UNIVERSITY OF LATVIA
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES

NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION AND DECEPTION

NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION

1st Year, MSP
A. E. Rubene

Adviser: assoc. prof. S. Ozoliņa

Riga 2015

ABSTRACT

Deception goes hand in hand with human nature just as the pair of verbal and nonverbal communication. Though often it goes unnoticed as in the case of white lies, sometimes ability to uncover deceit proves crucial as in high stakes situations when reputations and even lives depend upon either the deceiving or detecting party's success. Studies of research materials on the nature of and cues to deception show that a correlation exists between an observer's ability to detect lies with higher accuracy rates and a better understanding of the channels and expressions of nonverbal behavior that might prove contradictory to verbal communication. Practical analysis of documentary case studies illustrates the application of theoretical knowledge to real life situations of serious lies told by politicians.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Lying is part of human life and it is generally acknowledged that 'people admit to deceiving others routinely, on the average of once or twice a day' (Frank and Svetieva, 2013: 121, referring to DePaulo, Kashy, Kirkendol, Wyer and Epstein, 1996). According to Knapp and Hall, the research questions that have captured sholarly attention focus on the correlation between behaviors and cognitive and emotional processes characteristic to liars in contrast to truth tellers and detection accuracy that results from close observation of nonverbal communication that accompanies verbal output. In this report, I shall examine the nature and types of deception as characterized by prominent researchers in the field in order to see how knowledge of nonverbal cues can aid in detecting lies leaked by public figures. In order to reach this aim, I will employ the methods of quantitative studies in comparative analysis of previous research materials and qualitative case studies of empirical samples.

In *Chapter 1*, I shall describe the shades of lies and reasons behind them to draw a liar's profile and gain insight into accuracy rates and methods used in detecting deception based on studies by Paul Ekman and Wallace V. Friesen, Bella M. De Paulo et al., Aldert Vrij, Maria Hartwig et al., Tim Cole, Gemma Warren, Elizabeth Schertler and Peter Bull, Mark G. Frank and Elena Svetieva, and M. L. Knapp and J. A. Hall.

Chapter 2 will provide an analysis of documentary case studies of lies excercized by Bill Clinton and Vladimir Putin.

1. THE NATURE OF DECEPTION

1.1. Truth versus deception

Telling the truth is at the basis of trust valued across cultures as a prerequisite to honest relationship. Yet, truth can be told from different viewpoints, thus becoming a part of narrative – edited and elaborated versions of individual perceptions and interpretations. In certain situations, telling the truth is considered to be rude and might prove dangerous. So, people are taught since childhood to silence unpleasant facts to avoid offence and master the art of white lies in order to spare the feelings of others, repress taboo desires and enhance socially acceptable and powerful self-images (De Paulo, 2003; Frank and Svetieva, 2013). As a result, distortion of truth is unavoidable as 'telling the whole truth […] is rarely possible' (B. M. De Paulo, 2003:105) and lies pervade the world irrespective of culture, being inherent in human nature that aims at gaining benefits through persuasion and influence of others (M. L. Knapp and J. A. Hall, 2010: 435).

This gives rise to ambivalence and deception where contradictory information is conveyed through verbal and nonverbal channels of expression. In both cases nonverbal cues signal important information and are crucial in decoding intentionally veiled messages or detecting deliberate lies respectively. According to Ekman and Friesen, 'The consciously ambivalent person […] conveys his message but in a form where alter is less likely to explicitly respond, and in a manner which will allow him to deny responsibility for it, or even to deny its occurrence' (1969: 104). Thus, conscious ambivalence is regarded as being close to deception with the intent of being caught and therefore appears in 'macro facial displays, postural cues, hand in space movements, and other forms of nonverbal activity which customarily receive attention from alter' (ibid.). As a result, ambivalence stands midway between truthful expression and deliberate deceit since the nonverbal channel is used to transmit an encoded message, i.e. the sender wants the receiver to perceive it though the content would not be socially acceptable if delivered verbally.

