(Self-)Argumentation in favour or against extraversion: Does it change the trait and the attitudes toward it?
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What questionnaire-takers think about personality beyond our items?
Meta-personality

- Peoples’ beliefs about personality
  - Meta-perception
    - Meta-insight (Carlson, Vazire, & Furr, 2011)
    - Metaperceptual traits
    - Meta-attitudes toward traits (Shchebetenko, 2016)
- Controllability of traits
- Inheritance of traits
- Attitudes toward traits
Attitudes toward traits
They matter

• Introversion -> +A t introversion -> impersonal avatars at one’s OSN profile
  • Shchebetenko, 2016

• Extraversion -> +A t extraversion -> Sociometric status
  • Balabina, 2015

• Gender -> A t traits -> Traits (except Neuroticism)
  • Mishkevich & Shchebetenko, 2018; Shchebetenko, 2017
Attitudes toward traits: What is it, after all?

Well, What Is It?
Are they as stable (in time) as traits?

Or as malleable as social attitudes?
The aims

• To study how...
• 1. stable/changeable (*in a short-run*) the attitudes towards traits are;
• 2. malleable the attitudes are under an argumentation pro/contra that trait
Extraversion was a focus. Why?

• It is a core personality trait
  • Eysenck (1973), Soto & John (2017), Zuckerman & Cloninger (1996),

• It is a socially (quite) neutral trait
  • Ones, Viswesvaran, Reise (1996)
Study One

Does argumentation affect Extraversion and the attitude toward it?
Prof. Manu Keirse (Heel erg Bedankt!)
Participants

• 363 students aged from 17 to 24 (M = 19.10; SD=1.05)
  • 112 men (30.9%)
  • “Introversion is great”
    • 172 students (47.4%)
      • 55 men (32%)
  • “Extraversion is great”
    • 191 students (52.6%)
      • 57 men (29.8%)
Measures

• Traits:
  • Russian version (Shchebetenko, 2014) of the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John et al., 1991, 2008)

• Attitudes toward Traits
  • Attitude version (Shchebetenko, 2016) of BFI
How to measure the attitudes?

- by an attitude scale
- 1 ("very bad trait") – 5 ("very good trait")
Repeated measures

**Time 1**
- Traits (BFI)
- Attitudes t traits

**Manipulation & then Time 2**
- Watching a lecture
- Traits (BFI)
- Attitudes t traits

**Time 3**
- Traits (BFI)
- Attitudes t traits

N = 363

1st day

6 weeks

12 weeks

“Extraversion’s great” (n=191)

“Introversion’s great” (n=172)
Results
Extraversion increased from T1 to T3 (to an extent)

Slight main effect of T (F=2.99, p=.056) with no interaction, F=0.30.

*Greenhouse-Geisser correction for non-sphericity
...having no interaction with the arguments

Slight main effect of T (F=2.99, p=.056) with no interaction, F=0.30.
Attitude toward E: Neither main effect of T, $F=2.22$, nor interaction with arguments, $F=1.21$
... though a pre-post ("Introversion-likers") from T1 to T3 significant (weak), \( t=2.10, p=.037, d=0.16 \)
Study One: Main effects from T1 to T3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>F; p</th>
<th>What happened (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>2.99; 0.056</td>
<td>Increased from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>1.76; 0.175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.27; 0.756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neuroticism</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.51; 0.002</strong></td>
<td>Decreased from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.16; 0.834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes toward</th>
<th>F; p</th>
<th>What happened (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>2.22; 0.110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreeableness</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.35; 0.002</strong></td>
<td>Turned negative from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>20.87; 0.000</td>
<td>Turned negative from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>4.73; 0.010</td>
<td>Turned positive from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>5.56; 0.004</td>
<td>Turned negative from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study Two

Self-Argumentation
Participants

• 320 students aged from 16 to 24 (M = 19.08; SD=1.03)
  • 75 men (23.4%)

• Subsamples
  • “Introversion is great”
    • 106 students (33.1%)
      • 24 men (22.2%)
  • “Extraversion is great”
    • 108 students (33.8%)
      • 21 men (19.8%)
  • “Intelligence is g-factor”
    • 106 students (33.1%)
      • 30 men (28.3%)
Extraversion tended to increase (again), $F=2.38, p=.098...$
...with no interaction, $F=0.22$. 
Attitude toward extraversion turned negative from T1 to T3, $F=7.58, p<.001$...
Argumentation\*Time interaction approached significance, $F=2.30$, $p=.058$
For “i-likers”, the attitude became (really) more negative from T1 to T2, $t=4.71$, $d=0.32$. 
...though somewhat bounced back from T2 to T3, $t=1.23, d=0.12$. 
For “e-likers”, the attitude “got frozen” from T1 to T2...
...and then “thawed” (turned negative) from T2 to T3, $t=1.84$, $p=.069$, $d=0.19$
For “g-supporters”, the attitude constantly turned negative from T1 to T3, $t=1.57, p=.119, d=0.15$
# Traits: An overview across both studies

## Study 1 (N = 363)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>F; p</th>
<th>What happened (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>2.99; .056</td>
<td>Increased from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>1.76; .175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.27; .756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neuroticism</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.51; .002</strong></td>
<td>Decreased from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.16; .834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Study 2 (N = 320)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>F; p</th>
<th>What happened (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>2.38; .098</td>
<td>Increased from T1 to T3 (except for “i-likers”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>1.83; .164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.52; .577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neuroticism</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.53; .032</strong></td>
<td>Decreased from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td><strong>12.93; .000</strong></td>
<td>Decreased from T1 to T2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Openness decreased from T1 and T2 and then stabilized, $F = 12.93$
Attitudes: An overview across both studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes toward</th>
<th>$F; p$</th>
<th>What happened (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>2.22; .110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>6.35; .002</td>
<td>Turned negative from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>20.87; .000</td>
<td>Turned negative from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>4.73; .010</td>
<td>Turned positive from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>5.56; .004</td>
<td>Turned negative from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study 2 ($N = 320$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes toward</th>
<th>$F; p$</th>
<th>What happened (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>7.58; .001</td>
<td>Turned negative from T1 to T3 (except for “i-likers”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>8.89; .000</td>
<td>Turned negative from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>24.55; .000</td>
<td>Turned negative from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>12.82; .000</td>
<td>Turned positive from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>39.43; .000</td>
<td>Turned negative from T1 to T3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

1. The Big Five traits don’t change in a short run
   - minus neuroticism which may decrease as a self-report
   - and a trait strongly affected by an accident
     - like an intellectually challenging task for Openness

2. Attitudes toward traits may be a less stable mean-level construct
   - as compared to the traits
Summary

3. The attitudes turned more socially negative
   - Probably, individuals got more sincere

4. Argumentation pro and contra a extraversion had a limited impact on respective attitude and on the trait itself
   - Self-argumentation had a more profound effect than an external (more passive, lecture-like) argumentation