TPM Vol. 32, No. S1, 2025
ISSN: 1972-6325
https://www.tpmap.org/

THE INTERPLAY BETWEEN ACADEMIC COMMUNICATION AND SPEECH MANIPULATION: A PSYCHOMETRIC ANALYSIS

NADİR MAMMADLİ
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9233-4873
LİNGUİSTİCS INSTİTUTE NAMED AFTER I.NASİMİ OF AZERBAIJAN NATİONAL ACADEMY OF SCİENCES, BAKU, AZEBAİJAN

KONUL HABİBOVA
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8502-229X
LİNGUİSTİCS INSTİTUTE NAMED AFTER I.NASİMİ OF AZERBAIJAN NATİONAL ACADEMY OF SCİENCES, BAKU, AZEBAİJAN

Abstract Academic communication is grounded on the principles of clarity, honesty, and the open exchange of knowledge. This article explores the complex interplay between academic communication and manipulative speech tactics, bringing a psychometric perspective to bear on this phenomenon. In this stydy is examined how psychometric methodologies — such as validated communication style inventories and content analysis techniques — can be applied to detect and measure manipulative tendencies in academic contexts. An analysis of existing instruments (e.g., scales of communication style *impression manipulativeness*, Machiavellianism, and classification schemes for research spin) is presented to assess their utility in studying speech manipulation in academia. Ethical considerations are discussed, emphasizing the importance of maintaining trust and integrity in scholarly communication and the potential consequences of manipulative practices. Authors suggest recommendations for improving communication in academic environments, including training in ethical persuasion, greater transparency in reporting, and the development of tools to identify and mitigate manipulative discourse. This work highlights the need for continued vigilance and methodological innovation to ensure that academic communication remains both effective and ethically sound.

Keywords: Academic communication; Speech manipulation; Communication style; Manipulative practices; Manipulative discourse.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Nadir Mammadli, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Linguistics Institute named after I. Nasimi of National Academy of Sciences, H. Gavid Ave., 115, AZ1073 Baku, Azebaijan. Email: nurlanl959@gmail.com

Academic communication is the cornerstone of knowledge dissemination in research and higher education. In theory, scholarly discourse is governed by norms of truthfulness, clarity, and objectivity, allowing researchers and educators to share findings and ideas in a manner that advances collective understanding. In practice, however, academic communication often involves persuasive elements – scholars strive to convince readers of the significance of their work, instructors seek to engage students, and grant writers aim to persuade funders. This inherent persuasive aspect opens the door to speech manipulation – the use of language and communication tactics to influence others in ways that may distort or misrepresent the underlying truth. The interplay between legitimate academic persuasion and manipulative speech is a critical area of concern, as it touches on the integrity of scientific literature, the trust within academic communities, and the ethical responsibilities of scholars.

Recent years have witnessed growing attention to subtle forms of manipulation in academic communications. One widely discussed example is “research spin,” defined as the manipulation of language to potentially mislead readers from the likely truth of the results (Boutron et al., 2010, p. 2057). Researchers may, for instance, highlight positive or statistically significant findings while downplaying nonsignificant outcomes, thereby portraying results as stronger than justified (Bastian, 2016). Studies in biomedical fields have documented a concerning prevalence of spin. A 2024 scoping review in dentistry found that 30% to 86% of published studies showed some form of spin in reporting (Boutron, 2020, p. 432). Spin can take many forms, from selective reporting of outcomes to using biased or persuasive language that misleads readers (Boutron, 2020, p. 433). Regardless of intent, the effect is to present a distorted picture of research findings, which in turn can mislead readers who lack the time or expertise to detect the bias (Bastian, 2016). While spin is one manifestation of speech manipulation in academia, others include exaggerated claims in

conference talks, and also strategic framing of hypotheses after results are known (HARKing), overly complex jargon intended to impress rather than inform, or even deceptive interpersonal communication in academic settings (such as a mentor giving misleading feedback for personal motives).

The relevance of studying speech manipulation within academic communication cannot be overstated. Science and scholarship thrive on trust: the credibility of academic work depends on accurate, honest communication of methods and results. When researchers engage in manipulative reporting or rhetoric, it can erode trust in scientific findings and impair evidence-based decision making (Boutron et al., 2010). For example, spin in clinical research has been shown to mislead clinicians and patients, sometimes with serious real-world consequences. One study noted that oncologists who read spun abstracts were more likely to overestimate a treatment's efficacy, potentially putting patients at risk (Boutron & Ravaud, 2018). Moreover, manipulative academic communication can contribute to the "replication crisis" by overstating results that later fail to reproduce, and it can hamper scientific progress by entrenching false beliefs (Bastian, 2016). Ethical breaches like data falsification or plagiarism are well-recognized forms of misconduct, but the murkier gray-zone of manipulative speech - exaggeration, selective reporting, and rhetorical sleight-of-hand - also warrants scrutiny. Some scholars even question whether spin should be considered a form of scientific misconduct, since it involves misleading and manipulation even if not as overt as data fabrication (Boutron et al., 2010).

