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The purpose of this study was to test directly the change in meaning hypothesis of the context effect. Ss were given 3 personality-trait adjectives description of a stimulus person, and they rated their liking for the person, their liking for a test adjective and its connotative meaning. The degree of semantic redundancy among 3 adjectives was manipulated by varying their semantic similarity. The results indicated that the both ratings of the test adjective's likability and its connotative meaning directly varied as a function of the context desirability. While the changes in meaning were unexpectedly greater in highly redundant adjectives than in the less redundants, the magnitude of the context effect was significantly greater in the less redundant adjectives than in the highly redundants. Moreover, the impressions based upon the less redundant descriptions were more polarized than the impressions based upon the highly redundants. While these findings strongly support the change in meaning hypothesis, the results were discussed in the light of the differential weighted averaging formulation.

When subjects are required to evaluate the likability of a given personality-trait adjective of a person description (test adjective), the evaluation is displaced toward the evaluative level of adjectives with which it was presented (context adjectives). While the context effect has been a well-established phenomenon in personality impression formation, the interpretation of the effect has been a matter of some debate.

Thus far, the two main hypotheses have been considered to be plausible for an explanation of the context effect. Asch (1946) offered the change in meaning hypothesis, in which the context effect is assumed to occur as a result of a change in connotative meaning of a test adjective toward the meaning of context. In this case, the change in meaning is also assumed to occur after an overall impression of a stimulus person was formed more fully. Therefore, according to this hypothesis the difference in likability rating of a test adjective in two different contexts is due to a change in its meaning within the framework of the person impression.

An alternative explanation is the weighted averaging hypothesis provided by Anderson and Lampel (1965) and Anderson (1966). In this hypothesis, the evaluation of a test adjective in context is assumed to be a weighted average of it's "context-free" favorableness value and the favorableness of a person impression, as follows:

\[ s' = ws + (1-w)I \]  

where, \( s' \) denotes the likability rating of a test adjective in context, \( s \) is its context-free likability value, \( I \) is the likability of an overall impression, and \( w \) is a weighting parameter. This formulation means that the test adjective rating in context is a linear function of the normative test-ad-
jective value and the person impression, and that therefore the context effect occurs as a result of the influence of a generalized "hallo effect" based upon the overall person impression.

To test which hypothesis is more plausible for the explanation of the context effect, a number of authors have examined the magnitude of the context effect as a function of several independent variables; set size of context adjectives, likableness variability, rating order of a test adjective, inter-trait relation between test and context. Among those who have performed comparative tests between the two hypotheses, some have provided evidences favoring the weighted averaging model (Anderson, 1966, 1971; Kaplan, 1971; Wyer & Watson, 1969), and some have supported the change in meaning hypothesis (Hamilton & Zanna, 1974; Takahashi, 1971a, 1971b).

For instance, concerning to the set size effects, Takahashi (1971a) argued that the context effect was larger when there were four, as opposed to two, context adjectives, and the difference of the set size effects in the magnitude of the context effect increased as the likableness level of a test adjective increased. Namely, there is a significant interaction between the test-adjective favorableness and size of context adjectives. These results were explained by the change in meaning hypothesis. On the other hand, Anderson (1971) and Kaplan (1971) found that while the context effect increased with an increase in set size, the interaction between a test adjective and set size was nonsignificant. Since the weighted averaging theory predicts that the context effect does not depend on the evaluative level of a test adjective, these findings seem to lend support for the weighted averaging theory.

These confounding results seem to be mainly yielded by an absence of direct tests of the change in meaning hypothesis. That is, since a directive method to measure the magnitude of a change in connotative meaning of a test adjective in context has not been devised, comparative tests between the two hypotheses have been quite indirect.

Recently, Hamilton and Zanna (1974) succeeded to measure directly the magnitude of a change in meaning of a test adjective in context, and found that the connotative meaning of a test adjective varied with a change in the likability of context, thereby substantially supporting the change in meaning hypothesis. In their experiment, subjects were presented with a three-word description of a stimulus person, and they were asked to rate the likability of a particular word in the description. They were also required to rate its connotative meaning on a 8-point bipolar scale on which the endpoints were labeled by test adjective synonyms that differed in desirability.

