



ISSN: 2957-3874 (Print)

Journal of Al-Farabi for Humanity Sciences (JFHS)

<https://iasj.rdd.edu.iq/journals/journal/view/95>

مجلة الفارابي للعلوم الإنسانية تصدرها جامعة الفارابي



## Investigating Face-Saving Mechanisms: Sympathy and Empathy Strategies in Iraqi Arabic

Dr. Arkan Abdulhasan Nassar

jasim19822@gmail.com

تقصي آليات حفظ الوجه : استراتيجيات التعاطف والتقمص الوجداني في العربية العراقية

م. د. اركان عبد الحسن نصار

وزارة التربية/ المديرية العامة لتربية كربلاء المقدسة / كربلاء المقدسة/العراق

### المستخلص

تتاولت هذه الدراسة الفعل الكلامي للتعاطف والتقمص الوجداني بين العراقيين العرب. تهدف الدراسة لتحديد الأنواع والاستراتيجيات المستخدمة للتعبير عن هذين الفعلين الكلاميين في اللهجة العراقية العربية. الأداة التي استخدمت لجمع البيانات كانت مهمة تكلمة الخطاب مفتوحة النهاية، متضمنة ستة مواقف موزعة بالتساوي لاستحثاث التعاطف والتقمص الوجداني تجاه المحاور من مسافة اجتماعية قريبة ومكانة اجتماعية متساوية. اتبعت هذه الدراسة منهجاً وصفيّاً نوعياً مدعوماً بالتحليل الإحصائي. إجابات الطلاب كوّدت إلى تعاطف إيجابي وسلبي اعتماداً على تصنيف مكدوغال (٢٠٠٣)، بينما التقمص الوجداني كوّد وفقاً لـ غولمان (١٩٩٦) إلى التقمص الوجداني المعرفي، والتقمص الوجداني العاطفي، والتقمص الوجداني المشفق. إضافة إلى ذلك، الاستراتيجيات حللت إلى صيغ دلالية اتباعاً لـ بلوم-كولكا وأولشتين (١٩٨٤). هذه الدراسة كشفت بأن التعاطف والتقمص الوجداني اعتبرا كأفعال حفظ الوجه من قبل العراقيين العرب لحماية الوجه الإيجابي للسامع. ومع ذلك، النتائج الإجمالية أظهرت أن العراقيين العرب يفضلون أنواعاً واستراتيجيات أكثر لإظهار التقمص الوجداني تجاه المتحاور من مسافة اجتماعية قريبة ومكانة اجتماعية متساوية أكثر من التعاطف. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، النتائج أظهرت بأنهم يفضلون التعاطف الإيجابي بالمقارنة بالتعاطف السلبي. بالمقابل، التقمص المشفق كان الأكثر شيوعاً، متبعاً بالتقمص العاطفي ثم التقمص المعرفي. فيما يتعلق بالاستراتيجيات المحددة، النتائج أشارت بأن المشاركين نوّعوا رغباتهم تجاه الاستخدام المحدد للاستراتيجيات وفقاً لسباق المواقف؛ بمعنى آخر، هم يمنحون الأولوية للاستخدام المتكرر لاستراتيجية التهوين في الموقف الأول، والتشجيع في الموقف الثاني، بينما في الموقف الثالث كان "الدعاء" هو السائد. على نحو مماثل، المشاركون اتبعوا تفضيلات متنوعة في التعبير عن التعاطف؛ فكان "مشاركة المشاعر" هو الاستراتيجية السائدة في الموقف الرابع، بينما "الأفعال الإلزامية" في الموقف الخامس، و"الإقرار" ظهر كأكثر استراتيجية في الموقف السادس. والجدير بالذكر أن المشاركين وظفوا بعض الاستراتيجيات الجديدة للتعاطف التي لم تُستخدم في الدراسات السابقة، شاملةً: التهوين، الطمأنة، الدعاء، التعزية، التشجيع، الندب، اللوم القديري، والاستتكار. كذلك استراتيجيات جديدة للتقمص الوجداني مثل: المحاكاة العاطفية، مشاركة المشاعر، التماهي الحسي، الأفعال الإلزامية، الإقرار، الشهامة أو المروءة، واستراتيجيات الوفاء؛ حيث استخدمت فقط في هذه الدراسة. الكلمات المفتاحية: آليات حفظ الوجه، التعاطف والتقمص الوجداني، العربية العراقية

### Abstract

The present study investigates sympathy and empathy speech acts among Iraqi Arabs. It aims to identify the types and strategies employed to express these two speech acts in Iraqi Arabic dialect. The instrument employed to collect the data was an open-ended Discourse Completion Task comprising six situations, equally divided to elicit sympathy and empathy towards a close equal-status interlocutor. This study follows a quantitative descriptive approach, supplemented by statistical analysis to analyze the data. The participants' responses were coded into active and passive sympathy based on McDougall's (2003) classification, while empathy was coded according to Goleman's (1996) categorization into cognitive, emotional, compassionate. Additionally, the strategies were analyzed as semantic formulas following Blum-Kulka and Olshtain's (1984) taxonomy. This study showed that sympathy and empathy were seen as a face-saving act by Iraqi Arabs employed to protect the positive face

of the hearer. However, the overall results revealed that Iraqi Arabs preferred to use more types and strategies to show empathy towards a close equal- status interlocutors more than that for sympathy. Moreover, the findings showed that they favored active sympathy compared to passive. On the other hand, compassionate empathy was the most dominant followed by emotional, and cognitive. Regarding the specific types of strategies, the findings indicated that the participants vary their tendencies towards a specific use of strategies according to the context of the situations. That is, they prioritize the frequent use of minimizing in Situation 1, encouraging in Situation 2, while in Situation 3, praying was the dominant. Similarly, participants followed various preferences in expressing empathy. Sharing feeling was the most prominent strategy in Situation 4, whereas, commissive was the most prevalent strategy in Situation 5, and validation emerged as the most frequent in Situation 6. Importantly, participants employed some new strategies of sympathy that were not used in the reviewed literature involving minimizing, reassurance, praying, condoling, encouraging, lamenting, fatalistic blaming, and deploring, Also, new strategies of empathy such as emotional mirroring, sharing feeling, somatic sharing, commissive, validation, gallantry, and loyalty were only appeared in the present study.

