

Chebykin O. Ya., Kosyanova O. Yu.
THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO
UNDERSTANDING PSYCHOLOGICAL CATEGORIES OF
“DECEPTION” IN INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS AND THEIR
ANTIPODES

Odesa, Ukraine

Abstract. *The article deals with the analysis of psychological notions of “deception”, “lie”, and “untruth” in interpersonal relations and their antipodes. The historical development of the system of philosophic and psychological categories in the connection “truth” – “verity” is considered. The characteristics of “lie” and “deception”, as well as their understanding in terms of the development of Psychology are generalized. The main methods of detecting deception are characterized. Modern problems of comprehending, distinguishing and systematizing the categories of “lie” and “deception” are considered.*

Keywords: *system of philosophic and psychological categories in the connection “truth” – “verity”, characteristics of “lie” and “deception”, distinguishing and systematization of categories of “lies” and “deception”.*

According to historical evidence, there is no doubt that deception has been typical for every epoch. Deception was developing together with humanity; just its levels, methods and forms of study were changing. Specialists studied the peculiarities of its mimic, pantomimic and verbal manifestations, as well as the dynamics of brain centers together with subconscious and conscious processes in terms of personality socialization. The researches aimed at necessary results achieving became very popular at that time. They used both the progressive (training, convincing, psychotherapy and psychocorrection) and the regressive (manipulating, in other words “behavior modification”) efficient tools of influencing the consciousness. The latter include lies, deception, disinformation, covering the truth, spreading rumors, etc. On the other hand, in opposition to the latter there is “truth” as a source of justice, honesty and sociability in interpersonal relations. Thus, a number of works on Psychology speaks for their obvious relevance but the insufficient level of their study.

Taking the above mentioned into consideration, we have set a goal to specify psychological categories, connected with the understanding of the notions “deception”, “lie”, “untruth” of the interpersonal relations and their antipodes. The following tasks have been set in order to implement the target goal: -

- to analyze a system of philosophic and psychological categories in the connection “truth” – “verity” and their historical development;

- to specify the meaning of the words “lie” and “deception”, as well as their understanding in terms of Psychology development;

- to characterize and describe the main methods of detecting deception and find out modern problems of considering and distinguishing the notions of “lie” and “deception”.

Dealing with the first task, it is necessary to admit that the problem of understanding the notion of “truth” in Psychology is closely related to the interpretation of “verity” in Philosophy. Modern scientific works show that in terms of analysis of communication and mutual understanding the logical category of “verity” in its meaning and content is more limited than the psychological category of “truth”.

According to O. Boryshpolets, the Ukrainian expert in this field, the main modern types of “verity” are the following: eternal verities, which are the basis of vitality and life activities of humanity, the main of which are moral and ethical values, common for everybody; scientific verities – knowledge obtained by scientific methods, which build the content of every science and the basis for its further development; social verities, which reflect the essence of everyday events, regardless of their scale [3, pp. 28-29]. According to V. Busel the notion “verity” is considered in the following ways: 1) as the same thing as truth, 2) as a moral

ideal, justice; 3) as an insight, 48 which indicates the reality in people's consciousness; 4) as a statement, proved by practice or experience [5, p. 506].

As one can understand from the above mentioned, verity is summed up into a complex of knowledge about the rules of nature and humanity, which must correspond to reality, in other words they must be right. It displays the reality in an adequate way, as it is in practice, regardless of our consciousness. Obtaining knowledge from the trusted data source or carrying out one's own research, "one has only two ways of verity perception: the way of searching and the way of faith" [17, p. 11]. In real life verity is almost always considered and perceived as truth, subjectively full of psychological components. Thus, "verity" is a category of logic and Theory of cognition, and "truth" is considered as a category of Psychology [10, pp. 262-263]. In addition, truth is a kind of "verity", which is a matter of personal attitude, subjective estimation [10, p. 106]. On the other hand, "verity is not only accuracy, but truth, justice, the ability to accept things as they are, face the truth and reveal it" [22, p. 64]. In other words, "truth" is a property of our knowledge about the object of cognition, not the property of the object, which is "verity". It always contains a part of "verity" but it is not enough to make the "verity" "truth".

