

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AMBIVERSION AND COMMUNICATION
ADAPTABILITY

Kaitlyn Marie Shannon

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Master of Arts
in the Department of Communication Studies,
Indiana University

May 2022

Accepted by the Graduate Faculty of Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Master's Thesis Committee

Maria Brann, PhD, MPH, Chair

Elizabeth Goering, PhD

Ronald Sandwina, PhD

© 2022

Kaitlyn Marie Shannon

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to everyone who so willingly listened to and shared information about this study. I am so thankful for you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My deepest gratitude to my committee chair and advisor, Dr. Brann. Thank you for your patience, attention to detail, and for being a constant source of inspiration. Thank you to my other two committee members, Dr. Goering and Dr. Sandwina, for listening to my questions and offering helpful ideas and solutions.

Thank you to all of the supportive professors in the Communication Department at IUPUI who have constantly supported me up to this point. You inspired me to continue my studies and move forward. Special thanks to Trevor Potts and Mike Polites for never ceasing to be strong sources of encouragement.

Thank you to my fellow students in the IUPUI Applied Communication graduate program, especially those who were guinea pigs with me in the BA/MA program as well as Janice, Jake, Persis, Emilie, Maggie, Bridgette, and Chloe. Thank you for being amazing sounding boards and the cohort I have always wanted.

Finally, thank you to my family and dear friends for supporting me through this journey in innumerable ways. Special thanks to Mom, Dad, Nate, Cam, Devin, Naomi, and Alex. God bless you all.

Kaitlyn Marie Shannon

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AMBIVERSION AND COMMUNICATION
ADAPTABILITY

Communication is a skill humans are constantly utilizing, and their personality can have a strong effect on the way they utilize their communication skills. Understanding the adaptability of our ever-present communication and the influence personality type can have provides vital knowledge to all communicating individuals. This study focused on the potential connection between communication adaptability and the personality types of introversion, ambiversion, and extraversion. Many studies have explored communication adaptability and personality type independently; however, the relationship between the two has had very little study. The connection between the variables of communication adaptability and personality type was determined via a cross-sectional survey utilizing the Introversion Scale (McCroskey, 2007) and the Communication Adaptability Scale (Duran, 1983). The relationship between introversion, ambiversion, and extraversion was analyzed using Pearson's bivariate correlation and ANOVA, which indicated that extraverted participants tended to have statistically significant higher levels of communication adaptability. There was also a moderate correlation between ambiversion and social composure, a low correlation with social confirmation, and a high positive correlation to social experience. Introversion had a moderate positive correlation with social composure and social experience. Finally, there were moderate positive correlations between extraversion and social composure as well as social experience. These results indicate that the more extraverted one is, the more likely they will be to have higher communication adaptability. Thus, there are communication adaptability

strengths for all three personality types, but extraverts have the highest tendency to have high scores of communication adaptability. Individuals should consider determining what their personality type is to allow them to take advantage of their areas of strength and ascertain weaknesses they could potentially work on when it comes to their communication adaptability.

Keywords: Communication adaptability, personality, ambiverts

Maria Brann, PhD, MPH, Chair

Elizabeth Goering, PhD

Ronald Sandwina, PhD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	ix
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	3
Communication Adaptability	3
Personality Typing	5
Introversion and Extraversion.....	7
Ambiversion.....	9
Rationale for Study	11
Chapter 3: Methodology	15
Participants.....	15
Measurement of Personality	18
Measurement of Communication Adaptability.....	18
Data Analysis	19
Chapter 4: Results	20
Ambiversion and Communication Adaptability	20
Personality Types and the Dimensions of Communication Adaptability.....	20
Chapter 5: Discussion	23
Implications.....	23
Limitations	28
Directions for Future Research	29
Conclusion	31
Appendices.....	32
Appendix A: Demographic Questions	32
Appendix B: Introversion Scale.....	33
Appendix C: Communication Adaptability Scale.....	36
References.....	39
Curriculum Vitae	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Study Sample	16
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Ambiversion	21
Table 3: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Introversion.....	21
Table 4: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Extraversion.....	22

Chapter 1: Introduction

Understanding oneself and one's communication proficiency is not only commonly explored in popular press (Davidson, 2017) and scholarly research (Patel, 2014), but it is also important to give individuals a general understanding about their preferences and proficiencies. Personality typing has been explored for millennia, allowing individuals a better understanding of their strengths and weaknesses working with others and their perceptions of the world. Additionally, communication and specific areas related to communication adaptability have a long history of study. With the availability of various communication methods and the need to alter communication behaviors due to the ever-changing influence of the COVID-19 pandemic on society, for example, being able to adapt one's communication style is highly beneficial.

Introversion and extraversion, and the under-researched personality type of ambiversion, are important personality types that individuals use to define themselves and their interactions. Individuals often categorize themselves as introverts or extraverts through a variety of personality tests or hearsay about what it means to be a certain personality type (e.g., talkative, reserved). These personality types (as well as ambiversion), along with the six key dimensions of communication adaptability (i.e., social experience, social composure, social confirmation, appropriate disclosure, articulation, and wit) are measurable, and their intersection may be quite valuable for understanding modern communication interactions.

Ultimately, the goal for this study was to gain information for individuals about the relationship between their personality type and communication adaptability, which could improve their understanding of themselves and enhance their communication.

Beyond answering a call for more research into the dimensions of communication adaptability (Gareis et al., 2011), a specific purpose of this study was to explore the nature of the relationship between the under-researched personality type of ambiversion and communication adaptability. Additionally, this fills a large research gap connecting a specific aspect of personality (i.e., ambiversion) and communication research. After a brief review of the literature surrounding communication adaptability and personality typing, the cross-sectional survey methodology is presented. Then data is analyzed via Pearson's bivariate correlations and an ANOVA. Research questions are then answered and findings are presented. Finally, the discussion presents a summary of the results as well as implications of this research, limitations, and directions for future research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Understanding the background of communication adaptability and personality typing lends to a better understanding of the importance between the connection of these topics. This literature review provides an overview of communication adaptability, background information on personality typing, explanations of introversion and extraversion, and a description of a third important, but rarely spoken of, personality type – ambiversion.

Communication Adaptability

Communication adaptability originated from communication competence, which is most aptly defined for the sake of this research as “the ability to display appropriate communication behaviors in given situations” (Jabin & Putnam, 2001, p. 3). As communication adaptability addresses specifically the social contexts of communication competence, it is a measure of social communicative competence (Duran, 1983).

Communication adaptability is derived from aspects of speech accommodation theory (Giles et al., 1987), more specifically communication accommodation theory (Gallois et al., 1995), and communication apprehension theory (McCroskey, 1970). Communication adaptability is defined as “the ability to perceive socio-interpersonal relationships and adapt one’s interaction goals and behaviors accordingly” (Duran, 1983, p. 320). In other words, communication adaptability is when an individual utilizes their communication competence to adapt to various communication contexts.

Communication adaptability focuses on six key dimensions: social experience, social composure, social confirmation, appropriate disclosure, articulation, and wit (Duran, 1992). Social experience is an individual’s social communication repertoire

based on their experience in different contexts and with different individuals. Social composure is how cool and collected an individual is in social situations and how present they are in the communication interaction (e.g., they could be experiencing anxiety in a social situation, keeping them from being fully present and collected in an interaction). Social confirmation is the process of recognizing and confirming the projected social image of the person with whom one is speaking. Appropriate disclosure is the sensitivity one has to the cues of others and to what degree they should disclose information. Articulation is the degree to which an individual can express their ideas appropriately and their satisfaction with their grammatical and verbal speaking ability. Finally, wit is the degree to which an individual uses humor to dissolve social tension and primarily to handle communication encounters that contain anxiety or awkwardness.

Communication adaptability has been used in various studies to measure how communicators adapt within different variables such as culture and setting. Chen's (1992) study discovered that those who had strong communication adaptability skills are better adjusted to a new environment, specifically during cross-cultural adjustment. It was similarly discovered by Long and Anarbaeva (2008) that the higher the communication adaptability, the lower the intercultural communication apprehension among undergraduate students. Additional research has also determined that communication adaptability allows for better and potentially longer-lasting relationships (Gareis et al., 2011; Lo, 2014). Furthermore, studies examining biological features of nervous systems and heritability demonstrate that sensitivity to an environment can limit communication adaptability (Glonek et al., 2007) and potentially be a heritable trait in areas related to

social composure (Beatty et al., 2001), with higher emotional intelligence scores having a positive relationship to communication adaptability (Hendon et al., 2017).