While conscious ambivalence can be employed in order to play with double meanings and is often present in courtship rituals, Ekman and Friesen argue that 'ambivalence in which one feeling or message is not conscious' is a signal of 'self-deception' where 'leakage and deception clues' can be observed (1969: 104). De Paulo et al., however, maintain that 'deception [is] a deliberate attempt to mislead others [whereas] [f]alsehoods communicated by people who are mistaken or self-deceived are not lies, but literal truths designed to mislead are lies' (De Paulo et al., 2003: 74). Moreover, as Vrij points out, 'People

have the tendency to make their stories sound interesting and coherent. If necessary, they will fill gaps in their memory by including some information that they do not actually remember but that they think makes sense and is probably true' (2008: 264). So, false memories and imagined events though distorting actual facts would nonetheless produce a truthful impression on the hearer because the speaker has come to believe in the veracity of misrepresented images (ibid.: 265). Consequently, Frank and Svetieva conclude that though '[o]ften the terms *deception* and *lying* are used interchangeably' a distinction between the two should be drawn (2013: 123). They argue that 'deception is the superordinate category, of which one subcategory is telling a lie [which] is always deliberate [and occurs without] *prior notification*' of the receiver in contrast to other subcategories of deception where the receiver is conscious of being deceived as in watching movies, 'bluffing in poker, or price negotiations' (ibid.). Since other authors use both terms as contextual synonyms where the features of lies pointed out by Frank and Svetieva seem to apply axiomatically also to deception, the terms will still be treated as synonymous in this paper.

1.2. Types, motives and contexts of lies

As there are gradations of truth that may ultimately morph into a clear deception, depending upon situational context and motives, there are distinct types of lies that are classified in relation to the consequences resulting from telling a lie as white lies versus serious lies. According to De Paulo et al., white lies are told 'about feelings, preferences, opinions, ordinary achievements and failures […], routine actions, plans, and whereabouts' (2004: 162). White lies are 'of little consequence' and regret, are hardly planned and told for 'benign' reasons to strangers and acquaintances to whom people 'feel less close emotionally' (ibid.: 147-8). So, white lies are more likely to be told by people in everyday situations with the aim 'to control the impressions that are formed of them' (De Paulo, 2003: 77) and for altruistic reasons if told to 'close relationship partners' (De Paulo, 2004: 148).

Serious lies, on the contrary, are characterized as being more carefully planned and perceived as threats, transgressions and betrayals therefore known also as high stakes lies that can endanger reputation, relationships and jobs. Serious lies are told to the closest people or bosses about affairs, misdeeds, personal facts, money and jobs, death and illness, and life stories (De Paulo, 2004: 162; 164). Consequently, serious lies are known to cause greater qualms, often resulting in feelings of guilt and remorse than white lies that are perceived as inevitable in daily social interaction and therefore easily forgotten. Serious lies occur at court or during police interrogations and are frequently told by patients, especially, psychiatric, to

doctors and relatives. However, according to De Paulo et al., serious lies are most commonly directed at 'parents, spouses and other romantic partners, best friends, and children' (2004: 164) because, as Cole indicates, these people 'have a difficult time detecting deception and tend to assume that the truth is being told' (2001: 108).

Thus, the type of lies people tell depends both upon the context of deception and the gullibility of the targets of lies. As Ekman and Friesen note, success in deceiving the other depends, first, upon 'the *saliency* of deception, the adoption of deceptive and detective *roles*' and, secondly, upon '*collaboration* or *antagonism* between ego and alter about the discovery or maintenance of deception' (ibid.: 91). It is due to saliency and motivation to succeed in their respective liar's or detective roles of either one or both of the parties involved in the deceptive situation that the stakes are high (ibid.) and a greater number of nonverbal cues to lying can be observed as a result of emotional involvement.

Ekman and Friesen draw attention to another classification of lies, making a distinction between alter-deception and self-deception. The first form of lies occurs when information is concealed from the other/s and appears in the form of inhibition and/or simulation that can be perceived either via deception clues that indicate that the person is lying or as a leakage that sheds light upon the content of the information intended to be withheld (1969: 89-90). Ekman and Friesen emphasize that 'Ego plans his behavior during alter-deception and is usually quite aware of what he wishes to conceal' by either 'cutting off communication entirely' or by 'pretending that nothing is being concealed while he carefully and selectively omits certain messages' (ibid.).

