Cross-cultural Deception in Polish and American English in Computer-Mediated Communication

Cross-cultural Deception in Polish and American English in Computer-Mediated Communication

By

Anna Kuzio

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Cross-cultural Deception in Polish and American English in Computer-Mediated Communication

By Anna Kuzio

Reviewers:
Prof. Joseph Gibbs
Prof. Sabine Asmus

This book first published 2018

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-1098-0
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-1098-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

INTRODUCTION

Deception appears to be common and can be damaging to relationships and personal finance. Individuals most frequently deceive to protect and promote themselves or to protect another (Seiter, Bruschke, & Bai, 2002). People are more likely to deceive to strangers than friends (Ennis, Vrij, & Chance, 2008). Those with psychological disorders, like psychopathy, may deceive to seek thrills (Siegel et al., 1986). Accordingly, when interrelating with a stranger, a person may be lied to because the stranger has something to gain or because she or he enjoys deceiving.

Although deception is common, individuals are poor at detecting deception. A meta-analysis of 120 deception detection studies performed from 1943 to 2000 determined that people could discriminate between truth and lies only 54% of the time (DePaulo et al., 2003). Deception detection was poor partly because individuals had a tendency to believe that what others said was true. Although that "truth bias" may fulfill a psychological necessity to trust those around us and reduce cognitive load, the tendency decreases one's ability to detect deception (Ekman, 2001; Feeley & Young, 1998; Levine, Kim, Park, & Hughes, 2006). Many people believe in cues that do not indicate deception. Belief in non-indicative cues hinders deception-detection accuracy (Global Deception Research Team, 2006; Vrij et al., 2000).

Communication seems to be an essential part of any interaction. Studies specify that computer-mediated forms of communication, such as e-mail and social media, are replacing the more traditional communication forms of telephone (Tassabehji & Vakola, 2005). CMC is described as "synchronous [simultaneous] or asynchronous [delayed] electronic mail and computer conferencing, by which senders encode in-text messages that are relayed from senders' computers to receivers" (Walther, 1992).

The issue of finding the evidence of deception in discourse, which is aimed at analyzing verbal communication, has not been given enough attention, especially taking into consideration intercultural aspects. Some studies have offered conflicting outcomes on the issue, providing the main problem that will be addressed in this study (cf. Zhou 2005, Duran et al. 2010, Hauch 2012). Also, in contrast to micro expressions being generally consistent, little has been done to determine whether hypothetical linguistic features of deception are also universal. Consequently, if these

linguistic structures are not the same cross-culturally, individuals attempting to detect deception in non-native English speakers may be have problems with recognizing liars and truth-tellers, which inaccuracies could have important consequences, particularly in shaping the process of communication and interaction.

The issue of the universality of linguistic features of deception involves the second matter addressed in this study. Regarding individuals' deception detection capabilities, it has been recognized that individuals usually accomplish accuracy at about the level of chance (cf. Reinhard et al. 2013). Vrij et al. (2010) observed that professionals' ability to detect deception were in reality no better than laypeople's. Kassin and Fong (1999) stated that deception detection training does not meaningfully improve one's accuracy, yet more current research has stated that it indeed can (Vrij et al. 2015). While this has been investigated within Western cultures, other research has observed that deception detection is also possible across cultures, and that individuals actually achieve about the same level of accuracy, whether they are detecting deception in their own culture or across cultures (Bond & Atoum, 2000). Nevertheless, little has been done on this topic, covering only a few different nationalities. This is the third problem that will be addressed in the present study. Moreover, little research has been conducted addressing cross-cultural perceptions of deceptive communication in writing, and more work on cross-cultural bias in deception detection concerning other cultures is desirable. These matters encompass the fourth problem that will be given attention in the monograph. This monograph will consider the way native English-speaking Americans and non-native English speaking Poles form various messages and thus provide answers to the following research questions: (1) What linguistic features do Americans and Poles employ in deceptive communication?; (2) What linguistic differences are there, if any, between Americans' and Poles' baseline written communication in this context?; (3) How do the groups vary regarding accuracy and confidence levels when detecting deception within their own culture versus across cultures?; and finally (4) does either culture display cultural bias in recognizing liars?.

