



A Study of Communication Styles Among Diverse Pakistani Cultures

Ahmed Khan^a, Ibarat Ali Laghari^{b*}, Shandana Siddiq^c, Saddam Hussain^d

^aLecturer, Department of Psychology, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, Pakistan. ^bLecturer, Department of Psychology, University of Karachi, Pakistan. ^cLecturer, Women Institute of Learning Psychology, University of Hazara, Pakistan. ^dMphil Scholar, Department of Psychology, University of Karachi, Pakistan.

*Email: ibarat.laghari@gmail.com

Abstract: The present research was conducted to study the different communication styles among diverse Pakistani cultures. The cross-sectional research design was used to conduct the investigation. The survey method was used to collect the data from different areas of Pakistan. The sample size for the current examination was 200. All of the 200 participants were subdivided further into four different Pakistani cultures. Cultures include Sindhi (N=50), Punjabi (N=50), Pakhtun (N=50) and Hazara (N=50). Results of the study have shown that the reliability coefficient of the Communication style inventory is .64. The reliability of the communication style inventory is satisfactory. The study also shows that people of Pakhtoon and Sindhi cultures have an equally high score on active communication, Punjabi has a high score on connector and theorist communication, and Sindhi has a high score on purposeful communication. Gender difference shows that females have high scores on active communication, and males have high scores on connector, theorist and purposeful communication

Keywords: Communication Styles, Active Communication, Theorist Communication, Connector Communication

1.Introduction

Communication started from the Latin word communis. Lunenberg (2010) concurs with them that communication has its roots in Latin from the word communis. In any case, he affirms that it signifies 'normal,' which recommends that there should be a typical comprehension of the message between the source and the beneficiary concerning the message being conveyed. The overall perspective on communication is an association inside a social setting. As a rule, communication includes a sender (source) and a collector. It consists of the conversationalist's trading signals. These signs could be verbal or realistic, and they may be gestural or visual (photographic). The communication includes utilizing codes finished with the eyes, body development, or sounds made with the voice. However it is done, there is consistently an interaction in which somebody starts a significant expectation that is passed to the conversationalist (recipient) (Daniel, 2013).

1.2 Communication Styles

Each individual has a propensity toward a particular communication style, and that inclination can, here and there, make that individual does not understand others' communication style. Our communication style is created during two or three long periods of our life. It is a mix of inherited and natural components, and every individual makes their propensity dependent on practices that overwhelm them when they grow up. That communication propensity is the thing that we call communication style (Pânișoară et al, 2015). Our communication style is a blend of a huge number, similar to voice designs, eye developments, look, and stance. The examples of conduct we see in others are social or communication styles. Communication is likewise the perspective and acting, preferably a style over a capacity. By style, it is implied in the way somebody gets a kick out of the chance to accomplish something. A capacity alludes to how well somebody can accomplish something (Jordain & Kathy, 2004).

1.3 Types of Communication Styles

Some communication styles are following;

1.3.1 Active Communication

Active' communicators seem to be immediate and certain about conversations, paying little heed to the degree of their insight regarding the matter. They will rapidly express their point, sum up conversations, and decide. They don't care to be hindered or prohibited and will fill any hushes or stops. Active communicators are people whose words and non-verbal communication are expressive. The words they use in discussions will have an effect and may regularly twist the standards of etiquette. You may perceive individuals from you group who act along these lines and you might know that they tend to talk things up. Their capacity to pay attention to others is regularly eclipsed by their energy for talking and being important for the conversation (Brown, 2017).

1.3.2 Connector's Communicators

There are others inside your group that can be singled out in light of the fact that they generally attempt to forestall conversations getting angry and have a need to include everybody. These people are 'Connector' communicators, conceived ambassadors who are prudent and thoughtful of others in the conversation and of their perspective. Their style of communication makes them congenial and compassionate. They frequently energize general conversations toward the beginning of a gathering with the goal that they can acquire a comprehension of every individual. You can see that these people with their instinctive ways and fondness for the sensations of others will bother the Logical and Active communicators. In any case, Connectors are a great idea to have in conversations since they will cautiously think about an issue prior to voicing their assessment, in this way frequently bringing balance into conversations (Brown, 2017).

1.3.3 Purposeful Communication

Purposeful communication goes outside only ability to comprehend the trading of these thoughts, and focuses on why they exist. It permits an association to consider the purpose for your communication (i.e., to spur workers, or sell an item), the best methodology, and the result you need to accomplish (Leo, 2019).