A trickier form of deception occurs when an individual subconsciously activates the defense mechanisms of the psyche, e.g. blocking, repression or dissociation, in order to avoid facing the truth of painful issues (Ekman and Friesen, 1969: 90). Cole reasons that self-deception often takes place in romantic relationships since 'individuals prefer not to see their partners' deceptive behavior because the cost of entertaining such a belief is relationally prohibitive' (2001: 125). He hypothesizes that 'truth bias would be more prominent in *voluntary interdependent* relationships' because it is hard to justify their being 'willingly involved with someone who is betraying them' (ibid.). In this case, others may be aware of deception cues while the self remains oblivious. However, as awareness of the conflicting feelings begins to emerge, the self may experience 'an uncanny feeling [and] severe anxiety' (Ekman and Friesen, 1969: 89-90) due to the possibly life-shattering consequences of disillusionment. Thus, deception among closely related people serves as an indicator of relational instability and psychological immaturity and, according to Cole, is used also to

‘restore autonomy’ and withdraw from unsatisfactory relationships that lack in reciprocity (2001: 109-10).

According to De Paulo et al., lies can be categorized also according to the motives behind them:

1) Entitlement – lies about forbidden but coveted behaviors;
2) Avoid punishment/blame – lies to avoid negative consequences;
3) Instrumental – lies to gain material rewards or personal pleasures and/or advantages;
4) Identity and self-presentation – lies to impress;
5) Protect self – lies to avoid embarrassment, confrontation or relationship conflict;
6) Hurt other – deliberate malevolence;
7) Protect other – lies to protect others from distressing information (2004: 152).

Since ‘serious lies often begin with behaviors that would be considered bad by significant persons in the transgressors’ lives’, research shows that the top three categories of lies are ‘instrumental, avoid punishment/blame and entitlement lies’ which are judged harsher by female respondents (ibid.: 166; 162; 164-5).

Cole, on the other hand, employs ‘a social exchange perspective’ and distinguishes ‘three interrelated explanations’ (2001: 108) for lies told to significant others:

1) Reciprocity – lies told due to ‘the perception that a partner is dishonest’, applied also when projecting doubts of honesty on the targets of lies ‘as a means of protecting self-esteem’ (ibid.: 118);
2) Avoiding punishment – deception used to ‘foster a positive image’ or in hope to avoid conflict (ibid.: 111);
3) Intimacy/attachment needs – manipulations, fabrications and concealment employed to manage distance and borders in relationships in the name of either independence or intimacy, resulting from fear of either commitment or abandonment (ibid.: 112-3).

So, serious lies originate due to psychological reasons and are connected with lack of dignity and low moral standards.

Knowing the motives, contexts and types of lies that can be encountered increases awareness of situations in which deception might take place and helps picture a liar’s profile that aids in sensing when to be on guard for nonverbal cues to deception. As a result, deeper understanding of the nature of deception might improve accuracy in lie detection.

2. NONVERBAL CUES TO DECEPTION AND ACCURACY IN LIE DETECTION

2.1. Nonverbal cues to lying

To begin with, it should be noted that there are no signals of lying that confirm deception as definitely distinct from truth (Frank and Svetieva, 2013: 124). As De Paulo et al. indicate, 'behaviors that are indicative of deception can be indicative of other states and processes as well', for example, anxiety, nervousness, shyness, or a case of genuine ambivalence (2003: 106). Likewise, cues typically related to deception, might in fact be specific to the transgression that has triggered the discrepancy between verbal and noverbal messages (ibid.: 105) because only lies 'that could spoil [the] identities [of transgressors], and when their success at lying was linked to important aspects of their self-concepts' deception cues were of sufficient significance whereas white lies might as well pass unnoticed on the background of the daily flow of information (ibid.: 104). Therefore, as Frank and Svetieva observe, 'Virtually all scientists agree that emotions and cognition are the main underpinnings for all behavioral clues to deceit' (2013: 124). However, Frank and Svetieva draw attention also to two less noted types of clues to deception – 'signs of strategic behavioral control and changes in instrumental movements' which stand for concealment and leakage cues respectively (ibid.: 125).