This monograph is an attempt to come closer to an answer to the aforementioned questions. More precisely, it concentrates on empirical studies that inspect content and language alterations of deceptive and true statements. Before presenting the specific investigations that are offered in this monograph, theoretical aspects and previous studies concerning the role of language will be offered. Many different linguistic cues were examined (e.g., Newman, Pennebaker, Berry, & Richards, 2003; Zhou,

Burgoon, Nunamaker, & Twitchell, 2004). Consequently, a systematic review is evidently reasonable. The current operational definitions for linguistic cues to deception are offered. Moreover, numerous important independent variables, such as event type, degree of personal investment, emotional valence, or extrinsic motivation of the narrator are examined to shed light on the relevance of the context of a statement for linguistic differences between liars and truth-tellers. The findings are discussed vis-a-vis their theoretical background, limitations, and usefulness in applied settings.

Cross-cultural research is a vital path for researchers to pursue; however, some have recommended that the discipline is marked by culturally biased research (Galliers & Meadow's 2003). Not only is it important to understand how we perceive deception and detect deceit in our own culture, it is also important to gain insight as to how likely Americans and Poles are to detect deception by people from other cultures and vice versa. This type of research would be appealing to people involved in trade negotiations, intelligence gathering, and international conflicts, as well as the ordinary individual who uses Skype to make cross-cultural calls. In the past there was less need for research on this topic due the time and distance separating people from each other and the expense and limited availability of electronic communication with those from different cultures. However, the technology is now accessible to allow communication partners to send messages and make domestic and overseas calls via the Internet. Therefore, these newer technologies create an environment which allows and supports more frequent cross-cultural interactions. In exchange, this generates more opportunity for cross-cultural deception using CMC, thus elevating the need to understand deceptive behavior and its detection across cultures. Consequently, the objective of this monograph is to determine the differences in deceptive behavior and deception detection for people of different cultures communicating with CMC.

Computer programs, though, can automatically detect some cues. Automated deception detection eliminates human judgment from the equation and may increase a layperson's ability to detect deception. Seeing if computer programs could aid in deception detection was the goal of this monograph. This research describes theories about why cues to deception exist, theories specific to verbal cues to deception, and theories about computer mediation in communication. The report discusses automating detection of verbal deception cues and reviews prior studies on verbal cues to deception.

The following literature review describes how each deception cue was operationalized, research results, and possible theoretical reasons for those

results. The review lays the foundation for four hypotheses and one research question. The methods section describes the experiment performed in this study and how variables were operationalized. The results section reports descriptions of participants, results of hypothesis testing, and responses to the research question. The discussion section gives possible explanations for unexpected results, applications of outcomes to future research, and study limitations.

CHAPTER ONE

COMMUNICATION

1.1 Introduction

"Communication is one of those human activities that everyone recognizes but few can define satisfactorily" (Fiske & Jenkins, 2011, p. 2). Consequently, communication studies perceive the process of communication in different ways and researchers describe communication from various perspectives (Littlejohn et al., 2017). Shepherd et al. (2014) separates studies about human communication into rhetorical and relational studies. Rhetorical communication studies concentrate on how to influence and persuade others while relational communication concentrates on the transaction and coordination of communication among people to achieve a shared cognition (McCroskey et al., 1995). Nevertheless, classifications such as the one just mentioned have not been useful in guiding researchers to any integrated type of studies in communication. Communication is defined as the practice of exploiting messages to create meaning (Pearson et al., 2006:9). Communication seems to be a functional, dynamic and transactional process whereby two or more individuals intentionally aim to share meaning as well as promote understanding by sending and interpreting verbal and non-verbal messages. On the other hand, the way one communicates varies from person to person as well as from culture to culture (Du Plooy-Cilliers & Louw, 2014, p.9). In the field of relational communication as well, a number of studies have focused on the way that communication works, and shared cognition is formed; yet, there are still difficulties in measuring and analyzing shared cognition.

