

## Personality Traits and Communication Styles Among University Students

Javeria Ahmed & Irum Naqvi  
National Institute of Psychology  
Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad.

This study was aimed to explore the relationship between personality traits and communication styles among male and female university students. Moreover, the role of personality traits in the predictability of communication styles was also examined. Two instruments viz., NEO-Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) (Costa & McCrae, 1992) and Communication Style Inventory (CSI) (de Vries, Bakker-Pieper, Konings, & Schouten, 2011) were used to assess personality traits and communication styles in students. The study was carried out in two phases. First phase was carried out to check the cultural appropriateness and difficulty level of CSI. The second phase focused to see the relationship between variables of study. The study was carried out on 98 men and 96 women. The results indicated that extraversion was positively related with expressiveness; neuroticism was positively related with emotionality and impression manipulateness; openness to experience was positively related with questioningness; and conscientiousness was positively related with impression manipulateness. Furthermore, results showed that women scored high on agreeableness and expressiveness while men scored high on preciseness in their communication style.

*Keywords:* personality traits, communication styles, CSI, gender, university students

Personality is a reflection of thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and behaviors (McCrae & Costa, 2003). The assessment of these thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and behaviors can be assessed through communication that is why communication leads to judging others' personality, similarly, if personality of someone is known conversation gets facilitated. Emanuel (2013) suggests people with different personalities use different communication styles, for instance, an individual with shy dispositions will restraint from making much conversation, and extravert on the hand may engage in boisterous conversation.

Personality traits are defined as stable patterns of behaviors (McCrae & Costa, 2003, p. 21) and include five-core traits namely extraversion, neuroticism, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Extraverts are talkative, love being with people, enjoy their company, and often experience positive emotions and are usually associated with warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, and excitement seeking (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Matthews, Deary, & Whiteman, 2003). Neuroticism is emotional instability a tendency to experience negative emotions easily like anger, hostility, anxiety, self-consciousness, vulnerability, and depression (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Matthews et al., 2003).

Agreeableness defines cooperation and social harmony, people with this trait are open, value others opinion, and support each other; trust, straight-forwardness, modesty, tender-mindedness, and compliance are all aspect of this trait (Costa & McCrae, 1988; Matthews et al., 2003). Conscientiousness leads people to control, regulate, and direct their impulses, which are not naturally bad and require quick decisions (Costa & McCrae, 1988) and include competence, order, dutifulness, self-discipline, and deliberation (Matthews et al., 2003). Openness to experience describes a people as being imaginative, creative, down-to-earth, and conventional. They are curious about world, experience new things, and are

appreciative of art (Costa & McCrae, 1988). Openness to experience portrays fantasy, aesthetic, feelings, actions, ideas, and values (Matthews et al., 2003).

There are many factors that play an important role in the development of a personality i.e., heredity (Goleman, 1986), brain (DeYoung et al., 2010), family background, social capital, and culture (Zabihi, 2011). Goleman (1986) suggested that more than half of the variations in personality are due to the genetics and the other half is due to family background, home environment, and other life experiences, that is why men and women genetically and socio-culturally are different (Chapman, Duberstein, Sorensen, & Lyness, 2007).

Communication styles are defined as "the characteristic way a person sends verbal, nonverbal, and para-verbal signals in social interactions denoting (a) who he or she is or wants to be, (b) how he or she tends to relate to people with whom he or she interacts, and (c) in what way his or her messages usually be interpreted" (de Vries, Bakker-Pieper, Konings, & Schouten, 2011, p. 179). This definition focuses more on the interpersonal communication and involves the message, its interpretation, feelings, and thoughts that one may transfer in a conversation (de Vries et al., 2011, p. 179). de Vries et al. (2009) developed CSI to measure communication styles in which the interpretation of the message was more important; their major focus was to assess the communication styles through which people share their feelings, thoughts, and emotions.

These styles include expressiveness (X), preciseness (P), verbal aggressiveness (VA), questioningness (Q), emotionality (E), and impression manipulateness (IM) based largely on de Vries et al. (2011). The following description of communication styles follows from de Vries et al. (2011): An expressive person is fun loving, informal, and always takes part in the conversations. Their way of talking is very helping, full of humour, and extroverted. Expressiveness is characterized by four facets i.e., talkativeness, conversational dominance, humour, and informality. A precise person always structures his/her communication, are considered high on conscientiousness, and four facets of preciseness include: thoughtfulness, conciseness, substantiveness, and structuredness. Verbally aggressive people talk in angry and loud tones and appear

