

Figure 1. Average sample size (n_{act}) as a function of the probability of drawing a majority representation (P_{maj}) based on the results of the simulation experiment (panel A), and as a function of the probability of choosing the majority option (PC_{maj}) (Panel B). Both Panels A and B are adapted with permission from "The Construction of Attitudinal Judgments: Evidence from Attitude Certainty and Response Latency," by A. Koriat and S. Adiv, 2011, *Social Cognition, 29*, p. 586–587. Copyright 2011 by Guilford Press.





Figure 2. Mean confidence (left panel) and response latency (right panel) for majority and minority responses for items with low consensus and high consensus. The results for confidence are based on 7 experiments, and those for response latency are based on 8 experiments. The figures are based on a reanalysis of the raw data (see text for details).

Supplementary material





Figure 3. Mean confidence (left panel) and response latency (right panel) for frequent and rare choices as a function of item consistency (the number of times that the majority choice was made). The results are based on 6 experiments (see text for details). Panels A, B, C, and D are adapted from "Subjective Confidence in Perceptual Judgments: A Test of the Self-Consistency Model," by A. Koriat, 2011, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 140*, p. 124 and 130. Copyright 2011 by the American Psychological Association. Panels E and F are adapted from "The Construction of Categorization Judgments: Using Subjective Confidence and Response Latency to Test a Distributed Model," by A. Koriat and H. Sorka, 2014. Panels G and H are adapted with permission from "Confidence in One's Social Beliefs: Implications for Belief Justification," by A. Koriat and S. Adiv, 2012, *Consciousness and Cognition, 21*, p.1606. Copyright 2012 by Elsevier Inc. Panels I and J are adapted with permission from "The Construction of Attitudinal Judgments: Evidence from Attitude Certainty and Response Latency," by A. Koriat and S. Adiv, 2011, *Social Cognition, 29*, p. 589. Copyright 2011 by Guilford Press. Panels K and L are adapted with permission from "Confidence in Personal Preferences" by A. Koriat, 2013, *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 26*, p. 252. Copyright 2012 by John Wiley & Sons.

Supplementary material





Figure 4. Mean confidence (left panel) and response latency (right panel) for majority and minority predictions of others' responses for lowconsensus and high-consensus items. The results are based on 5 experiments (see text for details). Panels A, B, C, and D are based on a reanalysis of the results reported in "Confidence in the Predictions of Others' Beliefs and Attitudes," by A. Koriat and S. Adiv, 2014. Panels E and F are based on a reanalysis of the results reported in "Confidence in Personal Preferences," by A. Koriat, 2013, *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, *26*, 247-259. Panels E, F, G and H are based on a reanalysis of results reported in "Can People Predict Whether Group Discussion Should Be Beneficial or Detrimental to Accurate Decisions?" by A. Koriat, 2014.

