found that the use of 'belief' was greater in the control group, while both groups evenly employed 'intention'. We interpreted these findings on the grounds that BPD individuals have developmental deficits in achieving a solid understanding on others' beliefs, while others' intentions, i.e. desires, are well defined (even though not always based on a sense of reality). These findings proved to be consistent for both comparisons (entire patients group vs. controls and BPD group vs. all others).

To examine whether each of the CECA domains predicts 'belief', a series of t-test analyses were computed. Antipathy, neglect, physical, psychological and sexual abuse were defined as independent variables so the entire sample was divided into two sub groups: '1' - experiencing the adversity and '2' - not experiencing the adversity. 'Belief' constituted the dependent variable. No significant results were found (see table 9.10).

These results show that there are no direct relations between experiencing abuse in childhood and employing 'belief' in judging sentences as lies or truth.
9.3.4.1 DSM Axis-I & Axis-II disorders as predictors of 'belief'

The findings so far show that there is no direct association between abuse and the use of 'belief'. Our hypothesis was that childhood experience of care and abuse would affect a deficiency in achieving a mature concept of lying (as a derivative of TOM) which would be prevalent in the borderline psychopathology. We also assumed that affective regulation might be a product of experiences of abuse and that it might contribute to failure to achieve a mature concept of lying.

Thus, the use of 'belief' is not directly associated with abuse. The next step is to construe which variables are correlated with the use of 'belief'. A series of variables to be entered to the final linear regression analysis to predict the use of 'belief' and were computed by a series of t-tests. The t-tests include SCID-I and SCID-II disorders as the independent variable and 'belief' as the dependent variable.
Table 9.11 shows the SCID-I diagnoses that were related to 'belief'.

Alcohol abuse, substance abuse, cocaine and social phobia were found to be correlated with 'belief'. Although the results were significant, it was detected that few subjects (7) were diagnosed as alcohol abusers and as cocaine abusers (3), thus they were excluded from the stepwise regression analysis. IQ was inserted as a control variable. Substance abuse and social phobia were included as the predictors. IQ was the only significant predictor of 'belief'. It accounted for 8% of the variance (F = 4.42, df = 1,51, R = .398, p < .04, standardised regression coefficient (β) = .283, F = 4.44, p < .04).

Table 9.12 shows the SCID-II diagnoses that were related to 'belief'.

Avoidant and borderline personality disorders were found to be significantly related to 'belief' and were entered to the stepwise multiple regression analysis. IQ score was entered as a control variable in the first step of analysis. The model excluded avoidant personality as a predictor, and IQ score was not significant, thus BPD was the sole personality disorder that was included and it accounted for 16% of the variance (F =...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 'Belief'</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant Personality</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-2.075</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline Personality</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-2.526</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.12: t-tests: SCID-II and 'belief'

Thus, Borderline personality disorder is the only disorder (from both DSM Axis-I and Axis-II disorders) that predicts 'belief'.

9.3.4.2 DSM Axis-I & Axis-II disorders as predictors of affective response

In section 9.3.3 we showed that negative affective response was significantly different between groups only in uncharged condition. Negative emotions to protagonist’s target sentence were marked higher by BPD individuals than controls and non-BPD individuals. This negative affect ('affect') response in the uncharged condition that stands as a unique response manifested by BPD individuals would be treated as the dependent variable for subsequent analyses.

A series of t-tests was conducted to find out which variables should be entered to the final linear regression analysis to predict the use of 'affect'. The t-tests include SCID-I and SCID-II disorders as the independent variable and 'affect' as the dependent variable.

Table 9.13 shows the SCID-I diagnoses that were related to 'affect'.

Anxiety and mood disorders were found to be significantly correlated with 'affect' and were entered into the stepwise regression analysis. IQ score was entered as a control variable in the first step of analysis. The model excluded Mood disorder as predictor and IQ score was not significant, thus anxiety disorder was the sole DSM Axis-I disorder included and it accounted for 20.8% of the variance (F = 5.506, df = 2.42, R = .456 p < .008; β = .404, F = 8.35, p < .006).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 'Affect'</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-2.408</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-3.11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.13. T-tests: SCID-I and 'affect'

Table 9.14 shows the SCID-II diagnoses that were related to 'affect'. Avoidant, paranoid and borderline personality disorders were found to be significantly correlated with 'affect' and were entered to the stepwise regression analysis. IQ score was entered as a control variable in the first step of analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 'Affect'</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-2.444</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-2.051</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-2.069</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.14. T-tests: SCID-II and 'affect'

The model excluded avoidant and borderline personality disorders as predictors and IQ score was significant, thus IQ and paranoid disorder were entered to the final regression equation and accounted for 19% of the variance ($F = 4.791, df = 2.41, R = .435 p < .013$; constant = 1.116, IQ standardised regression coefficient ($\beta$) = -.316, $F = 4.8, p < .034$; paranoid disorder standardised regression coefficient ($\beta$) = -.377, $F = 6.84, p < .012$). As expected and discussed previously, subjects diagnosed as having paranoid disorder were highly affected by the protagonist's target lying sentences and were highly scored on the Affect Scale. The correlation between anxiety disorders and paranoid disorders were significant ($\chi^2 = 5.169, df = 1, p < .023$).
9.3.4.3 CECA as predictor of affective response

Table 9.15 shows which CECA domains were related to 'affect'. Parental antipathy, others' antipathy, parental psychological abuse, others' sexual abuse, antipathy, neglect and sexual abuse were found to be significantly correlated with 'affect' and were entered to the stepwise regression analysis. IQ score was entered as a control variable in the first step of the analysis. The model excluded parental antipathy and others' antipathy, parental psychological abuse, others' sexual abuse, antipathy and neglect as predictors. And IQ score was insignificant, thus sexual abuse was the sole variable to enter to the final step of the regression equation and it accounted for 21% of the variance (F = 5.485, df = 2,41, R = .459 p < .002; 'Sexual abuse - all' standardised regression coefficient (b) = .404, F = 8.21, p < .007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 'Affect'</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antipathy - Parents</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-2.126</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipathy - Others</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-2.286</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych. abuse - Parents</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-2.121</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual. abuse - Others</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-2.521</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipathy - All</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-2.693</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect - All</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-2.518</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse - all</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-3.297</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.15. T-tests: CECA and 'affect'
9.3.4.4 Path analysis: childhood experience of care and abuse and its relation to affect regulation, to the concept of lying and to BPD

Hitherto, the results show that:

1. Neglect, physical, psychological and sexual abuses were prevalent in the experimental group (consisting of all patients in the sample).
2. No significant results were found, linking childhood experience of care and abuse and the use of ‘belief’.
3. Borderline personality disorder was the only disorder (from both SCID-I and SCID-II disorders) that was significantly linked with the use of ‘belief’ and it accounted for 16% of the variance.
4. Anxiety disorders were the sole SCID-I disorders linked with ‘affect’ and accounted for 20% of the variance in negative ‘affect’ responses.
5. Paranoid personality disorder was the only SCID-II disorder linked with ‘affect’, which accounted for 19% of the variance in negative ‘affect’ responses.
6. Sexual abuse by parents, household members and others was the only CECA domain linked with ‘affect’ and it accounted for 20% of the variance in negative ‘affect’ responses.

In order to construct a model representing the possible links between childhood experience of abuse and BPD, several linear regressions were conducted. The model structured for path analysis incorporating all regression analyses is plotted in figure 9.3.

Firstly we wanted to explore the link between various AXIS-I diagnoses and CECA. CECA domains were set as the independent variables and each cluster of SCID-I diagnoses (mood, anxiety, substance abuse, somatoform and eating disorders) were used as the dependent variable. The findings are shown in table 9.16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AXIS-I</th>
<th>CECA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Antipathy</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>1,51</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Sexual abuse</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1,51</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1,51</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>1,51</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1,51</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatoform</td>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1,51</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.16. Linear regression - SCID-I and CECA
Thus, antipathy predicts mood disorders, sexual abuse predicts anxiety disorders, neglect predicts both anxiety disorders and substance abuse, and physical abuse predicts somatoform disorders and substance abuse. The next step was to find potential links between the above Axis-I clusters and 'affect'. Controlling for IQ, it was just anxiety disorder that proved to predict negative affect ($F = 5.506, \text{df} = 2.43, R = .456 \ p < .008, \beta = .402, F = 8.35, p < .006$).
Our assumption was that childhood experience of abuse would affect the regulation of affect, which in itself would affect the development of TOM, which would affect the diagnosis of BPD. Amongst all childhood experiences of abuse, sexual abuse alone was significantly correlated with 'affect'. Thus it would be determined as the independent variable affecting variances in all other variables. Borderline disorder was significantly linked with use of 'belief', implying that no other DSM Axis-I or Axis-II disorders accounted for the variance in 'belief'. Thus we determine 'belief' as a predictor of BPD.

To analyse the relation between 'affect' and 'belief', a linear regression analysis was conducted, IQ score and 'affect' were assigned as predictors of 'belief'. 'Affect' entered to the regression analysis and IQ score was excluded. 'Affect' accounted for 11.5% the variance (F = 5.605, df = 43,1, R = .340 p < .022; constant = .451, F = 92.79, p < .001, 'affect' regression coefficient B = -.34, F = 5.61, p < .0)

In this model two CECA domains predict BPD. Antipathy through the development of mood disorders is one trajectory that predicts BPD. Sexual abuse through negative affect that affects the use of belief is the second trajectory that predicts BPD.

The data was analysed using EQS (Bentler, 1995) structural equation analysis, one of the currently popular procedures for testing structure equations, models or causal paths among the variables. A structural model consists of one or more equations with variance and covariance specifications. The technique assumes a multivariate normal distribution for the measures and allows the researcher to propose various sequences or causal links among the study variables. These proposed links are simultaneously explaining or accounting for all the observed interrelationships. Equations containing various parameters (the most important of which are described below) are then developed to represent these associations. Along with each equation, measures of fit to evaluate the correspondence between observed and hypothesised links are obtained. These include χ², a regular and adjusted goodness-of-fit index, root mean square residual, and Bentler-Bonnet Index (BBI) (Ullman, 1996).

The final and significant path analysis is shown in figure 9.4.
Figure 9.4. Final path analysis - sexual abuse and antipathy on BPD

In this final analysis only 45 subjects were included since for ‘affect’ there were 8 subjects with missing data. EQS summary statistics: Chi-Square = 4.6, df = 9, p < .868, BBNFI = .934, BBNNFI = 1.133, CFI = 1.0. The findings show that two CECA domains predict BPD. Antipathy predicts development of mood disorders that predicts BPD. Sexual abuse through negative affect that affects the use of belief is the second path that predicts BPD. The analyses with other paths did not reached significant fit indexes. They thus were omitted from the final model.

9.4 Discussion

In the discussion we firstly elaborate on the differential diagnosis between the experimental and the control groups. We then discuss the differences in the concept of lying, especially the level to which lying entails complex representations of others’ minds, and the borderline tendency to manifest deficiencies in moving from understanding others’ mental states in intentional terms (desires) to mentalising terms (thoughts and beliefs). These findings are then discussed with reference to the history of abuse.
Borderline personality disorder is a classification that varies in its symptomatology. Its features comorbid with a wide range of other personality disorders. Avoidant, paranoid, schizotypal and borderline personality disorders prevail in the experimental group. The difference in psychopathology manifested by the control in contrast to the experimental group was evident when measuring the total number of disorders in Axis-I and Axis-II diagnoses. Subjects in the experimental group were diagnosed as having the mean of three types of personality disorders whereas subjects in the control group were diagnosed having the mean of just one personality disorder. As predicted, the experimental group is far more psychologically disturbed than the control group. More than half of the patients were diagnosed as having BPD, avoidant or paranoid personality disorders. BPD, avoidant, self-defeat, paranoid and schizotypal personality disorders were clustered together. BPD was significantly correlated with avoidant, dependent, paranoid and antisocial disorders.

The considerable comorbidity is regularly found in studies of clinical populations. Swartz (1990) reported high rates of comorbidity of Axis-I disorders in borderline patients, chiefly affective disorders (both anxiety and depression) and alcohol abuse. Eating disorders have particularly high prevalence of associated BPD (Waller, 1993), especially bulimia, but clinical significance of this association is controversial (Steiger et al., 1992; Steiger, 1993). In addition there is significant overlap between BPD and other personality disorders according to DSM criteria, including histrionic personality disorder (Pfohl et al., 1986), avoidant personality disorder (Skodol et al., 1988), narcissistic personality disorder, and schizotypal disorder (Gunderson et al., 1991). Zimmerman (1989) reported that paranoid, avoidant and borderline personality disorders are almost always comorbid.

The borderline organisation has been conceived of as a structurally defective level of pathology that interpenetrates several of the less severe personality styles. One of the distinguishing features of borderline personalities is the wide variety of covariant symptoms they exhibit over time. The affective instability and diminished control that characterises the pattern result in the periodic emergence of a number of different Axis-I disorders. The experimental group showed high prevalence of mood, substance abuse and anxiety disorders. BPD individuals (only) had high prevalence of mood and substance
abuse disorders. Markedly, no difference was found for somatoform and eating disorders between groups.

The comorbidity with anxiety in BPD is explained as a result of the patients’ fear of the imminence of an impeding disaster or feeling that they are being overwhelmed or will disintegrate from forces that surge within them. In relation to depression, borderlines succumb frequently to several forms of it. It is assumed that they gain some measure of control over their inner conflicts and hostile impulses. They do this by turning their angry feelings inwards and taking out their hatred on themselves. Guilt and self-disparagement are voiced for their failures, impulsive acts, contemptuous feelings, and evil thoughts. Not infrequently this sadness and melancholy solicit support and nurture from others.

The strong association with substance abuse does not appear to be an intrinsic element, but appears to signify the borderline’s desire to experience varied forms of reality and an effort to search for an identity that may give structure to divergent impulses and confusions.

Somatoform syndromes have as their primary goal the blocking from awareness of the true source of the borderline anxiety. Lack of predominance of somatoform disorders in our sample might be linked with the fact that all patients underwent thorough psychotherapy in in-patient and day-hospital settings where the primary goal is reaching essential and comprehensive awareness of inner realities and their link with external realities.

Analysis of the concept of lying revealed some important results that confirm the previous findings presented in chapter 8 (the same experimental group, different control group). Firstly, there was no difference between groups in defining statements as lies, truth or neither. Patients reached normative judgements when needing to classify lying statements. The end product of both controls and patients was identical. We would have predicted that borderlines would judge more sentences as lies on the basis that they experience objects as malevolent. However, the composition of fragile affective states did not affect their judgements.

Secondly, subjects in the control group used more prototypical elements (even when controlling for differences in IQ level). The concept of lying was analysed in two
variations: (1) comparing controls and the whole experimental group; (2) comparing controls and DSM-III-R BPD individuals. In both analyses we obtained nearly the same results. We refer to the use of elements as an indication of the degree of complexity in psychological-mindedness, as evidence for a multi-level capacity to understand human behaviour. Judging a lie is a task in which the subject needs to consider altogether external reality and the ‘liar’s’ internal state. Weighing up more elements as the basis for judgement shows that the thinking about human relations in the context of lying entails complex representation of others. We have found that among all prototypes it was ‘belief’ and to a lesser degree ‘factuality’ that contributed to these differences. Considering the liar’s beliefs indicates that one is able to think about other’s thoughts. The fact that control subjects also employed more ‘factuality’ and that groups did not differ in the use of intention may indicate that intentions are more valued, and that the interaction between the external (‘factuality’) and internal state of affairs (‘belief’) is less accessibly activated among patients. Elsewhere (in chapter 8) we noted that developmentally, intention precedes belief and we assumed that the findings manifest patients’ deficiency in thinking about other’s thoughts, as an evidence for a fragile capacity to maintain TOM. We assumed that BPD individuals are less equipped to progress from understanding desires to beliefs.

These findings match Lerner’s (1984) and Stuart’s (1990) results. They employed Rorschach responses and Blatt’s (1976) system. Blatt’s system examines responses depicting human and quasi-human figures for the affective nature of the interaction of figures perceived, malevolent or benevolent, and for a number of cognitive qualities, such as, degree of articulation of the representation and the accuracy and appropriateness of the elaboration. The researchers found that borderline could be distinguished from neurotic and psychotic subjects by the number of percepts they produced that were of poor form level. On the level of subjects’ attributions of intention, that is, the degree of complexity and psychological mindedness of attributions, borderlines were significantly more advanced. Westen (1990) compared adult borderlines with major depressives and normals employing a measure of object relations and found that borderlines did not evidence more complex representations than comparison subjects.
Thirdly, the uncharged condition elicited similar application of 'belief' in both groups, validating the assumption that when affect is diminished, in non-conflictual human relations, BPD individuals could manifest a well-developed cognitive capacity to understand others’ beliefs. The charged condition evoked an opposite tendency, so that BPD individuals manifested deficiency in engaging in a complex understanding of others' thoughts or beliefs. Thus as long as borderlines experience the object world as malevolent they may attribute the causes of people's behaviour, thought and feeling in idiosyncratic ways that are probably sometimes developmentally 'primitive', and sometimes simply abnormal, distorted by motivational and defensive processes and by defective cognitive structures and procedures. In such highly charged conditions they also tend to represent the self and others in pathological ways. Sometimes they blurred the perspectives of self and others as young children do. Sometimes they infused their representations with many fantasy elaborations so as to render their understanding of the self and others complex and highly distorted. It follows Westen’s (1990, p.682) claim that these attributes are not manifested at all times adding that emotional charge may be the trigger for their activation of these distorted pathological representations.

Another interesting finding was that BPD and control individuals marked a similar score of negative affect in the charged condition, implying that they were similarly emotionally affected. In the charged condition they both gave their highest negative affective responses. This finding reconfirms that in highly emotional human interactions, although emotionally affected, controls are not cognitively affected, whereas BPD individuals emotional response diminishes their capacity to think about others’ thoughts and beliefs.

Most CECA domains, notably, antipathy, neglect, physical, psychological and sexual abuse significantly differentiated between controls and the entire experimental group (including all patients). When comparing BPD individuals and all other subjects (including other patients) BPD individuals differed only in antipathy and neglect. These controversial findings contrast substantial research that has identified BPD as associated with severe neglect or abuse (for review of research, see Fonagy, 1995). This is hardly surprising given the heterogeneity of the population and the limited size of the sample. In fact more than half of the reported abuse was associated with non-parental figures. Research indicates that the effects of sexual abuse are most likely to be severe if father is
the perpetrator and a penetrative sexual act is involved (Browne and Finkelhor, 1986). In
the majority of cases of abuse in studies of BPD individuals, penetrative sexual abuse was
not involved (Zanarini et al., 1989; Ogata et al., 1990). Since the size of our BPD sample
was small we could not employ procedures to differentiate between various perpetrators
and severity of abuse.

Antipathy and neglect were the only direct measures of parental thoughtlessness. The fact
that antipathy and neglect differentiated between BPD (the whole experimental group)
and controls validates the suggested direct link between childhood maltreatment and
BPD. It verifies the manifestation of a general trait of personality disorganisation
characterised by a series of significant failures of psychological functions underpinning
normal personality. Antipathy and neglect might indicate a better measure of childhood
maltreatment in the absence of a large sample in which differentiation between various
perpetrators can be discerned. The impact of sexual or physical abuse alone cannot be
studied in isolation, separate from the complex matrix of social, family and intra-psychic
variables which contextualise it and give its meaning. Millon (1987) for example
emphasised the sociological and cultural context of the genesis of BPD. Clearly, the
experience of abuse depends on the context, above the entire family context, in which it
occurs. It follows also that it is inherently improbable that any psychiatric disorder will
ever be possible to link to any single pathogenic factor (Paris and Zweig-Frank, 1992).

Millon (1996) in a recent review on personality disorders noted that

"The results of empirical studies seeking to verify the preceding hypotheses indicate
that there is a mixed and complex picture in the pathogenic background of
borderline personality. For example, although childhood sexual abuse appears to be
relatively common in borderline patients, not all borderlines have history of such
abuse, and many borderlines, as well as non-patients, also have such histories. It is
evident that number of pathways lead to the development of borderline pathology,
some of which include abuse, neglect, parental loss, and so on. The possible
mechanisms of abuse or trauma require an explication of several interacting forces,
including such secondary elements as feelings of betrayal, shame and guilt, as well
as stigmatisation and powerlessness" (Millon and Davis, 1996, p. 680).

We assume that maltreatment in childhood brings about disorganisation of personality.
Hence, we explored the possible pathways that might lead to the development of
borderline pathology.
In a series of analyses we found that 'belief' was not associated with maltreatment in any domain but that it was significantly associated with avoidant and borderline personality disorders (BPD reached higher probability, BPD and avoidant personality disorder are significantly correlated; 'Belief' is also significantly associated with substance abuse, substance abuse and BPD are highly correlated). If we accept the assertion that the use of 'belief' is an indication of mentalisation, which in essence is the product of a cognitive capacity and of emotional maturity, then the above mentioned findings strengthen the theory that in certain conditions BPD individuals fail to manifest the capacity of TOM.

As no direct links were found between 'belief' and CECA domains, we further looked at other mediating variables that could explain this deficiency. Subjects’ affective reaction to the protagonist’s target statement was applied as an indicator for emotional vulnerability, as evidence of the ability to regulate affect. High negative emotional responsiveness in the uncharged condition significantly differentiated between BPD and non-BPD individuals, so that BPD individuals marked their emotional responses to the uncharged interactions as more negatively laden. Interestingly, no differences were found between groups in the charged condition. A consequence of prolonged habituation to extreme manifestations of tension and havoc in the family is one explanation for these findings. Alternatively it can be explained as an outcome of a ceiling effect, where both groups achieved their highest level of negative reaction. The remarkable result that the non-charged condition evoked more negative emotions among BPD individuals shows that it was probably their tendency

“... to become too prone to impose features of their enduring object representations upon their experience of current object relations” (Westen 1990, p. 680), activating exceedingly malevolent object representations, and grossly illogical attributions.

Notably, Axis-I mood disorders and anxiety disorders, and Axis-II avoidant, paranoid and borderline personality disorders were significantly associated with 'affect'. In the final regression analysis anxiety and paranoid disorders entered to the regression accounting for 20% of the variance. Evidently, patients having paranoid personality disorders are prone to projective ideation and to represent others as malevolent.
Finally, starting with antipathy, neglect and sexual abuse, it was only sexual abuse that entered in the final regression, predicting for 20% of the variance of 'affect'. The fact that indexes of maltreatment, markedly sexual abuse were significantly correlated with negative affect seem to provide further validation to the theory that such childhood experiences provoke the representation of interpersonal relations as malevolent. Traumas of abuse may contribute to difficulty in modulating affect. The literature suggests that individuals who have experienced extremely traumatic events fail to develop the capacity to effectively deal with emotional arousal. People respond to such arousal with an emotional intensity disproportionate to the given situation or with severe constriction of affect (van der Kolk, 1987).

Another perspective on the quality of BPD individuals’ affective responses can be found in their contextual responses to the task of judging lying. Remarks involving anger, identification with the dupe and idiosyncratic judgement were common. To quote a few (even in the uncharged condition):

-Subject No. 102, plot 5: “However the solicitor should have the decency to remember who his clients are.”
-Subject No. 109, plot 8: “Who does he thinks is going to take the blame instead of him. This is a stupid blatant lie that is so obvious it’s ludicrous. When you’ve so obviously been caught out, why lie?”
-Subject No. 109, plot 4: “Her intent was dishonest and her deceit calculated.”
-Subject No. 113, plot 8: “Again it is a lie and I hate people like that.”
-Subject No. 214, plot 4: “I don’t want to answer this question.”

Does a severe abuse, where the parent was openly hostile and/or completely indifferent towards the child, decrease the capacity to regulate affect so that she less equipped to sustain her ability to take the object's perspective, especially in conditions where genuine or inferred malevolence in a significant other is perceived? The analysis detected two potential trajectories to the development of borderline personality disorder. Firstly, the effect of antipathy on the prevalence of mood and borderline personality disorders. Secondly, the effect of sexual abuse on having deficiency in affect regulation that decreases the capacity to think about others' minds which is linked to BPD.
The association between depression and parental antipathy was also observed in Bifulco's (1998) study. Her large sample facilitated analysing the effect of the type of perpetrator on the development of depression. Although the experience of antipathy from either parent in childhood led to an increase in depression in adulthood, it proved to be the combination of antipathy from both parents, which was responsible for this association. She concluded that the presence of a positive input from one caring adult, or at least the absence of malice from that adult, might buffer some of the damaging effects of hostile treatment from the other parent. Antipathy is a form of child maltreatment that is rarely mentioned as a source for BPD. Despite its potential for long-term damage, it seems that the more dramatic forms of maltreatment as physical and sexual abuse are more frequently topics of concern.

The coincidence of affective illness with borderline personality is greater than might be expected statistically (Gunderson and Eliott, 1985). What are the relations between affective disorders and BPD? Generally, four explanations are discussed in the literature for this high coincidence. The first two hold that one disorder is a consequence of the other: drug taking or promiscuity is used to relieve feelings of dysphoria or depression; depression may be secondary to poor impulse control and unsatisfactory relationships. The third is that both disorders co-exist independently in the same subjects. The fourth postulates that affective symptoms or character traits arise from interaction of symptoms peculiar to each individual. Gunderson (1991) reached the conclusion that the third hypothesis is most tenable, namely that BPD and affective illnesses commonly occur together, but are unrelated. Berelowitz and Tranopolsky (1993) in their review concluded that affective symptoms and borderline traits are both common, and often occur together, but depression occurs in other personality disorders as well. Hitherto, we cannot interpret a causal link between mood disorders and BPD. In our sample both disorders were highly affected by childhood experience of parental antipathy.

To illustrate, one patient described various appalling childhood experiences. She was asked whether her mother punished her:

**Patient:** *It depends. She would hit me or beat me up, or used to say things to me and get me to repeat them over and over again. She would threaten and say she would put me in a home or have me locked up. And she used not to feed me for days.*

**Interviewer:** *You mean literally?*
Patient: Literally, not feed me. She would let me have sips of water and she'd say: "If you were really really good I'll let you have a piece of dry toast tomorrow". And tomorrow she'd say: "No, you haven't been good enough" and every one around me would be eating and I would be still hungry. And she did it quite a lot. On the other hand if she gave something to eat you had to eat everything regardless of how revolting it was, 'cause she was an awful cook and used to just make me swallow it.

Interviewer: How old were you then?

Patient: I was quite... Well she did it all through my really young childhood. Probably until I was a teenager. Then she used to squash my nose, you can't breathe, and you're sort of half choke, there were times when I was sick and she would just feed that all back to me. She was just really out of order with food. I mean there were times when I was OK and she cooked and I ate, and she wasn't starving me and she wasn't feeding me like that, and there was also a lot of control over food, because when she was at work we weren't allowed to eat, and we'd be hungry all day, so we used to steal the bread, thinking that she wouldn't notice, and we used to put tomato sauce on the bread and eat it. She went mad when she came home, and it was my entire fault. So then she wouldn't let me have anything to eat at night.

Interviewer: And then what would you do?

Patient: She would just send me upstairs to my bedroom. But she never stopped the others, she never didn't feed the others. You couldn't go and help yourself to a glass of milk or... It was all about stealing, it was all hers. I would have understood if she'd have said: "Look you mustn't keep helping yourself 'cause I haven't got much money and if we use up all the milk we will not have anything for breakfast". Now kids could understand that. But she'd say: "How dare you steal from me!"

From this example one can observe the close association between antipathy and physical abuse where the child is overwhelmed with fear, where primary needs are deprived, anticipation of events is obscured and mother's mind is inconceivable. Such experiences definitely crush any sense of self-worth, objects must be represented as malevolent, and oscillation between depression and anger is expected.

The most valuable finding was the effect of sexual abuse on having deficiency in affect regulation, the decrease in the capacity to think about others' minds, and diagnosis of BPD. Nearly all the sexual abusers proved to be males, therefore sexual abuse to girls involves a very specific power relationship involving gender. By comparison the perpetrators of physical abuse and neglect involved both male and female perpetrators. Sexual abuse perpetration involves also a wider social, kin and neighbourhood arena than other abuses. Another unique feature of sexual abuse is its frequent incomprehensibility and immaturity. Often patients reported that while they found the incidents unpleasant
when they occurred, the main impact did not hit them until years afterwards. To illustrate, we present another extract of the already cited patient.

**Interviewer:** And it all started when you were nine years old?

**Patient:** That was when I was first sexually abused. But I remember, I actually think I was being abused before that, I've just got this weird feeling about it.

**Interviewer:** And can you tell me a bit more about this person that abused you?

**Patient:** He was my mum's best friend husband, and I was looking after his kids when she was going out, and... It must have been Sunday morning and he must have gone fishing, and she went somewhere with my mum, and I was looking after the kids, and he came home and... I don't know were the kids were actually, and for ages and ages he'd sat me on his lap and like cuddled me which was really nice 'cause no one else did it really in my home and my mum used to say to me “Don't sit on his lap” and I said: “Why?”. And she probably thought that he might abuse me, but she never did anything about it. And... this day he was kissing me and I thought it was weird really. And then he said I am going to do something to you which you really like, and it'll be nice to you and you mustn't be afraid. And off he went. And I wasn't afraid really. It was just weird. And then every time I went up there, he did that or he did something else or... and that went on till I was 13.

... 

**Interviewer:** Did you confide in anybody about these experiences?

**Patient:** Yes, quite extensively, quite a lot, because I only remembered bits of it, I remembered the first of it, and I thought that that was more or less all that he ever did to me, that he touched me, and then I had these kind of vague feelings of fear around it, and when my dad died, I started to have all these awful flashbacks, and I got a lot of memories back, and they just really, they explained a lot of things to me 'cause I was really scary, and that I got angry 'cause I never got angry with him before, he didn't hurt me, and it was all right really, and when I got some memories back, it was just horrible, and when I was in halfway house I had the worse flashback, and I've not had one since then, because it was just horrible...

Most of the incidents of sexual abuse in our series of women were kept secret. Children were often threatened with violence if they did not comply with the abusers' wishes. No intervention from the mother is another characteristic. Inevitably it originated in the mother's seeming helplessness or as a consequence of lack of insight. Various coping styles were obtained. Some patients were petrified, others were not actually scared. Some described the dissociative 'out of the body experiences' commonly linked with sexual abuse. Many developed much stronger feelings about the abuse later in life when they could consider it more objectively.
The exceptional association of negative affect and sexual abuse is considered as an indication of unusual and extreme experience of parental maltreatment. We believe that it is the malevolent treatment from both parents that brings about the development of negative feelings towards significant others, and not only the experience of sexual abuse. Sexual abuse by parents or others is possibly the leading evidence of maltreatment. It is most probable that because of the small sized sample it was mainly sexual abuse and not other domains that contributed to the observed correspondence with negative emotions.

Finally, what are the inferences from the association between negative affect and the use of ‘belief’ as predictors of BPD? We argue that as borderline individuals experience the object world as malevolent they would attribute the causes of people's behaviour, thoughts and feelings by defective cognitive structures and procedures, blurring the perspectives of self and others, infusing their representations with fantasy elaborations. We noted that these processes are not manifested at all times, but mainly in highly emotionally charged object relations which may impair the possibility of thinking about others’ internal states.

The results should be taken cautiously and with some reservations. Firstly, our subjects were in-patients and the question is whether these findings can be generalised to less disturbed borderline patients. We have dealt with small sized samples, trying to predict possible links between various variables. This liability certainly reduces the power of generalisation. Secondly, the scales employed a combination of widely used and well-established measures (SCID-I, SCID-II, CECA, NART) as well as newly developed (The Concept of Lying, Affect Scale) measures, which have not been validated in other studies. Thirdly, the findings may reflect subjects’ current mood rather than enduring traits, noting that other researchers have argued that the content of early memories can be influenced by depressed mood (Lloyd and Lishman, 1975). Fourthly, the strength of the association between childhood abuse as the formative role in the development of mood disturbances on the one hand, and on deficiencies in affect regulation and in the development of the capacity to understand others’ minds on the other hand, and their conjoint effect on the development of BPD is strongly supported by our studies. The strength of the association suggests that it is an important factor but not alone sufficient to account for borderline psychopathology. It is possible that trauma is the most pathogenic source for children.
with vulnerable temperaments or for those most lacking protective factors, such as positive relationships with other caretakers or siblings. Fifthly, our sample included mainly females diagnosed with BPD. Epidemiological data on child abuse (Finkelhor, 1979) indicate that although boys and girls are at approximately equal risk for physical abuse, girls are at two to three times greater risk for sexual victimisation. Thus, girls may be more frequently exposed to conditions favouring the development of BPD. Childhood abuse as a formative role in the development of BPD in boys remains open to further research.
CHAPTER 10: THE UNDERSTANDING OF LYING IN CAREGIVER AND SELF

This research pioneers in exploring concepts from various theoretical disciplines. So far, we have found that there are differences in the use of internal states when defining lying. We inferred qualitative variance from quantitative measures. Analysis of the pattern employed when judging the concept of lying yields the understanding that groups quantitatively differed in the number of times they used each of three prototypical elements. We discussed these findings (chapter 8) in terms of the capacity to take into consideration, to maintain, and to process all elements at once. We concluded that it is probable that subjects in the experimental group are less able to employ belief, but not intention.

Further steps were taken to explore subjects’ concept of lying by employing a different non-quantitative method. The challenge we undertook was to develop a preliminary semi-structured interview, through which such an analysis could be feasible. The goal was to get a simple and direct overview of subjects’ explicit description of own and of others’ state of mind when recalling memories of being deceived or deceiving others. Analysing the content of these responses could enhance our understanding of the difference between patients and control subjects in the concept of lying. Elsewhere we proposed a theory that classifies lying into immature and mature concepts. We assumed that individuals having a relatively well integrated self who acquired a capacity of TOM would employ mature lying. In our view immature lying reflects the presence of varying degrees of lack of integrated self, where the concept of self and other is blurred and the capacity to have TOM is impaired. We predicted that BPD individuals’ disposition toward their experiences of deception in the context of interacting with significant others would manifest more confusion between their and the other’s states of mind indicating a prevalence of immature concept of deception.
10.1 Method

10.1.1 Measure and procedure

Subjects were asked to recall childhood memories concerning events where parents withheld the truth or lied to them as well as memories of their own lies. This interview was conducted after completion of all other interviews and instruments. The aim was to create a condition in which subjects would be willing to share their experiences as dupes and/or liars without being overwhelmed. It was assumed that at this stage, by the end of all the interviews, subjects would establish a good rapport, they would be more acquainted with the setting, would develop better trust with the interviewer, with his expectations, and with the content being discussed. This interview followed two sessions of interviews about childhood experiences of care and abuse. It was assumed that at this stage subjects would become more identified with their role as interviewees, a role which requires activation of both disclosure and self-reflection. Introducing this interview, the interviewer said,

We are coming to the last phase of our study. I would like us to discuss issues related to deception or lying. Try and recall memories of events when you felt that your parents withheld the truth or even lied to you. I wish to add that I am not really interested in the moral or ethical issues coupled with lying, but to understand your experience as a subject in such circumstances. It is widely known that deception is part of life, and that almost every one of us has experienced it. So, the first thing that I’d like you to think of is your childhood experiences of being lied to.

We presented a number of leading questions. After recalling memories related to being lied to, subjects were asked,

‘What did you think, as a child, that X (the liar) had in his mind when telling lies?’

Thereafter:
‘What did you have in mind when you were told those lies?’

These questions were targeted to explore subjects’ understanding of their and others’ minds. The same pattern was conducted in the next phase, when subjects spoke about their own lies, either in childhood, or as adults. First, they were asked to disclose instances where they withheld the truth from their parents or other close relatives or significant others. Then they had to try and recall what they thought those others had in
mind when lying to them, and what they themselves had in mind when they told these
lies.

When it was difficult for the subject to recall significant memory the interviewer asked
about current experiences. Rarely did it happen that subjects were reluctant to recall any
memories, to disclose them, or to think loudly and discuss these issues.

At several times, when the interviewer anticipated such reluctance, he added

We know that almost everyone lies. We, as psychologists, know that many children
lie and it is part of their normal development. Adults also lie for many different
reasons. I'd like to remind you that I am not interested in any ethical or moral
consequences related to lying, that I am trying to understand how people
conceptualise deception.

At the end of the interview the interviewer thanked the subjects for their willingness to
participate, co-operate and disclose intimate information.

10.1.2 Content analysis

Interviews were transcribed, read and analysed individually. This method facilitated in
classifying each interview into its relevant domains. This initial review of material is
presented in Appendix 10.1. For the full transcripts of subjects’ interviews see Appendix
10.2. We then established two dimensions:

(1) Awareness to the difference between 'real' and 'not real': confusion about what was
real and what was a creation of an imaginative mind.

(2) Immature - mature concept of lying: the extent to which subjects manifested the
capacity to understand lying as a process by which one manipulates the other’s mind with
the intention to change the other’s behaviour.

10.1.3 Design

Two groups (consisting of 18 experimental and 14 control subjects) were analysed by two
within-factor variables: (1) awareness to the difference between ‘real’ and ‘not real’; (2)
The concept of lying: immature - mature.
10.2 Results

10.2.1 Awareness of the distinction ‘real’ and ‘not real’

Patients found themselves confused about what was real and what was imaginary. Consequently we found evidence for their deficiencies in understanding their own and their caregivers’ minds. We will present short extracts of interviews followed by concise analysis of the material.

The first subject introduced us to a state where reality and fantasy were interwoven.

Subject 111: ... But my mum lies about everything, my mum lies today. She would just make up all that kind of stuff and I mean, really, she was such a liar that I actually... Some of the things that I have accepted as being true probably weren’t and vice-versa. I was very confused about what was true and what wasn’t when I was a kid, because also she would say things to me like, you did that, and I would say I didn’t, and she said I did and I said I didn’t, and she would say, I saw you. And I hadn’t done anything, and I just used to think I must have done it because she saw me. I got older and thought I didn’t do it and she’d be still insisting. I mean really it’s only quite recently that I talk to my sister and be able to say she was lying about that. She just... I could never really tell when I was little, it was very difficult because she very often said she’d seen me do things or she would say something like, you did that deliberately. Something might go wrong, I don’t know, like if for instance, this isn’t lying exactly but its like if I went to the launderette and something got torn in the machine I’d say mum look and she’d say, you did that on purpose didn’t you. I’d say I didn’t and she say you did, I bloody well know you did. I used to think she must be right. So in a way that was kind of like lying to me.

This patient describes her upbringing in which developing a concept of lying is inconceivable. She depicts herself growing up with an omnipotent-aggressive mother who has given no way to develop a sense of separateness. Boundaries between the patient’s sense of herself and her mother could not be fabricated. She gives a painful account of unthinkable encounters, which illustrates her diffused mental representations of herself and her mother. Confusion is predetermined. It was only after being exposed to her sister’s mind, as a grown up, and while undergoing psychoanalytic psychotherapy, that she started to develop an awareness of the differences between truth and falsity not only of mere prepositions, but also of her mother as an object. She was struggling to find refuge from all these intolerable feelings.
Subject 113 (experimental group) spoke about her foster parents. Her account is especially interesting as she was voluntarily reflecting upon her current thoughts, questioning the authenticity of her memories (this will be discussed specifically in its turn).

Subject 113: It was so sad, we were so scared. My sister was cold and they used to send us out to the cold to play in the snow for certain amount of time, no matter what, and I remember they said (imitating her father’s voice) ‘Half an hour walk!’ So we went out and it just stretched the worry. And when we got back we really got punished for the two of us having managed to rip her (her sister’s) new ski suit. I don’t even know if I am lying or if I am telling the truth about every thing I told, about this family. They were so cruel, and you know, kind of crazy, what they did and what happened (crying)... They were so cruel and I’m thinking that I make it up? They sure were really so cruel.

This patient is aware that she has no access within her own mind to what is definitely an accurate representation of the truth. She is possibly in a dissociative state, so that she just does not know.

Subject 209 (experimental group) was brought up by her grandparents. She recalled them sparing her from the knowledge of her mother who had abandoned her when she was three months old (also not knowing who her father was).

... All the children the same age as me, all lived with their mums and dads err which is like the normal sort of thing, and they always used to be asking you like um, why do you live with your grandma and granddad and not with your mummy and daddy? And all this you know what I mean and like so I went home and like ‘Why do I live with you and not with my mum’ and it’s like um ‘Oh well you see...’ This is what they used to say: ‘Well you see when you were born we went and saw you and we thought ooh what a lively child and we said ooh can we have her’. And em that was the answer so one presumes from this that if that scenario is true, and I don’t think for one moment that it is that um me mother sort of said ‘Yeah you can have her I don’t want her’ you know what I mean so em...

She then spoke about a situation where facts and fabrications were merged.

Subject 209: I don’t think... I don’t think the ques... I think what I always said when I was em when I was asked this question at school, I mean I didn’t I just said to them oh well my mother and da... My mother and father got divorced before I was before I was err very old when I was... Soon after I was born they got divorced so my granddad err like I went to live with me Nan and granddad and em well this is what I would tell them but I assumed it was true. I assumed it was true but that was something I dreamed up myself. I mean like people do they make sense of things and I just assumed that they must have been married at one point, you know what I mean? But I don’t know they weren’t as it goes. They weren’t married.
Interviewer: Do you remember any other lies? I mean...
Subject 209: What? Like fabricate you mean? Um... Um... No not really.
Interviewer: Mm-hmm. What's the difference between fabricating and lying?
Subject 209: Um, I don't think there is one, I think it's the same thing isn't it? More or less.
Interviewer: With fabricating, what do you mean? You mean to...?
Subject 209: Well I think the word I, I would have used if I'd been thinking properly is confabulating. Confabulating I think are stories you actually believe yourself like you find that people with dementia confabulate and they actually believe what they're saying it just makes sense of something that didn't make sense to them and I think that's what I did pretty much is confabulate.

Her grandparents told her that the reason they brought her up was because she was a nice baby. She told children at school that her parents were divorced. She assumed it was true as she had dreamt about it. It is most likely that she resorted to a semi-dissociative state as a means to retreat from otherwise painful or potentially traumatic experiences. She resorts to mere fabrications, which she totally believes. She is pressed to create a comfortable psychic reality that replaces the harsh one.

Subject 218 spoke about physical pain when she broke her collar bone and her father was negating her pain saying that if she would sit still the pain would disappear. Her account is lengthily presented as her verbal ability and eloquent style gives a clear perspective into understanding her mind.

Subject 218: um ... {long pause} ... I'm trying to think of some sort of examples. Like I know the feeling, em... A feeling of what I was expected to feel rather than what I was feeling, so err, I'm just trying to think of an example... err... Like when I broke my collar bone I can remember feeling physical pain and because my parents were both rowing about whether or not they shouldn't or should take me to casualty and my... My father was basically saying that I was making a complete fuss over nothing and it wasn't really hurting me and I was getting into a state about nothing really... I can remember thinking, you know, how can he say that? I feel physical pain, my arms are sore... And I remember thinking how can you tell me that I'm making a fuss because I'm the person in my body and you're not in there and how do you know whether I've got any pain in my arms or not and, you know, you never saw what I did so how do you know, why are you telling me that I shouldn't be, you know, feeling like my shoulders are really painful, em...

Interviewer: Okay, what do you think was in his mind when he told you that?
Subject 218: Err, I think it, err I dunno, I mean it was almost like I was being a bit inconsiderate really, you know like... You know, I doubted I mean some-... If my dad said to me something like 'The sky is blue' then I don't know initially whether it's blue or pink, because if I hadn't seen blue before I wouldn't know what it looks like, anyway, if I said to, um you know, if I know it's blue and someone says to me 'What
colour is the sky? ‘ And I say ‘Blue’ and they say ‘Well no it isn’t it’s pink’. And then I sort of question whether it’s blue and that’s what I see or whether my dad has completely lied to me and told me the wrong colour. So then I remember very gradually sort of questioning every thing that he did say then, err...um... I dunno they go to sort of two extremes and one would be to say, ‘If you sit down quietly and don't move your arms they won't hurt any more’. So I’d sit down quietly and not move my arms and they’d still hurt so as far as I’m concerned he was lying because I knew that they were hurting.

The patient recollects childhood memories in which she questioned her own internal physical state. She found it difficult to maintain her own physical experience as part of the sense of herself. She doubted it repeatedly. Internal reality, internal truth, and in her case, natural physical discomfort is disavowed. Her capacity to normally develop a genuine apprehension of the links between internal states and external representation is being impaired. Internal states are equated with the object’s representation of these states. This subject-object-merged state is equated with lying. The patient’s response to the thoughts and feelings of her father remained insufficiently differentiated. Without sufficiently reliable reality appraisal to conceive of fantasies and feelings as mental rather than actual her sense of herself remained diffused. The father’s inclination to deny his daughter physical pain was translated by her as a lie.

In reviewing control subjects’ interviews we found no evidence for confusion between incompatible representations of internal and external realities.

To sum up, we found some evidence for the hypothesis that subjects in the experimental group would express more confusion between representations of facts and fabrications. Lying is used in the service of making sense of the implausible. Some resorted to dissociative states, having no access within their own mind to what is definitely an accurate representation of the truth. It is most likely that they resorted to such a state as a means of withdrawing from intolerable experience. Sometimes they would even doubt whether their own physical experience was part of the sense of self. The material also provides some evidence for the hypothesis that the child’s emotional expression triggers a temporary failure on the part of the caretaker to perceive the child as an intentional person. The child comes to experience her own arousal as a danger signal for abandonment. It brings forth an image of the parent who withdraws from the child in a
state of anxiety or rage to which the child reacts with a complementary dissociative response.

10.2.2 The concept of lying: from an immature to a mature concept of lying.

What is the objective of the subject’s lying? In almost all interviews subjects were asked to recall their own lies (as children or as adults) and to elaborate on them. The material was sorted into two categories according to subject’s objective when telling a lie. At the low end of the continuum we could spot lies where the subject did not have any intention in changing other’s minds. We define immature lying as a process, by which the person mainly engages in confabulating, where the other does not stand as an object for manipulating of mind, where in fact there is no other mind at sight. It is a process where the other is not perceived as an object having a mind that encompasses desires and beliefs. It functions mainly as a mechanism to construct, to obtain a cohesive sense of self. The other’s main function is to reflect on the subject’s mind, her thoughts, beliefs and intentions. The concept of lying is still defined as immature when it is instrumentally directed. In this mode, the object’s mind is not yet fully conceivable, her behaviour is generally interpreted in terms of its observable consequences, rather than being driven by desire. The subject intends to deceive but she uses learned contingencies to get an anticipated physical or emotional reward, or to avoid punishment (physical or psychological). At the high end of the continuum we find the mature concept of lying. It is manifested in subjects who have a firm sense of their own and of the other’s minds. Lying is basically aimed at changing others’ behaviour through the manipulation of others’ minds.

10.2.2.1 Immature concept of lying

We found that subjects in the experimental group (who were randomly assigned for the current study) manifested an immature concept of lying. Two of them also manifested a mature concept. Only one subject in the control group displayed an instrumental mode of
lying. This subject also exhibited a mature concept. Presented below are interview extracts of subjects in the experimental group.

Subject 111’s account shows her difficulty in understanding and employing lying correctly and maturely.

**Subject 111:** I used to lie all the time. I used to just make up stories to make myself look interesting. I used to make up stories when I was at school to cover up the gaps in things that I couldn’t tell people because it was about the house.

**Interviewer:** Such as?

**Subject 111:** Just, I couldn’t really say what went on at home so I used to make up stories about how I’d met people or how I’d been somewhere when I’d not been there before. It actually got worse as I got older, I mean I just used to make up lies, now I just cringe when I look at it. I feel like I am lying all the time, a lot of the time. I’d lie about conversations I’d had, for no reason just to lie about them. I just used to embroider them. I’ve got a terrible tendency to do that in my head now. I have to really be aware sometimes and stop myself and go hang now that’s not true, and sometimes I don’t know whether I’ve made a mistake or an intention to lie but I have to stop myself sometimes because I find myself going off into... But I just got used to embroidering things really and making things more interesting than they were. I don’t remember lying to get an advantage over anybody. I told lies really so that people would like me and so they’d think that I was interesting and that I would have something to say, it was having something to say.

... Well I’d lie to my mum, I’d go home and say, oh you know so and so in my class, she’s got this brother and he is very ill. They’re taking him into hospital and no one’s allowed going and seeing him and they think he might die. She’d go ‘Oh bloody hell that’s terrible isn’t it, if I see his mum I’ll...’ And I thought ‘Oh shit’. It was like having something interesting to say. Or I’d go to school and say: ‘Me and my mum were talking yesterday and she said this and I said that’, and it would be a conversation, I’d go between mother and child on TV but I’d made it into me and mum. Or if something happened, I don’t know, say if I cut myself accidentally I’d say I’d cut my finger and someone would ask how I did it and I would say I did it on so and so and I would say my mum was really nice and she bandaged it all up for me, well I bandaged it myself and she sat next to me and gave me a cuddle, when she hadn’t at all. It was those kinds of lies bridging the gaps in things that I couldn’t tell about at home. I couldn’t say well I went out last night and my mother kicked seven shades of shit out of me. I tried saying that a couple of times but no one believed me.

Lies were not targeted to change anything in others’ minds. The patient is just trying to get an image of herself as an interesting person. She was not trying to fool others. She must fill in many unthinkable memories with comforting images. She must fill in the gaps because otherwise the other dismisses her story. She does not wish others to change their behaviour as a consequence of her ‘lies’ (‘it was having something to say’). It is as if she
needs others to believe her story, so she can believe it too. She embroiders something that
is not real in her mind. It is not really embroidering since it is not distorting something
which was real and true, but magnifying fragile images of herself in a fantasy-real world.
The confusion between the inner and the outer world gives way to her experience: ‘I feel
like I’m lying all the time, a lot of the time’.

A similar form of immature lying is demonstrated in the next example. Lies aim to
establish the truth. In this interview extract the patient refers to the emotional abuse she
had suffered from her foster father, who had also been reported as sexually abusing her.

Subject 113: ...They were so cruel and I’m thinking that I make it up? They sure
were really so cruel.
Interviewer: So you don’t know whether it really happened, whether it is the truth?
Subject 113: Or whether I am exaggerating? Oh, no, these things did happen, all
the things I told you, but you know, hmm, I am not sure that I am... It is not that I
am lying but is it really the truth? Am I saying what really happened? Or I may be
exaggerating to make sure you understand. Because you weren’t there every day, so
if I tell you one little thing you might think it was nothing. So I have to make sure
you understand (crying). I mean such an awful life... I remember having been
punished by that, very vividly thinking what...

This patient is aware that she has no access within her own mind to what is definitely an
accurate representation of the truth. She then has the false belief that in order to be taken
seriously, in order to be believed, she has to exaggerate. She must fill in the gaps because
otherwise the other dismisses her story. The other’s belief in her story is a critical part of
her belief in her story. By seeing the others believing her she comes to believe herself.
This is part of an infantile pattern. The patient does not seem to independent psychic
reality apart from the one that she shares dyadically with the other person. She has got to
make the other person believe that so then she knows what the truth is. She cannot reflect
within and see what is the truth and what is not the truth. The reason that she cannot lie in
the strict sense of the term is because lying is paradoxically there to establish the truth.
She lies to have thereby an inner truth. The inner truth does not exist within her and can
only exist as part of the interaction with the other. In other words, she knows what the
truth is in general because it is something one believes. She then thinks, if she believes
something, it must be true, and then she can believe it. Her psychological self does not
have integrity, and it exists as part of a joint entity with another mind. An inner dialogue
of the same order like Let me tell this story to myself and see if I believe it, then it is true,
and then I know what the truth is would probably be more normal. The process is not going on in her mind but has to be done through another person.

Subject 226 was added to the experimental group although, initially, she was recruited, interviewed and assigned to the control group. Her diagnosis (using the SCID II) revealed a pathological personality pattern. It was interesting to find out that in her interviews the same fragile concept of lying, which had been revealed in previous analyses with patients was discerned. Initially, she portrayed the experience of being brought up in a low standard of living but in a loving family. No lying or withholding of truth was recalled. When she was asked to share her own lies it seemed that the wish to get attention by embroidering and fantasy making was prominent. The use of fantasy lying was probably used to escape painful traumatic experiences and also to magnify her attractiveness for others.

Subject 226: The sort of thing will be like, say, if you were at school and somebody had fallen over, I'd say so and so had fallen over today and they'd say: 'What happened?' and I'd say: 'Ooh, he'd cut his knee and the bones, here they are' (showing the broken bones visible on the skin). But also elaborated on everything, everything was dramatic, with things like that. I remember my dad coming to school to talk to the teachers about that and they'd said that it is just a sort of active mind... but it was just her mind... 'Cause my dad said she doesn't lie, she tell stories... She exaggerates all the truth, take just the first line and that's the truth and the rest of it is just building up on it.

Interviewer: And what was in your mind when you exaggerated, or when you told, for example, the story about the broken knee?

Subject 226: I think it was just (unclear)... 'Cause I had people's attention and I'd say: 'Look, I'm here, this is me... take that as me'. And that was one of my ways to get people to see me.

She felt she needed others to see her. She needed others to believe her so that she could feel her physical being, which possibly enhanced also her own feeling of worth. She was trying to acquire a sense of being through exaggerating. She was producing reality that was a creation of her imagination. As analysed with subject No. 113, it seems that she also has the false belief that in order to be taken seriously, in order to be believed, she has to exaggerate. She must fill in the gaps because otherwise the other dismisses her story. The other's belief in her story is a critical part of her belief in her story. By seeing the other believing her she comes to believe herself. Subsequently, the interviewer asked her about recent events of lying.
Subject 226: ... I can't really think of anything, I think I've just blocked them out... hmmm... Oh, there was a fire about a year ago, or a year and a half ago, something like that, I suppose it was a fire over the road from where I live. Well, I was actually on the phone with my sister at the time and I said to her: 'Oh look, there is a fire outside', and she said: 'Oh tell me what's going on, what's going on'. And I said: 'And it was only like five boys I suppose'. And by the time I finished there was a full riot (laughing loudly)... You know and she sort of said: 'Oh God, it's funny I can't see any sirens or anything'. And I said: 'No, you can't'. So she said: 'So what was actually going on?' And I said: 'Oh, from your flat you can't observe the fire'. But I was actually telling her all sort of things.

Interviewer: And when you told her all those sort of things what do you think she had in her mind?

Subject 226: She knew I was telling the truth... I was telling stories, she knew it, cause she was... I think I had done it because she was just about to hang up the phone, and I think probably I was just trying to keep her talking a bit longer, you know, so I had made up the story.

Does she have a clear understanding of her sister's mind? Confusion between facts and fiction, self and object is evident: 'She knew I was telling the truth... I was telling stories, she knew it'. She could grasp that it was difficult to see the imagined scene. But when distorting her believed truth ('it was only like five boys I suppose') she did not consciously hold her sister's mind within her own mind. It was just an impulsive reaction. It is most likely her overwhelming experience of neglect that she is defending herself against. She possibly forced herself to believe that her sister thought it was the truth. It seems that she did not have clear apprehension of her sister's thoughts and feelings. Telling stories ('I had made up the story') are linked with actions rather than mental states ('to keep her talking a bit longer').

Subject 205 (experimental group) fluctuates between what might be perceived as a clear concept of lying to an immature concept of lying.

Interviewer: Do you remember yourself lying to her?

Subject 205: I can't remember but it was stupid things sort of half lies not kind of proper lies sort of like twisting, you know, twisting things for my own benefit a little bit, or saying yeah, twisting things a bit to get my own way, I think it's stupid ways because she found out about them. I remember having a big argument with her and her saying that I was always telling half the truth and I was making other bits up that suited me, I can't think properly, I can't remember it properly, I just this... There was something about something to do with money and something about this girl Name1 and I can't remember it properly. It's always a bit funny about lying though because I remember my friend used to ask me if she could come to my house after school and so I said I'd ask my mum and instead of just saying, no I don't want you to come to my house I'm doing something or just saying my mum says you
can't come, I went home and I said 'Oh, can Nemil come to my house, say no' so that I could go back and say my mum said no without having lied to her, stupid but...

**Interviewer:** So what was on your mind when wanting to tell these lies?

**Subject 205:** I guess I just didn't like lying, I didn't think it was... I just thought it wasn't something you did if you weren't a horrible person but at the same time I don't know why I just didn't say I don't want you to come to my house today I'm doing something so I suppose it was wanting to be a horrible person without getting the flak for being horrible.

This subject could not give an example of an active lie. She told her friend she would ask her mum, and in her mind she planned to ask her mum not to let her friend come. Although having the idea that lying can be used as a potential procedure to change her friend's behaviour, she could not actually lie. In her mind, it seems that she knew she did not want her friend to come, but she needed her mother to say that she would not let her. It is possible that within her own mind she could not represent herself as a lying object equivalent to being bad. Within her mind the wish not to let her friend meant that she was a horrible person. When she thought about lying she was utterly not interested in her friend's mind. All she knew was that she did not want the friend to come. It is not only the idea of manipulating the friend's mind, which is not comprehensible, but also the manipulation of her mother's mind.

In the next extract, she conceived of lying as an aggressive behaviour. But, still she was reluctant to give any clear example of lying. It was impossible for her to express a mature concept of lying.

**Interviewer:** Do you remember incidents where you lied to your stepfather?

**Subject 205:** Um, I'm sure there'd be lots, um, I just don't know. I don't know. Don't really know. With him it was really a case of you can tell him whatever you like just as long as you don't get caught. It was what you can say to keep yourself out of trouble.

**Interviewer:** Mm-hmmm, for example?

**Subject 205:** I can't think of examples. I mean it was just a question of dodging the bullets you know. I think it was more like that when I got older, 'cause when I was younger I would be quite truthful with him I think that was more when I was older, when I was younger I was quite truthful and then when I got older I was more into dodging things. Plus I don't think, err, I don't think... it's just self-protection. I'm not into lying and things I'm just a truthful person and em, but then again there's some people that don't deserve the truth, such as my stepfather who doesn't deserve anything I mean why should I tell him anything. But I wouldn't give a shit about telling him a crock of absolute crap because he isn't worth anything more than that
and you know there are certain types of behaviour that—well, you get what you
deserve if you behave like that towards people.

Lies are not directed at changing another's mind and behaviour. It is just 'telling a crock
of absolute crap'. With the realisation of being lied to, she developed a sense of being
devolved and betrayed. It follows that lying, when perceived as an injury, may be
perpetrated as an aggressive act. One may lie to another person with the belief that the
other does not deserve the truth and with the feeling of contempt that the other is not
smart enough to decipher the lie.

Subject 206 (experimental group) was sexually abused by her stepfather. She was asked
to recall her own lies. It was a hopeless attempt to retrieve any such memories. At the end
she spoke about lying in the context of being upset.

Subject 206: It must have happened, but I can't think, you know, I can't think, it
feels, when I'm thinking about that, I could feel that I'm getting upset and I don't
know why, and it's because I can't remember... Can't even remember them talking
to each other, not to mention lying to each other. You know, and I was just there, in
the house, but I'm not anything, you know what I mean. I don't really have a role,
so how can lying come into it, you know?

... Subject 206: I suppose that when people ask you if you're OK and you are not OK,
and you say you are, it's a lie, isn't it?

Interviewer: Hmm... What do you think?

Subject 206: Yeah, I think it's a lie. That's the most obvious lie I can think of.
That's the most obvious lie I think of. It's if people would've asked me if I was OK, I
has lied the whole time, because I never was, but I said 'Oh, yeah, I'm OK'.

Interviewer: Hmmm.

Subject 206: So that's quite devious.

Interviewer: Hmmm. And do you remember specific instances when you would say
that you were OK.

Subject 206: Well I used to say it to my old psychiatrist all the times, when I was 13
I was lying. It was sounded OK even if I wasn't, I knew I was lying.

Interviewer: And why did you decide to lie?

Subject 206: I really didn't want to talk to her about it.

Interviewer: To talk to your psychiatrist?

Subject 206: Yeah, I really didn't want to talk to her, and if I'd said that it was OK,
then she was just... thought she would leave me alone. So...

Interviewer: But then, were you feeling OK?

Subject 206: I knew I wasn't OK but I just meant to say it. I just didn't want people
to ask me any more questions, and I would say that 'Oh, yeah, I'm OK'.

Interviewer: Hmm... Any other lies that you can remember, as a child?

Subject 206: I suppose it's like saying: 'Did you move the newspaper from the
chair?' and you say: 'No', even if you did. It's a lie, isn't it? So there were probably
millions of lies in my childhood. And it's probably millions of lies now, really... And I'm pretty a devious person, so (laughing)...

The patient is being asked to recall memories of deception and she is unable to get access to such memories of deception. She then reports that she has chosen not to remember, implying that there has been some unbearable trace of experience, some unbearable truth in her mind which has disavowed ('I can't... I don't want to remember, I've chosen not to remember'). There is direct association between lying and the feeling of being upset, but an inability or resistance to locate specific memories associated with feelings of being upset ('...When I'm thinking about that, I could feel that I'm getting upset'). She needs the interviewer's assistance to overcome this obstacle. In fact, at that stage, she clearly communicates her wish to dissociate herself from such memories. Thus unveiling a subsequent internal state. She does not have a sense of real being, a real sense of self ('You know, and I was just there, in the house, but I'm not anything'). Then she talks about her relationships with caregivers and the wish to negate her absent state of mind. She is immensely uncertain about her inner world. She hesitates as to whether negating a supposedly internal state (the feeling of being upset) is a kind of lie. She is quiet right in her doubt since lying can only exist when there is a clear knowledge about one's own thoughts, beliefs, feelings, and a clear sense of oneself. When the doctor asks her whether she is OK, she feels or believes that she is not feeling OK. So, she assumes it is a lie to say that she is OK. But she doesn't know what is wrong with her or what the matter is, and she can't give a meaningful answer. She believes that people do not like the truth, the truth of having memories of experiences of abuse, the truth that people don't like to know the truth. In the context of her sexual abuse, without doubt she is speaking the truth. Because her truth is unbearable, she senses that somebody else's mind couldn't bear the truth of hers, so she is forced to a state of quasi-dissociation where she has to ignore her own internal states in order to salvage the mental state of the other. She is not telling lies in the mature sense of the term, in wanting to create an impression in somebody else's mind that differs from reality. She just wants the questions to stop. She says: 'I really didn't want to talk to her, and if I'd said that it was OK, then she was just... thought she would leave me alone'. She does not know what her psychiatrist has in her mind. She just imagines the psychiatrist would leave her alone. It is probably through a simple learning process that she associates her negation with a certain relief. This associative learning
process is illustrated when she recalls that her denial when moving the newspaper from the chair is a result of having been slapped around the face when admitting it in the past.

For her, lying is activated just in the simple instrumental immature mode. Punishment is behaviourally associated with telling the true account of events and avoiding punishment is behaviourally associated with denying the true account of events. Her lies are intended to fulfil her wish to escape from an unbearable and not clearly defined internal state. She does not have the intention of manipulating the other’s mind. The mature mode cannot be employed since the fragmented self either has no access to the actual internal state, or repetitively dissociates itself from the unbearable truth.

The next subject (number 209) fabricated the story that her parents got divorced and her grandparents raised her since her mother abandoned her.

**Interviewer:** Mm-hmm and when you told the children that your parents were separated um what did you think the children had in their mind?

**Subject 209:** Don’t know.

**Interviewer:** You don’t know?

**Subject 209:** No.

**Interviewer:** Mm-hmm, so what was your intention then?

**Subject 209:** How do you mean what was my intention?

**Interviewer:** Well in terms of...

**Subject 209:** Well it was just an a-, they asked me a question and I suppose I just gave them... I made sense of... I thought that was right. I thought that was true, I assumed it must be true.

