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**Participant Sample**

Participants were recruited via the online platform Prolific (<https://www.prolific.co/>). Responders were restricted to those who self-reported being fluent in English and having no language disorders. A total of N = 605 participants (359 male, 240 female, 6 unspecified, *Mage* = 29.44 , *SDage* = 10.6) completed the study. Participants completed the rating task in 34 minutes on average and were compensated with GBP £4. Following exclusions (see below), the final sample consisted of 539 participants, with ages ranging from 18 to 76 years (*M* = 29.7; *SD* = 10.67). Of the participants, 216 (40.07%) were female, 317 (58.81%) male and 6 (1.11%) unspecified. English was the first language for 273 (50.65%) participants. Of the remaining 266 (49.35%) participants, 111 self-reported as being proficient in English, 124 advanced and 31 beginner/intermediate. A total of 185 (34.32%) participants were monolingual, while the remaining 354 (65.68%) reported speaking more than one language.

**Descriptive Statistics**

The resulting socialness ratings are provided on the OSF project page. The socialness ratings have a unimodal distribution with a mean of 3.63 (*SD* = 1.24) (Figure 1A). More descriptive statistics for the mean ratings are provided in Table 1. The ratings have an average standard deviation of 1.85 (*SD* = 0.35) and participants provided more consistent responses at the extremes of the scale (Figure 1C). Examples of words at the extremes of the socialness dimension are given in Table 2. Words like *friendship*, *people* and *sociable* received high socialness values, while words like *avalanche*, *millimeter* and *hemoglobin* received low socialness ratings, suggesting good face validity.

(#tab:descriptives table )

*Descriptive Statistics for Socialness Ratings for 8,388 Words.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Descriptive Statistic | Value |
| Mean | 3.63 |
| Median | 3.57 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.24 |
| Minimum | 1.05 |
| Maximum | 7.00 |
| 1st Quartile | 2.62 |
| 3rd Quartile | 4.58 |
| Skewness | 0.19 |
| Kurtosis | -0.80 |

(#tab:examples table and distribution figure)

*List of words at the extremes of the socialness dimension.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highest-rated Words | Rating | Lowest-Rated Words | Rating |
| friendship | 7.00 | eucalyptus | 1.05 |
| socialize | 7.00 | crocodile | 1.09 |
| relationship | 6.96 | horizontal | 1.09 |
| people | 6.90 | sulfur | 1.10 |
| romance | 6.78 | sleeve | 1.17 |
| marriage | 6.76 | cranberry | 1.18 |
| socialism | 6.75 | dragonfly | 1.18 |
| political | 6.73 | turbo | 1.18 |
| family | 6.72 | hemoglobin | 1.20 |
| teamwork | 6.72 | shark | 1.21 |
| boyfriend | 6.68 | sunflower | 1.21 |
| friend | 6.68 | millimeter | 1.22 |
| sociable | 6.68 | sandpaper | 1.22 |
| mother | 6.67 | avalanche | 1.22 |
| sisterhood | 6.67 | spinach | 1.22 |
| democracy | 6.65 | airspeed | 1.23 |
| togetherness | 6.65 | button | 1.23 |
| sister | 6.65 | redwood | 1.23 |
| festival | 6.64 | pistachio | 1.24 |
| stepfather | 6.64 | birch | 1.25 |
| humankind | 6.62 | haystack | 1.25 |
| meeting | 6.62 | toothpaste | 1.26 |
| parental | 6.62 | paprika | 1.27 |
| befriend | 6.61 | cellophane | 1.28 |
| chatty | 6.61 | magnolia | 1.28 |

**Reliability and Validity**

We first examined the reliability of the ratings by computing the one-way intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) of all ratings using variances estimated via a random effects model with a global intercept and a random intercept per word (Brysbaert, 2019; Stevens & Brysbaert, 2016). We found an ICC of 0.9 which indicates good reliability of the mean socialness ratings. We further computed the split-half reliability for the 30 control words which were the only items in our dataset rated by all participants. We found a mean Spearman-Brown corrected split-half reliability of 0.998 (*SD* = 0.16) across 100 random splits, suggesting high reliability for the control items.

We then examined the validity of the ratings by computing the correlations between the ratings observed here and the mean ratings collected in the pilot study (*n* = 60 words), as well as two previous related sets of social interaction norms collected by Binder et al. (2016) (*n* = 258 words), and Troche et al. (2017) (*n* = 450 words). The current socialness ratings were strongly and positively correlated with the ratings collected in the pilot study (*r* = 0.97) with the previous social interaction ratings collected by Binder et al. (2016) (*r* = 0.76) and Troche et al. (2017) (*r* = 0.76), suggesting good validity.