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Javeria Ahmed, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan. E-mail: jaweriyah\_ahmed@hotmail.com

authoritative. They are bad listeners and often involve in physical and verbal fights and considered low on agreeableness. Four facets of verbal aggressiveness include: angriness, authoritarianism, derogatoriness, and non-supportiveness. People who use questioning as their communication style love to question about things. They are deep learners and discoverers and criticise and argue while in a conversation. They are high on openness to experience. Four facets of questioningness include: unconventionality, philosophicalness, inquisitiveness, and argumentativeness. People who use emotionality as their communication style are emotional and sentimental, and are defensive and try to deal things emotionally. They are high on neuroticism. Four facets of emotionality include: sentimentality, worrisomeness, tension, and defensiveness. People who use impression manipulateness, often use deception are involved in self-management, try to impress, and be seen positively by others. Four facets include: ingratiation, charm, inscrutableness, and concealment.

Many factors affect and build useful communication style e.g., culture (Belshek, 2010; Nevgi, Nishimura, & Tella, 2008), personality traits (de Vries et al., 2011), and gender (Emanuel 2013; Gray, 1999; Mahmood, 2006; Merchant, 2012). People from individualistic cultures are more dominating. They communicate differently due to their capacities or traits (Nevgi et al., 2008). Women communicate emotionally in private settings to satisfy their need for intimacy (Mahmood, 2006) than men, who are more public and logical in their communication (Personal & Professional Development, 2011).

Every individual is a mixture of all personality types. They communicate in the similar way as they act, feel, or behave (Adler & Rodman, 2006), for example de Vries et al. (2011) claimed that every personality trait expresses itself in a different way. They assumed that when a person communicates with others depends on the way he/she behaves in particular, for example, a person who is friendly, calm, optimistic, and sensation seeker is the one who communicate according to their personality in a more expressive way, and are known among their fellows as helping and humorous. Agreeable individuals talk humbly and are helpful, and score low on verbal aggressiveness. Individuals using questioningness in their style of communication score high on openness to experience, welcome new things and try to discover them. P is positively related with conscientiousness as these individuals are more structured, organized, perfectionist, concise when communicating with others, thoughtful, and are leaders and need everything to be done on time and order (de Vries et al., 2011).

This study is conducted to investigate communication styles that related to personality types, in particular the relationships between personality traits (i.e., extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience) and communication styles (i.e., expressiveness, preciseness, emotionality, verbal aggressiveness, questioningness, and impression manipulateness). In addition, to explore gender differences across these variables and predict communication styles from personality traits among university students.

## Method

### Sample

We extracted a convenient sample of 98 men and 96 women (96 bachelors and 98 masters from eight different universities of

Pakistan. The participants ranged in age 18-27 ( $M = 22.06$ ,  $SD = 1.88$ ) years.

### Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Table 1

*Frequency and Percentages across Demographic Variables (N = 194)*

Demographic Variables	F	%
Gender		
Men	98	50.5
Women	96	49.5
Age (in years)		
Young adults (18-22)	117	60
Adults (23-27)	77	40
Education		
Bachelors	96	49.5
Masters	98	50.5

### Instruments

Neuroticism-Extraversion-Openness Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI). This test was developed by Costa and McCrae in 1992 to assess personality traits and was an updated version of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Based on The Five Factor Theory of Personality Traits, it takes 10-15 minutes to administer, and can useful to understand an individual's basic emotional, interpersonal, experiential, attitudinal, and motivational styles (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The test is appropriate for normal adults aged 17 and above and contains 60 items that provide a quick, reliable, and accurate measure of the five domains of personality i.e., extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience with 12 items per domain. Composite scores for items 2, 7, 12(R), 17, 22, 27(R), 32, 37, 42(R), 47, 52 and 57(R) represent extraversion; where "R" represents reversed scoring. Composite scores for items 1(R), 6, 11, 16(R), 21, 26, 31(R), 36, 41, 46(R), 51 and 56 represent neuroticism. Composite scores for items 3(R), 8(R), 13, 18(R), 23(R), 28, 33(R), 38(R), 43, 48(R), 53 and 58 represent openness to experience. Composite scores for items 4, 9(R), 14(R), 19, 24(R), 29(R), 34, 39(R), 44(R), 49, 54(R) and 59(R) represent agreeableness. And composite scores for items 5, 10, 15(R), 20, 25, 30(R), 35, 40, 45(R), 50, 55(R) and 60 represent conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

It is rated on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) with a possible score range from 12 to 60. As every dimension has independent items so, there are no overlapping dependent scores. A high score in any domain represent that specific type of trait. Cronbach's alpha coefficients obtained for the present sample was ranged from .36 to .65 (Ahmed, 2014) (see Table 2).