**Key Words:** Face-Saving Mechanisms, Sympathy and Empathy, Iraqi Arabic

## 1. Introduction

Language is a dynamic means of human communication that enables individuals to convey emotions, express thoughts, and strengthen social relations. The various structures and forms of language are functionally categorized depending on their communicative purpose. According to Jakobson (1960), language has six key functions involving metalingual, phatic, poetic, conative, referential, and expressive. The expressive function is particularly, important because it allows the speaker to convey their emotional attitudes, feelings, and state through language (Tannen, 1990). The expressive function highlights the role of language as a tool for emotional expression, through which the speakers convey the psychological attitudes and emotions to others. This function is highly powerful among societies in which communal values, where linguistic choices reflect expectations and deep-seated social norms, are prioritized. However, the meanings of emotional utterances are derived not only from their linguistic forms, but also from the surrounding contexts in which they are performed. The emotional expressions are not used only as descriptive statements, but they are powerful speech acts which perform specific social functions in interactions. In other words, these speech acts are not just used to say things but to do actions (Austin, 1962). For instance, the utterance "I'm so sorry for your loss" as an example of sympathy when uttered by a speaker doesn't indicate an expression of sadnesses, but it demonstrates the action of offering condolences. The speaker doesn't describe his feelings for the hearer, but they participate in a socially recognized ritual to acknowledge their grief and comfort the bereaved (Schiffrin, 1994). Similarly, the speech act of empathy is not just feeling, but it indicates a communicative act (Tracy & Robles, 2013). For example, the utterance "I can only imagine how difficult that must be for you" reflects a deeper connection between the speaker and the hearer as the speaker didn't only observe another person's pain but they participate in it. That is, language is not only used as a means of communication but it performs actions. Therefore, emotional expressions like sympathy and empathy are not used to describe the internal feeling of the speakers, instead, sympathy is used to participate in a social ritual or offer comfort, while empathy used to build a connection and maintain solidarity by showing trust, understanding, and shared experience. Based on Searle's (1969) taxonomy, speech acts are categorized into five types according to their functions in communication comprising expressives, commissives, directives, assertives, and declarations. The present study focuses on investigating sympathy and empathy speech acts which are classified under expressive category. Expressive speech acts defined as those that convey the attitudes or feelings of the speaker considering a certain state of affairs. While both sympathy and empathy function to convey a psychological state (e.g., shared pain, sorrow), they represent different kinds of expressive acts. As a speech act, sympathy is an act of commiseration employed to express sadness for another's misfortune, mainly through formal language and the established phrases (McDougall, 2003). Conversely, empathy is viewed as a more complex speech act that involves imaginative or personal reflection by the speaker to understand the emotional state of the hearer creating a sense of shared experience (Goleman, 1996). Despite the universal underlying functions of speech acts, their realization is linguistically and culturally specific. For this reason, the present study aims to investigate the pragmatic strategies and types of sympathy and empathy in Iraqi Arabic dialect. Moreover, this study seeks to highlight the pragmatic difference between feeling sorrow with someone (empathy) versus feeling sorrow for someone (sympathy) in the Iraqi Arabic context.

## 2. Problem Statement

Sympathy and empathy as expressive speech acts serve function of maintaining and building social relations. However, the pragmatic rules of performing sympathy and empathy are not universal but are culturally specific, thereby misunderstandings are likely to occur in cross cultural interaction. What is regarded as appropriate expressions of empathy or sympathy in one culture, or language might be perceived as insufficient or rude in another (Wierzbicka, 2003). For instance, direct emotional expressions that are valued in one society might be seen as intrusive or impolite in another culture that prefer emotional reserve. Accordingly, this cultural difference can lead to the pragmatic failure to perform a speech act successfully and appropriately; consequently, breaking social relations, rather than strengthening them (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Therefore, investigating speech acts cross-culturally is important to avoid misinterpretation and to fully understand the complex relationship between culture, language, and social interaction (Gumperz, 1982). The theoretical framework of sympathy and empathy that extensively developed in pragmatics, primarily based on Western languages. That is, there is a significant gap regarding their specific linguistic realization in Iraqi Arabic context. Consequently, there is a lack of a comprehensive understanding of how a community with communal and strong tribal values like Iraqi Arabic employs the linguistic strategies to handle moments of emotional distress. Although the speech acts of sympathy (feeling for someone) and empathy (feeling with someone) are universal (Ekman & Davidson, 1994), the specific pragmatic strategies employed by Iraqi Arabs to express their empathy and sympathy are still largely unexamined. Moreover, the pragmatic meaning of these two speech acts is context-dependent (Horn, 2004), and they vary significantly across cultures. The social and cultural values and norms of Iraqi Arabic society, in which the emphasis particularly on communal and tribal ties, considerably affect how emotional expressions are performed. Thus, it important to conduct a study to investigate how these cultural factors shape the linguistic choices of Iraqi Arabs when expressing their emotional solidarity, shared pain, or sorrow. This study aims investigates the pragmatic strategies employed by Iraqi Arabs when expressing their emotions through sympathy and empathy in the Iraqi Arabic dialect. By classifying and identifying these distinct pragmatic strategies of these two expressive speech acts, this study will offer a crucial contribution to the fields of pragmatics, and speech act theory in particular focusing on the complex relationship between emotional solidarity, language, and culture in Iraq. Therefore, investigating speech acts cross-culturally is important to avoid misinterpretation and to fully understand the complex relationship between culture, language, and social interaction (Gumperz, 1982). Therefore, this study aims to answer the following the following two research questions:

1. What are types of sympathy and empathy employed by Iraqi Arabs as equal-status interlocutors to express their sympathy and empathy towards an individual with close social distance.
2. What are the pragmatic strategies employed by Iraqi Arabs when they show their sympathy and empathy towards a close, equal-status interlocutor.

### **3. The Pragmatics of Sympathy and Empathy**

Sympathy and empathy are expressive speech acts that communicate feelings or attitudes of a speaker towards a specific situation (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). They are not only used to state facts; but to show the emotional state of the speaker. While both fall under expressive category, they perform different purposes and goals. That is, their perlocutionary effects and illocutionary forces are significantly different. Sympathy functions as a verbal act of commiseration through which the speaker intended to express an external feeling of sorrow or pity for another person's unfortunate circumstances. (Svenaeus, 2015). The primary illocutionary force of sympathy is to acknowledge the interlocutor's pain from an objective point of view and to create a shared emotional understanding or offer consolation (McDougall, 2003). For example, the utterance "What a shame, my heart aches for you" performs the speech act of sympathy by conveying sadness without explicitly claiming to share the exact same feeling, but showing concern from a safe, emotional distance. According to Bennett (1979), sympathy entails 'the imaginative placing of ourselves in another person's position (p. 411)'. According McDougall's (2003), sympathy is divided into two types: active and passive. Actives sympathy is defined as the urge to support, defend, console someone, and share feelings with others, while passive sympathy is referred to as "an expression of having feelings for other people without intending to assist them" (Puspitasari and Ariatmi, 2024, p. 312) On the other hand, empathy is considered as a more complex speech act whose perlocutionary goal is to show understanding or create a shared emotional state between the speaker and the hearer (Ioannidou & Konstantikaki, 2008). Its illocutionary force is to demonstrate the speaker's empathetic competence by revealing the ability of the speaker to intellectually understand the feelings of other individual as well as to personally relate to and share in their emotional state. For instance, "I know exactly what you feel; I went through the same thing myself," is a clear example empathizing act as the speaker uses their imagination to mentally

