Seven- and eight-year-old children's deception in the conflict situation

Ryoichi Watanabe

Graduate School of Education, Kyoto University

Author Note

Ryoichi Watanabe, Graduate School of Education, Kyoto University, Japan

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ryoichi Watanabe, Department of Education, Kyoto University, Yoshidahoncho, Kyoto, Japan. E-mail: watanabe.ryoichi.27a@st.kyoto-u.ac.jp.

Abstract

Six-year-olds will deceive in the individual condition, only if a competitor exists; but not in the conflict condition, when a competitor and a cooperator both exist. Seven- and eight-year-olds acquire the second-order theory of mind (ToM2) related to sophisticated deception. However, it is not known whether children and adults resort to deception in the conflict condition; and if a relationship exists between deception and ToM2. Children (N = 34, range = [6 years 7 months-8 years 5 months]) and adults (N = 38, range = [18-24]) participated in two deception tasks: for self-benefit and for the other person's benefit. Children also participated in a ToM2 task. Although adults deceived above chance levels, children deceived only for self-benefit. Furthermore, although there was no relationship between children's deception and ToM2; children who passed the ToM2 task tended to deceive by denying or not responding. These findings suggest that 7- and 8-year-olds can deceive for self-benefit in the conflict condition without ToM2.

Keywords: deception, lie, second-order theory of mind, children

Deception and lying develop dramatically in childhood. Deception is defined as intentionally, knowingly, and/or purposely misleading another person (Levine, 2014). A lie is a subtype of deception that involves outright falsehood, which is consciously known to be false by the teller and is not signaled as false to the message recipient (Levine, 2014). The development of children's deception is one of the essential topics in development research because it is known that children's deception is related to the development of cognition and sociality (Talwar & Lee, 2008).

According to previous research on children's deception, children aged above 4 years can selectively deceive an enemy to whom they must not give information, when the enemy is alone (Chandler, Fritz, & Hela, 1989; Hayashi, 2017; Sodian, Taylor, Harris, & Perner, 1991).

However, even at 6 years of age, children could not deceive an enemy when the enemy and the friend with whom they had to share the information existed at the same time (Hayashi, 2017).

Hayashi (2017) presented a puppet show for children aged 4-6 years composed of a protagonist; an enemy who wanted to catch the protagonist; and a friend who wanted to see the protagonist.

The author showed that in a non-conflict situation where only the enemy existed, 6-year-olds could easily deceive the enemy. However, most 6-year-olds could not deceive the enemy in a conflict situation when the enemy and the friend existed at the same time. Moreover, in this situation, the enemy had hidden behind a tree while eavesdropping, and had not been noticed by the friend.

Two factors could be attributed to the difficulty of deception in the conflict condition. The first is the understanding of the conflict condition, when children need to understand that conveying the information to a friend means also conveying it to an enemy simultaneously. Hayashi (2017) discussed that it was difficult for young children to deceive in the conflict condition because it was difficult for them to comprehend the conflict condition. Moreover, the

author discussed that it was necessary to acquire the second-order theory of mind (ToM2) to understand the conflict condition. Children should understand that “the friend does not know that the enemy intends to eavesdrop” to deceive in the conflict condition. This ability which is called the ToM2 is acquired around the age of 7-8 years (Perner & Wimmer, 1985). Moreover, there is a relationship between the ToM2 and children’s deception (Talwar, Gordon, & Lee, 2007; Talwar & Lee, 2008). Therefore, if there is a relationship between deception in the conflict condition and the ToM2; it is expected that children from the age of 7-8 years can deceive in the conflict condition. If not, they may also deceive in the conflict condition without the ToM2.

The second factor is deceptive motivation. The deception task of Hayashi (2017) demanded deceiving for the other person’s benefit. However, according to previous research, in daily life, adults deceive more for self-benefit than for the other person’s benefit (DePaulo, Kirkendol, Kashy, Wyer, & Epstein, 1996). Appropriate responses were then classified into active and passive deception, i.e., deceiving more easily for self-benefit than for the other person’s benefit (Minamishima, Fujii, Matsui, Tojo, & Hakarino, 2016). Minamishima et al. (2016) presented preschool and elementary school children with a self-benefit deception task in which, if they lied to an enemy, they would be rewarded. In another “other person’s benefit task;” if the children could lie to the enemy, the main character would be helped. The authors showed that the correct answer rate of the self-benefit task was higher than that of the other person’s benefit task in both preschool children and elementary school children.

