

**THE EFFECT OF EXTRAVERSION AND
INTROVERSION ON WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE
WITH PERSONS OF UNDESIRABLE TRAITS**

GRACE FORD

MARIA M. BAILEY

THE EFFECT OF EXTRAVERSION AND INTROVERSION
ON WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE WITH PERSONS
OF UNDESIRABLE TRAITS

An Abstract
Presented to
the Graduate Council of
Austin Peay State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in Psychology

by
Maria M. Bailey
September 1976

ABSTRACT

Extraverts seek out the company of others due to a strong stimulus hunger. Through their interaction with others they learn to be more responsive to both negative and positive reinforcement potentials of others. Research has shown that extraverts rate people described by favorable traits as more likeable than do introverts and those described by unfavorable traits as less likeable than do introverts. It has been postulated that introverts have a high level of arousal and avoid seeking new stimulation.

If extraverts seek out the company of others due to a strong stimulus hunger, then they should seek out the company of even those with less desirable personality traits rather than being alone. The opposite should hold true for introverts. The purpose of this study was to investigate the above mentioned hypothesis and to evaluate the obtained data to see if there is a difference between extraverts and introverts in willingness to spend time with people described by less desirable traits.

Ninety students were administered the Eysenck Personality Inventory to determine extraversion and introversion. They they filled out a second questionnaire describing 20 favorable and 20 unfavorable traits. They were asked how much time they were willing to spend with people described by these traits.

The results showed no significant difference between extraverts and introverts in willingness to spend time with people of undesirable personality traits. The hypothesis, therefore, was not supported. As the sample contained only 12 introverts whose data

was additionally confounded by lies, it was suggested that no valid conclusion could be reached.

THE EFFECT OF EXTRAVERSION AND INTROVERSION
ON WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE WITH PERSONS
OF UNDESIRABLE TRAITS

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Council of
Austin Peay State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in Psychology

by
Maria M. Bailey
September 1976

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a Thesis written by Maria M. Bailey entitled "The Effect of Extraversion and Introversion on Willingness to Associate with Persons of Undesirable Traits." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Psychology.

Garland E. Blair

Major Professor

We have read this thesis and
recommend its acceptance:

Stephen F. Davis

Second Committee Member

Hugo Beiswenger

Third Committee Member

Accepted for the Council:

Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Garland E. Blair who aided and counseled her during the course of the study. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Stephen F. Davis and Dr. Hugo A. Beiswenger for their help and patient understanding.

Gratitude is extended to Ms. Diana Brent for her cooperation and the use of her classes in this study. Gratitude is also extended to the students who volunteered to serve as subjects in this study.

The author wishes to express her deepest thanks to her husband and children whose help, patience, and understanding supported her throughout the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. METHOD.....	14
Subjects.....	14
Apparatus.....	14
Procedure.....	15
III. RESULTS.....	17
IV. DISCUSSION.....	18
APPENDIX.....	20
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	23

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It seems that there are some people who are constantly surrounded by others and who are steadily engaged in a stream of activity, while there are others who seem to prefer the quiet life and are contented to be by themselves. The first category is commonly referred to as extraverts, while the latter is known as introverts.

The terms extraversion and introversion have been known for several hundred years. They became, however, better known through the writings of Carl Jung in the early twentieth century. Jung (1924) perceived extraversion and introversion as directional attitudes of the life force (libido). Consistently outward directed libido, Jung thought, resulted in the extraverted personality which is accepting of the outside world. The extravert is interested in the objective world of things and events. He makes friends easily, is comfortable in social situations, and is generally characterized as a practical person. The consistently inward turned libido, on the other hand, resulted in a personality that is characterized by reflectiveness, hesitation, defensiveness, and caution when dealing with the outside world. The introvert is seen as subjective in orientation. He is more interested in the self and less in the world around him. Jung believed that this subjective orientation resulted in a personality that was more intellectual, emotional, and introspective.

Other early attempts to classify personality were based on body built. Kretchmer (1925) thought that physique determined personality.

He felt that a stocky build (pyknic) resulted in an extraverted personality which was sociable and outgoing. A tall thin person was seen as introspective and timid and was classified as introvert (asthenic). Kretchmer based his findings on studies with schizophrenics and manic-depressives. Schizophrenics seemed to be thin (asthenic) while manic-depressives tended to be stocky (pyknic). Kretchmer felt that this typology could also be applied to the normal population. He saw the asthenic as shy, sensitive, and withdrawn, and the pyknic as friendly, energetic, and outgoing. He felt that the pyknic was subject to mood changes.

