Disagreeing in Bogota YouTubers' Sites: A Playful Display of Identities and Solidarity Through the Use of Disagreement

Key Words: Communication, Internet, Latin American, Linguistics, Social Media

Jennifer Sierra

Department of Anthropology

University of Michigan

Introduction

As Social Media continues to transform and expand contemporary linguistic landscapes, this paper intends to add to the analyses of the new communicative practices taking place in these sites. Even though social media has been a worldwide phenomenon, Latin American participants have been rather overlooked in the scope of social media studies. Thus, in this research project, I focus on Latin American youth as active interactants of social media discourse. This project displays the preliminary stages of what is currently unfolding as my senior thesis. Through analyzing conversations taking place in popular YouTubers' channels from Bogota, Colombia, this study focuses on disagreement as a positive communicative strategy to build a set of identities (Ardington, 2013). Participants in these communities of practice display skillful communicative competence to successfully demonstrate their identities as followers. Disagreement in these sites have multiple functions, it allows interactants to increase participation, to create connections between participants, and to actively negotiate a different set of identities, thus creating agency.

Most importantly, the concept of identity becomes highly relevant in this study, as participants commenting on these sites prioritize identity negotiation over 'polite' behavior. Disagreement is not perceived as an impolite behavior in these sites, instead, these types of face-threatening acts can be used as strategies to build an identity within the constraints posed by online communication. The approval of face-aggravating behaviors in computer mediated communication presents Politeness Theory with a problem, which invites researchers to acknowledge other processes that might account for this shift, such as the importance of identity formation (Upadhyay, 2010). Latin American participants in these Youtubers' sites are invested in building their identities as followers through their discursive practice, even when this identity requires them to engage in what could be judged as 'impolite' behavior.

Thus, this study addresses the comments posted on four videos from four different Bogota YouTubers between the ages of 19 to 24. I am particularly interested in the multi functionality of disagreement in YouTube discourse. In this study, I argue that participants in the observed YouTube interactions use disagreement as an opportunity to actively construct a set of identities. Participants in these sites discuss their ideas of what it means to be a YouTuber while at the same time addressing what it means to be a follower. Thus, the research questions I will discuss in this project are:

1. How is disagreement carried out by participants in Bogota YouTubers' sites?
2. What set of identities do participants establish while disagreeing in Bogota YouTuber' s sites?

Background

YouTube is a video-sharing site where people have the possibility to share their videos with a public audience. YouTube first appeared in 2004 and has been rapidly growing in popularity ever since (Soukup, 2014). Yet, YouTube has been described as more than a video sharing site; it has been described as an experience and emotional sharing platform between users (Strangelove, 2010). More recently, there has been a trend of a younger population establishing popularity on the site; this population with established popularity on YouTube has been called: 'YouTubers' or 'vloggers.' These YouTubers upload videos regularly on their channels while maintaining a general theme for their videos. Some of the most popular video themes for YouTubers are: 'how-to-style' videos (i.e. channel is mainly about makeup tutorials or fashion-related content), 'comedy' and 'people and blogs.' The latter allows for a more flexible content because YouTubers, also known as vloggers in this category, tend to share random aspects of their personal lives. A typical video in this category could be a YouTuber talking for a few minutes about a thought or an opinion on a topic they had found interesting (Lange, 2009). The selected channels for this research project are a combination of 'comedy' and especially 'people and blogs.'

Although YouTube allows people to watch videos without having to leave a comment, people who decide to leave a comment are already becoming active agents of the YouTube interaction. Commenters in these sites play an essential role in the online interaction, as these participants are in charge of the realization of the uptake of the video. Without commenters, the relationship between video makers and viewers will be more like the one maintained with TV media (Soukup, 2014). Commenters offer feedback and engage in conversations (sometimes conflicting) with other participants creating a sense of a 'YouTube community' (Lange, 2007; Mendez et al., 2014). This sense of community is relevant to my study, as I argue that participants in these YouTube interactions are concerned with creating a sense of belonging in these sites.

Studies on YouTube discourse and social media in general have approached diverse topics within the communicative practices taking place in these online contexts (Burgess & Green, 2009; Griffith & Papacharissi, 2010; Mendez et al., 2014; Hillewaert, 2015; Stangelove, 2010). For instance, the study of 'hating' on YouTube has been subject of much debate in these types of research (Lange 2007; Pihlaja 2014), as it has the issue of context in social media communication (Wesch 2009; Marwick & Boyed, 2012). Moreover, as I address in the next section, the issue of politeness has also been previously discussed in the scope of computer-mediated communication research. Politeness, or as I will refer to in this paper: 'appropriateness,' (Watts, 2005) is central to participants in these types of interactions to conform to the expectations of the community of practice.

Appropriateness Behavior

Because this study is concerned with the presentation of self, concepts such as 'face' are useful in the analysis of the data. In Goffman's terms, face is the image that participants in each interaction perform while complying with the social attributes and expectations of the particular group (Goffman, 1967). On the other hand, the concept of politeness is more contentious. In their 1987's study, Brown and Levinson argue for the concept of politeness as a universal behavior where members of a social group know each other's desires (Brown & Levinson, 1987). They called these desires 'face wants;' further on Brown and Levinson classify these face desires into 'positive face' and 'negative face.' Positive face entails the desire to gain approval by other members of the group, whereas, negative face is the desire to be unimpeded by other members in the group (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Moreover, Brown and Levinson claim that the actions taken by either a hearer or a speaker which presented a risk to meeting these face wants are defined as 'face threatening acts' or 'FTAs'.

Politeness Theory as a universal, posed by Brown and Levinson, has been challenged in the past (Holmes, 1995; Watts, 2003) arguing that what is considered polite behavior depends highly on the context and how participants perceive a particular speech behavior (Watts, 2003). In his 2003 book, Watts revises the concept of polite behavior and puts forth a new term that he calls 'Politic behavior.' Watts defines his concept of politic behavior as: "the linguistic behavior which is perceived to be appropriate to the social constraints of the ongoing interactions" (pg. 19). Thus, I consider Watts' term appropriateness to be more useful in describing the different interactions observed in the studied YouTube sites. Because participants in Bogota YouTubers' sites are part of a community of practice with shared expectations, participants would usually conform to their agreed expectations using a set of appropriate linguistic behaviors. Moreover, YouTube participants in my data would often violate 'universal' perceptions of politeness by using 'rude language' (e.g. strong disagreement, insults, swearing words), yet I argue that these linguistic forms were appropriate in this particular community of practice.