The bulk of research assessing communication adaptability was undertaken 10-20 years ago, with research from the last decade focusing on a wide variety of areas. For example, more recently, Barr (2017) studied the effect of video games on learners and found that those who participated in playing videos games for a set amount of time had higher scores of communication adaptability and resourcefulness than the control group. Additionally, both Hwang (2011) and Lai and Hwang (2014) found that efficiency on mobile devices utilizing media extends to better online and face-to-face communication competence. With this wide range of foci, communication adaptability has been shown to be applied to a wide range of contexts. However, there are more areas to be explored, one of which is the relationship between communication adaptability and personality.

Personality Typing

Personality has been analyzed for millennia. However, personality traits are a concept that has been debated across disciplines, including within the field of communication. Some communication scholars view personality as something that is primarily influenced by surroundings and is not biological or trait-based but rather more of a preference or general temperament (Cole, 2000; Daly & Diesel, 1992; Hazel et al., 2014; Motley & Smith, 1989). However, many communication scholars agree that, to some extent, personality is a trait humans possess and carries a degree of biological basis or heritability (Amsalem et al., 2020; Beatty et al., 1998; Charalampous & Kokkinos, 2014; Heisel et al., 1999; Horvath, 1995; Katt & Collins, 2013; Song & Boomgaarden, 2019). Regardless of whether personality is a temperament or a trait, it is clearly shown

through many studies that personality has an influence on communication (Beatty et al., 1998; Daly & Diesel, 1992; Hullman et al., 2010; Katt & Collins, 2013; Song & Boomgaarden, 2019). Additionally, an aspect of personality—extraversion—has been studied in a variety of ways and often shows a strong connection to communication (Cole, 2000; Charalampous & Kokkinos, 2014; Hazel et al.; Hullman, et al., 2010; Song & Boomgaarden, 2019).

A specific method of determining personality is called The Big Five factor model and consists of the aspects of I: Extraversion/introversion, II: Friendliness/hostility (agreeableness), III: Conscientiousness (will), IV: Neuroticism/emotional stability, and V: Intellect (openness) (Digman, 1990). In fact, personality types part of the Big Five help define the premise of personality traits (Mondak, 2010) to create a more understandable taxonomy related to personality (John et al., 2008). The aspects of the Big Five are also found across most cultures (McCrae & Costa, 1997), and the Big Five has been utilized as the basis for many communication research studies (e.g., Amsalem et al., 2020; Cole, 2000; Hazel et al., 2014; Hullman et al., 2010; Katt & Collins, 2013; Song & Boomgaarden, 2019). As the Big Five is commonly used in communication studies focusing on personality as a trait, a trait-focus will be taken in this study with a focus on the first factor of the Big Five.

The first factor of the Big Five, extraversion/introversion, is a commonly found personality trait connected to communication and is therefore of the focus of this research project. The concepts of introversion and extraversion are not novel. In fact, traces of this concept have been around since 150 AD with Galen's theory of the 4 temperaments (i.e., sanguine [being optimistic and social], choleric [being short-tempered and irritable],

melancholic [being analytical and quiet], and phlegmatic [being relaxed and peaceful]) (Dammayer & Zettler, 2018). Since that time, many physicians, psychologists, and social scientists have elaborated on this topic, narrowing down Galen's temperaments to the specifically defined personality traits of introversion and extraversion (Eysenck, 1963). Carl Jung, renowned for his study on personality, described the two types as "so essentially different, presenting so striking a contrast, that their existence, even to the uninitiated in psychological matters becomes an obvious fact, when once attention has been drawn to it" (Jung, 1921, p. 2). He also thoroughly defines introversion and extraversion in his book *Psychological Types*, explaining how the libido of each type functions differently towards the "object." In other words, introversion and extraversion are defining terms of whether a person is inwardly or outwardly oriented. Since then, Eysenck (1963) is best known for his work on personality theory and discovering its relation to biology, which is used in many tests to determine the personality type or level of introversion or extraversion. As such, this study will be focused on personality as a trait that affects individuals' communication, specifically measured in areas of extraversion.

Introversion and Extraversion

Introversion and extraversion are the opposite ends of the spectrum of the first factor of personality (Digman, 1990). As described by Myers and Myers (1993),

The introvert's main interests are in the inner world of concepts and ideas, while the extravert is more involved with the outer world of people and things. Therefore, when circumstances permit, the introvert concentrates perception and judgment upon ideas, while the extravert likes to focus them on the outside environment. (p. 7)

In other words, as the names imply, introverts are "intro," internally focused, and extraverts are "extra," externally focused. Additionally, a study on introvert and extravert

leaders found that extraverts tend to process information externally and with an audience to rationalize their thoughts whereas introverts process internally and need no audience (Hudson & Ferguson, 2016). Other studies have also found that extraverts are much more interpretive and abstract when they speak and describe phenomena, whereas introverts are much more concrete, and their words are more planned. This is likely due to extraverts tending toward faster and less accurate performances whereas introverts often take more time and are more accurate and careful in their performances (Beukeboom et al., 2013). Similarly, when introverts and extraverts speak to each other, extraverts are more upbeat and focused on finding common ground with the other, while introverts are more serious and focused on problem-solving (Thorne, 1987).

A study by Bajwa et al. (2017) noted that “despite their tendency of being easy going and sociable, extravert’s assertiveness and overwhelming tendency of sharing their own views and thoughts could serve as an obstruction in being sensitive to others” (p. 155). This demonstrates that despite extraverts’ good wishes and the general assumption that extraversion is the preferred communication type, extraverts may take sociability too far and some negative consequences may exist. For example, another study explained that extraverts like to be in the thick of the action and are fun-loving but also may not be good listeners as they tend to dominate the conversation (Patel, 2014). Cuperman and Ickes (2009) also found that as extraverts increase extraversion in interactions, becoming the passive observer may become a less pleasant experience for the person with whom the extravert is speaking. Both introverts and extraverts have a relatively high level of cognitive and social adaptability, but because introverts spend more time examining and

focusing on the inner world, they may have more knowledge, increasing their adaptability (Bajwa et al., 2017).

Because of the seriousness and focus of the introvert's word choices, they are also found to be more trustworthy in their linguistic style (Thorne, 1987). However, introverts are also much more likely to have higher communication apprehension due to their dislike of outward focus (Opt & Loffredo, 2000), and they are more serious, quiet people (Patel, 2014). One study discussed that extraverts do not necessarily speak more than introverts do, rather they do it in a more confident and less self-conscious manner (Cuperman & Ickes, 2009), thus, making their chance to experience communication apprehension less likely than introverts. Extraverts, in comparison to introverts, spend more time in conversations and less time alone (Mehl et al., 2006).

Despite the focus on introversion and extraversion in research, Hudson and Ferguson (2016) explained that the personality types of introversion and extraversion are not all-encompassing. Much of the literature on introversion and extraversion subtly describes introverts as less competent, but Hudson and Ferguson explained that description could be insulting to introverts who consider themselves to possess the friendly, talkative aspects of defined extraversion. These authors also noted that these “definitions also completely ignore the presence of a third personality type, that of the ambivert, a person with a balance of extrovert (sic) and introvert features” (p. 999).

Ambiversion

Ambiverts are defined in Patel's (2014) study as individuals who are in between introverts and extraverts and can “move easily from working with others to working alone, have moderate threshold for sensory stimulation and may tire of it after a while”

(p. 22). Ambiversion has been shown to exist as well through electroencephalography (EEG) reflections of elements that fit neither solely introversion nor extraversion, showing that it is an independent personality characteristic (Georgiev et al., 2014).