Eysenck (1959) developed a personality inventory which identifies extraversion and introversion by means of factor analysis. Personality is seen by Eysenck as a collection of primary traits which determine how personality is structured and organized. Even though personality is arranged on a continuum, certain traits are more characteristic of certain people. These traits can, therefore, be used to identify personality. Eysenck states that personality can be explained on two levels, namely, the stable-unstable (or normal-neurotic) and the extravert-introvert.

While working with hospital patients in 1947, Eysenck found that highly neurotic patients were highly suggestible, had little persistence, and did not do well on learning tasks. Patients that rated high in extraversion were found to lack ambition. Their task performance was quick but lacked accuracy. They did not show much persistence with assigned tasks. In contrast, those scoring low on extraversion,

the introverts, evidenced mood swings and sensitivity. On task performance they exhibited persistence and accuracy. They were rated high in intelligence but low in sense of humor.

Before admission to the hospital the highly neurotic patients had led a normal but rather dependent life. Patients rated high on extraversion evidenced conversion symptoms while patients rated low on extraversion tended to be more anxious, depressed, and not interested in their surroundings. Eysenck saw the patients' disorders as two major types, namely hysterical (extraverted) and dysthymic (introverted).

In 1952 Eysenck studied a group of normal and hospital patients and found that neurotics were annoyed more often (25 %) than normals (22 %). Scores of manual dexterity tests were lower for anxiety-state neurotics (22 %) than for normals (25 %), and hysterical neurotics scored somewhat in between (23 %). Test results showed also that there were variations within the responses of the normal patients, indicating that neuroticism and the opposite of it, stability, could be found to some degree in normal groups. This is in agreement with his findings in 1947 stated previously.

Eysenck's findings led to the development of a personality questionnaire that identifies extraversion-introversion and neuroticism (emotionality or anxiety)-stability. A score at or above the 70th percentile places a person in the extravert category. The extravert is usually characterized by preference for being with others, seeking out social contact, optimism, alertness, and some aggressiveness. The

introvert is identified by a score at or below the 31st percentile. Characteristics of the introvert are preference for his own company to the company of others, and generally a rather reserved and quiet manner, slow to make social contact, adherence to rules, preference for regularity in daily life rather than frequent changes, and tendency toward pessimism.

Many studies have been done based on personality inventories such as Eysenck's and others to shed some light on the area of extraversion and introversion. Research seems to indicate that there are some pronounced differences between extraverts and introverts in various areas such as vigilance tasks, sensory threshold tasks, formation of conditioned responses, and learning tasks. It has been shown, for example, that extraverts perform less well on monotonous tasks than do introverts. Bakan, Belton, and Toth (1963) tested a group of subjects under isolation and group conditions. Half the subjects were kept in isolation throughout the experiment and half were kept in a group. The subjects were instructed to write down a certain sequence of numbers that they periodically heard in a set of earphones. Performance of the introverts exceeded that of extraverts significantly. The extraverts' performance declined steadily, while the performance of the introverts rose slowly and declined slowly. The study showed also that introverts perform better when they are alone, while extraverts do better when they are with others.

It appears from the above data that extraverts become bored easily by the sameness of a task and also by their own company. When given

the extra stimulation of adding a second task to the first one to be performed, the extravert's performance exceeds that of the introvert's. This has been shown in an experiment conducted by Claridge (1960). He presented a group of subjects with a 30-minute tape recording of numbers in which the subjects had to react to three numbers in a series. Immediately after the 30 minutes another ten minute task was introduced in which the subjects had to respond to another number in addition to responding to the three digits. On the first part of the test introverts did much better than extraverts, whereas on the second part of the test introverts became distracted and their performance declined, while the extraverts became more alert and performance increased. This is in agreement with Bakan (1959) who found that extraverts do better on a primary task if an additional task is introduced, whereas this is not the case for introverts.

