Introduction
When we have a choice to make we tend not to turn to complete strangers for their advice. Where possible we will seek the advice of someone who we have had some contact with before - perhaps a friend or acquaintance, a colleague who we recall having an interest in a particular area, or a fellow member. Over time we may build up a picture of the style with which they express their advice or information - they may always be extremely confident in the advice they proffer or they may be uncertain in what they say.

Since previous research has proposed that we utilise confidence heuristically, whereby we associate a person's confidence with attributes relating to a speaker's competency (Price & Stone, 2004; Thomas & McFadyen, 1995), we may seek out the advice of the highly confident person and stop asking the person who expresses their uncertainty. In doing so we believe that we are using an effective decision-making strategy, using confidence as a heuristic which allows us to determine the quality of another person's information. Confidence heuristic use has been demonstrated in many different areas, and ranging across many different task types (e.g. Pulford & Colman, 2005; Wesson & Pulford, 2005; Zarnoth & Sniezek, 1997).

Discussion
The results indicate that receiving feedback about the quality of a speaker's performance affects the influence a speaker's confidence had upon the choices participants made but had a minimal effect on the confidence they had in their choice of answer. Overall the results lend support to Hesse and Kimmel (1993) report that people are highly confident in receiving feedback regarding another's performance compacts our insensitivity to the judgmental biases of others. However, if people do not know on answer ourselves, we will not be able to detect other people's inaccuracies. But when feedback is made available people do appear to pick up on the discrepancy between their overall confidence and their accuracy, leading to a seemingly reduced, but not absolute, use of the confidence heuristic: Higher levels of confidence are still associated with perceptions of competency, intelligence and accuracy, even when there was evidence to the contrary.

It would seem then that one's ability to monitor another's judgmental biases is important in how we perceive them, and their subsequent influence. However, there is evidence to suggest that some people are better at this, or more willing to engage in the extra cognitive effort involved, and hence further research should consider the reasons behind this.

Influence of Confidence on Choice
Although participants were slightly more confident in their chosen answers when feedback was given than when it was not (43.93% vs. 47.92%), there were no main effects of Condition, or Speaker Confidence, nor a significant Speaker x Feedback condition interaction, (all p's > .05).

Influence of Confidence on Accuracy
Participants in the No Feedback condition showed accuracy levels no better than would be expected by chance whereas those in the Feedback condition showed a slight, but significant, improvement in accuracy levels (87.33% vs. 89.78%), F(1, 22) = 13.21, p < .001. Degrees of Freedom = 2

Influence of Confidence and Feedback on Perceptions of Speakers
An additional experiment was conducted to determine participant's perceptions of users who used different confidence levels in the Feedback condition only. Table 2 illustrates these results.

Table 2
Perceptions of speakers using different confidence levels when feedback is provided (K participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker Confidence</th>
<th>Perception, Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5.00 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4.00 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.00 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References

Method
Participants
86 students, aged between 18 and 39 years old (M= 20.90), took part in the experiment.

Materials
A PowerPoint presentation was prepared. On each slide a general knowledge question appeared, followed one-by-one by three responses each given by a ‘friend’. One response was spoken with high confidence, one with medium confidence and one with low confidence, using confidence cues developed in a previous pilot study (Wesson & Pulford, 2006). In the Feedback condition, the correct answer was revealed after all three responses had appeared. In the No Feedback condition, the answers were not revealed.

In a further experiment an additional 88 participants viewed the Feedback condition PowerPoint presentation only and then filled in a questionnaire regarding their perceptions of the speakers. Participants were asked to choose which speaker they liked and trusted most/least, and whom they thought was most/least intelligent, competent, and optimistic, as well as give an estimate of each speaker’s overall accuracy, so as to investigate people’s reasoning behind their decision-making strategies.

Results
Influence of Confidence on Choice
The percentage of times each speaker’s answers were chosen was calculated (Table 1). A Speaker Confidence x Feedback Condition ANOVA found a main effect of Speaker Confidence, F(2, 168) = 29.84, p < .001, and a Speaker Confidence x Feedback Condition interaction, F(2, 168) = 9.70, p < .001. Across the two conditions, as a speaker’s confidence increased so did the percentage of times that speaker’s answers were chosen, although the extent to which this occurred depended upon the Feedback Condition.

Influence of Confidence on Accuracy
Across the two conditions, as a speaker’s confidence increased so too did the percentage of times that speaker’s answers were chosen, although the extent to which this occurred depended upon the Feedback Condition.

In further research should consider the reasons behind this.

Figure 1 shows that feedback had a detrimental effect on the influence that a speaker expressing high confidence had on choice, with agreement with this speaker’s answers dropping by 16.05% when feedback was given compared to when it was not. For the medium and low confidence speakers, feedback led to significant increases in agreement.

Figure 2 shows that participants perceived the highly confident person as more trusted and liked, regardless of feedback condition. However, for the medium and low confidence speakers, participants perceived the person to be less trusted and liked when feedback was given.

Figure 3 shows that participants were more likely to choose the highly confident person, regardless of feedback condition.