The language of lies

B.D. Bond, A.Y. Lee (2005). **Language of lies in prison: linguistic classification of prisoner's truthful and deceptive natural language.** *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 19* (3), 313–329.

How do natural language users design their communication in order to disguise the fact that they are lying? In an experiment people (prisoners) were shown a video and were given 30 seconds to think of what they would tell to somebody else about what they had seen. Their task was to tell three lies and three truths, but they could choose when they wanted to lie or tell the truth. Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count software was used to code truthful and deceptive words in prisoner's natural language. Two models were used to describe the data. One model (called NP) indicates that lies contain fewer self-references, other references and exclusive words, and higher numbers of negative emotion and motion words. The other (RM) predicts higher sensory, spatial, temporal and effective terms for truths, and more cognitive mechanism words for lies. The ability of both software programs to detect lies was compared to each other as well as compared to the ability of humans to detect lies in the prisoners' stories. Data show that even the best model (RM) still incorrectly classifies about 30 % of speakers' statements, which is about similar to the lie detection rate of humans in this experiment.

(Bregje Holleman)

Discourse in organizations

D. Grant (2005). **Discourse analysis and the study of organizations.** *Text, 25* (1), 37–66.

The study of organizational discourse has been approached from two different perspectives: the discourse analysis trend originating from linguistics, and the organizational studies approach with its foundations in organization and management theory. Grant's article gives an overview of the latter in a journal mostly devoted to the former in order to help bridge the gap between organizational discourse studies (ODS) and organizational discourse analysis (ODA). ODS emerged from a need to shift away from the holistic analysis of organizations and to take a cultural perspective to account for individuals' actions. In opposition to ODA that first examines discourse in terms of empirical manifestation and regularity, ODS considers discourse first as a resource that is used creatively and opportunistically for the definition of our identity as social-organizational beings. ODS can be categorized along five dimensions. The first dimension differentiates between theoretical studies oriented towards the philosophy of social organization and representation, and studies based on empirical data to demonstrate the unstable nature of organization. The second dimension opposes studies that are predominantly language focused and studies that examine a larger scope of meaning-making aspects. The third dimension concerns the goal of the study: is it to identify discourse patterns in the organization, or to look at how possible it is to go beyond these patterns and thus bring organizational change? The fourth dimension contrasts discourse as the effect of thinking