

Generic Language in the Communication of Health Research

Harry T. Clelland*, PhD

Matthew Haigh, PhD

Abstract

Generic claims imply universal rules about categories or groups by glossing over individual variability and exceptions. Consider, for example, the generic news headline ‘Exercise helps teens quit smoking’ relative to the non-generic ‘Exercise helps *some* teens quit smoking’. When generic language is used in primary reporting of scientific research (i.e., journal articles) the reported claims are perceived to be more important and more generalizable than when non-generic language is used. In this study, we aimed to establish whether the same effects would be present in secondary reporting of research (i.e., news articles aimed at the public), with a particular focus on personal health claims. Participants read a series of genuine news headlines in either their original generic format (e.g., ‘Exercise helps teens...’) a past-tense non-generic format (e.g., ‘Exercise helped teens...’) or a qualified non-generic format (e.g., ‘Exercise helps *some* teens...’). Generic headlines were rated as slightly more important and more generalizable than headlines qualified with the word ‘*some*’. In contrast, we found no differences in perceived importance or generalizability between generic headlines and past-tense non-generic headlines. Our results suggest that writers must be explicitly non-universal when summarizing research to communicate constraints on generality.

Keywords: generics; language; inference; pragmatics; health communication

* Corresponding author may be reached at harry.t.clelland@northumbria.ac.uk

Introduction

Generic generalizations (aka generics) make category wide claims (Cimpian et al., 2010). Take for example statement (1):

(1) Women give vaginal birth

The generic statement (1) expresses a characteristic (giving vaginal birth) as a group categorization (women) and few people would argue the truthfulness of the statement. A key characteristic of generics is that they have a tolerance to exceptions (Krifka et al., 1995). In other words, they are difficult to prove false. For example, consider generic (1) in comparison to its universal equivalent (2):

(2) All women give vaginal birth

The generic statement (1) can be asserted truthfully even in the face of obvious exceptions, such as the common knowledge that some women do not give birth and that some women give birth via caesarean section. By contrast, the non-generic universal statement (2) cannot be true in the face of exceptions, as it can be falsified with a single counterexample. A single woman who gives birth by caesarean section is sufficient to conclude that ‘not all women give vaginal birth’ (Lazaridou-Chatzigoga, 2019).

Another notable characteristic of generic statements is that they require minimal evidence to be accepted as true. Across four experiments, Cimpian et al. (2010) compared interpretations of generic statements about a fictional creature (e.g., “Lorches have purple

feathers”) to a quantified version of that statement, modified with the term ‘most’ (e.g., “Most Lorches have purple feathers”). Even when a property was uncommon (i.e., less than 50% of Lorches have purple feathers) participants often judged the generic statement to be true. Moreover, when asked to judge proportion based on the generic statement, it was inferred that the property occurs in over 90% of category member cases (i.e., over 90% of Lorches have purple feathers). In comparison, no such finding was present for the quantified statement using ‘*most*’. That is, for the quantified statements there was no such asymmetry between truth judgments and implied proportion prevalence. In short, generics have three notable characteristics – they require minimal evidence to be accepted as true, they are difficult to prove false, and they may imply universal rules based on not-so-universal evidence.

One area of concern with regards to generalizability relates to how scientific findings are communicated (e.g., journal articles, university press releases, social media posts). The findings of research with humans, which is always based on a limited sample, tends to be generically generalized to ‘humans’ or ‘people’, despite Henrich et al. (2010) highlighting an over-reliance on ‘WEIRD’ samples (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, Democratic) that are not necessarily representative of the global population.

There is growing evidence suggesting that generic statements can be used to imply that research findings are both more important and more generalizable than what can truly be inferred from the data. DeJesus et al. (2019) sampled research papers and found that almost 90% summarized their results with a generic statement in either the title, highlights or abstract (e.g., ‘*group discussion improves lie detection*’) (see also DeJesus et al., 2023 for similar findings). Then, they

experimentally manipulated journal article titles that contained generics to assess how changes would be interpreted by readers. Specifically, bare generic headlines were altered to create non-generic versions for comparison (e.g., group discussion improved lie detection; *Some* group discussion improved lie detection). Overall, the results of multiple experiments revealed that generic statements were perceived as more important than their non-generic counterparts. Moreover, generic statements were perceived to be more generalizable and more conclusive than non-generics, but only under some circumstances.

