

SEX DIFFERENCES ON COGNITIVE REFLECTION: A META-ANALYSIS

Supplementary Materials of the Manuscript:

Sex Differences on Cognitive Reflection: A meta-analysis

Inmaculada Otero, Alexandra Martínez, Dámaris Cuadrado, Mario Lado, Silvia Moscoso, and
Jesús F. Salgado

Table S1.*Studies Included in the Meta-analysis of the Sex Differences on CR*

Study	Year	Type of CRT	N	d_{xy}	r_{xx}	Sample
Aczel et al.	2015	original	864	0.256	.62	
Aktas et al.	2017	original	267	0.124	.54	Study 1
		original	239	0.345	.63	Study 2
		original	382	-0.165	.73	Study 3
Albaity et al.	2014	original	880	0.486	-	
Alós-Ferrer et al.	2016	original	155	0.476	-	
Alós-Ferrer & Hügelschäfer	2012	original	416	0.827	-	Exp. 1
		original	111	0.528	-	Exp. 2
		original	364	0.335	-	Exp. Class
Avram	2018	original	194	0.441	-	
Bar-Hillel et al.	2019	V-CRT	394	0.056	.49	
Baron et al.	2015	original	103	0.242	.62	
Bialek et al.	2019	CRT-6	123	0.258	.78	Study 1
		original	122	0.124	.78	Study 2
Bosch-Doménech et al.	2014	original	623	0.394	-	
Bosley et al.	2019	original	451	0.438	.62	
Bronstein et al.	2019	original	947	0.387	.70	
		V-CRT	947	0.068	.63	
Brosnan et al.	2014	original	68	0.517	-	
Browne et al.	2014	original	1,137	0.538	-	
Burger et al.	2020	original	399	0.266	.54	Study 1
		CRT-6	399	0.322	.78	Study 1
		original	304	0.458	.53	Study 2
		CRT-6	304	0.516	.77	Study 2
Byrd & Conway	2019	original	276	0.181	.80	Study 1
		V-CRT	276	-0.080	-	Study 1
		original	191	0.120	.78	Study 2
		V-CRT	191	0.100	-	Study 2
Cáceres & San Martín	2017	original	19	1.060	-	
Calvillo et al.	2019	CRT-7	411	0.539	-	Exp. 1
		CRT-7	231	0.086	-	Exp. 2
Campitelli & Gerrans	2014	original	2,019	0.336	.66	
Campitelli & Labollita	2010	original	155	0.220	-	
Capraro et al.	2017	CRT-7	677	0.604	-	
Čavojová et al.	2019	CRT-7	121	0.604	.77	
Cheng & Janssen	2019	V-CRT	135	0.110	.60	
Corgnet et al.	2015	CRT-7	150	0.603	-	Study 1
		CRT-7	158	0.673	-	Study 2

Table S1.*Continuation*

Study	Year	Type of CRT	<i>N</i>	d_{xy}	r_{xx}	Sample
Corgnet et al.	2016	CRT-7	150	0.549	-	
Drummond & Fischhoff	2017	original	395	0.383	.80	Study 1a
		original	393	0.324	.73	Study 1c
		original	268	0.307	.80	Study 2
Duttle & Inukai	2015	original	66	1.155	-	
Finucane & Gullion	2010	CRT-6	608	0.408	.80	
Fosgaard et al.	2019	original	1,926	0.377	-	
Frederick	2005	original	3,428	0.112	-	
Gervais et al.	2018	original	3,461	0.370	-	
Grossman et al.	2014	CRT-4	224	0.346	-	
Guthrie et al.	2007	original	241	0.132	-	
Kahan	2017	original	1,993	0.381	.65	
Kiss et al.	2016	original	900	0.343	-	
Koehler & Pennycook	2019	V-CRT	866	0.138	.61	
Lohse	2016	original	284	0.359	-	
Narayanan & Moritz	2015	original	96	0.062	-	
Mandel & Kapler	2018	original	190	0.636	.71	Exp. 1
		original	316	0.223	.80	Exp. 2
Muñoz-Murillo et al.	2020	original	195	0.676	-	
Obrecht et al.	2009	original	417	0.606	-	
^a Otero	2019	original	1,367	0.452	.58	
		CRT-10	1,367	0.632	.70	
Otero	2020	CRT-10	186	0.325	.65	Study 2
		original	186	0.113	.64	Study 2
		V-CRT	186	0.475	.45	Study 2
Pennycook et al.	2012	original	223	0.324	-	Study 1
		original	267	0.473	-	Study 2
Pennycook et al.	2016	original	369	0.510	-	
Pennycook & Rand	2019a	original	799	0.320	.68	Study 1
		V-CRT	790	0.158	.57	Study 1
		original	2,630	0.512	.71	Study 2
		V-CRT	2,615	0.150	.58	Study 2
Pennycook & Rand	2019b	original	401	0.351	.74	Study 1
		V-CRT	401	0.092	.63	Study 1
		original	397	0.233	.74	Study 2
		V-CRT	395	0.134	.54	Study 2

