Incoherence in Comments of Cooking Channels in Algeria

Cherifa Benkaddour

PhD, University of Ahmed Zabana (Relizane, Algeria)
cherifa.benkaddour@univ-relizane.dz

ABSTRACT: This study is an analysis of impoliteness language behavior that results due to conversational incoherence in the comments on YouTube. Based on data from comments of Algerian Arabic viewers of two YouTube channels providing recipes, this study argues that some impolite comments in threads appear to be the result of conversational incoherence in the comment threads. This means that the absence of comments that respond to the video itself or the topic addressed in the video creates incoherence and hence impolite linguistic behavior on the part of the commentators who are interested in the topic of the video. In this respect, the appearance of comments addressing nothing in threads and whose owners advertise for their channels instead creates annoyance and hence impoliteness among the commentators. In other words, such comments can be seen as an impoliteness trigger in these YouTube commenting threads. It can also be concluded that the comments that respond to the video are important because they can establish conversational coherence between commentators and their absence may create complaints and impoliteness. This work is based on the study of Herring and Seung Woo (2021), who emphasize the consideration of addressee (including video topic) and message content relationship in analyses of conversational coherence on YouTube. It both supports and expands it by analyzing qualitatively the language itself. In addition to this, a quantitative study was conducted for empiricism. This study also draws on Culpepper's (2011) model of impoliteness.

KEYWORDS: impoliteness, addressee types, conversational coherence, computer-mediated communication, YouTube thread comments

1. Introduction

In any successful communication, coherence is such an important fact. Sinclair & Coulthard (1975) say that an ideally coherent conversation consists of a sequence of initiating and responding turns. This implies the responding turns to be relevant to the initiating ones (Grice 1975). From the standpoint of discourse-analytics and pragmatics, Bou-Franch et al. (2012) say, '*coherence is understood as a general process of sense-making in which individuals engage whenever they communicate.*' On the basis of this assumption, conversational computer-mediated communication interfaces are designed (Donath 2002). Since the 1990's, coherence has been analyzed within some studies of Computer Mediated Communication. Herring (1999) made a pioneer study of different synchronous and asynchronous CMC fields where she identified disrupted adjacency and lack of simultaneous feedback as two causes of incoherence in online interaction. She argues that this disjointed connection online was pleasurable to some and posed problems for others.

At the level of participation structure which is a sensitive feature of coherence, YouTube participation structure encompasses both instances of one-to-many interaction and intergroup discussion Bou-Franch et al. (2012). In comparison with dyadic interaction, YouTube text-based interaction is complex, flexible, unstable, and unpredictable (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2004). The structural properties of YouTube polylogues to be featured by turn-by-turn adjacency, and 'networked sequences' consisting mainly of adjacent and nonadjacent interaction turns like asynchronous interaction (Lorenzo-Dus et al. 2009). These structural properties also have an impact on how coherence works within YouTube text-based discussions (Bou-Franch et al. 2012). However, while incoherence causes have been analyzed in numerous studies, its consequences remain ignored by most of research in language and communication in online settings.

In presenting deeper studies of online interaction on YouTube, Dynell (2012) proposes a dimensional framework for overall communication on YouTube. The framework consists of three levels in which different types of interaction are available. The first level of communication is between speaker(s) and hearers in the video. The second level is communication between video producers/ senders and recipients/ hearers. In this level, the recipients can interact with the senders by commenting on the video. The

third level is interaction between the recipients of the video, who alternately take on the roles of speakers and hearers in the YouTube comment threads. However, and according to Herring Seung Woo (2020), this framework does not consider interaction between commentators and the video itself. Nor does it consider the issue of topics. Not only is that, but the analysis by Dynell is conceptual and not empirical (Herring Seung Woo 2021). In this respect, Herring and Seung Woo (2020) present an empirical analysis of addressee types and topics in YouTube comment threads, as well as the relationship existing between them. In fact, they expand Dynel's study, and consider additional possible addressees assuming that any addressee can be the topic of a YouTube comment. One of the conclusions they make is that the YouTube platform should support deep threading to indicate logical turn-adjacency at multiple levels of reply. They also suggest that the YouTube platform should consider a reply mechanism to address common addressee types that occur in prompts and that the relationship between addressee and message content should be taken into consideration. They argue that such changes would facilitate automated thread identification and improve the coherence of user conversations on rich-prompt platforms. On the basis of this claim for conversational incoherence in platforms such as YouTube, this study confirms and expands this assertion by analyzing the language in the comments and their replies that display annoyance because of such incoherence resulting in impoliteness linguistic behavior. So this study does not only consider conversational incoherence on the YouTube platform but seeks to relate between this incoherence and the linguistic behavior itself. Also, the level of communication addressed in this study is the one introduced by Herring and Seung Woo (2020) and who emphasize the video content as an addressee in addition to the levels introduced by Dynel (2012). Therefore, the research question that can be addressed is the following: How does conversational incoherence as a result of the existence of non-related and self-advertising comments affect the linguistic behavior of the commentators to make it impolite on YouTube? In this respect, I will introduce some examples of comments in which the use of impolite linguistic behavior is explicit because of incoherence and the presence of some comments that have no relationship with the video topic. This study examines incoherence in a corpus of YouTube postings in Arabic, and hence