In this context, researchers in psychology and communication have begun to examine how psychometric methods might help detect and understand manipulative communication in academia. Psychometrics – the science of measuring psychological phenomena – offers tools to quantify subtle attributes of communication, such as an individual's propensity to mislead or the characteristics of messages that signal manipulation. By developing reliable measures of these constructs, one can study speech manipulation systematically: What motivates it? How prevalent is it across fields or contexts? Can certain patterns in language be objectively identified as manipulative? And importantly, how can interventions be designed to reduce such practices? This article aims to synthesize current knowledge on these questions. We will lay out a conceptual framework for considering academic communication and speech manipulation, then adopt a psychometric perspective to explore how this phenomenon can be measured and analyzed. We review existing instruments and methodologies that shed light on manipulative communication – from personality scales that capture manipulative traits to content analysis schemes for detecting biased reporting – and evaluate their applicability in academic settings. Throughout, we discuss the ethical implications of both the phenomenon (speech manipulation) and the methods used to study it, recognizing the delicate balance between persuasive advocacy for one's ideas and the obligation to maintain honesty and transparency. Finally, we outline practical steps and recommendations for improving academic communication, leveraging insights from psychometrics to foster an environment where scholarly dialogue remains both persuasive and principled.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Academic Communication: Academic communication encompasses the myriad ways in which scholars convey information and ideas, including written genres (journal articles, monographs, grant proposals), oral communication (conference presentations, lectures, seminars), and even digital discourse (emails, academic social media, online forums). This form of communication is typically characterized by certain expectations: claims should be supported by evidence, reasoning should be transparent, and language should aim for clarity and precision. There is also a communal norm of honesty or sincerity in academic discourse – often described as a "norm of truthfulness." Philosophers of communication argue that even ordinary conversation is undergirded by a cooperative principle that assumes sincerity and relevance (Grice's maxims). In academic contexts, this expectation is heightened by formal peer review and community standards. Researchers are expected not only to avoid outright falsehoods but also to provide complete and balanced accounts of their findings (e.g. discussing limitations, reporting all relevant results) in order to advance knowledge. Academic communication, however, is not devoid of rhetorical strategy. Scholars must persuade readers of the importance of their work and interpret data in light of theories. As such, academic writing often contains persuasive elements – careful wording, emphatic highlighting of significant results, hedging of uncertain findings, and so on – which are acceptable and even essential to scientific argumentation when done in good faith. Meanwhile, the line between acceptable persuasion and unethical manipulation can be thin, making a clear framework necessary.

Speech Manipulation: We define speech manipulation in the context of academic communication as any intentional attempt by a communicator to influence the beliefs or actions of others through message strategies that mislead, distort, or otherwise exploit the norms of cooperative communication. This definition draws on general theories of manipulative communication in psychology and linguistics. For instance,

Reboul offers a broad definition: "*manipulation in linguistic communication occurs when a speaker benefits by inducing a hearer – through communication – to believe or do something that the hearer would not otherwise, in a way that primarily benefits the speaker*" (Reboul, 2017). Crucially, such manipulation often involves deception or omission and typically succeeds best when the audience does not recognize the manipulative intent (Reboul, 2021). In academic terms, the "benefit" to the manipulator could be intellectual (e.g., getting one's hypothesis accepted, bolstering one's reputation) or material (securing funding or publication). The "cost" to the hearer might be accepting a false or exaggerated claim, or making a poor decision based on skewed information – though, as Reboul notes, manipulation *need not always harm the hearer* to count as manipulation (Reboul, 2017). What distinguishes manipulative speech from ordinary persuasive communication is the element of misleading intent or effect. Persuasion becomes manipulation when it undermines the informed autonomy of the audience – for example, by concealing relevant information, using logical fallacies, or appealing to emotions in a way that bypasses reasoned judgment.

Within academic communication, speech manipulation can take several forms along a spectrum of severity. On the most egregious end lies outright deception, such as falsifying data or fabricating references; these are clear violations of academic integrity (and fall outside the subtle "speech" focus, as they are direct data manipulation). Moving toward subtler forms, we encounter selective reporting and misrepresentation – for example, an author might report only the experiments that "worked" and omit those that failed, or claim a causal implication that the data do not truly support. An influential framework here is Information Manipulation Theory (IMT), which conceptualizes deception as arising from covert violations of Grice's conversational maxims (Quantity, Quality, Relevance, Manner). According to IMT, deceptive messages "function deceptively because they violate the principles that govern conversational exchanges" (McCornack et al., 2014, p. 350). In academic writing a similar analysis can be applied: an author might violate the maxim of Quality by making a claim that isn't fully true (or is overstated beyond the evidence), the maxim of Quantity by withholding important results or methodological details, Relevance by discussing tangential findings that distract from a null result, or Manner by obscuring meaning with jargon. Empirical studies confirm that when people manipulate information along these dimensions, their messages are indeed perceived as more deceptive (McCornack et al., 2014). Academic examples abound: failing to report a failed replication violates Quantity, declaring a hypothesis "confirmed" when results were marginal or exploratory violates Quality, emphasizing a secondary positive outcome when the primary outcome was null is a Relevancy dodge, and couching a tenuous claim in impenetrable language might be a Manner violation intended to forestall critique.