inhabit other's viewpoint, adopting a "second-person" perspective (Darwall, 1998). Bennett (1979) states that empathy entails "the imaginative intellectual and emotional participation in another person's experience" (p. 418). Empathy is classified into compassionate, emotional, and cognitive by Goleman (1996). Cognitive empathy, or what is known as perspective-taking, comprises the ability to understand the point of view of the hearers, i.e., knowing how the hearers feel and what they might think representing a mental mapping of their interior world. Whereas, emotional empathy includes feeling what the hearers feel creating an emotional and physical rapport. However, compassionate empathy is considered as the most effective, functional, and dynamic form of empathy, and it requires a transitional shift from internal resonance to externalized action towards the hearer (Goleman,1996)Socially, feelings of empathy and sympathy are essential part of social support and an important part of human life. Emotional support such as reassurance of affection esteem and worth is more influential than instrumental support such as material assistance (Bersheid & Reis, 1998). Importantly, both empathy and sympathy are used to express emotions, accordingly they have pragmatic significance in shaping social relation. However, the choice between expressing empathy or sympathy is considerably determined by the social relationship between interlocutors and context (Dey, 2023). By using sympathy, the speaker aims to offer consolation from a distance, while by expressing empathy, they tend to validate the emotion by creating a shared experience. While empathy seeks to create a shared emotional feeling; sympathy offers a hand of pity marinating a clear emotional distance. Thus, to bridge the gap in the literature on how Iraqi Arabs show their sympathy or empathy, the present study is essential to investigate the pragmatic strategies they employed highlighting how these speech acts are influenced by social distance, social status, and situational context.

#### 4. Literature Review

Sympathy and empathy are considered universal speech acts that perform a significant function in building and maintaining social relations. However, the realizations of these two speech acts vary across cultures and languages. To have a systematic overview, six studies were reviewed to explore the pragmatic strategies employed when performing and realizing sympathy and empathy across various contexts. These six studies are categorized into three distinct domains depending on methodological approaches and their research environments. The first domain focuses on the multimodal and digital realizations of sympathy and empathy within cinematic scripts and Instagram discourse. The second domain investigates empathy and sympathy cross-culturally, and the last domain explores how these two speech acts by non-native speaker of English. This overview aimed to examine how sympathy and empathy speech acts are perceived and performed highlighting the similarities and differences in different contexts and cultures. Puspitasari and Ariatmi (2024) analyzed empathy and sympathy expressions employed by Instagram users who commented on a video posted by a Palestinian journalist showing the condition of children in Gaza. This study followed a qualitative descriptive analysis. The data was collected by using documentation and observation of written expressions of empathy and sympathy from the comment sections on this video. All comments expressing sympathy and empathy on the video were collected. The results showed that the most dominant type of expressions was passive sympathy compared to active sympathy which was less frequently suggesting that most users tended to express feelings of sympathy without an intention to help. Moreover, the study indicated that Instagram users employed three types of empathy including compassionate, emotional, and *cognitive empathy*. The most prominent type was *emotional empathy* compared to *compassionate* and *cognitive empathy* which were used the least frequently. The study also demonstrated that 13 types strategies were used involving lamenting, criticizing, wishing, requesting, condoling, regretting, begging, praising, apologizing, blaming, thanking, proposing, and vowing. Lamenting was the most frequently used strategy while proposing and vowing were the least ones. These results demonstrated that most Instagram users preferred to lament their deep sadness regarding the loss of Palestinian children. The second study by Mohammed and Kadhim (2023) investigated expressing sympathy in the American Movie "The Help" focusing on both verbal and nonverbal acts employed by the characters in their dialogue in this Movie. This study followed a descriptive qualitative method to analyze the data. The collected data were classified according to Searle's (1969) taxonomy of speech acts as a primary model for analysis involving commissives, declaratives, expressive, directives, and representatives. Paralinguistic acts and social variables such social class, ethnicity, position, gender, and age were considered in analyzing the data of this study. The main findings showed that the writers of American movie preferred to use expressive and commissive speech acts to create effective sympathy situations. Additionally, sympathy speech act can be expressed by both nonverbally and verbally acts. The results demonstrated that combining paralinguistic acts like tone, facial expressions, eye contact, proxemics, and gestures with verbal acts can produce more distinctive sympathy situations. Finally, this study concluded

that the effectiveness of these acts is significantly affected by the social variables like ethnicity, age, social class, and gender. The third study conducted by Sugiharto (2008) shed light on sympathy and empathy speech acts by describing the intention behind using these two speech acts as well as clarifying the reason of employing them in movie manuscript. The researcher adopted "Documentation Method" to analyze the data collected from printed movie manuscript. The findings showed three utterances for empathy and twelve sympathy utterances, mainly through declarative sentences comprising varied structures (compound, complex, and simple). The main finding indicated that sympathy is utilized for condoling, encouragement, and concern motivated by grief and distress. On other hand, empathy is used to show understanding and encouragement by means of consideration and advice. The fourth study by Lychuk, et al. (2023) examined the communicative strategy of sympathy. This study focused on linguistic means of expressing sympathy and the problems of translation from English to Ukrainian. The data were collected from English and Ukrainian literary texts. The study employed a descriptive qualitative approach to analyze the linguistic means of expressing sympathy. It also followed component analysis to specify different and similar features of the strategy during translation as well as comparative analysis to describe language constructions with the semantics of sympathy and lexical items. The results indicated that the communicative strategy of sympathy is an addressee-oriented, purposeful and intentional act. It is used to express empathy and pity in order to affect the interlocutor's psycho-emotional state. The study showed a key difference in the expression of sympathy between Ukrainian and English. "I'm sorry" as an apology was the most common way to express sympathy in English language, while it was quite rare in Ukrainian. The results also demonstrated that emotions in Ukrainian language are expressed more intensely and strongly than that in English. Therefore, to achieve the same emotional impact on a reader, translators often need to increase the emotionality of lexical units or add more emphasis. The study also showed that changes in gestures, tone, and voice dynamics as non-verbal means significantly influence the expression of sympathy in both languages. Another cross-cultural study was conducted by Elasri (2018) to examine empathy, sympathy, compassion, and pity in English and Moroccan Arabic. It is a comparative corpus-based study. The "Natural Semantic Metalanguage" was employed to analyze the data. The findings showed a prominent cross-cultural difference, mainly related to various models of emotional expression and social interaction. While the degree of familiarity was often ignored in English concepts, these emotions were lexicalized in Moroccan Arabic depending on the closeness between the target person and the experiencer. For example, "shafaqa" were related to distant individuals, whereas "mhenna" was reserved for close relations. Importantly, the findings indicated that empathy in Moroccan Arabic was often expressed through the phrase 'ha:sbi:k', and it lacks a direct lexical equivalent. Finally, the study revealed that social and cultural values shape the social processing and linguistic expression towards others' misfortunes. The last study by House, Kádár, and Cang (2025) explored expressions of sympathy among advanced "Chinese learners of English" and "English-speaking learners of Chinese". This study aimed to highlight the differences in sympathizing behavior between English and Chinese. It employed a descriptive qualitative approach to analyze the collected data. First, initial interviews were used to determine which situations caused the participants feel a sense of "puzzlement" when expressing sympathy. Then, "Discourse Completion Tests" were used to specify conventions of sympathizing. This study combined speech acts and interaction rituals providing an analysis of how different speech acts like sympathize, suggest, and opine are used in various contexts. The results indicated significant differences between the two languages. "Ritualized Suggest" and "Opine" speech acts were the most frequently used by Chinese participants, and they often offer philosophical help or advice. Rather than simply consoling, they tended to provide solutions or philosophical suggestions and put the responsibility on the victim. In contrast, the speech act of sympathy, often with the phrase "I'm sorry", was the most favored among English participants. However, Chinese expatriates sometimes perceive the utterance "I'm sorry" as "cold" and "robotic" since the same utterance employed for trivial apologies. Importantly, this study revealed that "intercultural puzzlement" are often occurred because of the pragmatic and cultural differences in expressing sympathy. The reviewed literature showed that sympathy and empathy are performed and realized differently across various contexts and cultures. Moreover, these two speech acts are referred to as a complex speech act, and distinguishing between them represent a significant challenge, particularly for English EFL learners because their meanings often overlap. They are often considered as a continuous emotional response rather than two separate acts (House et al., 2025). Despite the cross-cultural studies conducted to examine sympathy and empathy, there is a lack in examining these two speech acts among Iraqi Arabs. Therefore, the present study aims to investigate the types of sympathy and empathy and the pragmatic strategies employed by Iraqi Arabs in different contexts.

