



College of Basic Education Research Journal

www.berj.mosuljournals.com



A Critical Discourse Approach of Telegram Bullying in Male-male Iraqi University Students Interactions.

Afrah abed Al Qadir Jassim

Instructor at the University of Mosul

Candidate at the University of Mosul

Nashwan Mustafa Al-Sa'

Department of English

College of Arts/University of Mosul

Article Information

Abstract

Article history:

Received: May 8.2024

Reviewer: May 27.2024

Accepted: : June 9.2024

Key words :

Bullying, verbal aggression, gossiping, Telegram platform, slander

Correspondence:

Afrah.abed@uomosul.edu.iq

nashwan.m.s@uomosul.edu.iq

The study employs an eclectic model, a critical discourse analysis approach related to Fairclough (1989) to examine realization of the phenomenon of social media bullying among university students at College of Basic Education/ University of Mosul linguistically. The second model is Lunge model (2002) to identify bullying stages. Study investigates instances of online verbal bullying by students at first academic level, utilizing informal Arabic language. The research aims to define the notion of bullying in general and online bullying in specific. In addition, identify common expressions used by male-male students. The research is guided by a set of research questions designed to explore linguistic realization of bullying and determine frequency of specific bullying expressions employed by male students. A hypothesis is formulated, including the most frequent expressions of bullying used by students on social media. The outcomes of this study provide valuable insights into linguistic aspects of social media bullying among Iraqi university students, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of this prevalent issue within an educational context in Iraqi universities.

ISSN: 1992 – 7452

منهجية تحليل الخطاب النقدي للتنمر عبر منصة التواصل الاجتماعي التلي كرام بين طلاب الجامعة الذكور

نشوان مصطفى الساعاتي
جامعة الموصل/كلية الاداب/ قسم اللغة
الانكليزية /العراق

افراح عبد القادر جاسم
جامعة الموصل /كلية التربية الأساسية /قسم
اللغة الإنكليزية /العراق

المستخلص

اعتمدت الدراسة انموذجا انتقائيا ،يتكون من نموذج فيركلف (١٩٨٩) تحليل الخطاب النقدي لدراسة ظاهرة التنمر عبر وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي بين طلاب الجامعات في العراق، مع التركيز بشكل خاص على جامعة الموصل لغويًا واجتماعيًا و اعتماد نموذج لا يون (٢٠٠٢) لتحديد مراحل التنمر. تبحث الدراسة في حالات التنمر اللفظي عبر الإنترنت من قبل الطلاب في المستوى الأكاديمي الأول، باستخدام اللغة العربية غير الرسمية. تهدف الدراسة إلى تعريف مفهوم التنمر بشكل عام والتنمر عبر الإنترنت بشكل خاص. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، تحديد التعابير الشائعة المستخدمة من قبل الطلاب الذكور. تم صياغة مجموعة من الأسئلة البحثية لاستكشاف الجانب اللغوي للتنمر وتحديد تكرار التعابير الأكثر شيوعا وتكرارا للتنمر التي يستخدمها الطلاب الذكور. تم صياغة فرضية عن التعابير الأكثر شيوعا وتكرارًا للتنمر اللغوي. وتوصلت نتائج هذا البحث الى رؤية قيمة حول الجوانب اللغوية للتنمر عبر وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي بين طلاب كلية التربية الاساسية، مما يساهم في فهم التنمر أكثر شمولاً لهذه المشكلة المنتشرة داخل البيئة التعليمية في الجامعات العراقية والحد من هذه الظاهرة.

1. Introduction

The issue of bullying is frequently addressed as a social phenomenon due to its distinctively aggressive characteristics. However, Yahn (2012) argued that there is insufficient research providing a cohesive, comprehensive, and standardized understanding of the fundamental dynamics, origins, and societal factors associated with bullying. He further pointed out that there is a lack of agreement on a set of definitions or standards that universally define what constitutes bullying. Yahn (2012, p. 20-28) emphasized the need for more research that offers a unified and thorough comprehension of the essential dynamics, causes, and societal influences contributing to bullying. Additionally, he highlighted the absence of consensus on universally accepted definitions or criteria that accurately delineate what qualifies as bullying.

Bullying through social media is a growing concern, particularly among university students in Iraq. The research investigates the issue of bullying at university students on social media specifically on the Telegram application. The focus is on analyzing the language patterns employed by male bully students to harm and apply power over their male colleagues. Both the roles of the bully and the target are explored across various themes within the interaction. The study aims to define bullying within the university context, identify the common types of bullying used by male students, and investigate the strategies employed by bullies and the targets, particularly through the social media platform Telegram.

However, it's important to acknowledge certain limitations in this study. Firstly, the sample size was restricted to include participants from a single college with Basic Education at the first level. The students from one city in various demographic places. Additionally, the study's focus was limited to the analysis of bullying within a single social media platform Telegram.

2. Literature Review

Over the past few decades, there has been a notable increase in focus on addressing the issue of bullying across a wide range of contexts, including educational institutions, workplaces, and even within families. This heightened awareness has led to a growing body of research dedicated to understanding and combating bullying, with a particular emphasis on educational settings (Harris and Petrie, 2003, p. 1-2). According to Koo (2007, p. 107-116), the earliest comprehensive academic work on bullying was conducted by Burk in 1897. However, after Burk's pioneering research, there was a significant gap in research on bullying until subsequent efforts began to explore deeper into the field of bullying starting in the 1970s and continuing up to 2013. This period witnessed significant developments in the definition and understanding of bullying. In the 1970s, specifically in Scandinavia, studies were published that

played a vital role in reshaping the academic discourse on bullying in school settings. Research conducted and published in Scandinavia during this period had a significant impact on refreshing academic discussions surrounding bullying in school environments.

Pikes (1975, p. 1-12) and Olweus (1978) began to focus their attention on topics related to bullying, particularly behaviour that occurs between students. The initial studies in Scandinavia also introduced the term **mobbing** which referred to the harassment of an individual by multiple individuals, highlighting the emergence of patterns in bullying behaviour. (Cited in Koo, 2007, p. 109). According to Faucher et al. (2014), bullying employs language as a tool for various harmful actions, including but not limited to criticizing, threatening, excluding, separating, disapproving, embarrassing, annoying, revealing personal information, or using hostile, profane, or derogatory remarks to cause harm to the targeted individual. Thus, bullying is considered a harmful style used by the individual or group to empower or insult others to the needs of the bully person.

3. Definition of bullying

Concerning the definition of bullying which is provided by Smith et al. (2008, p. 376), they characterized it as a repeated aggressive act or behaviour performed through electronic means, either by an individual or a group, targeting a target who faces difficulty in self-defence. Languors (2012, p. 288) presents a new form of bullying occurring on social media platforms. This type of bullying employs information and communication technologies to engage in a series of actions, as observed in direct online bullying, or a singular action, as evident in indirect online bullying. The essential objective of these actions is to cause harm to an individual or group, specifically the target, who may face difficulties with the bully person in such a way. This emphasizes the evolving new nature of bullying in the digital age and the varied ways in which it is marked.

In addition, Waasdorp and Bradshaw (2015, p. 483-485), bullying can be defined as a type of 'undesired aggressive behaviour' that is repetitive, directed towards a victim, and characterized by a power imbalance. This aggression can manifest physically (such as hitting and kicking), verbally (like teasing and threats), and relationally (for example, spreading rumours and exclusion). The phenomenon can be characterized as deliberate aggression or mistreatment aimed at establishing dominance and fostering an uneven power dynamic over the target. This can manifest through physical, verbal, and relational means. Patchin et.al. (2013) defined online bullying as repetitive harassment, abuse, or mockery of an individual more than one time by using electronic devices such as mobile or other numerical implements. According to the definition provided by Putril et al. (2017), bullying is defined as a harmful activity marked by power and

control. This behaviour involves an individual or a group using negative actions against a specific individual or group over a continued period, including elements of harshness and a power imbalance.