It seems that she was not trying to manipulate the children’s minds. Lying is used in the service of making sense of the implausible. She could not understand the mind of her mother who forcefully rejected her. Being overwhelmed by intolerable thoughts that her mother physically rejected her she resorts to fabricate a better reality. As she was not utterly convinced, she was trying, to no avail, to establish a better representation of her mother and assumed father in sharing her ‘unreal thoughts’ with other children at school. It is not that the fabrication represents a plea for sympathy. She probably thought that if another person believed her, it must have been true, and then she could believe it too, she could make sense of the unthinkable.

Subject 214 (experimental group) firstly spoke about the experience of parental indifference. She then spoke about her intentional lies.
Interviewer: So when you returned home that afternoon pretending that you came back from school, and your stepmum was at home, what did you think she had in mind then?

Subject 214: Um, I wouldn’t know because when I got home from school we never really talked um I wasn’t really interested in what she’d been doing that day either, she wasn’t particularly interested in what I’d been doing. I just went up to my room more often than not, got changed and then went out again. I sort of - told them very little about what was going on with me and I didn’t give them a chance to talk about what was going on for them.

Interviewer: But let us say that you got home, and she would think that you were at school and you were pretending being at school. So what was in your mind then?

Subject 214: What was in my mind? I can’t actually remember. I was constantly preoccupied with having time off school. I mean after she did find out I would just go in for the register every morning to get my name ticked off by the teacher and then go and that way the days wouldn’t tally up.

Interviewer: Right, so you needed to conceal the fact that you didn’t go to school, so let’s assume that you had in mind the knowledge that you were not allowed to stay at home or to take any days off, right?

Subject 214: Well there was nothing to hide because she wasn’t interested in where I was going.

Interviewer: But you hid it in a way, so you had something in mind that you felt you needed to hide.

Subject 214: Yeah, oh yeah, I knew I had to hide it because I knew I’d get in trouble if I told them.

Interviewer: You’d get in trouble? So I understand that it was a lie in order to avoid punishment?

Subject 214: Yeah, I mean the fact is they never asked me how my day’s been at school. They must have automatically assumed I’d been at school all day. Even if they’d asked me I’d have said I’d been because the fact was I wasn’t really lying because they never asked me where I’d been all day.

Within her mind, the patient represented her father as indifferent and her stepmother as abusive. Her behaviour, ‘going in for the register every morning gets my name ticked off by the teacher’, was performed when no object was at sight. Was her stepmother interested or not? No clear linkage between stepmother’s internal state and her external responses is detected. Apart from what seems to be an instrumental lying, she is mostly employing deceptive behaviour that ultimately cannot or does not take into consideration the other’s mind.

The next extract (subject 225) clearly illustrates how behaviour is interpreted in terms of observable consequences. The behaviour of the other is not explained in terms of wishes and beliefs.
Interviewer: Try to remember some kind of lies or times when you had to withhold the truth from either mum or your step-father, I mean...

Patient 225: Well there's lots of little lies um, because we were never allowed to take anything from the cupboard, we always had to ask permission not like kids of today and if you took a couple of biscuits that was stealing and um, we or I used to say that it wasn't me when it was me but I said it wasn't me so I didn't get blasted.

Interviewer: So, when you took out some sweets or something like that...

Patient 225: Biscuits.

Interviewer: Biscuits, mm-hm, right and it was a kind of daily thing?

Patient 225: Sort of after school we'd have a couple biscuits but she'd always know and I'd say no it wasn't me must've been my brother.

Interviewer: And what do you think when you told her that it wasn't you and it was your brother, you'd blame him, um, what do you think mum would have in her mind? What did she think?

Patient 225: She used to hit the lot of us to get to the right one.

Interviewer: Right, so what do you think was in her mind when you told her?

Patient 225: She used to be furious for the sake of taking a couple of biscuits.

Interviewer: When you told her that it wouldn't have been you, what was in your mind? What did you think of?

Patient 225: I knew what the consequences were going to be because I'd done it several times and um, don't really know.

Interviewer: Don't really know what was in your mind when not telling the truth?

Patient 225: Not telling the truth because you didn't want to get hit but you were hungry so you had to take food, and it was either bread or biscuits.

Her mother's mind is firstly associated with actions. When asked about her mother's thoughts she replies that 'she used to hit the lot of us to get to the right one'. After elaborating, and being asked again the same question she answers it differently. 'She used to be furious for the sake of taking a couple of biscuits' possibly linking mum's 'beating' to 'being furious', thus linking external behaviour to internal state. Referring to her own state of mind, she says that '... not telling the truth because you didn't want to get hit but you was hungry so you had to take food, and it was either bread or biscuits'. She is thus introducing her desperate state of affairs. Basic needs are discarded, eating is equated with fear of aggression and lying is then equated with stealing. Both serve as a means to escape mum's fury.

One subject in the control group exhibited the concept of lying in terms of observable consequences. She also manifested a mature concept of lying (which will be presented in the next section).
Subject 966: ...I never lied about where I was staying but more probably about where I was going. If I was going to a party then I'd lie about that.
Interviewer: Mm-hmm, and what would you say?
Subject 966: That I was going to the cinema.
Interviewer: Right, and what was in your mind when you told him that you were going to the cinema?
Subject 966: Well, the thing is if I sort of told my dad I was going to a party with a friend then sometimes he wouldn't let me go, so rather than being not able to go I'd lie and say that we were going to the cinema instead and that I was staying at a friend's house, which I was but, oh they knew I was staying at my friend's house. I wasn't going to say I was going to a party, something like that.
Interviewer: Right, and what do you think he had in mind when you told him that you were going to the cinema?
Subject 966: What do you mean, what? I suppose he thought I was telling the truth.
Interviewer: Right so what would he have in mind when asking you where are you going?
Subject 966: Oh, I don't know. Um, maybe he thought I was going to a party. Well I don't know why he would think I was going to a party, maybe he would, maybe he thought I was lying to him, I don't know.

The subject thoroughly reflects upon her own mind, but less clearly on her father’s mind. She links her father’s reluctance to let her go out with a friend to a party, to her urge, to go to a party, and presumably understands that he will accept her staying at a friend’s house, which was actually true. She tells a lie by omission. When referring to her father’s state of mind, she responds astoundingly, as if it is quite banal for her. First, she assumes they believed her story ("They thought I was telling the truth"), and then she becomes doubtful ("Maybe they thought I was going to a party"). It is likely that she finds it difficult to acknowledge the differences between what she is sure was in her mind and what she failed to consider was in her father’s mind. It is also likely that conceptualising others’ minds is a difficult task for her. It confuses her.

To sum up, patients’ elaboration on their own lies revealed an immature concept of lying. They were frequently not trying to fool others. They did not wish to change others’ mind as a consequence of their lies. They needed others to believe their story, so that they could believe it too. It seems that they have to make the other person believe so that then they know what the truth is. Lying is paradoxically there to establish the truth. In fact they cannot lie in the strict sense of the term. Sometimes lies aim at establishing comforting images to defend inconceivable memories. Frequently telling stories are linked with actions rather than mental states.
Some patients displayed understanding lying in the context of behavioural consequences where no clear linkage was made between the other's internal state and external response. Although lying may sound as an attempt at changing the other person's beliefs it is mainly perceived in terms of the course of action. Sometimes the mature mode cannot be employed since the fragmented self either has no access to the actual internal state, or repetitively dissociates itself from the unbearable truth. Sometimes with the realisation of being lied to, the patient develops a sense of being devalued and betrayed. It follows that lying, when perceived as an injury, may be interpreted as an aggressive act. Subsequently one may lie having the belief that the other does not deserve the truth and with the feeling of contempt that the other is not smart enough to decipher the lie.

10.2.2.2 Mature concept of lying

At the high end of the continuum we find the mature concept of lying. It is found in subjects who manifested a firm sense of their own and of the other’s mind. Lying is basically aiming at changing others’ behaviour through the manipulation of others’ mind.

Some patients showed the capacity to understand lying as a mentalising process. All control subjects interpreted lying in terms of changing others’ belief.

Subject 214 (experimental group) gave few examples of a mature concept. She talked about an event when her father revealed the fact that her mother was in fact a stepmother.

Subject 214: Um, yeah, I do sometimes wonder why they didn’t tell me and I think it was because I mean I think if my dad could relive that day then he wouldn’t have told me. Um, I really don’t think that he ever wanted to tell me. I think he was just hoping that I wouldn’t start asking questions or become in any way suspicious and that we’d sort of be a family until we all sort of reached old age.

Interviewer: And why do you think he wouldn’t have liked to tell you the truth? Subject 214: Because I think he finds it very difficult dealing with relationships and family matters and problems I mean work problems and anything like that he can handle without a problem at all but I think emotional matters I don’t think he can cope with at all.

The patient evidently understands the link between her father’s mind (‘... sort of be a family’), his deceptive behaviour (concealing the truth) and the behavioural consequences (‘I wouldn’t start asking questions or become in anyway suspicious’).
She proceeded giving other indications of this capacity.

Subject 214: My lies weren't very interesting or glamorous or anything just small petty lies to get me out of trouble.

Interviewer: For example?

Subject 214: About fighting with my brothers, um, it tended to be whenever I was sort of infringing on any of their space or belongings or causing any trouble to anyone else, including her (her stepmother). If things went missing I was always the first person to be asked where it'd got to and a lot of the time it was pointless even denying it. I think the lies got bigger and bigger about taking time off school and saying how things were going in school.

Interviewer: So let’s discuss one or two examples.

Subject 214: Well, I wasn't really lying to both in a way when I used to take time off school. I used... very often I would just say what they wanted to hear.

Interviewer: What sort of things?

Subject 214: Things about how things were going at school and whether I liked where we were living at the time, quite often I didn't... Mm, my dad especially I mean he used to tell me things about work and how many more people he was employing and how much money he was bringing home and stuff, I'd say it was really good I was really pleased for you dad and I wasn't really interested at all.

She starts describing a common instrumental lying ('Just small petty lies to get me out of trouble'). It seems, again, that the concept of lying incorporates understanding that others have desires that can be manipulated, 'I used... very often I would just say what they wanted to hear'. Then: 'I'd say it was really good I was really pleased for you dad and I wasn't really interested at all', a statement that shows her awareness to the distinction between inner mental state ('not interested'), external communication ('really good').

Subject 218 (experimental group) was mentioned in the context of her wish to accept her parents' beliefs and the turmoil when realities struck. The next extract follows her description of an event when she was injured by swing and received four stitches in her back.

Subject 218: No, so I went with my dad and I remember going in there and the only thing about it I can remember, er, is just desperately wanting to cry and I couldn't because every time I got close you know got close to tears I was, you know, I was told that I was a very brave girl and you know I was that I didn't need to cry because I was a big girl and you know, 'You're being very good' and you know, 'You know you're being a good girl by not crying'. And if you cry it's almost like sort of you know, sort of like you're being bad. And I can remember just having these stitches put in my head and the whole time I sat there I can remember only thinking about not crying and that was it, and then I can remember sort of after, I can remember that night in bed when I was really had a lot of- when my head was really sore, em, feeling that it was okay to cry because I knew that it hurt and that was why I wanted to cry but I also knew that if
I had cried and people had seen me then I would be not sort of doing what people wanted me to do. I'd be sort of like you know making a mess or you know making things look untidy. Erm, and I can remember being sort of I- at the time I don't think I thought my dad was or you know I really thought that if I didn't cry that I was going to be okay. And I didn't think, you know, you just don't want me to cry because you just can't cope with it or- but it was more just you know kind of, before you go to school or before you start spending quite a bit of time around other people and not just your family, initially you do feel like your parents are God really and what they say is true. And it's only really when you get other people on the scene that they sort of do things differently or react very differently. It's only then that I can remember that I questioned how I saw things really. And what happened when I did that was that I sort of, er, I can remember my parents saying you've got to do this way because that's the best way and then I'd perhaps see someone doing something a different way but I still wouldn't know which was the right way erm, so, I didn't actually feel that my parents were lying but I did actually feel that what they thought was the truth wasn't what everyone thought in the end.

Interviewer: As the truth?

Subject 218: As the sort of, like if my dad said to me, 'Don't cry because you'll be being really good'.

Interviewer: Was that lying?

Sub218: I didn't feel it was a lie I felt it was the way that people coped. And then when sort of like I'd be upset at my friends or something they didn't spend loads of time trying to stop me crying, then I would think well, I'm still okay and I cried. And I didn't actually think my dad was lying I just thought he did things differently. Because I think if I had thought that he wasn't doing things that were with my best intentions, I think I would have hated him a long time ago. Um, but I think I didn't just- I think I went from believing in him wholly to sort of feeling a bit sort of insecure because I didn't know if I could trust what he said, um, and I suppose that progressed to sort of feeling frightened because what I did feel wasn't solely what I was supposed to, um, which made me trust my parents even less.

From the patient's childhood recollections, the father's intentions and beliefs have not yet been recognised. Moreover, the ground for lying emanated in a reverse direction. It is not the case of manipulating the mind, which affects subsequent behaviour, but vice versa, manipulating behaviour affects subsequent internal states. Before being exposed to other minds, she really thought that if she didn't cry, it was going to be OK, and in her mind it was her own fault. Later, a different representation of her father emerges. Her view of the object's internal state emanates more distinctly. Her father's desire becomes clear and salient. It seems there is less lack of differentiation with the object and it has its own mind. She understands that 'Dad didn't want her to cry because he couldn't cope with it' and it implies that she understands he has his own mind which is different from hers. We observe the evolution in the capacity to represent the other as a psychically functioning
being. It was his wish to reject her internal states because he couldn’t cope with it.
Wholeness is given to the object through an understanding of the processes that provide
an account of the object’s actions in the physical world.

Subject 225 (experimental group) was previously presented in the context of having an
instrumental concept of lying.

**Patient 225:** But that wasn’t the only um, lies I told like when I told you I fell through
the ice and I went home with one shoe. I told my mum I was pushed under the ice by
some boys but I’d- I went on there on myself and fell through the ice but because I
didn’t want to get hit I told her that they made me do it.
**Interviewer:** And what happened then?
**Patient 225:** Well, she hit me with the remaining shoe and I went to find the other shoe
but I couldn’t get on the ice.
**Interviewer:** Right, so what did you have in your mind when you told her that you
were being pushed by others and that’s why...?
**Patient 225:** Just to err, make her feel sorry for me because I’d lost my shoe. And...
But it didn’t work, she hit me as well.
**Interviewer:** Why would she be sorry for you if you told her...?
**Patient 225:** Well, that some bullies had got hold of me and made me go on the ice
and when in fact it wasn’t true, I went on myself.
**Interviewer:** And when you told her that you’d been pushed, what do you think was in
her mind?
**Patient 225:** She was most probably angry about having to buy me some more shoes.

The patient is trying to manipulate her mother’s mind. She knew it was she who had lost the
shoe and she was trying to make her mother feel sorry by introducing the belief that some
bullies had got hold of her, possibly having in mind the causal link between feeling sorrow,
anger or violence. She is repeatedly faced with the experience that mum’s mind is
determined, immutable. Overwhelmed with fear of reprehensible punishment, from within
and from without, she desperately wishes to impose feelings of shame and guilt. The wish
‘to make her feel sorry for me because I’d lost my shoe’ shows also that lying is interpreted
as an aggressive act.

As mentioned, all control subjects manifested a mature concept of lying. For example,
subject 952 talked about denying stealing a ball.

**Interviewer:** So what was in your mind about not volunteering it?
**Subject 952:** I didn’t want to be found out as a thief. I didn’t want her to know that
I’d done something that she had told me I shouldn’t do. She always told me I
shouldn’t.
It is not the fear of punishment that motivated him. He did not want to be believed by his mother as if he was a thief. He did not volunteer that he stole it because he knew what was in his mother’s mind - not liking him doing things that he should not do. He then illustrates the same mental process, giving another example concerning his lie as a union representative.

Subject 952: Particularly it’s important to present a group of negotiators as a team and make it appear to the members that we’re all working together and supporting each other. It gives big confidence when it comes to an industrial action or whatever. And also it gives us a competitive advantage over parallel unions in the same business. Where as an actual fact there was some almighty fallings out and some people, senior people would eat each other’s throats. We can talk about it amongst senior union reps but trying not to say it to ordinary members. It just rocks their confidence, the thing that there is a problem. So I would often cover things up, like that. There was one guy in particular, well he was a full-time officer, and he would say completely insincere things, complimentary to me when I knew he’d really hated me, but in public he would be nice about me. And similarly I would play down the difficulties that were between the two of us...To the general membership, and I would sort of say that it has been sorted out now, that it is all right when definitely there was still a problem.

The subject speaks about presenting and representing ideas and thoughts. He analyses it from various perspectives: ‘He was a full time officer, and he would say completely insincere things, complimentary to me when I knew he’d really hated me, but in public he would be nice about me.’

Subject 966 perfectly understood her motives. She talked about a situation in which she lied to her boyfriend who thought she was seeing someone else.

Subject 966: Um, I lied to Husband before we got...Well, before we got married when I was seeing someone else at the same time I was seeing him. So I suppose I lied, I mean he knows the truth now but I did lie about that. I kept it quiet for about 3 months. He asked me.

Interviewer: Right, yeah, so what was in his mind when he asked you?
Subject 966: Um, I suppose because we’d been...He lived in Place1 and I lived in Place2 and we didn't see a lot of each other. And maybe my behaviour was a bit odd on the phone, like that so he suspected. And I lied to him a number of times saying like ‘Oh, don't be silly.’

Interviewer: So what would you say when he asked you?
Subject 966: Oh, I'd say 'Don’t be silly' basically and ‘Who could I possibly be seeing?’ and ‘You would’ve found out by now by family’ and stuff like that, you know, just cover it up.

Interviewer: Right, so what was in your mind when you decided not to tell him the truth?
Subject 966: What was in my mind?
Interviewer: Yes, what was in your mind.
Subject 966: Well I didn't want him to know, so basically I lied.
Interviewer: Right well then try to think of why you didn't want him to know?
Subject 966: Well I didn't want him to know I suppose because I didn't want him to split up with me but I wasn't sure about the other person so that's why I lied in the first place. I was afraid.
Interviewer: Again, what do you think that he thought when you lied to him? What was in his mind?
Subject 966: Um, he probably didn't know whether to believe me or not to believe me basically. He wanted to trust me but I hadn't done anything else before for him to distrust me anyway so he might have believed me but then he might have been thinking 'Well we're so far apart, I don't know what goes on when I'm not there.'

When first confronted with the question about her boyfriend's mind she gives a clear linkage between her behaviour ("... maybe my behaviour was a bit odd on the phone"), her thoughts about his internal state, ("... so he suspected") his behaviour ("... questioning her about seeing somebody else"), and her response ('Oh, don't be silly'). When she is pressed to think about her husband's mind, she gives two alternatives. She delineates a clearer description of his mind. In retrospect, it sounds that when she actually lied she did not really take into consideration all these alternatives, maybe since it was evident for her. But on the other hand, although fragile, she does not have the capacity to hold and maintain the other's mind.

Subject 970 speaks about a row with her brother about whose right it was to watch TV. Then she describes lying to her mother that she was there first, or lying about not doing homework, or denying breaking something in the living room, or lying about going to places where her parents would forbid her to go.

Interviewer: Anyway, as a child what did you think mum had in her mind? After you told her that you were first.
Subject 970: Err, well she knew one of us was lying and she would probably know who it was 'cause she would have probably heard the TV and it would show, it was on, whose show it was so she would have either, you know, I guess either said well, well she would never say that I knew that Brother was watching it first or anything like that. She would never say that's not true, I don't think she would say that, she'd just say er something like 'Brother has this hour, you have the next half-hour' or 'You can have this half hour if you want' or 'You can have the next... 'you know.

The differences between the two minds are unequivocal. She delineates the links between her mother hearing the TV sound and knowing whose show it was. She did not
experience her lying as unacceptable to her mother. It is not just that she has the concept of lying but lying seems also to be feasible. It is also her humorous style that gives a light flavour to the idea of discussing this subject, not to mention to employ deception.

Subject 971 recollects memories of her parents’ concealing the ‘immoral fact’ of her having been conceived before the wedding. She was asked about her own lies.

**Subject 971:** A recent lie, you mean like nowadays. Oh this is one I told to my mother recently. I was at my boyfriend’s house on Friday night and my mother phoned on Friday night quite late about 10 or 11 and I wasn’t in. And my friend (another one) said ‘Oh, I’m not sure where she is, um, we’ll leave a message for her to phone you back’, and I didn’t get back in until the Sunday because I stayed over until the Sunday. And when I spoke to my mother I said I hadn’t seen Friend1 or Friend2 so they hadn’t passed on the message so, in fact it was true, I hadn’t actually seen them but it wasn’t because I hadn’t seen them it was because I hadn’t been home rather. But I sort of intimated by omission that I’d arrived home that night but just hadn’t got the message.

**Interviewer:** Okay, so again what you had in mind before telling mum that you hadn’t seen Friend1 or Friend2.

**Subject 971:** Um, as I said before my parents are very religious and my mother especially wouldn’t be happy at all if she discovered that I was spending the night with my boyfriend. As far as they’re concerned we’re all going to be married in white and so the reason I lied was so she didn’t know... Or so I didn’t have to say to her that I’d stayed over and slept at my boyfriend’s house.

**Interviewer:** And when telling her that you didn’t see Friend1 or Friend2, what did you think she had in mind?

**Subject 971:** Um, I think she probably thought I’d been too busy to get back to her, because I had been working and...

**Interviewer:** Is that what she would have thought?

**Subject 971:** Oh yeah, before I phoned her she probably thought I’d been too busy.

**Interviewer:** So this was in your mind as well?

**Subject 971:** She probably thought I was too busy, yeah. But she was probably a bit anxious as well because she always gets you know, if I haven’t replied by the Sunday she probably would have got, you know, anxious and tried phoning me again, tried to get through to me.

Subject 971 tells a lie, intending to comply with her parents’ moral codes. In her mind she could represent her mother as having a separate mind. When the interviewer persists in asking whether a certain thought was hers, not her mother’s (‘Is that what she would have thought?’) she answers, without hesitation, what she thought was in her mother’s mind (‘She probably thought I was too busy, yeah. But she was probably a bit anxious as well’). There is a conclusive view of the definite association between emotions and actions - anxiety stirs the action of making a call phone, which in itself, compels the subject to call on Sunday.
Lastly, subject 983 recalls an event when she hit a girl at school, did not get back to classroom and hid in the bushes. Mother confronted her.

Interviewer: When you told her that you played what was in your mind?
Subject 983: That I had socked this girl and had her crying and that I was going to get in trouble.

Interviewer: As a child what did you think she had in her mind?
Subject 983: I think she probably wasn’t concerned about the situation itself as it was just a normal childhood thing. Kids hit each other and I’m not an aggressive person so it wouldn’t be a typical part of me, so she would have considered it a fluke, sort of a situational thing, so I think her concern was more for the fact that a) I disappeared that I was so afraid by what I had done and unwilling to take the consequences in truth or trying to postpone the consequences so I think her concern was more for how I reacted to it and the fact that I had disappeared and had worried everybody, it had worried the school and it had worried her, although I wouldn’t have known it was going in there although I’m sure that she was but that before they were just waiting to see what would happen after school, and I didn’t show up so being calm about it.

As a child she told a lie without really thinking about her mother’s mind. She was defending herself from what she thought would be the consequences of behaving inappropriately. She knew she had struck this girl and had made her cry and she thought that she was going to get into trouble. Then, she gives a clear description of her mother’s thoughts (‘She probably wasn’t concerned about the situation itself... I think her concern was more for the fact that I disappeared... It had worried the school and it had worried her...’) and reaction (‘She said I actually had a phone call from the school, but she wasn’t angry, she didn’t yell at me, I don’t remember being put on restriction I remember her talking to me about how what I did was wrong but how it was even more wrong for me to disappear’) which she acknowledges are different from her thoughts (‘I knew I was going to get into trouble’), feelings (‘I was so afraid by what I had done and unwilling to take the consequences in truth or trying to postpone the consequences’) and reaction (‘I hid in the bushes, and waited for the bell to ring and then went home... I say Oh just played’).

To conclude, few experimental subjects showed a mature concept of lying. When control subjects were asked to explain the process of lying with reference to theirs and the others’ state of mind, almost unanimously they manifested a clear linkage between desires, beliefs and actions.
10.3 Discussion

How do BPD individuals conceptualise lying as opposed to normal subjects? The aim of this qualitative study was to explore this question. We examined whether BPD individuals are less able to genuinely manipulate others' beliefs, but merely their behaviour. What may appear as a lie is in fact a simplistic version of immature lying. It is a composition in which the BPD learns a simple strategy, linking 'false statement' to observable consequences. For example, 'If I say I am so tired when mum has asked me to do something I do not want to do, then mum does not make me do it'. It was assumed that if subjects were aware of the existence of differences between different minds and different actions, when they would be asked to portray them in connection to lying, then they could be identified as having the capacity to hold a theory of mind.

The content of the material presented revealed some discernible distinctions between groups. First, the narratives were described along with the behaviour of deception. Control subjects revealed common daily lies depicting what might be characterised as undisturbed normal upbringing in a positive family environment. Experimental subjects almost unanimously depicted unbearable circumstances of development with either indifferent or rejecting, abusing parents. Scenes of hatred, extreme violence, excessive physical punishment, harsh rejections, acute deprivation, unrealistic expectations, and premature demands predominated.

Secondly, subjects in the experimental group appeared to recollect more disturbing memories of withholding the truth from, or lying to their parents. They revealed truths about parents whom they did not know as their stepparents, unknown real parents, alcoholic caregivers and extra-marital affairs. They spoke about parents who twisted the truth, made up entire stories, or required them to lie for their (the parents) benefit. Normal subjects either did not recall memories of deceit, mostly saying their parents had been truthful with them, or revealed parents who were hiding their economic condition, siblings' or parents' illnesses, new-born siblings, and extra-marital affairs.

Thirdly and most important is the qualitative difference in understanding other minds. We argued that BPD individuals are not always telling lies in the mature sense of the term, in
wanting to create an impression in somebody else's mind that differs from reality. Two immature modes are suggested, self-oriented and instrumental. In the self-oriented mode, borderlines negotiate the complexity of internal and external realities. Lying is viewed as an ongoing personal or interpersonal process by which inner truth is negotiated. When inner truth does not exist within their mind it can only exist as part of the interaction with the other. The self-oriented mode encompasses fantasy lying which is mostly associated with uttered wishful thinking or exaggeration aiming at the alleviation of painful experiences. It functions within internal and external representations of self and others. In the instrumental mode, BPD individuals link a chain of stimuli–response associations, without having a clear understanding of the process that is taking place in the manipulation of the other's mind.

Analysis of the protocols of subjects in the experimental group revealed that some of them resorted to conceptualising lying employing mainly the instrumental mode. Subject 225, for example, replied, 'She (her mother) used to hit the lot of us to get to the right one'. After elaborating, and being asked the same question again she answered it differently: 'She used to be furious for the sake of taking a couple of biscuits', possibly linking mum's 'beating' to 'being furious', thus connecting external behaviour to internal state. But still, the fear of punishment activated the denial of misdeeds. She definitely did not think about changing her mother's mood, but knew that her mother reacted irritantly. She just wished not to get hurt. She was in fact so overwhelmed with fear (of violation) that she could not even think about her mother's mind, '...Not telling the truth because you didn't want to get hit but you were hungry so you had to take food, and it was either bread or biscuits'. It is a clear attempt to protect herself from the profound annihilation associated with identification with the thoughtless state of the parental abuser. Subject 952's response is an example of the concept subjects in the control group used when they described the denial of misdeeds. He said: 'I didn't want to be found out as a thief, I didn't want her to know that I'd done something that she had told me I shouldn't do. She always told me I shouldn't'. He voluntarily used the verb 'to know'. It is not the fear of actual punishment that motivated him but the wish that his mother would not discern in her mind, what he actually knew.

The lack of awareness of one's own mental state coupled with the predominance of pre-mentalistic physical action-centred strategies was also noted. In a threatening
environment, behaviour of the other is interpreted in terms of its observable consequences, rather than being driven by desire. Talking about the other’s state of mind makes sense if the other’s behaviour has been explained in terms of wishes and beliefs. If it is interpreted mostly in terms of its observable consequence a kind of ‘mentalsitic learned helplessness’ (Fonagy, 1997) sets in.

In fantasy lying, we refer to lies told for example, by subjects 111, 209, 226. Fantasy lying is a term coined by Anna Freud (1965). She claimed that the child copes with intolerable realities by means of regression to infantile forms of wishful thinking. Wishful thinking serves to construct a subjective reality more tolerable than the one from which the subject has taken flight. Carveth (1992) referred to the capacity to utilise abstract attachment figures to sustain identity and self-esteem in the absence of positive response and affirmation, or in the presence of hostility and negation in one’s current milieu.

Subject 111, for instance, was inventing stories about an ideal family she had watched on television programs.

I’d go to school and say me and my mum were talking yesterday and she said this and I said that, and it would be a conversation, I’d go between mother and child on TV but I’d made it into me and mum. Or if something happened, I don’t know, say if I cut myself accidentally I’d say I’d cut my finger and someone would ask how I did it and I would say I did it on so and so and I would say my mum was really nice and she bandaged it all up for me, well I bandaged it myself and she sat next to me and gave me a cuddle, when she hadn’t at all.

Unlike daydreaming, this mode implies making up stories in conjunction with interacting with others. It is almost always difficult to locate a conscious wish to change others’ minds, or to make others entirely believe in the stories. This subject said: ‘I used to lie all the time, I used to just make up stories to make myself look interesting, I used to make up stories when I was at school to cover up the gaps in things that I couldn’t tell people because it was about the house’. When saying ‘To make myself look interesting’ she speaks about her wish to be referred to by others as ‘interesting’, which could be interpreted as ‘to be seen, or to have a positive impression in others’ eyes.

The transcript of subject 113 exhibits another striking example. She said

I don’t even know if I am lying or if I am telling the truth about every thing I told, about this family. They were so cruel, and you know, kind of crazy, what they did and what happened. They were so cruel and I’m thinking that I make it up? They
sure were really so cruel... Or whether I am exaggerating? Oh, no, these things did happen, all the things I told you, but you know, hmm, I am not sure that I am... It is not that I am lying but is it really the truth? Am I saying what really happened? Or I may be exaggerating to make sure you understand. Because you weren't there every day, so if I tell you one little thing you might think it was nothing. So I have to make sure you understand (crying). I mean such an awful life... I remember having been punished by that, very vividly thinking what..."

The other's belief in her story is a critical part of her belief in her story. By seeing the other believing her she comes to believe it herself. This is part of an infantile pattern. The patient does not seem to have an independent psychic reality apart from the one that she shares dyadically with the other person. Her psychological self does not have integrity, and it exists as part of a joint entity with another mind.

The mode of fantasy lying aims to redefine unbearable psychic realities by expressing it to actual others. Fantasy lying involves some sort of mental activity that perceives what is real and what is not real, and then actively choosing to dwell on the not real. Fantasy lying is not played in an isolated space. When BPD individuals use fantasy lying they compel others to participate in their effort to contain and reconstruct a variety of representations supplementary to the original one.

Processes underlying fantasy lying are related to 'fantasy making' (Cohen 1989), play and pretend play. Within the psychoanalytic school, Winnicott (1971) was the first and the strongest believer that play and fantasy making are capacities that develop in the child, and have a constructive and adaptive functioning throughout life. For him, they belong to the ‘transitional area’ of experience that mediates or transcends such binary oppositions, polarities or dichotomies as reality and fantasy, the objective and the subjective. ‘Pretend mode’, a term coined by Target and Fonagy (1996), is aimed at freeing representations from their referents and allowing these freed representations to be modified, creating a more flexible mode of thought that encourages the emergence of latent mental states. They stressed the unique role of parents, caregivers or siblings when activating their capacity for containment of the infant’s mental states that enhances the

---

1 The concept of "fantasy-making" is in accordance with Winnicott's term "illusion." Winnicott reserved the concept "fantasy" for the stored early structures that populate the unconscious; see Davis (1983, p.670). Cohen (1989) argued that "... pretend games are by not isolating activities for young children. In fact, children seem more often than not aware of the great appeal that their fantasy play exerts on others, and the ability to engage the other via the creation of fantasy may involve some of the invaluable adaptive value of
child’s confidence in her capacity to assist with overwhelming affect. The expectation of effective comforting and soothing both strengthens the child’s emotional bond to the caregiver and encourages him to be receptive to indications of her thoughts and feelings, thus maximising the opportunities for internalisation of the reflections of his mental states.

Subjects who resort to fantasy lying are assumed to refer to others as a source of facilitation. It urges them to accept two realities, internal and external, without needing to split their ego functioning to maintain a dual mode of thinking. For them, lying is an ongoing interpersonal process by which inner truth is negotiated.

In certain cases, even fantasy lying cannot be employed. Subject 206, for example, does not exaggerate, nor does she use imagination to modify her inner reality. She has not got a sense of real being, a real sense of self. ‘You know, and I was just there, in the house, but I’m not anything’. She is immensely uncertain about her inner world. She hesitates as to whether negating a supposedly internal state (the feeling of being upset) is a kind of lie. She is quiet right in her doubt since lying can only exist when there is a clear knowledge about one’s own thoughts, beliefs, feelings, a clear sense of oneself. Because her truth is unbearable, she senses that somebody else’s mind couldn’t take the truth of hers, so she is forced into a state of quasi-dissociation where she has to ignore her own internal states in order to salvage the mental state of the other.

Subject 205 remembered that

...My friend used to ask me if she could come to my house after school and so... I said I’d ask my mum and instead of just saying, no I don’t want you to come to my house, I’m doing something or just saying my mum says you can’t come, I went home and I said ‘Oh, can Name1 come to my house, say no’, so that I could go back and say to my mum ‘Say no’ without having lied to her, stupid but...

Her truth, not wanting her friend to come over, in her mind, was probably unbearable in the sense that it was not just a mere thought. It was equated with physical sense of being bad. She was engulfed with confusing feelings (rejection, shame, and aggression). She could not take this truth, so she was forced to a state of actual dissociation where she had to ignore her own internal state and to embody it in her mother.

pretend behaviour and fantasy-making. The child seemed to communicate something through creating fantasy, and in so doing she is likely to find an eager audience” (pp. 64-65).
In these extreme cases, instrumental lying is expected to operate. Patient 206, for example, has learnt the association between saying she feels OK and her caregiver’s corresponding withdrawal response, thus using it as a measure to dissociate herself from her pain or her sense of emptiness.

... I was more into dodging things. Plus, I don’t think, er, I don’t think – it’s just self-protection. I’m not into lying and things I’m just a truthful person.

Finally, although not frequently, BPD individuals did manifest an awareness, knowledge or understanding of the connection between internal state and external reality. It is not a total failure to take others’ minds into consideration when lying. In several cases we observed a display of the capacity to have a grip of the other’s mind. As discussed in chapter 8, it was mainly the other’s intentional state that was discerned.

Subject 111 suggested that her mother maliciously lied to her.

I just think when I first thought about it, that it was because she was quite wicked and she did it to get me. I think I’ve always felt that in a way that it was quite deliberate. It was just to get me, to hurt me.

In response to the same question, another subject (number 225) said, ‘She used to be furious for the sake of taking a couple of biscuits’. For these patients being hit is surely equated with malevolence. The difficulty rests in their inability to differentiate the sense of their selves from their caregivers’ self. They must have found it extremely difficult to reconstruct a variety of representations for a variety of emotions. Thus the fragile inner reality abides. ‘I am hungry - I am taking biscuits’, the wish to be nurtured, is negated. Being hungry is equated with being overwhelmed with fear and aggression. The representation of ‘me, being hungry’ is modified to a representation of ‘me, being frustrated, angry, frightened’. It becomes clear that besides the identification with a furious mother, these subjects are faced with insurmountable difficulty in achieving a realistic perception of their mother’s psychic life. The reality of their lack of love apparently leaves them with no option but to deny their capacity to think. It is probably eminently terrifying and painful to think about mental states.

It is most likely that the capacity to conceive of the contents of one’s own, as well as the object’s mind is an important prerequisite for normal object relations. In its absence, BPD individuals are prone to experiences of meaninglessness, chaos and nameless dread, as their
own and others' feelings and intentions can only be represented at a primary level (the immediately accessible\(^2\)) and cannot be reflected upon or thought about.

Finally, in contrast with the borderlines, the control subjects largely construed others in terms of mental states. Thus their concept of lying was evidently mature in the sense of their wish to manipulate the other's mind when using lying.

To conclude, content analysis of subjects' responses to thinking about theirs and the others' minds in events where they were deceived or told lies supported our hypothesis that a different concept of lying would be exhibited between groups. An immature concept of lying was prominent in the patients' responses and mature concept of lying characterised the control subjects' responses.

The conclusions drawn from this study should be taken cautiously. The analysis is heuristically based. The protocols were carefully studied, but no quantitative method was applied. Although almost all participants co-operated and we could develop thorough discussions about memories of lying, it is important to note that the material studied does not represent a random selection. Verbal fluency, articulation level, state of mood, memory accessibility, and specific content sensitivity are probably just part of the interfering variables.

---

\(^2\) Elsewhere, Target and Fonagy (1996) used the term 'psychic equivalence' to name the equivalence between an appearance and reality. For example, given a sponge, painted and shaped to look like a rock, children's answer to the question of what the object looks like and what it actually is, tends to be the same.
CHAPTER 11: GENERAL DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The object of this thesis was to investigate the relationship between experience of abuse in childhood, the concept of lying and borderline personality disorder. The rational for investigating these issues was presented in chapters 1-6. This chapter is divided into five parts. First, the major results presented in chapters 7-10 are summarised, and general themes emerging across the four chapters are identified. In the second section, implications for the understanding of lying in normal subjects are considered. The third section outlines the implications for understanding of borderline personality disorder pathology. It is presented in two sub-sections: abuse, theory of mind and borderline personality disorder; and object relationships, lying and psychic functioning in borderline personality disorder. A fourth section outlines the clinical implications in the context of therapy with abused individuals and with abused liars. Finally future directions are suggested.

11.1 Summary of results

Chapter 7 reported on the development of the Concept of Lying scale. Two groups of subjects commented on the proposed scale that was based on Coleman's (1981) model. The final scale consisted of two sets (uncharged and charged) of eight plots (consisting of all combinations of prototypical elements).

The findings showed that: (1) a lie is a word whose definition involves a prototype; (2) the prototype probably contains the three elements considered; (3) subjects fairly easily and reliably assign the word ‘lie’ to reported speech acts in a more-or-less, rather than all-or-nothing fashion; and (4) subjects agree fairly generally on the relative weights of the elements of the semantic prototype of lie.

Chapter 8 employed the Concept of Lying scale to compare patients having severe personality disorders and control subjects. We assumed that borderline patients do not always have access within their own minds to what is an accurate representation of their truth and of the object’s representation of the truth. Hence, they may be lying without understanding that saying something untrue can affect the listener’s beliefs and, as a consequence, the listener’s behaviour. The study explored the differences between control
subjects and borderline patients in responding to the Concept of Lying scale, which measures both external (*factuality*) and internal (*intention, belief*) components, and to the Affect scale that measures subjects' emotional responses to the deceiver.

The findings showed that more subjects in the control group tended to judge more target sentences as 'the truth' than did subjects in the experimental group, especially when facts matched reality. 'A lie' judgement was given more by experimental subjects when the speaker believes his/her utterance. Subjects in the experimental group responded with negative emotions towards the protagonist more than subjects in the control group. It indicates that when judging lying subjects in the control group tend to contemplate object relations as more benevolent.

The most significant finding was that patients with severe personality disorders employed fewer prototypical elements altogether to reach their decision, and that subjects in the control group employed more *factuality* and *belief* in uncharged and charged conditions, separately and inclusively. An interesting finding was that both groups employed the element of *intention* relatively equally. We thus suggested that controls can access and operate all elements and that they show better capacity to employ the necessary mental effort to operate alternative choices.

The finding that patients employed *belief* less confirms the assumption of a possible deficiency in their capacity of thinking about others' beliefs. The finding that factuality was used significantly more by controls when defining a statement as 'the truth' or 'a lie' was quite unexpected. This tendency was less significant in the uncharged condition (p < .07) while highly significant in the charged condition (p < .005). It is probable that the charged cells lifted patients' sensitivity to the speaker's intention and thus they gave priority to this element rather than to others. Patterns of splitting and projection may also perplex patients' thinking processes in highly charged human interactions and conflicts, highlighting *intention* (bad or good) rather than *facts*.

The results enabled us to refer to the use of prototypical elements as an indication of the degree of complexity in psychological-mindedness, as evidence for a multi-level capacity to understand human behaviour. The use of belief is regarded as an indication to mentalisation that is, in essence the product of a cognitive capacity and of emotional maturity.
Chapter 9 investigated the relations between childhood experiences (CECA) of antipathy, neglect, physical, psychological and sexual abuse, the concept of lying and a diagnosis of BPD. Following the intensity of BPD individuals’ emotional reactions in the Affect scale we suggested that the tendency to develop negative emotions and of being overwhelmed by negative emotions affect the process of lying. When borderlines are overwhelmed with negative emotions they are more likely to blur the perspectives of self and others.

We first established the differences in psychiatric diagnoses between the groups. The difference in psychopathology manifested by the control in contrast to the experimental group was evident when measuring the total number of disorders in Axis-I and Axis-II in the DSM-III diagnoses. Avoidant and paranoid personality disorders prevail in the BPD group. BPD individuals had high prevalence of mood, anxiety and substance-abuse disorders. As predicted, the experimental group is far more psychologically disturbed than the control group.

Secondly, analysis of the concept of lying revealed some important results that confirm the findings presented in chapter 8. Subjects in the control group used more prototypical elements, even when controlling for differences in IQ level. We found that among all prototypical elements it was 'belief', and to a lesser degree 'factuality', which contributed to these differences.

Thirdly, the uncharged condition elicited similar employment of 'belief' in both groups, confirming the assumption that when affect load is diminished, in daily non-conflict human relations, borderline individuals could manifest a well-developed cognitive capacity to understand others’ beliefs. We concluded that as long as the borderline experiences the object world as malevolent she might attribute the causes of people’s behaviour, thoughts and feelings in idiosyncratic ways. These are frequently developmentally ‘immature’, and sometimes abnormal, distorted by motivational and defensive processes and by defective cognitive structures and procedures.

Fourthly, an interesting feature was that BPD and control individuals marked a similar rating of negative affect in the charged condition, implying that they were equally affected. Both gave their highest negative affective responses. This indicates that in high emotionally-laden human interactions, although emotionally affected, control subjects are not cognitively affected, whereas BPD individuals emotional response diminishes their
capacity to think about others’ thoughts and beliefs. BPD individuals marked higher scores of negative affect in the uncharged condition.

In most CECA domains, notably: antipathy, neglect, physical, psychological and sexual abuse, significant discrepancy was shown between controls and the entire experimental group (all patients). When comparing BPD and control individuals, BPD individuals differed only in antipathy and neglect.

At this stage we performed a series of stepwise multiple-regression analyses to examine the effect of maltreatment on affective response to the Concept of Lying scale, on the use of 'belief', and on having been diagnosed as BPD. The analysis detected two potential trajectories to manifestation of borderline personality disorder. We have shown a potential effect of antipathy on mood disorders (r = .53) and on the prevalence of borderline personality disorders (r = .48). Secondly, we have suggested the effect of sexual abuse on high prevalence of negative affect (r = .46) that in itself decreases the use of 'belief' (r = -0.33). Lastly we have indicated the use of 'belief' which predicts BPD (r = -0.27).

Chapter 10 analysed the content of subjects’ explicit description of their own and of others’ state of mind in an interview that was aimed at recalling memories of being deceived or deceiving others. The content of the material revealed some discernible distinctions between groups.

Firstly, we consider the themes that were described together with the behaviour of deception. Control subjects revealed common daily lies depicting what might be characterised as undisturbed normal upbringing in a positive family environment. Experimental subjects almost unanimously depicted unbearable circumstances of development with either indifferent or rejecting abusive parents.

Secondly, we confirmed the hypothesis about a qualitative difference between groups in conceptualising lying either maturely or immaturely. Analysis of the protocols of subjects in the experimental group revealed that some of them resorted to employing mainly self-oriented or instrumental modes of lying. In the self-oriented mode they tended to negotiate the complexity of internal and external realities and lying is viewed as an ongoing personal or interpersonal process by which inner truth is negotiated. In the
instrumental mode, BPD individuals link a chain of stimuli–response associations, without having a clear understanding of the process that is taking place in the manipulation of the other’s mind. The control subjects largely construed others in terms of mental states. Thus their concept of lying was evidently mature in the sense of their wish to manipulate the other’s mind when using lying.

A number of themes run through the summary of the various analyses reported here. The concept of lying might be a potential measure of theory of mind. Prototypic analysis of lying has proved that BPD individuals show impaired capacity to employ the necessary mental effort to operate alternative choices. Subjects in the control group showed marked use of ‘factuality’ and ‘belief’ elements. BPD individuals showed higher sensitivity in their affective responses to low-charge human interactions. Sexual abuse predicted BPD where affective responses and immature concept of lying served as mediators.

11.2 Implications for the understanding of lying in neurotic subjects

This thesis is concerned primarily with vicissitudes in the conceptualisation of lying. Following Leekham’s (1992) model we have suggested immature and mature concepts of lying as two principal modes. The mature concept of lying incorporates the second and third level in Leekham’s model. On the second level the person considers the beliefs of another person and intends to manipulate these beliefs. The person recognises that the target of a lie will evaluate any future statement in the light of the new belief. The third level of lying takes into account the listener’s evaluation of the liar’s intent and sincerity about the lie. It is important that the listener believes the content of what is being said. Thus there is an awareness of one’s non-verbal behaviour and the capacity to gauge the level of the listener’s credibility. This feedback system allows a considerable increase in the ability to provide credible stories. Our findings have confirmed the hypothesis that normal subjects would conceptualise lying in the mature mode. The capacity to judge lying on the premises of other’s beliefs, without being immensely emotionally affected was shown quantitatively and qualitatively. Hitherto, lying in normal people can be considered as a conscious process activated as a means for a known end. The desire is to manipulate the other’s mind. An integral part of the lying process is to make the other
believe in something. The self and the other are considered as having an independent functional mind that is alterable. The intention to deceive emanates from one’s desires, which might be conscious, preconscious or unconscious.

This section concerns itself with issues related to lies told by neurotic patients. We have assumed that the mature concept of lying is developed through the child’s experience of his/her mental states being reflected on, prototypically through interaction with his/her reflective caregivers. We believe that patients who have the capacity to hold TOM, who were brought up by caregivers who fostered their sense of mental self are capable of holding a mature concept of lying. This implies that neurotic patients with specific personality styles such as narcissistic or hysterical styles may be well equipped to have a mature concept of lying. We will explore specific modes of deceit as expressed in a variety of personality styles.

Psychoanalytic literature to date contains references to lying that supposedly emanates from patients’ unresolved conflicts organised at the oedipal phase of development. It mainly demonstrates episodes representing a re-enactment within analysis and the transference neurosis of a particular aspect of the oedipal conflict. In light of the research on theory of mind we now know that it is concurrent the oedipal phase in development that normal children become capable of holding a TOM. It presupposes inter-subjectivity, which is defined as the joint, or shared, experience of mental states between self and object, coming to mental awareness of the ‘third’ in the evolution of the Oedipus complex (Fonagy et al., 1993). It is thus not surprising that lies told by neurotic patients would be conceptualised as mature.

Firstly, Freud reported a number of lies told to him by his own patients. In Two Lies Told by Children Freud (1913) suggested that the lies of children are often a response to lies of adults. He went on,

“A number of lies told by well brought-up children have a particular significance and should cause those in charge of them to reflect rather than being angry. These lies occur under the influence of excessive feelings of love, and become momentous when they lead to a misunderstanding between the child and the person it loves” (Freud, 1913, p. 305).

Freud’s patient recalled that when she was seven she had wanted to paint some eggs and had asked her father for money for the paint, which he had refused to give her. Shortly
after she asked him for some money for a contribution towards a wreath for the funeral of their reigning princess. Her father gave her the money, she paid the contribution and then stolen the change. When confronted by him, she denied it. At her angry father’s behest, her mother punished her. Afterwards when the mother saw how great the child’s despair was she was herself shaken. She caressed the little girl and took her out for a walk to console her. Freud claimed that associating the lie with punishment became a turning point in the child’s development, a source of guilt and self-reproach. It is possible that she could not understand her father’s rage, who otherwise had been introjected as a good object, nor her mother’s ambivalent punishing-consoling reactions. Psychoanalytic interpretation of her unconscious wishes would suggest that admitting her deceptions would have been tantamount to admitting her hidden incestuous love.

Freud regarded lying as a communication of love in children who were being brought up by primarily loving parents. He treated lying as an everyday phenomenon, like slips of the tongue or dreams. One of the characteristics in his treatment of lying was a repudiation of vindictive and accusatory attitudes towards children’s lies. He took issue with those attitudes of adults, which first treated children’s lies as meaningless and then, in accordance with a double standard, punished them as signs of incipient bad character. Freud captured the essence of the parent’s reflection rather than action when confronted with lying. The initial reliance on the parent’s reflective self and the gradual recognition of his/her separateness are seen as necessary precursors of the evolution of a securely established reflective self in the child.

There are some possible contextual reasons for lies to evolve in psychoanalytic treatment. Generally the neurotic patient perceives the psychoanalyst as a person whose actions are driven by internal states. In this view the patient may feel that free association is no longer free when omissions are questioned and interpreted. The analyst’s neutrality becomes compromised by the selectivity involved in asking questions. As a result, some patients may think and anticipate the kinds of information the analyst needs to know in order to help them. In doing so they engage in thinking about his thoughts. Others may assume, consciously or subconsciously, that analysts are omnipotent and omniscient. They certainly fantasise about their analyst’s mind assuming his/her omnipotence is
related to observable verbal and non-verbal behaviour in the sessions. Balint (1968) wrote,

"... They may expect the analyst to know more, and to be more powerful. The analyst is expected to promise, either explicitly or by his behaviour, that he will help his patient out of the regression, or see the patient through it" (Balint, 1968, p. 167).

Still others may experience the analyst internally as a parent who de-cathected them and did not need to know or care to know. Some tend to withhold information in order to protect themselves from the analyst as an intrusive parent.

Omissions of important known events or communicating 'untrue course of events' have been traditionally dealt with as the manifestation of underlying preconscious and unconscious wishes. In chapter 5 we referred to a variety of motives for lying. Psychoanalytic reports on lying in neurotic patients which describe communication of active lies (or omissions) reveal patients largely depicted as holding a mature concept, albeit their lies manifest forbidden oedipal wishes.

Weinshel (1979), for example, interpreted lies of neurotic patients as enabling them to re-enact aspects of the oedipal conflict. Pre-genital factors are present but not considered by him to be essential. The lies permit partial recovery of old memories, and unconscious fantasies, in some cases screening oedipal and primal scene fantasies. Weinshel described a patient who lied saying "I have nothing to say" (p.507). She reacted to the analyst's focusing on her fear of revealing insisting that the analyst was the one who withheld the truth from her since he was the one who 'knew' why she did not talk. She insisted that even if it were true that she indeed did have things on her mind than

"... The thoughts that she had withheld were so trivial and so prosaic that telling them would be truly humiliating. Since I (the analyst) would be the agent of her humiliation, she was perfectly justified in lying to me" (Weinshel, 1979, p. 508).

The patient thinks about her analyst's mind associating it with her conscious wish not to humiliate him. Thus, within her mind the lie aims at what Freud had regarded a communication of love. Subsequently she revealed that her secrets were related to her fantasy that the analyst had a crush on her. These lies became a focus for extensive analytic work around the inhibitions of her letting people know what she really 'knew'.
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She recalled that she felt her parents lied to her when her mother told her that she and her father were speaking about 'nothing', which she equated with their sexual secrets.

Secrets, like slips of the tongue or dreams, may represent a means for both revealing and concealing the oedipal secret. Ambivalence, the composition of love and hatred for the same object, which is a core structure in neurosis, is thus seen as the resolution of secrets that are the essence of these lies.

A secret is something known by one or more persons, which is deliberately hidden from one or more persons. By withholding information, the secret holder may knowingly wish to create false beliefs in others (Ford, 1996). The need to maintain secrecy coupled with conflicts around intimacy and betrayal may produce such terms of deception. The subject may resolve the problem of the risk of conveying secrets in order to secure an intimate relationship by dealing in ‘false secrets’. Anais Nin (Stuhlman, 1966) described this curious behaviour. She was in despair. On her way to visit Otto Rank, apparently paradoxically, she planned to tell him lies. This is what she told him

“I must confess to you the mood, which preceded my talk with you. I made this note on the train. ...On my way to see Dr. Rank I am planning impostures, cheating, tricks... I begin to invent what I will tell Dr. Rank, instead of coordinating truths. I begin to rehearse speeches, attitudes, gestures, inflections, and expressions. What should I say to create such and such effect? I meditate lies as others meditate confessions. Yet I am going to him to confess, to get help in the solution of my conflicts, which are too numerous, and which I do not succeed in mastering by writing. I prepare myself for a false comedy” (Stuhlman, 1966, p. 57).

Normal individuals sense within themselves certain themes of thoughts, images, feelings and memories that are felt to be peculiarly personal. These internal states are affectively laden. Moreover, they are highly valued and perceived as a kind of inner core, which is generally hidden and protected. Such secrets are only disclosed with care in a developing dialogue with others who can be trusted to share and respect them. In this way, secrets become the coins of intimacy, and the currency of its transactions (Meares, 1988). The exchange of experiences which one senses as valuable is behaviour central to our social existence. It can only emerge when one can make decisions about what will be disclosed and what will not. Such decisions depend upon the knowledge that one’s thoughts are not accessible to others, that one’s thoughts are different from others’ thoughts.
In normal individuals, the fear of exposure leads to a dilemma because the individual has an overpowering need for attachment. When the risk involved in exposing a secret is high, its function as an ordinary means for developing an intimate relationship is denied. Strategies of conveying this dilemma will consist of silence, emotive language, or 'false secrets'. All strategies aim at reassuring oneself that what others may think is, in fact, not a real idea. Whereas thoughts are experienced as transient and alterable, keeping secrets is associated with withholding specific internal states. For normal individuals they are a way of dealing with fantasies involving shame.

For some individuals the analytic setting itself seems almost ineluctably designed to excite paranoia. The analyst is out of the patient’s line of sight behind his defenceless back, and the patient is in the impossible position of being asked to trust the good intentions of someone unknown and invisible. Any abrupt attempt to interpret a defence arouses all the prior conviction of the imminence and inevitability of attack, and the defences are paradoxically strengthened. The analytic situation then may bring out prominent paranoid defences that are otherwise well contained. The patient communicates with the therapist conscious, deliberate deceptive behaviour so that the latter will be misled in assessing the patient’s emotional state and reality.

Exaggeration is another type of lying reflecting a dramatic attempt to influence another person. It might be displayed as a maximisation of felt emotions reflecting a dramatic attempt to influence the other person. Saarini (1982) suggested that this type of deceit is the first to emerge developmentally. Children are more likely to cry after experiencing a minor injury when they believe that they are being observed than when they believe that no one is attending them. The proto-hysteric is a sensualist, a child who delights in being stimulated and pampered (Lionells, 1986). Sullivan (1956) called hysterics ‘the greatest liars to no purpose in the whole range of human personalities.’ He was referring to their propensity for dramatisation and exaggeration that he saw as contemptuous of reality.

One end of the continuum of hysteria consists of relatively normal individuals with hysterical traits who are dramatic and make use of repression. At the other end are those who meet the diagnostic criteria for histrionic personality disorder. They demonstrate a considerably greater degree of psychopathology and share many characteristics of the borderline personality disorder (Kernberg, 1975).
The extent of fabrication and confabulation distinguishes between these two extreme types in terms of the concept of lying. Dramatisation and exaggeration are part of the demanding nature in both cases. Dishonesty is viewed as purposeful actions designed to structure interpersonal situations to manipulate the responses of others in order to assure the continued interest and affection (Halleck, 1967, p. 750). Neurotic patients with hysterical style who exaggerate in order to dramatise a viewpoint are generally concerned about adherence to the truth. Using the term exaggeration implies that a true representation is possible. In the process of treatment many such exaggerations still betray the truth to the psychoanalyst in spite of the intention of the liar to deny it. Patients with borderline organisation are tremendously less concerned about rigid adherence to the truth if a distortion will better accomplish the drama.

Kemberg (1970) spoke about features of narcissistic personalities that reside in hysterical personalities. He described an individual with hysterical personality, who has the need to be admired, to be the centre of attention. Such need in these individuals goes hand in hand with a capacity for deep and lasting relationships with others. Women with narcissistic personalities may appear as quite ‘hysterical’ on the surface. In the transference, beneath the conscious or unconscious seductive efforts may lie the wish to become the object of the analyst’s desire. Seduction is then coupled with exaggeration aiming at manipulating the analyst’s mind to believe that the seducer is admirable. The analyst’s mind may be enticed, controlled or manipulated for the service of fulfilling the need for approval and attention. Individuals with narcissistic traits use exaggeration, half-truths and even blatant lies to present themselves to others as highly confident and competent. They use prevarication to shield the true experience of their limitations (Ford, 1996).

In the context of manipulation, such patients can be placed on a continuum between two major sub-classifications. The neurotic patient with narcissistic style who has the capacity to manipulate the other’s mind at one end, and the patient with narcissistic personality disorder who does not hold such a capacity, at the other end.

The former category has been reported in descriptions of many politicians who appear to be consistent with narcissistic traits. Ford (1996) has claimed that obtaining power and prestige in the political arena may be a method of attempting to boost an underlying feeling of low-esteem. Kemberg (1980) has observed that in times of stress, people may
turn towards and look for narcissistic leaders. These politicians and their constituents are thus involved in mutual self-deception. The politician says what he thinks the others want to hear or describe how things should be according to his view anticipating what the citizens’ wishes are. Kernberg (1980) also noted that fuelled by their need for self-importance and the need to maintain self-esteem, persons with narcissistic personalities seek and obtain positions of authority and leadership.

The latter category involves profound narcissistic disturbances that seem to be central to the aetiology of deceptive pathology. Antisocial behaviour is viewed as one aspect of this type of narcissistic personality. At times, when such individuals are feeling powerless, they may lie for the thrilling sensation of putting something over on another person. The former are fuelled not so much by antisocial motives as the need to perceive and define the world according to their own internal states. Kernberg (1992) has coined the term ‘psychopathic transference’ to refer to periods in the treatment when conditions of deceptiveness and projection prevail. Kernberg argued that in patients with narcissistic personality disorder, the enactment of a sadistically infiltrated, pathologically grandiose self that operates against the healthy, dependent part of the patient’s self constitutes a frequent dynamic underlying such psychopathic transference.

Kets de Vries’s (1985) description of three types of narcissistic personalities confirms the distinction between mature and immature concepts of lying. In his classification, the malignant narcissism is displayed in the reactive narcissist who experienced rejecting and unresponsive parenting. These individuals are often ruthless in their use of power, do not tolerate disagreement and crush dissension. The intermediate type is allocated to the self-deceptive narcissists, who as children were led by parents to believe that they were loveable and perfect. They are often progressing in playing the role of manipulative leaders. They frequently have interpersonal difficulties because of their emotional superficiality and lack of genuine empathy for others. At the high end off the continuum the constructive narcissists are classified. They are ambitious and manipulative, and they generally get along well with subordinates because they have self-confidence, adaptability, humour, and the capacity to recognise the strengths and needs of other persons. As a result they are often able to energise subordinates and achieve genuine accomplishments.
The narcissist who holds a mature concept of lying perceives that another person’s goal is in conflict with his own goal. He intends to influence the other person and employs deception in order to do so. When the manipulation works, he has the satisfying feeling of having put something over on the other person. These components of manipulation are readily available to the manipulator’s consciousness. He knows exactly what he is doing. This criterion excludes much behaviour that psychiatrists would define as ‘manipulative’, the kind of manipulation that we have defined as instrumental lying. The mere fact that a person’s actions influence others to treat her in a certain way does not constitute manipulation. Manipulation in the mature sense implies the conscious existence of conflict of goals, intention to influence deception, and the feeling of putting something over that comprise the manipulation.

In conclusion, the lie of an individual holding a mature capacity for lying is aimed directly at the one being lied to. The neurotic patient’s lying is comprised of making certain assumptions about the other’s mind, such as the belief that the analyst possesses special knowledge of what goes on in the analysand’s mind. Individuals with specific personality traits may resort to different sort of lies. A patient with paranoid features will tend to be more secretive, wishing that the analyst would believe what has been verbally shared. The patient with paranoid disorder functioning on borderline level of organisation would hold onto his own beliefs. Thoughts are equated with raw substance. Secrets or omissions are used as a defence when the individual fears that these thoughts might be stolen. Exaggeration is another way to deceive others. Individuals with hysterical and/or narcissistic may resort to this type of lying.

Mature and immature lying can be discerned. The mature type of deception in narcissistic personality is observed in those who hold the capacity to manipulate others’ minds. The difference between neurotic individuals who use exaggerations and severely disturbed hysteric and/or narcissistic individuals is in the adherence to truth. Persons in the former category adhere to the truth. Pathological deception is at the core of the reactive narcissists who are often ruthless in their use of power. Deception is an element of sadism. Frequently the other’s mind is not perceived.
11.3 Implications for understanding lying of borderline disorder pathology

Dennett (1978) proposed that intentional states provide good grounds for predicting human behaviour – the only grounds accessible to all of us. This knowledge is embodied in the theory of mind of folk psychology. This theory was presented as the fundamental building blocks of borderlines’ deficiency in object relationship. Following our findings, we discuss the borderline individual’s deficiency in having a TOM in relation to childhood experience of abuse. Psychic functioning as reflected in lying is then discussed with reference to object relationships in borderline personality disorder.

11.3.1 Abuse, theory of mind and the borderline personality disorder

In a series of studies we have attempted to operationalise individual differences in adults’ mentalising capacities. Our operationalisation is based on the presence of unequivocal descriptions of mental states (e.g. false beliefs) when judging lying. We have found some evidence that borderline patients differed quantitatively and qualitatively in the concept of lying. We have also indicated a causal link between childhood experience of sexual abuse, high affective responsiveness and failure to manifest the capacity to understand false beliefs in certain conditions.

We have taken the view that the acquisition of TOM is part of an intersubjective process between infant and caregiver. Fonagy (1995; 1997; 1997) introduced attachment status as having a remarkable role in the development of personality disorders. Attachment theory is based on Bowlby’s (1973) assumption that the infant’s behaviour is intentional, goal directed, and apparently based on specific expectations. The evolution of these expectations about the availability and responsiveness of the caregiver lies at the core of attachment theory. Earlier, in 1969, Bowlby recognised the significance of the developmental step entailed the emergence of

“... The child’s capacity both to conceive of his mother as having her own goals and interests separate from his own and to take them into account” (Bowlby, 1969, p. 368).
Bowlby proposed that the quality of childhood relationships with caregivers result in internal representations of working models of the self and others that provide prototypes for later social interactions. Accordingly, internal working models are mental schemata, where expectations about the behaviour of a particular individual towards the self are aggregated. The expectations are themselves abstractions based on repeated interactions of specific types with that individual.

How does deprivation, particularly early trauma, come to affect the individual deficiency in developing self-reflection and the propensity to dissociative disorder? The quality of maternal care has been repeatedly shown to predict infant’s security. The sensitive responsiveness of the parent is traditionally regarded as the most important determinant of attachment security in the infant (Isabella and Belsky, 1991; 1993). Attachment theorists regard early experiences of flexible access to feelings as formative. These experiences enable secure children both to maximise the opportunities presented to them by the environment and to draw on socially supportive relationships (Fonagy, 1997). The caregiver facilitates the creation of mentalising models through complex linguistic and quasi-linguistic processes, primarily through behaving towards the child in such a way that her own behaviour may be best understood by assuming that she has ideas and feelings which determine her actions, and the reactions of others to her.

