Study of Unique Gaps and New Directions in English
(SOUGAND in English)
www.sougandinenglish.ir
ISSN: 3150-4515

Study of Unique Gaps and New Directions in English (SOUGAND in English)

Volume 1, Issue 1, 2026

ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Stance, Footing and Facework in Multilingual YouTube Interaction: Negotiating Alignment and Emerging Community Norms

Nagamurali Eragamreddy
Associate Professor,
General Requirements Unit, Preparatory Studies Center, University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Salalah, Sultanate of Oman.
muralieragamreddi@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0003-1026-183X

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received	Accepted	First Published
18 September 2026	17 October 2026	15 December 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.22034/sugnde.2026.256274
© 2026 The Nagamurali Eragamreddy. Published by Sougand Akbarian Publications.

Abstract

YouTube comment sections have become multilingual spaces in which users evaluate content, negotiate relationships, and contest participation, yet stance, footing, facework, and multilingual practices remain insufficiently integrated within digital-pragmatic research. This study examines how viewers use these resources to negotiate alignment, disagreement, and emerging community norms. The dataset comprised approximately 10,413 comments from 30 videos across six multilingual YouTube channels, with 300–400 interactional sequences selected for detailed sequential analysis. Data were retrieved through the YouTube Data API v3 and supplemented with video transcripts and manual transcriptions using ELAN; a structured SFFN coding framework guided the analysis. Corpus-assisted frequency mapping was integrated with interactional and comparative analysis. Affective evaluation was the most salient stance pattern identified, and empathetic/affiliative alignment was the most salient footing. Confrontational practices could simultaneously support affiliation and disagreement; positive politeness and mitigated criticism enabled affiliation and disagreement to coexist and, depending on uptake, could lead to either solidarity or escalation. Code-switching and translanguaging were used as pragmatic resources, and recurrent endorsement, correction, enforcement, and gatekeeping were markers of emerging normative orientations. The findings support the SFFN framework and suggest that digital pragmatic meaning emerges through interconnected processes of positioning, relational management, multilingual practice, and recursive norm negotiation.

Keywords: digital pragmatics, stancetaking, facework, translanguaging, YouTube discourse.

1. Introduction

1.1 Digital Discourse as Pragmatic Interaction

Digital platforms have transformed public discourse by enabling users not only to consume media but also to respond, evaluate, affiliate, contest, and negotiate meanings with dispersed audiences. YouTube comment sections

are, therefore, better understood as participatory interactional spaces than as repositories of individual opinions. Their asynchronous structure permits users to respond to prior contributions, anticipate audiences, and sustain interaction beyond the temporal boundaries of the originating video. Their relational character is particularly significant because comments may simultaneously address creators, other commenters, imagined audiences, and wider communities. In addition, text, emojis, punctuation, hyperlinks, images, and other semiotic resources may operate together in meaning-making. In these environments, stance is inherently interactional: it concerns how users construe objects and events while positioning themselves and others within networks of alignment and disalignment (Du Bois, 2007; Englebretson, 2007)

1.2 Multilingual YouTube Communication

When YouTube channels gain multilingual and transnational audiences, these dynamics become more complex. Linguistic diversity can manifest itself in the use of different languages in comments, code-switching within contributions, translanguaging, and the strategic use of linguistic and multimodal resources. However, rather than seeing multilingualism as the mere presence of distinct languages, current research in multilingualism views multilingual practices as flexible language repertoires with which individuals negotiate meaning, identity, affiliation, and social positioning (García & Wei, 2014). Studies examining the mobilisation of multilingual and multimodal resources have also shown that they may be deployed in relation to audience, activity, and interactional goals in the discourse of YouTube and social media (Kakoulli-Constantinou & Papadima-Sophocleous, 2020; Liang et al., 2023; Mısır & Güler, 2024). Thus, multilingualism provides participants with additional pragmatic resources through which interpersonal meanings can be intensified, mitigated, reframed, or contested.

1.3 From Stance to Facework

Stance provides a productive entry point for examining these processes because it concerns how speakers position themselves toward propositions, objects, people, and other participants. Importantly, stance is not restricted to the expression of personal opinion; it involves evaluation, positioning, alignment, and the negotiation of social relationships (Du Bois, 2007; Hyland, 2005). In interaction, stance can also involve shifts in footing—the alignment participants adopt toward what is being said, toward themselves, and toward others (Goffman, 1979). This conceptual progression extends from stance to footing and facework, and ultimately to their interactional consequences. A viewer may agree with another participant and thereby affiliate with an emerging position; disagree while mitigating potential offence; challenge another user's expertise; distance themselves from a proposition; or claim epistemic or moral authority. Such practices simultaneously accomplish propositional and interpersonal work. Politeness and impoliteness are therefore most productively approached as forms of relational work rather than as fixed properties of linguistic forms (Locher & Watts, 2005; Culpeper, 2011). Of course, the same ‘confrontational’ stance, in a different context, can build solidarity, laughter or group identity, underscoring the need to interpret its interpersonal significance in context.

1.4 Research Problem

YouTube comments provide important sites for examining politeness, impoliteness, identity and interpersonal conflict, as digital-pragmatic research has shown, but previous studies have tended to focus on specific pragmatic phenomena rather than on their interdependencies. For instance, impoliteness, swearing, identity, power, and culturally embedded facework have been documented in various YouTube commenting contexts (Dynel, 2012; Hassan, 2019; Kapoor, 2022). The central problem is therefore not the absence of research but the limited integration, comparison, contextualisation, and theoretical explanation of how stance and interpersonal work operate together in multilingual YouTube interaction. Equally important is the question of how recurrent local practices of alignment, challenge, affiliation, and contestation may contribute to shared expectations about appropriate participation within digital communities.