it answers calls for research on languages other than English in the field of 'multilingual internet' (Herring, 2010a; Danet & Herring 2003, 2007).

The article is organized as follows. First, a review of relevant work on (in) coherence online is given; this is in addition to that of impoliteness in different forms of online communication. Second, the methodological design of this study is explained in detail. Next, results and discussions are presented and dealt with. Finally, a conclusion about YouTube communication and conversational coherence in relation to impoliteness is given.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Conversational coherence online

In her pioneering study of many (a) synchronous computer-mediated communication environments, Herring (1999) tackled the issue of coherence online by identifying two main reasons hindering its realization. They are lack of simultaneous feedback and disrupted adjacency. This claim led many scholars to conduct research for the reason of testing the validity of this claim. In this respect, a number of other problems were identified. The first was multi-tasking and authority in instant messaging introduced by Woerner, Yates & Orlikowski (2006), and the second was multiple participation in discussion forums, chat rooms, text messaging on interactive television, and Twitter presented by Honeycutt & Herring (2009) and Zelenkauskaite & Herring (2008). Korolija (2000) says that coherence is multi-layered and activity-specific process. This served many discursive resources employed to achieve coherence mainly including sequential features like adjacency and topic development, grammatical and lexical cohesion, and turn-taking features like backchannelling, naming, or quoting (cf. e.g. Berglund 2009; Herring 1999; Herring & Kurtz 2006; Herring & Nix 1997; Herring, Kutz, Paolillo and Zelenkauskaite 2009; Honeycutt & Herring 2009; Lapadat 2007; Markman 2006; Nilsen & M¨atikalo 2010; Simpson 2005; Woerner et al. 2006; Zelenkauskaite & Herring 2008).

YouTube participation structure encompassing instances of one-to-many interaction and intergroup discussion (Herring 1996; 2007; Yates 2000) also affects coherence. Hence, it constitutes a sui generis case of polylogal communication open to public, mainly anonymous multiparticipation, since the YouTube video-clips remain posted. This polylogal feature of

YouTube is also characterized by the double-articulation of interaction that it generates. This includes communication of one-to-one interaction and inter-group discussions polylogue; and the "imagined 'mass' of ordinary users" (Burgess & Green 2008, 8), who passively participate in the polylogue without commenting. So, YouTube text-based interaction is complex, flexible, unstable, and unpredictable (Bou-Franch 2015). Generally speaking, it is its structure of turn-by-turn taking and 'networked sequences' of adjacent and nonadjacent turns typical of asynchronous interaction (Lorenzo-Dus et al. 2009) that affects coherence. Herring and Sueng Woo (2021) introduce the question of interaction between addressee and message content in analyzing conversational coherence on YouTube. They argue that this would facilitate communication between commentators. According to the study at hand, the comments addressing topics other than the video topic pose problems of coherence and create impoliteness among the users.

2.2. Impoliteness

Apart from the abundance of theories on politeness research, Lakoff (1973), Brown and Levinson (1978/1987), Leech (1983), Locher and Watts (2005), Spencer-Oatey (2008) and others, impoliteness was not focused on except recently. Culpeper (1996) drew attention to impoliteness by creating a framework which is contrary to Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness. Culpeper's model of impoliteness is based on the principle of failure to maintain politeness or 'each other's face'. He proposes five super strategies of impoliteness. The first is *bald on record impoliteness*, where the FTA is performed directly. This has to be distinguished from Brown and Levinson's Bald on record, where it is considered a politeness strategy used in cases of emergency like 'Come in!', 'Do sit down!' etc. The second strategy is *positive impoliteness* which is designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants. The third one is *negative impoliteness* by using strategies to damage the addressee's negative face wants. The fourth strategy is *sarcasm or mock politeness*, where the FTA is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are insincere. The last strategy introduced by Culpeper is '*withhold politeness*,' which is in fact the absence of politeness where it should be expected, such as failing to thank somebody for his/her favors (Culpeper 1996, 356).