DeJesus et al. (2019) highlight a discipline-wide tendency to over-generalize psychological research findings by making generic claims in article titles and abstracts. Their work was limited to primary source journal articles, written for research professionals. In the study below we aim to extend the findings of DeJesus et al. (2019) by investigating how generics are interpreted when used by the media to report research to the public. We focus specifically on the communication of health-related research as health-related research findings are frequently overgeneralized by academics (Peters et al., 2024), are frequently reported by the media (Bossema et al., 2019; Schat et al., 2018), and may inform consequential health-related behaviors by members of the public.

The Present Research

The aim of the current study was to extend the findings of DeJesus et al. (2019) and test whether generic statements would be interpreted as more important and more generalizable than non-generic statements when reported through a secondary source (i.e., the headline of a news article). The reason for our decision is two-fold.

First, this approach has wider applicability because a lay person is more likely to read news headlines that present short summaries of research than they are to read a primary source. In this study, headlines were rated by the same audience that will read them in the real world (i.e., the public), which was not the case in DeJesus et al. (2019), as non-academic participants evaluated the importance and generalizability of research papers written for an academic audience.¹ This distinction has important implications because academics (via their research methods training) should have an implicit understanding of the limitations of a sample (i.e., they should be aware that a generic claim does not apply across-the-board). This is not necessarily true of the public however, meaning that overgeneralizations caused by generics may have greater consequences in this context.

Second, generic claims may be more widespread in the media, as journalists are more motivated to utilize them. Generics are inherently short, simple, and easy to understand, all of which are desirable properties for news article writers. Whereas academics should fulfil their obligation to rigor and factual accuracy, secondary reporters are tasked primarily with translating the findings to a wider audience in an appealing manner. For this reason, generics may be more widespread in secondary reports because journalists are more motivated by appeal (and less motivated by precision) than the original authors (Haigh, Birch & Clelland, 2024).

We chose to focus specifically on reports of health research because these reports could inform consequential health behaviors made by the public. If research findings presented in a generic manner are perceived as more important and more generalizable, then individuals may be more likely to adopt

associated lifestyle changes (for better or worse). Therefore, there is a potential danger that generic summaries of nuanced health research will cause some people to make health decisions based on the ill-informed assumption that research findings apply across-the-board.

The experiment reported below examines whether the use of generic phrases in the secondary reporting of health research increases the perceived importance and generalizability of findings. We selected 18 genuine generic news headlines (e.g., ‘*Online therapy helps teens recover from chronic fatigue syndrome*’). For each headline we created a non-generic past-tense version (e.g., ‘*Online therapy helped teens....*’) and a non-generic version qualified with ‘some’ (e.g., ‘*Online therapy helps some teens....*’). Participants rated each headline on importance and then rated generalizability in three ways – implied sample diversity, implied sample size, and implied efficacy.

We expected that the effects observed by DeJesus et al. (2019) relating to summaries of primary data would carry over to secondary reporting of data. Therefore, we hypothesized that bare generic headlines (i.e., X helps Y) would be perceived as more important and more generalizable than both past-tense non-generic headlines (i.e., X helped Y) and qualified non-generic headlines (i.e., X helped some Y).

Methods

This study was preregistered prior to data collection (osf.io/wgz7d/). Materials, raw data, and the analysis script can be found on the Open Science Framework (OSF; osf.io/krpab/).

¹ Note that one sample reported in DeJesus et al. (2019) was introductory psychology students (i.e., not ‘non-academics’), however, it remains true that this population are not the primary target audience of research papers.

Design

We used a one-factor counterbalanced (Latin Square) repeated measures design. The independent variable (fixed factor) was the Headline Format with three levels (Bare Generic, Past-Tense Non-Generic, Qualified Non-Generic). Participants were randomly assigned to one of three Latin Square presentation lists, each of which contained 18 health research headlines presented in a different random order to each participant (see osf.io/6jgb7/ for Latin Square design). Participants were exposed to all three conditions (six bare generic headlines, six past-tense, six qualified), but saw only one version of each headline. After reading each headline, they answered four questions (described below).

Participants

We conducted a prospective power analysis for a one-factor counterbalanced repeated measures design (one fixed effect, two random effects) with 18 items. To detect a ‘medium’ sized effect 80% of the time ($d = 0.5$, $\alpha = 0.05$) we required a minimum of 69 participants (Westfall et al., 2014). This was our minimum sample size target. An initial sample of 102 consenting participants were recruited via Prolific, an online recruitment platform. One participant was excluded for non-completion. All remaining participants declared that they took the survey seriously. The final sample was 101 English-speaking adults (38 male, 63 female), aged between 18 and 77 (mean age = 37.37, $SD = 14.08$). Participants were paid £1.

