

All My Children: The Roles of Semantic Category and Phonetic Similarity in the Misnaming of Familiar Individuals

Journal:	<i>Memory & Cognition</i>
Manuscript ID	MC-ORIG-15-184.R2
Manuscript Type:	Resubmitted Manuscript
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Deffler, Samantha; Duke University, Psychology and Neuroscience Fox, Cassidy; Duke University, Ogle, Christin; Duke University, Psychology and Neuroscience Rubin, David; Duke University, psychological & brain sciences
Keywords:	memory, semantic memory, memory errors, recall

All My Children: The Roles of Semantic Category and Phonetic Similarity in the Misnaming of
Familiar Individuals

Samantha A. Deffler, Cassidy Fox, Christin M. Ogle, & David C. Rubin

Duke University

Author Note

Samantha A. Deffler, Cassidy Fox, & Christin M. Ogle, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Duke University; David C. Rubin, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Duke University, and Center on Autobiographical Memory Research, Aarhus University.

Portions of this project were completed by Cassidy Fox for her Graduation with Distinction Senior Thesis. We thank Irene Lee for help with the phonetic analysis and Kaitlyn Brodar for her editorial assistance.

Address correspondence to Samantha Deffler, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Duke University, Box 90086, Durham, NC, 27708, samantha.deffler@duke.edu.

Abstract

Despite knowing a familiar individual (such as a daughter) well, anecdotal evidence suggests that naming errors can occur among very familiar individuals. Here, we investigate the conditions surrounding these types of errors, or *misnamings*, where a person (the *misnamer*) incorrectly calls a familiar individual (the *misnamed*) by someone else's name (the *named*). Across five studies including over 1,700 participants, we investigated the prevalence of the phenomenon of misnaming, identified factors underlying why it may occur, and tested potential mechanisms. We included undergraduates and MTurk workers and asked questions of both the misnamed and the misnamer. We find that familiar individuals are often misnamed with the name of another member of the same semantic category; family members are misnamed with another family member's name and friends are misnamed with another friend's name. Phonetic similarity between names also leads to misnamings; however, the size of this effect was smaller than that of the semantic category effect. Overall, the misnaming of familiar individuals is driven by the relationship between the misnamer, misnamed, and named; phonetic similarity between the incorrect name used by the misnamer and the correct name also plays a role in misnaming.

Introduction

“Becky... Jesse... Molly... no, Samantha! Help me with the groceries,” your mother yells, looking at you. Each of the authors, though different in gender, age, and background, have been called a sibling’s name by an older family member who actually knew who we were; for three of us that had a dog, we were even called the dog’s name. The last author, having experienced this seeming insult by loving parents as a child, now does it to his graduate students, and he only has two. This could not be simply part of the aging process; a young adult calling a romantic partner by another real or imagined partner's name is a common plot line in popular culture. Instead of leaving this as a laboratory joke, we decided to study it because, despite the prevalence of research into the retrieval of proper names that are low in familiarity (e.g., Burke, MacKay, Worthley, & Wade, 1991; Cohen, 1990; McKenna & Warrington, 1980), very few studies have looked at how the names of highly familiar (non-celebrity) people are retrieved, or more interestingly, incorrectly retrieved. More formally, we investigate the conditions surrounding these types of errors, or *misnamings*, where a person (the *misnamer*) incorrectly calls a familiar individual (the *misnamed*) by the name of someone else (the *named*).

In spite of the anecdotal data suggesting that misnamings are a common phenomenon, we could find only two diary studies that examine the phenomenon of individuals misnaming those that they know personally. Young, Hay, and Ellis (1985) had participants record errors in person recognition, including not recognizing a familiar person and difficulty retrieving a person’s name. Of interest here, roughly 1/3 of the reports were for the misidentification of a familiar person. The authors suggest that these misnamings occurred because of both semantic (within the same category) and physical similarity between the misnamed and the named. Cohen and Faulkner (1986; also see Burke, et al., 1991) also questioned people about naming blocks (the

Running Head: MISNAMINGS OF FAMILIAR INDIVIDUALS

1
2
3 inability to recall a name), although their focus was on age differences. No name blocks for
4
5 relatives were reported, but the majority of naming difficulties reported did occur for friends and
6
7 acquaintances. When trying to retrieve the correct name, people reported recalling the names of
8
9 those semantically similar to the individual in question, suggesting that proper names are linked
10
11 with other semantic information about a person that in turn connects them to similar individuals.
12
13
14

15 Other studies have examined difficulty in remembering the correct names of moderately
16
17 well-known individuals, rather than the problem of easily remembering a wrong name for a
18
19 personally-known individual. For example, research on the naming of celebrities has shown that
20
21 naming blocks or misnaming of celebrities can occur (Brédart, 1993; Griffin, 2010; Young, Ellis,
22
23 & Flude, 1988), but these misnamings may be qualitatively different from misnaming a
24
25 personally- and well-known individual. However, given the paucity of data on the phenomenon
26
27 of interest, these studies also provide useful sources of information and hypotheses. In one
28
29 misnaming study by Griffin (2010), college students were asked to recognize the faces of well-
30
31 known celebrities. When subjects failed at recognizing the celebrities, they did not make random
32
33 errors. Instead, celebrities that were misrecognized were mistaken for individuals with similar
34
35 characteristics. These characteristics were occasionally physical, but errors also occurred due to
36
37 similarities in nationality and profession. For instance, President Kennedy was mistaken for
38
39 President Regan and Elizabeth I was mistaken for Mary Queen of Scots. This observed semantic
40
41 relatedness between misnamed individuals and named individuals is consistent with a possible
42
43 mechanism by which misnaming occurs: semantic information activated by seeing or thinking of
44
45 a person can cause the incorrect activation of another person's name because those people are
46
47 within the same group or semantic category (here, family, friends, or other).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

