

Does Jugdement of Learning Predict Accuracy of Recall During Emotional Arousal ?

Gyanesh Kumar Tiwari



Introduction

Metacognitive processes refer to knowledge of our own cognitive behaviour that stems from the self-monitoring of one's own cognition which is critical for providing input to self-directed control process (Metcalf, 1996) and termination of attempts at retrieval (Nelson, Gerler & Narens, 1984). This interest in studying metacognitive processes spans across different areas of psychology that includes memory (Koriat, 1993, 2007), developmental psychology (Butterfield, Nelson & Peck, 1988), aging (Backman & Lipinska, 1993), neuropsychology (Shimamura, 2000), social psychology (Schwarz, 2004), judgement and decision making (Winman & Juslin, 2005) and forensic psychology (Pansky, Koriat & Goldsmith, 2005). Metamemory pertains to our beliefs about our own prospective and retrospective memories. Several types of metamemory judgements have been identified that mediate performance during various cognitive indices including learning and memory i.e., ease of learning (Leonesio & Nelson, 1990), judgment of learning (Mazzoni & Cornoldi, 1993, Tiwari, 2010a, 2011a, 2011b), judgment of source (Kelly, Carroll & Mazzoni, 2002, Tiwari, 2010b), feeling of knowing judgment (Schwartz & Metcalfe, 1992), subjective confidence in the correctness of the retrieved information (Koriat & Goldsmith, 1996), judgement of comprehension (Maki & McGuire, 2002) remember/know judgements (Gardner & Richardson-Klavehn, 2000), output-monitoring (Koriat, Ben-Zur & Sheffer, 1988), olfactory metacognition (Johnson & Olsson, 2003) and monitoring of source (Dutton & Carroll, 2001).

The metacognitive knowledge that people have about their future ability to recall accurately is known as judgement of learning (JOL); whereas judgment of source (JOS) made just after learning and concerns predictive accuracy in sourcing an event. Many different variations of these general paradigms have been explored based on variations in the types of memory studied (semantic, episodic, autobiographical, eyewitness-type events etc.), the format of the memory test (free recall, cued recall, forced-choice, recognition etc.) and the particular judgements elicited (item by item judgements or