The origin of "truth" was the object of researches as far back as the time of Ancient Philosophy. Stoics were sure that it appears by nature, not by admission as a law or a rule (according to Chrysippus' work "About beauty" (Greek: Χρύσιππος – Σολεύς; 281/278 BC, Athens) [7, p. 311]. As opposed to this point of view, Plato (Greek: Πλάτων, 428/ 427 - 348/347 BC, Athens) was sure that truth had been created by people [21]. Aristotle (Greek: αριστοτέλης; 384 – 322 BC, Chalcis) in his famous work "Nicomachean Ethics" determines "truth" as a middle ground between doing unjust things and abiding by unjust things. By this, truth is a "golden mean" and lie is considered as extremity [3, Vol. 4, 157]. The word "truth" has a meaning of justice, validity and is perceived as a part of the most important system of cognition in the Greek language, the basis of which is the idea of eternal lifestyle, which originates from the ancestors, society arrangement, which reflects the divine peace and fairness [10, p. 23].

In this aspect it is worth noting that Slavonic understanding of "verity" and "truth" has been always considered from the moral point of view, as categories of moral Philosophy. Our "national self-consciousness has been forming and developing on the basis of an idea that reality cannot be limited by facts. If verity is not connected with justice, then it is detrimental verity or not the verity at all" [10, p. 31]. The profound analysis of the cultural and historical traditions in terms of the studied phenomena shows that domestic understanding of correlation between verity, truth and goodness is not equal to the western concepts, which consider this correlation within the framework of comparing intelligence, cognition and values. These differences are particularly obvious within the context of works of I. Kant, the famous western philosopher. His understanding of truth is an issue of analyzing a true-life statement for every 49 person with his/her duty, which has a legal nature. At that the inner world of a human loses its value (in particular, its attitudes, goals, knowledge, value orientations); the estimation of his/her activity is not grounded on the psychological motives of a person, because they are changeable. Thus, according to I. Kant, carrying out obligations is "not a servile obedience to society rules, on the contrary, it is the manifestation of morally mature individual's own will", the highest level of human objectivity manifestation. Then a new moral approach to the understanding of the semantic antipode of "truth" – "lie" (by J. Fichte, B Russel, M. Weber) emerged, and it has become rather popular nowadays.

The preconditions of the objectivity of "verity", which make it "truth", are the following: belief that an event did happen; perception of truthfulness of not every statement about the discussed true events, phenomena and facts, but only those, which are considered as realistic; one more feature of statement truthfulness is the conformity with justice. Along with that [10, p. 95] subjectivity of "truth" as a category can be presented in its following peculiarities: cognition and understanding, faith and freedom of choice, correspondence with the social environment, value attitude. "Truth" is relative, because it depends on

other people's attitudes, points of view and knowledge, which are as a rule one-sided and superficial. The English philosopher of the 21st century John Stuart Mill wrote: "Truth is kaleidoscopic and it changes according to one's point of view".

Taking the above mentioned and other scientific works into consideration, we understand "verity" as "something real", regardless of our opinion or our attitude towards an event or phenomenon, i.e. this is a process of objective knowledge presentation about reality.

Dealing with the second task (the issue of understanding "lie" and "deception" within the historical context), it is worth noting that we first heard of it from ancient philosophers' works. For example, Socrates (Greek: Σωκράτης, about 469-399 BC, Athens) insisted on the verity of his own statements, being self-contradictory, taking up the position that verity was not familiar to him. The issue of a virtuous deception is considered by him through the example of a strategist, who deceived his enemy. Augustine of Hippo (Latin: Aurelius Augustinus Hipponensis, 13 November, 354 – 28 August, 430) wrote: "Not the one is deceived, who sees the false, but the one, who believes in false" [2, p. 182]. According to him, human trustfulness is the main determinant of deception. One more statement of Augustine of Hippo is important of understanding these concepts: "Not the one lies, who tells a lie not knowing the truth, but the one, who presents obvious lie as truth". Similar views are considered by I. Kant (German: Immanuel Kant, 22 April 1724 – 12 February, 1804, Königsberg, Prussia) in this essay "On the Supposed Right to Lie for the Sake of the Love of Humanity", in which a man puts up a friend, who is followed by an abuser. According to this story, soon the abuser knocks the door 50 and flatly asks if there is a person, who he is looking for, in a house. In Kant's opinion, the main duty of a person is to tell an abuser the truth. He wrote: "The duty to tell the truth does not make any difference between people, towards whom it must be implemented, and those, towards whom it may not be used; on the contrary, it is an absolute obligation, important in every type of relations" [12]. Besides, this rule does not allow to tell lies even for one's friend's sake. F. Nietzsche (German: Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, 15 October, 1844 – 25 August, 1900, Weimar, the German Empire) was in favor of absolute truth, which corresponds to I. Kant's imperative, which forbids lying even for a good cause. Being against traditional moral values, he suggests his own example of moral self-consciousness in a form of an oath: "If I lie, then I'm a dishonest person and let everybody tell his own. This pattern I suggest instead of a swear: it is more powerful" [20, p. 79]. However, in spite of his prohibition on lies, he admits the following: "Lie, if not the mother, then the nurse of goodness" [20, p. 126].