Results of these studies are consistent with the Interactive Activations and Competition Model of person recognition (Brédart, Valentine, Calder, & Gassi, 1995; Burton, Bruce, & Hancock, 1999; Burton, Bruce, & Johnston, 1990) which posits that information about a person is coded as a shared semantic unit or category (e.g., relative, friend); activation of a semantic unit can spread to facilitate retrieval of other individuals within the same unit. This shared semantic information can lead to associative and categorical priming when naming closely related individuals (Carson & Burton, 2001; Darling & Valentine, 2005; Vladeanu, Lewis, & Ellis, 2006; see Stone, 2008 for a more nuanced examination of the associative versus categorical priming debate). Names of people within a given category can even cause proactive interference for the name of a known individual (Darling, Martin, & Macrae, 2010), and release from proactive interference occurs when new, unrelated semantic information is retrieved (Darling & Valentine, 2005). Here we attempt to extend these findings to the misnaming of well-known individuals.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Consistent with the difficulty in recall, the names of known individuals are also more vulnerable to tip-of-the-tongue (TOT) states than common nouns (Reason & Lucas, 1984). A TOT occurs when one feels that information is known but cannot recall it (Brown, 1991). In a survey of TOT states, Burke and colleagues (1991) found that the majority of TOTs reported by participants were for the names of acquaintances with which they had not recently been in contact. In a study of TOT states for celebrity names, Hanley and Chapman (2008) found that celebrities who were lower in familiarity were more likely to elicit a TOT state; here, both semantic (familiarity) and phonetic (two names, e.g., Meryl Streep; versus three, e.g., Helena Bonham Carter) factors affected the prevalence of TOT states. TOT states may occur because a more accessible word, or persistent alternative, is currently in the individual's consciousness and

1
2
3 therefore blocks the production of the target word. Cross and Burke (2004) attempted to
4
5 determine if the presentation of target words could be used to increase TOT states. However,
6
7 when individuals were primed with an incorrect but plausible name (the name of a character a
8
9 celebrity played), TOT states did not increase. Having more knowledge about a particular word
10
11 also did not increase the prevalence of TOT states (Cross & Burke, 2004).
12
13
14

15 TOT states may be related to the phenomenon of misnaming because they involve a
16
17 failure to retrieve a name and include the production of alternate names that are similar to the
18
19 “persistent alternatives” in TOT states. However, a key difference between the occurrences that
20
21 we are exploring and TOT states is the quick retrieval of an incorrect name during misnaming (as
22
23 opposed to the effortful and temporally disjointed attempt to recall during a TOT state).
24
25
26

27 Misnaming involves the fluid replacement of the misnamed’s correct name with an incorrect (but
28
29 often plausible) name. In its fluidity, misnaming is more akin to pronunciation errors or slips of
30
31 the tongue (Freud, 1901/2009; Bomer & Laver, 1968; Motley, Baars, & Camden, 1983), such as
32
33 spoonerisms, malapropisms, and word substitutions (e.g., “runny babbit,” “weapons of mass
34
35 production,” and “on my elbow” versus “on my knee”, respectively; Dell & Reich, 1981; Fay &
36
37 Cutler, 1977; Motley, Camden, & Baars, 1982). Similar to some of these examples, misnaming
38
39 may also be influenced by the phonetics of names, or at the phonological feature layer of a
40
41 spreading activation network (Berg, 2006; Dell, 1986). For example, similarly sounding words
42
43 can prime proper nouns (e.g., cherry pit primes Brad Pitt; Burke, Locantore, Austin, & Chae,
44
45 2004). We therefore test whether phonetic similarity plays a role in the misnaming of familiar
46
47 individuals.
48
49
50
51
52

53 The aims of the current study are threefold. First, we intend to show that misnaming of
54
55 familiar individuals is a widespread phenomenon. Second, we will establish the parameters by
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 which it tends to occur. Because few studies have explored the misnaming of personally-known
4
5 individuals, we examine a wide variety of potential factors that may lead to this phenomenon.
6

7
8 We derived self-report measures from existing literature and from anecdotal reports of the
9
10 misnaming phenomenon to examine the circumstances surrounding misnaming. Third, we test
11
12 the two potential mechanisms that the literature indicates are most likely to influence misnaming:
13
14 1) semantic relatedness, with the semantic category in which the misnamed belongs (e.g., family,
15
16 friend) influencing the names that he or she is called; and 2) phonetic similarity between the
17
18 incorrect name used and the correct name.
19
20

21
22 We use five studies to establish the phenomenon of misnaming familiar individuals and
23
24 describe its properties. Study 1 establishes that about half of the over 1,500 undergraduates we
25
26 screened have been misnamed by familiar individuals. Studies 2, 3, 4, and 5 explore the
27
28 phenomenon, document its properties, and test our hypotheses regarding the mechanism(s)
29
30 underlying misnaming. To ensure the generalizability of our results over different populations,
31
32 Studies 2 and 4 test undergraduate volunteers, whereas Studies 3 and 5 replicate these using a
33
34 more age-diverse, paid adult sample. Studies 2 and 3 measure the phenomenon from the
35
36 perspective of the misnamed whereas Studies 4 and 5 measure it from the perspective of the
37
38 misnamer, providing somewhat different information and further replications.
39
40
41
42

43 **Study 1: Demonstration of Phenomenon**

44 **Method**

45
46
47
48 **Participants.** Duke University undergraduates participated in the study as part of a
49
50 department-wide web-based questionnaire used to select participants for future studies. Across 5
51
52 semesters, a total of 1544 undergraduates were given a brief questionnaire about instances of
53
54 misnaming. Of the 1544 undergraduates who participated in the larger survey, 25 declined to
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running Head: MISNAMINGS OF FAMILIAR INDIVIDUALS

answer the questions about misnaming. The final sample included 1519 individuals and was 61.1% female. The mean age of the participants was 18.76 ($SD = 1.03$; range: 17 - 23). These data were also used to recruit participants for studies 2 and 4.

Procedure. All participants answered the following questions: 1) Have you ever been called the wrong name by someone familiar to you? and 2) What is your relationship to this person? A subset of participants ($N = 799$) also answered: 1) Have you ever called someone familiar to you by the wrong name? and 2) What is your relationship to this person?

Results

Of participants who provided data, 51.0% reported that they had been misnamed by someone familiar to them. If misnamed, 95.0% of the participants were called the incorrect name by a family member. Of all of the female participants, 55.3% reported being misnamed and 44.7% did not. Of all of the male participants, 44.3% of males reported being misnamed and 55.7% did not, indicating a relationship between gender and being misnamed, $\chi^2(1) = 17.32$, $p < .001$, $\phi = .11$.

