Migration Letters

Volume: 21, No: S11 (2024), pp. 628-641

ISSN: 1741-8984 (Print) ISSN: 1741-8992 (Online)

www.migrationletters.com

Antagonistic Communicative Function Of Pakistani Trolling Tweets

Zara Obaid & Muhammad Asim Mahmood (corresponding author)

Abstract

Trolling phenomenon has not been an area of interest until very recently in 2010 (Hardaker, 2017). This saw a surge in trolling researches but mostly from a Euro-centric perspective since the use of social media started very early in those societies. However, trolling language like any other form of language is contextual (Cruz et al., 2018; Fichman & Sanfilippo, 2015, 2016, Phillips, 2021). Hence, it should be investigated as such. Therefore, in order to understand the language of trolling in Pakistan, this study in continuation to previous research (Obaid et al, 2023) explores lexico-grammatical variation of trolling tweets in Pakistan. For this purpose, a corpus of 2,317 trolling tweets is used which is explored through short text multidimensional analysis proposed by Clarke (2019, 2020). The data is run through R software using multiple correspondence analysis. The results reveal that one of the dimensions of Pakistani trolling tweets contrast between antagonistic and conciliatory tweets where the former are more confrontational in their communicative function whereas the latter are non-confrontational. This study adds to the understanding of phenomenon of trolling not only in Pakistan but also corroborates previous notions of trolling.

Keywords: *Trolling, Tweets, X, Pakistan, Multiple correspondence analysis.*

1. Introduction

In the present times if somebody does not use social media, they may be accused of living under a rock. Rightly so because social media are web based services that enable connection and interaction between individuals (Treem et al., 2016) that has in many ways replaced the traditional socialization. Still, many developing countries such as Pakistan did not see a boom in its use until very recently. With the rapid rise in the use of social media in Pakistan, there is an equally urgent need to protect these very spaces from their own curse. One such threat looming over cyberspaces world over and in Pakistan is trolling.

Trolling can be regarded as "posting inflammatory messages directly to other users to provoke an equally reactionary response" (Duncombe, 2019, p. 409). Trolling behaviour is prevalent across all social media platforms such as Facebook, Instagram and X (previously Twitter). However, previous researches show that it is most rampant on Twitter (Case & King, 2017; Case et al., 2019; Fearn, 2017). So much so that Hannan (2018) equated Twitter with a "schoolyard run by bullies" (p. 219) and asserted that this platform brings out users' inner sadists. It is important to mention that with time this social media platform has become controversial (Nycyk, 2019) and lost its essence for which it was developed in 2006 by Jack Dorsey, Evan Williams and Biz Stone. It was developed as a microblogging site where users "tweet" or post about "What's happening?" within 280 characters (previously 140 characters). After Elon Musk took over this platform in 2022, he rebranded this platform as X and now tweets are simply called posts. However, X has gradually developed into a site of trolling where even the most dignified ones find it difficult from being sucked into the black hole of trolling as is evident from the case of the former

President of the United States, Donald Trump who was notorious for his Twitter trolling (see Cillizza, 2018).

With a sharp rise in trolling in recent years in Pakistan and its effects on physical and psychological wellbeing, there have been calls to at least begin a discussion around what is actually considered trolling (see for example, Iftikhar, 2022; Siddiqi, 2020). In recent years, the academics in Pakistan have started to take over this task by either focussing on one kind of a troll particularly political troll (Li et al., 2023; Younus et al., 2014) or on trolls targeting a particular group of society i.e. women in this case (Hussain et al., 2022; Siddiqua et al., 2023). Some studies have also looked into it from a pragmatic perspective (Jameel, 2021; Rabbani et al., 2024). However, there is a dire need to investigate this phenomenon at micro-linguistic level as well. The current study is in continuation to the previous research at micro-linguistic level which showed that Pakistani trolling tweets contrast between interactive and informational communicative function (Obaid et al., 2023). For this purpose, a short text multidimensional analysis is used to identify the set of co-occurring linguistic features and the communicative function they carry.

2. Literature Review

The troll in the proper sense is one who speaks to a community and as being part of the community; only he is not part of it, but opposed. And the community has some good in common, and this the troll must know, and what things promote and destroy it: for he seeks to destroy (Barney, 2016, p. 193)

The above mentioned definition of a troll reflects a very playful attempt by Barney who imitated the prose style of Aristotle to sketch a troll. One thing becomes clear from this definition that a troll is someone who intends to oppose and destroy. This discourse about troll being a dark and sinister character dominates a plenty of other literature as well. For example, Bishop (2014) talks about Anonymous trolling also called flame trolling which is done "at the expense of someone outside of a particular community" (Bishop, 2014, p. 9) either for the troller's own sick pleasure or for others who make part of the 'clubhouse' and encourage it. Similarly, Hardaker (2010) found out that phenomenon of trolling consists of four interrelated characteristics i.e. deception, aggression, disruption and success, which ultimately form the basis of a working definition of a troll. Among these, aggression comprises "malicious behavior undertaken with the aim of annoying or goading others into retaliating" (Hardaker, 2010, p. 231). Later, Hardaker (2013) redefined trolling as "the deliberate (perceived) use of impoliteness/aggression, deception and/or manipulation in CMC to create a context conducive to triggering or antagonizing conflict, typically for amusement's sake" (p. 79).

