



وقائع المؤتمر العلمي البحثي الدوري الثامن للباحثين من حملة الشهادات العليا
شعبة البحوث والدراسات التربوية / قسم الاعداد والتدريب وبالتعاون مع مركز
البحوث والدراسات التربوية / وزارة التربية وجامعة بغداد / كلية التربية ابن رشد
والجامعة المستنصرية – كلية التربية الاساسية والمنعقد تحت شعار
((الاستدامة ودورها في تنمية القطاع التربوي))

للمدة 2025/2/12

“Analysis of discourse concerning bully in political texts pertaining to Trump”

Asst. Lec. Mohammed Fadhil Abbas
Directorate of Education, Rusafa Second

Furatabbas9999@gmail.com

07806969769

Abstract

Donald Trump's public communication is marked by using personal attacks to discredit critics and opponents, exaggerating threats or providing inappropriate reassurance, mixing fact with fiction, fueling cultural divides and racial tensions, and questioning the authority of the law. His language aligned with his previous statements before becoming president and diverged from the typical behavior expected from a president.

The president's public speech has reduced his effectiveness in governing rather than enhancing it. His persuasive language has not helped him broaden his group of supporters. The president's rudeness has failed to convince those who were not already inclined to support him. He has not succeeded in making most people doubt his detractors, such as the media, via his use of exaggerations or downplaying of dangers. The public perceives him as untrustworthy and not deserving of respect. Ultimately, Trump's language has further complicated the task of governing efficiently.

Keywords: Trump, president, rhetoric, leadership, public speech

1.1 Problem of the Study

Politics is now a subject of extensive discussion, and it is quite probable that you may encounter such disputes in many locations, particularly on the internet. Therefore, it is advisable to have an open-minded attitude. Not only are individuals articulating their viewpoints, but the politicians who are competing against them also possess a substantial amount of information on the individuals they are opposing. Moreover, the most of it is not notably enjoyable. Indeed, a substantial portion of it is undeniably detrimental.

1.2 Research questions

1. What are the many forms of political bullying seen throughout society?
2. What is the effect of bullying on individuals?
3. What strategies may society use to manage such a concerning phenomenon?

1.3 Significant of the Study

Critical analysis is inherently subjective since it conveys the author's perspective on a literary work. A critical essay is often categorized into two main components: critical reading and critical writing. The term "analyses" refers to the process of dissecting and assessing.

Examine the organization of the passage by identifying all noteworthy concepts. This paper aims to provide an overview or description of the chosen topics and ideas pertaining to bullying in the context of political literature, using critical analytics.

1.4 Limitations of Study

Assuming we delve enough into this phenomenon. In this scenario, we will observe that it relies on diverse behavioral bullying frameworks, such as the boldness to disseminate corruption worldwide through the utilization of substantial public funds to purchase sporting triumphs or exclude countries from competitions, or by financing terrorist organizations to incite unrest in particular nations. One of the forms of overt bullying seen at this level is the interference in the internal affairs of other nations. The biggest nations and their rulers, as the second layer of the bullying triangle, have a strong understanding of their own interests, which allows for the occurrence or at least allows for the kind of political bullying we facilitate. These countries occasionally use bullying tactics, similar to how the United States imposes sanctions or engages in military aggression against other nations. Nevertheless, the most peculiar aspect of their conduct is in their remarkable silence when confronted with various forms of bullying. Although it has the capacity to recognise and critique instances of political bullying, it is unable to provide substantial solutions as a consequence. Our findings indicate that the method consistently aims to increase complexity.

2. Theoretical Background:

Bullying is a well-known occurrence that has been consistently shown throughout our educational establishments for a significant period of time. Contemporary presidents seem to have less influence in convincing others compared to previous presidents, despite the fact that they are engaging in public communication more often (Cohen, 2010: 65; Edwards, 2003; Kernell, 1997: 98). Despite extensive efforts to elucidate this conundrum, the existing body of literature has not yet provided a comprehensive answer. Partly, this is because both the "going public" paradigm (Kernell, 1986: 22) and contemporary challenges to the paradigm (Edwards 2003, 2009: 8) highlight

the president's ability to persuade. The prevailing perspective on the public presidency is that presidents utilize speeches to exert influence over public opinion, thereby shaping the policy agenda of Congress (Barrett, 2004; Canes-Wrone, 2006; Kernell, 1986; Tulis, 1987: 66), the Supreme Court (Yates et al., 2005: 44), and the bureaucracy (Whitford & Yates, 2009: 7). However, this perspective diminishes the national news media's position to that of a mediator between the president and the general people. On one end of the spectrum, the president is most effective in persuading the public when he directly communicates with them, without the interference of the news media (Rottinghaus, 2010: 12).