Experiment	Variable	n	n	Confidence	Mean	Mean	t-test	95% CI	Cohen's	Binomial
		items	Participants	Scale	Majority	Minority			d	
General Knowledge (Koriat, 2008)	Conf.	105	41	50-100	72.31	64.36	<i>t</i> (40) = 14.79, <i>p</i> < .0001	<u>+</u> 1.05 (6.90 – 9.00)	1.34	41 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
	Response Latency				5.05	5.79	t(40) = 6.24, p < .0001	$\pm 0.23 (0.51 - 0.97)$	0.39	35 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
Perceptual –Lines (Koriat, 2011)	Conf.	40	39	0-100	69.42	60.87	<i>t</i> (38) = 7.08, <i>p</i> < .0001	<u>+</u> 2.37 (6.18 – 10.92)	0.82	35 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
	Response Latency				7.59	9.46	t(38) = 3.69, p < .001	$\pm 0.99 (0.88 - 2.86)$	0.35	30 subs, <i>p</i> < .001
Perceptual –Shapes (Koriat, 2011)	Conf.	40	41	50-100	75.56	66.96	t(40) = 9.42, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 1.79 (6.81 – 10.39)	0.95	39 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
	Response Latency				6.46	9.15	t(40) = 5.84, p < .0001	$\pm 0.90 (1.78 - 3.58)$	0.66	35 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
Category Membership	Conf.	100	33	0-100	87.46	74.98	t(32) = 8.17, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 2.99 (9.49 – 15.47)	1.16	31 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
(Koriat & Sorka, 2014)	Response Latency				4.00	5.25	t(32) = 7.94, p < .0001	$\pm 0.31 (0.94 - 1.56)$	1.15	31 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
Like-Dislike Judgments (Huge & Glynn, 2013)	Response Latency	75	198		1.39	1.58	<i>t</i> (197) = 12.54, <i>p</i> < .0001	<u>+</u> 0.03 (0.16 – 0.22)	0.50	173 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
Beliefs (Koriat & Adiv,	Conf.	60	41	0-100	79.69	70.21	t(40) = 7.48, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 2.48 (7.00 – 11.96)	0.95	39 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
2012)	Response Latency				3.24	4.15	t(40) = 5.24, p < .0001	$\pm 0.34 \ (0.58 - 1.26)$	0.54	33 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
Attitudes (Koriat & Adiv, 2011)	Conf.	50	41	0-100	79.76	63.47	t(40) = 16.27, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 1.96 (14.33 – 18.25)	1.83	41 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
	Response Latency				2.82	3.48	t(40) = 4.64, p < .0001	$\pm 0.28 (0.38 - 0.94)$	0.51	35 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
Preferences (Koriat, 2012)	Conf.	60	41	0-100	82.68	77.24	t(40) = 5.02, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 2.12 (3.32 – 7.56)	0.55	35 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
	Response Latency				3.87	4.36	t(40) = 2.85, p < .01	$\pm 0.34 (0.15 - 0.83)$	0.31	30 subs, <i>p</i> < .005

 Table 1: Subject-Based Analyses: For Each Study, The Table Lists the Number of Items, the Number of Participants, the Confidence Scale Used, Mean Confidence/Latency for Majority and Minority Responses, t-test, 95% CI for the Difference, Cohen's d, and Binomial Test

Table 2: Item-Based Analyses: The Table Lists for Each Study the Number of Items, the Number of Participants, the Confidence Scale Used, Mean Confidence/Latency for Majority and Minority Responses, t-test, 95% CI for the Difference, Cohen's d, and Binomial Test (The removal of responses with outlier response latency sometimes resulted in 100% consensus for one or two additional items, and these were removed)