People communicate with each other though they have dissimilar knowledge and backgrounds. In some cases, communication occurs between a person who has in-depth knowledge about definite items and a person who has very broad knowledge. Individuals tend to employ categories to communicate; language, which is exploited in communication, is categorical. Additionally, knowledge can be expressed in categories, and the categories are formed on the basis of the knowledge that the person possess. If the person has a superficial knowledge about a specific subject,

he/she then creates superficial categories; whereas, if he has in-depth knowledge, he/she creates detailed, technical categories.

The communication process between a person with technical categories of knowledge and a person with non-technical categories can be described by the way they match their categories. Shared cognition is built if a category exists or is formed that is fully comprehensible for both parties.

Communication appears to be a foundational structure of society and in practice part of every facet of human existence. Without communication, information cannot be processed or changed. This part of the book will therefore include a brief literature review on the components of communication. The dimensions of communication will also be examined. Literature on communication studies has not focused on the way people with categorical knowledge communicate. Attention will be paid to the aspect of exploiting the aforementioned concepts.

1.2 Definitions and functions of communication

Communication seems to be a significant feature of our lives, since each individual must constantly base his/her behavior on accessible information. Communicating appears to be a behavior that allows the sharing of information between (interacting) individuals by way of responding to each other (Houghton, 1997, p.2). One can assume that communication shares accessible information. Human communication is not purely made up of a sentence or other expressions, but it is rather the performance of certain kinds of acts (e.g., asking questions, giving orders, making statements, apologizing, thanking, explaining, making requests, congratulating), assuming the possession of certain prior knowledge (Knapp, 1997).

The word communication comes from the Latin word *communicatio*, which signifies *sharing*. In this broad sense, speaker A communicates with the speaker B if anything is shared between A and B or transferred from A to B (Hinde, 1997).

Lyons (2009) considered the terms *communicate* and *communication* and assumed that both are exploited in an equally wide range of contexts in their everyday, pre-theoretical sense. He indicated that individuals talk as eagerly of the communication of feelings, moods and attitudes as individuals do of the communication of factual information. Lyons intended to limit the term *communication* and constrained it to the intended transmission of information by means of some recognized signaling-system. Originally, however, for the purpose of this study, the

term will be limited still further, to the intentional transmission of factual, or propositional information (Lyons, 2009) that results from formerly possessed knowledge.

Smith (1980) also recognized communication in terms of signals and noticed that "when we speak of communicating, we commonly imply the use of specialized signals" (p.13). He mentioned that "they are not strictly necessary; we could define communication as any sharing of information from any source, as is regularly done in biology and some other sciences" (p.13). From this viewpoint, if communication is to take place, the information *must* be shared between a speaker and a receiver. Consequently, misleading signals or the suppression of information which are essential for making the process of communication possible, leads to imperfect communication (Smith, 1980).

Communication is also mentioned by Allwood et al. (1991), who believes that communication, frequently and at a given time, concentrates more on either *sending* or *receiving* information, i.e., they (speakers) are mainly either in the sender's role (e.g., speaker, writer, etc.) or in the receiver's role (e.g., listener, reader, etc.).

Allwood et al. (1991) perceived communication in the following way: in its widest sense *communication* is employed to designate the sharing or transference of any phenomenon whatsoever between two entities, e.g., in physics one speaks of 'communicating vessels' or of the 'communication of power to a machine', in a narrower sense the term 'communication' can be exploited to designate any such sharing or transference which takes place between human beings with some (perhaps low) degree of consciousness.

To speak or to make gestures means to perform actions. This proposition supports Allwood's interpretation (1991) that linguistic communication is grounded on action as well as cooperation on the part of interlocutors. Namely, both speaker and listener in spoken or written communication perform actions which are subject to the co-operative principle.

Over the years, the term for communication has developed from being technical, to a process and then a transactional explanation. Steinberg (2007, p. 39) explains that the technical interpretation of communication is concerned with how precisely and efficiently messages can be relocated from one person to another along a channel such as a telephone wire or airwaves that transmit sound and pictures. This view attempts to control ways of increasing the clarity of the message and concentrates on refining the tools as well as techniques that stimulate efficient communication.

