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1. Introduction

Given the amount of material that students must learn across a wide variety of courses, they should strive to achieve durable learning and also to use their time efficiently. To help foster efficient and durable learning, researchers have recommended the use of accurate monitoring to guide learning (e.g., Dunlosky, Hertzog, Kennedy, & Thiede, 2005; Pashler et al., 2007). One reason for this recommendation is that students who are overconfident in their evaluations of learning may fall short of their learning goals, whereas accurate evaluations of one’s own learning can be used to more effectively guide further study (Rawson & Dunlosky, in press). Although intuitive, the evidence for this link between overconfidence and achievement is limited and may exaggerate the importance of accurate monitoring for effectively achieving durable retention. Before we describe the available evidence, we briefly discuss general theories of self-regulated learning, which predict that monitoring accuracy will be related to learning and retention. We then consider previous research in relationship to the present studies, which were primarily designed to answer the following question: Does overconfidence produce underachievement when students are learning key-term definitions?

1.1. Is better monitoring accuracy related to better acquisition and retention?

1.1.1. Theory of self-regulated learning

Metacognitive theory of self-regulated learning inextricably links monitoring to control (e.g., Boekaerts, 1997; Flavell, 1979; Koriat & Goldsmith, 1996; Metcalfe, 1996; Metcalfe, 2009; Nelson & Narens, 1990; Winne & Hadwin, 1998). The relationship between monitoring and control was eloquently illustrated by Nelson and Narens (1990) for historical roots, see Miller, Galanter, & Pribram, 1960), who separated cognitive processes into two interrelated levels, called the meta-level and the object-level. Nelson and Narens (1990) proposed two dominance relations, called ‘control’ and ‘monitoring’, which are defined in terms of the direction of the flow of information between the meta-level and the object-level...The basic notion underlying control—analogue to speaking into a telephone handset—is that the meta-level modifies the object-level, [and] the basic notion underlying monitoring—analogue...
to listening to the telephone handset—is that the meta-level is informed by the object-level (pp. 126–127; italics in original).

In this model, the output from control processes (from the object-level) informs monitoring (cf. Koriat, Mâ’ayan, & Nussinov, 2006), and most important here, monitoring in turn influences control decisions.

Without this latter link, in which a learner’s assessments of ongoing learning are used to make decisions about what and how to study, metacognitive monitoring would be inert—an epiphemomenon perhaps worthy of discussion by philosophers of the mind but not relevant to understanding how human thought and action is controlled (Lieberman, 1979; Nelson, 1996). Fortunately, correlational evidence (e.g., Hines, Tournon, & Hertzog, 2009) and experimental evidence (e.g., Metcalfe & Finn, 2008; Thiede & Dunlosky, 1999) converge on the conclusion that learners’ monitoring does influence control decisions about what to study. Whereas the influence of monitoring on the control of study has been firmly established, the present studies were designed to evaluate the under-explored question of whether the accuracy of monitoring is related to better retention. It is critical to not confute monitoring with monitoring accuracy. That is, many studies have demonstrated that learners of all ages and abilities use monitoring to guide their study (for reviews, see Dunlosky & Arieli, 2011; Son & Metcalfe, 2000), but the key issue here is whether the accuracy of learner’s monitoring is related to better acquisition and retention.

Because learners use monitoring to efficiently obtain their learning goals (for reviews, see Benjamin, 2007; Castel, 2007; Dunlosky & Arieli, 2011), better monitoring accuracy is expected to be related to more effective learning and higher levels of retention. Although this accuracy-influences-memory (AIM) hypothesis appears relatively straightforward, it relies on two auxiliary assumptions. First, it assumes that monitoring is used to control learning in a relatively effective manner (Thiede, 1999), because even if learners’ monitoring were perfectly accurate, if they did not (or could not) appropriately use their monitoring to control learning across items (Son & Sethi, 2006), then better accuracy will not benefit retention (Nelson, Dunlosky, Graf, & Narens, 1994). The second assumption is a corollary of the first; namely, an association between monitoring accuracy and learning may not be observed if learners differ in how they use monitoring to control study time—for example, a learner who monitors accurately but uses this monitoring inappropriately to control study may be outperformed by a learner with somewhat lower monitoring accuracy who makes more effective control decisions (Thiede, 1999). The relevance of these assumptions will be highlighted in the following review.