Communication Style Inventory (CSI). This test was developed by de Vries et al. (2009) and was used for the assessment of communication styles. It's a self-report questionnaire and consists of 96 items. The items are equally divided among six domains with 16 items per domain. Each domain of expressiveness, preciseness, verbal aggressiveness, questioningness, emotionality, and impression manipulateness consisted of four facet level-scales. Composite score for items 1, 7, 13, 19(R), 25, 31(R), 37(R), 43(R), 49(R), 55, 61, 67, 73, 79, 85 and 91(R) measures expressiveness (and its four facets: talkativeness, conversational,

dominance, humor, and informality). Composite score for items 2, 8, 14, 20, 26(R), 32, 38, 44, 50, 56(R), 62(R), 68(R), 74, 80, 86 and 92 measures preciseness (thoughtfulness, conciseness, substantiveness, and structuredness). Composite score for items 3, 9(R), 15(R), 21(R), 27(R), 33, 39, 45(R), 51, 57, 63, 69(R), 75, 81, 87 and 93 measures verbal aggressiveness (angriness, authoritarianism, derogatoriness, and non-supportiveness). Composite score for items 4, 10(R), 16, 22, 28, 34, 40(R), 46, 52, 58(R), 64, 70, 76, 82, 88, and 94 measures questioningness (unconventionality, philosophicalness, inquisitiveness, and argumentativeness). Composite score for items 5, 11, 17, 23, 29(R), 35, 41, 47(R), 53, 59, 65(R), 71, 77, 83, 89 and 95 measures emotionality (sentimentality, worrisomeness, tension, and defensiveness). Composite score for items 6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 42, 48, 54, 60(R), 66, 72(R), 78, 84, 90(R) and 96(R) measures impression manipulateness (ingratiation, charm, inscrutableness, and concealingness) (de Vries et al., 2011).

All items are answered on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). High score in any domain reflects that particular type of communication style. Each domain can have a possible score range of 16-80. Cronbach's alpha reliabilities of the CSI domain level-scales for the present sample were ranged from .60 to .70 (Ahmed, 2014) (see Table 2). CSI was used in this study because it has a strong connection with personality traits (de Vries et al., 2011).

### Research design

The research was completed in two phases. The first was the *Pilot* phase. In this phase cultural appropriateness, language comprehension, and difficulty level of items of CSI among university students was determined. For this purpose, expert's and student's opinions were taken. Some difficult words have been identified by them. Modifications were made with the help of a committee of experts. After selecting the suitable words with the help of committee experts, the scale was again given to university students for their final opinion. The second phase was the *Main Study* phase. The main purpose of this phase was to test the objectives and hypotheses developed in the study. We used conven-

ient sampling and correlational design to determine the relationships between personality traits and communication styles among university students.

### Procedure

Permission was sought from the heads of all the institutions and informed consent was taken from the participants to take part in the study. For the most part, the tests were administered individually, but group administration was also conducted occasionally. They were asked to read the instructions carefully and provide their responses on each and every item and do not leave any item unanswered. There was no restriction of time. The tests were conducted in the classrooms where it was made sure that they were seated comfortably in a relaxed and noise free environment. They were provided with all the essentials require to complete the questionnaire. At the end, they were thanked for their cooperation. They were also ensured that their information would be kept confidential and will be used only for research purpose. After collecting the data, responses on all items were scored, coded, and entered in statistical analysis software (SPSS) for further analysis.

### Results

Table 2 shows extraversion is positively and significantly related with expressiveness ( $p < .01$ ) and preciseness ( $p < .05$ ); neuroticism significantly positively with emotionality ( $p < .01$ ), impression manipulateness ( $p < .01$ ), and verbal aggressiveness ( $p < .05$ ); openness to experience significantly positively with expressiveness ( $p < .05$ ), preciseness ( $p < .01$ ), verbal aggressiveness ( $p < .05$ ), and questioningness ( $p < .05$ ); and conscientiousness significantly positively related with expressiveness ( $p < .05$ ) and preciseness ( $p < .01$ ). This table also shows Cronbach's alpha reliabilities and inter-scale correlations among personality traits and communication styles.

