# Mapping Self-Presentation through Lenses of Non-Verbal Cues and Body Language; Observational Analysis of Pakistani Society 


#### Abstract

Non-verbal signals or silent language play a significant role in understanding of verbal communication since inception of mankind on this planet. Several factors including gender, age socio-economic background, communication setting and cultural differences influence our non-verbal communication in conspicuous manners. This research paper presents in-depth analysis of non-verbal cues mainly eye contact smile, forward lean of body, touch and play with hair as well as tapping with fingers on surface and arms positions etc. of Pakistani society. The body language of 217 research subjects was measured with the help of covert observational technique. The findings of the study divulge quite interesting practices but different mode of nonverbal behavior among Pakistani males and females as it was observed that males smile more than


[^0]females irrespective of their age group at public places. Similarly Pakistani women of rural background seemed to be less confident, assertive and dominating with blend of shyness in term of body language as compared to urbanized women. On the other side men were found more open, commanding and confident than both type of women. It was also revealed that the ratio of open arm position among males was found greater as compared to females. Due to the social and Islamic cultural constraints, Pakistani women feel comfortable using free arm positions as well as of their bodies movement at inhouse premises rather than open or public places. More and above the impact of customs and tradition was clearly seen in the context of posture, eye contacts, arm positions to the body, tapping fingers on the surface. Finally it is sum up conveniently that the gender difference, nature of relationship and location were the strong variables which created conspicuous influences on nonverbal mode of behavior of Pakistanis.
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## ■ Introduction

C
ommunication is an integral part of our lives. We communicate in different ways to express our thoughts, feelings, knowledge, skills, and ideas. It is normally assumed that communication is identified with speech and sounds but communication is, in fact, the combination of verbal and non-verbal transmission of
knowledge. During everyday communication, especially face-to-face interaction, vocal and visible behaviors are typically coordinated in ways that provide for their mutual performance. When people talk, they also locate their bodies, assume various postures, direct their eyes, and perhaps move their hands, altogether behaving in ways that constitute an interactive event. Historically, however, verbal and nonverbal messages have been studied separately, as though they were independent rather than co-occurring and interrelated phenomena.

Non-verbal communication includes sounds, gestures, body movements, eye contacts, facial expressions, pitch or tone of a voice, spatial distance, apparent behavior, postures, and dress of an individual. According to Dlleo (1977) "Language comprises all forms of communication: crying, facial expression, gestures, touching, yelling, and also speech and writing."Givens (2002) stated, "A body movements, postures, or material artifacts which encodes or influences a concept, motivation, or mood (thus, a gestures is neither matter nor energy, but information). In its most generic sense is a sign, signal, or cue used to communicate in tandem with, or part from words. Gestures include facial expressions, clothing cues, and body movements.

In comparison to men, women in general differ in their communication style: they self-disclosemore (Eagly \& Johnson,1990)) and use a greater relationship-oriented style, with more smiling, more gazing at the other, less physical distance, and increased emotional expressiveness. Women also tend to adjust their status to equal their partner's, whereas men underscore status differences (Dindia \& Allen, 1992). Within society, women behave less dominantly and are less likely to embrace hierarchies, be competitive, take on leadership positions, or emerge as group leaders than men
(Eagly et al, 1995). Research by Mehrabian (1971) in USA suggests that, as far as feelings and attitudes are concerned, the total impact of a message/communication is transmitted as follows:

Head Movements to show receipt of a message; to indicate agreement or disagreement; to indicate uncertainty; to give somebody else space

Facial Expressions to show a variety of moods including agreement; disagreement; sympathy; hostility; amusement; concern etc.

Eye Contact to establish rapport; to watch for reactions in the other party

Gestures to reinforce/add emphasis to the verbal message; to help somebody else into the conversation

Posture to reinforce/add emphasis to the verbal message; to help establish rapport; to show interest and commitment; to help self-confidence; to indicate formality or informality

Body Movements to reinforce/add emphasis to the verbal message; to help terminate a conversation

Proximity to establish rapport; to allow space for the other parties; to indicate degree of formality or informality; to help engage or disengage

Appearances indicate formality or informality; to help rapport.

## Literature Review

Thill and Bovee (1999) stated, "The most basic form of communication is non-verbal communication: all the cues, gestures, vocal qualities, spatial relationships, and attitudes toward time that allow us to communicate without words.

Anthropologists theorize that long before human beings used words to talk things over, our ancestors communicated with one another by using their bodies. They gritted their teeth to show anger; they smiled and touched one another to indicate affection (p.21).

Miller (1988) stated, "The most important and reliable features of the face, the eyes provide a constant channel of communication. They can be shifty and evasive; convey hate, fear, and guilt; or express confidence, love, and support. He further stated, "Teachers can have individual contacts with every student in the classroom through eye contact. Attitudes of intimacy, aloofness, concern or indifference can be inferred by the way a teacher looks or avoids looking at a student.