The child’s development and perception of mental states in herself and others depends on her observation of the mental world of the caregiver. The increased control of the secure child permits her to move towards ownership of inner experience and to come to recognise the self as competent in eliciting regulatory assistance, to develop metacognitive control and to achieve an understanding of self and others as intentional agents whose behaviour is organised by mental states, thoughts, feelings, beliefs and desires (Sroufe, 1990; Fonagy et al., 1995). Fonagy (1995) has found that secure attachment may be a key precursor of robust reflective capacity. It suggests that a reflective caregiver increase the likelihood of the child’s secure attachment, which, in turn, facilitates the development of mentalisation. The securely attached child sees that the caregiver represents herself as an intentional being and this representation is internalised in the form of the self.
Negative parental personality traits are associated with insecurity in many studies (Zeanah et al., 1993). Liotti (1992), for example, conceived the disorganised/disoriented pattern of attachment as predisposing the child to dissociation as a defence. Parents with unresolved patterns of attachment present alternating frightened and/or frightening emotional displays to their child. The caregiver of the disorganised child is less likely to be reliably contingent in responding to infant’s self-state, and to further show systematic biases in her perception and reflection of her state (Fonagy and Target, 1997).

Mary Main (1990) has shown that the absence of metacognitive capacity, the inability to “understand the merely representational nature of their own (and other’s) thinking” (p.128), makes infants and toddlers vulnerable to inconsistency of their caregiver’s behaviour. They are unable to step beyond the immediate reality of experience and grasp the distinction between immediate experience and the mental state that might underpin it. Fonagy, et.al., (1994) analysed a sample that was divided into those who had or had not reported significant deprivation (overcrowding, parental mental illness). All the mothers in the deprived group with high reflectiveness ratings (a scale that measures the capacity to describe mental states of self and others) had children who were secure with them. Only 1 out of 17 deprived mothers with low ratings had a child who was secure with her. These findings imply that the cycle of disadvantage may be interrupted if the caregiver has acquired a capacity to reflect productively on mental experience.

Many experimental subjects depicted experiences of parental helplessness and their accompanied feeling of distress. Parents (or caregivers) were described at times threatening and at other times rescuing. Some of the patients perceived the caregivers as indifferent and themselves as unworthy of parental attention. For others we have observed the frightening experience in having no escape from the terror and the pervasive sense of helplessness when parents were extremely abusive. Their internal working models are thus likely to include extreme representations of the self as well as manifesting a multiple and incoherent-unintegrated structure.

The capacity for understanding false beliefs may be particularly absent when the child is exposed to unfavourable experiences, in the extreme, abuse or trauma. Why should the family environment of maltreatment undermine reflective function? Fonagy (1997) noted three reasons. (1) Recognition of the mental state of the other can be dangerous to the
developing self. The child who recognises the hatred or murderousness implied by the parents’ acts of abuse forced to see herself as worthless or unlovable; (2) The meanings of intentional states may be denied or distorted. Abusive parents commonly claim beliefs or feelings at odds with their behaviour. The child cannot test or modify representations of mental states, which become rigid or inappropriate and may be abandoned; (3) The public world, where reflective self function is common, may give rise to alternative models of experiencing herself which are rigidly kept separate from attachment context.

Fonagy (1996) and Target (1996) developed a theory about two modes of experiencing psychic reality. In the mode of psychic equivalence, the mother may echo the child’s state without modulation, panicking at the child’s distress. Alternatively she may avoid reflection on the child’s affect through a process akin to dissociation, which effectively places the mother in a pretend mode, unrelated to external reality, including the child. The mother may then ignore the child’s distress, or translate it into illness, and so forth. Both strip the child’s communication of meaning, which he can recognise and use. It may lead to the child’s interpretation of feelings in physical terms, so that the physical state is the ‘real thing’.

There is some evidence that maltreatment impairs the child’s reflective capacities and sense of self. Beeghly and Cicchetti (1994) showed that abused toddlers were not retarded in receptive language but were significantly behind a productive language, reflecting a withdrawal from social interactions. Their specific deficit was in relative absence of internal state words and that such language tended to be context bound. Their internal state language was particularly sparse in terms of words pertaining to cognition and belief states, but was richer for perception and desire. Schneider-Rosen and Cicchetti (1984; 1991) noted that abused toddlers with a history of maltreatment showed neutral or negative affect on recognising themselves in the mirror, unlike their non-abused peers. Fonagy (1997) reported a study of maltreated five to eight year olds, in which specific deficits were found in tasks requiring mentalisation, particularly amongst those referred for sexual or sexual and physical abuse. They could not resolve puzzles requiring them to conceive of one’s person’s false beliefs concerning a second person’s false beliefs.

Fonagy (1996) and Target (1996) proposed that a child who has not received a recognisable but rather more modified of her affective states, may later have trouble in
differentiating between reality and fantasy, physical and psychic reality. This interplay was clearly observed in those patients who recalled experiences of lying and were entangled in the confusion between what was ‘real’ and ‘not real’. Fonagy et al., (1996) demonstrated that individuals with history of maltreatment who appear to react to these experiences by a dramatic reduction in their consideration of mental state constructs are far more likely to manifest borderline psychopathology than individuals with the same degree of maltreatment history but who maintain the capacity to mentalise.

We have suggested that borderline disordered individuals are those victims of childhood abuse who were compelled to cope by refusing to conceive of their attachment figure’s thoughts, and thus avoided having to think about their caregiver’s wish to harm them. As a consequence of their continuous deficiency in depicting mental states in themselves and in others they operate inaccurately, having schematic impressions of thoughts and feelings, thus they become immensely vulnerable in intimate relationships.

Many manifestations of BPD individuals may be understood in terms of a defensive strategy of disabling mentalisation or meta-cognitive capacity. BPD individuals fail to take into consideration the listener’s current mental state thus communication with them is bound to be very hard to follow. Their insistence and rigidity in realising that there may be more than one point of view of an event or that indeed a thought is not physical reality, which brings out interminable debates concerning reality. The failure to understand how someone can believe something that is not true may lead them to feel tremendously suspicious of others’ motives and to represent the world of objects as malevolent. The desperate dependence may reflect their difficulty in retaining a representation of others as thinking individuals. They thus depend on the others’ physical presence and find it difficult to keep them in mind as objects having a mind on their own. Their aggression, lack of concern and empathy may arise because of their lack of representation of suffering in the mind of the other. The frequently absent quality of playfulness and ‘as if’ in their relations and communications may be related to their deficiency in meta-representation, in the capacity to entertain a belief whilst at the same time knowing it to be false.

Finally, not all the abused patients manifested continuous deficiencies in manifesting a TOM. Some patients showed the capacity to understand lying as a mentalising process. We believe that the presence of any attachment bonding with any significant others may
foster the development of mentalising capacity. The existence of a caregiver who could reflect on the infant’s mental state, such as a non-abusive parent, grandparents, siblings or nannies may bring the child to observe and understand intentional stances in others.

One patient observantly described that,

“...Before you go to school or before you start spending quite a bit of time around other people and not just your family, initially you do feel like your parents are God really and what they say is true. And it's only really when you get other people on the scene that they sort of do things differently or react very differently. It's only then that I can remember that I questioned how I saw things really”.

11.3.2 Object relationships, lying and psychic functioning in borderline personality disorder

So far we have debated how childhood experiences determine the borderline’s failure to understand theirs and others’ mental states. We would like to portray how such deficiencies are manifested in the borderline individual’s concept of lying and how it is related to her psychic functioning in the context of object relationships.

In chapter 10 we have suggested that borderline individuals might frequently resort to lying without having an intention to change other’s minds. When the developmental process is sidetracked or derailed as a result of overwhelming environmental stressors, the sense of the self is bound to become fragile. Self-correction, which is a normal process in the establishment of empathic relationships, becomes non-operative. One mechanism to cope with increased anxiety and tension is to lie or to pretend to be someone other than who one is. By deceiving others, borderline individuals consciously or unconsciously deceive themselves into feeling that they are in control, having a sense of power over the other, and can force the other to feel helpless.

We have determined how a sense of self develops from the ability to exchange, and at time to manipulate others’ ideas. One learns to manage the impression that one makes on others and to dissemble emotional responses in order to protect others or oneself from unnecessary pain or embarrassment. Sigmon and Snyder (1993) stated that external events that reflect poorly on the individual are altered for representations in the internal
world through self-deception, excuses, rationalisation, and even total denial. Conversely, to feel good about how they appear to the external world, people may dissemble their emotions, provide false information, or play roles.

It seems that borderline individuals are less able to use this mechanism of deception and tend to perceive themselves and the external world in a realistic manner. Normally the child achieves control over affect through symbolisation. The child, who has not received recognisable but modified images of her affective states, may later have difficulties in differentiating reality from fantasy, and physical from psychic reality. Fonagy and Target (1998) have introduced the thesis that for the borderline, fantasy is equated with reality and psychic reality is moulded as physical rather than mental. The body is not a symbol of a state of mind in the mother, but the physical equivalence of the mother’s state of mind experienced at a specific moment.

The confusion between what was real and not real in the context of lying was especially observed in patients who resorted to fantasy lying. The feeling that one’s mental states are experienced as ‘real’ has been reported in the literature, especially in the context of paranoid personality disorders. Meares (1988) gave an example of a young woman who at their first meeting was too afraid to talk, and stood in the corner of the room. Later she tried to explain her fear.

“I suppose I’m scared that if I talk, there’ll be nothing left to say. Say, I told you all my thoughts, ideas and whatshit, it’d be like me piled up beside up with nothing left to say” (Meares, 1988, p.653).

She seemed to experience her thoughts as the stuff of her existence. In this case thought is conceived as substantial, and if thought is a substantial material then it can be removed, leaving a gap. When the person has such a fragile concept of the sense of innerness and the capacity to think about her thoughts, feelings and beliefs is deficient, she is apt to feel at times that the other has taken away her real experience.

Secrets are a core deceptive behaviour of the paranoid. The difference between the concept of secrets or lies in normal individuals and persons with paranoid disorder who function at the level of borderline organisation originates in the capacity for meta-cognition. When the child distinguishes between inner and outer, he also comes to know the difference between his thoughts of things and those things themselves. Before this
stage, there is little such distinction so that thoughts are in the things (Piaget, 1973). Thoughts for the borderline experienced as ‘things’ and not as mere representations. Secrecy is thus experienced as holding to a ‘thing’ within oneself. Grotstein (1980) stated that in their own idiosyncratic ways, by being secretive, borderline patients are ‘practising’ that autistic safety which somehow had become lost. They may practice it by acts of extreme secrecy, which is but the attempt to develop privacy, of disappearance in order to achieve safety, or of static stillness so as to achieve the longed for serenity.

Secret keeping is a routine aspect of patients with paranoid features, representing the shame they experience about many aspects of their inner life. Some patients attempt to start treatment under conditions of secrecy, or to exert an unrealistic control over the therapist, which distorts the therapeutic relationship and often ends up in therapeutic stalemate (Heimann, 1955). These patients generally experience the analyst as a persecutor, fearing he would steal their thoughts, which are experienced as real things.

Kernberg (1992) has coined the term ‘psychopathic transference’ to refer to periods in treatment when conditions of deceptiveness and projection prevail. Kernberg described a patient, a young woman, having severe narcissistic character pathology, who worked as a call girl with select upper and upper-middle class clientele. She informed her analyst that she had recently told one of her clients that he was the only man in her life, and only a few days later, saying exactly the same thing to another man with whom she spent a considerable time. To the analyst’s surprise she said that she had not been lying at all and that she meant what she said in both instances.

"... And if these men extrapolated from her statement that her feeling would last forever, this was their problem" (Kernberg, 1992, p. 18).

She subsequently said that a commitment statement such as ‘You are the man of my life’ was certainly true in movies but not in real life, adding that she did not believe a relationship was ever anything but commercial transaction. Kernberg noted the transformation of a narcissistic aloofness and uninvolvment to transitory psychopathic transference illustrated by her belief that ‘everybody is trying to get the most out of everybody else, and feelings don’t count’. Two conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, the patient’s concept of lying is different from the analyst’s concept. In her mind the patient does not think she lies. She possibly resorts to duplicate a sentence rehearsed from movies
she had seen in an effort to retain a sense of power. Secondly, she does not link the statement that expresses commitment and responsibility (internal states) to real long lasting relationships (external condition). Internal states are not related to the external world. Object relationships are translated into commercial transactions, i.e. physical exchanges rather than mental. Lying is about ‘a thing’ and not about ‘a thought’. Some borderline individuals are known to be very hypersensitive to mental states, needing to know immediately what those around them feel and think to pre-empt further trauma. This pseudo-knowledge of minds is superficial and selective, scanning for particular danger signals. When they resort to lying to avoid their inner sense of badness, they do not wish to alter the others’ feelings or thoughts.

Different dynamics is portrayed for narcissistic individuals. Earlier we noted that severely disturbed narcissistic individuals with hysterical features use exaggeration with less adherence to the truth. For these individuals, inner reality is not experienced as ‘real’. Driven to reconstruct and preserve a better sense of self they resort to confabulation. Lying is viewed as an ongoing personal or interpersonal process by which inner truth is negotiated. When inner truth does not exist within their mind it can only exist as part of the interaction with the other. In such circumstances the object’s function is to reflect or mirror the missing link between mental and actual states. Without sufficient reality appraisal reliably to conceive of fantasies and feelings as mental rather than actual the sense of the self remain diffused. The borderline’s underlying wish is to communicate her confused and frail state. She does not seem to have independent psychic reality apart from the one that she shares dyadically with the other person. She has got to make the other person believe so that then she might know what the truth is. For the other it might seem that the borderline individual is fantasying, or even trying to create a false impression. In fact the psychological self does not have integrity, and it exists only as part of a joint entity with another mind. In normal individuals it would be manifested as an inner dialogue whereas for the borderline individual it is not going on in the mind but has to be processed through another person.

The use of lying thus functions as a communicative effort to establish a sense of self. This process may be originated in the child’s innate wish to discover that she can lie successfully. Children’s secrets and active lies were reported as essential mechanisms by
which the child defines her autonomy (Tausk, 1933; Woolf, 1949; Yung, 1953; Smith, 1968; Goldberg, 1973). The revelation allows individuation from the parents. The knowledge of separateness allows the child to develop a private world filled with personal aspirations, feelings, beliefs, wishes, fantasies and thoughts. Eating disorders and other forms of self-harm have been widely associated with lack of achievement of sense of separateness (Bruch, 1974; Cooper and Fischer, 1981; Sprince, 1984; Birksted-Breen, 1989). Others indicate the manipulative aspects of these behaviours (Bruch, 1982; Brenner, 1983). Our emphasis is different in that not being able to feel themselves from within they are forced to experience the self from without. Lying is thus a means to negotiate inner truth.

Manipulation is sometimes associated with the borderline individual’s functioning. Borderline individuals intend to deceive others when applying learned contingencies to get an anticipated physical or emotional reward or to avoid foreseen punishment (physical or psychological). Deception is thus seen as manipulatively instrumental rather than signal-communicative. The lie aims to directly change behaviour rather than manipulating the other’s mind and consequently the other’s behaviour. Some authors mention the borderline tendency to manipulate others. Kernberg (1967), for example, proposed that the need to manipulate others in an exploitative way corresponds to the defensive need to keep control over the environment in order to prevent more primitive, paranoid fears connected with the projection of aggressive self and object images from coming to the surface. We assume that under certain conditions borderline’s exploitative manipulation is instrumental rather than mental.

We suggest that the level of reflective functioning determine how well developed the manipulation is. At times when reflective functioning is intact we can expect to observe evidence of the borderline’s conscious, deliberately deceptiveness in communicating with

---

3 In normal development, with an increasing appreciation of the differences between oneself and others, there are opportunities for empathy and intimacy. Paradoxically thus the evolution of lying is one of the significant building blocks in constituting the capacity for a sense of responsibility for the other and for concern in a relationship.
the therapist, so that the latter will be misled in assessing the patient’s emotional state and reality. This deceptiveness may then take the form of suppressing information, and/or manipulative behaviour geared to disorient the therapist or to exploit him in some way. Some narcissistic patients can become tremendously self-serving and need gratifying under certain conditions but nevertheless remain exquisitely able to understand the perspective of the other person in the interaction. Indeed, sociopath individuals who manifest good skills of lying must, of necessity, maintain a non-egocentric capacity to ‘read’ and hence manipulate people.

The need to further explore types of deception with reference to specific personality traits and disorders, and to specific process-related issues in deceptive transference and in the counter-transference seem to be the next inevitable step in clarifying the qualitative difference between mature and immature concepts of lying. Our study has laid the foundation to understand that severe personality disordered individuals’ concept of lying may be tremendously different from that of normal individuals. Normal people who have knowledge of their own mental states may infer a great psychological manipulativeness from the ‘borderline liar’, which might in fact not exist.

In the next section we outline some clinical implications in the context of therapy with abused individuals and abused liars.

11.4 Clinical implications

Analytic objectives are usually described in terms of quite complex theory-laden aims such as making the unconscious conscious, reducing splitting, diminishing the tendency to projective identification. The focus is on structural change within the patient, enduring alteration of personality leading to less maladaptive responses. What would be the strategic therapeutic aims in the treatment of abused patients in view of their relative incapacity to conceive of an object at a mental level? This section concerns with therapeutic approaches in the treatment of abused individuals and abused liars.
11.4.1 Therapy with abused individuals

Achieving insight has always been central psychoanalytic aim. The uniquely analytic commitment is to maintain as full an exploration of the patient’s life as possible, with an aim of awareness, understanding, and choice on the part of the patient. The crucial therapeutic aspect in psychoanalysis lies possibly in its capacity to activate the patient’s ability to find meaning in her own and other people’s behaviour (Holmes, 1996). Psychoanalysis has always aimed at strengthening the patient’s capacity to recognise mental states (Fonagy, 1997). In view of our findings, we believe that the capacity to reflect is an essential precondition for the existence and maintenance of the analytic process. Systematic effort to enhance mentalisation holds the promise for therapeutic effectiveness of psychoanalysis for abused individuals.

The deficit in reflective capacity as manifested in psychoanalytic psychotherapy has been observed, for example, by Eyre (1991) who reported on the analysis of a sexually abused woman. The patient’s mental presentation in therapy, in the beginning, was one of puzzlement, being perplexed as to what was expected of her. It related particularly to,

“... Not knowing anything about herself, therefore not knowing anything about others, and therefore not knowing how to relate to the analyst and what he expected from her” (Eyre, 1991, p. 404).

Practically, this often came out in her relationships with other people. In the course of therapy, at the beginning, she was sounding out people’s opinions and their reactions before she did anything. The lack of association between internal states and behaviour was notably expressed when the analyst made some comments, and the patient would come in the next day, very upset and demanded an exact explanation of what he had meant by inference of it.

What is the therapeutic technique that may enhance mentalisation processes in abused individuals? In individuals, where the capacity to mentalise is severely impaired, dealing with this aspect of the transference could be considered as a precondition of analytic treatment. An appropriately flexible enabling context would offer the patient the optimal opportunity to develop the capacity and to maintain analytic goals when at the outset that capacity may not appear to exist. In other words, the aim is to provide, maybe for the first
time, an environment in which the capacity to understand and reflect on one’s own and on the analyst’s mind could be organised. Fonagy (1997) suggested that accomplishment of this aim should follow: (1) The establishment of attachment relationship with the patient; (2) The use of this to create an inter-personal context where understanding of mental states becomes a focus and (3) The attempt, mostly implicit, to create situations where the self is recognised as intentional and real by the therapist, and this recognition is clearly perceived by the patient.

Goldberg (1988) recommended a similar sequence of steps through which a patient may achieve understanding: (1) The analyst must first understand the patient, he does so by way of empathy; (2) The analyst must explain what he understands to the patient; (3) The patient begins to understand herself. This capacity to understand oneself is the essential of structure formation and consists of taking up a position at a different level from that of the mere experience of being understood (pp. 217–218).

The main obstacle is the patient’s terror of a mind, which offers understanding. In the transference, the terror is in the mind, which so disastrously failed the abused patient in the past. This obstacle can be discerned in Gehrie’s (1993) analysis of a woman who had experienced a traumatic history of abandonment by her mother and sexual abuse by her father and brothers. She was drowning in a negative mother transference, in which the analyst, like her mother, would essentially ignore her and be critical of her strident cries for attention and recognition. In the analysis it took a highly sexualised form, the perpetual attempt to seduce the analyst. Even after several years of four times per week analysis, the patient remained essentially unable to grasp the implications of her longings. The empathic grasp of this patient’s subjective world had led to a mixed result, in which she experienced the available understanding as always inadequate because they did not lead to the act of sexual intimacy, and therefore, for her, were essentially rejecting in quality. Discerning the patient’s subjective reality increased her struggle to fulfil her wishes, and provided evidence to her that the analyst is withholding what he knows she wants, and is therefore rejecting her. It appears to be a reflection of her fundamental inability to distinguish between past and present, and to process intentionality. Everything was either ‘mother’s plan’ or ‘what father will take.’
In the transference the patient unconsciously expects that the therapist, despite overt helpfulness and concern, will covertly exploit the patient for her own narcissistic gratification. The transferential pattern is based on the patient’s expectation of misuse of power by the parental or authoritative figure in the relationship. Hegeman (1995) reported on two cases of traumatic transference. Hegeman noted that one of the key counter-transference experiences in the analysis of the abused patient is that even the most well intentioned analyst will be experienced as abusing her power at some point, and will certainly feel like, and possibly even be the patient’s victim. Interpretation based on the patient’s internal conflicts or dynamics will most likely seem to the patient to deny the interpersonal or relational nature of those events, implying that the destructiveness is in the patient. When the patient has moved to a psychological position of expression through enactment, full interpretations of unconscious anxieties and conflicts are unlikely to be heard.

Rosenfeld (1984) clarified two aspects of narcissism, identifying thick- and thin-skinned narcissists. In thick-skinned narcissists, the survival of an idealised self is paramount. The analyst is experienced as someone who wishes to dismantle the patient’s self, to effect a cure and to engender dependence. Rosenfeld suggested that the ‘thin-skinned’ narcissistic patients were repeatedly severely traumatised as children in their feelings of self-regard. They are tremendously vulnerable, feel sensitive to rejection and persistently judge themselves as inferior to others. While warning that these patients are difficult to treat, Rosenfeld stressed the importance of being on guard not to add to these traumas by saying or doing anything that might make them feel humiliated. Rosenfeld warned against interpreting destructive narcissistic elements in such patients. Interpretation may both inhibit their ability to build up satisfactory object-relationships and puncture their vulnerable sense of self. Bateman (1998) pointed out that interpretation was effective just with thick-skinned patients. In Bateman’s view,

“... It (an interpretation) only becomes so at the point, which a patient is moving between thick- and thin-skinned elements... Only then is the patient capable of understanding the thinking within the analyst’s mind as formulated in the interpretation” Bateman (1998, p. 23).

Fonagy (1998) reported on psychoanalysis with Emma, a 21 year old woman who was referred for treatment because her diabetes had been hopelessly out of control since she
was first diagnosed diabetic at the age of 12. Her family had been torn apart by psychiatric and physical illness. Her mother had been diagnosed as both schizophrenic and manic-depressive. Father’s psychiatric disturbance was probably as severe as mother’s. He was a violent man who deserted the home when she was six. Fonagy explained that she felt ideas to be physical, i.e. concrete, thus her attacks on her body were attacks on the mother’s psychological world. Emma’s self destructiveness made sense as a desperate attempt to clarify the distinction between her own sense of herself and her mother’s sense of her. Her relative incapacity to conceive of an object at a mental level caused her to create representations of mental states via the body and it was this predicament that predisposed her to acts of aggression. In the absence of early experiences of relations with a caregiver who holds a reflective self function, the self feels no true ownership of its acts. The analyst’s aim is thus to present the patient with a mind capable of recognising the patient’s intentional state and bringing external state of affairs in line.

Fonagy (1997) suggested that recognition rather than understanding constitute the first step. The past makes no sense as a cause of the present, as it is the present that cannot be thought or felt about. Interpretation of self-harm, as aggression towards the analyst and as attacks on the analysis would be futile. Firstly, the analyst needs to offer his recognition of the patient’s mind and behaviour. The analyst’s ability to what is happening and to have his own situation recognised enables the patient to be understood. It is as if the patient is treated as a person who wishes to be understood and not to understand. Fonagy suggested that the route to this should involve brief, accurate and simple statements of the analyst’s perception of the patient’s current mental state vis a vis the analyst or the patient’s own self. Finding her own thinking self is achieved by the active involvement of the analyst in the mental functioning of the patient and the reciprocal process of the patient becoming actively in the analyst’s mind.

Therefore, the analyst’s primary aim is to recognise that the abused patient has little or no mental capacity. Direct correspondence between beliefs and reality predominates. Doubt is inaccessible. The possibility of alternative links between beliefs and reality is obliterated. The exploration of triggers for feelings or thoughts, emphasising differences in perceptions of the same event, bringing awareness to manifold relationships between
actions and meaning are at the crux of the analytic endeavour. Diverse interpretations concerning the patient’s perception of the analytic relationship would enable her to attempt to create a mental representation both of herself and of her analyst, as thinking and feeling. This then could form the core of a sense of herself with a capacity to represent ideas and meanings, and to create a basis for the bond that ultimately permits independent existence.

11.4.2 Therapy with abused liars

The very heart of psychoanalytic psychotherapy lies in the therapist’s interpreting the patient’s self-deception in a way that the patient can understand. As pointed out, in the course of psychotherapy, neurotic patients’ lies can be very meaningful and useful for therapeutic purposes.

In cases of prolonged history of overwhelming trauma, certain truths become too threatening, too intrusive, and too stressful to be assimilated, contained and absorbed. Abused patients who lie typically use dissociative mechanisms. They sometimes precipitously terminate treatment when realistic perception becomes unavoidable and split-off aggression inherent in the lying becomes accessible. Strange derailment in the treatment, unusual or unexplained absences or cancellations, and inconsistencies in the patient’s reports might alert the analyst to the possibility that a patient might be prone to telling lies. Derailment in the treatment of a patient who lied was described by Gediman and Lieberman (1996). They reported a psychoanalytic psychotherapy of an anorexic-bulimic woman who, after several months of treatment, acknowledged to the analyst that she regularly lied to others. Two years into treatment she arrived quite late during a severe rainstorm. She explained that she was late because she could not find a taxicab, and had to walk twenty blocks to the analyst’s office. The analyst, by chance, had glanced out from her office window and saw the patient alight from a taxicab. Disarmed and defending against the signal anger and the disappointment, the analyst did not address this lie. She waited for the next opportunity, when she raised the issue of her patient’s ability to pay a small fee increase, pointing to the discrepancy between her reportedly low income and her lifestyle. The patient precipitously broke off treatment.
Kernberg (1975, 1992) and O'Shaughnessy (1990) have raised important issues about the treatability of patients with dishonest transferences who generally misled the analyst. Kernberg determined that to treat a patient psychotherapeutically requires honest and full communication between patient and therapist. It is for this technical reason that the therapist has to address the problem of opening the field of communication by resolving deceptive communications in the transference ('psychopathic transference'). Kernberg argued that psychopathic transference tends to and corrupt the entire psychotherapeutic process, and is a major reason for stalemates and failure. In his view, it is essential to explore patient's psychopathic transference in great detail, and to resolve them interpretively before proceeding with other material.

O'Shaughnessy concluded that the habitual liar could be analysed, despite the fears of a fundamental antagonism between a liar and psychoanalysis. She has taken the position that lying is the means of communicating urgently the fundamental truth about early object relations. Founded on the assumption that the liar knows that she lies, she knows also that there could be truthful object relations, O'Shaughnessy observed how her patients were deeply touched by, and appreciative of the experience of being analytically understood on a level they had lacked and needed.

Special technical difficulties arise in the psychoanalytic treatment of lying patients, especially in the context of timing and the suggestion that lies should be dealt with as soon as they are recognised, within the limits of dosage and tact. The question of timing and dosage is linked with the analyst's impression whether the patient can tolerate the threat of a fantasised loss of the analyst, and on the extent to which the patient is able to mentalise.

To treat effectively patients who lie, one needs to understand adequately the patient's relation both to her inner world and the outside world. It implies that the analyst should consider the extent of the patient's awareness to hers and to others' mental states. When the patient has rigid commitment to a false belief, when there is direct correspondence between beliefs and reality, the possibility of doubt is unapproachable. One version of reality is true. We claim that in such states interpretation of a lie as a communication of false belief might be unattainable. Lacking the capacity for symbolisation, the abused liar will not be able to understand the symbolic meanings of her lies. In such conditions,
interpretation of the meaning of the lie as corresponding to the patient’s mind, and what lies express about the patient’s feelings towards the therapist might be futile. The patient’s lies, as enactments, cannot be interpreted, because they simply do not have symbolic meaning beyond wishing to create a specific reaction in the therapist.

Ambiguousness, confusion, feeling of uncertainty and incomprehension are commonly experienced in the countertransference. These mental states are usually interpreted as a projection of the patient’s mind. It is as if the patient wants the analyst to suffer and know it over and over again. The patient wishes to make it hard for the analyst to understand her. Hostility, hope and fear in the abused patient are highly condensed. They hope the analyst would understand them, fear a wrong response to their communications, and defend themselves hostilely and masochistically by inviting it. We suggest that in the absence of mentalising capacity it is not the conscious or unconscious wish to impose confusional state in the analyst’s mind that operates, but the creation of a specific reaction, mostly anger, irritation or puzzlement.

Recognising that the patient lies does, however, tend to endanger considerable emotional responses within the therapist. Countertransference to lying patients can be quite powerful and usually emerge quite abruptly. O’Shaughnessy (1990), for example, described how lies in the transference made her incapable of working, depriving her of needed knowledge and brought her to experience herself as a ‘corrupted container’, ‘a partner in the perversion of the analytic relationship’ (p. 184). The lie may be experienced as a greater assault than any other hostile manifestation. The lie may render the analytic work meaningless.

It is only after establishing attachment relationship with the patient and creating an interpersonal context where understanding of mental states becomes the focus, when the self is recognised as intentional and real by the therapist, when this recognition is clearly perceived by the patient, that interpretations of unconscious conflicts could be addressed. When the analyst notices a patient who lies she must simultaneously become the person the patient needs her to be and at the same time retaining in a part of her mind a representation of the patient’s mental state, and represent this to the patient with sufficient clarity to provide the basis of mentalising self representation.
The analyst needs to bear in mind the correspondence between young children’s and abused patients’ lies, especially the awareness that their lies are a mixture of conscious prevarication and fantasy, or that sometimes fantasies are experienced as real. This is clearly illustrated in a father’s response to his daughter’s lie. A young daughter of divorced parents told her father that she wanted a television set in her room at his house, just like the one she had in her room at her mother’s house. The father, fairly sure that she did not have a television at her mother’s house, responded,

“You mean to say that you would like to have a television set in your room at your mother’s house, and one here too?”

The girl immediately answered in the affirmative, and the issue was quickly dropped.

Finally, Fonagy (1998) noted that there is danger in crediting the patient’s material with more meaning that it really contains. Over estimation of the patient’s mental capacity, the consideration of her psychic reality as being similar in quality to that of the analyst, can lead to fruitless and repetitive search after truth. It might be extremely notable when the patient lies.

To conclude, the therapist’s aim is to adopt a non-pragmatic mentalistic stance which demands the patient to think about the thoughts and feelings of the dupe, to create for the patient a representation that was never fully developed in early childhood and was undermined by subsequent painful interpersonal experiences. The behaviour represented in the lie should become understandable, meaningful and predictable.
11.5 Future directions

The findings reported constitute the first prospective demonstration of a link between a critical aspect of emotional development (care and abuse), the concept of lying, and borderline personality disorder.

This study is preliminary and exploratory. It did not permit a wider range of measures to be used and further studies will need to determine if the associations observed, primarily for the cognitive-emotional task are generalised to other theory of mind tasks.

The sample size was relatively small for study of individual differences. Many of the associations could not be seriously explored because of small cell sizes. For example, the tantalising association between sexual abuse, affective response and use of belief was not robust to more rigorous statistical analyses.

It remains an open question to what extent differences in the concept of lying might have accounted for individual differences in theory of mind competence. Furthermore, we do not know what measure these were associated with the quality of parental care or abuse.

The fact that sometimes patients showed both immature and mature concept of lying may suggest that this construct is a capacity that is operated within a continuum, from an immature to a mature concept. Certain mediators may facilitate the development of this capacity in children who experienced maltreatment. Transitions from one mode to another might be expected in specific conditions. The existence of other significant adults, siblings or peers who engage in co-operative interactions with the child, who engage in conversations about feelings and reasons behind people’s actions may stand as possible mediators. Differences in the level of maltreatment interacting with these mediators are suggested as additional possible explanation. Exploring interactions between measures of bonding (or attachment status) and specific situations or conditions that might trigger change in mentalising capacity seems to be the next step.

We have noted how intention may precede belief in the course of development. Our findings have indicated that when judging lying, borderline individuals tend to employ intention rather than belief. Further investigation using more direct and rigorous measures is suggested.
We also looked for manifestation of theory of mind in different emotional laden tasks. To what extent different contextual factors might be associated with different emotional responsiveness is still another open question. Further studies should be carried out to validate the findings that highly emotional charged conditions impair the potential for manifestation of mentalising capacity.

This thesis was mainly concerned with the concept of lying. The examination of the proportion of daily employment of lying in both normal and borderline individuals was not in the prospect of this study. We mainly examined the cognitive aspects of conceptualisation without reference to practicing lying. Further research will broaden our knowledge as to the amount of lying used and concurrently, to enquire possible roots for such deceptive behaviour. Although difficult to know, it seems worthwhile getting some independent evidence, such as nurses’ reports and patients’ records.

The need to further explore the types of deception with reference to specific personality traits and disorders, and to specific process-related issues in deceptive transference and in the counter-transference seem to be another inevitable step in clarifying the qualitative difference between mature and immature concept of lying.

Further studies exploring these relationships in greater depth appear to be well justified by both empirical and theoretical considerations.
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APPENDIX 7.1: SET OF NORMALLY CHARGED PLOTS

Plot 1

Dick, Selma and Richard are playing golf. Richard steps on Dick’s ball. When Dick arrives and sees his ball pushed into the turf, he asks: “Selma, did you step on my ball?” Selma replies: “No, I did not.”

Answer the questions:

1. When Selma told Dick that she did not step on his ball, did she tell (put to indicate your answer)?

   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are of your answer?

   a. Very sure ______
   b. Fairly sure ______
   c. Not too sure ______

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.

   ______________________________________________
   ______________________________________________
   ______________________________________________
   ______________________________________________
Plot 2

Tom’s mother doesn’t like when Tom is playing with his friends (but she really doesn’t care if Tom plays with them). This afternoon Tom is playing with his friends. It is a rough play and in one of the tackles Tom faints. It takes him ten minutes to recover. Unfortunately, on his way back, he is hit by a cyclist and faints once again. Tom returns home. His mother notices his confused state and she asks him what happened. Tom feels that he has nothing to conceal, and wants to tell his mother all that has happened to him. He slightly is aware to the fact that he fainted twice. He replies to his mother by saying that he was playing, and on his way back home he was hit by a cyclist who caused him to faint.

Answer the questions:

1. When Tom said that he was playing, and on his way back home he was hit by a cyclist who caused him to faint, did he tell (put to indicate your answer)?

   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are of your answer?

   a. Very sure ______
   b. Fairly sure ______
   c. Not too sure ______

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.
Ann and Chris live together. Betty, their friend phones and invites them to her birthday party on Thursday at 8 p.m. Chris answers that they would be delighted to celebrate it with her. That Thursday, Ann returns home from work before Chris. Usually, Chris finishes to work at 6 p.m. At 7:30 p.m. Chris phones her and tells her that he has just left his office, and that as they have forgotten to buy the present for Betty, he is going to buy something, and then he will return home.

At 8.30 p.m. Betty phones Ann and asks her why they haven’t come yet. Ann doesn’t want Betty to know that they have forgotten to buy a present. At that moment, Ann notices that her toast is burning, so inattentively she tells Betty that Chris is late from work and he hasn’t come home yet because he went to buy the present for her.

Answer the questions:

1. When Ann answered that Chris was late from work and he hadn’t come home because he went to buy the present for her, did she tell (put to indicate your answer)?
   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are of your answer?
   a. Very sure _____
   b. Fairly sure _____
   c. Not too sure _____

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
Plot 4

One day Liz has an arithmetic test which she hasn’t studied for, and so she doesn’t want to go to school. She feels slightly sick. Although she does not believe that she is sick enough to stay away from school, she remains at home. She takes her temperature and she notes that she has no fever at all.

Later that morning, her mother returns home and asks Liz why she hasn’t gone to school. She answers that she is sick.

Her mother takes her temperature, and to Liz’s surprises, it turns out, that she really is sick, developing the measles.

Answer the questions:

1. When Liz said that she was sick, did she tell (put ______ to indicate your answer)?
   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are of your answer?
   a. Very sure ______
   b. Fairly sure ______
   c. Not too sure ______

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Plot 5

Two clients are waiting at the solicitor’s office.
The solicitor, who does not remember their cases, asks his secretary, Debra, to remind him of each of the cases so he can prepare himself.
Although Debra knows that these clients are very important to her boss, she confuses the two clients’ cases in her mind and replies: “Mr. Smith’s case is about inheritance and Mr. Green’s is about a loan from the building society.”
In fact, Mr. Smith’s case is about the building society and Mr. Green’s is about the inheritance.

Answer the questions:

1. When Debra replied the solicitor that Mr. Smith’s case was about inheritance and Mr. Green’s was about the loan from the building society did she tell (put to indicate your answer)?
   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are of your answer?
   a. Very sure ______
   b. Fairly sure ______
   c. Not too sure ______

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________
Plot 6

Brian is invited to dinner at his boss's house. In fact, it was a dismal evening enjoyed by no one. Brian believes it was not a nice party and he is just concerned to say something nice to his boss's wife.
Before leaving he says to his host: "Thank you, it was a nice party."
He really isn't trying to convince anyone he had a good time. He is sure that his host will recognise that he is merely being polite.

Answer the questions:

1. When Brian told his host that it was a nice party, did he tell (put to indicate your answer)?

   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are of your answer?

   a. Very sure ______
   b. Fairly sure ______
   c. Not too sure ______

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
Tim knows that he has to go around the fair in the park to get to the pool hall, but he is wrong about this because the fair left town. He goes to the pool, daydreaming, without noticing that the fair has gone. Unfortunately, at the entrance to the pool hall, he finds out that the pool hall is closed. When he returns home, his mother, who doesn’t approve of pool, asks him where he had been. Tim answers that he was going around the fair.

Answer the questions:

1. When Tim told his mother that he was going around the fair, did he tell (put to indicate your answer)?

   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are of your answer?

   a. Very sure ______
   b. Fairly sure ______
   c. Not too sure ______

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.
Bob has eaten the cake Juliet was intending to serve to company. Juliet asks Bob: “Did you eat the cake?” Bob replies: “No, I did not eat the cake.”

Answer the questions:

1. When Bob replied Juliet that he did not eat the cake, did he tell (put to indicate your answer)?
   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are of your answer?
   a. Very sure ______
   b. Fairly sure ______
   c. Not too sure ______

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX 7.2: SET OF EMOTIONALLY CHARGED PLOTS

Plot 1

Helen and Ross are friends. They work at Bruce’s fashion shop. Every morning Ross gives Helen a lift.

Last night they had a row. The next morning, Helen is waiting for her lift. She believes that Ross is late because he overslept late. Ross phones Helen and says that he will be late to work because he overslept late that morning. Helen takes a taxi.

Bruce, the boss, asks Helen where Ross is. She replies that Ross phoned her and told that he would be late to work because he overslept late that morning.

Answer the questions:

1. When Helen replied Bruce that Ross phoned her and told that he would be late to work because he overslept late that morning, did she tell (put to indicate your answer)?
   a. A lie _____
   b. The truth _____
   c. Neither _____

2. How sure are you of your answer?
   a. Very sure _____
   b. Fairly sure _____
   c. Not too sure _____

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
Plot 2

This afternoon Jack has a toothache. He leaves his office and goes to the dentist. After being treated by the dentist, he goes out to a pub. There, he meets his first girlfriend from school. He is thinking of seeing her again.

During that time, Kate, Jack’s wife phones his office and finds out that he is not there. Jack returns home at midnight. He is still very drowsy.

Kate is angry and says to him: “I was waiting for hours, you are selfish, you have left me again to deal with your lazy kids, where were you?”

Jack really cares for Kate and feels that he has nothing to conceal. He wants to tell her all that has happened to him. He slightly is aware to the fact that something good has happened with a girl.

He answers: “I had a toothache, I went to the dentist, then I went to the pub to recover, and there, I met an old friend of mine.”

Answer the questions:

1. When Jack answered that he had had a toothache, then went to the dentist and to a pub to recover, and there he met an old friend, did he tell (put to indicate your answer)?
   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are you of your answer?
   a. Very sure _____
   b. Fairly sure ___
   c. Not too sure __

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
John and Mary have recently started going out together. Roger is Mary's ex-boyfriend. One evening John asks Mary: "Have you met Roger this week?"

Mary doesn't want John to know that she had a date with Roger last night (but she also believes that there is a good chance that John will find it out). Being anxious, impulsively, she answers that she met Roger last night.

Answer the questions:

1. When Mary answered John that she met Roger last night, did she tell (put to indicate your answer)?
   
   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are you of your answer?

   a. Very sure ______
   b. Fairly sure ______
   c. Not too sure ______

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.
Plot 4

Ruth and Harvey are lovers. One day Harvey dates Emma, Ruth’s best friend. They go out to a film. Harvey is very keen to sleep with Emma, so he is trying to seduce her. They go to her apartment, ending by having sex. In fact what happened was that Emma was not really aware of Harvey’s efforts to seduce her, so she felt she needed to force him to sleep with her. So in fact it was Emma who really seduced Harvey.

Ruth, who knew that they were meeting, jealously asks Harvey what happened with Emma.

Harvey, terrified by Ruth’s jealousy, answers that they had sex and that Emma seduced him.

Answer the questions:

1. When Harvey told Ruth that it was Emma who seduced him, did he tell
   (put    to indicate your answer)?

   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are you of your answer?

   a. Very sure ______
   b. Fairly sure ______
   c. Not too sure ______

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.
Plot 5

Gloria returns home from the disco with her partner, Martin. On their way a van crashes into Martin's car. The van drives off. Gloria noticed the guy in this van and believes it is Paul, her ex-boyfriend.

After recovering from his s, Martin, who did not notice anything during the accident, asks Gloria whether she recognised the driver of the van that collided with them.

Gloria answers that she is almost sure it was Paul.

In fact, the police investigation reveals that the driver is somebody else called Jeremy whom Gloria do not know.

Answer the questions:

1. When Gloria told Martin that she was almost sure it was Paul, did she tell (put to indicate your answer)?
   
   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are you of your answer?
   
   a. Very sure ______
   b. Fairly sure ______
   c. Not too sure ______

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Plot 6

Cecilia is overweight. In fact, Colin, her boyfriend, dislikes her figure. She is always asking him what he thinks of her figure. As usual, Colin does not expect Cecilia to believe him. He answers that her body is rather nice.

Answer the questions:

1. When Colin told Cecilia that her body was rather nice, did he tell (put to indicate your answer)?
   a. A lie ______
   b. truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are you of your answer?
   a. Very sure ______
   b. Fairly sure ______
   c. Not too sure ______

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
Plot 7

Eric is married to Claudia. They have a son, called David. James, Eric’s brother lives with them. One day Eric returns home drunk. He gets into David’s room, screaming and shouting at him, with no good reason. He gets out from the room. James believes that David took money from his purse. He goes into David’s room and injures him seriously. Then, he goes out to calm down. Claudia hears David’s weeping and asks Eric whether he has hit David again. Being drunk, Eric is sure that he has hit David. He doesn’t want to admit it to Claudia. However, a slip of the tongue gives him a way and he tells Claudia that he has hit David.

Answer the questions:

1. When Eric told Claudia that he had hit David, did he tell (put to indicate your answer)?

   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are you of your answer?

   a. Very sure ______
   b. Fairly sure ______
   c. Not too sure ______

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Plot 8

Karen returns home from school. Her father, in an outburst, swears at and humiliates her in front of her mother, Barbara. Later on, Karen tells this to grandma. Grandma asks her daughter, Barbara, whether it is true that her husband swore at and humiliated Karen. Barbara is trying to deny her husband’s bad behaviour, answers that Karen made it up.

Answer the questions:

1. When Barbara told grandma that Karen made it up, did she tell (put to indicate your answer)?
   a. A lie ______
   b. The truth ______
   c. Neither ______

2. How sure are you of your answer?
   a. Very sure ______
   b. Fairly sure ______
   c. Not too sure ______

3. Please explain and justify your choice in as much detail as you can.
APPENDIX 7.3: AFFECT SCALE

Do you feel any of these about ‘name of speaker’ (mark with )?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Very strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7.4: INTRODUCTION PAGE

Number: ______

QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions:

The aim of this questionnaire is to find out how people think about lies and truth telling. In the following pages you will find short stories and questions. In each story there is a conversation in which utterances might be categorised as lies or truths. Please, read each story carefully, and then answer the following questions. There is no “right answer” to the questions.

Please fill in:
Sex: ______
Age: ______
APPENDIX 8.1: LETTER SENT TO PATIENTS

24 July 1995

Mr. ________________

____________________

____________________

Dear Mr. ____________

I am a postgraduate student in Psychology, currently employed as Hon. Research Assistant at the Cassel Hospital. As a part of a research project we are investigating relations between care and abuse in childhood and the subsequent development of different psychological problems. All current and future outpatients referred to the hospital are invited to participate.

The research will involve 5-6 interview sessions which last for about 2 hours (each) during which you will be asked to fill in and answer questions about yourself and your past experiences. You will be free to withdraw from the study at any time, without having to give a reason and without this affecting your present and/or future treatment at the Cassel Hospital. I will be glad to discuss with you the details and the implications of the study and to give you as much information as needed before the interviews.

I will contact you shortly after the receipt of this letter.

Yours sincerely

Ilan Diamant
Hon. Research Assistant
Title of Study: The relations between care or abuse in childhood and the subsequent development of different psychological problems.

I, ............................................................................................................. confirm that:

1. I have had the opportunity to discuss the details and the implications of the Study with the researcher;

2. I have had enough written and verbal information about the Study from Mr. Ilan Diamant; and

3. I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time, without having to give a reason and without this affecting my treatment at the Cassel Hospital.

Therefore, I agree to take part in this Study.

Signed.................................................................................................Date...........................................

Name Block Letters.........................................................................................
Do you wish to earn £25?

You will have to fill in two questionnaires and then you will be interviewed about your childhood. The interview lasts about 2½ hours.

You should be 21-35 years old

You are in a control group and should not have any serious psychiatric problems

Confidentiality is completely guaranteed.

If you are willing to earn £25.- without much effort, all you have to do NOW, is contact ILAN DIAMANT at 0171 - 624 0728. Leave your name and telephone number and I will contact you soon.

APPENDIX 9.1: FLYER RECRUITING SUBJECTS IN THE CONTROL GROUP
APPENDIX 9.2: LETTER, CONSENT FORM AND DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Ms. ......................
...........................
...........................

Ilan Diamant
Dept. of Clinical Psychology
Gower Street
London

Date ........................

Dear Ms. ..............

Thank you for your interest in the research project. The aim of the study is to find out the effect of various childhood experiences on the personality. Although relations between childhood experiences and modes of functioning have been widely acknowledged, only few studies have been carried out to examine the links between them. In our study, we look for specific experiences (such as care, affection, or maltreatment in childhood) with relations to specific modes of functioning (for example, inclination to avoid social interactions or preference to be the centre of attention). Another objective is to understand the impact of early experiences of deception on the child’s development.

The study is divided into two phases. Firstly, you are asked to fill in two questionnaires consisting of:
1. Short demographic questionnaire and set of questions portraying your personality.
2. Sixteen short stories depicting various social interactions aiming at getting your definition of lying.

The questionnaires will be. Then we will proceed to the next phase, in which you will be invited to the interview. The interview covers various childhood experiences and many interviewees, from our experience, find the interview quite stimulating and enriching. It will be conducted at University College London (located close to Goodge St. underground station, Tottenham Court Road, W1) and it lasts about 2-2½ hours.

After concluding the interview you will be entitled to receive £25. If you do not want proceed to the second phase you will still be eligible to receive £5 which will be mailed to you.

Enclosed are the questionnaires, and a stamped envelope.

Yours sincerely,

Ilan Diamant
Title of Study: The relations between childhood experience and subsequent development of psychological problems.

Researcher Name: Mr. Ilan Diamant

I, Ms. .................. confirm that:

1. I have had the opportunity to discuss the details and implications of the Study with the researcher;

2. I have had written and verbal information about the Study from Mr. Ilan Diamant; and,

3. I understand that I am free to withdraw from the Study at any time, without having to give a reason.

Therefore, I agree to take part in this Study.

Signed...............................................................................Date..............................

Subject number:...........

I, Ilan Diamant confirm that Ms. .................. will be eligible to receive £25 for filling in two questionnaires (a demographic-personality questionnaire, and a questionnaire on the definition of lying) and for being interviewed about my childhood experience.

Signed.................................................................Date..............................
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TELEPHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>Subject number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARITAL STATUS</th>
<th>CHILDREN</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Further Education</th>
<th>Working History</th>
<th>Where Were You Born</th>
<th>Where Were You Brought Up</th>
<th>Family Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 never divorced</td>
<td>Boy / Girl</td>
<td>1 none</td>
<td>1 none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 married once</td>
<td>Boy / Girl</td>
<td>2 any C.S.E. grades 4-5</td>
<td>2 apprenticeship - subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 divorced</td>
<td>Boy / Girl</td>
<td>3 any C.S.E. grades 2-3</td>
<td>3 non professional training - subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy / Girl</td>
<td>4 O level or any C.S.E. grades 1:1-4 passes</td>
<td>4 profession, non graduate - subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy / Girl</td>
<td>5 O level or any C.S.E. grades 1 5 or more passes</td>
<td>5 graduate - subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHERE WERE YOU BORN

WHERE WERE YOU BROUGHT UP

FAMILY ORIGIN

Mother: age .......... (if deceased: year .......... age ..........)
Father:  age .......... (if deceased: year .......... age ..........)
Stepmother: age .......... (if deceased: year .......... age ..........)
Stepfather: age .......... (if deceased: year .......... age ..........)
SIBLINGS:
Sister/brother: full sibling/half sibling age .....................
Sister/brother: full sibling/half sibling age .....................
Sister/brother: full sibling/half sibling age .....................
Sister/brother: full sibling/half sibling age .....................
Sister/brother: full sibling/half sibling age .....................

ALTERNATIVE CAREGIVERS
Grandmother: age .......... (if deceased: year .......... age........)
Grandfather: age .......... (if deceased: year .......... age........)
Grandmother: age .......... (if deceased: year .......... age........)
Grandfather: age .......... (if deceased: year .......... age........)
Other: age .......... (if deceased: year .......... age........)
Other: age .......... (if deceased: year .......... age........)
APPENDIX 9.3: NATIONAL ADULT READING TEST

List of words

| ACHE     | SIMILE        |
| DEPOT    | BANAL         |
| AISLE    | QUADRUPED     |
| BOUQUET  | CELLIST       |
| PSALM    | FACADE        |
| CAPON    | ZEALOT        |
| DENY     | DRACHM        |
| NAUSEA   | AEON          |
| DEBT     | PLACEBO       |
| COURTEOUS| ABSTEMIOUS    |
| RAREFY   | DETENTE       |
| EQUIVOCAL| IDYLL         |
| NAIVE    | PUELPERAL     |
| CATACOMB | AVER          |
| GAOLED   | GAUCHE        |
| THYME    | TOPIARY       |
| HEIR     | LEVIATHAN     |
| RADIX    | BEATIFY       |
| ASSIGNATE| PRELATE       |
| HIATUS   | SIDEREAL      |
| SUBTLE   | DEMESNE       |
| PROCRERATE| SYNCOPE      |
| GIST     | LABAILE       |
| GOUGE    | CAMPANILE     |
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APPENDIX 9.4: TABLE OF IQ PREDICTED SCORES

The WAIS full scale, Verbal and Performance IQs predicted from the number of errors on the NART.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NART Errors</th>
<th>Predicted Full Scale IQ</th>
<th>Predicted Verbal IQ</th>
<th>Predicted Perform. IQ</th>
<th>NART Errors</th>
<th>Predicted Full Scale IQ</th>
<th>Predicted Verbal IQ</th>
<th>Predicted Perform. IQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full Scale IQ = 127.7 – 0.826 X NART error score

Verbal IQ = 129.0 – 0.919 X NART error score

Performance IQ = 123.5 – 0.645 X NART error score
APPENDIX 10.1: INITIAL REVIEW OF LYING INTERVIEWS

Subject 111

This subject introduced us to a state where reality and fantasy are interwoven.

Subject 111: My Mum used to lie all the time, she used to make up things to frighten us. She’d invent stories to frighten us, like she would say that she, for instance, she met this woman the other day and Mrs. so and so down the road, you must know who I mean and she’s got these two kids and there right little bleeders and anyway she was difficult so she phoned up this office and these people said if they are misbehaving that much you’d better bring them and she’s had them put away and she’s glad to be without them. I’m going to do that to you. She used to make up lies like that. But my mum lies about everything, my mum lies today. She would just make up all that kind of stuff and I mean, really, she was such a liar that I actually some of the things that I have accepted as being true probably weren’t and vice-versa. I was very confused about what was true and what wasn’t when I was a kid, because also she would say things to me like, you did that, and I would say I didn’t, and she said I did and I said I didn’t, and she would say, I saw you. And I hadn’t done anything, and I just used to think I must have done it because she saw me. I got older and thought I didn’t do it and she’d be still insisting. I mean really it’s only quite recently that I talk to my sister and be able to say she was lying about that. She just, I could never really tell when I was little, it was very difficult because she very often said she’d seen me do things or she would say something like, you did that deliberately. Something might go wrong, I don’t know, like if for instance, this isn’t lying exactly but it’s like if I went to the launderette and something got torn in the machine I’d say mum look and she’d say, you did that on purpose didn’t you. I’d say I didn’t and she say you did, I bloody well know you did. I used to think she must be right. So in a way that was kind of like lying to me.

It was so scary and it’s really only very recently that I’ve got out of that as two years ago when I went into treatment I thought that if I said things about her in a room like this that she knew what I was saying and she would get me, and I believed it to, because she always seemed to know these things, it was a very scary place to be because I used to
think I can't even think about hating her because she'll know. I remember once when I was a little girl she said something, I went. She turned round and she threw this egg slice at me, and I said what. She said that's for pulling faces behind my back. I was just speechless, because I thought how did she know that she must have some kind of, she must know. At the time it made her so powerful, that she knew what I was thinking, and sometimes of course she did, she knew because she was able to, she was just a good guesser. It made her this hugely powerful person.

This patient describes her upbringing in which developing a concept of lying is impossible. She depicts herself growing up with an omnipotent-aggressive mother who has given no way to develop a sense of separateness. Boundaries between the patient’s experience of herself and her mother could not be fabricated. She gives a painful account of unthinkable encounters, which illustrates her diffused mental representations of herself and her mother. Confusion is predetermined. It was just after being exposed to her sister’s mind, as a grown up, and while undergoing psychoanalytic psychotherapy, that she started to get an awareness of the differences of truth and falsity not just of mere prepositions, but also of her mother as an object. She is struggling to find refuge from all these intolerable feelings.

**Interviewer:** Why did she lie to you?

**Subject 111:** I just think when I first thought about it, that it was because she was quite wicked and she did it to get me. I think I've always felt that in a way that it was quite deliberate. It was just to get me, to hurt me.

She was then asked about her lies. It is an account of the difficulty to understand and employ lying correctly and maturely.

**Interviewer:** What about you as a child?

**Subject 111:** I used to lie all the time. I used to just make up stories to make myself look interesting. I used to make up stories when I was at school to cover up the gaps in things that I couldn't tell people because it was about the house.

**Interviewer:** Such as?

**Subject 111:** Just, I couldn't really say what went on at home so I used to make up stories
about how I'd met people or how I'd been somewhere when I'd not been there before. It actually got worse as I got older, I mean I just used to make up lies, now I just cringe when I look at it. I feel like I'm lying all the time, a lot of the time. I'd lie about conversations I'd had, for no reason just to lie about them. I just used to embroider them. I've got a terrible tendency to do tin my head now. I have to really be aware sometimes and stop myself and go hang now that's not true, and sometimes I don't know whether I've made a mistake or an intention to lie but I have to stop myself sometimes because I find myself going off into. But I just got used to embroidering things really and making things more interesting than they were. I don't remember lying to get an advantage over anybody. I told lies really so that people would like me and so they they'd think that I was interesting and that I would have something to say, it was having something to say.

Although others were told many fantasies, it was not targeted to change anything in their mind. These fantasies are not like fantasies acted in pretend play. The latter are aimed to move the child's development forward, for it is through them that the child develops a view of herself in relation to others and is able to try on and act out the consequences he anticipates from the imaginary relationships he creates. The patient was just trying to get an image of herself as an interesting person. She was not trying to fool others. She must fill many unwanted, inconceivable memories with comforting images. She must fill in the gaps because otherwise the other dismisses her story. She does not wish that others would change their behaviour as a consequence of her “lies” (“it was having something to say”). It is as if she needs others to believe her story, so she could believe it too. She embroiders something, which is not real in her mind. It is not really embroidering since it is not distorting something which was real and true, but magnifying fragile images of herself in a fantasy-real world. It is not clear whether she is able to distinguish between ideation and perceptions, as it is most adversely affected in psychotic states and conditions. It is most unlikely for her to construct the boundaries between self and object representations, which in normal development gradually become stronger and both kinds of representations progressively are based more on perceptual and self-perceptive data. The confusion between inner and outer world gives way to her experience: “I feel like I lying all the time, a lot of the time”.

Subsequently, she clarify how possible it was to develop a concept of lying
Interviewer: Can you remember lying to her?

Subject 111: Only in a sense that I made up stories from school because I didn’t feel that I could really tell lies to her because I thought she knew I was lying. But I thought I could make up stories like that. If she did she never said. I don’t remember her. Oh I do remember her calling me liar I can’t remember what it was about. If I didn’t say exactly what she wanted to her I was lying anyway as far as she was concerned.

This patient’s elaboration impressively reflects how altered subjective sense of reality of the self, along with disturbed self and object representations have been manifested in her life.

Subject 113

A similar form of immature lying is demonstrated in the next example. Lies aim to establish the truth. In an extract of an interview with another borderline patient, she refers to emotional abuse she had suffered by her foster father, one of three, a father who had been also reported as sexually abusing her.

Subject 113: It was so sad, we were so scared. My sister was cold and they used to send us out to the cold to play in the snow for certain amount of time, no matter what, and I remember they said (imitating her father’s voice) ‘Half an hour walk’. So we went out and it just stretched the worry. And when we got back we really got punished for the two of us having managed to rip her (her sister’s) new ski suit. I don’t even know if I am lying or if I am telling the truth about every thing I told, about this family. They were so cruel, and you know, kind of crazy, what they did and what happened (crying). They were so cruel and I’m thinking that I make it up? They sure were really so cruel.

Interviewer: So you don’t know whether it really happened, whether it is the truth?

Subject 113: Or whether I am exaggerating? Oh, no, these things did happen, all the things I told you, but you know, hmm, I am not sure that I am... It is not that I am lying but is it really the truth? Am I saying what really happened? Or I may be exaggerating to make sure you understand. Because you weren’t there every day, so if I tell you one little
thing you might think it was nothing. So I have to make sure you understand (crying). I mean such an awful life... I remember having been punished by that, very vividly thinking what...

This patient is aware that she has no access within her own mind to what is definitely an accurate representation of the truth. She is possibly in a dissociative state, so that she just does not know. She then has the false belief that in order to be taken seriously, in order to be believed, she has to exaggerate. She must fill in the gaps because otherwise the other dismisses her story. The other’s belief in her story is a critical part of her belief in her story. By seeing the other believing her she becomes to believe herself. This is part of an infantile pattern. The patient does not seem to have independent psychic reality apart from the one that she shares dyadically with the other person. She has got to make the other person believe so then she knows what the truth is. She cannot reflect within and see what is the truth and what is not the truth. The reason that she cannot lie in the strict sense of the term is because lying is paradoxically there to establish the truth. She lies to have thereby an inner truth. The inner truth does not exist within her and can only exist as part of the interaction with the other. In other words, she knows what the truth is in general because it is something one believes. She then thinks, if she believes something, it must be true, and then she can believe it. Her psychological self does not have integrity, and it exists as part of a joint entity with another mind. An inner dialogue of the same order like: ‘Let me tell this story to myself and see if I believe it, then it is true, and then I know what the truth is’ would probably be more normal. The process is not going on in her mind but has to be done through another person.

Subject 205

This patient’s mother is portrayed as a lying object. Lying is connected to the experience of her mother who was engaged in many fights and rows with the stepfather and who promised to leave him but never fulfil her pledge to the patient.

Subject 205: I don’t know, I can’t remember anything specific at the moment. I remember one time being-, I was in the kitchen in our old house and I remember telling my mum, I ’t
even remember what we were talking about and I remember screaming at my mum that she was a liar about something and running out the room and her running after me and belting me on the arse but um, I don’t remember what that was about, er god I don’t know. Er, I wouldn’t look I mm- that’s always- ... Yeah, what I would said is I would mind about as far as lying is concerned um would be more the sort of thing – remember when we used to have really big fights and stuff with my step father, usually in the middle of the night, you know usually with everyone screaming at each other and kicking each other and whatever else um I’d be you know, I’d be getting really upset and crying and all this crap and I remember very clearly quite a few- I mean one time in particular but I remember other times um, you know crying and crying and being really upset and thinking I didn’t want to live here and I want to – I have to have any more of this and um I remember saying to my mum you know please please I don’t want you know I don’t want him to live here with us any more and my mum saying oh it’s all right it’ll all be fine. I can’t remember if she said if he would go away or if she’d kick him out or you know we would go somewhere but she said one or the other and I said to her no we won’t cause you’ve said this to me before, you’ve said this “yeah yeah it’ll be fine you know we’ll get rid of him” whatever else.

The first thing she remembers is being hit for calling her mother a liar, seemingly associating her mother’s double bind messages. “It’ll be fine, we’ll get rid of him” and “he’d go away” are linked with the fact that he did not, that promises are unfulfilled.

In order to survive, she must keep in some compartments of her mind the delusion of good mother and the delusive promise that all the terror and pain and hate will be transformed into love. Her mind is split into contradictory fragments to separate the bad from the good. We observe the establishment of isolated divisions of the mind that provides the mechanism for a pattern in which contradictory images of the self and of the parents are never permitted to coalesce. Since she could not understand what was done to her, her mind is unable to deal with, to work over, what is not understood and what may not even be allowed to register. The absolute need for good mothering makes her believe in the promise that her mother will be good and rescue her, and to believe that she must be bad.
Interviewer: But as a child, what would you think? Why would she put you into believing that it would be changed?

Subject 205: Yeah, um, I don’t know, I find it quite confusing and I didn’t think of it as anything sort of malevolent I just didn’t know- I didn’t understand at all and I couldn’t find any way to understand it because I did know that my mum cared about me and stuff like that but then again pretty bizarre equation you know, my mum cares about me so much that she brings me up in a house where, you know, I get completely undermined about everything and get the shit kicked out of me, do you know what I mean? It doesn’t balance but I can’t find another way to balance it. But I didn’t ever think that she was doing it just to spite me or doing it cause she hated me or something like that but I didn’t understand, maybe she just didn’t care enough or maybe I wasn’t worth protecting or maybe she just wanted to calm me down you know say what I wanted to hear and beyond that who gives a shit, beyond that we just carry on and we’re helpless. I always got the impression from my mother that things happen to you, I think probably to do with the situation with my step father that things just happen to you and you can’t do shit about it, you know? So you might as well not try.