Table 3 illustrates gender differences and indicates that women has significantly higher levels of agreeableness than men ( $p < .05$ ); as far as communication goes, men were higher on preciseness than women ( $p < .05$ ) and women significantly more expressive

Table 2  
Mean, Standard Deviations, Alpha Coefficients of, and Correlation Matrix between Personality Traits and Communication Styles among University Students ( $N = 194$ )

Variables	<i>M(SD)</i>	$\alpha$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
<b>Personality Traits</b>													
1. EXT	38.90(4.82)	.62	-	-.10	.18*	.17*	.31**	<b>.34**</b>	.14*	.09	.13	.05	.10
2. NEU	36.24(5.12)	.60		-	-.03	-.05	-.09	.04	-.12	.15*	.08	<b>.34**</b>	<b>.21**</b>
3. OE	39.51(4.82)	.36			-	.31*	.28**	.17*	<b>.34**</b>	.18*	<b>.30*</b>	.09	.13
4. AGR	38.21(4.63)	.60				-	.32**	.04	.16*	-.06	.06	.13	-.01
5. CON	41.76(4.42)	.65					-	<b>.14*</b>	<b>.31**</b>	.00	.07	.10	.04
<b>Communication Styles</b>													
6. X	50.05(5.37)	.60						-	.05	.04	.18*	.14*	.22*
7. P	52.92(5.79)	.65							-	.09	.18**	.08	.19**
8. VA	48.68(5.67)	.60								-	.35**	.41**	.34**
9. Q	49.90(4.61)	.60									-	.30**	.29**
10. E	50.55(6.47)	.70										-	.31**
11. IM	49.84(4.86)	.63											-

Note. EXT = Extraversion; NEU = Neuroticism; OE = Openness to experience; AGR = Agreeableness; CON = Conscientiousness; X = Expressiveness; P = Preciseness; Q = Questioningness; E = Emotionality; VA = Verbal aggressiveness; IM = Impression manipulateness. Absolute correlation  $\geq .21$  are noted in bold-face.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and T-Values on NEO-FFI Personality Traits and CSI Communication Styles among Men and Women University Students (N = 194)

Variables	Men ( <i>n</i> = 98)		Women ( <i>n</i> = 96)		<i>t</i> (192)	<i>p</i>	95% CI		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
Personality Traits									
Extraversion	38.58	5.03	39.23	4.61	0.94	0.34	-2.02	0.71	0.13
Neuroticism	35.81	5.44	36.68	4.97	1.17	0.30	-2.31	0.58	0.16
Openness to Experience	39.43	4.90	39.59	4.77	0.22	0.82	-1.52	1.21	0.03
Agreeableness	37.60	4.29	38.81	4.91	1.83	0.05	0.09	2.51	0.30
Conscientiousness	41.76	3.55	41.76	5.18	0.00	0.99	-1.25	1.25	0
Communication Styles									
Expressiveness	49.74	5.20	50.37	5.54	0.81	0.04	2.15	0.89	0.11
Preciseness	53.67	5.71	52.17	5.73	1.80	0.05	0.13	3.13	0.30
Questioningness	50.38	4.95	49.41	4.21	1.46	0.14	-0.33	2.27	0.21
Emotionality	50.47	6.32	50.66	6.65	0.23	0.81	-2.06	1.61	0.02
Verbal aggressiveness	49.30	5.70	48.03	5.58	1.56	0.12	-0.33	2.88	0.22
Impression Manipulativeness	50.34	5.22	49.32	4.43	1.45	0.14	-0.35	2.39	0.21

Note. EXT = Extraversion; NEU = Neuroticism; OE = Openness to experience; AGR = Agreeableness; CON = Conscientiousness; X = Expressiveness; P = Preciseness; Q = Questioningness; E = Emotionality; VA = Verbal aggressiveness; IM = Impression manipulativeness; CI = Confidence interval.

Table 4

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis showing the effect of Personality Traits on the Prediction of Communication Styles among University Students (N = 194)

Expressiveness Communication Style			
Model 1		95% CI	
Variables	B	LL	UL
Constant	28.66**	17.70	39.63
Extraversion	.37**	.21	.52
$\Delta R^2$	.13		
F	6.08**		
Preciseness Communication Style			
Variables	B	LL	UL
Constant	29.92**	18.27	41.56
Openness to Experiences	.33**	.16	.50
Conscientiousness	.29**	.10	.48
$\Delta R^2$	.18		
F	8.33**		
Verbal aggressiveness Communication Style			
Variables	B	LL	UL
Constant	32.24**	20.15	44.33
Openness to Experiences	.21**	.04	.40
Neuroticism	.17*	.02	.33
$\Delta R^2$	.06		
F	2.68*		
Questioningness Communication Style			
Variables	B	LL	UL
Constant	38.07*	28.08	48.05
Openness to Experiences	.05*	-.09	.19
$\Delta R^2$	.03		
F	1.28*		
Emotionality Communication Style			
Variables	B	LL	UL
Constant	18.76**	5.63	31.88
Neuroticism	.45**	.29	.62
$\Delta R^2$	.15		
F	6.89**		
Impression manipulativeness Communication Style			
Variables	B	LL	UL
Constant	34.00**	23.74	44.26
$\Delta R^2$	.08		
F	3.38**		
Neuroticism	.21**	.08	.34

CI = Confidence interval.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

than men ( $p < .05$ ). Cohen's  $d$  indicated small and medium effect size in men and women comparison (Cohen, 1992).