Witt and Wheeless (1999) conducted a research study on, "Nonverbal communication expectancies about teachers and enrolment behavior in distance learning." This study was focused at exploring the relationship of nonverbal communication expectations between students and the teachers. The findings of the study showed that the students of distance learning had less expectation for teachers' nonverbal communication as compared to on-site classroom students they had fewer enrolments in the courses than onsite students.

Darrow and Johnson (2009) conducted a study on "Preservice music teachers' and therapists' nonverbal behaviors and their relationship to perceived rapport" in this article two studies were reported and the main purpose of the study was to analyzed whether or not a relationship exists between pr-eservice music therapists' and teachers' nonverbal behaviors and their perceived rapport. The results and findings of both studies show that nonverbal behaviors are
important to verbal and musical behaviors in determining therapists' and teachers' rapport.

Wills and Briggs conducted a study entitled," Relationship and touch in public settings" the main objective of this study was to analyzed gender differences among the US couples. They argued that men and women interpret touch differently. In this study the researchers analyzed touch initiation among the couples and observed them in a variety of public places. The findings revealed that men were more tend to touch than women during courtship and women were more likely to initiate touch after their marriage.

Houser and Frymier (2009) analyzed the role of non-verbal behavior in the development of student's confidence and their achievements. They argued that the way of communication among educators and the students during their interaction can be reflected through both verbal and non-verbal communication. They further explained that the communication patterns of the educators are congruent and reinforcing that enable the students and provide them the clear sense of confidence in their everyday actions. However, when there is a lack of congruity in their verbal and nonverbal cues it can produces or create high degree of uncertainty for the students.

Sime (2006) in the research entitled," What do learners make of teacher's gestures in the language classroom? "Explains the three areas for classroom development in which teachers nonverbal communication plays an effective role and have a deeper impact on student learning process. After analyzing the data concerning the teacher nonverbal cues and behavior researcher argued that teacher's nonverbal responses strengthen the classroom processes in three particular areas.

According to Helmer and Eddy (2003) non-verbal communication among diverse cultural background can be a major and important issue. Therefore, the students from different cultures may misunderstand or misinterpret the nonverbal behavior and it can be a strong barrier in effective communication. They argued that it leads to conflict and also disturbs the learning and stated that often non-verbal communication is culturally incline and unconscious. It can be possible that teachers may unintentionally employ nonverbal communication which can create conflict among culturally diverse students.

According to Remland (1981) in the marketing research nonverbal behavior is mostly common. He further explains that the attitude of the consumers can be easily determined by the nonverbal communication because they pay more attentions to the nonverbal cues and they are able to identify more closely the true feelings by observing their body language, facial expressions and eye contact.

Gottman and Porterfield (1981) hypothesized that marital satisfaction is related to the ability of married couples' understanding towards nonverbal messages communicated by their wives. Twenty one married couples and additionally twenty one husbands and wives were selected to investigate and rate their marital satisfaction and understanding nonverbal cues and signs during their relationship. The results of the study indicated that there was a positive relationship between marital satisfaction and nonverbal competence but that was only for husbands who were able to read their wives nonverbal signs or cues.

The study conducted by Damnet \& Borland (2007) investigated five nonverbal cues which were different between Thai and native English norms including facial expressions, touching, vocalic communication, eye contact and bodily communication. The findings of the study
revealed that the experimental group students had more positive feelings towards the nonverbal communication of English native speakers and they also have the higher ability than the control group to understand and interpret the nonverbal cues of English native speakers.

## Hypotheses

H1: The proportion of high eye contact frequency would likely to be observed greater among boys as compared to girls.
H2: The ratio of smile of males would likely to be observed lower than females.
H3: The ratio of open arm position would likely to be observed greater among males as compared to females.
H4: Girls would tend to be observed with more open arm position within in-house premises as compared to public place.
H5: The ratio of tapping hand or finger on surface would likely to be observed lower among males in comparison of females.
H6: The ratio of touching or playing with hair would likely to be observed lower among males as compared to females.
H7: The ratio of forward lean of the body of females would likely to be observed lower in public places as compared to in-house premises.
H8: The ratio of touching or playing with clothes would likely to be observed higher among females as compared to males.

## Methodology

In order to accurately measure non-verbal behavior of research subjects, the technique of covert observation was applied. Initially, a team of research suppliers was systematically trained about how to measure and count the body language of the selected subjects. Subsequently, the proper instructions were given to the research team with regard to operational definitions of different variables i.e. low medium and high in the context of eye contact, smile, forward lean of the body, touch and play with hair, tapping hand or finger on the surface etc. For the purpose of cross examination and to establish internal validity, the assessment of research team regarding their observation of single subject was evaluated. Deliberate and unintentional flaws, errors were rectified, so that the rest of the sample would be measured precisely and accurately.