Finally, Hana et al. (2017, p. 6) highlight the diverse nature of bullying, stressing its significance as a persistent issue in academic settings. Their research establishes that bullying harmfully impacts academic performance, with females experiencing a greater impact than males. The study sheds light on the prevalence of bullying behaviours across different social contexts.

In summary, the general definition of bullying is that a harmful aggressive discourse verbal or nonverbal used by people to degrade or impose power upon another person for personal needs, that occurs face to face or through social media.

4. Statement of the Problem

The rationale for the selection of this issue by university students through social media was their exposure and interactions leading to conflicts. In addition, there has been limited research on bullying as a social phenomenon, despite its increasing prevalence online in Iraq universities. Besides, a significant gap still exists in exploring bullying specifically within the context of universities, especially through social media channels. While there has been extensive attention directed towards bullying in schools and workplaces, the phenomenon of bullying within university settings remains under-researched and requires further investigation, precisely through social media.

5. Research question

The current study attempts to answer the following question:
what are the common expressions of bullying that are used by Iraqi universities through social media?

6. Hypothesis

The present study hypothesizes that the most frequent bullying expressions used by Iraqi students refer to physical traits, gossiping, cursing, slander, and insulting.

7. Limitations

The study is limited by written verbal bullying, the samples are in the form of screenshots. The students were only from one university as participants from Mosul city in Iraq. The current study investigated only one social media site, specifically the Telegram application.

8. Methodology The sample contains several messages reflecting the bullying phenomenon. The identity of the students has been preserved by using the capital letters(M, F) that indicate the gender of the participants rather than their real names to protect the reputation and social standing of the students, as decided by

the researcher. Besides, the researcher is involved in these groups without the students' awareness, ensuring the confidentiality of the research and the reliability of the results. The researcher obtained a verbal agreement from the head of the Department of English to participate in student groups. The student who was responsible for these groups was not included in the research sample. The goal was to keep the students unaware of the research topic initially, completing data collection to ensure the credibility of the student's behaviour in their natural settings, thereby achieving credibility in the results.

Concerning the model analysis, an eclectic model is adopted to analyze discourse across two models: The critical Discourse approach which related to Fairclough's (1989) language and power in three dimensions: textual, discourse practice, and social practice, and the second model is Lunge model (2002) the stages of bullying. The researcher collected the data from the English department at Basic Education in the form of screenshots messages of interactions taken from the Telegram application. The results revealed that the bullied students used harmful language to abuse and belittle their targets, intentionally improving their defenselessness.

9. Results and Discussion

The following section contains an interaction among five male students. MS2 is the target student, MS1 the bully students, (MS3, MS4 and MS5) are the active bystander students. MS1 engaged in making the target student MS2 a trend in social media by sharing a harmful video and picture to belittle him and damage his reputation among his peers. Besides, MS1 and MS2 use dialect language and nonverbal (long laugh, emoji forms which support in revealing the bullying phenomenon.

The sample is going to be analyzed according to the Lunge model (2002), at three stages (the initiation, escalation, and termination). The first stage which is **the initiation (pre-bullying) stage**, contains reasons that contributed to raising bullying behaviour among (MS1, MS2, MS3, MS4, and MS5). It started with the comment of MS1(/ʔljo:m da jo:mil-faɖa:jih̩ jaxu:ja binuʃʃi-gneih/ Today is the day of scandals for few pennies, brother.), and ends with MS2. /m:aku ʔakθar min hi:tʃ xara:b/It will not reach more than this bad level).

According to Fairclough (1989), three dominations (textual, discourse practice, and social practice) are used to identify the realization of the bullying phenomenon linguistically and socially.

The textual analysis focuses on vocabulary, metaphor, grammar syntax, cohesion, coherence, rhetoric devices and pragmatics. **At the vocabulary level**, in terms of formal and informal language, the chat started with MS1 the bully student used the words (/faɖa:jih̩ / scandals), which included negative meanings

that MS2 is a bad and disrespectful student. The bully student MS1 used the word brother (/jaxu:ja/ brother) in the Egyptian language linked by the laughter emoji to belittle, abuse and damage the reputation of MS2 among the group. MS1 continued by using a harmful word such as (qunbula/ strong trend) reflecting that the video about MS2 was shameful and would make him a trend. Also, MS1 cursing MS2 by using the verb /jinʕal / Damn you) involves an impolite meaning towards MS2.

At grammar and syntactic levels, grammar includes how grammatical forms of language construct relationships. According to Alo (1998 as cited in Yeibo, 2011, p. 198), the sentence may be used to have different speech functions such as to approve or disapprove, express doubt, ask questions or give answers; or to command others; to include others within the social group or to exclude others from it. These various uses or functions of the sentence correspond to the syntax i.e. the grammatical categories refer to sentence modalities, which are called declarative (statement sentence): imperative (commands, requests) and exclamatory (exclamation).

The participants used different types of sentences, for example, the bully student and the target used direct and indirect declarative and imperative sentences to apply bullying through warning and threatening language. Such as MS1 using direct statement with vocative (ja) /ʔljo:m da jo:mi-l-faḍa:jiḥ jaxu:ja binuṣṣi-gneih/ Today is the day of scandals for few pennies, my brother) to insult and abuse MS2 to damage the reputation of MS2 among the group. As a reaction, the target student MS2 warns MS1 by saying (/ /sawi: ha ṣaḥi:h ʔuʃu:f ʃra:h ʃsi:r bi:k/ Do it, and you will see what will happen to you)/. The phrase (/ʔuʃu:f/, you will see), reflects the desire of MS2 to challenge in a harmful way and warns him (/ʃra:h ʃsi:r bi:k / what will I do with you). MS3 the bystander student used a direct rejection to be honest that he doesn't have any relation with this problem through using negation (ma: not) and saying (/xu:ja ʔḥna ma: ʔlna ʕala:qa ʔabad/ It is not our business, brother). MS2 uses a direct imperative sentence to warn MS1 to stop gossiping by spreading fake information about him (/sawwi: ha ṣaḥi:h ʔuʃu:f ʃra:h ʃsi:r bi:k/ Do it, and you will see what will I do with you), as a response MS1 used direct complex sentence and warns MS2 the video is a big problem which made MS2 as trend (/ʔlvi:djo qunbula bas-ṣbr ʔṣṣaba:h raba:h hijja xurbat baṣad/; The video is a strong trend, just wait to see what will happen next morning). MS2 warns MS1 that their friendship will become worse by using the word (/xara:b/. MS1 used a cursing expression (Damn you, MS2!) as a way to continue bullying MS1. MS1 uses the phrase (hijja xurbat baṣad / It is worse than before) to refer to their friendship as going to be worse.