The second and more multifaceted interpretation of communication improves the transmission of messages; it concentrates on the interpretation

and meaning of the message. This views communication as a process with an emphasis on the interaction between the participants in the communication process. Contrary to the technical view, communication as a process is not static; rather it is a continuing action and interminable process (Samovar et al., 2017, p.12). The process provides the users with information that communication is considered by incessant change as well as progress. As a result, people are changed by others when they communicate; they alter their knowledge by being provided with some cues that originate from the other(s). Information, ideas and opinions gathered from our encounter with others progressively change our behavior and opinions of people, subjects and objects. Steinberg (2007, p.40) confirms that every communication encountered affects ones' attitudes and beliefs in some way.

An extension of the process definition is the transactional definition of communication. Du Plooy-Cillers and Louw (2014, p.5) assert that the transaction definition of communication is the process of providing and receiving messages. The transactional process of communication concentrates on the interactive process of exchanging meaningful messages, but as a transaction between the participants during which a relationship is established. Both participants of the communication interaction interchange communication cues as well as assume the role of both communicator and recipient. Steinberg (2007, p. 40) adds that a transactional definition of communication is favored because the concept of „transaction" proposes that the participants must reach at some mutual agreement about the meaning of their messages for the communication to be efficacious and for their relationship to be rewarding.

The purpose of communication differs from person to person, depending on the situation and the anticipated outcome of the communication process. Steinberg (2007, p.19) confirms that needs are the driving force behind human behavior. Needs are defined as requirements of life, which range from the need for food and shelter to a general sense of achievement. Physical needs are vital for the survival of an individual. Individuals communicate to attain basic necessities of life like food, water, air and shelter. These are the primary needs that an individual needs to gratify before other needs are fulfilled (Mersham & Skinner, 2001, p.42).

Another significant reason for communicating is to cultivate relationships. Pearson et al. (2017, p.133) explain that relationships concentrate on any connection or association between people. Steinberg (2007, p.19) adds that individuals require the love and friendship of friends and family and the co-operation of those at work and social groups to feel secure. The prominence of relationships gives rise to interpersonal

communication Pearson et al. (2017, p.134) add that the significance of interpersonal relationships is the need for attachment or being involved with others, as well as the need for control, or the ability to influence others, our environment, and ourselves.

In many communication situations, individuals have a tendency to persuade others to think the way they think or to change an attitude or behavior. Pearson et al. (2017, p.134) state that persuasion seems to be an ongoing practice in which verbal and non-verbal messages form, reinforce, as well as change people's minds. Fielding (2014, p.180) noticed that people try to persuade others either by using factual language or by employing emotive language, or a mixture of both. Steinberg (2007, p.21) emphasizes that in current society, high technology and the mass media are devices broadly exploited for the purpose of persuasion.

Through the process of communication with others and their response to individuals, people change their sense of who they are (self-concept). Baron (2012, p. 177) state that our perceptions about ourselves rely on how individuals are treated by others. The connection between ones' need to create relationships and obtaining a sense of self is expressed in the following way: "to understand oneself, one needs to be understood by another. To be understood by another, one needs to understand the other" (Steinberg, 2007, p.20).

Collecting information appears to be yet another significant function of communication. Individuals cannot exist in a society without information. Mersham and Skinner (2001, p.160) maintain that one of the vital purposes of communication is to inform and clarify. Individuals want and need to distinguish as well as comprehend what is happening around them and in other parts of the world. Information gathered by individuals helps them to live, behave and communicate correctly within society and the world on the whole.

Communication is also essential, as it allows individuals to make decisions. Decisions are made both consciously and unconsciously. Whatever the context, individuals communicate to gain as well as share information that allows them to make informed decisions in the process of communication (Steinberg, 2007, p.20).

1.3 The communication processes

Smith (1980) mentions the relation of the process of communicating to a semiotic theory based on C.W. Morris (1970). Morris mentioned three main divisions or levels of abstractions, namely:

- The *syntactic* level, which is concerned only with signals, the elementary tools of communicating
- The *semantic* level, which is concerned only with what the messages *are*, not with the use made of them
- The *pragmatic* level, which is the most comprehensive, embracing the signals and their messages considered at the previous levels and examining their exploitation by perceiving participants (speakers) who are truly communicating (Smith 1980, p. 19).