## Findings

## Table-1: Respondents' Demographics

| Personal Characteristics | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | - | - |
| Male | 142 | $65.5 \%$ |
| Female | 75 | $34.6 \%$ |
| Age | - | - |
| Young | 182 | $83.9 \%$ |
| Old | 35 | $16.1 \%$ |
| Nature of Subjects | - | - |
| Friends/Familiar | 178 | $82 \%$ |
| Employer/Businessmen | 9 | $4.1 \%$ |
| Clients/Employees | 9 | $4.1 \%$ |
| Family members | 21 | $9.7 \%$ |
| Location | - | - |
| Public place(canteen, garden. library | 139 | $64.1 \%$ |
| etc. | 78 | $35.9 \%$ |
| Private place(In-house ,hostel room) | - | - |
| Nature of conversation | 24 | $11.1 \%$ |
| Formal |  |  |


| Informal | 193 | $88.9 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{N = 2 1 7}$ |  |  |

The data of table No. 1 presents a comprehensive picture about demographic profile of 217 respondents. Most of the research subjects were males (65\%) because in a country like Pakistan where phenomena of religious extremism as well as social taboos were the hindrances in the way of observing female subjects. Additionally, the ratio of young research subjects was greater (approximately 84\%) than older ones. It was relatively convenient task for the research team to measure the non-verbal behavior of familiar faces at public places. It is significant to identify here that non-verbal behavior of overwhelming research subjects (approximately 89\%) were calculated in informal setting.

Table-2: Frequency levels of Eye Contact

| Personal <br> Characteristics | Low | Medium | High | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Gender | -- | - | - | - |
| Male | $22(15.4)$ | $62(43.6)$ | $58(40.8)$ | 142 |
| Female | $24(32)$ | $30(40)$ | $21(28)$ | 75 |
| Age | - | - | - | - |
| Young | $44(24.1)$ | $72(39.5)$ | $66(36.2)$ | 182 |
| Old | $2(5.7)$ | $20(57.1)$ | $13(37.1)$ | 35 |
| Nature of Subjects | - | - | - | - |
| Friends/Familiar | $41(23.1)$ | $77(43.2)$ | $60(33.7)$ | 178 |
| Employer/Businessmen | $0(0)$ | $5(55.5)$ | $4(44.4)$ | 9 |
| Clients/Employees | $1(11.1)$ | $1(11.1)$ | $7(77.7)$ | 9 |
| Family members | $4(19.1)$ | $9(42.8)$ | $8(38.1)$ | 21 |
| Location | - | - | - | - |
| Public place(canteen, | $28(20.1)$ | $56(40.2)$ | $55(39.5)$ | 139 |
| garden. library etc. |  |  |  |  |
| Private place(In-house, | $18(23.1)$ | $36(46.1)$ | $24(30.7)$ | 78 |
| hostel room) |  |  |  |  |


| Nature of <br> conversation |  | - | - | - |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Formal | $4(16.6)$ | $5(20.8)$ | $15(62.5)$ | 24 |
| Informal | $42(21.7)$ | $87(45.1)$ | $64(33.1)$ | 193 |
| $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{2 1 7}$ |  |  |  |  |

Table-3: Eye Contact on Gender and Age basis

| Age Group |  |  | Eye contact |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Low | Medium | High |  |
| Young | Gender | Male | 20 | 51 | 51 | 122 |
|  |  | Female | 24 | 21 | 15 | 60 |
|  | Total |  | 44 | 72 | 66 | 182 |
| Old | Gender | Male | 2 | 11 | 7 | 20 |
|  |  | Female | 0 | 9 | 6 | 15 |
|  | Total |  | 2 | 20 | 13 | 35 |

Above tables shows the Respondents' observed frequencies of eye contact. The researchers constructed two gender based categories of respondents (young and old with respect to their age groups) and explained them along with their designed ranking (low, medium and high) respectively. Category containing young audience is consisted of 182 respondents including 122 males and 60 females. Using frequency and percentage, the results show that out of 122 young male respondents, 51 had higher eye contact, 51 put in medium category while 20 were at the lower level of eye contact. Same category also depicts the results of young female respondents. Out of 60 female respondents, 15 captured the higher positions, 21 were placed in medium category while remaining 24 got to be at low level of eye contact. Males are much ahead here in their eye contacts in comparison with females. Another category containing old audience has also been given place in this table which is consisted of 35 respondents including 20 males and 15 females. Again same methods of frequency and percentage were employed. The results show that out of 20 old male respondents, 7 respondents had higher eye contact, 11 were kept in medium category while rest of the 2 were found to
have lower level eye contact. It is observed that there were total 15 old female respondents amongst whom 6 and 9 had higher and medium level of eye contact respectively while no female respondent could get access even to the lower level of eye contact. Here, female respondents again showed less eye contact in comparison with male respondents. So, these findings indicate that 58 males ( 51 young and 7 old) secured higher level of eye contact in comparison with female respondents who were just 21 in numbers ( 15 young and 6 old). Moreover, it is also learned that informal conversations among friends at public place covered more space in comparison with formal conversations held elsewhere among different groups of people (employer, clients etc.) Since the results support the hypothesis. So H1 stands accepted and concluded on the basis of findings and results that proportion of high contact frequency is greater among boys (including both categories of young and old) as compared to girls.