Another theoretical perspective is the distinction between lying and misleading. Academic communication rarely involves bald-faced lies (which would be easily caught in peer review or by replicators). Instead, problematic manipulation often involves *misleading with technically true statements*. A researcher can "spin" an outcome by stating facts that are literally true but create a false impression by virtue of what is left unsaid or how they are framed (Reboul, 2021). For example, an author might write, "Our treatment led to improvement in 60% of patients," which is true, but neglect to mention that an equal 60% of the control group also improved – leading readers to incorrectly infer the treatment's efficacy. This aligns with what Reboul (2021) calls "truthfully misleading" communication (Reboul, 2021). By downplaying commitment to certain details or using underinformative phrasing, communicators can invite readers to draw unwarranted inferences while maintaining plausible deniability that they technically didn't lie (Reboul, 2021). Such tactics exploit the cooperative principle: listeners assume the speaker has been fully informative and truthful, so if a piece of relevant information is omitted, most will not realize its absence. In academic writing, omission of uncertainties or limitations is a common way to mislead without falsifying data.

Persuasion vs. Manipulation: It is important to differentiate ethical persuasion from unethical manipulation in academic settings. Persuasion is a normal part of scholarly rhetoric – researchers use evidence, logical argument, and appeals to shared values of inquiry to convince colleagues of a claim. Ethical persuasion respects the audience's rational agency and provides them with the information needed to make up their own minds. In contrast, manipulation often involves exploiting cognitive biases or information asymmetries. For instance, an academic presenter might use overly charismatic delivery, knowing that style can sometimes sway opinion more than substance, or a writer might bury a null finding in dense prose hoping reviewers won't notice a weak point. The ethics of influence in communication have been debated in multiple fields. In applied ethics, some argue any form of influence that bypasses rational deliberation (for example, using emotional appeals unrelated to the merits of the case) edges into manipulation. In the academic context, a degree of enthusiasm and selective emphasis is expected – authors naturally highlight the strengths of their work. The key ethical boundary is crossed when the communicative act undermines the truthful interpretation of the work. As Boutron and colleagues note, "distorted presentation and interpretation of results" can

mislead readers and misguide decision-makers, with spin effectively functioning as a form of scientific misinformation (Yank et al., 2007; Khan et al., 2019). Indeed, spin has been described as "a strategy that favors the author's interest… regardless of the motivation", whether it be career advancement or confirmation of a theory (Oxman et al., 2022). While persuasion is about clarifying significance, manipulation is about obscuring weakness or exaggerating significance.

This framework sets the stage for analyzing how speech manipulation manifests in academia. It occurs at the level of individual psychology (e.g., certain personalities may be prone to using manipulative tactics) and at the level of communication content (e.g., certain phrases or presentation styles that consistently mislead). Given the complexity of academic communication, detecting manipulation is not always straightforward. The next section will argue that a psychometric approach – systematically measuring traits and patterns – is invaluable for illuminating this hidden interplay. By treating aspects of communication and manipulation as variables that can be quantified, one gains tools to analyze them empirically. These are the kinds of questions a psychometric perspective encourages to ask: How can we tell if an academic text is likely to contain spin? Can we measure a researcher's tendency to "oversell" their findings? Can we quantify the degree of manipulativeness in an academic debate or the trustworthiness of a speaker?

PSYCHOMETRIC PERSPECTIVE

Adopting a psychometric perspective means treating the abstract concepts discussed above – honesty in communication, manipulative intent, misleading content – as constructs that can be operationalized and measured. Psychometrics provides the methodology to design instruments (surveys, rating scales, coding schemes) that yield quantitative data on these constructs, and to evaluate the reliability and validity of those measurements. In the context of speech manipulation in academic communication, there are two broad targets for measurement: (1) individual differences (traits, dispositions, or skills of people who communicate) and (2) message characteristics (features of the communication content itself that may indicate manipulation).