Present experiment attempts to test the change in meaning hypothesis by using the direct method to measure the change in connotative meaning of a test adjective developed by Hamilton and Zanna (1974). The main independent variable manipulated is the degree of semantic redundancy between the meanings of a test adjective and of the context adjectives.

As a similar variable to the semantic redundancy, Kaplan (1971) and Wyer and Watson (1969) examined the effects of likableness variability of a test adjective on the context effect. By presuming that the degree of variability reflects the number of different connotations it could have; that is, the likability or range of its meaning, Wyer and Watson manipulated the variability by varying discrepancy between subject's rating of adjective's typical favorableness and its "most" or "least" favorableness, and Kaplan operationalized variability of adjectives in terms of the variance of their context-free favorableness ratings. Their findings that the context effect occurred independently of the variability levels of a test adjective were not difficult to be explained within the frame-
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work of the change in meaning theory, because the theory predicts that the context effect should be a positive function of the variability.

While the degree of variability may reflect in part the latitude of meaning of a test adjective, a number of factors might influence determining the degree of variability such as rating errors, familiarity, centrality, and individual difference in the normative ratings. Moreover, the variability does not refer to an interadjective relation between a test adjective and the context. Thus, even if a test adjective have high variability, a less context effect would be predicted when both adjectives of test and context were closely related to each other. Namely, the magnitude of the context effect is not to be determined only by the variability, but critically depends on the relation in connotative meaning between a test adjective and context adjectives.

The semantic redundancy is one of effective variables representing the connotative relation between the both adjectives. In this study, the degree of semantic redundancy among the adjectives is defined by a number of different connotations they could have; that is, the redundancy is presumed to reflect discrepancy between the connotative meanings of test adjectives and context. The decreased redundancy is considered to lead an increase in discrepancy between meanings of a test adjective and context, thereby a test adjective's potential for meaning change. A main prediction to be tested is that if the context effect occurs as a result of a change in meaning, the magnitude of the context effect should vary inversely with the degree of semantic redundancy.

Additional purpose of this study is to examine the rating order of the test adjective. If the context effect is caused by the change in connotative meaning of a test adjective, the rating of test adjectives after an overall impression was thoroughly formed would differ from the ratings before the overall impression was formed. That is, once the adjectives is rated as the whole prior to the test-adjective ratings, some kind of framework is produced to evaluate the test-adjective’s likability in a manner consistent with the overall person impression. Hence, the change in meaning theory predicts a greater context effect when the ratings of test adjectives were followed by the likability ratings of person impressions. This prediction has been supported by Wyer and Dermer (1968), but Anderson³ (1971) and Takahashi (1971b) failed to provide a evidence favoring this prediction. In these studies, however, no directive evidence was provided to indicate whether or not a change in connotative meaning of a test adjective occurred.

In the present experiment, therefore, it is directly tested by using the rating scale of connotative meaning whether the context effect depends on the rating order of a test adjectives, or not.

Method

Stimulus Materials

In this study, three personality-trait adjective descriptions of the stimulus persons were constructed using the adjectives scaled for social desirability values by Aoki (1971). Among three adjectives one was defined as a test adjective and the other two as the context adjectives. In the study of Aoki, 455 personality-trait adjectives were rated their desirability along a 9-point scale, and each adjective was classified into 10 semantic categories on the basis of their semantic similarity. On basis of their desirability scores, highly desirable adjective (H), mildly desirables (M⁺), mildly un-

³ In the study of Anderson (1971), the manipulation of the rating order was somewhat different from Wyer and Dermer (1968) and Takahashi (1971b). He tested the effects of person impressions on the context effect by differing in whether or not Ss wrote a paragraph description of each person before making likableness ratings of the person and of the test adjectives.
desirables (M−), and extremely undesirables (L) were selected from each of 10 categories as the stimulus adjectives of this experiment.