Similarly, Cook (2021) and Cook et al. (2018) conducted a study based exclusively on the understanding of self-confessed trolls regarding trolling behaviour. They established that trolling is varied and that there are three categories i.e. attack trolling, thrill-seeking trolling and interaction-seeking trolling. Out of these, Attack trolls want misery for their victims. Likewise, March and Marrington (2019) qualitatively analysed the questionnaire responses of participants, trolls as well as victims of trolls, and revealed that the majority of participants define trolling as "an insulting, bullying, and deliberate behaviour, designed to provoke a reaction which has significant emotive effects [such as anger and distress]" (p. 196) also referred to as flame trolling. In a similar manner, Ortiz (2020) revealed that for the participants (as a troll and victim) trolling is "a collective form of harassment perceived as having the malicious intent to provoke another user" (p. 4). All of these studies reflect the predominant notion of trolling being aggressive in nature. However, trolling language like any other is contextual in nature and it is important to explore and study it in cultural context.

Very limited research has tried to investigate this diversity and contextuality in trolling through the lens of culture. This perspective is important because in online communities every user "brings with them cultural baggage and expectations from their real-world

contexts" (Kirman et al., 2012, p. 122). Fichman and Sanfilippo (2016) assert that "culture is often subtly infused into the language people use and the ways in which people interact" (p. 152). Therefore, it can be stated that "cultural norms of politeness, adherence to rules and regulation" (Fichman & Sanfilippo, 2016, p. 143) have an impact on the language of trolling.

Very few studies have delved into exploring trolling through the lens of culture, amongst which most of them have done so from the perspective of North-American online communities (De Seta, 2013). However, a few researchers did move beyond the 'white' trolls and investigated the phenomenon of trolling in other cultures. De Seta (2013), for example, through his study on Chinese trolls found out that trolling behavior comprising of various ironic, humorous, deceptive and aggressive conducts existed in Chinese online media. Recently, Cook (2021) cross-culturally examined victim reactions to overt (flaming) and covert (ostracism) trolling online. Participants from Pakistan (honor valuing culture-where maintaining honor is important over maintaining face, hence are aggressive) and Taiwan (face valuing culture-where maintaining face over honor is important, hence avoid conflicts) were put in a simulated trolling interaction. The findings revealed that Pakistani participants were equally aggressive whether trolled overtly or overtly, whereas Taiwanese participants were found to be more aggressive when trolled overtly in comparison to covert trolling. This is because Pakistani participants belonging to an honor-valuing culture perceive both overt and covert trolling to be equally threatening, hence requiring defense. Taiwanese participants, in contrast, went against the essence of their face-valuing culture where aggression results in loss of face, and chose to be aggressive at overt trolling, thus fitting into the internet culture.

Owing to the scarcity of such researches, it is important to explore the phenomenon of trolling in different cultures because each culture adds its nuance to the trolling language. Keeping this in view, the present study aims to investigate the language of Pakistani trolling on X (previously Twitter) at lexico-grammatical level and examine whether the patterns of aggression exist in Pakistani trolling.

3. Research Methodology

The current study used short text multidimensional analysis by Clarke (2019, 2020) to examine the co-occurring linguistic patterns in Pakistani trolling tweets. This section gives details on this methodology as well as the data collection and its tagging.

3.1. Data Collection

Three approaches were used to collect data as summarized by Clarke (2018, 2019, 2020). First approach employed specific offensive linguistic markers such as slurs, curse words, name-calling, and particular hashtags to identify the cases of trolling. An initial list of such linguistic markers and hashtags most of them embedded in Pakistani culture was developed. After an initial run, this list was further modified with more Pakistani culture specific keywords. One of the shortcomings of this method is that trolling does not always include such offensive language, and such words do not always intend to abuse. For example, the use of slurs and name-calling is often common among friends who employ it in a non-targeted manner.

The second approach extracts tweets from self-identifying trolls i.e. people who identify themselves as trolls. However, it is only a sub-culture of trolls (Phillips, 2015) as not all trolls are this straightforward in marking their identity specifically because one of the most important aspects of trolling is deception i.e. convincing others of their good and genuine intentions. The present study analysed the tweets of a Pakistani Twitter troll who described themselves as an "ethical troll". Due to ethical considerations their account details are kept hidden.

The third and last approach is considered least problematic by Clarke (2018, 2019, 2020) as it relies on the perception of others and gathers tweets that have been accused to be trolls. This takes the burden off the researcher of being biased. For the present study, the word "troll" was used to extract tweets that were called out by others to be trolls. Posts which these tweets were in reply to were also collected. Interestingly, this method also has its limitations as not all posts accused of trolling are in fact trolling. Also, some forms of trolling are accused of trolling more than the others. For example, explicit trolling consisting of profanity is more likely to be accused of trolling than a subtle deceptive post where a troll may be projecting themselves to be a well-wisher.

In order to collect the data through these three methods, a Twitter API account was used and the Twitter API key was used to collect data through RStudio software using 'academictwitteR' package. It is important to mention that the job of all the three approaches employed to identify trolling was to only provide tweets that have a major probability of being trolls. However, not all of them were in fact trolls. Therefore, all the tweets collected through these three methods were further manually examined in order to shortlist the tweets that were the actual examples of trolling. Consequently, the final corpus of Pakistani troll posts comprised of 2,317 posts/tweets.

3.2. Tagging

The final twitter trolling corpus collected after the manual examination of all the tweets was tagged using Clarke's (2019, 2020) Multidimensional Analysis Twitter Tagger (MDATT) based on Gimpel et al. (2011), Owoputi et al. (2012) and Owoputi et al. (2013) twitter tagger output which tags the corpus as per MDA feature set and CMC-specific features. Since this tagger was not available on web, the corpus was tagged upon request by Clarke (2019, 2020).

