**Methods**

**Participants**

## undergraduates from the University of Southern Mississippi participated in this study for partial course credit. (Insert number of people removed for bad data). (Enter demographics once collected). All participants were native English speakers with normal or corrected-to-normal vision. There were also ## undergraduates from the University of Southern Mississippi that participated for gift card compensation. (Should this be mentioned separately?)

**Materials**

(Need help re-wording this section) One-hundred-eighty associative word pairs were taken from the University of South Florida Free Association Norms (Nelson et al., 2004). There were 40 forward pairs which only had an association in the forward direction (e.g., credit-card), 40 backward pairs which only had an association in the backward direction (e.g., card-credit), 40 unrelated pairs which had no directional association (e.g. art-lion), 40 symmetrical pairs which had an association in both the backward and forward direction (e.g., salt-pepper), and 20 non-tested buffer pairs to control for primacy and recency effects. The word pairs were divided evenly into two study lists with each list having 20 forward, backward, unrelated, and symmetrical pairs and 10 buffer pairs, for a total of 90 word pairs in each list. All participants saw both lists presented separately in study-test blocks, and the order of the word pairs was counterbalanced. Each list had five buffer pairs at the beginning and end with the others pairs in between and randomly mixed for each participant. (Need help describing the associative strength)

The cued-recall test in each block contained all 80 cue words from the studied pairs, without the exception of the buffer pairs. The cue word was shown next to a question mark that had replaced the target word. The order of the test was randomly organized for each new participant.

**Procedure**

(Should I mention Nick’s paper since my procedure is almost directly following his?)

All participants were run individually on computers using the *E-Prime* 3 software (Psychology Software Tools, Pittsburgh, PA). (Should I mention here that there were 3 different conditions?) Participants were told that they were going to be presented with word pairs, with the cue word always presented on the left and the target word always presented on the right, and were going to be tested on their memory for the word pairs. Participants were instructed rate how likely they were to remember the word pair, and these JOL ratings were done a scale from 0 to 100, with 0 being “I WILL NOT remember the word pair” and 100 being “I WILL remember the word pair.” Participants were also instructed to use the full range of the scale when providing their ratings to help reduce anchoring on the ends of the scale. Participants were then given one of three different study instructions depending on which condition they had been randomly assigned. For the Read condition, participants were instructed to study the word pairs by reading them silently; this served as the control condition. For the Relational condition, participants were instructed to study the word pairs by thinking about how the words in each pair were related. The example given was if a participant saw the pair “Cat-Turtle”, they may think about how cats and turtles are both animals or how cats and turtles can both be pets. For the Item-Specific condition, participants were instructed to study the word pairs by thinking about how the words in each pair were unique. The example given was if a participant saw the pair “Cat-Turtle”, they might think about how cats have fur, but turtles have shells or how cats are mammals, but turtles are reptiles. Participants only saw one type of study instructions. After the instructions, participants were given their first block of word lists to study. Participants studied the word pairs at their own pace and provided their JOL rating while the word pair was displayed.

After the first study block was completed, participants were given 2 minutes to complete a math sheet that served as a filler task. Participants then completed a cued-recall task in which the cue word was presented and they were asked ask to provide the target word from memory. (Do I need to mention that I encouraged participants to give their best guest if they couldn’t remember the word; instead of just skipping?) Participants were encouraged to give their best guest as to what the target word was if they were unable to retrieve the target word, but participants were able to skip to the next cue by pressing enter if they could not remember. After the first cued-recall test was finished, participants then went through a second study/test block with the same instructions as the first block. Once participants had completed the second block, they were debriefed on the study. The Read condition lasted approximately 30 minutes, and the Relational and Item-Specific conditions lasted approximately one hour.
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