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Abstract:
This paper tackles nonverbal communication cues among refugees. It is widely believed that nonverbal communication is one of the most effective types of communication to enhance better human understanding and cooperation. Besides, interpretation and comprehension of this type of communication are crucial among diverse nations, cultures, and ethnic groups. On the other hand, the number of refugees has increased because of several factors, mainly including armed political conflicts in Middle-Eastern countries. Thus, they face political, economic, social, and/or psychological threats. Besides, they encounter other challenging difficulties in verbal and nonverbal communication. Therefore, communication enhancement has become essential and crucial to treat refugees through more proactive nonverbal communication strategies.

The study targets real people in Sulaimani Governorate refugee camps, Kurdistan Region of Iraq. It investigates the types of nonverbal cues in the sociopragmatic refugeeism context. It initiates by some definitions of sociopragmatics and nonverbal communication and its cues categorization. In addition, it extends to explain the impact of sociopragmatic variables on the communicative types of nonverbal cues.
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1. Introduction:

It seems that there is a strong relationship between sociopragmatic context and encoding/decoding nonverbal communication cues. Few researchers studied the relationship between sociopragmatic context and the usage of nonverbal cues, such as investigating the issue in the classroom, workplace, and court environments. However, the relationship between the sociopragmatic context of refugeeism and nonverbal communication has not been thoroughly studied. Therefore, an investigation is attempting to show the impact of sociopragmatic refugeeism context and the usage of nonverbal cues.

This paper first explains the types of nonverbal communication cues and then the influence of sociopragmatic variables: age, gender, ethnicity, and religion on encoding/decoding nonverbal communication cues are investigated in refugees’ camps context. Moreover, the data collected by qualitative research tools from refugee camps are presented and discussed. The paper has drawn some conclusions based on the collected data.

2. Key Definitions:

Sociopragmatics is a dominant field of General Pragmatics. As a term, Sociopragmatics was first coined by Leech to illustrate the study of ways in which pragmatic meanings reflect “specific ‘local’ conditions on language use, and it is the sociological interface of pragmatics” (Leech 1983, p: 10). In this book, he writes “sociopragmatics” with a hyphen, but recently it has been generally solid. Additionally, in his book footnotes, Leech attributes the formulation of the Pragmalinguistics/Sociopragmatics distinction to Jenny Thomas (1981, 1983) (cited in Culpeper 2009, p: 185). Through this term, the connection between the sociopragmatic refugeeism context and the types of nonverbal cues, which is a major concern of this study, is investigated.

On the other hand, nonverbal communication has been paid a great deal of attention in sociology, because it has a significant impact on the competent presentation of self in everyday life. The awareness of nonverbal communicative norms, i.e., socially acceptable nonverbal behavior according to specific social contexts, is essential to felicitous social interaction. Two main perspectives encompass the study of nonverbal communication in sociology. First, symbolic interactionism has been suggested by Erving Goffman (1956), who believes that the elements of impression management, information control, and being attentive to what human bodies and faces are “telling” others are essential to a successful interaction with others. Secondly, phenomenology suggests that sensory experiences and information are too crucial to the development of a self-sense and to interact with others. Recent studies, such as Paynton and Hahn (2018), Yilmaz (2017) on nonverbal communication, have concentrated on the styles people decorate and mark their bodies to convey information about belonging group membership and status.

Likewise, pragmatics is regarded as one of the required fields of study that tackles the issue of nonverbal behavior (Wharton, 2009). Most research, in this respect, concentrates on context as the most crucial item that must be studied, while studying nonverbal behavior, simultaneously. Studying language use in context is the core of the domain of pragmatics, similarly almost all the studies in diverse fields of study, especially psychology, sociology, and communication, insist on regarding context in usage, interpretation, and comprehension of nonverbal behaviors. Eventually, from Leech’s definition of sociopragmatics, the current study investigates how the sociological interface of pragmatics influences the usage of nonverbal communication cues.
3. Methodology:
Nonverbal behavior can be used as a style, skill, and communication. This paper studies nonverbal behavior as communication from a sociopragmatic perspective. The research methodology involves sampling and data collection tools. Later, the data is going to be analyzed.

3.1 Sampling and Data Collection Tools:
This study targets refugees in Kurdistan Region of Iraq. The samples are randomly selected from refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) camps in Sulaimani Governorate. The camps are composed of refugees and IDPs from a variety of ethnicities (Kurd, Arab), religions (Muslim, Yazidi), and nationalities (Iraqi, Syrian). One hundred participants have been selected randomly during three field visits carried out by the researcher, while the most expressive participants that are dealt with for the analysis have been chosen within the whole samples purposively. The samples’ categorization is displayed in the table (1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Ashti Camp</th>
<th>Arbat Camp</th>
<th>Barika Camp</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young+ Middle Age</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim/ Sunni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim/ Shiite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazidi</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study is achieved by applying a qualitative research method, and qualitative data collection tools have been used. The tools are an unstructured in-depth interview, participant observation, photographing, and video recording techniques.
3.2 Data Analysis Method:

The method used for data analysis includes a sociopragmatic analysis of types of nonverbal cues. This process encompasses the analysis of contextual sociopragmatic variables of the study participants, which are gender, age, ethnicity and religion, and their impact on nonverbal cues types among refugees.

3.3 The Selected Model for Data Analysis:

As the study tackles the sociopragmatic perspective and types of nonverbal cues, a blended model from Leech’s model (1983) of sociopragmatics, and Patterson (2017) model, as well as Gamble and Gamble’s (2013) model of nonverbal cues types, have been applied.

4. Data Analysis:

Since the context is a shared point among the models of the current study, the data analysis process of nonverbal cues types focuses on refugeeism context. Thus, four contextual sociopragmatic variables, namely gender, age, ethnicity, and religion, have been analyzed. The purpose of selecting those variables relates to Patterson’s personal factors, which involve biology, culture, age, gender, and personality. Besides, ethnicity and religion constitute the most effective components of culture, having impacts on personality as well.

In this study, observations are made at three refugee camps where the researcher conducted several hours of observations focusing on the nonverbal tendencies among the intercultural population of the camps. Observations mainly depend on nonverbal communication through the use of nonverbal cues. The conclusions are drawn based on how the sociopragmatic variables: gender, age, ethnicity, and religion influence the use of nonverbal communication cues in the context of refugeeism. On the other hand, the impact of the context on using nonverbal cues has been studied among 100 participants who were observed at refugee camps setting. The paper initiates a comprehensive explanation of the types of nonverbal cues based on the selected blended model.