1.4 Culture and Communication Styles

Communication and culture correspondingly impact one another. The way of life in which people are mingled impacts how they impart, and the manner in which people convey can change the course of life (Balc, 1018). Culture furnishes its individuals with a piece of understood information about how to act in various circumstances and decipher others' conduct in such cases. Truth be told, since the days of yore, communication has been an essential piece of culture, and as culture propels, the communication examples of people change (Giri, 2006).

Munter (1993) has recognized four explicit issues identified with language troubles in diverse communications. To start with, there are hindrances brought about by semantics. Note that words mean various things to various individuals. This is especially valid for individuals from various societies. In Indian culture, a few words, such as bhismpatigya or Sanskrit, cannot straightforwardly be easily converted into English. Second, there are hindrances brought about by word meanings. Words infer various things in various dialects. Dealings among American and

Japanese leaders, for example, are made more troublesome because the Japanese word *hai* is interpreted as "yes"; however, its meaning might be "indeed, I am tuning in," instead of "indeed, I concur." Third, boundaries are brought about by tone contrasts. In certain societies, language is formal; in others, it is casual. In certain societies, the tone changes depending upon the unique circumstance: individuals talk diversely at home, in friendly circumstances, and at work. Utilizing an individual, casual style where a more conventional style is standard can be humiliating and off-putting. For instance, Indian servers utilize a falling sound when offering food to clients. Albeit the two Indians and Americans think about the demonstration of asking for amiable conduct, Americans pose inquiries with a rising pitch. American clients view this distinction, i.e., offer with a falling sound, as inconsiderate and unseemly (Maltz & Borker, 1982). Fourth, there are boundaries brought about by contrasts in discernment. Individuals who communicate in various dialects unexpectedly see the world. Eskimos see snow distinctively because they have numerous words for it. Thais see "no" diversely to Americans because they have no such word in their jargon. Also, Indian culture is very delicate. The communication style of Indians changes regularly depending upon the unique situation (Giri, 2006).

1.4 Rationale of the Study

The study will be conducted to examine the communication styles among diverse cultures. Cultures include Punjabi, Pathan, Sindhi and Hazara Cultures. The study will aim to discover the different communication styles among various civilizations. Studies have yet to be done on this topic in Pakistan. The study's findings can be used to examine these variables further. The study will focus on the communication styles among different cultures of Pakistan. This will help us know the communication patterns of these cultures. The study's findings demonstrate the communication style and that communication style may further give indications about other healthy behavioral aspects, i.e., communication is the way information is transferred from one individual, which helps identify specific needs. Furthermore, investigating communication styles among diverse cultures within Pakistan holds substantial significance in the realm of intercultural understanding and social cohesion. By delving into the distinct communication patterns of Punjabi, Pathan, Sindhi, and Hazara Cultures, this study aims to unravel the intricate layers of communication dynamics prevalent in these societies. Understanding these nuances is pivotal not only for fostering effective intercultural communication but also for promoting inclusivity and harmony within the diverse fabric of Pakistani communities. Additionally, as communication serves as a conduit for conveying information and needs, comprehending the specific communication styles prevalent in these cultures can potentially offer insights into addressing broader societal issues, facilitating more tailored and culturally sensitive approaches to social welfare and community engagement.

Moreover, the dearth of prior research on this particular subject within Pakistan underscores the novelty and significance of this study. By venturing into uncharted territories of exploring communication styles among these diverse cultures, this research seeks to fill a crucial gap in the existing literature. The findings of this study have the potential not only to contribute to academic knowledge but also to inform practical applications in fields such as education, business, and community development. By shedding light on the communication intricacies specific to these cultures, this study endeavors to lay the groundwork for future investigations, creating a foundation for comprehensive and nuanced studies in the realm of intercultural communication within Pakistan. The objectives of this study is to find the communication styles and demographic differences in communication styles among diverse cultures in Pakistan

2. Research Methodology

2.1 Research Design

The chosen research design for this investigation is a cross-sectional approach, providing a snapshot of communication styles among diverse cultures within a specific period. This method allows for the collection of data at a single point in time, offering insights into the prevalent communication styles among the Punjabi, Pathan, Sindhi, and Hazara Cultures within the context of this study. The utilization of a cross-sectional design enables the efficient gathering of data from a diverse range of participants representing these cultures, facilitating a

comprehensive overview of communication patterns at a particular moment in time.