**Manipulations of Experimental Conditions**

**Manipulation of semantic redundancy.** In this experiment, as well as Takahashi (1975), the degree of semantic redundancy among the three adjectives combined into a description of a stimulus person was manipulated by varying their semantic similarity on the basis of the normative data obtained by Aoki (1971). The degree of semantic similarity was determined by whether a test adjective and a pair of context adjectives were both selected from the same category, or not.

1. **High-Redundancy.** Highly redundant descriptions (Hi-R, in short) were developed combining the adjectives selected from the same category. Thus, descriptions defined as high

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>test</th>
<th>Hi-R condition</th>
<th>Lo-R condition</th>
<th>Connotative meaning scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>omoiyariga-aru†</td>
<td>atatakasa</td>
<td>kaikatsuana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sewazukina††</td>
<td></td>
<td>hitowokabau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kandaina</td>
<td></td>
<td>sekininkanga-aru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+</td>
<td>tegatai</td>
<td>shinchōsa</td>
<td>kikotsunitomo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kichōsen</td>
<td></td>
<td>nen-irina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yuikitodoku</td>
<td></td>
<td>chamekkega-aru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M−</td>
<td>inochishirazu</td>
<td>kinotsuyosha</td>
<td>gekishiyasui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ikujiga-aru</td>
<td></td>
<td>kimogasuwatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gamusharana</td>
<td></td>
<td>rokotsuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>rettokanga-tsuyoi</td>
<td>akarusa</td>
<td>ochitsukiga-nai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hitonattsuoki</td>
<td></td>
<td>nonkina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yuutsuna</td>
<td></td>
<td>mukiryokuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>ganbaru</td>
<td>ganbari</td>
<td>genkiga-aru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>detatakoshobu</td>
<td></td>
<td>kimamana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>köjōshinga-aru</td>
<td></td>
<td>kenkyōna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+</td>
<td>anteishita</td>
<td>ochitsuki</td>
<td>zakkubaran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sosokashii</td>
<td></td>
<td>sewashii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jikkurishita</td>
<td></td>
<td>mamen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M−</td>
<td>hikkomishian</td>
<td>kinoyowasa</td>
<td>yukiataribattari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rōbaisuru</td>
<td></td>
<td>ukemiteki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tameragachi</td>
<td></td>
<td>sugenai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>shutaiseiga-nai</td>
<td>mukiryokusa</td>
<td>kagehinataga-aru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shūchakushina-nai</td>
<td></td>
<td>kankasareyasui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>konkiga-nai</td>
<td></td>
<td>higamippoi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Adjectives and corresponding semantic categories were quoted from the normative data obtained by Aoki (1971).

†† In each combination, a test adjective was presented at a second position, and the first and the third were defined as the context adjectives.
Information Redundancy on Context Effects in Personality Impression Formation

Redundancy are considered to have single connotative meaning.

(2) Low-Redundancy. Low redundant person descriptions (Lo-R, in short) were developed by combining the adjectives selected from the three different categories. These descriptions, therefore, are said to have three different connotative meanings.

Favorableness levels of test adjectives are two; $M^+$ and $M^-$, and levels of context were four; $H$, $M^+$, $M^-$ and $L$. As stimulus adjectives selected were combined into person description according to the experimental design, 16 stimulus persons were constructed. Each person description and corresponding semantic category to each adjective are listed in Table 1.

Rating order of test adjectives. Among 80 Ss, half of Ss were asked to evaluate the likability of the test adjective before the total person evaluation was made (T-O, in short), and the half were asked to rate the test adjective likability after the total rating was made (O-T, in short). Both ratings of a test adjective and of the person impression were made along a 21-point scale on which three points were labeled; 0 (highly unfavorable), 10 (neutral), and 20 (highly favorable).