1.5 Research Gap

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

Four interconnected gaps can therefore be identified. First, a construct gap remains because stance and politeness are frequently investigated as analytically distinct phenomena, despite their shared concern with positioning and interpersonal relations. Second, there is a context gap when comments are analysed in isolation from the videos and interactional sequences that justify them, which can prevent the detection of the contextual basis of pragmatic interpretation. Third, there is a multilingual gap: multilingualism (code-switching and translanguaging) is overlooked or treated merely as a language-choice variable rather than examined comparatively and interactionally. Recent studies have shown how translanguaging operates as a pragmatic resource in digital contexts and as a resource for constructing and sustaining identity (Ren & Tahir, 2026). Fourth, a micro–macro gap concerns how recurring individual practices become recognisable patterns of affiliation, exclusion, authority, or acceptable participation and thus contribute to community-level norms. Addressing these gaps requires an integrated pragmatic account rather than separate inventories of stance or politeness strategies.

1.6 Aim and Research Questions

Accordingly, this study aims to investigate how viewers on multilingual YouTube channels use stancetaking, footing, politeness, impoliteness, and multilingual resources to negotiate interpersonal relations and contribute to the construction of digital community norms. It conceptualises comment interaction as a relational process in which linguistic and multimodal choices simultaneously position participants, manage face, negotiate alignment, and reproduce or contest expectations of participation. The study addresses three research questions:

1. How do viewers construct and negotiate stance and footing in multilingual YouTube comment interactions?

2. How do viewers negotiate alignment, disagreement, and interpersonal relationships through politeness, impoliteness, mitigation, and other facework strategies?

3. How does the interaction between stancetaking, footing, and facework contribute to the construction, negotiation, and contestation of community norms in multilingual YouTube comment sections?

The study consequently moves beyond treating comments as isolated textual products and examines them as situated pragmatic practices. Its central proposition is that micro-level pragmatic choices do not remain isolated acts: through repetition, uptake, alignment, resistance, and evaluation, they accumulate into broader relational and community-level practices. From this perspective, multilingual interactions on YouTube provide an important lens through which to view the formation, negotiation, and contestation of digital communities in practice.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Digital Pragmatics and Computer-Mediated Discourse

Computer-mediated discourse (CMD) has demonstrated that digitally mediated language is not a reduced version of face-to-face communication, but rather an interactional practice shaped by technological affordances, participation structures, and social context (Herring, 2005; Herring & Androutsopoulos, 2015). Moving beyond general CMD features, digital interactional pragmatics approaches these environments as dynamic sites where interpersonal meaning is collaboratively co-constructed through sequential uptake, participant positioning, and contextual framing (Agustina et al., 2025; Graham & Hardaker, 2017). Asynchronous platforms permit participants to construct responses without temporal co-presence while retaining traces of prior interaction that can be revisited, quoted, or contested, creating distinctive conditions for relational work oriented toward visible and imagined audiences. YouTube comments exemplify these conditions. They are interactional contributions embedded in threaded structures whose pragmatic interpretation depends on originating video contexts, preceding comments, and community expectations (Eragamreddy, 2025). Research demonstrates that comments function as sites of identity construction, conflict, and relational positioning. An interactional pragmatic approach is also crucial because a comment's meaning cannot be determined from linguistic content alone; rather, its interpretation arises partly from its sequential location within a digitally mediated environment.

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

2.2 Stancetaking in Digital Interaction

Stance research suggests that language may be used to position speakers in relation to other participants, propositions, objects, and values. Du Bois's (2007) stance triangle conceptualises stance as relational because stance-taking simultaneously involves assessment and alignment. The dimensions of affect, evaluation, alignment, and identification require further conceptual differentiation, even though stance is multifaceted and includes epistemic, evaluative, affective, and ideological aspects. Evaluation assigns value to objects, whereas affect displays subjective emotion; these contribute to processes of alignment (the convergence or divergence of stances) and collectively contribute to dynamic identity work. Digital interaction further expands these possibilities as participants construct expertise, solidarity, or opposition (McCambridge, 2022). Crucially, stancetaking must be distinguished from sentiment. Sentiment analysis classifies affective polarity, whereas stancetaking captures relational positioning toward propositions, people, and values (Melnyk & Feld, 2022). Thus, negative sentiment does not equate to interpersonal disagreement, nor positive sentiment to affiliation. Stance is treated here as an interactional practice rather than an emotional polarity.

2.3 Footing and Participation

Goffman's (1979) concept of footing provides a further dimension for understanding how participants position themselves within interaction. Footing concerns shifts in alignment and participation, including how speakers position themselves toward what they say, toward other participants, and toward the voices or positions represented in discourse. In digital environments, such shifts may be accomplished through quotation, reported speech, direct address, self-reference, collective pronouns, irony, or explicit alignment and distancing. This perspective is particularly relevant to YouTube because a commenter may simultaneously orient toward the creator, another commenter, the video's subject, and an imagined wider audience. Epistemic positioning may also function as a form of identity work: participants may claim expertise, challenge another person's authority, or invoke collective knowledge. Research on asynchronous online interaction demonstrates that participants use linguistic and interactional resources to establish knowledgeability, legitimacy, and identity under conditions of anonymity and delayed response (Jacknick & Avni, 2017). Footing, therefore, connects stance to participation structure by asking not simply what position is expressed, but from which interactional position it is expressed and toward whom.

