Indian Journal of Extension Education
Vol. 57, No. 2 (April-June), 2021, (105-114)

ISSN 0537-1996 (Print)
ISSN 2454-552X (Online)

Perceived Deception in Upward Organizational Communication: An Examination of Information Manipulation Theory

R. Mittal[1]* and V. Randhawa[2]

ABSTRACT

The thrust of the study was to examine Information Manipulation Theory (IMT) during upward communication in an Indian organizational cultural context. To test IMT theory, stimulus material in the form of a hypothetical interactional situation between superior and subordinate was prepared and presented before the faculty of the academic organization for testing the efficacy of violated messages along the four dimensions of IMT i.e. Quantity, Quality, Relevance and Clarity. The results revealed that all the violations were perceived different than the baseline (honest) message along the respective dimensions. Further, results suggest that all violations were considered deceptive, though with varying degrees. Amongst all, quality violation was perceived as most deceptive while quantity violation was perceived as least deceptive form of information manipulation. Interestingly, the results were in conformity to preceding studies conducted to test the claims of the theory in western cultures and partially similar to those conducted in non western cultures. The study directs towards the need for multi situational and multidirectional research at international level for generalization of the theory across cultures.

Keywords: Information manipulation theory, Organizational communication, Organizational deception, Upward communication

INTRODUCTION

Organizational communication is the cornerstone for upbringing and grooming the environment of any organization. It is not possible to have good personal and professional relationships without effective information exchange. So, effective communication of information with coworkers/ colleagues is crucial and permanent challenge to the success of any organization. If this exchange is effective it results in increased productivity of the organization, even with the limited resources (Buchholz, 1993).

Complete, correct and effective communication along each direction of information flow i.e. downward, upward and horizontal along the workplace hierarchies is crucial for effective organizational functioning. If communication in all directions is satisfactory, the environment of the organization is bound to be conducive and smooth but opposite is also true if communicational is not congenial (Dansereau and Markham, 1987; Haskins, 1996). Observation and experience reveal that organizational communication process gets fouled up due to different motives, self construal and other reasons (Meese and Buchholz, 1993; Lindsey *et al.,* 2008; McMohan, 2012; Koles and Kondath, 2015). Sometimes, the employees get the message which is distorted due to omissions, losses, changes, additions, elaborations and adjustments, which leads to poor interpersonal relations,

[1]Assistant Professor, [2]Professor, Department of Extension Education and Communication Management, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana-141027, Punjab
*Corresponding author email id: rituhsee@pau.edu

hostility and conflicts in organizations which are detrimental to team work and morale. In downward communication, problem may occur due to unclear commands and instruction subordinates gets from their superiors. In upward communication, the potential danger lies in deliberate attempt at manipulating information by the subordinates while passing information to their superiors. They may report false or exaggerated information to save their skin or look good in the eyes of the administrators. In this context, Metts and Chronis (1986) summarized that 'people sometimes refuse to exchange the crucial information or indulge in manipulating the actual information via falsification, half truth and concealment and escape'. Result of a study by Lindsey *et al*. (2008) on power and deception at work place revealed that approximately 45 per cent of employees reportedly indulged in deception at work place. In specific, 51.28 per cent of subordinates reportedly deceived their superiors and 37 per cent of supervisors deceived their subordinates. Various other research studies also supported that in organizations; people at higher levels are less apt to lies as they have favorable perception of the system and that mostly it is the subordinate that lies to the supervisor. Barrick and Mount (1996); Deluga (1991) indicated that subordinates and less powerful people have motivation to lie to their superiors and often use deception to manage their supervisor's impressions. However, this might result in an anxiety-inducing situation in which deception detection is most likely. McCornack and Levine (1990) in the same line concluded that deception on the part of less powerful individuals appears to be more common but this differential power status might place subordinates in a dangerous position if their deception is detected. Similarly DePaulo *et al*. (1991) revealed that mostly lies go undetected, but if the lie told to authority is detected, repercussions could be serious such as demotion, punishment, rustication etc. It is widely understood therefore that deception occurs more frequently during upward communication in organizations rather than vice versa. Hence, the current study focused on capturing this phenomenon of violations in upward organizational communication using Information Manipulation Theory (IMT) founded by Steven A McCornack (1992).