Later in (2011), Culpeper affirms that "impoliteness is partly inherent in linguistic expression" although it is context related. He separates between two main groups of impoliteness: Conventionalized formulae and Implicational impoliteness. Conventionalized formulae include the subcategories of insults, pointed criticisms/complaints, unpalatable questions and/or presuppositions, condescensions, message Enforcers, dismissals, silencers, threats, and negative expressives.

Culpeper (2011) divides implicational impoliteness into three kinds. The first one is *form-driven* and is based on lexical cues and co-text, like using mocking mimicry. The second kind is *conventional-driven,* in which one can mismatch conventional politeness behavior in a context where the interpretation of politeness is unacceptable. The last kind is context-driven impoliteness which is marked by the absence of politeness where it is strongly expected by the hearer. In addition, Culpeper (2011) classifies the functions of impoliteness into four types. The first is *affective impoliteness,* where the speaker uses the emotional senses like anger in his language behavior. The second is coercive impoliteness that implies the use of unacceptable language behavior by speaker to exert power on hearer. The third type is *entertaining impoliteness,* used to add humor to a third-party audience. The last type is *institutional impoliteness,* in which the speaker uses the dominant group behind an institution.

2.3. Impoliteness online

One of the most important characteristics of online linguistic communication is impoliteness. It has drawn the attention of many scholars to date. Herring (1994) refers this fact to anonymity, the absence of social accountability due to geographical distances. Döring (2003, 270–275) analyses the aggressive linguistic behavior of users in cyberspace. Also, Maricic (2005) deals with 'face' issues online. In the same sort of way, Haugh (2010) deals with impoliteness in email communication. Danet (2013) also discusses issues of flaming and linguistic impoliteness on a Listerv.

In its relation to politeness study, impoliteness has recently been emphasized by scholars such as Culpepper (1996, 2011), Bousfield (2008), etc. Impoliteness was studied by scholars like Herring (2001) in computer-mediated communication, who claimed that it was generally widespread and pervasive.

However, the reasons behind the use of impoliteness are various and cannot be detected easily. For instance, in his study on YouTube, Bahaa-eddin (2019) shows that identity and power are variables that trigger impoliteness in Arabic online responses in political talk shows. In this study, we are going to see another impoliteness trigger standing behind such impolite behavior. It is conversational incoherence in comments as a result of the existence of other comments which do not address the topic of the video and advertise for themselves instead.

3. Methods

The data in this study is collected from the comments and replies that show annoyance because of certain comments that do not care about the subject of the topic in the videos and generally advertise for their own channels instead. These comments generally ask for help from participants in the sense of urging them to hit the subscription and like buttons of their channels on YouTube. As it is known for the success of any YouTube channel, it has to attract the most followers, likes, comments and views. For this reason, we find a lot of new YouTube channel owners who ask for these things with insistence, and do everything to reach what the YouTube Corporation oblige them to do. This is why you find them everywhere in the threads asking participants to follow them. However, the reaction of other participants on YouTube threads is not always positive. By contrast, it is sometimes very negative to the point of insulting them, mocking at them and even denigrating them. In this study, I analyzed some of these comments in two threads of two famous YouTube channels. One of the channels exceeds nine million followers by now and the other exceeds two million. The subjects of the videos were two cookery courses in which one gave a recipe of 'Taco', a recently popular food in Algeria originating from Mexican culinary art and that was restricted to only restaurants, and the other brought a recipe of 'white pizza' which is also a very popular and loved food among Algerians and people in general. The data was in the Arabic language and mainly Algerian Arabic. I relied on content analysis but used the qualitative approach so as I can concentrate on analyzing the language itself. For more confirmation of the results of this study, quantitative analysis was used to support the findings.

The first thread under study contained 3.390 comments and the second contained 1.180 comments at the time of the study. The dataset of the user comments from these channels contains a variety of impolite comments. I started by identifying the impolite comments in the YouTube threads. For such identification, I used Culpeper's framework (2011) to categorize the comments according to conventionalized impoliteness and implicational impoliteness.

The analysis showed that impolite comments due to other ones advertising for their channels were recurring patterns and mostly liked by other users. In this respect, I subcategorized conventionalized impoliteness according to Culpeper's model of impoliteness in addition to implicational impoliteness. However, I focused only on insults, mock impoliteness, and complaints in conventionalized impoliteness. I identified 60 comments and replies to comments that can be classified into these types of impoliteness. This number might seem small but all these comments got a number of likes from other users who agreed with them which made them appear with the first comments in the threads. Also, I used an application called 'hadzy' that helps knowing the most liked comments in threads and their placement the threads in opposition to other comments. In this study, there are some comments that were deleted by either the YouTube platform or the video maker herself later and after I captured them using the 'screenshot' option available on my phone when the videos were first released. However, after a while they disappeared from the threads.