The concept of ambiversion was first coined by Edward Conklin in the 1920s, and Young (1927) explains that:

We might say for convenience that the introvert lives on the inside of his head, the extrovert (sic) on the outside. As Conklin shows, however, no doubt the bulk of people fall in between these extremes. To describe this middle range of life interests, he has invented the word “ambivert.” (p. 383)

Conklin faced significant backlash from the psychological community when he first introduced ambiversion, but, over time, it has become accepted as an aspect of the introversion-extraversion continuum, though still rarely researched (Davidson, 2017). This concept is far more popular and accepted in popular press as opposed to scholarly articles, being a featured concept in more blogs, quizzes, YouTube videos, and articles than in journal articles, suggesting its importance to society even with the lack of research. However, some scholarly articles have acknowledged and researched the ambivert. Petric (2019) explains that ambiverts are often considered antisocial extraverts, outgoing introverts, or social introverts, and defines an ambivert as “someone who exhibits qualities of both introversion and extraversion and can flip into either depending on their mood, context and goals” (p. 1). Howard and Howard (1995) similarly state that the ambiverts are unique in that they can “move comfortably from outgoing social situations to the isolation of working alone” (p. 5), unlike introverts or extraverts. Petric (2019), as does Young (1927) when citing Conklin’s work, points out that it is very unlikely for all individuals to be solely introverts or extraverts. It can also lead to frustration when individuals feel like they are misunderstood or put in a box where they

do not belong in relation to being either all of the traits of an introvert or all of the traits of an extravert.

Ambiversion offers an alternative to introversion and extraversion (Howard & Howard, 1995). Because of this tendency towards introvert and extravert traits, Petric (2019) explains that ambiverts likely have more communication adaptability due to their ability to oscillate between those types. Stough and Brebner (1996) found that ambiverts have been shown to have higher intelligence and central nervous system arousal at rest than introverts and extroverts, having a significant intelligence quotient (IQ) advantage. However, the reason for this finding is still largely unresearched. Still, if accurate, this likely leads ambiverts to be more knowledgeable about how to communicate in various situations; hence, their communication adaptability is likely positively affected.

Previous research has shown that ambiverts' adaptability extends to areas where introverts and extraverts were formerly thought to be the most likely to excel. For example, in a study of sales, Grant (2013) found that ambiverts were at the top in terms of sales productivity. He explained why by stating,

Because they naturally engage in a flexible pattern of talking and listening, ambiverts are likely to express sufficient assertiveness and enthusiasm to persuade and close a sale but are more inclined to listen to customers' interests and less vulnerable to appearing too excited or overconfident. (p. 1)

This speaks to the adaptability of ambiversion, and Grant (2013) recommends that future research include more testing to affirm this kind of adaptability.

Rationale for Study

It could be argued that communication adaptability is increasingly more important in the 2020s than at other points in history. With the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, for example, there is an increased need for flexible and effective

communication by all. However, the bulk of communication adaptability research is dated, calling for more research in this area. Communication adaptability has been shown to allow for better coping with social difficulties (Chen, 1992), and interpersonally, communication adaptability affects relationships and makes them last longer (Gareis et al., 2011; Lo, 2014). It also aids in intercultural relationships as well as intercultural adjustment to new surroundings, which is important for our increasingly global community (Chen, 1992; Long & Anarbaeva, 2008).

In addition to general research on communication adaptability, it is important to focus on areas such as individual characteristics of personality types, or personality traits. The study of personality types has a long history and is frequently found in both academic work and popular press. The Big Five personality types are prevalent in research today in many fields, but the connection to communication adaptability is slim. Introversion and extraversion, a factor of the Big Five, have been researched somewhat extensively. However, although these personality types have been around for a significant amount of time as the prime options of an individual's determined personality type, they do not always hold true as the only two options. Another valid personality trait, ambiversion, is an additional option for defining personality and needs significantly more research, especially in its relation to communication adaptability. This connection could aid in understanding communication adaptability and personalities from a new perspective, aiding those who are neither introverts nor extraverts to be aware of their communication ability. This will also expand communication research in the area of personality and individual influences on communication, an area that, while researched, is minimal in scope.

Some research (e.g., Bajwa et al., 2017; Grant, 2013) has shown a connection between introversion and extraversion and communication adaptability; however, the connection with ambiversion is unknown. It is possible there is no connection and the extent to which personality is connected to communication adaptability begins and ends with extraversion, but without research, this premise remains unanswered and could leave researchers and the populous at large unaware of the effect of the ambivert personality type. Therefore, to explore this under-researched personality type, and gain more knowledge of communication adaptability, the following research question was posed:

RQ 1: Is there a relationship between ambiversion and communication adaptability?

Additionally, Gareis et al. (2011) called for more research on the dimensions of communication adaptability, which could be extended to this study and its relation to communication and personality type. Several studies (Beatty et al., 2001; Lo, 2014; Merkin & Ramadan, 2016) have focused on the different dimensions of communication adaptability, finding some had valuable connections with aspects of their study (e.g., heritability, interpersonal communication media preferences, intercultural communication). As such, the six dimensions of communication adaptability may also have a connection to personality types, moving us forward in this under-researched area. It could also be beneficial to understand what areas are stronger for those with different personality types so they could work to improve their communication while living in an era where adaptable communication is of utmost importance. Therefore, this study was also guided by the following research question:

RQ 2: What is the relationship between the personality types of introversion, ambiversion, and extraversion and each of the six dimensions of communication adaptability?

Chapter 3: Methodology

A cross-sectional survey of adults was used to assess relationships between personality types (i.e., introversion, ambiversion, and extraversion; McCroskey, 2007) and communication adaptability (Duran, 1983). Adults were asked demographic questions in a survey (see Appendix A) in addition to completing the scale items of the concepts under investigation.

Participants

In line with previous research related to personality typing and communication adaptability, adults were solicited for participation. Participants were recruited on social media platforms (e.g., Instagram, Facebook, Twitter, Nextdoor), academic listservs (e.g., university and departmental listservs, National Communication Association's COMMnotes), and r/SampleSize (i.e., a sub-reddit thread utilized for survey research). Based on previous research (e.g., Shatz, 2017; Wei, 2020), the sub-reddit platform, in particular, is ideal for obtaining quality data, and participants are generally adults residing in the United States. Additionally, because users already utilize the internet, the likelihood of technological knowledge needed to complete an online survey increases in this population, making it an ideal sample group for this study.

To begin, 504 individuals, 18 years and older, started the survey, which was available for two weeks via an online Qualtrics survey. However, 54 surveys were incomplete in one or both scales, making them invalid for score comparison. These incomplete surveys were deleted, resulting in a sample of 450 completed surveys.

Participating adults ranged in age from 18 to more than 75 years, and most identified as female ($n = 327$). An overwhelming majority of the participants ($n = 396$)

identified as being from the United States of America, so most ($n = 414$) hailed from individualist cultures. The majority of participants scored as ambiverts ($n = 383$) even though most participants self-identified as introverts ($n = 224$). See Table 1 for demographic frequencies.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Study Sample

Demographic Characteristics	Number	(%)
Gender		
Male	113	25.1
Female	327	72.7
Nonbinary	5	1.1
Prefer Not to Say	5	1.1
Age (years)		
18-24	118	26.2
25-34	71	15.8
35-44	51	11.3
45-54	67	14.9
55-64	66	14.7
65-74	60	13.3
75+	14	3.1
Not disclosed	3	0.7
Country		
Algeria	1	0.2
Australia	1	0.2
Bulgaria	1	0.2
Canada	7	1.6
China	5	1.1
Columbia	1	0.2
Denmark	1	0.2
Ecuador	1	0.2
France	1	0.2
Germany	3	0.7
Ghana	1	0.2
Greece	1	0.2
Guatemala	1	0.2
Honduras	1	0.2
Hungary	1	0.2
India	1	0.2
Indonesia	1	0.2
Ireland	1	0.2

Demographic Characteristics	Number	(%)
Kuwait	1	0.2
Mexico	3	0.7
Myanmar	1	0.2
Pakistan	1	0.2
South Africa	1	0.2
Turkmenistan	2	0.4
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	2	0.4
United States of America	396	88
Vietnam	1	0.2
Not Disclosed ^a	12	2.7
Cultural Orientation		
Individualist	414	92
Collectivist	21	4.7
Undetermined	3	0.7
Not Disclosed ^b	12	2.6
Preconceived Personality		
Introvert	224	49.8
Extrovert	153	34
Neither (Ambivert)	71	15.8
Not Familiar with the Terms	2	0.4
Measured Personality Type		
Ambivert	383	85.1
Extrovert	26	5.8
Introvert	41	9.1

^a Due to rounding, country percentages do not add up to 100%. ^b Using Hofstede Insights (2022), individualistic and collectivistic cultures were determined.