It is also important to mention that since the corpus of trolls was collected from Pakistan, a country where English is not a native language; therefore, many of the trolls did not purely troll in English. Some words of Urdu which is the national language of Pakistan were also code-mixed. As Clarke's tagger was only capable of tagging the English words, so the Urdu words were manually tagged later on. The tagged corpus was then further treated using short text multidimensional analysis.

3.3. Short Text Multidimensional analysis

This study in line with Clarke (2017, 2018, 2019, 2020) and Clarke and Grieve (2017, 2019) opted for a new modified version of MDA appropriate for short texts such as tweets. According to Clarke there are two major reasons why a standard MDA is not appropriate for the analysis of short texts especially tweets. Firstly, tweets as a reflection of online discourse employ loads of non-standard spellings and grammar. These non-standard forms specific to Twitter discourse are not catered to using a standard MDA tagger. Therefore, she developed a Multidimensional Analysis Twitter Tagger (MDATT), mentioned previously, which tags the tweets as per standard MDA feature set as well as CMC specific features. The second reason for choosing the modified version of MDA over a standard one is that tweets are too short comprising of 17 words at average (Clarke, 2019, 2020). As standard MDA measures relative frequencies of features in each text because texts vary in length, and relative frequencies become accurate and meaningful only at around 500 words (Passonneau et al., 2014); therefore, it is not a reliable measure for individual tweets which seldom exceed 40 words (Clarke, 2020). Consequently, a new form of MDA introduced by Clarke (2017, 2018, 2019, 2020) which employs MCA was applied. This new form of MDA called short text multidimensional analysis by Clarke simply takes the occurrence of features into account i.e. instead of measuring relative frequencies it only observes whether the feature is present or absent. This information is then recorded in the form of a table, a binary data matrix of tweets and lexico-grammatical features to be precise with tweets on the vertical axis and lexico-grammatical features on the horizontal axis. Next, this matrix

is subjected to multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) in R using FactoMineR package (Husson et al. 2020) suitable for categorical data (presence or absence of features) rather than factor analysis which is suitable for continuous data (relative frequencies) as is used in a standard Biber's (1988) MDA.

The function of MCA is "to identify patterns in a table of individuals (i.e. tweets) and categorical variables (i.e. the grammatical features)" (Clarke, 2019, p. 67). On the basis of these patterns, MCA reduces the grammatical features into dimensions, and assigns each category of grammatical feature (e.g. present or absent) as well as each tweet a positive or negative coordinate and a value indicating their contribution to a particular dimension. Coordinates of the categories of grammatical features are reflective of the extent of their proximity. When coordinates of grammatical features categories are closer on a dimension, it is indicative of their co-occurrence in tweets. In a similar manner, the distance between the coordinates of individual tweets help establish "the dissimilarities in their linguistic composition with respect to the major pattern of variation that the dimension represents" (Clarke, 2020, p. 169). Shorter distance indicates tweets share common categories of grammatical features.

Apart from coordinate values, MCA also assigns each category of the linguistic features as well as each tweet a contribution value. Contribution values reflect the contribution of each category of linguistic features and each tweet to a particular dimension. These values are important particularly for interpretation. According to Le Roux and Rouanet (2010) categories of linguistic features contributing above average should only be interpreted as they are representative of the major patterns of variation. Contribution value for each dimension is positive and collectively equal 100. Therefore, average can be calculated using 100/K where K is equal to total number of categories of linguistic features which is 122 in this study. Hence, only those categories of features were interpreted for each dimension which had a contribution value higher than the average (100/122=0.82).

In order to interpret the patterns functionally and how linguistic co-occurrence patterns carry an underlying communicative function, individual tweets were observed to examine co-occurring features in their context. As mentioned previously, tweets are also assigned a positive or negative coordinate and a contribution value. The tweets with high positive and negative coordinates which were most contributing to the dimension were examined along with the grammatical features associated with the corresponding side of that dimension. This helped trace down the communicative functions that co-occurrence of different grammatical features help achieve.

4. Results and Discussion

The short text multidimensional analysis which employs MCA was carried out on 2,317 trolling tweets in English from Pakistan. It analyzed the tweets for the presence or absence of 61 linguistic features that occurred in more than 5% of the Pakistani trolling tweets. MCA of these tweets gave 61 dimensions ($L \leq 122$ categories - 61 linguistic features = 61). One of the previous studies showed that on one of these dimensions Pakistani trolling tweets contrasted between interactive and informational tweets (Obaid et al., 2023) which is now considered a universal dimension to be found in many text types and genres. However, the interpretation of another dimension in the current study showed that Pakistani trolling tweets can be viewed from a different angle as well.

One of the dimensions of Pakistani trolling tweets revealed that there was a contrast between trolling tweets that are antagonistic and explicitly oppositional/confrontational and those that are not explicitly confrontational rather conciliatory in their communicative function. The linguistic features contributing above average on this dimension are given in table 1. The table shows that there is presence of nine linguistic features on the positive coordinate and seven features on the negative coordinate of this dimension. The top 10

most contributing tweets on the positive and negative coordinate of this dimension are given in table 2 and 3 respectively.