2.2 Research Sample

This study used purposive convenient sampling to select the participants from different areas of Pakistan—the sample size was $N=200$ individuals. The sample was further subdivided into four respective cultures. All these four subgroups carry an equal number of participants ($N=50$)

2.3 Inclusion Criteria

The inclusion criteria for participant selection in this study were specifically targeted towards individuals belonging to four distinct cultures prevalent in Pakistan: Pakhtun, Sindhi, Punjabi, and Hazara. These cultures were chosen as the primary focus of the research due to their significance and representation within the diverse cultural landscape of Pakistan. Participants meeting the cultural affiliation with any of these specific groups were eligible for inclusion in the study. This criterion ensured that the sample comprised individuals who could provide insights into the communication styles and patterns specific to these cultural cohorts, thereby aligning with the research objectives aimed at exploring communication dynamics within these specific cultural contexts.

2.4 Exclusion Criteria

Conversely, individuals who did not identify with the Pakhtun, Sindhi, Punjabi, or Hazara Cultures were excluded from the sample. This exclusion criterion aimed to maintain the study's focus on these specific cultural groups and their distinctive communication styles. Individuals from other cultural backgrounds or those unable to identify themselves within the specified cultural categories were deliberately excluded to ensure homogeneity within the sample and to avoid confounding factors that could potentially dilute or obscure the specific communication patterns prevalent in the selected cultural groups. This exclusion criterion aimed to enhance the clarity and specificity of the study's findings by limiting the sample to participants with explicit cultural affiliations to the Pakhtoon, Sindhi, Punjabi, or Hazara Cultures of Pakistan.

2.5 Instruments

2.5.1 Demographic Sheet

A detailed demographic sheet was used to collect demographic information from individuals. The demographic sheet included Gender, Education, Socio-Economic Status, Family System and Culture (Pakhtun, Hazara, Panjabi and Sindhi).

2.5.2 Communication Style Questionnaire

The communication style questionnaire has 37 items that measure four types of communication styles. The communication styles include Active Communication, Connector Communication, Theorist Communication and Purposeful Communication. Response categories are yes and no; there are 10 items of Active Communication, 9 items of Theorist Communication, 9 items for Purposeful Communication and 9 items of Connector Communication. The respondents who select yes on more Active Communication items will be considered Active Communicators. If they have score on another scale, they will be regarded as of that style. But if a participant scores equally on two or more scales, they have a combination of styles and can communicate in different ways in different situations.

2.6 Procedure

First of all, permission was taken from the concerned authorities. After obtaining consent, participants were approached for data collection through Google Forms. Google form was made first, and then it was sent to the participants through emails. All the instructions were given on the questionnaire, and they were asked if they had any queries they could ask the researcher through the email provided below the instructions. All the questionnaires will be filled out online. Members are guaranteed that their information will be kept classified, won't be imparted to anybody, and will be used only for research purposes. After getting the questionnaires filled the data was analyzed through SPSS (v.25).

3. Results

The study was conducted to find out the communication styles among diverse Pakistani cultures.

Table 1

Alpha Reliability Coefficient of Communication Style Inventory (CSI) (N=200).

| | M | SD | Range | A |
|---------------------|------|-----|-------|-----|
| Communication Style | 1849 | .95 | 13-24 | .64 |

M=Mean; SD=Standard Deviation

The findings of Table 1 exhibit that the calculated reliability coefficient of the Communication style inventory are .64. The reliability of the communication style inventory are satisfactory

Table 2

One Way Analysis of Variance of Communication Style Inventory (CSI). (N=200).

| | Pakhtun (n=50) | | Hazara (n=50) | | Punjabi (n=50) | | Sindhi (n=50) | | |
|--------|-------------------|-------|------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|------------------|-------|---------|
| Scales | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | F |
| AC | 5.08 | 1.122 | 4.96 | 1.009 | 4.44 | .907 | 5.08 | 1.259 | 3.978** |
| CC | 4.52 | 1.313 | 4.70 | 1.199 | 4.86 | 1.143 | 4.22 | 1.266 | 2.480 |
| TC | 4.10 | 1.111 | 4.26 | 1.121 | 4.76 | 1.238 | 4.40 | 1.355 | 2.702* |
| PC | 4.20 | .904 | 4.02 | 1.078 | 4.20 | .904 | 4.60 | 1.195 | 2.846* |

Note. M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; AC= Active Communication; CC= Connector Communication; TC= Theorist Communication; PC= Purposeful Communication

Table 2 shows the cultural difference on the communication styles. Table 2 indicates that Pakhtoon and Sindhi cultures have equally high score on the Active Communication, while Punjabi culture have high score on Connector and Theorist Communication and Sindhi high score on Purposeful Communication. Hazara culture has

been low on each subscale.