Two reasons can be considered in relation to deception for the other person’s benefit being more complicated than deception for self-benefit. The first reason is the number of mental states that children hold while deceiving. While for self-benefit, children only hold the enemy’s mental state; for the other person’s benefit, they hold the mental states of the enemy as well as

the main character. The second reason is empathy. Children may feel character's anxiety, and it causes the cognitive load. Minamisima et al. (2016) had examined children's deception only in the individual condition; and therefore, I examined the effect of deceptive motivation in the conflict condition. Since I assumed that this difficulty applies to deception in the conflict condition; it is expected that it will be easier for children to deceive for self-benefit than for the other person's benefit in the conflict condition.

According to previous research, deception strategy develops during the age of 4-6 years in the individual condition (Hayashi, 2017; Sodian et al., 1991). The frequency of passive deception (e.g., denying or not responding) decreases and the number of active deceptions (e.g., falsifying) increases with age (Hayashi, 2017; Sodian et al., 1991). Moreover, there is a relationship between active deception and the first-order theory of mind (Talwar et al., 2007). However, little is known about deception strategy in the conflict condition. Passive deception may once again increase in the conflict condition. Moreover, there may be a relationship between passive deception and the ToM2. Passive deception decreases the guilt of deceiving the friend because 7- and 8-year-olds believe that commission is worse than omission (Hayashi, 2015). Moreover, there is a relationship between the ToM2 and the feigning of ignorance (passive deception) (Talwar & Lee, 2008). Therefore, it is predicted that 7- and 8-year-olds use passive deception as much as, or even more than active deception. Moreover, there may be a relationship between passive deception and the ToM2.

To summarize, previous research has not revealed that: i) 7- and 8-year-olds can deceive in the conflict condition, ii) the relationship between deception in the conflict condition and the ToM2, iii) the difference in difficulty levels between deception for self-benefit and the other person's benefit in the conflict condition, and iv) deception strategy in the conflict condition.

The purpose of this study was to clarify these issues. Children aged 7-8 years were, therefore, given deception tasks for self-benefit and the other person's benefit. Each task had both individual and conflict conditions. Moreover, they were given a ToM2 task. Furthermore, to consider the difference between adults and children, I examined adults' deception as an appropriate response and a comparative object. The hypotheses are: (1) most of the children aged 7 and 8 years deceive in the conflict condition, (2) children deceive for self-benefit more easily than for the other person's benefit in the conflict condition, and (3) there is a positive relationship between the ToM2 and deception in the conflict condition. I also investigated the deception strategy.

Method

Participants

Thirty-four elementary school students (22 boys and 12 girls; mean age = 7 years 6 months, range = 6 years 7 months to 8 years 5 months) and thirty-eight college students (17 males and 21 females, mean age = 21.42, range = 18 years to 24 years) participated. Children lived in Niigata, Japan, and college students lived in Kanagawa, Japan. For the children, informed consent was obtained from the principal of the after-school center; and only those, who provided their verbal assent for taking part in the research were allowed to participate. All the college students gave their informed written consent.

Procedure and Materials

The experiment was conducted individually in a quiet room. Children took two deception tasks (self-benefit and the other person's benefit), and the order of the two tasks was counterbalanced by using a PC laptop; followed by the ToM2 task. Children had selected their favorite sticker before the experiment, and this was used in the experiment. They had enough rest

time between each task; after the experiment which took approximately 20 minutes; they were rewarded with the sticker. The college students took two deception tasks (self-benefit and the other person's benefit), and the order of two tasks was counterbalanced, using a PC laptop. After the experiment, which took approximately 15 minutes, they were given a reward in exchange of the sticker. The experiment was conducted during October and November, 2018.