1.1.2. Evidence relevant to the AIM hypothesis

Only a few studies have investigated the link between monitoring accuracy and memory (Begg, Martin, & Needham, 1992; Bisanz, Vosender, & Voss, 1978; Nietfeld, Cao, & Osborne, 2006; Thiede, 1999; Thiede, Anderson, & Therriault, 2003). Begg et al. (1992) had college students study word pairs (e.g., railroad—mother), and this study trial was followed by a delayed judgment of learning (JOL) in which the students predicted the chances of remembering the pair. These JOLs were prompted with either the cue-only (railroad) or the cue-target pair (railroad—mother); cue-only prompts lead to substantially greater levels of monitoring accuracy. After making a JOL, the entire pair was presented for restudy for 4 s, and after all pairs had been restudied, a criterion test of paired-associate recall occurred. Despite the greater accuracy of cue-only JOLs, test performance was no different when participants made cue-only JOLs versus cue-target JOLs. This evidence led Begg et al. (1992) to conclude that “memory monitoring does not make a valuable contribution to memory” (p. 212). Note, however, that the first auxiliary assumption introduced above was not met: Because the restudy trials were brief and experimenter paced, participants could not use monitoring to effectively control learning. Similarly, Rhodes and Tauber (2011) conducted a meta-analysis on papers examining judgment accuracy, which demonstrated that conditions supporting higher levels of judgment accuracy were not related to greater memory performance. Most relevant here, the studies in their meta-analysis did not employ methods that allowed participants to use their judgments to control study (in fact, judgments were made after studying was completed), so these studies also fail to meet the first auxiliary assumption and hence are not relevant to evaluating the AIM hypothesis.

To sidestep such problems, Thiede (1999) used a procedure similar to the one used by Begg et al. (1992), but with two key changes. First, accuracy was not manipulated between groups; instead, the focus was on whether individual differences in accuracy were related to better learning. Second, all participants made delayed cue-only JOLs on the first study-test trial, and during each of the next four study-judgment-test trials, participants selected those items that they wanted to restudy. Thus, participants could use their monitoring to control their learning in a (potentially) effective manner. Thiede (1999) computed the relative accuracy of the delayed JOLs on Trial 1, which involved correlating each participant’s JOLs with his or her own recall performance across items. As predicted by the AIM hypothesis, individual differences in relative accuracy on Trial 1 were positively correlated with subsequent boosts in learning across trials (i.e., participants who were better at discriminating items they knew from items they did not yet know profited more from the subsequent opportunities to select items for restudy). However, the relationship between accuracy and learning arose only on later trials and was relatively weak. One reason for the weak effect is that participants selected items for restudy, so that some benefits of better accuracy may have been offset by individual differences in how well monitoring was used to allocate study time (as per the second auxiliary assumption described above). Although investigating individual differences in how learners use monitoring to control study is important, holding control processes constant across participants can provide a more valid estimate of the influence of monitoring accuracy on retention. Accordingly, in the present studies, the same algorithm was used to control study decisions for all participants.

The present studies also critically differ from research by Thiede and his colleagues (Thiede, 1999; Thiede et al., 2003) in that they focused on relative accuracy (see also, Bisanz et al., 1978), whereas we are focusing on absolute accuracy. Relative accuracy refers to the degree to which judgments predict which items (relative to others) are more likely to be recalled on the criterion test and is measured by the aforementioned intra-individual correlations. By contrast, absolute accuracy refers to the extent to which people’s judgments demonstrate overconfidence (judgments are more optimistic than actual performance) versus underconfidence (judgments are less optimistic than actual performance; for details about other conceptualizations of absolute accuracy, see Boekaerts & Rozendaal, 2010; Keren, 1991; Schraw, 2009). Arguably, absolute accuracy is critical for obtaining efficient and durable learning. The theoretical claim here is straightforward, but it has major implications for student success. Overconfidence should lead to premature termination of study and hence yield lower levels of learning during practice, which in turn will translate to lower levels of retention on the final test. Put differently, students who are more overconfident are not expected to learn as much during practice as compared to students who are better calibrated, and these initial differences in learning are expected to persist on the final retention test.

The relationship between absolute accuracy and performance has been investigated in two studies (Nietfeld et al., 2006; Shin,
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