This data seems to suggest that extraverts need higher levels of stimulation than do introverts to perform well on a task. It appears that introverts have a lower threshold and evidence less adaptability to continuous stimulation, while the opposite is seen for extraverts. Eysenck (1967) suggested that the same amount of stimulation would be experienced differently by the extravert than by the introvert due to excitation and inhibition in the central nervous system. An excess of cortical excitation would result in the introverted personality. The normal state for an introvert person would be one of high arousal. Therefore he would avoid extra arousal and continue with a task already started. Low cortical

excitation, on the other hand, would result in the extraverted personality. The extravert, due to this low level of arousal, would search for extra stimulation and change his activity often. Eysenck went on to say that introverts would condition easier which in turn would make them more socialized and less impulsive. The extravert would be slow to condition as excessive cortical inhibition is believed to interfere with learning. Therefore, he would be slower to acquire socialized habits and he would tend to be more impulsive.

Haslam (1966) reported a marked difference in pain threshold between extraverts and introverts. Introverts showed a much lower threshold than did extraverts. When she raised the excitation level in a latter experiment by using threat of electric shock, performance for the extraverts increased considerably, while it increased only slightly for the introverts. Haslam concluded that extraverts in the previous experiment had been working below their excitation level whereas the introverts had worked at their approximate level. Haslam's experiment seems to support Eysenck's hypothesis that there are different stimulation levels for extraverts and introverts.

The hypothesis that extraverts prefer extra stimulation has also been supported by results of an experiment done by Weisen (1965). Subjects were selected by means of the MMPI and then tested for preference of sensory stimulation. They were placed in a dark, quiet room and could push a button to fill the room with loud music and colored lights for stimulation which would last three seconds.

The button could be pushed again if more stimulation was desired. How strong the button was pushed determined condition of the room. Results showed that rate of correct responses increased for extraverts during periods of added stimulation. It also showed that extraverts found strong sensory stimulation rewarding while introverts did not.

In an earlier study conducted by Jensen in 1962 results showed that introverts do not respond well to extra stimulation. He conducted an experiment which incorporated the Maudsley Personality Inventory (Eysenck, 59) which is an earlier version of the Eysenck Personality Inventory. Subjects participated in a paired associate learning task where the stimulus was first introduced at the rate of four seconds and later at two seconds. Results showed that the error rate stayed the same for persons low on neuroticism (un-emotional) scale but doubled for subjects who rated high on the neuroticism (highly emotional and low in extraversion) scale.

There is some evidence that extraversion and introversion may have a biological basis. Experiments with drugs have shown that people react different to drugs according to their personality type. Janke (1964) administered central nervous system depressants to subjects in a study. Subjects low in neuroticism became less stable emotionally, those high in neuroticism became more stable emotionally. The mood of subjects rated low in neuroticism went down, whereas the mood of subjects high on neuroticism improved. Performance in psychomotor tests improved when subjects that evidenced exaggerated emotional tensions were given tranquilizers.

Eysenck (1963) had shown that stimulating drugs can become introverting and depressant drugs extraverting and shift a person's position on the extraversion-introversion scale. This might be seen as further evidence of a biological foundation for the two personality types.

Further evidence for a biological basis on extraversion and introversion is suggested by studies with twins. Studies with identical twins seem to indicate a similar degree of neuroticism. This is evident even when the twins are raised apart. Wilde (1964) studied 88 monozygotic and 42 dyzygotic pairs of twins. The twins were divided into groups that had been living together for five or more years and into those that had been living apart five or more years. Neurotic instability in monozygotic twins raised apart did not differ much. It was .55 for those living together and .52 for those living apart ($p > .01$). Results for dyzygotic twin pairs were significantly different. It was -.14 for those living together and .28 for those living apart. Results for extraversion showed a large difference between monozygotic twins. Those raised together had a score of .58 ($p < .01$), those raised apart, a score of .19 ($p > .01$). Shields (1962) had reported identical twins raised apart correlated very highly in both extraversion and neuroticism and that identical twins raised apart were more similar than fraternal twins that were raised together. Results of the above mentioned studies may suggest that, perhaps, tendencies towards introversion or extraversion may be inherited to some extent.

Let us now leave the area of biological foundation of extraversion-introversion and look at differences in verbal conditioning

between extraverts and introverts. Introverts seem to condition easier than extraverts. Jawanda (1966) reports a significantly higher rate of conditioning for introverts ($p < .01$). He divided 120 subjects into three age levels and four groups. They were shown a sentence completion card containing a verb with which they were to form a sentence that included the verb and a personal pronoun. The experimenter reinforced responses containing I or we with the remark good during trials 26-85 while at the beginning and end of trials reinforcement was not received. Introverts showed a significantly higher rate of conditioning. This is in agreement with Eysenck (1959) who had obtained findings pointing towards higher conditioning ability in introverts. Beech and Adler (1963) reported similar results. Many years previous to these studies Pavlov had shown that cortical excitation aids in conditioning. If introverts have a higher cortical excitation level, it would explain why they condition easier.