## 5. Methodology

This study investigated the speech acts of sympathy and empathy among Iraqi Arabs. It followed a quantitative descriptive approach, supplemented by statistical analysis to analyze the data. The data collected by employing "Written Discourse Completion Task" (WDCT). Six situations employed in this study to express sympathy and empathy towards interlocutors of equal status and close social distance. To increase the validity and reliability of findings of this study, two assistant professors holding Ph.D. in Arabic Linguistics as Arabic native speakers, and two professors holding Ph.D. in English linguistics and speaking Arabic as their native language, were consulted in designing the situations to ensure the appropriateness of the situations of sympathy and empathy to the Iraqi Arabic contexts. The description of the six situations is summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Situations of Sympathy and Empathy: Description of WDCT

Situations of Sympathy	Status of Interlocutors	Distance of Interlocutors
S.1 Expressing sympathy to your friend who called you stating that he was late due to the traffic congestion, and he likely to miss work today.	Equal	Close
S.2 Expressing sympathy to your brother who nearly with same age when informing you that he started a new business, and he lost all his money.	Equal	Close
S.3 Expressing sympathy to your close friend at work who has fallen ill, and that will prevent him from travelling with you on the agreed date.	Equal	Close
<b>Situations of Empathy</b>		
S.4 Expressing empathy to your friend who lost his father recently, and he is suffering from deep sorrow.	Equal	Close
S.5 Expressing empathy to your close colleague who suffered from some problems feeling unable to continue at his work.	Equal	Close
S.6 Expressing empathy to your friend who experienced propound disappointment and loss of trust from former close friend.	Equal	Close

This study conducted in April during the second academic semester of 2025 at Karbala University/ College of Education for the Humanities. 50 male students participated in this study, and they were fourth year students (aged 22 to 23) who studying English as a foreign language in the English department. To avoid any gender differences which might affect employing sympathy and empathy strategies, this study was restricted to male participants enhancing the reliability of the findings. Accordingly, the findings of this study can be generalizable to male participants only. Importantly, the participants' consent was taken to increase the ethical integrity. After taking the permission of the instructors inside the classroom, the participants were provided with full description of the six situations of sympathy and empathy in relations to the equal social status and close social distance. The participants were asked to give their responses at the time of 12 minutes expressing their sympathy and empathy as if they were engaged in real- life situations. Based on McDougall's (2003) classification, the collected data from the first three situations (S.1, S.2, and S.3) was classified into *active* and *passive* sympathy. While the data conducted from the last three situations (S. 4, S.5, and S.6) was classified as *compassionate*, *emotional*, and *cognitive* empathy following Goleman's (1996) categorization. Further, to analyze the types of strategies of sympathy and empathy employed by Iraqi Arabs in expressing sympathy and empathy across the six situations, the collected data were coded into *semantic formulas* proposed Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984). *Semantic formulas* could be a word, a phrase, or a sentence (Fraser, 1981) (See Appendix 1). For example, the following utterance employed by the participants when expressing their sympathy towards their close friend who started a new business, and he lost all his money is coded as in Table 2.

"دفع الله ما كان أعظم ، والله غثني الخبر وما تمنيت هيج يصير بتعبك وفلوسك وتخسرهم"

"May Allah avert what could have been worse; I was truly distressed by the news, and I never wished for your hard work and money to be lost like this."

**Table 2:** Coding of Sympathy: Types and Strategies

Utterances	Types of Sympathy	Strategies
"دفع الله ما كان أعظم" "May Allah avert what could have been worse"	Active	Divine invocation
"والله غثني الخبر" "I was truly distressed/voted by the news"	Passive	Lamenting
"وما تمنيت هيج يصير بتعبك وفلوسك" "I never wished for your effort and money to be lost in this way"	Passive	Deploring

Similarly, the following utterance employed by the participants to show their empathy for a close friend who experienced propound disappointment and loss of trust from a former close friend is coded in Table 3.

"لا تكمل.. وصلت الفكرة، حاس ببيك والله ومقدر هاي الحركة اللي بگلبك لأن أنه هم مريت بهيج خذلان من اقرب صديق وأعرف هذا الشعور  
شكد يكسر الواهس"

"Say no more; I get it. I feel for you, I truly do, and I can sense that burning pain in your heart because I've been through a similar letdown by a close friend myself. I know exactly how much it crushes one's spirit."

**Table 3:** Coding of Empathy: Types and Strategies

Utterances	Types of Empathy	Strategies
"لا تكمل.. وصلت الفكرة" "Say no more; I get it."	Cognitive	<i>Understanding</i>
"حاس ببيك والله ومقدر هاي الحركة اللي بگلبك" "I feel for you, I truly do, and I can sense that burning pain in your heart"	Emotional	Sharing feeling
"لأن أنا هم مريت بهيج خذلان" "Because I've been through a similar betrayal by a close friend myself"	Compassionate	Sharing experience
"وأعرف شكد يكسر الواهس" "I know exactly how much it crushes one's spirit."	Compassionate	Validation

## 6. Results and Discussion

The section is organized in four subsections. The first and the second subsections present the overall results of the types and strategies of sympathy and empathy employed by Iraqi Arabs. Then, the third and fourth subsections focused on how Iraqi Arabs express their sympathy and empathy according to the context of the situations.