Materials

We selected 18 online news headlines from the Google News archive that summarized research findings using a generic statement. Headlines were selected on two

key characteristics. First, the headline had to make a generic statement. Second, the headline had to summarize primary research that reports improvements in an aspect of personal health (e.g., ‘*online therapy helps teens recover from chronic fatigue syndrome*’).

The headlines varied in content, but each could be reduced to a generic ‘X helps Y’ format, whereby ‘X’ is a treatment or intervention that ‘helps’ (e.g., ‘improves’, ‘boosts’, ‘beneficial to’) a specific group of people ‘Y’ (e.g., ‘patients’, ‘men’, ‘children’). One headline followed the inverse of this format by starting with the group (e.g., ‘stroke patients [Y] recover arm use with virtual reality [X]’) but served the same functional purpose as an ‘X helps Y’ statement. The headlines related to six categories of people (patients, children, women, men, elderly, teenagers). Full details of all 18 items (as well as their past-tense and qualified versions) can be found on the OSF (osf.io/3mav5/).

Headline Format Manipulation

Each bare generic headline was manipulated to create two distinct non-generic versions. One version was edited to become past tense (e.g., ‘helps’ edited to be ‘helped’), whereas the other version was edited to include a qualifier (i.e., ‘men’ edited to become ‘some men’). Table 1 presents examples of our manipulations.

Measures

Measures were based on those used by DeJesus et al.’s (2019) study 2. We constructed our questions with the intention of replicating fundamental elements of their wording, while making each question specific to each individual headline. For example, when measuring efficacy DeJesus et al. (2019) broadly asked, ‘*What percentage of those in the world today would show the effect described*’. By contrast, our questions

Table 1*Three Examples of Bare Generic, Past-Tense and Qualified Headlines used in the Experiment.*

a) “Stroke Patients Recover Arm Use With Virtual Reality”		
were specifically	<i>Bare Generic</i>	<i>Stroke Patients Recover Arm Use With Virtual Reality</i>
	<i>Past-Tense</i>	<i>Stroke Patients Recovered Arm Use With Virtual Reality</i>
	<i>Qualified</i>	<i>Some Stroke Patients Recover Arm Use With Virtual Reality</i>
b) “Plasma Therapy Helps Critically Ill Covid-19 Patients”		
tailored to each	<i>Bare Generic</i>	<i>Plasma Therapy Helps Critically Ill Covid-19 Patients</i>
	<i>Past-Tense</i>	<i>Plasma Therapy Helped Critically Ill Covid-19 Patients</i>
	<i>Qualified</i>	<i>Plasma Therapy Helps Some Critically Ill Covid-19 Patients</i>
c) “Testosterone Therapy Beneficial to Men with Heart Disease”		
headline (e.g.,	<i>Bare Generic</i>	<i>Testosterone Therapy Beneficial to Men with Heart Disease</i>
	<i>Past-Tense</i>	<i>Testosterone Therapy was Beneficial to Men with Heart Disease</i>
	<i>Qualified</i>	<i>Testosterone Therapy Beneficial to Some Men with Heart Disease</i>

‘What percentage of *stroke patients* would *recover arm use with virtual reality*’).

Importance (DV1): Subjective ratings of importance were established by asking participants how important they thought the research findings were. Importance was rated on a scale ranging from 0 (Not at all Important) to 7 (Extremely Important).

Diversity (DV2): Subjective ratings of diversity were established by asking participants to estimate the likelihood that the research findings would extend to those from diverse backgrounds. Diversity was rated on a 0 (Not at all Likely) to 7 (Extremely Likely) scale.

Sample Size (DV3): Subjective ratings of sample size were established by asking participants to guess how many people took part in the research. Estimated sample size was chosen from 1 of 7 options (1-10 people, 11-50 people, 51-100 people, 101-250 people, 251-500 people, 501-1000 people, 1001+ people). These are the same options used by DeJesus et al. (2019).

Efficacy (DV4): Subjective ratings of efficacy² were established by asking participants to estimate the percentage of those described in the headline (e.g., stroke patients) that would show the effect described (e.g., recover arm use with virtual reality). Efficacy was rated as from 0 to 100%.