BACKGROUND OF THE IMT THEORY

IMT explains deception as covert violation of Grice's conversational maxims i.e. quantity, quality, relevance and manner. Based on the work of Grice (1989), the Information Manipulation Theory proposes that in any given conversation there exists a set of basic reasonable assumptions about how transmission of information occurs. According to IMT, 'in order to make sense of what others say, we need to assume that sender is communicating cooperatively while exploitation of this presumption enables deception'. The theory suggests that 'violated messages function deceptively because they covertly violate the principles that govern conversational exchanges' (McCornack, 1992). According to him, 'deception is a phenomenon in which speaker exploits listener's expectations for disclosure, by covertly altering the information that is disclosed in terms of 'quantity' (via omission), 'quality' (via falsification), 'relevance' (via evasion) and/or 'manner' (via equivocation). Deceptive messages are deceptive in that, although they deviate from the principles underlying conversational maxims propounded by Grice, the departure remain unveiled. Listener is misled by the belief that speaker is behaving in a cooperative manner'.

In fact, IMT provided a powerful conceptual framework for addressing the observable variation in deceptive message design. The first empirical test of Information Manipulation Theory was conducted in USA by McCornack *et al.* (1992). Different deception provoking situations were generated and examples of deceptive messages were produced and analyzed. They found that manipulation of all four dimensions of IMT influence perception of message honesty. Though manipulation of 'quality' resulted in the 'most deceptive' messages, manipulation of 'quantity', 'clarity' and 'relevance' were also perceived as significantly deceptive as compared to baseline message. Though the theory was tested in western culture still it needed validation in non western cultures before providing its generalizability. Moreover, extension of any social theory between various country contexts needs to consider a variety of contextual and country specific perspectives (Perenyi, 2014). Thereby, several subsequent studies followed the original work of McCornack and his

colleagues to test the claims of the theory in different parts of the world. Murai (1998) investigated some of the IMT's predictions in Japan and results were consistent with the theory. Mittal and Randhawa (2014) in India and Yeung *et al.* (1999) in Hong Kong attempted to replicate IMT findings, outside the western cultures to represent the collectivist perspective as opposed to individual perspective of U.S. The results showed that messages violating 'quality' and 'relevance' were rated as deceptive while violation of 'manner' and 'quantity' were not. They further concluded that the results of the research were different from original study conducted in USA, perhaps because collectivists don't perceive violation along 'manner' and 'quantity' as deception. The experiment concluded that truthfulness of any message, acceptance of violations, the motivations for those violations and understanding of conversational maxim is dependent on cultural identity. IMT theory has also been investigated from an intercultural perspective. Mittal *et al.* (2014) concluded that quality violation was perceived as most deceptive form of Information manipulation although manipulation on other three forms of information manipulation is also prevalent. Lapinski (1995) examined the effect of 'self construal' and 'self benefit' and 'other's benefit' on ratings of the message honesty in Honolulu. The result indicated that independent individuals (individual perspective) tend to see 'quality' violation as less deceptive, while interdependent (collectivist perspective) tend to see 'relevance' violations as less deceptive. Based on these research studies it is widely understood that IMT offers a useful framework for understanding cross cultural differences and similarities in deception (Lapinski, 1995; McCornack *et al*., 1992; Murai, 1998; Yeung *et al*., 1999).

