

FEEDBACK REPORT FOR PARTICIPANTS

Detecting deception using mock interview video recordings

SMU REB # 19-001

Research Project conducted by:

Claudine Bolduc

Undergraduate Honours' Student

Department of Psychology

Saint Mary's University, 923 Robie Street, Halifax, NS B3H 3C3

Claudine.bolduc@smu.ca

Dr. Nicolas Roulin

Associate Professor

Department of Psychology

Saint Mary's University, 923 Robie Street, Halifax, NS B3H 3C3

Nicolas.roulin@smu.ca

INTRODUCTION & GOALS OF THE PROJECT

Deception has been the topic of research for hundreds of years (DePaulo et al., 2003). During employment interviews, most job applicants engage in some form of deception by using impression management or faking tactics (Levashina & Campion, 2007). Nearly all studies examining the accuracy of deception detection have shown that detectors (e.g., interviewers) are only slightly better than what would be expected by chance (Bond & DePaulo, 2006; Roulin et al., 2015).

Interestingly, how language can affect that deception detection accuracy has scarcely been examined. Recent studies suggest that foreign-language speakers are more likely to be judged as lie-tellers than native-language speakers (Da Silva & Leach, 2013; Evans & Michael, 2013). In other studies focused on cultural differences, detectors held a truth-bias for individuals of a different race as a way to not be viewed prejudicial (Lloyd et al., 2017). Given globalization, employment interviews where applicants are not speaking in their first language have become common-place. As such, it is especially important to ensure that job applicants are not incorrectly judged with regard to their difference in culture or language.

Therefore, the present research intended to examine if speaking in a foreign language has an effect on deception detection by native speakers. The goal was to better understand of how decisions are made when trying to detect deception in an interview setting with foreign-language speakers, and what individual differences (such as ethnocentrism, sensitivity to others' expression and cross-cultural self-efficacy) may affect the process.

PARTICIPANTS, DATA COLLECTION, & ANALYSES

We conducted two studies. In Study 1, a total of 136 undergraduate students (115 females and 21 males) from a Canadian university participated in an online study. The average age of students was 22.29 years ($SD = 6.03$). The sample included a diversity of ethnicities (71% Caucasian, 11% Black, 5% Asian, 4% Middle Eastern, 2% Hispanic, 2% Aboriginals, 5% other ethnicity). Study was a replication with a group of 120 American participants recruited on the Mechanical Turk online platform.

Participants were asked to watch 10 video clips presenting ten interviewees answering the same job interview question in English. They were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: Canadian interviewees speaking in their native language vs. Chinese interviewees speaking in a foreign language (i.e., English). After each video clip, participants were asked to rate each interviewee as honest or deceptive, as well as their confidence level in each decision. At the end of the 10 interview clips, they answered a series of questions about deception cues they used to make decisions, their overall level of confidence in their decisions, and standardized measures of ethnocentrism, self-monitoring, cross-cultural psychological capital.

MAIN FINDINGS

In the first study (student sample), we found that detection accuracy was just above chance level (about 53%). Detection was higher for native English speakers than second-language speakers. For participants assessing Chinese interviewees speaking in English, their level of ethnocentrism and cross-cultural self-efficacy was associated with their detection accuracy. That is, more ethnocentric assessors were worse at lie detection, while those with higher cross-cultural self-efficacy were better.

In the second study (MTurk respondents), we also found that detection accuracy was just above chance level (about 54%). However, this time we found no difference in detection between the native English speakers and the second-language speakers. We also did not find any clear relationship between detection and ethnocentrism or cross-cultural self-efficacy.

Overall, our findings were quite mixed. Detection of faking from interviewee speaking in English as a second language was lower with Canadian student assessors, but not for older American assessors. Similarly, the relationship between cultural factors and detection was present in the student, but not the online panel sample.

If you have any question about this research or our findings, please contact nicolas.roulin@smu.ca.