Due to the recurrence of such impolite comments, I decided to conduct an empirical analysis based on direct questions to my students. In my quantitative analysis, I delivered a questionnaire on my university students whose ages ranged between 17 and 21 and who use the YouTube platform for pleasure, studying, fashion, learning how to cook, etc. I asked them whether they got annoyed with the comments having no relationship with the video topic or not.

4. Results

This section is concerned with a sketch of the subcategories that I chose in my dataset. It is worth saying that these types cannot easily be categorized and comments may carry an insult and a mockery at the same time. Also, the examples given are in Algerian Arabic but full of mistakes. Since

online communication is anonymous, face is less important than in offline communication. Focus was put on only insults, pointed criticism/complaints and silencers by giving examples with descriptions.

The most recurrent type of impoliteness in this case under study is insults, pointed criticism and complaints. This is due to the fact that the first aim of these commentators was to learn from the video. This type of impoliteness is directed to the comments that do not respond to the video content. This form of criticism shows clearly that the commentator is very annoyed with those who advertise for their channels instead of talking about the recipe in the video. Therefore, the aim of this type of impoliteness is to attack their face directly by criticizing as well as insulting them and hoping thus not to see them again in the threads. The following examples are taken from a channel with more than 2 million subscribers. She introduced a recipe of 'taco', a newly introduced Mexican food to Algerian people. I have to note that there were comments of all kinds in the thread. Some of them thanked the video-maker, others gave advice, and other ones commented about problems in their lives being out of the subject too. The thread had at the time of the study a number of 2.700 comments varying from thanking, advising, problem introducing, etc. However, very few of these comments got 'likes' from other users if compared with the following examples. So, the following sections are a description of the types of impoliteness in these examples.

4.1. Conventionalized impoliteness

4.1.1. Insults

Example (1) shows that the commentator uses the insult 'beggars of likes' to attack the self-advertising commentators. This comment got a number of 196 likes and 5 replies agreeing with him/her. This can be regarded as an example of conventionalized impoliteness.

(1) Commentator

والله تعبت من قراءة التعليقات لكي اجد تعليق يخص هذا المحتوى ولم اجد الا شحدين الليكات الذين يدعون انهم يحبون الله ورسوله عليه الصلاة والسلام و عديمين المحتوى يشحدون المشتركين وانا اقدم لكم نصيحة لعبدة الله يعبده باركانه التي فرضت عليه والذي يبحث عن المشتركين فل يجذبهم بالمحتوى الرائع

I swear that I got tired of reading the comments to find nothing but beggars of likes, those who pretend they love God and His Messenger (Peace be upon him) and those who have no good content begging subscribers. Look! I advise you something: if you want to worship God, do it truly and if you search subscribers, try to bring good content.

This commentator starts with a complaint of getting tired of searching for a comment addressing the video content and as a result of not finding one, s/he insults those whom s/he finds on the threads asking for 'likes' and who s/he reports they pretend to love God and his Messenger.

Another example where the insults 'beggar' is used to attack the comments who do not address the video topic is the example that follows. This commentator complains of not finding a comment addressing the recipe in the video to have an idea on it, and consequently starts insulting the ones who ask for support to their channels and those who ask for praying to them.

(2) Commentator

**نقرا التعليقات نشوف بلاك كاش وحدة جربت الوصفة لقيت غير دعولي ودرولي لايك والله خصّ ،
وصاي ولله تنارفو فففففف**

I scrolled down to read the comments to see if someone has tried the recipe and I found nothing but 'prey for me' and make me 'likes'. I swear that you are beggars, that is driving me crazy ffffff

This comment has had a number of 108 likes and 3 replies who agreed on what she/he says like the following ones:

(3) Reply 2 to commentator 2

والله غير صح قلعتيها من فمي هههههه

Yes, I swear you are right; this is exactly what I was going to say hhhhh

We can notice that this reply is mocking at those who ask for support by agreeing that they are beggars.

4.1.2. *Complaints/ pointed criticism*

One of the liked comments in which pointed criticism and complaints is clear in its language use is the following:

(4) Commentator

أغلبية التعليقات ابوني اشترك كارثة قليل وين نلقى تعليق مع الوصفة على كل حال شكرا على الوصفة اليوم نجربها إن شاء الله

Most of the comments ask for subscription; that is a catastrophe. Very few people comment on the recipe. Anyway, I will test it today if God will.