Cohesion is shown through using personal. Karapetjana (2011: 43) defines personal pronouns as "grammatical forms which refer directly to the speaker and the audience". The **first-person** singular pronoun (/ʔa: ni/ I (me). and plural pronouns (/ʔlna/ we) are persuasive features that are speaker-oriented and allow the speaker to accept personal accountability and authority., they show direct power, involvement and obligation to the audience and the speaker's beliefs him by using such pronouns. The bullied student uses the **second-person pronoun** 'you' in his speeches as a form of direct speech to his receiver to involve them in the interaction and accept the agreement or approval group and control them in addition to reflecting his ideology and identity. Such as (MS1/you, he). **Conjunction** tools such as (/ʔuʃu:f/ and, /bas/ just, /liʔn /because) are used to connect the ideas of the chat. In addition, using the form of negation (ma:/ not, /la/no) reflects a sort of rejection between MS1, and MS2, whereas **coherence** is realized through connecting the ideas logically and systematically. The content revolves around negative comments acting as warning, belittling and threatening (scaring). Furthermore, the bully and the target students used nonverbal language represented by the emoji's forms and punctuation marks to reflect their emotions through interaction which makes the content of the messages more coherent and coherent.

Rhetorical devices by repeating the word (/ʔljo:m/today, jaxu:ja /brother), using the exaggeration word (/faʔa:jiħ/ scandals), using metaphor, describing the participant as (/jaxu:ja /brother) in the Egyptian language, to get the attention of the group to increase the emotional effect towards MS2, and highlighting the consequence of the day's actions.

Concerning the pragmatic level, some participants used different strategies to provoke, warn, and scare each other and to control the group. For instance, the act by MS2 the target student (/sawi: ha ʃaħi:ħ ʔuʃu:f ʃra:ħ ʃsi:r bi:k/ Do it, and you will see what will happen to you), involves a type of warning, which reflects the impression that MS2 tries to control MS1. The bully student as a reaction threatened MS2 by saying (/bas ʔlvi:djo qunbula bas-ʃbr ʔʃaba:ħ raba:ħ hijja xurbat baʃad/ The video is a strong trend; just wait and see what will happen next morning. It is worse than before), and the state of affairs for MS2 will become worse if the video spread. MS3 the active bystander student confirmed that it is not the group's concern, but their problem (MS3. /xu:ja ʔħna ma: ʔlna ʃala:qa ʔabad/It is not our business, brother).

Discourse practice contains the following levels, turn-taking, adjacency pairs, speech acts, interaction strategies, and sequential organisation. The students follow the formula of **turn-taking**., based on act and response. This turn includes several roles which contributed to shaping the chat and reflecting the ideas of

bullying. The bully student started the turn by saying that this day is the day of defemination (/ʔljo:m da jo:mil-faḍa:jih jaxu:ja binuʃi-gnash/Today is the day of scandals for a few pennies, brother). As a response, MS2 the target student took his role by warning MS1 (/sawi: ha ʃahi:h ʔuʃu:f ʃra:h ʃsi:r bi:k / Do it, and you will see what will happen to you). In addition, the turn is constructed in the form of **adjacency pairs** i.e. each pair is a related utterances that follow a specific pattern including act and response. For example warnings/rejections.

MS1. /ʔljo:m da jo:mil-faḍa:jih jaxu:ja binuʃi-gneih/

Today is the day of scandals for a few pennies, brother.

MS2. /sawi:ha ʃahi:h ʔuʃu:f ʃra:h ʃsi:r bi:k/

Did it, and you will see what will I do with you

MS3. /xu:ja ʔhna ma: ʔlna ʃala:qa ʔabad/

It is not our business, brother.

MS1. /ma: ʔadri leiʃ nawa:f jwaḍih mini-ʃʃu:ra ..

walla ʔltaʃwi:r ma: bi: ʃi:/

I don't know why Nawwaf feels upset about the picture. Oh my God the picture is ok!

MS2. /la: txarib bi ʃahi:h/

It may be truly worse.

Furthermore, the participants used various types of **speech acts** to bully each other. Such as MS1 (/ʔljo:m da jo:mil-faḍa:jih jaxu:ja binuʃi-gneih/Today is the day off for a few pennies, brother), he used the act of slander to damage the reputation of MS2 by posting a picture and inviting the group to see it. He continued bullying MS2 and used mocking and warning acts (/ʔlvi:djo qunbula bas-ʃbr ʔʃʃaba:h raba:h hijja xurbat baʃad/ The video is a strong trend; just wait to see what will happen next morning. It is worse than before) to belittle and control MS2. Besides, the target student MS2 warning and rejecting by saying (/sawi: ha ʃahi:h ʔuʃu:f ʃra:h ʃsi:r bi:k/Did it, and you will see what will I do with you), and remembered him about their friendship it may damage (/la: txarib bi ʃʃahi:h/ It may be truly worse).The bully student used the cursed act to insult MS2 (/jinʃal jo: mal MS2/ Damn you, MS2)

Interaction strategies refer to how the bullied students and the target students used language to apply bullying. They used various strategies including insulting, mocking, gossiping, and defamation, besides using metaphor (hostile nickname) to belittle the target. **Sequential organisations** are represented by the utterances delivered by the participants to make a complete meaningful dialogue which contributes to reflecting the phenomenon of bullying. For example,

MS1. /ʔljo:m da jo:mil-faḍa:jih jaxu:ja binuʃi-gneih/

Today is the day of scandals for a few pennies, brother.

MS2. /sawi:ha šahi:h ?u|u:f |ra:h jši:r bi:k/

Do it, and you will see what will I do with you

MS3. /xu:ja ?hna ma: ?lna šala:qa ?abad/

It is not our business, brother.

MS1. /ma: ?adri lei| nawa:f jwađih mini-ššu:ra .. walla ?ltašwi:r ma: bi: |i:/

I don't know why Nawwaf feels upset about the picture. Photography is ok!, but

MS2. /la: txarib bi šahi:h/

It may be truly worse.

MS1. /bas ?lvi:djo qunbula bas-šbr ?šaba:h raba:h hijja xurbat bašad/

The video is a strong trend; just wait and see what will happen next morning. It is worse than before.

MS3. /?a:ni da:ʔiman ?aqu:l ma: ?ari:d ?ahadi-šawirni liʔn ?ašur ha:ji-suwalif/

I always say that I don't anyone to photograph me because I know what may happen then.

MS1. /jinšal jo:mal nawwa:f/

Damn you, Nawwaf

MS2. /m:aku ?akθar min hi:ʔf xara:b/

It will not reach more than this bad level.

Social practice includes the following levels, power dynamic, ideology, identity, social] value, and educational context. **Power relation** is reflected through using degraded language by the participants. For example, MS2 seems to be more powerful than MS1 due to his acts by warning MS1 /sawwi: ha šahi:h ?u|u:f |ra:h jši:r bi:k/ Do it, and you will see what will I do with you). **Ideology** is reflected in the comment delivered by the bully student MS1(/ʔljo:m da jo:mil-fađa:jih jaxu:ja binušši-gneih/ Today is the day of scandals for a few pennies, brother). Thus, spreading such fake information, pictures or videos about someone is to damage his reputation in front of the community. Here, the bully student MS1 posted a fake picture related to MS2 to damage his reputation belittle him among peers and empower him, besides convincing the group that MS2 unrespected person. According to Tajfel and Turner (1979), **identity** is proposed by evaluating others as (us, we, I)or (them, they, he) i.e. in-group and out-group. MS1 identity is reflected by using direct language and using the first pronouns. regional identity would be if one used the Mosuli dialect. **At social value**, the participants used negative and impoliteness verbal and nonverbal language. They used threatening, derogatory language in an attempt to control or shame other students. For examples(MS1(/ʔljo:m da jo:mil-fađa:jih jaxu:ja binušši-gneih/ Today is the day of scandals for a few pennies, brother), and MS2

by saying (/ʔlvi:djo qunbula bas-ʃbr ʔʃʃaba:h raba:h hijja xurbat baʃad/ The video is a strong trend; just wait to see what will happen next morning. It is worse than before). MS2 posted such a picture and a video because he knew that MS2 would be upset and unhappy if one posted his photo in the group.