The complexity of understanding, distinguishing and systematizing the categories of "lie", "deception" and "untruth" was described in as early as 16th century. "If lie, like truth, was one-sided, our state would be much better. In this case we would consider the words opposite to liar's statement to be true". But the contrast to verity is many-sided and unlimited" [15]. Thus, first of all it is necessary to specify different scientific approaches to the understanding of categories of "lie", "deception" and "untruth". The analysis of scientific sources shows that these terms were considered as synonyms till the end of the 19th century. However, at the beginning of the 20th century the French philosopher and pedagogue Jean-Paul Charles Aymard Sartre (1905-1980) wrote: "The essence of lie is that a liar knows the truth, which is covered by him. One cannot lie about things, which he/she does not know; one does not lie, when he/she spreads a mistake, made by himself/herself". In other words, the one, who deceives, is not always guided by evil intentions or personal benefit. However, a good intention of an individual cannot guarantee the truthfulness of his message.

"Lie" and "deception" are not the only way of protecting important information, there are also such things as avoiding the topic and refusal. Difficulties, which emerge in the process of analyzing the category of "deception", are connected with overlapping of intentional, cognitive and moral aspects of this issue. Famous researchers (V. Znakov, P. Ekman, A. Piz, Yu. Sherbatykh, D. Dubrovskiy) note that the phenomena

of “lie” and “deception” are many-sided, so they still remain understudied. One of the main aspects of this issue is distinguishing them.

Thus, some scientists (O. Baryshpolets, Yu. Scherbatykh, P. Ekman, O. Markina, S. Ozhehov, O. Frei, etc.) consider “lies” and “deception” to be synonyms. This opinion can be confirmed by the interpretation in the Oxford English Dictionary: “In modern use, the word “lie” is normally a violent expression of moral reprobation, which in polite conversation tends to be avoided, the synonyms falsehood and untruth being often substituted as relatively euphemistic”. Along with that F. Carson together with coauthors give the following definition of the term “lie”: “Lie is an intentionally untruthful statement, which is aimed at deceiving someone or just a probability of deception” [25].

Besides, some latest investigations in this field [18] show that most of former CIS countries population consider “lie” and “deception” as synonyms. The similar investigations of other authors [6] also state that “lie”, “deception”, “untruth” are synonyms. Besides, personal factors, which influence the understanding of “lie” and “deception”, have been analyzed in one of the studies [9]. There has been made an attempt to analyze and describe psychological differences of the surveyed, who think that “lie” causes stronger emotional distress than “deception”, and vice versa. The comparison of value orientations of the examined two groups of people has shown that those, who think that “lie” damages the trust and adequate relations between people, have more proactive approach to life [9].

Some theoretical sources [16, p. 27] indicate that despite the fact that in everyday life “lie” and “deception” are considered to be synonyms, from the scientific point of view these two notions belong to two different categories. Such scientists as S. Bok, R. Hopper, R. Bell, V. Znakov agree with the statement that these two terms should be examined as two different categories. But there are still some peculiarities and disagreements. For example, some researchers distinguish “deception” as something more general, compared to “lie”. In particular, in S. Bok’s opinion, the category of “deception” includes the category of “lie”. Along with that, intentionally presented information (in any oral or written forms), belongs to the category of “lie”. O. Nikitina shares this point of view [19], noting that the following phrases are used to determine lie: “I have been told lies”, but “the result of lying” sounds like “I have been deceived”, i.e. the notion of “deception” is more general compared to “lie”.

