ELite Journal : International Journal of Education, Language, and Literature
Volume 6 (4) 2026
ISSN: 2621-8127 (online)
https://journal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/elite

Religious Identity and Evaluative Language in Verbal Bullying: An Appraisal Theory Analysis of *Pesantren* Discourse in East Java, Indonesia

Dwi Nurcahyani[a], Maisarah Maisarah[b], Nur Laili[c], Achmad Fanani[d,*]

[abc] *Universitas Pesantren Tinggi Darul Ulum, Indonesia*
*Corresponding author. *E-mail address: achmadfanani@fbs.unipdu.ac.id*

ABSTRACT

Verbal bullying remains underexplored in Islamic boarding schools (*pesantren*), where strong communal traditions often normalize harsh verbal interactions as discipline, humor, or seniority culture. This study examined how evaluative language constructs verbal bullying among students in two *pesantren* in East Java, Indonesia. Using Appraisal Theory, it analyzed appraisal resources, namely affect, judgment, appreciation, and graduation, together with the lexico-grammatical devices that realize them. A qualitative discourse-analytic design was adopted. Fifty *santri* took part, and data were gathered through semi-structured interviews, non-participant observation, a questionnaire, and utterances that students recorded as instances of bullying. A corpus of 320 utterances was analyzed. Four types of bullying emerged inductively: physical mocking, religious performance ridicule, academic insults, and family-related insults. Judgment was the dominant appraisal resource across all four types, affect appeared in expressions of emotional rejection, and graduation intensified negative evaluations. Imitation of senior expressions by juniors and peer approval helped sustain these expressions. The findings identify religious identity as a distinctive target of verbal bullying and show the value of linguistic analysis for recognizing and addressing bullying in *pesantren*.

Keywords: Appraisal Theory, Judgment, *Pesantren* Discourse, Religious Identity, Verbal Bullying

INTRODUCTION

Pesantren are residential Islamic educational institutions that combine religious instruction, moral formation, and communal living (Rahmansyah, 2023). Students, known as *santri*, share dormitories, classrooms, and dining spaces under the supervision of teachers and caregivers, so most of their waking hours are spent among peers. This arrangement can cultivate discipline, independence, and solidarity. It also places students in a dense and hierarchical network of everyday talk in which seniority shapes who may speak, to whom, and in what manner. Recent reviews point to peers and the wider boarding environment (Khoir & Kurniawati, 2025), as well as to seniority hierarchies and a cultural acceptance of aggression (Muzayanah et al., 2025), as conditions that sustain bullying in these institutions.

Verbal bullying refers to the use of language to insult, mock, humiliate, or threaten another person. Although it leaves no physical trace, it is associated with anxiety, depression, low self-esteem, and social withdrawal among adolescents (Han et al., 2025), and it can leave students feeling unsafe in the very settings where they are expected to learn (Abatan et al.,

2025). In *pesantren*, harsh expressions may be received as humor, discipline, or a sign of belonging, so that speakers and targets alike may not describe them as bullying. This blurring of boundaries is particularly relevant to *pesantren*, where communal living intensifies everyday interaction and gives such expressions an immediate audience.

Research in Indonesia has documented the forms and effects of verbal bullying among junior high school students (Maalikih et al., 2024), its consequences for the mental health of senior high school students (Nurhalimah et al., 2025), and the role of peer relationships and social environments in sustaining it (Jumra et al., 2025). Studies situated in *pesantren* have mapped psychological effects, contributing factors, and intervention strategies (Khoir & Kurniawati, 2025; Muzayanah et al., 2025). Taken together, these studies explain why bullying occurs and what it does to victims. The studies reviewed here, however, give little attention to the linguistic means through which verbal bullying is performed and made to appear acceptable in *pesantren* discourse.

Appraisal Theory offers a way of addressing this gap. Developed within systemic functional linguistics, it describes how speakers express and negotiate attitudes through three subsystems, namely affect, judgment, and appreciation, together with graduation, which scales the force and focus of those evaluations (Martin & White, 2005). Because the framework locates evaluation in meaning and not in isolated words, an utterance can be analyzed as bullying according to what it does within an exchange, and not merely according to whether it contains a recognizably offensive term. The approach is especially pertinent to a religious boarding community, where evaluations of character, competence, and morality can position a student as unworthy of belonging.

