

tures a real apple is ascribed. Therefore, before making these judgments, participants were told what the features of each category were, and were asked to consider only "real" category instances; not, for example, toy or stuffed ones. The other measures were collected without first showing participants all the category's features because knowledge of those features should not have affected their judgments.

All ratings were made on a 0-1.0 scale except similarity-to-an-ideal which used a 0-10 scale, cue validity and category validity which used 0-100 percentage estimates, and availability which used 0 or 1 (no or yes) responses.

All ratings but the availability judgments were collected by questionnaire in small groups. Participants were shown a sheet of instructions describing the task and providing two example judgments with justification. Next, participants provided a rating for each feature within each category. The same random order of features was used for each participant and each category appeared in each serial position an equal number of times. Participants proceeded at their own pace. Participants were encouraged to ask questions at any time and were told that they would not have to justify their responses.

The availability judgments were collected individually at computer terminals. The task was speeded and reaction times were collected although will not be reported here. Each participant read statements from all four categories, such as "A robin has wings," and typed 'P' to respond yes and 'Q' no. Mixed in with statements were blatantly false ones, like "A robin is made of wood." False statements were constructed using features from the other tested categories. Each participant was tested on the 41 true statements from all four categories and 41 false statements in 1 of 10 random orders.

Results and Discussion

For each feature, the mean rating across participants for each category-feature was calculated. In the case of availability, this refers to the mean proportion of subjects who said "yes." Correlations across all 41 category features are reported in Table 3 for each pair of tasks. Correlation matrices for each of the four categories appear in Appendix A.

TABLE 3
Pearson Correlations between 10 Category-Feature Rating Tasks

TASKS	sprz	e-of-i	gd-ex	sim	name	var	cue valid	infer	poten	prom
surprise	1									
ease of imag	-0.88	1								
goodness of ex	-0.86	0.87	1							
sim to ideal	-0.79	0.79	0.84	1						
naming	-0.87	0.84	0.91	0.79	1					
variability	-0.75	0.66	0.71	0.75	0.68	1				
cue validity	-0.018	-0.039	-0.15	-0.052	-0.24	0.065	1			
infer potency	0.27	-0.23	-0.34	-0.14	-0.35	-0.18	0.68	1		
prominence	0.20	-0.31	-0.51	-0.39	-0.44	-0.14	0.21	0.068	1	
availability	0.16	-0.093	-0.075	-0.092	-0.049	-0.053	0.057	0.33	0.068	-0.11

Note. Column labels refer to the same tasks, in the same order, as the row labels.