Experiment	Variable	n items	n Participants	Confidence Scale	Mean Majority	Mean Minority	t-test	95% CI	Cohen's	Binomial
		nems	1 articipants	Beale	wingonity	winnority			u	
General Knowledge (Koriat, 2008)	Conf.	104	41	50-100	70.92	64.59	t(103) = 6.74, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 1.84 (4.49 – 8.17)	0.53	78 items, <i>p</i> < .0001
	Response Latency				5.14	5.91	t(103) = 4.17, p < .0001	$\pm 0.36 (0.41 - 1.13)$	0.52	67 items, <i>p</i> < .005
Perceptual –Lines (Koriat, 2011)	Conf.	38	39	0-100	68.48	62.33	t(37) = 3.66, p < .001	\pm 3.29 (2.86 – 9.44)	0.82	32 items, <i>p</i> < .0001
	Response Latency		57		8.05	9.62	t(37) = 2.09, p < .05	<u>+</u> 1.47 (0.10 – 3.04)	0.50	28 items, <i>p</i> < .005
Perceptual – Shapes (Koriat, 2011)	Conf.	36	41	50-100	74.03	67.00	t(35) = 4.88, p < .0001	$\pm 2.82 (4.21 - 9.85)$	1.11	29 items, <i>p</i> < .0005
()	Response Latency				6.87	9.46	<i>t</i> (35) = 4.55, <i>p</i> < .0001	<u>+</u> 1.12 (1.48 – 3.72)	1.07	28 items, <i>p</i> < .0005
Category Membership	Conf.	85	33	0-100	84.61	75.27	t(84) = 5.30, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 3.45 (5.88 – 12.78)	0.70	65 items, <i>p</i> < .0001
(Koriat & Sorka, 2014)	Response Latency				4.34	5.22	t(84) = 4.53, p < .0001	$\pm 0.38 (0.50 - 1.26)$	0.70	56 items, <i>p</i> < .005
Like-Dislike Judgments (Huge & Glvnn, 2013)	Response Latency	75	198		1.41	1.57	<i>t</i> (74) = 4.44, <i>p</i> < .0001	<u>+</u> 0.07 (0.09 – 0.23)	0.51	53 items, <i>p</i> < .0005
Beliefs (Koriat & Adiy.	Conf.	59	41	0-100	78.90	68.68	t(58) = 5.81, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 3.45 (6.78 – 13.68)	1.16	47 items, <i>p</i> < .0001
2012)	Response Latency	58			3.29	4.11	t(58) = 3.04, p < .005	<u>+</u> 0.53 (0.28 – 1.34)	0.60	36 items, <i>p</i> < .07
Attitudes (Koriat & Adiv, 2011)	Conf.	46	41	0-100	77.80	62.28	t(45) = 5.65, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 5.38 (10.13 – 20.89)	1.31	36 items, <i>p</i> < .0001
	Response Latency	45			2.86	3.85	t(44) = 3.13, p < .005	$\pm 0.62 (0.37 - 1.61)$	0.69	35 items, <i>p</i> < .0005
Preferences (Koriat, 2012)	Conf.	59	41	0-100	82.09	76.73	t(58) = 4.13, p < .0001	$\pm 0.40 (4.35 - 5.15)$	0.66	44 items, <i>p</i> < .0005
· · · · /	Response Latency				3.94	4.75	t(58) = 3.66, p < .0005	$\pm 0.43 (0.38 - 1.24)$	0.64	37 items, <i>p</i> < .05

Table 3: Within-Individual Analyses: The Table Lists for Each Study the Number of Items, the Number of Presentations, the Confidence Scale Used, MeanConfidence/Latency for Frequent and Rare Responses, t-test, 95% CI for the Difference, Cohen's d, and Binomial Test

Experiment	Variable	n	n	Confidence	Mean	Mean	t-test	95% CI	Cohen's	Binomial
		items	Presentations	Scale	Frequent	Rare			d	
Perceptual – Lines	Conf.			0-100	62.71	59.03	t(38) = 5.22, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 1.37 (2.31 – 5.05)	0.25	31 items, <i>p</i> < .0005
(Koriat, 2011)	Response Latency	39	5		6.25	7.28	t(38) = 3.45, p < .005	$\pm 0.59 (0.44 - 1.62)$	0.28	35 items , <i>p</i> < .0001
Perceptual – Shapes	Conf.			50-100	68.43	66.62	t(40) = 3.22, p < .005	<u>+</u> 1.10 (0.71 – 2.91)	0.19	28 items , <i>p</i> < .05
(Koriat, 2011)	Response Latency	41	5		4.73	6.44	t(40) = 4.21, p < .0001	$\pm 0.79 (0.92 - 2.50)$	0.68	37 items, <i>p</i> < 0001
Category Membership	Conf.			0-100	73.92	62.70	t(32) = 7.37, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 2.99 (8.23 – 14.21)	0.69	30 items, <i>p</i> < .0001
(Koriat & Sorka, 2014)	Response Latency	33	7		3.22	3.74	t(32) = 3.64, p < .005	$\pm 0.28 (0.24 - 0.80)$	0.62	24 items , <i>p</i> < .01
Beliefs (Koriat &	Conf.	41	E	0-100	66.76	56.09	t(40) = 5.29, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 3.95 (6.71 – 14.61)	0.67	36 items, <i>p</i> < .0001
Adiv, 2012)	Response Latency	41	0		3.00	3.92	<i>t</i> (40) = 3.25, <i>p</i> < .005	<u>+</u> 0.55 (0.37 – 1.47)	0.55	32 items, <i>p</i> < .0005
Attitudes (Koriat &	Conf.	41	7	0-100	59.84	44.93	<i>t</i> (40) = 4.53, <i>p</i> < .0001	<u>+</u> 6.52 (8.38 – 21.42)	0.88	34 items, <i>p</i> < .0001
Aulv, 2011)	Response Latency	40			2.29	3.49	<i>t</i> (39) = 3.07, <i>p</i> < .005	<u>+</u> 0.77 (0.43 – 1.97)	0.64	29 items, <i>p</i> < .005
Preferences (Koriat, 2012)	Conf.	40		0-100	65.96	52.73	<i>t</i> (39) = 4.56, <i>p</i> < .0001	<u>+</u> 5.68 (7.55 – 18.91)	0.74	32 items, <i>p</i> <.0001
	Response Latency	38			3.36	3.16	t(37) = 0.85, p < .41	<u>+</u> 0.44 (-0.64 – +0.24)	0.15	11 items, <i>p</i> < .01