Of those who scored as ambiverts, 48.3% ($n = 185$) self-identified as introverts, 33.2% ($n = 127$) as extraverts, 18% ($n = 69$) as neither introverts nor extraverts (therefore, ambiverts), and 0.5% ($n = 2$) were not familiar with the terms. Of those who scored as extroverts, 92.3% ($n = 24$) thought they were extraverts, and 7.7% ($n = 2$) thought they were neither introverts or extraverts. None of the extraverted scoring participants thought they were introverts or were unfamiliar with the terms. Of those who scored as introverts, 94.9% ($n = 37$) thought they were introverts, and 5.1% ($n = 2$) thought they were extraverts. None of the introverted scoring participants thought they were neither introverts or extraverts or were unfamiliar with the terms.

Measurement of Personality

To measure whether participants are introverts, ambiverts, or extraverts, they completed McCroskey's (2007) Introversion Scale (see Appendix B). This scale was created based on Eysenck's (1963) research and measures items to assess introversion and extraversion. This scale has 18 items, 12 of which measure introversion and 6 of which measure neuroticism to distract participants from the desired variable. Questions were modified from yes-no questions to statements to allow for Likert scale response items. Participants self-reported their responses on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. Scores ranged from 12-60. Participants who scored 49 or more were highly extraverted, those who scored between 24 and 48 were ambiverted, and those who scored 23 or below were highly introverted (McCroskey, 2007).¹ The first report of the scale found reliability alphas of .80-.90 (McCroskey, 1997), and more recent studies have reported similar scale reliabilities (Ahmad et al., 2019; Crist, 2017; Girelli, 2019; Kumar, 2016). This study reported a reliability alpha of .70.

Measurement of Communication Adaptability

To measure communication adaptability, participants completed the 30-item self-report Communicative Adaptability Scale (Duran, 1983; see Appendix C). Duran's scale is organized by adaptability dimension, so the scale was randomized for survey use. Scales were slightly modified for clarity. For example, "I try to make the other person feel important" was changed to "When communicating, I try to make the other person feel important". Participants responded on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = never true of

¹ Upon cleaning the data, it was discovered that McCroskey's (1997) original categorization of personality for the Likert scale version of the scale was incorrect, with the categorization of introversion/extraversion needing to be reversed for accuracy. Future researchers are advised to keep this in mind if using a Likert version of this scale.

me and 5 = always true of me. Lower scores indicate lower adaptability, and higher scores indicate higher adaptability (Crowley & High, 2020; Long & Anarbaeva, 2008). Duran (1992) studied 10 samples of more than 4,000 individuals to gain reliability for the 6 categories this scale measures, which are social composure ($\alpha = .82$), social experience ($\alpha = .80$), social confirmation ($\alpha = .84$), appropriate disclosure ($\alpha = .76$), articulation ($\alpha = .80$), and wit ($\alpha = .74$). The linear composite reliability of the six dimensions was found to be $\alpha = .79$ by Duran (1992), and even higher in more recent studies, $\alpha = .85$ (Merkin & Ramadan, 2016) and $\alpha = .89$ (Crowley & High, 2020). For this study, linear composite reliability of the six dimensions was found to be $\alpha = .81$, and the six dimensions' reliabilities were social composure ($\alpha = 0.70$), social experience ($\alpha = 0.87$), social confirmation ($\alpha = 0.84$), appropriate disclosure ($\alpha = 0.70$), articulation ($\alpha = 0.39$, which, given its lack of reliability, was not included when analyzing individual subscales), and wit ($\alpha = 0.81$).

Data Analysis

A Pearson's bivariate correlation was run using SPSS 28 between participants' level of introversion and their communication adaptability composite score as well as the individual dimension scores of communication adaptability. Correlation effect size was interpreted using Guilford's (1956) guidance where "< .20 slight, almost negligible relationship; .20 - .40 low correlation, definite, but small relationship; .40 - .70 moderate correlation, substantial relationship; .70 - .90 high correlation, marked relationship; > .90 very high correlation, very dependable relationship" (Guilford, 1956, p. 145). An ANOVA was also run to determine the distinction between the means of variables.

Chapter 4: Results

This chapter presents the results of the data analysis. The results of the research questions are presented through Pearson's bivariate correlations and an ANOVA. This data analysis serves to answer the two research questions posed.

Ambiversion and Communication Adaptability

In answering the first research question regarding the relationship between ambiversion and communication adaptability, a moderate positive correlation was found ($r(448) = .627, p < .001$), indicating a substantial relationship between ambiversion and communication adaptability. The more extraverted participants are, the more they tend to have higher levels of communication adaptability. To further explore the relationship, Tukey's HSD was used to determine the nature of the differences between personalities. A significant difference was found among the personality types ($F(2, 447) = 66.48, p < .001$) with those who were introverts scoring lower in adaptability ($M = 93.15, SD = 11.53$) while ambiverts scored a bit higher than introverts ($M = 107.22, SD = 10.44$) and extraverts scored the best overall ($M = 122.77, SD = 7.19$).

Personality Types and the Dimensions of Communication Adaptability

In answering the second research question about the relationship between the personality types of introversion, ambiversion, and extraversion and each of the six dimensions of communication adaptability, it was determined that there was a moderate positive correlation between ambiversion and social composure, $r(383) = .420, p < .001$. There was also a low positive correlation between ambiversion and social confirmation, $r(448) = .263, p < .001$, indicating a definite but small relationship between the variables, and a high correlation with social experience, $r(383) = .723, p < .001$, indicating a

marked relationship (see Table 2). There were also moderate positive correlations with introversion and social composure, $r(39) = .458, p < .001$, as well as social experience, $r(39) = .624, p < .001$, indicating substantial relationships (see Table 3). Finally, there were moderate positive correlations between extraversion and social composure, $r(26) = .499, p < .001$, and social experience, $r(26) = .531, p < .001$, indicating substantial relationships (see Table 4).

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Ambiversion

Correlations			
Variable	M	SD	Correlation with Ambiversion Score
Ambiversion Score	35.6	6.6	-
Social Composure	17.7	3.4	.420**
Social Confirmation	20.0	2.8	.263**
Social Experience	17.7	3.3	.723**
Appropriate Disclosure	19.0	2.8	0.03
Wit	16.0	3.9	0.10

** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed); $N=383$

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Introversion

Correlations			
Variable	M	SD	Correlation with Introversion Score
Introversion Score	19.3	3.4	-
Social Composure	12.9	3.5	.458**
Social Confirmation	18.8	3.9	0.28
Social Experience	11.2	3.2	.624**
Appropriate Disclosure	18.8	3.3	-0.06
Wit	15.0	5.2	0.19

** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed); $N=39$

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Extraversion

Correlations			
Variable	M	SD	Correlation with Extraversion Score
Extraversion Score	52.1	2.5	-
Social Composure	21.1	2.5	.499**
Social Confirmation	22.3	1.9	-0.02
Social Experience	23.8	1.5	.531**
Appropriate Disclosure	20.3	2.8	-0.07
Wit	18.4	3.6	-0.20

**p < 0.01 (2-tailed); N=26

Chapter 5: Discussion

The goal of the present study was to ascertain the connection between personality type and communication adaptability. The results of this study can help aid individuals in understanding how their personality affects their communication ability. Based on the data from this study, extraverts are likely to have higher communication adaptability than individuals with other personality types. Ambiverts have high positive correlations to social experience as well as a moderate positive correlations with social composure and a low correlation to social confirmation. Introverts have moderate correlations to social composure and social experience, as do extraverts. Extraverts have slightly higher social composure correlations than do introverts or ambiverts. Ambiversion is the only personality type with a correlation to social confirmation, albeit low. Ambiverts have the highest correlation to social experience, followed by introverts, and then extraverts have the lowest correlation.

Implications

Communication adaptability stems from communication competence. It is a construct that is defined by an individual utilizing their communication competence to adapt to various communication contexts. In fact, the communication adaptability scale has a strong relationship with behavioral measures of communication competence, making it a valid way to measure both adaptability, and, in a larger scope, communication competence (Duran, 1983). In previous research, extraverts tended to score higher in communication competence, especially in areas of social relaxation and appropriate self-disclosure, both of which are related aspects of communication adaptability (Hullman et al., 2010). Although communication competence has yet to

become a full-fledged theory, the construct still fits well with the concepts within this study. Those who have communication competence tend to have generally good communication skills, including flexibility and adaptability (Jablin & Putnam, 2001), and these strengths are often considered hallmarks of competent communication skills (Spitzberg, 2003).

