

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

DATA SCREENING

There were 353 completed responses initially, and their appropriateness was assessed using the following three methods. First, the responses from those who reported malfunctions in video playing were removed. Second, the responses from those who did not stay on the video page long enough (i.e., taking less than 15 seconds to watch the video and complete the rating) were removed because those participants were judged as not watching the video properly. Finally, the participants who failed to identify the gender of the speaker in the video accurately were removed. This data-cleaning process left 260 responses to be analyzed.

THE CREATION OF VIDEO STIMULI

The videotaped interview was used in this study, in which a speaker talked about personal interactions. This speech topic was chosen based on previous studies on veracity judgments (e.g., Levine & McCornack, 1991; Murai et al., 2018; Reinhard et al., 2013). The speakers were two volunteers (one male and one female, mean age = 23) who consented to the recording procedure and the use of the videos. They were presented with eight interpersonal situations involving some problems, for which lying might be an option for the speaker (e.g., “You overslept and were late for a meeting with your friend. He/she is angry with you”). They were asked to imagine the situation and describe how they would behave. The speakers were asked to provide an honest and natural account of their thoughts for two of the eight situations, while they were asked to make up a deceptive account (things that they would not do in truth) for the rest. The speakers were instructed whether to tell the truth or lie immediately after viewing each situation’s description. They were asked to provide speech relatively soon after the truth-lie instruction, so they did not have much time to prepare their answers carefully. They were allowed to talk freely with gestures and other body movements. The videotaped segment started with the presentation of the situational description and ended after the speakers had finished talking. It captured from their heads to ankles. The lengths of the videos ranged from 25 to 44 seconds. A Canon Ivis HF G20 camera was used for the recording.

A preliminary study was conducted to measure how the veracity of the speech in the videos was perceived. Seventeen undergraduates viewed all sixteen videos and assessed how deceptive each speech was using a six-point scale (1 – *I strongly believe that the person is telling the truth*, 6 – *I strongly believe that the person*

is deceptive). After this rating, the participants made a dichotomous truth-lie judgment for each video. The videos for the main study were selected as follows. First, those that had ambiguous truthfulness were chosen. They either had a near chance level of truth-lie judgment accuracy or a deceptive rating close to the midpoint (3.5). Then, more unambiguous videos were chosen while avoiding ones with extremely high or low deceptive ratings. Ten videos containing five from each speaker were used in the main study. The mean duration of these videos did not differ between the speakers (male speaker: $M = 41.2$ s, $SD = 6.42$; female speaker: $M = 37.4$ s, $SD = 6.99$; $t(8) = 0.90$, $p = .397$).

THE MANIPULATION TO INDUCE THE STATE SUSPICION

For participants in the suspicious condition, the following article about a theft crime case was presented, which was created by modifying an actual news published in Japan:

“In a city, a fraud case occurred in which an elderly woman had her cash card stolen. She had previously received a telephone call in her home from a person claiming to be a police officer. The officer told her that someone had made a copy of her cash card, and the police were trying to help her stop being robbed. A few days after the phone call, young adults claiming to be financial officials whose role was to check the copied cards visited her. They again explained the possible risk of her bank account being illegally accessed and emphasized the necessity of taking some measures. They then took her cash card briefly to check it. In this short period, while the woman looked away, they switched it to a fake card and returned it to her. Being unable to use her bank card, she talked about it to her family, and they contacted financial service officials, who confirmed that her card was fake. The police have started investigating this case as fraudulent.”

SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSIS 1

Some preliminary analyses were performed to check whether the state suspicion manipulation was successful and whether the level of GCS and the potential factors related to veracity judgments differed between the two conditions. The mean and standard deviations for all variables measured in this study are shown in Table 1 in main text.

First, the responses for the two manipulation check items (i.e., the degree of guilt for theft and the possibility of a theft lying) were compared to the midpoint of the scale (3.5) to determine whether the story given in the suspicious condition was appropriate to raise the state suspicion. Regardless of the condition they were in, participants rated both items significantly higher than the midpoint, indicating that they thought that being involved in a fraud is more guilty than not (non-suspicion condition: $M = 6.25$, $SD = 1.08$, $t(136) = 26.70$, $p < .001$; suspicion condition: $M = 6.30$, $SD = 1.07$, $t(122) = 29.01$, $p < .001$), and a suspect of theft would be more likely to tell a lie than not (non-suspicion condition: $M = 5.99$, $SD = 1.12$, $t(136) = 26.02$, $p < .001$; suspicion condition: $M = 6.02$, $SD = 1.10$, $t(122) = 25.51$, $p < .001$). This means that the story about the theft is most likely to have raised state suspicion about the participants in the suspicious condition. Next, the connection between the possibility of theft's lying and the deceptiveness ratings made after watching the first video was examined. These two measures were significantly correlated with each other in the suspicious condition ($r = .23$, $p = .011$), but not in the non-suspicious condition ($r = -.003$, $p = .97$). It means that the participants in the suspicious condition attributed the theft story to the suspicion of the speaker, whereas this was not true for the participants in the non-suspicious condition. Therefore, it was concluded that the manipulation of the state suspicion was successful.