The escalation stage refers to the consequences of bullying behaviour among the group. The bully and target are engaged in bullying each other, the bystander students (MS3 and MS4) support MS2, while MS5 tries to reduce the tension among the students by rejecting their bad behaviour toward each other. The stage is labelled by the comment of MS1 (/lak ʔʔanistigra:m liʃbiti: ʔlla ʔaniʃrak/ Hey, Instagram app. is my own game. I manage to share yours there), and ends with MS1 (/ʃabba:s ʔljo:m yaddeitak ma: laħħagit tuglub ʃalajja/ Abbass, remember that I have invited you to lunch. Then, you want to be against me!).it includes five related turns. MS2 used the verb phrase (/xalas kafi/ Shut up) linked with an angry emoji, reflecting his rejection of this issue.

Based on the Fairclough model (1989), textual analysis is organised under the following levels: vocabulary, grammar and syntax, cohesion, coherence, rhetoric device and pragmatics.

At **the vocabulary level**, the participants used many degrading words such as MS1 used the word (/ʔaʃhirak / trend), the meaning of this word reflects harmful behaviour towards MS2 to damage his reputation., which is considered as a type of bullying (slander or defamation)), also, the (/ ʃabrak/Just wait) contains types of warring MS2 to make him as a joke among the group tile morning.MS4 the bystander student who supports MS2 warns him by using a hostile nickname (/mʃaxxam/ bare-faced guy). this type of word is commonly used there is a type of solidarity among friends, here, MS2 seems to be a good student which makes MS4 warn him about the video.MS3 the active bystander student who supports MS1 uses the noun (/ʔaʃra:d/ private things) to insult MS2 and agree with MS1 to bully MS2. The bully student MS1 continued insulting MS2 by (ma: jiʃrifunak / you are an unknown person.)which included a hint of negative meaning that MS2 unfamiliar student in the group, to belittle him among their peers. MS2 as a response uses the adjective (/qaʃma/ ridiculous.) to describe MS1 to reduce his confidence. Furthermore, MS1 insults MS3 by using the refuted verb (/latiddaxal/ Don't insert, /tuglub/hypocrite) due to MS3 supporting and motivating MS2 against MS1.

At syntactic and grammar levels, different structural types of sentences are adopted which serve numerous purposes and have a role in persuading the speakers. These types of sentences are simple, compound, complex and compound-complex. A simple sentence is used to assert a direct actual statement, a compound sentence is used to combine the two notions, a complex sentence is

to make a sense of doubtfulness to evoke his listeners' emotions, and a compound-complex sentence is to present many ideas and much more information about bullying and its role in defeating the students use declarative, command, questions, and future tense in their interactions. For example, MS1 swears to defame(offend) MS2 (ʔurabbi ʔlla ʔaʃhirak ʃabrak ʃa/ By God, I will make you a trend. Just wait), here MS1 uses the expression By God to assert his bullying upon MS2 and promise to do that in the future. MS4 as an active bystander who supports MS2 warns and advises him about the video that MS1 posted (/mʃaxxam ʔlvi:djo riħit bi: ha MS2/ Hey, bare-faced guy, this video will make a scandal for you, MS2) by using vocative and using the hostile nickname (mʃaxxam/ Hey, bare-faced guy) to warn him about its effects on him. Besides MS5 recommends MS1 and MS2 not to share anything by using vocative through a negative declarative sentence including (/MS2, MS1 ʔxwa:n la: tnazlu:n ʃi:// MS1, MS2 brothers, don't share anything)also, he uses the polite word (/ʔxwa:n/ brothers) as a way to convenes MS1 and MS2 to stop sharing a shameful comment. The bystander student MS3 tries to provoke the situation by blaming and insulting MS1 and MS2 (ʃaba:b ʃbi:kum ha:j ʔaʃra:d ʃaba:b ma:jʃi:r ʔaħħadi-jʃu:fha/ Hey guys, it is incorrect to share such private things. No one is allowed to watch them. Hahaha) he uses the phrase (ʔaʃra:d ʃaba:b/ private things)with the expression (hahaha)includes degrade meaning by considering MS1 and MS2 like female.

MS4 the bystander who takes a neutral position asserting that they have no responsibility for this issue saying (/xu:j ʔihna Guys, it is not our business, /ʔihna musa:limi:n ma:jʃi:r tuglub ʔala nawwa:f/ We are on the fence. You cannot be against MS2). Again, MS1 insults MS2 by declaring that it will be a big show and inviting the group to see it (/ʔlli ma: jilʔari jitfarradz/ Hey come and see. I will make a show, Besides, he uses the expression / hahahahaha/ Hahahahah to support his bad behaviour. MS1 continues bullying MS2 by saying (/ntadru-liʃda:r-ldʒidi:d/ Wait for the new version.)warring his for more videos. And asking him in a hostile way (/bas ʔiða: ʃndak θiqa bru:ħak min ʔanazzil ʃi: ʔaleik tihðifa/why you rush to delete everything I share about you?) to make him less confidence in front of peers, and using the if clause to challenge him. MS used the phrase (/tuglub ʃalajja/ to be hypotonic) to describe MS3 because he supports MS2. MS2 used the rhetorical device (metaphor) and described him as (/mu: ʔinta qaʃmar/ridiculous) to embrace him among peers.

There is an attempt to persuade MS1 not to post certain content by the bystander students. MS3/nawaf ra:kan la:tnZalu:n ʃay ikhwa:n/MS1, MS2, don't post anything, brothers, MS5(/ixwa:n taʃuðu: min alʃaiṭa:n ra:h naʃi:r masta:wʔa habit/ hold your horse, bothers stay away from the Satan; we're becoming

trend!!!!). In addition, the bystander who provoked and described MS1 as a coward, because MS2 refused to bull MS1 (/xa:ʔi:f jimaʃu:d ʃuja:k/ Scared he might lose his temper!). Besides, MS4 provokes MS2 by /nazzil nazzil MSSS2/ MSSS2, make your share. Do it!), MS3 also supports MS2 by motivating and provoking him to share bad things about MS1 (/nawwa:::f nazzzzil ʔaʃʃir-lwadiʃ/ MSS2, make you share. Common do it). As a reaction, MS1 is surprised and blames MS3 for his behaviour (ʃabba:s ʔljo:m ʔaddeitak ma: laħħagit tuglub ʃalajja/ Abbass, remember that I have invited you to lunch. Then, you want to be a hypocrite!)

Cohesion and coherence are applied by using pronouns(/lak/you, /liʃbiti:/my, /ʔaniʃrak/you, /sawwi: ha/it, /beinna/us, /ʔtʃallamit/I, /minnak/you/, /jʃu:fu:k ,yours...etc. , conjunction,(wʔuʃu:f /and, some transitional expressions and rhetorical devices. Furthermore, the participants used nonverbal expressions to support their actions against each other and to assert the phenomenon of bullying. Such as the long laughter (hahaha), and using sad and angry emoji. The ideas of the text messages are connected **coherently** reflecting the ideas of bullying. MS2 uses the **metaphorical devise as in** (/lʃibi:r/the wise one) which includes a hostile meaning to describe MS1 the bully student. MS3 describes MS2 by unwise for his harmful behaviour and asserting his speech by swearing (/walla ʔaggaṭ bra:s/ Wallah, MS2 becomes cracked) MS2 used the word (/qaʃmar/ ridiculous.) to describe MS1. /MS4 used metaphor to warn MS1 and MS2 to become bad students for their hostile bad behavior (/muħtawa:/bad boys). In addition, repeating the sentence (/ʔurabbi ʔlla ʔaʃhirak ʃabrak ʃalajja/ I will make you a trend. Just wait. By God,/ /nazzil nazzil MS2/ MS2, make your share .make your share.!) which make the content of the messages more coherent.