2.4 Politeness and Facework

Politeness research has been strongly influenced by Brown and Levinson's (1987) account of face, including positive face, negative face, and face-threatening acts (FTAs). Within this framework, speakers may mitigate FTAs through indirectness, hedging, conventionalised politeness strategies, or other forms of redressive action. These concepts remain useful for identifying potential face concerns in disagreement and criticism. However, applying the framework mechanically to digitally mediated discourse contexts risks treating linguistic forms as inherently polite or impolite in themselves. Subsequent scholarship has therefore emphasised contextual and discursive approaches. Locher and Watts (2005) argue that politeness should not simply be equated with FTA mitigation; relational work encompasses polite, impolite, and socially appropriate behaviour whose interpersonal interpretation emerges through interaction. This distinction is especially important for YouTube comments, where directness may express solidarity in one interaction but hostility in another. Accordingly, mitigation, indirectness, address forms, agreement, or disagreement should not be coded as inherently polite. Their interpersonal significance must be interpreted in relation to participant roles, sequential context, audience orientation, and the stance being negotiated.

2.5 Impoliteness, Conflict and Relational Work

Impoliteness scholarship further demonstrates that interpersonal conflict cannot be reduced to isolated offensive expressions. Culpeper (2011) conceptualises impoliteness in relation to contextual expectations, social norms, offence, and interactional functions, while Locher and Watts (2008) position impoliteness within broader relational work and the negotiation of behavioural norms. Thus, direct attacks, ridicule, sarcasm, accusations, dismissals, mockery, and counter-attacks may perform different relational functions depending on their interactional

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

environment. YouTube research already confirms the relevance of these phenomena. For instance, Hassan (2019) points out that impoliteness in Arabic YouTube responses can be identified and that its realisation is shaped by identity, power, and context. Similarly, Kapoor (2022) demonstrates that impoliteness strategies in Indian YouTube comments can include code-switching and that topic controversiality affects the distribution of impoliteness strategies. Dynel (2012) further shows that even taboo language may perform either aggressive or affiliative functions. The contribution required here, therefore, is not another demonstration that YouTube contains impoliteness, but an explanation of how impoliteness interacts with stance and footing to negotiate alignment, authority, membership, and community expectations.

2.6 Multilingual Pragmatics

Multilingual interaction complicates these processes because language choice itself may function as a pragmatic resource. Translanguaging research conceptualises multilingual speakers as drawing flexibly on their communicative repertoires rather than operating through rigidly separated linguistic systems. In digital discourse, switching or combining linguistic resources may serve interpersonal and identity-related functions beyond information transmission. A change of language may intensify criticism, establish intimacy, signal insider status, create distance, introduce humour, or modify the force of a potentially face-threatening act. Research on Indian YouTube comments, for instance, demonstrates that switching between Indian English and Hindi can itself function as an impoliteness resource. Such findings caution against treating multilingualism as a demographic variable. Instead, language choice should be examined as a pragmatic action whose meaning depends on interlocutors, audience, topic, identity, and interactional position. This approach also avoids assuming that particular languages possess fixed politeness values.

2.7 Digital Community Norms

When interpersonal practices recur, they can become recognisable patterns of participation, acceptable behaviour, and norm enforcement that extend into community-level processes. Micro-level sequential acts and macro-level social structures are interconnected through recurrent discursive practices. These recurrent discursive practices connect micro-level interaction with macro-level social structures and, through repeated occurrence, may develop into relatively stable expectations and contribute to the formation of new social structures (Bourdieu et al., 1991; Schatzki, 2002). In YouTube environments, these practices signal legitimate positions and tolerated disagreement. However, recurrent practices should not be equated with universally shared rules; rather, they constitute negotiated and contested normative orientations visible through repeated interaction (Arundale, 2023; Ivaturi & Phang, 2019).

2.8 Synthesis and Research Gap

The literature establishes that YouTube comments constitute important sites of stance, identity, politeness, impoliteness, and ideological positioning. Yet these strands have largely developed as separate lines of inquiry. Stance research explains positioning and alignment; footing explains participation and alignment shifts; politeness research explains face and relational work; multilingual research demonstrates the pragmatic potential of linguistic repertoires; and digital-community research addresses norms. What remains insufficiently explained is how these dimensions operate in conjunction and sequentially within multilingual YouTube interaction, and how recurring micro-level practices contribute to the negotiation of community-level norms. The present study addresses this integrative gap by treating stancetaking, footing, facework, and multilingual resources as interconnected pragmatic practices rather than isolated analytical categories.

3. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

The study proposes a pragmatic account of how meanings are shaped through locally situated viewer responses that may develop into recurrent interactional expectations, termed the Stance–Footing–Facework–Norm Negotiation (SFFN) framework. The framework does not simply restate existing concepts of stance, footing, facework, and norms, but instead extends them by specifying their sequential and recursive interrelationships. Stance is defined here as the positioning of participants toward objects, propositions, and other participants (Du Bois, 2007; Wei & Wang, 2025).

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

Shifts in footing refer to changes in participants' positioning, voice, participation, and identity work (Goffman, 1979; McEntee-Atalianis & Vessey, 2025). Facework is understood as a relational process rather than a linguistic structure and is 'relationally negotiated'; that is, it is not a fixed property of a linguistic form, but rather its meaning emerges in relation to other participants (Locher & Watts, 2005; Culpeper, 2011).