If extraverts have a lower level of cortical arousal, then this would also effect their pattern of learning. Kleinsmith and Kaplan (1963) showed that recall of learned material is effected by level of arousal during acquisition of learning. Kleinsmith et al used words such as rape and swim to obtain various levels of arousal which were measured by degree of drop in skin resistance. Results showed that paired associates learned under low arousal were easily recalled right after learning but became more difficult with passage of time, whereas associates learned under high arousal conditions could be recalled poorly immediately after learning but

improved over a period of time. To test if extraverts and introverts have different patterns of learning, Howarth and Eysenck (1968) conducted an experiment with extraverted and introverted subjects as measured by the Eysenck Personality Inventory. Subjects learned pairs of nonsense syllables and were later tested for recall. The mean number of words recalled after 0 minutes was 11.8 for extraverts and 7.0 for introverts, whereas 24 hours later mean number of words recalled for extraverts was 7.0 and for introverts 11.0. This data seems to indicate that extraverts show a pattern of learning consistent with findings for low level of arousal, namely immediate and delayed memory performance, whereas introverts show patterns of high cortical arousal.

Electrical activity in the brain can be picked up by means of electrodes such as the EEG. The work done by Mundy-Castle (1955) seems to lend some support to Eysenck's theory of personality differences between extraverts and introverts. They found a $+ .46$ correlation between resting alpha rhythms and temperament. Those with high alpha rhythms were found to be impulsive and lacking in control. Persons with low alpha levels appeared to be deliberate, careful, and reserved. Later studies by Mundy-Castle (1956) lend further support to a link between extraversion and high alpha frequencies and introversion and low alpha frequencies. Similar findings were reported by Gastaut (1957). Gale (1973) also found that introverts are more highly aroused on EEG indices than are extraverts.

The material presented so far seems to suggest that extraverts and introverts may have different levels of cortical arousal. It

appears that the extravert has a chronic low level of arousal, whereas the introvert has a high level of arousal. The extravert looks for extra stimulation, whereas the introvert is usually content to stay at his present cortical excitation level. It is assumed that this search for outside stimulation also carries over into social behavior. Eysenck (1967) hypothesizes that association with others serves as stimulation and therefore, the extravert seeks out other people. As this outside stimulation is rewarding to the extravert, he becomes conditioned to repeat it. That outside stimulation is rewarding can be seen in the experiment by Weisen, quoted previously, in which extraverts responded more correctly when stimulation was increased whereas introverts increased their correct responses when no stimulation was present.

Human contact serves as a source of stimulation but it may not always be rewarding. Why then, would the extravert continue to seek out stimulation from others? One explanation may be the difference in pain threshold as reported by Haslam (1966) quoted previously. Another explanation may be the extravert's higher toleration for pain. Schalling and Kareby-Levander (1963) report that in an experiment with nine introverts and ten extraverts in which electric pain stimulation was used to measure sensation thresholds, pain thresholds, and tolerance thresholds, extraverts exhibited a greater toleration for pain than did introverts. It could be hypothesized therefore, that extraverts may not find some social situations as painful as do introverts.

Merely presence of another person may not contribute as much to

added stimulation as the form in which the interaction takes place. One form of stimulation may be eye contact with others. The more one looks at the partner, the more stimulation one should receive. Findings by Nichols and Chapness (1971) seem to link eye contact with increases in arousal. The stimulus hungry extravert should, therefore, seek more frequent eye contact with his partner. This has been indeed shown in several experiments such as in the one by Rutter, Morley, and Graham (1972) where extraverts were shown to have more eye contact with their partners. Similar findings have been reported by Kendon and Cook (1968). So these are more examples of the extravert's preference for added stimulation and that in fact it extends into the area of social responsiveness as well.

Frequent association with others may also make the extravert more aware of the rewarding potentials of others. He will soon learn which person serves as positive reward and which does not. Harkins, Becker, and Stonner (1975) conducted an experiment in which they presented extraverts and introverts with a list of people described by favorable and unfavorable traits and asked them to rate their likeability. Results showed that extraverts rated people described by favorable traits as more likeable and those described by less favorable as less likeable than did introverts. This seems to indicate that even though the extravert wants social stimulation from others, he does not respond equally well to all types of people. It appears that extraverts evidence a greater dislike for persons described by negative traits than do introverts. Why this should be so is open to speculation. Logically extraverts should evaluate any type of stimulation more

favorable than the introverts would.