5. Types of Nonverbal Cues:

“Nonverbal Communication” is often mistakenly called “Body Language,” which is a popular vernacular. According to Patterson (2017) and Burgoon (2016), using the term Body Language to label Nonverbal Communication is vague because the latter involves more elements than body parts movement, such as paralinguistic cues, spatial distances, touch, chronemics, as well as using objects, design, and arrangement of settings to send messages. Besides, as Burgoon asserts, not all nonverbal cues are communicative, i.e., some are a part of personal behavior style, like switching on a light or answering the telephone while some are regarded as human nonverbal skills such as driving, hammering, playing musical instruments, and so on.

Burgoon (2016, pp. 8, 9) defines Nonverbal Communication as “those behaviors other than words themselves that form a socially shared coding system; i.e., they are typically sent with intent, typically interpreted as intentional, used with regularity among members of a speech community, and have consensually recognizable interpretations.” However, Paynton and Hahn (2018) have criticized this definition because it sounds like a verbal communication definition, and it disregards the importance of nonverbal communication as a tool for interpreting the hidden meaning beyond the words. Whereas, nonverbal cues are defined as “Perceptual information communicated in a social exchange by codes accompanying the words used in speech” by Rahmat et al. (2019, p. 4), or as cues that substitute verbal message in its absence by other researchers.
According to Patterson (2017), the nonverbal system of communication encompasses components that are both static and dynamic, i.e., some elements are relatively unvarying throughout an interaction, whereas others are variable. He further argues that the fixed features of the setting and interactants found the context for interaction while the dynamic behaviors are the fluid components in the give-and-take of nonverbal communication. Consequently, nonverbal communication occurs as a coordinated pattern of elements, not merely an additive package.

Types of nonverbal cues, codes, or behaviors have been the focal point of researchers and scholars in the field of nonverbal communication studies. Likewise, several classifications have been provided based on human body parts movements. This study applies a blended model of Patterson’s, Gamble, and Gamble’s models since the outcome of this blending is a comprehensive approach to deal with the nonverbal cues categorization scientifically. Besides, the term “Cues” is used in this research because it is more inclusive than the terms “Behaviors” or “Codes” to indicate almost all human nonverbal behaviors. The following are the major types of nonverbal cues according to the blended model.

5.1 Kinesics:

Kinesics is the anthropological term of body language. Originally, it was coined by the anthropologist Ray Birdwhistell (1918-1994). According to Dael et al. (2011), kinesics belongs to skeletal body movement, that is, motions of the head, torso, and limbs. Some scholars exclude facial expressions and eye movements while some others include them in the kinesics. Birdwhistell also developed one of the first coding systems aimed at complete body movement symbolic transcription following the hierarchical structure of linguistic principles. “Body movement is segmented into kinemes, the most elementary unit of behaviors, much like phonemes in speech. Kinemes combine into kinemorphs (analogous to morphemes), and further into larger units of kinemorphs constructions” (Matsumoto et al. 2016, p. 556).

Kinesics can communicate liking, social status, and even relational responsiveness (Mehrabian, 1981, p.73). It is the study of human body motion or physical movements. According to the paper blended model, it also encompasses facial expressions, gestures, posture, and postural adjustments, rate of walk, body lean, body orientation, hand, foot or leg movements, and eye language. Moreover, kinesics involves self and objects manipulations, such as scratching, adjusting clothes, and fiddling with rings, keys, or other objects (Patterson 1983, p.3). The importance of kinesics is evitable in communication; even some scholars believe it composes 70% of the context of the conversation (Waiflein 2013, p. 2).
5.1.1 Facial Expressions:

Facial expressions are the primary means of expressing and sharing emotions and feelings (Paynton & Hahn 2018). According to Patterson (2017), facial expressions are rich sources of information. That is why most of the interlocutors’ visual attention is directed at others’ faces. Specific facial signals have become universal throughout the world, such as happiness, sadness, anger, fear, disgust, and surprise. Patterson (2017) believes that facial expressions are primarily signals of emotions while a different approach, Fridlund’s behavioral ecology theory, argues that facial expressions are signs of intentions or social motives, not emotions. Thus, facial expressions are cues to indicate what people are likely to do, not how they feel. For instance, an “angry” face may imply a threat, not just hiding anger. A smile may reflect a sign of cooperation and be friendly or even disgust or sometimes mocking, not just happiness. Moreover, facial expressions complete and qualify verbal comments, any inconsistency between the words and the facial expression; listeners might doubt the intention of the speaker (cited in Patterson 2017, p. 3).

On the other hand, facial expressions can reduce the rigidity of the informal written messages through emojis, which have become widespread since mid of 2010 and known as literal icons of nonverbal communication. Emojis are used to express the emotional attitude of the writer, to convey information briefly, and to communicate a message playfully without using words (Paynton & Hahn 2018).

Gamble and Gamble (2013), have distinguished two types of communicative facial expressions, representational facial expressions, and presentational facial expressions. The former is exhibited when the interlocutors use their facial expressions to communicate real inner feelings, whereas the latter is performed when the interlocutors consciously control their faces to communicate a message meant only for public consumption. When the interlocutors practice presentational facial expressions, they are probably are engaging in interpersonal deception. Gamble and Gamble have also detected another type of facial expression, which is labeled microfacial, or micromomentary expressions. Such expressions are lasting no more than one-eighth to one-fifth of a second; reveal actual emotional states and typically appear when interlocutors try to disguise or hide their states.

5.1.2 Eye Language:

Eye language is regarded as an essential part of kinesics because most of the human information about others comes through the visual channel. For example, the meaning of a particular look depends on the context, cultural norms, the relationship of the participants, and the message that wanted to be conveyed. According to Gamble and Gamble (2013), eye behaviors constitute a crucial part of interpersonal communication since human beings use their eyes to establish, maintain, and terminate contact, and eye contact indicates if a communication channel is open. It determines whether the interlocutors want to initiate, continue, or avoid the interaction.

Eye language includes eye movement, gaze amount and direction, pupillary dilation or constriction. Moreover, there are different types of gaze, such as holding gaze, repeated gaze, lower gaze, staring down, upper gaze, lateral gaze, steady gaze, and averting gaze. Eyes can also be described as “Shifty eyes,” “Goo-goo eyes,” “Eye to eye.” Besides, messages sent by eyes can be interpreted in a variety of ways, yet there are three central functions eye movements serve. First, eyes disclose the extent of interest and emotional involvement. Secondly, eyes have judgment impact of persuasiveness and perception of dominance or submissiveness. Finally, eyes regulate turn-taking and person-to-person interaction (Gamble and Gamble 2013, p. 160).