Pragmatically, the student's group used harmful language to assert bullying among the group, specifically the bully, and the target students. they used various types of acts such as insulting, gossiping, mocking, and defamation(slander) to assert bullying. Such as MS1 insults MS2 by using the act of warning and swearing to make him a trend among the group (/lak ʔʔanistigra:m liʃbiti: ʔurabbi ʔlla ʔaʃhirak ʃabrak ʃalajja/ Hey you, I said that the Instagram app. is my own game. I will make you a trend. Just wait. By God). Furthermore, MS1 provokes and invites the group to see such a funny show.

Concerning **discourse practice** which is the second dimension of the Fairclough model (1989), the focus is on the following levels. Turn-taking, adjacency pairs, speech acts, interaction strategies, and sequential organisation. The students follow the formula of **turn-taking**., based on several acts and responses to assert bullying.

The first **turn started** with the act of MS1 and ended with the act of MS5. The turn-about warning MS2 from the effect of the video posted by MS1. It includes five participants (the bully MS1, the target MS2 and the bystander students (MS3, MS4, and MS5)).

MS1. /lak ʔʔanistigra:m liʕbiti: ʔurabbi ʔlla ʔaʕhirak ʕabrak ʕalajja/

Hey, I said that the Instagram app. is my own game. I will make you a trend. Just wait.

MS4. /mʕaxxam ʔlvi:djo rihit bi:ha nawwa:f/

Hey, bare-faced guy, this video will make a scandal for me, Nawwaf.

MS5. /nawa:f ra:ka:n ʔxwa:n la: tnazlu:n ʕi:/

MS2 and MS1, please brothers, don't share anything.

MS2. /ha:j hijja xalaʕ/

Ok, that's it.

MS3. /ʕaba:b ʕbi:kum ha:j ʔaʕra:d ʕaba:b ma:jʕi:r ʔahhadi-jʕu:fha/

Hey guys, it is incorrect to share such private things. No one is allowed to watch them.

MS5. /xu:j ʔihna ma:lina ʕala:qa/

Guys, it is not our business

The second turn started with the act of MS1 ends with MS4.

MS1. /ʔlli ma: jʕʕtari jʕfarradʕ/

Hey, come and see. I will make a show

MS4. /ʔihna musa:limi:n ma:jʕi:r tuglub ʔala nawwa:f/

We are on the fence. You cannot be against MS2

Here, MS1 invites the group to see the funny show about MS2. As a reaction, MS4 rejects MS1's comment advising him to be aware of MS2.....etc.

In addition, each turn is based on **adjacency pairs** such as:

MS2. /leiʕ tihʕif ra:ka:n/

Why did you delete rakan?

MS1. /ʔtʕallamit minnak/

I have learnt that from you.

Furthermore, the participants use various types of **speech acts** to bully each other or to reject MS1 act. Such as MS1 acts, (/lak ʔʔanistigra:m liʕbiti: ʔurabbi ʔlla ʔaʕhirak ʕabrak ʕalajja/ Hey, I said that the Instagram app. is my own game. I will make you a trend. Just wait.), here, MS1 used warning as an act to bully MS1, also (/ʔlli ma: jʕʕtari jʕfarradʕ/Hey, come and see. I will make a show), to damage the reputation of MS2 using scandal act(gossiping), by inviting the group to see a funny show about MS1. As reaction MS2 (/wha:ða-anta-lʕʕibi:r hi:ʕ na:ʕirni min xamis sa:ʕa:t xalli ʔaniʕrak hatta jʕu:fu:k-ldʕama:ʕa/You are in a great position, how can you do that; I mean you shared something about me five

hours ago. So, let me share yours to make the group watch and interested.), accused MS1 of sharing harmful information for five hours and blamed him for this bad behaviour because MS1 retained a good position among the group and had to respect this. MS1 neglects MS2's comment and mocks him by acting along laugh (/hahahahaha/Hahahahaha).

MS3 the bystander student tries to provoke MS2 (/walla taggat bra:s MS2 maʕal-ʔasaf lo: ʕabba:s ʔa:n tama:m/Oh, MS2 is the accused one. I hoped that to be with MSX, it would be very fine.). MS1 uses the act of insulting by describing MS2 as a coward (/bas ʔiða: ʕndak θiqa bru:hak min ʔanazzil ji: ʔaleik tihðifa/But, if you have self-confidence, so you rush to delete everything I share about you), as reaction MS2 (/mu: ʔinta qaʕmar/That's because you are ridiculous) insults MS1 by calling him with a harmful nickname as a silly person. MS1 blames MS3 (/ʕabba:s ʔljo:m yaddeitak ma: laħħagit tuglub ʕalajja/MS3, remember that I have invited you to lunch. Hypocrite! shame on you.)

Interaction strategies denote how the participants engaged in applying bullying when they communicate. These strategies include insulting, mocking, gossiping, rejecting and defamation. Using hostile nicknames as a way to belittle the target. The interaction at the escalation stage is constructed in **sequential organisations** characterized by the utterances provided by the participants to make a complete meaningful exchange of ideas which helped in reflecting the phenomenon of bullying, such as,

MS1./dija:lla mu: zein niʕtarik θnein θnein bilfariʕ ma: jiʕrifunak ʔntaḍru-liṣda:r-ldzidi:d/

Common guy. Even if you are shared by others; you are an unknown person. Wait for the new version.

MS2. /xalli: ʕa:di ma: ʔari:d ʔanazzil ʕurtak ʔlhadijja ʔaqu:l ma: ra:hma/

Come what may. I don't like to share your photo, the one you gifted to me. I think it is an inappropriate act.

MS1. /bas ʔiða: ʕndak θiqa bru:hak min ʔanazzil ji: ʔaleik tihðifa/

But, if you have self-confidence, so you rush to delete everything I share about you.

MS2. /mu: ʔinta qaʕmar/

That's because you are ridiculous.

MS1. /ʔintaḍru-l-ʔiṣda:r-ldzidi:d ʔabadan latxa:f ʔlla ʔaxalli:k trend/

Wait for the new version. Don't worry, I swear that I will make you a trend.

MS2. /xalli: ʕa: di/

Aa you want.

Here, the participants engage in the sequential organization, i.e. each role related to the next one to reveal the ideas of bullying through the strategies of, insulting, asserting bullying by swearing, mocking by using a hostile nickname.

Social practice includes the following levels, power dynamic, ideology, identity, social value, and educational context. **The power dynamic** is realized and limited between MS1, and MS2. MS1 (ʔurabbi ʔlla ʔaʃhirak ʃabrak ʃalajja/ . I will make you a trend. Just wait. By God), he threatened and swearing to make MS2 a trend though posting the video, to damage the reputation and self-esteem of MS2 among the group. Furthermore, MS1 swears and insists on making MS1 less respectful (/ ʔlli ma: jiʃtari jitfarradʒ / Hey come and see . I will make a show), by inviting the group to see the funny show about MS2. Using nonverbal expression by MS1 (/ hahahahaha/Hahaha), the long laugh to insult reflects the impression among the group that MS2 is a coward. MS1 continued in mocking MS2 (/θnein bilfariʃ ma: jiʃrifunak// ʔntaḍru-liʃda:r-lɔʒidi:d/ you are an unknown person. Wait for the new version.), to assert dominance among the group, and to belittle MS2 because MS2 is a good student respectful one in the group.