Within the subset of participants asked about misnaming a familiar individual, 38.3% reported misnaming a familiar person. If they had misnamed someone, 55.1% reported misnaming a family member and 41.0% reported misnaming a friend. Of the female participants, 41.1% reported misnaming and 58.9% did not. Of the male participants, 33.2% reported misnaming and 66.8% did not, indicating a relationship between gender and being misnamed, $\chi^2(1) = 4.87$, $p = .03$, $\phi = .08$. Reporting committing a misnaming was related to reporting being misnamed, with participants more likely to report both occurrences or neither type of occurrence, $\chi^2(1) = 182.77$, $p < .001$, $\phi = .48$.

Study 2: Misonaming of Undergraduates by Known Individuals

Running Head: MISNAMINGS OF FAMILIAR INDIVIDUALS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
Given that misnaming by familiar individuals is a widespread phenomenon, the goal of Study 2 was to understand the circumstances under which misnamings occur (e.g., when it occurs and who misnames whom). To that end, we gave undergraduates a longer survey about particular misnaming episodes with more specific questions that were derived from data about misnaming incidents from a pilot study with Duke students.

15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 **Method**

Participants. One-hundred and nineteen Duke University undergraduates (56.3% female) who had reported being misnamed in Study 1 were recruited to complete an online survey. The mean age of the participants was 18.97 ($SD = .91$; $Range: 18 - 22$).

Procedure. Participants were directed to an online Qualtrics survey, where they consented to participate. After reading the instructions, all participants completed the misnaming and demographics portion of the survey.

34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 **Measures.**

Misnaming information. Participants were asked to report up to 10 incidents of misnaming. For each instance of misnaming, participants were first asked to: (1) identify the name of the person who had misnamed them, (2) indicate whether they had been called one name or a string of names, and (3) indicate, if called multiple names, whether the incorrect names were always said in the same order. Participants were then asked what name(s) they had been called, as well as their relationship to the individuals with whom their names were switched. Participants also rated the misnaming episode on a number of different dimensions shown in Table 1. One dimension asked how often this type of misnaming occurred (rarely, yearly, every few months, monthly, and daily or more often). We categorized these responses

1
2
3 into two bins: rarely, yearly, or every few months (bin 1); and monthly, daily, or more often than
4
5 daily (bin 2).
6

7
8 For each misnaming incident, we also coded the phonetic similarity of the participant's
9 name and the name that he or she was wrongly called in two ways. First, phonetic similarity was
10 independently rated by two coders on a scale from 0 to 2 (0 = *no similarity*, 1 = *somewhat*
11 *similar*, 2 = *similar*), and the ratings showed high reliability, $K = .77$. Disagreements were
12 scored by a third independent coder. The third coder's ratings were retained in all cases of
13 disagreement. Names were rated as similar if they had identical beginning and ending sounds
14 (e.g., Michael and Mitchell) or if they had multiple letter similarity at the beginning (e.g., Phillip
15 and Phyllis). Names were rated as somewhat similar if they shared a beginning sound (e.g.,
16 Abigail and Agatha; Felicity and Phyllis) or if they shared a common ending sound (e.g., Joey
17 and Mikey). Names with none of these features in common were rated as not similar.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Second, we analyzed the number of overlapping phonemes between the names. Each
33 name was translated into the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) by using an online dictionary
34 based upon the Carnegie Mellon University Pronouncing Dictionary. Next, a trained linguist
35 checked the translations for correctness, as well as translated names that were not processed by
36 the dictionary. A proportion of phonetic overlap between the used name and the correct name
37 was then calculated by counting the number of phonemes in the used name that were also present
38 in the correct name, and dividing this number by the number of phonemes in the correct name.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Demographics.** Questions included the participants' age, gender, race/ethnicity and
49 languages spoken. In addition to information about the participants, the demographic section
50 also asked participants to describe their family members, pets, and anyone who was mentioned in
51 the previous sections. For each person mentioned, they were asked to list their relationship,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running Head: MISNAMINGS OF FAMILIAR INDIVIDUALS

1
2
3 perceived physical similarity (1 = *not at all similar* to 7 = *very similar*) between the person and
4 themselves, and whether the person lived with them or not. For each pet mentioned, they were
5 asked the pet's type, gender, and whether the pet was currently owned. Participants were also
6 prompted to include information for all of the individuals that had been mentioned previously
7 when describing misnaming incidents. Later, the names and demographics of these individuals
8 were matched to the information pertaining to each misnaming incident in which they or their
9 names were involved.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Results and Discussion**

20
21
22 Participants provided a total of 292 cases of misnaming. Note that here and in the
23 subsequent studies, due to missing data some frequencies do not sum to the total N and some
24 percentages may not sum to 100%. Here and throughout the paper, we report all of our results,
25 but mainly discuss those that address our hypotheses. See Table 1 for the relevant data on the
26 demographics of the misnamer and misnamed, as well as characteristics of the misnaming
27 incidents. To summarize, misnamers were more often female rather than male, were almost
28 always older than the misnamed, and saw or spoke to the misnamed regularly. Each type of
29 reported misnaming event was typically experienced every few months, yearly, or rarely, and the
30 misnamed tended to only be called a single name during a misnaming episode. Perceived
31 negative mood did not have an effect on misnaming.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 We also analyzed the qualities of the named individuals whose names were incorrectly
47 used to refer to the misnamed participant. About half of the time, the named individual was
48 present when the misnaming occurred. On average, the named individuals were only somewhat
49 physically similar to the misnamed participants, suggesting that perceived physical similarity
50 between people was not driving misnaming.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Besides the qualitative characteristics of the misnaming event and the individuals involved with misnaming, the relationships between the misnamer, the misnamed, and the named were also examined. Specifically, we were interested in whether misnaming occurred because the misnamed and the named were members of the same group or semantic category (e.g., the same family), and thus their names shared some semantic meaning. The relationships between the misnamer and the misnamed, and the named and the misnamed were categorized into one of four categories: family members, friends, other humans, and pets. For all following analyses, only the first name reported was analyzed due to the internal similarity of naming strings skewing the results. The relevant data are reported in Table 2; each incident of misnaming was categorized by the relationship between the misnamed and the misnamer (rows) and the relationship between the named and the participant (here, the misnamed; columns). The relationships between the misnamed and the misnamer and the misnamed and the named largely overlapped. In other words, family members tended to misname other family members using a third family member's name, friends tended to misname other friends, and others tended to misname others. When analyzed using Chi-Square, which assumes independence between the relationship of the misnamer and the misnamed and the relationship between the misnamer and named, the results were significant across all categories. The large value of ϕ (.93) indicates a large effect of semantic relatedness. In this sample, only 13 pets were mentioned and their names were used exclusively by family members of the misnamed.