Other experts (R. Hopper and P. Bell) emphasize that “deception” cannot relate only to untruthful verbal statements, it cannot be limited by words. These researchers are sure that in reality “deception” is often grounded on “playing a certain role”, not on something concrete, which conflicts with the statement of “lie”. For example, a careless student plays a role of a diligent one in order to make a good impression on a professor. Thus, not all deceivers are liars [26]. J. Podlesny and D. Raskin have similar views on this issue, determining “deception” as an act or a statement, aiming at covering the truth or disorienting someone [29].

Scientific works of V. Znakov, who has been dealing with these issues for a long time, show that “deception” should be considered from the point of view of its main meaningful characteristics. Firstly, “deception” is based on the desire of a person to create a wrong view of his/her partner on a topic (not bending the truth). Thus, according to the scientist, the main difference between “deception” [52] and “lie” is that “deception” does not distort facts [10, pp. 251-255], i.e. when sharing information with someone, the deceiver tells only half of the story, withholding some important facts to make a partner understand the sense of the story in a wrong way (or in a way, profitable for a deceiver). The purpose of deception, according to the author, is to orient “victim’s” thoughts at the way of actualizing familiar situations. With that a so-called “failed expectations effect” comes into action and taking the obtained information into account, the profitable course of events takes place. “As a result, a deceived person is always an accessory of a deception. Besides, a deception is always associated with real acts and often with loss of a deceived person’s property or other material losses” [11, pp. 119-124].

To make “untruth” a psychological category V. Znakov determines it as a statement, which does not correspond to facts without an intention to deceive a partner. In other words, that is called “deceiving a person” [28]. In this aspect “untruth” can be described as an automatic misinterpretation of words and insincerity, which make it different from conscious “lies” that is usually characterized by false sincerity.

Dealing with the third task of the study, it is worth noting that a philosophic analysis of “lie” demanded searching for some research techniques in Psychology, Physiology, Criminal sciences, etc. Chronicles of different ethnic groups and nationalities show that methods and tools of detecting truth have been familiar to humanity since the ancient times. Nowadays modern psychologists and psychophysicists give some scientifically-grounded justifications for ancient ways of detecting deception. The main characteristics of all ancient methods were the following: mentality of people; religion or supernaturalism; belief that only God can judge people, that God can see everything and one cannot hide one’s deeds from him. An honest man wasn’t afraid of trials and his/her respond to them was always adequate. On the contrary, a person, who was unfair, did his/her best to hide the bad deeds, waited for God’s punishment, and this caused emotional stresses, so as a result this person behaved in a strange way. The ancient methods were based on psychological peculiarities and stressful states of honest and dishonest people. The analysis of ancient techniques of detecting lie shows that ancient philosophers and scientists (chiefs and leaders) tended to control the indicators of psychophysiological processes (emotional state, sweating, salivation, heart rate, hands motion activity, etc.). At that the following ordinary things were used as indicators of physiological changes in a deceiver’s organism: a handful of rice-flour, stale bread, an egg with slight crack; or just observing the potential deceiver’s psychophysiological behavior. As a rule the survey led to some changes in the physiological functions: stopping salivation, body trembling, cold sweating, increasing the heart rate, which affected results of the survey. Creation of truth detecting techniques was based on the knowledge about the mechanisms of psychophysiological reactions in modern interpretation, which was grounded on the interrelation between human’s emotions and his/her objective physiological changes, which cannot be controlled. Abulfaragius Bar Hebraeus (1226-1286), a representative of Syrian medieval literature, generalizing Hellenistic, Persian and Jewish folk wisdom, basing on Aristotle’s opinion, wrote: “According to Aristotle, from the moment when a vital power of soul found its place in a body, they became a unity. They are interdependent, and soul has especially strong impact on a body in the moments of rage, passion and sadness. The feelings, caused by a soul, are frankly expressed by a body. Observing body movements and facial mimics, one can examine emotional state of a person. And this is the mastery of physiognomists” [1, p. 260-270]. It is quite obvious that these methods and techniques were based on empirical observations and intuitive knowledge of human’s psychology and physiology. But they have given rise to the further development of psychophysiological methods of lie detection.