This study applied Appraisal Theory as its analytical framework to verbal bullying among *santri* in two *pesantren* in East Java, Indonesia. Fifty students took part, and data were gathered through interviews, observation, a questionnaire, and utterances that students themselves recorded as instances of bullying. The resulting corpus of 320 utterances was analyzed in terms of appraisal resources, meaning the subsystems of affect, judgment, appreciation, and graduation, and of the lexico-grammatical devices that realize them, such as intensifiers and similes. Three research questions guided the analysis: (1) What types of verbal bullying occur in *pesantren* discourse? (2) Which appraisal resources, and which lexico-grammatical realizations, characterize these expressions? (3) How do these expressions construct negative identities and social relationships among *santri*?

By answering these questions, the study offers a linguistically grounded account of verbal bullying in a religious boarding context and draws attention to religious identity as a target of evaluation. Such an account may help teachers and caregivers recognize evaluative language that is framed as joking, and it may inform prevention strategies that are sensitive to *pesantren* culture.

LITERATURE REVIEW

VERBAL BULLYING IN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS

Verbal bullying is the use of language to insult, mock, humiliate, or threaten another person, and unlike physical bullying, its harm is carried by meaning and not by bodily contact. Reviews of the adolescent literature link school bullying to anxiety, depression, and other mental health difficulties (Han et al., 2025), and a systematic review by Halliday et al. (2021) examined how victimization in early adolescence relates to later psychosocial and academic outcomes. In

classrooms, such experiences can create an atmosphere of insecurity that undermines learning and overall development (Abatan et al., 2025).

Whether verbal bullying persists depends partly on the social setting in which it occurs. Jumra et al. (2025) identified peer relationships and social environments as significant influences on bullying, and Ugwu et al. (2024) reported that peer influence contributes to bullying perpetration among adolescents. Maalikih et al. (2024) showed that verbal bullying can be embedded in everyday interaction, which makes it difficult to separate from ordinary talk. This blurring of boundaries is particularly relevant to *pesantren*, where communal living intensifies everyday interaction.

Studies in Indonesian schools have examined the effects of bullying on social development (Sintawati et al., 2025) and on mental health (Nurhalimah et al., 2025), and reviews of *pesantren* have mapped its causes, consequences, and interventions (Khoir & Kurniawati, 2025; Muzayanah et al., 2025). In this work, bullying is treated mainly as a behavioral and psychological problem. How evaluative meanings are constructed in the language of religious boarding communities has received comparatively little attention, and this is the question the present study takes up.

APPRAISAL THEORY AS AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR VERBAL BULLYING

Because verbal bullying is realized through language, this study adopts Appraisal Theory (Martin & White, 2005) as its principal analytical framework. The theory describes how speakers construe attitudes, adjust their strength, and position themselves relative to other voices. Its Attitude system comprises affect, which construes emotional reactions; judgment, which evaluates people's behavior and character against social norms; and appreciation, which evaluates things, events, and performances. Graduation, divided into force and focus, scales the intensity or sharpness of these evaluations. The Engagement system, which concerns dialogic positioning, lies outside the scope of this study. Because evaluation is located in meaning and not in isolated words, an utterance can be treated as bullying according to the negative stance it takes toward a person within an exchange.

Judgment is especially pertinent to bullying. Martin and White (2005) divide it into social esteem, which covers normality, capacity, and tenacity, and social sanction, which covers veracity and propriety. Evaluations such as "lazy," "stupid," or "has no manners" attach durable traits to a person and may therefore be experienced as statements about who the person is and not about what the person did. In a *pesantren*, such judgments may also bear on moral and religious standing. Appraisal-based research on hostile online discourse points in a similar direction. In a corpus of aggressive tweets, del Saz-Rubio (2024) found judgment to be the most frequent Attitude resource, ahead of affect and appreciation, with propriety and veracity prominent among its subtypes. If the predominance of judgment is a common feature of hostile discourse, the distribution of judgment subtypes and their interaction with graduation are likely to be more informative than the predominance of judgment alone.