One of the most striking linguistic features that is used to oppose someone is second person pronoun, and this feature is the most contributing feature on the positive coordinate of this dimension. For example, in example 4 (**you** are a compromised general and **your** so called ISI ka chief. **You** two are involved in this operation regime change!), 'you' and 'your' are used to directly confront and oppose the addressee. Similarly, in example 5 (Concentrate on **your** own country, **you** hypocrite dummy don't even talk about humanity as **yourself you** don't have it. Being a prime minister **you** are conservative jerk.), all the different forms of second person pronoun that are highlighted are used confront the addressee. Another CMC-specific feature that is used in trolling tweets to call-out somebody is the use of mentioning specifically initial-mentioning. A closer look at all the examples contributing the most to the positive coordinate of this dimension given in table 2 shows that almost all the tweets have an initial-mention in order "to explicitly direct their micropost at another user" (Zappavigna, 2017, p. 209) and in this case confront them. For example, in example 1 (**@TararAttaullah** dont wory dude! just ask your daddy #Bajwa to make a call & this all will be gone!) the initial mention is used to address the person at whom the tweet is directed. Similarly, in example 9 (**@HamzaSS** like any one gives a f*ck what you say!! go, cry to your daddy #Bajwa!!) the initial mention is used to address the user and abuse them.

Table 1: The linguistic features contributing above the average contribution on the given Dimension

Coord	Features
+	**Present Features (Coordinate, Contribution)**
	General interjections (0.374, 1.157), WH-word (0.385, 1.382), Exclamation marks (0.477, 1.793), Mentioning (0.534, 3.725), Question marks (0.595, 2.251), Second person pronoun (0.724, 10.611), Pronoun IT (0.792, 3.063), Contracted forms (0.883, 3.332), Imperatives (0.923, 5.328)
	Absent Features (Coordinate, Contribution)
	First person pronoun (0.151, 1.188), Subject pronoun (0.238, 2.77), Third person personal pronoun (0.259, 3.319)
-	**Present Features (Coordinate, Contribution)**
	Third person singular verb (-0.22, 1.153), Predicative adjectives (-0.398, 1.171), Complementation (-0.514, 0.981), First person pronoun (-0.644, 5.086), Subject pronoun (-0.735, 8.553), Third person personal pronoun (-0.834, 10.668), Object pronoun (-1.233, 8.016)
	Absent Features (Coordinate, Contribution)
	Mentioning (-0.135, 0.942), Second person pronoun (-0.33, 4.829)

Other linguistic features that add to the confrontational tone of these trolling tweets are Question marks and WH-words that are used to confront the other person by mocking them. For example, in example 6 (What's the Plan after Retirement? What Country You Have Chosen after your Retirement for your Residence? Did you already got Immigration Visas for your whole Family or Still in Progress?), a series of mocking questions are asked to an army general about his plans of leaving the country after retirement for a better future. Likewise, in example 1 (**How** r you gona explain al this to @POTUS!), the WH-word is used to ask a rhetorical question to the Pakistan army that how will they explain their acts to the President of USA, mocking them that they take orders from USA. Another linguistic

feature on the positive coordinate of this dimension is exclamation marks which are associated with "aggravated disagreement" (Vandergriff, 2013) and "aggressive forms of online communication" (Clarke & Grieve, 2017, p. 5) show that these trolling tweets are aggressively oppositional. For example, in example 3 (@siasatpk Awe don't worry HUNNY**!!**), the exclamation marks are preceded by the word "HUNNY" to tease the addressee in an aggressive manner. Similarly, in example 8 (since you have so many papas, so have to mention a few just to jog your damn memory**!!**), the exclamation marks preceded by the words 'damn' and 'papas' show that the author of the trolling tweets is aggressively confrontational with the addressee.

Table 2: Examples of most strongly contributing trolling tweets on the positive coordinate of the given Dimension with their coordinate and contribution values

No.	Tweet	Coord	Contrib
1	@TararAttaullah dont wory dude! just ask your daddy #Bajwa to make a call & this all will be gone! as it use to be! @OfficialDGISPR #Babar_Iftikhar #Neutrals #Handlers #Establishment save your dumb a*s puppets before you have to import new ones from USA! How r you gona explain al this to @POTUS!	0.66	0.742
2	@ARYNEWSOFFICIAL what about these bloody generals @OfficialDGISPR #Bajwa #Establishment #Neutrals who have been harassing the State of Pakistan and its People..fuck off @OfficialDGISPR, go sit in your masters laps aka @POTUS!!! @ImranRiazKhan @ImranKhanPTI	0.638	0.693
3	@siasatpk Awe don't worry HUNNY!! This is Pakistan. Just pretend you are having back pain or a heart attack. Ask #Chorni @MaryamNSharif for #Calibri font fake medical certificate. You'll be out in 3 months. #FailedJustice	0.586	0.584
4	@OfficialDGISPR Have some shame bajwa, you are a compromised general and your so called ISI ka chief. You two are involved in this operation regime change! #begyrto #BajwaSurrender #BajwaTraitor	0.576	0.566
5	@PakPMO @ImranKhanPTI @MiddleEastEye Concentrate on your own country, you hypocrite dummy don't even talk about humanity as yourself you don't have it. Being a prime minister you are conservative jerk. What were ur statements before ur tenure n what are now. Alas! How would you answer Allah.	0.569	0.551
6	#BajwaTraitor What's the Plan after Retirement? What Country You Have Chosen after your Retirement for your Residence? Did you already got Immigration Visas for your whole Family or Still in Progress? Shame on You! @OfficialDGISPR	0.558	0.53
7	@PTAofficialpk then ban everything damn thing and ask @ICT_Police to file FIRs on all Pakistani except the ones supporting these clowns in #ImportedGovernment!!	0.551	0.516