To summarize, the concepts of face, face-threatening acts, and appropriateness are meaningful in the analysis of disagreement in the observed YouTubers' sites. The division between positive and negative faces are not relevant in the analysis, as these concepts would often overlap making it difficult to distinguish between one another (Holmes, 1995). For instance, linguistic forms such as hedges, which had been classified as a negative politeness strategy (Brown & Levinson, 1987) were used to convey solidarity and alignment (a positive face strategy) in my data. Yet, the concept of face-threatening acts was meaningful in this study because members of these communities of practice, more often than not, wanted to fulfill the group's shared expectations; thus, when these expectations were threatened or violated, participants engaged in playful linguistic behaviors in order to sort out these face threats. Lastly, as Planchenault (2010) finds in his study on transvestites websites, online communities of practice have defined notions of what is accepted (i.e. appropriate) in their interactions, therefore they want to represent these appropriate behaviors in order to signal a sense of belonging with their particular groups.

Disagreement in Online Discourse

By the same token, online discourse in general has been characterized by being conflictive and hostile, claiming that participant's anonymity in these sites allows for hostile communication (Tannen, 1998). Nevertheless, Lange (2006) argues that the concept of anonymity in an online setting is flawed, as participants do have access to context cues that provide them with important information about their peers. For instance, in her study, Lange finds that participants obtain personal and behavioral information from other participants from their frequent encounters on the same blog. Most importantly, even when participants had access to names and ages from their peers, this information did not prevent them from having a conversation that a researcher might classify as hostile (Lange, 2006).

Lange invites researchers focusing on online communication to reevaluate the tendency to label a message as a 'flame' or hostile, when in fact these types of messages might not be interpreted as such by participants. Most importantly what a researcher would consider flaming (i.e. mean comments) might be used by participants to achieve certain social goals in the interaction (Lange, 2006). Moreover, the thriving of social media sites such as Facebook or Twitter continues to challenge the idea of online anonymity. This is because sites such as Twitter provide a great amount of information about the account's owner, therefore decreasing anonymity; nevertheless, we continue to observe instances of 'hostile' interactions on these sites (Marwick & Boyd, 2012). Thus, one can propose that disagreement in these sites might be achieving meaningful functions for interactants so that these interactants continue to portray it even when having access to participant's personal information.

On the other hand, other studies have argued for the culture-restricted use of disagreement as a communicative strategy for sociability (Schiffrin, 1984). While disagreement had been viewed in the past as an impolite behavior (Brown & Levinson, 1987); Zhu and Boxer's (2013) study found that Chinese participants in 'English corners' (places where Mandarin speakers get together to practice their English) did not perceive disagreement as such. These Chinese participants often engaged in what they have classified as a strong disagreement; however, these interactants did not regard this disagreement as face-threatening acts. In this study, the strong disagreement was defined as the responses that completely contrasted with a prior utterance (Zhu & Boxer, 2013). Most importantly, disagreement is viewed as a continuum where we can find different levels of weak to strong disagreement. Weak disagreement, in this continuum, can be identified as having more hedging devices, repairs, pauses or portraying only partial disagreement (Ibid). This distinction will be helpful throughout this study because not all participants in the Bogota YouTubers' sites revealed the same level of disagreement; nonetheless, I will argue later in more detail that most participants tended to soften their comments when disagreeing.

Supporting the view of disagreement as a multifunctional tool for bonding and displaying cooperative participation, Ardington (2013) puts forth an analysis of an online Australian blog in which a group of academics displayed solidarity and negotiated their identities as scholars by a series of argumentative posts. In this study, disagreement did not always carry negative outcomes; moreover, Ardington proposes that people in these sites might want to argue just for the sake of the practice (Ardington, pg. 172). She also points out that disagreement, as means for

sociability might be a cultural phenomenon; thus, other cultures might not share this same view (Ardington 2013). Earlier in 1995, Janet Holmes also brought up the issue of disagreement as achieving functions of solidarity and group membership, especially for males' communities of practice in New Zealand. In the case of this study, I predict that participants in Bogota YouTubers' sites might also be using criticism and disagreement to increase participation, simultaneously creating a space for bonding, and portraying their identities. Yet, the question that remains is whether this culture-restricted use of disagreement is being translated by online groups that also use disagreement in this manner in their face-to-face interactions, or has disagreement rather become a characteristic of online culture overall? Further, cross cultural studies will be needed on this issue.

Methodology Theoretical Framework

In this study, I use Sifianou's (2012) definition of disagreement as the expression of a view that differs from what another speaker says. Disagreement in the observed data emerged when participants engaged in the speech acts of criticizing and complaining.

Criticism is defined as providing negative evaluations about someone (may include addressee) or a situation (Nguyen, 2008). Complaining is defined as expressing dissatisfaction as "an attempt to manipulate or control the social behaviors of addressees" (D' Amico-Reisner, 1985). The speech acts of criticizing and complaining can share similar characteristics as these acts can both be perceived as inappropriate, face threatening acts; further, they both intend to influence the improvement of performance from the target of the criticism or complaint (Nguyen, 2008). However, they both differ in that in a criticizing act the criticizer is not directly affected by the consequences of the negative actions performed by the target of the criticism (ibid). In the case of complaints, both the target and the complainer might be affected by the actions of the target (Ibid).

In the particular case of the YouTube interaction, YouTubers are often the initial target of both criticisms and complaints. Later in the interaction, participants can also become the subject of these acts. Criticisms in this study are direct negative judgements against the YouTuber, nonetheless these judgements can sometimes be perceived as advice to the YouTuber to improve their performance (Lange, 2006). Yet the commenter posting the criticism will not be affected by whether the YouTuber changes future actions; whereas participants articulating complaints are and may continue to be affected if the YouTuber does not change his/her negative actions. For instance, unchanged actions might cause subscribers to stop watching a YouTuber's videos.

Speech act of criticizing:

1. Jesse: *En pocas palabras sus tatuajes no significan nada, solo son esteticos y ya, coma !es gusta hacerla de emoci6n inventando mamadas para justificar las tontadas que se tatuan jaja*

   'In a few words your tattoos don't mean anything, they are just for aesthetics and that's it, they like to mask their stupidity by coming up with bullshit to justify the dumb tattoos they like to get haha'

Speech act of complaining:

2. Alexa: *Nunca eh entendido esto... ;,Par que mientras mas famosos se hacen, menos videos suben?*
'I've never understood this... Why as they become more famous, do they upload fewer videos? (not all)'

In example (1) the commenter is making negative judgments about the explanations that the YouTuber has given about his tattoos. Although the commenter is (1) criticizing the YouTuber, the commenter does not express to be concerned about the YouTuber's future actions. In the case of example (2), whereas this participant is also making negative evaluations in regard to the YouTuber's inconsistency of video uploading through the use of emoji, word choice and structure, this participant expresses more emotional involvement with the YouTuber's past and future actions. Thus, excerpt (2) illustrates a case of complaining in the observed data.