Table 4 indicated that multiple linear regression analysis was used with personality traits of NEO-FFI as predictor variables and

communication styles as an outcome variable. The results of the regression indicated that 13% of the variance in the outcome variable (i.e.,) expressiveness has been accounted by the predictors  $F(5, 188) = 6.08, p < .01$  but only extraversion personality trait has significantly predicted X ( $\beta = .33, p < .01$ ). 18% of the variance in the outcome variable (i.e.,) preciseness communication style has been accounted by the predictors  $F(5, 187) = 8.33, p < .01$  but only openness to experience ( $\beta = .27, p < .01$ ) and conscientiousness ( $\beta = .22, p < .01$ ) has significantly predicted preciseness communication style. 6% of the variance in the outcome variable (i.e.,) verbal aggressiveness has been accounted by the predictors  $F(5, 186) = 2.68, p < .05$  but only openness to experience ( $\beta = .18, p < .01$ ) and neuroticism ( $\beta = .15, p < .05$ ) has significantly predicted verbal aggressiveness. 3% of the variance in the outcome variable (i.e.,) questioningness has been accounted by the predictors  $F(5, 188) = 1.28, p < .05$  but only openness to experience ( $\beta = .06, p < .05$ ) has significantly predicted questioningness. 15% of the variance in the outcome variable (i.e.,) emotionality has been accounted by the predictors  $F(5, 187) = 6.89, p < .01$  but only neuroticism ( $B = .36, p < .01$ ) has significantly predicted emotionality. 8% of the variance in the outcome variable (i.e.,) impression manipulativeness has been accounted by the predictors  $F(5, 188) = 3.38, p < .01$  but only neuroticism ( $B = .22, p < .01$ ) has significantly predicted impression manipulativeness among university students.

## Discussion

Individuals interact with one another on the basis of their personalities (Bashir, 2013). People with same personalities attract each other and they share their thoughts. For this purpose, they used different modes to convey their thoughts either verbally or non-verbally (Adler & Rodman, 2006). Literature indicated that every personality type has its own way of communication with others (de Vries et al., 2011). The way people communicate to one another can also be learned. It's a continuous process that never ends. But with the passage of time and experience it refines and become more prominent (Adler & Rodman, 2006; Zafar, 2005).

Reliabilities of NEO-FFI subscales ranged from .36 to .65 (see Table 2). Triandis and Sch (2002) found low reliability of these measures in collectivistic cultures especially openness to experience

because the items represent individualistic and idiocentric cultures i.e., people who believe in exploration and self-satisfaction. On the other hand, reliabilities of CSI ranged from .60 to .70. As it was used for the first time in Pakistani context, these reliabilities may be considered as satisfactory as compared to the original one (.83 to .87) (De Vries et al., 2011). Reliabilities of this instrument may vary because of the sample but presently the range is acceptable for further higher analysis like correlation and regression. Furthermore, it was observed that with these values of reliabilities the correlations were found significant. On the basis of correlation results it was decided further to conduct regression analysis as predictions doesn't depend on the psychometrics of the instrument directly, rather they can be carried out if correlations are significant (Field, 2009). Range of reliabilities ranging from .60 to .70 is sufficient to analyze the objective based on predictions (R. E. De Vries, personal communication, March 15, 2014). Both instruments are considered as reliable to use.

Extrovert individuals are more open, relaxed, friendly, and fun loving while communicating with others (Emanuel, 2013). de Vries et al. (2011) stated that expressiveness has the characteristics of extraversion personality trait. It indicated that extroverts are likely to interact with others in a more friendly way and are more dominant than their fellows. While neurotic individuals report more apprehension about communication. They deal things emotionally and are overly dramatic (Emanuel, 2013; McCroskey, Heisel, & Richmond 2000). de Vries et al. (2011) reported in their study that people who use emotional communication style always score high on neuroticism because neurotic personality communicate in a more emotional and defensive way. It was seen that neurotic individuals deal with most of the matters emotionally and have low self-concept. They try to impress and manipulate others for their own satisfaction (Emanuel, 2013).