Ekman and Friesen were among the first who attempted to systemize signals of deception and introduced the categories of leakage and deception cues in 1969. They singled out three features of nonverbal cues that play an important role in lying, namely, sending capacity, external feedback and internal feedback. Sending capacity matters because the average transmission of time, the number of discriminable stimulus patterns and the degree of visibility differ across various nonverbal channels. External feedback gives account of the perceived and processed reaction of the other to nonverbal signals transmitted by the liar that the other makes known in the form of a verbal comment, gaze direction or imitative behavior. Internal feedback, on the other hand, is connected to the liar's conscious awareness of his actions, memories, cognitive processes and behavior patterns (Ekman and Friesen, 1969: 93-6). Assessing the correlation between the sending capacity of different nonverbal channels of expression and a liar's ability to control his nonverbal communication, Ekman and Friesen came to the conclusion that though face is the best sender and legs or feet are the worst while hands can be easily hidden, exactly 'the legs/feet, which have a limited repertoire of information, are a primary source of both leakage and deception clues' because the face

receives the most attention of both the sender and receiver in a communicative situation and consequently is much more guarded by liars than their legs and feet which usually remain out of the deceivers'focus (ibid.: 99).

As pointed out by Frank and Svetieva, 'there are only five families of behavioral clues found within [three] behavioral channels' that have the potential to indicate deception (2013: 125):

1) The facial channel that conveys facial expressions and eye movements, which Ekman and Friesen distinguish as affect displays that can take the form of:
    a. Micro affect displays – brief, barely perceptible fragments of full muscular movements;
    b. Macro affect displays – indicative of simulation when contradictory to micro affect displays;
    c. Eye contacts – revelations of interest in the shades of guilt and fear as opposed to confidence and candor (1969: 97);
2) 'The body channel, which includes manipulators, illustrators, emblems, posture, and other movements' (Frank and Svetieva, 2013: 125) of which Ekman and Friesen single out adaptors as more prone to betray lies because adaptors are developed during childhood, retained as habits and activated subconsciously in response to the environment as:
    a. Self-adaptors that master problems and needs;
    b. Alter-directed adaptors that manage interpersonal contacts;
    c. Object adaptors that are related to instrumental tasks (1969: 97-8);
3) The voice channel represented by paralinguistic features – 'the vocal style and vocal tone' (Frank and Svetieva, 2013: 125).

According to De Paulo et al., though all of the above mentioned nonverbal clues can be potent signals of deception, research results show that the predicted liar's profile differs from the profile proved. Though it has been assumed that liars tend to be less forthcoming, less compelling, less positive and pleasant, more tense and include fewer ordinary imperfections and unusual contents in their stories than truth tellers, in fact only pupil dilation, higher pitch in interactive contexts and blinking in non-interactive contexts have shown sufficient significance in research results as convincing indicators of deception (2003). This is due to the fact that, first, liars are aware of stereotypical clues that might betray them and therefore 'don't simply suppress all behaviors but strategically choose those they believe are associated with lying' (Frank and Svetieva, 2013: 133). Secondly, although 'higher cognitive load and extra mental effort tends to manifest itself [….] through a paralinguistic

array of behaviors such as longer speech latencies, increased speech disturbances, less verbal and vocal involvement, less talking time, and so forth' (ibid.: 127) and emotions like 'fear, distress, disgust, and contempt' are more frequent in facial expressions of liars and are often accompanied by 'increased manipulators, sweat, and body orientation more conducive to escape or avoidance' (ibid.: 129), these nonverbal cues should be treated with caution since they might be indicative of states and processes unrelated to lying. Consequently, 'the observer still has to figure out why this person is feeling that emotion' (ibid.: 132) and apply his/her knowledge of the nature of deception as opposed to various states of truth tellers in order to make sure that an overhasty conclusion has not been drawn.