The proposed mechanism is modelled as a progression from context to stance, footing, facework, uptake and response, recurrence, and ultimately to an emerging normative orientation. The arrows representing these relationships denote empirically observable interactional trajectories rather than deterministic causation. First, the video and its broader sociocultural context provide an initial interactional stimulus. A viewer then evaluates, aligns with, distances from, or contests that discourse through stancetaking practices. This positioning simultaneously shapes footing by establishing affiliation, disalignment, authority, expertise, or group membership. Footing consequently shapes the relational work performed through politeness, mitigation, confrontation, impoliteness, or repair. Subsequent replies provide observable uptake, through which participants ratify, reinterpret, resist, or escalate preceding positions. Only when comparable patterns recur across multiple interactional sequences can they be interpreted as evidence of an emerging normative orientation, rather than an established norm. This micro-to-macro logic is consistent with recent research demonstrating that pragmatic conventions can emerge through recurrent multilingual interaction (Pitzl-Hagin, 2024).

Crucially, the framework is empirically operationalised rather than merely illustrated through examples. Each analytical pathway is examined through linked comment–reply sequences: stance is identified through evaluative, epistemic, or confrontational positioning; footing through shifts in alignment, participation, or identity; facework through relational consequences and contextual evaluations of politeness or impoliteness; uptake through observable subsequent responses; and norm negotiation through recurrent patterns, endorsement, correction, enforcement, or gatekeeping across sequences. The corpus-level distributions identify recurrent configurations, while sequential analysis tests whether the proposed links are actually instantiated in interaction. The study, therefore, treats SFFN as a testable explanatory model: evidence supporting the framework requires convergence between quantitative patterns and sequential evidence, whereas absent uptake, inconsistent sequencing, or contradictory interactional outcomes would qualify or challenge the proposed pathway.

Finally, to bridge micro-level interaction and macro-level expectations, the SFFN framework operationalises norm emergence through three observable empirical markers: recurrent language policing (systematic correction of code-switching or translation boundaries across independent threads), standardised pushback against gatekeeping (collective community sanctioning of exclusionary comments), and corrective uptake stability (predictable patterns where subsequent users invoke unwritten rules to arbitrate local disputes). Tracking these converging markers across sequences provides a rigorous analytical benchmark for distinguishing isolated user preferences from recurring interactional patterns consistent with emerging normative orientations.

4. Methodology

4.1 Research Design

The study employed a comparative, corpus-assisted interactional pragmatic design combining descriptive corpus-based frequency mapping with fine-grained qualitative pragmatic analysis. The design did not treat the quantitative and qualitative components as separate approaches, but integrated quantitative pattern identification with qualitative interpretation, using corpus distributions to identify interactionally rich sequences (Partington et al., 2013; Flowerdew, 2013). The corpus-assisted component established the distribution and co-occurrence of stance, footing, facework, (im)politeness, and multilingual practices across the dataset. The interactional component then examined how these practices acquired pragmatic meaning within comment sequences, interpreting quantitative frequencies through sequential, contextual, and relational evidence.

4.2 Research Context

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

YouTube was selected as the empirical setting because it combines multimodal video discourse with asynchronous, participatory, publicly accessible interaction. Viewers respond to creator-produced discourse through top-level comments and threaded replies, allowing creator–viewer and viewer–viewer positioning practices to be examined within persistent interactional records. YouTube's data model formally distinguishes comment threads, top-level comments, and individual replies, making threaded interaction analytically recoverable when the relevant data are retrieved systematically.

4.3 Channel Selection

The study used criterion-based purposive sampling to identify six multilingual YouTube channels. Channels were eligible if they satisfied all of the following criteria: sustained audience engagement rather than engagement attributable primarily to a single viral event; demonstrable multilingual content or substantial multilingual viewer participation; active comment and reply interaction; sufficient publicly accessible video material for contextual interpretation; a clearly identifiable linguistic or sociocultural orientation; and a stable publication history during the sampling period. The final corpus comprised Korean Englishman, Easy Arabic, Easy Spanish, Easy German, Easy French, and Easy Languages. Their respective primary linguistic and multilingual resources, geographical or sociocultural orientation, subscriber counts at the collection date, and rationales for inclusion are reported in Table 1. Subscriber count was recorded descriptively but was not used as the principal sampling criterion. Selection instead prioritised multilingual relevance, interactional density, and suitability for addressing the research questions.

Table 1

Selected YouTube channels

Channel	Principal linguistic resources	Sociocultural/contextual orientation	Videos sampled	Rationale for inclusion
Korean Englishman	Korean, English (Code-switching, bilingual commentary, and cross-cultural reaction formats)	UK-South Korea cross-cultural exchanges, food tourism, and bicultural lifestyle narratives (6.2 M subscribers)	5	Provides high-density intercultural pragmatic data and bilingual viewer engagement bridging Western and East Asian contexts.
Easy Arabic	Arabic (Egyptian, Levantine, and North African colloquial dialects, Modern Standard Arabic) alongside English translation/subtitles	Street interviews across urban centers in Egypt, Palestine, and Tunisia (40.5K subscribers)	5	Offers rich multidialectal Arabic interactions, translanguaging dynamics, and localised pragmatic norms.
Easy Spanish	Spanish (Peninsular and Latin American regional varieties) with dual Spanish/English captioning	Street interviews and public vox pops focusing on everyday life in Spain and Latin America (644K subscribers)	5	Supplies extensive peer-to-peer discussions, politeness strategy negotiation, and vibrant cross-dialectal community feedback.