Furthermore, the pupils of human eyes indicate lots of emotion reliably. For instance, the pupils widen, and the blinking rate decreases when the interlocutor takes an interest in what another is saying. Likewise, pupils dilate...
when the interlocutors experience positive emotion and lessen with a negative one. Gamble and Gamble (2013) propose, “The pupils rarely, if ever, lie because regulating pupil size is a nonverbal cue beyond conscious human control.”

Almost all the researchers in the field contend that there is a robust mutual relation between the type of relationship among the interlocutors and eye contact. As much as the relationship is closer and intimate, the more eye contact, especially gaze, will be practiced (Patterson, 1983, p. 5). However, the matter is also culture-specific. In some cultures, avoiding direct eye contact is regarded as respect and modesty, especially between different genders, whereas it is considered disrespect and dishonesty in some other cultures. Direct eye contact is also essential if an interlocutor tries to persuade another. Hence, the steady gaze is urgent, neither looking down nor looking away serves a persuasion situation. Besides, the visual dominance can be practiced by increased eye contact while averted eyes indicate the impression of submissiveness. Besides, a downward gaze with a closed posture indicates a perception of powerlessness (Gamble and Gamble, 2013, pp. 160, 165).

5.1.3 Postures:

Postures provide information about a person’s feelings and intentions. Interest, respect, and openness toward participants in the rate of interaction can be indicated by an individual’s posture. For instance, a closed or rigid posture is less inviting than a relaxed and open one. Posture differences among people also signify power and social status. More dominant individuals are more relaxed and less caring about their social environment than less powerful ones. People are also different in how quickly they move and whether they are graceful or awkward, coordinated or selfish (Patterson, 2017, p. 3).

Gamble and Gamble (2013) suggest that individuals move and stand in distinctive ways, so significant that people can be identified by their characteristic walk or posture. Although some of the individual’s body messages facilitate effective interpersonal interaction, others, whether sent consciously or unconsciously, interfere in it.
5.1.4 Gestures:

Patterson (2017, p.3) defines gestures as “specific movements of the hands, arms, and even the head that merit distinction.” Gestures usually accompany speech, yet they can be practiced independently or can even replace verbal messages such as waving instead of leave-taking verbally. Ekman and Friesen (1969) identify five categories of gestures that can be used to describe bodily cues: emblems, illustrators, regulators, affect displays, and adapters, shown in table (2).

Table (2) Types of Bodily Cues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cue Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emblems</td>
<td>Deliberate body movements that can be translated into speech</td>
<td>Thumbs-up, wave hello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrators</td>
<td>Body cues that support or reinforce speech</td>
<td>Direction pointing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulators</td>
<td>Intentional cues to influence turn-taking</td>
<td>Head nods, breaking eye contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect displays</td>
<td>Unintentional body movements that reflect emotional states of being</td>
<td>Slumping body; relaxed, confident body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptors</td>
<td>Unintentional movements that are frequently interpreted as signs of nervousness</td>
<td>Nose scratches, hair twirling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cited from (Gamble and Gamble, 2013, p. 163)

Gamble and Gamble (2013) view that the use or misuse of gestures reveals much about interlocutors’ social skills since ignorance or unawareness of self or another’s use of the gestural cues may be interpreted as rudeness or insensitivity. Generally, the individuals’ postures and gestures reveal a lot about how they feel about themselves and others. Even when they want to avoid verbal communication with someone, their bodies continue talking.

5.2 Paralinguistics (Vocalics)

Paralanguage is the term which is used to describe vocal qualities. The nonverbal cues are nonvocal; nevertheless, paralinguistic cues, are vocal. Patterson (2017) labels them as Vocal behaviors, which are characteristics of speech that are distinctive from its content or meaning. Paralinguistic cues play a crucial role in the communication process as changes in voice tone and stress can modify the meaning of utterances. According to Patterson, the vocal (not verbal) characteristics that can reveal information about the interlocutors, their feelings and motivations are pitch, loudness, emphasis, tempo, and pausing. He also suggests that the voice also impacts the first impression, including judgments of dominance and attractiveness (Patterson, 2017, p. 4).

Likewise, Gamble and Gamble (2013) identify Paralanguage as the messages that interlocutors send by their voices. Often, an interaction outcome is determined by how words are said and not what is said. Interlocutors depend on the vocal cues to elicit the real meaning of the spoken words. These include variation in the voice, pitch, volume, speech rate, articulation, intonation, pronunciation, hesitation, pauses, interruptions, speech duration, and silence.
Paralanguage focuses on how words are said since it is more effective in conveying meaning than the words themselves. Sarcasm, sincerity, humor, encouragement, mocking, jocking, condemning, complaining, uncertainty, hesitation, shyness, embarrassment, and confusion are good examples of the impact of paralinguistic cues on conveying a specific meaning in a specific context. Paralinguistic cues also serve a function of nonverbal communication, which is accenting the verbal messages when the encoder emphasizes a specific word in his/her utterance. Consequently, the tone of the voice supports to communicate what the speaker means to convey or hide. It can strengthen or negate the spoken words. The sound of voice communicates the interlocutors’ emotional state, attitude, personality, status, and turn-taking. The way of speech influences how others interpret the speaker’s intention, honesty, intelligence, and attractiveness (Gamble and Gamble, 2013, p.165).

On the other hand, some studies consider silence as an independent nonverbal cue and behavior while others, such as Gamble and Gamble (2013) regard it as a part of paralinguistic cues. Silence conveys lots of messages and meanings. Losey (1997) indicates, “Listening to silences can be just as instructive as listening to voices, maybe more” (cited in Nakane, 2007, p: 14). Recently, silence grabs the researchers’ interest as an effective or secret form of communication. Calero (2005) believes that silence can have many meanings, such as ignorance, nuanced opposition, complex hesitation, and lack of interest. He further argues that there is a deep cultural significance to silence. Sociopragmatically, silence has several functions; Nakane (2007) indicates that functions of silence can be classified into cognitive, discursive, social, and affective functions.

5.3 Proxemics:

Proxemics studies how space and distance are used to communicate. Humans do not use special distance arbitrarily, but it reveals their feelings about themselves and what they think of others. Generally, the interlocutors use physical proximity and distance to indicate either desire to communicate or disinclination in communicating. Furthermore, the physical proximity and distance mostly signal the type of relationships among them, such as friendliness, unfriendliness, extroversion, and introversion. Edward T. Hall (1966) has coined the term Proxemics to show that proximity affects human interaction. It also belongs to the usage of personal space around the interlocutors as they interact with each other as well as the way they structure the space around them in homes, offices, and communities (Gamble and Gamble, 2013, p.168).

