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 **Introduction**

**Meta-memory**

It is judgments and beliefs around memory by people (Gabrieli et al., 2015). It helps in promoting knowledge by helping to estimate the information that might be retained the future. Trustworthy memories are also identified. It consists of ease-process heuristic and stability bias. Stability bias involves asking people to report their belief in studying as a part of learning. Inaccurate memory predictions lead to inadequate allocation of cognitive resources (Schneider, 2013). Predictions and the real experiment taken about their memory are contradicting when using meta-memory. People think that they learn by studying as in experiment 3 but this is contrary to what is researched in experiment 1 which shows that repetition does not lead predict the level of their meta-memory.

**Experiment hypothesis**

1. It is predicted that items that are easy to process, are relatively more memorable by ease process heuristic. This is somewhat true since the prediction large type was significantly true compared to the actual outcome.
2. It is foretold by stability bias that people tend to believe that their memories are fairly stable meaning that they will tend to underrate additional chances to study. They react according to the immediate experience.

It is evident that word type size was manipulated for the participants. The research indicated that large type was subjectively much fluently as compared to the small type therefore affecting prediction memory but not entirely the actual memory. Participants predicted that they would recall a word easily if it was large type than a small type but their actual memory depended not on type size.

**Theories about my hypothesis.**

I expect that study repetition does not necessarily give out people's judgment. Though there were several repetitions in experiment 2, it is evident that the size type of the word is crucial for their memory. I prefer that people be asked only once, including some extra features such as asking them compound words. This can bring better conclusions about their mind. This research will explore their actual ability to remember without considering the number of repetitions.

**My research and its purpose.**

Get a group of individuals, ask them different word type-size with a considerable amount being complex. Give them adequate time for them to read before they can recall them. The research will assist to know people's memory judgment about type size and intricate words ignoring the effect of their repetition (Schneider, 2013). It is evident that numerous trials are unreliable when assessing people's memory judgment. Immediate judgment and belief about a situation define their recall decision (Gabrieli et al., 2015). It was observed that small-type was lower compared to large-type. Compound words had a lower score as many people judged that they were hard to remember.

**My research hypothesis and prediction.**

 It should be done using large type and small type of words. A relative number of compound words should be used giving participants some good time to read, before recalling them. Participants are given some time to gradually remember ensuring that they are well conversant with that respective language.

**Proposed research**

To research finding whether perpetual difficulties affect participants’ memory performance in their perpetual fluency.

**Nice questions to be answered**

1. Why should you use tough questions and what time should be given for the participants to make a reasonable recall?
2. If a person is unable to recall a complicated word, does it mean their judgment memory is faulty?
3. Will difficult question make participants process hard or will it discourage them from producing good performance?

**Message to take home.**

 The ability to recall numerous compound words and indicates that one’s memory is better implying that they can easily keep track of different situation in their daily lives. It can highly assist in their general decision making.

**Strategy**

1. Introduction disfluencies to the reader will cause stress to them thus forcing them to put more effort and process genuinely thus raising their memory performance.

2. Use of methods such as name latency in constant intrusion manipulation disturbs perpetual fluency. It creates a perception to participants that, integral words are easy to evoke, and that words that have been interfered are easy to recall (Hanczakowski et al., 2013).

**Goals**

The goal of the research was to predict retention performance will be reduced by constant manipulation interference regardless of the number of trials made in the start or conclusion of the study list.

**Motives of the experiment regarding ease-process**

Ease-process involves asking participants to make of predictions about their future memory performance mainly on manipulated type-size of words. Encoding and retrieval fluencies are used for the production of high metacognitive judgments thus highly aiding in learning though not very accurately. Much processing was done in large type than in small-type thus affecting prediction memory than actual memory (Gabrieli et al., 2015). It was predicted that type size would affect judgment about consciousness but not the mind itself, the number of trials would distress actual remembrance but not a review of the memory and that people's beliefs would be mostly independent of the perception of mind and the real reminiscence memory (Hanczakowski et al., 2013).

**Manipulations.**

You clearly showed the type size and trials study times sensitizing participants’ to the study recurrences thus, influencing their actual recall compared to their predicted memory (Gabrieli et al, 2015).. Fluency was measured by requesting participants to predict their future memory performance on words type size. Fluency of processing consistently affects the verdict of prospective memory since information that is easily retrievable and encoded highly produces metacognitive conclusions.

**Hypothesis and prediction**

It was expected that people's memory was as their prediction, but a significant difference was between their actual memory and their specific expectation memory. It is evident as many people presumed that, they were in a position to easily recall mostly large type words compared to small type and also that repetition of words would affect their judgment on memory (Hanczakowski et al., 2013). High-frequency words were easily remembered compared to low-frequency words while high and low length words are relatively equal. Some partakers believe that studying a word more than once and also reading large size words creates a better judgment on memory. In reality, the repetition of words did not affect their memory judgment. Their immediate decision about a situation without application of that event's beliefs that affects their metamemory judgments

**Conclusion**

In summary, it is perceived that perpetual fluency highly predicted people's memory judgment indicating that use of large size words is highly memorable compared to small type. It is seen that numerous trials do not translate to high memory of words. It the people's ability to retain a word or its fluency that determines their memory judgment. At times, the use of disfluency causes a person to process harder and highly maintain the respective word. People decide according to the immediate situation experience without considering future consequences.
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