

Aldert Vrij

Why Professionals Fail to Catch Liars and How They Can Improve

First, I will briefly review research findings that show that professional lie catchers, such as police officers, are generally rather poor at distinguishing between truths and lies. I believe that there are many reasons contributing towards this poor ability, and will give an overview of these reasons in the second part of this talk. I also believe that professionals could become better lie detectors and will explain how in the final part of my talk.

Sean A. Spence

Towards a Functional Anatomy of Deception

The prospect of being able to tell when other people are lying to us has a certain appeal, as reflected in the media interest attracted by the application of modern brain imaging techniques to the detection of deception. Such approaches have been described as deserving of especial emphasis in the light of recent security concerns in the West.

Our work, and that of other groups, has focused upon using functional neuroimaging to study subjects whom we know to be lying, at least part of the time. Intermittent deception, albeit regarding relatively trivial data, is inherent in these experimental designs.

When such studies have compared the activation patterns of subjects telling lies with activity in those same brains during truthful responding, they have revealed patterns of increased activity in 'higher' cognitive centers during deception. While certain similarities emerge across studies, there are still considerable technical issues to be addressed not least regarding the feasibility and ethical consequences of detecting deception in non-compliant subjects.

My presentation will focus on recent work from our laboratory and offer a cognitive neurobiological framework for understanding deception in humans.

Pär Anders Granhag,

How to Interrogate to Detect Deception

Decades of psycho-legal research has shown that both lay people and presumed experts (e.g., police officers) are poor at detecting deception. However, previous research has neglected that in many real-life situations there is evidence against a suspect. This paper will focus on the presence of evidence during interrogation, and how strategic use of this evidence can affect the statements of the suspects as well as the accuracy of the lie-catchers. Specifically, the focus of the paper is guilty and innocent suspects' verbal strategies. The point of departure will be two types of fundamental human behaviour, stemming from research on aversive conditioning: *avoidance* and *escape*. It will be argued that construing the mental threat that is experienced in the interrogation room as an aversive stimulus opens a path for understanding the strategies used by guilty and innocent suspects. Furthermore, and importantly, it informs us on how the differences in

strategies can be utilized to increase lie-catchers' deception detection accuracy. The paper consists of three parts; (1) an outline of a general theoretical framework, (2) a specification of the predictions that can be derived from this theoretical framework, and (3) a summary of what the empirical tests of these predictions show.

Jenny Thomas

...to be announced...

Ole Togeby:

Types of Linguistic Deception

Linguistic deception is defined as a speech act that causes someone to accept as true, sound or good what is false, unsound or bad. Linguistic deception is found in several types. In my paper I will define the differences between to lie, to delude, humbug, to bully, to mislead, to beguile. Deceptive speech is related to phenomena as plot in a short story, punch line in a joke, presupposition failure and conversational implicature.

Kamila E. Sip

Deceiving in a Play-Game Situation versus Deceiving in a Crime Situation

The objective of the talk is to elaborate on the notion of interpersonal deception viewed in a frame of a game paradigm that is close to a real-life interaction. To illustrate the difference in the processing of deceptive behavior and the perception/production of the mendacious messages, we need to realize that attitudes to deceptive activities may differ. The idea behind this reasoning is that brain activation may be different in e.g. a game paradigm vs. a mock crime interrogation.

Bill McGregor

Language, Deception and the Theory of Mind

In this paper I propose to explore ways in which the theory of mind (ToM) impacts on language and deception. I begin by discussing the components of ToM, and examine the extent to which they are unique to human beings and/or are shared with other primates. This leads into a discussion of how ToM is relevant to language ontogenetically, phylogenetically, and ultimately in language use (pragmatics) and system (especially in modality and complementation). Instead of linking all this (as is usually done) to false-belief reasoning, I explore the relationship to deception. Finally, I raise the question of universality: to what extent is ToM universal vs. culturally specific, and what might the consequences of relativity be for language and deception?

Andreas Roepstorff

Summing up: Brain, Pragmatics and Deception.

I will use a short overview of brain imaging studies of "deception scenarios" as a starting point for a discussion of the topics raised during the workshop.