Patterson (2017) uses distance and orientation for Proxemics, and he regards them as the essential elements of dynamic behaviors. He has identified two types of features of nonverbal communication, fixed and dynamic. Thus, the fixed features of the setting and interactants establish the context of interaction while the dynamic behaviors are the fluent components in the give-and-take of nonverbal communication. On the other hand, he argues that even the fixed features of design and arrangement of settings affect how individuals space themselves. Moreover, they indicate the power, dominance, social, and economic status of their owners. Distance and orientation importance lies in their contribution to the overall involvement level in interactions and affects the other dynamic behaviors such as body posture, type of gaze, paralinguistic cues especially voice volume and touch. Thus, Patterson believes that various component behaviors operate as a system, so a change in distance and orientation causes changes in other nonverbal behaviors.

Types of spatial relationships draw the interest of researchers since Hall (1966), who identified four distances that signify the kinds of interactions interlocutors have and the relationships they share. Although they are cultural-specific, the four types are:

A. Intimate distance ranges from skin contact to 18 inches from another person. Such proximity, which may involve physical touches, is frequent with trusted or intimate persons, especially among family members.
Nevertheless, this distance is also used for physical fight or harassment in some crowded public places such as elevators, buses, and theater lobbies. In such places individuals, tend to put up with the intimate distance between themselves and strangers.

B. Personal distance grades from 18 inches to 4 feet. It is less proximate than the intimate distance, which may include handshaking. It is used at social events such as receptions, talking between classes, or coffee breaks.

C. Social-consultative distance extends from 4 feet to 12 feet. At this distance, the interlocutors do not talk about personal matters. It includes issues that are neither private nor of a personal nature, such as business discussion or conversation during meals, conferences, or meetings. The more distance kept between interlocutors, the more formal their interaction becomes.

D. Public distance ranges between 12 feet and beyond. This distance is used by interlocutors to remove themselves physically from interaction, to communicate with strangers, or to address large groups (cited in Gamble and Gamble, 2013, pp. 168, 169).

Furthermore, Gamble and Gamble (2013) argue that three types of environmental space involve nonverbal communication: Fixed-feature space, semi-fixed-feature space, and informal space. Fixed-feature space encompasses the permanent characteristics of an environment, including walls, doors, built-in-cabinets, windows, roads, and paths; e.g., the placement of windows in a school building is different from that of a hospital. Secondly, semi-fixed-feature space involves movable objects such as furniture, plants, temporary walls, and paintings to indicate boundaries and even enhance or prohibit interaction; e.g., in the education environment, desks can reduce contact while face-to-face chairs encourage interaction.

On the other hand, the third type is informal space or non-fixed-feature space, which is the space the interactants carry with them. It is invisible, mobile, and enlarged or contracted at their will to keep the individuals at a specific distance or bring them closer. This type varies according to the type of interaction or relationship. The usage of informal space leads to the rise of another proxemics variable, labeled “Territoriality” by Gamble and Gamble (2013). Identifying spatial areas like one’s own rooms, chairs, and seats are examples of territoriality, which may causes problems if they are not regarded by others or being used without their owners’ permission. In the professional environment, territory signifies status, e.g., the size and location of the offices are usually designed and employed according to the hierarchy of authority and professional power from the president to the managers, and then the other lower-status employees.

5.4 Haptics:

Haptics is the study of how touch communicates. Patterson (2017) considers touch an essential cue of nonverbal communication in all kinds of relationships. Beginning with infancy, touch is critical to the physical and psychological health of infants and young children. In this stage, touch involves feeding, bathing, comforting, and playing. Touch is vital in other stages and relationships. It may communicate affection, support, encouragement, and comfort in the friendly contexts while it expresses hatred, threat, and aggression in intense hostile settings. Thus, its interpretation depends on the sociopragmatic context of the interaction, and it is culture-specific. For example, contact cultures consider touch as closeness and warmth in relationships whereas non-contact cultures do not. Moreover, inappropriate touch causes too negative impressions; e.g., tapping on shoulders can be a sign of solidarity or encouragement in specific contexts and culture while it can be mocking or deriding the touched person in others.

According to Gamble and Gamble (2013), haptics is usually encompassed in the closest relationships. Like proxemics, touch should be practiced within cultural norms; otherwise, it will turn to discomfort or disrespect. It
plays a vital role in interpersonal communication and conveys various messages according to diverse cultural contexts, such as communicating attitude, affect, or support; affiliation encouragement; showing control, power, and concern for others. Touch also signifies greetings and leave-taking. Even a handshake can differ according to different contexts and relationships, i.e., it is gender and culture-specific. It can be formal, social, and polite or friendly and warm. People of the higher professional, economic, or social status usually initiate touch. Hence, the touching act implies power although it can also signal dislike, dominance, aggression, or abuse.

5.5 Artifactual Communication and Appearance:

Artifactual communication and appearance include several cues such as appearance, hairstyle, clothing, jewelry, mode of dress, personal adornments, and grooming behaviors. These cues are very influential in the process of communication, especially in forming the first impression in the early stage of any relationship. They are so important that they may lead to acceptance or rejection of a job opportunity interviewer, for example. Moreover, they influence others’ judgment about the individuals’ characters, power, success, and competence. Generally, people respond more positively to those that are perceived to be well dressed than to those whose dressings are questionable or unacceptable (Gamble and Gamble, 2013, p.172).

On the other hand, Patterson (2017) believes that appearance characteristics supply important information affecting impression and communication. Thus, the automatic judgments of others are inevitable and often useful. For example, information about sex, race, and age is indicated by physical appearance. Likewise, clothing style can exhibit information about a person’s social class, ethnicity, religion, and also occupation. Moreover, Patterson argues that individuals are sensitive to appearance since it indicates the similarities/ differences among them. He further proposes that despite being imperfect indicators of what others are really like, the automatic judgments expressed by appearance characteristics, are useful and relatively accurate. Besides, individuals can modify their appearances to create desired impressions and increase likeability. The modification can be simple, such as changing clothing and grooming, or it can be complicated like practicing exercises, weight loss regimens, and cosmetic plastic surgeries.

Social and cultural contexts impose a specific style of physical attributes on both genders, especially body size and shape. For example, in the US, men are preferred to be larger and bodily strong, whereas women should be smaller and very thin. This view has been imposed widely all over the world communities through globalization and technological advancement. Thus, plastic surgeries, diet programs, and sports practicing have become much more common than the previous centuries.