Self-benefit deception task. The deception task for self-benefit was modified from Minamishima et al. (2016) and Hayashi (2017). In the present study, the participants were presented movies of a puppet show, with puppets of two characters: a friend and an enemy. The puppet characters were selected from famous children's animated characters. However, the relationship between the friend and the enemy was not part of the instructions, when setting the most basic condition. The experimental set consisted of two boxes (red and blue) and a PC laptop. The puppet shows comprised: a warm-up phase, an individual condition (enemy and friend phase), and a conflict condition. The order of the phases and the conditions were fixed. Since the participants were deceived about getting a star sticker, which they had chosen as their favorite before the experiment; this task was for self-benefit.

Warm-up phase. The warm-up condition's purpose was to inform about the task's rules. The friend puppet (FP) told the participants three things. First, to hide a star sticker in either a red or a blue box. Second, after hiding the star sticker, if the FP came, to disclose its hiding place. Third, if the enemy puppet (EP) came, not to reveal its hiding place. Then, the experimenter asked two questions: (1) If the enemy finds the star, what does he do? (2) If the friend finds the star, what does he do? If the participants did not correctly answer, the FP re-explained the rules.

Individual Condition. This condition was constructed from both the enemy and friend phase.

Enemy phase. After the participants hid the star sticker, the EP came and asked them where

the star sticker was. There were three patterns of responses. First, if the participants revealed the place of the star sticker, the EP took it away. Second, if the participants did not correctly share the hiding place of the star sticker, the EP did not take it away. Third, if the participants refused to respond or said nothing for fifteen seconds, the EP did not take it away.

Friend phase. After the participants hid the star sticker, the FP came and asked them where the star sticker was. There were three patterns of responses. First, if the participants disclosed the place of the star sticker, the FP gave it to them. Second, if the participants shared a different hiding place of the star sticker, the FP did not give it to them. Third, if the participants refused to respond or said nothing for fifteen seconds, the FP did not give it to them.

Conflict condition. In the conflict condition, the FP asked the participants where the star sticker was, while the EP was hiding and eavesdropping. After the participants hid the star sticker, the EP came and hid in a box (meant for hiding) on the screen. Then, the FP came and asked where the star sticker was, without noticing the EP. There were five patterns of responses. First, if the participants disclosed the place of the star sticker, the EP appeared from the box and took it away. Second, if the participants told a different hiding place of the star sticker, the EP did not take it, and went away. Then, the FP asked where the star was again as was the case in the friend phase. Third, if the participants refused to respond, the EP did not take it and went away. Then, the FP asked where the star was again; which was the same as the friend phase. Fourth, if the participants secretly shared the place of the star sticker to the friend by pointing or whispering, the EP did not take it and went away. Then, the FP asked where the star sticker was again; which was the same as in the friend phase. Fifth, if the participants said nothing for fifteen seconds, the FP repeated the question. If the participants still said nothing for fifteen more seconds, the EP did not take it and went away. Then, the FP asked where the star sticker was again; and what

followed was the same as in the friend phase.

Other Person's Benefit Task. The task was a deception task for the other person's benefit. It involved presenting movies of a puppet show, with puppets of three characters: the protagonist, his friend, and his enemy. The task was modified from that of Minamishima et al. (2016) and Hayashi (2017). The process was the same as in the self-benefit task; except that the protagonist hid, regardless of whether the participants hid the star sticker. If the participants divulged the hiding place of the protagonist puppet (PP) to the FP; the PP could meet the FP. However, if the participants disclosed the place of the PP to the EP; the PP was bullied by the EP, which was the same as in the self-benefit task.

ToM2 Task. It was used to examine recursive mindreading. The task was presented as a slideshow by using a laptop PC, and the experimenter narrated the story. The task which was modified from that of Perner and Wimmer (1985) had two sections: the story section and the questions section. The story was as follows. (1) In a park, there is an ice cream shopper, Taro, and Hanako. Hanako had gone home to get money. (2) The shopper told him that he would go to their school. (3) While the shopper was going to the school, he met Hanako. He told her that he would be going to the school. (4) Taro arrived at Hanako's house. Her mother told him that she had gone to the shopper. Then, the questions were as follows: "Where does Taro think Hanako went?" (belief question), and Where did Hanako go? (real question).