Data Collection and Participants

The data for this study was collected from four different Bogota YouTubers' sites during the periods of June and September of 2015. I selected four videos from each YouTuber and observed the different interactions taking place in the selected videos. While this study adopts an ethnographic approach, I was not an active participant on these sites. Yet I have been watching these YouTubers for two years with non-research purposes. The four YouTubers' sites that this study addresses are: Juana Martinez with about 1 million subscribers; Matu Garces with about 200,000 subscribers; Juan Pablo Jaramillo with about 2 million subscribers; and Nicolas Arrieta with about 1 million subscribers.

Although two of these YouTubers were not born in Bogota, but other cities of Colombia, they were either raised or have lived in Bogota for a long time (as stated in their own channels). The age range for these four YouTubers was between 19 to 24 years old. These YouTubers joined the site between the years of 2008 and 2010. Unfortunately, I did not have direct access to the subscribers' actual age, nationality, or place of residency. However, through comments that made explicit a subscriber's age or country of residency, or through the subscriber's particular word choice, I was able to infer that most subscribers were Latin American youth located mainly in countries such as Colombia (most participants), Mexico and Argentina. Despite the difference in nationalities, subscribers seem not to have major complications in the uptake of intended meaning, as this community of practice has already developed a code for interaction in this type of setting.

This study analyzed 40 initial comments that generated a total of 510 replies. Only comments that posed a criticism or complaint and at the same time initiated a thread of replies were considered. It is worth noting that, as it had been previously found in other studies (Thelwall, Sud, and Vis, 2012), negative comments tend to receive more replies than positive or neutral ones. While most of the comments posted in these videos were positive or of the

usual fan type: 'te amo' or 'tu eres el mejor', comments that provided criticisms/complaints against YouTuber triggered more responses from participants.

Findings Disagreement in Bogota YouTubers' sites

Disagreement in the observed four channels developed in a very particular manner. First, disagreement was initiated by a criticism or a complaint against the YouTuber. Although not all criticisms or complaints received replies, the occurrence of these two speech acts were more likely to encourage participation within the sites. Criticisms and complaints were almost evenly distributed throughout the data. From the 40 total initial comments, 23 were complaints and 17 were criticisms. See table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of speech acts of complaining and criticizing (initial comments)

Speech Act	Juana Martinez	Matu Garces	Juan Pablo Jaramillo	Nicolas Arrieta	Total
Complaining	7	8	7	1	23
Criticism	3	2	3	9	17
	10	10	10	10	40

While criticisms and complaints are face-threatening performances (Nguyen, 2008), they were often softened using linguistic resources such as hedges, apologies, and partial criticism by participants. However, softened complaints were more common than softened criticisms in the data; this may be due to the previously mentioned definition of criticism in which the criticizer is not really concerned with the future consequences of the posed negative evaluations. Later in this study, I will argue that softening criticism and complaints is a strategy to signal a more inclusive in-group membership.

Once an initial criticism or complaint had been posted on the comment section, what came after was a thread of replies either agreeing or disagreeing with the previous comments. It is important to point out that in this study agreement and disagreement is determined in relation to the initial comment. In other words, subsequent replies disagree if they contrast with the claims posed in an initial comment; or in agreement when they support the initial claims. An initial criticism or complaint most often leads to the development of two or more opposing views that are then carried out by participants trying to defend their stance in the interaction. Therefore, participants can disagree amongst themselves without directly addressing the initial commenter, yet the main topics of discussion were set by the initial comment.

Disagreeing in this study is seen as a continuum in which I found varied forms of weak and strong disagreement. The weak disagreement was characterized by partial agreements, hedges, and repairs (Zhu & Boxer, 2013), whereas strong disagreement was characterized by full contrastive views, warnings, and sometimes insults between participants. It's important to point out that weak disagreement was more common throughout replies.

Weak disagreement:
3. Vanessa: yo no dije que iban a dejar de hacer videos dije que ustedes para ellos no existen, no los aprecian ni hacen lo que deberian de hacer con sus fans, y el programa esta muy malo. Esper no te ofendas.
   'I didn't say that they would stop making videos, I said that you guys don't exist to
   them, they don't appreciate you nor do they treat their fans as they should, plus this channel is really bad. I hope you don't get offended.'

4. Alexa: tienes raz6n, pero tampoco es para tardarse siglos... Se que tienen cosas que hacer y que no todo gira en torno a Youtube, pero yo no me trag6 lo de falta de ideas. Opino igual que Sebastian…
   'You are right, but that doesn't mean they can take centuries ... ! know she has things to do and that not everything revolves around YouTube, but I don't believe that they run out of ideas. I have the same opinion as Sebastian'

Strong disagreement:
5. Kelly:jajajajajajaLA PUTA ENVIDIA PENDEJO... EL DIA QUE SEPAS HACER LO MISMO QUE NICO AY SI TE DOY BOLA .l.
   'hahahaha you cunt, you're just fucking jealous... the day that you can do what Nico does, I'll listen to you'

6. Mexican Boy: si no !es gusta no la vean, aside simple
   'If you don't like it then don't watch it, as simple as that'

Example (3) illustrates a form of repair used in these sites. A repair seeks to provide clarification from a previous misunderstanding (Schiffrin, 1993); moreover repairs in the data are attempts to recover participants' face (i.e. public image). In this example, the participant explains her previous comment, which has been misinterpreted by other interactants. While the participant continues to perform disagreement stating that YouTubers do not really care about their followers, she ends her comment with the use of a hedge'/ hope you don't get offended' implying that she doesn't want to cause further tension between participants. Example (4) illustrates weak disagreement, as it portrays partial disagreement by stating 'You are right but ...' this partial disagreement helps to soften the face-threatening act of disagreeing. On the other hand, excerpt (5) exemplifies a common form of strong disagreement found in these sites. This comment is not only stating opposing views to a previous comment, but also posing insults against the previous commenter. Disregarding the intrinsic face-threatening act of disagreeing, this participant engages in a more competitive performance in which the previous participant becomes the target of the commenter's attack. This action can be considered as a face-attack (Ardington, 2013). Notice participant in (5) uses uppercase letters to signal yelling (i.e. anger) and swearing words.