Allwood et al. (1991) recognized 'communicative acts' (also named 'actions and co-operation') in two contexts, in particular: the expansion of communicative acts in children on the basis of some recent empirical work in this area (Allwood et al., 1991, p.158) communicative acts as actions by which a sender aims at displaying or signaling information to a receiver (Allwood et al., 1991, p.170).

Allwood prefers the term 'communicative acts' to the more restrictive 'speech acts' employed by Searle (1969), who suggested that speech acts ought to be viewed as the "fundamental units of human communication". Allwood et al. (1991, p. 179) disapproved Searle's examples of speech acts, e.g., warning, begging, admitting, denying, etc. and drew attention to the fact that many of them are not inevitably connected with speech. This has some truth as, for instance, warning, begging or denying can be signaled non-verbally.

Special attention should be paid to the aspect of behavior and action that are indispensable elements in effecting communication. Action is associated with human behavior and activity is linked to creating the relations between the speakers in any communicative event.

In connection with human behavior, Allwood et al. (1991) called what is associated with *intention* as 'action'. He maintained that both action and behavior are interrelated, such that all action involves behavior, but there is behavior which is not directed by intention and thus cannot be regarded as an action. Allwood et al. (1991) concentrated his discussion on the listener's reaction, when the listener was asked definite questions, e.g., why he/she responded in a certain way. The listener's answers are connected to four concepts: reasons, grounds, motives, or intentions. All these notions are associated with the listener's actions. Both *grounds* and *reasons* for action are conditions which are associated with an action in the way suggested here. The degree to which aspiration or need gives rise to action will be referred to as *motive*.

Considering actions could generate another problem connected with types of behavior. A definite type of behavior can have numerous types of

meaning, along with being understood as several (different) types of action. All are restricted to different intentions (Allwood et al. 1991, p. 6). Allwood et al. (1991) believe that the term 'basic intention' is a concept which is closely associated with the degree of consciousness that the agent has of his/her performance of an action. Consequently, simple action is only meant to apply as long as an action is considered as, for example, intention-governed behavior. According to Allwood et al. (1991), one can observe that at least one of these four concepts must take place initially; then as a result of any of those concepts, actions will rise. It can be noted that any action has to be built on a reason, ground, motive or an intention that is previously known to the sender/receiver.

There are many levels, as Allwood et al. (1991) suggested, that comprise crucial but not adequate conditions, and they are indispensable but not adequate enablement (resources) for human communication in both spoken and written form. These levels seem to be as follows:

1. Physical: The communicators are perceived as physical objects and their communicative contributions appear to be physical processes.
2. Biological: The communicators are supposed to be biological entities whose communicative contributions from this perspective can be assumed to be biological activity and directed behavior.
3. Psychological:
   a) Perception, understanding and emotion: The communicators are perceived as understanding and emotional individuals whose communicative contributions are perceptually comprehensible and emotionally loaded phenomena.
   b) Motivation, rationality and agency: The communicators seem to be motivated, rational managers whose communicative contributions, consequently, tend to be motivated, rational acts.
4. Social:
   a) Culture or social institution: The communicators appear to be participants in a culture and one or more social institutions, and their communicative activities can be recognized as cultural and socially institutional acts.
   b) Language: The communicators are seen also as members of one or more linguistic communities and their activities are usually linguistic acts.
   c) Activity: They typically play a part in a social action, and their communicative actions seem to be seen as contributions to that activity through their role.

d) Communication: They generally focus more on either sending or receiving information.

Communicative activity appears to be any action associated with sending or receiving information from one agent to another (Allwood et al., 1991, p.64-65). Wittgenstein et. al. (1998) suggested that the meaning of linguistic expressions should be examined as different language games. The concept of a "language game" is studied as stereotypical language practice in an exact type of social activity.

On the other hand, Kowtko et al. (1992), noticed that language games can be perceived in sequences of conversational moves, for example, opening, closing, etc. – containing the option of nested sub-games. They explained the conversational games for that aspect of discourse coherence that is established in initiation – response – feedback patterns, and they do so by linking the form of dialogue to underlying non-linguistic aims.