Coding of Response

Children's responses were classified as appropriate or inappropriate depending on whether they were able to avoid conveying the correct information to the enemy. The appropriate responses were then classified into active and passive deception. In this study, deception by falsifying or secretly behaving only to the FP was defined as active deception; and the deception

by denying or not responding was defined as passive deception. Appropriate and inappropriate responses were different in the individual and conflict conditions.

Individual Condition. In this condition, appropriate responses were required in both the enemy and friend phases; and there were three patterns of responses. First, “Tell the place,” which meant to disclose the hiding place of the star sticker by pointing or speaking. Second, “Tell a lie,” which meant to reveal a different place of the star sticker by pointing or speaking. Third, “Don’t tell,” which meant refusing to give a response or saying nothing for fifteen seconds. In the enemy phase, the inappropriate response was “Tell the place,” and the appropriate responses were “Tell a lie” (active deception) and “Don’t tell” (passive deception). These appropriate responses were defined with reference to a study by Hayashi (2017). In the friend phase, the appropriate response was “Tell the place,” and the inappropriate responses were “Tell a lie” and “Don’t tell.”

Conflict Condition. In this condition, there were five patterns of responses: first, “Tell the place,” which meant to disclose the hiding place of the star sticker by pointing or speaking; second, “Tell a lie,” which meant revealing a different hiding place of the star sticker by pointing or speaking; third, “Don’t tell,” which meant refusing to give a response or saying nothing for 15 seconds; fourth, “Whisper,” which meant to secretly tell the hiding place of the star sticker to the FP by speaking; and fifth, “Point,” which meant secretly revealing the hiding place of the star sticker to the FP by pointing. These appropriate responses, too, were defined with reference to the study by Hayashi (2017). The inappropriate response was “Tell the place,” and the appropriate responses were: “Tell a lie” (active deception), “Don’t tell” (passive deception), “Whisper” (active deception), and “Point” (active deception).

ToM2 Task. In this task, it was necessary to appropriately answer the belief question as well as

the real question. The appropriate answer to the belief question was “the park,” while the appropriate answer to the real question was “the school.”

In the “Main Analysis” section below, “S,” “O,” “I,” and “C,” have been used for referring to “Self-benefit,” “Other person’s benefit,” “Individual condition,” and “Conflict condition,” respectively; and will be used to represent combinations of conditions such as SI, SC, OI, and OC.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was carried out with statistical software SPSS (version 19.0) and R (version 3.5.1). A comparison between the average percentage of appropriate responses and the chance level (50%) was estimated using binomial tests. Moreover, the comparison for the average percentage of appropriate responses among situations was estimated with Cochran’s *Q* test and McNemar’s pairwise comparisons. In addition, the relationship between the pass rate of ToM2 and the average percentage of appropriate responses for each deceptive situation was estimated with Fisher’s exact tests. Finally, the relationship between the pass rate of ToM2 and the deception strategy was estimated with Fisher’s exact tests. Differences were considered significant if at least $p < 0.05$.

Results

Preliminary analysis

ToM2 task data were excluded of one child because of the failure of the experiment’s machine. Preliminary data analyses revealed no gender-related effects. Thus, the data for boys and girls were combined for all subsequent analyses.

Main analysis

Table 1 shows the number of appropriate responses in the deception tasks. Children’s

average percentages of appropriate responses in the SI, SC, OI, and OC conditions were 100%, 74%, 97%, and 62%, respectively. I conducted binomial tests to assess whether the average percentages of appropriate responses were above or near chance. SI, SC, and OI were above chance (50%), $ps < .001$, but OC was near chance, $p = .23$. Adults' average percentages of appropriate responses in the SI, SC, OI, and OC conditions were 97%, 87%, 100%, and 89%, respectively. I conducted binomial tests to assess whether the average percentages of appropriate responses were above or near chance. SI, SC, OI, and OC were above chance, $ps < .001$. I conducted Cochran's Q test to examine differences in the percentages of appropriate responses among the SI, SC, OI, and OC. Cochran's Q test was significant for children, $Q(3, N = 34) = 26.89, p < .001$, but not for adults. For children, McNemar's pairwise comparisons indicated that the number of appropriate responses was significantly more in the SI and OI than in the SC and OC; SI > SC, adjusted $z = -3.03$, adjusted $p = .02$; SI > OC, $z = -4.37, p < .001$; OI > SC, $z = 2.69, p = .04$; and OI > OC, $z = -4.04, p < .001$. There were no significant differences in the number of appropriate responses between the SI and OI, adjusted $z = -.34$, adjusted $p = 1.0$; nor between SC and OC, $z = -1.35, p = 1.0$. However, there was a medium effect size between the SC and the OC, $r = .41, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.41, .86]$.