Bullying is often described in the literature as a specific kind of hostility (Land, 2003). Reactive aggressiveness refers to a defensive reaction to a perceived danger, which is considered an adaptive response. On the other hand, proactive aggression is driven by the aggressor's desire for a good result. Researchers hypothesize that bullying is associated with proactive aggression, since this kind of aggression against peers is believed to be motivated by the anticipation of rewards, such as monetary benefits or gaining recognition and respect within the peer group. Nevertheless, by adopting this perspective, bullying may be considered adaptive when it results in personal benefits, despite its lack of social acceptability.

2.1 Donald Trump's Political Discourse

According to York (2013: 109), many scholars suggest that American politics is starting an era of highlighted incivility, represented by free exhibitions of disrespectful political rhetoric and behaviour. Nithyanand et al. (2017: 1) mention that several factors including the rising popularity of Donald Trump contribute to the declining quality of American political discourse. Similarly, Lakoff (2017: 2) states that Trump desperately wants to be a macho man. Thus, he echoes sentences fragments, reuses the very words and phrases, and boasts.

2.2 Definition and perceptions

The development of the idea of bullying has been characterized by uncertainty and inconsistencies from its first investigation. Professor Dan Olweus (1978: 23) raised concern over the prevalent use of the term mobbing in Scandinavia. The term was first 'adopted' from the ethological research conducted by Konrad Lorenz. It pertains to the phenomenon found in the animal realm when a collective of animals would initiate an assault on an individual belonging to a different species. In his work, Lorenz (1966: 5)

used the term "mobbing" to characterize the conduct of a collective of school pupils who unite in opposition to an individual who deviates from the norm. Olweus (1978: 63) expressed worry that the extensive and common use of the word may have led to a narrow emphasis on group violence directed at individuals who are considered deviant, thereby neglecting other significant components of the phenomena.

2.3 Branding and Delegitimizing

Prior to becoming the presidency, Trump instructed his advisors to conceptualize each day of his presidency as an episode of a television program, in which he triumphs over his adversaries. He followed his counsel. The president consistently resorts to ad hominem counterattacks as his first reaction to any kind of dissent or criticism. According to a notable analyst, the president is consistently irritable and prone to expressing anger. Instead of prioritizing the promotion of policy, the president has placed more emphasis on branding his opponents by launching personal attacks on their character or intentions. Furthermore, he exhibits proficiency in this area, carefully selecting impactful vocabulary and consistently repeating them, providing his followers with a sense of clarity and coherence. Notable instances including

- “Crooked Hillary”
- “Lyn” Ted Cruz.
- “Pocahontas” (Elizabeth Warren)
- “Fake News,”
- The “failing” New York Times

During the process, he simplifies and reduces his opponents to their core characteristics. According to Trump, Clinton is not only guilty of a crime, but she is fundamentally dishonest and corrupt. Not only did Cruz utter falsehoods, but lying was fundamentally integral to Ted Cruz's identity. Elizabeth Warren's views are not only dumb, but they should not be regarded seriously by anybody. Likewise, it is not that the media committed an error in their coverage of a story. The media is characterized by the pervasive presence of lies. The FBI and Justice Department, notwithstanding his allegations of corruption and involvement in "witch hunts," should not be regarded as credible.

The president's objective is to undermine the legitimacy of his adversaries, and he is transparent and unequivocal about his approach. When questioned

by seasoned 60 Minutes journalist Lesley Stahl about his persistent criticism of the media, Obama replied:

“You know why I do it? I do it to discredit you all and demean you all, so when you write negative stories about me no one will believe you.”

Trump is quite skilled at insulting others, and although his primary objective in criticizing his opponents is to undermine them, it also serves to demonstrate to his supporters that he is fulfilling his commitment to challenge those in positions of authority, openly criticizing the established figures in Washington. The president also seems to believe that his criticism enhances his image of toughness, a characteristic he greatly esteems. On July 2, 2017, he shared a manipulated video clip depicting him forcefully striking the skull of a symbolic representation of CNN. Unsurprisingly, the media extensively covered these postings, which plainly deviated from both the standards of politeness and the standards expected from a president.

Furthermore, Trump, much to Richard Nixon, has an inexhaustible supply of self-pity. He asserts that he is retaliating against anyone who criticize his actions because to his belief that he is being unjustly targeted and persecuted by the country's privileged class, members of the Democratic party, the media, and law enforcement agencies. According to him—despite his significant lack of historical knowledge—no president has encountered such an intense and unjust resistance. This stance elicits empathy and unity from his disgruntled followers, especially when the president implies that when his detractors criticize him, they are also being targeted.

If Trump displays pettiness and vindictiveness, it is mostly directed at those whom his base has negative opinions of, and it seems that his supporters are accepting of his lack of decorum. E. J. Dionne, Norman Ornstein, and Thomas Mann have contended that Trump's language capitalized on enduring patterns that have influenced the contemporary Republican Party, such as a campaign against the "liberal media," the discrediting of political adversaries, appeals to racism and xenophobia, and a disdain for democratic principles. “This history helps explain why so many Republican leaders are reluctant to call out Trump’s excesses and to acknowledge the risks he poses to our political system.”