Previous studies showed that those individuals who are optimistic in bad situations, creative, imaginative, philosophers, and are open to experience new things are somewhat uses questioningness as their style of communication with others (Emanuel, 2013). They avoid bad situations by experiencing the other side of the situation and by discovering good things via questioning about them. de Vries et al. (2011) stated that those individuals who considered themselves as explorers are always discovering new aspects of events and situations, love to question, and are curious while interacting with others. It was also shown that individuals who are open to new things are also precise and expressive while talking. Literature indicated that those individuals who are rational, concise, ready to hard work, and conscientious are more towards using precise communication styles. They always structure their communication and thinks logically (Emanuel, 2013). de Vries et al. (2011) indicated that individuals who are precise while talking, are thoughtful, concise, and are considered as high on conscientiousness.

Furthermore, the present study has also investigated the inter-scale correlations among personality traits and communication styles of NEO-FFI and CSI respectively. As literature shows that personality trait extraversion has a significant positive relationship with openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Openness to experience is significantly positively related with agreeableness and conscientiousness. Conscientiousness also shows significant positive relationship with agreeableness. But neuroticism personality trait has a nonsignificant negative relationship with extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness personality traits (Bhatti, 2013; Khan, 2013; Soric, Penezic, &

Buric, 2013) because they show strong incremental validities with each other (Linden, Nijenhuis, & Bakker, 2010; McCrae & Costa, 2004). Likewise, communication styles of CSI show some significant and nonsignificant inter-scale correlations. Previous literature also supported these findings because of the individuality of CSI scale as they measure different styles of communication (de Vries et al., 2011).

Table 2 indicated the correlation coefficients between personality traits and communications styles. As compared to de Vries et al. (2011), the current study showed some minor changes. Former study illustrated that openness personality trait has a strong significant positive relation with expressiveness and questioningness and a weak positive relation with preciseness communication style; neuroticism showed a strong significant positive relation with emotionality; extraversion displayed significant positive relation with preciseness. Likewise, agreeableness has a significant negative relation with expressiveness (de Vries et al., 2011). The correlation coefficients for the present study has been accepted as the reliabilities of the measures are found satisfactory and hypotheses are also found accepted.

Literature findings suggested that women have more tendency of agreeableness than men (Costa & McCrae, 2003). Evolutionary and social role theorists suggested that females tend to be more nurturing that's why they score high on agreeableness (Chapman et al., 2007). They are helpful and able to compromise their needs or interests with others. Some studies supported these findings that women are more expressive, polite, and affectionate while interacting and communicating with others while men are more assertive, power hungry, and goal directed during conversation. Women use communication as a tool for forming and maintaining relationships while men use language to achieve their goals and exert dominance (Merchant, 2012). In university, women also score high on speech patterns in group discussions because women want to satisfy their Need for Intimacy (Mahmood, 2006). It was also seen that women use more affectional expression in their talk (Ansari & Aftab, 2007). It was indicated that both men and women differ biologically. They have different brain structures. Women way of expressing themselves is more related to the emotional part of brain while men's ability to speak is related to the logical part of their brain (Personal and Professional Development, 2011).

de Vries et al. (2011) stated that CSI communication styles are derived from personality traits. So, every personality trait is contributing its role in every style of communication. Results of the present study indicated that 13% variance in expressiveness is predicted by the personality traits of NEO-FFI but only extraversion personality significantly predicted this variance in a positive direction. Existing literature indicated that extraversion personality trait and expressiveness are positively related to one another. It also indicated that individuals who are extroverts score high on expressiveness (de Vries et al., 2011). 18% variance in preciseness is predicted by the personality traits of NEO-FFI but only openness to experience and conscientiousness personality traits are significantly predicting this variance in a positive direction. Prior literature indicated that openness to experience and conscientiousness personality traits are positively related to preciseness. Moreover, it was studied that those who use precise communication style are more conscientious and logical. They communicate in a more organized and logical way (de Vries et al., 2011).

6% percent of variance in verbal aggressiveness is predicted by

the personality traits of NEO-FFI but only openness to experience and neuroticism personality traits significantly predicted this variance in a positive direction. Previous literature indicated that openness to experience and neuroticism personalities are related and contributing their role in the presence of verbal aggressiveness. They are unable to control their emotions while communicating with others (de Vries et al., 2011). 3% variance in questioningness is predicted by the personality traits of NEO-FFI but only openness to experience personality trait significantly predicted this variance in a positive direction. Existing literature indicated that openness to experience personality trait is positively related with questioningness. It was also studied that those who use questioning as their communication style are more curious about the world. They try to discover things and ideas. They have the urge to satisfy themselves by asking questions (de Vries et al., 2011).