Second, the GCS scores were compared across the conditions. The mean for the participants in the non-suspicious condition was 2.93 ($SD = 0.48$), and that for the suspicious condition was 2.92 ($SD = 0.46$). There was no significant difference between the two, $t(258) = 0.01$, $p = .978$, Cohen's $d = .002$.

Finally, the potential factors related to veracity judgments were also compared across the conditions. The mean scores of the questions about the guiltiness of thefts, the potential of a suspect lying, and the importance of accurate judgment also did not differ between conditions ($ps > .148$, $ds < .18$). A difference was found in the frequency of making veracity judgments. The participants in the suspicious condition ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 0.96$) reported a higher frequency than those in the non-suspicious condition ($M = 2.72$, $SD = 1.02$, $t(258) = 3.21$, $p = .002$, $d = .40$). In terms of the experience of being deceived, 26.9% of all participants were victimized at least once, and the proportion of people who experienced fraud did not differ between the conditions (30.7% for the non-suspicious condition and 22.8% for the suspicious condition; $\chi^2 = 1.67$, $p = .196$, $V = .08$).

SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSIS 2

A second supplemental analysis was performed to explore the association between the amount of gathered

information to make different judgments and the level of dispositional suspicion within the same participant. For this purpose, we selected only participants who judged one of the speakers as truthful and the other as deceptive ($n = 106$, 40.8%). Then, they were divided into a high GCS ($n = 66$: $M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.30$) and a low GCS group ($n = 40$: $M = 2.48$, $SD = 0.27$).

A mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA) with GCS group (2) \times condition (2) \times judgmental direction (2: truth vs. lying) was conducted on the number of watched videos. The first two were between-subject factors, and the judgment direction was a within-subject factor. The result showed the main effect of judgmental direction, $F(1, 102) = 24.67$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .195$, but the effects of GCS group, $F(1, 102) = 0.36$, $p = .549$, $\eta^2_p = .004$, and condition, $F(1, 102) = 0.45$, $p = .505$, $\eta^2_p = .004$, were insignificant. Overall, participants watched more videos when they reached lie judgments than truth judgments. The interaction between judgmental direction and condition was not significant, $F(1, 102) = 2.24$, $p = .137$, $\eta^2_p = .022$, but a such a trend was observed. Looking into the effect of the judgmental direction in each condition, participants in the suspicious condition watched more videos before making lie judgments than truth judgments, $t(102) = 2.49$, $p = .014$, $d = .30$. When the number of watched videos was compared across conditions in each judgmental direction, the result showed that participants in the suspicious condition watched slightly more videos than those in the non-suspicious condition before reaching the lie judgments, $t(102) = 4.51$, $p < .001$, $d = .52$. The three-way interaction was not significant ($p = .724$). These results remained unchanged after all the control variables in the previous regression analyses were added to the ANOVA as covariates.

In summary, these results showed that there was no difference by participant's level of GCS in the number of videos watched between making a truth judgment and a lie judgment. Therefore, regardless of the level of dispositional suspicion, participants engaged more in information gathering when making a truthful judgment than when making a lie judgment, which suggests that they were more reluctant to easily label the speaker as a liar.

SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSIS 3

The analysis in the section above showed that the information gathering behavior is related not only to individuals' GCS level, but also to the level of state suspicion and outcome of the veracity judgements, suggesting that these variables interact in a complex manner. In order to break down the interaction, we separated the state suspicion conditions and examined how GCS and number of watched videos predict veracity judgements. The results showed that the

number of videos watched was positively associated with lie judgments in both state suspicion conditions (low, $\Delta R^2 = .10$, $\beta = .28$, $Z = 3.91$, $p < .001$; high, $\Delta R^2 = .13$, $\beta = .33$, $Z = 5.27$, $p < .001$). On the contrary, GCS was not related to veracity judgement in both conditions ($ps > .45$). These findings suggest a possibility that the information gathering behavior mediated the association between GCS and lie judgment. However, the result of Sobel tests denied that possibility, revealing no indirect effect of GCS on lie judgments via information gathering (low state condition, $Z = -0.28$, $p = .782$; high state condition, $Z = -1.62$, $p = .105$).

REFERENCES

- Levine, T. R., & McCornack, S. A. (1991). The dark side of trust: Conceptualizing and measuring types of communicative suspicion. *Communication Quarterly*, 39, 325–340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379109369809>
- Murai, J., Nose, I., & Takiguchi, Y. (2018). The more attractive, the less deceptive? Effects of female facial attractiveness on perceived deceptiveness. *Psychology*, 9, 529–539. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2018.94032>
- Reinhard, M. A., Greifeneder, R., & Scharmach, M. (2013). Unconscious processes improve lie detection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105, 721–739. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034352>