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

Channel	Principal linguistic resources	Sociocultural/contextual orientation	Videos sampled	Rationale for inclusion
Easy German	German (Standard German and colloquial regional variants) paired with bilingual subtitles	Street conversations recorded primarily in Berlin and other German-speaking urban settings (3.26 M subscribers)	5	Captures structured local interactional behaviours, direct stance-taking, and active international learner participation.
Easy French	French (Hexagonal and global francophone varieties) with integrated multi-language support	Public spaces in Paris and across the broader francophone world (1.19M subscribers)	5	Demonstrates rich metapragmatic commentary, stylistic register variation, and sustained conversational threads.
Easy Languages	Global multilingual matrix (featuring rotating international languages, bridging segments, and meta-linguistic discussions)	Global network framework coordinated from Germany focusing on street-level multilingualism (1.54M subscribers)	5	Enables a comparative macro-perspective on multilingual identity construction, cross-cultural code-switching, and global user interaction.

4.4 Sampling Design and Corpus Construction

Five videos were selected from each channel, producing 30 videos and an initial raw retrieval pool of approximately 10,413 comments (Dataset A). The sampling period extended from January 2023 to 5 September 2026. Video selection followed three criteria: relevance to the channel's multilingual communicative orientation, sufficient comment volume, and the presence of substantive reply activity. To reduce topic-specific bias, videos were distributed across the six topic categories rather than selected solely based on popularity. To bridge corpus-scale frequency mapping with qualitative depth, a systematic two-stage data-reduction pipeline was implemented. First, from the raw retrieval pool (Dataset A), non-interactive remarks, automated spam, and single-turn isolated comments lacking interactional uptake were filtered out, retaining threads containing at least one initiating comment and two or more sequential replies. Second, a stratified random sampling approach was applied across the six channel sub-corpora to ensure balanced representation of diverse linguistic and sociocultural contexts, yielding a focused corpus of sequential interactions, from which 726 comment units were selected for analytical coding for fine-grained quantitative categorisation and sequential analysis.

4.5 Video and Transcript Data

For each sampled video, the dataset included the video ID, title, publication date, description, language information, and relevant creator discourse. Creator speech was included only where it was necessary to interpret viewer responses, particularly when comments explicitly referenced a proposition, evaluative statement, person, event, or linguistic expression occurring in the video. Where an official YouTube transcript/caption was available through an authorised access route, it was used as the primary textual source. YouTube's current API documentation distinguishes caption metadata from caption-content retrieval and specifies authorization requirements for caption downloads. Where no suitable transcript was available, relevant video segments were manually transcribed in ELAN using standard conversational transcription conventions. Transcriptions retained multilingual expressions, code-

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

switching, culturally marked forms, pauses where analytically relevant, and other features necessary for pragmatic interpretation.

4.6 Comment-Thread Data

On September 5, 2026, comment data were gathered using the YouTube Data API v3. For each video, the dataset retained the video ID, comment-thread ID, comment ID, parent-comment ID, publication timestamp, available language information, comment text, and reply structure. The API permits comment-thread retrieval by video ID and supports pagination; importantly, the replies object does not necessarily contain every reply, requiring the comments list endpoint with the relevant parent ID when complete reply retrieval is necessary. Accordingly, each selected thread was reconstructed using the available reply structure. For analytical clarity, the study distinguished between the unit of quantitative coding and the unit of interactional analysis. The individual comment constituted the unit of quantitative coding, whereas the comment sequence constituted the unit of sequential interactional analysis. Each selected sequence was reconstructed using the available reply structure so that the pragmatic interpretation of each comment could be evaluated in relation to preceding contributions, subsequent uptake, and interactional consequences. Emojis, punctuation, capitalization, quotation, orthographic stylisation, hyperlinks, and other interactionally meaningful multimodal markers were retained where they contributed to interpretation.

4.7 Coding Framework

Coding operationalised the study's Stance–Footing–Facework–Norm Negotiation (SFFN) framework. Stance was coded in terms of epistemic, evaluative, affective, moral, and ideological positioning. Footing was coded through alignment, misalignment, affiliation, distancing, quotation, and participation/role shifts. Facework captured face support, face threat, mitigation, intensification, and repair. Politeness coding included solidarity, appreciation, agreement, hedging, indirectness, and common-ground construction, whereas impoliteness included ridicule, sarcasm, accusation, dismissal, insult, and confrontation. These categories were interpreted contextually rather than assigned mechanically based on lexical form.

For quantitative frequency analysis, the individual YouTube comment constituted the unit of analysis. From Dataset A, 726 analytically selected comments were subjected to fine-grained quantitative coding. Each analysed comment received one primary focal code representing its most salient pragmatic feature for the mutually exclusive distribution reported in Table 2. To capture the multidimensional nature of interaction, secondary or co-occurring properties, including code-switching, translanguaging, norm enforcement, gatekeeping, and face-attacking acts (FAAs)—were coded independently as non-exclusive qualitative variables. Thus, a comment could receive an affective/evaluative stance as its primary focal code while simultaneously displaying code-switching or normative positioning. Multilingual practices were coded as code-switching, translanguaging, language alternation, translation, and culturally marked expressions, while community-level normative practices were coded as endorsement, enforcement, violation, gatekeeping, inclusion, and exclusion.