A further distinction concerns the level at which analysis operates. Affect, judgment, appreciation, and graduation are semantic resources, whereas intensifiers, similes, evaluative adjectives, and comparisons are lexico-grammatical devices that realize them. Expressions such as *banget*, *parah*, and *paling* realize graduation of force by raising the strength of an evaluation. Martin and White (2005) also separate inscribed evaluation, which is stated explicitly through attitudinal lexis, from invoked evaluation, which is evoked without such lexis. This distinction matters for data in which insults often rely on comparison and implication.

PESANTREN AS A COMMUNICATIVE CONTEXT

The social organization of *pesantren* shapes who may evaluate whom. Senior students commonly hold authority over juniors, and juniors are expected to show obedience and respect, so that verbal aggression directed downward may be tolerated or even expected (Khoir & Kurniawati, 2025; Muzayanah et al., 2025). Because students live together, a target is often evaluated in the presence of peers, which may deepen humiliation.

Religious identity is also central to *pesantren* life. Students are expected to embody religious and moral values, and failure to do so may become grounds for ridicule. Expressions that question a student's religious commitment may be especially damaging because they challenge that student's standing as a legitimate member of a valued community. Such evaluations can be read as judgments of propriety and veracity in the sense of Martin and White (2005), which makes Appraisal Theory a principled way of examining them.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative discourse-analytic design and used Appraisal Theory (Martin & White, 2005) as its analytical framework. It was conducted in two traditional *pesantren* in East Java, Indonesia, which were selected because they share communal living arrangements, hierarchical senior-junior relationships, and strong religious education programs. The participants were 50 *santri* drawn from these institutions through purposive sampling, a procedure intended to ensure diversity in age, gender, and length of stay.

Data were collected through four sources. Semi-structured interviews with 20 students explored their experiences of both perpetrating and receiving verbal bullying, with attention to the types of expressions used, the contexts in which they occurred, and their perceived effects. Non-participant observation was carried out in classrooms, dormitories, dining areas, and recreational spaces, focusing on naturally occurring interactions among students, particularly between seniors and juniors. A questionnaire administered to all 50 participants gathered information on the frequency, types, and perceived impact of verbal bullying. In addition, students recorded utterances that they considered to be verbal bullying. The corpus comprised 320 utterances collected through these procedures.

The researchers identified verbal bullying manually through discourse analysis, treating an utterance as bullying when it carried a negative evaluative meaning directed at an individual or a group, interpreted in light of the interaction in which it occurred. The bullying types were derived inductively through repeated coding of the corpus and were not set before analysis. This process produced four categories: physical mocking, religious performance ridicule, academic insults, and family-related insults. The appraisal resources, by contrast, were applied deductively, since affect, judgment, appreciation, and graduation are the categories supplied by the framework. Each utterance was classified by bullying type and by its dominant appraisal resource, and it was then analyzed to show how affect, judgment, and graduation were deployed to construct negative evaluations. Finally, the findings were interpreted in relation to the socio-cultural context of the *pesantren*, including hierarchical relationships, religious identity, and communal living arrangements.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the 320 utterances yielded four types of verbal bullying: physical mocking, religious performance ridicule, academic insults, and family-related insults. These categories

were derived inductively through repeated coding of naturally occurring interactions, whereas the appraisal resources were applied deductively from the categories supplied by Martin and White's (2005) framework. Table 1 presents the frequency of each type with a representative example.

Table 1 Types of verbal bullying identified in the corpus

Type of verbal bullying	Example	Frequency	Percentage
Physical mocking	"Badanmu kayak bambu." (Your body is like bamboo.)	92	28.8%
Religious performance ridicule	"Santri abal-abal." (Fake santri.)	89	27.8%
Academic insults	"Otakmu lambat banget." (Your brain is very slow.)	74	23.1%
Family-related insults	"Pantesan dari kampung." (No wonder you're from the village.)	65	20.3%
	Total	**320**	**100%**

Table 1 shows that physical mocking was the most frequent type (28.8%), followed by religious performance ridicule (27.8%), academic insults (23.1%), and family-related insults (20.3%). The gap between the first two types is small, so religious performance ridicule is better described as nearly as frequent as physical mocking than as a minor category. In the coding, judgment was the dominant appraisal resource in all four types. Because the dominant resource was the same across types, what distinguishes the types is the target of the judgment, namely the body, religious standing, intellect, or family. In each case, speakers evaluated the character, competence, morality, or social worth of the person addressed and did not simply voice a feeling or assess an object. This is consistent with the *pesantren* context, where moral and religious character are highly valued. By targeting appearance, religious commitment, academic ability, and family background, speakers construct negative identities that position targets as inferior or unworthy. These evaluations do more than express momentary emotion, because they help to establish and maintain social hierarchies.