If we consider the relational and situational perspective, most of the research on deception in western as well as non western cultures has examined lie detection with children and in romantic relationships rather than perceptual and situational factors associated with deception in the workplace (Gordon and Miller, 2000; Seiter *et al.,* 2002). Recently, IMT has been investigated by few researchers in organizational cultural contexts. Hubbell *et al.* (2005) applied IMT to measure organizational deception and the results showed that each deceptive message violating Grice's conversational maxims are in practice in organizations and that at least three of the message violations accurately represent the expected dimensions. They identified 'quantity' violation i.e. withholding as the most acceptable while 'quality' violation i.e. lying/distorting as the least acceptable form in organizational deception. The findings provide support for use of this approach and its continued development to study and analyse the phenomenon of deception in organizational communication in a more comprehensive way. They further suggested that by using the IMT approach, seemingly disparate perspectives on deception can be brought together to represent a large literature base, upon which future research can be built. Similarly, Dunleavy *et al.* (2010) in support of Information Manipulation Theory concluded that deception is always frowned upon in the workplace. Co-workers who violate along quantity parameter are seen as more competent & possessing more character than those who violate along quality parameter. So, in organizations too, it was suggested that 'quality' violation is most deceptive form whereas 'quantity' violation is perceived as least deceptive form of Information manipulation. However, the experiment performed by Zhou and Lutterbie (2005) in China followed the tests of IMT and emphasized that best way to apply the principles of IMT across cultures is to take a multi dimensional, multi pronged approach. Indian organizations appear to have the most positive organizational climate when Koles and Kondath, 2015 compared the organizational climate of Hungry, Portugal and India. Results indicated that among the three countries Indian organizations appeared to have more positive organizational climate, with good human relations. Nevertheless actual deception in everyday conversation among organizational employees is understudied despite claims about its prevalence. The subjects of normative actions in conversation may be approached with a top down and bottom up approach. The researchers claimed that 'bottom up approach is an effective method for examining general patterns of deception across organizational cultures while top down can account for situational variation to explain deceptive behaviour pattern in order to create an applicable cross cultural IMT model'. Therefore current study examined deception in bottom up approach.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted at Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, using Descriptive survey research design to test the claims of the IMT theory. The participants were the full time university faculty. From the available list of 542 campus faculty members, two separate lists of 320 male and 200 female faculty members were obtained from the Registrar of the university. To give equal representation to both men and women fifty faculty members from each list were selected through systematic random sampling technique and in all 100 faculty members (n=100); with 88 Doctorate and 14 Master's level qualification were selected. The data was collected personally by the researchers using structured interview schedule which included stimulus material to test the claims of the IMT theory.

For the purpose of the study, stimulus material was developed which consisted of a hypothetical organizational situation and different message examples violated along each dimension of IMT. McCornack *et al.* (1992) semantic differential scale was used to evaluate the messages and test the applicability of Information Manipulation Theory. The methodology proceeded through following stages:

Formulation of situation and message examples (Stage I)

A deception provoking hypothetical organizational situation was generated based on 'Information Manipulation Theory'. The situation was followed by five types of messages viz: baseline message (true message), quantity violated message (telling half information), quality violated message (complete lie), relevance violated message (providing irrelevant information) and manner (providing vague information) violated message These five types of messages were basically the potential stimulus statements, peculiar to the situation. Further, three message examples for each type of violation as well as true messages were framed. Thus, there were 15 messages in all which were used as stimulus material (1situation x 5 message types x 3 message examples).

Selection of messages (Stage II)

Each of the 15 messages was coded by six communication experts from the disciplines of 'Home Science Extension and Communication Management' and 'Agricultural Journalism, Languages and Culture' who worked in two groups with three experts each. A session was held to discuss IMT theory and its conditions with the experts. They were asked to rate each variable i.e. 'quantity', 'quality', 'relevance' and 'manner' against four semantic differential scales using five point response format along the respective dimension of information manipulation as specified by McCornack *et al*. (1992). Ratings were accomplished along five point continuum, where score one (1) was assigned for no violation, three (3) for moderate violation and five (5) for an extreme violation. The values for which, each group of experts reached a consensus regarding each message example were calculated. Finally, the individual values assigned to each message example were calculated by averaging the scores given by both groups of experts. Out of three message examples for each type of violation, the two messages showing better degree of violation as per ratings of judges along the respective dimension were selected, thereby discarding one message example of each message type. In case of true message, messages showing better degree of truthfulness were selected. Thus, out of 15 message examples, 10 message examples i.e. 1 x 5 x 2 (1 situation x 5 message types x 2 message examples) were finally selected for introducing as stimulus material to the respondents. The judges were also requested to check the situation and responses with regard to the ambiguity, clarity of language, instructions and appropriateness of the response. Based on the judgment and suggestions of the experts, the necessary changes were incorporated.