The results above suggest that misnamings occur within semantic categories; however, the analysis did not exclude the possibility that the misnamings also occurred because of phonetic similarity between names. For each measure of phonetic similarity (rated similarity and proportion of phoneme overlap), the phonetic similarity of the incorrect name used by the

Running Head: MISNAMINGS OF FAMILIAR INDIVIDUALS

1
2
3 misnamer to all of the correct names (legal name and nicknames) were averaged. Of all the
4
5 cases of misnaming ($n = 292$), the name used and the correct name were, on average, low on
6
7 phonetic similarity as rated by research assistants ($M = .33$, $SD = .45$), as well as when the
8
9 proportion of overlapping phonemes between the correct name and the used name was calculated
10
11 ($M = .34$, $SD = .22$). We ran a Monte Carlo procedure to determine a baseline of phonetic
12
13 similarity by pairing names of all misnamed individuals in the study at random with the incorrect
14
15 names used across the misnaming incidents and rating these pairs for phonetic similarity as
16
17 above ($K = .85$), as well as calculated the overlapping phonemes between the two names. Here
18
19 too, the rated phonetic similarity and proportion of phoneme overlap between pairs was low ($M =$
20
21 $.18$, $SD = .34$; $M = .29$, $SD = .21$, respectively). The rated phonetic similarity of the original
22
23 name pairs was statistically higher than the randomly generated word pairs, $t(582) = 4.61$, $p <$
24
25 $.001$, $\eta^2 = .04$, as was the proportion of phoneme overlap, $t(582) = 2.68$, $p = .008$, $\eta^2 = .01$.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32 The similarity of the used name to the correct name was also compared to the results of
33
34 the Monte Carlo randomization using Chi-Square analysis (see Table 2). The Monte Carlo
35
36 ratings were used as expected values for the Chi-Square calculation. This allows for the
37
38 comparison of the effect size ϕ between semantic relatedness of the misnamed and the name and
39
40 the rated phonetic similarity of the correct name and the name used. There was a significant
41
42 difference between the rated phonetic similarity of the observed misnamings and the expected
43
44 Monte Carlo-generated values, with the observed misname-name pairs rated as more similar than
45
46 the Monte Carlo pairs. However, the effect size ($\phi = .49$) is smaller than the effect of semantic
47
48 relationships on misnaming ($\phi = .93$), Fisher's $Z = 13.47$, $p < .001$.

49
50
51
52
53 Consistent with Study 1, these results suggest that instances of misnaming are common
54
55 occurrences that participants can remember and report on; however, the retrospective nature of
56
57
58
59
60

the survey may influence these findings. Additionally, misnaming between familiar individuals is not random. Rather, the wrong name used tends to be within the same semantic category and is affected by the phonetic similarity between the correct name and the name used.

Study 3: Misonaming of Community-Dwelling Adults by Known Individuals

Study 3 took the same approach as Study 2, but was administered to Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) workers in order to sample from participants of various ages; the MTurk participant population tends to be older and have a wider age range than undergraduates (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011), which allows us to better examine characteristics of the relationship between the misnamer and the misnamed. To preview, Study 3 replicates the findings of Study 2 by establishing that misnaming is a common phenomenon amongst familiar individuals and it typically occurs within a semantic group.

Method

Participants. Participants were recruited through MTurk and completed an online survey for \$1.00 compensation; they were told to only complete the survey if they had experienced a misnaming. They were included in the sample only if they correctly answered a “check” question correctly; of 102 participants surveyed, 97 participants (52.6% female) did and were included in the sample. The mean age of the participants was 33.51 ($SD = 10.85$; *Range*: 19 – 64). Most were born in the United States or India (55.7% and 27.8%, respectively) and currently resided in those countries (60.8% and 27.8%, respectively). Participants were also born in Europe (6.2%), Canada (4.1%), East Asia (4.1%), the Middle East (1.0%), and the South Pacific (1.0%); and resided in Europe (7.2%), Canada (2.1%), East Asia (1.0%), and the South Pacific (1.0%). Most participants were native speakers of English (75%).

1
2
3 **Procedure.** Participants accessed the study through the MTurk website, where they
4 followed a link to a Qualtrics survey. After reading the instructions and answering a “check”
5 question, all participants completed the survey.
6
7

8
9
10 **Measures.** As in Study 2, all participants answered an online survey that queried both
11 demographic information and information about misnaming incidents. The questions were
12 exactly the same as in Study 2, with three exceptions: 1) participants provided their country of
13 origin and their current country of residence; 2) participants were asked what name(s) each
14 individual who has misnamed them called them normally when they had not been misnamed
15 (e.g., what nicknames were used) and 3) whether they see the individual they were misnamed
16 more often than they see the misnamer (this was used to parallel questions in Studies 4 and 5).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Phonetic similarity was rated by two independent coders with high reliability ($K = .81$ for
28 observed name pairs; $K = .89$ for Monte Carlo generated name pairs) using the same scale as in
29 Study 2; disagreements were scored by a third independent coder whose rating was retained in
30 all cases of disagreement. The proportion of overlapping phonemes between the correct name
31 and the name used was also calculated as above.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Results**

39
40 Data from Study 3 were analyzed similarly to that of Study 2. Table 1 presents
41 participant and misnamer demographics and episode characteristics. A total of 207 cases of
42 misnaming were reported. Misnamers in this sample were nearly as often female as male, were
43 typically older than the misnamed, and saw or spoke to the misnamed regularly. Misnamings
44 typically occurred every few months, yearly, or rarely, and participants were usually called only
45 a single name. Once again, perceived negative mood did not have a large effect on misnaming;
46 participants did not often report the misnamer as being tired, frustrated, or angry. As in Study 2,
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the named individuals were present about half of the time when misnaming occurred. On
4
5 average, the named individuals were only somewhat physically similar to the misnamed
6
7 participants.
8
9