15% variance in emotionality is predicted by the personality traits of NEO-FFI but only neuroticism personality trait significantly predicted this variance positively. Previous literature indicated that neuroticism is related to emotionality. Furthermore, it was studied that those who use emotionality are more sad, depressed, inward, anxious, and hostile and they overcome these feelings by communicating in an emotional manner (de Vries et al., 2011).

Finally, the results of the present study indicated that 8% variance in impression manipulateness is predicted by the personality traits of NEO-FFI but only neuroticism personality trait significantly predicted this variance positively. Existing literature observed that neuroticism personality is moderately related to impression manipulateness. It was studied that those who are sad, low, feel depressed are more involved in the formation of their impression on others and manipulating them so, that they can control these feelings of sadness (de Vries et al., 2011).

### Conclusion

Personality traits and communication styles both are highly individualistic phenomenon but there exist a relationship between personality traits and communication styles as the present study indicates. This study gives us a basic view that some specific personality traits have some specific styles of communication with others. Extraversion and expressiveness are positively related to each other. Neuroticism and impression manipulateness and emotionality, conscientiousness and preciseness, openness to experience and questioningness are positively related to each other. Women score high on agreeableness and expressiveness while men show more degree of preciseness. Extraversion personality trait played its role in the prediction of expressiveness. Conscientiousness and openness to experience personality traits have high chances of having preciseness. Verbal aggressiveness is predicted through openness to experience and neuroticism personality traits. Openness to experience personality trait also played its role in the prediction of questioningness. Communication style of emotionality is predicted through neuroticism personality trait. Lastly, neuroticism personality trait also predicted impression manipulateness.

### Implications

Communication is a very essential part of one's life. People share their feelings, thoughts, and ideas while interacting with others either verbally or non-verbally. It's the basic source of learning and growth. The present study provides a way for students to learn

about communication styles and adopt the most appropriate style with relation to their personalities. By studying these communication styles one can adopt the best and improve their current style of communication. As these communication styles are very descriptive and informative. One can also change their problematic styles and can learn better.

The present study can be used as guidance for the teachers to enhance the ability of their students to communicate with others. They can introduce different styles of teaching in their class that also requires the participation of students. They can teach their students how to adopt a good communication style according to their personalities. It relates with many things like self-perception, perceiving others, how you are presenting yourself etc. So, a good communication style adopted by a student can help him to lead a successful professional and personal life. Moreover, those organizations where effective communication is the basic requirement for their jobs can also use this study. They can introduce different workshops in which they can improve the communication styles of their employees by knowing their personality types. It can also be helpful for clinical psychologists who are involved in the treatments of many psychological and other interacting problems that occur due to poor communication styles.

### Limitations

The total numbers of items in the present study were 156 and it was very difficult for students to complete the questionnaire within the time limit and with full interest. It is suggested that future researchers can use its subscales and study it with other variables. The study also has some generalizability issues because the data was only collected from two cities. So, further studies should use sample from diversified locations in order to generalize the findings.

### References

- Adler, R., & Rodman, G. (2006). *Understanding Human Communication* (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ansari, K., & Aftab, S. (2007). Extravert personality trait as a predictor of affectional expression in married women. *Pakistan Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 6(1-2), 3-13.
- Ahmed, J. (2014). *Personality traits and communication styles among university students*. (Unpublished M.Sc. Research Report). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Bashir, S. (2013). *Personality traits and autonomy as predictors of facebook usage: Moderating effects of adult attachment styles*. (Unpublished M.Phil. Dissertation). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Belshek, J. A. (2010). *How are core cultural values manifested in communication styles of Libyan postgraduate students in the UK?* Communication and Language Sciences, Newcastle University. Retrieved from <https://theses.ncl.ac.uk/dspace/handle/10443/981>
- Bhatti, A. S. (2013). *Personality as a determinant of attitude of people towards Piri-Muridi relationships*. (Unpublished M.Phil. Dissertation). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Chapman, B. P., Duberstein, P. R., Sorensen, S., & Lyness, J. M. (2007). Gender differences in five factor model personality traits in an elderly cohort: Extension of robust and surprising