Evaluation of messages (Stage III)

The researchers made two sets, each containing five message examples of each type for evaluation by respondents. These two sets were randomly assigned to 100 respondents in such a way that each set was evaluated by 50 respondents. The respondents were told to assess the plausibility of messages and rate the extent

to which the given response represents the four dimensions and message honesty on 5 point semantic differential scale. Given below is the situation followed by two sets of message examples used as stimulus material for the current investigation.

Hypothetical Bottom of Form

Situation used as stimulus material

Suppose 'X' is the In- charge of Teaching Reports of your Department. On March 22, 2014, the Department gets a circular to prepare Annual Report which is supposed to reach to the quarters concerned by March 28, 2014. The Head of the Department (HOD) marks that letter to 'X' with instructions to compile the report by March 25, 2014 for further transmission of the same in time. X' circulates that letter to other colleagues of the Department for submitting the requisite information immediately without mentioning the deadline. Next day, she receives the requisite information from all the colleagues except 'Y' and 'Z'. The colleague 'Y', who was out of station for two days, joins back on March 24, 2014 but fails to submit the information due to urgency of some pending tasks and submits the information the following day i.e. March 25, 2014. The colleague 'Z', who happens to be friend of 'X', also submits the information on 25th March. It so happens that in spite of getting information from all on 25th 'X' gets busy and fails to compile the information on that day. The next two days happened to be weekend. Thus 'X' compiles the report on 28th, 2014 and instructs the office to dispatch the information immediately to the quarters concerned. However, the office dispatches the information on 29th March. Meanwhile, the HOD gets a telephonic inquiry about the delay in sending the report. Therefore, the HOD calls 'X' in her office to ask the reason for delay.

Set I of message examples

'X' replied:

1. Y and Z submitted the information on March 25, 2014 and I being busy could not submit the information on that day. The following two days being holidays, I submitted the information on March 28, 2014. (baseline message)
2. I instructed the faculty to submit it immediately; even then, they submitted it according to their convenience. (quantity violation)
3. Only 'Z' colleague complied with my instruction and I had to wait to receive the information from others before compiling it. (quality violation)
4. Oh.... (showing like never heard) I am getting late for the class.....(relevance violation)
5. I think this is not a big deal; Information is seldom submitted in time. (manner violation)

Set II of message examples

'X' replied:

1. 'Y' and 'Z' submitted the information on March 25, 2014, the day on which I was supposed to present it to you. I was busy on that day and then happened to be weekend. Hence, I submitted it on March 28, 2014 (baseline message)
2. The report was submitted in time, the delay happened because of official inefficiency/apathy in dispatching. (quantity violation)
3. 'Y' submitted the information very late, so the delay occurred (quality violation)
4. Can this duty be assigned to somebody else as I am overloaded with the responsibilities? (relevance violation)
5. Majority of faculty and staff fail to comply with my instructions every time (manner violation)

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Dimension wise manipulation checks to compare differently violated messages against the honest message (research question 1)

The 'Information Manipulation Theory' says that messages which covertly violate Grice's Conversational Maxims are said to be deceptive. Before testing the theory i.e. checking whether the violated messages are perceived to be deceptive or not, it was necessary to find out whether respondents perceive the stimulus material (violated messages) as significantly different

from honest message or not. Hence, manipulation checks were employed. A series of tests were performed to determine whether the message examples coded as representative of the different types of information manipulation (violations) were perceived in the similar fashion by the respondents. To test this, respondents' evaluation of information within the manipulated messages was compared with respondents' evaluation of the information within the completely disclosive baseline messages (true/ controlled message). Results of the study showed that in all the cases, violated messages were significantly different from true message and hence, all violations were successful. Data in Table 1 depicted that in both message sets, messages involving manipulation of 'quantity' (mean = 3.93 and 3.55 respectively) were perceived less disclosive as compared to baseline 'honest' messages (mean = 1.42 and 1.38 respectively). Mann Whitney U test was applied to check the significance level of the difference. The z values for the comparisons were worked out to be 7.62 and 7.72 respectively for both set I and set II, both of which were significantly different at one per cent level of significance.