This comment was liked by 95 people and got 12 replies where some of which agreed with her/him and others asked about the reliability of the recipe. Some of the replies to this comment are the following:

(5) Reply 1 to commentator 3

صاح مام انا ضقت ذرعا بهم

Even me, I got fed up with them

(6) Reply 6 to commentator 3

صح سمطولنا اليوتوب، نكره حياتي كي يخرجو على الموضوع

You are right, I got fed up, I hate when they get out of the subject.

This commentator seems to have tested the recipe and answered the most important question in the thread in a positive way. Not only that but some other users commented in the replies about the recipe by agreeing that it was good.

The next comment is another complaint carrying criticism towards those who comment out of the subject and do not address the video topic. This commentator ended with the expression 'pfffff' to show her/ his disgust towards those who are out of the subject. This comment, also got 264 likes and 19 replies, most of which either agreed or talked about the reliability of the recipe positively and negatively.

(7) Commentator

دخلت نشوف كشما واحد جرب الوصفة لقيت التعليقات الكل خارج الموضوع بففففف

I tried to see if there were some people who tried this recipe, I found most of the comments out of the subject. Pfffff

Some of the replies to this comment are as follows:

(8) Reply 7 to commentator 4

شفتي يكرهو التعليقات ديما خارج الموضوع

Do you see?! I hate those comments that are out of subject.

Here in the replies, there were some people who spoke about the recipe either positively and/ or negatively.

Due to its recurrence, the next complaint also criticizes those commentators who do not address the video topic and advertise for themselves instead. It got 31 likes and 3 replies agreeing with him/her.

(9) Commentator

شكون جرباتو عيييييت ونا نحوس على كاش كومونتار يهدر على المحتوى مكااااش

Who has tested it? I got tieeeeered of searching comments talking about the subject but in vaiiiiiin

Another comment which caught a number of considerable likes (67) is what follows:

10) Commentator

شكرا على الوصفة انا ما فهمتش هادو عباد يكتبو كلش واش دخل طياب في حاجات وحدخرين الله يهديكم مشكورة لحبيبا

Thank you, I do not understand those people writing about anything; what is the relation between cooking and other things! May God direct you! Thanks dear

This comment has had no replies. As it is clear from this comment, this person is inquiring about what relates cooking to other things such as likes, subscribing, etc.

4.1.3. Silencers

The following examples are taken from the biggest YouTube channel in Algeria with a number of subscribers exceeding 10 million. The recipe introduced here is on how to make white pizza. It attracted a lot of views and comments. However, apart from the different comments that talked about different subjects, the following one got second place of the most liked comments in the thread with a number of 387 likes and 22 replies.

11) Commentator

سكتونا (يرحم والديكم) افتحو عزرين قروب وادعيو بعضاكم وشبيكم متخلفين هكذا؟ شان تاع طبخ كومونتيو عللوصفة خليونا نشوفو راي لي جربو نديو ملاحظات والله الواحد ولا يهبط للي كومونتار ويندم وحدة تحكي فحياتها وحدة تدعي وحدة تحكي ف سوجي ما نعرف منين جاتها الفكرة والله كارثة روحو الفيس بوك وقصر

Shut-up (God bless your parents), open a s***t group and pray for one another! Why are you so uncivilized like this? This channel is for cooking and you have to comment on the recipe to see the opinions of those who tested it to learn from them. I swear that when I read the comments I feel regret because you are just narrating your life stories, pray, and speak about any subject like that. It is catastrophic, go to Facebook and have fun

The commentator here vents out directly in the face of those who ask for support from others. s/he uses the expression (God bless your parents) not as a polite cue but to show her/ his disgust and that they can no longer support the situation they are in. Also, the commentator shows the role of this channel whose main aim is cooking and not other things like praying for one another. This comment got a number of 22 replies as mentioned above and here are some of the replies:

(12) Reply 8 to commentator 11

من كثرت ما <u>قلقونا برب ادعيولي</u> عدت انا وماندعيش لروحي عدت كي نشوف وحدة كاتبة ادعيولي ندعي عليها .ب<u>ففف</u> ياخي <u>طليا</u> ياخي.قرحة

Due to the large number of s***t prayers, I found myself not able to pray for myself and pray on them instead, <u>pfff you such beggars</u> (unclear text)

This user starts by using a four letter tabooed word because of finding comments asking for praying to them. S/he also insults them by saying they are beggars of likes and subscribers.