Identity is reflected through the desire of MS1 to damage the reputation of MS2 by using harmful dialect language, which is based on his region, demography, background knowledge, and cultural differences. Such as the dialect words (/mʃaxxam/ bare-faced guy, /dija:lla Common guy./ ma: ra:hma/ unsuitable act,/ θiqa bru:ħak / self-confidence,/ latiddaxa/ Don't insert your nose.etc), and using proverb (/ʔlli ma: jiʃtari jitfarradʒ/ Hey come and see. I will make a show,/ /la: txa:f ʔlxo:f ma: ʃaz-irdʒa:l wala: jʃaammir ʔlxo:f ʔamdʒa:d-lʔumam la: txa:f ʔlxo:f mu: ʃabʃ-lʔisu:d/ Don't worry, you are a man. Never mind at all. Lions do not know what 'fearing' is), the sentence (wallah ʃaggaḡ bra:s nawwa:f/ Wallah, MS2 becomes cracked, //mu: ʔinta qaʃmar/ That's because you are ridiculous.// /nawwa:ʃ nazzzil ʃaʃfir-lwadiʃ/ Nawwaf, make you share. Common do it). **Social value**, the comment of MS1 reflects his desire to harm the persona and the reputation of MS2 and get the approval of the peers' attention to be strong to get their respect and make MS2 a coward and less powerful.

The third stage is **the termination stage** which shows the end of the exchange among the students who are involved in bullying. It started with the comments of MS4 (ʔxwa:n tʃawwaḡu-ʃʃeita:n ra:h ja:xḡu:na muħtawa: / Brothers, stop it! We will be accused by bad boys and ends with MS2 (MS2. /ra:ka:n ʔħs: bak jammi hassa ʔanazzil-lvi:djo wil-hadijja/Rakan, I have your account. I am going to share the video with the present. According to Leung's bullying model (2002), **the initiation** stage comprises the opening statement of the encounter or the tension, referring to the reasons that cause bullying. In textual analysis at the vocabulary level, the students used harmful words such as the bull student MS1 used the

words (/trend/ trend, / ni-lqawi/, I am the stronger, / dzarrib/ Try to share,/ /di:r ba:lak / Beware!, /ʔurabbi ʔanʔira/ By God, I will share it) to fear, warns, and control MS2 to belittle him among peers.

In grammar and syntax, the bully, target, and bystander male students used numerous types of direct and indirect speech to reveal bullying. MS4 tries to reduce the tension among the group by using the future tense in a direct declarative sentence to convince MS1 and MS2 to stop behaving childishly (/ʔxwa:n tʔawwaðu-ʃʃeita:n ra:h ja:xðu:na muhtawa:/ Brothers, stop it! We will be accused by a bad boy). MS1 asserts bullying by saying (/vi:djo ʔiða: niʔartu ra:hi-jʃi:r trend/ This video will be a trend if I share it) by using complex sentences in condition case to fear MS2 from the effect of the video in the future if post it, he continued in mocking and warning MS2 by (/ʔistaqbil ʔlli: raħ jidzi:k/ Watch what will happen to you).

The bystander MS3 used direct speech to incite MS2 to share the gift about MS1(/nazzil MS2 /MS2, make share), and he continued in provoking and convincing MS2 to share the gift about MS1 by saying (/huwwa niʔarak ʕal-ʔanistigra:m ʔmnazli: ha maljo:nein ʔuniʃ kulhum ʃa:faw ʔinta ham nazzzil MS2 nazzil/ He shares on Instagram. It is shared for about two and a half million. All watched it. So, you also do the same MS2. Make share just now. MS4 the other bystander supports MS2 in sharing the gift and the video without mercy (/MS2 la: txa:f nazzil ʔula: jhin qalbak/ MS2, don't worry. Share it and don't be kind). As a reaction MS1 continued in warning MS2, and swearing if he shared anything about him he would become a funny show by using compound-complex sentences reflecting the consequence desire of MS1 to belittle and dominate MS2 (/walla ma: ʕindi muʔkila xalli jinʔir bas jithammal ʔlli raħ jidzi:h vi:djo ʔiða: ʔanʔiru: ʔijʃi:r trend ʔurabbi/ I have no problem. Let him make share, but he will be responsible for what will happen to him about this video, //ʔa:ni-lqawi dzarrib ʔinʔir ʔuʃu:f/ I am the stronger. Try to share, and you will see. If I make a share, it will be a trend, //ʃo:n daxalli: ʔilli ma: jiltari jitfarradz/ I will make him cry, / /di:r ba:lak ʔurabbi ʔanʔira sto:ri feis buk ʔuanistigra:m ʔuħatta ju:tju:b/ Beware! or, I will share it on Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube also). MS1's reaction calling MS2 a long tone (MSS222222), reflects his anger because MS2 agree with MS3 about sharing the big gift on social media to make trends too. MS2 replied (/baʕid ha:ðal-vi:djo ma: ʔal ʃi:/ After this video, nothing is left). MS3 warns MS2 for the video which is shared by MS1, and advises him to solve this problem. (/ʔmʃaxxam ʔvi:djo riħit bi: nawwa:f huwwa na:ʔrak sto:ri:/ You, barefaced guy, this video will hurt you Nawwaf. He shared the stories). As a reaction, MS2 (/leiʃ ma: qilit ʕaleik wiħda vi:djo qadi:m/ /leiʃ ma: qilit ʕaleik wiħda vi:djo qadi:m/) blames MS3 because he doesn't tell him before about the

video. MS3 justify that (/waḥaq-alla ma: ʔaʃruf ja: qadi:m/ I swear I don't know it is old.) by swearing he does not know. The participants try to end the exchange but they still bully each other, MS1 warns MS2 to be wary if he posts anything about him (/ʔanazzil-lvi:djo di:r ba:lak//nawwaaaa:f/ Beware! Otherwise, I will share the video. Nawwaf!). MS2 rejected MS1 warning by saying (/ra:ka:n ʔhs: bak jammi hassa ʔanazzil-lvi:djo wil-hadijja/ Rakan, I have your account. I am going to share the video with the present).

At **cohesion** level, the text of the interaction is oriented through clauses and sentences which are linked together by cohesive devices such as pronouns(/ ja:xðu:na /we, / niʃartu/ I, /huwwa/, he, / ʔinta you, /kulhum /all, conjunctions and subordinate-conjunction (/ʔula:/and, /baʃid/ /after transitional phrases, and lexical repetition(/hassa/ Just wait,/trend/trend, / nazzzzil/share,/ /nawwaaaaaa:f/ Nawwaf, /ʔi: ʔi:/yes, yes, , sentence repetition(/ʔilli ma: jiʃtari jitfarradz/make him cry, / /di:r ba:lak ʔurabbi ʔanʃira sto:ri feis buk ʔuanistigra:m ʔuhatta ju:tju:b/Beware! or, I will share it on Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube also, and references (/ʔxwa:n/ Brothers, muḥtawa:/bad boys,/ trend/ trend,/ vi:djo, video(bullying). **At coherence**, the students repeated some expressions which asserted the idea of bullying. Besides, they exchange smoothly, overlapping, and interpreting to reveal bullying behaviour which gives the text its clarity, organisation and coherence. **At rhetoric devices**, MS1 describes negatively by using the noun (trend) which includes a hint of negative meaning. MS4 used the word (muḥtawa:/bad group) and also included a negative hint meaning that the members of the group behaved badly. MS2 the bully student used the word (/hadijja dabil/big surprise)as a metaphor which included the implicit meaning of bullying. MS3 the bystander student describes the target student MS2 as (/ʔmşaxxam/ You, barefaced guy), which reflects a harmful meaning.