Further it is evident from the Table 1, messages involving manipulation of 'quality' in both sets (with average mean value of 4.71 and 4.52, respectively) were perceived less accurate as compared to baseline/ honest messages (mean = 1.18 and 1.16, respectively). Mann Whitney U test again showed that z values of the comparisons (9.05 and 8.70 respectively) were significantly different at one per cent level of significance. Similarly, messages involving violations of 'relevance' in both the cases (mean = 4.60 and 4.66, respectively) were perceived different from mean values of baseline messages (1.31 and 1.17, respectively) in terms of relevance of information to preceding discourse. Here, z values calculated for the comparisons were found to be 8.64 and 9.01, respectively which showed that there was significant difference at one per cent level of significance.

Finally, messages involving manipulation of 'manner' in each case (mean= 4.46 and 4.25, respectively) were perceived different from mean values of baseline messages (1.25 and 1.14, respectively) along the clarity dimension of the messages. Mann Whitney U test proved that z values for both comparisons were 8.66 and 8.86, respectively showing significant difference at one per cent level of significance.

Hence, the manipulation checks revealed that all the violations were successful. The results were similar to previous studies (McCornack *et al*., 1992; Murai, 1998; Yeung *et al.,* 1999) as all violations were found to be statistically different than the baseline/honest message at one percent level of significance.

Perceived message honesty of differently violated messages

Although all the violations were perceived to be significantly different from the baseline message, it was necessary to find out whether all violations were perceived to be deceptive or not. If the message violations are perceived as manipulations along respective dimensions but respondents don't consider

Table 1: Dimension wise manipulation checks for comparison of differently violated messages against the true message for hypothetical situation (n=100)

Measured Dimension	(Set I)			(Set II)		
	True (c)	Violated Messages	Z value	True (c)	Violated Messages	Z value
Quantity	1.42	3.93	7.62**	1.38	3.55	7.72**
Quality	1.18	4.71	9.05**	1.16	4.52	8.70**
Relevance	1.31	4.60	8.64**	1.17	4.66	9.01**
Manner	1.25	4.46	8.66**	1.14	4.25	8.86**

C - Controlled Mean Score Range: 1(No Violation) to 5 (High Violation)
**$p < 0.001$

them as deceptive, we can't say that "there are significant differences between various forms of information manipulation and the baseline/honest messages in terms of perceived message honesty" as per Information Manipulation Theory. To test this, all the violated messages were compared with the baseline message along honesty parameter. The results show that in both example sets, all violated messages were perceived as significantly different from true message in terms of honesty. Mann Whitney U test was worked out to see whether difference between perceived honesty of baseline message and all violated messages was significant or not.

The average mean scores on 'honesty' dimension for all the violated message examples were compared with mean of baseline message. The Table 2 depicts that in both example sets, messages involving manipulation of information along all the dimensions were perceived as significantly different from 'baseline' (true) message in terms of honesty. In example set I, message involving manipulation of 'quantity' (mean = 2.83), 'quality' (mean = 4.61), 'relevance' (mean = 3.71) and 'manner' (mean = 3.49) were perceived different from baseline 'honest' message (mean = 1.21) in terms of honesty. Mann Whitney U test was applied to check the level of significance statistically which showed that all violations i.e. 'Quantity' (Z value = 7.62), 'Quality' (Z value = 8.90), 'Relevance' (Z value = 8.45) and 'Manner' (Z = 8.31) were significantly less honest then baseline message at one percent level of significance. Among all dimensions 'Quantity' violation i.e. withholding some information was ranked first on honesty rating. It means withholding some information is perceived as least deceptive form of information manipulation. Violation on 'manner' dimension (lack of clarity) and 'relevance' violation i.e. changing the subject were perceived as second and third, respectively. Manipulation of 'quality' i.e. complete distortion of information is ranked fourth as per perceptions of respondents on honesty parameter. In other words, it implies that 'Quality' violation is perceived to be the most deceptive form of information manipulation.