Modern Psychology possesses a great variety of different methods and techniques of lie detection and information verity assessment. Among these are methods, based on observation of expressive behavior and communication peculiarities, as well as a number of different questionnaires and tests (including project procedures) and others. Thus, there are the following modern valid methods of lie detection: analysis of microgestures and miscoexpressions (P. Ekman, A. Piz); method of polygraph detection (V. Varlamov, A. Alekseev, S. Popovichev, A. Soshnikov, A. Pelenitsyn, A. Malkhazov); magnetic resonance imaging (MRI); electroencephalography; graphoanalysis (handwriting analysis) (R. Matousek, D. Anthony, O. Isaieva); analysis of eye movement path; voice stress analyzer; psychological probing of brain activity (MindReader, SprintTest); thermovision analysis.

Nowadays one of the most popular techniques of lie detection is polygraph method, which is based on the hypothesis of “hidden processes taking place in human’s psycho in a situation of specially organized examination and short changes of some physiological processes, which can be registered with the help of some assistive devices” [13, pp. 39-40].

Recently specialists have been making efforts to implement some modern hardware-based methods, such as Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and thermovision analysis for lie detection. MRI is a technique of examining human organism, including brain and body fluids, with the help of a physiological phenomenon, which is called “nucleic magnetic resonance”. Daniel Langleben of the University of Pennsylvania proposed to use the results of this method for detecting lie. He stated: “If you deceive someone, you have to bear also truth in your memory, so it is obvious that in this case brain should be more active”. His researches have soon shown that withholding the truth stimulates the brain activity in some brain regions, including anterior lobe (where higher mental processes take place), temporal lobe and limbic system (where emotions are processed). In particular, he has paid attention to unusual activity in the anterior 54 cingulate cortex (which is responsible for conflict solution and repression of aggressive respond). Laboratorial examinations have shown 99% of good results in using this method. Critics confirm the usefulness of this method in lie detection, noting that in fact MRI cannot detect the deception itself, but just brain activity stimulation allegedly caused by information withholding. It may happen that when examining a person in a state of distraction the device will work in an improper way and make mistakes, because it detects only emotional excitement, which also may be caused by other factors. “There is an aspiration to obtain methods, which could accurately distinguish truth from lie, and no one cares about science” – states neuroscientist Steven Heiman from Harvard university [23]. The main disadvantage of this technique is high cost and large equipment.

Besides, some experts make efforts to implement system elements, which are used by thermography cameras (techniques of thermovision study) and powerful software aiming at lie detection. The main advantage of this method is that it can be used privately 12 meters apart from a subject. It allows using it for examination of a great number of people. The general accuracy of this technique is evaluated in 84%.

Generalizing the abovementioned methods, it is worth noting that a valid mechanism, able to distinguish truth from lies, has been searched for for a long time. Nowadays there is a great number of unique devices aimed at detecting and distinguishing truth and lie, but as a rule these methods are used as a supporting or additional tool to a polygraph, and just a few of them could be considered as its alternative. In most cases these devices are large, expensive, they may create additional technical problems and as a rule they require profound scientific investigations. Thus, a polygraph still remains the most efficient and reliable device for lie detection.

In summary, the issue of distinguishing the notions of “lie”, “untruth” and “deception” is still very important in Psychology. At the same time some researchers relate different kinds of “deception” to other categories, without changing their meaning. In our opinion, the main unifying features of these categories are the following:

- the aim of a subject, i.e. conscious desire to bend the truth;
- attitudes, motives and intentions of bending the truth, presented by a subject;
- the detection of information verity.

This approach in a certain degree coincides with some scientific works, which specify [19] that one of the main features of these categories is negative emotional coloring but without any functional peculiarities of this group of categories. When one is extremely angry, irritated by some statements or disagreed with them, he/she says: “That’s lie!”, “You are lying!”, not “You’re deceiving me!”. The last statement is suitable for a calm conversation, a game, or even may express flirtation.