She is now unsuccessfully trying to construe a reasonable understanding to her mother’s broken promises. She momentarily has the capacity to think of her mother’s mind as a separate one: “...or maybe she just wanted to calm me down you know say what I wanted to hear”. But this knowledge is bound to be fragile: “beyond that who gives a shit, beyond that we just carry on and we’re helpless”. The ultimate conclusion is that she could not understand the relations between external events and internal states “I always got the impression from my mother that things happen to you, I think probably to do with the situation with my step father that things just happen to you and you can’t do shit about it, you know? So you might as well not try.”

She then spoke about her lying. She was trying to uncover it unsuccessfully. Although it feels she acquired somehow a clear definition of lying, by the end she manifests her inability to perform a mature lying.

Interviewer: Can you recall other incidences or other...?

Subject 205: Lying. Um, ... I remember lying to her but I can’t remember her lying to me.
Interviewer: You remember lying to her?
Subject 205: Yeah, I remember going through a phase where I'd never quite tell mum the truth, I can't remember, stupid things, must've been when I was about 6 or 7, yeah. Um, and I used to always tell her, I can't remember, there was something to do with money I just remember and something to do with ... I can't remember but it was stupid things sort of half lies not kind of proper lies sort of like twisting, you know, twisting things for my own benefit a little bit, or saying yeah, twisting things a bit to get my own way, I think it's stupid ways because she found out about them. I remember having a big argument with her and her saying that I was always telling half the truth and I was making other bits up that suited me. I can't think properly, I can't remember it properly, I just this-there was something about something to do with money and something about this girl Nامل and I can't remember it properly. It's always a bit funny about lying though because I remember my friend used to ask me if she could come to my house after school and so I said I'd ask my mum and instead of just saying, no I don't want you to come to my house I'm doing something or just saying my mum says you can't come, I went home and I said "oh, can Nامل come to my house, say no" so that I could go back and say my mum says no without having lied to her, stupid but.

When trying to tell part of the truth and adding something else from her own imagination, she is probably engaging in fantasies. It is questionable whether she lies for her own benefit, or whether she is "making other bits up that suited me".

In fact she could not give an example of any active lie. She told her friend she would ask her mum, and in her mind she planned to ask her mum not to let her friend come. Although having the idea that lying can be used as a potential method to change her friend's behaviour, she could not actually lie. In her mind, it seems that she knew she did not want her friend to come, but she needed her mother to say that she would not let her. It is possibly that within her own mind she could not represent herself as a lying object, as a bad object. What was in her mind?

Interviewer: So what was on your mind when wanting to tell this lies?
Subject 205: I guess I just didn't like lying I didn't think it was- I just thought it wasn't something you did if you weren't a horrible person but at the same time I don't know why
I just didn’t say I don’t want you to come to my house today I’m doing something so I suppose it was wanting to be a horrible person without getting the flak for being horrible.

We certainly could not expect her to clearly recall instances of lying as long as she feels that she is a horrible person, that lying is equated with being bad. Within her mind the wish not to let her friend come meant that she wanted to be a horrible person. Now we understand that when she intended to lie, she was not interested at all with her friend’s mind. Lying is equated with rejection which in itself is equated with being bad.
In the next extract, she explains lying as an aggressive behaviour. But, still she is reluctant to give any clear example of lying. It is impossible for her to get a mature concept of lying.

Interviewer: Do you remember incidences where you lied to your stepfather?
Subject 205: Um, I’m sure there’d be lots, um, I just don’t know. I don’t know. Don’t really know. With him it was really a case of you can tell him whatever you like just as long as you don’t get caught. It was what can you say to keep yourself out of trouble.

Interviewer: mm-hm, for example?
Subject 205: I can’t think of examples. I mean it was just a question of dodging the bullets you know. I think it was more like that when I got older, cause when I was younger I would be quite truthful with him I think that was more when I was older, when I was younger I was quite truthful and them when I got older I was more into dodging things. Plus I don’t think, er, I don’t think – it’s just self-protection. I’m not onto lying and things I’m just a truthful person and erm, but then again there’s some people that don’t deserve the truth, such as my step-father who doesn’t deserve anything I mean why should I tell him anything but I wouldn’t give a shit about telling him a crock of absolute crap because he isn’t worth anything more than that and you know there’s certain types of behavior that- well, you get what you deserve if you behave like that towards people.

It seems that this patient could not commit herself to facts or reality. She mainly communicates her disturbed emotional state. For her, lies are not means to change other’s mind and behaviour. It is just “telling a crock of a crap”. With the realisation of being lied to, she developed a sense of being devalued and betrayed. It follows that lying, when
perceived as an injury, may be perpetrated as an aggressive act. One may lie to another person with the belief that the other does not deserve the truth and with the feeling of contempt that the other is not smart enough to decipher the lie.

The interviewer tried to get some examples of lying.

**Interviewer:** Can you think of an example?

Subject 205: Umm. I just can't think of any examples and my brain doesn't work all that brilliantly when I want it to. ...You know and that pisses me off / sorry? / It Name I pisses me off cause I can't / because you can't connect it to any real experiences? / Yeah, partly that and partly because I just can't um, .. You're asking me for something that I've agreed to – you know, just by being here I've agreed to give you and I can't do it and I'm not doing it. These kind of, like reneging on my side of the bargain. And I suppose partly cause – oh, I dunno, doesn't matter.

But it's annoying because I know I've got a thousand and one self-protection strategies um because they are so unconscious, it's like I can't stop them when I want to stop them they're there when I don't think I need them I can't stop them which is really annoying actually.

She possibly felt being pushed to illustrate was an assault. She could not bear being a horrible person, not communicating what she was supposed to deliver, not being able to tell the “whole truth”. This was unarguably her sole truth. Thus, she felt that her own truth was rejected by the interviewer. She expressed her difficulty in making comprehensible what was going on in her mind and the terrible helplessness this caused her to feel. She could not conceive of herself as a person with various feelings and thoughts in the past and present. For just as she could not conceive of psychic processes of her own from which to draw in describing herself, she could not understand that objects, or in this case the interviewer, did not have an immediate knowledge of what went on in her mind.

In such as state, lying can not properly develop. It is most likely that when she previously referred to “always telling half the truth and I was making other bits up that suited me” it was basically her inability to distinguish between various feelings and to associate them with certain actions.
In some interviews, when being asked to bring up memories of deception at home, patients chose to talk about experiences of sexual, physical, or emotional abuse. For them, lying, is comparable with the experience of abuse rather than with other occurrences.

Subject 206 was sexually abused by her stepfather for a couple of years. An extensive piece of the interview is presented, in which confusion between perceptions of truth and deception, reality and falsehood is clearly prominent.

The patient was asked to recall instances when her parents withheld the truth from her. She replied:

Subject 206: Probably, but I can’t remember. I can’t think of incidents, I can’t think of anything actually. I find this part really difficult because there are things I can’t... I don’t want to remember, I’ve chosen not to remember.

Interviewer: Right, OK. (silence)... so maybe we can discuss it from another perspective, such as observing other’s lying. Whether parents lied to others, or that father withheld the truth from mother or vice versa.

Subject 206: It must have happened, but I can’t think, you know, I can’t think, it feels, when I’m thinking about that, I could feel that I’m getting upset and I don’t know why, and it’s because I can’t remember.

Interviewer: Right, OK, and...

Subject 206: Can’t even remember them talking to each other, not to mention lying to each other. You know, and I was just there, in the house, but I’m not anything, you know what I mean.

Interviewer: Hmmm.

Subject 206: I don’t really have a role, so how can lying come into it, you know?

Interviewer: Hmmm (silence)...

Subject 206: I feel pretty useless about it cause I can’t help you.

Interviewer: Well, I understand. Maybe we can talk about it from another perspective. People do lie, and lying is part of our life, children lie, parents lie, I lie etc. I don’t know of people who don’t lie. So, I would like you to think of instances when you lied as a child either to either your parents or others.
Subject 206: I suppose that when people ask you if you’re OK and you are not OK, and you say you are, it’s a lie, isn’t it?

Interviewer: Hmmm.. What do you think?

Subject 206: Yeah, I think it’s a lie. That’s the most obvious lie I can think of. That’s the most obvious lie I think of. It’s if people would’ve asked me if I was OK, I have lied the whole time, because I never was, but I said “Oh, yeah, I’m OK”.

Interviewer: Hmmm.

Subject 206: So that’s quite devious.

Interviewer: Hmmm. And do you remember specific instances when you would say that you were OK.

Subject 206: Well I used to say it to my old psychiatrist all the times, when I was 13 I was lying. It was sounded OK even if I wasn’t, I knew I was lying.

Interviewer: And why did you decide to lie?

Subject 206: I really didn’t want to talk to her about it.

Interviewer: To talk to your psychiatrist?

Subject 206: Yeah, I really didn’t want to talk to her, and if I’d say that it was OK, then she was just... thought she would leave me alone. So...

Interviewer: Hmm. And what was her response?

Subject 206: She used to say to my mother “if she’d been like that all day, it suits me like that”... yeah.... hmm. And she ...(unclear).... The all week, you know?

Interviewer: So, it worked, isn’t it?

Subject 206: Yeah... If you say you’re OK people usually do that.

Interviewer: But then you weren’t feeling OK?

Subject 206: I knew I wasn’t OK but I just meant to say it. I just didn’t want people to ask me any more questions, and I would say that “Oh, yeah, I’m OK”.

Interviewer: Hmmm... Any other lies that you can remember, as a child?

Subject 206:(long silence) Hmm... Probably millions of lies..... (long silence). Can’t really remember.

Interviewer: Maybe you can remember lying about rules broken, or misdeeds?

Subject 206: I suppose it’s like saying: “Did you move the newspaper from the chair?”, and you say: “No”, even if you did.

Interviewer: Hmmm.
Subject 206: It's a lie, isn't it?

Interviewer: Hmmm.

Interviewer: And you did that for your own protection otherwise you would have been slapped around your head, so, you say, you know.

Subject 206: So there were probably millions of lies in my childhood. And it's probably millions of lies now, really...

Interviewer: Hmm.

Subject 206: And I'm pretty a devious person, so (laughing).

Interviewer: we may talk now about what seems to be your current "lies", I mean for example those lies that you already mentioned...

Subject 206: Oh, I tell lies here, you know.

Interviewer: Hmm.

Subject 206: (laughing loudly) Yeah, practically it's really funny but I'm feeling that when I don't want to talk to the staff and to be sounded OK and....

Interviewer: Sorry, I couldn't hear you?

Subject 206: I say it to the staff, "I'm just, I'm OK" and it means leave me alone, basically. But I lie cause I'm usually not OK, I'm never OK and I'd never been OK, for 25 years, for the whole of my life, really, so I am... So how well I am now? So, I say I'm OK. And if they would say: "Do you like doing stuff" I would say: "Yes" but really I'm lying cause most of the things I don't like doing, so you know...

Interviewer: Hmm.

Subject 206: I tell lies on quite many occasions, without even realising that I'm telling a lie.

The patient was being asked to recall memories of deception and she firstly was unable to get access to such memories of deception. She then reports she has chosen not to remember, implying that there has been some unbearable trace of experience, some unbearable truth in her mind which is disavowed (I can't... I don't want to remember, I've chosen not to remember). There is direct association between lying and feeling of being upset, but an inability or resistance to locate specific memories associated with feelings of being upset (when I'm thinking about that, I could feel that I'm getting upset). She needs the interviewer's assistance to overcome this obstacle. In fact, at that stage, she clearly
communicates her wish to dissociate from such memories. Thus unveils a subsequent internal state. She has not got a sense of real being, a real sense of self (You know, and I was just there, in the house, but I'm not anything). Then she talks about her relationships with caregivers and the wish to negate her absent state of mind. She is immensely uncertain about her inner world. She hesitates as to whether negating a supposedly internal state (the feeling of being upset) is a kind lie. She is quietly right in her doubt since lying can only exist when there is a clear knowledge about one's own thoughts, beliefs, feelings, a clear sense of oneself. When the doctor asks her whether she was OK, she feels or believes that she is not feeling OK. So, she assumes it is a lie to say that she is OK. But she doesn't know what is wrong with her or what the matter is, and she can't give a meaningful answer. She believes that people do not like the truth, the truth of having memories of experiences of abuse, the truth that people don't like to know the truth. In the context of her sexual abuse, it's undoubtedly, that she is speaking the truth. Because her truth is unbearable, she senses that somebody else's mind couldn't take the truth of hers, so she is forced to a state or quasi-dissociation where she has to ignore her own internal states in order to salvage the mental state of the other. She is not telling lies in the mature sense of the term, in wanting to create an impression in somebody else's mind that differs from reality. She just wants the questions to stop. She says: "I really didn't want to talk to her, and if I'd said that it was OK, then she was just... thought she would leave me alone." She doesn't know what her psychiatrist has in his mind. She just imagines the psychiatrist would leave her alone. It is probably through a simple learning process that she associates her negation with a certain relief. This associative learning process is illustrated when she recalls that her denial when moving the newspaper from the chair is a result of having been slapped around the face when admitting it in the past.

To sum up, for her, lying is activated just in the simple instrumental immature mode. Punishment is behaviourally associated with telling the true account of events and avoiding punishment is behaviourally associated with denying the true account of events. Her lies are aimed to fulfil her wish to escape from an unbearable, and not clearly defined internal states. She does not have the intention to manipulate the other's mind. The mature mode cannot be employed since the fragmented self either has no access to the actual internal state, or repetitively dissociates from the unbearable truth.
Subject 209

Subject 209 was brought up by her grand parents. Her mother did not want her. The father was unknown.

Interviewer: Do you recall experiences with your grandparents when they lied to you or they withheld the truth from you?
Subject 209: Um, the only- the only thing that springs to mind really, obviously, well not obviously but I mean as as one might expect like all the children in my class at school, all the children the same age as me, all lived with their mums and dads er which is like the normal sort of thing, and they always used to be asking you like um, why do you live with your grandma and grandad and not with your mummy and daddy? And all this you know what I mean and like so I went home and like "why do I live with you and not with my mum and it's like um "oh well you see when you were born we went and saw you and we thought ooh what a lively child and we said ooh can we have her" and erm that was the answer so one presumes from this that if that scenario is true, and I don't think for one moment that it is that um me mother sort of said "yeah you can have her I don't want her" you know what I mean so erm –

Interviewer: But then you were at school and what you were saying?
Subject 209: I don't think the ques-, I think what I always said when I was erm when I was asked this question at school, I mean I didn't just said to them oh well my mother and da-, my mother and father got divorced before I was before I was erm very old when I was, soon after I was born they got divorced so my grandad erm like I went to live with me Nan and grandad and erm well this is what I would tell them but I assumed it was true. I assumed it was true but that was something I dreamed up myself. I mean like people do they make sense of things and I just assumed that they must have been married at one point, you know what I mean? But I don't know they weren't as it goes. They weren't married.

Interviewer: Mm-hm and when you told the children that your parents were separated um what do you think the children would have in their mind? What..?
Subject 209: Don't know
Interviewer: You don't know?
Subject 209: No.

Interviewer: Mm-hm so what was your intention then?
Subject 209: How do you mean what was my intention?

Interviewer: Well in terms of..
Subject 209: Well it was just an a-, they ask me a question and I suppose I just gave them-, I made sense of-, I thought that was right. I thought that was true, I assumed it must be true

Facts and fabrications are merged. Her grandparents told her that the reason they brought her up was because she was a nice baby. She told children at school that her parents were divorced. She assumed it was true. She dreamt about it. She was not trying to manipulate the children’s minds. She was trying to make sense of things.

Interviewer: Do you remember any other lies? I mean...
Subject 209: What? Like fabricate you mean? Um... Um.. No not really.

Interviewer: Mm-hm, what's the difference between fabricating and lying?
Subject 209: Um I don’t think there is one, I think it's the same thing isn't it? More or less.

Interviewer: With fabricating, what you mean? You mean to...?
Subject 209: Well I think the word I I would have used if I'd been thinking properly is confabulating. Confabulating I think are stories you actually believe yourself like you find that people with dementia confabulate and they actually believe what they’re saying it just makes sense of something that didn’t make sense to them and I think that's what I did pretty much is confabulate

Interviewer: Right, mm-hm,
Subject 209: I mean I don’t um never have been one for lying at all, you know what I mean I’m pretty honest.

She even voluntarily gives her definition for lying. Lying is used in the service of making sense of the implausible. She could not understand her mother’s mind who forcefully rejected her. The fabrication does not represent a plea for sympathy. This subject was
resorting to fabrication as a means for not dealing with otherwise painful or potentially traumatic material. Unlike fantasies, which comprise of a synthesis of memories and percepts into a mental image of a person or thing which is not present, and of an inner world of mental representations as opposed to the external world of sensory perceptions, she resorts to mere fabrications, which she totally believed.

Subject 214

This patient speaks about the revelation that her mother was in fact her stepmother.

Interviewer: So now, when you are thinking about it, what do you think they had in mind, when they kept on concealing the truth?

Subject 214: Um, yeah, I do sometimes wonder why they didn't tell me and I think it was because I mean I think if my dad could relive that day then he wouldn't have told me. Um, I really don't think that he ever wanted to tell me. I think he was just hoping that I wouldn't start asking questions or become in anyway suspicious and that we'd sort of be a family until we all sort of reached old age.

Interviewer: And why do you think he wouldn't have liked to tell you the truth?

Subject 214: Because I think he finds it very difficult dealing with relations and family matters and problems I mean work problems and anything like that he can handle without a problem at all but I think emotional matters I don't think he can cope with at all.

Interviewer: Right, are there any other instances when either he or she withheld the truth from you or lied to you?

Subject 214: I can't really think of any instances. I'm sure they did, I mean it's very difficult to get any information out of... and when it does come out it tends to be very twisted and sort of mutated. You didn't really take it as a gospel truth.

Firstly she explicates how confused it was to know that her mother was in fact her stepmother. From her answer, on the one hand, it is difficult to differentiate whose mind she refers to, her father, who is hoping that his girl wouldn't ask the question or the girl who is hoping that was not the truth? Whose fantasy it was that "we'd sort of be a family until we all sort of reached old age". On the other hand, we could also interpret that the
patient has understanding of the link between her father's mind ("sort of be a family"), his deceptive behaviour (concealing the truth) and the behavioural consequences ("I wouldn't start asking questions or become in anyway suspicious"). Thereafter, she speaks about "information that tends to be very twisted". She uses the term "mutated" to illustrate the experience of having been grown up with her father whose has got constant altered representation of reality.

She then gives an example of her father's lying, or the twist of the truth.

Subject 214: The end of that year there was a possibility of going to Place 1 grammar school, which I thought was great um, you know, I was a bit surprised, you know, that they were willing to see me for an interview. I went to the interview, I did okay, but at the end of the day I wasn't acceptable to them, um, and I asked my dad why had had this interview with a grammar school um, and why hadn't he tried to enrol to this before because the school was only up our road, it was only now that he'd managed to arrange it, um, and he he didn't have any problem at all about telling me that he was going to offer them a very good deal on some computers if they would accept me into the school. He had no idea how that would affect me at all, I don't think I really did at the time either.

Interviewer: So he was quite open with you?

Subject 214: Yeah, I mean he was almost proud of the fact that he was able to negotiate this deal with the headmaster um and as a result try to get me into the school, no qualms about that at all.

She conveys her experience of her father who was conceived as a lying object. Outwardly he would act as if he protected her, but in her mind, she felt his indifference, and much more, she felt as if she was a used as a means to fulfil his narcissistic wishes. It was not twisting the truth, not falsity of propositions that she experienced, but the genuineness of her father that was in question. She depicts herself as growing up in disappointment and suffering with objects that purport to hold her, but instead, agitate and confuse him, that purport to discriminate, but instead 'swallow everything'. On the other hand she was also aware that her primary object's false facade was an attempt at outward composure at least
in part out of concern for her. Her primary object was not in this and many other ways a total fraud.

She then was asked about her lies.

Subject 214: My lies weren't very interesting or glamorous or anything just small petty lies to get me out of trouble.

Interviewer: For example?

Subject 214: About fighting with my brothers, um, it tended to be whenever I was sort of infringing on any of their space or belongings or causing any trouble to anyone else, including her (her stepmother). If things went missing I was always the first person to be asked where it'd got to and a lot of the time it was pointless even denying it. I think the lies got bigger and bigger about taking time off school and saying how things were going in school.

Interviewer: So let's discuss one or two examples.

Subject 214: Well, I wasn't really lying to both in a way when I used to take time off school. I used... very often I would just say what they wanted to hear.

Interviewer: What sort of things?

Subject 214: Things about how things were going at school and whether I liked where we were living at the time, quite often I didn't... Mm, my dad especially I mean he used to tell me things about work and how many more people he was employing and how much money he was bringing home and stuff, I'd say it was really good I was really pleased for you dad and I wasn't really interested at all.

She starts describing a common instrumental lying (“just small petty lies to get me out of trouble”). She speaks about bigger lies. It seems, again, that the concept of lying is there: “I used... very often I would just say what they wanted to hear”. But subsequently, she confuses hers and her father's mind. She speaks about herself as a respondent to her father's assertions, and in the end: “I'd say it was really good I was really pleased for you dad and I wasn't really interested at all”, where just before she spoke about her unconcerned father who put a false facade of being interested. She is aware to the distinction between inner reality (not interested) and external communication (interested).
and a motive (to please). Her lying is linked to her deep doubts about communications, which she fears must overwhelm her and her objects and express lies rather than truth.
As the interview continues, she refers to her ‘active lies’ -

Interviewer: Mm-hm, and what were the lies about school?
Subject 214: Well the lies about school was that they assumed I was going to school whereas a lot if the time I just- I was taking 20, maybe 30 days off a term /
Interviewer: And then what would you
Subject 214: I would go home and spend the rest of the day in bed
Interviewer: Right. And then?
Subject 214: I mean looking back then I didn’t realise how seriously depressed I probably was
Interviewer: Yeah , and then you would stay in bed for the whole day?
Subject 214: Yep, or watch a bit of Telly or cook some food
Interviewer: Yeah, and then?
Subject 214: I’d go back out for half an hour and pretend I’d just come back from school.
Interviewer: Right. And you would pretend?
Subject 214: Yeah I would just come in and say- well we didn’t really speak much anyway so I would normally go up to my room
Interviewer: Mm-hm. Right and...
Subject 214: Well there was one time when I just got in from school and I was going up to my bedroom and I looked in at my dad's bed and he was in bed because he’d been drinking because he was (tape cuts) I was in the house so er, I sort of went into my bedroom and sort of pushed the door to because he would very rarely come into my bedroom anyway, um, and then I went to sleep for a couple of hours and then I remember waking up and seeing that he wasn’t there and that the car had gone and so I went out, came back again and then assumed everything was okay said hello to my mum, blah blah blah and then a couple of hours later he would come back. He’d still be drunk because in that time he’d gone to the pub but he’d told my step-mum that he’d been at work.
Interviewer: So he lied to her?
Subject 214: Yeah.
Interviewer: Most of the things you did were not telling them the truth or pretending, right? Pretending you were at school when in fact you weren't there.

Subject 214: No well it wasn't actively telling lies.

Interviewer: So when you returned home that afternoon pretending that you came back from school, and your stepmum was at home, what do think she had in mind then?

Subject 214: Um, I wouldn't know because when I got home from school we never really talked um I wasn't really interested in what she'd been doing that day either, she wasn't particularly interested in what I'd been doing. I just went up to my room more often than not, got changed and then went out again. I sort of - told them very little about what was going on with me and I didn't give them a chance to talk about what was going on for them.

Interviewer: Let say that you got home, and she would think that you were in school and you were pretending being at school. So what was in your mind then?

Subject 214: What was in my mind? I can't actually remember, I was constantly preoccupied with having time off school. I mean after she did find out I would just go in for the register every morning get my name ticked off by the teacher and then go and that way the days wouldn't tally up.

Interviewer: Right, so you needed to conceal the fact that you didn't go to school, so lets think that that you had in mind the knowledge that you were not allowed to stay at home or to take any days off, right?

Subject 214: Well there was nothing to hide because she wasn't interested in where I was going.

Interviewer: But you hid it in a way, so you had something in mind that you felt you needed to hide.

Subject 214: Yeah, oh yeah, I knew I had to hide it because I knew I'd get in trouble if I told them.

Interviewer: You'd get in trouble? So I understand that it was a lie in order to avoid punishment?

Subject 214: Yeah, I mean the fact is they never asked me how my day's been at school. They must have automatically assumed I'd been at school all day. Even if they'd asked me I'd have said I'd been because the fact was I wasn't really lying because they never asked me where I'd been all day.
As expected, there is a swing between manifestation of a theory of mind lacking of the capacity to mentalise.

This subject moves from self to object. She communicates a confused, enmeshed, not distinctly conceptualised and emotionally charged state of affairs. In few occasions, the interviewer had to reflect upon the subject’s mind to move from actions to thoughts and reflection. Within her mind, she sensed her indifferent father, abusive stepmother, their falsehood, and the false facade. She was also pretending, it seemed, to provoke her parents. But, this behaviour (going in for the register every morning get my name ticked off by the teacher) was performed when no object was at sight. As if the motive was not clear. Was her stepmother interested or not? No clear linkage between stepmother internal state and her external responses is detected. Apart from instrumental lying, it seems that she mostly is playing deceptive behaviour, which ultimately cannot and does not take into consideration the other’s mind.

Subject 218

This patient is presented in length. The next extract describes the first section in the interview, which illustrates the developmental process through which the patient underwent as a child, and in the here-and-now, with the interviewer, when confronted with the questions about her deceptive parents.

Interviewer: Okay, now what I would like to discuss today is a related to deception and lying. This section is about memories of events when you felt that your parents withheld the truth from you, didn’t tell you the truth or even lied to you.

Subject 218: um, ...... {long pause} ... I’m trying to think of some sort of examples. Like I know the feeling, erm, ... , a feeling what I was expected to feel rather than what I was feeling, so er, I’m just trying to think of an example...er...like when I broke my collar bone I can remember feeling physical pain and because my parents were both rowing about whether or not they shouldn’t or should take me to casualty and my, my father was basically saying that I was making a complete fuss over nothing and it wasn’t really hurting me and I
was getting into a state about nothing really I can remember thinking, you know, how can he say that? I feel physical pain, my arms are sore... and I remember thinking how can you tell me that I'm making a fuss because I'm the person in my body and you're not in there and how do you know whether I've got any pain in my arms or not and, you know, you never saw what I did so how do you know, why are you telling me that I shouldn't be, you know, feeling like my shoulders are really painful, erm...

**Interviewer: Okay, what do you think was in his mind when he told you that?**

**Subject 218:** Erm, I think it, erm I dunno I mean it was almost like I was being a bit inconsiderate really, you know like...

**Interviewer: Inconsiderate to him?**

**Subject 218:** Yeah like I'd hurt my arm and was expected to- cause that meant he had to put me in the car and take me to casualty and sit there for 4 hours and it would be really just too much hassle really to um, to deal with it and I didn't actually- at the time I don't remember really feeling very much about the fact that-, you know, because he was the only adult, sort of, around in my life, and my mum, you know, from sort of being around other children at school and I suppose teachers as well. You know, I doubted I mean some-... if my dad said to me something like "the sky is blue" then I don't know initially whether it's blue or pink, because if I hadn't seen blue before I wouldn't know what it looks like, anyway, if I said to, um you know, if I know it's blue and someone says to me "what color is the sky?" and I say "blue" and they say "well no it isn't it's pink" and then I sort of question whether it's blue and that's what I see or whether my dad has completely lied to me and told me the wrong color. So then I remember very gradually sort of questioning everything that he did say then , erm, ...um, ...I dunno they go to sort of two extremes and one would be to say, "if you sit down quietly and don't move your arms they won't hurt any more." so I'd sit down quietly and not move my arms and they'd still hurt so as far as I'm concerned he was lying because I knew that they were hurting

**Interviewer: And you knew that they were hurting?**

**Subject 218:** Yeah, and so then ... I don't know, my mum said to me you know, stupid things that people say to kids, you know, if you eat all your carrots you're going to have-, you can see in the dark and I'd look at her and think she was crazy.

**Interviewer: You did..?**
Subject 218: I'd think she was crazy, telling me if I ate carrots that I could see in the dark because I couldn't understand what she was talking about and I couldn't understand how eating these carrots was going to actually make me see in the dark, because I can't see in the dark because it was pitch black and whether I ate carrots or not it didn't make any difference, um...

Interviewer: What did they actually have in mind while telling you that...
Subject 218: Well basically that they were good for you.
Interviewer: That they were good for you?
Subject 218: Yep.

Interviewer: And what do you think was in your father's mind when he told you that if you didn't move your arms they wouldn't hurt you? What was in his mind then?
Subject 218: Well, I mean, I mean my answer would be different, at the time. I thought he would -, he was going to tell me how I could make things better, that if I sat still everything was going to be okay that it wouldn't hurt anymore if I didn't move and it was only when I did sit still for a while and it did still hurt that I doubted even then I can remember thinking you know, not necessarily that he was doing it in a malicious way but that he wasn't right necessarily.

Interviewer: Mm-hm so what did you doubt...
Subject 218: Well I doubted myself in the end because I actually doubted whether or not I felt anything because if he was saying if I sat still then it wouldn't hurt, then the fact that I'd sit still and it would still hurt meant that maybe I was doing something wrong or maybe I wasn't sitting still you know it must've been that you know I must've moved because it was still hurting. Erm and I suppose I mean now it was like if you sit still you're not going to sort of cause any more discomfort if you're still and if you're not going to be in any more pain or discomfort you know the chances are I'm not going to be, you know, I'm not going to have to go out for 2 hours time and take you to casualty, that is how I'd look at it now but not at the time. Um, ..... Well I can remember sort of. Well I can remember when I cracked my head open with a swing um I think I told you about this when we'd run underneath a swing, we used to do it as kids, you used to sort of all the swings out together and everyone lets go at the same time so they swing back and you run through the middle. And I did that and tripped and I sort of sat on the floor thinking that I was lucky because I didn't actually get hit by a swing cause I couldn't see any. And the thing was the swing was behind me and it came and
whacked me on the back of the head and I had, erm, I think it was about 4 stitches in the back of my head and my mum wouldn't go to casualty with me.

Interviewer: She wouldn't?

Subject 218: No, so I went with my dad and I remember going in there and the only thing about it I can remember, er, is just desperately wanting to cry and I couldn't because every time I got close you know got close to tears I was, you know, I was told that I was a very brave girl and you know I was that I didn't need to cry because I was a big girl and you know "you're being very good" and you know, "you know you're being a good girl by not crying." And if you cry it's almost like sort of you know, sort of like you're being bad. And I can remember just having these stitches put in my head and the whole time I sat there I can remember only thinking about not crying and that was it, and then I can remember sort of after, I can remember that night in bed when I was really had a lot of- when my head was really sore, erm, feeling that it was okay to cry because I knew that it hurt and that was why I wanted to cry but I also knew that if I had cried and people had seen me then I would be not sort of doing what people wanted me to do, I'd be sort of like you know making a mess or you know making things look untidy. erm, and I can remember being sort of l- at the time I don't think I thought my dad was lying or you know I really thought that if I didn't cry that I was going to be okay. and I didn't think, you know, you just don't want me to cry because you just can't cope with it or- but it was more just you know kind of, before you go to school or before you start spending quite a bit of time around other people and not just your family, initially you do feel like your parents are God really and what they say is true. And it's only really when you get other people on the scene that they sort of do things differently or react very differently. it's only then that I can remember that I questioned how I saw things really. And what happened when I did that was that I sort of, er, I can remember my parents saying you've got to do this way because that's the best way and then I'd perhaps see someone doing something a different way but I still wouldn't know which was the right way erm, so, I didn't actually feel that my parents were lying but I did actually feel that what they thought was the truth wasn't what everyone thought in the end.

Interviewer: As the truth?

Subject 218: As the sort of, like if my dad said to me "don't cry because you'll be being really good."

Interviewer: It was lying.
Subject 218: I didn't feel it was a lie I felt it was the way that people coped.

Interviewer: How do you think of a lie?

Subject 218: And then when sort of like I'd be upset at my friends or something and they didn't spend loads of time trying to stop me crying, then I would think well, I'm still okay and I cried. And I didn't actually think my dad was lying I just thought that he did things differently. Because I think if I had thought that he wasn't doing things that were with my best intentions, I think I would have hated him a long time ago. um, but I think I didn't just- I think I went from believing in him wholly to sort of feeling a bit sort of insecure because I didn't know if I could trust what he said, um, and I suppose that progressed to sort of feeling frightened because what I did feel wasn't solely what I was supposed to, um, which made me trust my parents even less.

The patient recollects childhood memories in which she questioned her own internal physical state. She found it difficult to maintain her own physical experience as part of the sense of herself. She doubted it repeatedly. Internal reality, internal truth, and in her case, natural physical discomfort is disavowed. Her capacity to normally develop a genuine apprehension of the links between internal states and external representation is being impaired. Internal states are equated with the object’s representation of these states. This subject-object merged state is equated with lying. Without a theory of mind, the patient’s responses to the thoughts and feelings of her father remained insufficiently differentiated. Without sufficient reality appraisal reliably to conceive of fantasies and feelings as mental rather than actual her sense of herself remain diffused. The father’s inclination to deny his daughter physical pain is translated by her as a lie. For this patient, the discrepancy between her internal state and her father’s representation of this state forms the foundation of lying. Could it be defined as a mature lying? From the patient’s experience, the father’s intentions and beliefs have not yet been recognised. Moreover, the ground for lying might have been based on a reverse direction. It is not the case of manipulating the mind which affects subsequent behavior but vice versa, manipulating behaviour affects subsequent internal states.

Before being exposed to other minds, she really thought that if she didn’t cry that was going to be OK, and in her mind it was her own fault. Subsequently, a different representation of her father emerges. Her view of the object’s internal state emanates
more distinctly. Father’s desire becomes clear and salient. It feels there is less fusion with the object and it has got its own mind. She understands that “dad didn’t want her to cry because he couldn’t cope with it” and it implies that she understands he has got his own mind which is different from hers. We observe the evolution in the capacity to represent the other as psychically functioning. It was his wish to reject her internal states because he couldn’t cope with it. ‘Wholeness’ is given to the object through an understanding of the processes that provide an account of the object’s actions in the physical world.

Subject 225

This interview shed light on a developmental process through which the patient, as a child, found it difficult to achieve the capacity to have a TOM.

Interviewer: This section is about your childhood up until the age of about 16. We can just think up until that age. Thinking back about your childhood, okay? Do you remember times when either of your parents withheld the truth from you?
Patient 225: Well my mum hid the fact that my father was- that my stepfather was alcoholic, you know, she used to make excuses for him
Interviewer: What would she say?
Patient 225: She would just say he'd gone out shopping or gone to get a newspaper and he'd be gone like- we'd be in bed and he still wouldn't be home. That's like on the nights she wasn't working. Sometimes she worked at nights. And then in the morning she would say he's got a headache and he'd be in bed.
Interviewer: That he'd got a headache?
Patient 225: Yeah and it was a hangover really.

This part describes her initial reaction associated to the experience of her mother who wished to conceal the stepfather drunkenness, and possibly other related events. Subsequently, we understand how the experience of chaotic relationships associated with being overwhelmed with violence brought her to be less able to link external events with mental states.
Interviewer: Did your mum have any other instances or occasions or things that either your stepfather or your mother withheld?

Patient 225: I remember once they were in the kitchen cooking Sunday dinner, which was stew, we didn't have roast dinner then and he threw the pot of stew across the kitchen floor and we had no dinner because they were rowing in the kitchen and told us to keep out of the kitchen and told us to keep out of the kitchen and go in the living room. We just - I don't know if I was with my brothers now or what happened, I just remember he threw a pot of stew.

Interviewer: At her?

Patient 225: I don't know if it was at her. It was on the kitchen floor. She was screaming and we ran in, she didn't seem as if she was wet or anything and it was just on the floor we had no dinner that day.

Interviewer: And then, did you ask mum or him what was happening? What..?

Patient 225: Well I suppose we knew they were rowing but we got told not to ask questions and to mind our own business and shut up and be quiet.

Interviewer: And how is this related to withholding the truth?

Patient 225: Well it's hiding the truth isn't it?

Interviewer: In what sense?

Patient 225: In not explaining what's happening, you know, we got frightened because we didn't know what was happening and they never told us what they rowed about, they just seemed to keep rowing.

Interviewer: So, what were you frightened of?

Patient 225: I suppose him harming her, and not having a mum.

Interviewer: Anything else that comes to mind?

Patient 225: I suppose we most probably thought if we got involved, we would be hit, by my stepfather.

Interviewer: And did he hit you?

Patient 225: Erm, not in their rows but he did hit me yeah, I told you he hit me with straps.

The child's experiences her self being overwhelmed with fear of aggression which might lead to annihilation of the self. She depicts her basic incapacity to understand other's mind: "we didn't know what was happening and they never told us what they rowed about, they just seemed to keep rowing." There was no explanation to potential and real
aggressive acts, which left the child with the experience of horror from within and from without. On the hypothesis (Klein, 1952); (Bion, 1962) that an infant has an innate preconception of a good object, which will feed, clean, warm him, etc., and also receive and transform for the better his communications, that is, understand him, then, if actual experience falls too far short of expectation, the infant may doubt if the object is a true realisation of his innate preconception.

The fragility of achieving a mature sense of TOM is manifested when she refers to her mother’s mind in fusing instrumental and mental terms:

**Interviewer:** Try to remember some kind of lies or times when you had to withhold the truth from either mum or your step-father, I mean-

**Patient 225:** Well there's lots of little lies um, because we was never allowed to take anything from the cupboard, we always had to ask permission not like kids of today and if you took a couple of biscuits that was stealing and um, we or I used to say that it wasn't me when it was me but I said it wasn't me so I didn't get blasted.

**Interviewer:** So, when you took out some sweets or something like that,

**Patient 225:** Biscuits.

**Interviewer:** Biscuits, mm-hm, right and it was a kind of daily thing?

**Patient 225:** Sort of after school we'd have a couple of biscuits but she'd always know and I'd say no it wasn't me must've been my brother.

**Interviewer:** And what do you think when you told her that it wasn't you and it was your brother, you'd blame him, um, what do you think mum would have in her mind? What did she think?

**Patient 225:** She used to hit the lot of us to get to the right one.

**Interviewer:** Um, what do you mean? Can you describe your situation?

**Patient 225:** My brother would say he didn't do it, Jane must've done it and I had 2 elder brothers and she used to like slap us round the back of the head the 3 of us or bang our 3 heads together, and she used to say if you don't tell me the truth I'll have {can't hear} the three of you after supper.

**Interviewer:** Right, so what do you think was in her mind when you told her?

**Patient 225:** She used to be furious for the sake of taking a couple of biscuits.
Interviewer: When you told her that it wouldn't have been you, what was in your mind?
What did you think of?
Patient 225: I knew what the consequences were going to be because I'd done it several times and um, don't really know.

Interviewer: Don't really know what was in your mind when not telling the truth? Patient 225: Not telling the truth because you didn't want to get hit but you was hungry so you had to take food, and it was either bread or biscuits.

Interviewer: But you called steal-
Patient 225: If you were caught it was stealing but you know we just took it because we were hungry but to her that was stealing because we hadn't asked for it.

Her mother's mind is firstly associated with actions. When asked about her mother's thoughts she replied: "she used to hit the lot of us to get to the right one. After elaborating, and being asked again the same question she answers it differently: "she used to be furious for the sake of taking a couple of biscuits" possibly linking mum's beating to being furious, thus linking external behaviour to internal state. Referring to her own state of mind, she says that: "not telling the truth because you didn't want to get hit but you was hungry so you had to take food, and it was either bread or biscuits". She is thus introducing her desperate state of affairs. Basic needs are discarded, eating is equated with fear of aggression and lying is then equated with stealing. Both serve as means to escape mum's anger. We assume that her attempt at protect herself from the traumas of her early life must have included a profound identification with the thoughtless state of the original abusers. In the next section the patient is trying to, what seems to be a manipulation of her mother's mind.

Interviewer: Then you got hit indiscriminately I mean all of you.
Patient 225: All of us.

Interviewer: Right.
Patient 225: Because no one owned up. But that wasn't the only um, lies I told like when I told you I fell through the ice and I went home with one shoe. I told my mum I was pushed under the ice by some boys but I'd- I went on there on myself and fell through the ice but because I didn't want to get hit I told her that they made me do it.

Interviewer: That they pushed you?
Patient 225: Yeah.

Interviewer: And what happened then, I mean..?

Patient 225: Well, she hit me with the remaining shoe and I went to find the other shoe but I couldn't get on the ice.

Interviewer: Right, so what did you have in your mind when you told her that you were being pushed by others and that's why..?

Patient 225: Just to er, make her feel sorry for me because I'd lost my shoe. And- but it didn't work, she hit me as well.

Interviewer: Why would she be sorry for you if you told her..?

Patient 225: Well, that some bullies had got hold of me and made me go on the ice and when in fact wasn't true I went on myself.

Interviewer: And when you told her that you'd been pushed, what do you think was in her mind?

Patient 225: She was most probably angry about having to buy me some more shoes.

The patient is trying to manipulate her mother's mind. She knew it was her who had lost the shoe and she was trying to make her mother feel sorry, possibly having in mind the causal link between feeling sorry and anger or violence. She recurrently is faced with the experience that mum's state of mind is determined, immutable. Overwhelmed fear of reprehensible aggression, from within and from without, she is desperately communicating, what she define as lying, which was in fact the wish to impose her own feeling of shame, guilt and rage onto her mother. Being asked about her own mind when lying, she gives an illogical answer: "to make her feel sorry for me because I'd lost my shoe". It should have been "to make her feel sorry for me because they made me do it". She definitely could not alter her own thoughts in a way that it would fit to the 'supposed' other's mind.

Subject 226

This subject was added to the experimental group although, initially, she was recruited and interviewed and assigned to the control group. Her diagnosis (using the SCID-II) revealed a personality pathological pattern. It was interesting to find out that in her interview, the same fragile concept of lying, which was revealed in the previous analyses,
was discerned.
Initially, she portrays a poor and loving family. No lying or withhold of truth is memorised.

Subject 226: No, nothing. I mean hmm, they were always very... I mean one Christmas when they couldn’t afford to buy us any toys, and my Dad had gone to buy some old bike frames and stuff like that, paint them all up, rebuilt them, anything like that, and it was a thing that he was very good at, he’d paint them up and rebuilt them and all the rest of it, mine was black and gold and my sister’s was black and silver and they were going to be our Christmas presents, and I think about two weeks before Christmas there was a bill coming and they had to sell both of them, but they actually said to us, you know, it was discussed and anything.

The wish to get attention using exaggeration and fantasy is built-in within this subject’s lying. The use of fantasy lying is probably to escape from painful traumatic experiences and also to magnify others’ attraction.

Subject 226: The sort of thing will be like, say if you were at school and somebody had fallen over, I’d so and so had fallen over today and they’d say: “What happened?” and I’d say: “Ohhhhh, he’d cut his knee and the bones, here they are (showing the broken bones visible on the skin) but also elaborated on everything, everything was dramatic, with things like that. I remember my Dad coming to school to talk to the teachers about that and they’d said that it is just a sort of active mind...but it was just her mind... Cause my Dad said she doesn’t lie, she tell stories... she exaggerates all the truth, take just the first line and that’s the truth and the rest of it is just building up on it.

Interviewer: And what was in your mind when you exaggerated, or when you told, for example, that story about the broken knee?
Subject 226: I think it was just (unclear)... Cause I had people’s attention and I’d say: “Look, I’m here, this is me....” Take that as me, and that was one of my ways to get people to see me.

Using the term exaggeration implies that a true representation is possible, but not always
accessible. Exaggeration begins as the genuine expression of an emotion or an attitude but the accretion of manifest distortions reveals that the purpose has imperceptibly changed, and there finally is a gross disproportion between the situation and the affect.

She felt she needed others to see her. She was driven to enhance her feelings of worth. She was trying to acquire a sense of being through the invention of stories, based on true facts, producing reality which was a creation of her own imagination. Identification with the victim is prominent.

Subsequently, the interviewer asks her about recent events of lying.

Subject 226:........ I can’t really think of anything, I think I’ve just blocked them out....
hmmm........ Oh, there was a fire about a year ago, or a year and a half ago, something like that, I suppose it was a fire over the road from were I live. Well I was actually on the phone with my sister at the time and I said to her: “Oh look, there is a fire outside”, and she said: “Oh tell me what’s going on, what’s going on”, and I said and it was only like five boys I suppose, and by the time I finished there was a full riot (laughing loudly)... you know and she sort of said:” Oh God, it’s funny I can’t see any sirens or anything, and I said: “No, you can’t”. So she said:” So what was actually going on?”, and I said:” Oh, from your flat you can’t observe the fire”. But I was actually telling her all sort of things.

Interviewer: And when you told her all those sort of things what do you think she had in her mind?

Subject 226: She knew I was telling the truth.. I was telling stories, she knew it, cause she was.... I think I had done it because she was just about to hang up the phone, and I think probably I was just trying to keep her talking a bit longer, you know, so I had made up the story.

Does she have a clear understanding of her sister’s mind? Confusion between facts and fiction, self and object is evident: “She knew I was telling the truth.. I was telling stories, she knew it”. She could imagine that it was difficult to see the invented scene”. But when distorting her known truth (“it was only like five boys I suppose”) she did not consciously have her sister’s mind within her mind. It was just an impulsive reaction. It is most likely her overwhelming experience of neglect that she is defending against. She possibly forced herself to believe that her sister thought it was the truth. It seems that she did not have
clear apprehension of her sister’s thoughts and feelings. Telling stories (“I had made up the story”) are linked with actions rather to mental states (“to keep her talking a bit longer”). There was no intermediate mental state.

Her inability to take others’ minds is observed in another example.

Subject 226: I mean there was one point, it was in cookery class and we were going on a day out somewhere, and the teacher just said: ”Anyone who can’t go” to let her know. And I said I couldn’t go and she said: ”Why not?” And I said for some reason I don’t know why I said: ”Cause I have Appendicitis”. Anyway the reason why I didn’t want to go was cause I had got travel sickness and I didn’t want anyone to know that I’d got travel sickness. Anyway then I stayed home and a couple of days later I got flu, and I wasn’t allowed to go to school cause I wasn’t well, and the teacher dropped my Dad up cause she was concerned with the fact the I’d got Appendicitis, and I was going to the hospital, so when I wasn’t in school she thought: ”Oh she must have gone into hospital” so she rang up my Dad to find out how I was and this is all she’d found, she’s at home bla bla bla, and then she’d thought she didn’t got appendicitis she had got the flu, and it’s over. A little while later he’d sort of say to me: ”Why did you say that to your teacher?” and I said to my Dad: “No.” And he said: “You do know and why did you say that?” and I said: ”Cause I didn’t want to go to the trip”. And he said: ”We didn’t know you weren’t going to the trip. And I said: ”But if she knew why, it wouldn’t save me the trouble of sickness and all the rest of it. And he said to me: ”So when you go back to school you’ve got to tell the teacher that I got that message”. And it was so hard to go to that teacher knowing that she now knew that I’d lied to her.

Interviewer: And again I’ve got the same question - when you told your teacher you had Appendicitis did you think she had in her mind?

Subject 226: She was probably worried I had sickness, that I had Appendicitis (laughing). And I mean I was only little and definitely didn’t know what Appendicitis was (laughing), it was probably a word I’d heard on the Telly or something…. (laughing).

The reason for lying is clear. The subject elaborates on her state. She clearly knows what was in her mind, but she fails to take her parents’, sister’s, and teacher’s minds. She is aware to the fact that Appendicitis was just a word. It meant nothing to her.
Fantasy lying is probably used without a mature concept of laying, that is, without the capacity to maintain other’s mind and to understand the difference between hers and others’ thoughts, emotions, beliefs etc. Her concept of lying is fragile.

4.2.2. Control group

Subject 952

This subject could not remember his parents withholding the truth from him. Being asked about his own lies, he recalls a time when he stole a rubber ball.

Subject 952: Oh sure, I once, when I was quite small I stole a rubber ball from a shop and of course Mum saw me playing with it and asked where I’d got it from, cause I’d never have money of me own in those days. And then I had to tell her and she was very cross. But funny enough I then asked: ”Well, should I take the ball back” and she said: ”No it’s OK”.

Interviewer: So you didn’t tell her you’d stolen the ball.

Subject 952: I admitted that I’d stolen it straight on, but I didn’t volunteer.

Interviewer: So what was in your mind about not volunteering?

Subject 952: I didn’t want to be found out as a thief. I didn’t want her to know that I’d done something that she had told me I shouldn’t do. She always told me I shouldn’t.

He has got a clear understanding of the process. It is not the fear of punishment that motivated him. He did not want to be caught as a thief by his mother. He did not volunteer that he stole it because he knew was in his mother’s mind - not liking him, doing things that he should not do. He then illustrates the same mental process, giving another example.

Interviewer: Right. Was it the same about drinking as you mentioned earlier?

Subject 952: Ahhhhhhh.... Yes I kept quite about that.

Interviewer: So what was in your mind in keeping quite about that?
Subject 952: Hmmm......... I actually even now I felt that Mum was quite hard on me. I quite liked having an approval, I quite liked being a favourite, and I didn't like her to know that I was doing something that was illegal. And didn't see any reason to tell her either, it was none of her business, that some of us got up to that's all.

The significance is in the clarity of the representation of his mother's mind: "I didn't like her to know that I was doing something that was illegal". There are clear boundaries between self and object: "I was doing something I knew was illegal and I did not want her to know about it."

The interviewer then asked him about other instances where he told lies to others.

Subject 952: Oh a lie...... A lie...........................................(long pause). I can't think of much but I suppose there's an occasion when I was.......... I had an insurance claim made against me, a road accident. And I did my level best to try and make it like it was the other motorist's fault. When I think it was pretty much my fault, and also trying to prove as much possible that he'd cause the damage as well. Or that they caused more damage than they did, just trying to make it awkward for them. That's the only thing I can think of. The only other thing is...... in the union work without actually lying very often cover up things and avoid saying certain truth.

Interviewer: Such as?

Subject 952: Particularly it's important to present a group of negotiators as a team and make it appears to the members that we're all working together and supporting each other. It gives big confidence when it comes to an industrial action or whatever. And also it gives us a competitive advantage over parallel unions in the same business. Where as an actual fact there was some almighty fallings out and some people, senior people would eat each other throats. We can talk about it amongst senior union reps but trying not to say it to ordinary members. It just rocks there confidence, the thing that there is a problem. So I would often cover things up, like that. There was one guy in particular, well he was a full time officer, and he would say completely insincere things, complementary to me when I knew he'd really hated me, but in public he would be nice about me. And similarly I would play down the difficulties that where between the two of us... to the
general membership, and I would sort of say that it has been sorted out now, that it is all right when definitely there was still a problem.

Speaking about the insurance claim, he uses the expression “to try and make it like it was the other motorist’s fault. When I think it was pretty much my fault, and also trying to prove as much possible that he’d cause the damage as well.”. It is clear that for him it was a “to make it like”, so it was not the facts but altering the facts in their minds that was in process.

The next paragraph distinctly illustrates it. He speaks about presenting and representing ideas and thoughts. He analyses it from various perspectives: members of the union, senior people, ordinary members, as well as from different situations: “he was a full time officer, and he would say completely insincere things, complementary to me when I knew he’d really hated me, but in public he would be nice about me”. It is more about pretence that he is talking rather than genuine lying.

Interviewer: So when there was still this problem what did you have in mind?
Subject 952: Hhhhhhh...... It was important out of loyalty to the organisation to first try and bury the differences as they were, and secondly, to make it appear that we had buried what differences there were in order to maintain confidence in the whole the organisation together.

Pretence is the operation of make feelings and thoughts appear not as they really are in other situations. He uses the verb “to bury” to depict the wish to hide differences. It gives a vivid image of that that is seen and that that is covert.

Then he recalled a genuine lie.

Interviewer: OK, is there anything else that you can think of?
Subject 952: I once... once cheated on a girlfriend, no often did I have the opportunity to do so (laughing) I hmm... an opportunity arouse one weekend to see somebody different and... So I.... I can’t remember what lie I told my girlfriend. I can’t remember whether I told her that I’ve got my dates wrong and that I have to go work, or what it was, or whether I double booked, I was going to see my parents or something like that... but
whatever it was told the lie, went off with this girl for the weekend and when this girl had
gone to France after, I saw my girlfriend again and I had to tell her... and the funny thing
is that she knew (laughing)...

Interviewer: And you don’t remember your exact lie?

Subject 952: I think that I told her that I either got the date wrong and that I had to work,
or that at short notice my shift had been changed, and I didn’t have the date after all,
cause I knew I’d have the Saturday and the Sunday off and we planned to do something
together and I had to get out of that to be with that other girl instead.

Interviewer: So what did you have in mind when were telling her your excuse?

Subject 952: Hmmm... I didn’t want to hurt her feelings, I didn’t want to lose the
relationship, but I didn’t want to lose the opportunity of having this weekend with the
other girl.

Interviewer: And what did you think was in her mind?

Subject 952: I think she was very practical. I think she.... Realised what was up, but I was
also fairly confident that she would still have me afterwards, and she was right.

Interviewer: And was it that you were feeling like that when telling her the lie, or do
you think that it is your analysis?

Subject 952: At that time I was very nervous, because at the time when I didn’t want her
to see through the lie, and I didn’t want to miss the opportunity with this other girl, and I
didn’t want to lose the relationship with my girlfriend, either.

Interviewer: So what did you think she had in her mind?

Subject 952: Well, I thought she’d believed me. I thought I carried it off quite well
(laughing).

Interviewer: So she believed that you had something else to do?

Subject 952: I told her that. I thought so and when I confessed her afterwards she told me
she’d worked that out anyway (laughing loudly). I always assumed that she was smarter
than I gave her credit for. I don’t think that she said it afterwards as a sort of defence
mechanism to hide her feeling or something like that because she was an open person,
and there was no sort of reaction, there was nothing unprepared about it, there was all
very confident as if she knew down well what I’d been up to. She dealt with men playing
this trick before and she could tell when the man is lying, and she could tell when it
matters that a man is lying, or whether it doesn’t matter.
When he is asked to describe what was happening in his mind when lying to his girlfriend, he gives three sensible reasons: not hurting her, maintaining the relationship with her, and not losing a desired opportunity. But it seems that he is somehow confused when being asked to communicate his girlfriend’s mind. He gives what the interviewer thinks is the subject’s own projected thoughts.

**Subject 966**

This subject seems to be less reflective than others in the control group. It is manifested in the way she retrieves memories of deception. The first lie is a common teenage one.

Subject 966: Just say "oh, oh yeah, we got back about 11 o'clock. I never lied about where I was staying but more probably about where I was going. if I was going to a party then I'd lie about that.

*Interviewer: Mm-hm, and what would you say?*
Subject 966: That I was going to the cinema.

*Interviewer: Right, and what was in your mind when you told them that you were going to the cinema?*
Subject 966: Well, the thing is if I sort of told my dad I was going to a party with a friend then sometimes he wouldn't let me go, so rather than being not able to go I'd lie and say that we were going to the cinema instead and that I was staying at a friends house, which I was but, oh they knew I was staying at my friends house. I wasn't going to say I was going to a party, something like that.

*Interviewer: Right, and what do you think they had in mind when you told them that you were going to the cinema?*
Subject 966: What do you mean, what? I suppose they thought I was telling the truth.

*Interviewer: Right so what would they have in mind when asking you where are you going? What would they think?*
Subject 966: Oh I don't know. um, maybe they thought I was going to a party. Well I don't know why they would think I was going to a party, maybe they would, maybe they thought I was lying to them, I don't know.
The subject thoroughly reflects upon her own mind, but less clearly on her father’s. She links her father’s reluctance to let her go out with a friend to a party, to her urge, to go to a party, and presumably, understands that he will accept her staying in a friend’s house, which was actually true. She tells a lie by omission. When referring to her father’s state of mind, she responds astoundingly, as if it is quite banal for her. Firstly, she assumes they believed her story (“they thought I was telling the truth”), and then she becomes doubtful about that (“maybe they thought I was going to a party”). It is likely that she finds it difficult to acknowledge the differences between what she is sure was in her mind and what she failed to consider her father’s mind. It is also likely that conceptualising others’ minds is a difficult task for her. It confuses her. In this state of affairs, ambivalence prevails.

Then she speaks about a more recent lie.

Subject 966: Uum, I lied to Namel before we got- well, before we got married when I was seeing someone else at the same time I was seeing him. so I suppose I lied I mean he knows the truth now but I did lie about that. I kept it quiet for about 3 months. He asked me.

Interviewer: Right, yeah, so what was in his mind when he asked you?
Subject 966: Um, I suppose because we'd been - he lived in Place1 and I lived in Place2 and we didn't see a lot of each other. And maybe my behaviour was a bit odd on the phone, like that so he suspected. And I lied to him a number of times saying like "oh, don't be silly."

Interviewer: So what would you say when he asked you?
Subject 966: Oh, I'd say don't be silly basically and "who could I possibly be seeing?" and "you would've found out by now by family" and stuff like that, you know, just cover it up.

Interviewer: Right, so what was in your mind when you decided not to tell him the truth?
What was in your mind? To tell him that he was silly basically?

Subject 966: What was in my mind?

Interviewer: Yes, what was in your mind.

Subject 966: Well I didn't want him to know so basically I lied.

Interviewer: Right well then try to think of why you didn't want him to know?
Subject 966: Well I didn't want him to know I suppose because I didn't want him to split up with me but I wasn't sure about the other person so that's why I lied in the first place. I was afraid.

Interviewer: Again and what do you think that he thought when you lied to him? what was in his mind?
Subject 966: Um, he probably didn't know whether to believe me or not believe me basically. He wanted to trust me but I hadn't done anything else before for him to distrust me anyway so he might have believed me but then he might have been thinking 'well we're so far apart, I don't know what goes on when I'm not there' so,

The same process occurs when trying to think about these lies. She perfectly understands her motives. When firstly confronted with the question about her boyfriend’s mind she gives a clear linkage between her behavior (maybe my behavior was a bit odd on the phone), her thoughts about his internal state ("so he suspected ") and behavior (questioning her about seeing somebody else), and her response ("oh, don't be silly"). When she is pressed to think about her husband’s mind, she gives two alternatives. She delineates a clearer description of his mind. In retrospect, it sounds that when she actually lied she did not really take into consideration all those alternatives, maybe since it was evident for her. But on the other hand, although fragile, she has got the capacity to hold and maintain other’s mind.

Subject 970

The subject gives many examples of lying. She speaks about a row with her brother about whose right it was to watch TV. Then she describes lying to her mother that she was there the first, or lying about not having done homework when asked, or denying breaking something in the living room, or lying about going to other places which her parents would forbid her to go.

The extract presents her response when she was asked about her mother’s mind, telling the lie that she was the first to watch TV. She is speaking in her mother’s voice-
Subject 970: Ugh, oh, hmm, they're fighting again, you know, this is ridiculous, it's only TV, something like that, knock it off

Interviewer: Okay and then what did you have in mind?

Subject 970: Um, well number one, I think, the truth is we were lying about- like before the lie is even told I think the truth is we're fighting so we're in trouble anyway, so I'd better win {laughs} cause otherwise I'm in big trouble, if I'm the one who caused the fight then we both shouldn't have been fighting, ha, you think, I'm not going to be the one to get in trouble for us fighting right now, cause my mother hated us fighting its just, yeah, hated that so I knew the fact that we were fighting was bad but the fact that one of us it was an avoid- oh, you know the fight could have been avoided 'cause we know the rules, and basically I didn't want to be the one

We could assume that for the subject, as a teenager, watch a specific television program was definitely indisputable. She could differentiate her feelings about it from her mother’s thought: “they're fighting again, you know, this is ridiculous, it's only TV”. She refers to her awareness that she was lying when she said she was the first to be there. For her both inner and external realities are evident. Then, she gives a flowchart of her mind:

“We are in trouble anyw a^I'd better win otherwise I am in trouble. We both knew the rules. I do not want to be the one who is in trouble.”

And later she was asked again the question about her mother’s mind.

Interviewer: Anyway, try to think of yourself as the child there what do you think mum had in her mind? After you told her that you were first in TV.

Subject 970: Erm well she knew one of us was lying and she would probably know who it was 'cause she would have probably heard the TV and it would show, it was on, whose show it was so she would have either, you know, I guess either said well, well she would never say that I knew that G. was watching it first or anything like that she would never say that's not true, I don't think she would say that, she'd just say er something like "G. has this hour, you have the next half hour" or you can have this half hour if you want or you can have the next- you know.
The differences between the two minds are unequivocal. She delineates the links between her mother hearing the TV sound and knowing whose show it was. She did not experience her lying as unacceptable by mother. It is not just that she has the concept of lying but lying seems be also feasible. It is also her humorous way of describing her lying that gives it a light flavour to the idea of discussing this subject, not to mention to employ deception.

Subject 971

Interviewer: Do you remember times that your parents withheld the truth from you and you knew it as a child? Or even lied to you?

Subject 971: Yeah, my brother was 1 year old when my parents married and um, my parents always I was about 16 my parents always celebrated their wedding anniversary as if it was either 1 year or 2 years ahead of what it was and they'd be saying "oh, yeah, it's our 10th wedding anniversary" when it was only their 8th or they'd say it was their 12th when it was only their 10th so that was quite a big lie that they purposefully carried on for our benefit.

Interviewer: What do you mean for your benefit?

Subject 971: As in um, you know when we sort of celebrated their wedding anniversary they'd be saying to us this is our paper - you know every anniversary has something associated with it - so they'd be purposefully saying it was 2 years on so we wouldn't know that Name1 was born before they got married.

Interviewer: What was in their mind?

Subject 971: Probably they wanted to give us a sort of moral, you know all the moral things they were teaching us as we were growing up say that, if we- if we knew that they hadn't married and, you know, Name1 was actually quite old when they had married that we might think that they were hypocrites or perhaps we might um, I dunno, yeah, probably the hypocritical part, you know, in order to pass on morals perhaps they thought they must be very moral themselves.

This subject gives some explanations for her parents’ lying. In her mind the lie is aimed to protect the children, to pass on moral values that are in conflict with actual behaviour. She also links between the lie itself and the parents’ belief that “perhaps they thought they
must be very moral themselves”. Lying is equated with morality, where morality is surely a representation of her parents’ beliefs.

Subject 971: A recent lie, you mean like nowadays. Oh this is one I told to my mother recently. I was at my boyfriend's house on Friday night and my mother phoned on Friday night quite late about 10 or 11 and I wasn't in. And my friend (another one) said "oh, I'm not sure where she is, um, we'll leave a message for her to phone you back." and I didn't get back in until the Sunday because I stayed over until the Sunday. And when I spoke to my mother I said I hadn't seen Name2 or Name3 so they hadn't passed on the message so, in fact it was true, I hadn't actually seen them but it wasn't because I hadn't seen them it was because I hadn't been home rather. But I sort of intimated by omission that I'd arrived home that night but just hadn't got the message.

Interviewer: Okay, so again what you had in mind before telling mum that you hadn't seen Name2 or Name3. I mean, what was in your mind that brought you to tell her what you eventually told her.

Subject 971: Um, as I said before my parents are very religious and my mother especially wouldn't be happy at all if she discovered that I was spending the night with my boyfriend. As far as they're concerned we're all going to be married in white and so the reason I lied was so she didn't know- or so I didn't have to say to her that I'd stayed over and slept at my boyfriend's house.