In their evaluation of their experiment, Harkins et al (1975) raised the question what would happen if extraverts were asked how willing they would be to spend some time with persons described by negative traits. Would extraverts, although they dislike persons described by negative traits more intensely than introverts, still be more willing to spend time interacting with them?

The purpose of this study was to see if indeed extraverts would be more willing to spend time with people described by unfavorable traits. It appears that extraverts would prefer any type of stimulation rather than receiving no stimulation at all. Therefore, if given the choice between being alone or being in the company of others, even though their personality characteristics are less desirable, extraverts should choose their company over no company (no social stimulation) at all. The opposite should hold true for introverts. As they normally have a high level of cortical arousal, they should prefer to be alone rather than to be with people of undesirable personality characteristics. In regard to the extravert, he may not view a person with negative personality traits as having highly rewarding potentials but this type of person would, nevertheless, represent a form of social stimulation. As extraverts have more tolerance for pain, they may have also more tolerance for less rewarding, i.e., painful, social stimulation. It is hypothesized that if extraverts seek out the social stimulation of others due to their low cortical level of arousal, then they would prefer even the company of those that they consider as having undesirable traits rather than being alone. The opposite should hold true for introverts.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects consisted of 90 college students enrolled in a psychology course at Austin Peay State University, during the Summer Quarter, 1976. Male and female subjects were used. The subjects ranged in age from 18 to 47. All subjects were volunteers.

Apparatus

Students were asked to fill out the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI). The EPI measures extraversion (E) and neuroticism-stability (N). Twenty-four "yes" and "no" questions measure traits which are selected on the basis of factor analysis. A lie detection scale is included in the test. There are 57 questions in the EPI (see Appendix A).

Attached to the EPI was another questionnaire which they were asked to fill out. This questionnaire contained 20 desirable personality traits and 20 undesirable personality traits. Traits were picked from Anderson's list of 555 personality traits. Every tenth word was picked from the desirable traits starting with the tenth word from the top of the list, then going to word number 20, etc. Every tenth word was picked from the undesirable traits starting with the 10th undesirable word on the bottom of the list which was word number 550 and then going backwards on the list, picking number 540, etc. Words were arranged randomly, so as not to let the subjects know that half of the words were desirable and half were undesirable traits.

Procedure

The EPI and attached questionnaire were administered to 90 students. The experiment was conducted in the students' regular classroom. Instructor and experimenter were in the room when the students came in. After they all sat down, the experimenter gave a speech concerning the experiment. Students were advised that participation in the experiment was voluntary and that they could stop at any time during the experiment if they decided to do so. All Ethical Principles in the Conduct of Research with Human Participants laid down by the Committee on Ethical Standards in Psychological Research were adhered to.

Subjects were told that this was a study to determine how frequently people are willing to interact with others. It was explained to them that the first part of the study, the EPI, was done to get some background information on them. Then they were told that the second questionnaire would be used to determine their willingness to interact with others. The willingness to interact with others was rated on a 5-point scale running from 1 (very willing) to 5 (would rather be alone).

Questionnaires were passed out to every subject. Students were asked to bring their questionnaires to the instructor's desk and lay them on the desk face down when they were finished with them.

After the questionnaires had all been placed on the desk, the experimenter asked the subjects if they had any questions concerning the experiment. They were told that the experimenter would explain more about the study and also give them the results of the findings the following week. Then the students were thanked for their participation and the experimenter left. The whole procedure took about 20 minutes.

Scoring the EPI - The EPI was scored by means of a key to determine extraversion and introversion. Of the 90 samples obtained, those scoring 14 and above were considered to be extraverts, and those scoring 9 and below to be introverts.

Scoring of the second questionnaire - The second questionnaire was evaluated next. It contained 20 desirable traits and 20 undesirable traits. Separate scores were obtained for desirable and undesirable traits. The average scores were then used to determine the differences between extraverted and introverted subjects.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The Eysenck Personality Inventories were evaluated resulting in 31 extraverts, 36 ambiverts, and 12 introverts. Eleven questionnaires could not be evaluated as the subjects had either not filled in all the blanks or given more than one response per question. The lie detection scale was applied to the Eysenck Personality Inventory. Means were 1.77 for extraverts, 2.97 lies for ambiverts, and 3.42 for introverts. Because of these confounding factors no statistical analyses were done other than obtaining the means for each group.