5.6 Olfactics:

Olfactics is the study of the sense of smell and how smell communicates. Gamble and Gamble (2013) regard smell as one of the nonverbal cues that influence communication. Smell triggers emotional reactions, romance, or friendship, and it can attract or repel. Throughout history, olfactics has attracted human interest resulting in the production of many kinds of perfumes, colognes, mouthwashes, deodorants, household disinfectants, scented candles, aromatherapy oils, and air freshers. The smell is also associated with the recall of good and bad memories, e.g. the sense of smell sharpens when something terrible happens, and also good memories related to the presence of pleasant smells like freshly baked cookies and Rose blooming.
Patterson (2017) also believes that the importance of olfactory cues is obvious in varying cultural rules about cleansing and grooming, as well as the marketing of soaps, shampoos, perfumes, and air fresheners. People spend a considerable amount of money annually on products to remove unpleasant odors and replace them with more desirable ones. Some natural pheromones can affect attraction or other feelings like fear, unconsciously. Patterson argues that this situation is an instance where nonverbal communication operates automatically in affecting judgments and behaviors.

5.7 Color:

Color is considered a basic cue in nonverbal communication that talks both to and about its users. Gamble and Gamble (2013) suggest that colors individuals wear affect them physically and emotionally. Research reveals the influence of colors on the individuals in both clothing and the living environment. For example, exposure to pure red for extended periods leads to the nervous system excitement and the rise of blood pressure, respiration rate, and the heart rate whereas the exposure to dark blue causes the occurrence of a calming effect, and the fall of blood pressure, respiration, and the heart rate. The users' predictable reaction to various colors is regarded in various settings, such as restaurants, hospitals, schools, markets, and law enforcement agencies.

Colors convey different meanings according to various cultures, i.e., their messages are culture-specific. For example, white is the color of wedding in most countries, while in some Asian countries, white is the color of mourning. Table (3) exhibits different meanings conveyed by different colors.

Table (3) Color Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Meaning/Personality</th>
<th>Communicates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Neutrality</td>
<td>Noninvolvement, concealment, or lack of commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Calmness</td>
<td>Contentment, being at peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Persistence, high self-esteem, constancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Intensity, conquest, fullness of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Lack of inhibition, a desire for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>Enchantment</td>
<td>Longing for wish fulfillment, a desire to charm others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Need for physical ease and contentment, for release from discomfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Nothingness</td>
<td>Surrender, renunciation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cited from (Gamble and Gamble, 2013, p.174)
5.8 Chronemics:

Chronemics is an essential cue of nonverbal communication. Gamble and Gamble (2013, p. 174) define chronemics as “The study of how humans use the time to communicate.” It is the communicative value of time that modifies individuals and also nations’ notion of time management. Some individuals are preoccupied with time, whereas others regularly waste it. This will be reflected on the public level when time-wasting becomes a feature of a specific society.

Moreover, the concept of punctuality is individual and culture-specific that causes communication and relationship problems due to misunderstandings, miscalculations, and disagreements involving time can create. For example, the meaning of “being on time” is different from the context of a job interview or a critical test to the context of attending a party, which is more flexible. Thus, culture influences how individuals use and think about time. In some cultures, people live for today, while in others, they are waiting for tomorrow.

On the other hand, Patterson (2017) suggests that the allocation of time may be necessary for setting the context of interaction, e.g., being on time for a meeting implies punctuality, interest, and reliability in some contexts whereas in others it implies desperation. Patterson believes time as a resource, is also exploited by the physical setting. A typical example of this is uncomfortable furniture designing in fast-food restaurants, which allows minimal interaction to save time for serving as many customers as possible.

5.9 Design and Arrangement of Setting:

The design and arrangement of the setting are static components of the nonverbal system of communication that affect interaction. Patterson (2017) has dealt with this cue and regards it as one of the most influential features of nonverbal communication. He studies lots of setting designs and arrangements, and how they affect the interaction and how different nonverbal cues participate and interfere with making communication felicitous. For example, the arrangement of chairs in a party, a classroom, or a meeting is different, and it influences other nonverbal cues such as eye contact, paralinguistics, and proxemics.

Besides, the design and arrangement of settings affect interlocutors’ behavior and etiquette according to their professional and social status as hosts and guests, as well. For example, official offices of presidents and governmental posts, as well as huge companies’ heads, are mostly very large and well furnished. However, lower-level employees may share ordinary rooms or halls with simple furniture. Large offices signify the power and status of the people at the top, keeping enough distance between them and their visitors. One more significant example embodies in devoting specifically designed rooms for guests at houses where distinguished visitors mostly directed. Likewise, other rooms and places are designed and furnished according to the purpose of their usages, like dining rooms, kitchens, and bedrooms (Patterson, 2017, pp. 2, 3).
6. Sociopragmatic Variables and Types of Nonverbal Cues

6.1 Gender and Types of Nonverbal Cues

Gender-based analysis of nonverbal cues types has triggered many researchers in the field. It is widely believed that males and females use nonverbal communication cues distinctively. Women and men show different patterns of nonverbal cues both in encoding and decoding in the social interaction (Patterson 1983, 2010; Matsumoto et al. 2016). Studies indicate that females and males differ in using specific nonverbal cues, especially artifacts, proxemics, haptics, kinesics, paralinguistic cues, and physical attributes.

Basically, nonverbal cues determine masculinity and femininity since birth, such as artifacts. Recently, in most cultures, pink and blue blankets are used to wrap girl and boy newborn babies, respectively. One can notice gender-based differences of colors and designs used to manufacture toys, games, mechanical and electronic devices, clothing, jewelry, and accessories. These examples of artifacts communicate gender, express self-identity, and indicate the personal tastes and also social roles (Paynton and Hahn 2018).

Likewise, some nonverbal cues are thought to be gender-specific. For example, in the paralinguistic perspective, crying is believed to be more practiced by females than males even in some cultures if male cries, he will be accused of effeminacy. Generally, both genders are sensitive to the usage of nonverbal cues avoiding gender-deviant and cross-gender behaviors according to their cultural norms (Matsumoto et al. 2016).

Moreover, silence is another gender-specific as well as a culture-based nonverbal cue that has enormous implications. Silence has different usages in different social and cultural contexts. For example, in Kurdish culture, females’ silence is preferable while the males’ is not. Most societies have imposed females’ silence as a form of gender-based or domestic violence. There have been many victims of violence that forced to be silent and do not report their cases. Even more, in the previous centuries, women did not dare to publish their literary and educational production under their real names. Either they have published them under men’s pseudo names, or men have published them as their own works. With regard to this study, the male participants were more expressive than the female ones. This probably refers back to their cultural, social background, which provides more opportunities for the males’ participation. Thus, the number of male participants is approximate twice the female ones, 62: 38 (Table 1).

