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Novel Objects

The following pages include images for the 64 principle novel objects and images for 20 additional exemplars of some of the principle objects. Each image beginning with “20” is available in standard resolution (300 DPI) and high resolution (600 DPI). Images beginning with “10” are only available in low resolution. Images are 4in x 4in.

In addition, familiarity scores and name-ability scores are provided for each principle image.

Familiarity scores ($F$) are equal to the % of adults who indicated they had seen one of these objects before. Therefore the higher the score, the more familiar, i.e., less novel and more common the object is (to adults). Depending on your study design, you may want objects that are most novel. See Figure 1 for a rank ordering by novelty.

Name-Ability scores ($N$) are equal to the % of adults who spontaneously came up with the same name for the object. Therefore, the higher the score, the more name-able, i.e., the more likely adults will agree on what to call it.

E indicates multiple exemplars are available for this object. See the Multiple Exemplars and Category Similarities sections for more information.
novel objects & unusual names

2001
F = 19% N = 50%

2002
F = 22% N = 83%

2003
F = 59% N = 74%

2004
F = 41% N = 70%

2005
F = 6% N = 25%

2006
F = 34% N = 64%

1007
F = 22% N = 46%

1008
F = 34% N = 25%

2009
F = 47% N = 78%

2010
F = 66% N = 52%

2011
F = 22% N = 75%

2012
F = 41% N = 50%
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F = 6% N = 14%
F = 16% N = 71%
F = 22% N = 38%
F = 6% N = 47%
F = 19% N = 27%
F = 9% N = 43%
F = 16% N = 32%
F = 47% N = 90%
F = 9% N = 57%
F = 72% N = 39%
E; F = 13% N = 54%
F = 59% N = 70%
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F = 34% N = 24%

E; F = 56% N = 63%

E; F = 28% N = 64%

E; F = 31% N = 64%

F = 34% N = 38%

F = 38% N = 67%

F = 66% N = 76%

E; F = 6% N = 27%

F = 25% N = 29%

F = 34% N = 67%

F = 41% N = 32%

E; F = 13% N = 47%
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F = 19% N = 44%

F = 31% N = 68%

E; F = 53% N = 60%

E; F = 41% N = 53%

E; F = 44% N = 79%

F = 3% N = 25%

F = 13% N = 33%

F = 19% N = 59%

F = 34% N = 32%

F = 22% N = 33%

F = 75% N = 92%

F = 38% N = 32%
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2061
F = 53% N = 53%

2062
F = 44% N = 56%

2063
F = 25% N = 38%

2064
F = 28% N = 33%
Multiple Exemplars

Category 2015

2015
2015-B
2015-C

Category 2035

2035-B
2035-C
2035-D

Category 2038

2038
2038-B
2038-C

Category 2039

2039
2039
2039

Category 2040

2040
2040-B
2040-C
### novel objects & unusual names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2044</th>
<th>2044-B</th>
<th>2044-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2048</th>
<th>2048-B</th>
<th>2048-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2051</th>
<th>2051-B</th>
<th>2051-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image7.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2052</th>
<th>2052-B</th>
<th>2052-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image10.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2053</th>
<th>2053-B</th>
<th>2053-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image13.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Below are the similarity ratings within each category (e.g., cell 2015/2015 indicates the mean similarity between items in category 2015) and between categories (e.g., cell 2015/2035 indicates the mean similarity between items in categories 2015 and 2035). Note: smaller numbers indicate greater similarity. When considering items for forming global-level categories, we recommend a cut-off of .87 or lower (this is \( M + .25SD \)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>2039</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2044</th>
<th>2048</th>
<th>2051</th>
<th>2052</th>
<th>2053</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2044</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2051</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2052</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2053</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Novelty**

**Figure 1.** This figure plots the objects in order of most novel (2054) to least novel (2024). The novelty scores are $1-F$ (familiar scores in the main catalog). Dotted lines are included to facilitate readability.
Figure 2, Part 1. This figure plots the percentage of adults who spontaneously referred to the objects’ color(s) when answering the question “what would you call this object?” Dotted lines are included to facilitate readability. Note, frequency of color qualifiers is correlated with object novelty (the more novel something is the more likely people will mention color when asked what to call it), $r = .42$, $p = .0006$, CI = .189 -.599.
**Figure 2, Part 2.** This figure plots the percentage of adults who spontaneously referred to the objects’ color(s) when answering the question “what would you call this object?”
Texture Saliency

Figure 3. This figure plots the percentage of adults who spontaneously referred to the objects’ textures or materials (e.g., spikey, soft) when answering the question “what would you call this object?” Dotted lines are included to facilitate readability.
Similar Objects

We calculated the mean distance scores for every object in the database against every other object. These 16 objects had the lowest mean distances (i.e., greatest similarity). For all 64 objects, $M = .8566$, $SD = .0367$, range = .7546-.9348. For additional comparisons, please use the Supplementary Electronic Table.
Distinct Objects

We calculated the mean distance scores for every object in the database against every other object. These 16 objects had the highest mean distances (i.e., greatest dissimilarity). For all 64 objects, $M = .8566$, $SD = .0367$, range = .7546-.9348. For additional comparisons, please use the Supplementary Electronic Table.
The unusual names (AKA pseudo-names, non-names & novel names) are listed alphabetically on the next page. These names have been compiled from NOUN user suggestions and the studies listed below.

If you are interested in determining the phoneme length, neighborhood density and other features of the unusual names, we highly recommend using the Storkel and Hoover (2010) online calculator: http://www.bncdnet.ku.edu/cgi-bin/DEEC/out_ccc.vi


### A
- adet
- agen
- akar
- aned
- ange
- aque

### B
- beag
- bem
- bink
- biss
- blap
- blick
- blicket
- bosa
- boskot
- brend
- brisp
- broost

### C
- chatten
- cheem
- Ciop
- colat
- cuddle
- culp
- cusk
- cvack

### D
- dage
- dand
- darg
- dax
- deld
- derd
- dite
- doff
- doud
- dunch
- dupe

### E
- eder
- eget
- erag

### F
- fapt
- feag
- fiffin
- fimp
- fis
- fode
- fode
- foom
- fote
- fupp

### G
- gade
- gake
- gasser
- gaz
- gazzer
- geag
- geap
- gip
- glark
- gloop
- goke
- gree

### H
- hage
- hane
- heab
- heach
- hach
- husp
- hux

### I
- ipis iree
- isol

### J
- jang
- jate
- jefa
- jick
- judge
- juff
- juss

### K
- kaki
- kern
- kinch
- kita
- kiv
- koba
- koob
- krat

### L
- leam
- lep
- loche
- lorp
- lort

### M
- manu
- mel
- modi
- mense

### N–O
- nare
- nega
- nilt
- noop
- osip

### P
- pabe
- pafe
- pank
- pentants
- pisk

### Q–R
- quan
- ratch
- reda
- regli
- reng
- roak
- roke

### S
- sarl
- sarn
- shed
- shil
- sibu
- slint
- sme
- smope
- sois
- soit
- sob
- sount
- spoov
- sprock
- stad

### T
- tand
- tannin
- tanzer
- teebu
- terb
- tever
- tife
- toma
- trag
- tream
- tri
- tulver
- tunk
- tust

### U–V
- upos
- vab
- virdex

### W
- whis
- wilp
- wiot
- wiso
- wolp
- wost
- wupt

### Y–Z
- yok
- yosp
- zav
- zeb
- zios
- zorch
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Are you still reading? There is a new study to design and plan! What are you waiting for?!
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