Measuring Individual Differences in Communicative Manipulativeness: One approach is to measure stable traits or tendencies that make a person more likely to engage in manipulative communication. In personality psychology, a well-known construct is Machiavellianism, named after Niccolò Machiavelli's writings on manipulation and deceit in politics. Machiavellianism, as part of the "Dark Triad" of personality, describes individuals who are prone to deceit, have a cynical view of human nature, and focus on personal gain – essentially, a disposition towards manipulation. Psychometric scales exist to assess Machiavellianism; for example, the Mach-IV questionnaire (Christie & Geis, 1970) and more recent measures provide statements like "I am willing to manipulate others to get my way" which respondents rate their agreement with. Modern research has refined Machiavellianism into facets, one of which is explicitly "Amoral Manipulation." This facet captures the willingness to disregard morality to manipulate others. In a study of university students, Barbaranelli et al. (2018) found that the Amoral Manipulation facet of Machiavellianism was significantly associated with academic cheating behaviors. In other words, students who endorsed manipulative attitudes were more likely to engage in dishonest academic practices (cheating on exams, plagiarism), linking a *measured personality trait* to unethical communication behavior. This kind of finding suggests that personality assessments could identify individuals at risk of manipulative conduct in academia. While it would be ethically dubious to "screen" academics for Machiavellian traits as a gatekeeping measure, understanding this link is useful for designing interventions – for example, emphasizing ethics training for those high in such traits, or creating team environments that discourage opportunistic behavior.

Beyond dark personality traits, there are also communication-specific style measures. Communication style inventories aim to quantify how people typically communicate in interpersonal settings. A notable example is the Communication Styles Inventory (CSI), which has been studied and validated in multiple cultures. A recent psychometric study by Diotaiuti et al. (2020) introduced an Italian brief version of the CSI, confirming a three-factor model of communication style: impression manipulativeness, emotionality, and expressiveness. The factor of Impression Manipulativeness (sometimes termed "impression management" in earlier literature) directly relates to our topic – it measures the extent to which a person's communication is characterized by ingratiation and charm in order to control the image they project (Diotaiuti et al., 2020). Individuals scoring high on this factor tend to carefully tailor their words to influence how others perceive them, using tactics like flattery, strategic self-disclosure, or persuasive charisma. In the CSI validation, impression manipulativeness was measured with items reflecting *charm* and *ingratiation* behaviors (Diotaiuti et al., 2020). Importantly, this psychometric factor showed meaningful correlations with personality profiles: it was positively correlated with Cynicism and with Impression Management scales of a personality inventory. Cynicism reflects a distrustful, self-interested outlook, while

impression management (in personality terms) indicates a person's tendency to consciously shape others' opinions of themselves. These correlations support the convergent validity of the impression manipulativeness construct – people who habitually manipulate their image in communication indeed share traits associated with manipulative and guarded interpersonal behavior (Yang et al., 2020).

Such instruments offer a way to quantify a latent characteristic – a "manipulative communication style" – that might otherwise be hard to pin down. In an academic context, one could envision using the CSI or similar scales to study, for example, whether academics in certain roles or disciplines exhibit higher impression manipulativeness, or whether that correlates with other outcomes (perhaps academics with high manipulative communication style produce papers that independent raters find to have more spin). Psychometric assessment of communication style thus provides one bridge between individual dispositions and communicative outcomes.

Another relevant individual-difference measure emerging recently is the "Bullshitting Frequency Scale." Philosopher Harry Frankfurt famously defined "bullshit" as speech that is not concerned with truth at all – the bullshitter's aim is to impress or persuade without regard for whether what is said is true or false. In everyday terms, this might be akin to making things up on the fly or speaking confidently on a subject one knows little about. Building on Frankfurt's theory, psychologists have begun to measure this tendency empirically. Littrell et al. (2020) developed a Bullshitting Frequency Scale to distinguish how often people engage in two types of BS: *persuasive BS* (aimed at impressing or persuading others) and *evasive BS* (aimed at avoiding or deflecting a topic). While data are still accumulating, initial findings suggest some interesting links: for example, people who frequently manifest BS tend to have lower analytical reasoning skills and greater overconfidence in their judgments (Littrell et al., 2020). In an academic communications frame, one could argue that the use of jargon without understanding, or making grandiose claims without evidence, qualifies as a form of bullshitting. A scholar might manifest BS in a Q&A portion of a talk by giving a verbose non-answer to mask uncertainty, or a student might address to BS an essay response hoping the superficial appearance of knowledge will get partial credit. By measuring bullshitting as a trait, researchers can investigate its antecedents (what makes someone prone to BS?) and consequences (do frequent BS-ers get ahead in certain situations, or are they eventually recognized and penalized?). One recent study even found that the ability to produce convincing bullshit correlated with intelligence, suggesting that producing *plausible-sounding statements with little concern for truth* is a cognitive skill that some intelligent individuals excel at. This paradoxical finding that "bullshit ability" might be an honest signal of social intelligence (because it requires wit and quick thinking) adds nuance to our understanding – it means that not all manipulative communication is born of ignorance; some is quite sophisticated. Regardless, from an ethical standpoint, high ability or frequency in bullshitting within academia is problematic, as it conflicts with the values of accuracy and accountability.