10 We were again interested in whether misnaming occurred because the misnamed, the
11 named, and the misnamer were part of the same group or because of phonetic similarity between
12 names. The relationships between the named, the misnamed, and the misnamer largely
13 overlapped (e.g., family members misnamed other family members; see Table 2). Regarding
14 phonetic similarity of the name pairs, rated phonetic similarity between the name used and the
15 correct name ($M = .45$, $SD = .53$) was significantly greater than the ratings of name pairs
16 randomly assigned through a Monte Carlo procedure ($M = .16$, $SD = .31$), $t(412) = 6.77$, $p <$
17 $.001$, $\eta^2 = .10$. For the proportion of overlapping phonemes, the similarity of the observed
18 misnaming pairs ($M = .39$, $SD = .22$) was also greater than the Monte Carlo generated pairs ($M =$
19 $.30$, $SD = .19$), $t(412) = 4.32$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .04$. Chi-Square analysis of the rated phonetic
20 similarity of the naming pairs (with the Monte Carlo generated pairs again serving as expected
21 values; see Table 3) showed a significant effect, but the size of the effect ($\phi = .68$; see Table 3)
22 was smaller than the effect of semantic relatedness ($\phi = .84$), Fisher's $Z = 3.94$, $p < .001$.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Study 4: Misnaming of Known Individuals by Undergraduates**

42 While Studies 2 and 3 provided evidence of the misnaming phenomenon from the
43 perspective of the misnamed, some questions were answered from the perspective of an outside
44 observer. The characteristics of the misnamer, particularly his or her mood at the time of the
45 misnaming incident, are speculative because the participants are reporting times that they are
46 misnamed. We further explore the characteristics of the misnamer in Study 4, where we query
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 participants on instances where they have called someone the wrong name. As in Study 2, we
4
5 first investigated this phenomenon in undergraduates.
6
7

8 **Method**

9
10 **Participants.** Seventy-six Duke University undergraduates (88.2% female) who had
11 reported committing a misnaming in Study 1 completed an online survey for course credit. The
12 mean age of the participants was 18.80 ($SD = .92$; $Range: 18 - 21$). Most of the participants
13 were native speakers of English (94.9%).
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Procedure.** The procedure was the same as that used in Study 2.
20
21

22 **Measures.** The misnaming information subsection of the questionnaire was altered from
23 that which was used in Studies 2 and 3; here, the focus was on instances where the participants
24 were committing the misnaming and therefore would have better insight into the internal states
25 of the misnamer at the time of the misnaming. To parallel the questions asked of the MTurk
26 sample, a question on native language was also added to the Demographics section, but we did
27 not have enough variability in the sample to analyze differences as a function of native language.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Phonetic similarity was rated by two independent coders with high reliability, $K = .81$,
37 using the same scale as in Studies 2 and 3; disagreements were scored by a third independent
38 coder whose rating was retained in all cases of disagreement. The proportion of phoneme
39 overlap between the name used and the correct name was again calculated.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Results and Discussion**

47
48 All data from Study 4 were analyzed in the same manner as that in Studies 2 and 3. A
49 total of 212 cases of misnaming were reported. For this particular sample, the misnamer
50 demographics are found in the section describing the participants (as they were reporting on
51 times they had called someone the wrong name). The misnamer spoke to the misnamed
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 regularly. Unlike in the previous studies, here the misnamer was often close in age to the
4
5 misnamed (i.e., less than 3 years age difference; 65.5% of valid cases), likely because the
6
7 participants (here, the misnamer) were college students. The number of incidents where the
8
9 misnamer was older than the misnamed (14.5%) was about the same as the number of incidents
10
11 where the misnamer was younger than the misnamed (20.0%).
12
13

14
15 As in the previous samples, most misnamings were reported as occurring every few
16
17 months, yearly, or rarely. Most times, participants only used a single incorrect name when
18
19 committing a misnaming. Because the participants providing survey data are remembering times
20
21 they committed a misnaming, the data may be a more accurate representation of the internal and
22
23 external circumstances of the misnamer at the time of the misnaming (as opposed to Studies 2
24
25 and 3, where the participants were the people being misnamed). When misnamings occurred, the
26
27 misnamer was usually looking at the misnamed and was not usually asking for something at the
28
29 time of the misnaming. Here, the misnamers reported being tired, frustrated, or angry when the
30
31 misnaming episode occurred at a higher rate than the previous two studies. The named
32
33 individuals were present about half of the time when misnaming occurred. On average, the
34
35 named individuals were perceived as only somewhat physically similar to the misnamed
36
37 individuals; this is similar to the finding in Study 3.
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 Misnamings typically occurred within a group. The relationships between the individuals
45
46 are reported in Table 2; the categories of the named, misnamed, and misnamer largely
47
48 overlapped. When the phonetic similarity of the name pairs was examined, the results provided
49
50 evidence that phonetic similarity plays a role in misnaming. Across all cases of misnaming ($n =$
51
52 212), rated phonetic similarity between the name used and the correct name was low ($M = .40,$
53
54 $SD = .53$), but significantly greater than the ratings of name pairs randomly assigned through a
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running Head: MISNAMINGS OF FAMILIAR INDIVIDUALS

1
2
3 Monte Carlo procedure ($M = .19$, $SD = .43$), $t(419) = 4.58$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .05$. For the
4
5 proportion of overlapping phonemes, the similarity of the observed misnaming pairs ($M = .39$,
6
7 $SD = .20$) was also greater than the Monte Carlo generated pairs ($M = .33$, $SD = .21$), $t(419) =$
8
9 3.09 , $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Chi-Square analysis of the rated phonetic similarity of the naming pairs
10
11 (with the Monte Carlo generated pairs again serving as expected values; see Table 3) showed a
12
13 significant effect, but the size of the effect ($\phi = .50$) was smaller than the effect of semantic
14
15 relatedness ($\phi = .93$), Fisher's $Z = 11.31$, $p < .001$.
16
17
18
19

20 Study 5: Misnaming of Known Individuals by Community-Dwelling Adults

21
22 Study 5 again investigated misnaming from the perspective of the misnamer, but we
23
24 increased the age range of the participants by sampling from MTurk in the same manner as in
25
26 Study 3.
27

28 Method

29
30
31 **Participants.** Participants on MTurk completed a survey for \$1.00 compensation; they
32
33 were instructed to only complete the survey if they had committed a misnaming. Participants
34
35 were screened in the same manner as in Study 3 to ensure they read the survey directions. Of the
36
37 105 participants who took the survey, 94 (57.4% female) correctly answered the check question
38
39 and were included in the final dataset. The mean age of the participants was 36.52 ($SD = 13.52$;
40
41 *Range*: 18 – 74). Most of the participants were born in the United States and currently resided
42
43 there (78.7% & 86.3%%, respectively). Participants' regions of origin also included India
44
45 (8.5%), South America (6.4%), Canada (2.1%), Europe (1.1%), the Middle East (1.1%), and
46
47 Africa (1.1%). In addition to the United States, participants also resided in India (8.5%), Europe
48
49 (3.2%), and South America (2.1%). Most of the participants were native speakers of English
50
51 (91.2%).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Procedure.** The procedure was the same as that of Study 3, in that participants were
4 recruited through MTurk and accessed the survey through Qualtrics. The survey measures
5 themselves were identical to that of Study 4.
6
7