4.8 Data Analysis

The analysis proceeded in three integrated stages. First, a descriptive quantitative baseline was established using the 726 primary-coded comments to generate the mutually exclusive distribution in Table 2. Secondary and co-occurring properties were analysed independently as marginal indicators and were not added to the primary-code denominator, preventing conflation between comment counts and multidimensional coding frequencies. Descriptive frequencies were used to identify recurrent patterns and guide the selection of sequences for qualitative analysis rather than to infer population-level statistical generalisations. Second, interactional pragmatic analysis examined selected sequences through the analytical trajectory: video/context → viewer interpretation → stance → footing/alignment → facework/(im)politeness → interactional response → consequence, paying close attention to sequential uptake. Third, comparative analysis examined similarities and differences across channels and linguistic configurations while retaining negative cases. Normative orientations were inferred cautiously from recurrence, participant uptake, explicit evaluation, metapragmatic commentary, enforcement, correction, and sanction.

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

4.9 Reliability, Validity, and Reflexivity

A formal coding manual specified category definitions, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and decision rules. Following pilot testing on 10% of Dataset A (1,041 comments) to refine ambiguous categories, intra-coder consistency was assessed by having the researchers re-code 20% of the corpus after a defined time interval. Coding stability was assessed using Krippendorff's alpha ($\alpha = .84$) for variables permitting multiple codes, and Cohen's kappa where a binary or mutually exclusive coding structure applied (Krippendorff, 2004; Lombard et al., 2002). Discrepancies identified during intra-coder re-evaluation were resolved through systematic review against the coding manual. Because pragmatic interpretation is inherently context-sensitive, numerical reliability estimates were supplemented by iterative recoding, negative-case analysis, translation verification, reflexive analytic memos, and documentation of interpretive decisions. The researchers also emphasised the importance of language abilities and translation decisions to mitigate the risk of interpretive bias.

4.10 Ethics and Data Governance

Because this study relied exclusively on publicly available, non-identifiable user comments from a public video-sharing platform, formal institutional ethical board approval was not required under institutional guidelines. However, relevant ethical principles for digital research were rigorously observed. Usernames, user identifiers, and unnecessary personal information were removed from the research data. Quotations were selected conservatively, and potentially searchable or sensitive comments were paraphrased to prevent reverse-identification via search engines where verbatim reproduction could create unnecessary traceability or risk of harm. Data were stored on university-secured, encrypted OneDrive cloud storage with access restricted exclusively to the researchers. The collection procedure complied with the applicable YouTube Terms of Service and YouTube API policies. YouTube's current documentation provides authorised mechanisms for retrieving public video and comment data, while its Researcher Program imposes additional conditions on access, use, storage, and disclosure of research data. Accordingly, API access/Researcher Program status was established before data collection, and the study retained only the information necessary for the stated research purposes. No usernames or unnecessary personal identifiers were reproduced in the publication.

5. Results

The results are organised around the three research questions. The quantitative analysis comprised 726 analysed comment units selected from the broader corpus of approximately 10,413 comments. Each analysed comment received one coded pragmatic feature for the mutually exclusive descriptive distribution reported in Table 2. Secondary and co-occurring pragmatic properties—including code-switching, translanguaging, norm enforcement, gatekeeping, and face-attacking acts—were coded independently and were not added to the primary-code denominator. The numerical results, therefore, establish the distribution of primary focal pragmatic orientations, while the qualitative findings examine how multiple pragmatic properties could co-occur within individual comments and how their interactional consequences depended on uptake, alignment, resistance, mitigation, or escalation.

5.1 Stancetaking

Affective evaluation was the most frequently observed stance feature, occurring in 248 of the 726 analysed comments (34.16%), followed by epistemic stance (112; 15.43%) and confrontational stance/practice (36; 4.96%). These frequencies describe the occurrence of the coded stance features rather than the total incidence of all stance-related meanings in the corpus. A comment assigned another primary code could nevertheless contain affective, epistemic, or confrontational elements as secondary or co-occurring properties. Thus, viewers frequently positioned themselves through an affective/evaluative stance rather than through knowledge claims or confrontational positioning. Affective stance was commonly intensified through expressions such as “so fun,” “love,” “amazing,” “hilarious,” and “joy,” often reinforced by repetition, punctuation, laughter markers, and emojis. Descriptions of the guests’ enjoyment as ‘contagious’ further demonstrate alignment with the participants’ affective orientation rather than detached observation.

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

Epistemic stance was realised through assertions, explanations, corrections, and culture-related knowledge claims. Viewers positioned themselves as knowledgeable interpreters of food, pronunciation, language, regional practices, and cultural conventions, for example, by explaining why Korean corn was chewy or clarifying the meaning of "not too sweet." These were not merely informational contributions; they also displayed competence and established an authoritative interactional footing.

Stance was therefore simultaneously propositional and relational. A single comment could evaluate an event while simultaneously affiliating with the hosts, challenging an interpretation, or claiming insider knowledge. This was particularly clear in playful confrontation. Samantha's repeated "why" questions were described as a valued feature, and "aggressive questions" were positively evaluated. The apparently accusatory stance consequently functioned as an affiliation when uptake treated confrontation as humorous and desirable. Across contexts, stance intensity ranged from enthusiastic praise to categorical cultural claims, with meaning shaped by the relational positioning established through the interaction.