Measuring Message Characteristics: The other side of the psychometric coin is to evaluate the content of communication for markers of manipulation. This typically involves coding schemes or automated text analysis rather than self-report surveys. Researchers have developed structured protocols to detect deceptive or biased content in communications. For example, in deception detection research (much of it applied in forensic or security contexts), methods like Criteria-Based Content Analysis and the Reality Monitoring framework use qualitative criteria to assess the veracity of statements. These approaches evaluate narratives on attributes such as logical structure, unstructured production, and the amount of detail, which tend to differ between truthful and fabricated accounts (Amado et al., 2016). In academic texts, analogous approaches can be taken. As discussed earlier, Boutron et al. (2010) created a classification scheme for identifying "spin" in clinical trial reports, particularly trials with non-significant primary outcomes. Their scheme provided categories of spin (e.g., focus on statistically significant secondary outcomes, use of optimistic language in conclusions, etc.) and was used as a template in many subsequent studies of research literature (Chiu et al., 2017). For instance, a systematic review by Chiu et al. (2017) applied such classification to estimate the prevalence of spin in biomedical papers. These classification checklists function much like a psychometric instrument: multiple raters are trained to apply the criteria to a text, inter-rater reliability is measured, and the presence/absence (or degree) of spin is recorded. One finding from these studies is that spin is widespread across disciplines and sections of papers – everything from titles and abstracts to discussions can contain biased framing (Boutron & Ravaud, 2018). However, no universally accepted, formal "spin measurement" tool exists yet (Boutron et al., 2010). Each study tends to tweak the coding to its needs, which makes it hard to compare across studies. The development of a standardized "Spin Index" with clear psychometric properties (reliability, construct validity) would be a valuable contribution to meta-research. It could allow journals or reviewers to more objectively flag manuscripts that are at risk of spin.

Advances in computational linguistics and stylometry are also enriching our ability to gauge manipulative content. Automated text analysis can sift through large corpora of articles or transcripts to find linguistic cues correlated with deception or bias. A 2022 review by Tomas and colleagues examined computational measures of deceptive language, comparing theory-driven approaches (looking for specific linguistic cues like fewer first-person pronouns or more negative emotion words, as suggested by cognitive load theory of lying) with machine learning approaches that classify texts based on patterns learned from examples (Tomas et al., 2022). They concluded that while these stylometric tools show promise – often classifying truth vs. lie with about 70% accuracy under experimental conditions – they are not yet field-ready for high-stakes settings (Tomas et al., 2022). Challenges include the need for clean, transcribed data (especially if analyzing speech), variability across contexts, and the risk of automation bias (over-reliance on a tool that is imperfect). Ethical standards are a concern; deploying an algorithm to label researchers' papers as "manipulative" could have reputational consequences, so such tools must be rigorously validated and used with caution. In academia, one could imagine using text analysis to detect, say, *rhetorical red flags* in writing: overly frequent use of positive superlatives ("groundbreaking", "definitive"), or a mismatch between strong claims and weak evidential language ("we prove that…" in a correlational study). Already, some researchers have applied sentiment analysis and other NLP techniques to scientific writing to identify exaggerated claims. For example, one study found that abstracts in high-impact journals used more striking and positively spun language than those in lower-tier journals, suggesting a selection for hype in elite publications (though one must ask, cause or effect?) – such findings emerge from treating language features as quantifiable data.

Psychometric approaches also contribute to detecting manipulative intent via audience response. For instance, researchers could measure how readers or listeners perceive a piece of communication: Are there reliable individual differences in the ability to spot spin or deception? Some people are more discerning readers; perhaps there should be a "Consumer of Research Literacy Scale" that measures how well someone can detect common forms of bias or manipulation in academic writing. If an academic paper is an "item" presented to many readers, one could gather data on whether people notice the logical gaps or inflated language. While not being a traditional use of psychometrics, this could help quantify what effective manipulative communication is – if 90% of readers are fooled by a given spin tactic, that's a sign of a serious issue. Indeed, the concept of "epistemic vigilance" (Sperber et al., 2010) is pertinent: it refers to the psychological mechanisms listeners use to guard against being misled. Not everyone has equal epistemic vigilance, and that itself could be measured by tests of skepticism or critical thinking applied to information consumption.

