



Australian  
National  
University

---

THESES SIS/LIBRARY  
R.G. MENZIES LIBRARY BUILDING NO:2  
THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY  
CANBERRA ACT 0200 AUSTRALIA

TELEPHONE: +61 2 6125 4631  
FACSIMILE: +61 2 6125 4063  
EMAIL: [library.theses@anu.edu.au](mailto:library.theses@anu.edu.au)

## USE OF THESES

This copy is supplied for purposes  
of private study and research only.  
Passages from the thesis may not be  
copied or closely paraphrased without the  
written consent of the author.

**PERSON MEMORY:  
ASSOCIATIVE NETWORKS, CATEGORIES, AND SCHEMAS**



Martin Andrew Therkelsen

A thesis submitted for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy of  
the Australian National University

Department of Psychology,  
Australian National University,  
Canberra.

December, 1989

Originality of thesis  
Except where otherwise acknowledged,  
this thesis is my own original work.



Martin A. Therkelsen

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation and thanks to Dr. Michael L. Cook for his supervision and support. I would also like to thank Dr. May Jane Chen for her confidence and enthusiasm.

I also thank all those who served as subjects in my experiments.

Finally, I would like to thank Deborah and my son Nicholas for their support and inspiration during this time.

## CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	iii
Contents	iv
Abstract	vi
Chapter 1: THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL REVIEW	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Natural categories for persons	1
1.3 Features of a person: The impression	5
1.4 Memory for exemplars: The general domain	7
1.5 Memory for exemplars: The human domain	10
1.6 Recent Developments	23
Chapter 2: TWO COGNITIVE PROCESSING MODELS	36
2.1 The schema concept	36
2.2 Two processing models	39
2.3 Summary	47
Chapter 3: EXPERIMENT 1: RECOGNITION OF AN IMPRESSION	49
3.2 Method	54
3.3 Results	59
3.4 Discussion	73
Chapter 4: EXPERIMENT 2: RECALL OF AN IMPRESSION	84
4.2 Method	88
4.3 Results	92
4.4 Discussion	101
Chapter 5: EXPERIMENT 3: RECALL OF AN IMPRESSION: EXTENSION OF EXPERIMENT 2	106
5.2 Method	109
5.3 Results	112
5.4 Discussion	116

Chapter 6: EXPERIMENT 4: RECALL OF AN IMPRESSION: A SIMPLE ASSOCIATIVE NETWORK MODEL	121
6.2 Method	130
6.3 Results	133
6.4 Discussion	139
Chapter 7: EXPERIMENT 5: RECALL OF AN IMPRESSION: ROLE OF INTRA AND EXTRA IMPRESSION ASSOCIATIONS	144
7.2 Method	146
7.3 Results	149
7.4 Discussion	158
EXPERIMENT 6: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRAIT GROUPS AND PAIRWISE TRAIT CO-OCCURRENCES	163
7.6 Method	163
7.7 Results	165
7.8 Discussion	166
Chapter 8: OVERVIEW AND CONCLUSIONS	168
References	182
Appendix A: Data analyses of Experiment 1	204
Appendix B: Data analyses of Experiment 2	228
Appendix C: Data analyses of Experiment 3	237
Appendix D: Data analyses of Experiment 4	245
Appendix E: Data analyses of Experiments 5 & 6	248

## Abstract

A model of impression memory was utilized which partitioned impression information into category-consistent (schema) and category-inconsistent information (peripheral). The memory for consistent and inconsistent information was investigated in a series of experiments. Two information-processing models, the Schema-Pointer-Plus-Tag (SP+T) and the Associative-Network-Plus-Elaborative-Processing (AN+EP) models were tested for their ability to account for impression memory data.

Experiment 1 tested subjects' recognition memory for an impression. Subjects' hit rates for schema and peripheral impression traits were equal both at immediate and delayed test intervals. False alarm rates were greater for schema nonimpression distractors than for peripheral distractors at each retention interval. Reaction times paralleled recognition performance. Times to make schema and peripheral hits were equal, while correct rejections of schema nonimpression distractors took longer than peripheral distractors.

Experiment 2 tested subjects' recall memory for an impression. Subjects recalled equal proportions of schema and peripheral impression traits at immediate test, but recalled a greater proportion of schema traits after a delay. Recall intrusions at immediate test were equal for schema and peripheral nonimpression traits, but there were more schema than peripheral intrusions at the delayed test.

Experiment 3 also tested subjects' recall memory for an impression, though in this experiment subjects were required to furnish impression traits themselves, rather than selecting them from a checklist as in Experiments 1 and 2. The pattern of results was similar to that of Experiment 2, except that there was a greater proportion of schema impression traits recalled at both retention intervals, rather than only at the delayed test.

Experiment 4 found that recalled impression traits were no more or less associated or linked with other impression traits than nonrecalled impression traits. Additionally, recalled traits were no more likely to be linked with other recalled traits than nonrecalled traits, and no more likely to be the source of links to other impression traits.

Experiment 5 found a similar pattern of results to Experiment 4 with respect to not only

those links within the impression, but also between impression traits and other traits in the subjects' vocabularies. Recalled impression traits did not differ from nonrecalled traits on any of the measures of association or interlinking.

Experiment 6 found a significant relationship between traits categorized together as measured in Experiments 1-3, and traits seen as associated when judged on a pairwise basis as measured in Experiments 4-5. The better recall of schema traits as found in Experiments 2 and 3, which contrasts with the failure of Experiments 4 and 5 to show that recalled traits were simply more interassociated than nonrecalled traits, cannot be attributed to measurement factors.

Both the SP+T and the AN+EP models were found to be inappropriate for modelling impression memory data, as was a simple associative model. Memory for impression information was shown to be schematically driven, though not to the extent suggested by the SP+T model.