Moraititis et al. (2005) specified that a language game comprises the turns which are indispensable to accomplish one conversational sub-objective. They confirmed that an *instructing* game begins when an instruction is stated and ends when the follower displays that the instruction is either finished or well on its way to being completed, without any other communication needed. They further maintained that a game typically continues smoothly from opening move to final move; however, two types of variation may occur, i.e.: nesting or a break within a game. Nesting occurs when a sub-game is opened with a purpose subsidiary to the objective of the current game, e.g., when a follower requests further information with the intention of performing an instruction. A break, such as statement of a misinterpretation, indicates that the status of the current game is uncertain. The game might continue on course if the misapprehension is explained, or it might become uncontrolled (Moraitis et al 2005, p.35).

Before discussing Wittgenstein's claim, it is worth considering that the concept 'activities', regarding the term 'communicative', was given the most rational interpretation by Austin (1962), i.e. the locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, in addition to those recommended by Searle (1969), i.e. the reference act, the illocutionary act, etc. For Wittgenstein et al (1996) the choice and meaning of linguistic expressions is perceived as a product of the interaction between an intrinsic 'meaning potential' of the expression, and the use to which it is put: linguistic constructions, communicative functions as well as joint social activities. Wittgenstein continues to maintain that the usage is, therefore, recognized in terms of (i) collocations in various types of grammatical structure, (ii)

contribution to different types of communicative functions, and (iii) occurrence in an exact type of social activity.

It is also necessary to mention that in both activities and communication a definite degree of co-operation between activity and communication is vital (see Allwood 1976). Mersham and Skinner (2002, p.76) describe communication codes as all the signs and symbols that are employed in the communication process to transmit the message in such a way as to be distinguished by the receiver's senses. Steinberg (2007, p.15) explains that a code is a system for exploiting signs. A significant code or sign system seems to be language, which is a vital aspect of the communication process.

Encoding and decoding denote the construction and breaking down of messages. As stated by Du Plooy-Cillers and Louw (2014, p.15) encoding can be recognized as a cognitive (thought) process of converting ideas and beliefs into symbols and expressing them in a message. Encoding can be simplified as the process of creating a message. Decoding is the procedure of taking the verbal and non-verbal messages obtained from the communicator and assigning meaning to that message. Pearson et al. (2017, p. 13) confirm that decoding is giving meaning to that idea or thought. Encoding and decoding languages are crucial aspects of communication that contribute to the failure of the communication as they influence the process of exchanging information among cultures.

Steinberg (2007, p.18) states that interpretation comprises more than a literal comprehension of the signs in a message. Interpretation relies on both social (shared) meanings and individual (personal or subjective) meaning. On obtaining a message, the receiver usually decodes or interprets it, or the message is rendered into a form that can be understood. The receiver reacts to the message or offers feedback and in the process signals whether the message has been understood. Yet, meanings appear to be relative and subject to individual interpretation. Meanings are in people, not in the message. Words do not have any meaning in themselves; the source and the recipient allocate meaning to words. The message can consequently be misrepresented. Distortion of messages can happen by various forms of interference (noise, disturbance, or barriers). Interference implies anything that distorts the information conveyed to the receiver, causes a distraction, or interrupts receipt of the message (Skinner *et al.* 2007, p.76).

Smith (1980, p.118) confirms that noise is any stimulus that interferes with the encoding and decoding process that limits the clarity of the message from sender to receiver. This inference creates a barrier between the communicator and the recipient. Noise can be broken down into

external, internal and semantic noise. According to Du Plooy-Cillers & Louw (2014, p.20) internal noise consists of the thoughts, feelings, perceptions, attitudes and stereotypes that distort the message. An example of internal noise is how our perceptions and stereotypes influence and distort messages. Internal noise plays an important role in intercultural communication, as it can be a major barrier. Individuals entering a conversation with preconceived perceptions, attitudes and stereotypes about another culture are considered dangerous as it is bound to lead to a breakdown in communication. Steinberg (2007, p.49) adds that an individual's bias (thoughts) prevents the accurate reception of the message intended.