- findings to an older generation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(6), 1595-1603. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2007.04.028
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155-159. Retrieved from <http://web.vu.lt/fsf/d.noreika/files/2011/10/Cohen-J-1992-A-power-primer-kokio-reikia-imties-dyd%C5%BEio.pdf>
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1988). From catalog to classification: Murray's needs & Five factor model. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 54, 258-265.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- de Vries, R. E., Bakker-Pieper, A., Konings, F. E., & Schouten, B. (2011). The communication styles inventory (CSI): A six dimensional behavioral model of communication styles and its relation with personality. *Communication Research*, 20(10), 1-27. doi: 10.1177/00936502 11413571
- de Vries, R. E., Bakker-Pieper, A., Siberg, R. A., Gamenen, K. V., & Vlugs, M. (2009). The content and dimensionality of communication styles. *Communication Research*, 36(2), 178-206. doi: 10.1177/0093650208330250
- DeYoung, G. C., Hirsh, B. J., Shane, S. M., Papademetris, X., Rajeevan, N., & Gray, R. J. (2010). Testing predictions from personality neuroscience: Brain structure and the Big Five. *Psychological Science*, 21(6), 820-828. doi: 10.1177/0956797610370159
- Emanuel, C. R. (2013). Do Certain Personality Types Have a Particular Communication Style? *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 2(1). Retrieved from <http://www.researchpub.org/journal/ijssh/ijssh.html>
- Goleman, D. (1986). Major personality study finds that traits are mostly inherited. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1986/12/02/science/major-personality-study-finds-that-traits-are-mostly-inherited.html>
- Gray, J. A. (1999). *A critique of Eysenck's theory of personality* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Berlin: Springer-Verlag. Retrieved from [http://www.academia.edu/164198/The\\_Personality\\_Theories\\_of\\_H.\\_J.\\_Eysenck\\_and\\_J.\\_A.\\_Gray\\_A\\_Comparative\\_Review](http://www.academia.edu/164198/The_Personality_Theories_of_H._J._Eysenck_and_J._A._Gray_A_Comparative_Review)
- Khan, A. (2013). *Comparison of personality traits and distress tolerance between shisha smokers and non-shisha smokers*. (Unpublished M.Sc. Research Report). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Linden, D. V., Nijenhuis, J. T., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). The general factors of personality: A meta-analysis of Big Five intercorrelations and a criterion-related validity study. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44, 315-327. Retrieved from [http://www.beanmanaged.eu/pdf/articles/arnoldbakker/article\\_arnold\\_bakker\\_218.pdf](http://www.beanmanaged.eu/pdf/articles/arnoldbakker/article_arnold_bakker_218.pdf)
- Mahmood, R. (2006). *Study of gender differences in communication style and contents among university students*. (Unpublished M.Phil. Dissertation). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Matthews, G., Deary, I. J., & Whiteman, M. C. (2003). *Personality traits* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/samples/cam041/2003046259.pdf>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2003). *Personality in adulthood: A five factor theory perspective* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2004). A contemplated revision of the NEO Five-Factor Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 587-596. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00118-1
- McCroskey, J. C., Heisel, A. D., & Richmond, V. P. (2000). Eysenck's BIG THREE and Communication Traits: Three correlational studies. *Communication Monographs*, 68(4), 360-366. Retrieved from <http://www.as.wvu.edu/~richmond/articles/eyesencks-big-three.pdf>
- Merchant, K. (2012). How men and women differ: Gender differences in communication styles, influence tactics, and leadership styles. *Claremont Mckenna College*, 513. Retrieved from [http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1521&context=cmc\\_theses](http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1521&context=cmc_theses)
- Nevgi, S., Nishimura, A., & Tella, S. (2008). Culture, communication style and approaches to teaching: A case study of Finland, Japan, and India. *Department of Applied Sciences of Education*, 299. Retrieved from <http://www.helsinki.fi/~tella/nishimuranevgitella299.pdf>
- Personal and Professional Development. (2011). *Gender communication*. Retrieved from <http://www.assoa.nt.edu.au/MATERIALS/ppd/gender.pdf>
- Soric, I., Penezic, Z., & Buric, I. (2013). Big five personality traits, cognitive appraisals, and emotional regulation strategies as predictors of achievement emotions. *Psychological Topics*, 22(2), 325-349. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com.pk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCwQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fhrca.hr%2Ffile%2F159885&ei=sOvUsC7IKGTyWOL8oHYCQ&usq=AFQjCNGzNBomNoYpOfBpIvLRkAYPn6r0pg&sig2=wFlZpR0o6NkywH1-qlrHIA>
- Triandis, H. C., & Sch, E. M. (2002). Cultural influences on personality. *Annual review psychology*, 53(1), 133-160. Retrieved from <http://web.yonsei.ac.kr/suh/file/cultural%20influences%20on%20personality.pdf>
- Zabihi, R. (2011). Personality traits shaped by family background: A new perspective in Social Psychology. *Continental Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(1), 13-23. Retrieved from <http://www.wiloludjournal.com/pdf/socialsci/2011/13-23.pdf>
- Zafar, A. (2005). *Relationship of couple communication pattern with marital adjustment*. (Unpublished M.Phil. Dissertation). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Received: 20<sup>th</sup> June 2015Revisions Received: 5<sup>th</sup> December 2015