Interviewer: Mm-hm, right. And when telling her that you didn't see Name2 or Name3, what do you think she had in her mind?

Subject 971: Um, I think she probably thought that I'd been too busy to get back to her, because I had been working and..

Interviewer: Is that what she would have thought?

Subject 971: Oh yeah, before I phoned her she probably thought I'd been too busy to

Interviewer: So this was in your mind as well?

Subject 971: She probably thought I was too busy, yeah. But she was probably a bit anxious as well because she always gets you know, If I haven't replied by the Sunday she probably would have got, you know, anxious and tried phoning me again, tried to get through to me.
In the end of the interview she spoke about a recent lie told to her mother. She tells a lie, intending to comply with her parents' moral codes. In her mind she could represent her mother has a having separate conceivable mind. When the interviewer persists on asking whether a certain thought would have been hers and not her mother’s (Interviewer: Is that what she would have thought?) she answers, without hesitation, what she thought was in her mind (She probably thought I was too busy, yeah. But she was probably a bit anxious as well). There is a conclusive view of the definite association between emotions and actions - anxiety stirs the action of making a call phone, which in itself, compels the subject to call on Sunday.

**Subject 983**

This interview extract illustrates the process of getting into a subject matter, which seems somehow remote. The subject discloses an active mind, which is thinking, elaborating and exploring forgotten images.

She recalls her sister’s birth.

*Subject 983:* Oh you’re wanting me to actually think of things now. Gosh. There is, you said it, my sister, but you see I don’t know that they didn’t talk to us about it. I have no memory of them talking to us about it but that doesn’t mean that it wasn’t it wasn’t present. Because I can’t believe there wasn’t a conversation in the household. Certainly they must have, its just that I don’t have a memory of being sat down but I don’t have a feeling of when she came in the house of being unhappy about it, certainly as a baby it was very exciting loving so I don’t have any memory of feeling that we were deceived and angered because of that. Gosh feelings of being, deceitfulness. I honestly don’t have of them purposely withholding information or deceiving us memories of my mother being closed, but I don’t view that as purposely trying to lie to us and certainly my father has never talked about his father or but again he’s never talked about so its not as if I asked him and he’s lied about it, I don’t think he would do that. I actually think that they both are pretty honest people in their relationships with their family. I don’t have any memories, I’m so sorry.
It seems that she vividly explores her childhood memory traces of events, thoughts and feeling. Later she speaks about two incidents of lying, one to her mother, and the other to her husband.

**Subject 983:** *My first memory of I guess lying, although I'm not sure I really lied is when I hit this girl during recess so I knew I was going to get into trouble, so I didn't go back to classroom so I hid in the bushes, and waited for the bell to ring and then went home. Then my mother asked me how the day was, obviously she knew because school had called her because I had disappeared so she was, I have this memory of my mother always ironing, she was always ironing in her free time when we were growing up. So she's downstairs ironing and I come down and she says how was your day and I say Oh it was fine and she says what did you do at say Oh just played. Then she said I actually had a phone call from the school, but she wasn't angry she didn't yell at me, I don't remember being put on restriction I remember her talking to me about how what I did was wrong but how it was even more wrong for me to disappear because then everyone is worried and c, not so much that I hit a little girl but that something had happened to me and so my memory of it was, yeah I guess I lied in that I didn't tell her what happened but my memory of her reaction to it was actually quite a sane intelligent response.*

**Interviewer:** *When you told her that you played what was in your mind?*

**Subject 983:** *That I had socked this girl I and had her crying and that I was going to get in trouble.*

**Interviewer:** *As a child what did you think she had in her mind.*

**Subject 983:** *I think she probably wasn't concerned about the situation itself as it was just a normal childhood thing, kids hit each other and I'm not an aggressive person so it wouldn't be a typical part of me, so she would have considered it a fluke, sort of a situational thing, so I think her concern was more for the fact that a) I disappeared that I was so afraid by what I had done and unwilling to take the consequences in truth or trying to postpone the consequences so I think her concern was more for how I reacted to it and the fact that I had disappeared and had worried everybody, had worried the school and had worried her, although I wouldn't have known it going in there although I'm that*
she was but that before they were just waiting to see what would happen after school, and I didn’t show up so being calm about it. I’m seemed such a good girl I was so boring I always went where I said I was going to go.

As a child she told a lie without really thinking about her mother’s mind. She was defending herself from what she thought would be the consequences of behaving improperly. She knew she had socked this girl and had made her crying and that she thought she was going to get in trouble. Then, she gives a clear description of her mother thoughts (“she probably wasn’t concerned about the situation itself... I think her concern was more for the fact that I disappeared... it had worried the school and had worried her... “) and reaction (“she said I actually had a phone call from the school, but she wasn’t angry she didn’t yell at me, I don’t remember being put on restriction I remember her talking to me about how what I did was wrong but how it was even more wrong for me to disappear”) which she acknowledge are different from hers thoughts (“I knew I was going to get into trouble”), feelings (“I was so afraid by what I had done and unwilling to take the consequences in truth or trying to postpone the consequences”) and reaction (“I hid in the bushes, and waited for the bell to ring and then went home... I say Oh just played”).

Than she uncover the lies to her husband.

**Interviewer:** Can you think of any example of a specific time, a specific event when you told him you’d been with Name1 or whatever?

**Subject 983:** No I can’t because actually I don’t talk to him at all about when I eat. So. My birthday, a girlfriend took me out to lunch for my birthday, I didn’t tell him I went out to lunch. He said what did you do and I said well Name1 wanted to spend some time with me because it was my birthday, so I went over to Name1’s house and then we just talked and she gave me my birthday presents.

**Interviewer:** Fine, nice.

**Subject 983:** It would be something like that.

**Interviewer:** When you told him that you’d been to Name1’s house and got your presents, what do you think he had in his mind?
Subject 983: Nothing he would accept that at face value. That would be fine with him, which's not an issue.

Interviewer: Why?

Subject 983: Well because she’s a close friend of mine and it makes sense that she’d be with me on my birthday. A lot of times he asks questions not specifically to entrap me but just more of a curiosity, as in how was your day, what did you do and my reaction to that general thing would be to keep it very general and by saying I was at my friend’s house wasn’t lie specifically because I was at her house, we just also went out. So it’s again more concentrating on aspects of the day that he won’t find offensive or annoying and leaving out the bits that he’s going to respond to, in a way that is going to make me angry.

This subject gives a prototypic mature understanding of the process of constructing a lie. In her husband’s mind it would be normal that she was with Namel. She knows that she could concentrate on ‘non-offensive’ aspects, in his view, so that he will not ask more questions. And she is also aware to the fact that the whole procedure is for the wish of not making herself feel angry with him.
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I: Do you remember a time when either of your parents didn’t tell the truth?
S: My mother always lies always did, still does.
I: About what kind of stuff?
S: It could be something very trivial to something quite important. Something trivial it could be like she might have not done the shopping and she might have said she forgot to do it, or she didn’t have time but in reality it was that she didn’t want to do it, so she didn’t want to do it and that’s what I mean something trivial and she’d lie. Something not quite so trivial would be things like when she was having an affair she was lying and quite deceptive about where she was going what she was doing, the whole thing. Even though I knew that she was having an affair she would still lie to me.
I: How old were you when you knew she was lying?
S: I was about sixteen.
I: How do you know that she lied?
S: I know that she lied about things like her relationships with other people, friends who she broke off contact with because she would not speak to people any more and then I might bump into them and they’d express total surprise to see me and surprise about not being in contact with my mother any more. But my mother would say things like, for example, a couple of years ago we went to the funeral of this woman’s husband who had died and we went to the funeral this woman invited us back for drinks and my mother said she wasn’t going and asked her why she wasn’t going and she said the woman’s son Anton had been very rude to her at some stage, and she couldn’t quite amplify what it was he was rude about therefore she never wanted to see this woman again. Well I actually confronted Anton about it and I said what was it that my mother was upset about with you, and her said I don’t know what you’re talking about I haven’t seen your mother in years and at the funeral he said he hadn’t seen her for about three years and this was the first time he’d seen her. So when I asked my mother when Anton upset her she said oh it was a few months ago when we were there for dinner he upset me.
I: You talked about two things one which was minor and one which was major, having the affair, for you thinking about the other lies what was the worst lie in terms of revealing the truth?
S: What do you mean?
I: Who told you that she was having an affair?
S: Well I found out.
I: How did you find out?
S: I came home one day and the chain inside the door was on and I knocked and knocked and nobody came, eventually she came down and seemed very angry that I had turned up even though it was the usual time for me to come home, and she wouldn’t let me go upstairs she said you can’t go upstairs and I said why not and she distract my attention, I remember this distinctly, she tried tdistract my attention and as she was distracting my attention this bloke came down the stairs looking as if he’d got dressed in hurry. Like his shirt button weren’t done the right way so it looked like something had happened and he left and I said to my mother are you sleeping with Laand she said oh no he’s just helping me out with an assignment I was doing and I said to her don’t lie to me and she said I’m not lying and she got very angry with me and she even now lies and it’s a bit deceptive not in an outward way but Larry’s sister she’an artist, and she became friends with Larry’s sister and she gave my mum a painting that she had done. It was a copy of a Larry that she had done, which my mother liked very much and I told my mother that I didn’t think she should put it up on the wall, I didn’t think it was appropriate but still today its up on the wall. And I thought that was very deceptive behaviour because when my dad said where had the picture come from she said this girl from college gave it to me.
I: So your Dad didn’t know about it?
S: No.
I: Does your Dad know that she lies?
S: I think he knew as well because he threw her for a lot of her lies and a lot of her behaviour.
I: Now try to remember if you have an example of when you were young of a lie she told you or anyone else.
S: well the one that clearly comes to mind is when we were living in Israel and we left she had to back to South Africa because her father had died but we weren’t told this was the reason.

I: What was the reason?

S: I gather that my dad said she had to go and sort a few things out and he just said that her father wasn’t well and we spent like, about two months travelling in the car because we travelled a bit and I remember we were staying in Italy in this place, it was some place near Florence, and I remember going to Florence and saying oh Mum I’ve really loved this and its really nice and it suddenly slipped out from him that her father had died and he just said well before we left South Africa he said because her father was travelled, he travelled around the world and he said that when we left South Africa he said to me you know it was your grandfather’s last wish that you see as much of Europe as possible and he said I suppose I’m doing that now and that it came out about him dying and her going back and I felt very angry that she lied about why she was going back and why she couldn’t come with us and then I wasn’t quite sure what was happening but all I knew was that we were going to London and I wasn’t quite sure how we were getting there or anything but I remember my father didn’t say very much apart from a just enjoy the holiday kind of attitude and that was quite difficult because I didn’t know what was quite happening and it was the whole deception game with my parents in a way that the children mustn’t be told and all this kind of stuff. And eventually when we came to London my mother had come to London straight from South Africa and she’d found a flat and I remember feeling very angry because I felt that she hasn’t really said much about what’s happened with her and it’s all a bit strange what’s happening and we only stayed in London for a year and I think that was my father’s plan, he planned to go to Canada it had been a plan of his and then all of a sudden we were moving again and my parents knew but they didn’t tell us till a month before and I felt that I wasn’t being told. I wasn’t ever told the real reasons why we left Canada, never. And in fact a few years ago a friend of the families, their son, came to London he’d got a job in Boston and he was going over to Canada first and he was asking my Dad about the medical system there, because he’d got a job as some senior resident and my dad said, what came out from my Dad was, you wouldn’t want to go to Canada and he told him all about the difficulties with his work but he never told any of this to us. They said it was the climate, it was the bad winters, they
didn’t say it was because Dad was unhappy in his job. I feel that each time another story develops and I should have been told, although in was young I wasn’t that young to not understand, and I knew that the truth wasn’t being told, I knew the whole time.

I: Was it the same for your sister and brother?

S: Yeah they were told either. My brother was very deceptive. When he finished school he came home one day on his last day of school and he packed his bags and I said to him where are you going and he said to me I’m leaving home.

I: How old was he?

S: He must have been about sixteen. And I said to him tell me where you’re going. And he said well I’ve decided that I want to go back to Israel but I don’t want to tell Mum and Dad yet. So he said I’m going to go out there just for a holiday and see how things go and take it from there, anyway just tell them I’ve gone away on holiday. He deliberately did this before they came home from work. He went off and my parents were very worried about him but I was sworn to secrecy. After about two weeks he phoned to say he didn’t want to come back. But when he was asked whether he was staying there he didn’t say he said he wasn’t sure. When I spoke to him I said you must know by now you’ve been there two months and I said to him you must know how long and he said I have decided to stay but the situation is if I tell Mum and Dad that I’m going to stay here they wont want to let me because of the situation in Lebanon. So he decided to stay and after four months he was called up because we were Israeli residents on our passports.
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I: The next interview is about deception at home, mostly times that you remember mum withholding the truth from you or even lying to you. Now, one thing that I know is about your dad that she withheld it up until the age of...

P: 8 or 9.

I: It was 8 or 9 when you found it out.

P: Yes.

I: And... We discussed it a bit.

P: Yes.

I: So what I'd like you to do is just try to remember or memorise either this occasion or occasions that you could think of when you felt that mum withheld the truth or told you lies.

P: Right, hmmm, she used to tell lies by saying I was sick and not sending me to school, and then I had to take a letter saying that she was sick and that's why I wasn't at school, at it was a lie cause she was all right...

I: Hmmm.

P: She just wanted me home with her.

I: Right... and how old were you then?

P: Well, I, she did it lots of times.

I: Throughout your childhood you mean?

P: Yes, yes.

I: And she decided that you needed to stay with her..

P: Yes, yes.

I: And then she didn't send you...

P: She didn't send me to school. I used to go ...(unclear)

I: And what happened then, when you went back to school?

P: They just asked how she was and if she is all right and things.

I: And how would you respond?
P: Well... used to sort of...hmm.........hmmm..... it used to sort of made me feel left out really.. Because everyone was always concerned about her and not concerning about me.. Hmm.... Whenever there used to be school concerts, and things like that.

I: And what would you say?

P: Well I said if she was OK or she wasn’t OK.

I: And when she did it, I mean, what was in her mind? I mean when she decided to send you to school saying that it was you who had been sick, what did she write?

P: She wrote that she was sick.

I: That she was sick, which was the truth?

P: Well, well, well it wasn’t always, because she wasn’t always well.

I: All right, I see...

P: She sort of kept me home for company.

I: Hmm, OK. So the reason would be to keep you home for company?

P: That was what I assumed.

I: So at that time you thought this was the reason for that...?

P: Well yes...yes... I don’t think I thought about it at that time, I think at that time I just sort of accepted that sometimes happened.

I: Hmm.

P: But she used to... get a big moan at me if I got restless after a couple of days, if I wanted to go to school, hmm...then she then she used to get me the sort of guilt trip sort of that you didn’t love her, cause you didn’t want to be with her, that sort of thing, so.....

I: Hmm...

P: I mean other times she lies...I was a bit older and she wouldn’t want me to go out with my boyfriend, my friend. And she used to say she had a headache and she... (unclear) the chance whether she did have a headache or whether she didn’t have a headache. Most of the times I used be too worry that she might have a headache, so that she wanted the day with ....

I: And then you stayed with her?

P: Yes......

I: So again, try and think what was there in your mind when she said it, I mean...What do you think of the thing that she said she wasn’t feeling OK and that you needed to stay with her?
P: Well it I mean as a young child it used to worry me because hmm... I suppose that’s why I didn’t make much moans about wanting to go to school because I thought that if she is not well and she might be in hospital when I get home..
I: And then..
P: And then you know what I would do then that sort of thing.
I: Which might be a terribly harmful thing.
P: Oh yes, so it was safer if she said she didn’t feel well to stay with her because at least you kept tracks of things, and if you left you wouldn’t know to what you’d come back to... so there was a lot of uncertainty and anxiety about it, whether she was unwell or... or not... And I again I don’t think that as a young child I used to actually think that she was lying, I think I’d just accepted that that what it was like.
I: An now, and it might be bit difficult task to do... ham.. But try to think of what was in her mind while doing this, I mean what did she think of... while for example pretending she was sick?
P: Hmmm....
I: For example do think she knew that she wasn’t sick? Did she know that she was pretending?
P: No.
I: She didn’t?
P: No. I think she thought she was sick.
I: And... You said that probably she wanted you to stay with her
P: Yes.
I: Right, which was some thing that you thought but she didn’t tell you?
P: No, she didn’t.
I: So it was a kind of assumption.
P: Yes.
I: Any other times?
P: Well she lied about my father.
I: What did she say, when you asked her about him?
P: She said he was killed in the war and what happened, by the time I was born there wasn’t a war....
I: Hmmm.
P: So I just used to accept that. At school I used to lie and tell them he was a policeman in case the other kids would start picking on me so I said that if they didn’t leave me alone my dad would come and get them.
I: So in a way you kind of invented a person, so you had a kind of person, dad in your mind?
P: Hmm.
I: Was it just a policeman or other things as well?
P: No, just a policeman.
I: Right, OK, and did it work?
P: Yes.
I: So when you told them that your dad was a policeman they believed you?
P: Yes.... I used in just in occasions. I didn’t have any ideas of what he was or wasn’t. I never had any idea, I never thought about my father. I can’t remember thinking about my father.
I: And did mum know about that?
P: No.
I: Right, OK... I believe it was a kind of comforting for you to use this kind of. Well on my side it was sort of to protect me. I mean I could have said my big brother is in the next playground but I didn’t. For some reason I fantasised and decided that my father was a policeman....
P: I had a jumper, it was blue and I used to say it was his jumper, and that he had lent it to me, which meant that if he’d lent it to me that he was a policeman.
I: Do you remember specific occasions when it happened for example, I mean with the blue jumper, for instance, with specific child?
P: Hmmm... There was... I don’t know why they used to pick on me really, cause it was sort of only... I think it was really in the early days of my school, infancy in fact...and... Whether or not they bit me because I was on own, which made it worse, cause I didn’t have any friends really, and so they had started picking on me and the only way I could think of stopping them to pick on was me to invent something scary, so that’s what I did....
I: So then when you found out that it worked...
P: Yes
I: ...You kept on doing the same I mean.
P: Yes, I did if they had started again picking on me I used to say the same tale.
I: And did you know it was a tale?
P: .....Yes.
I: Any other memories, what about lying at home, did you lie to anybody at home?
P: ....Only sort of childhood lies...
I: Such as..
P: Something like “Which way did you come home from school, did you come by coach?” and I haven’t, I come by the woods...That sort of lies. I wasn’t really a liar...
It was just me inventing things.
I: Those kind of lying like coming back from school by the woods and not by the coach.... Was it on the way back from school?
P: Yes.
I: And you had to come back by coach?
P: Yes, and it stopped in some point and I’d walked down from there.
I: And what would mum ask you?
P: She’d say something like sort of “Did you get the coach?” and I’d say “Yes”, but if I came throughout the woods, I mean the only thing that it was that it took longer so she could have guessed that I was lying.
I: And what was there that you decided to go by the woods?
P: Cause I walked with my friends.
I: And she wouldn’t allow you?
P: No, because she said it was dangerous to walk in the woods.
I: So then when you told her that you came by coach, and in fact it took you longer, what did she think of? What was in her mind?
P: ...She just used to go a bit berserk and say you know things had happened to you in the woods, you know ..... (unclear) harm you in the woods. If I was too late I couldn’t bluff it out that I was on the coach, so she’d know I’d came through the woods because of the late time, she knew that my friends would come through the woods or used to play on the river... and then they’d get the bus, so it’d be much later because it was much later than and she would say you know, “I was worried about you... what happened to you and so forth and you didn’t care about me and all that sort of things.
I: Right. It feels that you had to build kind of boundaries to protect yourself. Can you think of other times...

P: Or when she was in hospital and I stayed with my friends, hmmm, we used to go and see my mum every day, hmm, I used to get my friends to steal some money of mum's purse, to buy sweets
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S: My Mum used to lie all the time, she used to make up things to frighten us. She’d invent stories to frighten us, like she would say that she, for instance, she met this woman the other day and Mrs so and so down the road, you must know who I mean and she’s got these two kids and there right little bleeders and anyway she was difficult so she phoned up this office and these people said if there misbehaving that much you’d better bring them and she’s had them put away and she’s glad to be without them. I’m going to do that to you. She used to make up lies like that. But my mum lies about everything, my mum lies to today. She would just make up all that kind of stuff and I mean, really, she was such a liar that I actually some of the things that I have accepted as being true probably weren’t and vice-versa. I was very confused about what was true and what wasn’t when I was a kid, because also she would say things to me like, you did that, and I would say I didn’t, and she said I did and I said I didn’t, and she would say, I saw you. And I hadn’t done anything, and I just used to think I must have done it because she saw me. I got older and thought I didn’t do it and she’d be still insisting. I mean really it’s only quite recently that I talk to my sister and be able to say she was lying about that. She just, I could never really tell when I was little, it was very difficult because she very often said she’d seen me do things or she would say something like, you did that deliberately. Something might go wrong, I don’t know, like if for instance, this isn’t lying exactly but its like if I went to the launderette and something got torn in the machine I’d say mum look and she’d say, you did that on purpose didn’t you. I’d say I didn’t and she say you did, I bloody well know you did. I used to think she must be right. So in a way that was kind of like lying to me.

S: It was so scary and its really only very recently that I’ve got out of that as two years ago when I went into treatment I thought that if I said things about her in a room like this that she knew what I was saying and she would get me, and I believed it to, because she always seemed to know these things, it was a very scary place to be because I used to think I can’t even think about hating her because she’ll know. I remember once when I was a little girl she said something, I went. She turned round and she threw this egg slice at me, and I said what. She said that’s for pulling faces behind my back. I was just
speechless, because I thought how did she know that she must have this kind of, she must know. At the time it made her so powerful, that she knew what I was thinking, and sometimes of course she did, she knew because she was able to, she was just a good guesser. It made her this hugely powerful person.

I: When did you find out these were lies
S: When I found out they were real lies I suppose when I got married.
I: Not beforehand?
S: No. Up until then everything that happened to me, everything that went on in my life, she had a kind of effect on. And it was only when I left home and I lived with my husband, he used to ... But I began to realise that she’d probably told me quite a few lies, but then that left me more confused because I didn’t know what to believe then. It left me feeling quite vulnerable and confused.
I: Why did she lie to you?
S: I just think when I first thought about it, that it was because she was quite wicked and she did it to get me. I think I’ve always felt that in a way that it was quite deliberate. It was just to get me, to hurt me.
I: What about your dad, do you remember him lying?
S: No, I don’t remember him lying at all.
I: What about you as a child?
S: I used to lie all the time. I used to just make up stories to make myself look interesting. I used to make up stories when I was at school to cover up the gaps in things that I couldn’t tell people because it was about the house.
I: Such as?
S: Just, I couldn’t really say what went on at home so I used to make up stories about how I’d met people or how I’d been somewhere when I’d not there before. It actually got worse as I got older, I mean I just used to make up lies, now I just cringe when I look at it. I feel like I lied all the time, a lot of the time. I’d lie about conversations I’d had, for no reason just to lie about them. I just used to embroider them. I’ve got a terrible tendency to do that in my head now. I have to really be aware sometimes and stop myself sometimes because I find myself going off into. But I just got used to embroidering things really and making things more interesting than
they were. I don’t remember lying to get an advantage over anybody. I told lies really so that people would like me and so they they’d think that I was interesting and that I would have something to say, it was having something to say.

S: Well I’d lie to my mum, I’d go home and say, oh you know so and so in my class, she’s got this brother and he is very ill. They’re taking him into hospital and no one’s allowed going and seeing him and they think he might die. She’d go oh bloody hell that’s terrible isn’t it. If I see his mum I’ll, and I thought oh shit. It was like having something interesting to say. Or I’d go to school and say me and my mum were talking yesterday and she said this and I said that, and it would be a conversation, I’d go between mother and child on TV but I’d made it into me and mum. Or if something happened, I don’t know, say if I cut myself accidentally I’d say I’d cut my finger and someone would ask how I did it and I would say I did it on so and so and I would say my mum was really nice and she bandaged it all up for me, well I bandaged it myself and she sat next to me and gave me a cuddle, when she hadn’t at all. It was those kind of lies bridging the gaps in things that I couldn’t tell about at home. I couldn’t say well I went out last night and my mother kicked seven shades of shit out of me. I tried saying that a couple of times but no one believed me.

I: Can you remember lying to her?

S: Only in a sense that I made up stories from school because I didn’t feel that I could really tell lies to her because I thought she knew I was lying. But I thought I could make up stories like that.

S: If she did she never said. I don’t remember her. Oh I do remember her calling me liar I can’t remember what it was about. If I didn’t say exactly what she wanted to her I was lying anyway as far as she was concerned.

S: What openly or just in my head?

I: Openly.

S: Do you mean pretended to be someone else to people who otherwise wouldn’t have known me. No.

I: In your head?

S: In my head, yes. All the time. In my head I was always a character from one of my books that I used to read called the Lone Ranger on my bike. I was always a different person in my head. Even when I was playing I was not afraid of going home. In my head I
was happy and clever. Although I actually was quite clever but most of the time I felt very stupid. I was just better, always in my head. And I didn’t have to tell anybody I was playing with that that’s who I was because it was almost like if I said it would have ruined it all. Because they would no it wasn’t true so it was all in my head.
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I: When I say the word pretends what comes in your mind?
S: I suppose for me it’s to pretend that everything is okay, to pretend that everything’s fine. Sitting down with the family watching television all very quiet watching television. You’re even afraid to comment on things on the television and in a way it feels sometimes that you should respond. It would be dangerous to say that things weren’t fine because then my father would want to know what it is and then to pretend that were getting on fine at school so he doesn’t ask us about that. There was a real need to keep my parents away from my feelings, to really keep them away.
S: Well I remember once they were having an argument at school a girl was very nasty to me at school in the classroom and she called me a tramp and said all these dreadful things and I was crying and I came home, and I was still crying and I couldn’t stop crying and I told my mother that this girl called me a tramp. She said that my shoes were not very nice and this and that and I remember my mother just dismissing saying why should you cry because they called you a tramp why should you cry. And I felt like I couldn’t take that to anyone, I couldn’t say how I felt, I felt so bad. And I remember also I had a crush on a boy and I spent a lot of time crying and I remember not being able to say anything about it to my mother, I was just sitting there feeling so unhappy. I tried with my mother but I didn’t try with my father at all. Oh yes, I’ve remembered another deception. My mother used to do Avol, this makeup thing and I started wearing makeup when I was about fifteen and I remember saying to her there are some girls at school who would like to order these things and there mothers let them wear makeup so can I take the book if they want to order some stuff. What she didn’t know is that I was ordering it for myself, and I was doing this for a very long time and then she found out about it and I got into trouble. I got told off and I had to stop taking the book and she wanted to know where I got the money to order these things. But I wasn’t having any meals at school and saved the money to buy the makeup.
S: I thought it was quite clever really. I just feel that my parents wouldn’t let us do anything that seemed to be normal, that everyone else was doing. I wanted to be the same as everyone else, so I understand it that I was trying to be like everyone else.
I: How else were you different?
S: Well the other kids at school seemed to be more independent, they seemed to have so much more freedom. They went out at the weekends with their friends they played out sometimes, they wore, I suppose, nice shoes. They just seemed to be a lot freer.
I: So would you say that stealing sweets or lying to your parents were a kind of freedom for you, or fighting for your freedom?
S: I suppose in a way, yeah. I suppose it was something that they didn’t know about
I: So if you’re talking about these things that they didn’t know when you were a child it means that they knew all other things in your life other than that. Did you feel that way, is it true?
S: I’m not sure if I felt that way at the time, I don’t know. I probably did, I mean my mother used to go upstairs in my room when I went to school, and I know she went through my things, she said she was tidying up my room. Obviously being embarrassed about wetting my bed sometimes I’d leave the sheets there because its too embarrassing bringing the sheets downstairs. I know she went through my things so it felt like they were always intruding. My father would know about it because she would tell him, she would tell him everything. There is nothing that you could say to my mother that she wouldn’t go and tell to my father. My father took an interest in my schoolwork and everything that happened at school.
S: It’s almost like even people who are close to me, don’t know how much it intrudes in my life. The bulimia intrudes into my life, they’re not aware that its every day and I get depressed every single day. I go shopping know and I have to go to different supermarkets otherwise I’d be in the same supermarkets every single day and I don’t want people to see me there every day and I get embarrassed about going down my road with all this shopping every single day. There is a need to hide it, if I could have a huge bag I could put everything in so no one could see what I’d got in there I’d do that. I’m so conscious of the fact that I’m shopping there every single day, I think that’s what it is. I am embarrassed about it. I’m embarrassed about other people being aware of it. And other people do notice, other people do notice.
I: Other people notice that you do or do you imagine?
S: I don’t think I imagine, I was in Crouch End once and there was a guy, I don’t know who he was, and he said to me, every time I see you your shopping. I didn’t know who he
was, I’d never met him before. But I do recall seeing him in the supermarket and seeing him in Woolworth’s a few times and I remember this woman saying you come here a lot, so really it’s not in my imagination. I feel like they knew exactly what I was doing. I think they knew, I think that sometimes in a supermarket that they must know that I have an eating disorder. Because of all this food and I’m thinking well I hope they think I have a big family. I don’t always have this feeling but I’m conscious of it. If I shop in the same place day in day out.

I: If they knew that you had an eating disorder?
S: Oh, it would be embarrassing, it would be dreadful.
I: Why would it?
S: Because not normal people have it. It’s very damaging.
I: So it’s the feeling of everybody all the time observing you.
S: No, not everybody all the time, God no. If I felt like that I wouldn’t leave the house. It’s not like that.
I: So what, would they observe you at certain times?
S: I feel that when I’m shopping I feel embarrassed about it, when I’m shopping. When I’m shopping for food, when I’m shopping for binge food, yes. I feel embarrassed about it yes. And it’s those times when I feel very self-conscious.
I: Do you feel the same kind of embarrassment as when you were a child, stealing the sweets?
S: Yeah, it’s the same kind of, being found out.
S: if I could be invisible and do my shopping I think I’d be okay.
I: So its just the shopping, not other behaviours
S: No.
I: What about the times when you eat?
S: Well no one sees me when I eat. Okay sometimes I can be in restaurants or McDonalds or whatever, and yes I feel embarrassed then, but when I’m at home I don’t because there is no one there to see me, so it doesn’t matter. I don’t feel embarrassed about it just me because I know what I’m doing. Sometimes I feel a bit bad about it, I feel helpless, but generally I don’t.
I: So then if you do feel embarrassed in front of others thinking that that you have eating problems, what’s the problem? I mean if
S: Because it's not, I don't know. I suppose it's because they all look down on me. They might not respect me they might think I'm just rubbish because I do this. They think it's disgusting, how can you do that?
I: Do you remember yourself pretending in your childhood playing.
S: Yeah, I remember with some kids like, cooking pretending to be like families.
I: Do you remember playing with your parents?
S: I don't remember those kinds of interactions with my parents at all. I feel like my parents were very distant. There wasn't any closeness, there certainly wasn't any hugs and kisses. I don't remember any. It's almost as if we were like that, so far apart.
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S: Intentionally only
I: You will tell me when you want to pause either intentionally or not and your reactions and I’m talking about your life throughout your childhood, coming up to when you were sixteen or seventeen and then we will move to talk a bit about the child’s blind, I mean your blind if there were any pictures. So we can start from scratch again and try to remember the times when either your parents or anyone withheld the truth from you.
S: Well my Dad, well I think I never knew what this psychic woman who she was, I mean I knew her name and she was mentioned a lot. We’d go and see her on the weekend but knowing me I’m sure we’d have asked questions but we never asked. I think they were very keen to answer all my questions, as best they could. And the first time I was in the lie was when my Dad took me to that place. I was two and a half and that was horrendous because it was just he answered all my questions. Is that deception or isn’t it.
I: What did he say? What do you remember him saying?
S: I remember he was like solid as a rock, driving and I think he was crying and we
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I: When you told the teacher that you were feeling sick what do you think she was thinking of?
S: I don’t know.
I: What was in her mind?
S: I haven’t a clue.
I: Do you think that she believed you?
S: Yeah.
S: I used to bunk off games a lot, say that I had my period when I didn’t. That always used to work.
I: At school?
S: Yeah.
I: Again, what was the reason for doing this?
S: I didn’t want to play sport.
I: And it worked?
S: Yeah.
S: That’s all
I: Tell me about the conversation about lying to me in the sessions. It’s not that I know or I think that you are lying to me, but it would be easier for me to understand because I’d like to understand what it is behind the lying. I know that people do lie. Think about your answers about to my questions. Can you think of any time when you withheld truths or not to tell the whole truth or to change some bit of the truth.
S: I don’t think I’ve ever done that.
I: Can you think of any other lies in your life. For example just thinking about the lies that you just told me at school, or trying to avoid some kind of embarrassment. Maybe you lie in order to avoid being embarrassed.
Okay so now let's move to the next section which is about lying and I'd like to know about how you felt as a child being lied or being withheld the truth from your parents.

I don't remember because I used to think everything my dad told me was the truth and the only lies that I found out later was the women he was sleeping with.

**So he lied to you or lied to your mother?**

Well, I'd ask him you know when I was getting older 'are you having these affairs?' And he'd say 'cause I'm not and I caught him a few times so I know he was lying.

**And this was after they separated? It was before that? When did you find out?**

No I didn't really take much notice about the lies because I always believed my father. {small laugh} I thought he wouldn't lie about that. / mm-hm / but my mum knew and I heard her crying.

**So you don't remember him lying to you?**

If I asked him for money, he would lie like I knew he'd got his wages because his wage packet in his pocket and he'd say you can't have this I've got no money but that was just because he didn't want me to pump myself full of sweets and that BUT always say holidays at school, can't afford it but he used to have three jobs I knew he had money. I was never allowed to go out with the class at school. Not even day-trips I used to be the only one out of the class sitting at school I was at school that day on these day trips to museums so he lied.

**Did he explain why? Why you weren't allowed?**

Just couldn't afford it that was his reason for everything.

**So believed him?**

Just thought he was a bit spiteful thought he didn't want us to have a nice time / mm-hm / he hit my mum once for letting us go on a school trip because he found out. He only found out because he changed shifts so he came home early and said where's Name1 my mum had made up this little packed lunch, it was nice and it was only one pound fifty, the trip, so...
Do you remember her lying to you

Erm, she lied through my teenage years than when I was young. I remember the lies more clearly then. This guy used to stalk me, Name2 his name was / what was his name? / Name2. And I used to glue sniff and I would lie to her and he used to call me up {?} and he used to terrorise me and I would have black eyes off of him when I was pregnant with Name, he cornered me and I had to get these community plan petty courts to go away you go and when I was about 8 months pregnant he tried to cut the baby from my stomach in the high street with loads of big knives and he’d absconded from a home visit when I met him, I didn’t know that till the police told me. And when he went back to prison for that he used to send me letters and I knew, someone told me, did you get a letter off of Name3 and I didn’t want to know nothing of it and my mum said nothing had come through the door and then one day I came across some old photos cause she has loads of photos of us when we were kids and I found all these letters addressed to me and I never read them because I didn’t want to read them but I couldn’t have kept it to myself, I was really abut I shouldn’t been going through her stuff but she said she was doing it to protect me so then and then I found out that she lied to me for years that she didn’t know if my dad was my dad she because my dad was in that prison and he came home this week-end and she was having an affair with this other guy and as a result of this weekend, she didn’t know if it was my dad or this other guy I come out later.

How old were you when you found out?

About 20 because er we were talking about this uncle Name4 who used to come round and my mum had a big smile across her face and I said ‘what was it between you and Name4? What was it did you have an affair with him cause I know you did, I feel you did and I remember because he come round one day and I run up to him because he used to bring us sweets and everything and jumped on his lap and give him a hug and I’d always feel comfortable sitting on his lap and my dad started crying and I remember the row and him saying you know she looks more like him than she does me and I called her about it loads of times and then Name5 told me outright that mum wasn’t sure because Name5 her father died on a motorbike and that’s why my mum and dad got married and I could be the result of this weekend not being my father’s who I know as my father / mm-hm / but it didn’t matter to me because it was my father brought me up all these years.
And when you were a child did you have any, any reservations, any questions?
I always wondered why he loved me more than the rest, he always clung onto me, I just thought it was because I was the youngest but there was more to it, especially when Name4 was around and about my dad would say ‘come on lads lets go out in the car’ and leave my mum and Name4 to it in the house with my sisters out so it was only clearer over the years before Name4 died that there was a possibility that this man who I really got on with could have been my father but I just left it because I just didn’t want any more torment and if he was my dad he was my dad but my father brought me up. My sister went through years and years not talking to my dad saying you’re not my dad. My dad died in a motorbike accident but she was only 16, - 6 weeks old when my dad and mum were married so she shouldn’t have said that to him / right /
Well then it feels that your father just when you got hold of it, some of the lying or some of the reasons

Well my dads a born liar, the reasons- / but you didn’t know that when you were a child / well, because we’d all sit there, the kids from all the neighbourhood would all sit there just to listen to his lies. The stories the man would tell that he’d been in Vietnam and that he’d been- he was- he was a chef on this big liner with all these crews and Jesus Christ the lies that that man told. And he really believes his own lies, really believes in them

And did you believe his lies?
I suppose when I was little I did it’s just that it got really way out as we got older like how could he have done this when he was that age and I’m saying to him ‘all those years you lied to me and I believed them things you told me’ and you would have been about ten dad if you’d have been in Vietnam, no, just stopped my father so..

And what were his other lies?
It was just all stories basically, about him having 16 brothers and one sister where my mum told me he’s got one brother who lives in Place2 , never met him / and how many sisters? / uh? None. {laugh} but I would believe all that because I thought my dad would tell me the truth and that but he trained in the truth because the things my dad did- he trained as a police officer and a security guard and I knew that was a fact / how did you know that was a fact / because that was his job and that was his uniform when he used to
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come home from work with another puppy. And we used to go and watch him train as he was a dog handler I think, the other it was just bullshit

And why do you think he made up stories?

Maybe to look bigger, better, I dunno, maybe he was just born a bloody liar. I mean he tells my son all these stories and my son goes yeah pull the other one my son does not believe a word he says so but they’re quite funny some of the stories.

Try some, give me a funny story.

Oh so many stories, er, it’s always ‘in the jungle..’ he was walking through this swampy thing and there was this big snake and it wrapped itself around his entire body and he was fighting for his life and this crew they tried to pull him out and they couldn’t and he had to fight and so I said to him what’s your fucking name? Tarzan? And he says it’s true it really is true and then he shows this scar he’s got on his body, it’s like, he had a lot of crashes and he fixes cars and stuff and he’ll get injuries from it and it’s always like ‘I was in a crash’ and he wasn’t in a crash he’d fallen of his bike or something stupid, you know what I mean? But that’s just him, that’s my father.

I believe then that when you was a child you believed him? / I did, I had no reason not to. / and it was maybe quite nice to hear these stories?

Well we were all excited cause we all used to sit there and listen to him, er, so I suppose they were for his own benefit as well but we did enjoy them, still do enjoy them, he’s still lying through his teeth me and his girlfriend get a right buzz off my dad {can’t hear}

And now lets talk a bit about you / ‘bout my lies {laughs}/ when you were a child / when I was a child. Um, I lied / I don’t care about the variety of lies / I don’t care about them either / {laughs} okay. / Um, I lied when I was a kid. I lied about where I was going, about what I was doing / since when? / Constantly. Since I can remember I could start lying, you know. Er, if I wasn’t-. my dad didn’t like some of my friends, you know, so I’d say I was going to someone else’s house when I knew damn well I was going to see that person who my dad didn’t like now we nicked some- we nicked some bikes out of a shed. Well, we borrowed them they sort of put it to us like we’d stolen them but we’d borrowed them. We did, we were going to put them back, and we borrowed them every day after school and put them back. He wouldn’t buy us bikes. Everything seemed to be a constant lie, you know “where you going?” it was never the truth so you know, it was
quite easy. But when we did tell the truth and he used call us liars it used to get right on my nerves. / **For example?** / Like, erm, ... {break in recording}

..Box and that, they would be gone, you know, we’d have the kids in, cornets and that, we’d give them that, and he got so fed up with all this going he put this big chain around it and my sister got these bolt cutters and she cut through the chain and he had this bathrobe so she took the tie bit out of it put it through the loop and tie it round so he didn’t even know the chain was even cut and then she was aggravated and she’d get the tins, great big tins of fruit and open them and drink the juice and then them upside down and when pat used to go a week later and say “do you want some fruit?” it would be green and mouldy and then he’d line us up in front of the cooker and say who stole this? This was your punishment. And he’d put your hand like this over the cooker and one day he put Name6’s hand over the cooker because she wasn’t telling him the truth but we were pleading with him saying dad it wasn’t us it wasn’t us. But he didn’t believe us and it really aggravated me so one day I said of all the fucking lies I told you that wasn’t one of them and he said but I had to punish you all to find out which one would say I don’t want you to burn my hand, it wasn’t me but the day that he burnt her hand she never even told him the truth and I said why didn’t you tell him the truth? She said he would have done it anyway so now he’s done it and she was a thief she used to go into shops and steal clothes and whole shopping trolleys of food and walk out of Safeway’s and we’d have to explain where they’d come from and it was really bad sometimes cause I’d only ever stolen ten pence off a mantle piece like that in my life because I was so scared of the punishments he’d give out. / **Mm-hm** / but the lies just got easier he used to say to me when I was 16, “you’re not a virgin no more” and I’d say how would you know that you know and he’d say your dad knows you’re not my little girl anymore you disgust me and I’d end up lying and saying yes I am and I was 8 months pregnant and saying I’m a virgin and that’s it I was pregnant with his grandchild and he never knew, it just got easier to lie to him. It was only basically to him and my mum / **same to her** / and her boyfriends / **so what did you lie to her about?** / Everything, you know. Um he’d want her to know where I was going and what I was doing, you know? Why should she know? She used to read my diaries so I’d just write things about her in it. I knew she read my diaries and she’d say, “I don’t read your diaries” and I’d look at her and I’d say, “that’s a bare-faced lie.” Cause I’d see her one day through this glass panel and she’d heard my footsteps and threw it under the
bed and run out there, "I’m getting your dirty washing." So then I started writing things about her and about her boyfriend in my own diary. And leave it where she would read it and one day she was very upset when I came home from school and I said, "why you upset? You been reading my diary?" and she said "evil bitch. Why did you write those things?" and I said "look, you’re not allowed to read them and she looked at me and I said why do you want to know where I’m going all the time you know? I said what you trying to do? Do you want to come with me and hold my hand? I got quite vicious with my mum. Because of what her boyfriend was doing. And I thought one day does she know what he’s doing and is she trying to cover it up but it’s quite reasonable she didn’t know what he was doing but it just felt how come? Is she blind? Why can’t she spot these things that are going on you know? She’s meant to be looking out for us but then again I kept saying why couldn’t I spot what he was doing to my sisters because when I found out that he had abused my sisters I thought why didn’t I see that when he was doing it to me and I mean I often questioned, I wonder if he has but I never see him touch my sisters. I see them fight I mean the fight was awful. I mean my sister dragged him down the stairs by his hair one day and said if you ever put your hands on me again I’m going to fucking knife you. I was just thinking it was over something stupid you know because I was just blind to the fact that he’d given up my sisters moved along the line, but I didn’t have no little sisters after me. So he {can’t hear}. I think it was a weird thing that my mum kicked him out because he moved in with this woman that had 3 girls you know and then he got done for sexually abusing them. I’d deliberately lie to her and say that he’d said stuff to me and calling her names. / Did he? / Well I’d walk past him and say “don’t spit at me.” She’d say what’s going on? And I’d say your feller spat at me. Cause I hated him and I tried to drive him out the house / blah / yeah and that’s why it was hard to let go and why was I saying these things when it all came out and my mum said why did you lie about these things and he told me that you wouldn’t believe what he was doing, and she probably wouldn’t because she didn’t want to be on her own and it was my way- / sorry, who she? She didn’t want..? / to live on her own he made out that she was so happy with him and I told her that I didn’t want him in the house and I told her when we were in the Old Bailey I said I lied about this and that so you would fuck {chuck?} him out of the house from what he was doing because if I told you the truth what he was doing to me and then you found out, unless my sisters had verified what is out in the open now, we’d
probably be in care or something because you’re all bound over with this man who didn’t batter you, what you took off my dad, and we’d be kicked off on the side and she said I would have believed if you’d said those things to me and I said well it shows that we couldn’t have trusted our mother you know to lie to get him out of the house / but you couldn’t / we couldn’t not by lying and he only got that it happened when he stabbed Maryanne {?} that he got chucked out. And / so your lies were a part a way to protect yourself and also in part ./ it got very confusing because the lies we were telling to protect to get this thing removed you know the drastic things we say he’s done like spitting and hitting us, you know what I mean he used to hit us in front of my mum so she knew that but we’d say- we had a fight me and my sister we’d say god mum’s going to go mad so we’d say that he did it you know cause she knew that he’d hit us loads of times so, we were doing it so that she’d get so fed up of him hitting us, that one day he’d do it as well and he’d be out the door. So when it become to the truth time as in the abuse it was hard because we’d lied so much / mm / about these things that he hadn’t been doing will she believe us the truth about what he really is doing. So it would shut your mouth and we shut our mouths and it was only like physical evidence and that and my sister and that. It was proof of what he was doing. I was the only one that he never denied what he was doing. And he denied / happening to all 3 of you / mm he just didn’t deny me I just maybe because he didn’t think it was bad and he’d get less of a sentence you know he denied my sister Theresa and it was proved that she had been abused, um, she’d gone to a hospital through the school and it was questioned had she been abused and that so there was a lot of evidence to say we know you abused her but he just wasn’t going to admit. He said he abused me because my mum wasn’t paying me enough attention and things like that and he felt- I think he was trying to push the blame on me basically by saying as I was getting older I shouldn’t have really sat on his lap and given him cuddles you know which is the sort of thing that 12 or 13 year old kids do. My son always does that sort of thing to me. He said this attention just got too much for him and at the time when he abused you, did you think was in his mind? Why was..?

Why was he doing it? / Yes /he told, I mean I don’t know, he was more um a lot of abused cased you hear of er, sort of getting round children you know sort of affection and that. His was aggression, you know he would frighten me into these things you know and by saying that if I didn’t do this or if I told my mum about this that I would end up the
other side of the {??} with my dad who was living in a wooden shack and the beatings and that or I would end up in a children’s and never be let out and this or physical violence like if he needs a bigger stake he’d say to me men come along and pick little girls like you off the street and they won’t find your body if I take you and I don’t know I used to cry and basically do what I was told / mm-hm / and erm / without understanding what was his..? / The only time was once when he said he’s taken from me what my mother should be giving me and I didn’t fully understand what he was saying but I understand my mum didn’t have sex with him for a very long time / right so did you understand what would be done? / no, I was in so much fear I don’t think I tried to reason with him / right / but I know he talked aggressively to my sister like that “I’m sort of punishing your mum for what she’s not giving me / right / so that’s his lie / but um you didn’t understand what it was about other than being threatened / I said to him one day I come out my mum picked me up and him up as well. We used to always go up and take her a cup of tea in the morning and my sister always sat round his side on her side and I used think bitch I don’t want to sit there while I drink my tea and he used to always lift the covers up and he always slept with no clothes on and this day my mum see him deliberately do it and know that he had nothing on underneath and I sort of turned my head and said here’s your tea, I’m going to school and my mum picked it up that it wasn’t just a gesture of “I’m just pulling the blankets over so that you can sit down next to me she said to him what the fuck do you you’re doing and he said to her “oh you know, they’re the kids I should be able to walk round the house with no clothes on” and she said if you ever do I’ll kill you and it was paid no more attention. He always- Every time as soon as I got up to go to school he knew what time my alarm went off, he knew first thing I’d do is go to the bathroom he’d be there and hadn’t put his bits away after going to the toilet so they’re all hanging out at me you know, I said to him get the fuck away from me and my mum said my language you know I began to swear a hell of a lot and I was just so aggressive with myself and I just looked down at him at everything he was doing you know and even I started not getting scared of him then and I would lash out and he’d say Polly go tell your mum and I’ll see you when you end up in court and I’d say well living in a children’s home has got to be better than this and he’d say you’ll break your mum’s hearts and she’ll have another overdose like when my dad died. And that’s the only thing that ever stopped me in case she did kill herself for him, you know. And I bit my tongue
and my lip and then there become no communication in the house, I wouldn’t talk to him. / Mm / I it would have to go through my mum, he’d say Name2 go and make me a cup of tea and I’d totally ignore him my mum says go on darling make us a cup of tea and I’d make him a cup of tea and I’d often put salt in it just to get- any way to get at him but she chucked him out any was. He’s got a living and I’m not going to punish myself anymore and that so I’ve had an eventful life and I suppose the serious things got faster it just got from bad to worse so that’s me anyway / mm-hm / 

So, I’ll just switch it off / sure
Subject 205

So er, going back to your childhood, we’re going to talk about for 15, 20 minutes / mm-hm / going back to childhood, do you remember times where your parents withheld the truth from you either deliberately or without intention or whether you remember times they lied to you?

I don’t know, I can’t remember anything specific at the moment. I remember one time being-, I was in kitchen in our old house and I remember telling my mum, I can’t even remember what we were talking about and I remember screaming at my mum that she was a liar about something and running out the room and her running after me and belting me on the arse but um, I don’t remember what that was about, er god I don’t know. Er, I wouldn’t look I m- there’s always-. Yeah, what I would sat is I would would mind about as far as lying is concerned um would be more the sort of thing – remember when we used to have really big fights and stuff with my step father, usually in the middle of the night, you know usually with everyone screaming at each other and kicking each other and whatever else um I’d be you know, I’d be getting really upset and crying and all this crap and I remember very clearly quite a few- I mean one time in particular but I remember other times um, you know crying and crying and being really upset and thinking I didn’t want to live here and I want to – I have to have any more of this and um I remember saying to my mum you know please please I don’t want you know I don’t wasn’t him to live here with us any more and my mum saying oh it’s all right it’ll all be fine. I can’t remember if she said if he would go away or if she’d kick him out or you know we would go somewhere but she said one or the other and I said to her no we won’t cause you’ve said this to me before, you’ve said this “yeah yeah it’ll be fine you know we’ll get rid of him” whatever else. And I don’t remember it was this time, another time this was the only time we ever left, me and my brother and I don’t remember if my wee brother went with us I suppose he must’ve done, I’m not sure erm went and stayed at my Gran’s, in the middle of the night, we went off in the night and drove down to my Gran’s and we stayed there for a couple of days and it was great cause I thought you know this is it, away from it and then my mum went up to the house and sort of spoke to him and I remember getting this sort of sense of just dread, you know, when I think the whole time I
really did know we were going back and needless to say, you know, after a week we were back and yeah it was all going to be fine and blah blah blah, you know, and we knew it wasn’t, I knew it wasn’t going to be fine, I mean I was probably 9 or something at this point and I knew it wasn’t going to be fine and I couldn’t see how my mother aged 40 or whatever couldn’t bloody tell it wasn’t going to be fine. You know I remember telling these things to my mum when I was 7 or 8 and stuff. I remember having this pretty well sussed just having his- just how he was and how he manipulated things really how the whole thing worked really quite sussed out you know when I was 8 or 9 certainly having quite a clue then and certainly having it well sussed by the time I was in my you know when I was maybe 13 or something I remember having it – but yeah that bullshit, that oh yes we’re going oh yes, we won’t have to live with him any more it’s alright. And when she was saying that you were not going to stay there, you would leave, what was going in her mind I mean what she tried to tell you? Um, I’m not sure whether she meant it or not at the time, maybe she did. I mean, I’ve always found my mum’s motivation for staying in this situation and keeping us in this situation very very strange. I’ve always found it very difficult to understand. First of all I was because of my wee brother cause you know, she was pregnant with my wee brother and all that and I could sort of understand that, you know, though in a way it isn’t terribly logical but I could understand why people do stuff like that erm, I mean she’s still there, you know what I mean, and okay so it’s not that much hassle these days but to me I think after my father was killed and stuff I think it – I think my mum just resigned herself to he fate, I think my mum just resignherself to the fact that nothing good was ever going to happen to her and that there wasn’t any point trying to make something of her life or expecting anything good from her life because I think I dunno I think she’s just got a pretty fatalistic attitude in some way, I dunno that’s the only way I can to explain it because I don’t understand it.

But it’s difficult to explain now, you couldn’t explain it as a child / I can’t even really explain it now it still seems very bizarre and when people ask me why she’s with him, I don’t fucking know, you know? / But when as a child, would you think? Why would she put you into a position of believing that this would be changed the situation? Yeah, um, I don’t know, I find it quite confusing and I didn’t think of it as anything sort of malevolent I just didn’t know- I didn’t understand at all and I couldn’t find any way to
understand it because I did know that my mum cared me and stuff like that but then again pretty bizarre equation you know, my mum cares about me so much that she brings me up in a house where, you know, I get completely undermined about everything and get the shit kicked out of me, do you know what I mean? / Mm / it doesn’t balance but I can’t find another way to balance it. But I didn’t ever think that she was doing it just to spite me or doing it cause she hated me or something like that but I didn’t understand, maybe she just didn’t care enough or maybe I wasn’t worth protecting or maybe she just wanted to calm me down you know say what I wanted to hear and beyond that who gives a shit, beyond that we just carry on and we’re helpless. I always got the impression from my mother that things happen to you, I think probably to do with the situation with my stepfather that things just happen to you and you can’t do shit about it, you know? So you might as well not try.

Can you recall other incidences or other..?
Lying. Um, ... I remember lying to her but I can’t remember her lying to me / you remember lying to her? / Yeah, I remember going through a phase where I’d never quite tell mum the truth, I can’t remember stupid things, must’ve been when I was 6 or 7, yeah. Um, and I used to always tell her, I can’t remember, there was something to do with money I just remember and something to do with ... I can’t remember but it was stupid things sort of half lies not kind of proper lies sort of like twisting, you know, twisting things for my own benefit a little bit, or saying yeah, twisting things a bit to get my own way, I think it’s stupid ways because she found out about them. I remember having a big argument with her and her saying that I was always telling half the truth and I was making other bits up that suited me. I can’t think properly, I can’t remember it properly, I just this- there was something about something to do with money and something about this girl Louise and I can’t remember it properly. It’s always a bit funny about lying though because I remember my friend used to ask me if she could come to my house after school and so I said I’d ask my mum and instead of just saying, no I don’t want you to come to my house I’m doing something or just saying my mum says you can’t come, I went home and I said “oh, can Name! come to my house, say no” so that I could go back and say my mum says no without having lied to her, stupid but.

So what was on your mind while doing this lying?
I guess I just didn’t like lying I didn’t think it was something you did if you weren’t a horrible person but at the same time I don’t know why I just didn’t say I don’t want you to come to my house today I’m doing something so I suppose it was wanting to be a horrible person without getting the flak for being horrible.

Er, we are trying to recall an incident about you lying. Although it was for you to get something / think so. / So by lying or telling half the truth you were going to feel some gets {?} so she told you you invented half the things yourself

Well, I don’t know when I was lying I was always using some of the truth. I suppose so I didn’t feel like I was lying / mm-hm / but I could still be lying or still be twisting something to my own gain, I don’t know cause it was a little phase I went through cause I remember doing it quite a lot, I can’t even remember any of the things I did but I just remember because I remember my mum getting really angry with me about it.

And how did you react when she told you were lying?

Totally cried or something crap. I think I do I remember being very upset and feeling that I’d really been quite horrible and quite let my mum down and stuff like that cause I guess I was brought up to be quite a moral person

Do you remember incidences where you lied to your stepfather?

Um, I’m sure there’d be lots, um, I just don’t know. I don’t know. Don’t really know.

With him it was really a case of you can tell him whatever you like just as long as you don’t get caught. It was what could you say to keep yourself out of trouble. / Mm-hm, for example? / I can’t think of examples. I mean it was just a question of dodging the bullets you know / mm-hm /

So in a sense you would say things that would fit to his belief or to be. ..?

I think it was more like that when I got older, cause when I was younger I would be quite truthful with him I think that was more when I was older, when I was younger I was quite truthful and them when I got older I was more into dodging things. Plus I don’t think, er, I don’t think — it’s just self-protection. I’m not onto lying and things I’m just a truthful person and erm, but then again there’s some people that don’t deserve the truth, such as my step-father who doesn’t deserve anything I mean why should I tell him anything but I wouldn’t give a shit about telling him a crock of absolute crap because he isn’t worth anything more than that and you know there’s certain types of behaviour that- well, you get what you deserve if you behave like that towards people.
So do you remember lying when you were a bit older or...?

Erm, oh god I’m sorry, I’m not remembering anything really today much about it.

Um, let me ask it maybe from another point of view, um...

I did lie about things like where I’d been and things like that if I was doing things that my parents didn’t you know want me to be doing yeah I mean I’d quite often lie about where I’d been and things like that just because I’d be places my my mum didn’t want me to be / mm / I mean nothing particularly {would be talk?} just in the park when it was dark or meeting strange people you know

Did you know that your mother wouldn’t approve?

Yeah and that she would I suppose worry about me. / mm-hm /

So, what would you say in such instances?

Um, I dunno just make up some crappy excuse as believable as possible.

{end of side}

Hmm can’t remember, yeah she probably would believe me but I was probably not bad at doing it. But I’m quite good at lying. I don’t do it that often but when I do I’m quite good at it.

What do you mean by that? That you’re quite good?

Erm, convincing I just mean. Convincing, that’s all. It’s not something I do very much. It’s not something I’m I’m really that into.

You’re convincing others you mean?

Mm. if I want someone to believe me I can be quite good at it.

Can you think of a recent example or any other example?

No, now I mean I just wind people up about thing, just tell them a lot of garbage but we- I mean just some of my friends I mean one of my friends particularly. We just sort of have this on-going contest to try and make the other one believe the biggest load of shit ever, you know. That’s just..

For example? What kind of shit?

Just silly stories, you know, just made-up rubbish. Make somebody believe something really, really stupid but that’s just for you know, stupidity just for a laugh at the other one’s expense you know it’s not any real deceit / joking? / I can’t.. It would be just some stupid story you’d make up about some famous person or one of your neighbours or something you know I can’t make up stupid stories on demand.
Okay, mm well as you put it we I mean people do lie. It’s a given / it’s a...? / it’s a given/ yeah. / It’s something which is there and I’m not talking about the ethical issues behind lying or the moralistic issues behind it but talking about the discussions with me, / uh-huh / if you can think of things that you tried to hide from me or not telling the whole truth or not...

I haven’t. I haven’t done that at all, not at all. / Yeah. / I’m sure I’ve done it but not in a way- not intentionally because I don’t really see the point in doing this research if I’m not going to do it truthfully.

So not with intention?

I’d say the only way I may have withheld things from you is just the level that my brain works, just whether I can remember things, that’s the only way. I mean today you’re asking me al these questions about lying and I’m telling you basically jack shit you know? I can’t think of it.

You can’t think, you can’t remember?

Mmm. I just can’t think of any examples and my brain doesn’t work all that brilliantly when I wit to. .....You know and that pisses me off / sorry? / It pisses me off cause I can’t / because you can’t connect it to any real experiences? / Yeah, partly that and partly because I just can’t um,.. You’re asking me for something that I’ve agreed to – you know, just by being here I’ve agreed to give you and I can’t do it and I’m not doing it. This kind of, like reneging on my side of the bargain. And I suppose partly cause – oh, I dunno, doesn’t matter.

Well, you put yourself in a rather judgmental role when you’re talking about it, because what I can understand is that what you see or feel is that you’re telling me something which is there, I mean it’s there in your body and you could feel it then you can realise it now that it’s happening somewhere there / mm-hm / but you cannot get hold of the truth I mean what was happening there. It happens to you quite often / mm / such things right? / yeah / and maybe it’s for your I mean a kind of mechanism either to protect yourself or to protect something with me / mm-hm / I mean I don’t know yet anything about it but cause in a way it might be related to the need to withheld something I mean without deliberately a need to withhold / yeah / hmm
But it’s annoying because I know I’ve got a thousand and one self-protection strategies
um because they are so unconscious / mm / it’s like I can’t stop them when I want to stop
them they’re there when I don’t think I need them I can’t stop them which is really
annoying actually.

And when you are doing this what do you think that I think? What do you think
that I have in my mind?

Um, I don’t really know, um I don’t know. I guess if I’m sitting here and you’re asking
me questions and I don’t have answers to them and I can’t give you examples which is
what you want me to do. You want me to say well, this happened with my mother and
here’s an example of this and that’s nice and neat and whatever else for your research and
I can’t do that I suppose I think you’re probably pissed off with me or you’re thinking
Jesus Christ this is a waste of my time you know, getting angry with me or some thing.....

And then if I’m angry with you, / I just don’t know, like er I don’t find that easy to cope
with / sorry? That..? / I don’t find that easy to cope with. People being angry even if it’s
not anything to do with me. I mean I’ve noticed that a lot recently the last couple of years
I’ve noticed myself getting worse and worse with that I mean if I’m in a group of people
and people start kind of arguing or getting a bit heated even if it’s like nothing to do with
me and I’m not involved with it and no-one’s going to get pissed off with me or whatever
I just get really, really – I can’t stand it I really hate it, get really tense I mean like today I
was outside and Name3 came out and started shouting at Kevin about something and I
actually ducked and I was just sitting there and had my back there, Kevin facing me there
and Name3 came down effing and blinding at Kevin about something and I mean I
actually totally flinched and I knew it was nothing to do with me you know, I knew no-
one was going to start having a go at me or whatever..
Patient 206: Probably, but I can’t remember. I can’t think of incidents, I can’t think of anything actually. I find this part really difficult because there are things I can’t... I don’t want to remember, I’ve chosen not to remember.

Interviewer: Right, OK. (Silence)... so maybe we can discuss it from another perspective, such as observing other’s lying. Whether parents lied to others or that father withheld the truth from mother or vice versa.

Patient 206: It must have happened, but I can’t think, you know, I can’t think, it feels, when I’m thinking about that, I could feel that I’m getting upset and I don’t know why, and it’s because I can’t remember.

Interviewer: Right, OK, and...

Patient 206: Can’t even remember them talking to each other, not to mention lying to each other. You know, and I was just there, in the house, but I’m not anything, you know what I mean.

Interviewer: Hmmm.

Patient 206: I don’t really have a role, so how can lying come into it, you know?

Interviewer: Hmmm (silence)...

Patient 206: I feel pretty useless about it cause I can’t help you.

Interviewer: Well, I understand. Maybe we can talk about it from another perspective. People do lie, and lying is part of our life, children lie, parents lie, I lie etc. I don’t know of people who don’t lie. So, I would like you to think of instances when you lied as a child either to either your parents or others.

Patient 206: I suppose that when people ask you if you’re OK and you are not OK, and you say you are, it’s a lie, isn’t it?

Interviewer: Hmmm.. What do you think?

Patient 206: Yeah, I think it’s a lie. That’s the most obvious lie I can think of. That’s the most obvious lie I think of. It’s if people would’ve asked me if I was OK, I has lied the whole time, because I never was, but I said “Oh, yeah, I’m OK”.

Interviewer: Hmmm.

Patient 206: So that’s quite devious.
Interviewer: Hmmm. And do you remember specific instances when you would say that you were OK.

Patient 206: Well I used to say it to my old psychiatrist all the times, when I was 13 I was lying. It was sounded OK even if I wasn’t, I knew I was lying.

Interviewer: And why did you decide to lie?

Patient 206: I really didn’t want to talk to her about it.

Interviewer: To talk to your psychiatrist?

Patient 206: Yeah, I really didn’t want to talk to her, and if I’d say that it was OK, then she was just... thought she would leave me alone. So...

Interviewer: Hmm. And what was her response?