	go cry to your sugardaddy @POTUS @OfficialDGISPR #Bajwa #Neutrals #Handlers #Establishment fyi! #PakistanUnderFascism		
8	@betterpakistan go and cry to your papa-jani (aka @OfficialDGISPR #Bajwa #Handlers #Neutrals #Establishment @POTUS) since you have so many papas, so have to mention a few just to jog your damn memory!! @OfficialDGISPR fyi, #PakistanUnderFascism!!	0.548	0.512
9	@HamzaSS like any one gives a f*ck what you say!! go, cry to your daddy #Bajwa!! @OfficialDGISPR #Handlers #Neutrals #Establishment @GovtofPakistan fyi!! same goes for you too!! if not here, will see you in afterlife for sure, have fun while you can... :)	0.541	0.498
10	@MaryamNSharif This woman seriously needs some help! Visit a psychiatrist you psycho! You're always just bullsh*tting here and there. Aur sarak-chap kis ko bol rai ho?? Pakistan ki 90% awam ko??	0.488	0.405

The second most contributing linguistic feature on the positive coordinate of this dimension is imperatives which are used to order others to do something or make demands. These demands are used in this dimension to insult others as it is common in an argumentative discourse (Clarke, 2018). For example, in example 7 (**go** cry to your sugardaddy @POTUS), the imperative is used to insult the Establishment of Pakistan by asking them to go complain to the President of USA. Similarly, in example 4 (@OfficialDGISPR **Have** some shame bajwa), the imperative is again used to insult the addressee and is asking them to be ashamed. In a similar manner, in example 10 (**Visit** a psychiatrist you psycho!) the imperative is used to ask the addressee to go to a psychiatrist for help in an insulting manner which is aggravated by the word 'psycho' at the end of sentence. Two other features that occur on the positive coordinate are general interjections and contractions. Both of them add interactivity and informality to the tweets (Clarke, 2020). Contractions are used to save time and space when writing and reflect the spoken style (Werry, 1996). For example, in example 10 (**You're** always just bullsh*tting here and there), the use of contracted construction 'you're' adds to the informality of the statement. General interjections are used to encode a reaction (Smith, 2003; Jefferson, 2002) in an informal manner. For example, in example 3 (**Awe** don't worry HUNNY!!) the interjection 'awe' is used as a slang to mock the addressee. In popular culture, 'awe' is used for something cute and adorable. Here, 'awe' coupled with 'HUNNY' expresses the emotion of contempt by mocking the addressee for complaining about their health. Lastly, pronoun IT also reflects a more spoken style. It is the most generalized pronoun used in place of nouns and phrases (Biber, 1988). For example, in example 5 (you hypocrite dummy don't even talk about humanity as yourself you don't have **it**), the pronoun IT is used in the place of noun 'humanity'.

Lastly, the absence of first person pronoun, third person personal pronoun and subject pronouns and the presence of second person pronoun as discussed previously on this coordinate show that this coordinate is more interactive in nature and coalescence with other features result in a confrontational communicative function of these tweets directed at particular individuals.

Table 3: Examples of most strongly contributing trolling tweets on the negative coordinate of the given Dimension with their coordinate and contribution values

No.	Tweet	Coord	Contrib
11	I condemn #khalilurrehmanqamar abusing #MarviSarmad - the woman who ABUSES ppl SHAMELESSLY 24/7. Both are disgraceful. 👎 I remember her DIRTY fight with Hamdullah. We all CONDEMNED him but later, he was her BEST friend against #ImranKhan 😂#AuratMarch2020 #AuratAzadiMarch2020 https://t.co/HCl21WADoL	-0.639	0.694
12	They Used To Told Us That Bhutto Was a Hero And MujiburRehman Was Traitor But Sorry Bangla History Is Again Repeating Here Bloods Of Bhutto Are Following Same Foot Steps Like Him And Showing That They Are His Blood! #BajwaSoldTheNation #Traitor #آج_سازش_نہیں_چلے_گی https://t.co/aKsLjPdRt0	-0.546	0.508
13	Something tells me that this guy's left hand is way bigger than his right hand https://t.co/wCFFgVzSrz	-0.541	0.499
14	Had us dollars which they wasent taking at nz airport:) but glad 1nce again our media entertaining all of u 😜 https://t.co/nDyW9cOJBx	-0.513	0.449
15	Just like Bajwa yahya khan Made Him look like traitor but now we realize what happen to him at that time #BajwaSoldTheNation https://t.co/5rYGnl1LwZ	-0.491	0.411
16	We found her.. sorry him… #ام_حریم #ISPR #Hacked Do Darya Pakistan Army #1444_محرم #محرم https://t.co/DcDYTuJ7l7	-0.463	0.365
17	This guy is a disgrace to be in Army he ruined the beautiful name of our Army. Shame on him #DGISPR #BajwaTraitor https://t.co/muV51oBVvq	-0.447	0.341
18	I wish mothers would do a better job of raising their sons and teach them respect for women https://t.co/XVvWtzzJaX	-0.441	0.331
19	The more TLP pigs comment under this post with their dim wits, the more satisfied I will feel that this Tweet has properly insulted them. So far not much. Let's see. 😏	-0.438	0.326
20	I want someone to protect me like Aurat March protects criminals 😍 https://t.co/9gCh9NNyF3	-0.433	0.319