Procedure

Subjects were run in group and the experiment was made as a part of the lecture of an introductory psychology. Prior to the experiment, the experimenter explained that the experiment was designed to investigate “the way how people form impressions of other unknown people’s personalities.” Then, Ss were instructed that they would be given a stimulus sheet in which 16 college female students were described by the three personality-trait adjectives. Then, they were told that they would be asked to rate how much they felt they would like her, and to rate how much they thought they would like a given adjective in the three-adjectives descriptions of each person. After these instructions, $E$ gave Ss a stimulus sheet and three rating sheets; total ratings, test adjective ratings, and connotative meaning ratings. In the stimulus sheet, to left of each description hypothetical initials (e.g., S.K.) were written referring to each of 16 persons who supposedly were being. Ss assigned to T-O condition were asked to rate the likability of the test adjective at first, and were asked to rate the likability of the person impression secondly. On the other hand, Ss in O-T were required to rate the person impressions at first and the likability of the test adjective next.

After the both ratings, all Ss were asked to rate the connotative meanings of the test adjectives in context along a 9-point scale on which the endpoints were indentified by test adjective synonyms that differed in favorableness. The terms labeled the endpoints of each test adjective are listed in Table 1.

Subjects

Subjects of this experiment were 80 female undergraduate students at Aichi University of Education enrolled in an introductory psychology.

Results

Mean ratings of the three dependent variables, the likability ratings of the test adjectives, the ratings of a test adjective’s connotative meaning, and the likability ratings of the person impressions, are graphically presented in Figs. 1, 2 and 3, respectively. On basis of these data, an analysis of variance was performed as a function of the rating order (O), the degree of semantic redundancy (R), the favorableness of the test adjective (T), and the favorableness of context adjectives (C).

Likability Ratings of Test Adjectives

At first, the likability ratings of test adjectives were analysed to test the predictions that the likability ratings of test adjectives combined into the less redun-
dant descriptions would be more displaced toward the evaluative levels of context than the ratings in the high redundant descriptions, and that a greater context effect occurs when the test adjectives were rated after the likability of stimulus persons were rated.

Analyses of the likability ratings of test adjectives indicated that a strong context effect did occur, consistent with the findings of the previous studies (Anderson, 1971; Hamilton & Zanna, 1974; Kaplan, 1971; Takahashi, 1971a, 1971b; Wyer & Dermer, 1968; Wyer & Watson, 1969). The main effect for context (C) was highly significant \((F=68.82, df=3/234, p<.001)\). While the main effect for rating order (O) did not reach a significant level \((F=0.75, df=1/78)\), a three-way interaction between rating order, redundancy and context was significant \((F=4.49, df=3/234, p <.01)\). This interaction indicates that in T-O condition, the context effect tends to be greater when the test adjective and a pair of unfavorable context adjectives (M- and L) were combined into the less redundant description.

The findings that the significant context effect occurred independently of the rating order are consistent with the findings obtained by Anderson (1971) and Takahashi (1971b), implying that the likability ratings of the test adjectives are susceptible to the person impressions even though the impressions were not formed overtly before the test adjective ratings.

Concerning to the effects of semantic redundancy on the magnitude of the context effect, the analysis of variance revealed the significant main effect for redundancy \((R) (F=14.49, df=1/78, p<.01)\), thereby providing a evidence favoring the prediction that the context effect would vary inversely with the degree of semantic redundancy. As shown in Fig. 1, the likability ratings of the test adjectives tend to be more displaced toward the context desirability in Lo-R than in Hi-R. Especially, this tendency was strongly found in the ratings of M+ test adjectives with M- and L contexts. In contrast, the predicted redundancy effect was not shown in the ratings of M- test adjectives. These results suggest that the differences of the context effects between the two redundancy conditions tend to increase as the evaluative levels of context adjectives with which M+ test adjective was presented decreased. Although in the ratings of M- test adjectives the predicted redundancy

![Fig. 1. Mean test-adjective rating as a function of redundancy, test and context.](image)
effects did not appear, the results as a whole provide an evidence supporting for the change in meaning hypothesis.