Similarly, in example Set II of the situation, message involving manipulation of 'quantity' (mean = 2.79, Z value = 7.72), 'quality' (4.19, Z value = 9.18), 'relevance' (mean = 3.54, Z value = 8.63) and 'manner' (mean = 3.42, Z = 9.01) were perceived as highly significantly different from 'baseline' message (mean = 1.15) in terms of honesty at one per cent level of significance. Consistent to the results of example set I, 'quantity' violation i.e. withholding some information was ranked first among all violations on honesty rating i.e. perceived as least deceptive form of information manipulation in Set II. It means not providing complete information was considered comparatively least deceptive form of information manipulation. Violation on 'manner' dimension (lack of clarity) and 'relevance' dimension i.e. changing the subject were perceived as second and third, respectively while rating them on honesty scale. Manipulation of 'quality' i.e. complete distortion of information is perceived to be last on honesty parameter as compared to other dimensions. In other words, falsifying and complete fabrication is perceived as most deceptive form of information manipulation in second set, too. Because all violations were found to be significantly deceptive, hence, we can conclude that

Table 2: Perceived honesty of the differently violated messages by the faculty (n=100)

Message Types	Example Set 1			Example Set 2		
	Mean Score	Z value	Rank	Mean Score	Z value	Rank
Baseline (True)	1.21			1.15		
Quantity	2.83	7.62**	I	2.79	7.72**	I
Quality	4.61	8.90**	IV	4.19	9.18**	IV
Relevance	3.71	8.45**	III	3.54	8.63**	III
Manner	3.49	8.31**	II	3.42	9.01**	II

C - Controlled Mean Score Range: 1 (No Violation) to 5 (High Violation)
**$p < 0.001$

there are significant differences between the various forms of information manipulation and the baseline messages (true message) in terms of perceived message honesty during upward communication. Since all the violated messages were perceived as deceptive messages, hence, the study revealed that 'Information Manipulation Theory' is applicable in Indian organizational context.

DISCUSSION

The results showed that all violations i.e. quality (falsification), quantity (omission), relevance (evasion) and manner (equivocation) were perceived to be significantly deceptive as compared to honest message. In other words, the current findings suggest that manipulation of information along any of the four dimensions of IMT influenced message deceptiveness in an Indian Organizational cultural context. The results are similar to previous studies conducted by various researchers (McCornack *et al*., 1992; Lapinski, 1995; Jacobs *et al*., 1996) who tested IMT in western cultures. However, interestingly the results varied from studies conducted in non western cultures (Yeung *et al*., 1999; Zhou and Lutterbie, 2005). Yeung *et al.* (1999) who reported only quality and relevance were rated as more deceptive than the baseline messages suggested that the differences could perhaps be owing to situational, directional and cultural differences. They tested IMT using only one situation i.e. 'Committed Chris dating situation' with one set of message examples. They further inferred that a dating situation (romantic relationships) might have reduced applicability and so further studies incorporating different situations would be necessary to test the reasons for differing perceptions. Zhou and Lutterbie (2005) in their study in non western cultures also proposed that best way to apply the principles of IMT across cultures is to take a multidirectional and multi prong approach. The current study therefore studied an upward communication situation in an academic organization. It is attempted to test whether upward communication in an organizations is perceived to be deceptive when it is not complete, correct, relevant and clear which is a necessary condition for smooth functioning and overall productivity of the organization. Moreover, all the respondents in the current study were from academia that could make out the importance of each conversational maxim in an organizational context. This perhaps explains the reason that our respondents perceived all violations as deceptions, though, with a varying degree.