(13) Reply 9 to Commentator 11

يا ادعيولي يا ادعموني لقناة ...<u>تفوه عليهم</u>

Either pray for me or support my channel … <u>I spit on them</u>

The expression 'I spit on them' shows clearly how angry this commentator feels because of those who ask for support to their channels or ask for praying to them. The expression 'I spit on them' is used here to describe his/ her feelings towards such self–advertisers in this comment thread.

(14) Reply 10 to commentator 11

ههههههه والله غير عندك الحق

Hhhhh you are right

This user is agreeing with the commentator and making fun of those who are out of subject and ask for support instead of commenting on the video content.

4.2. Implicational impoliteness

All the above examples are part of conventionalized or direct impoliteness. The following examples in this section rely on inference that is related to Gricean cooperativeness (cf. 1975). Inference is needed to draw impolite implications. The following example could be interpreted as *implicational impoliteness*. There is a conventional politeness expression mismatch with a co-text or prosodic context where the interpretation of politeness is not expected. It is like a discord which results of the clash of expectations; mainly because of mixing two opposite linguistic features – both conventionally polite and impolite. The first part is 'doctor' which is conventionally a polite form of address, while the second part is of the comment attacks the commentator's positive face by using the conventionalized impolite insult 'begging'.

(15) Reply to a Commentator

<div dir="rtl">اول مرة اشوف دكتور شحاد</div>

The first time I see a doctor begging

As it is seen, this is a reply to a commentator who claims he is a doctor of medicine, advertising for himself and asking for support from other users. He seems to give medical advice to people on his/her YouTube channel and because this is not very frequent on YouTube, he was insulted ironically bysaying.'the first time I see a doctor begging.'

On the basis of these observations, the seeking for quantitative analysis was started to get the complete picture of this fact. In this respect, I conducted a quantitative empirical analysis on whether irrelevant comments were that annoying to other viewers or not. I delivered a questionnaire to my students to see what they thought about those kinds of self-advertising for their own channels in YouTube threads. Table 1 shows their opinions clearly. Not surprisingly enough and as was expected, most of the informants found them annoying and even more disgusting because some answers showed hatred towards them. Thus, more than three quarters of my informants (81.66%) said that this was annoying to them. Only 06.66 percent said they were

not disturbed by irrelevant comments, while the remaining showed little annoyance by saying this sometimes disturbed them. The second question in the questionnaire was if they thought that the YouTube platform should delete or filter the non-related comments so as not to appear first in threads. 41.66 % of them were with deletion while 51.66 % of them thought they would be better filtered. In general, most of the users under study did not really want to see or come across such kind of comments. Tables 1 and 2 show the results clearly:

Table1: Irrelevant Comments Annoyance Rates

The question	The answers	The rates
1. Do you feel annoyed when finding irrelevant comments to the video topic?	Yes	81.66 %
	No	06.66 %
	Sometimes	11.66 %

Table 2: Opinion Rates related to the deletion or filtration of Irrelevant Comments

The question	The answers	The rates
2. Do you think that the YouTube platform should delete the non-related comments or filter them so as not to appear first in threads?	Deletion	41.66 %
	Filtration	51.66 %
	Do not care	06.66 %

5. Discussion

The main aim of this study was to examine the impolite linguistic behavior that results due to conversational incoherence and which is directed to the users who advertise for their channels and do not comment on the video topic in two YouTube threads in Algeria. The most interesting result is that those comments which do not address the video topic and make publicity to their channels in the threads are considered as an obstacle that precludes conversational coherence in the threads. Therefore, since this fact obstructs coherence to other users, they start using impoliteness to show their anger to

them. Also, according to table1, the totality of my informants did not want to see such kind of comments in the YouTube threads. According to their responses, they feel annoyed when such comments surface in the threads. In this respect, one can say that the existence of such kind of comments which are out of subject are a source of annoyance to other users and hence can be regarded as a trigger of impoliteness on these YouTube threads. Not only was that, but the comments that vented out their anger impolitely due to this fact got many likes by many users and commentators in these threads.

6. Functions of impolite comments and replies

Culpeper (2011) introduced four functions of impoliteness. However, according to the data at hand, the functions that dominate the impolite language behavior in the comments are the affective, entertaining and coercive ones. Concerning the affective function, the commentator blamed the other users and insulted them for the bad use of the commentary section to fulfill their needs. So, example 2 is a vent of anger where the commentator blamed the users for not being interested in the video topic and commented on it. The entertaining function of impoliteness is mostly present in the replies rather than in the comments. Reply 2 to commentator 2 is clearly mocking at the self-advertisers of being 'beggars'. The coercive function of impoliteness can be clearly observed in comment 7 where the commentator tried to exert his/her power on the other users by ordering them to 'shut-up'; that is s/he had used an unacceptable speech pattern to show her/his anger.