However, his support base is a minority of the general population and is neither uniform or homogeneous. When questioned about the propriety of the president tweeting personal derogatory remarks about people, including criticisms of their physical appearance or qualities, 56 percent of female

Trump supporters and 36 percent of male Trump supporters expressed disapproval. Just 32 percent of Trump supporters deemed it acceptable for him to engage in personal assaults. In a similar vein, 75% of the general population expressed their discontent when Trump engaged in derogatory remarks against individuals, while 66% said that criticizing political adversaries was always inappropriate.

The influence of Trump's branding on public opinion is uncertain. While it is possible that he somewhat reduced his support for Hillary Clinton in 2016, Republicans did not need his influence to express their dislike for her. Similarly, Republicans have similar perspectives towards other prominent Democrats during the president's term. In contrast, Trump's words did not seem to sway Democrats, at least not in the manner he hoped.

It is evident that Trump excels at creating a negative image of his opponents rather than focusing on developing effective programs. Although he has a talent for deriding others, it has not been effective in garnering popular support for his views, as seen. The absence of influence is to be expected, since it is much more challenging to summarize the argument for intricate policies using a hashtag compared to mocking people.

Furthermore, engaging in derogatory remarks against adversaries is unlikely to foster widespread endorsement or motivate individuals, including members of Congress, to collaborate with him in the future. The president's branding may bolster the beliefs of his supporters, but it seems to have little persuasive impact on others and may even estrange a significant number of individuals. Furthermore, he ultimately degrades his own self-worth.

Trump's most significant impact may lie in shaping the level of politeness and respect in public discussions. Distinguishing between personal attacks or attacks on someone's intentions and the act of evaluating a concept is important. Uncivil conversation diminishes the importance of significant matters when discussions about them deteriorate into personal attacks and contempt for factual accuracy. Discrediting proponents and their concepts obviates the need for rational rebuttal and evidence-based discourse. "Today the goal is linguistic," said Frank Luntz, a Republican strategist who specializes in the words and messages that candidates employ. "We are no longer rewarding policy; we are rewarding rhetoric." "On a personal level," Luntz added, "it sickens me."

In July 2019, President Trump organized a White House summit focused on social media. While he chose not to provide a comprehensive roster of participants, it is certain that he provided a platform for individuals with a history of disseminating provocative tweets, videos, and other concerning material. “They’re advocating for a particular kind of social media system where they are allowed to harass, defame [and] post indecent content, and not be censured for it, and not be moderated in any way,” said Joan Donovan, the director of the Technology and Social Change Research Project at Harvard University. “They want the benefits of social media with none of the civility.”

The use of vulgar language by Trump and his followers has prompted those individuals who are against him to adopt their own extreme measures. Kathy Griffin, a comedian, was terminated from her position after participating in a photo shoot where she seemed to be clutching a severed head resembling that of the president. Samantha Bee, a fellow comedian, expressed remorse for use a vulgar expression to characterize Ivanka Trump. Actor Peter Fonda expressed his thoughts on the social media platform Twitter, “WE SHOULD RIP BARRON TRUMP FROM HIS MOTHER’S ARMS AND PUT HIM IN A CAGE WITH PEDOPHILES.” In addition, he used an offensive word to characterize the president. Fonda subsequently removed the tweet and expressed regret: “I went way too far. It was wrong and I should not have done it.” Most prominently, Robert De Niro appeared on the nationally televised 2018 Tony Awards show and declared, “I just want to say one thing: F--- Trump.¹⁶ It’s no longer down with Trump. It’s f--- Trump.” Considering the strongly divided opinions on the president, it is not unexpected that the actor's emotional outburst received a prolonged standing ovation, but it did not contribute much to promoting respectful and constructive conversation.

The proportion of the general public who believed that Trump was excessively critical of Hillary Clinton during the 2016 election was far more than the evaluations made by voters on any other candidate, regardless of political affiliation, in elections spanning over a period of more than twenty years. In the middle of 2018, a significant majority of 91 percent of the general population saw the absence of politeness in politics as a grave issue, with the largest portion attributing the responsibility to the president.

During the 2018 midterm elections, a significant majority of the public, including 74 percent, and even 63 percent of Republicans, said that the

general atmosphere and degree of politeness between Republicans and Democrats in Washington, D.C. had deteriorated since Trump's victory. 40% of respondents attributed the hostile tone and lack of civility in Washington on Trump, while 20% held the media responsible, 17% blamed Democrats in Congress, and 7% charged Republicans in Congress. Additionally, a significant 79 percent of the general population expressed worry about the detrimental atmosphere and absence of politeness in public discussions, fearing that it may potentially result in violent incidents or acts of terrorism. During the spring of 2019, a majority of the public reached the conclusion that political discourse in the United States had deteriorated in terms of respect, reliance on facts, and attention on important matters. Additionally, 55 percent of respondents said that Trump had negatively influenced the tone and character of political discussion.

