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The main focus of this research is the relationship between communication apprehension and vocal stress levels during the communication process. The authors propose three different types of deceptions: prepared, spontaneous, and delayed interrogative lies. First, they investigate the use of vocal stress arousal to measure deception. Second, they explore how trait anxiety and deceit jointly impact the arousal level during deception. They begin their study by defining communication apprehension as an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons. The results show that liars who report a high level of communication apprehension demonstrate significantly higher levels of vocal stress when lying preparedly than when communicating a prepared truthful response. The process of anticipating the enactment of the lie during the study proposes further research using voice stress analysis in communication contexts other than during deception.


This paper exposes competitive views of arousal, emotional state, cognitive load, attempted behavioral control, and motivation on deception detection. They argue that all of these factors will debilitate nonverbal performance, resulting in more readily detectable deceit. However, deceptive verbal performances are suggested to be facilitated by motivation,
resulting in less accurate detection. The prevalent view is that deception triggers involuntary “leakage” during the deceptive communication process. The study proposes that motivation impairs nonverbal deception but facilitates verbal deception. A notable challenge discussed is the rival hypothesis of interpersonal deception theory that predicts that a speaker’s motivation can facilitate both verbal and nonverbal performance. Finally, another possible explanation assumed in this paper is the possibility that our deception induction ability works as an unintended motivation induction factor.


In this theoretical piece, Lippard identifies five situational exigencies affecting how deception is used as a problem-solving strategy. Recent research indicates that deception in interpersonal relationships is not only common but socially acceptable. Deception is frequently judged as “the right thing to do” and often perceived as the only communicative alternative available in a situation. Her findings indicate that relational variables are key factors in deceptive communication and need further examination. Also, if we are to understand more completely how intimacy and power, as well as other relational variables, affect deceitful behavior, it is important to examine recipient role in more detail. Lippard’s findings are consistent with gender role socialization and stereotyped perception of female behavior. Finally, a pattern common to most of her test subjects is that a probing question or request creates a dilemma for the subject and prompts the deceptive response.

This article analyzes job candidate’s predictability to distort the way they present their competencies and credentials in order to make a favorable impression to hiring professionals. While it is important to have an accurate assessment of candidates’ traits and abilities, professionals need to understand that virtually everyone exhibits a variation of what they call “social desirability bias.” The study outlines a three-part strategy for due diligence on candidates that reduces bad hires resulting from untruthful information. Their strategy includes objective assessment, behavioral interviewing, and reference checking. The research investigates examples of lying offline situations. The idea is that inconsistencies or the change in delivery are clues that something peculiar or “out of sync” is going on. Finally, it is appropriate to discuss the notion of whether people can learn to become better “lie detectors” or not. Many sources claim that they can teach how to detect deception reliably, but the evidence does not generally back up these claims, the latest research suggests that detectors are born rather than made. Houran and Krieger believe that this complete system of checks and balances can greatly reduce the prospect of making bad hires from erroneous information given by candidates.


This study discusses the interaction phenomena of deception by testing some propositions and ideas of the interpersonal deception theory. First, they test whether engaging in strategic behavior and displaying more nonstrategic cues are more characteristics of deceivers than truth tellers. Second, if skilled senders perform more strategic activities, then what is the dynamic character of deception in interactive contexts. The main goal of their research was to
isolate psychological and behavioral markers of deception in individuals with strong beliefs and group affiliation. The results reveal no significant differences between deceivers and truth tellers in behavioral management, strategy use and nonstrategic behavior. The idea that more skilled senders are better at appearing truthful by performing more strategic behavior is not supported by their finding. A limitation of this study is that, although the participants were randomly selected, the analyzed sample was rather small, so it is necessary to test results on a more representative scale.


In this theoretical piece, the authors discuss two major criticisms of the use of personality measures for employee selection. The first is that personality measures are poor predictors of job performance. The second criticism is that job applicants distort their scores by faking. They define faking in terms of score changes from an initial baseline of responses in the first job application. They use the results from the first employment test administration as a benchmark against which to compare the results from the second employment test administration. Two views are presented, the first one is that people engage in impression management on specific occasions. The second view is that during social interaction most people behave in ways that are intended to convey a positive impression of themselves. Their findings show that, when instructed, some people can alter their personality scores as compared with their scores when not instructed. Additionally, mean score differences are larger in laboratory faking studies than in applicant studies. Finally, it’s concluded that impression management has minimal impact on employment outcomes, although other scholars disagreed.