SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS for
Generics about Categories and Generics about Individuals: Same Phenomenon or Different?

Supplementary Text A

We conducted a series of mixed-effects logistic regressions on the endorsement data (0 = *false*, 1 = *true*) from Experiments 1–4 (see Tables S1 and S2 below). These mixed-effects models included the same predictors as the ANOVAs reported in the main text, except that prevalence was modeled as a continuous (rather than categorical) variable. In the models for Experiments 1, 1R, and 2, the random effects consisted of crossed random intercepts for participants and items. Models with this random-effects structure did not converge in Experiments 3 and 4, so we simplified them by omitting the by-item random intercept. All predictors (i.e., fixed effects) were mean-centered to facilitate interpretation of lower-order coefficients. These analyses were performed with the *lme4* package (version 1.1-23; Bates et al., 2020) in R version 4.0.2; the tables were created with the *sjPlot* package (version 2.8.9; Lüdecke, 2021). The results of these models agreed with those of the ANOVAs reported in the main text, except as outlined below. In comparing the mixed-effects models with the ANOVAs, we focused on the key terms involving property content (i.e., distinctiveness and danger).

Experiment 1. The interaction between distinctiveness and prevalence was not significant in the mixed-effects model (unlike in the ANOVA), $b = -0.64$, $SE = 0.54$, $p = .24$. Thus, when the data from Experiment 1 are analyzed with a mixed-effects logistic regression, they do not support the claim that the truth conditions of generic statements are sensitive to distinctiveness. However, the preregistered, higher-powered Experiment 1R provides support for the effect of distinctiveness, regardless of how the data are analyzed (see main text and Table S1), as does prior work (e.g., Cimpian et al., 2010).

Experiment 1R. The two-way interaction between type of generic (category vs. individual) and distinctiveness was significant when the data were analyzed with a mixed-effects logistic regression (vs. an ANOVA), $b = 0.67$, $SE = 0.22$, $p = .002$, suggesting that the effect of distinctiveness was significantly stronger for category generics than for individual generics. Although this difference contradicts our hypothesis that endorsement of category and individual generics is facilitated to a similar degree by the distinctiveness of the properties being described, two considerations should be factored into the interpretation of this result. First, endorsement of individual generics was close to ceiling (>80% "true" responses) at the 30%, 50%, and 70% prevalence levels, which limited the extent to which distinctiveness could have boosted endorsement of these generics. Indeed, in a mixed-effects model that examined just the lower three prevalence levels (1%, 5%, and 10%), the interaction between type of generic (category vs. individual) and distinctiveness was no longer significant, $b = 0.32$, $SE = 0.22$, $p = .14$. Second, the internal meta-analysis reported in the main text, which is the most powerful test of whether the effect of property content differs for category vs. individual generics, supported the null hypothesis by a wide margin ($BF_{01} = 8.56$).

Experiment 2. There were no discrepancies between the mixed-effects model and the ANOVA for any terms involving property content in Experiment 2.

Experiment 3. The main effect of property content (dangerous vs. non-dangerous) was not significant in the mixed-effects model (unlike in the ANOVA), $b = 0.27$, $SE = 0.19$, $p = .15$. However, the interaction between property content and prevalence was significant (as in the

ANOVA), *b* = −2.01, *SE* = 0.85, *p* = .018, so the interpretation remains materially the same as in the main text.

Experiment 4. The four-way interaction was not significant in the mixed-effects model (unlike in the ANOVA), *b* = 2.58, *SE* = 3.07, *p* = .40. Instead, the three-way interaction between statement type (individual vs. category), property content (dangerous vs. non-dangerous), and quantification type (existential vs. universal) was significant (unlike in the ANOVA), *b* = −1.84, *SE* = 0.89, *p* = .039. However, much like the four-way interaction described in the main text, this three-way interaction provides little support for the claim that endorsement of quantified statements is boosted by danger information.