Physical mocking accounted for 28.8% of the corpus. It covers expressions that ridicule the target's body shape, facial features, and height, as in the following utterances.

"Badanmu kayak bambu." (Your body is like bamboo)

"Kurus banget, kayak orang nggak makan." (So skinny, like someone who doesn't eat)

"Mukanya kayak orang sakit." (Your face looks like a sick person)

"Pendek banget, kayak kerdil." (So short, like a dwarf)

The first utterance targets thinness. The second strengthens the evaluation of body shape by implying that the target is underfed. The third targets facial appearance, and the fourth targets height. All four evaluate the person negatively, and they can be interpreted as judgments of normality, because they present the body as deviating from an expected standard. It is useful to separate the resource from its realization here. The simile (*kayak bambu*, *kayak orang sakit*, *kayak kerdil*) and the intensifier *banget* are not appraisal resources in themselves. They are lexico-grammatical devices through which the evaluation is expressed and its force raised.

Whether targets internalize such evaluations was not measured in this study. Research on school bullying nevertheless links these experiences to poorer mental health and to later psychosocial difficulties (Han et al., 2025; Halliday et al., 2021), so body image concerns, low self-esteem, and social withdrawal are plausible consequences that future research could examine directly. The frequency of physical mocking may reflect the weight that appearance carries in peer relationships and the sensitivity of adolescents to criticism of the body. In a *pesantren*, where students live together and interact constantly, physical appearance is highly visible and is therefore readily available as an object of evaluation. Such evaluations typically occur in front of peers, which may intensify humiliation.

Religious performance ridicule accounted for 27.8% of the corpus and comprises expressions that target religious and group identity. The following utterances illustrate the category.

"Santri abal-abal." (Fake *santri*)

"Cuma pakai label santri." (Only using the *santri* label)

"Santri kok perilakunya kayak preman." (How can a *santri* behave like a thug)

"Ngaji aja malas, gimana mau jadi santri beneran?" (Even studying is lazy, how can you become a real *santri*?)

The first two utterances question religious commitment and authenticity, the third contrasts behavior with expectation, and the fourth questions dedication. They can be read as judgments of veracity, which question whether the target is genuine, and of propriety, which question whether the target's conduct is acceptable. Each contrasts the recipient with the expected image of a disciplined, well-mannered, and devout *santri*, and so questions the student's legitimacy as a member of the group. Religious learning, moral education, communal living, and social cohesion are central to *pesantren* (Rahmansyah, 2023), which gives such contrasts particular force. Bullying often reflects the prevailing norms of a peer group and is bound up with identity development (Moody & Stahel, 2025), which helps explain why questioning conformity to a religious identity can carry social and psychological consequences.

The word *abal-abal* ("fake") is especially pointed because it denies authenticity outright. In a community where religious identity is central to self-concept, an accusation of this kind may be deeply destabilizing. Setting a *santri* against a *preman* ("thug") likewise constructs a binary opposition between the sacred and the profane and casts the target as having violated the moral order of the *pesantren*. This finding extends research that identifies peer relationships and social environments as important factors in bullying (Jumra et al., 2025) and research showing that verbal bullying can be embedded in ordinary communication (Maalikih et al., 2024). In the present data, however, the target is not merely appearance, academic ability, or behavior but conformity to a moral and religious identity. Religious identity thus adds an interpersonal, social, and identity-based dimension to verbal bullying, and religious performance ridicule appears to be a type closely tied to the *pesantren* setting.

Academic insults accounted for 23.1% of the corpus and ridicule the target's intellectual ability, academic performance, or capacity to learn.

"Otakmu lambat banget." (Your brain is very slow)

"Bodoh banget, nggak bisa ngapa-ngapain." (So stupid, can't do anything)

"Belajar aja nggak bisa, gimana mau sukses?" (Can't even study, how can you succeed?)