Likewise, a number of cues previously strongly associated with lying have failed to prove being exclusive to deception. For example, although there 'is some evidence that liars press their lips more, […] it is uncertain as to whether this is to control an emotional reaction or whether it is an action […] that occurs when people think harder' (Frank and Svetieva, 2013: 127). Former 'red flag' indicators of lying like 'putting a hand over one's mouth, or touching one's nose or face' as well as reduced eye contact have not reached critical significance in latest researches (ibid.: 131-2). Moreover, only high stakes situations 'provide a more complete insight into the behavioral signals that may betray lying' (ibid.: 135) because serious lies in tense situations may generate clusters of tell-tale deception and leakage clues that only professional liars might be able to control, so that catching them in being deceitful would require knowledge of their individual 'distinct behavior pattern' that differs from their normal, truthful behavior (ibid.: 126).

2.2. Accuracy and methods used in lie detection

Accuracy in detecting lies is closely interlinked with beliefs of what nonverbal cues are characteristic to lying and individual gut feeling as to whether the other is truthful or deceptive therefore methods used in lie detection and research results they provide are of great importance in arriving at a better understanding of the nature of deception and a clearer picture of what liars actually do that might be incongruent with the deceptive verbal message they are trying to sell. According to Vrij, two types of settings are used by researchers: laboratory studies as opposed to field studies (2008: 50). Though both settings employ video footage and listening to audiotapes in order to analyze behavior and paralinguistic patterns, each has drawbacks that may undermine credibility of research results. Vrij states that 'only truthful and deceptive responses should be analysed which are truly comparable in all aspects other than the veracity status [in order that] differences in behavior between the truthful and

deceptive fragments be attributed to the fact that the person is lying' (ibid.). On his view, failure to produce such equivalent samples of analysis, especially in field studies, and the lack of real motivation to succeed or absence of feelings of fear and guilt in laboratory studies due to the participants being instructed what to tell account for the lack of convincing results that would clearly set apart deceitful behaviors from uncertain yet truthful presentations even though 'particular coding systems' such as lie detectors are employed to rate frequencies of various non verbal cues (ibid.: 50-2). Another reason why assessment of potentially deceptive communication is difficult is ingrained in the subjectivity of the human psyche that often jumps to 'illusory correlations': 'once observers have formed the impression that someone is lying, they then overestimate [for example] the amount of gaze aversion the alleged liar actually displays', thus perceiving 'evidence that in fact does not exist' (ibid.: 130).

As a result, it is not surprising that 'research on deception has consistently shown that people are poor lie detectors [reaching] accuracy levels [that] are rarely above 60%, where 50% is expected by chance alone' (Hartwig et al., 2002: 1). Hartwig et al. point out that since 'people have a tendency to be overconfident in their judgments […] lie-catchers rarely have a realistic perception of their own performance [and even] presumed experts are generally more confident […] than laypeople, but not more correct' (ibid.). In fact, they conclude that 'neither probing nor different levels of conversational involvement [commonly employed to test veracity, have] any effect on accuracy levels' (ibid.).

Warren, Schertler and Bull, however, maintain that 'although performance on the deception detection task was no better than chance, [their research shows that] performance for emotional lie detection was significantly above chance' in contrast to poorer results in case of unemotional lies (2009: 59) due to subtle expressions as facial affect displays that serve as leakage cues, especially when the stakes are high. Thus, their research proves 'the importance of taking the type of lie into account when assessing observers' decoding skills' (ibid.: 67).

While agreeing with other researchers on the average accuracy rates obtained, Frank and Svetieva outline also conditions that 'need to be met before one can truly assess accuracy in judgment': first, 'the individual being judged must display behaviors *relevant* to […] a person's truthfulness', secondly, these clues 'must be *available* to the judge', thirdly, 'the judge must actually detect' them, and, finally, 'they must be adequately *interpreted*' (2013: 136). Failure to meet any of the four conditions mentioned affects accuracy in the detection of deception, but ability to meet them all depends 'not [on] a single skill, but a skill composed of many subskills' in detecting the different types of nonverbal cues (ibid.: 137). Though Frank and Svetieva admit that 'it is possible to train people to be better lie catchers'

they also attest that ‘it is not exactly clear why [certain individuals] are better than others’ (ibid.). Their hypothesis is that talent in detecting lies might be fostered by ‘early upbringing in emotional situations’, vocational influence, ‘left-hemisphere brain damage’ and physical ‘abuse’ (ibid.).

