**Descriptions of datafiles**

Experiment 1

Participants in this experiment were presented with 6 lists of words designed to produce false memories know as DRM lists, taken from Deese/Roediger-McDermott (Deese, 1959, Roediger & McDermott, 1995). Each list consisted of 10 that were all associates of a nonpresented ‘critical lure’ (e.g., one list consisted of words such as *bed*, *wake*, *dream*, *rest*, etc, which are all associates of the nonstudied word *sleep*). Participants rated the words in one of five conditions:

1. relevance to a past event

2. relevance to a future event

3. relevance to the planning of a past event

4. relevance to the planning of a future event

5. valence (positive v negative ratings)

Rating task was manipulated between-subjects. After rating all six lists, participants were asked to recall the words. The dataset is in SPSS format (.sav) and includes the numbers of words correctly recalled, the numbers of critical lures falsely recalled, the mean ratings of the words, and demographics such as age and gender of the participants. Each row represents one participant. No reliable effects were observed in correct recall, but participants in the future and future planning conditions falsely recalled more critical lures than participants in the other conditions.

Experiment 2

Participants rated words on three dimensions:

1. relevance to the planning of a past event

2. relevance to the planning of a future event

3. valence

Rating task was manipulated within-subjects with different lists in each condition. An additional manipulation was that one group were presented with the words in a blocked list-by-list format whereas a second group were presented with the words in random order. Memory was tested by recognition rather than free recall. The dataset includes the numbers of words correctly recognised, the numbers of critical lures falsely recognised, the mean ratings of the words, and age and gender of the participants. Each row represents one participant. No reliable effects were observed in correct recognition, but participants in the future planning condition falsely recognized more critical lures than participants in the other conditions, but only when the words were presented in a blocked format rather than random.

Experiment 3

Similar design to Experiment 2 but without the random presentation condition. In addition to rating DRM lists, participants rated lists of unrelated words. Each row represents one participant. No reliable effects were observed in correct recognition, but participants in the future planning condition falsely recognized more critical lures than participants in the other conditions, but only for DRM lists and not for unrelated words.

Experiments 1, 2 and 3 were published in the following paper:

Dewhurst, S.A., Anderson, R.J., Grace, L., & van Esch, L. (2016). Adaptive false memory: Imagining future scenarios increases false memories in the DRM paradigm. *Memory & Cognition, 44*, 1076-1084*.*

Experiment 4

Participants studied lists of object nouns either related or unrelated to three scenarios (picnic, camping, beach holiday). The encoding task was to rate how likely each object was within the scenario. The critical manipulation was whether participants rated them in relation to a past event, a future event, or an atemporal (typical) scenario. The rating task was followed by a recognition test featuring studied and unstudied words related and unrelated to the scenarios. The dataset includes the numbers of words correctly recognised, the numbers of critical lures falsely recognised, the mean ratings of the words, and age and gender of the participants. Each row represents one participant. No reliable effects were observed in correct recognition, but participants in the future planning condition falsely recognized more related but unstudied items than participants in the other conditions.

Experiment 5

This followed the same design as Experiment 4 but used scenarios that participants were unlikely to have experienced personally (bank robbery, making a movie, going into space). The dataset includes the numbers of words correctly recognised, the numbers of critical lures falsely recognised, the mean ratings of the words, and age and gender of the participants. Each row represents one participant. No reliable effects were observed in correct recognition, but participants in the future planning condition falsely recognized more related but unstudied items than participants in the other conditions.

Experiment 6

Participants rated object nouns for relevance to a past holiday, future holiday, or a typical holiday. After the rating task, participants were asked to list items that one would typically take on a holiday. The dataset shows the numbers of studied and unstudied words generated in the listing task. Each row represents one participant. The main finding was that participants in the future condition listed fewer studied items but more unstudied items that participants in the past condition.

A paper reporting Experiments 4, 5 and 6 is currently in preparation.

Experiment 7

Participants rated a series of action phrases for their relevance to past, future, or typical events. The dataset includes the numbers of action phrases correctly recognised, the numbers of unstudied action phrases falsely recognised, the mean ratings of the words, and age and gender of the participants. Each row represents one participant. No reliable effects were observed in correct recognition or false recognition.

Experiment 8

Participants rated words for relevance to a past holiday or a future holiday. Hey then took part in an implicit memory task (stem completion) in which they were presented with the first two letters and had to complete them with the first word that came to mind. The dataset shows the numbers of stems completed with studied and unstudied words. Each row represents one participant. No effects of temporal direction were observed.