Table-4: Frequency of Smile on the basis of Demographics

| Personal <br> Characteristics | Low | Medium | High | Tota <br> I |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Gender | -- | - | - | - |
| Male | $80(56.8)$ | $50(35.2)$ | $12(8.5)$ | 142 |
| Female | $41(54.6)$ | $29(38.6)$ | $5(6.6)$ | 75 |
| Age | - | - | - | - |
| Young | $98(53.8)$ | $68(37.3)$ | $15(8.2)$ | 182 |
| Old | $22(62.8)$ | $11(31.4)$ | $2(5.7)$ | 35 |
| Nature of Subjects | - | - | - | - |
| Friends/Familiar | $102(57.3)$ | $61(34.2)$ | $15(8.4)$ | 178 |
| Employer/Businessmen | $5(55.5)$ | $3(33.3)$ | $1(11.1)$ | 9 |
| Clients/Employees | $4(44.4)$ | $5(55.5)$ | $0(0)$ | 9 |
| Family members | $10(47.6)$ | $10(47.6)$ | $1(4.7)$ | 21 |
| L |  |  |  |  |

## Location

| Public place(canteen, <br> garden. library etc. | $75(53.9)$ | $50(35.9)$ | $14(10)$ | 139 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Private place(In-house, | $46(58.9)$ | $29(37.1)$ | $3(3.8)$ | 78 |
| hostel room) |  |  | - |  |
| Nature of <br> conversation | - | - |  | - |
| Formal | $15(62.5)$ | $7(29.1)$ | $2(8.3)$ | 24 |
| Informal | $106(54.9)$ | $72(37.3)$ | $15(7.7)$ | 193 |

$\mathrm{N}=217$
Table-5: Levels of Smile on Gender basis

| Gender | Smile |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low | Medium | High |  |
| Male | 80 | 50 | 12 | 142 |
| Female | 41 | 29 | 5 | 75 |
| Total | 121 | 79 | 17 | 217 |

P-Value = 0.407P-value $<0.05$

The researchers created two gender based categories of respondents (male and female) and explained them along with their proposed ranking (low, medium and high) respectively. Category containing male audience is consisted of 142 respondents. Using frequency and percentage, the results show that out of 142 male respondents, 12 had higher smile practices, 50 put in medium category while 80 were at the lower level of smile ratio. Another category containing female audience has also been specified in this table which is comprised of 75 respondents. Again same methods of frequency and percentage are employed. The findings reveal that 5 seized the higher positions, 29 were placed in medium category while remaining 41 caught to be at low level of smile rate. Likewise, it is also found that informal conversation among friends at private place protected more attention in comparison with formal
conversations held elsewhere among different groups of people (employer, clients etc.) Since the results don't support the hypothesis. So H 2 stands rejected.

Table-6: Frequency of Forward lean of Body within Demographic Context

| Personal | Low | Medium | High | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Gender | - | - | - | - |
| Male | $119(83.8)$ | $20(14.1)$ | $3(2.1)$ | 142 |
| Female | $71(94.6)$ | $3(4)$ | $1(1.3)$ | 75 |
| Age | - | - | - | - |
| Young | $158(86.8)$ | $21(11.5)$ | $3(1.6)$ | 182 |
| Old | $32(91.4)$ | $2(5.7)$ | $1(2.8)$ | 35 |
| Nature of Subjects | - | - | - | - |
| Friends/Familiar | $155(87.1)$ | $20(11.2)$ | $3(1.6)$ | 178 |
| Employer/Businessmen | $6(66.6)$ | $2(22.2)$ | $1(11.1)$ | 9 |
| Clients/Employees | $9(100)$ | $0(0)$ | $0(0)$ | 9 |
| Family members | $20(95.2)$ | $1(4.8)$ | $0(0)$ | 21 |
| Location | - | - | - | - |
| Public place(canteen, | $118(84.8)$ | $17(12.2)$ | $4(2.8)$ | 139 |
| garden. library etc. |  |  | $0(0)$ |  |
| Private place(In-house, <br> hostel room) | $72(92.3)$ | $6(7.7)$ |  | 78 |
| Nature of |  | - | - | - |
| conversation | - | - |  |  |
| Formal | $17(70.8)$ | $7(29.2)$ | $0(0)$ | 24 |
| Informal | $173(89.6)$ | $16(8.2)$ | $4(2.1)$ | 193 |