8
9
10 **Measures.** The misnaming information subsection of the questionnaire was the same as
11 in Study 4.
12

13
14 Phonetic similarity was rated by two independent coders with high reliability, $K = .76$,
15 using the same scale as in Studies 2, 3, and 4; disagreements were scored by a third independent
16 coder whose rating was retained in all cases of disagreement. The proportion of overlapping
17 phonemes between the name used and the correct name was again calculated.
18
19

20 21 22 **Results and Discussion**

23
24 The data were analyzed in the same manner as the previous studies. A total of 193 cases
25 of misnaming were reported. Replicating the previous studies, the majority of the misnamings
26 occurred every few months, yearly, or rarely, and misnamers tended to use only one incorrect
27 name (see Table 1). As in Study 4, the participants provided information about times that they
28 had committed a misnaming. Therefore, the misnamer demographics can be found above. The
29 misnamer saw or spoke to the misnamed regularly. In approximately half of the misnaming
30 episodes, the misnamer was older than the misnamed. When the misnamings occurred, the
31 misnamer was usually looking at the misnamed. In contrast to Study 4, misnamers reported
32 being tired, frustrated, or angry at the time of the misnaming less often than not. As in the
33 previous studies, the named individuals were present about half of the time when misnaming
34 occurred. Similar to the findings in Studies 3 and 4, on average the named individuals were only
35 somewhat physically similar to the misnamed individuals.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Once again replicating the finding that misnaming was influenced by semantic relationships between the misnamer, the named, and the misnamed, the relationships between these individuals largely overlapped (see Table 2). Furthermore, the phonetic similarity of the named and the misnamed (see Table 3) also factored into misnaming; the rated phonetic similarity of the reported pairs ($M = .44$, $SD = .59$) was greater than the randomly paired names ($M = .20$, $SD = .43$), $t(384) = 4.68$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .05$. The proportion of overlapping phonemes for reported pairs ($M = .39$, $SD = .23$) was greater than the proportion of overlap for the Monte Carlo generated pairs ($M = .29$, $SD = .20$), $t(384) = 4.29$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .05$. Chi-Square analysis of the phonetic similarity of the names showed a significant effect, but as in previous studies, the effect was smaller ($\phi = .52$) than that of semantic relatedness ($\phi = .77$), Fisher's $Z = 4.29$, $p < .001$.

General Discussion

In five different studies, we investigated the circumstances surrounding the misnaming of personally- and well-known individuals by asking both undergraduates and MTurk workers about times that they were misnamed and times in which they had misnamed people familiar to them. Overall, misnaming occurs typically within the same semantic social groups, with family members calling other family members by a wrong name belonging to another family member. Our finding that, across studies, most misnamed-named pairs were rated as only somewhat physically similar suggests that misnaming is likely not due to perceived physical similarity between the named and the misnamed. Our data instead suggest that, similar to studies of TOT states and slips of the tongue, misnaming of highly familiar individuals are influenced by both semantic and phonological factors; potential substitutions for the correct name may be more likely to be used if they share semantic or phonetic properties with the correct name (Dell &

1
2
3 Reich, 1981; White, Abrams, & Frame, 2013); this suggests that misnamings can occur at
4
5 different stages of speech production. A comparison of the effect sizes for semantic similarity
6
7 and phonetic similarity from the Chi-Square analysis revealed a larger effect of semantic group
8
9 that was consistent across all four studies, even though sample characteristics and participant
10
11 perspective (misnamer or misnamed) varied.
12
13

14
15 Aggregate analyses also provide interesting insight into the categorization of non-human
16
17 animals, as well as their status within a category. We analyzed all the cases across Studies 2
18
19 through 5 that contained at least one pet's name. Of the 42 episodes of misnaming involving pet
20
21 names, 41 occurred when a family member's name was intended. Of these 41, parents
22
23 misnamed their children 18 times and siblings misnamed other siblings 16 times with the names
24
25 of pets. Overall, our data suggested that dogs are grouped with other (human) family members,
26
27 much more so than other pets. Although cats were owned by our participants about as often as
28
29 dogs, they were rarely included in a string of incorrect names (of all of the naming strings that
30
31 contained a pet's name, only 4 non-dog names were used). Given the scarcity of misnaming
32
33 episodes involving the names of family pets other than dogs, our data suggest that dogs may be a
34
35 central part of (at least some) families (in fact, two of the authors, SAD and CF, have distinct
36
37 memories of being called the dog's name by their mothers) as human-like members, whereas
38
39 cats and other pets, although they may be part of the family, are not categorized as "human-like".
40
41 Humans often form unique attachments to dogs (Jalongo, 2015; Sable, 2013) and verbally
42
43 communicate with them (Prato-Previde, Fallini, & Valsecchi, 2006), which may lead to
44
45 increased frequencies of dogs' names used over other pets.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Although the study did lend support to the idea that the misnaming of familiar individuals
54
55 is semantically and phonetically motivated, it was not without limitations. As with any data
56
57
58
59
60

