The Blowfish Effect: Do children use exemplar typicality to determine the intended taxonomic level?

**Background**
- Word learners rely on inference heuristics.
  1. Number of exemplars
  2. Exemplar typicality
     - Suspicious Coincidence (Xu and Tenebaum, 2007)
     - Blowfish Effect (Goldberg, Emberson and Treves, under review)
- Atypical exemplars are given subordinate labels (Murphy & Brownell, 1985)

**Current Study**
Do children use both type of exemplar and number of exemplar when inferring level of taxonomic categorization?

**Methods**
- Participants
  - **N** = 46 (16 male, **M** = 4.34 yrs)
  - > 80% English Exposure
- Familiarization
  - Familiarized to pressing iPad and searching screen

**Methods (cont.)**
2. Word Learning
   - 4 categories
   - Number of exemplars between subjects
   - Typicality of exemplars within subjects

3. Categorization
   - 4 categories
   - Single typical exemplar

**Results**
- Generalizations to the Basic Level
  - We find effects of typicality and number of exemplar on generalizations to the basic level

- Categorization Trial Generalizations
  - Children recognize atypical exemplars as being members of the category
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**Conclusions**
- Do we replicate the suspicious coincidence? **Yes**
- Are children sensitive to exemplar typicality? **Yes**
- Is this typicality sensitivity seen because children do not recognize the atypical items as category members? **No**