Example (6) poses a warning; this participant is also adopting a more competitive form of disagreement in which he challenges the previous participant's comment. However, by using the Spanish second person plural form, this participant expands his warning to all participants who dislike the YouTuber's content.

Participants in these sites also take advantage of other linguistic resources available in cun-ent computed mediated communication (Ardington, 2013). For instance, interactants can use popular emojis as hedging devices in their comments such in (4). Although, participant in (4) is judging a previous commenter for posing what she perceives as destructive criticism, she avoids threatening the previous participant's face by including emojis. An emoji such as© probably implies that the participant's message is not intended to create further tension between interactants; instead the message can be interpreted as an amicable advice. Thus, what originally seemed to be a hostile criticism against a previous participant, through the inclusion of emojis (also word choice and text form) the comment becomes an amicable suggestion between two peers.

Most often when these emojis are included in the comment, the comment tends to be well received by participants; moreover, future replies will be likely to also be softened. Another semiotic resource is the use of uppercase; as experienced social media users have stated, uppercase use implies 'yelling' in the text, as in excerpt (5). Capitalization use was usually restricted to strong disagreement in this study; however, uppercase letters also signaled excitement in some instances, as in (12). The last device worth mentioning is the use of punctuation for expressing emotions. For instance, double question marks'??' implied strong confusion, or more than one exclamation point '! 'was used to indicate great excitement.

This skillful use of recent (e.g. emoji) and long-established linguistic resources while disagreeing, shows the extensive communicative experience that these participants have developed in these sites. As members of a community of practice, participants in these YouTubers' sites display the appropriate linguistic forms for interactions to avoid misunderstandings. Rarely during my research did I encounter participants not being able to at least partially understand each other; although misunderstandings do emerge, they are not due to the lack of communicative competence but rather to content-related misinterpretations.

To summarize, long threads of disagreement in the four YouTubers' sites emerged from complaints and criticisms posed by an initial commenter. This disagreement can take the form of different levels of weak or strong disagreement; however, weak disagreements were more common throughout the interactions. Participants in these sites achieved different levels of disagreement by portraying a skilled communicative competence to successfully convey intended meaning. Different linguistic devices are used to soften not only the face-threatening act of disagreeing, but also the initial acts of criticizing and complaining. Some of the devices used by participants to soften speech are hedges (including use of emoji), repairs, apologies, and partial disagreement. As it will be discussed in the next sections, softening face-threatening speech acts are important in the building of cooperation and solidarity among participants in these speech communities.

Solidarity Through Disagreeing

Polemic conversations allowed online participants in the observed sites to create connections and portray solidarity or distance in a playful way. On one hand, all participants involved in the different interactions originating from an initial post were being cooperative, whether they were agreeing or disagreeing with a previous comment. Cooperation in this study is not viewed in terms of agreement or politeness; instead cooperation is treated in terms of participation and engagement in the interaction. In this sense disagreement opened a space for participants to cooperate with one another while constructing and negotiating their identities. On the other hand, solidarity in these sites was in some respects more complex than cooperative behavior. Planchenault (2010) defined solidarity as the expression of commonality, "a sense of being part of a group and a desire to exchange support." (pg.90). While participants in the observed interactions were part of a broader community, which I refer to as the YouTube community, most of these participants also belonged to a narrower community of followers of a particular YouTuber. Therefore, ascribing to the narrower community of followers determined with whom participants will show alignment in the interaction.

Participants in this community of followers, which I will address in more detail in the following section, are expected to express support towards the YouTuber whose videos they are watching. Moreover, a person watching these videos is assumed to be doing so because they enjoy the YouTuber's content. This assumption becomes important in the interaction when people purposely violated this expectation through their comments distancing themselves from the follower community. Nevertheless, in other cases participants were still eager to express their sense of belonging with this community even when being critical of the YouTuber.

Participants adopted different ways for agreeing or disagreeing with either an initial comment, or other comments within the thread (in relation to initial post; see section 4.1). Less often would participants solely disagree or agree by a direct 'es toy de acuerdo contigo ' (I agree with you) or 'no estoy de acuerdo' (I disagree); instead, replies provided participants the opportunity to expand on their arguments while also allowing for stance taking in the interaction. Although responses were varied, I found three major ways in which participants articulated their solidarity through disagreement/agreement: 1) Solidarity in strong disagreement 2) Solidarity in softened disagreement; 3) Solidarity in agreement.

Solidarity in strong disagreement:
7. Gabriela: Se me hace super irrespetuoso de tu parte que subas video cada cuando tu quieras o puedas, desde mi punto de vista, me gustan mucho tus videos pero no me agrada nada eso!
'I find it super disrespectful that you only upload videos whenever you feel like it, in my opinion, I really like your videos, but I just don't like that you do that'

Pame: Como dicen varios youtubers "Es mi canal y me lo folio cuando quiero"
'Like YouTubers say themselves "It's my channel and I fuck with it however I want"'

In (7) the interaction starts with a direct complaint; this complaint motivates the subsequent participant's strong disagreement by opposing the initial commenter's post and

delegitimizing her frustration. This participant creates distance from the original commenter through invalidating original commenter's claims. The second participant supports her counter argument through quoting a statement made by YouTubers themselves; this statement makes the participant appear knowledgeable. Notice that although the initial commenter is violating most participants' expectations in these sites (i.e. to support the YouTuber) by complaining, she uses a hedge by expressing that she does like YouTuber' s videos. Thus, this participant intends to still show her affiliation with the follower community; yet, the second participant disregards the first participant's attempt to ascribe as a follower. Instead the second participant's use of strong language (e.g. swearing words) distances herself from the initial commenter. Nevertheless, the second participant is also indexing solidarity with other participants in the interaction who might also oppose the original commenter's views, most likely a community of "true fans'.

Solidarity in softened disagreement:
8. Klau: No tardes mucho en subir videos, recuerda que el que mucho se ausenta pronto deja de hacer falta
    'Don't delay uploading videos too much, remember that the one who is absent for a while will soon stop being missed ... '

    Megar: No me lo tomes a ma! pero side verdad te importan sus videos y ella note vas a cansar de esperar. Ademas de que siempre vuelve. Solo es mi opinion.
    'Don't get offended but if you really care about her and her videos you would not get tired of waiting. Besides she always comes back. It's just my opinion.'