Running Head: MISNAMINGS OF FAMILIAR INDIVIDUALS

1
2
3 collected through self-report, errors in report are possible. Participants may not have fully
4
5 reported all incidents of misnaming, but instead only reported those that were most salient to
6
7 them at the time. These salient misnamings may give an idea of the incidents that are most
8
9 important to the participants, but may not represent the wider phenomenon of misnaming. This
10
11 subjective self-report may also have influenced our finding that perceived physical similarity did
12
13 not affect misnaming; our participants may have not been good judges of perceived physical
14
15 similarity because these judgments can be influenced by irrelevant information (e.g., Imhoff,
16
17 Dotsch, Bianchi, Banse, & Wigboldus, 2011; Wenzel, Mummendey, Weber, & Waldzus, 2003).
18
19 Furthermore, participants may have engaged in meaning-making while remembering these
20
21 events, which could lead to inaccurate responses to the questions regarding the circumstances
22
23 surrounding the misnaming episodes. Follow-ups to these studies could use a diary method, such
24
25 as that used by Burke and colleagues (1991) to more accurately capture the circumstances
26
27 surrounding misnaming. A diary method would also allow us to explore the finding that
28
29 misnamers were more often female than male. This may be because our participants talked to
30
31 their female relatives more than their male relatives and these increased interactions lead to more
32
33 misnaming, but the current data preclude the testing of this hypothesis.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 One inconsistency across studies concerned the reported mood of the misnamer at the
42
43 time of the misnaming incident. With the exception of Study 4 (undergraduates reporting when
44
45 they committed a misnaming), the proportion of incidents where the misnamer was in a negative
46
47 mood state was less than or about equal to the proportion of incidents where the misnamer was
48
49 not tired, frustrated, or angry. It is unclear why there was a difference when undergraduates
50
51 were reporting their own mood, but this may be due to demand characteristics or rationalization
52
53 of the phenomenon as they remember misnaming events. Another measure of misnamer mood
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 state may be more effective in testing the effects of different mood states on misnaming. We
4
5 expect that misnamer distraction does affect misnaming incidents, although further research is
6
7 needed to test this claim.
8
9

10 In closing, the misnaming of familiar individuals is a common phenomenon that has been
11
12 demonstrated using quantitative techniques and theoretically motivated measures to understand
13
14 the nature of and circumstances surrounding the misnaming of familiar individuals.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Berg, T. (2006). A structural account of phonological paraphasias. *Brain and Language*, *96*, 331-
7
8 356.
9
- 10 Bomer, D. S., & Laver, J. D. M. (1968). Slips of the tongue. *International Journal of Language*
11
12 & *Communication Disorders*, *3*, 2-12.
13
- 14 Brédart, S. (1993). Retrieval failures in face naming. *Memory*, *1*, 351-366.
15
- 16 Brédart, S., Valentine, T., Calder, A., & Gassi, L. (1995). An interactive activation model of face
17
18 naming. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology A: Human Experimental*
19
20 *Psychology*, *48*, 466-486.
21
22
- 23 Brown, A. S. (1991). A review of the tip-of-the-tongue experience. *Psychological Bulletin*, *109*,
24
25 204-223.
26
27
- 28 Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source
29
30 of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *6*, 3-5.
31
32
- 33 Burke, D.M., Locantore, J.K., Austin, A.A., & Chae, B. (2004). Cherry pit primes Brad Pitt:
34
35 Homophone priming effects on young and older adults' production of proper nouns.
36
37
38 *Psychological Science*, *15*, 164-170.
39
- 40 Burke, D. M., MacKay, D. G., Worthley, J. S., & Wade, E. (1991). On the tip of the tongue:
41
42 What causes word finding failures in young and older adults? *Journal of Memory and*
43
44 *Language*, *30*, 542-579.
45
46
- 47 Burton, A. M., Bruce, V., & Hancock, P. B. (1999). From pixels to people: A model of familiar
48
49 face recognition. *Cognitive Science*, *23*, 1-31.
50
- 51 Burton, A. M., Bruce, V., & Johnston, R. A. (1990). Understanding face recognition with an
52
53 interactive activation model. *British Journal of Psychology*, *81*, 361-380.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Carson, D.R., & Burton, A.M. (2001). Semantic priming of person recognition: Categorical priming may be a weaker form of the associative priming effect. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *54A*, 1155-1179.
- Cohen, G. (1990). Why is it difficult to put names to faces? *British Journal of Psychology*, *81*, 287-298.
- Cohen, G. & Faulkner, D. (1986). Memory for proper names: Age differences in retrieval, *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *4*, 187-197.
- Cross, E. S., & Burke, D. M. (2004). Do alternative names block young and older adults' retrieval of proper names? *Brain and Language*, *89*, 174-181.
- Darling, S., Martin, D., & Macrae, C.N. (2010). Categorical proactive interference effects occur for faces, *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *22*, 1001-1009.
- Darling, S., & Valentine, T. (2005). The categorical structure of semantic memory for famous people: A new approach using release from proactive interference, *Cognition*, *96*, 35-65.
- Dell, D. S. (1986). A spreading-activation theory of retrieval in sentence production. *Psychological Review*, *93*, 283-321.
- Dell, D. S., & Reich, P. A., (1981). Stages in sentence production: An analysis of speech error data. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, *20*, 611-629.
- Fay, D., & Cutler, A. (1977). Malapropisms and the structure of the mental lexicon. *Linguistic Inquiry*, *8*, 505-520.
- Freud, S. (2009). The psychopathology of everyday life (1901). In B. F. Gentile & B. O. Miller (Eds.), *Foundations of psychological thought: A history of psychology* (pp. 237-243). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Running Head: MISNAMINGS OF FAMILIAR INDIVIDUALS

1
2
3 Griffin, Z. M. (2010). Retrieving personal names, referring expressions, and terms of address,
4
5
6 *The Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 53, 345-387.

7
8 Hanley, J. R., & Chapman, E. (2008). Partial knowledge in a tip-of-the-tongue state about two-
9
10 and three-word proper names. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 15, 156-160.

11
12 Imhoff, R., Dotsch, R., Bianchi, M., Banse, R., & Wigboldus, D. (2011). Facing Europe:
13
14 Visualizing spontaneous ingroup projection. *Psychological Science*, 22, 1583-1590.

15
16
17 Jalongo, M. R. (2015). An attachment perspective on the child–dog bond: Interdisciplinary and
18
19 international research findings. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 43, 395-405.

20
21 McKenna, P., & Warrington, E.K. (1980). Testing for nominal dysphasia. *Journal of Neurology*,
22
23
24 *Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, 43, 781-788.

25
26
27 Motley, M. T., Baars, B. J., & Camden, C. T. (1983). Experimental verbal slip studies: A review
28
29 and an editing model of language encoding. *Communication Monographs*, 50, 79-101.

30
31 Motley, M. T., Camden, C. T., & Baars, B. J. (1982). Covert formulation and editing of
32
33 anomalies in speech production: Evidence from experimentally elicited slips of the
34
35 tongue. *Journal of Verbal Learning & Verbal Behavior*, 21, 578-594.

36
37
38 Prato-Previde, E., Fallani, G., & Valsecchi, P. (2006). Gender differences in owners interacting
39
40 with pet dogs: An observational study. *Ethology*, 112, 64-73.

