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Judgment of learning tasks (JOLs) require participants to rate the probability that they can correctly a recall a target word from a studied cue-target pair (e.g., credit-card) if only shown the cue word at test (e.g., credit-\_\_\_). Prior work has shown that direction of the cue-target pair can influence the accuracy of JOLs: Forward associative pairs (e.g., credit-card) are well calibrated (i.e., JOL estimates and recall accuracy were similar), but an illusion of competence emerges for backward pairs (e.g., card-credit), symmetrical pairs (e.g., king-queen), and unrelated pairs (e.g., muffin-floor) where JOL ratings are inflated relative to recall accuracy. The present study expands upon this by examining whether different study strategies can moderate this effect. Participants studied forward, backward, symmetrical, and unrelated cue-target pairs using one of three study strategies: Item-specific processing (e.g., how is each concept unique?), relational processing (e.g., how are both words similar in meaning?), or silent reading. Overall, the illusion of competence was replicated across each study group. However, Item-Specific Study reduced the illusion of competence for backward pairs by increasing correct recall, and Relational Study decreased the illusion for unrelated pairs by boosting both JOLs and recall rates. Overall, these findings suggest that different study strategies may be effective at reducing metacognitive illusions.