In a broader sense, incivility presents difficulties for the political system. A staggering 79% of the general population saw the 2016 presidential election as lacking in civility. Incivility was cited as a factor in the decision-making process by 59% of those who abstained from voting in the presidential election. An equivalent proportion of individuals said that they ceased to pay attention to politics as a result of the lack of civility. Ninety-seven percent of respondents said that it is crucial for the president to exhibit civility. It is challenging to engage and motivate people when they are disregarding your message.

Trump often used the "how-dare-you" argument to counter his opponents. San Juan Mayor Carmen Yulín Cruz's criticism of the federal disaster relief effort after Hurricane Maria prompted President Trump to question her audacity to complain, given the substantial support provided by the federal government to Puerto Rico. When NFL players reacted to his critique of their act of kneeling during the rendition of the national anthem, he reminded them of the advantageous position they have in earning millions of dollars by playing football.

Trump often used the "how-dare-you" argument to counter his critics. San Juan Mayor Carmen Yulín Cruz expressed concerns about the federal response to the disaster relief efforts after Hurricane Maria. In response, President Trump questioned her right to criticize, considering the extensive assistance being provided by the federal government to Puerto Rico. When NFL players responded to his critique of their act of kneeling during the rendition of the national anthem, he reminded them of the advantageous

position they have in being able to earn millions of dollars by playing football.

The president's objective is to undermine the legitimacy of his adversaries, and he is openly and explicitly expressing his strategy. When queried by seasoned 60 Minutes journalist Lesley Stahl as to why he persisted in attacking the media, he responded:

“You know why I do it? I do it to discredit you all and demean you all, so when you write negative stories about me no one will believe you.”

Trump possesses a high level of proficiency in the art of verbally attacking individuals. While the primary aim of the president's critique of his adversaries is to weaken their position, it also allows him to demonstrate to his supporters that he is fulfilling his commitment to be a source of irritation to those in power by highlighting the untouchable figures in Washington. The president seems to highly value the perception of strength, and he seems to hold the belief that criticism contributes to this appearance. On July 2, 2017, he posted a video that seemed to be manipulated, showing him striking a CNN mascot with a hammer. These posts clearly violate the principles of etiquette, much alone the standards required of a president. Therefore, it is not surprising that the media gave them enormous attention.

Similar to Richard Nixon, Trump has an abundant supply of self-pity. He claims to be retaliating against those who have opposed his work, claiming that he is under unjust persecution from influential figures in the nation, such as Democrats, the media, the police, and the government. He asserts, without knowledge of historical events, that no previous president has encountered such unfair resistance. The president's insinuation that his supporters are equally targeted when critics express disapproval strikes a chord with his dissatisfied voter base.

The supporters of Trump seem to endorse his impolite conduct since he directs it only against those they deem objectionable. E. J. Dionne, Norman Ornstein, and Thomas Mann have argued that Trump's rhetoric aligns with prevailing trends in the modern Republican Party, including a disdain for democratic norms, a campaign against the "liberal media," and a focus on racism and xenophobia when confronting political adversaries. “This history helps explain why so many Republican leaders are reluctant to call out Trump's excesses and to acknowledge the risks he poses to our political system.”

In July 2019, President Trump convened a social media meeting at the White House. Although he declined to provide a comprehensive guest list, it is evident that he afforded those who had previously disseminated offensive videos and messages a chance to express themselves. “They’re advocating for a particular kind of social media system where they are allowed to harass, defame [and] post indecent content, and not be censured for it, and not be moderated in any way,” said Joan Donovan, the director of the Technology and Social Change Research Project at Harvard University. “They want the benefits of social media with none of the civility.”

The use of vulgar language by Trump and his followers has prompted those individuals who are against him to engage in extreme behavior. Kathy Griffin, a comedian, was terminated from her position after participating in a photo shoot where she seemed to be clutching a severed head resembling that of the president. Samantha Bee, a fellow comedian, expressed remorse for use a vulgar phrase to characterize Ivanka Trump. Actor Peter Fonda expressed his thoughts on the social media platform Twitter, “WE SHOULD RIP BARRON TRUMP FROM HIS MOTHER’S ARMS AND PUT HIM IN A CAGE WITH PEDOPHILES.” In addition, he used an offensive word to characterize the president. Fonda subsequently removed the tweet and expressed regret: “I went way too far. It was wrong and I should not have done it.” Notably, Robert De Niro made an appearance on the widely broadcasted 2018 Tony Awards presentation and said, “I just want to say one thing: F--- Trump. It’s no longer down with Trump. It’s f--- Trump.” Considering the strongly divided opinions on the president, it is unsurprising that the actor's emotional outburst resulted in a prolonged standing ovation, but it did not contribute much to promoting respectful and constructive conversation.