Table 4: Confidence and Response Latency for the Predictions of Others' Responses: The Table Lists for Each Study the Number of Items, the Number ofParticipants, the Confidence Scale Used, Mean Confidence/Latency for Majority and Minority Responses, t-test, 95% CI for the Difference, Cohen's dand Binomial Test

Experiment	Variable	n items	n Participants	Confidence Scale	Mean Majority	Mean Minority	t-test	95% CI	Cohen's d	Binomial
Beliefs (Koriat & Adiv, 2014)	Conf.	60	41	0-100	72.99	64.92	<i>t</i> (40) = 10.47, <i>p</i> < .0001	<u>+</u> 1.51 (6.56 – 9.58)	0.70	37 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
	Response Latency				3.50	4.37	t(40) = 4.06, p < .0005	<u>+</u> 0.42 (0.45 – 1.29)	0.38	35 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
Attitudes (Koriat & Adiv, 2014)	Conf.	42 (out		0-100	71.32	61.51	t(39) = 9.01, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 2.14 (7.67 – 11.95)	1.04	39 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
	Response Latency	of 48)	40		2.70	3.46	<i>t</i> (39) = 4.18, <i>p</i> < .0005	<u>+</u> 0.35 (0.41 – 1.11)	0.61	33 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
Preferences (Koriat, 2012)	Conf.	57 (out	ut 41	0-100	73.76	62.32	t(40) = 7.96, p < .0001	<u>+</u> 2.81 (8.63 – 14.25)	0.05	39 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
	Response Latency	of 59)			2.54	3.10	t(40) = 3.99, p < .0005	$\pm 0.27 (0.28 - 0.82)$	0.01	34 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
Perceptual- Lines (Koriat, 2014)	Conf.	34 (out of 40)	34 (out 20 of 40)	50-100	73.33	69.00	t(19) = 4.24, p < .0005	<u>+</u> 2.00 (2.32 – 6.32)	0.74	16 subs, <i>p</i> < .01
	Response Latency				4.94	5.80	t(19) = 2.69, p < .05	<u>+</u> 0.63 (0.23 – 1.49)	0.38	14 subs, <i>p</i> < .08
Perceptual- Shapes (Koriat, 2014)	Conf.	31 (out of 40)	19 (out	50-100	74.40	68.07	t(18) = 4.09, p < .001	<u>+</u> 3.04 (3.29 – 9.37)	0.75	18 subs, <i>p</i> < .0001
	Response Latency		of 20)		4.19	6.13	t(18) = 3.03, p < .01	<u>+</u> 1.25 (0.69 – 3.19)	0.80	16 subs, <i>p</i> < .005