² This DV is named ‘generalizability’ in our pre-registration, but we favoured ‘efficacy’ here as it is more reflective of the question that was asked.

Procedure

This online study was run using Qualtrics. Participants accessed the study anonymously via the Prolific recruitment platform. They were then randomly allocated to one of three item lists. Once allocated, a series of 18 headlines were shown in a different random order to each participant. For each, they indicated their interpretations of importance, diversity, sample size and efficacy. Afterwards, participants were asked whether they took the survey seriously (Aust et al., 2013). Median completion time for the entire survey was 8.1 minutes. A .qsf file for the survey, which allows for direct replication, can be accessed via the OSF (osf.io/azjimp/).

Data Analysis

All questions required a response, so there were no missing data. No data points were excluded. Analyses were conducted using R version 4.0.2 and RStudio version 1.3.959. Each dependent variable was analyzed using a linear mixed effects model, fitted via the ‘lme4’ package (Bates et al., 2015). The fixed factor was Headline Format which had three levels (bare generic vs. past-tense vs. qualified). We obtained *p*-values for our fixed effects using ‘lmerTest’ (Kuznetsova et al., 2017), which uses Satterthwaite’s method for approximating degrees of freedom. Participants and items were entered into the model as crossed random factors. Following the recommendations of Barr et al. (2013), each model began with a maximal random effects structure (i.e., random intercepts and slopes for participants and items). If the model did not converge, we systematically reduced the random effects structure until the model did converge. The first reduction method was removing the random correlations. The next reduction method was running a random slopes-only model, followed by a random intercepts-only model

if still unsuccessful. For all our measures, the most maximal converging model was a random intercepts-only model (i.e., maximal model with random slopes removed). We conducted *post hoc* tests using the ‘emmeans’ package (Lenth, 2022) and Satterthwaite’s method for approximating degrees of freedom. We made a Bonferroni correction (adjusted $\alpha = .0167$) for each model when comparing condition means.

Results

Figure 1 displays the condition means for all four DVs. For each type of headline (Bare Generic, Past-Tense, Qualified), the figure plots average ratings of importance (i.e., how important the summarized finding is perceived to be; upper left quadrant), estimations of how the summarized finding may extend to a diverse background (upper right quadrant), estimations of the sample size from which the summarized finding was derived (lower left quadrant), and estimations of the summarized finding’s applicability to the wider population (lower right quadrant). Table 2 shows the inferential statistics from the linear mixed models.

Importance

Headline format significantly predicted importance rating (Table 2). *Post hoc* comparisons revealed that Qualified headlines (mean = 5.27) were rated as significantly less important than Bare generic (mean = 5.43; $t(1700) = 2.618, p = .009$) and Past-Tense (mean = 5.54; $t(1700) = 4.368, p < .001$) headlines. There was no statistically significant difference between the Bare and Past-Tense conditions ($t(1700) = -1.750, p = .080$).

Diversity

Headline format significantly predicted diversity rating (Table 2). However, after

Figure 1

Density plots showing mean ratings by condition. Surrounding bands represent 95% CI.




Table 2*Parameter estimates for each dependent variable.*

Condition	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Importance				
Bare (Intercept)	5.430	0.150	36.302	<.001
Past-Tense	0.105	0.060	1.750	.080
Qualified	-0.157	0.060	-2.618	.009
Diversity				
Bare (Intercept)	4.841	0.149	32.518	<.001
Past-Tense	0.017	0.067	0.250	.802
Qualified	-0.124	0.067	-1.855	.064
Sample Size				
Bare (Intercept)	4.145	0.152	27.350	<.001
Past-Tense	-0.035	0.061	-0.569	.569
Qualified	-0.188	0.061	-3.092	.002
Efficacy				
Bare (Intercept)	54.225	2.446	22.172	<.001
Past-Tense	0.738	1.089	0.677	.498
Qualified	-4.243	1.089	-3.895	<.001

making the Bonferroni correction ($\alpha = .0167$), *post hoc* tests revealed no statistically significant differences between Bare (mean = 4.84) and Past-Tense (mean = 4.86; $t(1700) = -0.250$, $p = .802$), Bare and Qualified (mean = 4.72; $t(1700) = 1.855$, $p = .064$) and Past-Tense and Qualified conditions ($t(1700) = 2.106$, $p = .035$).