Table S1.*Continuation*

Study	Year	Type of CRT	<i>N</i>	d_{xy}	r_{xx}	Sample
Ponti & Carbone	2009	original	48	0.873	-	
Ponti et al.	2014	original	192	0.512	-	
^a Primi et al.	2015	original	939	0.340	-	
		CRT-6	908	0.320	.76	
Primi et al.	2018	original	281	0.719	-	Study 1b
		original	282	0.624	-	
		original	282	0.624	-	
		original	282	0.529	-	
		original	282	0.529	-	
		original	282	0.529	-	
		original	282	0.434	-	
		original	282	0.434	-	
		original	281	0.339	-	
		CRT-6	181	0.699	.76	Study 2
Razmyar & Reeve	2013	original	150	0.606	.64	
Royzman et al.	2014	original	527	0.372	.75	
Royzman et al.	2015	CRT-6	548	0.335	.85	
Sajid & Li	2019	original	601	0.508	.72	
Schulze & Newell	2015	original	58	0.817	-	Exp. 2a
		original	58	0.829	-	Exp. 2b
Sinayev & Peters	2015	CRT-5	1,459	0.473	-	Study 2
^b Sirota et al.	2021	°CRT-N	112	0.160	.75	
		°CRT-N	113	0.225	.75	
		°CRT-N	113	0.225	.75	
		°CRT-N	113	0.290	.75	
		°CRT-N	113	0.290	.75	
		°CRT-N	113	0.290	.75	
		°CRT-N	113	0.355	.75	
		°CRT-N	113	0.355	.75	
		°CRT-N	111	0.420	.75	
		V-CRT	112	-0.200	.83	
		V-CRT	113	-0.130	.83	
		V-CRT	113	-0.130	.83	
		V-CRT	113	-0.060	.83	
		V-CRT	113	-0.060	.83	

Table S1.*Continuation*

Study	Year	Type of CRT	<i>N</i>	d_{xy}	r_{xx}	Sample
		V-CRT	113	-0.060	.83	
		V-CRT	113	0.010	.83	
		V-CRT	113	0.010	.83	
		V-CRT	111	0.070	.83	
Skagerlund et al.	2018	original	2,058	0.432	.63	
Šrol	2019	original	1,204	0.550	.70	
		CRT-4	1,204	0.520	.65	
Stagnaro et al.	2018	original	2,759	0.364	-	
Stagnaro et al.	2019	original	513	0.279	.63	Study 1
		original	545	0.421	.69	Study 2
		V-CRT	545	0.324	.65	Study 2
Ståhl & Van Prooijen	2018	original	333	-0.098	.72	Study 1
		V-CRT	333	-0.293	.60	Study 1
		original	302	0.345	.74	Study 2
		V-CRT	302	0.060	.66	Study 2
Stieger & Reips	2016	original	2,127	0.275	.64	
Svenson et al.	2018	original	122	0.438	.69	
Teigen et al.	2018	original	130	0.570	.71	
^a Thomson & Oppenheimer	2016	original	129	0.813	.62	
		V-CRT	131	0.248	.51	
^a Toplak et al.	2014	original	158	0.637	-	
		CRT-4	158	0.652	-	
Toplak et al.	2017	CRT-11	232	0.473	.80	
Ventis	2015	original	146	0.449	.67	
Welsh et al.	2013	original	102	0.516	-	
Willard & Norenzayan	2017	original	1,006	0.306	-	
Woike	2019	original	698	0.250	.78	Study 2
		CRT-3	698	0.330	.66	Study 2
Yilmaz et al.	2019	original	8,647	0.445	-	
Yilmaz & Saribay	2016	original	337	0.293	.72	Study 1
		original	691	0.600	.50	Study 2
		original	126	0.128	.43	Study 3a
		original	86	0.473	.70	Study 3b
^a Yilmaz & Saribay	2017	original	395	0.366	.75	
		V-CRT	395	-0.020	.64	
Zhang et al.	2016	Original	205	0.370	.75	