2.4 Media

The media has been the president’s number one irritant, and he has criticized it often and harshly. He frequently dismissed unfavorable coverage as “fake news” and after less than a month in office he tweeted that “The FAKE NEWS media (failing @nytimes, @NBCNews, @ABC, @CBS, @CNN) is not my enemy, it is the enemy of the American People!”²² When challenged that his rhetoric encouraged uncivil and even violent behavior, the president placed responsibility on the press. “The media also has a responsibility to set a civil tone and to stop the endless hostility and constant negative — and oftentimes, false — attacks and stories,” Trump explained. With no hint of

irony, he declared that those in the political arena should “stop treating their opponents as morally defective.”²³

The media has been the president’s number one irritant, and he has criticized it often and harshly. He frequently dismissed unfavorable coverage as “fake news” and after less than a month in office he tweeted that “The FAKE NEWS media (failing @nytimes, @NBCNews, @ABC, @CBS, @CNN) is not my enemy, it is the enemy of the American People!” In response to accusations that his language incited uncivil and perhaps violent conduct, the president shifted the blame onto the press. “The media also has a responsibility to set a civil tone and to stop the endless hostility and constant negative — and oftentimes, false — attacks and stories,” Trump provided an explanation. Unironically, he said that anyone involved in the political sphere need to “stop treating their opponents as morally defective.”

2.5 Offering Reassurance

Leaders not only identify problems; they also reassure the public. Franklin D. Roosevelt famously told the country at the nadir of the Great Depression that “the only thing we have to fear is fear itself — nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance.” He did not pretend that conditions were not bad. Instead, he summoned the nation to defy what it feared rather than succumb to it. George W. Bush, standing on a pile of rubble of the World Trade Center in 2001, assured the country that the terrorists responsible for the attack would be punished and the U.S. would move ahead.

Trump certainly assures the public that his policies will solve the problems he has identified. However, he also tries to reassure the public that some problems that many people see are not concerns at all and thus it need not worry about them. If the president can convince the public that problems do not exist, there is no need for a solution to them. Moreover, it is not necessary to make tradeoffs such as those between economic growth and environmental protection.

In an interview on CBS’s 60 Minutes on October 14, 2018, Trump expressed the view that climate science was nothing more than political opinion, and that the scientists who have documented human’s impact on the climate had “a very big political agenda.” He has never offered any evidence for this view, however, apparently believing it unnecessary.

2.6 The Public Presidency as a Persuasive Tool

The modern president wields power far beyond those articulated in the Constitution. Many presidents have taken advantage of the informal powers of the presidency to expand the formal powers of the office and promote their policy agenda (Neustadt 1960; Tulis 1987). The rise of television provided presidents with another medium to influence the public agenda (Kernell 1986). However, despite early contentions that the president could use the bully pulpit to set the agenda of Congress and the public (Cohen, 1995; Hill, 1998; Kingdon, 1995: 88), recent work suggests that the power of the president to influence the public may be much more limited (Edwards, 2003; Young & Perkins, 2005: 22).

Indeed, the dominant view of the public presidency tends to define the success or failure of a particular public campaign in terms of persuasion. Yet, presidents are uniquely positioned to influence the national news agenda, even when their message is not persuasive (Kingdon, 1995: 77). The focus that the current literature places on persuasion neglects the potential to displace issues on the national agenda using the bully pulpit. Presidents may be going public more often because televised addresses allow them to influence the national news agenda.

2.7 Cyberbullying and Conventional

Bullying Although cyberbullying has similarities to conventional bullying, there are key differences as well (Slonje & Smith, 2008: 11). The features of cyberbullying that distinguish it from conventional bullying are (a) the perception of anonymity on the part of perpetrators; (b) a potentially infinite audience; (c) an inability of the perpetrator to observe the target's immediate reaction; (d) an altered balance of power; and (e) the absence of time and space constraints on bullying.

These four unique features of cyberbullying magnify the potential for harm that is more severe than in conventional bullying (Campbell, 2005: 51), and also provide an explanation for the appeal of this type of bullying to young adolescents. The perceived anonymity seems to reduce social inhibitions for some youth. For example, Patchin and Hinduja (2006: 44) reported that 37% of the teens in one survey indicated that they had said things in electronic communications they would not say in person. This is consistent with the online disinhibition effect described by Suler (2004: 32). For the target of cyberbullying, the inability to identify the attacker may increase the level of fear, because anyone (even trusted friends) could be the perpetrator and there

might even be numerous perpetrators involved (Badiuk, 2006: 19). In traditional bullying, the victim may escape his or her tormentors by being at home, whereas with cyberbullying, the bully can reach the victim at any time or place. Although the victim can (when familiar with technology) block senders or choose not to use the technology (Internet or cell phone) by which the cyberbullying is being perpetrated, most youth want to be able to use these devices without fear and consider the option to turn off devices to be punishment. In addition, determined perpetrators can change their screen name or set up new accounts so their tormenting messages circumvent those blocks. Most important, humiliating or denigrating images of information that has been posted on the Internet or texted to large groups of peers, even if removed at the victim's request, have already inflicted the harm of public humiliation. The inability of the bully to observe the target's reaction may interfere with the experience of empathy. The bully can rationalize that he or she was "just having fun" or "just joking" when the victim's reaction is unknown (Kowalski et al., 2008). While the conventional bully uses physical or social power, the cyberbully relies on technological expertise. Thus, individuals whose stature or status may inhibit conventional bullying are not similarly restricted from cyberbullying.