6.1. The recurring insult 'beggar' and those related to begging

YouTube is a paying corporation and those who open new channels to get payment from YouTube should fulfill some conditions. The known conditions for any new YouTube channel are getting a certain number of subscribers and views as well as likes. So the challenge of YouTubers in general, is realizing those conditions and this is why they start advertising for their own channels. In this respect and while doing so, they are sometimes faced with some impolite comments especially in big channels of millions of subscribers. These impolite comments can be in the form of irony, anger, or even insults. In this

study, one of the most recurring insults directed towards such commentators advertising for their own channels is the one of 'beggar'. As it is known, beggars are generally found on streets and not in online settings like YouTube or Instagram, or other. However, the use of such insult is used because those users know well that those self-advertisers are going to make money out of their views (users' views'), subscriptions, and likes. In other words, they think they are being exploitive to them in the sense of taking advantage of them and making money out of their views. This insult is sometimes used with irony and other times with vent of anger. An example of the ironical expressions carrying the insult 'beggar' is the following:

(16) Commentator

<div dir="rtl">طلبة هههههههه</div>

'Beggars hhhhh'

(17) Commentator

<div dir="rtl">صدقة صدقة</div>

'Charity, charity'

The insult by commentator 16 is a recurrent one and found in many comments that I read although they were mostly deleted by either the YouTube channel owner or the YouTube platform. Example 17 is a reply to commentator '11' in which the one who replied used the word 'charity' as a connotation to show that the ones who ask for support are like beggars who ask for charity.

Overall, this impolite language behavior which includes a vent of anger out, insults, ironies, complaints and pointed criticism, are clearly the result of the presence of non-related comments and self-advertisers who do not address the video topic and who are regarded as a cause of conversational incoherence in these two YouTube threads. Not only this, but this kind of impolite venting comments are the most liked by the other users in these two threads. This study is based on the one by Herring and Seung Woo (2021) who argue that *'the interaction between addressee and message content should be considered in analyses of conversational coherence on YouTube and other rich-prompt CMC platforms.'* This study indicates that the relationship between

the message content of the comment and the addressee (here in our case the video topic) is very important at the level of conversational coherence in these two YouTube threads. However, the findings of this study are restricted to only these two YouTube threads and this means that it does not account for larger data and this is one of its limitations. Not only that, but the data at hand are in the Arabic language only. So, the question that should be asked is whether this could be applied to larger data of YouTube channels and/ or in other languages such as English, Spanish and Chinese, etc.

7. Conclusion

This study concludes that the comments showing self-advertisements annoy most users especially those interested in the video topic. Therefore, such comments can obstruct coherence and preclude communication and hence can cause impoliteness. In this respect, conversational incoherence that is caused by those users' advertisements is an impoliteness trigger in these comment threads. In other words, the comments which address the video topic can create conversational coherence and their absence may result in complaints and impolite linguistic behavior such as insults, complaints and ironies. This study concludes that the relationship between addresses and message content is important. Therefore, it supports Herring and Seung Woo's (2020) work, which emphasizes considering the relation between addressee and message content in analyzing conversational coherence on YouTube.

References

Bahaa-eddin, A. Hassan. 2019. *Pragmatics* 29:4 (2019), pp. 521–544. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Berglund, T. O. 2009. "Disrupted turn adjacency and coherence maintenance in Instant Messaging Conversations." *Language@Internet*, 6.

Bou-Franch, P., Lorenzo-Dus, N., & Blitvich, P. G. C. 2012. "Social interaction in YouTube text-based polylogues: A study of coherence." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication 17*(4) : 501-521.

Bousfield. 2008. *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.167

Brown, P & Levinson, S.C. 1978/1987. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burgess, J. E., & Green, J. B. 2008. "Agency and controversy in the YouTube community." *Proceedings IR 9.0: Rethinking communities, rethinking place - Association of Internet Researchers (AoIR) conference*, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

Culpeper, J. 1996. "Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness." *Journal of Pragmatics* 25 (3): 349–367. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3.

Culpeper, J. 2011. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511975752.

Culpeper, J. 2016. "Impoliteness Strategies". In *Interdisciplinary Studies in Pragmatics, Culture and Society*, ed. by Alessandro Capone and Jacob L. Mey, 421–445. Basel: Springer international. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12616-6_16

Danet, B., & Herring, S. C. (Eds.). 2007. *The multilingual internet: Language, culture and communication online*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Donath, J. 2002. "A semantic approach to visualizing conversation." *Communications of the ACM, 45*.