It has been traditionally tested by the Context × Test adjectives interaction to determine indirectly whether the context effect occurs as a result of a change in meaning, or as a result of the weighted averaging process. The averaging theory assumes that the context effect should not depend on the evaluative level of the test adjective, accordingly assuming a zero interaction between text and context. On the other hand, according to the change in meaning theory the context effect is assumed to depend on the evaluative level of the test adjectives, leading to an expectation of a significant T × C interaction. In this experiment, the obtained T × C interaction, however, was nonsignificant (F=2.13, df=3/234). As shown in the right panel of Fig. 1, on which the both likability ratings of M⁺ and M⁻ test adjectives were plotted as a function of the context desirability with the rating order conditions combined the response curves for the M⁺ test adjectives against for the M⁻ test adjectives produced a set of parallel lines regardless of the semantic redundancy. This parallelism seems to lend support for the weighted averaging hypothesis.

Connotative Meaning Ratings of Test Adjectives

The primary concern of this study was focused on a direct test of the change in meaning hypothesis by determining a change in connotative meaning of the test adjectives. The predictions were two: The first was that if the context effect is due to a change in meaning, the ratings of connotative meaning would vary directly with the evaluative levels of context, and the second was that the changes in ratings of connotative meaning as a function of the context desirability would be greater when the test adjective was accompanied by a pair of less redundant adjectives. Mean connotative ratings are portrayed graphically in Fig. 2. This figure indicates that as the favorableness of the context adjectives decreased, there were corresponding decrements in the desirability of the connotative meaning of the test adjectives independently of the rating order condition.

Results of the analysis of variance indicated the significant main effect for context (F=91.88, df=3/234, p<.001). However, the main effect for rating order was not significant (F=0.07, df=1/78). The connotative meaning ratings varied with the context desirability regardless of the rating order, thereby providing a strong evidence support for the change in meaning hypothesis. These results are
Mean connotative meaning rating as a function of redundancy, test and context collapsed over rating order, and multiple comparison between each two levels of context desirability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M*</th>
<th>M⁻</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi-R</td>
<td>M⁺</td>
<td>7.75⁺⁺</td>
<td>7.88⁺</td>
<td>7.55⁺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M⁻</td>
<td>5.08⁺</td>
<td>4.11⁺⁺</td>
<td>2.03⁺⁺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo-R</td>
<td>M⁺</td>
<td>7.64⁺⁺</td>
<td>7.11⁺⁺</td>
<td>7.91⁺⁺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M⁻</td>
<td>4.51⁺⁺</td>
<td>2.79⁺⁺</td>
<td>2.69⁺⁺</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† In each row, figures with the same subscript are not significantly different from one another at the .05 level by Duncan's test.

also consistent with the findings obtained by Hamilton and Zanna (1974).

To test a significance in a decrement of the rating scores as a function of the context desirability, Duncan's (1955) multiple range tests were performed collapsed over the rating order condition. As shown in Table 2, results indicate that while the ratings of M⁻ test adjectives significantly decreased in likability as the context desirability decreased, the ratings of M⁺ test adjectives abruptly decreased in the extremely undesirable context.

Although the main effect for redundancy was significant ($F=24.58$, $df=1/78$, $p<.01$), the effect appeared to be unexpectedly reversal. Namely, a greater change in connotative meaning occurred in the ratings when the test adjectives were embedded in the highly redundant descriptions. As shown by a significant interaction between the semantic redundancy and the evaluative level of the test adjectives ($F=6.97$, $df=1/78$, $p<.05$), this reversal was strongly appeared in the ratings of M⁻ test adjectives.

One further significant main effect for test adjectives ($F=978.17$, $df=1/78$, $p<.001$) was due to the M⁻ test adjectives having significantly less desirable connotative meanings than the M⁺ test adjectives.