So, though success in lie detection is possible and some individuals exhibit commendable results, due to the number of interrelated factors that must be taken into account when attempting to assess a potentially deceptive communicative case, over confidence and truth-bias often cause failure to recognize and correctly identify and interpret nonverbal clues in relation to the nature, motives and context of deception. Consequently, subjective factors and difficulties in obtaining credible and equitable research material for analyzing deceptive behavior result in relatively few verible conclusions that draw sufficient distinction between lies as opposed to other states and processes.

3. DECEPTION IN PRACTICE

In order to see how theoretical knowledge of nonverbal signals of deception can be applied in both detecting and creating lies, two documentary case studies will be analyzed as illustrations of lies told by prominent politicians.

3.1. Clinton's scandal

In 1998, a 'sex scandal between President Bill Clinton and a 22-year-old intern Monica Lewinsky' broke out and 'led to the impeachment of Clinton by the House of Representatives [though Mr. Clinton] was later acquitted on all impeachment charges of perjury and obstruction of justice' (Online 1, 2012). The first online material analyzed displays a comparison of Clinton's facial expression and tone of voice while telling a lie versus admitting the truth about his relationship with Miss Lewinsky. Already this brief clipping of samples exemplifies the striking difference in the demeanor of a remorseful truth teller as contrasted to a liar's profile who engages in high stakes lies in front of the whole country and is highly motivated to conceal the embarrassing truth that might severely affect his political career. Though in the video excerpt where President Clinton attempts to play the role of a truth teller the President attempts to maintain a confident poise, initial lip pursing and further affect displays of facial expressions of happiness and pleasure undermine his efforts because such feelings contradict the seriousness of the topic, especially given the high stakes situational context. In the excerpt where President Clinton does indeed tell genuine truth, on the other hand, his demeanor demonstrates adequate affect states of a macro facial expression of solemnity and a micro affect display of sadness in his gaze that match both the message transmitted and the context of discourse (ibid.).

The second documentary sample of President Clinton's behavior during an official interrogation in front of the Court of Justice provides a whole cluster of nonverbal leakage cues. Here, the stakes are even higher since, in addition to the public transmission of the interrogation, the President must swear to tell the truth and a lie detector is employed in assessing his performance. As a result, though the President tries to stay calm and maintain eye contact, he appears nervous already before the start of the interrogation. Apart from the affect displays discussed in the analysis of the previous sample, President Clinton soon starts fidgeting and cannot help a brief, guilty-looking gaze aversion. Moreover, he starts to move to and fro, thus nonverbally indicating with his whole body a wish to escape. As the interrogation proceeds, Clinton encounters difficulties to control his demeanor and touches his

chin with closely pressed fingers. In addition, lies leak also via the voice channel, in the form of increased speech disturbances and longer response latencies. Sweat becomes visible as light reflects from President Clinton's blushing face that changes over the course of the interrogation from initially micro-smiling positive affect display to an ultimate expression of the negative affects of guilt and remorse, followed by lip pressing and hesitation to answer the questions asked. Finally, a micro-affect display of surprise leaks truth when the President is asked to comment upon the particulars of cigar use in his illegal relationship with Miss Lewinsky which results in Clinton's refusal to respond and a micro-affect display of pleasure at the reminiscence.

3.2. Putin lies

The war in Ukraine and the persistent denial of Russia to admit its military involvement in the conflict zone has provided another famous and more recent example of lies told in the political arena open to global spectators. Since the context and topic of lies told by President Putin differ vastly from those presented by President Clinton, the range of deception cues observed in these online samples is smaller but as convincing because here not only the President's personal reputation is at stake but that of his country. Video-footage published on 12 December, 2014, clearly shows frequent lip pursing, indicating Putin's attempt to withhold information, fleeting gaze movements characteristic to concealment and guilt, longer speech latencies and gulping as the President of Russia swallows the truth about to escape his sealed lips (Online 3).