$N=217$

Table-7: Gender distribution of Forward lean of the Body

| Location | Forward lean of the <br> body |
| :---: | :---: |


|  |  |  | Low | Medium | High |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Public Place | Gender | Male | 96 | 15 | 3 | 114 |
|  |  | Female | 22 | 2 | 1 | 25 |
|  | Total |  | 118 | 17 | 4 | 139 |
| Private Place | Gender | Male | 23 | 5 |  | 28 |
|  |  | Female | 49 | 1 |  | 50 |
| Total |  |  | 72 | 6 |  | 78 |

Above table shows the Respondents' observed ratio of forward lean of the body. This frequency is supposed to be observed both at public place as well as private (in-house premises). It primarily intends to discover that to what extent location does matter in determining the levels of this practice of forward lean. The researcher made two gender based categories of respondents (male and female) and explained them along with their designed ranking (low, medium and high) respectively. Category containing results of public places is consisted of 139 respondents including 114 males and 25 females. Using frequency and percentage, the results show that out of 114 male respondents, 3 had higher levels of forward lean, 15 positioned in medium category while 96 were at the lower level of this exercise of forward lean. Same category also illustrates the outcomes of female respondents. Out of 25 female respondents, merely 1 captured the higher positions, 2 were sited in medium category while remaining 22 got to be at low level of forward lean of the body. Another category encompassing results of private places has also been given place in this table which is consisted of 78 respondents including 28 males and 50 females. Again same procedures of frequency and percentage were employed. The results demonstrate that out of 28 male respondents, not even a single respondent took
higher position, 5 had access to medium category while rest of the 23 were found to have lower level of forward lean. It is observed that there were total 50 female respondents amongst whom no one could get access to higher spot while 1 and 49 had medium and lower level of forward lean practice respectively. So, these findings clearly suggest that females possessed lower level of forward lean of the body at public place in comparison with when they were at private sites. Additionally, it is also found that informal conversation among friends at private place covered more space in comparison with formal conversations held elsewhere among different groups of people (employer, clients etc.).Since the results support the hypothesis. So H7 stands accepted and concluded on the basis of findings and results that the ratio of forward lean of the body is lower in public places as compared to in-house premises.

Table-8: Demographic distribution of frequencies of Touch and Playing with Hairs

| Personal <br> Characteristics | Low | Medium | High | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Gender | - | - | - | - |
| Male | $125(88)$ | $16(11.2)$ | $1(.8)$ | 142 |
| Female | $61(81.3)$ | $7(9.3)$ | $7(9.3)$ | 75 |
| Age | - | - | - | - |
| Young | $152(83.5)$ | $22(12.3)$ | $8(4.4)$ | 182 |
| Old | $34(97.1)$ | $1(2.9)$ | $0(0)$ | 35 |
| Nature of Subjects | - | - | - | - |
| Friends/Familiar | $150(84.3)$ | $21(11.8)$ | $7(3.9)$ | 178 |
| Employer/Businessmen | $8(89)$ | $1(11)$ | $0(0)$ | 9 |
| Clients/Employees | $9(100)$ | $0(0)$ | $0(0)$ | 9 |
| Family members | $19(90.5)$ | $1(4.8)$ | $1(4.8)$ | 21 |
| Location | - | - | - | - |
| Public place(canteen, | $120(86.3)$ | $15(10.8)$ | $4(2.9)$ | 139 |
| garden. library etc. |  |  |  |  |
| Private place(In-house <br> hostel room) | $66(84.6)$ | $8(10.3)$ | $4(5.1)$ | 78 |
| Nature of |  |  | - | - |
| conversation | - | - | - | - |
| Formal | $21(87.5)$ | $2(8.3)$ | $1(4.2)$ | 24 |
| Informal | $165(85.5)$ | $21(10.6)$ | $7(3.7)$ | 193 |
| N=217 |  |  |  |  |

Table-9: Distribution of Touch and Play with hair on Gender basis

| Gender | Touches and play with hair |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low | Medium | High |  |
| Male | 125 | 16 | 1 | 142 |
| Female | 61 | 7 | 7 | 75 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 7}$ |

P-Value $=0.090 \quad$ P-value $>0.05$
In the above table the researchers assembled two gender
based categories of respondents (male and female) and explained them along with their proposed ranking (low, medium and high) respectively. Category containing male audience is consisted of 142 respondents. Using frequency and percentage, the results show that out of 142 male respondents, only 1 had higher level of touches and play with hair, 16 placed in medium category while 125 were at the lower level of occurrence. Another category comprising female audience has also been quantified in this table which is comprised of 75 respondents. Again same methods of frequency and percentage are hired. The findings reveal that 7 grabbed the higher positions, 7 were engaged in medium category while remaining 61 grew to be at low level of touches and play with hair rehearsal. Furthermore, it is also learned that formal conversation among friends at private place covered more space in comparison with informal conversations held elsewhere among different groups of people (employer, clients etc.) Since the results support the hypothesis. So H6 stands accepted and concluded on the basis of findings and results that the ratio of touching or playing with hair is lower among males as compared to females.