As a whole, as predicted in the introduction to this paper, the ratings of connotative meaning of the test adjectives were indicated to vary directly with the evaluative level of the context adjectives. As compared Fig. 1 with Fig. 2, however, a change in meaning does not necessarily correspond with a change in likability ratings, especially in the ratings of M⁺ test adjectives. This dissimilarity between the both rating patterns may be due to a methodological problem; that is, as the connotative meaning ratings were made after the likability ratings and the overall impression ratings in this experiment, the connotative meaning ratings might be influenced by the prior two ratings over the evaluative levels of the context adjectives. Therefore, if the connotative meaning ratings are made before the likability ratings.

![Fig. 3. Mean person impression rating as a function of redundancy, test and context.](image)
ratings, a more clear relation between the both ratings of likability and connotative meaning would be obtained. Furthermore, the effects of differences between Hi-R and Lo-R appeared unexpectedly to be reversal as opposed to the likability ratings. As this unexpected reversal is hard to explain at the present stage, this reversal is eliminated in later discussion.

**Likability Ratings of Person Impressions**

The analysis of the likability ratings for the stimulus persons indicated that the liking for the stimulus person linearly decreased as the both favorableness of the test adjective and the context adjectives decreased. The main effects for context and test were both highly significant ($F=229.04, df=1/78, p<.001$; $F=222.43, df=3/78, p<.001$, respectively). These main effects are a matter of course, since each of these manipulations changed the favorableness levels of the stimulus persons.

Regarding to the effects of redundancy, the main effect for redundancy was also significant ($F=10.16, df=1/78, p<.01$), and the Redundancy x Context was significant ($F=3.97, df=3/234, p<.05$). These results indicated that the impressions based upon the less redundant descriptions were more polarized than the impressions based upon the highly redundant, and further, that the polarity of impressions increased with the context desirability decreased in the less redundant descriptions. These findings are consistent with those obtained by Dustin and Baldwin (1966), Wyer (1968, 1970), and Takahashi (1975).

One last main effect for rating order (O) was noted: The ratings of person impressions were generally more polarized in T-O condition than in O-T ($F=8.67, df=1/78, p<.01$). Basing on Fig. 3, the person impressions are plotted in Fig. 4 in order to see the difference of response polarity between the two rating order conditions.

While it is hard to explain this main effect for O, the person impressions might be influenced by the ratings of the test adjectives which was also rather polarized in T-O condition than in O-T, as shown in Fig. 1. That is, in T-O, as the test adjectives were rated more extremely, the total impressions rated just after the test adjective ratings might be more polarized corresponding to polarization of the likability ratings of the test adjectives. This implies a possibility that the ratings of the test adjectives may affect on the ratings of person impressions; that is, there is a possibility that the both ratings of the test adjectives and of the person impressions are closely interrelated to each other.

**DISCUSSION**

The primary concern of this study was focused on a direct test of the change in meaning hypothesis as an explanation of the context effect by determining what changes in connotative meaning of a test adjective occur as a result of changes in the favorableness of the context adjectives. The main independent variable manipulated was the semantic redundancy among the three-adjective descriptions of the stimulus persons.

The analyses of the likability ratings of the test adjectives indicated that the strong context effect did occur independently of the rating order, and the effect increased

![Fig. 4. Mean person impression rating as a function of rating order, test and context.](image-url)
with a decrement in the degree of semantic redundancy. The analyses of the connotative meaning ratings also indicated that the connotative meaning ratings of the test adjectives in context changed directly with the decreased context desirability. However, the greater changes in meaning appeared unexpectedly to be reversal when the test adjectives were combined into the highly redundant descriptions.

As a whole, a larger part of results obviously lend support for the change in meaning hypothesis that the context effect is due to a shift in meaning of a test adjective toward the meaning of the context. Several aspects of the presented data, however, invite further discussion.