2.8 Conceptual Argument

The topic of presidential communication about Islam has gained more attention within the broader context of presidential religious communication. America's Judeo-Christian religious identity has played a vital role in shaping the national identity of the country since its establishment (Domke & Coe, 2010; Hart, 2005; Straughn & Feld, 2010). The sociological concept of "civil religion" is commonly emphasised by scholars studying U.S. presidential religious discourse. This concept refers to religious communication that seeks to involve its Judeo-Christian audience through the use of shared symbols, beliefs, and rituals. However, this approach often comes at the cost of individuals and groups who do not align with the religious majority of the nation (Bellah, 1967; Chapp, 2012; Domke & Coe, 2010; Gedicks, 2010). Presidents have continuously presented themselves as individuals of spiritual religion in order to garner support for measures that are morally justified (Coles, 2002; Wilcox, 1992: 111). They have positioned themselves as the "high priest of the national faith" (Hart, 2005: 34: 6) and the "de facto religious leader" (Coe & Chenoweth, 2013: 376).

The myth of manifest destiny, which emerged in the early 19th century, emphasised the civil religious concepts of mission and destiny. This doctrine served as the foundation for America's expansionist intentions and fostered its perceived "divine mission" to disseminate civilization throughout the continent, even at the expense of Native Americans (Coles, 2002: 167). Political leaders have consistently exploited the concept of manifest destiny, frequently combining it with exceptionalist language, to rationalise their policies and actions (Gilmore, 2014: 77). The use of religious rhetoric, particularly in relation to God, has typically risen under the contemporary administration, notably since Ronald Reagan and reaching its highest point with Trump (Hughes, 2019: 222). The religious rhetoric of the president is in harmony with the strong religious beliefs of many people and deeply connects with their emotions and sense of self (Chapp, 2012: 59). When engaging in communication regarding domestic and foreign communities that do not align with the religious majority in the United States, such as Islam, the president's communication has the potential to foster national inclusivity by establishing religious and sociocultural connections and alignments. Conversely, it may also incite feelings of alienation, discord, and hostility. With the increasing prominence of Islam in U.S. conversations, the manner in which presidents address it has the capacity to shape individuals' behaviours and perspectives towards the Muslim population and religion.

3. Methodology:

The concept of a "deep approach" to learning is the integration of recently learned information with previously acquired knowledge via a process of critical analysis. Furthermore, it necessitates the examination of theoretical concepts and ideas, the juxtaposition and evaluation of situations and perspectives to substantiate your assumptions, and the conjecture and pursuit of implications. Furthermore, it is important to possess the ability to differentiate between evidence and arguments while articulating one's position.

This research is analytical, quantitative, and empirical due to its utilization of a diverse array of data to get a deeper understanding of the therapy. The aforementioned facts provide sufficient responses to the many concerns raised by the researcher and the case analysis presented in the study. Moreover, the use of quantitative techniques is prevalent in academic research owing to its adept utilization of variables and measurements. " Quantitative methodologies have considerable importance as they facilitate

the execution of a more extensive investigation, including a bigger sample size and augmenting the generalizability and precision of the findings. Quantitative data summaries are often prepared to provide substantiation for overarching generalizations pertaining to the topic being examined. The use of the empirical approach is advantageous in this research, since it mostly depends on data derived from a case study and associated observations. The practical approach serves to both confirm and provide credibility to the findings.

4. Results

Political bullying is the act of openly humiliating or bullying people by someone who has a strong political opinion. The individual engaging in political bullying disseminates provocative political articles, memes, videos, and statements with the intention of eliciting a reaction. Engaging in a rational conversation with the political bully is unattainable due to his adherence to an immutable tribal mindset. The matter at hand is not only a matter of stubbornness. The mindset might be characterized as one of "I am right, and you are wrong." An irreversible belief. An adage states, "Do not engage in political conversations with family or friends." In the current era of acrimonious attitudes and misinformation, politics has the potential to quickly create divisions among family members and close friends. One effective strategy for addressing an online political bully is the use of measures such as blocking, muffled, or erased messages. Nevertheless, what if the bully persists in publicly humiliating you in other locations where it is not possible to prohibit or silence the bully? Users are provided with the opportunity to report any objectionable comments. Attempt to disregard the bully and pursue a more elevated course of action. Nevertheless, there are other methodologies that need our acquisition of skills to effectively manage instances of political bullying both in offline settings and on digital platforms. From a practical standpoint, this issue has not been adequately addressed.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study does much to advance our knowledge of cyberbullying. The dominant approach to the public presidency expects presidential campaigns to either persuade the public or set the policy agenda. However, the focus of the current literature on positive presidential powers may mask certain negative presidential powers. For instance, decades of research on policy change shows that the president is the most powerful player in the policy