    In (8) the initial comment warns the YouTuber that her actions might lead her to become forgotten by her viewers. The subsequent reply disagrees with the commenter's suggestions; however, this disagreement is softened by the participant with the use of hedges: 'don't get offended', 'it's just my opinion.' In this case the second participant is not interested in creating tension between the two participants; instead she interprets the initial comment as a concern which indicates that the initial participant cares about the YouTuber, hence he might be a follower. Most importantly, the first participant's inclusion of emojis and overall structure (e.g. Spanish informal second person form) of his comment indicates that he might have been avoiding tension in the first place. Thus, the second participant's positive uptake of the message was influenced by the softened criticism. While disagreeing, the second participant managed to express alignment with the previous commenter through softening her reply. Moreover, the second participant also indexes solidarity with other members of the community of followers who care and support the YouTuber. In this excerpt it is important to note that the second participant might be implying stronger solidarity with the broader community of followers than with the initial commenter, as his identity as a follower was rather hindered by his criticism.

    Overall softened disagreement in the data tended to convey solidarity with both the community of followers and those members of the broader YouTube community who did not show affiliation as followers.

Solidarity in agreement

9. Camila: Estoy deacuerdo y mas Juana q se cree lo mjr y no es NADA

   'I agree with you. Besides, Juana thinks she is the best and she is NOTHING'

Excerpt (9) illustrates a common form of agreement found in the data. In this example the participant expresses similar views as the ones posed in a previous comment (7), further on she expands on previous commenter's arguments by adding a rather hostile statement. This hostile statement that 'Juana thinks she is the best and she is NOTHING' is a face-threatening act as it violates the expectations of this community of practice. Furthermore, these types of comments were likely to promote tension with other participants (as it indeed did in this case) in the interaction. In this excerpt the participant is distancing herself from other participants in the site who identified as followers, while at the same time showing alignment with those in the interaction who did not. Most importantly, agreement in this study should not be assumed to be a friendly form of text, as I presented on excerpt (9), agreeing can also include insults to others in the group to accentuate contrastive views in these sites

This section illustrated the different playful ways in which disagreement and agreement were used to convey solidarity or distance among participants in the observed YouTubers' sites. While strong disagreement was described as indicating distance between the replier and the initial commenter, strong disagreement can also indicate solidarity with other interactants in these sites who affiliated themselves with a community of followers. Similarity occurred with softened disagreement. In the case of softened disagreement, this act indexed solidarity with both the initial commenter and other participants in the thread. However, this solidarity was not necessarily balanced throughout a reply. For instance, a replier could sometimes be inclined to portray stronger closeness with other participants throughout the thread than to the original commenter (especially if the status of the initial commenter as a follower was not clear in the comment). This softened disagreement allowed participants to show their ties with other participants as members of a broader YouTube community as well as members of the community of followers. Lastly, agreeing would usually imply stronger solidarity. With the initial commenter than to other participants opposing the initial post's claims. Thus, agreement in these sites can mark both: solidarity with the initial commenter signaling membership with the YouTuber community, and distance with other participants in the interaction rejecting an image as members of a follower community.

Identity display through disagreeing

This section begins with a broader overview of the interactions taking place in these YouTubers' sites. As I had previously mentioned, YouTubers have established popularity within the site. This popularity is often measured by the number of subscribers displayed on the YouTuber' s channel; thus, a larger number of subscribers implies a higher degree of popularity. In most cases this popularity extends to other social media sites such as Facebook or Instagram, and sometimes this popularity can spread to off-line contexts. By the same token, subscribers play an important role in building and maintaining a YouTuber's popularity. Subscribers that regularly watch a YouTuber' s videos are called 'followers' (this term is widely used in YouTube

discourse). In this study, participants will often call themselves 'seguidores,' 'followers' or 'fans' interchangeably. Nevertheless, participants did not need to explicitly refer to themselves as 'seguidores' during their interactions; instead they performed this identity throughout each encounter.

While disagreement in these sites allowed for several micro identities, participants were mainly concerned with the macro identity of 'being a follower.' Being able to successfully represent themselves as 'seguidores' was a major task that participants were trying to achieve through their discourse. In the next sections, I will be addressing three micro identities that were most useful in the construction of the 'follower' macro identity. These micro identities would often be displayed simultaneously using disagreement. In this section I present how participants managed to display and negotiate fluid representations of what it meant to be a follower in the observed YouTubers' sites.

Knowledgeable Followers

Knowledge was an important characteristic of 'seguidores' in this study. Followers were concerned with showing their knowledge throughout their interactions. Furthermore, as we will see in examples (10), failing to convey this knowledge was subject to criticism and rejection from other participants. While participating in disagreement, interactants built their identities as knowledgeable followers by displaying the experience they had acquired throughout their time spent in these sites. Being knowledgeable was not restricted to demonstrating information about a specific YouTuber, but this knowledge was sometimes expanded to sharing perceptions about YouTubers' practice in general. This knowledge provided participants with status, allowing them to successfully express membership with a community of 'seguidores.'

10. Tatys: Todos los videos de juana son falsos. Creen que esas palabras tan sabjas salen de ella misma, que ridiculos todo lo planea y todo lo saca de internet. En el 1:48 se ve como voltea rapidamente ala lap para leer y seguir hablando.
'All of Juana's videos are fake. You think that those wise words come from her, don't be ridiculous, she plans everything, and she gets everything from the Internet. At minute 1:48 you can see how she turns to quickly look at her laptop to read, and then she continues talking.'

Jeremy: Par alga se llama "hacer un gui6n". Duh.
'It's called making a "script" for a reason. Duh'

Danny: Si no la sabias Juana casi siempre hace un guion para no salirse de/ tema y que nosotros sus suscriptores captemos de la manera mas facil sabre de lo que habla y si no haria un guion saldria hablando de otras cosas y probablemente no entenderiamos el video.
'If you didn't know Juana almost always makes a script, so she does not digress and we, her subscribers, can easily catch what she wants to say, if she didn't make a screenplay then she would end up talking about different subjects and we would probably not understand the video.'

Josue: Jajajajajaja casi todos los youtubers hacen guiones !!! si no como dicen se saldrian del tema, olvidarian decir lo importante etc !!! Se ve que eres nueva en esto 'hahahaha almost all YouTubers use scripts!!! Otherwise they would digress, and they would forget to say what was important!! It is obvious that you are new to this hahaha.'