According to the results from this study, extraverts have the highest correlation to communication adaptability overall. This result aligns with previous research done on extraversion. For example, Myers and Myers (1993) explain that extraverts like to focus on the outside environment, “the outer world full of people and things” (p. 7). Because extraverts are so focused on this outward environment, this could lead to higher adaptability when it comes to communicating with others because they need to be able to adapt their communication style to be effective. Additionally, extraverts, in comparison to introverts, also spend significantly more time in conversations and less time alone (Mehl et al., 2006). Because the introvert focuses more on the inner world of concepts and ideas, that could lead to less adaptability (Myers & Myers, 1993).

It is also important to note that none of the extraverted-scoring participants thought they were introverts or were unfamiliar with the terms. Because they spend so much time in conversation, it is possible this could lead to them being more aware of their extraverted tendencies or they could have a more extraverted nature by necessity. Though not the focus of this study, COVID-19 may have had an impact on the knowledge extraverts may have of their personality type. As Folk et al. (2020) discuss, many extraverts experienced significant levels of loneliness and lack of social satisfaction during the first wave of the pandemic. The isolation many of them experienced could

have made them distinctly aware of their extraverted nature. Additionally, this need for social contact during various phases of the pandemic may have led extraverts to be more willing to adapt their communication skills to meet their social needs.

Of the individuals who scored as introverts, an overwhelming majority of them (all but two) thought they were introverts. This fits with the very self-aware and introspective nature of introverts (Bajwa et al., 2017; Hudson & Ferguson, 2016). Additionally, the COVID-19 pandemic could have made introverts very aware of their personality type as well because it was not always pleasant for them to be in quarantine with others for extended periods of time. Their tendency to process emotions (negative and positive) inwards and desire not to seek help externally resulted in levels of loneliness and mental distress that were heightened by the pandemic (Wei, 2020). Alternatively, it is also possible that introverts experiencing isolation during the pandemic could have increased their awareness of their need for some time to themselves, magnifying their position as introverts.

Of the 450 individuals who fully completed the survey for this study, 85.1% were classified as ambiverts, falling on neither the highly introverted nor highly extraverted ends of the scale (see Table 1). This verifies Petric (2019) and Conklin's (1927) points that it is unlikely for individuals to be solely introverts or extraverts, normally they have aspects of both. This can be shown through this study, for very few participants were on either extreme of the scale but primarily fell in the middle area of ambiversion, indicating they have both introvert and extravert abilities and traits.

Ambiverts have the highest connection to the social experience dimension of communication adaptability, the only personality type with a high correlation to any

dimension. Considering that social experience is an individual's social communication repertoire based on their experience in different contexts and with different individuals, this fits with the premise that ambiverts are capable of possessing, and tend to have, both introvert and extravert abilities and traits. These traits and abilities would serve to aid in their adaptability, being able to oscillate between (and also understand) extraverts and introverts (Petric, 2019). Grant's (2013) example of ambiverts being at the top of sales productivity fits here as well, as ambiverts have a flexible way of talking and listening to others. Their ability to talk and listen also fits with this study's results of ambiverts as the only personality type with a connection to social confirmation, albeit low. Social confirmation recognizes and confirms the social image of the person to whom one is speaking. Talking and listening to others well would add to this ability. Ambiverts are able to exhibit qualities of both introverts and extraverts and can "flip into either depending on their mood, context and goals" (Petric, 2019, p. 1). They are likely to express the emotions necessary but also take the time to listen to others without seeming too excited or overconfident (Grant, 2013). This would allow for understanding of and adaptability to whatever personality type and communication style is needed for the ambivert in a communication interaction. Research also shows that ambiverts have a significant IQ advantage over introverts and extraverts, which could lead to them being more knowledgeable about how to communicate in specific situations (Stough & Brebner, 1996). This research demonstrates this point, and adds to the existing, limited research in this area.

Most participants were not aware they could be considered something other than introverts or extraverts (i.e., ambiverts) as there were significantly more participants

whose results classified them as ambiverts than participants who considered their preconceived personality to be so. With how little research and awareness there is on the topic of ambiversion, and with the many studies calling for continued research in this area (Grant, 2013; Petric, 2019; Young, 1927), it makes sense that few individuals would be aware of their tendency toward both introvert and extrovert traits. However, being aware of personality types, and at least the inclinations each one has, can be a huge asset towards gaining internal perspective of oneself and how information is processed and communicated (Back, 2012; Kandler, 2012). Education fields now recognize the value of having their students take personality testing to ascertain their personality preferences to aid them in communicating with others more adaptably (Waite & McKinney, 2015).

This study demonstrates that each personality type has strengths in the area of communication adaptability. Introverts, though least adaptable by means of the scale, still have a moderate connection to social experience and social confirmation, which are valuable areas when it comes to communicating with others. Their self-aware nature also allows them to recognize their social abilities. Introverts could continue to seize the areas they excel in and work on learning about the other dimensions of communication adaptability. Extraverts, the most adaptable by means of the scale, should work to utilize that adaptability to their advantage while recognizing that introverts and ambiverts may not be as adaptable. Extraverts could utilize their extra adaptability to make interactions with those they communicate with who are not extraverts more comfortable for all involved. Ambiverts should recognize they do not need to be classified as introvert or extravert, but that they are part of a lesser known, and possibly silent majority, of personality types. Ambiverts also have great strength with social experience and should

use it to their advantage by utilizing their experience to talk with others and broaden their communication horizons. Ambiverts should also utilize their unique emphasis on social confirmation skills to aid in helping to confirm other's identities while working towards greater communication adaptability.

Limitations

Although this study presents valuable information related to the area of personality and communication adaptability, there are some limitations that warrant explanation. First, because this study utilized the self-report method, there is the possibility of social desirability effects and incorrect self-evaluation. This method also did not allow for any follow-up questions or contextual information. However, as personality is primarily understood by individuals' self-report, it was the best method for this study. This study also had participants primarily from the United States, imposing limitations on the generalizability of the findings with respect to geographic area and culture. Still, the results provide information for those from individualistic cultures like the United States.

Additionally, a larger percentage of participants were ambiverts than was anticipated, making the generalization between the three personality types more difficult. The reason for this could be attributed to McCroskey's (2007) scale having a larger range for ambiversion (24 points) than introversion and extraversion (11 points, respectively). To attempt to overcome this obstacle, the sample of ambiverts was divided into those who leaned more towards introversion and extroversion, respectively, as well as those who were truly in the middle of the sample, considered "true ambiverts." However, the

results were roughly the same and did not affect the overall outcome of the study so only the original analysis based on McCroskey's original classifications is reported.

Articulation also produced a very low reliability score ($\alpha = 0.39$) in this study, which is significantly lower than that of Duran's (1992) reliability of the scale dimension, where $\alpha = 0.80$. It is possible that with the growth of computer-mediated communication since the scale's original creation (i.e., more people use computer-mediated communication in the 2020s than the 1990s; Carr, 2021), the way that people pay attention to how they use words, grammar, and pronunciation differs. Because articulation focuses on individuals' grammatically appropriate expression of ideas and advances in technology have lessened people's use of, and expectation for, grammatically correct communication (Carr, 2021), this may not be as important of a dimension to assess.

Directions for Future Research

Upon the discovery of this larger ambiversion categorization and the incorrect categorization with the Likert version of the scale as noted earlier, a scale other than McCroskey's (2007) introversion scale may be more appropriate for future research projects exploring these personality traits. A scale like the Big Five personality scale (John et al., 1991) could lead to understanding more about the tendencies and social leanings of those with introversion, extraversion, and ambiversion (as well as other personality traits). It is also recommended to have ambiversion as a focus to learn more about the intricacies and build on this study in the area of ambiversion. It is still very under-researched, and as can be seen from this study, few individuals considered themselves to have a personality in the middle-ground even though the scale classified

them as such. Future research should focus on individuals identifying their personality correctly and being aware of the option of ambiversion to show how that can impact their communication adaptability.