Table 1

The number of the appropriate response in the deception tasks.

Age	n	S		O	
		I	C	I	C
Children	34	34	25	33	21
Adults	38	37	33	38	34

Note. S = Self-benefit, O = Other person's benefit, I = Individual condition, C = Conflict condition.

Table 2 shows the contingency of the number of appropriate responses between the

ToM2 and deception tasks. The average pass rate percentages of the ToM2 task were 39% for the belief question, 70% for the real question, and 21% for ToM2. I conducted Fisher's exact tests to examine associations of achievement between the deception task and the ToM2 task in children. The SI was excluded from the analysis because all children deceive in the SI. Fisher's exact tests were not significant in all situations, $ps > .05$.

Table 2

The contingency of the number of the appropriate responses between the second-order theory of mind task and the deception tasks.

ToM2	S			
	I		C	
	Appropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Inappropriate
Pass	7	0	5	2
Fail	26	0	19	7
ToM2	O			
	I		C	
	Appropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Inappropriate
Pass	7	0	4	3
Fail	25	1	16	10

Note. S = Self-benefit, O = Other person's benefit, I = Individual condition, C = Conflict condition, ToM2 = Second-order theory of mind. $n = 33$.

Table 3 shows the contingency of the number of the pass rate of the ToM2 task and the appearance of the deception strategy. Appropriate responses were categorized as active deception ("Tell a lie" and "Whisper") and passive deception ("Don't tell"). Only one child whispered the correct place to the friend, in each conflict condition. The children's average percentages for passive deception ("Don't tell") were 58%, 50%59% and 60% in the SI, SC, OI, and OC conditions, respectively. I conducted Fisher's exact tests to examine associations between the deception strategy and the achievement of the ToM2 task in children. Fisher's exact test was

significant for OI, $p = .03$, and the others were insignificant, $ps > .05$.

Table 3

The contingency of the number of the pass and fail of the second-order theory of mind task and the number of the deception strategy.

ToM2	S			
	I		C	
	Active	Passive	Active	Passive
Pass	2	5	1	4
Fail	12	14	11	8
	O			
	I		C	
	Active	Passive	Active	Passive
Pass	0	7	0	4
Fail	14	12	8	8

Note. S = Self-benefit, O = Other person's benefit, I = Individual condition, C = Conflict condition. ToM2 = Second-order theory of mind. $n = 33$.

Discussion

This study's purpose was to clarify the development of deception in the conflict situation in children. The hypotheses comprised: (1) most of the children aged 7 and 8 years deceive in the conflict condition, (2) children deceive more easily for self-benefit than for the other person's benefit in the conflict condition, and (3) there is a positive relationship between the ToM2 and deception in the conflict condition.

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were partially supported. About 75% of 7- and 8-year-olds deceived in the self-benefit conflict condition, and this percentage was above the chance level. However, only about 60% of the children deceived in the other person's benefit conflict condition, and this percentage was nearer to the chance level. Also, in the conflict condition, there was no significant difference between the self-benefit and the other person's benefit, but a middle effect

size. This result suggests that most 7- and 8-year-olds can deceive others in the conflict condition for self-benefit, but that deceiving for the other person's benefit in the conflict condition is still difficult. This finding is consistent with that of Minamishima et al. (2016). The authors showed that in the individual situation, preschool and elementary school children passed the self-benefit deception task more often than in the other person's benefit deception task. Therefore, deception for self-benefit may be easier than deception for the other person's benefit not only in the individual condition but also in the conflict condition. However, in the present study, there was no difference in performance between the self-benefit and the other person's benefit in the individual condition. The reason may be that the range of appropriate responses to the deception task were different from that in previous research. Although Minamishima et al. (2016) decided that only lying was the correct response, the present study also included passive deception such as "Don't tell," as the correct response. The percentage of appropriate responses in the individual situation were considered high, and there was no difference between self-benefit and the other person's benefit. This suggests that deception in the conflict condition will continue to develop, and will be at the same level, as in the individual condition.