In example (10) Tatys' criticism regarding the use of a script as a negative practice is rejected by other participants in the interaction. Not only do other participants dismiss 'Tatys' criticism, but they also question her familiarity with the YouTube interaction. 'Jeremy's statement 'it's called a script. Duh,' obviates the initial commenter's lack of knowledge immediately establishing himself as someone more knowledgeable. 'Tatys' comment violates the expectations of most participants in these sites (i.e. being supportive of the YouTuber). In addition, 'Tatys' does not soften her criticism, instead she uses capitalization throughout her comment to indicate yelling (i.e. anger). This failure to meet the expectations of the interaction, moreover portraying distance from the community of followers, causes other participants to use 'Tatys' apparent lack of knowledge to reject her arguments while also delegitimizing 'Tatys' stance in the interaction.

By the same token, Josue in the same excerpt (10) establishes his knowledge by stating that 'all YouTubers use scripts'. Josue and Danny legitimize the use of scripts by YouTubers explaining that they serve an important function in the understanding of a YouTuber' s video. Moreover, Josue finally adds: 'It is obvious that you are new to this hahaha. 'This statement is crucial in establishing the knowledgeable status of followers in the YouTube interaction; most importantly, this knowledge must be displayed throughout the comments in order for participants to gain membership as part of a community of 'seguidores.'This expectation of knowledge in computer-mediated communication had already been discussed in Lange 2007; in my particular study, displaying knowledge played an important role in acquiring a desirable status as a follower. Nonetheless, in cases where an identity as a follower was not being pursued, portraying knowledge was still useful to defend participants' stance in the conversation.

'Verdaderos seguidores'

Being a 'true follower' was another major theme found in these sites' discourse. Portraying an identity as a true follower was achievable through being supportive of the YouTuber, moreover, defending the YouTuber when they were subjected to a criticism or complaint. True fans would usually disagree with negative initial comments. Even though complaints and criticisms addressed the YouTuber directly, followers took on the role of saving a YouTuber's face from the face-attacks that criticism and complaints represented. However, as we can see on excerpt (11) , the interactions between 'true fans' and other more critical followers was not necessarily hostile, even when views conflicted.

11. Ana: 99.9999999% de tus videos se la pasa hablando ,no es por nada Juan pero antes, site preocupabas par entretener y divertir ,ahora que eres famoso "sabes que la gente solo por verte ,le dara like y vera tus videos. Si en verdad amas esto ,ponle mas empeno a tu canal ,ya que literal vives de esto ,no es para que te regalen el dinero.
'99.999999% of your videos are you talking, I don't know Juan, but before you did show some interest to be funny and to entertain, but now that you are famous you know that the people will like and watch your videos just to see you. If you really love doing this, show

more interest in your channel, because you literally are making a living out of this, it's not like they are giving you money for free.'

Ingrid: El ase lo posible y sus verdaderas fans lo seguiran asta el fin . Te amo Juan <3
'He does what he can and his true fans will follow him to the end. I love you Juan'

Alejandra: Nose le subio lafama, solo que ademas de tener un canal, Juan tiene una vida y aunque no pueda subir videos todos las dias, el intenta hacer todo lo posible y tener satisfechos a sus fans. Ademas estar en un programa de television es una gran oportunidad, par eso hizo este video, para hacer saber a sus fans que va ha estar en uno, ademas a muchas personas (coma a sus fans) /es interesa saber sabre Juan o cualquier cosas par la cual el tenga que hablar y aun asi sus videos siguen siendo igual de entretenidos (y no solo lo digo parser jaramishana)
'It's not that he got famous, it's just that besides having a channel, Juan has a life and even though he can't upload videos every day, he tries to do everything possible to satisfy his fans. Besides having a TV show is a great opportunity, that is why he made this video to let his fans know that he is with us, besides many people (like his fans) are interested in knowing about Juan or anything that he has to say, plus his videos continue to be entertaining regardless (I'm not saying this just because I am 'jaramishana').'

Example (11) illustrates the stance of 'true followers' in the different interactions throughout the data. 'Verdaderos seguidores' were supposed to support YouTubers regardless of other participants' criticisms and complaints, in fact true followers were expected to defend YouTubers in these instances of criticisms. In this example Ingrid portrays her identity as a true follower by expressing her unconditional support through her comment: 'He does what he can and his true fans will follow him to the end. I love you Juan. ' Alejandra expands on her identity as a true follower by providing an explanation that can counter argue the initial complaint.

Alejandra explains that YouTuber Juan Pablo also has a life and that he is in fact putting an effort into his channel, content. By disagreeing with the initial comment, Alejandra simultaneously performs her self-presentation as a true fan in the interaction. Furthermore, at the end of her comment, Alejandra makes explicit her affiliation as a 'Jaramishana' which is the name adopted by the followers of this particular YouTuber. This affiliation as a 'Jaramishana' is relevant as it shows organization among the group of 'verdaderos seguidores.'

In this section I briefly discussed the performance that some participants displayed as 'verdareros seguidores' of a YouTuber. While 'being a true follower' implied expressing unconditional support with a particular YouTuber, members in this group would still align with more critical followers. As shown in excerpt (11) true followers would usually disagree with criticisms and complaints posed against a YouTuber. However, through engaging in softened disagreement (e.g. using hedges, partial disagreement), true followers were able to index solidarity with more critical fans, moreover, signaling group membership with a broader community of followers. Instead, in instances where a strong criticism was posed and non-affiliation as a follower was explicit, true followers engaged in stronger disagreement rejecting these types of behaviors as inappropriate in these sites.

Critical Followers

Followers in the observed interactions also had an opportunity to be critical of the particular YouTuber or YouTubers in general. Because followers were expected to support YouTuber's content entirely, being critical of a particular YouTuber presented a problem in the interaction. Nevertheless, many participants challenged these expectations while maintaining their identity as followers. What I call here 'critical followers' is a characterization of the speech behaviors observed from some participants in these sites; however, these participants did not perceive themselves differently than as a regular follower. In fact, critical followers were more likely to soften their criticisms and disagreement to alleviate some of the tension already created by criticizing the YouTuber.

12. Andres: POR FINNNNNNNNNNNN, DESPUES DE UN SEMESTRE MATU VOLVIO A HACER VIDEO DE COMENTARIOS, EL ULTIMO FUE CASI TERMINANDO EL ANO PASADO EN EL QUE TENIA UNA COPA INVISIBLE. 'Finally, after a semester Matu made another comment video (i.e. YouTuber answers questions from followers), the last one was almost last year when she pretended to hold an invisible cup.'