References (Additional to the Main Text)

Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2020). *'lme4' package: Linear mixed-effects models using 'Eigen' and S4*. Version 1.1-23.

Lüdecke, D. (2021). *'sjPlot' package: Data visualization for statistics in social science*. Version 2.8.9.

Table S1

Mixed-effects logistic regressions in Experiments 1, 1R, and 3

	Experiment 1 (distinctiveness)		**Experiment 1R (distinctiveness)**		**Experiment 3 (danger)**	
Predictors	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*
Intercept	2.57 ***	0.27	2.21 ***	0.18	7.26 ***	0.71
Type of Generic (0 = individual, 1 = category)	−1.55 **	0.51	−1.64 ***	0.35	−9.18 ***	1.23
Property Content (0 = non-distinctive/dangerous, 1 = distinctive/dangerous)	0.15	0.12	0.60 ***	0.11	0.27	0.19
Prevalence	8.24 ***	0.34	11.80 ***	0.36	17.57 ***	1.05
Type of Generic × Property Content	0.19	0.24	0.67 **	0.22	0.31	0.38
Type of Generic × Prevalence	3.08 ***	0.67	1.72 *	0.68	2.99	1.93
Property Content × Prevalence	−0.64	0.54	−0.61	0.51	−2.01 *	0.85
Type of Generic × Property Content × Prevalence	0.15	1.08	1.99	1.03	2.02	1.69
Random Effects						
τ_{00}	10.33 subjects		7.88 subjects		78.73 subjects	
	0.00 items		0.00 items			
N	194 subjects		302 subjects		198 subjects	
	4 items		4 items			
Observations	4656		7248		4751	

Note. Prevalence was entered as a continuous variable ranging from 0.05 to 0.70. All predictors were mean-centered. The coefficients are log-odds. The τ_{00} values indicate the variances of random intercepts. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table S2

Mixed-effects logistic regressions in Experiments 2 and 4

	Experiment 2 (distinctiveness)		**Experiment 4 (danger)**	
Predictors	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*
Intercept	−1.18 ***	0.32	−1.33 **	0.41
Statement Type (0 = individual, 1 = category)	−0.65	0.60	0.33	0.81
Property Content (0 = non-distinctive/dangerous, 1 = distinctive/dangerous)	−0.18	0.16	−0.07	0.21
Quantification Type (0 = existential [some/sometimes], 1 = universal [all/always])	−11.72 ***	1.07	−18.91 ***	1.67
Prevalence	5.04 ***	0.35	5.89 ***	0.50
Statement Type × Property Content	0.25	0.33	−0.83	0.42
Statement Type × Quantification Type	−2.74 *	1.20	−0.10	1.64
Property Content × Quantification Type	−0.08	0.31	−0.01	0.45
Statement Type × Prevalence	−1.18	0.69	−0.31	0.98
Property Content × Prevalence	−0.19	0.61	0.57	0.74
Quantification Type × Prevalence	0.75	0.68	7.96 ***	1.05
Statement Type × Property Content × Quantification Type	0.11	0.63	−1.84 *	0.89
Statement Type × Property Content × Prevalence	−0.09	1.22	1.68	1.47
Statement Type × Quantification Type × Prevalence	5.31 ***	1.36	1.50	2.06
Property Content × Quantification Type × Prevalence	0.72	1.21	0.80	1.53
Statement Type × Property Content × Quantification Type × Prevalence	−2.26	2.41	2.58	3.07
Random Effects				
τ_{00}	12.58 $_{subjects}$ 0.03 $_{items}$		40.01 $_{subjects}$	
N	213 $_{subjects}$ 4 $_{items}$		221 $_{subjects}$	
Observations	5112		5304	

Note. Prevalence was entered as a continuous variable ranging from 0.05 to 0.70. All predictors were mean-centered. The coefficients are log-odds. The τ_{00} values indicate the variances of random intercepts. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$