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*Participants*

Participants in this study were recruited by students in the Research Design and Analysis course at Montana State University (MSU) during the Spring semester of 2023. Through convenience sampling, data was collected on a total of XX participants, XX of which were male and XX were female. Participants’ ages ranged from XX to XX years old, as those younger than 18 years old were excluded from the sample.

*Procedure*

Each student in the Research Design and Analysis class at MSU during the spring of 2023 recruited four people they knew to participate in the study. Age was a selection criterion for participation, as all participants must be at least 18 years of age. Participants were all run individually at locations agreed upon by each individual student-participant pair.

To begin each session, participants received the informed consent document, had an opportunity to reach it and ask questions, and submitted a copy of their signed consent form to the student administrator. Then, the student read scripted instructions to the participant. Depending on the warning condition the participant was assigned to, these instructions either intentionally included or excluded a warning of human susceptibility to falsely recognizing critical lure terms in the DRM paradigm. Participants were given the opportunity to ask any questions before the presentation of the word lists began. Four separate word lists were presented to each participant (either auditorily or visually), with words appearing for approximately 2 seconds, a short pause in between each word, and a slightly longer pause separating each list. Regardless of modality condition, the same words were presented to each participant in the same order at approximately the same speed. The order of the lists and words within each list remained constant across participants as well.

Immediately following the presentation of all word lists, students read a scripted prompt to instruct their participant to complete math problems – a distractor task – for the duration of 2 minutes. The students notified the participant as soon as their time was up and read scripted instructions for completing the recognition task. Participants were given as long as they needed to complete the recognition task, which was subsequently collected by the student.

After completing the recognition task, participants were fully debriefed about the purpose of the study. Then, students were individually responsible for scoring the recognition task of their participants by counting and recording the number of critical lure terms falsely identified and the number of correctly recognized list items. These activities took, at most, approximately 30 minutes per participant.

*Materials/Measure*

The four word lists were selected from those created by Roediger and McDermott. Each of the four lists contained 15 words relating to a non-represented critical lure term. For example, a list may consist of the following words: table, sit, legs, seat, couch, desk, recliner, sofa, wood, cushion, swivel, stool, sitting, rocking, bench. These are all related to the word "chair" which was not presented in the list and, thus, not studied by the participants. The four lists were specifically chosen because they tended to elicit the highest average rate of false recognition in previous studies.

For the recognition portion of the study, participants were instructed to circle either “yes” or “no” next to each word depending on whether they remembered it being presented. The recognition test was scored to measure two dependent variables: (1) the number of correctly recognized list items, and (2) the number of falsely recognized critical lure terms. These two measures are used to represent the construct of false memory creation in the DRM paradigm.
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