Sample Size

Headline format significantly predicted sample size estimates (Table 2). *Post hoc* comparisons revealed that Qualified headlines (mean = 3.96) were estimated to have significantly less participants in the sample than Bare (mean = 4.14; $t(1700) = 3.092$, $p = .002$) and Past-Tense (mean = 4.11; $t(1700) = 2.523$, $p = .012$) headlines. There was no statistically significant difference between the Bare and Past-Tense conditions ($t(1700) = 0.569$, $p = .569$).

Efficacy

Headline format significantly predicted estimates of efficacy (Table 2). *Post hoc* comparisons revealed that Qualified headlines (mean = 50.0) implied that the results were applicable to a significantly lower proportion of people than Bare (mean = 54.2; $t(1700) = 3.895$, $p < .001$) and Past-Tense (mean = 55.0; $t(1700) = 4.573$, $p < .001$) headlines. There was no statistically significant difference between the Bare and Past-Tense conditions ($t(1700) = -0.677$, $p = .498$).

Discussion

The key findings of this experiment are two-fold. First, bare generic headlines (e.g., ‘*exercise helps men regain bone mass*’) were perceived as more important and generalizable than qualified non-generic headlines (e.g., ‘*exercise helps some men regain bone mass*’). Second, bare generic headlines were perceived as no more important and no more generalizable than a

past-tense non-generic (e.g., '*exercise helped men regain bone mass*'). In other words, 'X helps Y' was perceived no differently to 'X helped Y'.

As predicted, headlines including generic statements were considered to summarize findings that were more important than the same headlines qualified with the word 'some'. In other words, 'X helps Y' was seen as more important than 'X helps *some* Y'. The same pattern of results also was found for estimates of sample size and ratings of percentage efficacy. Generic headline summaries of research findings were judged to have been concluded from a larger sample of participants than the qualified version (i.e., it was perceived that a larger sample was used to conclude 'X helps Y' than the sample used to conclude 'X helps *some* Y'). Finally, the same pattern of results was found for estimates of efficacy. The benefit described in a generic headline was perceived as applicable to greater proportion of relevant people than the same benefit described in a qualified headline (i.e., 'X helps Y in men' was considered to be applicable to a greater proportion of men than 'X helps Y in *some* men').

Taken together, these findings largely align with our understanding of generics to date, in that they can exaggerate claims and imply universal rules (Cimpian et al., 2010; Gelman & Roberts, 2017; Leslie, 2007; Leslie, 2008). Importantly, these findings develop our understanding by providing evidence that the effects of generic language that have been previously observed in primary reporting (i.e., journal articles), are also observed in secondary reports designed for public consumption. This may be consequential because implying that a research finding is more important and more generalizable than it really is could directly impact the health beliefs and behaviors of the reader.

An increased demand for shorter, more concise distribution formats encourages authors of journal articles to make enticing claims about their findings (Weinstein & Sumeracki, 2017), and the most exaggerated (or enticing) claims are favoured by the news media (Sumner et al., 2014). Whereas DeJesus et al. (2019) effectively demonstrate a widespread tendency for authors to use generics in the shortest sections of articles (titles, highlights and abstracts), and also demonstrate the over-importance and over-generalizability achieved by using generics, the present data (using genuine news articles titled with generics) indicate that the same effects carry over into interpretations of secondary reports (i.e., media headlines). This may be particularly concerning, because arguably, the dangers associated with generics are more pronounced within this context. Media headlines are predominantly read by members of the public, who by-and-large, are not trained in research methods like academics are. Therefore, there may be greater potential for generic claims to be understood as universals by lay readers, leading to the conclusion that a statement applies to *all* members of a category (e.g., all men) (e.g., Haigh et al., 2020; Haigh et al., 2024; Leslie et al., 2011).

Perhaps our most notable finding was that of no statistically significant difference between the generic headlines and the past-tense non-generic headlines on ratings of importance or generalizability. In other words, across all our measures, generic statements (i.e., X helps Y) produced the same ratings of importance and generalizability as the past-tense non-generic version (i.e., X helped Y). A potential explanation for this could be that both statements make a generalized (i.e., non-specific) claim about Y, and therefore, are perceived in the same way. By contrast, the qualified statement 'X helps *some* Y' makes an explicitly non-universal claim about Y

that is limited to a certain number of individuals; hence, it is interpreted differently. Interestingly, the pattern of results described here are mirrored in some (but not all) of the studies reported in DeJesus et al. (2019). For example, their studies 3a to 3d consistently show no differences in perceived importance between bare generic and past-tense non-generic summaries, but the original effect returns in study 4a when participants are given a direct comparison (i.e., they are asked to choose the most important from two versions of the same summary). Taken with the current findings, it is plausible that any interpretive differences observed between bare generics and past-tense non-generics are detectable only when the two formats are presented in close proximity (i.e., easily contrasted).