Means obtained yielded no significant differences between extraverts, ambiverts, and introverts in willingness to spend time with people of undesirable personality traits. Means were 3.85 for extraverts, 3.90 for ambiverts, and 3.87 for introverts. The hypothesis that extraverts would be more willing than introverts to spend some time with persons of undesirable personality traits was therefore not supported. It is difficult, though, to make a valid judgement due to above mentioned confounding factors.

Means for positive traits were also obtained. Data obtained revealed somewhat more willingness by the extraverts ($\bar{X} = 1.68$) to spend time with persons of positive personality traits than did introverts ($\bar{X} = 1.93$). No further evaluation of this data was done as it was not a part of the hypothesis. See tables for a summary of all data.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The extraverts indicated no more willingness to associate with people of undesirable personality traits than did ambiverts or introverts. The hypothesis that extraverts would prefer the company of people with negative personality traits rather than being alone was not supported. It seems that neither extraverts, nor ambiverts or introverts want to be in the company of people with undesirable traits. When one considers that 20 of the traits were considered commonly as socially undesirable, it may be that the subjects were reluctant to admit that they would want to spend time with people described by negative traits. They may have been afraid to be judged by the company they keep.

The Eysenck Lie Detection Scale indicated a mean of 3.42 lies for introverts and 1.77 for extraverts. In view of this, it is somewhat difficult to determine whether the introverts should have really been rated introverts or if the data should have been discarded altogether. As the sample contained only 12 introverts whose data additionally was confounded by lies, sample size may have been too small to form a valid conclusion.

Women were slightly overrepresented (61 %). However, means did not differ significantly, so it appears this did not influence the study to any extent.

There was an unexpectedly wide range in ages. Student's ages ranged from 18 to 47. The Eysenck Personality Inventory for Adults

may have been more appropriate for a mixed group such as this one. Additionally, educational level ranged from sophomore through graduate level. It may be that some of these students were "test wise."

Another thing to consider is that the questionnaire containing positive and negative personality traits may have been at fault. The personality traits were chosen from the best personality traits and the worst personality traits. The contrast in words may have been too obvious. Future research in this area should be done with a revised questionnaire. The wording in the beginning of the questionnaire could be revised to emphasize more that the choice is between being alone or being with others.

It is suggested that question number 25 on the Eysenck Personality Inventory be revised to read "Can you usually let yourself go and enjoy yourself a lot at a fun party" rather than the present wording of "gay party," as this received quite a few comments from the students.

TABLE 1
Means for negative traits

	Extraverts	Ambiverts	Introverts
Females	3.88	3.93	3.93
Males	3.82	3.84	3.75
Total	3.85	3.90	3.87

TABLE 2
Means for lies

	Extraverts	Ambiverts	Introverts
Females	1.60	2.90	3.13
Males	1.92	3.14	4.00
Total	1.77	2.97	3.42

TABLE 2
Means for positive traits

	Extraveris	Ambiverts	Introverts
Females	1.48	1.75	2.04
Males	1.96	1.68	1.70
Total	1.68	1.71	1.93

How willing would you be to spend time with people described by the personality traits listed below. Please indicate your choice by circling one of the numbers. The scale is as follows:

- 1 very willing
- 2 somewhat willing
- 3 somewhat unwilling
- 4 very unwilling
- 5 would rather be alone