First, decreased semantic redundancy led to the more polarized person impressions (Fig. 3) as well as a greater context effect (Fig. 1). That is, the person impressions based upon the less redundant descriptions were more polarized in likability than the impressions based upon the highly redundant descriptions, thereby replicating the findings of the previous studies (Dustin & Baldwin, 1966; Takahashi, 1975; Wyer, 1968, 1970). These findings indicate an existence of a parallel relationship between the both ratings of the test adjectives and of the person impressions. Namely, increased context effects in the less redundant adjectives are correspondent with an increase in polarity of the person impressions. This linear relation is predictable from not only the change in meaning theory, but also the weighted averaging theory, because the both theory predict the influence of the total impression on the context effect as noted in the introduction to this paper.

Concerning to the effects of redundancy on the context effect, however, the redundancy effects are substantially interpreted within the change in meaning theory, by assuming that the degree of the semantic redundancy among three adjectives represents the number of different connotations they could have, accordingly discrepancy in connotative meanings between the test adjectives and the context. Increased discrepancy is considered to lead to a greater test-adjective's potential for changes in meaning. While the presenting data strongly substantiate this prediction, it is difficult to interpret the effects of redundancy on the polarity of person impression ratings within the change in meaning hypothesis.

Taking into account of the person impressions, the results are not necessarily incompatible with the weighted averaging hypothesis, since an increment in polarity of the person impressions of the less redundant descriptions is well explained by a discounting explanation or a differential weighting. Anderson and Jacobson (1965) and Hendrick and Costantini (1970) argued that the primacy effect in impression formation occurred as a result of active discounting of the later informations. That is, several adjectives in the person description are discounted to produce a final impression when the adjectives were discrepant, or when the adjectives were presented serially. According to this discounting explanation, increased semantic redundancy might cause an increase in the number of adjectives to be discounted, because three adjectives in the highly redundant description were represented by only one personality dimension. Therefore, a less context effect and the less polarized person impressions might be due to adjective's discounting.

A discounting process is also related to a differential weighting process. In this regard, Kaplan (1971) found that the context effect was more pronounced under the high weighting condition than the low weighting condition, by manipulating the degree of weighting for informations by varying their credibility. In the present experiment, the highly redundant descriptions of the stimulus persons represented by the single personality dimension might be given less weights than in the less re-
dundant descriptions. Consequently, the person impression based upon the highly redundant adjectives might be less polarized as compared with the impressions based upon the less redundants, and this less polarized person impressions seem to attributable to a less context effect. Taka-
hashi (1975) also suggested that the differential weighting explanation was plausible for the interpretation of the redundancy effects on the integration of informations in personality impression formation.

A differential weighting in an information integration has been a well-known phenomenon. Many researches have provided evidences that the informations were differentially weighted when there was inconsistency between informations (Anderson & Jacobson, 1965), when they were presented sequentially (Anderson, 1965), or when the informations differed in their desirability values were combined into a stimulus person description (Hamilton & Zanna, 1972). Thus, if the weight given to a test adjective was influenced by the degree of semantic redundancy, the presenting data are explained by the differential weighted averaging model. Therefore, a more careful examination must be required to test how the redundant informations are differentially weighted in a process of information integration.

Secondly, concerning to the rating order of a test adjective, the change in meaning hypothesis predicted that a greater context effect occurs when a test adjective's likability was rated after the likability of person impression was rated (O-T condition), because Ss in O-T had an opportunity for forming more fully developed impressions. The obtained results, however, indicated that the context effect was not due to the rating order of the test adjectives. This finding implies that the likability ratings of the test adjectives were influenced by the person impressions even though Ss had not an opportunity for forming more organized impressions of stimulus persons. As Boyle (1965) and Hamilton and Zanna (1974) pointed out, Ss in T-O condition might tacitly formed the overall impression of the person prior to the likability rating of the test adjectives. If it were true, the variable of the rating order in an Asch-type impression formation task seems to be inadequate to perform comparative tests between the two hypotheses. For, as a stimulus person was presented with several simple personality-trait adjectives in Asch-type tasks, subjects could easily form an overall impression even if they were not required to form the person impression overtly.
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