## Speech timing cues reveal deceptive speech: an acoustic analysis of communication in social deduction board games

Ziyun Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Carolyn McGettigan<sup>1</sup>, Michel Belyk<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Speech, Hearing and Phonetic Sciences, University College London, London, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology, Edge Hill University, Ormskirk, United Kingdom

Ziyun.zhang.19@ucl.ac.uk

## Abstract (max 300 words)

The faculty of language allows humans to state falsehoods in their choice of words. However, while what is said might easily uphold a lie, how it is said may reveal deception. Hence, some features of the voice that are difficult for liars to control may keep speech mostly, if not always, honest. Previous research has identified that speech timing (Anolli & Ciceri, 1997) and voice pitch cues (DePaulo et al., 2003) can predict the truthfulness of speech, but this evidence has come primarily from laboratory experiments, which sacrifice ecological validity for experimental control. We obtained ecologically valid recordings of deceptive speech while observing natural utterances from players of a popular social deduction board game, in which players are assigned roles that either induce honest or dishonest interactions. When speakers chose to lie, they were prone to longer and more frequent pauses in their speech. This finding is in line with theoretical predictions that lying is more cognitively demanding (Zuckerman et al., 1981). However, lying was not reliably associated with vocal pitch. This contradicts predictions that increased physiological arousal from lying might increase muscular tension in the larynx (Patel et al., 2011), but is consistent with human specializations that grant Homo sapiens sapiens an unusual degree of control over the voice relative to other primates (Belyk & Brown, 2017). The present study demonstrates the utility of social deduction board games as a means of making naturalistic observations of human behavior from semi- structured social interactions.

## References

Anolli, L., and Ciceri, R. (1997). The voice of deception: vocal strategies of naive and able liars. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 21(4), 259–284.

- Belyk, M., and Brown, S. (2017). The origins of the vocal brain in humans. Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 77, 177–193.
- DePaulo, B.M., Malone, B.E., Lindsay, J.J., Muhlenbruck, L., Charlton, K., and Cooper, H. (2003). Cues to deception. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*(1), 74–118.
- Patel, S., Scherer, K.R., Björkner, E., and Sundberg, J. (2011). Mapping emotions into acoustic space: The role of voice production. *Biological psychology*, 87(1), 93-98.
- Zuckerman, M., Koestner, R., & Driver, R. (1981). Beliefs about cues associated with deception. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 6(2), 105–114.