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Abstract

How do L2 Listeners interpret deceit?

- The disfluency-as-deception bias is heavily anchored and can override other cues that bias people’s interpretations of deceit.
- L2 listeners believed more the L2 than the L1 speaker.

- The time-course of this interpretation is not affected by the speaker’s linguistic background.
- Similar time-course to L1 listeners.

Overall, the stereotypes associated with how a liar sounds are heavily anchored and rapidly integrated in constrained situations.

Introduction

What can bias our interpretation of deceit?

Nativeness-as-deception:
Speaker’s linguistic background (e.g., Lev–Ari & Keysar, 2010).

Disfluency-as-deception:
How a speaker talks (e.g., Arciuli et al., 2010, Loy et al., 2017).

A speaker’s linguistic background can impact how they speak, and as such, the interaction of these two factors may modulate the bias they individually exert (e.g., King et al., 2018).

Can a listener’s cognitive resources impact the reliance on these cues?

Method

- Eye-tracking “treasure-hunt” experiment.
- 58 L2 listeners (different L1s)

The treasure is behind the / thee uh apple. Are they lying?

Results

L1 Speaker

L2 Speaker

Future Directions

L2 processing relies on the same cues, and to similar extents, as L1 when it comes to interpreting deceit. Increasingly harder situations (i.e., L2 processing of L2 speech) do not modulate the timecourse of the integration of cues.

- Measures of cognitive difficulty?
  - Pupilometry.
  - Less constrained situations.
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