Considering the insufficiency of features, which clearly differentiate “deception”, “lie” and “untruth”, in our opinion, it is necessary to learn these categories as unity, because it is only form of expression, which changes: complete truth bending, fractal truth bending, understatement, etc. But these forms are not associated with the distinguishing of these categories. That is true, because a person may be

deceived in different ways: by telling only half of truth or telling lies, by acting in a certain way (as frauds do), or even by promising something and not fulfilling it. Lying can be expressed only by a verbal form, i.e. with the help of words (in an oral or written form). "Lie has many functions, but the main one is to be a tool of deception, which helps to get a benefit" [14, p. 54]. As distinct from "being lied to", a person can be deceived by not only words, but also acts, or both at the same time. Along with that, it is impossible to understand what caused the deception and if it resulted in "lies" or "untruth". That is why we consider "deception" as an integrated category, which includes "lie" and "untruth". To confirm that, it should be noted that it can be expressed in the following ways: as a statement; as acts or their absence (contrivance, hypocrisy, back-word, etc.); as a goal, based on attitudes, motives and intentions with a hostile character (lie) or without it (untruth, joke, etc.); in a form of false information or a truthful statement, presented in a special way to make a false impression on a partner; as an act of a subject, pursuing certain aims [8]; as a process of spreading false information; as a result, which means that a communication partner acquires untruthful information as a verity and is guided by it in further situations, in other words he/she is being deceived [8].

Summarizing the results obtained with the help of the theoretical analysis, we consider the meaning of the following notions:

- "Verity" is "something that is real", regardless of one's opinion and views on it, in other words it is a process of real presentation of knowledge about reality;

- "Truth" is "verity", which becomes a subject of personal attitude and considered as something relative, because it depends on other people's views and knowledge, which as a rule is superficial;

- "Deception" is truth bended in a certain way (verbal or non-verbal). In our opinion, "deception" is a system-forming category, which gives an idea of the peculiarities of the studied phenomenon and includes "lies" and "untruth". Conclusions.

- The studied philosophic and psychological categories of "truth" and "verity" are still relevant and urgent, despite the fact they have been researched by different philosophers and scientists since ancient times;

- Different specialists consider the psychological meaning of "deception", "untruth" and "lie" in their own different ways. Along with that, we have come to the conclusion that "deception" forms a system of other categories and includes such phenomena as "lie" and "untruth";

- The analysis of lie detection methods speaks for the great variety techniques, which include interviewing, questioning, observation and hardware examination. At that a polygraph method of lie detection still remains the most popular, simple and valid technique.

References translated and transliterated

1. Abul-Faradzh Bar-Ebrey, Grigoriy Ioann (1961). Kniga zanimatelnykh istoriy [Book of interesting stories]. Moscow: State publishing house of belleslettres [in Russian].

2. Avgustin, Avreliy (2000). Tvoreniya v 4 tomakh [Works in two volumes]. Tom 1. Ob istinnoy religii - Volume 1. About true religion. Saint Petersburg: Aleteyya; Kiev: UTsIMM-Press [in Russian].

3. Aristotel, Asmus, V. F. (Ed.) (1976). Sochineniya v chetyirekh tomakh – Compositions in four volumes, 4. Moscow: Mysl [in Russian].

4. Barishpolets, O. T. (2013). Brehnia v informatsiinomu prostori ta mizhosobovii komunikatsii [Lie in information space and interpersonal communication]. Kirovohrad [in Ukrainian].

5. Busel, V. T. (Ed.) (2005). Velikiy tлумachniy slovník suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy [The great dictionary of modern Ukrainian language]. Kyiv: IRPIN. VTF «Perun» [in Ukrainian].

6. Degtyareva, D. A. (2007). Polovyye, tendernyye i lichnostnyye razlichyya v ponimanii vranya [Gender and personal differences in understanding lie]. Psihologicheskie issledovaniya – Psychological researches, 2, 87-102. Zhuravlev, A. L., Sergienko, E. A. (Ed.). Vyip.2. Moscow: Izd-vo instituta psihologii RAN [in Russian].

