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BACKGROUND

The fairy tale of Pinocchio teaches children that lies are a bad thing and also easily detected - all it takes is two eyes, and perhaps a ruler. But outside of this fantasy world the detection of lies is actually challenging.

Several studies identified behavioral and functional anatomic correlates of lying and revealed that lying demands more cognitive resources than responding truthfully (e.g., Spence et al., 2001; Walczyk et al., 2009).

Correspondingly the event-related potential P300 was found to be attenuated for lying compared to truthful responses (Johnson et al., 2003). However, this difference vanished when participants decided whether to tell the truth or whether to lie in each trial. Thus we set up an experiment that isolated this decision to focus on the actual truthful and dishonest responses.

We expected lying to prolong reaction times (RTs) and to attenuate the amplitude of the P300 component for the actual target.

RESULTS

Peak amplitude of the P300 component was attenuated in lie trials compared to truth trials as indicated by a main effect of intention, $F(1, 30) = 22.44, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .43$.

The largest amplitudes were observed over Pz, followed by Cz and Fz, $F(2, 60) = 88.44, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .75$. Neither the main effect of feedback, $F(1, 30) = 0.03, p = .873, \eta_p^2 < .01$, nor any interaction was significant, $p s \geq .108$.

RTs were higher when participants lied about the knife’s position than when they indicated its true position, $F(1, 30) = 5.20, p = .031, \eta_p^2 = .15$.

CONCLUSION

The current study set out to investigate the correlates of lying and came up with the following results: The P300 amplitude was considerably attenuated for lies even though participants chose whether to lie or whether to tell the truth on each trial. Replicating previous findings (e.g., Spence et al., 2001) lying took longer than responding honestly.

The observed effects are most likely caused by the increased complexity of lie-telling as compared to responding truthfully.
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