5.2 Footing and Alignment

The most frequently observed footing pattern was empathetic viewer alignment, which was present in 185 of the 726 analysed comments (25.48%). Professional/peer footing was another recurrent footing pattern in 42 comments (5.79%). Commenters frequently shifted from an observer position to a more participatory footing, describing themselves as travelling with the hosts, expressing a desire to join future trips, and constructing the channel as a shared social space. One comment likened the experience to "a bunch of cousins going on a road trip together," explicitly reducing creator–viewer distance.

Agreement and affiliation were commonly realised through direct address, praise, invitations to visit other countries, requests for additional episodes, and shared reactions to food and cultural experiences. Professional/peer footing functioned differently: viewers with culinary knowledge aligned themselves with guest chefs by offering explanations, corrections, and craft-related observations. This positioned them not simply as fans but as knowledgeable participants.

Footing was also dynamic across agreement and disagreement. A commenter could establish solidarity and subsequently introduce criticism of editing, subtitles, linguistic accuracy, or upload schedules. In this sense, distancing did not necessarily replace affiliation; it could be layered onto it. Viewer–viewer relations similarly involved coalition formation, particularly when participants endorsed or contested another commenter's evaluation. The results, therefore, show creator–viewer and viewer–viewer positioning as negotiated rather than fixed, with commenters moving among solidarity, expertise, correction, and a sense of consumer entitlement according to the local interactional context.

Table 2

Distribution of Primary Pragmatic Codes Across Analysed Comments (n = 726)

Analytical dimension	Coded pragmatic feature	Comments exhibiting feature, n	% of analysed comments	Interactional function/orientation
Stance	Affective/evaluative stance	248	34.16	Emotional evaluation and affective positioning; generally endorsed

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

Analytical dimension	Coded pragmatic feature	Comments exhibiting feature, n	% of analysed comments	Interactional function/orientation
Stance	Epistemic stance	112	15.43	Knowledge, explanation, correction, or authoritative positioning
Stance	Confrontational stance/practice	36	4.96	Calling out behaviour or challenging a position; uptake may ratify or escalate
Footing	Empathetic/affiliative viewer alignment	185	25.48	Positioning self as participant, companion, or affiliative viewer
Footing	Professional/peer footing	42	5.79	Positioning self through professional or domain-specific expertise
Facework / Politeness	Positive-politeness/solidarity practices	74	10.19	Common-ground construction, appreciation, praise, and affiliation
Facework / Politeness	Mitigated criticism	29	3.99	Criticism or requests softened through hedging, supportive framing, or indirectness
Impoliteness	Face-attacking acts (FAAs)	0	0.00	No comment was assigned to this as its primary focal code
Total analysed comment units		726	100.00	One primary focal code assigned per analysed comment

Note. The unit of quantitative analysis is the individual comment. Each of the 726 analysed comments received one primary focal code, so the frequencies in this table are mutually exclusive and sum to 726. Secondary and co-occurring pragmatic properties were coded independently and are not represented in this additive distribution. Percentages are rounded to two decimal places; consequently, component sums may differ marginally from 100%.

5.3 Facework, Politeness, and Impoliteness

Within the primary focal-code distribution, 74 analysed comments (10.19%) were assigned positive politeness as their principal facework orientation, while 29 (3.99%) were assigned mitigated criticism. Positive politeness was realised through appreciation, gratitude, shared cultural references, agreement, and explicit affection. Expressions such as “Thank you, Josh and Ollie,” and “I love these two” constructed common ground and reinforced creator–viewer affiliation, strengthening relational bonds and increasing the acceptability of subsequent contributions. Mitigation was most clearly evident in critiques of production decisions. Complaints about episode length, editing,

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

upload frequency, and language delivery were frequently framed through hedging or supportive prefaces, such as "Please hear me out" or formulations equivalent to "I love you guys, but…". In the learner-oriented material, viewers combined positive evaluations with requests for slower speech or clearer delivery, allowing disagreement to coexist with continued affiliation while supporting positive face.

Face-attacking acts (FAAs) received no primary focal-code assignment in the quantitative matrix (0/726; 0.00%), indicating that no analysed comment was assigned an FAA as its principal focal pragmatic orientation. It is important to clarify that this 0.00% baseline reflects the mutually exclusive focal-code distribution only; it does not indicate the absence of face-threatening moves from the broader interactional material. However, because the coding architecture permitted independent secondary and co-occurring categorisation, localised hostile exchanges and face-threatening moves were captured as secondary indicators during qualitative sequence tracking. Localised hostile episodes were also observed in the qualitative material, such as in the Easy Esperanto discussions, where overtly negative evaluations elicited replies and counter-positioning. In these instances, impoliteness functioned as a resource for ideological and identity contestation, with relational consequences determined by subsequent uptake.

By contrast, the Korean-Englishman material showed that confrontation could be positively ratified rather than escalated: viewers endorsed "aggressive questions" as humorous and affiliative. Overall, facework, politeness, and impoliteness functioned as sequential resources through which participants supported, challenged, and renegotiated relationships and community boundaries.

Table 3

Non-Exclusive Distribution of Coded Pragmatic Features Across Analysed Comments

Channel	Analysed comments (*n*)	Percentage of analysed comments (%)
Korean Englishman	224	30.85
Easy Arabic	187	25.76
Easy Spanish	113	15.56
Easy German	83	11.43
Easy French	70	9.64
Easy Languages	49	6.75
Total	726	100.00

Note. The unit represented is the individual analysed comment (*n* = 726). Channel frequencies are mutually exclusive because each comment belongs to one source channel. Secondary/co-occurring properties (such as code-switching or gatekeeping) are reported separately rather than being summed into channel subtotals.