Patient 206: She used to say to my mother “if she’d been like that all day, it suits me like that”... yeah.... hmm. And she...(unclear).... The all week, you know?

Interviewer: So, it worked, isn’t it?

Patient 206: Yeah... If you say you’re OK people usually do that.

Interviewer: But then you weren’t feeling OK?

Patient 206: I knew I wasn’t OK but I just meant to say it. I just didn’t want people to ask me any more questions, and I would say that “Oh, yeah, I’m OK”.

Interviewer: Hmmm... Any other lies that you can remember, as a child?

Patient 206:(long silence) Hmm... Probably millions of lies..... (Long silence). Can’t really remember.

Interviewer: Maybe you can remember lying about rules being broken, or misdeeds?

Patient 206: I suppose it’s like saying: “Did you move the newspaper from the chair?”, and you say: “No”, even if you did.

Interviewer: Hmmm.

Patient 206: It’s a lie, isn’t it?

Interviewer: Hmmm.

Interviewer: And you did that for your own protection otherwise you would have been slapped around your head, so, you say, you know.

Patient 206: So there were probably millions of lies in my childhood. And it’s probably millions of lies now, really...

Interviewer: Hmmm.
Patient 206: And I’m pretty a devious person, so (laughing).

Interviewer: we may talk now about what seems to be your current “lies”, I mean for example those lies that you already mentioned...

Patient 206: Oh, I tell lies here, you know.

Interviewer: Hmm.

Patient 206: (laughing loudly) Yeah, practically it’s really funny but I’m feeling that when I don’t want to talk to the psychiatrist and to be sounded OK and ....

Interviewer: Sorry, I couldn’t hear you?

Patient 206: I say it to the staff, “I’m just, I’m OK” and it means leave me alone, basically. But I lie cause I’m usually not OK, I’m never OK and I’d never been OK, for 25 years, for the whole of my life, really, so I am... So how well am I now? So, I say I’m OK. And if they would say: “Do you like doing stuff” I would say: “Yes” but really I’m lying cause most of the things I don’t like doing, so you know...

Interviewer: Hmm.

Patient 206: I tell lies on quite many occasions, without even realising that I’m telling a lie.
- Now, these kinds of things that we are talking of now are related to another topic which I'd like to talk about which is lying deception and not or withholding the truth from you and I understand as a child many things were many facts were being withheld from you, any other things? Any other facts or things you remember were being withheld as a child even though I know that you didn’t know those things were being withheld from you

- Sorry, was that a question?

- Yeah it's a question, again to rephrase it thinking about you there. There are certain things that you felt inside that when you try to reflect on those feelings, the feelings were being denied, you weren’t – they – the facts that you told them yeah. For example, I’d been making it up and then there’s some kind of conflict there, the feelings towards mum were alright or forbidden whether you could believe your own feelings and another thing was that there was an atmosphere that things or facts were given okay so for example you don’t remember since you were brought by your grandparents that’s right and you don’t know or y- as a child you probably didn’t understand why you’d see mum once a week only for a couple of hours and you didn’t understand why she behaved the way she behaved towards you right? Mm-hm and many truths of life were being withheld from you okay? It’s true? The way I I put it?

- yeah that’s right

- Do you remember other things or other experience which or maybe more with your grandparents when they lied to you or they withheld the truth from you and you knew that this was the case, I mean that they lied to you?

- Um, the only- the only thing that springs to mind really, obviously, well not obviously but I mean as as one might expect like all the children in my class at school, all the children the same age as me, all lived with their mums and dads er which is like the normal sort of thing innit, and they always used to be asking you like um, why do you live with your grandma and grandad and not with your mummy and daddy? And all this you know what I mean and like so I went home and like “why do I live with you
and not with my mum / mm / and it’s like um “oh well you see..” this is what they used to say “ well you see when you were born we went and saw you and we thought ooh what a lively child and we said ooh can we have her” and erm that was the answer so one presumes from this that if that scenario is true, and I don’t think for one moment that it is that um me mother sort of said “yeah you can have her I don’t want her” you know what I mean so erm –

- **But then you were at school and what you were saying?**
- I don’t thin-, I don’t think the ques-, I think what I always said when I was erm when I was asked this question at school, I mean I didn’t I just said to them oh well my mother and da-, my mother and father got divorced before I was before I was erm very old when I was, soon after I was born they got divorced so my grandad erm like I went to live with me Nan and grandad and erm well this is what I would tell them but I assumed it was true / you assumed it was true / I assumed it was true but that was something I dreamed up myself / right / I mean like people do they make sense of things / mm-hm / and I just assumed that they must have been married at one point / mm-hm / you know what I mean? / Right / but I don’t know, they weren’t as it goes / sorry? They..? / They weren’t married.

- **Mm-hm and when you told the children that your parents were separated um what do you think the children would have in their mind? What..? / Don’t know / you don’t know? / No. / mm-hm so what was your intention then?**
- How do you mean what was my intention?
- **Well in terms of..**
- Well it was just an a-, they ask me a question and I suppose I just gave them-, I made sense of-, I thought that was right / yeah / I thought that was true, I assumed it must be true

- **Mm-hm and when your grandparents told you this story about a nice child, / mm-hm / did you believe them?**
- Um,. I don’t think I questioned it at the time, not- not when I was really young but erm it seemed a bit too much like a fairy story for me really / right now or then you thought it.. / At the time I don’t think I even questioned it very much. / Mm-hm so / just took it.. / for granted / yeah / as the case / yeah / right
- Do you remember any other things or any other things where you feel the need to lie? I mean
- What? Like fabricate you mean? Um,.. Um .. No not really.
- Mm-hm. what's the difference between fabricating and lying?
- Um I don't think there is one, I think it's the same thing isn't it? / mm-hm / more or less
- With fabricating, what you mean? You mean to...
- Well I think the word I would have used if I'd been thinking properly is confabulating. Confabulating I think are stories you actually believe yourself like you find that people with dementia confabulate and they actually believe what they're saying it just makes sense of something that didn't make sense to them and I think that's what I did pretty much is confabulate
- Right, mm-hm,
- I mean I don't um never have been one for lying at all, you know what I mean I'm pretty honest
- Yeah but I'm asking these questions because children do lie and it's part of their {urge?} to lie / right / and it's part of a thing that children lie / mm / and grown ups lie as well / mm / with many many the less small the bigger lie so it's kind of a convention that people do lie, there's no such a person that doesn't lie at all / mm / and I believe that I lied as a child and you lied as a child / mm / also, with many minor things maybe we need to bring that to to memory.
- Well put it another way then I can't remember, I can't recall
- You can't recall? / No / right. Well maybe if you can, I know it's quite er a difficult question, thinking about our discussions now whether there were any instances when you felt you didn't tell me the truth okay one of the things for many reasons and this is a thing as well, this other thing.
- I mean I might be inclined to say I can't remember or I don't know if I'm asked a question I don't feel comfortable answering I mean that's er would apply no matter what age I was
- Lets just- I'd like just to take this small thing and to you said the the reason behind this, for example when this kind of thing happens and you feel you'd like to not tell me certain things then you deny or you say you can't remember, right?
Yeah / er okay what is the intention or what you think that I’ve got in my mind when you are saying you can’t remember?

- Erm, well I suppose like erm if somebody’s asking a question, you or anybody else/mm-hm /that’s sort of question {?} because they need or want certain information um that I know the person they’re asking can’t give them that information I suppose they could get frustrated , irritated, annoyed, might think erm, you know, might think I’m useless um

- But um, this is not your intention to make me feel that way. What your intention is saying for example that you can’t recall / to avoid d- /when in fact you can, you can recall /

- To avoid discomfort or awkwardness, embarrassment I suppose

- From your side? / Mm / right so it’s kind of protection for yourself right? We’re talking about such instances, yeah / mm / right um what do you feel with this discussion?

- I’m alright, yeah I’m okay, my head’s a bit fuzzy today because I can’t get the sniff- I’m a bit sniffly apart from that I’m alright, you know when your head’s blocked, I can’t really think straight but I’ll see

- Okay do those things that to talk or to learn from your guard {?} is a bit about pretence er for example do you remember yourself playing, pretence playing as a child?

- Yeah.

- What kind?

- Umm, we used to play house. Do you sort of mean playing on my own or with other kid?

- With other- with other kids or with your grandparents.

- Um , we used to play house, doctors and nurses and all that {laugh} I can’t remember, I used to play- I used to play with other kids in the street, sort of like you do

- And did you like it?

- Yeah. Good laugh / sorry? / it was a good laugh when I was that age

- And did you play with dolls or..?

- Um, yeah I had dolls and that / can you recall, can you just give me / no I can recall / perhaps a certain theme that was playing with the dolls / umm I don’t know
really, I can remember playing school where I was the teacher and I used to arrange them all round ifront / then you were a teacher? /yeah / yeah / well they were a very obedient class they just used to sit there silent like erm what else? Well I used to have a nurses uniform / and you used to dress up as a nurse / yeah / at home? / Yeah / playing with yourself or calling your grandfather or mother to participate in this pretend thing?

- Erm, I don’t think I ever involved my Nan or grandad in this thing no I jus- I was pretty much, you know um, liked my own company {on me own?} really, I used to play with kids in the street um …um well I can’t- I can’t ever recall playing with my Nan and grandad, no.

- Now um in fact lets end the interview talking about childhood. / Right / erm {funny bit}.. It is called a... function assistant this is to / right / the title, um, so first of all, as far as I know, you did your GCSEs / well, CSEs and GCEs / right up until the age of?

- Oh God, er I finished school at 16, I did CSEs at school and I did er, I did O-levels, yeah, at 6th form college and I messed about something chronic, I really messed about and I failed the first lot that I did um but I I did another lot next year and I passed those by the skin of my teeth because I messed about again but I / how many A-l/ um O-levels this is / oh sorry / um, um {tape cuts}
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We can have the smallest questions about lying, is it all right? Did anyone in the household or do you remember anyone in the household who withheld the truth from you as a child or a teenager, sister or either of your parents? Either deliberately or less deliberately?

I don’t think so, um, I suppose they probably withheld information like my parents had to get married and it was my sister who told me that / mm-hm / my sister had um a , she had a baby , she was a nurse and she er got pregnant and she was sent away from home to have a baby and I didn’t know anything about this but my sister told me about it. Not the sister it happened to, another sister, my older sister. Things like that happened. / mm-hm, and how old were you when it happened? / Five. I’d be very small, I can’t remember how old I was.

Uh-huh, anything else? Any other information being withheld from you?

I don’t know. My brother used to get into trouble and I was never told about it , not fully/ mm-hm / he was in trouble with the police / it was a trouble with the police? He was.../ he was, yeah with the police and um my mum used to try and keep it from my dad and stuff like that / mm-hm / things like that, I can’t remember anything else.

And what about your lying? You said that you were quite often lied. But on the other hand can you remember incidences when you lied as a child and I must say that I know that children lie it’s part of development. And ....

Mm, I used to steal from my mum’s purse / mm-hm / and I lied about staying at a friends house once when I didn’t stay at a friend’s house. That’s all I can remember.

How old were you when you stole the money from the purse? / Can’t remember. Seven? / Seven. And did she find it out? / Don’t think so / no, so was it a lie? / No / can you tell me a bit more about this second incident when you .... ?

Well I said I was going to stay at a friend’s house and my friend told her mum and dad that she was staying at my house and we stayed out in this barn overnight and I
can't remember I think I was probably 9 or 10 / right / it was before I was 11 because I lost touch with her when I was 11/ mm-hm / it was before I was 11.

So you were sleeping in a barn whilst your parents were being misled to believe that you were sleeping in your friend's house / yeah / right. The same friend? / Yeah / you told them before going that you were going to stay there. / Yeah / and when you said that, what was I your mind?

I don't know, I don't know what you mean really.

I mean obviously there was a need to say that you were going to stay with your friend or in your friend's house / mm-hm / so, then in your mind was the idea that you were not going to stay there and that you would lie to say that you would be going to stay there. right? And why was that?

I think I just wanted to sleep out and we didn't think that our parents would let us./ that they wouldn't let you? / No, it was sort of like an adventure really / mm-hm so, in your mind you were thinking that in their mind it was forbidden to stay out, right? / Yes it was definitely / right. And how did they react? Did they know your father? / No they never found out./ any other instances? Try to think of any other instances whether at home or school or ever.

I can't remember anything else. Maybe I did lie but I can't remember. I thought I was quite honest / right, well, maybe I can ask you from a different angle. It has to do with a discussion or conversation with me. Er, and its not that I know that there was such a case but was there anything that you felt you needed to lie to me about or not tell the truth or withhold the truth while you've been talking to me and I can say that it's also common. That I did it and almost everyone does it, I mean not letting others to know everything or even lying. And I'd like to know if there was such a thing here so then you can explore we can try to understand it.

Hmmm. I don't think I've lied to you I think I've tried to tell the truth as I remember it but then in remembering it I'm not sure whether that did happen or just my perception, I'm not sure. Because I can't remember very well apart from odd little incidences like the one I've just told you and the fishing incident that stick in my mind / mm-hm / the rest of it's a blur though it's like having a sense of
something rather than a true picture / right. / Um, like well for instance when you asked me if I had any um, something about sexual abuse or something I don’t know I don’t think I was I haven’t got any memories but when I was having my therapy with my old therapist she seemed to think that something might have happened. So I can’t say, I’m not sure I can’t remember anything so that’s why I said no / mm-hm /

Right but in the case also there was nothing in your mind that could be linked to such a thing / no. / right.

That’s why I said no.

Right and generally thinking again, if you could just think of a lie that you had to lie to somebody, whenever not just as a child / yeah / so can you tell me about this instance about this time.

Yeah, well I er- when I was with my partner, my er, um, I used to go out for a drink and there wasn’t any more in it than that, it was a bit flirtatious I suppose, we used to go out for a drink with a colleague from work and I um used to lie to my partner I used to say I was going somewhere else I didn’t say I was going out with a drink with a colleague but there was more to it than just a drink. We never had sex or anything like that / mm-hm / but there was more to it than just going for a drink and I suppose that was a lie because I didn’t tell her all the truth. / You suppose that that was a lie? / yeah, well I feel like it’s not the whole truth.

And then again what was in your mind when telling him that you had gone or you didn’t?

I didn’t want to talk about the difficulties that my partner and I were having and how going out with this man, we used to go out and have a lot of fun and that was missing from the relationship so I didn’t- I wasn’t able to say that to my partner really.

Mm, and when you say to him what do you think was in his mind? What would he think?

Um, about me lying, do you mean?

About your, I don’t know if he knew that you were lying. About your…. / No, I don’t think he knew / about your relationship.

I think he believed me and trusted me.
Mm. to understand it a bit more, or to clarify it there was a need not to confide in him about the fragility of the relationship between you and him. It was a kind of lying or the relationship / yeah / I can say that this was the case?

Yeah.

So it was about the relationship not about you protecting yourself from him for example or not, definitely not the first thing in mind?

No, I'm not sure really, I think it was to protect the relationship, because I did love my partner and I wanted it to work but my needs weren't being met in the find I was getting them met elsewhere and I didn't want to tell my partner that for fear we'd break up I suppose. / mm-hm /

And did it work I mean in terms of the intention that the same kind- the same quality of relationship could carry on?

Well, my partner and I ended up separating in the end/ at what stage in the relationship we are talking about? / Well we were together for 6 years and I guess it would have been in about the third year / right / something like that.

Another thing that I'd like to ask you I don't remember if I asked you. Do you remember yourself playing, pretend playing? / Yeah / did I ask you? / No you didn't ask me. / Right can you tell me a bit more about this kind of playing as a child?

Well I used to pretend that I would make a nice home and, er, be really comfortable and cozy and I used to go off for picnics and pretend – I used to have dolls and things – and just make-believe they were my children. I used to play at doctors and nurses / with your dolls? / No, with other children I can remember, yeah. Um, I used to um, I don't know if this is what you mean but when I was little I remember um, lying in bed pretending I was dying and that all my family were around me begging me not to die, willing me to live. I don't know if that's the sort of thing you mean but I remember that quite clearly / how old were you then? / Um 7 maybe.

So you remember it quite clearly that you pretended as if you were going to die? And who was around there?
I can't remember who was around, I think it was my family but I'm not sure. / Mm-hm / but I can remember holding out my hands and them stroking my hands and pretending they were stroking my head and begging me not to die. / And you were in your bed? / In my bed, yeah. / Right.

And again can you remember what was the reason for that? I mean what was in your mind prior to this pretence? / I don't remember. / Can you imagine? What was there in your mind, what were you thinking about while you were doing this?

No well, I can imagine maybe that I wasn't feeling loved or something and er, that I was dying because I wasn't being loved enough and that they were showing that they did love me and wanting me not to die. Something like that.

So in a way it was an enjoyable experience on your part, I mean you got what you wanted. / Yeah / and in your mind then, also as a child then 7 years old, what did you think they would think of you? / What really? / Mm-hm , doing that, I mean again trying to get back to this state as if you were now 7 years old.

Um, I think that they'd think I was silly doing that. / Mm / and they'd tell me to stop / but they didn't. / They didn't, no. / so in a way again you succeeded in letting them believe that you were hurt physically as if you were dead and you succeeded in putting them in a position where they had to be more affectionate towards you / yeah / right? Which was part of the reason for doing this / mm / as far as you can realise it right now. And what happened when they found out that you were alive? / I can't remember / you can't remember / no / mm-hm. That was the imagination that they would have said you were silly. / Yeah, if they'd really found out they'd think I was really silly. Mm.

Erm. And this will be the last question I’ll ask you which is about lying between parents. Do you remember as a child either each of them would lie to the other and you knew the child of the other would be lying?

I can't remember. / You can't remember, mm-hm. / I remember my mum bought a washing machine and dryer thing and she bought it on H. P. and my dad didn't believe in it and she told me not to say anything and I let it slip and she she really pi- I can’t remember her hitting me but she really was mad with me. And I'd let it out and my dad wasn’t supposed to know. I can’t remember any other lies / how did he
react about it? / He was mad with her / he was mad with her? / Yeah. / Yelling at her or..? / Yelling at her, yeah. / And what about you? / I was sent up to my room / by her? / Mm-hm. I'd let the secret out. / Right.

And did you know that it was a secret, a shared secret then, as a child?

Um, I think I did but I didn’t let it out on purpose and she thought I had / mm-hm / but I hadn’t it was a genuine slip of the tongue I hadn’t done it on purpose. / Right.

Okay, so, we can take a short break now I need to arrange my papers.
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Now the last thing to talk about is a bit about deception, about lying er so, well, I feel that the first thing that you’d answer to the question of parents withholding the truth is your step-mother was your step-mother and not your real mother. So, er, if you could just recall what you were thinking about when you’ been told that she wasn’t your mother.

I remember thinking I knew anyway. / You knew anyway / yeah. I can’t- I think we talked about this briefly last time / yeah / I can’t believe I said it out loud at the time but I do remember thinking that. /mm-hm / I think I was quite tearful at the time.

Mm-hm. And when revealing this that she wasn’t your mother, what- or did you think of the reason for this why did they conceal it from you?

No, never. / You didn’t think bout.. / Well, it was only at 19 years that I started to think about it more / right / I mean I think at the time I was quite glad that I found out that she wasn’t my real mother because it gave me a reason to spite her and gave me an excuse for sort of treating her the way I had and was going to in the future.

So, now when you are thinking about it what do you think they had in mind? When not telling you the truth about it?

Um, yeah I do sometimes wonder why they didn’t tell me and I think it was because I mean I think if my dad could relive that day then he wouldn’t have told me. Um, I really don’t think that he ever wanted to tell me. / Mm-hm / I think he was just hoping that I wouldn’t start asking questions or become in any way suspicious and that we’d sort of be a family until we all sort of reached old age / right.

And what do you think it was that way and that he wouldn’t like to tell you?

Because I think he finds it very difficult dealing with relationships and family matters and problems personal problems I mean work problems and anything like that he can handle without a problem at all but I think emotional matters I don’t think he can cope with at all.
Right, are there other instances when either him or her withheld the truth from you or or lied to you?

I can’t actually think of any instances. / No. / I’m sure they did, I mean its very difficult to get any information out of…- and when it does come out it tends to be very twisted and sort of mutated. You don’t really take it as the gospel truth.

No. Take your time, just try to –

An example, well, yeah there was a time actually. When I was- the year I missed school, um , towards

The end of that year there was a possibility of going to Place1 grammar school, which I thought was great um, you know, I was a bit surprised, you know, that they were willing to see me for an interview. I went to the interview, I did okay, but at the end of the day I wasn’t acceptable to them, um, and I asked my dad why had this interview with a grammar school um, and why hadn’t he tried to enrol to this before because the school was only up our road, it was only now that he'd managed to arrange it, um, and he he didn’t have any problem at all about telling me that he was going to offer them a very good deal on some computers ifthey would accept me into the school. He had no idea hew that would affect me at all, I don’t think I really did at the time either.

So he was quite open with you?

Yeah, I mean he was almost proud of the fact that he was able to negotiate this deal with the headmaster um and as a result try to get me the school / mm-hm / no qualms about that at all.

And how do you relate it to deception? / Sorry? / And how do you relate it to deception or lying?

Well he was deceiving both me... I just feel he could have told me beforehand, I don’t know. I think if I’d been accepted he wouldn’t have told me. I think my dad’s sort of one of these people who tries to get away with as much ashe can, until he get found out. Quite difficult to talk to I suppose. I mean, this is quite recently, but when I asked him last year about my real mother and that, um, I got the impression that
he wanted to keep it to an absolute minimum in conversation and answer as few questions as possible and all I found out was her name and what she did. / Mm-hm / and I remember saying to him at the time this is the only chance I'm going to get, aren't I for the time being to know her and he said yeah. Not very helpful. / it wasn't very helpful ? / No, and I was I mean when he told me her name I was still in a little bit of shock and I just couldn’t think of any other questions to ask / mm-hm / um, and I've missed my chance really / you’ve.. to ? / To find out more and what went on. / Mm-hm / I mean If I asked him now he’d say why do you want to know. He doesn’t have any grasp whatsoever as to what other people may be feeling or / mm-hm /

And how do you think that this not being told that your stepmother was your stepmother how did it affect you?

I don’t consciously remember. I do know I was a bit of a shit during that time must’ve caused my stepmother serious amounts of trouble. Um, I always used to be in trouble and I used to lie all the time about things, um, and even on the time when I did something and wait till your father gets home and he confronted me with it I used to lie to him as well say that it was someone else because after the first few times it happened I had the impression that he didn’t care anyway and he just wanted the whole thing settled. He was really for settling things and not bringing things up he didn’t want to cause any ripples on the whole.

So you started lying after this case / yeah well maybe a bit before, maybe a bit after but / right. / That’s when I remember it starting to happen, I mean I’m sure I lied beforehand, little white lies, you know as kids do but.

So try to remember to me a bit about your lies.

Um yeah I mean they were nothing really interesting or glamorous just like if food went missing from the larder / if..? Sorry, what? / Weren’t very interesting or glamorous or anything they were just small petty lies to get me out of trouble. / To get you off trouble / yeah. / For example? / As I said before about fighting with my brothers / mm / um, it tended to be whenever I was sort of infringing on any of their space or belongings or causing any trouble to anyone else, including her. If things went missing I was always the first person to be asked where it’d got to and a lot of
the time it was pointless even denying it. / There wasn’t any point in denying it? / No / right. And then on you started to lie more regularly you telling after yeah? / I think the lies got bigger and bigger about taking time off school and saying how things were going at school.

So let’s talk about one or two examples I mean the big examples of your lying to her or to him.

Well, I wasn’t really lying to either of them I was sort of lying to both in a way when I used to take time off school um, I used- very often I would just say what they wanted to hear./ what sort of thing? / Um, things about how things were going at school and whether I liked where we were living at the time, quite often I didn’t / but you’d say that you did / yeah / right mm-hm, and you felt that they wanted you to tell them? / Mm, my dad especially I mean he used to tell me things about work and how many more people he was employing and how much money he was bringing home and stuff, I’d say it was really good I’m really pleased for you dad and I wasn’t really interested at all.

How do you know that you weren’t really interested in it?
I just remember, I’ve never really been interested in how much he earns or how many more people he employs. He’s sort of very materialistic and I just don’t give a shit really.

And when you asked him about the house, you said he lied to you, how do you know that you didn’t?

Because, I can’t remember, because I didn’t, I mean very often there was, although the friends were the same I just didn’t like the idea of moving a lot.

Mm-hm, and what were the lies about school?

Well the lies about school was that they assumed I was going to school whereas a lot if the time I just- I was taking 20, maybe 30 days off a term /

And then what would you do?
I would go home and spend the rest of the day in bed / right. And then? / I mean looking back then I didn’t realise how seriously depressed I probably was / yeah, and then you would stay in bed for the whole day? / yep, or watch a bit of telly or cook some food / yeah, and then? / I’d go back out for half an hour and pretend I’d just come back from school. / Right. And you would pretend? / Yeah I would just come in and say- well we
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didn’t really speak much anyway so I would normally just go up to my room / mm-hm. **Right and...** / well there was one time when I just got in from school and I was going up to my bedroom and I looked in at my dad’s bed and he was in bed because he’d been drinking because he was {tape cuts} I was in the house so er, I sort of went into my bedroom and sort of pushed the door to because he would very rarely come into my bedroom anyway / mm-hm / um, and then I went to sleep for a couple of hours and then I remember waking up and seeing that he wasn’t there and that the car had gone and so I went out, came back again and then assumed everything was okay said hello to my mum, blah blah blah and then a couple of hours later he would come back. He’d still be drunk because in that time he’d gone to the pub but he’d told my step-mum that he’d been at work. / So he lied to her? / Yeah

**Most of the things you did were not telling them the truth or pretending, right?**

**Pretending you were at school when if fact you weren’t there**

No well it wasn't actively telling lies,

**Try to think of active lies**

Active lies .......... {long pause} um I’m trying to think of a good one but all I can think of is sausages going missing and me getting the blame for it and me denying it and saying it was Name2. The one incidence I do remember is being told not to go to a particular shop and buy some sweets and I told my mum that I’d been round to see rob who was a friend of mine, a boy, um I said I wouldn't be that long but I did go to the shop and didn't realise what the time was and as I was coming back across a field um I saw my step-mum at the end of it and she looked furious and I remember riding a bike with this big bag of sweets on my handlebars and rapidly thinking I kind of put the bike down and kind of casually put the sweets on the floor in the hope she wouldn't see them sort of picked the bike up again and went towards he. I mean, by getting off the bike I was trying to pretend to see who it was / mm-hm / so pretty active. And then I rode over and got the usual what for and wait till your father gets home sort of thing.

**The usual what? Sorry?**

The usual wait till your father gets home bit-

**Okay, right. mm-hm.**

And she wouldn't have physically hit me but she sort of dragged me by the arm sort of thing / mm-hm / I wish I could think of more exciting lies to tell you but they were all petty trivial
lies the time like I could sort of sit down and tell you that this wall was pink and sort of argue about it for half an hour

Yeah, now tell me, when you pretended you were in school, did they believe you, did she believe you?
Yeah I mean, the only time they noticed was when they changed the school reports and they included a little box in the top corner which said how many days you'd taken off / mm-hm / and when it said things like 27 or 29 it started to raise questions.

Mm, they asked you questions / yeah. / And what happened then?
I can't actually remember what happened. I know they didn't ring up the school and I carry on doing it. And I think I did it as often

So when you came back an afternoon as if you came back from school- returned from school, what did she, and she was home, what would she have in mind then?
Um, I wouldn't know because when I got home from school we never really talked um I wasn't interested in what she'd been doing that day either, she wasn't particularly interested in I'd been doing. I just went up to my room more often than not, got changed and then went out again / yeah / I sort of- I told them very little about what was going on with me / right / and I didn't give them a chance to talk about what was going on for them.

But, say that you went back home, she would think that you were in school / yeah she would think I was in school / right, and pretending you'd been in school, what was in your mind then?
What was in my mind? / Yeah / .... I can't actually remember, I was constantly preoccupied with taking time off school. I mean after she did find out I would I just go in for the register every morning get my name ticked off by the teacher and then go and that way the days wouldn't tally up.

Right, but I mean you would have needed to hide it from her so lets think you had in mind that you weren't allowed to stay at home or take days off right?
Well there was nothing to hide because she wasn't interested in where I was going

But you hide it in a way / yeah I hide it / so you had something in mind that you needed to hide it.
Yeah, oh yeah I knew I had to hide it because I knew I’d get in trouble if I told them.

You’d get in trouble? / Yeah, if I told them / if you told them. / Yeah / so in this case it was a lie in order to escape punishment?
Yeah. / Right / I mean the fact is they never asked me how my day's been at school. They must have automatically assumed I'd been at school all day. Even if they'd asked me I'd have said I'd been because the fact was I wasn't actually lying because they never asked me where I'd been all day.

Right. And now when you're thinking about it does it add anything to your analysis about your behaviour?

Hmmm. not that I can think of. I'm sure if I went away and sat down for half an hour I could come up with a couple of things / mm / it hasn't triggered anything, no. I think all it's proved the last 15 minutes is how much I lied to them as they did to me. Whereas I've always thought it was them that did it to me. Well they've told the big lies, haven't they?

Hmmm, they told big lies? Other than the lie that you told me?

Um, er, of the {mother? can't hear} you mean. Well I think that one big one is / makes all little ones / big enough / right, mm-hm

But see you haven't got any clue to understand why they did it?

No I mean I've always assumed for the worst that they wanted to-.. My dad would have had the trouble of who would have told me if anyone at all. if my mum- if my step-mother had wanted to tell me she would have to talk to him before she would have told me / she would have..? / She would have had to speak to him because everything went via him / right / he was in control of everything / mm-hm / I can only think they didn't want to cause any wrinkles in the family, any arguments that would make things already worse than they already were. But it's only in the last few years that I thought that maybe I wondered, I wondered why my step- my real mother ran away and I think that- I mean I'm only guessing here but I assume that she was having a really bad drinking problem at the time and she just couldn't cope with it and also I don't know if I told you- did I tell you that she ran off with his brother? She ran off with his brother at the time. That's another fucking really big lie. That one really pisses me off. All these years my uncle was pretending very quiet and nice to me when he was the bastard that ran off with my mother I haven't seen him since I was told about it but I know what I'm going to do if I ever see him / yeah, I understand / I wouldn't have minded but they only split up about 2 years later / for 2 years they were together? / Yeah, / mm-hm / crazy. It's all his side of the family as well. I know where I get it.

But then, he was quite nice really with him? When you were a child? Your uncle?

Yeah.
And nothing was revealed?

I do remember an incident quite a few years back when I was about 13, 14 when my dad had been drinking a lot and he'd taken me away again and met up with the very same uncle in a pub on a motorway in Kent um for some reason I was sitting on my own on this table and my uncle and dad were speaking at a nearby table presumably because they didn't want me to hear what was being said and then they started arguing, they were fighting in the middle of this pub, and my dad was drunk out of his mind at the time apparently he'd asked my uncle to look after me while he tried to sort things up with my step-mum it's just crazy, it's mad ...but he didn't speak to his uncle- his brother till about 6 years after, all that had happened when I was born.

So, many things to work through, many things to / yeah, absolutely / you're thinking about {difference?}

Yeah well it's starting to come up a bit more in my sessions now about this I wish I-, I always feel there's this hidden agenda like there's this great big missing piece of the jigsaw that I don't know about and there's things going on that I-, well, I feel like there's things going on when in actual fact there aren't. I went to my review and I expected to be let into some big secret about what my problems were, but all they said was that I was doing okay and that I needed to work on my relationships and get my hands a bit more dirty.

Right, well I'll just switch it off-
Okay, now the next thing I would like maybe to talk about today is a bit about deception and lying. This section is about memories of time or events when you felt that your parents withheld the truth from you, didn't tell you the truth or even lied to you.

Um, ... I'm trying to think of some sort of examples. Like I know the feeling, em, ... , a feeling what I was expected to feel rather than what I was feeling, / right / so er, I'm just trying to think of an example...er...like when I broke my collar bone I can remember feeling physical pain and because my parents were both rowing about whether or not the shouldn't or should take me to casualty and my, my father was basically saying that I was making a complete fuss over nothing and it wasn't really hurting me and I was getting into a state about nothing really I can remember thinking, you know, how can he say that? I feel physical pain, my arms are sore / how old were you then? / I was about nine I think / so? / And I remember thinking how can you tell me that I'm making a fuss because I'm the person in my body and you're not in there and how do you know whether I've got any pain in my arms or not and, you know, you never saw what I did so how do you know, why are you telling me that I shouldn't be, you know, feeling like my shoulders are really painful, erm...

Okay, what do you think was in his mind when he told you that?

Em, I think it, erm I dunno I mean it was almost like I was being a bit inconsiderate really, you know like / inconsiderate to him? / Yeah like I'd hurt my arm and was expected to-cause that meant he had to put me in the car and take me to casualty and sit there for 4 hours and it would be really just too much hassle really to um, to deal with it / mm-hm / and I didn't actually- at the time I don't remember really feevery much about the fact that-, you know, because he was the only adult, sort of, around in my life, and my mum, you know, from sort of being around other children at school and I suppose teachers as well. you know, I doubted I mean some-... if my dad said to me something like "the sky is blue" then I don't know initially whether it's blue or pink, because if I hadn't seen blue before I wouldn't know what it looks like, anyway, if I said to, um you know, if I know it's blue and someone says to me "what colour is the sky?" and I say "blue" and they say "well no it isn't it's pink" and then I sort of question whether it's bland that's what I see or whether my dad has completely lied
to me and told me the wrong colour, so then I remember very gradually sort of questioning
everything that he did say then, erm, um, ... I dunno they go to sort of 2 extremes and one
would be to say, "if you sit down quietly and don't move your arms they won't hurt any
more." so I'd sit down quietly and not move my arms and they'd still hurt so as far as I'm
concerned he was lying because I knew that they were hurting / and you knew that they
were hurting? / Yeah, and so then ... I don't know, my mum said to me you know, stupid
things that people say to kids, you know, if you eat all your carrots you're going to have-,
you can see in the dark and I'd look at her and think she was crazy / you did..? / I'd think
she was crazy, telling me if I ate carrots that I could see in the dark because I couldn't
understand what she was talking about and I couldn't understand how eating these carrots
was going to actually make me see in the dark, because I couldn't see in the dark because it
was pitch black and whether I ate carrots or not it didn't make any difference, um...

What did they actually have in mind while telling you that....?
Well basically that they were good for you / that they were good for you? / Yep. / Mm-hm
/em /

And what do you think was in your father's mind when he told you that if you didn't
move your arms they wouldn't hurt you? What was in his mind then?
Well, I mean, I mean my answer would be different, at the time / at the time. / I thought he
would -, he was going to tell me how I could make things better, that if I sat still everything
was going to be okay / mm-hm / that it wouldn't hurt anymore if I didn't move / mm-hm /
and it was only when I did sit still for a while and it did still hurt that I doubted and even then
I can remember thinking you know, not necessarily that he was doing it in a malicious way
but that he wasn't right necessarily / mm-hm so what you doubt ...? /
Well I doubted myself in the end because I actually doubted whether or not I felt anything /
mm-hm / because if he was saying if I sat still then it wouldn't hurt, then the fact that I'd sit
still and it would still hurt meant that maybe I was doing something wrong or maybe I wasn't
sitting still you know it must've been that you know I must've moved because it was still
hurting / right. / em and I suppose I mean now it was like if you sit still you're not going to
sort of cause any more discomfort if you're still and if you're not going to be in any more
pain or discomfort you know the chances are I'm not going to be, you know, I'm not going
to have to go out for 2 hours time and take you to casualty / uh-huh / that is how I'd look at
it now but not at the time. um, .... Well I can remember sort of .. Well I can remember when
I cracked my head open with a swing um I think I told you about this when we'd run underneath a swing, we used to do it as kids / uh-huh / you used to sort of have all the swings out together and everyone lets go at the same time so they swing back and you run through the middle. / Mm-hm / and I did that and tripped and I sort of sat on the floor thinking that I was lucky because I didn't actually get hit by a swing cause I couldn't see any. And the thing was the swing was behind me and it came and whacked me on the back of the head / mm-hm / and I had, erm, I think it was about 4 stitches in the back of my head / mm-hm / and my mum wouldn't go to casualty with me / she wouldn't? / No so I went with my dad and I remember going in there and the only thing about it I can remember, er, is just desperately wanting to cry and I couldn't because every time I got close you know got close to tears I was, you know, I was told that I was a very brave girl and you know I was that I didn't need to cry because I was a big girl and you know "you're being very good" and you know, "you know you're being a good girl by not crying," and if you cry it's almost like sort of you know, sort of like you're being bad. / Uh-huh / and I can remember just having these stitches put in my head and the whole time I sat there I can remember only thinking about not crying and that was it / mm-hm / and then I can remember sort of after, I can remember that night in bed when I was really had a lot of- when my head was really sore, erm , feeling that it was okay to cry because I knew that it hurt and that was why I wanted to cry but I also knew that if I had cried and people had seen me then I would be not sort of doing what people wanted me to do, I'd be sort of like you know making a mess or you know making things look untidy. em, and I can remember being sort of l- at the time I don't think I thought my dad was lying or you know I really thought that if I didn't cry that I was going to be okay. And I didn't think, you know, you just don't want me to cry because you just can't cope with it or- but it was more just you know kind of, before you go to school or before you start spending quite a bit of time around other people and not just your family, initially you do feel like your parents are God really and what they say is true. and it's only really when you get other people on the scene that they sort of do things differently or react very differently. it's only then that I can remember that I questioned how I saw things really. and what happened when I did that was that I sort of, er, I can remember my parents saying you've got to do this this way because that's the best way and then I'd perhaps see someone doing something a different way but I still wouldn't know which was the right way erm, so, I didn't actually feel that my parents were lying but I did actually feel that what they thought was the
truth wasn't what everyone thought in the end. As the sort of, like if my dad said to me "don't cry because you'll be being really good." / it was lying. / I didn't feel it was a lie I felt it was the way that people coped / how do you think of a lie? / And then when sort of like I'd be upset at my friends or something and they didn't spend loads of time trying to stop me crying, then I would think well, I'm still okay and I cried. And I didn't actually think my dad was lying I just thought that he did things differently. Because I think if I had thought that he wasn't doing things that were with my best intentions, I think I would have hated him a long time ago. Um, but I think I didn't just- I think I went from believing in him wholly to sort of felling a bit sort of insecure because I didn't know if I could trust what he said, um, and I suppose that progressed to sort of feeling frightened because what I did feel wasn't solely what I was supposed to, um, which made me trust my parents even less.

Mm. {can't hear} I think the question that I want to ask you, if you could tell about your lying in childhood / mm-hm / lying to whoever, your parents or school. {can't hear}
Yeah. Yeah. I'll bring you a form back as well.

... Right so probably the next question I want to ask you is about your lying as a child. Can you think of instances or times when you lied. I'm not looking or I'm not interested in the moralistic issues that are behind / mm. / I'm not judging it. / Mm / you know from a moralistic point of view / yeah / I'd like to just know a bit more about events that happened and how your parents felt and what you felt and so on and so forth, okay?

Um, I think sort of generally, if I personally thought that I had done something I shouldn't have or um, if I felt that I was then, I felt like my parents were going to be angry with me without sort of great need to be, um, um, then like um I mean one afternoon I was going home. I went with my sisters to play by the stream we were playing on the rope string and I had her shoes on and I fell in athey were squelchy and I got home and I couldn't allow my mum to know that I'd got Sue's new shoes wet so I managed to sort creep in upstairs and took her shoes off, took her socks off, and I climbed out of her bedroom window which was sort of at the front of the porch and sort of I went on the front porch let myself down so I could then go back in the porch as if I'd just come in. and I can remember my mum saying oh where have you been and I remember saying oh I've just been for a walk. / Mm-hm / and
I can remember doing that because it was much easier than getting the sort of major things to do with the um, the shoes and that. And the other sort of things would be like, you know, "have you done all your homework?" "Yeah." and I'd know full well when you haven't. Um, "is everything you need for school ready in your room?" "Yeah." when it's not. and only a couple of times did I- my dad used to always ask us about our shoes and a couple of times "have you cleaned your shoes?" and I'd say yeah. And then I'd kind of try to get to them quickly and I'd clean them before he saw them and if my um, mum say put something on to wear that I thought looked ridiculous, there's no way I'd have told her as a child that she looked ridiculous because I'd be too frightened that I'd make her angry I'd say no I don't think you should wear that it makes you look fat.

Then you'd wear it? / No my mum would wear it. if she put on like a blouse and said, you know "do you think this looks okay.. / Oh yes I see, so then..? / Then I'd say oh yeah it looks lovely when really it looked awful. you wouldn't be asking for trouble saying that really. And I suppose the two um, well its probably only one really - classic that I can remember saying time and time again, the first one is why are you angry, I was sort of doing something saying I was angry, banging things in my bedroom or um, not eating my supper or and then I actually got to the point where didn't feel angry anyway, cause I didn't realise-feel like I had any anger in me anymore and in fact it was still there but I'd sort of become numb to it / mm-hm / um, but if my mother happened to see me crying or something, which is hardly ever but if she had noticed I'd been crying I certainly wouldn't, you know,- if she'd have said "are you upset?" I would have definitely said "no, I'm fine." and the only thing that made that slightly easier is when I started wearing contact lenses at about 14 so that if my eyes were a bit red I could just say "oh you know my lenses were playing up." and I can remember thinking that that was a good thing. um, .... Or if my mother sent me to the shops or my father even to go and buy, oh I don't know, a loaf of bread and some milk, very occasionally I used to get there and you know not remember what it was I was supposed to be getting and I'd turn back up with you know my pint of milk and then I'd realise when they said where's the bread that I hadn't got it, and rather than saying I forgot I'd probably say erm, they didn't have any.

So this event that you recalled, for example just to clarify, but that one where you walked to the shop and then you came back without the loaf or without the milk, / mm-hm / and you said that when they asked you for this thing, you realise you forgot it.
And they- and then you told them that they didn’t have it,- one of those-, why do you do this? What was in your mind when you said that they haven’t got / any bread or milk...

I suppose I was giving an excuse that sort of sounded sort of um a fairly sort of logical explanation for something because I was frightened that if I’d have said "I forgot it" that I’d either be sent back to get- have to go back and get it and not forget or that my mum would be angry to think that she gave me 2 things to remember and I actually forgot it. I mean she'd probably lay into me about the fact that you know: "how can you bloody forget to buy.." you know "I only asked you for 2 things" and I suppose it was just to sort of cushion the fact that she was going to be angry because I couldn't do what she'd asked or I didn't do what she'd asked me to do. And I suppose by making- I suppose I was just shifting the blame in a way for it, you know the blame- if they don't have any bread it's the blame of the shop. Whereas if I go to the shop and forget it it's probably my blame so I think I just shifted it to something different that my mother would find it very difficult to get angry at really.

I thought there was a fear of some kind of anger / yeah, just the fear of making her angry / and what do you think she had in her mind when you told her that there wasn't any bread there?

Um, I mean she wouldn't say I well never mind dear we'll get some tomorrow. I mean it would be questioned like "it's 2 o'clock in the afternoon and why have they run out of bread? They don't normally run out of bread at 2 in the afternoon." and it would probably end up with me having to go to a different shop and not the same one.

I think she would respond to your utterances but what it was in your mind with her telling you that it was just 2 o'clock and to go to another place?

Um, um, I suppose because she didn't really um, well, if I said there’s no bread at 2 o'clock in the afternoon apart from actually going there herself she couldn't actually check up on that so she had to take my word for it really. And I'd imagine at times she sort of thought about was there really no bread at 2 in the afternoon or did Denise just forget to get it/ mm-hm / yeah.

And then the former example about you being upset, crying or angry and you were denying it that you are, and the times when you felt {can't hear} from your point of view there are times you manage to keep it inside or you dissociate yourself from the pain / yeah. / And to pretend that its nothings happened, right? And we are not talking
about such a case / what? Initially when I was angry? / Initially, when you were angry. / Yeah. / Thank you, so then again I will ask you the same questions. What was in your mind while telling her that there was something wrong with your eye or that the contact lenses or you call it- what was the answer when you were younger? / er, / when she ask are you angry. / It would be "no, I'm not angry or upset" / right so lets take this notion, this answer and try to think what was in your mind while answering her back that you were happy there.

Um, I don't sort of know how exactly but sort of I can remember thinking er, but if I was upset um, and went to her for help, I can remember her not being particularly supportive um, in that the incident or you know you're just being silly or you're making a fuss over nothing, just you know just ignore it if it was painful. And I can't remember her advice ever being particularly helpful and so if she knew I was angry or she knew I was upset, and rather than have her try and get a reason from you so that she could say she didn't want to help me, I'd just say that there wasn't a reason there, there'd be no point um, and I suppose if I went inside, I don't- probably most of it stems from the fact that if I did cry which I did a fair amount when I was quite young, um, it was just so frowned upon and so sort of like you should not be doing it, um, I ended up sort of um, feeling if I was....... And so rather than think that I used to think the reason she's not helping me isn't because she doesn't care it's just because she doesn't know and I can remember being about 6, 7 thinking you know if I tell her that um I'm upset she's going to want to know why and then she's going to get angry with me cause sometimes I used to think when I was a bit older I used to feel that she was just saying it um, cause that seemed to be the done thing to do but she didn't give a damn what the answer was or you know I would say I was upset and the answer would be dismissed or something or I'd be made to feel stupid, um, / mm-hm / so um, I suppose I was sort of protecting myself in a way by not allowing her or my father in close enough to actually turn round and say no we don't really want to help you really.

Well, it seems that it was a point to protect yourself and to protect them as well as you said that at times you felt that she couldn't cope with it or he couldn't cope with it, with your feelings I mean not guilty so, but then again if you can try to trace what was as a child, the whether you felt or you knew what was in her mind when you dismissed her question ayour anger when you denied it. What did she think?
I didn't sort of feel that she um, I didn't feel that she didn't actually understand, I felt that it was obviously something I had done or something to do with me as to why um, why she sort of got angry, um, this is going round in circles and think um, I mean I didn't think she was being unkind when, um, she asked you know, "why are you an" but I feel like she actually didn't know, it wasn't that she didn't want to hear it I felt like she didn't understand, she didn't know why. / Why you were crying? / Yeah. / Right. and when you../ And when I told her why I was crying it would be dismissed so promptly that um, again instead of her um saying I sort of I don't really want to know why but I want you to sort yourself out rather than think that I used to think that she obviously didn't understand- I'm trying to think of an example, if I came in that door and came in the room and I had been crying, and walked out, I would imagine that I personally would think that you had not to do with the fact that I was crying. / Mm-hm / instead of thinking that you had seen me crying and you didn't say anything because you didn't care really it didn't make any difference whether you noticed or not and that was very much how it was. I couldn't cope with the fact that if I had being crying my mother was not going to help me and she certainly wasn't going to make me feel better. so the reason I didn't show her anything was because I didn't- I couldn't bare to think that the reason was she didn't care, it was always that she didn't know, or you know she didn't see it or / right. / It was very confusing..

It's difficult. What do you think the confusion means?

Um, I suppose the confusion came from when I was quite young, having some expectation that you know my mum and dad were sort of were quite sort of central to the world, you know, in that they'd um, um, I'm trying to think, what was the last bit again? Sorry.

You felt confused about I think that if you convinced you that she wasn't around to see you crying it was better than knowing she didn't care.

So, we are thinking back about your childhood. Do you remember anyone in the household withholding the truth from you?

Yeah my dad. He's never told us where he was born. / Mm /I only found that out when I was about 21.

Okay, but did you ask him?
Yeah yeah loads of times he just wouldn't say.

And what led you to ask him?
Well I guess you're just interested in where your parents are born or where they're from. / Mm-hm /

Right and how did he respond?
He just didn't want to talk about it so my mother would say he doesn't want to talk about it, leave him alone. We just left him alone with it.

So when it happened what did he have in mind, or rather, what did you think?
Didn't really think anything of it really, just thought, you know, whatever.

And that's okay, he withheld the truth. And what happened when you were 21?
I asked him or something or else my mother told me, whatever.

Okay. And did he tell you anything about the reason for withholding it?
No he didn't, he wouldn't really talk about it, my mother just went on, cause he was born in England, he was born in London, she said he had a big thing about people knowing he was English.

Right. Okay. Any other instances any other thing you can recall about your parents withholding the truth or them lying to you. Were there any major ones?
Not really, no.

Mm-hm you don't remember times when anybody from your family deceived you?
No, not really.

Mm-hm, what about occasions or instances when either mum withheld the truth from dad or deceived him in any way and vice versa.
I dunno she used to just bitch about him constantly it wasn't just any sort of- anyway we wouldn't have been let in on that if there was something going on, so..

Okay now we can go to the next question which is about your lies or the way you didn't tell the truth or whatever and we know that children not just children, all of us, do not tend to tell the truth all the time. so try to remember times of you withholding the truth or telling them lies. / Of me? / Yeah either as a child or as a teenager.
I used to do it constantly when I was a teenager. I used to I went through this stage of just staying out all the time from the house and she'd ask me where I was and I'd just lie, you know, say I was where I wasn't really / mm-hm / or they'd ask me if I was on drugs and they'd lie a bit about that. / Mm-hm / basically I'll just lie when I have to get out of a sticky situation it has to be the easiest option. / Mm-hm / or depends how I feel about the person
I'm lying to if I trust them or whatever if I like them and feel that if I lie to them it would mess everything up then I wouldn't lie / mm-hm / probably not. No, I wouldn't. / You wouldn't? / No.

Can you try to think of a specific example of lying to your parents?
Oh you know usual shit when you get to about 15 like do you smoke? Oh no, I don't smoke. That sort of thing. That's an easy option um, a little one.

Um, any other specific instance where you came home late or you didn't want them to know where you'd been to?
Um, yeah I went through a stage when I was 19 when I used to hand around with this person and I used to drink a lot, like she was my drinking buddy and um, we were forbidden to see each other and all this sort of thing by her parents and my parents and um, I used to meet her and they'd ask me where I was or whatever and I used to lie about that and um / what did you tell them? / I can't remember what I used to tell them really, just whatever, parents can be pretty thick at times / mm-hm / and then I got the whole thing when they found out, how can we ever trust you again and all that shit so whatever you know.

So, when you told them a fib or something which was not the truth, it would be something like er, you'd been to the cinema or watching something or - how would you..?
Well most likely- well every time I did see her I went home completely plastered and I'd just say I was on my own or something if they kept on at me / mm-hm / Right. Mm-hm, and what did you have in mind while telling them that you were on your own?
Nothing really / mm-hm / or- because I knew that they knew that I had seen her that I would either not be able to see her again or would get into trouble for it and it's just, you know, deny everything. / In order not to get into trouble, hmm? / Or in order not to cause hassle for yourself yeah.

Right. And what do you think was in their mind or your mums mind when you told them that you were on your own?
I don't know at the time I didn't care.

Mm-hm and then later on what do you think was in her mind when you told her such things?
She was probably just worried, you know, because I was being called an alcoholic left, right and canter / mm-hm / and I wasn't doing anything about it and she couldn't stop it so I would say it was just very much that she was really concerned but I didn't really care at the time.

Right. And when you were younger you mentioned something about smoking and denying smoking.

Well yeah you know, oh no I don't smoke, you know?

Again can you think of the thing you had in mind while denying you smoke.

That they'd kill me / they'd kill you / at 15 if they caught me smoking fags. / Mm-hm, so you were frightened of them? / Probably yeah.

Mm-hm, and what was in their mind when you...?

I don't know sometimes I'd just think that my mother especially was just malicious, she'd love to have caught me out. my fathewas more concerned sometimes but um, sometimes she just- I remember when I went home after school I was 16 and they'd gone through everything in my room and they'd found cigarettes and, like, their excuse, I mean they lied to me, their excuse was that they were cleaning my room up. / Mm. / they'd been through every single thing in my room to see if I had anything / mm-hm / so..

And what would they do if they found something?

Well they found cigarettes and they just went absolutely mad about you know smoking da di da.

Shouting at you or..?

Oh yeah and the whole guilt thing you know. / What do you mean the whole guilt thing / well, you know, I mean we trusted you look what you've done to us.

Mm-hm. any other memories that you have with regard to telling lies?

Yeah, I used to lie then because after, well when I was about 19, 20 when I was going out with this woman, like, they um forbid me to see her because um, she was a bit of a bitch in ways and um, then I started seeing her again and my mum used to ask me and I'd say no ofcourse I'm not, I've been through that, you know, I've learnt. / Mm-hm / and then my dad used to ask me and I'd say "no, no".

And were there any other, was there any story inventions or just denying.
Sometimes I'd invent that I'd been at a friend's or something but I'd more than likely be aware of the fact that if they got on the phone to them and asked them that I'd get into worse. I used to mostly deny everything. / Mm-hm /

Now one interesting thing about the kind of value that you wouldn't lie to anybody that you trust. Right? / Or valued. / yeah, or valued and your talking about today or..?

Well, unless I thought it would do something to the relationship then I'd lie if I had to.

Mm. can you think of an example of contemporary or current deception. Then again I want to making sure of, I'm not interested in the er, / there aren't any current deceptions, really, except with my family, there's a bit of deception there. But that's about it really. / mm-hm /

Yeah {phone rings} right. As I told you I'm not interested in the er ethical or moralistic issue behind lying but the way people or how people use lies and how they understand lying and deception. Any- can you remember any other..

Well, there used to always be a suspicion anyway in / sorry? / There was never a big trust factor in my family there was always a suspicion that you weren't telling the truth anyway so it just seemed the most natural remedy then you think you know I might as well lie, you know, just tell them what they want to hear, you know and they'll be happy.

Right, and how would you know what they want to hear?

Yeah mostly, yeah. / You would know? / Well I'd know what to not bloody tell them anyway you know / say it again? / I'd know what to not tell them / mm-hm. such as not smoking not..? / Anything that had to do with their sort of moral crap. / Mm-hm / that was that.

But then they said that you wouldn't be trusted at home that they wouldn't trust you / they wouldn't trust me no. / is that with other child as well or just with you? / Well when I was, I don't know I just remember like um, I suppose I must've been about 9 and my mum went ballistic one day and I can't remember what it was about, about nothing really. And 2 people went up to see me and I went out with them for a walk. And then she just went on about how I must've told them everything and I didn't like it's not the kind of thing you want to blast around the place and she was like oh you probably told them, you told them everything and I hadn't but I wasn't believed but you know, you're never believed when you didn't do something, and what was the point of not lying.

What does she men about telling them everything?
About, like, her blowing up and / **mm** / whatever.

Okay. Fine so anything else that you'd like to add before finishing this part? / No. / Right.
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I: I would like to ask you about times you remember your parents withholding the truth from you, or in fact was lying to you, as a child.
P: hmmm. I don't remember them lying... I think there's one big thing, I think they did lie to me about and that was the fact that they lied to me about my brother dying and how he died. And that still sticks in my mind to day so...
I: Can you tell me a bit more about that and how old were you?
P: I was six when my brother died. My mother told me my brother died from an illness that couldn't be cured.
I: What was the illness?
P: She didn't say what illness, she just said it was an illness... And hmm..... I did feel that it was her way of covering up guilt... For the mistakes she made by putting him in bed with her. I'm not quite sure... I have my... I've never been told this but.... I have this feeling.... I think that my brother died through suffocation. So my mum woke up in the middle of the... in the morning.... My brother was at the bottom of the bed under the blankets.
I: How old was he?
P: Six months old..... And that was quite a big lie. I don't know if that was also to cover guilt, I don't know. I have never asked questions like that.
I: And what do you think was in her mind when telling you that he had incurable illness?
P: Hmmmm.... I don't really know actually.... I don't know.
I: And now as an adult can you think of what probably was in her mind when telling you that he died from incurable illness?
P: ...... I don't know.
I: Have no idea. Any other deceptions that come up to mind?
P: Hmm..... No, I don't think so.
I: For example, you told me that you didn't know your real father. Did you know that your stepfather was in fact a stepfather when he joined you?
P: Yes.
I: Now you can try to think of occasions when you lied as a child either to your parents, in school or what ever. It is also just to remind you that I am not judging lies and it is known that people lie, almost everybody lies, and it is a kind of things that we all do.

P: Yes...... The biggest lie I ever told my mum was denying that I wrote a letter to her health visitor. That was few years after my abuse had started. My uncle and myself. Until I told someone what was going on, but not actually naming names. My sister had found this letter. She knew the name of the person, she knew the person, the health visitor, my sister, so she gave it to her, and the health visitor confronted me... and of course she confronted my mum and said, you know, I got this letter from one of your daughters, but she didn’t say what one. So of course I denied it.

I: She asked you if it was you who had written the letter?

P: Yes. My sister denied it, I denied it...

I: Can you tell me a bit more what was in your mind when denying that it was you who had written the letter?

P: I really wanted to tell the truth, I really wanted to say, “Yes, it was me that I’ve written the letter”, and my reasons of writing that letter, but I just couldn’t, I just couldn’t... Hmmm.... Just couldn’t come up with the fact that her brother was abusing me. And..... Because I...I... I thought I thought that if I told all my life will be probably ...hhh.... I have ended then.

I: In what way?

P: She would have made it...my life a misery, that I would have killed myself, or that she would have done it for me, that she would have ended my life.

I: And that it was in your mind then as a child?

P: Yes.

I: And when you denied it...

P: My sister confronted me about it.

I: On why you denied it?

P: Yes.... So I just said to her it doesn’t matter any more. And let’s forget about it... and we did...and it was never spoken after that. She had never... she hadn’t read the letter so she didn’t know what was in the letter. She only knew what was on the envelope, what name it was. So she never read the letter.

I: Right.
P: So she didn’t know about the abuse.
I: And ... when the health visitor told mum about the letter, and before asking you, or confronting you about the letter, what do you think was in her mind? What was she thinking?
P: Who? My mum?
I: Yes.
P: ............ Don’t really know actually............... Don’t know.
I: And after denying it what do you think she had in her mind? What was she thinking about?
P: Well when I, we both denied it..... she said that she would find out which one of us had written it....hmmm.... And that whoever it was................ She did say that she was killing us.
I: And that...
P: Because it’s a taboo subject. And maybe she was feeling guilty in herself about what was in the letter itself, about the abuse of her brother, maybe she was feeling guilt herself about the abuse that she so had inflicted on me. I don’t know. And maybe that was her way of getting her anger out.. On you know.... Her guilt by lashing out.. I don’t know. I never really sat down and had a proper conversation with my mum....
P: About anything.... You know..... We wouldn’t talk about school or friends or... nothing really.
P: It’s like when she became ill, I didn’t really know what was going on..... I was old enough to know but.... I was never sort of confided in that kind of way... I mean few weeks before she was taken into hospital I met her crying down the street, you know, I said what was wrong but she just said she had this backache for weeks and I tried to talk to her then. I managed to get an appointment with my GP, not hers, and it was through my GP diagnosing her as having gall stones that we finally found out what was wrong with my mum. But we still didn’t really talk, you know. An I’d go round to visit her, and still don’t know what to say, she never.. Huh.....I think I spoke more to my dad (SW stepfather) than I did to my mum.
I: Yes, it was difficult. OK. Well, yesterday you mentioned another lie, it was about your sister....
P: Oh, my sister... What had happened was that my sister... Hmm... Told me she was not coming home for dinner so I told mum that she was no going to come for dinner.
I: and how old were you?
P: Sixteen.
I: And you knew where she was staying?
P: Yes. Hmmm... Anyway I told my mum that she wasn’t coming over for dinner, and about half an hour after me telling my mum this, who is walking in the door for dinner, but my sister. Hmmm... And denied that she a had ever said it to me and she made me to be the liar... and that was when all things were broke up about...you know pregnant and that..... I was still put as the one that was lying...my sister hadn’t said this.... But I you know I don’t think my mum ever really lied to me about anything but that incident and don’t recall myself lying to her because I knew what would happen.
I: What do you mean by saying I knew what would happen?
P: I knew that my mum would always found out if I lied, you know?
I: How comes that she would always find out?
P: ..... Hmmm...... OK I take an incident that happened.... Hmmm... Huh.... My sister was seeing this boy. OK, and my parents didn’t know about him. I would go out with my sister and say we would go to the pictures, but would happen is my sister would go to see my boyfriend and I had to hang around sort of somewhere else and hmmm...hmmm...this time we were supposed to meet up at 9 o’clock to be home and hhh... my sister didn’t turn up at the corner in the street where I would was waiting for her to go home, so I ended up going home on my own, hmm.... And I had to hhh.. And I said that I had to leave my sister with a friend and that she wasn’t with me, and my mum found out that she had been seeing this boy behind her back, you know... But I got the… as well because I lied to her, you know.
I: And again, what was in your mind when you told her that your sister was staying with friends?
P: ................ I don’t really know hmm.....I don’t really know what was..... I don’t really know..... I can’t even answer
I: So you don’t really know what was in your mind?
P: No, but I know what was in my mind..... I was frightened of my mum....... (unclear)....
She was always saying to me that if I am going to be late why not to stay out for the
night.....But I couldn’t do that...
I: Staying out for the night?
P: No, I couldn’t hmmm... when I was really 5 minutes late I knew I’d get told off, but I
couldn’t stay out for the night...... And I never (unclear)........ At my mum, I only once
did that and I got the ruler ....... (unclear)
I: And do remember occasions lying to your dad?
P: No, I never really lied to him. I don’t think so. And don’t recall him lying to me.
I: And what about school, do you remember lying at school? To your teacher?
P: Yes, I’d lie about getting to class late.... The teacher kept us in our last lesson, she was
talking to us, and in fact we weren’t with the teacher.
I: And when you told that what was in your mind?
P: That the teacher would ask the other teacher whether it was true and I’d get detention
(laughing).
I: So you say that you had thought that the lie would be exposed?
P: Yes. I used to hate getting detention, cause if I was late from school I would be in
trouble by my mum.
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I: So, thinking back about your childhood, try to remember times when either of your parents withheld the truth from you.
P: Well, my mum hid the fact that my father.... My stepfather was an alcoholic, you know she used to make excuses for him....
I: What would she say?
P: She would just say he’d gone out shopping or he’d gone to buy a newspaper.... That’s like on the nights she wasn’t working, sometimes she worked the nights.... I mean in the morning she’d just say he had got a headache and he is in bed.
I: That he’d got a headache?
P: Yes, and he had got hangover really.....
I: And when she told you that he’d just gone out, what was in your mind?
P: I didn’t know any better, any different...
I: You mean that you believed her?
P: Yes.
I: And in the mornings?
P: I still didn’t know that he was drinking, and that it was causing him to be aggressive.
I: So what did you think?
P: Just unpleasant.
I: That you felt unpleasant?
P: No, that he was... Yes..... I didn’t realise what caused it and I just wasn’t told.
I: And when firstly did it come to your mind that he was drinking?
P: I suppose like coming up to being a teenager, I realised...hmm... The smell of the alcohol and things like that... And that mum was lying... that was out just to buy a newspaper.
I: And after revealing this secret, what do you think mum had in mind, withholding it from you?
P: I suppose she just wanted to protect us from that?
I: What do you mean?
P: To protect us from his drunkenness, I suppose. But we used to hear rows going on. So I suppose he came home drunk and rowed, and we didn’t realise he rowed because he was drunk, when he was having arguments with her. Mum used to try and hide that and say that it was nothing, you know.

I: The rows?

P: Yes.

I: So that happened when you’d asked what it was about?

P: Yes, but she would never give us an answer.

I: And what did you have in mind?

P: As a child I just didn’t know.

I: And did you try to imagine what it was about?

P: Well I used to think that it was all about money, mainly. That she’d spent too much money.

I: He would blame her for spending much money?

P: Yes. I suppose really now looking back, he wanted money from her to drink and she wouldn’t give it to him. And being a child we didn’t understand all that.

I: Right. And at the time when she denied that there’d been any rows, how did you feel, how did you reacted?