In sum, the psychometric perspective underscores that both the players and the messages in academic communication can be systematically studied. We can assess the communicators (their traits, styles, intentions) and the communication (its content, phrasing, structure) with quantitative tools. Applying these tools in tandem is particularly powerful. For example, one might find that authors who score high on a Machiavellianism scale are statistically more likely to produce writing that independent raters identify as containing spin or misleading elements. Or one might validate an algorithm to flag press releases that exaggerate academic findings, and then study whether these flagged releases indeed come from institutions with competitive pressures. By using measurement, we bring what is often discussed anecdotally ("this paper seems a bit too good to be true") into the realm of empirical science ("this paper scored 8/10 on a spin index, which places it in the top quartile of exaggeration in our sample"). This not only aids in diagnosing the problem but opens avenues for remediation and training.

The exploration of speech manipulation in academic communication, through a psychometric lens, carries several important implications. These implications span ethical considerations, practical actions for academic institutions and journals, and directions for future research and policy to foster more honest and effective communication in scholarly environments.

Ethical Considerations: At its heart, the presence of manipulation in academic communication raises ethical red flags. Scholars have a moral duty to communicate truthfully and transparently, as codified in guidelines for ethical research (e.g., the APA Ethics Code, the Singapore Statement on Research Integrity, etc.). When communication crosses into manipulation, it betrays this duty. One ethical issue is the *intentionality* behind manipulation. If an academic deliberately uses misleading rhetoric (for example, knowingly cherry-picking data to support a narrative), this is a clear breach of integrity – arguably a form of academic misconduct. Even if speech manipulation is unintentional or driven by unconscious bias (for instance, a researcher genuinely believes his theory and unintentionally downplays contrary evidence), there is still a responsibility to recognize and correct it. The gray area is that not every case of spin or persuasive flourish is a knowing deception; researchers are human and often optimistic about their work. Thus, one ethical task is improving self-awareness in communicators – through training, peer feedback, or checklists

(much like how many journals now require authors to fill out conflict of interest and data availability statements, perhaps they could also answer bias self-check questions upon submission).

Another ethical dimension concerns the impact on others. As noted, manipulative academic communication can mislead other scientists, policymakers, and the public (Hewitt et al., 2008). This can waste resources (people chasing a falsely promising line of inquiry), harm health decisions (clinicians or patients misled by overstated results), or generally erode trust in science. Ethically, academics should prioritize accuracy over persuasion, particularly in contexts like public health. Let us consider the COVID-19 pandemic: communication from scientists had to be careful not to overpromise on early data (to maintain public trust). If manipulative practices are left unchecked, public trust in academic expertise can diminish, which is a societal harm. Therefore, ethical communication is directly tied to sustaining trust. Initiatives to build trust in science often highlight transparency, openness, and honesty as key principles – the 'antidotes' to manipulation (Sutter, 2022).

There is also the ethical use of psychometric tools themselves. If we develop an instrument to label some communications or individuals as "manipulative," we must use it responsibly. For example, an algorithmic tool that flags papers for spin should not be used to shame or punish authors without a human review and opportunity for explanation, because false positives could unfairly damage reputations. Similarly, if one were to give students a "communication integrity test," it should be for self-improvement, not grading their morality. Ethical research practice demands that these tools are used to educate and improve, rather than to police in a punitive manner (except in clear cases of misconduct where formal investigations are warranted).

Practical Implications for Improving Academic Communication: The findings and perspectives discussed suggest concrete steps to mitigate manipulative communication and promote a healthier academic discourse:

— Education and Training: Integrating modules on ethical communication into graduate curricula and faculty development can raise awareness. Training researchers how to present their work accurately without hype is crucial. For instance, workshops can demonstrate common forms of spin (perhaps using real examples) and teach how to avoid them. Emphasizing skills like proper use of hedging versus certainty, candid discussion of limitations, and effective but honest abstract writing can reconcile the tension between making one's work accessible/interesting and staying truthful. Training can also improve researchers' ability to detect manipulation by others – essentially boosting their *epistemic vigilance*. This can lead to more rigorous peer review and critical reading, serving as a community defense against misleading communication.

— One of the simplest ways to reduce the opportunity for manipulation is to increase transparency in the research process. Open science practices – such as sharing data and code, preregistering study protocols and analysis plans, and publishing detailed supplementary materials – make it more difficult to manipulate through omission or selective reporting, because others can scrutinize the complete picture. As noted on the Embassy of Good Science platform, open data practices enhance transparency, allowing independent verification and thus discouraging spin (Lockyer et al., 2013). Journals and funders are increasingly mandating such practices. The implication is that by structurally embedding transparency (e.g., requiring raw data and analytic scripts on a repository upon publication), the system leaves less room for a manipulator to hide distortions.

— The development of and adherence to reporting guidelines (like CONSORT for trials, PRISMA for reviews, STROBE for observational studies, etc.) directly counteracts some common forms of spin. These guidelines ask authors to present all outcomes, to distinguish between primary and secondary outcomes, and to be cautious in interpretation. However, as the scoping review on spin noted, even a well-conducted study at low risk of bias can be spun in the report (Turrentine, 2017). So, an implication is that guidelines might need explicit sections on avoiding spin. For example, CONSORT could add: "If the primary outcome is non-significant, do not focus the abstract on other outcomes; discuss the primary result upfront." Some journals have gone further to issue instructions about writing titles and abstracts that reflect results without hype. Enforcing such standards through editorial and peer review processes is key – e.g., editors sending back manuscripts with overly promotional language in conclusions, asking for toned-down wording more proportional to the evidence.