1.4 Deceptive communication

Scholars of deception research have created a collection of definitions in an attempt to effectively capture the concept of deceptive communication. These definitions offer a range of concepts from something communicated consciously and intentionally to something which takes place at the subconscious level. DePaulo et al. (1988), for example, assumed that "deceivers are, by definition, deliberately misleading others (…) They are not doing so mindlessly or mistakenly" (p. 153). O'Hair, Cody, Wang, and Chao (1990) later improved this definition by stating that deceptive communication includes a *conscious* attempt to generate or perpetuate a false impression among other communicators. Further, Snyder and Higgins (1988) stated that "deception... involves distortion in the reporting of information; moreover, this distortion process is motivated by advantages that the individual perceives will accrue to him or her" (p. 237). In sharp contrast, other scholars have believed that deception entails neither deliberacy nor consciousness (Bavelas et al., 1990). In shaping a working definition for deception, scholars have concentrated their attention on the notion of intent as a main feature defining characteristic of deceptive communication. Buller and Burgoon (1996) recognized deceptive communication to be "a message knowingly transmitted by a sender to foster a false belief or conclusion by the receiver" (p. 50). Similarly, Zuckerman, DePaulo and Rosenthal (1981) stated that deceptive communication is "an act that is intended to foster in another person a belief or understanding which the deceiver considers false" (p. 3). Ekman (1988) defined it as "the deliberate choice to mislead a target without giving any notification of the intent to do so" (p. 41). Furthermore, Bok (1989) stated that "[w]hen we undertake to deceive others intentionally,

we communicate messages meant to mislead them, meant to make them believe what we ourselves do not believe" (p. 163).

Others have offered more elaborate definitions which comprise the deliberate use of specific deceptive strategies. Miller and Stiff (1993) recognized deception as "message distortion resulting from deliberate falsification or omission of information by a communicator with the intent of stimulating in another, or others, a belief that the communicator himself or herself does not believe" (p. 92-93). Likewise, Buller and Burgoon (1994) described it in terms of information control. Specifically, deception happens "when communicators control the information contained in their messages to convey a meaning that departs from the truth as they know it" (p. 7-8).

In the final analysis, a common thread linking the majority of prior definitions that have been created for the term *deceptive communication,* has been that deception is theorized to happen when the individual coins a statement to another individual or group of individuals that differs from what he or she knows or believes to be true. Conceptualized as such, irrespective of the motives underlying the deceptive act (i.e., self- versus other-benefit motivations), deception is believed to take place insofar as the message sender transfers a message that is planned to mislead the other. Hence, messages that are created in service of protecting one's own image or the face-needs of the other or to defend the relationship; likewise, it will fit the definition of deceptive communication if it points the message receiver in a wrong direction, or a direction other than what is really known or believed to be true.

1.5 Summary

This chapter presented the findings from an extensive literature review in the field of intercultural communication and effectiveness from the distance communication. It also studied the present cross-cultural research in communication systems domain and introduced the theoretical concepts that contribute to this research.

One should take into consideration that it is possible, depending whether they are from various cultures, individuals may preferentially attend to verbal channels during social interactions. Moreover, individuals from various cultures tend to value different verbal skills in communication, and consequently, may be more attentive to the verbal channel during communication. It is the main reason why the attention to the aspect of culture and communication should be taken into account.

CHAPTER TWO

CULTURE AND COMMUNICATION

2.1 Introduction

The concept of culture seems to be significant. First, culture appears to help provide significance to events, object, and people – consequently making the world less enigmatic place, less puzzling. The influence of culture becomes routine and subconscious and as a result it makes one's life easier (Samovar et al*.,* 2017, p.34-35).

Cultural awareness combined with good communication appears to be a vital component in the contemporary world. One's values, priorities and practices are formed by the culture in which one grows. Comprehending other cultures is vital for intercultural communication. Consequently, intercultural communication does not seem to be an option, but a requirement for a person's survival (Meyer, 2006, p.293-294).

2.2 The importance of culture

As human beings, one has become more and more sensitive to cultural differences. For instance, civilization is retreating from *assimilationist perspective* (the concept that individuals should leave their native cultural ways). With some significant exceptions (e.g. hate speech, racism, sexism, homophobia, and classism) individuals are getting more focused on saying the right thing and eventually with forming a society in which all cultures can coexist and enhance one another (DeVito, 2011, p.19).