41
42
43 Reason, J. T., & Lucas, D. (1984). Using cognitive diaries to investigate naturally occurring
44
45 memory blocks. In J. E. Harris & P. E. Morris (Eds.), *Everyday memory actions and*
46
47 *absent-mindedness* (pp. 53-70). London: Academic Press.

48
49
50 Sable, P. (2013). The pet connection: An attachment perspective. *Clinical Social Work Journal*,
51
52
53 41, 93-99.

- 1
2
3 Stone, A. (2008). Categorical priming of famous person recognition: A hitherto overlooked
4
5 methodological factor can resolve a long-standing debate. *Cognition, 108*, 874-880.
6
7
8 Vladeanu, M., Lewis, M. & Ellis, H. (2006). Associative priming in faces: Semantic relatedness
9
10 or simple co-occurrence? *Memory and Cognition, 34*, 1091-1101.
11
12
13 Wenzel, M., Mummendey, A., Weber, U., & Waldzus, S. (2003). The ingroup as pars pro toto:
14
15 Projection from the ingroup onto the inclusive category as a precursor to social
16
17 discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 461– 473.
18
19
20 White, K. K., Abrams, L., & Frame, E. A. (2013). Semantic category moderates phonological
21
22 priming of proper name retrieval during tip-of-the-tongue states. *Language and Cognitive*
23
24 *Processes, 28*, 561-576.
25
26
27 Young, A. W., Ellis, A. W., & Flude, B. M. (1988). Accessing stored information about familiar
28
29 people. *Psychological Research, 50*, 111-115.
30
31
32 Young, A. W., Hay, D. C., & Ellis, A. W. (1985). The faces that launched a thousand slips:
33
34 Everyday difficulties and errors in recognizing people. *British Journal of Psychology, 76*,
35
36 495-523.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1
Participant Demographics and Characteristics of Episodes

	Study 2	Study 3	Study 4	Study 5
N of Participants	119	97	67	94
N of Episodes	292	207	212	193
Misnamed Demographics				
% Female	56.3%	52.6%	61.3%	51.3%
Age <i>M (SD)</i>	18.97 (.91)	33.51 (10.85)	22.44 (11.87)	28.26 (18.17)
Age Range	18-22	19-64	2-70	1-85
Misnamer Demographics				
% Female	60.6%	54.6%	88.2%	57.4%
Age <i>M (SD)</i>	47.24 (18.08)	53.47 (21.86)	18.80 (.92)	36.52 (13.52)
Age Range	9-95	3-95	18-21	18-74
% Older than Misnamed	83.0%	73.7%	14.5%	53.1%
Do the misnamer and misnamed see each other or speak regularly (% yes)	78.1%	64.7%	78.7%	74.1%
Characteristics of Episodes				
How often does this type of misnaming occur?				
Rarely, yearly, or every few months	64.5%	57.7%	59.8%	66.3%
Monthly, daily, or more often than daily	35.5%	42.3%	40.2%	33.7%
Was the named called a single name or string of names?				
Single	66.4%	72.5%	85.8%	82.9%
String	33.6%	23.2%	14.2%	17.1%
If string, end with correct? (% yes)	98.0%	89.6%	100.0%	90.9%
Was the misnamed within sight of misnamer? (% yes)	79.8%	63.3%	79.6%	70.5%
Was the misnamed asking for something? (% yes)	55.5%	51.7%	40.7%	54.9%
Was the misnamer tired, frustrated, or angry? (% yes)	44.9%	44.0%	60.8%	43.2%
Was the named present when the misnaming occurred? (% yes)	55.2%	49.3%	56.9%	54.5%
Was the named a pet? (% yes)	4.5%	1.9%	3.3%	4.7%
If a pet, was the pet owned at the time? (% yes)	92.3%	100%	100%	100%
How physically similar is the misnamed to the named? <i>M (SD)</i>	4.58 (1.61)	3.91 (1.82)	3.23 (1.87)	3.46 (2.01)

Note. *Ns* refer to number of valid cases. Perceived physical similarity rated on a Likert scale from 1 (not at all similar) to 7 (very similar).

Running Head: MISNAMINGS OF FAMILIAR INDIVIDUALS

Table 2

Relationships between the Misnamer, Misnamed, and Named Individuals

Relationship between participant and named										
Relationship between misnamed and misnamer	Family		Friend		Other human		Pet		$\chi^2(6)$	ϕ
	Obs	Exp	Obs	Exp	Obs	Exp	Obs	Exp		
Study 2 ($N = 290$)									252.90	.93
Family	201	157.2	1	35.0	8	19.4	6	4.5		
Friend	6	42.2	43	9.4	9	5.2	0	1.2		
Other Human	4	11.6	3	2.6	9	1.4	0	.3		
Study 3 ($N = 204$)									142.62	.84
Family	111	79.5	4	36.5	13	13.7	5	3.3		
Friend	9	37.7	50	17.3	4	6.5	0	1.5		
-Other Human	2	4.8	2	2.2	4	.8	0	.2		
Study 4 ($N = 210$)									180.48	.93
Family	76	38.1	7	47.8	3	4.0	7	3.1		
Friend	8	44.2	98	55.5	2	4.6	0	3.6		
Other Human	2	3.7	3	4.6	4	.4	0	.3		
Study 5 ($N = 190$)									113.15	.77
Family	90	60.8	9	33.9	7	11.7	5	4.7		
Friend	11	35.0	46	19.5	6	6.7	1	2.7		
Other Human	3	8.2	3	4.6	7	1.6	2	.6		

Note. Obs = observed count; Exp = expected count. For Studies 2 and 3, column headings represent the relationship between the misnamed and the named; for Studies 4 and 5, column headings represent the relationship between the misnamer and the named.

Table 3

Phonetic Similarity between Correct Name and Misname

Study	Not at all		Somewhat		Very		$\chi^2(2)$	ϕ
	similar		similar		similar			
	Obs	MC	Obs	MC	Obs	MC		
Study 2 (<i>N</i> = 292)	154	213	114	70	24	9	69.00	.49
Study 3 (<i>N</i> = 207)	101	145	82	57	24	5	96.52	.68
Study 4 (<i>N</i> = 212)	126	168	77	38	9	6	52.03	.50
Study 5 (<i>N</i> = 190)	109	148	67	37	14	5	50.80	.52

Note. Obs = observed count; MC = Monte Carlo generated count.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60