"Nilaimu jelek banget, kayak nggak sekolah." (Your grades are so bad, like you don't go to school)

The first utterance evaluates cognitive ability, and the second strengthens that evaluation with *banget* and a sweeping claim of incapacity. The third links academic difficulty to future prospects, and the fourth targets academic performance directly. These expressions can be interpreted as judgments of capacity. Taking *otak* ("brain") as the object of evaluation reduces the person to a cognitive faculty, and the intensifier *banget* adds force to the assessment. Evaluations of this kind may affect academic self-concept and motivation, and, as with physical mocking, this is a possibility the present data cannot confirm. The frequency of academic insults may reflect the competitive nature of *pesantren* education and the importance placed on achievement. Students who struggle academically may become targets of ridicule, which could further weaken their confidence and performance. Because grades, recitation ability, and classroom participation are all open to peer evaluation, academic performance is highly visible in communal life.

Family-related insults accounted for 20.3% of the corpus and ridicule the target's family background, including geographic origin, economic status, parental occupation, and religious upbringing.

"Pantesan dari kampung." (No wonder you're from the village)

"Anak orang miskin, ya wajar nggak bisa beli apa-apa." (Poor person's child, of course can't buy anything)

"Bapakmu cuma petani, ya wajar kamu begini." (Your father is just a farmer, of course you're like this)

"Keluarga nggak pernah ngaji, ya wajar kamu nggak bisa ngaji" (Family never studied religion, of course you can't recite)

These utterances evaluate the target's social worth through family background. The markers *pantesan* ("no wonder") and *ya wajar* ("of course") construct a causal relationship between origin and personal characteristics, which presents the target's perceived deficiencies as the inevitable result of where the student comes from. The last utterance links family background to religious ability, so that this type partly overlaps with the previous one. Such expressions may reinforce social hierarchies and create divisions among students along socioeconomic and geographic lines. Targeting family background may be particularly harmful because it concerns an aspect of identity that the target cannot change. Academic performance or religious commitment may be improved through effort, but family background cannot, so these expressions suggest inherent inferiority and could contribute to shame and withdrawal, although this remains a question for future research.

Affect was also present in the corpus, mainly in expressions of emotional rejection, as in the following utterances.

"Aku muak lihat kamu." (I am sick of seeing you)

"Nyebelin banget kalau dia ngomong." (It is very annoying when he talks)

According to Martin and White (2005), these utterances realize negative affect because they state emotional rejection and hostility explicitly. Unlike judgment, which evaluates character or behavior, affect communicates emotional distancing more directly. The first utterance positions the target as a source of disgust, and *muak* ("sick of") conveys not only dislike but near revulsion. The second expresses irritation, with *banget* strengthening the feeling. Such expressions often occurred during disagreements or emotionally charged exchanges, which made the rejection visible to surrounding peers. In face-to-face settings, this visibility may intensify humiliation and social exclusion, because the recipient experiences rejection in front of others.

This finding is consistent with studies that link verbal bullying to psychological and social harm (Han et al., 2025; Abatan et al., 2025; Sintawati et al., 2025) and with Nurhalimah et al. (2025), who associated verbal bullying with emotional aggression and psychological distress. It also contrasts with online hostility, which has been associated with anonymity and a reduced concern for social conventions (del Saz-Rubio, 2024). In a *pesantren*, speaker and target know each other and share the same space, so emotional hostility is immediate and socially visible, because the target and the surrounding peers are present at the same time. Graduation operated as an intensifying resource across the corpus. Intensifiers such as *banget* ("very"), *parah* ("terrible"), and *paling* ("most") increased the force of negative evaluations, as the following pairs show.

kurus ("skinny") becomes *kurus banget* ("extremely skinny")

malas ("lazy") becomes *malas banget* ("extremely lazy")

These forms appeared repeatedly in the corpus, which indicates that students not only evaluated others negatively but also raised the interpersonal force of those evaluations. Intensification seems to serve several purposes. First, it strengthens the negative evaluation and makes it more forceful and potentially more harmful. Second, it signals the speaker's emotional involvement, conveying that the evaluation is not neutral but strongly felt. Third, it may help speakers establish dominance by positioning themselves as superior to the target. This last point is compatible with research showing that aggression can be used to establish and maintain a position in a peer hierarchy (Cañas et al., 2022). Both the content and the intensity of an utterance therefore contribute to its potential harm.