7. Diogen, Laertskiy (1979). O zhizni, ucheniyakh i izrecheniyakh znamenitnykh filosofov [About life, studies and quotes of famous philosophers]. (Gasparova, M. L., Trans.) Moscow: Mysl [in Russian].
8. Dubrovskiy, D. I. (2010). Obman. Filosofsko-psihologicheskii analiz [Deception. Philosophic and psychological analysis]. 2 nd ed. rev. Moscow: Kanon ROOI "Reabilitatsiya" [in Russian].
9. Zhdanova, O. O. (1998). Psikhologicheskie osobennosti ponimaniya lzhi [Psychological peculiarities of understanding lie]. Vestnik Rossiyskogo gumanitarnogo nauchnogo fonda – Newsletter of Russian humanitarian science foundation, 4, 183-189. Moscow [in Russian].
10. Znakov, V. V. (1999). Psikhologiya ponimaniya pravdy [Psychology of understanding truth]. Saint Petersburg [in Russian].
11. Ilin, E. P. (2013). Psikhologiya obscheniya i mezhlchnostnykh otnosheniy [Psychology of communication and interpersonal relations]. Publishing house "Piter" [in Russian].
12. Kant, I. (1980). O mnimom prave lgat iz chelovekolyubiya [On the Supposed Right to Lie for the Sake of the Love of Humanity]. Traktaty i pisma – Tractates and letters. Gulyga, A.V. (Ed.). Moscow [in Russian].
13. Knyazev V., Varlamov, G. (2012). Poligraf i ego prakticheskoe primenenie: Ucheb. posobie [Polygraph and its usage in practice: textbook]. Moscow: "Print-tsentr" [in Russian].
14. Kuznetsov, V. V. (2008). Psikhologiya vzaimoponimaniya. Nepravda, lozh, obman [Psychology of mutual understanding. Untruth, lie, deception]. Publishing house: Piter [in Russian].
15. Monten, Mishel (1979). Opyty [Experiments]. Bobovich, A. S. (Ed.). (1-3 Vols). Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
16. Moskovichi, S. (1995). Sotsialnye predstavleniya: istoricheskiy vzglyad [Social beliefs: historical review]. Psikhologicheskii zhurnal. – Psychological journal, 1, 3-18, 2, 3-14 [in Russian].
17. Nikandrov, V. V. (2009). Psikhologiya: uchebnik [Psychology: textbook]. Moscow: Volters Kluver [in Russian].
18. Nikitina, E. V. (2008). Lozh i obman: problema ponyatiynogo razgranicheniya. Psikhologicheskoe obespechenie natsionalnykh proektov razvitiya obschestva: opyt, innovatsionnyie tekhnologii, mentalnye barery [Lie and deception: issue of notion distinguishing. Psychological support of national projects of society development: experience, innovation technologies, mental barriers]. Proceedings of the international congress. Moscow; Kostroma: KGU im. N. A. Nekrasova [in Russian].
19. Nikitina, E. V. (2002). Teoreticheskie aspekty fenomena lzhi [Theoretical aspects of the phenomenon of lie]. Sotsialnaya psikhologiya XXI stoletiya – Social psychology of 21st century. Kozlov, V. V. (Ed.). Yaroslavl [in Russian].
20. Nietzsche, F. (2008). Utrennyaya zarya [Sunrise colors]. Mysli o moralnykh predrassudkakh – Thoughts about moral prejudice. Minsk [in Russian].
21. Losev, A. F., Asmus, V. F. (2007). Platon Sochineniya [Plato of modernity]. (1-4 Vols.), 1 Vol. Saint Petersburg: Izd-vo S.-Peterb. un-ta; "Izdvo Olega Abyishko" [in Russian].
22. Rubinshtein, S. L. (1997). Printsip tvorcheskoy samodeyatelnosti [Principle of amateur arts]. Izbrannye filosofsko-psikhologicheskie trudy – Collected philosophic and psychological works. Moscow [in Russian].
23. Heiman, S. (2003). Diagnostica zabolevaniy [Diagnostics of diseases]. V mire nauki – In the world of science. Moscow [in Russian].
24. Bok, S. (1978). Lying: Moral choice in public and private life [in English].
25. Carson, Th. L., Wokutch, R. E., Cox, J. E. (1989). An ethical analysis of deception in advertizing. Contemporary moral controversies in business. New York [in English].
26. Hopper, R., & Bell, R. A. (1984). Broadening the Deception Construct. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70(3), 288-302 [in English].

27. Kelly, G. (1963). *A theory of personality: the psychology of personal constructs*. New York: Norton [in English].

28. Lindsold, S., Walters, R. S., Koutsourais, H. (1983). Cooperators, Competitors, and Response to GRTT. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 3, 521- 532 [in English].

29. Podlesny, J., Raskin, A., David, C. (1977). Physiological measures and the detection of deception. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84 (4), 782-799 [in English].