Nonetheless, this unexpected finding may have important implications, as it suggests the requirement for writers to be explicitly non-universal when looking to convey limits on generality. DeJesus et al. (2019) found that their participants were more sensitive to language when journal article titles had multiple cues to non-generality, e.g., a title that is both qualified *and* past-tense (i.e., *X helped Y, under certain circumstances*). They concluded that to accurately communicate constraints on generality (i.e., acknowledging the limitations of the sample from which results are drawn from), writers may be required to take an explicit linguistic approach, rather than a reliance on subtle signals. Our results support this interpretation. Despite the fact that a generic statement phrased in the past-tense no longer fits the definition of a 'generic', the evidence here implies that there are no meaningful differences in how they are interpreted. This aligns with the notion that a writer cannot successfully acknowledge sampling limitations by taking a non-explicit approach to language (i.e., only slightly altering the generic statement format). Rather, substantial

linguistic changes to the generic formula may be required to avoid unintentionally misleading readers. We contend that replacing a generic (*X helps Y*) with a past-tense (*X helped Y*) is not substantial enough to accurately consider the limitations of a sample. Writers must instead be explicitly non-universal to achieve this (e.g., by explicitly qualifying their statement).

Implications for Health Behavior Research

This and other related studies (e.g., DeJesus et al., 2019, 2023) have implications for academic research into health behaviors, media reporting of health research, and the public's understanding of science. Academic researchers should reflect on their own use of generic language. Generics come across as appealing and conclusive, which may help research to be published and disseminated. However, this appeal can come at the expense of accuracy. We urge academic writers to identify generics in drafts of their work (i.e., manuscripts, press releases, social media posts) and consider whether non-generic phrasing might be a more accurate summary of the results. Health interventions rarely help 100% of participants in a trial, even if there is a statistically significant effect on average, so consider whether the intervention truly helps a whole group (e.g., men, women, people) or whether it is more accurate to say that it helps some or most of that group (e.g., some men). This approach would be complemented by the inclusion of a 'Constraints on Generality' statement, as recommended by Simons et al. (2017). A reduction in the use of generic claims by researchers may feed through to a reduction in their use by the media, as articles written by journalists and popular science writers tend to follow press releases closely (Sumner et al. 2014), but we also urge media and social media content creators to reflect on their own use of generic language. Finally,

public understanding of health research could be improved by promoting the message that generic claims are not necessarily based on larger or more diverse samples than non-generic claims (e.g., Peters et al., 2024).

The next step is to examine whether the effects reported above differ for reports of negative health outcomes (e.g., X harms Y). Our findings are limited to headlines reporting health benefits, but the effects may be amplified when the reported outcome is harmful (e.g., Baumeister et al., 2001). The second and potentially most impactful line of research should focus on whether the effects of generic language on perceived importance extend to consequential health decisions and behaviors. The current study is limited by a focus on interpretation, which fails to shed light on whether health-related decision making can be altered by generics. For example, are people more likely to accept a medication or make a lifestyle change if the efficacy of that intervention is described using generic language?

Conclusions

Generic language is common in the reporting of health research to the public. The choice to make a general claim may lead to an increased perception of importance and generalizability in the mind of a reader, so academics and journalists should be mindful as to whether the evidence is strong enough to warrant an unqualified claim.

Ethical approval

The project was approved through the Northumbria University Ethical Approval System (REF 26549).

Conflict of Interest

This work was partially supported by a Leverhulme Trust Research Project Grant

(RPG-2019-158) awarded to the second author.

Discussion Question

Generic claims published by the media often derive from generic claims made by researchers (e.g., in papers or press releases). Reflect on your own use of generics and discuss the potential impacts (both positive and negative) of avoiding these generalizations.