As far as the negative coordinate of this dimension is concerned, the trolling tweets on this side are more conciliatory in their communicative function. Most of the linguistic features on this coordinate are pronominal forms i.e. subject pronoun, object pronoun, first person pronoun and third person personal pronoun. All of these features are used to encode personal descriptions of the author specifically of other people rather than confronting them directly. For example, in example 19 (The more TLP pigs comment under this post with

their dim wits, the more satisfied **I** will feel that this Tweet has properly insulted **them**), the first person pronoun 'I' in the place of subject followed by verb of perception 'feel' reflect that the author of the trolling is giving their personal account of what they are perceiving about the other people, third personal pronoun 'them' in the object position here which refers to members of a political party called TLP, rather than openly confronting them.

In addition, complementation is used for idea elaboration or the elaboration of their account. For example, in example 15 (but now we realize **what happen to him at that time**) the WH-clause is the idea elaboration of what the author realized, and in example 13 (Something tells me **that this guy's left hand is way bigger than his right hand**) that verb complement elaborates on the personal account/description of the author that the person's left hand is bigger than the right hand. Predicative adjectives are also used to add to the personal description of the author. For example, in the example discussed previously the predicative adjective 'bigger' is used to describe the hand of the guy. Lastly, the absence of mentioning and second person pronoun show that the trolling tweets on this coordinate are not explicitly oppositional as they do not directly address the other users.

Overall, the trolling tweets on this dimension contrast between tweets that are antagonistic and used to confront others, and those that are conciliatory and describe entities and present the account of author without directly confronting other users. These two differentiate between a more aggressive form of trolling and a more subtle one. Interestingly, the same dimension is found in Clarke's (2017) study on abusive language comprising of racist and sexist tweets. Some of the linguistic features of antagonistic tweets in the present study are similar to Clarke's. For example, they both have the presence of second person pronouns, questions, exclamation marks, and absence of first person pronoun, third person personal pronoun and subject pronouns. Similarly, the linguistic features of conciliatory tweets are also similar to some extent. For example, they both have the presence of first person pronoun, third person personal pronoun, subject pronoun, object pronoun, and absence of mentioning and second person pronoun.

It is important to mention that a number of researches have established that a troll can be aggressive (Bishop, 2014; Hardaker, 2010, 2013; Hong & Cheng, 2018; Phillips, 2015) Hardaker (2010), for example, discussed that one of the characteristics of trolls is aggression and that trolls exhibit an "aggressive, malicious behaviour" (p. 231) such as "insulting and attacking others" (p. 232). Hardaker (2012) also characterized their behaviour as being "hostile, snotty, and idiotic" (p. 196). She (2013) however maintained that aggression is the most rarely used strategy to troll as it may result in trouble. Nonetheless, this study shows that Pakistani trolling tweets still reflect a clear pattern of antagonistic nature of tweets. According to Noble (2017) one of the motivations of trolling can be related to Nietzsche's concept of 'resentiment' where the trolls troll in "an attempt to claim some power (however brief and destructive) over another in order for them to experience the satisfactory feeling of possessing power" (p. 135). This stems from rage at their circumstances and perceived injustice (Noble, 2017, p. 122). A closer look at the examples of antagonistic trolling shows that all the tweets are directed at the Armed forces or political figures of Pakistan. Hence, it can be said that these Pakistani antagonistic trolling tweets also originate from a sense of injustice and rage at their circumstances. For example, in example 2 (what about these bloody generals @OfficialDGISPR #Bajwa #Establishment #Neutrals who have been harassing the State of Pakistan and its People), the author looks aggressive at the Army generals (more powerful than the author) and accuse and confront them with harassing people which he finds unjust, thus causing rage. Similarly, in example 9 (if not here, will see you in afterlife for sure, have fun while you can... :)) the author sounds aggressive because he thinks the addressee, again an army general, is having an unfair advantage and having fun due to unauthorized use of their power. However, this needs more research from a troll's intentions perspective.

5. Conclusion

This study explored the language of Pakistani trolling tweets through short text multidimensional analysis and showed that from the perspective of one of the dimensions Pakistani trolling tweets contrast between antagonistic and conciliatory tweets. The results showed that antagonistic tweets are dominated by second person pronouns and mentioning whereas conciliatory tweets are dominated by third person personal pronoun and first person pronoun. The study also revealed that antagonistic trolling tweets are more confrontational and directed at particular individuals whereas conciliatory tweets are descriptive and give personal accounts of the author about other people rather than explicitly confronting them. This dimension coincides with one of the dimensions of abusive language by Clarke (2017) which shows that troll language in Pakistan is highly aggressive. A closer look at the data of this study reveals that most of the trolls are political in nature even though it was collected through three different approaches. A number of studies have also previously shown that political trolling is in general hostile in nature (see for example, Akhtar & Morrison, 2019; Fichman & Akter, 2023). This study is pivotal in understanding the language of trolling in Pakistan; however, a more extensive trolling data collected from different social media platforms can help to comprehensively understand this language.