### 6.1 Overall Distribution of Sympathy: Types and Strategies

The overall results of types and strategies employed by Iraqi Arabs when expressing sympathy across three situations are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4:** Overall Results of Sympathy: Types and Strategies

1. Types of Sympathy	Types of Strategies	Situations (1, 2, & 3)	
		No	%
<b>Active Sympathy</b>		<b>186</b>	<b>65.26</b>
	Minimizing	34	11.93
	Reassurance	30	10.53
	Wishing	8	2.81
	Praying	48	16.84
	Condoling	11	3.86
	Self-Sacrifice	22	7.72
	Encouraging	33	11.58
<b>Passive Sympathy</b>		<b>99</b>	<b>34.74</b>
	Lamenting	19	6.67
	Pitying	32	11.22
	Fatalistic blaming	24	8.42
	Deploring	24	8.42
<b>Total</b>		<b>285</b>	<b>100</b>

The overall results in Table 4 showed that Iraqi Arabs employed 285 strategies to express sympathy towards a close equal-status interlocutor across the three various situations. The results indicated that Iraqi Arabs employed two types of sympathy: active and passive. The number of the types of strategies was 11, distributed into 7 types to express active sympathy, and 4 to express passive sympathy. However, *active sympathy* was the most prominent type accounted for 65.26% compared to *passive sympathy* which was employed at the percentage of 34.74 %. This suggests that sympathy among Iraqi Arabs is a social action that is employed to save the hearer's positive face mostly through the active sympathy via various linguistics strategies as staying silence or using passive sympathy may be interpreted as a neglect or pragmatic failure which threaten the positive face of the hearer. That is, Iraqi Arabs preferred active sympathy to show solidarity and support to the face of the hearer (Spencer-Oatey, 2008). In other words, Iraqi Arabs being belong to collectivist high-context culture tended to maintain social relationships as a pragmatic necessity determined by mutual obligation and positive face (Hofstede, 2011). Therefore, using sufficient verbal solidarity and explicit support through linguistic tools (i.e. strategies of active sympathy) are regraded mandatory among Iraqi Arabs to ensure the group cohesion and to prevent the disintegration of social bonds. Regarding the specific types of strategies of sympathy, *praying* was the most dominant strategy accounted for 16.84%, followed by *minimizing* at 11.93%, *encouraging* at 11.58%, *pitying* at 11.22%, and *reassurance* at 10.53%. Iraq Arabs utilized these strategies as "Face-saving acts", and they are considered as face positive politeness mechanisms that reinforce communal solidarity and uphold the social value of the hearer (Reiter, 2000; Scollon & Scollon, 2001). Strategies such as *fatalistic blaming*, *deploring*, *self-sacrifice*, *lamenting*, *condoling*, and *wishing* were used at the parentage of 8.42% and less.

## 6.2 Overall Distribution of Empathy: Types and Strategies

The overall results of types and strategies used by Iraqi Arabs when expressing empathy across three situations are organized in Table 5.

**Table 5:** Overall Results of Empathy: Types and Strategies

Types of Empathy	Types of Strategies	Situations (4, 5, & 6)	
		No	%
<b>Cognitive Empathy</b>		<b>88</b>	<b>18.00</b>
	Criticizing	14	2.86
	Evaluating	26	5.31
	Requesting	30	6.13
	Sharing experience	18	3.68
<b>Emotional Empathy</b>		<b>185</b>	<b>37.83</b>

	Praising	28	5.72
	Begging	10	2.04
	Apologizing	20	4.08
	Emotional mirroring	39	7.97
	Sharing feeling	50	10.22
	Somatic sharing	38	7.77
<b>Compassionate Empathy</b>		<b>216</b>	<b>44.17</b>
	Commisive	41	8.38
	Validation	41	8.38
	Gallantry	43	8.79
	Vowing	25	5.11
	Loyalty	20	4.08
	Proposing	28	5.72
	Thanking	18	3.68
<b>Total</b>		<b>489</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 5 revealed that Iraqi Arabs employed 489 strategies to show empathy towards an individual of close distance and equal status. 17 types of strategies were employed, and they were distributed across three types of empathy as follows: 4 for cognitive, 6 for emotional, and 7 for compassionate. The findings indicated that Iraqi Arabs prioritized compassionate empathy as the most preferred type at the percentage of 44.17%, followed by emotional empathy at 37.83%, and cognitive empathy at 18.00%. This suggests that in the Iraqi context the hierarchy of empathy is driven by "Pragmatic Obligation". That is, Iraqi Arabs preferred compassionate empathy since it functions as an "Illocutionary Act" used actively to satisfy or save the positive face of hearer. Moreover, Iraqi Arabs favored emotional empathy over cognitive empathy reinforcing sincerity and in-group solidarity that are regarded as essential socio-pragmatic factors in high-context cultures including Iraqi Arabic (Sharifian, 2017). They ranked cognitive empathy last, and this suggests that this type of empathy lacks the "Performative Power" in saving the positive face of the hearer (i.e., being desired, appreciated, and liked by speaker) by creating unnecessary social distance that stands in contrast with the expectations of Iraqi Arabs being belong to collectivist, high-context society. With reference to the most favored strategies among Iraqi Arabs across the three situations of empathy, the findings indicated that sharing feeling was the most prominent strategy that used at 10.22%, followed by gallantry at 8.79%, and commissive and validation at an identical percentage of 8.38%. Other strategies such as requesting, emotional mirroring, somatic sharing, proposing, vowing, praising, evaluating loyalty, apologizing, begging, sharing experience, thanking, criticizing were employed at 7.97% and less.

### 6.3. Expressing Sympathy Towards a Close Equal-Status Interlocutor: Types and Strategies

Table 6 presents the types and the strategies utilized by the participants when expressing sympathy towards a close higher-status individual according to three different contexts.