process because he is uniquely positioned to prevent changes to the status quo (Baumgartner et al. 2009:234). Likewise, this article demonstrates that presidents can use strategically timed public addresses to displace unwanted items from the national news agenda with relative ease. The bully pulpit need not be used exclusively to persuade. As the national representative, a president is in a unique position to both place items on the national agenda and displace unwanted items on the national agenda. Given the power of the press to influence what the public thinks is important (agenda-setting) and the considerations people use to evaluate political figures (priming), the power to influence media coverage should not be neglected. To date, the literature has focused so much on the power to place items on the national agenda that it has neglected the power to displace unwanted items on the national agenda. Yet, the power to displace should not be ignored. Once an issue is removed from the national agenda, it has very little chance of becoming enacted into policy (Baumgartner et al. 2009:193). Though some may struggle mightily to influence the national news agenda, modern presidents seem to be able to displace items on the agenda with ease.

Political bullying is a behaviour that engenders significant and enduring issues, prompting individuals to either disregard and evade unfavourable sentiments or actively strive to rectify them. The political bully employs a multifaceted strategy to exert control and inflict damage upon others via the use of accusations, dissemination of rumours, physical, verbal, and moral assaults, as well as deliberate exclusion.

In order to be a political individual, it has always been necessary to possess the ability to withstand bullying that attempts to undermine one's efforts. Anti-bullying regulations are required by almost all states, although there is less knowledge on their implementation and efficacy. Adherence to state anti-bullying rules is mandatory. Differences in peer aggression and harassment have been identified by researchers, highlighting the need to differentiate between these three forms of bullying. This differentiation is crucial in order to implement suitable preventative and intervention strategies tailored to each specific instance.

Bullying should not be classified as a criminal offence due to its diverse array of forms and varying degrees of intensity. Typically, rehabilitative methods may be used to address instances of bullying. Conversely, the issue of bullying requires a comprehensive approach that takes into account the specific circumstances and severity of the assault. Therefore, refrain from

engaging with the bully until you have taken measures to halt the bully's actions.

References

- Aaron, B. (2019). "Trump Claims His Intelligence Chiefs Said They Were 'Totally Misquoted.' They Spoke in Public," Washington Post, January 31, 2019; Shane Harris, "Intelligence Officials Were 'Misquoted' after Public Hearing, Trump Claims," Washington Post, January 31.
- Barrett, Andrew W. (2004). "Gone Public the Impact of Going Public on Presidential Legislative Success." American Politics Research 32:338–70.
- Bellah, R. (1967). Civil religion in America. Daedalus, 96(1), 1–21.
- Boulton, M. J., M. Trueman, et al. (2007). "Secondary school pupils' views of their school peer counselling service." Counselling and Psychotherapy Research 7(3): 188-195.
- Burr, V. (1995). An introduction to social constructionism. New York, Routledge.
- Chapp, C. (2012). Religious rhetoric and American politics: The endurance of civil religion in electoral campaigns. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Coe, K., & Chenoweth, S. (2013). Presidents as priests: Toward a typology of Christian discourse in the American presidency. Communication Theory, 23, 375–394. doi:10.1111/comt.12020
- Cohen, Jeff E. 2010. Going Local: Presidential Leadership in the Post-Broadcast Age. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coles, R. (2002). Manifest destiny adapted for 1990s' war discourse: Mission and destiny intertwined. Sociology of Religion, 63(4), 403–426. doi:10.2307/3712300
- Domke, D., & Coe, K. (2010). The God strategy: How religion became a political weapon in America (Updated ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Edwards, George C. (2003). On Deaf Ears: The Limits of the Bully Pulpit. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- George F. Will. (2019). "The Shabbiest U.S. President Ever is an Inexpressibly Sad Specimen," Washington Post, January 18.
- Gilmore, J. (2014). Translating American exceptionalism: Comparing presidential discourse about the United States at home and abroad. International Journal of Communication, 8, 2416–2437.

Gregory M. Walton and Mahzarin R. Banaji. (2004). "Being What You Say: The Effect of Essentialist Linguistic Labels on Preferences," Social Cognition 22:193-213.

Guerin, S. and E. Hennessy (1998). Student perceptions and definitions of bullying: A question of methodology. Researching children's experiences: Qualitative approaches. D. Hogan and R. Gilligan. Dublin, The Children's Research Centre, Trinity College.