Pragmatically, the participants use various types of speech acts as strategies reflecting the bullying phenomenon. MS1 used warning acts to fear MS2 and control the group such as, (/vi:djo ʔiða: niʃartu ra:ḥi-jʃi:r trend/This video will be a trend if I share it, /ʔistaqbil ʔlli: raḥ dʒi:k/Watch what will happen to you. Hahaha, /ʃo:n daxalli: ʔilli ma: jiʃtari jitfarradz/ I will make him cry, /ʔiða: ʔanʃiru: ʔijʃi:r trend ʔurabbi/ If I make a share, it will be a trend. Furthermore, MS1 use insulting act by using long laugh expression (/vi:djo ʔiða: niʃartu ra:ḥi-jʃi:r trend/This video will be a trend if I share it. Hahaha). MS3 used provoke act (/nazzil nawwa:f/Nawwaf, make share. Also, Ms4 used provoke acts. /nawwa:f la: txa:f nazzil ʔula: jḥin qalbak/ Nawwaf, don't worry. Make share and don't be kind.

In discourse practice, the exchange at the termination (post-bullying) stage is based on the following levels turn-taking, adjacency pairs, speech acts,

interaction strategies, and sequential organization. The participants follow a turn-taking structure to demonstrate bullying. The formula includes several turns, and each turn contains **adjacency pairs** related utterances (question/ answer, warning /approval or disapprovaletc) to expose or prevent bullying. Such as the first turn starts with the role of MS4 and ends with the role of MS4

MS4. /ʔxwa:n tʃawwaðu-ʃʃeiʃa:n ra:h ja:xðu:na muhtawa:/

Brothers, stop it! We will be accused by bad boy

MS1. /vi:djo ʔiða: niʃartu ra:hi-ʃʃi:r treind/

This video will be a trend if I share it. Hahaha

MS3./ ma:l-ʃʃu:ra/

About the photo?

MS1. /ʔistaqbil ʔlli: rah jidzi:k/

Watch what will happen to you. Hahaha

MS3. /nazzil MS2/

MS222, make share.

MS4. /MS2 la: txa:f nazzil ʔula: jhin qalbak/

MS2, don't worry. Make share and don't be kind.....etc

Here, the students (MS1the bully, MS2the target, and (MS3and MS4) the active male bystander students. MS1 continued to bully MS2, MS3 provoked MS2, and MS4 at the beginning tried to reduce the tension among the group, and later supported MS2 the target student.

As mentioned before the participants used **speech acts** strategies at a pragmatics level to apply bullying, for example using warning, insulting, threatening, scaring, and swearing to asser bullying. In addition, using hostile nicknames as a way to belittle the target student and embarrass him in front of peers. In **interaction strategies**, the bully, the target students and the active bystander used various types of strategies to apply or to prevent bullying, such as: threatening, scaring, warning, negative advising, provoking and insulting. For example

MS2: / MS1 hisabak jumi, hessa anzil alhadai/

your account is mine. Now I'll post the gift. (Scaring and threatening):

MS2: /ʔaʃbirli/

Hey, you watie!!.

Besides, these turns are connected logically in the sequential organisation and contribute to revealing the bullying phenomenon

MS2. /hassa// hassa/

Just wait. Just wait

MS1. /walla ma: ʃindi muʃkila xalli jinʃir bas jithammal ʔlli rah jidzi:h vi:djo ʔiða: ʔanʃiru: ʔijʃi:r trend ʔurabbi/

I have no problem. Let him share, and he will be responsible for what will happen to him about this video. If I make a share, it will be a trend.

MS2. /hadijja dabil/

a big surprise

The third dimension is **social practice** includes the following power relations, ideology, identity, social values, and educational context to identify the bullying phenomenon among university students. The interaction shows an imbalance of **power relation** among the student group trying to confirm control over specific students on the Telegram platform. For example:

MS1 and MS2 used threatening or scary, warnings and slander language to impose power, representing an attempt to control others. MS1 the bully student used a warning to control MS2 by posting a harmful video, to belittle and damage his reputation. This reveals that MS1 has more power than MS2, the long laugh supports MS1 to insult MS2 and to convince the group that MS2 is a bad student.

MS1. /vi:djo ʔiða: niʔartu ra:hi-ʃi:r treind/

This video will be a trend if I share it. (Hahaha)long laugh

Ms1. /ʃo:n daxalli: ʔilli ma: jiʔtari jiftarradʒ/

I will make him cry.

Ms1. /ʔanazzil-lvi:djo di:r ba:lak//MSSSSSS2/

Beware! Otherwise, I will share the video. Nawwaf!

Ms1. /la: xo:ʃ ma: ʒal ʃi: ʔa:ni-lqawi dʒarrib ʔinʃir ʔuʃu:f/

Ok. As you said nothing is left, I am the stronger. Try to share, and you will see

The reaction of MS2 (/kafi ʃad/ That is Enough 😞 😞 😞) reflects negative emotions of upset and less self-confidence through the sad emoji.

The students reflect their **ideology and identity by** accepting and rejecting performances which are based on their background knowledge, norms, and cultural differences.

As mentioned before in the pragmatics level, MS1 **ideology** is reflected through warning, insulting, slander, mocking, and using hostile nicknames to belittle MS2 and empower the group. Also, MS3 and MS4 used the act of provoking to support MS2 as a personal identity to reject MS1's harmful behaviour toward MS1. Furthermore, using swearing expressions reflects the identity of the participants i.e. they belong to the Muslim community and reject such harmful behaviour (bullying) reflects their ideology which is based on their norms, religion, and background knowledge. Besides bullying is considered as negative behaviour and unacceptable. Thus, they believed that such behaviour in their community was considered unrespectable. The first personal pronouns(/ ja:xðu:na /we, / niʔartu/ I,) are used to conceptualize group **ideology** in-group. According to Dontcheva (2011,p.114) mentions that the third-person pronouns

(/huwwa/, he, / ?inta you, /kulhum /all, /huma/ they,/(it) refer to groups or authorities. Such as perceiving threatening, warning, determination, or signified as negatively social performers or targets, and expressing negative evaluative toward out-group.

The concept of **identity** plays a vital role in understanding how language influences and influences the identities of the students who are involved in bullying interactions. In the sense that, the students challenge to share negative identity with other students through disturbing and damaging their reputation. For example MS2(/wa rabi la ?ařhurak /by God, I'll expose you, wa rabi, fi:dyo iza ?anřaru řsir tarend wa-lla:h/I swear, if I share the video, it will become a trend, by God). As stated before in the textual phase MS1 used the words (/trend/ trend, /ni-lqawi/, I am the stronger, / dřarrib/ Try to share,/ /di:r ba:lak / Beware!, /?urabbi ?anřira/ By God, I will share it) to fear, warn, and control MS2 to belittle him among peers reflecting his ideology to reject MS1 harmful comment. We believe that in the Arb community, the reputation of the person is very important to get respect from others. Thus, MS1 tries to damage the reputation of MS2 by posting such harmful pictures and videos. The reason behind posting such information about MS2 is because MS2 get a good status among the group. Furthermore, MS4 the bystander active student uses the expression (/?xwa:n třawwađu-ř[eiřa:n/ Brothers, stop it! and be aware of Satan) the meaning of this expression contributes to reflecting his **identity**, because this expression is commonly used by Arb Musil individuals when they want to reduce or solve conflicts among individuals. MS1 used Mousli dialect (/hassa hassa/ Just wait. Just wait),(?urabbi/ xalli jinřir bas jithammal ?lli rař jidři:h vi:djo / Let him make a share, but he will be responsible for what will happen to him about this video, walla) MS2 the target used dialect phrase /**hadijja dabil**/ a big surprise, /**?řbirli**/You will see what happens to you)reflect his identity through warning MS1.).