If we compare the data signifying difference in deceptiveness among various forms of violations, then in all the example sets, violation of 'Quality' emerged to have been considered most serious or most deceptive form of information manipulation. Putting another way, providing inaccurate information or falsifying information has been perceived as the most deceptive form of manipulation. This is in conformity with other studies conducted in western as well as non western cultures (Jacobs *et al.,* 1996; Levine *et al.,* 2002; McCornack *et al*., 1992; Yeung *et al.,* 1999; Zhou and Lutterbie, 2005) which concluded that 'Quality' violation consistently embodies the intended manipulation very effectively. 'Relevance' violation i.e. changing the subject was perceived as more deceptive as compared to 'Manner' and 'Quantity' violations but less deceptive than Quality violation. The results were again similar to few studies (McCornack *et al*., 1992; Yeung *et al*., 1999; Zhou and Lutterbie, 2005) which revealed that relevance violation is rated second most deceptive type of violation. Violation on manner dimension (lack of clarity/ambiguity while exchanging information) was rated as third on deceptiveness scale. The results are similar to studies in western cultures (Levine *et al.,* 2002; McCornack *et al*., 1992) and non western cultures (Murai, 1998) but contradictory to some studies conducted in non western cultures which concluded that manner violation was not perceived as deception (Yeung *et al.,* 1999; Zhou and Lutterbie, 2005). Data reveal that Quantity violation i.e. withholding some information was perceived as least deceptive form of Information Manipulation. This could be due to the reason that in quantity violation, communicator shares at least some part of the honest information and thereby academicians considered telling half truth i.e. giving incomplete information as a better option over giving wrong or vague information. Further, academicians believed that it is better to give ambiguous information rather than telling irrelevant tales or concocting irrelevant stories. The

deception ratings in quantity violation were similar to almost all deception studies available which revealed that quantity violation is least deceptive form of deception.

CONCLUSION

The current study attempted to test bottom up approach and to test the claims of the theory. Further studies can check if there is any difference in results when transfer of information is Top-down. The study serves a strong testimonial to the utility of IMT for addressing deception in organizational culture where deception can further result in non sharing of information which further impedes the productivity of the organization. The findings have implications for managers/superiors and authorities of large organizations for analyzing and promoting deception free communication exchange among superiors and subordinates. In future studies can be made to assess the prevalence of deception using the framework of the current study and reasons thereof. Such studies may suggest some model or strategy for discouraging deceptive behavior, create open communication environment lower hierarchical levels so that they are not compelled to deceive. The potential of IMT can be used to improve organizational culture and check information manipulation among employees of various cultures and civilizations.

Paper received on : January 18, 2021
Accepted on : March 16, 2021

REFERENCES

Barrick, M.R. and Mount, M.K. (1996). Effects of impression management and self-deception on predictive validity of personality constructs, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **81**(3), 261-272.

Buchholz, W. (1993). Open communication climate. In "Contemporary Business Communication", Boone, L.E. and Kurtz, D.L. (eds.). Prentice Hall, India. Available at: www.atc.bentley.edu/faculty/wb/printables/opencomm.pdfý.

Dansereau, F. and Markham, S.E. (1987). Superior - subordinate communication: multiple levels of analysis. In "Handbook of Organizational Communication", Jablin, F.M., Putnam, L.L., Roberts, K.H., Porter, L.W. (eds.). Sage Publications, California.

Deluga, R.J. (1991). The relationship of upward-influencing behaviour with subordinate-impression management characteristics *Journal of Applied Psychology*,21(14), 1145-1160. doi:10.1111/*j*.1559-1816.1991.tb00463

DePaulo, B.M., LeMay, C.S. and Epstein, J.A. (1991). Effects of importance of success and expectations for success on effectiveness at deceiving, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* **17**, 14-24.