References

Akhtar, S. & Morrison, C. (2019). The prevalence and impact of online trolling of UK members of parliament. Computers in Human Behavior, 99, 322-327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.05.015

Barney, R. (2016). [Aristotle], On trolling. Journal of the American Philosophical Association, 2(2), 193-195. https://doi.org/10.1017/apa.2016.9

Biber, D. (1988). Variation across speech and writing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511621024

Bishop, J. (2014). Representations of 'trolls' in mass media communication: A review of media-texts and moral panics relating to 'internet trolling'. International Journal of Web Based Communities, 10(1), 7-24. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJWBC.2014.058384

Case, C. J. & King, D. L. (2017). Internet trolling in social networking sites: A preliminary investigation of undergraduate student victimization. Journal of Business and Behavioral Sciences, 29(2), 32-43.

Case, C. J. & King, D. L. & Case, J. A. (2019). Social media usage and trolling: A longitudinal investigation of undergraduate business students. Global Journal of Business Disciplines, 3(1), 1-14.

Cillizza, C. (2018, November 29). Donald Trump, internet troll. CNN Politics. https://edition.cnn.com/2018/11/28/politics/donald-trump-internet-troll/index.html

Clarke, I. (2017). Dimension of Twitter trolling: Short text classification using multiple correspondence analysis. In The 9th International Corpus Linguistics Conference. University of Birmingham. https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/documents/college-artslaw/corpus/conference-archives/2017/general/paper60.pdf

Clarke, I. (2018). Stylistic variation in twitter trolling. In J. Golbeck (Ed.), Online harassment (pp. 151-178). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-78583-7_7

Clarke, I. (2019). Functional linguistic variation in twitter trolling. International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law, 26(1), 57-84. https://doi.org/10.1558/ijsll.34803

Clarke, I. (2020). Linguistic variation across Twitter and Twitter trolling. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham]. University of Birmingham. https://etheses.bham.ac.uk//id/eprint/10009

Clarke, I. & Grieve, J. (2017). Dimensions of abusive language on Twitter. In Z. Waseem, W. H. K. Chung, D. Hovy & J. Tetreault (Eds.), Proceedings of the first workshop on abusive language online (pp. 1-10). The Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W17-3001

Clarke, I. & Grieve, J. (2019). Stylistic variation on the Donald Trump twitter account: A linguistic analysis of tweets posted between 2009 and 2018. PLOS ONE, 14(9), e0222062. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0222062

Cook, C. (2021). Everything you never wanted to know about trolls: An interdisciplinary exploration of the who's, what's, and why's of trolling in online games. [Doctoral dissertation, Tilburg University]. [s.n.] https://research.tilburguniversity.edu/en/publications/409d746a-05e3-46fd-bae6-6ff6d5dab1de

Cook, C., Schaafsma, J. & Antheunis, M. (2018). Under the bridge: An in-depth examination of online trolling in the gaming context. New Media & Society, 20(9), 3323-3340. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817748578

Cruz, A. G. B., Seo, Y. & Rex, M. (2018). Trolling in online communities: A practice-based theoretical perspective. The Information Society, 34(1), 15-26. https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2017.1391909

De Seta, G. (2013). FCJ-167 Spraying, fishing, looking for trouble: The Chinese internet and a critical perspective on the concept of trolling. The Fibreculture Journal, (22: Trolls and the Negative Space of the Internet), 301-318.

Duncombe, C. (2019). The politics of twitter: Emotions and the power of social media. International Political Sociology, 13(4), 409-429. https://doi.org/10.1093/ips/olz013

Fearn, N. (2017, January 30). Twitter and the scourge of cyberbullying: How the tech industry is responding to the difficult contradiction between trolling and freedom of speech on social media. IDG Connect. https://www.idgconnect.com/article/3577219/twitter-and-the-scourge-of-cyberbullying.html

Fichman, P. & Akter, S. (2023). Trolling asymmetry toward Republicans and Democrats and the shifts from foreign to domestic trolling. Telematics and Informatics, 82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2023.101998

Fichman, P. & Sanfilippo, M. R. (2015). The bad boys and girls of cyberspace: How gender and context impact perception of and reaction to trolling. Social Science Computer Review, 33(2), 163–180. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439314533169

Fichman, P. & Sanfilippo, M. R. (2016). Online trolling and its perpetrators: Under the cyberbridge. Rowman and Littlefield.

Gimpel, K., Schneider, N., O'Connor, B., Das, D., Mills, D., Eisenstein, J., Heilman, M., Yogatama, D., Flanigan, J. & Smith, N. A. (2011). Part-of-speech tagging for Twitter: Annotation, features, and experiments. In Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Short Papers (pp. 42–47). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.21236/ada547371

Hannan, J. (2018). Trolling ourselves to death? Social media and post-truth politics. European Journal of Communication, 33(2), 214-226. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323118760323

Hardaker, C. (2010). Trolling in asynchronous computer-mediated communication: From user discussions to academic definitions. Journal of Politeness Research, 6(2), 215–242. https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2010.011

Hardaker, C. (2012). Trolling in computer-mediated communication: Impoliteness, deception and manipulation online [Doctoral dissertation, Lancaster University]. Lancaster University.