P: Well I used to hate him because he was our stepfather and she was our mum, and we both tried to be protective towards her.

I: What do you think mum was trying to protect you from?

P: I think seeing the.... Seeing what.... Hearing and seeing the rows and things like that. She used to say: “It was nothing, just go away, we are just having a row, we, grown ups have arguments, but this used to be dealt just as a one of things.

I: Do you remember any other instances ..........................
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I: Um, so thinking back about your childhood, er, try to think of instances or memories where you felt or you thought that either of your parents withheld the truth from you.
S: Um, can't think of-
I: You can't think of any specific example? And any other persons, the people around who withheld the truth or didn't tell you the truth and you knew that they didn't?
S: Um, I don't think so.
I: You don't? You can't think of anyone else? Okay, now, generally we all lie, generally speak about lying it's the kind of thing we all do and even though sometimes we might feel that it's not moral to do such things but mainly we need to lie, it's as simple as that. And as it is children do lie, and it's part of their development that they lie. And when you mentioned before lying about something try to think again, try to memories about you as a child lying to er to whomever and then we can discuss the examples. Minor lies or even major lying. And again before doing so I must say that I'm not interested in the moral or the ethical issues behind lying. As I told you I do know that each of us lies. I lie, you lie, and everybody lies.
S: Um, the problem is that I don't have a very good memory from when I was younger. / Mm. / I can't really think of anything.
I: So then when you mentioned lying about when you were going out, what did you have in mind?
S: Um, just sort of it's more just making up excuses as to why I couldn't go.
I: Such as? Think of any specific one.
S: Um, don't know, going out to people's houses and things I used to say I was doing something else when I just didn't want to go. / Say it again, I didn't hear. / Um, just when, um, I was supposed to be going out with people that I didn't want- couldn't manage or whatever I just used to say I was doing something else.
I: And you would rather stay at home, for example? / Yeah.
I: What kind of other things would you say? What kind of excuse?
S: I'd just say I had to stay at home to help out at home or something or..
I: Mm-hm, mm-hm, and right. Okay, and are you thinking of a specific person?
S: Not really.
I: Not really. Whoever?
S: / Yeah, I just-
I: Okay so try to think of maybe other times when you were more of a grown-up when you either withheld the truth from others or even lied to them. / Um, / I just want to take one or two examples and just analyse, just understand the process there.
S: Dunno, it's just the same sort of thing, when I can't manage to go out -
I: So try to think of a specific example, I mean just one we can discuss.
S: When I go home from here at weekends um, and friends phone up and want me to go out with her and I can't manage it. Instead of saying I can't manage it / so think of a specific friend who called you, I mean / um, yeah, I mean my best friend and Unwin asked me if I could sortof go round in the evening or something when I get back from here and instead of saying that I can't- couldn't manage it I sort of say that I'm busy doing something else.
I: Okay, then what did you have in mind when telling him or her? / Her. / Her, that you have something else to do?
S: Um, just because I think if I tell her that I can't manage to come round that she'll take it personally, that she thinks that I don't want to come round and see her and it's not so much that it's a problem of my own really
I: Right. So she- you don't want to hurt her in a way? / Yeah. / And what do you think she has in her mind when you are saying that you think you have something else to do at home?
S: Some kind of-.. Or?.. What's her name?
I: So what does she have in mind?
S: I think she's always pretty suspicious anyway, even if it's the truth that I can't go because I'm going somewhere else I think she always is quite suspicious that it's actually her that I don't want to come round and see.
I: She is suspicious about it? /
S: Yeah. / I mean she thinks that you really don't want to meet her, / yeah. /
I: That you don't want to go out with her?
S: Um, yeah I think she probably suspects that I’m just lying or whatever / mm-hm / um, but I think she thinks that even when it is the truth and I really am doing something else.
I: When you have something to do you mean?
S: Yeah, I think she still thinks that it's an excuse.
I: Right, hmm. And then, do you always say that it's the same kind of excuse that you need to do something else? / Um, / and is it the same pattern of lying with her?
S: Yeah, usually.
I: Usually, mm-hm, and right. Any other, think of another one. by the way with this kind of lie it feels that it doesn't work? Is it?
S: Um, I don't know because I don't kind of check up with her if that's what she's thinking or not I just- / yeah, all right, but from your side? / From my point of view, yeah, it doesn't
I: Doesn't really work?
S: Not really, no. I don't know any others?
I: With your parents?
S: Just the same again, making excuses, "I'm not very well" things like that.
I: When mum would ask you to go out or..?
S: Yeah, when she'd ask me if I were coming round to see her in the evening or something.
I: Mm-hm. and then you would say that?
S: Um, I dunno I'd just say I was going out with someone else or just say I was going out to work, you know.
I: You would say that you would go somewhere else? / Yeah. / Right, what do you have in mind while this not accepting her offer or invitation and saying that you go out with somebody else or you do something else while in fact you don't- you do not do this?
S: Um, I just can't bear spending time with my mum so / right. / So sort of letting her down gently rather than saying / letting her down gently rather than? / Just telling her outright that I just don't want to see her, I sort of think it's a bit easier. / Mm-hm.
I: And what do you think she has in mind while telling her that you are going out? Oh, this is the thing that you- are you saying that you're going out or you'd rather stay at home? What would you say? What would you tell her?
S: That I'm going out.
I: That you're going out / yeah. / That you're going out, okay, so what do you think she has got in her mind? When you tell her that you’re going out.
S: Er, well she gets quite upset, I mean you can tell from her tone of her voice that she's quite upset that I'm not going round but I don't know what she's thinking, don't know.
I: Right, and what about you and your dad, your father?
S: Um, I don't know, I don't see my dad any more so.
I: Right, I see, say in the past. You lived together, I understand until recently?
S: Yeah. Yeah, until a few years ago. No I didn't dare lie to him, so.. / You didn't dare lie to him. / No. / So, you were afraid of him? you were scared of him? You were frightened of him? / Um, yeah. / Mm-hm, I see, right.
I: But then when you say that you didn't dare lie to him, it should be in your mind, constantly in your mind that you felt like wanting to lie in certain circumstances but didn't because you were frightened?
S: No, can't think of any / specific things or examples. / No.
I: Okay, fine. So, that's about it.

{tape cuts}
I: It's er, the issue of withholding the truth. / Mm-hm / so, do you remember times when either mum or dad withheld the truth from you?
S: Um, not really, no.
I: They didn't tell any lies to you?
S: Not that comes to mind. Um,
I: And you had times as a child that you knew that adults had lied to either father had lied to mum or vice versa
S: Um, I'm not sure where my father said money went to whether he, you know, I don't think he admitted it went to gambling. I'm sure there was some deception there but I wasn't present in these situations.
I: Okay. In that case maybe it's easier, not always, to think about your lies. I mean as a child we all lie a child needs to lie. There are certain stages when children do lie / yeah / can you think of any instances when you lies to them either as a child or as a teenager and then we can discuss these examples.
S: Um, well I suppose - are you talking up until any particular age? Or...?
I: Generally up until the age of 16.
S: Up to 16, right. Um, / take your time. / Well, I still- I can't, you know, well I'm sure there was a general- odd fib about where exactly I was going on Saturday night, who exactly I was going to but I can't remember anything specific, no. I'm not a big liar, I'm not a big liar now. You know, I just- I get flustered when I lie which goes to show that I do it.
I: Try to think of some other time when you lied to somebody who was close to you, either parents or a friend or
S: Up until the age of 16? / Whenever. / Well, when I was at university which was obviously after I was 16, I had a relationship with someone called Ross who's Jewish and so even though he occasionally used to come down during the holidays and stay at our house my parents would say "are you going out with him? are you going out with him?" and I would say "no." but it didn't stop them giving me all the standard lectures about you know going out with a non-Jewish boy. but um, I carried on with that and now I don't tell them about my relationships at all, knowing that they wouldn't approve. but that's the only- actually I can think of another one but it's around the same time. I think it was the 16th, when I was 18 before I went to university I became pregnant and not by the boyfriend that I mentioned earlier but somebody else and um, my mother kept asking me and I kept saying I wasn't. I sorted it out- I think she overheard a phone call I had with a friend. And um, basically what she did was she had- basically since I was a little girl she put aside um money every month into a bank account or post office account and she just handed me the book and she said I've just signed this money over to you and so with that money I went and had a termination. / Right. / Um, but I never ever admitted it to her, ever.
I: Did she ask you whether you were pregnant?
S: Yep. And I said "no."
I: What was in her mind when she asked you?
S: What was in her mind? /
I: Yes, or what do you think was in her mind?
S: Well, she was bound to be terribly, terribly worried. / Mm-hm / also it was actually a very bad time- very bad time in my life, um, one of my closest friends, he was male but not the father of the child, um, had just been killed in a car crash and it was also the time I was taking my A-levels so all this was happening at the same time and I was just- I think I was a bit doolally actually. I just locked myself up in my room which is not surprising given everything um,
I: When you denied being pregnant what did you have in mind?
S: Oh, I knew I was going to have a termination, I wasn't going to have a child. And I was dealing with it.
I: But you were denying to her that you were pregnant.
S: Yeah, I didn't want- I couldn't handle the sort of worry. That kind of guilt and worry, guilt and worry that I would have to have if I told her so it was easier just for me to deal with it.

I: Right, so you didn't want to affect her emotionally.

S: I suppose part of was because I knew I'd been horrendously stupid in what had happened. I believed someone when he told me I couldn't get pregnant, you know, um, and I suppose if I'd admitted to her that I'd become pregnant and the reasons this happened and everything else like that, in a way it would reinforce her justification to be worried about me the whole time. / Mm-hm / and there I was trying to fight for my independence and going to university and she would, you know, it would be a reason for her to say "but you can't live by yourself, you don't know how to live by yourself, you can't look after yourself, look what happened, you've got to stay at home and I've got to molly-coddle you." / mm./ So, it was best for me, even though she knew, it was best for me to- for it never to come out. my father never knew, I don't know if he knows to this day.

I: And when you denied it, did you know that she knew? Or did you think that she knew?

S: yes, she wouldn't have done what she did. / Right, sorry? / She wouldn't have done what she did, I mean hand over this money? / Sure. / In the way that she did it if she didn't know. But what upset me is the way she found out. This is, you know, part of her worrying about me is like trying to keep track of everything. I found like, I mean before then, I found in the back of her address book that she kept in her bedroom, phone numbers of friends so that if I was out she could ring them all up, and I scribbled them all out. You know things like that. You know and the reason she found out is because she'd listened into a phone call / {can't hear.} / yeah absolutely. and um, with him anyway and this was a terrible, terrible invasion of my privacy. It was total disrespect to me.

I: Anyway when.. If you can remember this occasion, when you did deny it, what do you think was in her mind?

S: Well, she was probably terribly upset that I didn't tell her but that wasn't what was going through my mind at the time. I mean, at the time I was trying to keep myself afloat, you know and dealing with everything. But looking back it must've been heart-breaking for her that I wouldn't let her in to help me.

I: Right. Anything else that you remember.
S: Any other big lies? {laughs} / or small ones./ small lies. Well as a child or something, 
you know, if I took something from a shop, a sweetie or something I think every child has 
taken something at some stage. / It's not a lie that. / It's not a lie, yeah, but um and then 
mum finds a sweet and says "where did you get that from?" and you say "a friend took it." 
or "a friend gave it to me." whatever and, I mean, I can't really remember. That was a big 
thing in my life so that's why I remember it but I think I blanked it out, I seem to have done 
that, I seem to remember these instances and I remember this is how it affected me but you 
know if you ask me what the number of day was, like you did, I can't really remember. 
I: I don't think that if you would try harder you would bring up more memories so just 
relax.
S: Really, oh great. But it's not something I've thought about for the past 8 million years, 
so..
I: Okay, you just mentioned this small lie about the boyfriend. And what was in your mind 
when you lied about this?
S: Oh, because I knew that they wouldn't stop going on about it, you know, that they- there 
would be total disapproval. I mean, you know, they didn't stop going on about it even 
though I tried to cover it up. Every time I went back for the holidays, back to my parents, 
I'd get the whole ... about stuff and, you know, I could understand certain points of view 
but in the end, you know, I wasn't going to marry him. / You wasn't / no it was a 
relationship {can't hear}. Um, but he was- it was- I lied to protect myself. Again, I lied to 
protect myself. I think that's what I do, I lie to protect myself. I don't lie to hurt other 
people, I don't lie to- for reasons of just sheer dishonesty, I think I lie when I protect myself. 
And I lied to protect myself then.
I: Right, I can switch off the tape.
This bit is about your childhood up until the age of about 16. We can just thin up till there and then we can go for other ages. So thinking back about your childhood, okay? Do you remember times when either your parents withheld the truth from you?

Well my mum hid the fact that my father was- that my stepfather was alcoholic, you know, she used to make excuses for him / yeah. And it has been a thing since you can remember? / Yeah. / What would she say? / She would just say he'd gone out shopping or gone to get a newspaper and / mm-hm / and he'd be gone like- we'd be in bed and he still wouldn't be home / right. / That's like on the nights she wasn't working. Sometimes she worked at nights. / Right, okay / and then in the morning she would just say he's got a headache and he'd be in bed / that he'd got a headache? / Yeah, / mm-hm / and it was a hangover really.

And, when she did tell you that he was just going out, that's what you thought? / Yeah. / And what was in your mind? / We didn't know any better {can't hear} / and in the morning? / We still didn't know that it was drink that was causing him to be aggressive and.. / So, what did you think? that he was a bit sick or..? / Just unpleasant / you felt unpleasant? / No, that he was. / That he was unpleasant? / Yeah, we didn't realise what caused it cause it just wasn't told.

Mm-hm, right. And when first did it come to your mind that it was drinking?

Um, I suppose um like coming up to being a teenager um, we realised that he smelt of alcohol / mm-hm / and things like that and that mum was lying. / About? / About saying that he was out you know just buying a newspaper or something. / Uh-huh, right

So she didn't disclose it to you?

No she didn't say that he drunk.

Mm-hm, and after knowing- after revealing this secret, what you have in mind? What did you think that mum had in mind while withholding this thing?

I suppose she just wanted to protect us from it. / What do you mean? / to protect us from his drunkenness I suppose, like we used to hear rows going on so I suppose he came home drunk and rowed with her but we didn't realise that he rowed with her cause he was drunk
we just thought he was having arguments with her / mm-hm / and mum used to try and hide
that and say it was nothing, you know. / The rows? / Yeah.
So then, for example you would ask what it was about or..?
Yeah, but she never gave us an answer
And what did you have in mind?
Well, as a child I just didn't know.
You didn't know anything about it? / No. / and do you remember yourself trying to
imagine what it was about?
Well, we used to think it was over money mainly / mm-hm / that they rowed cause she'd
spent too much money / and he accused her or he blamed her for..? / For spending too
much money, yeah. I suppose really like looking back now, he wanted money from her to
drink and she wouldn't give it to him but a child we didn't understand all that. / Mm-hm.
Right and at the time when she denied that there were any rows, how do you
remember yourself your feelings towards it, the way you reacted?
We used to hate him because he was our step-father and she was our mum / mm-hm / and I
suppose try to be protective towards her.
Right, so you um, felt that you were kind of protective towards her? / Yeah. / And you
also said that when you found it out that he was a heavy drinker, er, you felt that
maybe mum was trying to protect you. / Yeah. / What from? What did she want to
protect you from?
I suppose seeing the - seeing what- hearing and seeing the rows and him hitting her and that
she was trying to protect- she would say it's nothing, go away, we're just having a row or
grown-ups have arguments / mm-hm / but this used to be day after day, it wasn't just a one-
off thing. / Mm-hm
Did your mum have any other instances or occasions or things that either your
stepfather or your mother withheld?
I remember once they were in the kitchen cooking Sunday dinner, which was stew, we didn't
have roast dinner then and he threw the pot of stew across the kitchen floor and we had no
dinner because they were rowing in the kitchen and told us to keep out of the kitchen and us
to keep out of the kitchen and go in the living room. / Mm-hm, and..? / We just- I don't
know if I was with my brothers now or what happened, I just remember he threw a pot of
stew / at her? / I don't know if it was at her. It was on the kitchen floor. She was screaming
and we ran in, she didn't seem as if she was wet or anything and it was just on the floor we had no dinner that day.

And then, did you ask mum or him what was happening? What..?
Well I suppose we knew they were rowing but we got told not to ask questions and to mind our own business and shut up and be quiet.

And how are they related to withholding the truth?
Well it's hiding the truth isn't it? / In what sense? / In not explaining what's happening, / mm-hm / you know, we got frightened because we didn't know what was happening and they never told us what they rowed about, they just seemed to keep rowing.

So, what were you frightened about?
I suppose him harming her, / mm-hm / and not having a mum.

Anything else that comes to mind?
I suppose we most probably thought if we got involved, we would be hit. / Mm, by..? / By my stepfather. / Which occasion did he hit you? / Em, not in their rows but he did hit me yeah, I told you he hit me with straps / yeah, right.

Okay, now ... we can try to discuss lies or withholding the truth from your standpoint so - and I know and you know that children and all of us at specific times, not always, do lie / yeah. / I mean, and so, try - again - try to remember some kind of lies or times when you had to withhold the truth from either mum or your step-father, I mean- Well there's lots of little lies um, because we was never allowed to take anything from the cupboard, we always had to ask permission not like kids of today and if you took a couple of biscuits that was stealing and um, we or I used to say that it wasn't me when it was me but I said it wasn't me so I didn't get blasted.

So, when you took out some sweets or something like that, / biscuits. / Biscuits, mm-hm, right and it was a kind of daily thing? / Sort of after school we'd have a couple of biscuits but she'd always know and I'd say no it wasn't me must've been my brother.

And what do you think when you told her that it wasn't you and it was your brother, you'd blame him, um, what do you think mum would have in her mind? what did she think?
She used to hit the lot of us to get to the right one. / Um, what do you mean? can you describe your situation? / My brother would say he didn't do it, Jane must've done it and I had 2 elder brothers and she used to like slap us round the back of the head the 3 of us or
bang our 3 heads together / mm-hm / and she used to say if you don't tell me the truth I’ll have {can't hear} the three of you after supper. / Mm-hm /

Right, so what do you think was in her mind when you told her?
She used to be furious for the sake of taking a couple of biscuits.

**Right and when you told her that it wouldn't have been you, what was in your mind?**

What did you think of?

I knew what the consequences were going to be because I’d done it several times / mm-hm / and um, don't really know, / **don't really know what was in your mind when not telling the truth?** / Not telling the truth because you didn't want to get hit but you was hungry so you had to take food / mm-hm / and it was either bread or biscuits. / **But you called steal-** / if you were caught it was stealing but you know we just took it because we was hungry but to her that was stealing because we hadn't asked for it.

Mm-hm, and how long had it been for been for, I mean this kind of...

I don't think we were doing it when we moved to our 3 bedroom house, I would have been about 12, 11 or 12, I don't think we was doing it after then but from the age of about 7 to about 11 or 12 we used to take food from the cupboard, we used to get hit for that.

**Then you got hit indiscriminately I mean all of you / all of us, / right.** / Because no one owned up. But that wasn't the only um, lies I told like when I told you I fell through the ice and I went home with one shoe. I told my mum I was pushed under the ice by some boys but I’d- I went on there on myself and fell through the ice but because I didn't want to get hit I told her that they made me do it. / **That they pushed you?** / Yeah. / **And what happened then, I mean..?** / Well, she hit me with the remaining shoe and I went to find the other shoe but I couldn't get on the ice.

Right, so what did you have in your mind when you told her that you were being pushed by others and that’s why..?

Just to er, make her feel sorry for me because I’d lost my shoe. And- but it didn't work, she hit me as well.

**Why would she be sorry for you if you told her..?**

Well, that some bullies had got hold of me and made me go on the ice and when in fact it wasn't true I went on myself.

**And when you told her that you'd been pushed, what do you think was in her mind?**

She was most probably angry about having to buy me some more shoes.
Mm-hm, right. And then you went you didn't find the other pair? / The other shoe, no. / and what happened?
I first of all went to school in wellington boots, / mm-hm / cause the other shoes were wellingtons and she most probably wanted that money for something else and was angry at the thought of having to buy me some more shoes.
Any other lies? if you can try to remember lies at school not just at home, other lies with friends or people, I mean- / it's hard to look back on lies. / Mm-hm. Any specific bit?
I can't think of any lies at school because school was really strict I went to a roman catholic school and it was very strict / mm-hm / there was little lies like talking in the class and the teacher saying if it was you and you saying "no, it wasn't me." things like that / misbehaving or something like that? / Yeah, well saying it wasn't you when it was. I remember um, we had to walk from our school to a place where we had our dinners and there was a row of houses along the way and I knocked on a door and by the end of the school line a person had come out of the door and caught a teacher and said that one of the kids had banged on the door and we was all asked who it was and I said it wasn't me but the kids said it was me and I had to stand in the headmistresses office knocking on the door for about half an hour, they made me knock, and I had already told her it wasn't me that did it but I had to do that as punishment cause the kids had told on me that I had did it.
And what was in your mind when you said it wasn't- that it hadn't been you?
Well, as I say our school was very strict and we used to get the stick, the cane / so..? / And I was worried that I would get that. / Right. / So that's why I lied and said it wasn't me. / Mm-hm /
Now we can go on to your adult life and just pick another example of either withholding the truth or lying to you, whatever, just try to pick a story to be told.
Well I used to lie to my kids when they were little about their father being an alcoholic until they cottoned on themselves and they knew and they were angry that I’d kept it from them for so long but I used to lie to them same as my mum lied to me.
What did you tell them?
Just that their dad was tired and that's why he used to be asleep a lot.
Uh-huh and did they ask you or..
They asked me why was he on the floor and things and I used to make up excuses, he used
to come in and collapse on the floor and I didn't say that he was drunk but they knew. I can't
really remember a lot of lies that I've told only lies that protect other people so they don't get
hurt. Haven't really told many lies.

Er, going back to this example about your husband, that's right? / Yeah. / And he being
again a heavy drinker? / Yeah. / What was in your mind when you told them he was
just fine, that he needed sleep.

Just to protect them, protect them from the truth so that they, well, sometimes it was difficult
to have their friends in and um, cause he'd either be on the floor or asleep in bed and we
didn't want to wake him because we didn't know what sort of mood he'd be in cause
sometimes he'd be in a bad mood.

Mm-hm. and what do you mean to protect them from the truth? What, I mean, what
was the t? What was the real truth?

Well, that their father was an alcoholic, I didn't want them to know that.

Which means what, I mean, what did you have in mind, what is related, what is
associated with it?

Well, in case their friends found out and they were embarrassed about it, to save them the
embarrassment / to save them the embarrassment. / Mm.

And then when you told them that he was fine or something, what do you think was
in their mind?

They just used to say "oh." and run out and play. / Mm-hm. / I mean I don't know what went
on in their minds but I know that my son, my eldest son, got very angry and said that I
should've told him, / when he found it out? / Yeah, and that he would have stayed with me
more, / why? / Cause we had rows and arguments and I suppose I lied, I lied then to the
children, that's when I was older. I said that the rows were nothing and not to worry, same as
my mum did to me. / Mm-hm / though we didn't row at nights particularly, we'd row in the
day and my husband's job, he used to work part-, he used to work at 7 o'clock in the morning
cause he was a dustman and sometimes he'd be finished by half-11, 12 o'clock and he'd go to
the pub and come home at quarter-to-3 and we'd have rows then when the kids were coming
home from school. / Before they'd come from school? / Well, it used to be just before
they'd come home from school and carry on some times after they'd come home from
school. / Mm-hm
Right, so they would observe the rows and the arguments, like..
Well, they would in the afternoons, yeah, and at weekends.

And so then you would deny it?
Well, I got so- too browned off to be polite that I used to say "oh, he's drunk" you know, and
tell them, and they used to go "oh." you know, and they used to go off cause there's nothing
they could do and they had their {whole?}, the only one who didn't believe that their dad
was drunk was my youngest son.

He didn't believe he was drunk?
No, he thought I'd lied and my husband thought I'd lied to him as well. He could do no
wrong. / His dad could do no wrong? / No, the child could do no wrong, my youngest son.

What did he think your youngest son?
He just thought his dad was all right. But he knows different now.

Right, I have a last question about this subject. It is if you could try to remember
whether in some point in our discussions, in the interviews, you felt that you had or you
needed to withhold something from me or you didn't tell the truth or the whole truth er
and then we can explore it maybe a bit. Again and I'm not trying to be judgmental, I
mean, I'm not judging anybody when anybody lies because as I told you, you know
everyone lies so its a basic thing in life. So then if you can think of and then again not
that I know that you withheld-
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I: Firstly, I’d like to recollect memories when your parents withheld the truth from you or even lied to you in any way.
S: I don’t think of any time.
I: You don’t think of any time...
S: No.
I: Nothing in particular.
S: No, nothing.. I mean hmm, they were always very... I mean one Christmas when they couldn’t afford to buy us any toys, and my Dad had gone to buy some old bike frames and stuff like that, paint them all up, rebuilt them, anything like that, and it was a thing that he was very good at, he’d paint them up and rebuilt them and all the rest of it, mine was black and gold and my sister’s was black and silver and they were going to be our Christmas presents, and I think about two weeks before Christmas there was a bill coming and they had to sell both of them, but they actually said to us, you know, it was discussed and anything.
I: So it was...
S: Yes, it was always open, yes, it was always open.
I: All right. Then we can discuss what you remember as your lying. For example you told me about a lie which was about.... Starting with the telling the truth and then telling stories...
S: Exaggerating, yes.
I: Can you try and recollect specific events or stories that you would make up?
S: The sort of thing will be like, say if you were at school and somebody had fallen over, I’d so and so had fallen over today and they’d say: “What happened?” and I’d say: “Ohhhhh, he’d cut his knee and the bones, here they are (showing the broken bones visible on the skin) but also elaborated on everything, everything was dramatic, with things like that. I remember my Dad coming to school to talk to the teachers about that and they’d said that it is just a sort of active mind...but it was just her mind.... cause my Dad said she doesn’t lie, she tell stories... she exaggerates all the truth, take just the first line and that’s the truth and the rest of it is just building up on it.
I: And what was in your mind when you exaggerated, or when you told, for example, that story about the broken knee?
S: I think it was just (unclear). Cause I had people’s attention and I’d say: “Look, I’m here, this is me....” Take that as me, and that was one of my ways to get people to see me.
I: And when you’d tell it to your parents...
S: Oh, anyone.
I: Where else for instance?
S: School, shopkeepers over the road, they all used to be you know used to me cause it was like a little village were we live and...
I: So maybe try to remember a specific time when it happened.
S: I can’t think of a specific one, it was just sort of anything really. You know I’d just used to do it... I usually even now find myself doing it and I have to sort of stop myself.
So occasionally now I’d sort of think: “What are you doing?!?” you know and I’d sort of stop myself.
I: So you are talking about more recent ones?
S: More recent....
I: What is the kind of lies that you’d stop yourself from telling?
S: I can’t really think of anything, I think I’ve just blocked them out... hmmm........
Oh, there was a fire about a year ago, or and a half ago, something like that, I suppose it was a fire over the road from were I live. Well I was actually on the phone with my sister at the time and I said to her: “Oh look, there is a fire outside”, and she said: “Oh tell me what’s going on, what’s going on”, and I said and it was only like five boys I suppose, and by the time I finishedthere was a full riot (laughing loudly)... you know and she sort of said:” Oh God, it’s funny I can’t see any sirens or anything, and I said: “No, you can’t”. So she said:” So what was actually going on?”", and I said:" Oh, from your flat you can’t observe the fire”. But I was actually telling her all sort of things.
I: And when you told her all those sort of things what do you think she had in her mind?
S: She knew I was telling the truth.. I was telling stories, she knew it, cause she was.... I think I had done it because she was just about to hang up the phone, and I think probably I was just trying to keep her talking a bit longer, you know, so I had made up the story.
I: Anything else that comes up to mind about lying as a child or as adult?
S: I mean I know that as a kid I did it a lot, and I would lie about anything. I mean there was one time when I was.... There was a puppy in the park, there was this puppy on the park and it hadn’t had a collar or lead on, so I picked it up and took it home. My Mum and Dad came and said:” Where is this puppy come from?” and I had told them I’d found it on a box on the railway lines (laughing), and those days people used to do that put puppies in a used box on the railways, and I must have said: “Oh and can we keep it?” and I think we had it for about three weeks before the owners came and got it. And I said:” No”. And they said:” No it was taken from the park. And my Dad asked: Why did you lie?” And I said: “Because I wanted the puppy”.
I: And what did you have in mind when you said you’d taken the puppy.....
S: To have the puppy. Yes, and that was it.
I: So you invented it?
S: Yes the story about the puppy?
I: And what was in the story that....
S: That I’d found on the railway lines in a cardboard box, and it was just playing in the park, not in a box on the railway lines, with it’s owner, but I said I’d found it in the box...
I: I see. And when you told your parents that you’d found it in the box, what did you think they had in?
S: ....I don’t really know..... I think they probably thought... well.... Cause I used to find things all the times you know like stray animals and they probably thought she might had done, we wait and see sort of thing. They also gave me the benefit of the doubt, they always gave me the benefit of the doubt.....I mean there was one point, it was in cookery class and we were going on a day out some where, and the teacher just said:” Anyone who can’t go” to let her know. And I said I couldn’t go and she said:” Why not?” And I said for some reason I don’t know why I said:” Cause I have Appendicitis”. Anyway the reason why I didn’t want to go was cause I had got travel sickness and I didn’t want anyone to know that I’d got travel sickness. Anyway then I stayed home and a couple of days later I got flu, and I wasn’t allowed to go to school cause I wasn’t well, and the teacher dropped my Dad up cause she was concerned with the fact the I’d got Appendicitis, and I was going to the hospital, so when I wasn’t in school she thought:” Oh she must have gone into hospital” so she rang up my Dad to find out how I was and this is all she’d found, she’s at home bla bla bla, and then she’d thought she didn’t got
appendicitis she had got the flu, and it’s over. A little while later he’d sort of say to me:” Why did you say that to your teacher?” and I said to my Dad: “No.” And he said: “You do know and why did you say that?” and I said:” Cause I didn’t want to go to the trip. And he said:” We didn’t know you weren’t going to the trip. And I said:” But if she knew why it wouldn’t save me the trouble of sickness and all the rest of it. And he said to me:” So when you go back to school you’ve got to tell the teacher that I got that message”. And it was so hard to go to that teacher knowing that she now knew that I’d lied to her.

I: So it was difficult to you.
S: Because she knew that I’d lied.
I: So?
S: Well cause she would never think of me as the same person. That was the hardest part of it cause... to lose face, yes. And yet she probably knew I lied cause everybody in the school used to know that I did it.
I: That you lie?
S: Oh yes they all knew it, all the kids in the class used to know it, you know, it was sort of an accepted thing. “(Name) exaggerates and somebody else smoke, but (Name) exaggerates, so, you know.
I: And again I’ve got the same question - when you told your teacher you had Appendicitis what did you think she had in her mind?
S: She was probably worried I had sickness, that I had Appendicitis (laughing). And I mean I was only little and definitely didn’t know what Appendicitis was (laughing), it was probably a word I’d heard on the Telly or something....(laughing).
I: Anything else?
S: No those were rather the classic ones... That’s about it.
I: All right, well thank you very much.
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Ask er is a bit about the experience of being lied to or being withheld the truth by your parents. / Mm. / and then maybe the experience of lying to others as a child. So firstly maybe you can try to think of times when you remember that you were being withheld the truth by your parents and when I’m asking questions about this subject about lying or deception, I’m not interested in the ethical or moralistic issues behind it. As you saw in the questionnaire it is a kind of more- it is aiming more to understand what lying is and what is their function in our lives. So the question was about being lied to or being withheld the truth as a child.

Mm. um, so its not with- the truth withheld from me? / Or lying to you. / Um, well I mean I was probably lied to all the time and not really realised it and I was lied to in the way um, I was given this sort of- my parents and certainly my father had developed a way of using these high moral standards to cover his deceptions and in a way they were lies and um so I felt like I wasn't being- that I didn't have honest parents really and a way that um, my mother its the way that they didn't really acknowledge what they were doing and weren't honest with themselves. and um, and it filtered through to how they were with their children so um, so they weren't being honest.

But as a child you feel that way? You feel that they weren't being honest about with you? / Um, / or is it a kind of thing that you know?

Well I know more now, I know more now. As a child um, things weren't being acknowledged and they weren't um, - it's very obtuse this - um, let me think of certain situations um, I think because I really felt like I wasn't trusted and I wasn't believed therefore they thought that I was very capable of lying. / Mm. that you weren't believed? / No, I wasn't believed at all and so I was- you know they saw me as this kind of mischievous, manipulative um , um, kind of child.

So maybe tell me a bit more

{tape blank for a second}

..Outwardly because I used to relieve the tension in the family by joking about things but um, but we were all- I used to um, we were all very- had very secret lives because we were forced into secrecy and so we were all living independently of each other in a way during
childhood. And I remember one occasion when I was going out on a - we were heavily involved in this church across the road and I um, must've been about 12 and we were collecting the - I don't know if you get them - these little envelopes people leave one week and collect the next week, it's very suburban you know, for different causes. so we used to- me and my sister we used to deliver these envelopes to the church for a certain cause and we used to collect them next week, you see, and I remember emptying most of them um, emptying most of the envelopes and redistributing this money and keeping a lot of the money, you see that was one instance of being very um, very- it was very thought about, vum, um, what's the word? Um, it wasn't crude really, no, it was quite thought about. I can't-

Did anybody ask you where the money went?

Um, no. We were just never asked to do it again and my sister had the feeling that what I was doing- she told me off for it. / Mm-hm. / but she was very / she told you off? / Yeah, but she was very deceptive in her own way, she used to steal a lot, she used to steal a lot, very, very- as a teenager.

So think of other instances where you would lie such as when you were 15 and you told your mum- she asked you whether you had slept / yeah. / Whether you were / and I said no. Yeah. / So think of lies.

Well there were things like my mother used to in the in the holidays when the children were off school, she used to sleep in the day and we used to get up to a lot of mischievous things and we used to um, we used to take things from the cupboards, we used to take the ingredients and make sort of cakes and eat the mixture and we used to take things like this and um, and we used to- she had this method of trying to find out who did it, you know this ilike who did it, out of 4 of us. "Who took that money out of the teapot, Name4" or "who took the nuts out of the cupboard?" simple things you see and she was very um, she found this outrageous and as part of trying to find the truth out of us she used to put us in one room and um,

{side ends}

And um, leave us there until one of us would own up, you see, and she used to come back, and some times it happened all day long. Sometimes um, it was almost like torture because she used to come back and say has anybody decided who did it and we always used to argue with each other because nobody would own up {laughs} and then after pure torture
one of us would sort of break down and say "it was me!" and so um, it was very unforgiving of her and this used to happen when she used to sleep or be away from the situation she had a lot of control over, you know, she was a control freak, so when she didn't have control people used to take advantage of it.

And do you remember times when you would lie?

Um, I would lie, especially when I had a boyfriend I would lie a lot and, um, and I would used- I found ways of using a cover because they were so moral that I would use moral cover stories so when I was 14 as a way of getting out- of escaping guides, of escaping girl guides - I involved in that - I used to - I was involved in voluntary work with the mentally handicapped - people with learning difficulties, and um, so that was a moral cover for me you see, my mother was quite proud of me doing that, and I enjoyed it but then at the same time I used to um, get up to all sorts because she believed I was away- that I was out for the day doing good things. I used to go out with my boyfriend or um, or there was a time when I wanted to see my sister, she was at university in Name1 and I was a teenager, I was about 15, and I pretended that it was a visit, it was um, a visit with school to Name1 {laughs}, completely unbelievable. because Name1 was known for it's lace you see and I was doing this needlework A-level so I sort of said its a trip to Name1 for the lace and basically I was going away to see my sister for the day. so I used to be very good at telling stories.

Do you think she- mum didn't mind when you told her you were going on a school trip?

Well, she let me go and when I came back that night she never really looked at me but she said um, "did you see NAME2 while you were in Name1?" / mm-hm, NAME2 is your sister? / Yeah,

So what did she have in mind?

Well she knew that things were out of her control in a way and she was very desperate for us not to have contact even as children she was very suspicious of us having contact because she obviously thought NAME2 was going to tell me all about- a fear of telling me what was happening to her and my father you see. I didn't know that but looking back she was very um, strict of us having contact so it was-

What did you have in mind when you told her you were going to a school trip?

Well I wanted to see my sister for the day.
Yes but you wanted to see her but there was something that was left to tell her that it was your sister that you were going to see.

Oh, yes because she would disapprove. She would completely disapprove of me going to see my sister. She disapproved all the time of me having contact and um, seeing her as this evil person you see and so it was um, she probably felt like I was betraying her and

Okay, and can you think of a lie you told as an adult? To whoever and we'll just discuss this.

Um, a bureaucratic person or a friend? / Oh, a friend. / Um, well I don't like telling lies because I know how easy - it's very easy for me to tell stories but um, I remember betraying a boyfriend when I was sleeping with somebody and he was pretty sure that I was having an affair and I completely lied and um,

What did you tell him? What did he ask and what did you tell him?

Well I was having um, I was having an affair with somebody but I really didn't enjoy having an affair and - because he'd betrayed me I felt as though I could betray him and er, and he was very paranoid and neurotic and he was distraught that I had continued to lie to him.

When he asked you - what did he ask?

Well he said, "are you having an affair?" and I said "no." but this person was living in the same house and this went on for quite a time. And it went on and on and on but I just lied all the way through it, I didn't enjoy it at all and I tried not to do that again but um-

What did you have in mind when you lied? Or rather you didn't tell him the truth?

Um, well I was very fearful of his reaction and um I couldn't bear to tell him the truth because I knew that it would um, maybe it was that I was fearful of him leaving me or fearful of him um, um, being upset, in a way I wanted to protect him at the same time and um, so I went on lying.

And what do you think he had in mind when he asked you and you told him?

What he had in mind? Well he was probably feeling very insecure and wanted to know what was happening.

And then when you told him that you weren't having an affair?

He probably didn't believe me. He probably wanted to believe me but he didn't believe me. I mean, this is going back about 8 years now and I've changed since then but I've lied to friend when they - I had a relationship with this person and they and I was quite
embarrassed by it because it was an affair you see, and um so I lied to my friend who thought that I was having a relationship you see and um, I um, because, as I said before, certain friends I can tell things to and others I can't, this one was quite moral, I lied to her when she asked me if I was having an affair with this person and um, and I went to Paris with this person for a week-end and I lied to her {laughs} I pretended it was somebody else you see because I thought she would disapprove of me having an affair with this person.

**And what did she have in mind when she asked you?**

She thought I was having an affair with this person and she wanted to know, she wanted to know what was going on. She wanted access to my life in a way.

**Was it her curiosity or..?**

Yeah, yeah. Curiosity and I didn't trust her, yeah, I didn't trust her, I though she'd tell her boyfriend and her boyfriend would tell everybody, so I told a lie in that way. but I was um, um, - I sort of- a big lie with um, with um bureaucracy I um, a few years ago I got a scholarship to go to Brazil on a, I had some exhibitions there, I had a residency and um, and this person that organised it, I really couldn't bear him and um, for lots of reasons. And he really didn't want me to go, and he refused my application but I got- other people accepted me and he organised that the- this organisation the forwarded £600 towards me and I applied for a grant and I should have paid it back with those funds. But when I was in Brazil um I was supposed to work in this studio but it was so badly disorganised that I didn't want to do it you see, I just didn't want to do it, and I met some very good people and I basically went on holiday with them while I was there and he, he was very angry about this you see this person and it added to our um, terrible professional relationship so when I got back from Brazil there was a cheque waiting for me for £600 that I’d applied for and I should have given it back and I refused to give it back out of stubbornness and wanting him to um, wanting to give him trouble in a way. But this escalated over year and on the board of trustees was this very important lawyer {laughs} this very important lawyer. And this snow-balled into a terrible scenario you see, because this lawyer, he was like the biggest partnership of lawyers in London, I later found out and he- there were all these threatening letters and I had to- I stood my groin a way. And he took me to court and then I could have paid and not gone on with the- but then I was so determined- I was so full of hate towards this person that I kept on with this claim you see. And they took me to court in malibu{?} and- but finally he dropped out because for him it became a personal vendetta towards me.
and um, but all the time I knew that I was lying and I felt very bad about it and um, it got to such a high pitch that I had to stay with my original- you know, it just escalated out of proportion. / couldn't go back / I couldn't go back, yeah.

Okay
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I: In fact what I'd like you to do is try and recollect memories when either Mum or Dad withheld the truth or even lied to you as a child.

S: Right. OK......... Hmmmmm........ I can't think of very much (whispering)........... Not very much springs to mind........

I: So let's think of your lies, I mean we know that everybody lie, I lie, children lie, and it is part of our development, as it is a kind of developmental task, to learn to lie. All this lead me to ask you about lies that you probably told when you were a child. What kind of lies would you tell either your parents or whoever. And you also need to know that I am not really interested in the moral or ethical issues with regard to lying, I am just trying to find out more about the process of lying.

S: I don't remember..... I don't really remember may very lies....... I'm sure there were some.

I: Or maybe withholding the truth?

S: Oh sure, I once, when I was quite small I stole a rubber ball from a shop and of course Mum saw me playing with it and asked where I'd got it from, cause I'd never have money of me own in those days. And then I had to tell her and she was very cross. But funnily enough I then asked:” Well, should I take the ball back” and she said:” No it’s OK”.

I: So you didn’t tell her you’d stolen the ball.

S: I admitted that I’d stolen it straight on, but I didn’t volunteer.

I: So what was in your mind about not volunteering?

S: I didn’t want to be found out as a thief. I didn’t want her to know that I’d done something that she had told me I shouldn’t do. She always told me I shouldn’t.

I: So you believed for example that she would tell you off?

S: I was sure of it.

I: Right. Was it the same about drinking as you mentioned earlier?

S: Ahhhhhhh.... Yes I kept quite about that.

I: So what was in your mind in keeping quite about that?

S: Hmmmm........ I actually even now I felt that Mum was quite hard on me. I quite liked having an approval, I quite liked being a favourite, and I didn’t like her to know that I was
doing something that was illegal. And didn’t see any reason to tell her either, it was none of her business, that some of us got up to that’s all.

I: And maybe you could think of any lie that you told whoever as an adult, and as I told you I’d like to understand the process going on behind it.

S: A lie.......hmmm........... I am sure there are some, there have to be...........

I: Take your time, it’s all right, sometimes it’s really difficult to get access to those kind of things.

S: Oh a lie......... A lie....................................................(long pause). I can’t think of much but I suppose there’s an occasion when I was.......... I had an insurance claim made against me, a road accident. And I did my level best to try and make it like it was the other motorist’s fault. When I think it were pretty much my fault, and also trying to prove as much possible that he’d cause the damage as well. Or that they caused more damage than they did, just trying to make it awkward for them. That’s the only thing I can think of. The only other thing is...... in the union work without actually lying very often cover up things and avoid saying certain truth.

I: Such as?

S: Particularly it’s important to present a group of negotiators as a team and make it appears to the members that we’re all working together and supporting each other. It gives big confidence when it comes to an industrial action or whatever. And also it gives us a competitive advantage over parallel unions in the same business. Where as an actual fact there was some almighty fallings out and some people, senior people would eat each other throats. We can talk about it amongst senior union reps but trying not to say it to ordinary members. It just rocks there confidence, the thing that there is a problem. So I would often cover things up, like that. There was one guy in particular, well he was a full time officer, and he would say completely insincere things, complementary to me when I knew he’d really hated me, but in public he would be nice about me. And similarly I would play down the difficulties that where between the two of us... to the general membership, and I would sort of say that it has been sorted out now, that it is all right when definitely there was still a problem.

I: So when there was still this problem what did you have in mind?

S: Hhhhhhh....... It was important out of loyalty to the organisation to first try and bury the differences as they were, and secondly, to make it appear that we had buried what
differences there were in order to maintain confidence in the whole the organisation together.
I: To whom did you tell it?
S: I just told it to the members in the branch meetings.
I: And what did you think they had in their mind when you told them that everything was allright?
S: Hmmm... They were suspicious (laughing).... Cause they knew the other character involved and they knew what he was like, falling out of people, and hmmm.. One of the reasons that I was elected to the position that I actually reached was that we.. That there was a blazing row at one point in the election campaign and he made it perfectly clear that he opposed my election, after which he voted for me (laughing loudly). And after that we had to keep quite of how bad it was, you know.....It's a bit like senior politicians of the same party hiding in public the fact that they hate each other and kind of close doors and drag on. And also there is the danger of showing weakness to the company, the danger of allowing the company's negotiators to know that there is a possible rift between different negotiators that they could then try and open up.
I: OK, is there anything else that you can think of?
S: I once... once cheated on a girlfriend, no often did I have the opportunity to do so (laughing) I hmm... an opportunity arouse one weekend to see somebody different and... So I.... I can't remember what lie I told my girlfriend. I can't remember whether I told her that I 've got my dates wrong and that I have to go work, or what it was, or whether I double booked, I was going to see my parents or something like that... but whatever it was told the lie, went off with this girl for the weekend and when this girl had gone to France after, I saw my girlfriend again and I had to tell her... and the funny thing is that she knew (laughing).. She guessed from the way I lied that she was sure I'd lied.
I: And you don't remember your exact lie?
S: I think that I told her that I either got the date wrong and that I had to work, or that at short notice my shift had been changed, and I didn't have the date after all, cause I knew I'd have the Saturday and the Sunday off and we planned to do something together and I had to get out of that to be with that other girl instead.
I: So what did you have in mind when were telling her your ex?
S: Hmmm... I didn’t want to hurt her feelings, I didn’t want to lose the relationship, but I didn’t want to lose the opportunity of having this weekend with the other girl.
I: And what did you think was in her mind?
S: I think she was very practical. I think she... Realised what was up, but I was also fairly confident that she would still have me afterward, and she was right.
I: And was it that you were feeling like that when telling her the lie, or do you think that it is your analysis?
S: At that time I was very nervous, because at the time when I didn’t want her to see through the lie, and I didn’t want to miss the opportunity with this other girl, and I didn’t want to lose the relationship with my girl friend, either.
I: So what did you think she had in her mind?
S: Well, I thought she’d believed me. I thought I carried it off quite well (laughing).
I: So she believed that you had something else to do?
S: I told her that. I thought so and she let me believe that and when I confessed her afterwards she told me she’d worked that out anyway (laughing loudly). I always assumed that she smarter than I gave her credit for. I don’t think that she said it afterwards as a sort of defence mechanism to hide her feeling or something like that because she was a very genuine, open person, and there was no sort of reaction, there was nothing unprepared about it, there was all very confident as if she knew down well what I’d been up to. She dealt with men playing this trick before and she could tell when the man is lying, and she could tell when it matters that a man is lying, or whether it doesn’t matter.
I: OK, thank you very much for telling me that.
The thing is my parents were quite secretive so.. / Why? / Were quite secretive, what I’m saying is you don’t know, what I’m saying is, you’re not told things. / Are they? / Well, you’re not lied or told the truth is you? So.. / Right. / And if I don’t remember promises that were never kept, and I don’t remember my parents lying about um, um, I don’t really remember.

So maybe it’s easier to think about your lies as a child, / my lies. / To them or at school, whoever.

I used to lie more when I was a teenager I suppose, when I was going out then I would lie about how late I was out, yeah? If I’d come back late or I was staying at a friend’s house then I’d lie about what time I got back there.

So what would you say? Just think about examples.

Just say "oh, oh yeah, we got back about 11 o’clock. / Mm-hm. / I never lied about where I was staying / mm-hm. / but more probably about where I was going. If I was going to a party then I’d lie about that.

Mm-hm, and what would you say?

That I was going to the cinema.

Right, and what was in your mind when you told them that you were going to the cinema?

Well, the thing is if I sort of told my dad I was going to a party with a friend then sometimes he wouldn’t let me go, so rather than being not able to go I’d lie and say that we were going to the cinema instead and that I was staying at a friend’s house, which I was but / would you say- / oh they knew I was staying at my friend’s house. I wasn’t going to say I was going to a party, something like that.

Right, and what do you think they had in mind when you told them that you were going to the cinema?

What do you mean, what? I suppose they thought I was telling the truth. / Sorry? / They thought I was telling the truth.

And that would be after telling them those lies? Before then. / What do you mean, sorry, before? / I mean you would tell them you were going to the cinema, right? / Yeah. /
They would ask you? / Yeah. "Where are you going?" / Yeah. / Right so what would they have in mind when asking you where are you going? What would they think?
Oh I don't know. Um, maybe they thought I was going to a party.
Mm. why do you think so? {Can't hear} this is what they thought?
{tapes cut}

Maybe they / well I don't know why they would think I was going to a party, maybe they would, maybe they thought I was lying to them, I don't know.
But as a child you didn't think they thought that you were going to a party or did you think that they thought you were going to a party?
I don't know what they thought. I never really asked. But I do remember probably lying to my dad more than my mum about things like that because my mum was always more accepting about me going out than my dad so I'd probably lie to my dad. My mum might know the truth but my dad wouldn't, wouldn't know the truth. I'd tell my mum for the reason being that she'd know where I was. But I didn't often do that because that put my mum in a difficult position.

Right, I see. So, can you think of any other lies? Like to your dad? About a different thing?
The thing is I wouldn't tell my dad things unless I had to ask his permission, so, so I suppose I didn't lie to him that often unless I had to ask his permission about something. but mum would go "go and ask your dad." / like? Think of an example. / Oh, I can't. um, well, for going to parties, basically. Sometimes I used to ask him outright. / Yeah. / Find out what he'd say. Sometimes I wouldn't use lying, I'd ask him.

Okay, but try to think of any lie that you lied more as an adult / adult. / And then again I'm going to ask you questions about the situation.
Um, what to my parents? / No, to whoever. / To whoever? ... Um, I lied to Name1 before we got- well, before we got married when I was seeing someone else at the same time I was seeing him. So I suppose I lied I mean he knows the truth now but I did lie about that. / At the time / yeah, I kept it quiet for about 3 months. / Mm-hm. and.. / He asked me. / He asked you? / Yeah. / So he suspected? / Not for a while though.
Right, yeah, so what was in his mind when he asked you?
Um, I suppose because we'd been - he lived in Place1 and I lived in Place2 and we didn't see a lot of each other. And maybe my behaviour was a bit odd on the phone, like that so he suspected. / Right. / And I lied to him a number of times saying like "oh, don't be silly."

So what would you say when he asked you?
Oh, I'd say don't be silly basically and "who could I possibly be seeing?" and "you would've found out by now by family" and stuff like that, you know, just cover it up.

Right, so what was in your mind when you decided not to tell him the truth? What was in your mind? To tell him that he was silly basically?
What was in my mind? / Yes, what was in your mind. / Well I didn't want him to know so basically I lied. /

Right well then try to think of why you didn't want him to know?
Well I didn't want him to know I suppose because I didn't want him to split up with me but I wasn't sure about the other person so that's why I lied in the first place / mm-hm. / I was afraid. / Yeah. / Again and what do you think that he thought when you lied to him? What was in his mind?
Um, he probably didn't know whether to believe me or not believe me basically. He wanted to trust me but I hadn't done anything else before for him to distrust me anyway so he might have believed me but then he might have been thinking 'well we're so far apart, I don't know what goes on when I'm not there' so,

So in the end did you succeed in lying to him then?
No, I told him the truth.

No, in the end but in the process of lying, did he believe you? / I don't know if he believed- / but from your point of view?
Oh. oh I think so. Um, yeah I suppose he did believe me.

So what happened then, there that it worked?
I suppose I behaved in a way that I would if I was telling the truth. / So, what? / I phoned him up more, I didn't act distant, that kind of thing. / Right. / Behaviour.

All right, okay. So let's have a look at it. I'm going to ask you questions related to this delicate matter, a very delicate matter? As I understand it was a delicate matter. / Mm. /
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First of all what I would like you to do is to try and remember incidences if possible about times when your parents withheld the truth from you or even lied to you. It's difficult I mean you might need to take a minute or something.

I feel as though my parents more kept the truth from me rather than lied, um, I suppose the way that was handled that you might say it was a lie right now, but it was nothing specific really.

What do you mean by holding the truth from you?

Well they'd try to keep back what they saw as a worrying situation, maybe something to do with money I'd go "have we got any money, dad" he'd go "well, we're okay" those sort of standard sort of things. They wouldn't give us information at all though obviously at times I'd be thinking "bollocks, they're quite um, strapped for money." um, '..... It was much more sort of thing, things we didn't need to know we weren't told, rather than actually lied to about it. Struggling actually to even vaguely to remember any situation of my...

Maybe it's easier to think of lies that you told them from early ages. Whether to them or to whoever as a child and then I'm going to ask a few questions about a specific lie.

I remember um, accidentally tripping somebody up in the playground at primary school. And the teacher came up and saw another little lad there and went "you tripped him up didn't you?" and he goes "no no no" and I didn't really say anything and got away without getting trouble so I presume that's the reason for my lying in the situation. I should've gone in and said it was me but um, I swear I thought it was an accident um, can't really ever remember lying about where I was going to anybody. Um, ..... Really can't recall any more examples I'm afraid.

So can you clarify that example that you told me?

Um, well that's the situation where somebody got in trouble for what I did and I didn't really say anything about it where I probably should have done.

And what was the situation, what was the trouble?

Well, it was just somebody running past in the playground and I instinctively put my foot out / right. / And they tripped and um, / right and who asked you about it? / I think half the trouble was they didn't actually ask me about it, they just presumed that it was this kid
and he was sort of carted of and I was left there and in a way not given a chance to say anything but I thought might keep quiet then because the opportunity to lie was offered it was a situation when I thought I could get away with it rather than thinking I'd to/ about whom did you lie to
Oh I presume it was the teachers I was being lying
But they didn't ask you anything, is it?
Yeah, they didn't really talk to me about that kind of thing.
So, I see, you haven't go any other of lying from your childhood so try to think of any lie, of you as an adult as well. Then I'm going to ask you a few further questions about it.
Um, well, going out with some, with a friend, spending £20 on a few drinks and a few other things and then coming home and realising I'd spent too much and saying I, only spent £10." um, lied there because I knew it was wrong for me to have done that in the first place. Then I bought um, well it was on the same day, and if they had to find out that £20 was gone then it doesn't seem as bad so it's better all round if I just say £10. / You mean this is with your parents or..?/ This is now, this is a present example.
Right. Anything else?
Um, I suppose when I was younger, actually, when I was at home, if I actually broke something I might say no I didn't do that even though it was pretty clear that I had done it, um... or to get out of certain things I'd say oh I've done this, I've finished doing whatever I was doing, I can go now can't I? and actually not done what I was supposed to have done, sort of situations like that. Um,
Okay so lets think of the situation that you told to me about you as young boy, and you would come home, spent £20 and what did you think and then telling her that you spent £10, on drinking only. / Oh and um, that I got something to eat out and um, played the fruit machine too which I probably shouldn't have done. / Okay, so what do you think she had in mind?
Um, had in mind. Um, how do you mean by that?
Well, you told her something, okay? But before telling her that um, you'd spent £10, what's happening in her mind? / Right. / What she thinking about.
Um, well I knew I'd spent too much money, so I thought she'd be quite annoyed I'd spent um, what was a relatively large amount of money that we had between us so if I could work
it into a situation where she wouldn't notice that um then that would be fine because that would save any trouble between us where I was accused of spending all the money and stuff so if I could keep that away, that information then she wouldn't be aware of that and it wouldn't be a problem.

Right okay and then when you told her the lie, um, what was in her mind, what did she think of I mean, presumably you don't know it's just a kind of assumption you need to take.

Um, she probably just said oh, that's okay then, that's all right, that's not a problem.

Okay, then you mentioned another, some kind of very general lying about um, doing or completing doing something that you didn't. / Mm. / which was a kind of condition to go out or to do something else when you were a child isn't it? / Yeah. / Again the same question. Do you have any specific occasion in mind, a specific event?

Um, well I sort of vaguely remember saying I'd done the grass when I'd only done half of it. I wanted to go out basically and I thought I could do the other half when I came home.

Was it to mum or dad?

I think it was probably to my mother.

So again think back to what did you think that she had in mind?

Well, she had in mind that I'd done the job and was going to go out- could go out. / When you told her that you'd finished it? / Yeah.

Mm-hm, but before that. Before telling her?

Um, she was probably thinking that it would be okay because he's done something around the house so he can go off and do what he wants once he finishes that.

Right, and then at the end of the lie that you'd do the whole lot at once, how did she react?

Um, she might have said "oh you haven't done that bit of grass" or something like that and I'd probably say "oh, I was going to finish it later it's a bit too wet. So, um, then I probably after a few more words go out and finish off what I was supposed to have done in the first place.

So again when you told her that the grass was still wet, again it was a kind of misrepresentation of the real truth?
Yeah, just using something that could have happened to my advantage so I could make it seem reasonable rather than just blatantly just leaving it. It probably made it a bit more acceptable in my mind as well, saying something like that.

Okay.
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Do you have memories when you as a child were being withheld the truth by your parents. Do you remember any times that they withheld the truth from you or they lied to you?

Mm. so whether they held something from me? Yeah, one of my sisters was very ill and they didn't tell me what was going on and this was obviously to protect me.

When was it? How old were you?

I was 6, yeah. And my sister was one and they thought she had meningitis and she didn't but they thought so for a couple of days. And I had my stepmother, uncle and aunts and I just remember being very happy and it was quite a nice time. They gave us nice food and just looked after us and I had no idea as to how ill my sister had been and afterwards, a few years later I thought it was amazing how I didn't have any idea what was going on.

And you said you thought that what was in their mind was that they should protect you without disclosing it to you right / yeah. / Any other things?

Dunno, sometimes I resented them for telling me the truth um, shall I go on? When I was 14, my mum had a scare for breast cancer and she told me and said "obviously I don't want your sisters to know because I don't want to worry them" and I thought well I don't want to know either I wished that she hadn't told me and as I said I was always and always knowing about things.

So what was in her mind when she told you about that?

Um, well I knew she'd been to the doctor's and I'd asked her why and I think she just thought I was old enough to know and she wanted to be honest with me. / She wanted to be honest with you? / Yeah.

So now onto your lie. You as a child lying to whoever and you mentioned lying about your success with about books?

Yeah, at school I'd lie about my marks all the time and if I got really good marks in English, say, I didn't like to admit it, because I thought people wouldn't like me if I had. / So this is top admit it to your peers? / Yeah, well I admitted it to my close friends but in general I didn't want people to know how well I'd done.
So it was an admission about you and on the whole was it just after they'd ask you? / Yeah. They would go and ask me and I would just try to keep quiet about it.

Right what about books? {can't hear}

Yeah I wouldn't like to read books and if it was books that other people hadn't read and they said "what are you reading?" then I’d say "oh, I’m reading.." and I’d say something which was popular rather than something I was actually reading.

And what was in your mind while saying you were reading something popular which is not what you're reading?

Just wanting to be accepted and wanting to be normal.

And what do you think they, your friends, were thinking of when you told him or her? / Mm. / About the books? What do you think she had in mind when you told her?

Um, I think it wasn't really just one person I think it was more a group of people in the classroom at lunchtime. And I think that if somebody was different they tended to be ostracised so there was a pressure to conform not from one person but general group pressure.

So was the general group pressure to conform to what everybody was reading at the time. / Not books but say music, what pop music say.

So what did they have in mind when you told them, the form what did they think of you? Because you say that you lied to them, that you didn't tell the truth. / Yeah, yeah. / And you were intending to lie to them, wasn't it? It was in your awareness because you didn't read the book and you told them something else / yeah. / And then what did you think that they had in mind?

Well, I think that most of them were telling the truth, I don't think they were lying / Say it again? / I think they were probably telling the truth, perhaps not all of them, I don't know, I guess there's no way of telling. /

Right, but they believed you? / Yeah. / Right. Any other lies?

Um, I’m sure there are lots of things but I can't really think of anything. Yeah, I lied about going on holiday because my parents didn't have enough money and the school I went to was very affluent it was a school, a girls grammar school and most people would go abroad on holiday so I lied and said I’d been abroad on holiday. And again, as a demonstration, I didn't initiate this conversation with "oh, I went to France." but the conversation was about
holidays and I felt pressurised to contribute and to make a contribution that would be normal so I lied about it.

So what was in your mind when you lied about it?

That if I didn't, if I told the truth that I'd be seen as inferior or I'd be laughed at or aggravated or humiliated or ashamed.

Mm-hm. and again what do you think the others had in mind when you told them you went abroad?

Um, I think that was what they wanted me to say, I think that was what was expected.

And did you think about it at the time or just in retrospect, you think now when I ask you the question. / What did I think? / What did you think that they had in their mind?

Um, I thought that perhaps they would enjoy the opportunity of picking up on it if I hadn't said the truth. But I didn't feel that it had been directed at me. I felt that it had been directed at the holiday not being what they had expected. And the other thing I would lie about is I would say my parents went to university when they didn't. / Mm-hm. / in my class all the other girls parents had been to university.

And again this was for the same reason / yeah. / Because you not wanted to feel you didn't conform. / Yeah.

Think of other lies when you were grown up, an adult, more recent lies. Maybe its more easy to think of those lies.

Um, I was meeting my friend the other day and I was late to meet her and I said "sorry, I've just been really busy." which was kind of

{end of tape}
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Do you remember times when your parents withheld the truth from you or they lied to you? Try to think. It’s quite difficult to think of such things especially when one doesn’t know their withholding such things. Or things where you then found out about it.

Um, both my parents had affairs while they were married which of course they didn’t proclaim to us um, but we found out.

And when did you realise that they had told lies?

Um, I don’t know, maybe around 10 or something I mean, with my mother it was a case of, you know, we weren’t stupid. We sort of worked it out the way she...... to an extent and um, this wasn’t denied my mum just told us afterwards / you only knew after.. / No it wasn’t,- she didn’t really treat it as a big deal actually just you know he had girlfriends on his way so.

And what did you have in mind when you figured out it that she had an affair? What was in your mind when you questioned whether she had an affair with this man?

Well, she spent a lot of time with this man and he’d be in her room when we went to bed and it would be a question of getting up in the middle of the night and seeing if his shoes were still in the hall or not, and they were so.. / So what did you think? / I thought- I can’t really remember- I think I was very fond of him actually. But um, I think I was angry you know that he’d stayed the night.

And at the time you didn’t try to challenge your mother?

{can’t hear}

And what do you think she had in mind when you {can’t hear}

I don’t {sniffing} sorry um, I think I’ve always been a bit surprised that both of them thought it’d be a big deal for us.

So this was a big secret in your childhood, no?

Um, I suppose so it was a really well kept secret so

Now I’ll ask you about your lying. Your lies as a child now, {can’t hear} so if you can try to just recall any of your lies as a child that you remember.

I remember there was a cupboard in the hall and my mother told us not to close it because the lock was a bit faulty and it would get stuck and one day I was playing around with it and I turned it and it locked and I couldn’t get it open again and my mum was sort of asking how
it happened and I didn’t confess I just sort of kept quiet. And you know how it is when you haven't said you don't want to admit it and it's worse if you said no and actually it was me so I never admitted to that one.

Mm-hm and what did you have in mind when you said no?
Well, I just hoped that she'd lose interest and forget about it.

And what did you think she had in her mind when you denied it?
I don't know I think she probably knew it was me or thought it was me but I dunno, there was nothing she could do.

Any other instances?
Um, the other one I remember is when I was 14 or 15, I used to fence at school and my mum would come and pick me up afterwards and um someone in my class said "oh, do you want to come out and watch some lacrosse match" or something like this and I was some time talking with her and my mum came and I wasn't in the hall where we did the fencing. And she went home again and when I got home she said you know, "where the hell, you're in trouble" and I came up with some lie "I was there I was in the changing room" or something like this and I didn't tell her what I’d been doing, it's a bit stupid really. And you know that was when I was older. Why do I have to be where she you want me to be? That sort of thing.