Hypothesis 3 was not supported. There was no significant association between the ToM2 and deception in the conflict condition. This result was not consistent with that of Hayashi (2017), who discussed that there would be a relationship between the understanding of the conflict situation and the ToM2 because young children cannot deceive in the conflict condition. In the current study, the average percentages of appropriate responses of the ToM2 were lower than those of the deception tasks. Therefore, it suggests that children can deceive in conflict situations, even before acquiring a second-order belief.

The current study showed that it is difficult for 7- and 8-year-olds in the order of ToM2,

OC, and SC. This finding indicates the process of the development of deception in the conflict condition. If 7- and 8-year-olds can deceive for self-benefit; then, they can also deceive for the other person's benefit without ToM2. It takes three steps to deceive in the conflict condition. First, children understand that the conflict condition is different from the enemy and friend phases in the individual condition; and that they must not behave the same as in the friend phase. Next, the children learned that if they deceived the enemy, he went away. Third, children controlled their behavior by not telling the truth to the enemy. Therefore, ToM2 is not needed for deceiving in the conflict condition.

The current study showed that there is a relationship between deception strategy and ToM2. Children who passed the ToM2 tasks tended to use passive deception. Previous research has shown that the frequency of active deception increases and that passive deception decreases from the ages of 4-6 years. However, the current study showed that 7- and 8-year-olds used passive deception a little more than active deception in the individual and conflict conditions. Therefore, the development process of deception strategy has three steps. First, 3- and 4-year-olds used passive deception by not responding because they did not understand the situation and could not behave otherwise. Second, 5- and 6-year-olds used active deception by falsifying due to acquiring the first-order theory of mind. Third, since 7- and 8-year-olds used active and passive deception; there might be a relationship between passive deception and the ToM2. Therefore, passive deception in the third stage was different from that in the first.

In the current study, there was no relationship between deception in the conflict condition and the ToM2. One of the reasons might have been a problem with the ToM2 concept itself. ToM2 is a concept that allows children to understand that "John thinks that Mary thinks the ice cream shopper is in the park," for predicting Taro's next behavior (Perner & Wimmer,

1985). According to Naito (2011), the concept of theory of mind (ToM) considers the representation of an individual's beliefs and desires to be the result of information processing. Furthermore, the author pointed out two assumptions relating to the ToM. The first was that by themselves, children modularize, construct a theory, and simulate information processing completely. The second is that children acquire a universal conception of the mind through a universal process.

However, Tomasello et al., (2005) suggested that the formation of interpersonal skills and understanding others was a cultural creation in which children interact and develop relationship with others, rather than simply a cultural learning in which they passively learn others' intentions and purposes. The developed human cognitive representations are called "dialogic cognitive representations." In other words, it could be considered that children are not only inferring the mental states of others, but they are also constructing mental states and predictions by interacting with others. Therefore, the first assumption does not necessarily hold.

Moreover, according to Naito and Koyama (2006) and Wellman, Cross, and Wason (2001), there is a cultural difference in the way children infer mental states and the ToM and ToM2 tasks as they increase in age (Naito & Seki, 2009). Therefore, the second assumption, too, does not necessarily hold. The ToM2 presupposes the ToM that has been described above. Therefore, the concept of ToM2 itself needs to be considered critically.

The results can possibly be interpreted as a factor without the ToM2. The factor is the omission bias. Since 7- and 8-year-olds believe that commission is worse than omission (Hayashi, 2015); the amount of passive deception increases from the ages of 6 to 7 and 8 years because they avoid active deception, which is a commission. Moreover, the results suggest that the omission bias may be stronger for the other person's benefit than in the conflict condition for

the other person's benefit.

One of the limitations of this study is that it did not examine the cognitive process, including the executive function and its neural base. The executive function is the ability to achieve a goal relating to the high order cognitive and behavioral controls (Zelazo, Frye, Carter, & Reznick, 1997), and constructed by "inhibition," "shifting," and "updating" (Miyake, Friedman, Emerson, Witzki, Howerter, & Wager, 2000). Previous research has shown that the executive function, especially, inhibition and updating, are related to children's deception and lies (Hala & Russell, 2001; Talwar & Lee, 2008). Further studies are needed to examine the relationships among deceiving, deception style, and executive function.

