Brit. J. soc. clin. Psychol. (1963), 3, pp. 141–144
Printed in Great Britain

The Personality of Judges as a Factor in the Validity of Their Judgments of Extraversion-Introversion

BY SYBIL B. G. EYSENCK AND HANS J. EYSENCK*
University of London

The questionnaire responses of nominated extraverts and introverts on the extraversion and neuroticism scales of the Eysenck Personality Inventory were studied, in conjunction with the E and N scores of the judges, and their intelligence test scores. High validity of choice was observed, but no relationship found between personality or intelligence of the judges, and the excellence of their judgments.

Personality is most frequently described in terms of behaviour patterns, and these in turn are most frequently indexed in terms of (*a*) self ratings, as on questionnaires, or (*b*) ratings by others. Both methods are open to criticism, but these criticisms are different in character; accordingly agreement between the two methods would argue in favour of the validity of both (Eysenck, 1960). Two recent studies have used the method of nominated groups (Eysenck, 1954) to test the validity of ratings of Extraversion and of Neuroticism, by having judges nominate persons supposedly extremely high or low on either of these dimensions of personality; personality inventories were then administered to these nominees, and their scores on relevant scales compared. S. B. G. Eysenck (1962) and Eysenck and Eysenck (1963*a*) both found evidence of considerable validity in studies using relatively small numbers of judges; they also found some presumptive evidence that some judges were better able than others to nominate persons correctly for the categories in question. The present study presents a repetition of the former experiments, with a much larger sample of judges, and extends the argument by attempting to relate the intelligence and personality of the judges to their success in judging the extraversion or introversion of their nominees. The influence of 'desirability' and 'acquiescence' response sets having been shown in earlier researches to be of relatively little import in relation to the questions used in the EPI (Eysenck, 1962; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1963*b*, 1963*c*) no special measurement was indertaken to assess their influence on our results.

The test of personality used was the Eysenck Personality Inventory (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1963), an improved version of the Maudsley Personality Inventory (Eysenck, 1959). This test has two parallel forms, but we shall here only be concerned with the combined scores from both forms. The measure of intelligence used was a well-standardized British test; this was administered in person to candidates who applied to become members of an organization (Mensa) which made the possession of a high I.Q. the prime requisite of membership. Candidates were first required to complete Form A of the test under unsupervised conditions; only those who succeeded were then admitted to the supervised test (Form B). Testing was carried out by the organization, not by the present writers, but appears to have been done conscientiously and well. From the results, two groups were formed which differed in intelligence, as defined by the test chosen. The intelligent group, with I.Q.s

* We are indebted to the Royal Bethlem and Maudsley Hospital Research Fund for financial support, to 'Mensa' for co-operation in securing subjects, and to Mr A. Hendrickson for preparing the computer programs.

above 148 on this test, will be denoted *M* in this study, and was made up of individuals who passed the test; the less intelligent group, with I.Q.s below 148 on this test, will be denoted *P* in this study, and was made up of individuals who failed the test. (The S.D. of this test being unusually high, the tested I.Q. of 148 corresponds roughly to one of 130 on the Binet or the Wechsler scale.) Names of members of both groups were kindly furnished us by the secretary of 'Mensa'. These two groups constitute the judges; they were circulated with the EPI, and invited to take part in the general scheme of research (which was not at this stage specified). Out of about 1500 *M*-group members, 751 filled in the original questionnaire; out of 317 *P*-group members, 229 did. Details regarding the E and N scores of these subjects are given in Table 1, together with the scores for the EPI standardization group of 1931 (which, of course, did not contain either *M* or *P* members).

Table 1. *E and N scores of* M *and* P *groups, as compared with normal standardization sample*

	E		N		
	M	σ	M	σ	n
M	20·213	7·541	17·177	8·985	751
P	22·699	7·709	18·432	8·840	229
Control group	26·264	7·742	19·557	9·038	1931

It will be seen that apart from being more intelligent than the general population, the *M* group, and to a lesser extent the *P* group, is slightly less neurotic and much less extraverted. The former may be a reflection of the preponderance of middle-class members in both *M* and *P* (S. B. G. Eysenck, 1960; Eysenck, 1964); the latter is possibly a function of the rather cognitively-oriented type of society to which subjects belonged, or aspired to belong. Ninety-two *M* and 27 *P* members were retested about 1 year later in person when they came to the Institute of Psychiatry in order to carry out some personality tests; the retest reliability for E and N was found to be 0·88 and 0·84 for *M* members, and 0·94 and 0·92 for *P* members. The correlation between E and N for the standardization group was −0·04; for the *M* and *P* groups it was −0·24 and −0·15.

M and *P* members were asked to act as 'judges' or selectors, and to choose one extreme extravert and one extreme introvert each from among their acquaintances. They were furnished with descriptions of 'typical' extraverts and introverts, as follows:

'The typical extravert is sociable, likes parties, has many friends, needs to have people to talk to, and does not like reading or studying by himself. He craves excitement, takes chances, often sticks his neck out, acts on the spur of the moment, and is generally an impulsive individual. He is fond of practical jokes, always has a ready answer, and generally likes change; he is care-free, easy-going, optimistic, and likes to "laugh and be merry". He prefers to keep moving and doing things, tends to be aggressive and lose his temper quickly; altogether his feelings are not kept under tight control, and he is not always a reliable person.

'The typical introvert is a quiet, retiring sort of person, introspective, fond of books rather than people; he is reserved and distant except to intimate friends. He tends to plan ahead, "looks before he leaps", and distrusts the impulse of the moment. He does not like excitement, takes matters of everyday life with proper seriousness, and likes a well-ordered mode of life. He keeps his feelings under close control, seldom behaves in an aggressive manner, and does not lose his temper easily. He is reliable, somewhat pessimistic, and places great value on ethical standards.'