The frequent use of *banget* reflects its ordinary role as a general intensifier in colloquial Indonesian. In bullying, however, its repeated use creates a pattern of intensified negative evaluation. The cumulative effect of hearing such expressions repeatedly may be more damaging than any single utterance, and it may contribute to a hostile environment in which targets feel constantly evaluated and devalued.

Observation showed that juniors often imitated expressions first used by seniors because they were perceived as humorous, acceptable, or symbolic of group membership. This is consistent with research identifying peer relationships and social environments as important

factors in bullying (Jumra et al., 2025) and with the finding that verbal bullying can be embedded in everyday interaction (Maalikih et al., 2024). Peer influence also contributes to bullying perpetration among adolescents (Ugwu et al., 2024), and intensive communal living in *pesantren* gives communication patterns frequent opportunities to be observed, reproduced, and reinforced (Rahmansyah, 2023).

Over time, imitation may turn individual derogatory expressions into shared communicative practices. Students often reported no intention to bully because they regarded such expressions as jokes or ordinary interaction, even though repeated use normalized verbal aggression. When derogatory expressions are met with laughter or approval, they are reinforced and become more likely to recur. Imitation and peer approval may thus shape shared norms about acceptable communication and blur the boundary between joking, peer bonding, and aggression. The communal nature of *pesantren* life, with its intensive interaction and strong peer bonds, may strengthen these dynamics, making it difficult for targets to object or for bystanders to intervene.

Overall, verbal bullying in *pesantren* appears to be a complex phenomenon shaped by linguistic, psychological, social, cultural, and religious factors. Although it shares patterns with bullying in other educational contexts, it also has distinctive characteristics arising from communal living, religious identity, moral expectations, and hierarchical relationships. The same utterance may function as humor, discipline, or social exclusion depending on the discourse context, the interpersonal relationship, and the recipient's emotional response. Understanding verbal bullying therefore requires attention not only to lexical choices but also to the communicative practices through which meaning and social relationships are constructed.

Four features appear to distinguish verbal bullying in this setting. The first is its religious dimension. Religious identity is central to *pesantren* life, and expressions that question a student's commitment or conformity can be especially harmful. Religious performance ridicule, which accounted for 27.8% of the corpus, shows why religious identity deserves attention in bullying research. The second is the senior-junior hierarchy, which creates power dynamics that can facilitate bullying. Seniors may use verbal aggression to assert dominance, while juniors may hesitate to challenge them because of norms of respect, and the imitation of senior expressions by juniors suggests that bullying patterns are transmitted through the hierarchy.

The third feature is communal living. Because students live together, bullying occurs in face-to-face settings where the target and surrounding peers are present at the same time. This visibility may intensify humiliation and social exclusion, because targets experience rejection in front of their peer group. The fourth is normalization. When verbal bullying is perceived as a joke or ordinary interaction, and when it is combined with peer approval and imitation, aggressive communication becomes normalized. This makes verbal bullying difficult to identify and address, since both perpetrators and targets may not recognize certain expressions as harmful.

CONCLUSION

This study examined verbal bullying among *santri* in two East Java *pesantren* through Appraisal Theory and showed that it is embedded in everyday communication. Expressions that students treated as jokes often carried negative evaluation, identity labeling, and emotional rejection. The corpus of 320 utterances fell into four types: physical mocking (28.8%), religious

performance ridicule (27.8%), academic insults (23.1%), and family-related insults (20.3%). Judgment was the dominant appraisal resource in all four, which indicates that verbal bullying in these settings mainly involves negative evaluation of the target's character and identity. Affect appeared in expressions of emotional rejection, and graduation intensified negative evaluations through devices such as *banget* and *parah*. Terms such as *malas*, *gagal*, *nggak punya adab*, and *santri abal-abal* show how language can construct negative identities and social hierarchies. Verbal bullying is therefore better interpreted through discourse context than through isolated words.

Religious performance ridicule was the category most closely tied to the *pesantren* setting. Expressions that question a student's religious commitment or conformity target the core of that student's identity as a *santri*, and they may carry serious psychological consequences, although this study did not measure the effects on targets. The study also found that imitation and peer approval help sustain verbal bullying. Juniors often reproduced expressions used by seniors, and derogatory expressions were reinforced when they were met with laughter or approval. Over time, such expressions became part of the group's communication style, which blurred the boundary between joking, peer bonding, and aggression and shows how the senior-junior hierarchy and communal living shape bullying in this setting.