Hart, R. (2005). The original argument. In R. Hart & J. Pauley II (Eds.), The political pulpit revisited (pp. 13–95). West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.

Hughes, C. (2019). The God card: Strategic employment of religious language in U.S. presidential discourse. International Journal of Communication, 13, 528–549.

Kernell, Samuel. (1997). Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership. 3rd Edition. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Kernell, Samuel. (1986). Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Lakoff, R. (2017). The hollow man. Donald Trump, populism and post-truth politics. Journal of Language and Politics, 16(4), 595-606.

Land, D. (2003). "Teasing apart secondary students' conceptualizations of peer teasing, bullying and sexual harassment." School Psychology International 24(2): 147-165.

Lee and Quealy, (2018). "The 551 People, Places, and Things Donald Trump Has Insulted on Twitter"; Philip Bump, "The People Whom President Trump Has Called Stupid," Washington Post, November 6, 2018; Kevin Coe and Dakota Park-Ozee, "From 'Snollygoster' to 'Son of a Bitch': Name-calling in the U.S. Presidency, 1933-2018," Presidential Studies Quarterly (forthcoming).

Lorenz, K. (1966). Evolution and modification of behaviour. London, Methuen.

Maggie Haberman, Glenn Thrush, and Peter Baker. (2017). "Inside Trump's Hour-by-Hour Battle for Self-Preservation," New York Times, December 9.

Madsen, K. C. (1996). "Differing perceptions of bullying and their practical implications." Educational and Child Psychology 13(Pt 2): 14-22.

Nithyanand, B., Schaffner, B. and Gill, P. (2017). Online Political Discourse in the Trump Era.

- Olweus, D. (1978). Aggression in the schools. Bullies and whipping boys. New York, Hemisphere Pub. Corp.
- Olweus, D. (1980). "Familial and temperamental determinants of aggressive behavior in adolescent boys: A causal analysis." *Developmental Psychology* 16: 644-60.
- Quoted in "Lesley Stahl: Trump Admitted Mission to 'Discredit' Press," CBS News, May 23, 2018.
- Robinson, G. and B. Maines (1997). *Crying for help, the no blame approach to bullying*. Bristol, Lucky Duck Publishing.
- Smith, P. K. and S. Levan (1995). "Perceptions and experiences of bullying in younger pupils." *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 65: 489-500.
- Stephenson, P. and D. Smith (1989). *Bullying in the junior school. Bullying in schools*. D. P. Tattum and D. A. Lane. Stoke-on-Trent, Trentham Books: 45-57.
- Stuart, T. (2000). *An attributional analysis of peer victimization and bullying behaviour in school children: A replication and extension*. Psychology. Palmerston North, Massey.
- Tuffin, K. (2005). *Understanding critical social psychology*. London, Sage.
- Tuffin, K. and C. Howard (2001). *Demystifying discourse analysis: Theory, method and practice. How to analyse talk in institutional settings: A casebook of methods*. A. McHoul and M. Rapley. London, Continuum International: 196-205.
- Whitford, Andrew B., and Jeff Yates. (2009). *Presidential Rhetoric and the Public Agenda: Constructing the War on Drugs*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- York, C. (2013). *Cultivating Political Incivility: Cable News, Network News, and Public Perceptions*. *Electronic News*, 7(3), 107-125.

تحليل الخطاب المتعلق بالتنمر في النصوص السياسية المتعلقة بترامب

م.م. محمد فاضل عباس
مديرية التربية الرصافة الثانية
اختصاص طرائق تدريس اللغة الانكليزية
جامعة بغداد/ كلية التربية ابن رشد

مستخلص البحث:

يتميز التواصل العام لدونالد ترامب باستخدام الهجمات الشخصية لتشويه سمعة النقاد والمعارضين، والمبالغة في التهديدات أو تقديم تلميحات غير مناسبة، وخلق الحقيقة بالخيال، وتأجيج الانقسامات الثقافية والتوترات العنصرية، والتشكيك في سلطة القانون. وتتوافق لغته مع تصريحاته السابقة قبل أن يصبح رئيساً، وتختلف عن السلوك النموذجي المتوقع من الرئيس. لقد أدى الخطاب العام للرئيس إلى تقليص فعاليته في الحكم بدلاً من تعزيزها. ولم تساعد لغته المقنعة على توسيع مجموعة مؤيديه. لقد فشلت وقاحة الرئيس في إقناع من لم يكونوا يميلون أصلاً إلى دعمه. فهو لم ينجح في جعل معظم الناس يشككون في منتقديه، مثل وسائل الإعلام، من خلال المبالغة أو التقليل من المخاطر. يعتبره الجمهور غير جدير بالثقة ولا يستحق الاحترام. وفي نهاية المطاف، أدت لغة ترامب إلى زيادة تعقيد مهمة الحكم بكفاءة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: ترامب، الرئيس، الخطابة، القيادة، الخطاب العام