— Ultimately, a broad implication is the need to foster a culture of integrity in academic communication. This involves leadership from universities and scholarly societies, emphasizing that *how* we communicate science is an integral part of research ethics. Codes of conduct could explicitly include clauses about honest representation of findings. Mentors should model this by being forthright rather than overly salesy in their own papers and talks. The reward structures in academia might also need recalibration: currently, there can be a short-term reward for dramatic claims (attention, citations) even if they later prove

exaggerated. If hiring, promotion, and funding decisions put more weight on quality and rigor rather than just exciting positive results, the incentive to manipulate communication would diminish. Some funding agencies now ask for "honor statements" where applicants attest that they will follow ethical guidelines in disseminating results – a sign that stakeholders are recognizing communication as part of the responsible conduct of research.

Implications for Psychometric and Methodological Research: For the field of psychometrics and methodology itself, this topic provides fertile ground. We see the need to develop new measures (like a standard Spin Index, or better self-report scales for communication ethics) and to refine techniques for detecting manipulation. It also challenges researchers to combine qualitative and quantitative methods – because context and nuance matter in communication. This interplay might spur innovative mixed-methods studies, for example using quantitative text mining to flag suspect papers and then qualitative expert analysis to understand the nature of the manipulation. Interdisciplinary collaboration between psychologists, linguists, data scientists, and domain experts (e.g., biomedical researchers for medical literature) is implied, as each brings tools to decode manipulation. Encouragingly, the topic sits squarely within applied psychometrics in a methodological journal context: it shows how measurement theory can be applied to improve a real-world domain (academic communication).

In summary, the implications highlight a path forward where awareness and measurement of speech manipulation leads to concrete actions: more ethical training, structural changes to academic publishing, and ongoing research to monitor and reduce manipulative practices. The goal is to create an academic ecosystem where persuasion is achieved through clarity and sound evidence, not through distortion or deceit – thereby enhancing the credibility and effectiveness of science itself.

CONCLUSION

Crucially, our exploration underscores that studying speech manipulation in academia is not a mere academic exercise – it strikes at the heart of research integrity and the progress of knowledge. Conversely, by understanding and addressing manipulation, we bolster the reliability and credibility of academic discourse. The ethical considerations discussed serve as a reminder that every scholar has a responsibility to engage in ethical persuasion rather than deceit. The practical implications we outlined – from improved training and guidelines to cultural shifts in incentives – provide a roadmap for stakeholders at all levels (individual academics, institutions, journals, and funders) to foster a communication environment where honesty and rigor are rewarded.

One important direction is the development of better measurement instruments specifically tailored to academic contexts, such as validated scales for research spin or indices of communication integrity. Another is longitudinal research to assess whether efforts like open science and reporting guidelines are tangibly reducing manipulative communication over time. There is also room for more granular studies, for example, examining if certain fields or career stages are more prone to speech manipulation, or how audiences (students, other researchers, public) react to and detect manipulation. Given the global nature of academia, cross-cultural studies would be valuable – what is considered manipulative or persuasive can vary by cultural communication norms.

In closing, the interplay between academic communication and speech manipulation is complex, but it is a challenge that the academic community can rise to meet. By bringing psychometric rigor to the study of how we communicate, we gain not only diagnostic tools to identify problems but also a scientific basis for improving our communicative practices. The result we strive for is an academic landscape in which compelling communication and methodological truthfulness go hand in hand – where researchers can still persuade and inspire, but do so through accurate representation and respect for their audience's right to an undistorted truth. Such a balance, once achieved, will enhance both the *effectiveness* of academic communication (as trust and clarity improve, messages carry more weight) and its *ethical standing*. In the long run, aligning methods of communication with the ideals of honesty is essential for the continued advancement of knowledge and the maintenance of public trust in scholarly expertise.