Repeating such words also reflects **social values**, for example: The use of phrases like (MSSSSS2, /MSSSS2,/ azzazzazzal, share it, /?ařbirli/ Hey you Wait.!!, /ma anta qeřmar/ You're clumsy). Reflects a negative value toward MS2 to leaving the university as a condition of threat, embarrassed feeling, and less confidence. Also using such harmful discourse in the university community influences the students negatively speared a type of unrespect behaviour and creates conflict among them. As a result, it may affect their academic performance.

The interaction takes place within an **educational setting**, it takes place on social media, specifically on the formal Telegram platform which belongs to the College of Basic Education in Mosul. For example:

MS1(/ alas'tu:ri min az zu'hu:r mi?a wa:hid ja:fa'wu:wa: 'ʕadi/ /'mi?a wa:hid ja:fa'wu:wa: 'ʕadi/ /ʔa:di/ /'anʃar bas 'axli lfi'ðjo malak yitlaʕ 'tarend ʃart 'axliki tit'ruk al'za:miʕa/ The Story has been viewed by 200 people since noon. I will post, but I will make sure your video becomes trending, and I swear you'll leave the university). Thus, the aggressive and threatening nature of the discourse may impact the overall educational environment, creating a negative atmosphere.

In summary, the exchange shows an imbalance of power, at online platforms reflects, authority, ideology, threats to identity, a lack of positive social values, cultural inferences, impoliteness expressions used by the students and the context placed within social media. All these features contribute to raising bullying behaviours among university students. In addition, the exchange shows features of encounters through the initiation, escalation, and termination stages including types of bullying such as using threatening, warning, insulting, mocking, provoking and humiliating expressions in attempts to control the target.

After analyzing the data of bullying discourse within male-male type interaction. We have come up with some findings that are shown in the following table which shows the frequencies and the percentages which are used by the participants.

Table (1): Male-male interaction frequency and percentage of verbal bullying categories.

Verbal Bullying Categories	Interaction Frequency	Total Percentage
Insulting	5	6.172
Sarcasm	7	8.641
Cursing	3	3.703
Gossiping	8	9.876
Slander	13	16.048
Scaring	5	5.952
Swearing	3	3.703
Warning	22	27.160
Tropes	10	12.709
Provokes	5	6.172
Negative Advising	3	3.703
Total	84	100%
Percentage	33.333%	

The table above shows that male bully students used **warnings** with the highest value (27.160%) percent in total per cent, far more than other categories. The male bully student succeeded in convening the other students in the group and persuading them by delivering negative attitudes about the target male student and describing him in a harmful manner using paralanguage to destroy the target's reputation and self-esteem. Furthermore, he uses such language to embarrass the target affect his feelings, and belittle him in their group, because MS2 is a clever student all the students trust and respect him, which makes MS1 feel jealous. so he decided to revenge by extorting him through warring by spearing fake information among the group. The second highest value is related to **slander** (16.048), Here the bully student used this type to make fun of and threaten the target to prove that the target is powerless. The other high frequency is related to **tropes** (metaphor and simile), with a value of (**12.709**) per cent in total percentage. Here, MS21 continues making fun of MS2 to degrade him among the group and make him feel less confident by using a hostile nickname. This reflects a high desire to change males' stereotyped image as a weak and dependent entity through being empowered via gossiping and scaring types. The other high score is related to **Gossiping** (9.876 %) in total per cent. As a human being such a type is considered a social issue famous among females more than males, but the analysis reflects the desire of male students to use this type to bully MS2. Thus, MS1able to convince and provoke the group to communicate with him at the beginning. Concerning **sarcasm** the value (8.641%) in total per cent, makes him feel embarrassed and leave the group. far more than other categories. In addition to asserting power over the other students.

Insulting and **provoking** occupy the same value (6.172 %), and the rest types **cursing**, **swearing**, and **negative advising** occupy less than the above types and the same value (3.703%) per cent.

The high percentages of warning, slander, tropes, gossiping and sarcasm reflect the desire of the MS1 to achieve power among males and the need to admit male authority in the group. However, bullying phenomena is considered an ideology that is reflected mostly implicitly through traditional norms, and social relations. Finally, the bully male student desires to influence the other male's attitude towards the target student. Accordingly, bullying discourse serves as a strategy that makes his behaviour seem reasonable and acceptable to others.

10. Conclusion

Based on the results obtained from the analysis and to answer the hypothesis the most common expressions used by male students are warning. slander, gossiping, and sarcasm bullying , these types of Social media bullying emerge and persistent issues affecting the younger group. The findings of this study shed

light on the manipulative nature of language employed by bullying students in online environments. Their tactics centred on exploiting the exposure of their targets, using language to embarrass, shame, and weaken the target. The act of exposing personal information generated anxiety among victims, while the usage of harsh language aimed to establish a sense of authority over them. Consequently, the victims experienced psychological distress characterized by feelings of seriousness, pressure, and uncertainty.

References

- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Faucher, C., Jackson, M., & Cassidy, W. (2014). Cyberbullying among university students: Gendered experiences, impacts, and perspectives. *Education Research International*, 2014, 1-10. DOI: 10.1155/2014/698545.
- Harris, S., & Petrie, G. (2003). *Bullying: The bullies, the victims, the bystanders*. Lanham: The Scarecrow Press. (pp. 1-2)
- Hanna, M., Helena, P., & Matti, M. (2012). "Studies in higher education on bullying at a university: Students' experiences of bullying". DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2011.649726.
- Hindawi, F., Saffah, M., & Raheem, A. (2021). The pragmatics of bullying in selected political speeches of Donald Trump. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(3), 1427-1439. Doi: 10.52462/jlls.103 Submission Date: 22/05/2021 (1430-1434)
- Koo, H. (2007). "A timeline of the evolution of school bullying in differing social contexts." *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 8(1), 107-116.
- Langos, C. (2012). Cyberbullying: The challenge to define. *Cyberpsychology, behaviour, and social networking*, 15(6), 285–289.
- Lunge, S. (2002). *Conflict talk: A discourse analytical perspective*. Teachers college, Columbia University.
- Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the Schools: Bullies and Whipping Boys*. Washington: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation. Oxford: Blackwell. Oxford, England: Hemisphere.
- Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2013). *Cyberbullying research: 2013 update*. Cyberbullying Research Center. [Online].
- Pikas, A. (1975). Treatment of mobbing in school: Principles for and the results of the Work of an anti-mobbing group. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 19(1), 1-12.
- Putril, S., & Prihandari, A. (2017). A Critical discourse analysis study of cyberbullying in LGBTQ's instagram account. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 33). <http://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20173300071>

- Smith, P., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., and Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: its nature and impact in secondary school pupils *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49 (4), 376-385. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01846.x>
- Waasdorp, T., & Bradshaw, C. (2015). The overlap between cyberbullying and traditional bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 56(5), 483–488. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.12.002>
- Watts, R.J. (1991). Power in family discourse. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yahn, M. (2012). The social context of bullying. *Encounter: Education for Meaning and Social Justice*, 25(4), 20-28.