While the video-footage presented to the public in Online 3 focuses on the upper body of the President of Russia, Online 4 demonstrates close-ups of the lower body parts and additional telling excerpts of Putin's lies. Here, it can be observed that though the President conveys feeling of relaxation with his body posture, leaning back in the chair, his feet and legs are in a constant motion pointing away from the audience indicative of his repressed desire to be elsewhere. Similarly, inner tension leaks through Putin's perpetual flexion of fingers into a half-fist. Frequent lip licking betrays his increased level of anxiety signaling difficulties to master his facial expressions and emotions which ultimately break out via an interruption of a question, quick leaning forward as if in an attack on the interrogator, a higher pitch of voice and speech disturbances which shatter Putin's rehearsed image of calm and reserve (Online 4, 2014).

CONCLUSIONS

In order to see how close observation of body language can aid in discovering deception, relevant research materials were studied and examples of lying analyzed, depicting both the hidden nature of deception that varies across contexts depending upon multiple motives that result in different types of lies and the more visible leakage and deception cues that constitute a liar's profile. Though researchers admit that nonverbal cues to lying should be treated cautiously, practical analysis confirms their hypothesis that accuracy rates at detecting deceit increase when the observers are aware of the nature of lies and know where to look for deception and leakage cues. Moreover, documentary case study affirms Ekman and Friesen's theory of key leakage channels: in the case of Putin's lies, legs and feet gave away instantly what the President attempted to conceal via the facial channel of nonverbal expression in addition to the final increase of pitch attested by De Paulo et al. as one of the key cues to arousal indicative of lying if accompanied by other cues to deception. With President Clinton where lower body parts were not included in the video-footages, micro facial displays proved to be fatal as suggested by various researchers. Thus, it can be concluded that studies of nonverbal communication and deception are an important asset in detecting high stakes lies even when deception is exercised by prominent and professional politicians since the body never lies and even at best attempts of control, one cue or another will leak the truth verbally withheld.

REFERENCES

1. Cole, T. (2001) *Lying to the one you love: The use of deception in romantic relationships.* In *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships.* London: SAGE Publications, Vol. 18, No.1, 107-129.
2. De Paulo, B. M. et al. (2003) *Cues to deception*. In *Psychological Bulletin*. Vol.129, No.1, 74-118.
3. De Paulo, B. M. et al. (2004) *Serious Lies.* In *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*. Vol.26, No.2&3, 147-167.
4. Ekman, P., Friesen, W. V. (1969) *Nonverbal Leakage and Clues to Deception.* In *Psychiatry*, Vol.32, No.1, 88-106.
5. Frank, M. G. and Svetieva, E. (2013) *Deception*. In Matsumoto, D., Frank, M. G., Hwang, H. S. (eds.) (2013) *Nonverbal Communication. Science and Applications*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
6. Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L. A., Vrij, A. (2002) *Deception Detection: Effects of conversational involvement and probing.* In *Göteborg Psychological Reports.* Vol.32, No.2., 1-12.
7. Knapp, M. L., Hall, J. A. (2010) *Nonverbal Communication in Human Interaction.* Boston: Wadson.
8. Vrij, A. (2008) *Detecting Lies and Deceit: Pitfalls and Opportunities.* 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley.
9. Warren, G., Schertler, E., Bull, P. (2009) *Detecting Deception from Emotional and Unemotional Cues.* In *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*. Vol.33, 59-69.
10. Online 1 (2012) *Bill Clinton Lies to America "I did not have sexual relations with that woman"*. Available from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2QTPVe6-Pso Accessed 15 March.
11. Online 2. Available from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hv7zqakhy3y Accessed 15 March.
12. Online 3 (2014). *Putin lie about Crimea Ukraine News 21.12 2014.* Available from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9uyFD9bDZVc Accessed 15 March.
13. Online 4 (2014) *Vladimir Putin lies about Ukraine*. Available from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y-TLmgqb7dM Accessed 15 March.