Note. N = sample size; d_{xy} = observed effect size; r_{xx} = internal consistency reliability of CR; CRT-3 = cognitive reflection test of Frederick (2005); V-CRT = verbal-CRT.

^aThe effect sizes are from the same sample but using different CR test.

^bThe distribution of effect sizes were obtained from a meta-analytic study.

^cThe CRT used in this study is a mixture of the CRT-3 (Frederick, 2005) and the CRT-7 of Toplak et al. (2014).

REFERENCES:

- Aczel, B., Bago, B., Szollosi, A., Foldes, A., and Lukacs, B. 2015. Measuring individual differences in decision biases: Methodological considerations. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 1770. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01770>
- Aktaş, B., Yılmaz, O., and Bahçekapılı, H. G. 2017. Moral pluralism on the trolley tracks: Different normative principles are used for 453 different reasons in justifying moral judgments. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 123, 297-307.
- Albaity, M., Rahman, M., and Shahidul, I. 2014. Cognitive reflection test and behavioral biases in Malaysia. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 92, 148-151.
- Alós-Ferrer, C., Garagnani, M., and Hügelschäfer, S. 2016. Cognitive reflection, decision biases, and response times. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1402. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01402>
- Alós-Ferrer, C., and Hügelschäfer, S. 2012. Faith in intuition and behavioral biases. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 841, 459 182-192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2012.08.004>
- Avram, L. A. 2018. Gender differences and other findings on the cognitive reflection test. *Studia Universitatis Babes Bolyai-Oeconomica*, 461 633, 56-67. <https://doi.org/10.2478/subboec-2018-0014>
- Bar-Hillel, M., Noah, T., and Shane, F. 2019. Solving stumpers, CRT and CRAT: Are the abilities related? *Judgment and Decision Making*, 145, 620-623.
- Baron, J., Scott, S., Fincher, K., and Metz, S. E. 2015. Why does the cognitive reflection test sometimes predict utilitarian moral judgment and other things? *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 43, 265–284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jar-466>
- Bialek, M., Bergelt, M., Majima, Y., and Koehler, D. J. 2019. Cognitive reflection but not reinforcement sensitivity is consistently associated with delay discounting of gains and losses. *Journal of Neuroscience, Psychology, and Economics*, 123-4, 169-183. <https://doi.org/10.1037/npe0000111>
- Bosch-Domènech, A., Brañas-Garza, P., and Espín, A. M. 2014. Can exposure to prenatal sex hormones 2D: 4D predict cognitive reflection? *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 43, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2014.01.023>
- Bosley, S. A., Bellemare, M. F., Umwali, L., and York, J. 2019. Decision-making and vulnerability in a pyramid scheme fraud. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 80, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2019.02.011>