Table 3

Mean, Standard Deviation and t-values of education type on active communicator, connector communicator, theorist communicator and purposeful communicators (N = 200).

| Variables | Male n = 101 | | Female n = 99 | | t | P | Cohen's D |
|------------|-----------------|-------|------------------|-------|--------|------|--------------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | | | |
| Active | 4.74 | 1.092 | 5.04 | 1.106 | -1.916 | .057 | 0.27 |
| Connector | 4.76 | 1.266 | 4.38 | 1.201 | 2.168 | .031 | 0.30 |
| Theorist | 4.50 | 1.270 | 4.26 | 1.174 | 1.343 | .181 | 0.19 |
| Purposeful | 4.28 | 1.001 | 4.23 | 1.086 | .304 | .761 | 0.04 |

Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation

The table 3 presents a comparative analysis of mean scores, standard deviations, t-values, and Cohen's D effect size for different communication styles among male (n = 101) and female (n = 99) participants based on their educational backgrounds within a sample size of N = 200. The results reveal interesting patterns. For instance, in Connector Communication, males (M = 4.76, SD = 1.266) tend to exhibit significantly higher mean scores compared to females (M = 4.38, SD = 1.201), with a t-value of 2.168 (p = .031), suggesting a noteworthy difference in Connector Communication styles between genders based on their educational backgrounds. However, in Active Communication, although not statistically significant (t = -1.916, p = .057), females (M = 5.04, SD = 1.106) demonstrate a slightly higher mean score compared to males (M = 4.74, SD = 1.092). Similarly, for Theorist and Purposeful Communication, the differences between male and female mean scores are not statistically significant (t = 1.343, p = .181 and t = 0.304, p = .761, respectively), indicating no substantial variations in these communication styles based on gender and educational types within this sample.

4. Discussion

This study is conducted to examine the communication styles among Pakistani cultures. Cultures include Sindhi, Punjabi, Pakhtun and Hazara. The first step of the current study was to calculate the reliability estimate of the scale which was used in the current study. The alpha reliability coefficient of the Communication style inventory is .64 for the current research which is satisfactory for the current examination. Table 2 shows the cultural difference on communication style. Results show that Pakhtun and Sindhi are equally high on the score of Active Communication, Punjabi Culture have high score on Connector and Theorist Communication and Hazara Culture got high score on Purposeful Communication. There is lack studies to support the present results. Table 3 shows the gender difference on communication styles. Results showed that female participants have high score on Active Communication style while male participants scored high on Connector, Theorist and Purposeful Communication Styles. Previous research shows that ladies are numerous ladies dynamic in friendly and political causes, yet they are the solitary ladies concentrated in our diaries to this point (Foss and Foss, 1983). There is not so many researches that support our result because there is not many researches that conduct on this topic.

Moreover, delving deeper into the cultural differences in communication styles among the Pakistani cultures reveals intriguing insights. While Pakhtun and Sindhi cultures showcase comparable high scores in Active Communication, a striking divergence emerges within the Punjabi culture, which demonstrates elevated scores in Connector and Theorist Communication styles. Conversely, the Hazara Culture exhibits a significant emphasis on Purposeful Communication, reflecting a unique facet distinct from the other cultures examined. These variations underline the rich diversity and nuanced communication dynamics within Pakistani societies. However, it's noteworthy to highlight the dearth of extensive studies substantiating these specific findings, signaling an area ripe for further exploration and investigation. Furthermore, shedding light on the gender disparities in communication styles, the results illuminate intriguing contrasts between female and male participants. The study showcases that female participants exhibit higher scores in Active Communication styles, reflecting a proclivity toward expressive and engaged communication. Conversely, male participants demonstrate elevated scores across Connector, Theorist, and Purposeful Communication styles, implying a distinct inclination towards strategic and purpose-driven interaction. These findings align with previous research suggesting that female tend to be more actively involved in social and political causes (George, 2019). However, it's important to note the limited number of studies addressing this precise intersection of gender and communication styles, indicating a crucial need for further comprehensive research in this domain to solidify and expand upon these observations.

While these findings shed light on the prevailing communication styles across Pakistani cultures and genders, it's crucial to acknowledge the broader socio-cultural factors that might influence these patterns. Factors such as historical legacies, socio-economic conditions, educational disparities, and the impact of globalization could significantly shape communication styles within these diverse cultural and gender contexts. Understanding these broader influences becomes imperative in comprehending the intricate tapestry of communication dynamics and could serve as a foundation for devising more culturally sensitive and effective communication strategies. Thus, future research endeavors should aim to explore these underlying factors comprehensively, aiming to not only validate the present findings but also provide a nuanced understanding of the multifaceted nature of communication within diverse cultural and gender landscapes.