From nominations made by *M* and *P* members, 302 and 92 replies respectively were received from nominated extraverts, and 335 and 88 replies respectively from nominated introverts. The mean E and N scores of these groups are shown in Table 2. It will be seen that the nominated extraverts have E scores of 31, while the nominated introverts have E scores of 16, i.e. almost exactly one-half as large. Both differ significantly from the population mean of 26, the introverts more so than the

extraverts. On N the nominated extraverts have lower scores than the nominated introverts, but the difference is slight (18 as against 20). This may be compared with the population mean of 20. It is apparent that, as in the previous studies, judges have no difficulty in identifying individuals who are extreme in extraversion or introversion, and it is also apparent that in doing so they do not fall into the error of confounding introversion and neuroticism to any considerable degree. The more intelligent *M*-group members do not judge extraversion better than the less intelligent *P*-group members. This argues against I.Q. as an important element in judging personality, although at lower levels it may of course exert a stronger influence.

Table 2. *Mean E and N scores of nominated extraverts and introverts*

	E		N			
	M	σ	M	σ		*n*
M	31·106	6·702	17·215	9·129	Extraverts	302
P	31·773	6·758	18·761	9·054	Extraverts	92
M	16·030	6·968	19·812	9·333	Introverts	335
P	15·924	6·064	19·739	10·284	Introverts	88

Among the nominees discussed above, many had no partners; i.e. some judges nominated an extravert who forwarded his questionnaire to us, but either failed to nominate an introvert, or nominated one who failed to forward his questionnaire. Similarly, some introverts had no matching extraverts. In all, there were 225 matched pairs nominated by *M* members, and 75 matched pairs nominated by *P* members. Table 3 gives the correlations between the E and N scores of judges, and the E and N scores of nominees, separated into extraverted and introverted nominees. The argument underlying this calculation was as follows. In the group of extraverted nominees, a high E score constitutes a 'good' choice, while in the group of introverted nominees, a high E score constitutes a 'poor' choice. If extraverted judges are better (or worse) than introverted judges in making good choices, then their E scores should correlate positively (or negatively) with the E scores of their choices. A similar argument applies to the N scores of the nominees, although there of course both a positive or a negative correlation would indicate that judges of the particular type of personality being correlated with N were erroneously choosing too many (or too few) extraverts or introverts because in their minds this dimension was adulterated with N. The figures in Table 3 do not suggest any relationship between judges' personality and accuracy of judgment, being uniformly low. (Levels of significance required for the 5 per cent and 1 per cent level of signi-

Table 3. *Correlations between E and N scores of nominated groups ($E_{nom.}$ and $N_{nom.}$) and E and N scores of judges (E_x and N_x)*

	$E_{nom.}E_x$	$E_{nom.}N_x$	$N_{nom.}E_x$	$N_{nom.}N_x$		*n*
E group	0·104	−0·069	+0·028	−0·023	Mensa	225
	−0·039	−0·128	−0·048	−0·006	*P*	75
I group	0·139	0·056	−0·094	0·044	Mensa	225
	0·105	0·090	−0·146	0·221	*P*	75

ficance for the *M* and *P* groups respectively are 0·13 and 0·18 for *M*, and 0·22 and 0·29 for *P*.)

It will have been noticed that in the *M* and *P* groups, both of which were more introverted than the standardization group, N and E correlated negatively, while in the standardization group the correlation was quite negligible. These figures suggest the possibility that introverted groups in general may be characterized by a negative relationship between E and N, while the opposite may be true of extraverted groups. This hypothesis can, of course, be tested on our nominated E and I groups. The actual correlations for *M*-nominated introverts and *P*-nominated introverts were −0·19 and −0·10; those for the nominated extravert groups were −0·06 and +0·01. The evidence is slight but significantly in favour of the existence of a negative relationship between E and N among introverts; this is in good agreement with the finding of a curvilinear regression line reported in connection with the MPI (Eysenck, 1959).

REFERENCES

EYSENCK, H. J. (1954). *The Psychology of Politics*. New York: Harper.

EYSENCK, H. J. (1959). *The Maudsley Personality Inventory*. London: University Press. San Diego: Educ. & Indust. test. serv., 1962.

EYSENCK, H. J. (1960). *The Structure of Human Personality*. New York: Macmillan.

EYSENCK, H. J. (1962). Response set, authoritarianism and personality questionnaires. *Brit. J. soc. clin. Psychol.* **1**, 20–24.

EYSENCK, H. J. (1964). Smoking, personality and psychosomatic disorders. *J. psychosom. Res.* to appear.

EYSENCK, H. J. & EYSENCK, S. B. G. (1963). *The Eysenck Personality Inventory*. San Diego: Educ. & Indust. test. serv. Also: London, University of London Press.

EYSENCK, S. B. G. (1960). Social class, sex and response to a five part personality inventory. *Educ. psychol. Meas.* **20**, 47–54.

EYSENCK, S. B. G. (1962). The validity of a personality questionnaire as determined by the method of nominated groups. *Life Sciences*, **1**, 13–18.

EYSENCK, S. B. G. & EYSENCK, H. J. (1963*a*). The validity of questionnaire and rating assessments of extraversion and neuroticism, and their factorial stability. *Brit. J. Psychol.* **54**, 51–62.

EYSENCK, S. B. G. & EYSENCK, H. J. (1963*b*). Acquiescence response set in personality questionnaires. *Life Sciences*, **2**, 144–147.

EYSENCK, S. B. G. & EYSENCK, H. J. (1963*c*). An experimental investigation of 'desirability' response set in a personality questionnaire. *Life Sciences*, **2**, 343–355.

Manuscript received 24 June 1963