- Bronstein, M. V., Pennycook, G., Bear, A., Rand, D. G., and Cannon, T. D. 2019. Belief in fake news is associated with delusionality, 479 dogmatism, religious fundamentalism, and reduced analytic thinking. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 81, 480 108-117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2018.09.005> 481
- Brosnan, M., Hollinworth, M., Antoniadou, K., and Lewton, M. 2014. Is empathizing intuitive and systemizing deliberative? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 66, 39-43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.03.006> 483
- Browne, M., Pennycook, G., Goodwin, B., and McHenry, M. 2014. Reflective minds and open hearts: Cognitive style and personality 484 predict religiosity and spiritual thinking in a community sample. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 447, 736-742. 485 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2059> 486
- Burger, A. M., Pfattheicher, S., and Jauch, M. 2020. The role of motivation in the association of political ideology with cognitive 489 performance. *Cognition*, 195, 104124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2019.104124> 490
- Byrd, N., and Conway, P. 2019. Not all who ponder count costs: Arithmetic reflection predicts utilitarian tendencies, but logical 491 reflection predicts both deontological and utilitarian tendencies. *Cognition*, 192, 103995. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2019.06.007> 493
- Cáceres, P., and San Martín, R. 2017. Low cognitive impulsivity is associated with better gain and loss learning in a probabilistic 494 decision-making task. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 204. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00204> 495
- Calvillo, D. P., Swan, A. B., and Rutchick, A. M. 2020. Ideological belief bias with political syllogisms. *Thinking and Reasoning*, 262, 496 291-310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13546783.2019.1688188> 497
- Campitelli, G., and Gerrans, P. 2014. Does the cognitive reflection test measure cognitive reflection? A mathematical modeling ap-498 proach. *Memory and Cognition*, 423, 434-447. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-013-0367-9> 499
- Campitelli, G., and Labollita, M. 2010. Correlations of cognitive reflection with judgments and choices. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 500 53, 182-191. 501
- Capraro, V., Corgnet, B., Espín, A. M., and Hernán-González, R. 2017. Deliberation favours social efficiency by making people dis-502 regard their relative shares: Evidence from USA and India. *Royal Society Open Science*, 42, 160605. 503 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.160605> 504
- Čavojová, V., Secară, E. C., Jurkovič, M., and Šrol, J. 2019. Reception and willingness to share pseudo-profound bullshit and their 505 relation to other epistemically suspect beliefs and cognitive ability in Slovakia and Romania. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 332, 506 299-311. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3486> 507
- Cheng, J., and Janssen, C. 2019. The relationship between an alternative form of cognitive reflection test and intertemporal choice. 508 *Studia Psychologica*, 612, 86-98. <https://doi.org/10.21909/sp.2019.02.774> 509
- Corgnet, B., Espín, A. M., and Hernán-González, R. 2015. Creativity and cognitive skills among millennials: Thinking too much and 515 creating too little. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1626. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01626> 516

- Corngnet, B., Espín, A. M., and Hernán-González, R. 2016. The cognitive basis of social behavior: Cognitive reflection overrides anti-517 social but not always prosocial motives. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 9, 287. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00287> 518
- Drummond, C., and Fischhoff, B. 2017. Development and validation of the scientific reasoning scale. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 301, 26-38. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.1906> 525
- Dutt, K., and Inukai, K. 2015. Complexity aversion: Influences of cognitive abilities, culture and system of thought. *Economic Bulletin*, 352, 846-855. 527
- Finucane, M. L., and Gullion, C. M. 2010. Developing a tool for measuring the decision-making competence of older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, 252, 271-288. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019106>. 540
- Fosgaard, T. R., Hansen, L. G., and Wengström, E. 2019. Cooperation, framing, and political attitudes. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 158, 416-427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2018.12.010> 542
- Frederick, S. 2005. Cognitive reflection and decision making. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19, 25-42. 543 <https://doi.org/10.1257/089533005775196732> 544
- Gervais, W. M., van Elk, M., Xygalatas, D., McKay, R. T., Aveyard, M., Buchtel, E. E., Dar-Nimrod, I., Klocova, E. K., Ramsay, J. E.; 545 Riekk, T.; Svedholm-Hakkinen, A. M., and Bulbulia, J. 2018. Analytic atheism: A cross-culturally weak and fickle phenomenon? 546 *Judgment and Decision making*, 133, 268-274. 547
- Grossman, Z., van der Weele, J., and Andrijevik, A. 2014. A test of dual-process reasoning in charitable giving (Working Paper). 548 University of California Santa Bárbara. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4tm617f7> 549
- Guthrie, C., Rachlinski, J. J., and Wistrich, A. J. 2007. Blinking on the bench: How judges decide cases. *Cornell Law Review*, 931, 1-44. 550
- Kahan, D. M. 2017. 'Ordinary science intelligence': A science-comprehension measure for study of risk and science communication, 557 with notes on evolution and climate change. *Journal of Risk Research*, 208, 995-1016. 558 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2016.1148067> 559
- Kiss, H. J., Rodriguez-Lara, I., and Rosa-García, A. 2016. Think twice before running! Bank runs and cognitive abilities. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 64, 12-19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2015.01.006> 567
- Koehler, D. J., and Pennycook, G. 2019. How the public, and scientists, perceive advancement of knowledge from conflicting study 568 results. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 166, 671-682. 569
- Lohse, J. 2016. Smart or selfish—when smart guys finish nice. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 64, 28-40. 579 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2016.04.002> 580
- Mandel, D. R., and Kapler, I. V. 2018. Cognitive style and frame susceptibility in decision-making. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1461. 583 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01461> 584
- Muñoz-Murillo, M., Álvarez-Franco, P. B., and Restrepo-Tobón, D. A. 2020. The role of cognitive abilities on financial literacy: New 594 experimental evidence. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 84, 101482. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2019.101482> 595