**Table 6:** Expressing sympathy Towards a Close Equal Status Interlocutor

1. Types of Sympathy	Types of Strategies	Iraqi Arabs					
		S.1		S.2		S.3	
		NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
<b>Active Sympathy</b>		<b>43</b>	<b>67.19</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>63.04</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>65.89</b>
	Minimizing	14	21.87	7	7.60	13	10.07
	Reassurance	11	17.18	7	7.60	12	9.30
	Wishing	0		2	2.17	6	4.65
	Praying	12	18.75	16	17.39	20	15.50
	Condoling	0		4	4.34	7	5.42
	Self-Sacrifice	3	4.68	5	5.43	14	10.85
	Encouraging	3	4.68	17	18.47	13	10.07

Passive Sympathy		21	32.81	34	36.96	44	34.11
	Lamenting	4	6.25	7	7.60	8	6.20
	Pitying	7	10.93	9	9.78	16	12.40
	Fatalistic Blaming	3	3.68	10	10.86	11	8.52
	Deploring	7	10.94	8	8.69	9	6.97
<b>Total</b>		<b>64</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>100</b>

The results in Table 6 revealed that Iraqi Arabs varied the use of the number of strategies according to the context of the situations as the highest number was in the third situation (i.e., 129 strategies) when they express their sympathy towards a close friend who was fallen ill. The second situation was ranked second as participants used 92 strategies when participants showed sympathy towards the hearer as their brother who lose all his money in his new business, while the first situation was ranked third when only 64 strategies were used in expressing sympathy towards their friends who was late because of the traffic congestion. This finding indicated that Iraqi Arabs increased the number of strategies based on "Severity of the Event". That is, the pragmatic obligation is increased in high-stakes situations such as sickness and loss; consequently, the speaker increases the number of strategies to provide intensive support to the face of the hearer to maintain social rapport compared to situation of being late that trigger less pragmatic obligation or require minimal illocutionary effort. Participants showed strong tendencies towards *active sympathy* across the three situations accounted for 67.19%, 63.04%, and 65.89% receptively, compared to *passive sympathy* that was used less frequently at 32.81%, 36.96, 34.11% sequentially. With reference to type of strategies in Situation 1, Table 6 revealed that *minimizing* was the most dominant at 21.87%, followed by *praying* at 18.75%, and *reassurance* at 17.18%. Other strategies including *pitying*, *deploring*, *lamenting*, *encouraging*, *fatalistic blaming*, *self-sacrifice* were used at 10.93% and less. In Situation 2, *encouraging* was the most preferred strategy among participants as they used it at the percentage of 18.47%. Importantly, as in the first situation, they maintained their preference of *praying* as the second prominent strategy at the percentage of 17.39%. The third favored strategy was *fatalistic blaming* at 10.86%, followed by *pitying* at 9.78%, and *deploring* at 8.69%. *Reassurance*, *lamenting*, *minimizing*, *self-sacrifice*, *condoling*, and *wishing* were used less frequently at, 7.60% and less. In the third situation, Iraqi Arabs ranked *praying* first at the percentage of 15.50%, followed by *pitying* 12.40%, *minimizing*, *self-sacrifice*, and *encouraging* at an identical percentage of 10.07%. Strategies such as *reassurance*, *fatalistic blaming*, *lamenting*, *deploring*, *condoling*, and *wishing* were employed at the percentage of 9.30% and less.

#### 6.4. Expressing Empathy Towards Close Equal -Status Interlocutor: Types and Strategies

Table 7 displays the types and the strategies employed by the participants to convey their empathy towards an interlocutor of close social distance and equal status across three different contexts.

Table 7: Expressing Empathy Towards Close Equal Status Interlocutor

Types of Empathy	Types of Strategies	Iraqi Arabs					
		S4		S5		S6	
		NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
<b>Cognitive Empathy</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>9.38</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>28.97</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>18.42</b>
	Criticizing	0	0	9	6.20	5	3.28
	Evaluating	4	2.08	13	8.96	9	5.92
	Requesting	9	4.68	11	7.58	10	6.57
	Sharing experience	5	2.60	9	6.20	4	2.63
<b>Emotional Empathy</b>		<b>92</b>	<b>47.91</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>19.31</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>42.76</b>
	Praising	8	4.16	9	6.20	11	7.23
	Begging	3	1.56	3	2.06	4	2.63
	Apologizing	9	4.68	4	2.75	7	4.60
	Emotional Mirroring	21	10.93	6	4.13	12	7.89
	Sharing feeling	27	14.06	6	4.13	17	11.18
	Somatic sharing	24	12.5	0	0	14	9.21

Compassionate Empathy		82	42.71	75	51.72	59	38.82
	Commisive	16	8.33	18	12.41	7	4.60
	Validation	11	5.72	9	6.20	21	13.81
	Gallantry	18	9.37	16	11.03	9	5.92
	Vowing	12	6.25	7	4.82	6	3.94
	loyalty	9	4.68	8	5.51	3	1.97
	Proposing	9	4.68	12	8.27	7	4.60
	Thanking	7	3.64	5	3.44	6	3.94
<b>Total</b>		192	100	145	100	152	100

Table 7 revealed that Iraqi Arabs also vary the number of the strategies of empathy towards a close equal-status interlocutor according to the context of the situations. They employed the highest number in Situation 4 when expressing empathy towards their friend who is suffering sorrow because of his father's death using 192 strategies. While in Situations 5, the number of strategies significantly reduced as they employed 145 strategies. Then, they slightly increase the number of strategies in Situation 6 utilizing 152 in expressing empathy towards a friend who has been disappointed, and lost trust with his former close friend. A close look at the distribution of the types and strategies of *empathy* speech act in Situation 4 showed that Iraqi Arabs preferred *emotional empathy* at the percentage of 47.91%, followed by *compassionate empathy* with slight difference at the percentage at 42.71%, and with significant reduction to *cognitive empathy* which was used at 9.38%. Concerning the types of strategies, *sharing feeling* was the most prominent strategy employed by participants at 14.06% followed by *somatic sharing* at 12.5%, *emotional mirroring* at 10.93%, and *gallantry* at 9.37%. Other strategies were employed less frequently involving *commisive*, *vowing*, *validation*, *requesting*, *loyalty*, *proposing*, *apologizing*, *praising*, *thanking*, *evaluation*, *sharing experience*, and *begging* at the percentage of 8.33% and less. Regarding the fifth situation, *compassionate empathy* was the most preferred type among Iraqi Arabs accounting for 51.72%, followed by *cognitive empathy* at the percentage of 28.97%, and *emotional empathy* which was the least at percentage of 19.31%. Notably, participants ranked *commisive* first as the most favored strategy at the percentage of 12.41%, followed by *gallantry* at 11.03%, *evaluation* at 8.96%, and *proposing* at 8.27%. Some strategies such as *requesting*, *criticizing*, *sharing experience*, *praising*, *validation*, *loyalty*, *emotional mirroring*, *vowing*, *thanking*, *sharing feeling*, *begging*, *apologizing* were utilized at 7.58 % and less. In Situation 6, Iraqi Arabs preferred *emotional empathy* at the percentage of 42.76%, followed by *compassionate empathy* with slight difference at the percentage of 38.82%. Whereas, *cognitive empathy* was the least preferred strategy accounting for 18.42%. With regard to the types of strategies, *validation* was the most frequent strategy at 13.81%. In addition, *sharing feeling* accounted for 11.18% as the second dominant strategy. The third favored strategy was *somatic sharing* at 9.21%, followed by *emotional mirroring* at 7.89%, and *praising* at 7.23%. Some strategies were less frequently used in this situation involving *requesting*, *evaluation*, *gallantry*, *apologizing*, *commisive*, *proposing*, *criticizing*, *thanking*, *vowing*, *sharing experience*, *begging*, and *loyalty* at 6.57%, and less.