   Matugarces: Loi no, subi otros :P
   'Lol no, I uploaded other ones.'

   Andres: haha pues el de los episodios con Kook pero esos no valen jajaja, esos saludos son muy cortos.
   'haha you mean the episodes with Kook but those don't count hahaha, those greetings are too short.'

   Vanille: shhh deja/a, Kook es genial!
   'shh leave her alone, Kook is great!'

   Andres: Kook es genial pero deben leer los comentarios def mes cada mes, debe ser tradicion, es a/go tannnnn Matu.
   'Kook is great but they should read the comments every month, this should be tradition, it is something that is unique to Matu.'

From excerpt (12), the initial commenter both celebrates the uploading of a new video, and at the same time includes a complaint in which the lack of videos from the Youtuber is brought up. This information would only be accessible to someone who regularly watches the YouTuber's videos. This inclusion of knowledge is important to legitimize participant's identity as a follower. Even though this complaint presents a face-threatening act, participant's complaint can also be interpreted as someone who enjoys a YouTuber's content, therefore wants more videos. In order to continue performing his identity as a follower, participants soften his complaint by adding an emoji of a sad face to represent his emotional involvement with the YouTuber.

Yet, while participant on (12) wants to maintain his identity as a follower through using weak disagreement and portraying knowledge throughout his comment, this identity does not prevent him from questioning the YouTuber. As someone invested in watching this Youtuber's videos, this participant considers himself entitled to ask for more frequent content from the YouTuber. This claim is important as followers are not portraying themselves as passive consumers of content (Papacharissi, 2011), instead followers use the comment section as a space for their criticisms and complaints to be expressed. Yet, through engaging in different linguistic strategies such as weak disagreement and displaying their knowledge, critical statements may not conflict with an identity as a follower; although this behavior might in fact threaten this identity. Throughout this section I have shown how participants in Bogota YouTubers' sites built and reproduced their identities as followers of a YouTuber while disagreeing. This macro identity as followers allowed participants to create a set of different micro identities: knowledgeable fans, true fans and critical fans, as useful resources to indicate their affiliations as 'seguidores.' These micro identities could be accessed and reproduced simultaneously in a given interaction; most importantly they were expanded upon in subsequent interactions. Participants made use of an array of linguistic resources to negotiate their self-portrayal as followers; for instance, the use of partial disagreements, hedges and repairs, were included in order to achieve a desired image. Lastly, the act of disagreeing challenged the participants to play with the ways in which the displayed their identities as followers, and the ways in which they could still index membership with a community of followers.

Discussion

Earlier studies on computer mediated communication had argued that aggressive speech behavior was the norm in these new settings (Tannen, 1998). However, more recent research had advocated for the social multi-functionality that so-called 'hostile' speech behaviors might be achieving for these online communities of practices (Lange, 2007; Ardington, 2013; Planchenault, 2010). In this study I presented a case of disagreement carried out by Spanish speaking participants of four different Bogota YouTubers' sites. While engaging in disagreement may be viewed as an impolite behavior (Brown & Levinson, 19), disagreement in these sites was shown to be a useful tool to increase participation, create connections, and display membership within a specific community. Thus, I argue that disagreement in these sites is an appropriate speech behavior that allows participants to negotiate and expand their identities as followers.

Participants in the observed sites were part of what has been characterized in previous literature as 'virtual communities.' Mendez et al. 2014's study had defined a virtual community to display four major elements: 1) a sense of belonging; 2) sharing common goals for the interaction; 3) exhibiting group membership through interactions; 4) members assign meaning to their activities through participation. In this view, participants in the four YouTubers' sites were concerned with displaying their affiliation with a virtual community, more specifically with a virtual community of followers. Yet, the common YouTube interaction restricted the way in which these participants could convey this membership. Contrary to other social media such as Facebook or Twitter, participants on YouTube don't have elaborated profiles in which they can articulate a public image of themselves. Instead, users of YouTube interested in creating a public image in this site do so through commenting, otherwise they would engage in behavior known as lurking (i.e. internet users that don't participate in the interaction) (Borda, 2015). Therefore,

concerned with. achieving sociability, participants in these sites developed a playful repertoire which allowed them to consolidate their status as a virtual community

However, interactants in these sites also moved in and out of sociability (Ardington, 2013) throughout the different thread of replies. Participants shifted from more collaborative softened disagreement to more aggressive strong disagreement. Though Ardington's 2013 study proposed that more playful and collaborative behavior indicated solidarity, I argue that strong disagreement (i.e. more aggressive, conflictive talk) in these sites could also index solidarity with a more restricted group of participants. For example, the group of 'true followers' engaged in strong disagreement when assumed norms of the interaction were trespassed: for example, criticizing a YouTuber. 'True followers' rejected these types of inappropriate behavior, thus, they used more aggressive linguistic forms that allowed them to reinforce their affiliations within the community. This type of behavior was also true for the wider community of followers when an inappropriate behavior was identified. Although strong disagreement was admittedly more competitive and conflictive, these linguistic forms were also shown to be collaborative, as participants did not cease to indicate solidarity and their affiliation with a particular community of followers through this type of linguistic behavior.

Lastly, the concern for promoting participation in these sites is essential to not only viewing social network users as merely consumers; instead these participants should also be viewed as producers of content (Papacharissi, 2011). In this study, interactants cooperatively discussed and performed their ideas of what a follower and a YouTuber should be like through disagreeing. For instance, followers were expected to be knowledgeable and supportive. In fact, as mentioned above, on instances where these expectations were violated participants were encouraged to use strong language such as swearing or posing insults, in order to effectively convey knowledge and support towards the YouTuber. Therefore, participants assigned new meanings to linguistic forms that in other contexts would have been considered inappropriate. Most importantly, the labels of' seguidores' 'followers' or 'fans' should not be misleading, as participants self-identifying as such in these interactions were also very critical of the YouTuber whom they claimed to be following.

Being critical is an important stance for the displaying of agency in these sites (Borda, 2015). Because of the fact that these 'seguidores' are supporting a YouTuber's content, they feel a sense of co-ownership of this content, therefore their criticisms and complaints also needed to be heard. This sense of co-ownership is crucial in challenging the view of these YouTube participants as primarily consumers. The role of participants as active producers of content alters the YouTube format where the role of producers is perceived to heavily rely on the actual YouTubers.