- Narayanan, A., and Moritz, B. B. 2015. Decision making and cognition in multi-echelon supply chains: An experimental study. 596 *Production and Operations Management*, 248, 1216-1234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/poms.12343> 597
- Obrecht, N. A., Chapman, G. B., and Gelman, R. 2009. An encounter frequency account of how experience affects likelihood estimation. *Memory and Cognition*, 37, 632-643. <https://doi.org/10.3758/MC.37.5.632>. 601
- Otero, I. 2019. Construct and criterion validity of cognitive reflection [Doctoral dissertation, University of Santiago de Compostela]. 602 <https://minerva.usc.es/xmlui/handle/10347/20521> 603
- Otero, I. 2020. [Unpublished raw data on the sex differences in cognitive reflection]. University of Santiago de Compostela. 604
- Pennycook, G., Cheyne, J. A., Koehler, D. J., and Fugelsang, J. A. 2016. Is the cognitive reflection test a measure of both reflection and intuition? *Behavior Research Methods*, 48, 341-348. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0576-1> 617
- Pennycook, G., Cheyne, J. A., Seli, P., Koehler, D. J., and Fugelsang, J. A. 2012. Analytic cognitive style predicts religious and para-normal belief. *Cognition*, 123, 335-346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2012.03.003> 619
- Pennycook, G., and Rand, D. G. 2019a. Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition*, 188, 39-50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.06.011> 621
- Pennycook, G., and Rand, D. G. 2019b. Who falls for fake news? The roles of bullshit receptivity, overclaiming, familiarity, and analytic thinking. *Journal of Personality*, 88, 185-200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12476> 623
- Ponti, G., and Carbone, E. 2009. Positional learning with noise. *Research in Economics*, 63, 225-241. 624 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rie.2009.09.002> 625
- Ponti, G., Rodriguez-Lara, I., and Di Cagno, D. 2014. Doing it now or later with payoff externalities: Experimental evidence on social time preferences (Working Paper No. 5). <http://static.luiss.it/RePEc/pdf/cesare/1401.pdf> 627
- Primi, C., Donati, M. A., Chiesi, F., and Morsanyi, K. 2018. Are there gender differences in cognitive reflection? Invariance and differences related to mathematics. *Thinking and Reasoning*, 24, 258-279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13546783.2017.1387606> 632
- Primi, C., Morsanyi, K., Chiesi, F., Donati, M. A., and Hamilton, J. 2015. The development and testing of a new version of the cognitive reflection test applying item response theory IRT. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 29, 453-469. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.1883> 635
- Razmyar, S., and Reeve, C. L. 2013. Individual differences in religiosity as a function of cognitive ability and cognitive style. *Intelligence*, 41, 667-673. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2013.09.003> 639
- Royzman, E. B., Landy, J. F., and Leeman, R. F. 2015. Are thoughtful people more utilitarian? CRT as a unique predictor of moral minimalism in the dilemmatic context. *Cognitive Science*, 39, 325-352. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12136> 646