Dunleavy, K.N., Chory, R.M. and Goodboy, A.K. (2010). Responses to deception in the workplace: perceptions of credibility, power, and trustworthiness, *Communication studies*, **61**, 239-255. doi:10.1080/10510971003603879

Gordon, A.K. and Miller, A.G. (2000). Perspective differences in the construal of lies: is deception in the eye of the beholder? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **26**(1), 46-55. doi: 10.1177/0146167200261005

Grice, P. (1989). Study in the way of words, Harward University Press, England.

Haskins, W.A. (1996). Freedom of speech: construct for creating a culture which empowers organizational members, *Journal of Business Communication*, **33**, 85-98.

Hubbell, A.P., Chory. R.M. and Medved, C.E. (2005). A new approach to the study of deception in organizations, *North American Journal of Psychology*, **7**(2), 171-180.

Jacobs, S., Edwin, J.D. and Dale, B. (1996). Information Manipulation Theory: a replication and assessment, *Communication Monographs*, **63**, 70-82.

Koles, B. and Kondath, B. (2015). Organizational climate in Hungry, Portugal and India: A cultural perspective, *Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Community*, **30**(2), 251-259.

Lapinski, M.K. (1995). Deception and the self: a cultural examination of Information Manipulation Theory, Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Hawaii, Honolulu. Available at: *www.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468*-2958.2003... x/pdf

Levine, T.R., Lapinski, M.K., Banas, J., Wong, N.C.H., Allison, D.S., Endo, K. and Anders, L.N. (2002). Self Construal, self and other benefit, and the generation of deceptive messages, *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, **31**(1), 30-46.

Lindsey, L., Dunbar, N.E. and Russell, J. (2008). Risky business or managed event? Power and deception in the workplace. *Proc. Annual Meeting International Communication Association, Montreal, Canada.* Available at: http:// citation.allacademic.com/metal/p234081_index.html

McCornack, S.A. (1992). Information Manipulation Theory, *Communication Monographs*, **59**(1), 1-16.

McCornack, S.A. and Levine, T.R. (1990). When lies are discovered: emotional and relational outcomes of discovered deception, *Communication Monographs*, **57**(2), 17-29.

McCornack, S.A., Levine, T.R., Solowezuk, K.A., Torres, H.L. and Campbell, D.M. (1992). When the alteration of information is viewed as deception: an empirical test of Information Manipulation Theory, *Communication Monographs*, **59**(1), 119-138.

Meese, N. and McMahon, C. (2012). Knowledge sharing for sustainable development in civil engineering: A systematic review, *Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Communication*, **27**(4), 437-449.

Metts, S. and Chronis, H. (1986). An exploratory investigation of relational deception. Proc. Annual Meeting International Communication Association. Chicago IL.

Mittal, R. and Randhawa, V. (2014). Information Manipulation Theory: A new approach to study organizational deception during interpersonal communication, *Journal of Research*, **51**, 305-309.

Mittal, R., Randhawa, V. and Javed, M. (2014). Testing the applicability of Information Manipulation Theory (IMT) in Indian organizational context, *Research Journal of Social Science and Management*, **4**(9), 25-32.

Murai, J. (1998). Perceived deceptiveness of verbal messages: an examination of Information Manipulation Theory, *Japanese Journal of Psychology*, **69**(5), 401-407.

Perenyi, A. (2014). Are theories applicable across different cultures? A cross national comparative analysis through the lens of firm life cycle theory in the ICT factor, *Journal of Knowledge*, *Culture and Communication*, **29**(3), 289-309.

Seiter, J.S., Bruschke, J. and Bai, C. (2002). The acceptability of deception as a function of perceiver's culture, deceiver's intention and deceiver-deceived relationship, *Western Journal of Communication*, **66**(2), 158–180.

Yeung, L.N.T., Levine, T.R. and Nishiyama, K. (1999). Information Manipulation Theory and perceptions of deception in Hong Kong, *Communication Reports*, **12**(1), 1-11.

Zhou, L. and Lutterbie, S. (2005). Deception across cultures: bottom up and top down approaches. Proc. IEEE International Conference on Intelligence and Security Informatics, Atlanta, USA.