THOUGHTFUL	1 2 3 4 5	HELPLESS	1 2 3 4 5
UNENTERTAINING	1 2 3 4 5	INDEPENDENT	1 2 3 4 5
UNIMAGINATIVE	1 2 3 4 5	VIGOROUS	1 2 3 4 5
KIND-HEARTED	1 2 3 4 5	UNAPPRECIATIVE	1 2 3 4 5
RASH	1 2 3 4 5	SHALLOW	1 2 3 4 5
TRUSTFUL	1 2 3 4 5	ENTERPRISING	1 2 3 4 5
CLEVER	1 2 3 4 5	MODEST	1 2 3 4 5
UNINTELLECTUAL	1 2 3 4 5	PREJUDICED	1 2 3 4 5
SQUEAMISH	1 2 3 4 5	REFINED	1 2 3 4 5
PESSIMISTIC	1 2 3 4 5	EASYGOING	1 2 3 4 5
BRILLIANT	1 2 3 4 5	ABUSIVE	1 2 3 4 5
BRIGHT	1 2 3 4 5	ILL-MANNERED	1 2 3 4 5
FICKLE	1 2 3 4 5	STRONG-MINDED	1 2 3 4 5
FOOLHARDY	1 2 3 4 5	CANDID	1 2 3 4 5
CLEAR-HEADED	1 2 3 4 5	DISRESPECTFUL	1 2 3 4 5
ETHICAL	1 2 3 4 5	GREEDY	1 2 3 4 5
INGENIOUS	1 2 3 4 5	PURPOSEFUL	1 2 3 4 5
FINICKY	1 2 3 4 5	UNTRUTHFUL	1 2 3 4 5
STINGY	1 2 3 4 5	SOFTSPOKEN	1 2 3 4 5
TOLERANT	1 2 3 4 5	COWARDLY	1 2 3 4 5

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, N. H. Likeableness ratings of 555 personality-trait words. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 272-279.
- Bakan, P. Extraversion-introversion and Improvement in an Auditory Vigilance Task. British Journal of Psychology, 1959, 50, 325-332.
- Bakan, P., Belton, J. A., & Toth, J. C. Extraversion-introversion and Decrement in Auditory Vigilance Task. In D. N. Buckner & J. J. McGrath (Eds), Vigilance: A Symposium, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Beech, H. R., & Adler, F. In H. J. Eysenck, The Biological Basis of Personality, Springfield: Thomas, 1967, 123.
- Claridge, G. S. The Excitation-inhibition Balance in Neurotics. In H. J. Eysenck (Ed), Experiments in Psychology, Vol 2, New York: Praeger, 1960.
- Eysenck, H. J. Dimensions of Personality, New York: Praeger, 1947.
- Eysenck, H. J. The Structure of Human Personality, London: Methuen, 1953.
- Eysenck, H. J. The Biological Basis of Personality, Springfield: Thomas, 1967.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. Manual for the Eysenck Personality Inventory, San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1963.
- Eysenck, H. J. Personality and Verbal Conditioning, Psychological Report, 1959, 5, 570.
- Gale, A. The Psychophysiology of Individual Differences: Studies of Extraversion and the EEG. In P. Kline (Ed), New Approaches to Psychological Measurement, London: Wiley, 1973.

- Harkins, S., Becker, L. A., & Stonner, D. Extraversion-introversion and the Effects of Favorability and Set Size on Impression Formation, Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 1975, 5(4), 300-302.
- Haslam, D. R. In H. J. Eysenck, The Biological Basis of Personality, Springfield: Thomas, 1967, 102, 291.
- Janke, W. In H. J. Eysenck, The Biological Basis of Personality, Springfield: Thomas, 1967, 14.
- Jawanda, J. S. In H. J. Eysenck, The Biological Basis of Personality, Springfield: Thomas, 1967, 123, 309.
- Jensen, A. Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Serial Learning, Acta Psychologica, 1962, 20, 69-77.
- Johns, J. J., & Quay, H. C. The Effect of Social Reward on Verbal Conditioning in Psychopathic and Neurotic Offenders, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 217-220.
- Jung, C. G. Psychological Types, New York: Harcourt, Brace, & Co., Inc., 1924, 542-543 & 567.
- Kendon, R., & Cook, M. The Consistency of Gaze Patterns in Social Interaction, British Journal of Psychology, 1969, 60, 481-494.
- Kleinsmith, L. J., & Kaplan, S. Paired Associate Learning as a Function of Arousal and Interpolated Interval, Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1964, 67, 124-126.
- Kretchmer, E. Physique and Character. New York: Harcourt, 1925.
- Mundy-Castle, A. A. The Electroencephalogram in Relation to Temperament. Acta Psychologica, 1955, 11, 397-411.
- Nichols, K. A., & Champness, B. G. Eye Gaze and the GSR. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1971, 7, 623-626.

Rutter, D. R., Morley, I. E., & Graham, J. C. Visual Interaction in a Group of Introverts and Extraverts, European Journal of Social Psychology, 1972, 2, 371-384.

Schalling, D., & Levander, S. In H. J. Eysenck, The Biological Basis of Personality, Springfield: Thomas, 1967, 114.

Wilde, C. J. S. Inheritance of Personality Traits, Acta Psychologica, 1964, 22, 37-51.