In addition to their distinctive usages of paralinguistic cues, females and males use vocal qualities differently, such as pitch, volume, inflection, the rate of speech, and rhythm. These differences have a reflection on their interaction practice. According to Paynton and Hahn (2018), women tend to use backchanneling more than men do. Such listening noises like “(h) mm,” “oh” and “ah” are usually accompanied by nodding the head. They often mean that the addressee listens to the addresser and follows what s/he is saying. However, men use such noises less frequently, which usually means the acceptance of the interlocutor’s utterance.

On the other hand, proxemics is another aspect of different usages between the two genders, which has two dimensions. First, proxemics has been understood as a personal space or a place where people feel comfortable. Studies show that females have greater involvement in using personal space rather than males. A high level of involvement depends on contact cultures, which interest in high level of using nonverbal cues. However, non-contact cultures prefer low levels of involvement. The unwanted closeness between the two genders is regarded as impoliteness or even harassment in most cultures. Secondly, proxemics can also mean the physical space to which individuals have access. For example, in eastern cultures, mostly the best spaces are devoted to men especially in
banquets and guest rooms. Likewise, men mostly invade more spaces in the houses, such as the library or office room, guest hall, and also garages. Whereas, women mostly engage in kitchens and dining rooms.

There are many examples of proxemics among the study subjects, such as intimate distance, which is represented by participants 1 in the Appendix, who are Kurdish Yazidi mother, and her children. She embraces her three little children affectionately; the feeling of her fear about their life and future is clear in her whole nonverbal status. Then, there is also a personal distance. This type is reflected in the participant’s 2 sociopragmatic contexts. There is a personal distance between the interviewer (the researcher) and the interviewee who is a Kurdish Yazidi young female refugee. They are aware of the personal distance that should be kept between them.

Next, there is a social-consultative distance, which can be seen with participants 3. They are two officials from the administrative staff in the camp. One of them is an Arab adult who is an IDP himself and has been appointed as an official to help the camp administration. The second is a Kurdish young man from the host community, who is a camp official also. They keep their space when they talk, and they hold their specific seats. Finally, there is a Public distance that is used to communicate with strangers or to address large groups. Hence, the example is participants 4, when the researcher talks to a number of the interviewees. They are aware unconsciously of keeping the public distance.

Haptics is another aspect of the gender-based difference between both genders. People use touch to communicate with others. However, the meaning that touch conveys depends on the user's gender and the social and cultural context of the usage. Women usually use touch to express caring and support, such as touching on the shoulder or giving a hug, whereas men use it to direct actions of another and to show control. Men also use haptics to express affection and desire in romantic contexts, to communicate caring and closeness to children, to show support to friends. Another strategy among men in using touch is to show power such as businessmen or politicians shaking hands, play punching, and wrestling.

Haptics is common in the refugee camps since it is a critical cue of nonverbal communication. For example, the participants 1 represent mother affection and family support in the touch between a Kurdish Yazidi female and her little children. Another instance is participants 2; here, haptics takes place between the researcher and a Kurdish Yazidi female interviewee by shaking hands warmly to communicate support and sympathy. The last example is participants 5; hence, the touch and hug are between the researcher and an Arab orphan female teen that lives with her two little sisters alone after her father’s death and her mother’s remarriage. Haptics here implies affection and love, which the two orphans are deprived from.

Like haptics, Kinesics is also a crucial nonverbal cue used by males and females distinctively. Men use their body motions or physical movements to show strength and control while women use theirs to communicate approachability and friendliness. However, using specific body cues by both genders, such as smiling is culture-specific. Participants 6, 7, and 8, in the Appendix, display clear examples of kinesics. Participant 6 is an aged, Muslim Arab female. Her facial expressions reveal her psychological and physical contexts. As a refugee, the feeling of sadness, disappointment, and helplessness have intermingled with her aging wrinkles. Although she expressed her satisfaction with her life circumstances verbally, her face and eye language are rich sources of information about her real inner emotions. Her mostly lower eyes contact alongside with her forehead and eyebrows disclose her impatience, grief about her current living situation as well as the catastrophes she had undergone in the past. Her posture and gestures integrate with her facial expressions and eye contact displaying a complete image of her status as a refugee.
Likewise, the kinesics of participant 7, who is a young Yazidi Kurdish female, disclose her genuine feeling and emotions about herself, her family, and relatives’ life status. Her facial expressions reveal that she has passed a lot of catastrophic crimes and violence, which is also noticeable in her lower eye contact. The image completes with her posture and gestures that express the helplessness and distant hope for any soon positive change in their living situation. Next, participant 8 is an aged Muslim Arab male. His kinesics expresses a lot about his feelings and personality. Although his facial expressions involve the same emotions as other participants but simultaneously, his eye contact, posture, and gestures reveal patience, stability, and insistence for waiting for better life circumstances.

6.2 Age and Types of Nonverbal Cues:

Nonverbal age-related issues have drawn the researchers’ attention. It is believed that this field is valuable because it is associated with multidisciplinary studies such as Sociology, Psychology, Communication, and Linguistics. Starting from the infancy and continuing to youth until late adulthood, human social interaction is influenced by the ability to express, interpret, and distinguish the nonverbal cues. Studies have investigated the extent to which age relates to the variation in using nonverbal cues. According to Manusov and Patterson (2006), those cues play a vital role in enhancing social interaction and achieving its goals. They believe that interlocutors need to acquire nonverbal communication proficiency with respect to encoding and also decoding, i.e. people possess “nonverbal sensitivity.” Consequently, the interlocutors also regard “sociopragmatic competence” in order to encode or decode the right nonverbal cue in its right context.

Like verbal communication, people have nonverbal communication abilities since the infancy, when the infants appear to have nonverbal communication instinctive ability to encode feelings and necessities. Parents or caregivers regard the nonverbal cues to interpret or decode infants’ needs, such as various types of cryings, and kinesics, especially facial expressions for hunger, sleeping, cleansing, and sickness. Then, encoding and decoding capacity improves gradually from infancy through early adulthood. Nevertheless, both abilities may begin to decrease at more advanced ages (cited in Manusov and Patterson, 2006, p. 2).