REFERENCES

1. Amado, B. G., Arce, R., Fariña, F., & Vilariño, M. (2016). Criteria-Based Content Analysis (CBCA) Reality Criteria in Adults: A Meta-Analytic Review. *International Journal of Clinical Health Psychology, 16,* 201–210. doi:10.1016/j.ijchp.2016.01.002

2. Barbaranelli, C., Farnese, M. L., Tramontano, C., Fida, R., Ghezzi, V., & Paciello, M. (2018). Machiavellian ways to academic cheating: A mediational and interactional model. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 695. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00695
3. Bastian, H. (March 17, 2016). How to Spot Research Spin: The Case of the Not-So-Simple Abstract. *Absolutely Maybe*. https://absolutelymaybe.plos.org/2016/03/17/how-to-spot-research-spin-the-case-of-the-not-so-simple-abstract/#:~:text=Research%20spin%20is%20when%20findings,or%20to%20minimize%20inconvenient%20results
4. Boutron, I., Dutton, S., Ravaud, P., Altman, D. G. (2010). Reporting and interpretation of randomized controlled trials with statistically nonsignificant results for primary outcomes. *JAMA, 303*(20), 2058-2064. doi:10.1001/jama.2010.651
5. Boutron, I., & Ravaud, P. (2018). Misrepresentation and distortion of research in biomedical literature. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115*(11), 2613–2619. doi:10.1073/pnas.1710755115
6. Boutron, I. (2020). Spin in scientific publications: a frequent detrimental research practice. *Annals of Emergency Medicine, 75*(3), 432–434. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2019.11.002
7. Chiu, K., Grundy, Q., & Bero, L. (2017). 'Spin' in published biomedical literature: A methodological systematic review. *PLoS Biology, 15*(9), e2002173. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.2002173
8. Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. Academic Press.
9. Diotaiuti, P., Valente, G., Mancone, S., & Grambone, A. (2020). Psychometric properties and a preliminary validation study of the Italian brief version of the Communication Styles Inventory (CSI-B/I). *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 1421. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01421
10. Hewitt. C. E., & Mitchell, N. (2008). Torgerson DJ. Listen to the data when results are not significant. *BMJ, 336*(7634), 23-25. doi:10.1136/bmj.39379.359560.AD
11. Khan, M. S., Lateef, N., Siddiqi, T. J., Rehman, K. A., Alnaimat, S., Khan, S. U., Riaz, H., Murad, M. H., Mandrola, J., Doukky, R., Krasuski, R. A. (2019). Level and Prevalence of Spin in Published Cardiovascular Randomized Clinical Trial Reports With Statistically Nonsignificant Primary Outcomes: A Systematic Review. *JAMA Network Open, 2*(5), e192622. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.2622.
12. Littrell, S., Risko, E., & Fugelsang, J. (2020). The Bullshitting Frequency Scale: Development and psychometric properties. *European Journal of Psychology, 116*(2), 260-277. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12379
13. Lockyer, S., Hodgson, R., Dumville, J. C., Cullum, N. (2013). "Spin" in wound care research: the reporting and interpretation of randomized controlled trials with statistically non-significant primary outcome results or unspecified primary outcomes. *Trials, 14*, 371. doi:10.1186/1745-6215-14-371
14. McCornack, S., Morrison, K., Paik, J., Wisner, A., & Zhu, X. (2014). Information Manipulation Theory 2: A propositional theory of deceptive discourse production. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 33*(4), 348–377. doi:10.1177/0261927X14534656
15. Oxman, A. D., Fretheim, A., Lewin, S., Flottorp, S., Glenton, C., Helleve, A, et al. (2022). Health communication in and out of public health emergencies: to persuade or to inform? *Health Research Policy and Systems, 20*(1), 28. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-022-00828-z
16. Reboul, A. (2017). *Communication and Cognition in the Evolution of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198747314.001.0001
17. Reboul, A. (2021). Truthfully misleading: Truth, informativity, and manipulation in linguistic communication. *Frontiers in Communication, 6*, 646820. doi:10.3389/fcomm.2021.646820
18. Sperber, D., Clément, F., Heintz, C., Mascaro, O., Mercier, H., Origgi, G., & Wilson, D. (2010). Epistemic vigilance. *Mind & Language, 25*(4), 359–393. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0017.2010.01394.x
19. Sutter, P.M. (October 20, 2022). Science Has a Communication Problem – and a Connection Problem. *Undark*. https://undark.org/2022/10/20/science-has-a-communication-problem-and-a-connection-problem/
20. Tomas, F., Dodier, O., & Demarchi, S. (2022). Computational measures of deceptive language: Prospects and issues. *Frontiers in Communication, 7*, 792378. doi:10.3389/fcomm.2022.792378
21. Turrentine, M. (2017). It's all how you "spin" it: interpretive bias in research findings in the obstetrics and gynecology literature. *Obstetrics & Gynecology, 129*(2), 239-242. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000001818
22. Yang Y., Kuria G. N., Gu D. X. (2020). Mediating role of trust between leader communication style and subordinate's work outcomes in project teams. *Engineering Management Journal, 32*(3), 1–14. 10.1080/10429247.2020.1733380
23. Yank, V., Rennie, D., & Bero, L A. (2007). Financial ties and concordance between results and conclusions in meta-analyses: retrospective cohort study. *BMJ, 335*(7631), 1202-1205. doi:10.1136/bmj.39376.447211.BE