Some studies have highlighted that the communication adaptability scale falls within a more individualistic cultural perspective than a collectivist one (Merkin & Ramadan, 2016). Hofstede's (2011) work on cultural dimensions could be used to identify cultural identity codes as either individualistic or collectivistic and allow for a cultural analysis with a more diverse sample. Though Hofstede's work has been critiqued (Baskerville, 2003), using Hofstede's method allows for clear categorization of cultural identities to ensure that the communication adaptability scale is used with its intended audience. It remains for future researchers to discover cultural differences in this area.

Though it was not notably unreliable in other recent studies (Crowley & High, 2020; Merkin & Ramadan, 2016;), future researchers are encouraged to utilize the communication adaptability scale (Duran, 1983) for future research, but are advised to be mindful of the reliability of the articulation dimension. Due to the low reliability in this study, it would be valuable for future studies to ascertain if the articulation dimension is still a reliable and necessary part of the scale. If not, it would be valuable for researchers to determine what aspects of the scale lend to its lack of reliability (e.g., phrasing of scale statements, potentially dated nature of questions) and move forward with adjustments to the communication adaptability scale dimensions, possibly removing or replacing articulation.

Conclusion

With the availability of various communication methods and the need to alter communication behaviors due to the ever-changing influence of the COVID-19 pandemic on society, having a communication style that can adapt is highly beneficial. This study has demonstrated how extraverts have the greatest tendency to have high scores of communication adaptability, but that there are strengths for all three personality types: introversion, extraversion, and ambiversion. Individuals are encouraged to determine what their personality type is to allow them to discover areas of strengths and weaknesses. This will allow them to be informed about how to harness and improve those areas, respectively, when it comes to their communication adaptability.

Appendices

Appendix A: Demographic Questions

Q. Gender: What is your gender?

- A) Male
- B) Female
- C) Nonbinary
- D) Prefer not to disclose

Q. Age: What is your age?

- A) 18-24 years old
- B) 25-34 years old
- C) 35-44 years old
- D) 45-54 years old
- E) 55-64 years old
- F) 65-74 years old
- G) 75 years or older

Q. Preconceived personality: Based on your understanding of the terms, would you consider yourself to be an introvert or an extrovert?

- A) Introvert
- B) Extrovert
- C) Neither
- D) I am not familiar with the terms

Q. Culture: With which country would you consider your national identity?
(Drop down all country feature)

Appendix B: Introversion Scale

The 3-point introversion Scale was originally reported in:

McCroskey, J. C. (1997). Self-report measurements. In J. A. Daly & J. C.

McCroskey (Eds.), *Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, &*

communication apprehension (pp. 191-216). Hampton Press.

However, McCroskey's newer version allows for the option of a Likert Scale and was utilized for this study. This can be found at:

McCroskey, J. C. (2007) *Introversion scale*. Communication Research Measures.

<http://www.jamescmccroskey.com/measures/introversion.htm>

DIRECTIONS: Below are 18 statements that people sometimes make about themselves.

Please indicate to what degree you believe each statement applies to you.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 = neither agree nor disagree 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree

_____1. I am inclined to keep in the background on social occasions.

_____2. I like to mix socially with people.

_____3. I sometimes feel happy, sometimes depressed, without any apparent reason.

_____4. I am inclined to limit my acquaintances to a select few.

_____5. I like to have many social engagements.

_____6. I have frequent ups and downs in mood, either with or without apparent cause.

_____7. I would rate myself as a happy-go-lucky individual.

_____8. I can usually let myself go and have a good time at a party.

_____9. I am inclined to be moody.

_____10. I would be very unhappy if I were prevented from making numerous social contacts.

_____11. I usually take the initiative in making new friends.

_____12. My mind often wanders while I am trying to concentrate.

_____13. I like to play pranks upon others.

_____14. I am usually a “good mixer.”

_____15. I am sometimes bubbling over with energy and sometimes very sluggish.

_____16. I often have “the time of my life” at social affairs.

_____17. I am frequently “lost in thought” even when I should be taking part in a conversation.

_____18. I derive more satisfaction from social activities than from anything else.

SCORING: To determine your score on the Introversion Scale, complete the following steps:

Step 1. Add scores for items 1 & 4

Step 2. Add the scores for items 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, & 18

Step 3. Complete the following formula:

Introversion = 12 - Total from Step 1 + Total from Step 2

Your score should be between 12 and 60. If you compute a score outside that range, you have made a mistake in computing the score.

Note: Items 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, and 17 are not used in computing your introversion scale.

Individuals scoring above 48 are highly extraverted; those scoring below 24 have low extraversion (are introverted).² Those scoring between 24 and 48 are in the moderate range.

² This original version of this scale said, “Individuals scoring above 48 are highly introverted; those scoring below 24 have low introversion (are extraverted);” however, due to the recognition of the items measuring introversion and extraversion being in the opposite direction as noted here, it has been changed.

Appendix C: Communication Adaptability Scale

The Communicative Adaptability Scale (CAS) was originally reported in:

Duran, R. L. (1983). Communicative adaptability: A measure of social communicative competence. *Communication Quarterly*, 31, 320-326.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01463378309369521>

DIRECTIONS: The following are statements about communication behaviors. Answer each item as it relates to your general style of communication (the type of communicator you are most often) in social situations.

Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by placing the appropriate number (according to the scale below) in the space provided.

5 = always true of me, 4 = often true of me, 3 = sometimes true of me, 2 = rarely true of me, 1 = never true of me

Social Composure

1. I feel nervous in social situations. (R)
2. In most social situations, I feel tense and constrained. (R)
3. When talking, my posture seems awkward and tense. (R)
4. My voice sounds nervous when I talk with others. (R)
5. I am relaxed when talking with others.

Social Confirmation

6. I try to make the other person feel good.
7. I try to make the other person feel important.
8. I try to be warm when communicating with another.
9. While I'm talking, I think about how the other person feels.

10. I am verbally and nonverbally supportive of other people.

Social Experience

11. I like to be active in different social groups.

12. I enjoy socializing with various groups of people.

13. I enjoy meeting new people.

14. I find it easy to get along with new people.

15. I do not “mix” well at social functions. (R)

Appropriate Disclosure

16. I am aware of how intimate my disclosures are.

17. I am aware of how intimate the disclosures of others are.

18. I disclose at the same level that others disclose to me.

19. I know how appropriate my self-disclosures are.

20. When I self-disclose, I know what I am revealing.

Articulation

21. When speaking, I have problems with grammar. (R)

22. At times, I don't use appropriate verb tense. (R)

23. I sometimes use one word when I mean to use another. (R)

24. I sometimes use words incorrectly. (R)

25. I have difficulty pronouncing some words. (R)

Wit

26. When I am anxious, I often make jokes.

27. I often make jokes when in tense situations.

28. When I embarrass myself, I often make a joke about it.

29. When someone makes a negative comment about me, I respond with a witty comeback.

30. People think I am witty.

R = Before summing the items to create dimensions, reverse the score of those that are followed by (R). If the person indicated 5 for that item, give it a score of 1.

If the person indicated a 4, give it a 2. If the person indicated a 2, give it a 4. If the person indicated a 1 for that item, give it a 5. A lower score will indicate lower communication adaptability and a higher score will indicate higher communication adaptability.

References

- Ahmad, S., Zeb, H., & Muhammad, H. (2019). Emotional intelligence, personality traits and procrastination among students and employees of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. *Pakistan Journal of Psychology*, 50(2), 3-19.
<http://pjpku.com/index.php/pjp/article/view/21>
- Amsalem, E., Zoizner, A., Sheaffer, T., Walgrave, S., & Loewen, P. J. (2020). The effect of politicians' personality on their media visibility. *Communication Research*, 47(7), 1079-1102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218758084>
- Back, M. D. (2012). Knowing our personality (S. Vazire, Ed.). In S. Vazire & T. D. Wilson (Eds.), *Handbook of self-knowledge* (pp. 131-156). The Guilford Press.
- Bajwa, S. U., Shahzad, K., & Aslam, H. (2017). Exploring Big Five personality traits and gender as predictors of entrepreneurs' cognitive adaptability. *Journal of Modelling in Management*, 12(1), 143-161. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JM2-04-2014-0026>
- Barr, M. (2017). Video games can develop graduate skills in higher education students: A randomised trial. *Computers & Education*, 113, 86-97.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2017.05.016>
- Beatty, M. J., Marshall, L. A., & Rudd, J. E. (2001). A twins study of communicative adaptability: Heritability of individual differences. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 87(4), 366-377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630109384346>
- Beatty, M. J., McCroskey, J. C., & Heisel, A. D. (1998). Communication apprehension as temperamental expression: A communibiological paradigm. *Communication Monographs*, 65(3), 197-219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637759809376448>