To summarize, this study's purpose was to explore the development of deception in the conflict condition and the relationship between children's deception, the deceptive situation, and the ToM2. The results suggest that in the conflict condition children find it easier to deceive for self-benefit than for the other person's benefit. Moreover, there is no relationship between the ToM2 and deception in the conflict condition.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Mari Hasegawa for insightful comments and advice on the experimental design and Yusuke Moriguchi, Hiromichi Hagihara, and Xianwei Meng for insightful comments and advice on the manuscript. Moreover, I am grateful to children and college students who participated in this study and the after-school center's staff. I would like to thank Editage (www.editage.com) for English language editing.

Competing Interests statement

The author declares no competing interests.

References

- Chandler, M., Fritz, A. S., & Hala, S. 1989. Small-scale deceit: Deception as a marker of two-, three-, and four-year-olds' early theories of mind. *Child Development*, 60, 1263-1277.
- DePaulo, B. M., Kirkendol, S. E., Kashy, D. A., Wyer, M. M., & Epstein, J. A. 1996. Lying in Everyday Life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(5), 979–995.
- Hala, S., & Russell, J. 2001. Executive control within strategic deception: A window on early cognitive development? *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 80, 112-141.
- Hayashi, H. 2015. Omission bias and perceived intention in children and adults. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 33, 237–251.
- Hayashi, H. 2017. Young children's difficulty with deception in a conflict situation. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 41, 175-184.
- Levine, T. R. 2014. Truth-Default Theory (TDT): A theory of human deception and deception detection. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 33(4), 378–392.
- Minamishima, A., Fujino, H., Matsui, T., Tojo, Y., & Hakarino, K. 2016. Deception and theory of mind in typical development and ASD children: Lie for self-benefit and other person's benefit. *Tokyo Gakugei University Research Bulletin*, 67, 235-243.
- Miyake, A., Friedman, N. P., Emerson, M. J., Witzki, A. H., Howerter, A., & Wager, T. 2000. The unity and diversity of executive functions and their contributions to complex “frontal lobe” tasks: A latent variable analysis. *Cognitive Psychology*, 41, 49-100.
- Naito, M. 2011. A conceptual change in “theory of mind”: From universalism to sociocultural construction. *Japanese Psychological Review*, 54(3), 249-263.

- Naito, M., & Koyama, K. 2006. The development of false-belief understanding in Japanese children: Delay and difference? *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 30(4), 290–304.
- Naito, M., & Seki, Y. 2009. The relationship between second-order false belief and display rules reasoning: the integration of cognitive and affective social understanding. *Developmental Science*, 12(1), 150–164.
- Perner, J., & Wimmer, H. 1985. “John thinks that Mary thinks that...”: Attribution of second-order beliefs by 5- to 10-year-old children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 39, 437-471.
- Sodian, B., Taylor, C., Harris, P., & Perner, J. 1991. Early deception and the child’s theory of mind: False trails and genuine markers. *Child Development*, 62, 468-483.
- Sullivan, K., Zaitchik, D., & Tager-Flusberg, H. 1994. Preschoolers can attribute second-order beliefs. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(3), 395–402.
- Talwar, V., Gordon, H. M., & Lee, K. 2007. Lying in the elementary school years: Verbal deception and its relation to second-order belief understanding. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 804-810.
- Talwar, V., & Lee, K. 2008. Social and cognitive correlates of children’s lying behavior. *Child Development*, 79, 866-881.
- Tomasello, M., Carpenter, M., Call, J., Behne, T., & Moll, H. 2005. Understanding and sharing intentions: The origins of cultural cognition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 28, 675–735.
- Wellman, H. M., Cross, D., & Watson, J. 2001. Meta-Analysis of Theory-of-Mind Development: The Truth about False Belief. *Child Development*, 72(3), 655–684.

Zelazo, P. D., Frye, D., Carter, A., & Reznick, J. S. 1997. Early development of executive function: A problem-solving framework. *Review of General Psychology*, 1, 198-226.