[TITLE HERE]

The ability for individuals to accurately monitor the progress of their own learning is critical for the successful retention of new information, as effective monitoring allows individuals to maximize retention by adjusting their study strategies (Nelson & Narens, 1990). Metacognitive judgments (i.e., having individuals make judgments about their memorial abilities) can be used to obtain information about the learning process. The Judgment of Learning (JOL) task is a commonly used metacognitive judgment paradigm. In a standard JOL task, individuals are asked to estimate their likelihood of correctly retrieving a target word if shown only the cue on a later memory test. These estimates can be elicited using several types of measurement scales (e.g., Likert Scales or binary “yes-no” responses; Hanczakowski, Zawadzka, Pasek, & Higham, 2013), however, JOLs are commonly elicited using a continuous 0 to 100 scale representing the percent likelihood of the target item being successfully recalled at test (e.g., 100% = definitely would remember; 0% = definitely would not remember). The use of a 100 point scale is beneficial because it allows for an easy comparison between predicted recall (via JOLs) and the proportion of items that are correctly recalled at test.

Though JOL ratings can be accurate and well calibrated with recall, various factors have been demonstrated to show discrepancies between predicted and actual performance. These include perceived ease in identical cue-target word pairs (Castel, McCabe, & Roediger, 2007), increased in time spent studying word pairs (Koriat & Ma’ayan, 2005), and both the direction and magnitude of associative relationships between the cue-target study pairs (Koriat & Bjork, 2005; Maxwell & Huff, in press). [ADD A SENTENCE OR TWO HERE ON HOW YOUR STUDY BUILDS UPON THESE]

Interest in the relationship between memory predictions and accuracy is not a novel area of exploration. For example, in an early study conducted(1) Overall, thisswere As such, the authors

Moreover, research conducted by Koriat and Bjork (2005) supports the notion that both the associative strength and direction of cue-target word pairs affects both the magnitude of JOL ratings and correct recall rates. Specifically, the authors delineated between types two types of associations that were thought to influence the relationship between JOLs and recall. First, *a priori* associations refer to forward associates (e.g., credit-card). The strength of these pair types is rooted in the likelihood that the cue item will elicit the target item at test. As such, a priori association strength can be readily assessed through the use of free association norms (e.g., The University of South Florida Free Association Norms; Nelson, McEvoy, & Schreiber, 2004; The Small World of Words Project; De Deyne et al., XXXX). These norms are generated free association tasks in which participants are provided with a cue word and are asked to respond with the first target word that comes to mind. These norms can then be used to compute the probability of responding to word A with word B (i.e., forward associative strength, FAS). Second, *a posteriori* associations refer to the perceived relatedness between pairs that are only apparent to participants when words are paired together. These pairs can refer to weakly associated pairs (e.g., XXX-XXX) or strong associates that in which the pair order has been flipped (i.e., backward pairs, XXX-XXX). Similar to a priori pairs, free association norms can be useful for indexing the backward associative strength (BAS) between pairs (i.e., the probability of responding to word B with word A in an A-B item pairs; see Nelson, McEvoy, & Dennis, 2000 for a review). Thus, a posteriori pairs should have either weak levels of FAS or strong levels of BAS.

To test the correspondence between JOLs and recall for a priori and a posteriori pairs, Koriat & Bjork (2005) conducted three experiments in which participants were presented with a mix unrelated and forward associates (Experiment 1), unrelated, backward, and forward pairs (Experiment 2), and [PAIR TYPES HERE] (Experiment 3). Across each experiment, an *illusion of competence* was detected for a posteriori pairs in which JOLs exceeded that of subsequent recall. In particular, this effect was most noticeable for the backward pairs presented in their second experiment, as the target item in these pairs does not readily converge upon the cue. Thus, though participants rate backward pairs as likely to be remembered, they are unlikely to correctly recall them at test.

Next, a follow-up study conducted by Castel et al. (2007) showed that the illusion of competence can be extended to include identical word pairs. Participants in Experiment 1 of this study were given a mix of strongly related, weakly related, unrelated, and identical cue-target word pairs and were asked to study the words and provide JOL ratings. Overall, an illusion of competence emerged for identical word pairs in which JOLs exceeded subsequent recall rates. One explanation for this finding is that participants perceived the identical pairs to be easier compared to the other pairs and thus spent less time studying them or because the participants did not encode the identical pairs as deeply because they thought they would be easier to recall (Castel et al., 2007).

More recently, further investigated the correspondence between JOLs and recallpaired associates (e.g., on-off)[ADD A SENTENCE HERE ON HOW SYMMETRICAL PAIRS ARE DIFFERENT FROM IDENTICAL PAIRS. ALSO EXPLAIN HOW THEY ARE DIFFERENT FROM ASSYMETRICAL ASSOCIATES LIKE FORWARD AND BACKWARD PAIRS]. Across four experiments, tfound a robustforpairs , additionally,demonstrated thatextends toassociates Furthermore, Maxwell and Huff showed that the illusion of competence is not contingent upon the type of JOL elicited at study, as the effect replicated across several manipulations designed to mitigate the illusion of competence by increasing the accuracy of JOLs (i.e., having participants make JOLs under experimenter paced study, employing the use of delayed JOLs, etc.). Finally, Maxwell and Huff employed the use of calibration plots in which JOL ratings were plotted against their corresponding recall accuracy Nelson & Dunlosky, 1991), allowing the authors to pinpoint the JOL rating at which the illusion of competence emerged for each pair type.

**Item-Specific-Relational Framework**

[WE NEED A GOOD TRANSITION SENTENCE HERE] In a study done by Hunt and Einstein (1981), they evaluated two different types of encoding strategies: relational processing and item-specific processing. They found that relational and item-specific processing can both be beneficial to memory, but that relational processing has a higher benefit for unrelated word pairs and item-specific processing has a higher benefit for related word pairs (Hunt & Einstein, 1981). Additionally, Hunt and Einstein (1981) found that the benefits of these processing types are dependent on the context of the words being studied. The example given in their study was that thinking about the color of the word pairs could either serve to relate the words (ex. blueness can relate ocean and blueberries) or to separate the words (ex. blueness can differentiate blueberries from strawberries). [NEED TO ADD MORE TO THE IS/RL STUFF]

As such, the present study seeks to test whether item-specific or relational encoding tasks can be used to reduce the illusion of competence found for backward and symmetrical paired associates and unrelated word pairs. Specifically, Experiment 1 compares JOLs and cued-recall performance for each of the aforementioned encoding strategies to a standard JOL control group who receives no explicit encoding instructions. Next, Experiment 2 tests whether combining these encoding manipulation with an explicit warning about the deceptive nature of backward, symmetrical, and unrelated study pairs further reduces the illusion of competence. Finally, across both experiments, we follow the design of Maxwell & Huff (in press) and [ADD SOMETHING ABOUT USING CALIBRATION PLOTS]. [QUICK OVERVIEW OF EX 1 AND EX 2 FINDINGS] Collectively, this set of experiments shows

**Experiment 1: Item-Specific vs Relational Encoding**

[WE NEED A PARAGRAPH OR TWO HERE SETITNG UP THE HYPOTHESES FOR EX 1 – TALK HERE ABOUT HOW WE MODELED THE STUDY AFTER THE IN PRESS PAPER] Overall, we expected that having participants engage in either item-specific or relational processing at encoding will reduce the illusion of competence by boosting correct recall relative to the control group. Additionally, because relational encoding forces participants to create an association instead of relying on the weak cues between the item pairs, this encoding manipulation should be especially beneficial for boosting recall of unrelated pairs.

**Method**

[We’ll copy and paste the methods stuff here]