

08-29-16

due: sep -13

Abstract Assignment

Choose a research article from a scholarly journal (communication journal). Prepare a summary of the article in your own words using the format below.

APA Citation

Attach a copy of the article

Author's Questions/ Hypothesis

end of review of literature

Description of Research

Quantitative articles.

Methodology:

Survey, experiment, naturalistic

Results of Research

what they found

Conclusions Drawn from Research

ABSTRACT

Full Article Citation (APA):

Burgoon, J. K., Dunbar, N. E., & Ramirez, A. (2003). The Effects of Participation on the Ability to Judge Deceit. *Communication Reports*, 16, (1), 23-33.

Author's Questions/Hypotheses:

Accurate judgment of deception is related to the role of the participant (whether they are observers or participant-receivers). In this study, the authors predicted that participant-observers are less accurate in detecting deception than observers.

Description of Research:

Sixty-four students (half male, half female) were included in the research portion of this study. Half of the students were assigned the participant role, and the other half were assigned the role of observer. The participants were further designated as sender or receiver. The participants had to interact with a same-sex student, which they weren't acquainted with prior to the study and were from another course. The observers had to watch a videotape of these participants' and same-sex unacquainted students' interaction.

Prior to the interaction, the participants had to review a list of conversational topics and received their instructions. The senders were told to deceive on two of four target questions in whatever way they wished. These deceptions were unknown to the receivers and observers. The topics were discussed between the participants until they felt they had fully understood each other's responses. Because two of the four topics were deceptive, the responses were counterbalanced between truthful and deceptive.

After the sessions had been recorded, participants had to observe two of the questions they had discussed with their partner, one being deceptive and one being truthful. Observers watched the whole video, but then were asked to comment on the same questions observed by the participants. Participants and observers then completed written post-measures (Likert-type scales for participants and Relational Communication Scale) after watching the questions to ensure that their responses pertained only to those questions rather than the whole conversation. After this was done, an analysis was drawn.

Methodology:

The research conducted in this study was quantitative. The authors used scales such as the 11-point Likert-type scale to review deception manipulation, the Relational Communication Scale to analyze involvement, dominance, pleasantness, rapport/similarity/trust, expectedness, competence, and character, an absolute discrepancy score to judge accuracy of deception detection, and Multivariate Analysis of Variance. Because all of these scales were objective to the authors and were number-oriented, the results could be measured and therefore qualifies as a quantitative study.

Results of Research:

All four of the researchers' hypotheses were supported. Participant-receivers were found to judge senders more favorably than observers. Participant-receivers judged participant-senders' communication style as more expected than the observers did. Participant-receivers were found to hold more favorable social judgments regarding credibility of the senders than did the observers. Finally, participant-receivers were found to be less accurate in deception detection than were the observers. From these results, many conclusions can be drawn.

Conclusions Drawn from Research:

From this study, researchers concluded that there is a relationship between conversational participation and how communicators are judged regarding accuracy in the truthfulness of their messages. Receivers judged senders more favorably and the interaction more expected than observers did. This conclusion supports Expectancy Violations Theory, in that if the behavior of the sender is consistent or positively exceeds the expectations of the receiver, then the sender is viewed more positively. Observers were less positive in their judgment of the senders because they viewed the session as less expected than those participating.

Senders were regarded as more credible by receivers than by observers. This shows that senders engaged in the session with a stronger positive bias than the observers. This bias was enhanced because of the interpersonal interaction, whereas the observers, who were not able to engage, were not able to feel this. However, observers were more accurate at detecting deception than the receivers due to their (observer's) lack of or less positive bias.

Overall, the study supports the belief that the role of participation plays a strong part in deception detection. The judgments between receivers and observers vary to a point where one can conclude that detection of deception is more accurately perceived by observers. Therefore, deception can be better detected by an observer, rather than a person engaged in the communication session.