- Sajid, M., and Li, M. C. 2019. The role of cognitive reflection in decision making: Evidence from Pakistani managers. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 145, 591-604. 648
- Schulze, C., and Newell, B. R. 2015. Compete, coordinate, and cooperate: How to exploit uncertain environments with social interaction. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 1445, 967-981. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000096> 655
- Sinayev, A., and Peters, E. 2015. Cognitive reflection vs. calculation in decision making. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 532. 658 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00532> 659
- Sirota, M., Kostovičová, L., Juanchich, M., Dewberry, C., and Marshall, A. C. 2021. Measuring cognitive reflection without maths: Developing and validating the verbal cognitive reflection test. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 343, 322-343. 663 <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.2213> 664
- Skagerlund, K., Lind, T., Strömbäck, C., Tinghög, G., and Västfjäll, D. 2018. Financial literacy and the role of numeracy—how individuals' attitude and affinity with numbers influence financial literacy. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 74, 18-666 25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2018.03.004> 667
- Šrol, J. 2018. Dissecting the expanded cognitive reflection test: An item response theory analysis. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 307, 673 643-655. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20445911.2018.1518327> 674
- Stagnaro, M., Pennycook, G., and Rand, D. G. 2018. Performance on the cognitive reflection test is stable across time. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 133, 260-267. 676
- Stagnaro, M. N., Ross, R. M., Pennycook, G., and Rand, D. G. 2019. Cross-cultural support for a link between analytic thinking and disbelief in God: Evidence from India and the United Kingdom. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 142, 179-186. 678
- Ståhl, T., and Van Prooijen, J. W. 2018. Epistemic rationality: Skepticism toward unfounded beliefs requires sufficient cognitive ability and motivation to be rational. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 122, 155-163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.10.026> 680
- Stieger, S., and Reips, U. D. 2016. A limitation of the cognitive reflection test: Familiarity. *PeerJ Life and Environment*, 4, e2395. 682 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2395> 683
- Svenson, O., Gonzalez, N., and Eriksson, G. 2018. Different heuristics and same bias: A spectral analysis of biased judgments and individual decision rules. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 135, 401-412. 685
- Teigen, K. H., Løhre, E., and Hohle, S. M. 2018. The boundary effect: Perceived post hoc accuracy of prediction intervals. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 134, 309-321. 687
- Thomson, K. S., and Oppenheimer, D. M. 2016. Investigating an alternate form of the cognitive reflection test. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 111, 99-113. 689
- Toplak, M. E., West, R. F., and Stanovich, K. E. 2014. Assessing miserly information processing: An expansion of the cognitive reflection test. *Thinking and Reasoning*, 202, 147-168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13546783.2013.844729> 693
- Toplak, M. E., West, R. F., and Stanovich, K. E. 2017. Real-world correlates of performance on heuristics and biases tasks in a community sample. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 302, 541-554. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.1973> 695

- Ventis, L. 2015. Thinking fast and slow in the experience of humor. *International Journal of Humor Research*, 283, 351-373. 696 <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2015-0070> 697
- Welsh, M., Burns, N., and Delfabbro, P. 2013. The Cognitive Reflection Test: How much more than numerical ability? In M. Knauff, 702 N. Sebanz, M. Pauen, and I. Wachsmuth Eds., *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Cognitive Science Society Vol. 35*, pp. 1587-703 1592. Psychology Press. <http://hdl.handle.net/2440/83719><https://cloudfront.escholarship.org/dist/prd/con-704tent/qt68n012fh/qt68n012fh.pdf> 705
- Willard, A. K., and Norenzayan, A. 2017. "Spiritual but not religious": Cognition, schizotypy, and conversion in alternative beliefs. *Cognition*, 165, 137-146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2017.05.018> 707
- Woike, J. K. 2019. Upon repeated reflection: Consequences of frequent exposure to the cognitive reflection test for Mechanical Turk 710 participants. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2646. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02646> 711
- Yilmaz, O., and Sarıbay, S. A. 2016. An attempt to clarify the link between cognitive style and political ideology: A non-western 712 replication and extension. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 113, 287-300. 713
- Yilmaz, O., and Sarıbay, S. A. 2017. The relationship between cognitive style and political orientation depends on the measures used. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 122, 140-147. 715
- Yilmaz, O., Sarıbay, S. A., and Iyer, R. 2020. Are neo-liberals more intuitive? Undetected libertarians confound the relation between 716 analytic cognitive style and economic conservatism. *Current Psychology*, 391, 25-32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-0130-x> 717
- Zhang, D. C., Highhouse, S., and Rada, T. B. 2016. Explaining sex differences on the Cognitive Reflection Test. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 101, 425-427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.034> 721