Table-10: Demographic distribution of Frequencies of touch and Play with clothes

| Personal <br> Characteristics | Low | Medium | High | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Gender | - | - | - | - |
| Male | $129(90.8)$ | $12(8.5)$ | $1(.7)$ | 142 |
| Female | $59(78.7)$ | $16(21.3)$ | $0(0)$ | 75 |
| Age | - | - | - | - |
| Young | $158(86.8)$ | $23(12.6)$ | $1(.5)$ | 182 |
| Old | $30(85.7)$ | $5(14.3)$ | $0(0)$ | 35 |
| Nature of Subjects | - | - | - | - |
| Friends/Familiar | $153(86)$ | $24(13.5)$ | $1(.6)$ | 178 |
| Employer/Businessmen | $8(88.9)$ | $1(11.1)$ | $0(0)$ | 9 |
| Clients/Employees | $9(100)$ | $0(0)$ | $0(0)$ | 9 |


| Family members | $18(85.7)$ | $3(14.3)$ | $0(0)$ | 21 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Location | - | - | - | - |
| Public place(canteen, <br> garden. library etc. | $123(88.5)$ | $15(10.8)$ | $1(.7)$ | 139 |
| Private place(In-house, <br> hostel room) | $65(83.3)$ | $13(16.7)$ | $0(0)$ | 78 |
| Nature of <br> conversation | - | - | - | - |
| Formal | $22(91.7)$ | $2(8.3)$ | $0(0)$ | 24 |
| Informal | $166(86)$ | $26(13.5)$ | $1(.5)$ | 193 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{N = 2 1 7}$ |  |  |  |  |

Table-11: Gender distribution of Touch or Play with clothes

| Gender | Touch or play with clothes |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low | Medium | High |  |
| Male | 129 | 12 | 1 | 142 |
| Female | 59 | 16 | 0 | 75 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 7}$ |
| P. Vannn |  |  |  |  |

P. Value: $0.233 \quad P$-value $>0.05$

Above table shows the Respondents' observed frequencies of touches and play with clothes. The researchers constructed two gender based categories of respondents (male and female) and explained them along with their designed ranking (low, medium and high) respectively. Category containing male audience is consisted of 142 respondents. Using frequency and percentage, the results show that out of 142 young male respondents, only 1 respondent had higher level of touches and play with clothes, 12 placed in medium category whereas 129 were at the lower level of occurrence. Another category comprising female audience has also been computed in this table which is comprised of 75 respondents. Again same methods of
frequency and percentage are hired. The findings reveal that no single respondent clutched the higher positions, 16 were engaged in medium category while remaining 59 produced to be at low level of touches and play with clothes rehearsal. Moreover, it is also learned that informal conversation among friends at public place gained more attention in comparison with formal conversations held elsewhere among different groups of people (employer, clients etc.) Since the results support the hypothesis. So H6 stands accepted and concluded on the basis of findings and results that the ratio of touching or playing with clothes is lower among males as compared to females.

Table-12: Demographic distribution of Tapping hand or Finger

| Personal <br> Characteristics | Low | Medium | High | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Gender | - | - | - | - |
| Male | $112(78.9)$ | $26(18.3)$ | $4(2.8)$ | 142 |
| Female | $64(85.3)$ | $9(12)$ | $2(2.7)$ | 75 |
| Age | - | - | - | - |
| Young | $152(83.5)$ | $25(13.7)$ | $5(2.7)$ | 182 |
| Old | $24(68.6)$ | $10(28.6)$ | $1(2.9)$ | 35 |
| Nature of Subjects | - | - | - | - |
| Friends/Familiar | $144(80.9)$ | $28(15.7)$ | $6(3.4)$ | 178 |
| Employer/Businessmen | $8(88.9)$ | $1(11.1)$ | $0(0)$ | 9 |
| Clients/Employees | $4(44.4)$ | $5(55.6)$ | $0(0)$ | 9 |
| Family members | $20(95.2)$ | $1(4.8)$ | $0(0)$ | 21 |
| Location | - | - | - | - |
| Public place(canteen, | $112(80.6)$ | $22(15.8)$ | $5(3.6)$ | 139 |
| garden. library etc. |  |  |  |  |
| Private place(ln-house | $64(82.1)$ | $13(16.7)$ | $1(1.3)$ | 78 |
| hostel room) |  |  |  |  |

Nature of conversation

| Formal | $17(70.8)$ | $1(29.2)$ | $0(0)$ | 24 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Informal | $159(82.4)$ | $28(14.5)$ | $6(3.1)$ | 193 |

$\mathrm{N}=217$

| Table-13: Gender distribution of Tapping hand or Finger |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Tapping hand or finger |  | Total |  |
|  | Low | Medium |  |  |
| Male | 112 | 26 | 4 | 142 |
| Female | 64 | 9 | 2 | 75 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 7}$ |