According to Burgoon (2016), some research findings can be framed in a series of propositions concerning dependence on nonverbal as compared to verbal information. Firstly, adults depend more on nonverbal than verbal cues to determine social meaning. Secondly, children rely more on verbal than nonverbal cues. They become more literal when they acquire language; however, they tend to use nonverbal signals before puberty. Finally, adults regard nonverbal cues when the verbal and nonverbal cues contradict; however, they depend on the verbal ones when the verbal and nonverbal cues are compatible. Thus, both coding systems, verbal and nonverbal contribute to the meaning equally.

On the other hand, nonverbal cues’ usage is culture-based behavior, for example, proxemics, posture, and haptics. Children and young interlocutors regard personal distance when they interact with aged ones. They are also supposed to stand up when an older person enters a room as a matter of respect and politeness. In addition, aged persons, especially guests, are guided to sit in the best place in eastern societies’ cultures. Concerning haptics, children and young mostly kiss their aged relatives’ hands instead of just shaking, especially in social occasions.

Aged individuals from diverse gender, ethnic, or religious backgrounds used to put head covers, e.g., participants 6, 8, 10, while young generations from diverse cultural backgrounds mostly stay away from practicing this cultural norm, e.g., participants 2, 3. Eventually, participant 9 is a Muslim Arab child. He alters the image of being a refugee completely. As childhood innocence, or because he has not seen any other lifestyle and environment, he is full of joy and happiness. This reflected in his face and eye, which had delighted when the photographer took
his photos. His posture and gestures display his joyfulness, entertainment, and satisfaction with the current life situation.

6.3 Ethnicity and Types of Nonverbal Cues:

Apparently, nonverbal cues seem to make up a “universal language”; however, scholars have shown that the usage and understanding of a range of nonverbal cues are evidently “cultured.” Nonverbal cues provide a typical site for providing information about culture (Manusov, 2017, p.239). Since each ethnicity encompasses its own culture, the relationship between ethnicity and usage of nonverbal cues is culturally specific. Moreover, nonverbal communication is included in the norms and values within the social identities of ethnic groups. Racial and ethnic identities have developed in-group codes that determine how group image and concept should be drawn (Yilmaz, 2017, p. 11).

On the other hand, nonverbal communication plays a vital role with regard to diverse ethnic groups’ cultures, which can be classified into several classifications. Gamble and Gamble (2013) identify contact and noncontact cultures which are labeled high-context and low-context cultures by Patterson (2017). Besides, cultures can be further classified as individualistic and collectivist. With regard to nonverbal cues and cultural variation, Manusov (2017, p.252) suggests that “nonverbal cues provide a rich and diverse set of objects and actions that can become part of a culture’s rules and patterns and take on specific meanings within culture.” She further argues that when nonverbal cues enter the cultural rule, they can be considered signs which means cues that are given specific meaning by a group and uses them, which reflect its worldviews, values, attitudes, histories, beliefs of that culture, letting cultural members know what is appropriate and inappropriate to use at a specific context, for instances nonverbal social customs and traditions that are practiced in public gatherings such as wedding celebrations, funerals, and special occasions. Hence, facial expressions, postures, gestures, and physical appearances are highly regarded by individuals.

According to Gamble and Gamble (2013), culture modifies human use of nonverbal cues. Hence, “contact or higher- contact cultures encourage nonverbal displays of warmth, closeness, and availability” while “noncontact or lower- contact cultures discourage nonverbal displays of warmth, closeness, and availability.” Likewise, Patterson (2017) emphasizes the insights of the anthropologist Edward Hall who proposed that cultures are different in the extent to which communication is relatively explicit or implicit. Thus, in low- context cultures, most information is transmitted in a relatively explicit style through language. Therefore, people mean what they say, i.e., ambiguity in the messages meaning is minimized.

In contrast, in high context cultures, messages encompass more considerable ambiguity because there is an increased emphasis on both situational cues and individuals’ nonverbal behaviors. As a result, nonverbal communication plays a more significant role in understanding the meaning of interactions. Generally, East Asian countries are on the high-context, whereas the United States and northern European countries are on the low-context end. However, cultural identification differs between younger and older generations, and between urban and rural dwellers, cultural norms have become mutable due to global communication and tourism (Patterson, 2017, p. 5). Besides, Gamble and Gamble (2013) propose that misunderstanding may occur in intercultural communication when interlocutors fail to understand that nonverbal cues usage is cultural-specific.

Another culture dimensions concerning expressive behavior involve individualism and collectivism. Patterson (2017) argues that “different physical and social environments increase variability in nonverbal communication across culture.” For example, individualistic cultures such as the United States and most western
Europe focus on the individual distinctiveness while the collectivist ones like East Asian countries tend to emphasize one’s identity within a larger social group. This dimension is reflected in assertiveness and expressiveness. According to Manusov (2017), individualistic and collectivist orientations towards cultures have been the basis of many cross-cultural studies of nonverbal behavior.

Moreover, Patterson suggests another dimension which is involved in culture distribution of power, prestige, and wealth. For instance, a lower power person is probably to show greater respect and control in interacting with a higher power partner. This might be expressed by keeping greater distances from high-power others and minimizing negative facial expressions (Patterson, 2017, p. 5).

In the term of the study participants, being of the eastern high-context culture, a large number of them showed warmth and closeness. Even though it was the first time they met the researcher, they welcomed her warmly, especially by female participants, e.g., participant 2, and 5. On the other hand, refugees from diverse ethnicities can be distinguished by their physical appearances, such as dressings and hairstyles. Even Yazidi males have a particular style of mustache, as the case of participant 10. In spite of ethnic special nonverbal cues, there is intercultural nonverbal communication among refugees. For example, Arab refugees from both genders wear Kurdish clothes such as male trousers (sharwal), and female overcoat (Kolawana), which are special traditional Kurdish clothes, e.g., participants (12, 13, 14).

Additionally, nonverbal cues involving clothing, hairstyle, and artifacts probably form the most prominent cues to indicate ethnic group appearance characteristics. Furthermore, ethnic groups’ identities affect usage, perception, and representation of nonverbal cues like haptics, proxemics, and gestures. The study participants’ ethnic background can be distinguished by their appearances, especially dressing, using, or not using headcovers. For example, participants 4, 6, 8 represent Muslim Arab ethnicity, while participants 2, 10, 11 represent Yazidi Kurdish ethnicity.