- Beukeboom, C. J., Tanis, M., & Vermeulen, I. E. (2013). The language of extraversion: Extraverted people talk more abstractly, introverts are more concrete. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 32*(2), 191-201.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X12460844>
- Carr, C. T. (2021). *Computer-mediated communication: A theoretical and practical introduction to online human communication*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Charalampous, K., & Kokkinos, C. M. (2014) Students' Big Three personality traits, perceptions of teacher interpersonal behavior, and mathematics achievement: An application of the model of reciprocal causation, *Communication Education, 63*(3), 235-258, <http://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2014.917688>
- Chen, G. M. (1992). Communication adaptability and interaction involvement as predictors of cross-cultural adjustment. *Communication Research Reports, 9*(1), 33-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824099209359895>
- Cole, J. (2000). A temperament perspective of nonverbal immediacy, *Communication Research Reports, 17*(1), 90-94,
<http://doi.org/10.1080/08824090009388754>
- Crist, A. T. (2017). *The quiet call: A grounded theory exploration of vocational development and introversion in college students* (Master's thesis, Taylor University). Pillars. <https://pillars.taylor.edu/mahe/78>
- Crowley, J. L., & High, A. C. (2020). Validating the support gaps framework: Longitudinal effects and moderators of experiencing deficits and surpluses during supportive interactions. *Communication Quarterly, 68*(1), 29-53.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2019.1668447>

- Cuperman, R., & Ickes, W. (2009). Big Five predictors of behavior and perceptions in initial dyadic interactions: Personality similarity helps extraverts and introverts, but hurts “disagreeables.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*(4), 667-684. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015741>
- Daly, J. A., & Diesel, C. A. (1992). Measures of communication-related personality variables. *Communication Education*, *41*(4), 405-414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529209378902>
- Dammayer, J., & Zettler, I. (2018). A brief historical overview on links between personality and health. In C. Johansen (Ed.), *Personality and disease: Scientific proof vs. wishful thinking* (pp. 1-16). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-805300-3.00001-3>
- Davidson, I. J. (2017). The ambivert: A failed attempt at a normal personality. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, *53*(4), 313-331. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhbs.21868>
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *41*(1), 417-440. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.41.020190.002221>
- Duran, R. L. (1983). Communicative adaptability: A measure of social communicative competence. *Communication Quarterly*, *31*(4), 320-326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463378309369521>
- Duran, R. L. (1992). Communicative adaptability: A review of conceptualization and measurement. *Communication Quarterly*, *40*(3), 253-268, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379209369840>

- Eysenck, H. J. (1963). Biological basis of personality. *Nature*, *199*(4898), 1031-1034.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/1991031a0>
- Folk, D., Okabe-Miyamoto, K., Dunn, E., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2020). Did social connection decline during the first wave of COVID-19?: The role of extraversion. *Collabra: Psychology*, *6*(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.365>
- Gallois, C., Giles, H., Jones, E., Cargile, A., & Ota, H. (1995). Communication accommodation theory: Elaborations and extensions. In R. Wiseman (Ed.), *Intercultural communication therapy* (pp. 115-147). Sage.
- Gareis, E., Merkin, R., & Goldman, J. (2011). Intercultural friendship: Linking communication variables and friendship success. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *40*(2), 153-171.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2011.581034>
- Georgiev, S. Y., Christov, C. V., & Philipova, D. T. (2014). Ambiversion as independent personality characteristic. *Activitas Nervosa Superior Rediviva*, *56*(3-4), 65-72.
<http://www.rediviva.sav.sk/56i3/65.pdf>
- Giles, H., Mulac, A., Bradac, J. J., & Johnson, P. (1987). Speech accommodation theory: The first decade and beyond. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *10*(1), 13-48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.1987.11678638>
- Girelli, T. (2019). *Mediators and moderators of the relation between loneliness and depression/anxiety* (Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University). Brandeis Institutional Repository.

- Glonek, K., Nash, E., Shields, V., Sawyer, C. R., & Behnke, R. R. (2007, November). *Communication adaptability as a function of nervous system mobility and sensory processing sensitivity* (Paper presentation). National Communication Association Conference, Chicago, IL.
- Grant, A. M. (2013). Rethinking the extraverted sales ideal: The ambivert advantage. *Psychological Science*, 24(6), 1024-1030. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612463706>
- Guilford, J. P. (1956). *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Hazel, M., Keaten, J., & Kelly, L. (2014) The relationship between personality temperament, communication reticence, and fear of negative evaluation, *Communication Research Reports*, 31(4), 339-347. <http://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2014.963219>
- Heisel, A. D., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1999) Testing theoretical relationships and non-relationships of genetically-based predictors: Getting started with communibiology, *Communication Research Reports*, 16(1), 1-9. <http://doi.org/10.1080/08824099909388695>
- Hendon, M., Powell, L., & Wimmer, H. (2017). Emotional intelligence and communication levels in information technology professionals. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 71, 165-171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.01.048>
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede model in montext. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>

- Hofstede Insights. (2022). *Country Comparison*. Hofstede Insights.
<https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/>
- Horvath, C. W. (1995). Biological origins of communicator style. *Communication Quarterly*, 43(4), 394-407. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01463379509369987>
- Howard, P. J., & Howard, J. M. (1995). The big five quickstart: An introduction to the five-factor model of personality for human resource professionals. *Viewpoints*, 120, 2-21. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED384754.pdf>
- Hudson Jr., S. W., & Ferguson, G. C. (2016). Leadership personalities: Extrovert, introvert or ambivert? *International Journal of Management and Economics Invention*, 2(9), 999-1002.
- Hullman, G., Planisek, A., McNally, J., & Rubin, R. (2010). Competence, personality, and self-efficacy: Relationships in an undergraduate interpersonal course. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 18(1), 3649.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15456870903340506>
- Hwang, Y. (2011). Is communication competence still good for interpersonal media?: Mobile phone and instant messenger. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(2), 924-934. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.11.018>
- Jablin, F. M., & Putnam, L. L. (2001). *The new handbook of organizational communication*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412986243>
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *Big Five Inventory (BFI)* [Database record]. APA PsycTests. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t07550-000>

- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 114-158). The Guilford Press.
- Jung, C. (1921). *Psychological types*. Routledge.
- Kandler, C. (2012). Knowing your personality is knowing its nature: The role of information accuracy of peer assessments for heritability estimates of temperamental and personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences, 53*(4), 387-392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.01.004>
- Katt, J. A. & Collins, S. J. (2013). The power of provisional/immediate language revisited: Adding student personality traits to the mix. *Communication Research Reports, 30*(2), 85-95, <http://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2012.747178>
- Kumar, N. (2016). The impact of personality types and gender on attitude towards drinking alcohol in patients with depression. *Indian Journal of Mental Health, 3*(3), 287-293.
- Lai, C. L., & Hwang, G. J. (2014). Effects of mobile learning time on students' conception of collaboration, communication, complex problem-solving, meta-cognitive awareness and creativity. *International Journal of Mobile Learning and Organisation, 8*(3-4), 276-291. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMLO.2014.067029>

- Lo, W. Y. O. (2014). *The effects of entrepreneurial characteristics, interpersonal relationship strategies, communication media preferences, organizational characteristics, and perceived relationship outcomes on financial performance among Hong Kong's small-and medium-sized enterprises*. (Master's thesis, The Chinese University of Hong Kong). ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Long, B., & Anarbaeva, S. (2008, November). *Communicative adaptability and intercultural communication apprehension: gender and cultural differences in college students* (Paper presentation). National Communication Association Conference, San Francisco, CA.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52(5), 509-516. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.5.509>
- McCroskey, J. C. (2007) *Introversion scale*. Communication Research Measures. <http://www.jamescmccroskey.com/measures/introversion.htm>
- McCroskey, J. C. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. *Speech Monographs*, 37(4), 269-277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637757009375677>
- McCroskey, J. C. (1997). Self-report measurements. In J. A. Daly & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, & communication apprehension* (pp. 191-216). Hampton Press
- Mehl, M. R., Gosling, S. D., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2006). Personality in its natural habitat: Manifestations and implicit folk theories of personality in daily life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 862-877. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.862>