## 7. Conclusion

The overall results revealed Iraqi Arabs perceive the speech act of sympathy and empathy as face-saving acts employed to protect the positive face of the hearer (of being appreciated liked, and desired by the speaker). This fact is supported by the high degree of productivity, where a sample of 50 participants employed an extensive array of 774 strategies distributed across 28 distinctive types of strategies. This is in accordance with Bennett's (1979) claim that strategies of empathy and sympathy serve as vital face-saving mechanism employed to maintain the social relation and to enhance the positive face of the hearer. However, this finding contrasts with Brown and Levinson's (1987) views that these two acts are considered as face threatening act that threat the hearer's positive face (by highlighting failure or vulnerability) and negative face (their desire for autonomy and privacy). The overall results showed that Iraqi Arabs have the tendency to employ more strategies and types when expressing their empathy towards a close equal-status interlocutor compared to express sympathy across different contexts. They used 489 strategies in expressing sympathy, while 285 were used to show sympathy. This indicates that Iraqi Arabs (being belong to high-context and collectivist culture), prioritized *feeling with* over than *feeling for*. Therefore, they tended to use a wide range of politeness strategies to reduce the emotional social distance between the speaker and the hearer to maintain the social solidarity. The overall results also showed that Iraqi Arabs employed two types of sympathy: active and passive. However, they showed strong

preference for *active sympathy* rather than *passive sympathy*. This in contrast with the finding included in Puspitasari and Ariatmi's (2024) study in which the preference was for *passive sympathy* rather than for *active*. On the other hand, three types of empathy were used by Iraqi Arabs comprising *emotional*, *compassionate*, and *cognitive*. *Compassionate empathy* was the most prominent strategy followed by *emotional*, and *cognitive*. This is also contrasted the finding conducted by Puspitasari and Ariatmi (2024), when *emotional empathy* was the most favored compared to *compassionate* and *cognitive empathy*. By employing *compassionate empathy*, the speaker is not only feeling or understanding the distress of the hearer, but he moves to perform an action to help the hearer. This suggests that *compassionate empathy* among Iraqi Arabs is seen as the most sufficient social repair mechanism to save the face of the hearer compared to *emotional* and *cognitive*. The overall results revealed that *praying* was the most dominant strategy in expressing sympathy, followed by *minimizing*, *encouraging*, *pitying*, and *reassurance* successively. While in expressing empathy *sharing feeling* was the most prominent strategy followed by *gallantry*, *commisive*, and *validation* sequentially. A close look at the findings of the three situations of sympathy revealed that Iraqi Arabs varied their preferences according to the context of the situations. They used the highest number of strategies in Situation 3, which significantly reduced in Situation 2, and the least was in Situation 1. *Active sympathy* was the most dominant type across the three situations of sympathy compared to *passive sympathy*. Moreover, minimizing was the most frequent strategy in the first situation of sympathy followed by *praying*, and *reassurance*. In Situation 2, *encouraging* was the most frequently used strategy followed by *praying*, *fatalistic blaming*, and *pitying*. While in Situation 3, *praying* was the most preferred strategy followed by *pitying*, *minimizing*, *self-sacrifice*, and *encouraging*. Regarding empathy, Iraqi Arabs used the highest number of strategies in Situations 4 when expressing empathy towards a close friend who suffered from his father's death. However, the findings showed a slight variation in the frequency of strategies employed in Situation 5 and Situation 6. With respect to the type of empathy, Iraqi Arabs' preferences were also modified according to the context of the situations as they used *emotional empathy* as the most prominent in Situation 4, followed by *companionate*, and *cognitive*. In Situation 5, *compassionate* was the dominant followed by *cognitive*, and *emotional*. While in Situation 6, *emotional empathy* was the highest in use followed by *compassionate*, and *cognitive*. Iraqi Arabs also showed different tendencies in their employment of strategies. They preferred the frequent use of *sharing feeling* followed by *somatic sharing*, *emotional mirroring*, and *gallantry* in Situation 4. In Situation 5, *commisive* was the dominant followed by *gallantry*, *evaluation*, and *proposing*. While in Situation 6, *validation* was the prominent strategy followed by *sharing feeling*, *somatic sharing*, *emotional mirroring*, and *praising*. Importantly, this study revealed that some strategies of sympathy employed by Iraq Arabs involving *minimizing*, *reassurance*, *praying*, *condoling*, *encouraging*, *lamenting*, *fatalistic blaming*, and *deploring* were not used at the reviewed literature. Similarly, *emotional mirroring*, *sharing feeling*, *somatic sharing*, *commisive*, *validation*, *gallantry*, and *loyalty* were new types of strategies of empathy that only used in the present study.

#### 8. Limitations, Suggestions, and Pedagogical Implications

This study has significant limitations. First, it is limited to examining the speech acts of sympathy and empathy among Iraqi Arabs in Iraqi Arabic dialect. However, the realizations of these two speech acts vary across cultures, societies, and languages. Second, this study focused on the equal status and close distance, while other levels of social status (i.e., higher and lower) and social distance (i.e., familiar and distant) have not been included. Moreover, some variables have not been investigated in this study involving formality, region, age, level of education, and gender as it was limited to one university, male students at the fourth year of their study, and aged 22 to 23. The realization of sympathy and empathy in cross-cultural interaction is significantly affected by these social variables. Therefore, future researches should focus on such effective and important variables. Third, the instrument used for collecting data in this study was limited to WDCT. Consequently, triangulation of instruments in collecting data by employing real-life situations or role plays could provide valuable insights on how sympathy and empathy are realized in real life contexts. Finally, it is anticipated that the findings of this study will contribute in avoiding and minimizing misunderstandings in cross cultural interaction between Iraqi Arabs and learners of Arabic as a foreign language. Consequently, pragmatic awareness will be enhanced achieving more effective intercultural and international communication.

#### References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words* (2nd ed.). Harvard University Press.  
Bennett, M. J. (1979). Overcoming the golden rule: Sympathy and empathy. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 3* (pp. 407–422). Transaction Books.