Döring, N. 2003. *Sozialpsychologie des Internet. Die Bedeutung des Internet für Kommunikationsprozesse, Identitäten, soziale Beziehungen und Gruppen*. [Social psychology of the internet: the importance of the internet for communication processes, identity, social relations and groups] 2nd edn. Göttingen: Hogrefe.

Dynel, M. 2014. "Participation framework underlying YouTube interaction." *Journal of Pragmatics* 73: 37-52.

Haugh, M. 2010. "When is an Email Really Offensive? Argumentativity and Variability in Evaluations of Impoliteness." *Journal of Politeness Research* 6: 7–31. https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2010.002.

Herring, S. C. 1999. Interactional coherence in CMC. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 4(4).

Herring, S. C. 2001. "Computer-mediated Discourse." In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, ed. by Deborah Tannen, Deborah Schiffrin and Heidi Hamilton, 612–634. Oxford: Blackwell.

Herring, S. C. 2007. "A faceted classification scheme for computer-mediated discourse." *Language@Internet* 4(1).

Herring, S. C. 2021. In *Proceedings of the Fifty-fourth Hawai'i International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS-54)*.

Herring, S. C., & Kurtz, A. J. 2006. "Visualizing dynamic topic analysis." *Proceedings of CHI'06*. NY: ACM.

Herring, S. C., & Nix, C. G. 1999. "Is 'serious chat' an oxymoron? Pedagogical vs. social uses of Internet Relay Chat." *Paper presented American Association of Applied Linguistics Annual Conference*. Orlando, Fl. March.

Herring, Susan. C., Kutz, D. O., Paolillo, J. C., & Zelenkauskaite, A. 2009. "Fast talking, fast shooting: text chat in an online first-person game." *Proceedings of the Forty-Second Hawai'i International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS-42)*. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press.

Honeycutt, C. & Herring, S. C. 2009. "Beyond microblogging: Conversation and collaboration via Twitter." *Proceedings of the Forty-Second Hawai'i International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS-42)*. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, K. 2004. "Introducing polylogue." *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 1–24.

Korolija, N. 2000. "Coherence-inducing strategies in conversations amongst the aged." *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 425–462.

Lakoff, R. 1973. "The Logic of Politeness or, Minding your P's and Q's." In *Papers from the 9th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by C. Corum, T. Cedric Smith-Stark, and A. Weiser, 292–305. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Lapadat, J. C. 2007. "Discourse devices used to establish community, increase coherence, and negotiate agreement in an online university course." *Journal of Distance Education* 21(3): 59–92.

Leech, G.N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Locher, Miriam A. and Richard J. Watts. 2005. "Politeness theory and relational work." *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(1): 9-33.

Lorenzo-Dus, N. 2009. "Anonymity and impoliteness – a comparative study of Facebook and YouTube." *Applied Linguistics Research Seminar Series*, Swansea, March 2009.

Maricic, I. 2005. *Face in Cyberspace: Facework, (Im)politeness and Conflict in English Discussion Groups* (PhD thesis). Vaxjo: Vaxjo University Press.

Markman, K. M. 2006. *Computer-mediated conversation: The organization of talk in chat-based virtual team meetings*. (Doctoral dissertation).

Nilsen, M., & M¨akitalo, A. 2010. "Towards a conversational culture? How participants establish strategies for co-ordinating chat postings in the context of in-service training." *Discourse Studies* 12(1): 90–102.

Simpson, J. 2005. "Meaning-making online: Discourse and CMC in a language learning community." In A. M´endez-Vilas, B., Gonz´alez-Pereira, J., Mesa Gonz´alez, & J. A. Mesa Gonz´alez (Eds.), *Recent research developments in learning technologies*. Badajoz: Formatex.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. 1975. *Towards an analysis of discourse.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Smith, M., Cadiz, J., & Burkhalter, B. 2000. "Conversation trees and threaded chats." In *Proceedings of CSCW 2000*, 97-105. ACM.

Spencer-Oatey, H. 2008. *Culturally Spealdng: Managing Rapport through Talk across Cultures.* 2nd edition. London: Continuum.

Woerner, S. L., Yates, J., & Orlikowski, W. J. 2007. "Conversational coherence in Instant Messaging and getting work done." *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences.*

Yates, S. J. 2000. "Computer-mediated communication: The future of the letter?" In D. Barton, & N. Hall (Eds.), *Letter writing as a social practice* (pp. 233–251). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Zelenkauskaite, A., & Herring, S. C. 2008. "Television-mediated conversation: Coherence in Italiani TV SMS chat." *Proceedings of the Forty-First Hawai'i International Conference on System Sciences.* Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press.