- Merkin, R. S., & Ramadan, R. (2016). Communication practices in the US and Syria. *SpringerPlus*, 5(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-2486-9>
- Mondak, J. J. (2010). *Personality and the foundations of political behavior*. Cambridge University Press.
- Myers, I. B., & Myers, P. B. (1993). *Gifts differing: understanding personality type*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Motley, M. T., & Smith, N. L. (1989). Effects of temperament upon hiring decisions: A preliminary examination of global personality traits and communicator compatibility. *Communication Reports*, 2(1), 22-29. <https://doi-org.proxy.ulib.uits.iu.edu/10.1080/08934218909367477>
- Opt, S. K., & Loffredo, D. A. (2000). Rethinking communication apprehension: A Myers-Briggs perspective. *The Journal of Psychology*, 134(5), 556-570. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X12460844>
- Patel, V. B. (2014). Five factor personality model of leadership. *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 21-24. http://www.raijmr.com/ijrhs/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/IJRHS_2014_vol02_issue_02_05.pdf
- Petric, D. (2019). *Introvert, extrovert and ambivert*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/rg.2.2.28059.41764>
- Shatz, I. (2017). Fast, free, and targeted: Reddit as a source for recruiting participants online. *Social Science Computer Review*, 35(4), 537-549. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439316650163>

- Stough, C., & Brebner, J. (1996). The relationship between intelligence, personality and inspection time. *British Journal of Psychology*, 87(2), 255-268.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1996.tb02589.x>
- Song, H., & Boomgaarden, H. (2019). Personalities discussing politics: The effects of agreement and expertise on discussion frequency and the moderating role of personality traits. *International Journal of Communication*, 13(24), 92-115.
<https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/8469>
- Spitzberg, B. H. (2003). Methods of interpersonal skills assessment. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burleson (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 93-134). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Thorne, A. (1987). The press of personality: A study of conversations between introverts and extraverts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(4), 718-726.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.53.4.718>
- Waite, R., & McKinney, N. (2015). Knowing your preference: The nexus of personality and leadership. *Creative Nursing*, 21(3), 172-178. <http://doi.org/10.1891/1078-4535.21.3.172>
- Wei, M. (2020). Social distancing and lockdown – an introvert’s paradise? An empirical investigation on the association between introversion and the psychological impact of COVID19-related circumstantial changes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11(1) 24-40. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.561609>
- Young, K. (1927). *Source book for social psychology*. Alfred A. Knopf.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/11034-000>

Curriculum Vitae

Kaitlyn Marie Shannon

EDUCATION

M.A. in Applied Communication, Indiana University Degree earned at IUPUI, May 2022, 4.0 GPA

B.A. in Communication Studies and in English: Concentration in Literature, minor in Spanish, certificate in Theatre & Performance Studies, Indiana University Degree earned at IUPUI, May 2021, 3.97 GPA, Summa Cum Laude

RESEARCH INTERESTS

Mental health, communication adaptability, cell phone and mediated communication use, personality, nonverbal communication

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Shannon, K. (2020, November 7) *The Effect of Cell Phone Use on the Mental Health of Young Adults* [Conference presentation]. Ball State University Undergraduate Communication Research Conference, Muncie, IN, United States.

Shannon, K. (2020, February 14) *Reflections from a Charlotte Mason Graduate* [Conference presentation]. Ideas for Living Retreat, Martinsville, IN, United States.

HONORS / AWARDS

- IUPUI Academic Achievement Award for Communication Studies – Spring 2022
 - This faculty nominated award is presented to a student receiving a Masters in Applied Communication who has demonstrated excellence in the field, made outstanding contributions to the department, achieved a superior grade point average, and has the support of the faculty.
- IUPUI Speech Night Faculty Mentor Award – Fall 2021
 - This award is given to faculty who have students make it to the final round of the Speech Night Competition. I had two students in this competition, placing as a finalist and as 3rd place.
- IUPUI Dean's Rise Scholarship – Spring 2021
 - A \$1000 scholarship given to a student who has met the requirements of the RISE courses at IUPUI which includes an additional element that focuses on research, international study, service, and/or experiential learning.
- IUPUI Honors College Talent Show Winner – Spring 2021
 - An honor for the best performance. Recited original poem "What Are You Waiting For?" from book publication

- IUPUI Outstanding English Major Finalist – Spring 2021
 - An honor for the top performing English Majors
- IUPUI Outstanding Undergraduate Research Award in Communication Studies – Spring 2021
 - Recognition by a committee of the faculty for outstanding undergraduate papers from the last academic year based on quality of scholarship/mastery of course content, coherence, creativity, organization, and overall writing quality.
- IUPUI Communication Studies Burns-Wagener Scholarship – Spring 2020
 - A \$1300.00 scholarship that is given to a Communication Studies student who shows promise in the form of an essay about communication and their academic and career goals.
- IUPUI Frances Dodson Rhome Scholarship – Spring 2020
 - A \$1500.00 scholarship that is given to a student who shows interest and capabilities in Women’s Studies and English Literature
- Hendricks County’s Got Talent Competition, Finalist – Summer 2019
 - Original poem “Scars” presented at this competition created for all ages to perform various talents onstage
- IUPUI’s Dean’s List, Fall 2017 – Spring 2021
 - Undergraduate honor that recognizes the highest achieving students
- IUPUI Honors College Chancellor’s Scholarship, Fall 2017 – Spring 2021
 - Given to students who meet entry academic requirements for the IUPUI Honors College (GPA 3.75, ACT 28) and maintain at least a 3.3 GPA and complete 24 hours of Honors level course work and 10 hours of volunteering per semester

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Associate Faculty, IUPUI (2021 - present)

Fundamentals of Speech Communication, COMM-R110

- Fall 2021: two sections, 25 students each
- Spring 2022: two sections, 25 students each
 - Disseminated class content, offered feedback, lectured, activity design

Teaching Assistant, IUPUI (2020-2021)

Fundamentals of Speech Communication, COMM-R110

- Summer 2020: two sections, 20 students each
- Fall 2020: two sections, 20 students each
- Spring 2021: two sections, 20 students each
 - Assisted lead professor during lectures, graded speeches and reflection materials

STUDY ABROAD

Intercultural Communication: Poland, Summer 2019

PUBLICATIONS

Shannon, K. (in press) Everything counts: Taking steps toward physical activity and diversity. *Public Library of Science (PLOS)*.

Shannon, K. & Overbey, S. (in press) 50 years of Speech Night. *Macmillan*.

Shannon, K. (2021). IUPUI Speech Night Competition. In K. H. Sheeler & S. J. Overbey (Eds.), *Fundamentals of Speech Communication*, (2nd ed.) (pp. 419-425). Macmillan.

Marie, K. (2020). *Life is poetry volume 2: The four seasons*. Amazon.

Marie, K. (2019). *Life is poetry volume 1: The first poetic decade*. Amazon.

SERVICE

Speech and Debate Judge / Christian Communicators of America

September 2019 – September 2021

Judged speech at debate competitions at various levels, offering feedback and informing student placement.

COMM-radery Club / IUPUI

May 2020-May 2021

Organized group activities and support for students in the novel BA/MA program in the Department of Communication Studies.

Lambda Phi Eta / IUPUI

April 2019 – April 2021

National honors society and academic club for top achieving students in Communication Studies. I inducted new members into the organization in 2021.

Academics for Civic Engagement / IUPUI Honors College

March 2018 – April 2019

Club for Honors student to engage in community service in the local Indianapolis community. Led community service trips at Gleaner's Food Bank and attended meetings for the club.

WORK EXPERIENCE

IUPUI / Speaker's Lab Supervisor, Documentary Researcher/Coordinator

August 2020-August 2021

Trained new Speaker's Lab Mentors as well as organized a documentary for the 100th Speech Night Celebration, researching information on the competition, former contestants and winners.

IUPUI / Speaker's Lab Mentor

August 2019 – August 2021

Assisted students taking Fundamentals of Speech Communication with reviewing speech outlines and delivery. Also helped run the Speech Night Competition.

MEDIA PRESENCE

Shakespeare Unraveled Podcast

The Vast World of Interpersonal Communication Blog

Young, Dumb, and Frugal Podcast

Indiana Adventure Tour Guide YouTube Channel, Instagram, and Facebook

Trying to Photography Instagram Account