Social Gaze and Deception Detection: How Context and Converging Evidence Shape Our Interpretation of Eye Movements

Proposed article type: Original Research / Empirical Study

Summary and Updates of the Research

Eye gaze plays an important role in social interaction, directing attention and providing cues that people may use to interpret others' intentions. However, the meaning of gaze is not fixed: the same behaviour may be interpreted differently depending on the social context, the observer's expectations and the task being performed. This raises an important question: when can gaze provide reliable information about another person's intentions, and when might observers draw misleading conclusions from it?

Building on research into the dual function of social gaze and the use of eye movements in deception detection, the present study investigates how social context influences the interpretation of gaze cues. It proposes an integrated framework distinguishing the information conveyed by gaze, the information observers infer from it, and the contextual factors that may shape those inferences. The study combines experimental evidence on social attention with a structured synthesis of findings on gaze and deception detection to examine whether conclusions drawn from individual behavioural cues are consistent across different research contexts.

The paper argues that gaze should not be treated as a universally reliable indicator of deceptive intent. Instead, its interpretation requires attention to the interaction between social context, task demands and the strength of converging evidence. By connecting social attention with deception-related judgements, the study aims to clarify the theoretical conditions under which gaze cues inform social cognition and to identify questions for future empirical research.

**This summary is invented for the workshop. It is not the abstract of either cited article, and it does not report real experimental findings. For the exercise, assume that the manuscript has a clear theoretical argument, but the strength of its empirical contribution and the integration of its two research strands still need to be evaluated.*