4.1 Conclusion

In summary, this study aimed to investigate communication styles across various Pakistani cultures and genders. The examination of cultural differences revealed distinctive communication tendencies among Sindhi, Punjabi, Pakhtun, and Hazara cultures. While Pakhtun and Sindhi cultures demonstrated similar inclinations towards Active Communication, the Punjabi culture showcased heightened Connector and Theorist Communication styles, whereas the Hazara Culture emphasized Purposeful Communication. These variations underscore the diverse and multifaceted nature of communication within Pakistani societies, highlighting the need for nuanced and culturally sensitive communication approaches. Furthermore, the exploration of gender disparities in communication styles elucidated intriguing contrasts between female and male participants. Women exhibited a predilection for Active Communication, displaying more expressive and engaged communication styles, while men demonstrated higher scores across Connector, Theorist, and Purposeful Communication styles, indicating a propensity towards strategic and purpose-driven interaction. These findings echo previous research but emphasize the necessity for further comprehensive studies to corroborate and expand upon these observations due to the limited extant literature in this domain.

However, the study is not without limitations. The reliance on self-reported data and the limited sample size within each cultural and gender group may have influenced the results. Additionally, while the Communication Style Inventory used in this research provides valuable insights, future studies could benefit from the integration of qualitative methods or cross-cultural comparisons to deepen our understanding of communication styles in diverse cultural contexts. Moving forward, this study underscores the importance of recognizing cultural nuances and gender-specific communication tendencies within Pakistani societies. A better understanding of these intricacies can inform more effective intercultural communication strategies, fostering cohesion and understanding across diverse communities. Future research endeavors should aim to explore the underlying socio-cultural factors

influencing communication styles comprehensively, thereby contributing to a more holistic understanding of communication dynamics and enabling the development of more inclusive and culturally attuned communication practices. Ultimately, bridging these communication gaps will pave the way for enhanced cross-cultural understanding and collaboration in diverse societal contexts.

4.2 Limitations of the Study

The present study was confronted with some limitations. Certain factors were assumed and acknowledged as limitations of the present study and therefore vital to declare for consideration for upcoming research. Sample was the only representative of just 4 cultures of Pakistan other cultures ignored. So in the future, it should be conducted in the other cultures. This study checks only one factor (communication styles) among these cultures many other important variables were ignored. So it is suggested that the future researcher should also explore these variables. The current study was quantitative, so to get further and comprehensive information regarding variables qualitative study should be conducted. The Interview method or observational method should be used to reveal the different dimensions of these cultures.

4.3 Implications

This research was used to understand the communication styles of the Pakistan 4 major cultures. It helps to understand the communication pattern of the Pakistani cultures and after understanding it helps us in the better communication. This study is used for further research in the future.

References

- Balc, S. (2018). The relationship between Culture and Communication within the Ecclesia. In Proceedings of the 10th International RAIS Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities (pp.258-264). Scientia Moralitas Research Institute.
- Brown, J. (2017). Recognizing Workplace Communication Styles. <http://www.free-management-ebooks.com/faqcm/effective-03.htm>
- Daniel, I.O.A. (2013). Communication as socio-cultural meaning exchange. The example of Richard Wright's Black Boy. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 2,5:173-177.
- Foss, K.A., & Foss, S.K. (1983). The status of research on women and communication. *Communication Quarterly*, 31:3, 195-204, doi: [10.1080/01463378309369504](https://doi.org/10.1080/01463378309369504).
- George, R. (2019). Gender norms and women's political participation: Global trends and findings on norm change. Retrieved from <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/2019/02/gender-norms-and-womens-political-participation-global-trends-and-findings-norm>
- Giri, V. J (2006). Culture and Communication Style. *The Review of Communication*, 6, 12, 124-130.
- Jordain & Kathy. (2004). Communication Styles and Conflict. <http://www.teamchrysalis.com/ACA/4|AC46-Communication-Styles>.
- Leo, A. (2019). Purposeful Communication: What Is It and Why Does It Matter?. <https://medium.com/purposeful-communications/purposeful-communication-what-is-it-and-why-does-it-matter-c9520edf0478>
- Lunenberg, F.C. (2010). Communication: The process, barriers and improving effectiveness. *Schooling*, 1.1:1-11.
- Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. A. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity* (pp. 146-216). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge.
- Munter, M. (1993). Cross-cultural communication for managers. *Business Horizons*, 36, 69-78.
- Pânișoară, G., Sandu, C., Pânișoară, I. O., & Duță, N. (2015). Comparative study regarding communication styles of the students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, (186), 202-208.