

## Appendices

### Appendix A

#### *A.1 Instruction money prime condition (presented on a printed paper sheet)*

Task 1:

In the following we would like to ask you to do an estimation task. The experimenter will show you a jar filled with bank notes.

Please estimate the value of the bank notes.

Studies show that the ability to estimate improves when the goods to be estimated can be touched. Therefore, please reach into the glass to touch the bank notes.

**Now please go to the experimenter and reach into the jar.**

Write down the estimated value of the bank notes:

---

Task 2:

Please estimate the number of bank notes.

Please reach into the glass again to enable a more accurate estimate.

**Now please go to the experimenter and reach into the jar.**

Write down the estimated number of bank notes:

---

**WHEN YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE CONTACT THE  
EXPERIMENTER SO THEY CAN ASSIGN YOU TO A PC!**

#### *A.2 Instruction paper prime condition (presented on a printed paper sheet)*

Task 1:

In the following we would like to ask you to do an estimation task. The experimenter will show you a jar filled with paper sheets.

Please estimate the weight of the paper sheets.

Studies show that the ability to estimate improves when the goods to be estimated can be touched. So, to give you a more accurate estimate, you are allowed to put your hands inside the jar.

**Now please go to the experimenter and reach into the jar.**

Write down the estimated weight of the paper sheets:

---

Task 2:

Please estimate the number of the paper sheets.

To give you a more accurate guess, you may put your hand in the jar again.

**Now please go to the experimenter and reach into the jar.**

Write down the estimated number of leaves:

---

**WHEN YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE CONTACT THE  
EXPERIMENTER SO THEY CAN ASSIGN YOU TO A PC!**

## Appendix B

### *Supplementary material, additional analysis*

#### *Judgmental bias*

No significant influence of the control variable gender on judgmental bias was found,  $F(1, 162) = 0.27, p = .603, \eta_p^2 = .00, 95\% \text{ CI}_{\text{female}} [-8.41, 8.21]$ . Gender and prime condition did not interact significantly,  $F(1, 162) = 1.27, p = .261, \eta_p^2 = .01$ . Unexpectedly, analysis yielded a significant main effect for the control variable set of messages,  $F(2, 161) = 14.38, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .16$  (set 1:  $M = 56.85\%, SD = 11.55\%$ ; set 2:  $M = 45.41\%, SD = 9.09\%$ ; set 3:  $M = 53.56\%, SD = 10.71\%$ ),  $95\% \text{ CI}_{\text{set 1}} [-9.95, 8.28], 95\% \text{ CI}_{\text{set 2}} [-12.49, 5.05]$ . However, there was no significant interaction between prime condition and set of messages on judgmental bias,  $F(1, 162) = 0.77, p = .465, \eta_p^2 = .01$ . No significant three-way interaction was found,  $F(2, 161) = 0.70, p = .501, \eta_p^2 = .01$  (see also Table 2).

#### *Classification accuracy*

Further, the analysis yielded no significant effect for the control variable gender on classification accuracy,  $F(1, 162) = 3.48, p = .064, \eta_p^2 = .02, 95\% \text{ CI}_{\text{female}} [-4.38, 10.66]$ . Gender and prime condition did not interact significantly,  $F(1, 162) = 0.32, p = .570, \eta_p^2 = .00$ . Unexpectedly, a significant main effect of the control variable set of statements on classification accuracy was shown,  $F(2, 161) = 21.87, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .23, 95\% \text{ CI}_{\text{set 1}} [-5.44, 11.05], 95\% \text{ CI}_{\text{set 2}} [7.83, 23.71]$ . We found no significant interaction between prime condition and set of messages on classification accuracy,  $F(2, 161) = 1.87, p = .158, \eta_p^2 = .02$ . There was no significant three-way interaction,  $F(2, 161) = 1.21, p = .302, \eta_p^2 = .02$  (see also Table 2).

#### *Classification confidence*

Further, for the control variable gender, no significant effect on classification confidence was found,  $F(1, 162) = 0.32, p = .575, \eta_p^2 = .00, 95\% \text{ CI}_{\text{female}} [-12.78, 7.01]$ . Further, no significant interaction between gender and prime condition emerged,  $F(1, 162) = 0.59, p = .444, \eta_p^2 = .00$ . There was also no significant effect for the control variable set of messages on classification confidence,  $F(2, 161) = 0.08, p = .926, \eta_p^2 = .00, 95\% \text{ CI}_{\text{set 1}} [-12.64, 9.06], 95\% \text{ CI}_{\text{set 2}} [-15.51, 5.38]$ . In line, analysis further yielded no significant interaction between prime condition and set of messages on classification confidence,  $F(2, 161) = 1.81, p = .167, \eta_p^2 = .02$ . No significant three-way interaction was found,  $F(2, 161) = 0.93, p = .396, \eta_p^2 = .01$  (see also Table 2).

**Table 2**

*Results of the additional univariate analysis of variance for judgmental bias, classification accuracy, and classification confidence depending on gender of the judges*

	Main effect (gender)		Interaction (gender x prime)	
	<i>F</i> (1, 161)	$\eta^2$	<i>F</i> (1, 161)	$\eta^2$
Truth bias	2.40	.02	1.85	.01
Classification accuracy				
Overall	0.37	.00	0.13	.00
True messages	3.48	.02	2.22	.01
Deceptive messages	0.38	.00	0.42	.00
Classification confidence				
Overall	0.33	.00	0.20	.00
True messages	0.77	.01	0.00	.00
Deceptive messages	0.04	.00	0.75	.01