These findings highlight the importance of considering religious identity in bullying research and of developing prevention strategies that are sensitive to *pesantren* culture. Teachers and caregivers may find it useful to recognize evaluative language that is framed as humor and to attend to how it functions within the group. Future studies could examine how targets experience these expressions, and could analyze how each appraisal resource is distributed across bullying types in a larger corpus.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Many thanks to DPPM Kemendiktisaintek Republic of Indonesia for supporting and funding this research.

REFERENCES

Abatan, F. E., Anakaka, D. L., & Wijaya, R. P. C. (2025). Factors causing verbal bullying behavior in elementary school students. *Journal of Health and Behavioral Science*, *7*(1), 485–498. https://doi.org/10.35508/jhbs.v7i1.19528

Cañas, E., Estévez, E., & Estévez, J. F. (2022). Sociometric status in bullying perpetrators: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Communication, 7*, Article 841424. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2022.841424

del Saz-Rubio, M. M. (2024). From 'low-class' and 'talentless' to 'narcissist and pathological liar': A functional-pragmatic approach to Meghan Markle's negative evaluation on X. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics, 60*(3), 311–348. https://doi.org/10.1515/psicl-2023-0068

Halliday, S., Gregory, T., Taylor, A., Digenis, C., & Turnbull, D. (2021). The impact of bullying victimization in early adolescence on subsequent psychosocial and academic outcomes across the adolescent period: A systematic review. *Journal of School Violence, 20*(3), 351–373. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2021.1913598

Han, Z.-Y., Ye, Z.-Y., & Zhong, B.-L. (2025). School bullying and mental health among

adolescents: A narrative review. *Translational Pediatrics, 14*(3), 463–472. https://doi.org/10.21037/tp-2024-512

Jumra, J., Rasyid, M., Baharuddin, A., & Arifullah, A. (2025). The dynamics of bullying in schools: Causes, impacts, and prevention strategies. *Journal of Indonesian Scholars for Social Research, 5*(1), 83–91. https://doi.org/10.59065/jissr.v5i1.176

Khoir, A. K., & Kurniawati, F. (2025). Bullying in pesantren (Islamic boarding school): A systematic review of its psychological effects, influencing factors, and intervention strategies. *Psikis: Jurnal Psikologi Islam, 11*(1), 14–31.

Maalikih, M. D., Sumarwati, S., & Rakhmawati, A. (2024). Forms and effects of verbal bullying: Perceptions of junior high school students in Indonesia. *Multidisciplinary Reviews, 8*(2), Article 2025066. https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2025066

Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English.* Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230511910

Moody, Z., & Stahel, T. (2025). School bullying: Children and adolescent norms, cultures and identity development. *Frontiers in Education, 10*, Article 1497681. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1497681

Muzayanah, U., Wasino, W., Arief, S., Wahyudin, A., Sofanudin, A., Maknun, M. L., & Kirana, S. I. (2025). Behind the walls of pesantren: A review of the hidden psychological and academic impacts of bullying in Indonesia. *JATI-Journal of Southeast Asian Studies, 30*(2), 121–145. https://doi.org/10.22452/jati.vol30no2.6

Nurhalimah, N., Haryati, O., Wartonah, W., & Adelia, A. (2025). The impact of verbal bullying on the mental health of students at a senior high school in Bekasi, Indonesia. *Healthcare in Low-Resource Settings, 13*(2). https://doi.org/10.4081/hls.2025.13092

Rahmansyah, I. T. (2023). Pesantren and community development. *Jurnal Syntax Transformation, 4*(11), 192–205. https://doi.org/10.46799/jst.v4i11.860

Sintawati, S., Najamuddin, N., & Alwi, A. (2025). The impact of bullying on students' social development at SMA Negeri 11 Makassar. *Juwara: Jurnal Wawasan dan Aksara, 5*(1), 11–21. https://doi.org/10.58740/juwara.v5i1.380

Ugwu, L. E., Ramadie, K. J., Ajele, W. K., & Idemudia, E. S. (2024). Childhood adversity and peer influence in adolescent bullying perpetration. *Scientific Reports, 14*(1), Article 30959. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-81978-8