DeVito (2011, p. 19) believes that at present most countries are economically reliant on each other. Economy relies on individuals' capacity to communicate successfully across cultures. The considerable growth of communication technology has helped various cultures from around the world to integrate. Technology has made intercultural communication easy, practical, and widespread. It has provided opportunities that permit people to have a social network of friends from a wide range of different countries and cultures. The Internet has also contributed to making intercultural communication as easy as writing a note on your computer and sending it to a person from a different culture

in a different geographical place. It is therefore visible that communication is heavily inclined by the culture in which people are raised; culture is very important to communication, and having a cultural perspective helps in many practical purposes (DeVito, 2011, p.19).

Kendall (2001, p. 67) states that culture is indispensable for the existence of communication between individuals. Individuals are not equipped with information when born. They gain the knowledge of how to dress, behave, and eat through others around them. Thus, people acquire information about culture through interaction, observation, and imitation with the aim of playing a role as members of a specific group or within a particular culture. However, just as culture is indispensable for people, it is also significant for the continuance of societies.

2.3 Culture and society

Schaefer (2002, p.55) claims that culture is completely learned by socially transmitted customs, knowledge, material objects, and behavior. It comprises the ideas, values, customs, and artefacts (for example DVDs, books, and CDs) of groups of individuals. Sharing a similar culture allows individuals to describe the group or society to which they belong. A large number of individuals are said to have established a society when they live in the same territory, are comparatively autonomous of individuals outside their space, and contribute to a common culture.

Schaefer (2002, p.55) states that a society includes people who share a common heritage and culture. Members of the society acquire a precise culture and convey it from one generation to another. It is obvious that having a common culture also makes simpler day to day interactions. Being a part of a society also permits people to take certain cultural patterns for granted. For example, people assume that doctors will not disclose private information and that parents will be cautious when crossing the street with a small child. These are among the assumptions that replicate the basic values, beliefs, and customs of cultures as a whole (Schaefer, 2002, p.55).

2.4 Components of culture

Although the particulars of specific cultures differ widely, all cultures have shared non-material cultural components, for example, symbols, language, values, norms, religion, social organizations and history. (Kendall, 2001, p.72).

According to Gamble and Gamble (2010, p.95) a symbol represents something else. Signs and symbols can substitute certain messages when they are employed to classify and to direct attention to the things they designate. Symbols often tend to be based on likeness, metaphor, or comparison. As symbols appear to be independent of language, they can be employed to communicate across language barriers. Nevertheless, not all symbols are commonly accepted. Symbols are created in society (Jandt, 2010, p. 108).

Another very important component of culture is the norms that are culturally deep-rooted ideologies of suitable and unsuitable behaviors which, if violated, convey an overt or covert penalty (Chaney & Martin, 2004, p.10). Froemling et al. (2011, p.188) emphasize that groups or cultures create norms, or informal rules, for universal behavior and role expectations. Adherents notice group norms when someone disobeys a norm or makes an observation about it. Moreover, Verderber and Verderber (2008, p.228) mention that norms commence to be established early in the life of the group or culture. Norms develop, altered, and harden as individuals become acquainted with one another.

However, the acceptance of norms appears to be subject to modification as the political, economic, or social conditions of a given culture change. As the provision for a traditional norm deteriorates, individuals feel that they are allowed to violate it more often and more openly and are less likely to be punished for doing so (Schaefer, 2002, p. 62).

Jandt (2010, p.15) explains that values are also significant in shaping culture, as they are the feelings not exposed to discussion in the culture about what is right or wrong, good or bad, wanted or unwanted. Kendall (2001, p.77) confirms that values do not order which behaviors seem to be suitable and which ones are not, but they equip individuals with the standards by which they assess other individuals, objects, and actions. Subsequently individuals employ values to explain their behavior, they have a tendency to preserve their values as well.

Froemling et al., (2011, p. 238) confirm that most individuals across cultures share values of equality, freedom, honesty, fairness and justice. These values establish the ideals people employ to judge and change their beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. While individuals' actions may not always match their values, those canons yet provide guidance on what they believe and how they ought to act.

Kendall (2001, p.73) emphasizes that language is another important aspect of culture, as it is a collection of symbols that transfers ideas and permits individuals to think and communicate with each other. Both verbal