Right so what did she have in mind when she asked you where you'd been?
I have no idea. I dunno, I suppose she thought we'd missed each other

And what did she have in mind when she asked you?
I think she- now that I think about it I think she was probably worried that I was sniffing glue or something like that. I think she would’ve been quite relieved that I was just watching a hockey match. But she also um, - she - I was messing around somehow and that always makes her very angry cause you know she's quite strict about not being late, if someone makes an effort for you, you make an effort back, you know, shjust drove out to pick me up, at least I should be there.

Do you know if she believed you?
No, I'm sure she didn't believe me. She didn't know what I was doing but she certainly didn't believe me.

Why didn't she believe you?
Well, it was very it was a very poor story.
Well, that's what you think I mean, you judge it as very poor, maybe it was poor from your point of view
Well, I mean you know my story just couldn't have stood up. She looked everywhere in the school, everywhere I could have been or said I was.

So was there a response?
No it was just her saying, "where were you? I'm angry you're not telling the truth." and me just sticking to my story.

Now, think of the lie when you were more {can't hear} to whoever. And then I'll ask you about that situation.
Well, there's a friend of mine and I met her boyfriend and I didn't really think much of him and she asked me what I thought of him and I said, "oh, he's really nice, blah blah blah" that sort of thing.

Okay so now we can try to analyse. When she asked you how was he what was in her mind? What did she think about?
Well you know I think she genuinely wanted to know she's one if my closest friends and she'd been going out with him a long time and I'd never met him though I'd heard a lot about him. No, I think she genuinely wanted to know what I thought of him.

Mm-hm, and what did you have in mind when you told her he was very nice?
I suppose I thought I'd only met him for half an hour, well, actually at that stage about 10 minutes or something um, it's just that he reminded me of her ex-boyfriend who I didn't like. I thought she was maybe, you know, picking the same pattern um, so I probably just- I was being- I didn't have enough evidence to say what my suspicions were so I was just you know why not be diplomatic and say something positive about him.

What do you mean being diplomatic to say something nice about him?
Well for a start she asked me when it wasn't really the time or place to start a discussion about him um, and I just - I suppose I was- there were clearly positive things about him and so I said "he's clearly x and I like that way he's y" you know I suppose I said truthful things but I didn't say my overall impressions which were negative.

And how did she respond when you told her?
Um, I think she probably- I think she understood because she'd not stupid um, / she read your mind? / Yeah, I think she knew that if I'd really like him I'd be a lot more unstinting um,
Mm-hm all right so we come to the other business, I'll switch it.

{Cut}
Subject 970

The first question is about, er, memories of, er, you noticing that your parents withheld the truth from you or even lied to you when you were a child.

Right, hmmm, oh jeez, it’s hard, that’s hard to think about -- um. {Pause of ten seconds} I really can’t think./ you can’t think? / No,

Okay, I think-, generally it’s easier to think about your childhood lie

{laughs} yeah uh yeah, yeah {here interviewer is also speaking but transcriber can’t make it out} pictures, try to pick up some of those childhood memories

Okay, mm, hmm, I’d lie about my brother all the time with my parents I guess, what he did or I’d exaggerate his problems just to make him look bad, I guess -

Take one specific example if you-

Ha gosh, I can’t remember, ha, right, um, I would say, say he did something mean I {should think?} when he did it or he was going to do it or I caught him and I would pretend, like, he had done the mean thing.

What kind of mean thing?

Ow, oh, say he turned the TV round when I was watching a show {laughs} ’cause that’s a real "whose ever watching first gets to watch the show" something like that I’d say I was there first when I wasn’t

{So you’d lie?}

{laughs} that sort of thing um, er, like "did you do all your homework?" "Yes." sort of thing er

When you didn’t?

When I didn’t, no, I used to do it on the bus on the way to school yeah, {4 second pause} there’s so much to remember, it’s just, you know,

There is much to remember?

Well there’s just so much I can’t think about examples of lying when I spend so long like, childhood lies and stuff, ugh, like say I broke something, I remember saying, like "I didn't do it, I-, nowhere-, I wasn't there I-" that sort of thing

And do you remember saying that specifically to your folks?

Something, I know I did-, I know did I-, I can’t remember what it was I broke though
Do you remember the situation, was it the same situation when mum would ask you {do you remember where you?} Denied breaking that thing
I think I did, cause I think I can-, it was in the living room somewhere and the thing was broken and me and my brother both broke it and we both pretended like we didn't cause I think we were fighting at the time so that would have been a double whammy, cause it never should have been broken, cause we never should have been fighting to begin with {laughs} so we were in it together on that one (mm-hm) lying about that one, em, oh and I used to lie to about, er, cause you know my parents would never let me do anything- or I thought they- and I'd lie and say I w-, I'm at here when really I was going other places-

When you were older an-?
Well when, probably thirteen, fourteen, fifteen that kind of thing, I did that a lot, just-, and I think they knew {laughs} you know, they just knew, one of those things they knew

You mean that when you lied you thought they knew that you-?
No, well when I lied I think they believed me but I think you know they weren't fooled that quickly

Thank you so lets- pick up some of the examples so first example is about you and your brother and when you, for example you would say that you- that you're the first to watch TV when in fact it was the- (yeh) I believe that there was a kind of row between the two of you (yeah, oh yeah) and then mum would come and (yep) ask you about (what's going on, yeah) what happened, okay so now what, ere, when in this situation and before telling mum that, er, it was you first who was first there (yeah) er what was in her mind? (Her mind?) What did you think as a child that she had in mind?

Ugh, oh, hmm, they're fighting again, you know, this is ridiculous, it's only TV, something like that, knock it off

Okay and then what did you have in mind?
Um, well number one I think, the truth is we were lying about- like before the lie is even told I think the truth is we're fighting so we're in trouble anyway, so I'd better win {laughs} cause otherwise I'm in big trouble, if I'm the one who caused the fight then we both shouldn't have been fighting, ha, you think, I'm not going to be the one to get in trouble for us fighting right now, cause my mother hated us fighting its just, yeah, hated that so I knew the fact that we
were fighting was bad but the fact that one of us it was an avoi- oh, you know the fight could have been avoided 'cause we know the rules, and basically I didn't want to be the one
{ {transcribers note: interview cuts out}}

So then you told what you told/yeah, I was there first/and then what/ my brother would say something like "nooo" and I'd say "uh-huh" and then that would go back and forth until my mum picked the honorary winner, she would- I think she had a-, you know she marked it down like okay say this time, child x won, you know like it was equally distributed amongst our- our fake squabble type things that weren't real serious ones like that .And the thing is if she had known we were lying I don't think we would have been in trouble for lying as well, I don't think, I can't remember any instance of being in trouble for lying like that

Er a-anyway, try to think of yourself as the child there what do you think mum had in her mind? After you told her that you were first in TV.
Erm well she knew one of us was lying and she would probably know who it was 'cause she would have probably heard the TV and it would show, it was on, whose show it was so she would have either, you know, I guess either said well, well she would never say that I knew that Greg was watching it first or anything like that she would never say that's not true, I don't think she would say that, she'd just say er something like "Greg has this h, you have the next half hour" or you can have this half hour if you want or you can have the next- you know.

Right now, I think I think I want to ask that question about any other example if you can just pick one other example that you had
There must be better examples than that / erm / I remember I changed my report card grade once {laughs} my- I changed a well I think and F to a B or something like that or no a D to a B / mm-hm yeah okay / and that didn't fool them for a second well I you know said yeah that's true that's true well that was a pretty big lie and that was a risky one as well I knew I was going to be in big trouble with that

And it was to your mum and sad- your mum and dad
Mum usually signed it but they always had a good look / yeah / at the report card cause we had to bring home the grades to parents look at it and sign it and take it back in, and um, because usually they went on the refrigerator like and we- seems really weird but the... when we got older our parents would bribe us to be on the honours list. We’d get a 20 for every A {laughs} which, you know, doesn't seem the right way to go about it it worked
when we were losing interest for a while so but m- but as a younger kid, no, it went on the refrigerator, you know, that would treat (or whatever?) so I think I changed one of the grades then, I think my mum ended up calling the school and all that, that big trouble, anyway I can't remember the trouble I think it was I got more- I got more of the disappointed in you lecture than the why- you know like what have you done you know that’s a lie, it was more a concern about the grades than the fact I tried to hide what was going on 'cause we will help you', I think I remember, ‘we will help you if you need help’ but it wasn't a case of not needing help that was the thing, it was just a case of I just didn't do any homework and stuff I wasn't really struggling. it wasn't a legitimate F or D or whatever it was - whatever it all the same if its below B with my family anyway so /yeah/ I can't remember if it was a-
yeh

So again try to think of yourself in the situation and er what you thought was before er changing them er the er the grade, what you thought mum would have in her mind about the er report, was it a report or-?

Yeah it was just the- it just had all your classes and all your grades/ mm-hm, mm-hm / um I don't know uh, it was really stupid though because I knew I shouldn't have done it to begin with because, you know- Okay right, erm she was probably thinking, "ohm hmmm lets see a B here in you know whatever you know math so you're doing pretty well then" you know and then "yeah fine, fine fine fine you are good good" you know

All right, mm-hm, okay and er what do you think your thoughts?

I-- think I was thinking it's working, it’s working {laughs} er / okay / cause she wouldn't say anything that minute if she knew/ she wouldn’t? / Nope

All right, now the last question about lying simply is to pick up any kind of lying that you that you told whoever is it {in the dark}?/ Oh right, um / I guess we'll try to explore this

Um, oh a lie, / {a really normal lie?} / Okay -- um right how about -- oh I know, I have one, I was walking down the street and I was- I'd had a really really bad day you know I felt just miserable and awful and this lady as I was walking past her turned her head and she spit and it it just missed me but the story I told was that it hit me to try to convey how bad of a day it was and I was saying like that was just the icing on the cake, that's one because she didn't really spit on me but it was close enough to count as far as I was concerned
So whom did you tell to?
Um I told that to -- er my boyfriend

Right thank you okay so again lets go over the- the whole uh uh uh interaction then
now you decided to tell that she spat and/ right /so {both laughing}/ yeah, okay / er I
didn’t ask the question about {being blushed?} Er I didn’t ask the question about
{being blushed?} or um / oh god. / so, what was in your mind?
You know that I’m going to have to tell him she didn’t spit on me now, you know that?
Okay er what was in my mind, I was just thought it would make a better story

In what- In what way?
Oh I just thought- I was trying to explain how bad I felt, you know, I was just so
miserable that the second, you know, that just did it for me and it nearly did, but if she
had spit on me that would have been severe trauma I think because she hadn’t- she didn’t
mean to do it she just turned her head and went to spit and I walked right into the plane of
spit and just-

Okay, now as I understand you you tried to impress- impress /yeah, yeah I guess,
yeah that’s it/ yes, now, what did you have in mind / I was spit on {laughs}, isn’t that
impressive {laughs} never mind/ what did you have in mind thinking that it might
impress him?
Just cause its just it’s an awful- awful thing what- what’s worse than being spit on really?
Mm-hm and er had you thought anything about his mind before /yeah / telling him
the story / yeah /, just exaggerating a bit
Um hmmm er --I guess um – I guess I’m just trying to tell him like how much pressure
I’m under lately and that maybe I’m not- I’m going to be so busy, like I want him to
know that it’s bad, it’s real and it’s- it’s not, you know, anything other than just the
pressure and that I’m very focused so I was just trying to say yeah, you know

And did this work?
{laughs} I dunno he was pretty impressed he actually told somebody else so now I’m
going to have to tell 2 people I wasn’t spit on

Okay

Beep
All right, so now we're thinking about you as a child. Do you remember times that your parents withheld the truth from you and you knew it as a child? Or even they lied to you?

Yeah, my brother was 1 year old when my parents married and um, my parents always until I was about 16 my parents always celebrated their wedding anniversary as if it was either 1 year or 2 years ahead of what it was and they'd be saying "oh, yeah, it's our 10th wedding anniversary" when it was only their 8th or they'd say it was their 12th when it was only their 10th so that was quite a big lie that they purposefully carried on for our benefit. / What do you mean for your benefit? / As in um, you know when we sort of celebrated their wedding anniversary they'd be saying to us this is our paper - you know every anniversary has something associated with it - so they'd be purposefully saying it was 2 years on so we wouldn't know that Name1 was born before they got married.

What was in their mind?

Probably they wanted to give us a sort of moral, you know all the moral things they were teaching us as we were growing up say that, if we- if we knew that they hadn't married and, you know, Name1 was actually quite old when they had married that we might think that they were hypocrites or perhaps we might um, I dunno, yeah, probably the hypocritical part, you know, in order to pass on morals perhaps they thought they must be very moral themselves.

And how old were you when you found it out?

I was 16, because my brother found out when he was 18 and he told me a couple of months later. / Right. Mm-hm / well, I mean, my parents told my brother when he was 18

Right, any other lies or omissions.

Let me think. Oh, my father had a gun which he kept in the top of the wardrobe and we used to like to play in my parents room and stuff, and we found it one time and I asked my dad is it a real gun, and he said no it wasn't it's just a, you know, a starting pistol and um, he said that but the next time we went in there it wasn't there. And I believe that it was a real gun but he didn't want to tell us. He didn't want me to know that it had been a real gun he'd found.

Right. Let's take this example and analyse it. When he told that it wasn't a real gun, it was just a starting pistol, um, what was in his mind? As a child what would you say?
Um I think he probably wanted to protect us a bit from the reality of his job because we were there for all the, you know, sparkling bits with people marching up and down and stuff and um, we were sort of involved in the army in quite a strong way, therewere all these events for children and the schools that we went to, quite often about 50% of the people there would be from army so I think in a way for it to be a real gun would sort of bring the idea of death closer in my mind and perhaps my father would be associated with death so I think the reason why he said it wasn't a real gun is because he wanted to distance himself from the negative aspect of death and perhaps him using the gun to perhaps kill someone.

I see. And for you as a child what was in your mind when he said that it wasn't a gun?

Well, I believed him when he said it wasn't a gun, when he said it was a starting pistol. / Mm-hm / but so it was just when it disappeared / when you started to think- did you think then? / Then I thought well, you know there's no reason- if it was a starting pistol then there's no reason why it would have gone. I think it was the winter time so there wouldn't have been running races or so on that you'd need a starting pistol for. And something that had been up in the cupboard and wrapped up, it didn't look as if it had been used for a while anyway, so why would it be-? It just seemed too much of a coincidence that after we'd found it, it had been- you know it had been taken away from us and that's one thing, if it was a starting pistol there was no need for it to be taken away from us, I mean, David had play-guns and stuff and um, the fact that it disappeared as wee / the play guns? / No, his gun, the fact that it disappeared indicated that it was something that he didn't want us to be near to.

Mm-hm, right, right, and you felt this as a child that he didn't want you to be near these sort of things? / Yep. / Okay now we know that children do lie, we know that already. As you said before something about sweet-talk, there isn't anyone who doesn't know what sweet-talk is about and doesn't use it so it's the same with lying. Now thinking back to you as a child, try to think about your lies.

As a child? / Yeah. / Um, I can't actually think of anything specific but I know that in general all the lies that I told as a child were to do with um, were to do with my brothers and sisters. Perhaps something had happened, some argument, something had broken you know, and it would be either as a group we'd lie to protect either, I've just thought of an example- my parents- this was in Place1, my parents had gone shopping and we were living in a big flat at the time and my little sisteName1, she was quite young at the time, but anything that happened at all, she would go running to my parents to tell them tales about what had
happened, and once we were playing- I can't remember what we were playing but we were sort of chasing each other round the flat. And there's this one bit where um, the dining room turned into the kitchen and you could run all the way through from the hallway to the dining room to the kitchen. And we were chasing each other round that way and my sister and I holed ourselves up in the dining room, you know, one of us holding each door and my brother trying to get at us, I don't know being a monster or something, I can't remember what he was being but he was pushing up against one of the doors and I ran to help my sister to stop the door from opening and this door came up and off it's hinges {laughs} and we were all panicked. And my sister Namel, we were all sitting in the dining room watching and we knew that as soon as my parents came in she would say "the door came off it's hinges, they were fighting and it came off." and we'd get in trouble for it. So we managed to get the door back on it's hinges and we sat Namel down and we started telling her all there tall stories about things like all sorts of things like um, er, like dragons coming in and magical things happening just to sort of confuse her a little so when my parents did come in and she started babbling about the door coming off it's hinges, she was also babbling about a story with dragons and the rest of it and my parents were saying "what's Namel going on about?" and we were like "we don't know. You know what Namel's like, she's always it's probably some story we told her". And I remember that was quite a big lie because we didn't actually manage to put the door back on properly we just- we were just, like, little children at the time so we just sort of leaned it on and then my dad two days later managed to push it off it's hinges and thought he'd done it and we agreed with him that he had done it. So that was a lie we told, well, yeah. I suppose that's a, - that's not really a personal lie I told. Do you want a personal one? / If you've got something in mind, please / um, oh, sometimes I lied about doing all my homework. My parents had this rule that you had to finish all your homework before we could sit down and watch TV. So sometimes I lied and said I'd done it and sort of got up in the morning and did it so I could watch what I wanted on TV.

Oh, things in the fridge like you know, delicacies, chocolate cake or whatever, um, maybe taking a bit of that and not- lying when they asked about it. "Do you know who took this massive slice out of the chocolate cake?" "No I don't know anything about it."

Mm-hm. okay, when you told them you didn't know anything about it, what did you have in mind?
Um, keeping myself out of trouble and um, you know, not being told of for taking a slice of chocolate cake or whatever it might be.

**Right and what did they have in mind when you told them** / that I hadn't done it, or I didn't know anything about it? They knew that one of us had done it. But they can't sort of pin point the exact person, you know, nobody got told off about it.

**So it was mainly fear of punishment that you er-**

Not just that. Well, fear of getting in trouble but also, say it was a chocolate cake for dinner or something, and if you'd already taken a slice then as part of your punishment you might not get another slice of it so by lying I was insuring the future well-being of my stomach, really.

**Right, okay. And now the last example to think about, one of your examples of one-**

**that one tells when he's older then** / older then, mm-hm. / **not just to your parents but whoever, I mean, a recent lie.**

A recent lie, you mean like nowadays / yes. / Oh this is one I told to my mother recently. I was at my boyfriend's house on Friday night and my mother phoned on Friday night quite late about 10 or 11 and I wasn't in. And my friend said "oh, I'm not sure where she is, um, we'll leave a message for her to phone you back." and I didn't get back in until the Sunday because I stayed over until the Sunday. And when I spoke to my mother I said I hadn't seen Name2 or Name3 so they hadn't passed on the message so, in fact it was true, I hadn't actually seen them but it wasn't because I hadn't seen them it was because I hadn't been home rather. But I sort of intimated by omission that I'd arrived home that night but just hadn't got the message.

**Okay, so again just try to make the association, the link of association that you did have in mind before telling mum that you hadn't seen Name2 or Name3. I mean, what was in your mind that brought you to tell her what you told her.**

Um, as I said before my parents are very religious and my mother especially wouldn't be happy at all if she discovered that I was spending the night with my boyfriend. As far as they're concerned we're all going to be married in white and so the reason I lied was so the didn't know- or so I didn't have to say to her that I'd stayed over and slept at my boyfriend's house.
Mm-hm, right. And at the moment of telling her that you didn’t see Name2 or Name3, What do you think she had in her mind? What do you think she was thinking about that?

Um, I think she probably thought that I’d been too busy to get back to her, because I had been working and..

Is it what she would have thought / oh yeah, before I phoned her she probably thought I’d been too busy to / so this was in your mind as well / she probably thought I was too busy, yeah. But she was probably a bit anxious as well because she always gets you know, If I haven’t replied by the Sunday she probably would have got, yknow, anxious and tried phoning me again, tried to get through to me.

Okay all right. Now..
Subject 972

And as a child each of us lie I mean, not just as children, try to remember times when you lied to them or to whoever.

Child lies. There were the very normal ones I suppose as a kid telling friends me and my mother did this, me and my mother went to this place, she bought me/ you don’t remember specific ones? / Not really, um, I remember discussions that I would have with my friends. I still remember one: there was a mountain next to the area we live and there is some special place with trees and YOU know, and one of my friends told me he and his dad went out there with his car and drove around these trees and was impossible to do it because there’s no roads or, you know, I knew it was a lie. And I remember that I told him another one back, I can’t remember which one but I remember we argued and sort of told lies during the whole afternoon. Um, we would pretend we’d gone to this place or whatever, um, I remember the first time we went to the states. It’s kind of traditional for big families to go to Disney world in Florida and all the nice places there. So when I came back I told them that we went to all over it, you know, I would pretend that we did / how old were you then? / 10, I was a child.

And so, just take for example this sort of lie, when you told them that you had been in places that you had never been / I remember one now. There is this nice picture of Mickey Mouse, monorail and a nice hotel and the monorail goes into the hotel and this is Disney world’s hotel, the main one. And I told them we were- we stayed there / even though you- / no, we didn’t because it would be so much expensive. And it was impossible to go there.

Right so when you told them you stayed in this expensive hotel, what did you have in mind?

I wanted to pretend we were doing so great things although we just went to any holiday hotel.

So what do you think he had in mind?

The person who I told the lies? He believed me. Um, I mean, it was um, such a expensive holiday going for one month or a month and a half that this wouldn’t make any big difference though it was a very- talking about money it would make a big difference / mm-hm. / but you know, we were kids and stuff and he believed me and went "oh, great!" and he asked me "how are the rooms?" and " did you see Mickey mouse running through the
corridors?" and I would say "yeah, yeah, I saw him couple of times and we spoke and" so he really believed it and I was so proud that he believed..

**Can you recall any other lies that you told? / No. / like to your parents?**

Lying to my parents. No I was- I think I was very truthful to them, you know. Maybe when I was a teenager. When I was at that, you know, they would ask me how was the party last night and if something really bad happened like my best friend ended up kissing another one or everybody or some girl just went topless, I wouldn't tell them that / mm-hm. / especially because I was very young {?} and I didn't want them to know about this. um, I was very very truthful to them.

**Tell me again what was in your mind when you didn't tell them about parties.**

Because um, I remember I told you that I was very young / you were young, / I was younger than most of my friends. So for them kissing in front of other people would be normal because they were experienced into it but for me it wasn't / right. / And I knew that my mother would be, they wouldn't expect me to kiss a girlfriend so I wouldn't tell them that. I would hide that. I would really hide things going on at parties or - because I think it was a different situation for me. Mainly people grow up together and they would do things together. I didn't. I jumped from playing with little cars to /because friends were older. / Yeah.

**The last question that I'd like to ask you about this is about any lying that you told as an adult. To whoever I mean, and then we can discuss it a bit.**

Um, let's see. Oh, I had job in the office and my boss begins to have a lot of trust in me, right? So I was keeping the pace, I was keeping the rhythm he wanted to have from me, even though I was very young to be an architect. Um, so he told me "I need to finish this set of plans for this Friday meeting with the clients but I can't do it, would you do it for me? Would you have time to do it?" and I thought "god, this thing. I already have work to do, you know, I do this " but I had to do it, he was my boss, it would be a good chance to get in touch with him and, you know, so I told him "yes, I'll do it." and I had a very nice friend at that office and she helped me to finish this work. And then when my boss asked me if I did all that work by myself, knowing that I already had a lot of work and I already had to work late with only that work, you know, I was very busy, and I said "yes, I did." and it turned out that I had to- he was having the meeting with the clients and they didn't understand something with the plans. So he called me and I went downstairs to the meeting room and
um, I explained them what I’d done for the project. And they liked it so much that they put me in charge of the project. And he asked me "Did you do this by yourself?" and I said "yeah." but my friend helped me.

So you said that your friend helped you?
No I didn't. That's the lie.

Okay and what did you have in mind when you didn't tell them the truth?
I just wanted to impress him?

And what did he have in his- in mind when he asked you?
He wanted to know if I- he was the kind of person that would push you to the very end. It wouldn't be a problem if I didn't finish the plans. He would tell the clients whatever. He would say "sorry we don't have time" you know it wasn't a big deal. But he wanted to see if I could do it.

And when you told him that it was you?
He was happy. He said "good!" you know, / what did he have in mind then? / To ask me?
Oh- / no, what did he have in mind when you told him it was you?
He was- when I told him I did it he was very happy because he probably thought I wouldn't finish all those plans. So that’s why I say he was trying to push me or trying to measure how good and how quick I was so anyway it was like a test, that’s the lie.

All right, so, now.
Subject 973

And our first introduction, I would like you to do this. It might be quite difficult to begin but, try to remember if you have any memories as a child of being told lies by whoever or that your parents withheld the truth from you that you later on knew that they had withheld the truth.

I really don't remember, because they always say the truth, would never lie, who lies and steals and does things wrong. / Mm / always the truth and the truth- / so you don't remember them hiding anything from you? / No I don't remember any.

Now, lies as a child. Now we know that children lie. Everybody lies as a child. It's part of life er, and in fact we know that it is part of the development of the child that the child lies. So try to think of yourself or of any lies that you had to lie as a child if you like, either to your parents or to whomever.

Probably I did lie, maybe did, I dunno if they said "have you been with some-" there is a friend of mine Diana or they said I had been with her Mary I don't know, doesn't matter because I know they don't like maybe this girl and I said something else. Or if they said where have you been, maybe have you been in the park playing, you know. And maybe I've been with another friend of mine at her home because her parents were out so she was alone at her home and we would just sit and smoke and laugh, you know, so I couldn't tell her yes I was there and smoking so I said playing.

I don't remember really I lied much. I lied when I started smoking and those things, going out then maybe I lied something you know, that we missed the but or we went to the cinema or we went to disco and but as a really child before then I don't remember really, can't remember really. Most things I remember mainly between the age of 13, 13 and 16 but before that I can't remember and so can't give an example there. No I can't remember before that. Mostly this part friends and where have you been and maybe if you ask for the pocket money, "what do you need it for?" you can say for a sandwich and then but cigarettes and those things.

So let's take a thing, one of these that you have been in the park playing, or you have been with your friend when her parents were not at home and you would say you were at the park. What do you think they um, -when you told them that you were in the
park, what do you think that they had in their mind or mum or dad had in his or her mind?

I don't know really. At the time I actually didn't know what they had in their mind. But maybe if I know try to guess. I remember someday they would just say all right I haven't seen you, you know, because she was wfrom the balcony or I haven't seen you around. Or I've been calling you and if she saw another friend and she asked for me and she said "I don't know I've been playing here for an hour I haven't seen her." so she would say, you know, if she didn't meet anyone alright, you know, but if by accident she met a couple of friends and if they didn't see me she asked, called you know, she needed me then she would say "you haven't been in the park." and then I would say, I don't know, "I just went to the shop," something like that, you know. Or maybe I would even say I just sit you know with another friend of ours and she'll say "oh, what have you been doing at that home the parents are both out?" maybe even I say that but you know if I was just sitting {can't hear} I just didn't want to upset them because of the smoking otherwise I would tell them that I was

You didn't want to upset them?

Yeah, because I know that they would mind, you know / if they knew that / yes. The smoking / right.

So then when you told them that you were in the park, you say that you didn't know what they had or what mum had in her mind?

Yes. / Did she think it was true? / Yes, I didn't think. I would just say that and then you know, always rushing, you know, playing, go there, go to another room, go see something on television to watch.

Right so we can go on and think of other lies as more of an adult, not at home, I mean at home but more as an adult. So again it's another very intimate question to go {can't hear}. I know that it is difficult for you to go into this. But now lets try to think of any other lie which you told somebody.

Oh, I can remember one. I remember when I wanted an abortion, you know, and I just went to the hospital and said, you know, I want to stay for an abortion and meanwhile I just called my partner and said I didn't feel very well, you know, I just had to go to hospital and I went out did a bit of shopping and I didn't feel well and they drove me to hospital, you know, and then he said "okay don't worry. If you need anything I will come to see you" and those things and I said, you know, I couldn't say anything but in that hospital well you know anyway they
only allowed it in reception in the ground floor, you know, so he couldn't come upstairs to
talk me. And he even didn't know. He didn't know anything that I was planning to do at the
time and then you know he came, I was there for 2 days and they didn't say when everything
is supposed to happen I changed my mind and I said "no, I don't want to do it." and I went
and back home I told him about that maybe last year or something like that. I didn't feel that
I intended to do that and I couldn't do it and.

Did he know that you were pregnant? / Yes. Yes. / Right. Did you told him that you
were going to. / No I didn't because he wanted very much, you know a baby, child. I also
wanted very much I just had some problems, you know, problems at the time, then I just
thought maybe for the best to do that and I didn't want to tell him because I knew that he
would try to stop me or something so I just go and then I will tell him "I didn't feel very well,
I have problems."

So I mean, what you think by that- what do you think that he had in his mind when
you told him you were on your way to the hospital, or you were in the hospital because
you weren't feeling okay?

Yes. He had in his mind just, you know, that he will help me. He didn't have in his mind that
I am trying to do an abortion or anything just really believed me because I know how they
are you know, tomorrow he came with something I needed for the hospital because I just
went straight there, I couldn't take anything from the home, I just pretended that it just
happened, I didn't feel well. So he brought me everything and said "everything will be all
right, don't worry, you look fine" I said "I didn't feel very well, I just collapsed in the street".

So you...

{end of side}

So you planned it so he would believe it? Yes? Is it? Am I following you? / Yes. / Mm-
hm.

I didn't know actually how to do it. I couldn't tell him "I'm going to do that." so I just
thought it the best that I said I suddenly had miscarriage or something.

Mm-hm. any other? / No. / but you know this might be quite difficult for you, you
know, this the time with all this around it.

I can't remember really anything else. Because I don't lie actually. I know that- I don't lie, I
tell the truth really but, sometimes maybe I remember also before but I can't now find an
example, you know, you can mix one lie with truth, so you can say part truth and you don't
have to lie anything. Maybe its just easier you just say something than that difficult part but it still is a lie, you didn't lie.

So if you're mentioning this thing, I'll ask you a question which is about the special interview. Thinking about it in retrospective, whether there are any other things that you feel or know that you didn't tell me the whole truth or you hide something consciously or less consciously / no. / with any other question. / No I don't think so because there is no.. / Think a bit.

No because I think I'm just telling you now what's come on my mind really, you know, I don't have any reason to lie anything really, generally, you know, - / its not that, I'm not asking you if- / yes, you know,

Right, okay and now we are coming to the last thing. And thanks for everything up until now,
Two minutes again going back to your childhood and it's kind of difficult to recollect memories about life but the first thing I'd like to do is trying to recollect memories about your parents withholding the truth from you or lying to you as a child if you can remember any events, occasions / that they lie or me? / That they lie to you as a child and that you knew that it was a lie but that you didn't know-

Yeah I remember something. It's this Christmas story. As a child you think about that, in Austria, I mean it's totally different than here I think they don't have it. But there is this angel who's flying in the room and brings the presents and- / how is it called? / {kiskin?} And I really believed in this angel. / He is a king? He's not a- / no, it means- klisking{?} means um it's the child of Mary and Joseph actually but in this translation its an angel who is flying from house to house in the night before the 24th and brings the presents and the window is always open then a little bit and they come in. and I like this story, I loved it and there was a little guy in school who told me "Hah, you're wrong. That's not true, your parents do these things." and I said "no, my parents would never do that to me." and I asked them and they said no this guy is wrong and after one year I recognised this must be the truth. I dunno, I saw my mother doing something and recognised them. And I was so shocked that they really lied to me and told me this story and but I think I was more shocked about losing this beautiful story than because of the lie / your fantasy about the angel. / Yeah, yeah. The nice story.

Right, okay. Do you know there's a nice story about it? About your story. I can't remember the name of it. About this thing, the trial when the child tries to convince the judge that it is real, that this story is real and nobody could prove that it is not real. Anyway and then there is one sort of lie that they told you but it's kind of very conventional, its a kind of convention that this is the . I mean, this was an angel. It wasn't the lie that they told you. It's a tradition that a lot of children hear this story. Right? / Yeah. / Um so then if we can move on and I can ask you about your lying, you mentioned before a lying which you wouldn't be at school throughout the day and then you saw your father and he would ask you how was school and you would say / normal.
Normal and then he would? Normal-boring, and he would, I remember actually he
didn't say anything, he just looked at me as I started to cry because I knew that he knows.
Right, how did you know that he knows?
I could see it in his eyes.
Right, okay. In this situation, when you came and er, he asked you we are trying to
establish the reason of the situation. We are trying to go into your mind. Okay. So he
is there, he is asking you about school and before answering him, what did you have in
your mind? What?
I think I would or I had in mind "should I say the truth or should I lie."
Okay so and go on- "what's easier?" and then I decided "lie." because how should he
know. But I didn't recognise that a teacher saw me in this coffee shop and called my mum.
She said its not possible that he saw me there because I'm at home, I'm ill. Say it again.
My mum would lie for me and say to this teacher that called her and told her that I'm in this
coffee shop. She said it's not possible / the teacher called your mum? Yeah he has. He
already called / but you didn't know. / I didn't know, no. For that reason I decided to lie.
Okay and in that case, before telling him that it was normal when you went to
school, what did you think as a child that he had in mind, when he asked you the
question?
He knew that I was lying, I mean, he knew / before giving the answer, I mean, he asked
you the question? / Uh-huh. I mean I understand you, I think he tried, perhaps he was not
sure if I would lie, perhaps he thought "I'll ask her and then she'll say the truth. If I ask her
she will say the truth." I think more he thought that I would tell him the truth.
Why did he have to ask you about, why did he ask you about school? What was in his
mind?
It was always,- he knew already because my mother told him so he knew already that I was
not in school, I mean it was not- / but then you didn't know it as a child, I mean, before /
I didn't know it / okay, so what did you think that he thought? / I felt in a certain way. As
I was lying, I felt in a certain way that he knows it before, actually, I was saying "normal." I
had this feeling mm. because he wouldn't ask me in this kind of- yeah, the voice was
different than he would normally ask, "how was school?" / right, he would normally ask
it? / He always asked yeah.
Okay, any other memory of lying? Any lies as a child?
Sometimes I lied in school that there was no time to do my homework because of something but I would never have lied in that case some people did that they said somebody died. I would always be very afraid that I would think something like that, that somebody could die or something awful would happen. But there are no specially lies I remember, just this small, really small things that you try to- yeah. You try to..? Try to I don't know, get rid of things or just have more time or whatever.

So now I'd like you to think of a lie that you told whoever yeah. As an adult. As an adult, yeah? Any lie that you told. Then I'm going to ask you things so we can understand how this situation was.
Hmm. actually I have really problems to lie because I get red. You blush? Yeah, in the face. I dunno, I'm sure there are some lies I did. These kind of lies you not even remember, yeah? Just because its more comfortable to lie like, for instance, somebody you don't like that much asking you if you can go with him for a coffee and you don't want to but you think it's very impolite if you say I don't want to and then you say you know, "I have to go to {centerpoint?} To make some copies so there's no time to go with you for a coffee."

Have you got any specific event, I mean, do you remember something specifically that you told someone you don't like to go?
Yeah, there was something about a girl I didn't want to go with her to the theatre but the day before I couldn't say no. I said "okay lets do it, it's fine. Lets go" and then I tried to find something, yeah? Not to lie. An excuse you mean? Yeah, some excuse who isn't really an excuse in that way that I also have to do it. And actually I then had to do a work and finish this work so I couldn't go with her but honestly I should have said to her the day before "oh, sorry I don't want to." but I couldn't.

But in the end you had something else to do.
At the end I found something {laughs} so you didn't lie. Or did you? No, in the end I didn't lie but I lied in the way that first I had to search for this thing. It would have been the same thing if I had lied and said, "I have to do this." because when I search from the moment I knew that I should go with her to the theatre, its a lie, in a way. Yes, I see.

Any other lies?
Lying is not that easy. Mm, yeah, sometimes perhaps if you get opens{?} to a lot of people, like, being here I've known a lot of new people and you try to combine these things but you
also have to work a lot. so sometimes you just keep on finding excuses not to say "sorry, I'm really not interested in that." / mm-hm. / because on the one hand it's not possible in the way that you are kind of master course or whatever, it's more the school thing. I wasn't used to it for a long time. But you feel really impolite and really, really bad if you do that thing so it's much easier to find some small lies and say "I can't make it because da da da." / again do you have anyone specific that you lied to? Whoever? / Not really because I- it's perhaps horrid but it's more that you keep on doing these small lies without really / realising it? / Yeah.

Okay, right now we're coming to the end if this bit. Switch it off.
Subject 976

We’re coming to the end of this. Again to think about your childhood. Firstly to recall instances where you know that your parents withheld the truth from you or even lied to you. It is a kind of very difficult question because we don't usually think along these kind of things or these terms but just take your time. See if you can dig out something from your memory.

.... Um, I dunno if I would really call it lying but maybe trying to brush over the truth / mm-hm / you know they um, - when they used to argue, I would- sometimes I would ask "is everything alright?" and my mum would just say "yes." kind of thing. But um, with the money thing, I told you they were quite skint, um, I would try and give my pocket money back to my mum and she would say "oh, things are fine, don't worry." sort of thing. And I don't think they ever really, not that I can recall anyway, they never really withheld a serious truth from me. / Mm-hm / um, ... I mean if there were things they didn't tell me it was because they thought it was none of my business rather than manipulating the truth or..

Okay, so maybe it’s easier to think about your own lies when you were a child. So think of any event, any time when you were telling lies either to your parents or to whomever. And then I’m going to ask you further questions about the situation just to understand how- to understand it.

Um, well I used to lie that I’d done things- I used to tell lies that I’d done things I hadn't done like um, you know really adventurous things. I remember at school I told my teacher that I could play the piano and I couldn't and um, she asked me to play something for them and I couldn't you see. Um, and then you know there was one occasion when I just told a bare-faced lie where it was so obvious I was lying, you know, my mum knew I was lying because the evidence was there in front of her. I never used to- I don't think I used to tell huge great whopping lies that were really serious. I think if there were things that I didn't want them to know rather than tell them an untruth I wouldn't tell them anything. And there are still things that they don't know and wouldn't ever dream of, you know, thinking. Um, I used to lie to get my sister in trouble. Um,

Okay, pick up just one example of lying or- yes. Concerning your sister. Think of one and just tell me about that, what you lied about.
Um, it's a really horrible lie actually. It was really unfair. Um, because, you know, I was the eldest, I always had to take responsibility for whatever I was doing and whatever she did as well. And I would get in trouble for her naughtiness and her misbehaviour. And it would seem that she would only ever get in trouble if there were absolute proof or evidence. / Mm-hm. / So I stuck my nails into me and said that she did it and she got in trouble, it worked.

**How old were you then?** / 7 or 8. / **Right and you remember this event quite vividly, isn't it?** / Yeah. / **Okay, now, try to get into your mind when you were a child because I'm going to ask you about your mind as a child. So as a child, and in this situation, what did you have in mind when you stuck your nails in your hand and you told mum it was mum?** / Yeah. / **It was - what's your sister's name?** / Name1. / It was Name1.

Just absolute glee. / Mm-hm. / I knew she'd get in trouble for it.

**Right, what were you thinking about when planning to put your nails or to stick your nails.**

It was quite spontaneous, / right. / Because she was supposed to hold my hand to cross the road and she didn't, she just ran off. And um, I was so annoyed that she hadn't done what I'd told her to do - and I suppose there was all this back-log of me being told off for her naughtiness / right. / That I just went like that.

**And when you went just- what was in your mind? I mean, I'll get her.** / That you'll get her? So in your mind you were thinking that you were going to tell mum that it was her nails / that had stuck in me. / Right, okay and in the chain of associations what did you think, or how did you think that mum would get her? And she would be told off about it?

Well, I just- I knew that that would annoy my mum because, you know, you can get infections from scratches and it's a really spiteful thing to do, you know, she always taught us never to nip or pinch or scratch anyone and I just think that she would have been absolutely disgusted that one of her children would do that to another one. So you know, it's quite a powerful- I knew it would evoke quite a powerful reaction.

**Right. Okay. So, now you are incorporating mum's thoughts, okay? So what did you think mum thought when you told her, before telling her that it was Name's nails and later on, what did she have in her mind, mum?** / I don't really understand. / When I asked you about the situation, a couple of minutes ago you said you knew that it would bother mum because she told you not to get anything in your skin because it might be
quite infectious / mm. / you get infections. So you knew that in her mind she would be quite angry at Name1. Okay? So as a child you knew that she would be quite angry, so you knew something about her before or after nailing yourself. And then, what happened when she saw and when you told her it was Name1's nails?

Well, she was really angry with Name1.

Right, so what was in her mind?

Well, that Name1 had misbehaved in the first place by not holding my hand to cross the road and had also been really spiteful by scratching me.

Okay, right, now lets go to another example, which would be the unsuccessful lying when there was evident which I don't know what it was about. What was it? / Um, so stupid. She had a banana and / who's she? / My mum, sorry, and um, she'd been eating it with her teeth and then I cut myself off just a tiny little slice so there was no, you know, no teeth marks and um, she asked me if I'd cut myself a piece of banana and I said "no." and then she got really mad because I'd lied to her and it was so obvious that, you know, there was no-one else in the house.

Okay so now lets go along the same kind of procedure that I did before. As a child when you saw the banana, what was in your mind? Er, before cutting? Why did you cut? And what did you think then that was in mum's mind?

Um, well, when I saw the banana I wanted a bit and um, I cut it just because there was a knife there and um she was more angry that I'd lied than had a piece of her banana but I lied because I thought she'd be angry that I'd eaten the banana.

Right, okay, but then initially you didn't bite it you cut it. / Mm. / so it wasn't just because the knife was there. You were planning to deny this was done.

No, I wasn't. / No? / I don't think I was. I think I just cut it because the knife was there, you know, I didn't take out a knife and cut it and I didn't really think she would ask me you know, if I'd had some / mm-hm. / and it was just spontaneous again, you know, / right okay, so then it was because you were frightened that she would be angry? / Yeah, that I'd had some banana. / That you'd had some banana. All right then, lets go to the first, er, example, which was about playing the piano. So can you describe me the situation where you told the lie?

Um, there was a piano in the classroom and I really desperately wanted to be able to play the piano but my parents wouldn't pay for lessons because we didn't have a piano at home on
which to practice so it would be a waste of time. And um, and most people were having piano lessons in the school. And then the teacher asked who could play the piano and I put up my hand and I said that I was having private lessons, because she didn't know that I was having lessons or didn't think that I was having lessons, she asked me if I would play something for the class.

At the same time, at the same moment when she asked you, after asking you who knows to play the piano. Okay? / It was the same one. / It was one occasion. Mm-hm. / so I said I didn't want to play anything and then she encouraged me and forced me to play and I just banged on a few keys. / And then what happened? / Oh, she wasn't angry. She just said "okay, thank you, Jo" / nice of her. And then again when she asked who knew to play the piano, what was in your mind? Before telling her that you know how to play the piano, what was in your mind?

Well, I didn't ever dream of it, you know that she was going to ask someone to play the piano but it was just that I really wanted to play the piano. It wasn't um, you know, I don't think I was being devious. I suppose I almost believed that I could play the piano.

Mm-hm, right. Because at first you mentioned that you would be making up stories. / Mm. / can you think of another story that you did make up?

Um, told this girl who bullied me in primary school that I had a boyfriend / mm-hm. / and you know, I created a whole personality and a name for him because she had a boyfriend and she was always trying to get me to go down to the bottom of the field and kiss boys which I didn't really want to do. I thought if I said I had a boyfriend, she'd leave me alone. / Right. Okay, and did it work? / Yeah. / Yes? / But then she became more and more interested in this fictitious person and it became quite hard to sustain the lie. / And was it successful or did she? / Yeah, she didn't find out. She just got tired of it.

All right.
Subject 980

Firstly try to think of or collect memories of times when you were told lies or your parents withheld the truth from you as far as you remember it, as far as you-. Now, take your time it's quite a difficult area, you don't think along those lines these days. The only one that springs to mind is I think my mum withheld the truth about how old my dad was but, / mm-hm. What would she tell you? / She didn't really, we didn't really talk about it I mean, because it was never really made into a big thing, he was just ill, like other people get ill. And you don't really discuss that but / so he was just ill like other people, what did you have in mind when- / well he wasn't but- / I know but as a child, I know, sure I know but the question is how was it like for you? Did you feel or was it like it was a kind of illness that was like other illnesses? / No I knew that it wasn't. / Right. / But I don't think we were never really told how serious it was. / Right. / But then we never asked so.. / Right, yeah, and you knew that it was serious? / I always suspected that it was. / Right. And when first did it happen you- it appeared that you knew or the lie that it was so serious? / I think right from the beginning we knew it was unusual because he'd been to see- been to have, like, a regular opticians appointment, and had been sent straight to Barts. And he rang up to tell my mum where he was going and he wouldn't speak to us on the phone cause he was really upset, and I remember being really upset then. And that was really odd that he wouldn’t speak to us so I think from the start it was quite obvious that it wasn't- not a normal thing.

Right, Any other thing that you can think of? Any other memories of not being told the truth or even..?

Um,... I can't really remember anything.

Okay so we can go to a much easier task which is to remember your lying, such as {laughs} {can't hear} it is like that people do find it easier to... yeah. So try to think of times when you wouldn't tell the truth to your parents.

Well, I remember constructing elaborate lies about where I was going because I wasn't going I said I was going. Um, I remember one new year's eve because I wasn't allowed to go where I wanted to go / which was where? / It was to a club, and / how old were you then? Just- / I think I was 16 but anyway and saying that I’d been to someone's party at someone's house
and having to tell my mum where it was and um, and not really being very sure because I wasn't that organised and, you know, just making up a general area of where it was and staying at my friend's house and just huge lies constructed about how I was going to get back from places and where I was staying and things like that. / **Mm-hm, so not just once?** / Oh, no. Because my mum was very strict about us going out and um, but we went anyway. But I can only remember being caught out once. Um, yeah.

**Okay, think of any other example and then we can discuss it more thoroughly.**

Um, I can remember lying about fighting with my sister and who started the fight and things like that.... But nothing really springs to mind.

**Okay, so lets think about specific example about you being asked where have you been, right? / Yeah, / can you- do you have any specific event in mind? Can you think of anything more..?**

Yeah, I wasn't asked where had I been / **so just tell me about that.** / I was asked where I was going. If it's a Saturday night and you're going out, you've got to tell your mum where you're going and who you're staying with and that sort of thing like and just lying blatantly about what you were doing. / **So what did you answer?** / Um, just that I'd arranged that I was going to stay at my friend's to watch videos. Um, and she seemed quite happy with that. But I think that she probably knew that I wasn't going to do that anyway. I don't know I always got- she never asked too many questions, I mean, either she just accepted me, what I said, um, but I don't think that that would be the case. I think she probably knew that I was going to do something different anyway.

**Right. But is this that it didn't occur to you that maybe she knew?**

I think it did. And I felt very guilty about it because I was sure that she knew but she never said anything.

**Right. Right, okay. Now when you intended to not tell the truth or you lied to her, what was in your mind? What did you think about? Now just think about the specific moment when she asked you.**

Terror that she'd find out / **yeah.** / You know, just worry that I'd been caught out. Especially when I had to construct fairly elaborate stories about where I was going to be and what I was going to do. And just worried that it wouldn't all tie together.
Right. Okay. So you were quite frightened of being caught out? / Yeah. / And again at this specific moment, what did you think she had in her mind when she asked you where you were going to? Okay? And then what did she have in her mind?
I think that at the time I thought that she knew I was lying to her.
At the time when you were / lying to her I thought that she knew. / Right.
Right. Okay, and then you didn't change the pattern of lying? I mean, it was the same kind of thing. So then you would tell her again and then you would think that she probably / yeah. / She doesn't believe you. And it was a kind of routine, I mean, is it? / Yeah. / I'm not just trying to make it up now.
No, I mean, I've always been convinced when I've lied to my mum that she's known the real state of affairs.
Right, okay. And the last thing to ask you is to try to recollect or remember any lie when you were as an adult. A recent lie, more recent lie.
Um, I'm sure there must have been one. I know I've lied to my supervisor about what I've been doing. / Mm-hm, you can pick up this, this- / this specific thing. / This specific thing, yes. / Um, when she's asked me how well things are going and how much I've done and how things are coming along, um, I've told her that everything's fine and I'm coming up with ideas for experiments and this sort of thing, and it's not at all.
Mm-hm, right. Okay. Fine. Now lets discuss this discourse. She asked you about your progress. / Yeah. It's not in a specific meeting, it's just when I pop in and see her or something. / Okay. And then why? / Why? I lied to her because- / no, no. The question is not why you lied. Why did you decide to mention that it wasn't in a formal meeting? / Oh, right. Because I wouldn't be able to- I wouldn't construct a lie in a formal meeting. / Right, so it was a kind of more impassive way to..? / Yeah. / Okay fine, so, now the question is as before I will ask you about 2 things. What was in your mind when she asked you about your, your..?
I was thinking "good god! I'm going to get another lecture if I say that things are going badly. She's going to pull that face at me again and I can't stand it." / which was before? I mean, she would put on this face before? / Yeah. And she'd go on about how time's ticking by and I've got to make some progress. And I think "for goodness sake! Does she really think I don't know that?" It just drives me mad.
Right, okay. Fine. And then, what do you think she had in mind when she asked you and after you told her?

I think she's worried about the progress I'm making and that's why she asked. But um, I don't think she wants to be told the truth, which is the problem.

Right, okay, anything else you'd like to add or any other lie that you'd like to share with me?

Um, nothing that springs to mind. Hmm

Okay.

{end of tape}
Subject 983

I: it's quite a difficult task to do trying to think about lying.
S: It’s hard because I don’t have a lot of childhood memories. It’s hard to give examples, just an overall impression it’s like my mother’s yelling and then you ask me to give a specific example and then it becomes so difficult.
I: It’s definitely about withholding things though, the first thing that comes to mind is the adopted child who just came into the house without prior understanding of what is going on. This kind of experience of being withheld of something which was quite significant. Anyway take your time.
S: But you’re going to ask me questions?
I: Later on.
S: Oh you’re wanting me to actually think of things now. Gosh. There is, you said it, my sister, but you see I don’t know that they didn’t talk to us about it. I have no memory of them talking to us about it but that doesn’t mean that it wasn’t it wasn’t present. Because I can’t believe it wasn’t a conversation in the household. Certainly they must have, its just that I don’t have a memory of being sat down but I don’t have a feeling of when she came in the house of being unhappy about it, certainly as a baby it was very exciting loving so I don’t have any memory of feeling that we were deceived and angered because of that. Gosh feelings of being, deceitfulness. I honestly don’t have of them purposely withholding information or deceiving us memories of my mother being closed, but I don’t view that as purposely trying to lie to us and certainly my father has never talked about his father or but again he’s never talked about so its not as if I asked him and he’s lied about it, I don’t think he would do that. I actually think that they both are pretty honest people in their relationships with their family. I don’t have any memories, I’m so sorry.
I: It’s allright. It’s easier maybe to think about your lying. Still as we know that everyone lies then children do lie, it’s a kind of developmental task, to lie. Try to think of your lies or...
S: My first memory of I guess lying, although I’m not sure I really lied is when I hit this girl during recess so I knew I was going to get into trouble, so I didn’t go back to classroom so I hid in the bushes, and waited for the bell to ring and then went home. Then
my mother asked me how the day was, obviously he knew because school had called her because I had disappeared so she was, I have this memory of my mother always ironing, she was always ironing in her free time when we were growing up. So she’s downstairs ironing and I come down and she says how was your day and I say Oh it was fine and she says what did you do and I say Oh just played. Then she said I actually had a phone call from the school, but she wasn’t angry she didn’t yell at me, I do’t remember being put on restriction I remember her talking to me about how what I did was wrong but how it was even more wrong for me to disappear because then everyone is worried and concerned, not so much that I hit a little girl but that something had happened to me and so my memory of it was, yeah I guess I lied in that I didn’t tell her what happened but my memory of her reaction to it was actually quite a sane intelligent response.

I: When you told her that you played what was in your mind?
S: That I had socked this girl I and had her crying and that I was going to get in trouble.
I: As a child what did you think she had in her mind.
S: I think she probably wasn’t concerned about the situation itself as it was just a normal childhood thing, kids hit each other and I’m not an aggressive person so it wouldn’t be a typical part of me, so she would have considered it a fluke, sort of a situational thing, so I think her concern was more for the fact that a) I disappeared that I was so afraid by what I had done and unwilling to take the consequences in truth or trying to postpone the consequences so I think her concern was more for how I reacted to it and the fact that I had disappeared and had worried everybody, had worried the school and had worried her, although I wouldn’t have known it going in there although I’m sure that she was but that before they were just waiting to see what would happen after school, and I didn’t show up so being calm about it.

I’m seemed such a good girl I was so boring I always went where I said I was going to go. I have a memory when I was in junior High School I was with my boyfriend I’m sure we were kissing, I know we were kissing in his back yard. I came home late and obviously my mother was concerned and obviously when I’m fourteen years old I’m not going to say I was with my boyfriend kissing him in his backyard, so I made up some sort of lie so that she wouldn’t know I was in the backyard kissing this boy. What other memories of lying, what big memories.
I: No need to dig out big memories this memory is all right. If we are trying to analyse this one.

S: See I don’t lie, I don’t remember ever really lying, I mean stupid things like you don’t do your homework and you say you lost it.

I: Try to think of any lie that you told as a grown up, a more recent one.

S: There more protective lies, its like my husband will say what have I been doing and I won’t tell him I’ve been out to lunch with my girlfriends or he’ll say have you eaten and I’ll say no but because that is our issues so there are those kinds of lies when I’ll say I haven’t done something related to food because I don’t want to listen to my husband.

I: Why do you say protective lies?

S: Well I mean he’ll just say something nasty back about how he thought I was supposed to be on a diet and how come I’m not.

I: Protective to you.

S: Yeah, that’s right, protective to me, because I don’t want to deal with his reaction, because he is extremely predictable, he’s so predictable that

I: What do you mean by predictable? Thinking about, for example, having lunch with friends. What would be his reaction?

S: Well, all you do is go out to lunch, all you is eat, you told me you were trying to lose weight but all you do is y’know, but in a really sort of mean, sort of spit. He sort of spits it out, which will just create a huge fight. So in order to just obviate that I just don’t.

I: So what will you tell him instead?

S: Oh, I’ll tell him I was running errands or I was with a girlfriend or that I’m doing something at school or that I was home and haven’t done anything. I mean I’ll say anything as opposed to, not big lies not specific lies, it’s more by emission as opposed to tell him that I was out to lunch.

I: Can you think of any example of a specific time, a specific event when you told him you’d been with A. or whatever?

S: No I can’t because actually I don’t talk to him at all about when I eat. So. My birthday, a girlfriend took me out to lunch for my birthday, I didn’t tell him I went out to lunch. He said what did you do and I said well D. wanted to spend some time with me because it was my birthday, so I went over to D.’ s house and then we just talked and she gave me my birthday presents.
I: Fine, nice.
S: It would be something like that.
I: When you told him that you’d been to D.’s house and got your presents, what do you think he had in his mind?
S: Nothing he would accept that at face value. That would be fine with him that’s not an issue.
I: Why?
S: Well because she’s a close friend of mine and it makes sense that she’d be with me on my birthday. A lot of times he asks questions not specifically to entrap me but just more of a curiosity, as in how was your day, what did you do and my reaction to that general thing would be to keep it very general and by saying I was at my friend’s house wasn’t lie specifically because I was at her house, we just also went out. So it’s again more concentrating on aspects of the day that he won’t find offensive or annoying and leaving out the bits that he’s going to respond to, in a way that is going to make me angry.
I: Alright, now
S: I had a boyfriend for four years, five years, and I started seeing someone else and I was not honest with either of them in that situation because, well actually I was with my old boyfriend because he knew I was seeing someone else, because we’d broken up and I found it hard to completely leave the relationship obviously he knew. But he also knew I was seeing the other guy and it went actually for a long time, two years two and a half years.
I: So the other boy didn’t know about
S: He did not no. Then the other boy that I’d been with for five years called him up after about two and a half years. So I guess that was actually quite a large deception. I hadn’t thought about it in a long time but that would be a big deception. And I think myself there were a lot of things going on because my old boyfriend was seeing someone else so I was jealous of that in fact and was purposefully trying to interfere with that relationship, which I did very successfully in fact. But at the same time I had moved beyond the relationship and did not want to make a future there, and I knew that. And had been seeing someone quite intimately and closely who had no clue.
I: About that?
S: Yeah that’s right because I didn’t drive, this was in NAME1, so I’d spend part of my week at university then I’d go down to NAME2 to where I grew up where the old boyfriend was. So during that time, but even my family didn’t know. He would pick me up at one in the morning and I’d sneak out of the house and see him and then I’d be back at five or six in the morning and come in through the back, so my family didn’t know. I mean he worked for my father, all these relationships they didn’t know and because the other women he was dating was actually the daughter of one of the pharmacists who was a very close friend of my father’s, I interfered with that relationship. I mean I created a lot of mischief with this, the girl worked for my dad also. It was a mess.

I: How did it end?

S: It ended, actually the boyfriend at school I continued to see after he had found out, it ended by me completely cutting it off with the one where I grew up which is what I should have done anyway, which is how it was meant to be anyway. And the other one I continued seeing for another year and the fact that I continued the other relationship told me that this wasn’t the proper relationship either. He was, at least to me, to my face very forgiving, but I’m sure I hurt him quite deeply in fact and I’m sure I hurt him very deeply in fact. I’m the one that eventually ended that relationship but I’m not sure that it would have gone any

I: Further?

S: I think that was always part of my issue in that relationship, he was ORIGIN, and so within that religion anyway there were all kinds of issues about the fact that I was sleeping with him anyway, I’m married and all of that. And the fact that I felt, well, that he cared for me very much, I felt he loved me, I felt he cared for me very deeply. I felt he was never willing to commit to me after, y’know, not that I think that even carried on the other relationship, I never gave that a chance, truthfully anyway. But certainly I felt after a year and a half two years I felt he really wasn’t able to commit to me in terms of life together anyway. I may have been wrong there, in retrospect but at the time that’s certainly how I felt. That was actually quite terrible, what I did there, it wasn’t fair to anybody and it hurt people, including my father, it hurt a lot of different people on a lot of levels. And interfered with relationships permanently I feel, beyond my relationship with these two men.

I: So it’s a kind of hallmark for you?
S: A hallmark, I feel on the deepest level that it was a horrible deception, I think that I'm not very proud of that, I think that I was, I create caused for a long period of years a lot of pain and anger and hurt and hatred that didn't need to be there, and I do feel, you know its funny, the girl, my old boyfriend was dating she's training to be a pharmacist, and she's the daughter of my father's best friend and she was interning at my Dad's and anyway I interfered to the point where they stopped seeing each other and she started seeing someone else and I don't think she used drugs a lot but she died of a brain aneurysm and she was found with drugs, I don't know if its, father nevtalked to anybody, never talked to my father but I have some feelings about that, that my intervention set a sequence that maybe would have happened anyway because my ex-boyfriend could have committed to her and could have cut me off, he didn't have to pursue his relationship to me which he also did, so he was no innocent certainly. But also that it was never given that if I had walked away clean, which is how it should have been, that it may have given this relationship to this other girl who cared for him very deeply a chance to grow and not end up the way it ended up and obviously her death caused enormous pain for, pain, you know I don't think they've ever recovered and he soon left my Dad and while they still talk there is a breach in the relationship because of what happened, there's no question. They hate me I think, certainly the mother does the father was always cordial to me, but I feel, because he liked me a lot, the favourite of my Dad's five girls, that I breached that trust too and hurt him very deeply.
Subject 985

I: What I’d like you to do is try to look at memories of either, basically of your parents either not telling or withholding the truth from you as a child. It is quite a difficult task to do as we don’t usually do these things, so take your time.

S: I can’t really think of, well I remember thinking of things that I don’t remember them telling us completely the truth but sensing that things weren’t quite right. So I don’t feel like, there was nothing that was completely a shock I feel we could sense. I think we ended up being a lot of support to our parents ourselves. My mother especially I confided in her with things that maybe other parents would have kept from their children.

I: So if we can go to the next thing which is trying to discuss your lies as a child. As we know we all lie and I think it is a kind of developmental task to lie in certain cases or most of the cases. Try to think of any lies you told as a child.

S: Only little lies really, about where I’ve been, like saying I’ve gone to someone’s house when I’ve really gone to the park or whatever and my mum wouldn’t want me to go to the park. Lies about how much money maybe I had to spend or if I spent more than I had. I think as a child I was probably too obedient I was always trying to please them, so the example of my dad smacking me and that was a lie when I hadn’t done it. Some of the time I’d take responsibility for things I hadn’t done, just to kind of absolve the situation. I think I’ve lied a lot more since then but as a child I think I was just very obedient. So there would just be little lies, I think with my brother and my sister there more lies, I know my sister stole some money from my Mum’s purse and went through a phase of that and that was a major thing but I can’t remember lying about anything really major.

I: Anything like spending more money than you should?

S: I used to have a craze about these things there were these little plastic threads and people used to weave them together or whatever and they were like 20p or something like that and I used to really enjoy doing that and doing different colours and all that kind of stuff. I used to really like going out and buying a new combination and I remember my Mum thinking that I was really stupid and that I was spending too much money on it, so I’d go and maybe buy more than I’d said like maybe say I’d bought one when I’d really bought three or four.
I: Sticking to this example, when you told her that you bought less than you had, what did you have in mind?
S: I was thinking she’ll be upset, not upset, she’ll be angry if she knows I’ve got more than I have and that she thinks it’s a stupid thing to do and she wouldn’t know that I’d bought more because she wasn’t really keeping a tab, counting how many I had. I could quite easily say somebody gave me them or something.
I: What do you think you were trying to achieve then in her mind?
S: I think she thought I was spending too much money, that was my pocket money but I think she couldn’t understand why I was doing it because she thought it was a stupid thing to do.
I: But then you told her that you didn’t buy so many, so what did she think?
S: I think she thought that even though I didn’t buy many I still bought too many or the fact that I’d go running to the shop to here was indicative. I think maybe she was trying to control it by saying all right you can just have one or two or whatever. I think she thought I was too crazed to buy it all and so maybe she was trying to control that.
I: Then you mention that it is easier to recollect memories from more recent lying, so think of one or two.
S: Well lying about the fact that, of who I’m going out with. I lied throughout that two year relationship about where I was, a lot of the time. I didn’t come up a lot but when it did it used to really upset me but they’d say where have I been and I’d tell a half truth because I’d have been out with some friends and my partner but I wouldn’t tell them that I went out with him, his name was never mentioned, so it felt like a half lie because I had been where I said and with other friends just with him and in about, I explicitly remember my mum asking me if I smoked and I said I didn’t and drinking alcohol and all those things really that I’ve lied about.
I: Did you just deny it?
S: Yeah, but then sometimes I mean, once they found some, I’d gone on holiday for three months and they found some marijuana in my room and it was just a tiny little piece so my mum confronted me with that and asked me if I smoked or taken drugs and for some reason I said yes, knee-jerk reaction, and it wasn’t so bad, they weren’t really punitive about it and she even asked me what it was like. But that was okay because I think they could understand that as a one–off maybe whereas if I said I drunk alcohol, but It was
really a one off I hardly ever bought marijuana and stuff but if I told them I drank alcohol and stuff that would be something about my way life and that would beharder for them to come to terms with. Or if I told them about my relationship that would be harder for them to come to terms with. Because it’s not just a one off or an isolated incident.

I: Any other times that pop out in your mind?
S: Lies about how much money I’ve spent on something, saying I’ve spent less on something than what I have because I think my mum will think that’s too much or..

I: And was it, is it successful?
S: Yeah I mean there’s no reason for them to know any different. It’s not an earth shattering thing at the end of the day, that’s not the kind of thing they’d want to follow up they would just take my word for it.