- Berscheid, E., & Reis, H. T. (1998). Attraction and close relationships. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 193–281). McGraw-Hill.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 196–213.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Darwall, S. (1998). Empathy, sympathy, care. *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition*, 89(2/3), 261–268.
- Dey, B. (2023). A new look at empathy in social interaction. *Emotion Review*, 15(2), 125–139.
- Ekman, P., & Davidson, R. J. (Eds.). (1994). *The nature of emotion: Fundamental questions*. Oxford University Press.
- Elasri, K. (2018). A linguistic and cultural analysis of sympathy, compassion, empathy and pity in English and Moroccan Arabic. *International Journal of Linguistics and Literature (IJLL)*, 7(4), 81–90.
- Fraser, B. (1981). On apologizing. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech* (pp. 259–271). Mouton Publishers.
- Goleman, D. (1996). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- Horn, L. R. (2004). Pragmatics and discourse. In L. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 58-75). Blackwell Publishing.
- House, J., Kádár, D. Z., & Cang, H. (2025). Analysing sympathy from a contrastive pragmatic angle: A Chinese-English case study. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 16(2), 849–875. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2023-0205>
- Ioannidou, F., & Konstantikaki, V. (2008). Empathy and sympathy: A comparative historical and philosophical analysis. *Health Science Journal*, 2(2), 11-16.
- Jakobson, R. (1960). Linguistics and poetics. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 350–377). MIT Press.
- Lychuk, M., Navalna, M., Marchuk, L., Shabat-Savka, S., & Skliarenko, O. (2023). The communicative strategy of sympathy: Linguistic means of expression and problems of translation. *XLinguae*, 16(1), 37–45. <https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2023.16.01.03>
- McDougall, G. J. (2003). A review of a review: Empathy and sympathy revisited. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 24(5), 455-463.
- Mohammed, E. A., & Kadhim, S. M. (2023). A socio-pragmatic study of verbal and nonverbal acts expressing sympathy in the American movie 'The Help'. *Diyala Journal for Human Research*, 2(98).
- Puspitasari, M., & Ariatmi, S. Z. (2024). A sociopragmatic analysis of sympathy and empathy expressions on Instagram: Insights from a video of children in Gaza. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 11(2), 306–321. <https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v11i2.37721>
- Reiter, R. M. (2000). *Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Blackwell.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2001). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishers.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sharifian, F. (2017). *Cultural linguistics: Cultural conceptualisations and language*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (Ed.). (2008). *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory* (2nd ed.). Continuum.
- Sugiharto. (2008). *A sociopragmatics analysis on sympathy and empathy utterances in movie manuscript* [Bachelor's thesis, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta]. Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta Digital Repository.
- Svenaesus, F. (2015). The phenomenology of empathy: Empathy and sympathy in a new light. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*, 18(4), 585-594.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. William Morrow.

Tracy, K., & Robles, J. S. (2013). The pragmatics of verbal empathy. In J. D. Robinson & L. R. P. E. G. O. O. O'Hair (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of communication and emotion* (pp. 531-546). SAGE Publications.  
Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Mouton de Gruyter.

### Appendix 1

Categorization of types of sympathy proposed McDougall's (2003) classification, types of empathy by Goleman's (1996), and semantic formulas conducted by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984).

1.Types of sympathy	Types of Strategies	Examples (Iraqi Arabic)	English Translation
<b>Active Sympathy</b>			
	Minimizing	"ما تسوه تحرك دمك، فدوة الك الفلوس"	"It is not worth the heartache; consider the money a sacrifice for your sake."
	Reassurance	"لا تهتم، بسيطة وكله تتحل بمرور الوقت"	"Do not worry; it is a minor matter, and everything will be resolved with."
	Wishing	"وأتمنى من كل قلبي تخلص هالأزمة اليوم قبل باچر"	"I truly wish from the bottom of my heart that this crisis ends today rather than tomorrow."
	Praying	"الله يسهل أمرك وتعدي هالشدة"	May God ease your path and let this ordeal pass over"
	Condoling	"البقاء بحياتك، وخاتمة الأحزان إن شاء الله"	"May your life be long, and may this be the end of your sorrows, God willing."
	Self-Sacrifice	"يا ريت الوجع بيّ ولا بيك، فدوة لروحك"	I wish the pain were mine rather than yours; consider it a sacrifice for your soul's sake."
	Encouraging	أنت سبع وكدهه، والكاع إذا ما تشيلك نشيلك بعيونه"	
<b>Passive Sympathy</b>			
	Lamenting	"يا بويه، قهرتني والله بهالخبر، كون الخسارة بيّ ولا بيگ"	"Oh dear, this news has truly distressed me; I wish this loss were mine rather than yours."
	Pitying	ما تهون عليّ والله أشوفك بهل الوضع، قهرتني حيل بهل الخبر"	"I cannot bear to see you in this situation; your news has truly distressed me"
	Fatalistic Blaming	"هذا نصيبك، مقدر ومكتوب"	"It is your predestined lot; ordained and written by fate."
	Deploring	"لا يا الله! ليش هيج صار وياك؟"	"Oh, dear God! Why has this happened to you."
<b>2. Types of Empathy</b>			
<b>Cognitive Empathy</b>			
	Criticizing	"استعجلت بالثقة، كان لازم تحذر"	"You were too quick to trust; you ought to have been more cautious"

1.Types of sympathy	Types of Strategies	Examples (Iraqi Arabic)	English Translation
	Evaluating	"أنت سويت اللي عليك" "وما قصرت"	"You have done your utmost; you cannot be faulted in the least."
	Requesting	"بشرنى، هسه أنت شلونك؟"	"Give me some heartening news; how are you faring at present."
	Sharing experience	"أنا هم مريت بنفس ظروفك قبلك"	"I, too, have endured similar circumstances before you."
<b>Emotional Empathy</b>			
	Praising	"طول عمرك صاحب موقف ومبادئ؛ ومعدنك طيب وأصيل، ما تغيره الشدايد"	"You have always been a man of steadfast principles; your noble nature is authentic and remains unchanged by adversity."
	Begging	"لخاطري اهدأ ولا تسوي بنفسك هيح"	"For my sake, please be calm; do not do this to yourself."
	Apologizing	"اعتذر منك، كان ودي أكون وياك"	"I offer my sincere apologies; I truly wished to have been by your side"
	Emotional mirroring	"أنا حاس ببيك، عيونك تحجي همك"	"I truly feel for you; your eyes betray the depth of your sorrow."
	Sharing feeling	"حزنك هو حزني وگلبي حاس ببيك"	"Your sorrow is my own; my heart truly feels for you."
	Somatic sharing	"والله من سمعت بخبر وفاة والدك، انصدمت وگلبي وجعني عليك"	"I swear, I was utterly devastated upon hearing the news of your father's passing; I felt a profound ache in my heart for your loss."
<b>Compassionate Empathy</b>			
	Commisive	برگبتي، ما أعوفك لحد ما تخلص"	"I take full responsibility; I shall not leave your side until this is resolved."
	Validation	"حقك والله، الموقف كلش" "صعب"	"You are quite right; the situation is profoundly difficult."
	Gallantry	أبشر بالفزعة، أنا أخوك وسندك"	"Rest assured of my unwavering support; I am your brother and your pillar of strength."
	Vowing	نذر عليّ لوجه الله، إذا انحلت شدتك، لأوزع صدقات للفقراء"	"I solemnly vow, for the sake of God, that should your ordeal be resolved, I shall distribute alms to the needy."
	Loyalty	"أني وياك للموت، لو شبيصير ما أعوفك"	"I am with you until the end; no matter what happens, I will never leave you."
	Proposing		
	Thanking	أشكرك لأنك وثقت بيّ "وحجيتلي"	"I am grateful for the trust you have placed in me by sharing this."