Conclusions

In this initial stage of what would later unfold as my senior thesis, I found that participants in the observed four YouTubers' sites used disagreement to promote sociability. While meeting at a YouTuber's channel with the shared purpose to watch the YouTuber's video, this community of practice developed a set of expectations that were crucial in the way disagreement was ultimately carried out. Further, when these goals were challenged by

participants posing complaints and criticisms against a YouTuber, these face-threatening speech behaviors (Ngyen, 2008) were often debated by other participants agreeing or disagreeing with the initial claims. Most importantly, participants would frequently engage in softened disagreement in order to reduce tension during the interaction.

Softened disagreement was useful in conveying solidarity with both the critical commenter and participants opposing the initial stated views. Because participants posting criticisms and complaints would in most instances still maintain an identity as 'seguidores,' softened disagreement was more inclusive when showing affiliation with a community of followers. Nevertheless, participants that engaged in strong disagreement also showed affiliation with a restricted community of followers. Participants who appealed to strong disagreement were more constrained in their views of what a follower should be like. They claimed an identity of 'verdaderos seguidores' (i.e. true followers) for themselves. This self-presentation as a true follower involved displaying complete support towards the YouTuber, furthermore, defending the YouTuber when they were the subject of criticisms. In some instances, true followers used more aggressive linguistic forms such as insults, writing their replies in uppercase letters (indicating yelling) or posing warnings. Yet true followers were also observed to soften their disagreement in cases where they wanted to align with a broader community of followers including critical followers.

This paper intended to discuss a fluid set of identities that emerged from varied forms of disagreement. Not only was disagreement an appropriate speech behavior observed in these sites; but in fact, disagreement was essential for participants to legitimize their identities as knowledgeable, true and critical followers. The role of identity formation in these sites resulted more meaningful for participants, hence superseding the role of 'polite' speech behaviors.

Furthermore, as suggested by Mendez et al. (2014) through assigning meaning to their activities, these virtual communities of practice play with their available linguistic resources, achieving new uses for such linguistic forms. Lastly, in this paper I argue for the importance of displaying agency from part of the participants engaged in the YouTube interactions. Participants in these sites should not be seen as passive viewers; instead they are concerned with exhibiting a sense of belonging (Planchenault, 2010) with a community of followers, this sense of belonging was expressed throughout each comment. Most importantly, 'being' a follower did not only indicate being supportive of a YouTuber, but it also entailed a role of producers of content contributing to the practice carried out by YouTubers.

Literature Cited

Ardington, A.
    2013. Negotiating Shared Perspectives that Move In and Out of Sociability. *Journal of Language and Aggression*, Vol. 2 (pp. 165-193). ISSN 2213-1272.

Borda, L.
    2015. Fanatismo y redes de reciprocidad. *La Trama de la Comunicacion*, Vol. 19 (pp. 67-87). ISSN 1668-5628.

Boxer, D., Zhu, W.
    2013. Strong Disagreement in Mandarin and ELFP Aggressive or Politic? *Journal of Language, Aggression and Conflict*, Vol. 2 (pp. 194-224). ISSN 2213-1272.

Burgess, J. & Green, J.
    2009. YouTube: Online video and participatory culture.

Wiley. Brown, P., Levinson, S.
    1987. Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

D' Amico-Reisner, L.
    1985. An ethnolinguistic study of disapproval exchanges. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

Gauntlett, D.
    2013. Making is connecting. John Wiley & Sons.

Goffman, E.
    1959. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday.

    1967. Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Griffith, M. & Papacharissi, Z.
    2010. Looking for You: An analysis of Video Blogs. *First Monday*, Vol. 15:1-4.

Holmes, J.
    1995. Women, men and politeness. London and New York: Longman Jenkins, H.,

Clinton, K., Purushotma, R., Robison, A. J. & Weigel, M.
    2009. Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, MacArthur Foundation.

Lange, P.
    2006. Getting To Know You: Using Hostility to Reduce Anonymity in Online
    Communication. *Texas Linguistic Forum.* Vol. 49 (pp. 95-107).

    2009. Commenting on Comments: Investigating Responses to Antagonism on YouTube.
    Society for Applied Anthropology Conference Tampa, Florida. 2007.

Marwick, A. & Boyd, D.
    2010. I Tweet Honestly, I Tweet Passionately: Twitter Users, Context Collapse, and the
    Imagined Audience. *New Media & Society*. (pp.1-20). doi:10. l 177/1461444810365313.

Mendez, L., Garcia-Pemia, M., Cortes, S.
    2014. Virtual communities in a secondary school - Discovering the internal grammar of
    video games. *New Approaches In Educational Research*, Vol. 3:1 (pp. 2-10). ISSN:
    2254-7399.

Nguyen, T. & Thuy M.
    2008. Criticizing in an L2: Pragmatic strategies used by Vietnamese EFL Learners.
    Intercultural Pragmatics. Vol.5:1 (pp. 41-66). ISSN 1613-365X.

Papacharissi, Z.
    2011. A Networked Self: Identity, Community and Culture on Social Network Sites. New
    York: Routledge.

Planchenault, G.
    2010. Virtual community and politeness: The use of female markers of identity and
    solidarity in a transvestites' website. *Journal of Politeness Research*. Vol. 6 (pp. 83- 103).
    DOI 10.1515/JPLR.2010.005

Schiffrin, D.
    1984. Jewish Argument as Sociability. *Language in Society,* Vol. 13:3 (pp. 11-335).

    1994. Approaches to Discourse. Blackwell.

Sifianou, M.
    2012. Disagreement Face and Politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics,* Vol. 44 (pp. 1554-
    1564).

Soukup, P.
    2014. Looking at, with, and through YouTube™. *Communication Research Trends*. Vol.
    33 (pp 3-25).

Strangelove, M.
    2010. Watching YouTube: Extraordinary videos by ordinary people. Toronto, Buffalo,
    London: University of Toronto Press.

Tannen, D.

   1998. The Argument Culture: Stopping America's War of Words. New York: Ballantine.
   Upadhyay, S.

   2010. Indentity and Impoliteness Computer-Mediated Reader Responses. J*ournal of
   Politeness Research.* Vol. 6. (pp. 105-127). DOI 10.1515/JPLR.2010.006.

Watts, R.

   2003. Politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wesch, M.

   2009. Youtube And YouExperience of Self-Awareness in the Context Collapse of the
   Recording Webcam. *Explorations in Media Ecology*. (pp.19-34). ISSN 1539- 7785.