P. Value: $0.876 \quad$ P-value $>0.05$

The table data shows the respondents 'observed frequencies of tapping hand or finger on surface. The researchers built
two gender based categories of respondents (male and female) and explained them along with their considered ranking (low, medium and high) respectively. Category containing male audience is comprised of 142 respondents. Using frequency and percentage, the results show that out of 142 male respondents, only 4 had higher level of this practice of tapping hand or finger, 26 placed in medium category whereas 112 were at the lower level of occurrence. Another category comprising female audience has also been totaled in this table which is comprised of 75 respondents. Again same methods of frequency and percentage are hired. The findings reveal that 2 seized the higher positions, 9 were engaged in medium category while remaining 64 rose to be at low level of tapping hand or finger rehearsal. Furthermore, it is also observed that informal conversation among friends at private place fascinated more responsiveness in comparison with formal conversations held elsewhere among different groups of people (employer, clients etc.).Since the results don't support the hypothesis. So H6 stands rejected and concluded on the basis of findings and results that the ratio of tapping hand or finger on surface is not lower among males in comparison of females.

Table-14: Frequency distribution of Arm position with Demography

| Personal Characteristics | Normal | Open/Stretch | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Gender | - | - | - |
| Male | $12(8.5)$ | $130(91.5)$ | 142 |
| Female | $40(53.3)$ | $35(46.7)$ | 75 |
| Age | - | - | - |
| Young | $45(24.7)$ | $137(75.3)$ | 182 |
| Old | $7(20)$ | $28(80)$ | 35 |
| Nature of Subjects | - | - | - |
| Friends/Familiar | $45(25.3)$ | $133(74.7)$ | 178 |
| Employer/Businessmen | $0(0)$ | $9(100)$ | 9 |
| Clients/Employees | $1(11.1)$ | $8(88.9)$ | 9 |
| Family members | $6(28.6)$ | $15(71.4)$ | 21 |
| Location | - | - | - |
| Public place(canteen, | $34(24.5)$ | $105(75.5)$ | 139 |


| garden. library etc. <br> Private place(In-house, |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hostel room) | $18(23.1)$ | $60(76.9)$ | 78 |
| Nature of conversation | - | - | - |
| Formal | $5(20.8)$ | $19(79.2)$ | 24 |
| Informal | $47(24.4)$ | $146(75.6)$ | 193 |

$\mathrm{N}=217$
Table-15: Frequency distribution of distance of Arm with Gender

| Gender | Arm position relative to body |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |$\quad$ Total

Table 15 shows the respondents 'observed frequencies of arm position of the body. The researchers constructed two categories of respondents (male and female) and explained them according to their arm positions (normal and stretch) relative to body. Category containing male audience is comprised of 142 respondents. Using frequency and percentage, the results show that out of 142 male respondents, 130 showed stretch/open gender arms whereas rest of the 12 male respondents performed normal arm position (close to the body). Another category comprising female audience has also been given place in this table which is comprised of 75 respondents. Again same methods of frequency and percentage are hired. The results show that out of 75 female respondents, 35 were placed in stretch/open gender arms category whereas the remaining 40 female respondents got to be located in normal (close to
the body) arm position category. So, these findings clearly suggest that male respondents (130 out of 142) stayed much ahead in showing open arm positions in comparison with females who were just 35 in numbers out of 75 . Since the results support the hypothesis. So H3 stands accepted and concluded on the basis of findings and results that the ratio of open arm position is found greater among males as compared to females.

Table-16: Distribution of frequencies of Arm position with Gender

| Gender |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location |  | Arm position relative to body |  | Total |
|  |  | Normal (Close to the body) | Stretch/Open arms |  |
| Public Place | Male | 11 | 103 | 114 |
| (Canteen, garden, library | Gender Female | 23 | 2 | 25 |
| etc.) | Total | 34 | 105 | 139 |
| Private Place (In | Male | 1 | 27 | 28 |
| House/Hostel room) | Gender Female | 17 | 33 | 50 |
|  | Total | 18 | 60 | 78 |
| P-Value $=1.000$ | P-value>0.05 |  |  |  |

Table shows the respondents 'observed frequencies of arm position of the body. This frequency is supposed to be observed both at public place (canteen, garden etc.) as well as private (in-house) premises. It primarily emphasis to discover that to what extent location does matter in determining the levels of performing arm positions. The researcher constructed two categories of premises (public
place and private place) which individually explain the different responses of males and females. These findings then get further classified into two categories according to the arm positions (normal and stretch) relative to body. Category containing the results of public place is comprised of 139 respondents including 114 male and 25 female respondents. Using frequency and percentage, the results show that out of 114 male respondents, 103 showed stretch/open arm positions whereas rest of the 11 male respondents performed normal arm position. This category also depicts the results of female respondents. It is observed that out of 25 females, only 2 showed stretch/open gender arm position while rest of the 23 female respondents performed normal arm position (close to the body). Another category comprising the results of private places has also been given place in this table which is comprised of 78 respondents including 28 male and 50 female respondents. Again same methods of frequency and percentage are hired. The results show that out of 28 male respondents, 27 were sited in stretch/open gender arms category whereas the remaining single male respondent got to be located in normal (close to the body) arm position category. It is observed that out of 50 female respondents, 33 showed stretch/open arm position while the lasting 17 respondents performed normal arm position (close to the body). So, these findings clearly suggest that female respondents showed more open arm positions at private places in comparison with when they were at public places. Since the results support the hypothesis. So H 4 stands accepted and concluded on the basis of findings and results that the ratio of open arm position is found greater among girls within inhouse premises as compared to public places.

## - Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore that how people including males and females used non-verbal signs in their everyday life to convey their messages more effectively. Non-verbal communication includes sounds, gestures, body movements, eye contacts, facial expressions, pitch or tone of a voice, spatial distance, apparent behavior, postures, and dress of an individual which aim to explore different meanings in different cultures. The sample comprised of 217 including 142 males and 75 females were taken to measure the non-verbal communication practices in Pakistani society. The presentstudy primarilyfocused on to see that those actions which come naturally without our consent differs to what extent between males and females in Pakistan.

Eye contact deals with a great importance in evaluating ones non-verbal signs of communication. It was observed that the ratio of eye contacting in Pakistan was found greater among males (including young and old) as compared to females. In Pakistani society, women are considered as shy, reluctant and less dominant so they hesitate to look into others' eyes while communicating but men are more leading, confident and dare to have considerable eye contact which shows its degree of social acceptance. In most cultures like Pakistan superiors are freer to look at sub-ordinate traditionally, men can look more at women than women at men. In western cultures, eyes are considered to show the central point of a person's focus. So, if somebody, doesn't give any eye contact during a conversation, it may be considered insulting and show a sign of distraction. In North American and Northern European cultures, eye-contact
shows openness, trust worthiness and integrity one doesn't has anything to hide. If a woman from the United States looks directly at someone, she allows that person to see her eyes and decide whether she is trustworthy. Someone who does not make eye contact is considered shifty (flirty) and makes the listener suspicious. But the Japanese feel uncomfortable with direct eye contact and they want to avoid it. So this form of non-verbal communication varies from culture to culture.

People in all cultures smile which unfold different meanings set according to different societal and cultural patterns. It is observed that men in Pakistani society are more ahead in passing smiles as compared to women. Perhaps it is because smiling women are less appreciated in Pakistani society. Here, people assume that the more a woman is smiling, the more she is confident. And bold kind of women is always less encouraged here due to male dominant society. The meaning of a smile may vary. For some culture, it indicates joy and amusement, but for other culture it can also indicate embarrassment. People in the United States smile a lot. Everyone smiles at everyone. But situation differs in Japan where people don't smile often and women in Japan are not supposed to show their teeth while smiling. The practice of forward lean of the body in different places was also watched. People in Pakistan were got more comfortable while showing forward lean of the body at inhouse premises as compared to public places.

The cover observation also unearthed this mode of nonverbal behavior that female especially young girls were found more customary of touching or playing with their hair as compared to males. It seems an obvious thing as women have got good aesthetic senses so they love to be looked
more beautiful and attractive than men so they do this practice all the time consciously or unconsciously.

Most non-verbal communications do have such complex properties and, indeed, there is often ambiguity about how non-verbal cues should be interpreted. Tapping hand or finger on surface is taken as one of these activities which don't have clear-cut meanings. Whether it shows someone's restlessness or feelings of joy heavily depend upon one's mental state doing it. Observed frequencies of tapping hands or fingers on surface explored that males were observed more habitual of doing it than women in Pakistan.

The existing study reveals that ratio of open arm position among males is greater as compared to females. Girls are comparatively shy of and reluctant due to the social and cultural constraints so they feel comfortable using arm positions of their bodies at in-house premises rather than open or public places.

In the nut shell, it can be concluded that non-verbal communication has become an integral part of our routine conversation. During everyday communication, especially face-to-face interaction, vocal and visible behaviors are typically coordinated in ways that provide for their mutual performance. When people talk, they also locate their bodies, assume various postures, direct their eyes and perhaps move their hands altogether behaving in ways that constitute an interactive event. It is important to consider any list of nonverbal signals within the cultural context in which they are being used because many of these signals will have different meanings within different cultures. Pakistan is an Islamic country where people belong to different regional cultures. These regional cultures determine the practices of these local people especially in the context of women. The women who were highly religious minded, come up with less openness. In
the same way, women who belonged to backward areas were restricted to remain hesitant and reluctant. They were not allowed to look into their men's eyes while communicating. They were not often allowed to shake hands with men or to use body movements. On the other hand in urban areas where people were more educated and civilized used all forms of non-verbal communication to convey their messages more effectively. So, it can be said that these practices of non-verbal communication make a lot of differences in leaving impact of a particular message but meanwhile the meanings of these non-verbal signs highly depend on cultural boundaries and are taken differently according to different cultural setup.
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