6.4 Religion and Types of Nonverbal Cues:

Religion makes one of the sociopragmatic variables that have been analyzed in this study. Research has shown the remarkable role of religion in nonverbal interactions, especially the proxemics, physical appearance, and kinesics: eye contact and gestures in particular. Religion plays a vital role in social and cultural identity construction. Consequently, it affects interaction and self-representation, especially through nonverbal communication (Yilmaz, 2017, p. 2). On the other hand, religious ideologies and ceremonies are mostly embodied in meaningful nonverbal cues. For example, in addition to verbal prayers, Muslims practice praying in a nonverbal system, which includes specific body posture and orientation, gestures, eye contact, dressing, and facial expression. Similarly, the other religious rituals, such as Pilgrimage, involves particular dressing, eye contact, postures, and gestures for binary genders. Likewise, other religious identities have their own nonverbal cues system along with their verbal ones.

The subjects of this study hold diverse religious identities, such as Islam (Sunni and Shiite), and Yazidi. Observations are majorly made based on the nonverbal interaction through the use of proxemics, kinesics, and physical appearance. Almost all participants who are observed in public and private settings made use of space, gestures, and artifacts in a way that is congruent with their religious identity. However, there are cases of intercultural nonverbal communication among them. The distinction of using specific nonverbal cues among diverse religious identities is most apparent in physical appearances. For instance, participant 15, who is a Muslim Arab aged male, puts on a traditional Muslim headcover, whereas participants 10 and 11 who are Yazidi aged males put on their own style headcovers.

The sociopragmatic context and cultural-based background of the observed camps’ residents make them aware of how to use proxemics, touch, eye-contact, especially with the opposite gender. Thus, the researcher has not faced any initiation for handshaking by any male participants from any diverse cultural background. Moreover, they sat or stood at a public spatial distance, as in the case of participants 4, 16. On the other hand, cases of intercultural nonverbal cues can be observed among the diverse religious refugees and IDP groups. For example, some Yazidi females cover their hair just like Muslim women, although it is not one of their fundamental religious norms, e.g., participant 1.

7. Conclusions:

Based on the collected data analysis, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Awareness of different types of nonverbal cues is crucial in communicating with refugees to decrease their suffering.
- The contextual sociopragmatic variables have an impact on using, producing, and comprehending nonverbal communication cues, which are gender, age, ethnicity, and religion.
- The context of refugeeism influences using specific types of nonverbal behavior, such as facial expressions, body postures, and paralinguistic cues.
- Most of the female participants feel shy and tend to lack self-confidence, but the males are ready to interact confidently due to the social background and cultural norms that provide more opportunities for male dominance and participation.
- Nonverbal cues convey the sociopragmatic contextual expressions of refugeeism.
- The complementary role of nonverbal communication constitutes an indispensable system for felicitous communication.
پوختە:
ئەم توێژینەوە لە جۆری ئاماژەکانی پەیوەندیگرتنی نازارەکی لەنێوان پەنابەراندا، دەکەتیەوە. ئەو راستەیە کە پەیوەندیگرتنی نازارەکی زەکیکە لە کاریگەرێکی نازارەکی پەیوەندیگرتن بە بەھێزکردنی تیکەیشتن و هەریکاریەکەی مرۆفەیەیە. سەرەوەیە نەمانەش راکەردن و تیکەیشتن لەم جۆرە بەھێزکردنی لەنێوان میلەڵەن و کلتووڕ، کەرپنیه، کەرەنگەکان دەکەت.

لەلایەکی ترەوە، زەمارەکی پەتایەرەن بەەوەی مەلەنییەکەی سەرەیییەکانی ئەمکەکانی وەڵاتیان و رۆژەورێکی ناوەڕاستە بەگەردنی ژیادی کردووە. کە پەیوەندیگرتنی نازارەکی و نازارەکی پەنابەرەکان دەگەرێتە وەزیری، بەپەیوەندیگرتنی پەوەزیتییەکان وەزیری و پەوەزیتییەکان بەبەسێکەیە. ئەمەدەکەی پەتایەرەن، بە میکانیزمی پەیوەندیگرتنی نازارەکی سەرکەوتووە. تەیزەوە مەھەڵیەکە پەتایەرەنی راستەنیە بەبەسێکەیە نەمانەگەرتووە. کە لە کەمەکانی سەنتیاری پارێزگایەکانی سەلێمیەکان، لە هەریکەی کە سەرکەوتووە سەرەزەوەیە بەبەسێکەیە بەبەسێکەیە کە لە کەمەکانی سەنتیاری پارێزگایەکانی سەلێمیەکان، لە هەریکەی کە سەرکەوتووە سەرەزەوەیە بەبەسێکەیە بەبەسێکەیە. نازارەکان لە کەمەکانی سەنتیاری پارێزگایەکانی سەلێمیەکان، لە هەریکەی کە سەرکەوتووە سەرەزەوەیە بەبەسێکەیە بەبەسێکەیە بەبەسێکەیە. نازارەکان لە کەمەکانی سەنتیاری پارێزگایەکانی سەلێمیەکان، لە هەریکەی کە سەرکەوتووە سەرەزەوەیە بەبەسێکەیە بەبەسێکەیە بەبەسێکەیە بەبەسێکەیە.
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ملخص:
تتناول هذه الدراسة أنواع الاشارات غير اللفظية بين اللاجئين. لقد أثبت على نطاق واسع أن التواصل غير اللفظي هو أحد أهم الطرق الفعالة لتعزيز التفاهم والتواصل الإنساني. إضافة إلى ذلك، يعد تفسير وفهم هذا النوع من التواصل أمرًا حاسماً بين الأمم والثقافات والمجموعات مختلفة. من ناحية أخرى، إن عدد اللاجئين قد زاد بسبب الصراعات السياسية والعنف في دول الشرق الأوسط، وهم يواجهون الكثير من التحديات الاجتماعية والاقتصادية والنفسية. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، يصعب التواصل اللفظي وغير اللفظي بين اللاجئين، وبالتالي أصبح الحاجة إلى تعزيز استراتيجيات التواصل غير اللفظي أمرًا ضروريًا وعاجلاً لتعزيز التفاهم.

الأنجح:
تستهدف الدراسة اللاجئين الحقيقيين في مخيمات محافظة السليمانية، كردستان، عراق. و تبحث في أنواع الإشارات غير اللفظية من المنظور التداولي الاجتماعي لحالة اللاجئين. و إنها تبدأ ببعض التعريف للمفاهيم التداولية الاجتماعية، والاتصال غير اللفظي و تصنيف اشاراته، وتعطي في شرح تأثير المتغيرات التداولية الاجتماعية على أنواع اشارات التواصل غير اللفظي.

كلمات الافتتاحية: التواصل الاجتماعي، الاشارات غير اللفظية، اللاجئين.
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