References

- Aust, F., Diedenhofen, B., Ullrich, S., & Musch, J. (2013). Seriousness checks are useful to improve data validity in online research. *Behavior Research Methods*, 45(2), 527-535. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-012-0265-2>
- Barr, D. J., Levy, R., Scheepers, C., & Tily, H. J. (2013). Random effects structure for confirmatory hypothesis testing: Keep it maximal. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 68(3), 255-278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2012.11.001>
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1), 1-48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, 5(4), 323-370. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.5.4.323>
- Bossema, F. G., Burger, P., Bratton, L., Challenger, A., Adams, R. C., Sumner, P., Schat, J., Numans, M. E., & Smeets, I. (2019). Expert quotes and exaggeration in health news: a retrospective quantitative content analysis. *Wellcome Open Research*, 4, 56.

- <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15147.2>
- Cimpian, A., Brandone, A. C., & Gelman, S. A. (2010). Generic statements require little evidence for acceptance but have powerful implications. *Cognitive Science*, 34(8), 1452-1482. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1551-6709.2010.01126.x>
- DeJesus, J. M., Callanan, M. A., Solis, G., & Gelman, S. A. (2019). Generic language in scientific communication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(37), 18370-18377. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1817706116>
- DeJesus, J. M., Callanan, M. A., Umscheid, V. A., & Gelman, S. A. (2023). Generic Language and Reporting Practices in Developmental Journals: Implications for Facilitating a More Representative Cognitive Developmental Science. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15248372.2023.2290504>
- Gelman, S. A., & Roberts, S. O. (2017). How language shapes the cultural inheritance of categories. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(30), 7900-7907. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1621073114>
- Haigh, M., Birch, H. A., & Clelland, H. T. (2024). "Experts think..." The production and comprehension of propositional attitude generics. *Thinking & Reasoning*, 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13546783.2024.2370924>
- Haigh, M., Birch, H. A., & Pollet, T. V. (2020). Does 'Scientists Believe...' Imply 'All Scientists believe...'? Individual Differences in the Interpretation of Generic News Headlines. *Collabra: Psychology*, 6(1), 17174. <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.17174>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2-3), 61-83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Krifka, M., Pelletier, F. J., Carlson, G., Ter Meulen, A., Chierchia, G., & Link, G. (1995). Genericity: an introduction. In G.N. Carlson & F.J. Pelletier (Eds.), *The Generic Book* (pp. 1-124). University of Chicago Press.
- Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 82(13), 1-26: <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13>
- Lazaridou-Chatzigoga, D. (2019). Genericity. In C. Cummins & N. Katsos (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Experimental Semantics and Pragmatics* (pp. 156-177). <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198791768.013.12>
- Lenth R (2022). emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means. R package version 1.7.5, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=emmeans>
- Leslie, S.-J. (2007). Generics and the structure of the mind. *Philosophical Perspectives*, 21, 375-403.
- Leslie, S.-J. (2008). Generics: Cognition and acquisition. *Philosophical Review*, 117(1), 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00318108-2007-023>
- Leslie, S.-J., Khemlani, S., & Glucksberg, S. (2011). Do all ducks lay eggs? The generic overgeneralization effect. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 65(1), 15-31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2010.12.005>
- Peters, U., Sherling, H. R., & Chin-Yee, B. (2024). Hasty generalizations and generics in medical research: A systematic

review. *PLoS One*, 19(7), e0306749.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0306749>

Schat, J., Bossema, F. G., Numans, M. E., Smeets, I., & Burger, P. (2018). Exaggerated health news: association between exaggeration in university press releases and exaggeration in news media coverage. *Nederlands Tijdschrift Voor Geneeskunde*, 162(1).

Simons, D. J., Shoda, Y., & Lindsay, D. S. (2017). Constraints on generality (COG): A proposed addition to all empirical papers. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12(6), 1123-1128.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617708630>

Sumner P., Vivian-Griffiths S., Boivin J., Williams A., Venetis C. A., Davies A. Ogden, J., Whelan, L., Hughes, B., Daton, B., Boy, F., & Chambers C. D. (2014). The association between exaggeration in health related science news and academic press releases: retrospective observational study. *BMJ*, 349.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g7015>

Weinstein, Y., & Sumeracki, M. A. (2017). Are twitter and blogs important tools for the modern psychological scientist? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12(6), 1171-1175.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617712266>

Westfall, J., Kenny, D. A., & Judd, C. M. (2014). Statistical power and optimal design in experiments in which samples of participants respond to samples of *stimuli*. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(5), 2020.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000014>