Hardaker, C. (2013). "Uh. . . ..not to be nitpicky,,,,,but. . . the past tense of drag is dragged, not drug": An overview of trolling strategies. Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict, 1(1), 57–85. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlac.1.1.04har

Hardaker, C. (2017). Flaming and trolling. In C. R. Hoffmann & W. Bublitz (Eds.), Pragmatics of social media (pp. 493-522). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431070-018

Hong F.-Y., Cheng K.-T. (2018). Correlation between university students' online trolling behavior and online trolling victimization forms, current conditions, and personality traits. Telematics and Informatics, 35(2), 397–405. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2017.12.016

Hussain, S., Bostan, H. & Qaisarani, I. (2022). Trolling of female journalists on Twitter in Pakistan: An analysis. Media International Australia, 0(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X221145977

Husson, F., Josse, J., Le, S. & Mazet, J. (2020). Package 'FactoMineR'. https://cran.rediris.es/web/packages/FactoMineR/FactoMineR.pdf

Iftikhar, K. (2022, August 29). Online trolling creating multipronged crises in Pakistan. The Pakistan Daily. https://thepakistandaily.com/online-trolling-creating-multipronged-crises-in-pakistan/

Jameel, S. F. (2021). Pragmatics of trolling: analysis of news articles and comment threads of online newspaper sites. [Masters dissertation, National University of Modern Languages,

Islamabad]. National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad. https://norr.numl.edu.pk/repository/listing/content/detail/1211

Jefferson, G. (2002). Is 'no' an acknowledgement token? Comparing American and British uses of (+)/(-) tokens. Journal of Pragmatics, 34(10-11), 1345—1383. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00067-X

Kirman, B., Lineham, C. & Lawson, S. (2012). Exploring mischief and mayhem in social computing or: How we learned to stop worrying and love the trolls. In CHI '12 Extended abstracts on human factors in computing systems (pp. 121–130). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/2212776.2212790

Le Roux, B. & Rouanet, H. (2010). Multiple correspondence analysis. SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412993906

Li, M., Hussain, S., Barkat, S. & Bostan, H. (2023). Online harassment and trolling of political journalists in Pakistan. Journalism Practice. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2023.2259381

March, E. & Marrington, J. (2019). A qualitative analysis of internet trolling. Cyberpsychology, behavior and social networking, 22(3), 192-197. https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2018.0210

Noble, W. (2017). Trolling, the ugly face of the social network. In T. Owen, W. Noble & F. C. Speed (Eds.), New perspectives on cybercrime (pp. 113-139). Palgrave Macmillan Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53856-3_7

Nycyk, M. (2019). Trolls and trolling history: From subculture to mainstream practices. In N. Brügger & I. Milligan (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of web history (pp. 577-589). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526470546.n39

Obaid, Z., Mahmood, M. A. & Mahmood, R. (2023). A short text multidimensional analysis of Pakistani X trolls in English. Research Journal of Language and Literary Studies, 3(2), 1-29.

Ortiz, S. M. (2020). Trolling as a collective form of harassment: An inductive study of how online users understand trolling. Social Media + Society, 6(2), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120928512

Owoputi, O., O'Connor, B., Dyer, C., Gimpel, K. & Schneider, N. (2012). Part-of-speech tagging for Twitter: Word clusters and other advances (Publication No. CMU-ML-12-107). Carnegie Mellon University. https://www.cs.cmu.edu/~ark/TweetNLP/owoputi+etal.tr12.pdf

Owoputi, O., O'Connor, B., Dyer, C., Gimpel, K., Schneider, N. & Smith, N. A. (2013). Improved part-of-speech tagging for online conversational text with word clusters. In Proceedings of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (pp. 380-390). Association for Computational Linguistics.

Passonneau, R. J., Ide, N., Su, S. & Stuart, J. (2014). Biber redux: Reconsidering dimensions of variation in American English. In J. Tsujii & J. Hajic (Eds.), Proceedings of COLING 2014, the 25th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Technical Papers (pp. 565–576). Dublin City University and Association for Computational Linguistics.

Phillips, W. (2015). This is why we can't have nice things: Mapping the relationship between online trolling and mainstream culture. MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/10288.001.0001

Phillips, W. (2021, June 1). A brief history of trolls. The Daily Dot. https://www.dailydot.com/via/phillips-brief-history-of-trolls/

Rabbani, K., Mehmood, M. A. & Areej, A. (2024). Speech act of flaming: A pragmatic analysis of Twitter trolling in Pakistan. Discourse and Society, 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265231222589

Siddiqi, K. (2020, August 16). Dealing with trolls. The Express Tribune. https://tribune.com.pk/story/2259811/dealing-with-trolls

Siddiqua, A., Gong, J. & Aksar, I. A. (2023). Twitter trolling of Pakistani female journalists: A patriarchal society glance. Media, Culture & Society, 45(6), 1303-1314. https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437231168306

Smith, B. (2003). The use of communication strategies in computer-mediated communication. System, 31(1), 29-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00072-6

Treem, J. W., Dailey, S. L., Pierce, C. S. & Biffl, D. (2016). What we are talking about when we talk about social media: A framework for study. Sociology Compass, 10(9), 768-784. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12404

Vandergriff, I. (2013). Emotive communication online: A contextual analysis of computer-mediated communication (CMC) cues. Journal of Pragmatics, 51, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.02.008

Werry, C. C. (1996). Language and interactional features of Internet Relay Chat. In S. C. Herring (Ed.) Computer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social, and cross-cultural perspectives (pp. 47—63). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.39.06wer

Younus, A., Qureshi, M. A., Saeed, M., Touheed, N., O'Riordan, C. & Pasi, G. (2014). Election trolling: Analyzing sentiment in tweets during Pakistan Elections 2013. In WWW'14 Companion: Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on World Wide Web (pp. 411-412). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/2567948.2577352

Zappavigna, M. (2017). Twitter. In C. R. Hoffmann & W. Bublitz (Eds.), Pragmatics of Social Media (pp. 201-224). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431070-008