As shown in Table 3, the analysed comments were distributed across all six channel contexts, ranging from Korean Englishman (224; 30.85%) to Easy Languages (49; 6.75%). These figures describe the composition of the quantitatively analysed comment set. The coding framework allowed for secondary and co-occurring codes, which was the reason for using qualitative sequence analysis and non-exclusive marginal frequencies for the examination of multilingual and normative practices.

5.4 From Micro-Stance to Macro-Norm Negotiation: A Sequential Trace

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

To illustrate the operationalisation of epistemic stance and its development into norm negotiation, a set of 142 analytical excerpts was selected from the Korean Englishman corpus.

Turn 1 - Top-Level Comment (Epistemic Stance): "That's not actually how traditional tteokbokki is made in Seoul; the sauce uses a base stock rather than just water and gochujang."

Turn 2 - Reply (Affiliative Uptake & Correction): "True, but Josh and Ollie were focusing on the quick home version for British students, so context matters here."

Turn 3 - Subsequent Reply (Norm Enforcement / Gatekeeping): "Fair point, but if we're explaining Korean food to a global audience, accuracy still matters; people try it and complain it tastes bland."

Analytical Trace: This sequence illustrates the construction of culinary authority through epistemic stance (certainty/assertion). Rather than functioning as an unmitigated criticism, Turn 2 combines mitigation with an affiliative footing, supporting the creators while also redirecting the exchange toward factual correction. Turn 3, however, introduces a further evaluative move that shifts the interaction toward normative negotiation concerning educational responsibility and cultural accuracy on multilingual channels. This progression exemplifies the SFFN framework in action: individual epistemic assertions, when taken up and evaluated across turns, contribute to the possible emergence of shared community expectations regarding authentic representation.

6. Discussion

6.1 Rethinking Stance and Footing as Relational Processes

The findings suggest that stance in asynchronous YouTube interaction should be understood less as an expression of an individual position than as a relational practice enacted toward multiple participants and audiences. Affective evaluation emerged as the most salient stance pattern, but its significance extended beyond emotional expression: praise such as "so fun," "love," "amazing," and "hilarious" positioned commenters affectively with hosts and guests and thereby contributed to affiliation. Epistemic stance similarly exceeded the communication of information. Explanations and corrections concerning food, pronunciation, culture, and language enabled viewers to construct knowledgeable identities and project authoritative interactional positions. Stance, therefore, involved both what was asserted and the social position from which it was asserted (Du Bois, 2007).

This finding extends an interactional view of stance by showing that asynchronous comments can remain relational despite the absence of immediate co-presence. Footing is consequently not simply a shift in speaker alignment but a resource for managing multiple participation roles. Empathetic/affiliative alignment showed viewers moving from observer to participant positions, while professional/peer footing enabled some commenters to claim expertise. Importantly, these footings could coexist within the same interaction: affiliation could be followed by criticism, expertise could be mobilised in support of creators, and distancing could occur without abandoning solidarity. In this respect, the findings develop Goffman's (1979) concept of footing for asynchronous discourse by demonstrating that participants can sustain, layer, and recalibrate footings across persistent comment sequences and in relation to both immediate interlocutors and imagined audiences.

6.2 Uptake, Facework, and the Variable Force of Confrontation

The findings also challenge form-based interpretations of politeness and impoliteness. Positive-politeness practices and mitigated criticism enabled disagreement to coexist with affiliation, while confrontational practices did not invariably produce relational damage. A comment that appears accusatory may become affiliative when subsequent uptake treats it as humorous, whereas similar disagreement may generate escalation when recipients ratify a hostile interpretation. Pragmatic force, therefore, cannot be reliably assigned from linguistic form alone; it emerges through sequential uptake and the relationship being negotiated (Locher & Watts, 2005; Culpeper, 2011). This is particularly important in YouTube interaction because comments are persistent, publicly inspectable, and oriented

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

simultaneously to the immediate interlocutor and potentially wider audiences. Participants therefore manage face not only in relation to a specific recipient but also before readers who may subsequently reinforce, challenge, or reinterpret the original move. Mitigation consequently does more than reduce the force of criticism: it helps preserve an affiliative footing while disagreement is introduced. Uptake thus functions as a crucial mediator of confrontation, determining whether an apparently face-threatening practice is subsequently ratified as solidarity, maintained as disagreement, or escalated into interpersonal conflict.

6.3 Multilingual Practice and the Explanatory Value of SFFN

The findings further demonstrate that multilingual practices should not be treated as an independent linguistic variable alongside stance and facework. Code-switching, translanguaging, language alternation, and translation could participate simultaneously in stance-taking, identity positioning, affiliation, expertise, and the negotiation of linguistic legitimacy. Multilingual practice could therefore itself become part of facework: a language choice might intensify criticism, create intimacy, signal insider status, or modify relational distance depending on its uptake and interactional context. This overlap is difficult to represent adequately through isolated analytical categories.

The SFFN framework addresses this problem by modelling the relations among these dimensions rather than merely placing them side by side. Its distinctive value lies in specifying an empirically traceable and recursive pathway: contextual interpretation shapes stance; stance configures footing; footing conditions facework; subsequent uptake ratifies, resists, or redirects the preceding move; and comparable patterns may recur as emerging normative orientations. SFFN therefore explains not only which pragmatic resources occur, but how their interactional consequences develop across sequences and how, under conditions of recurrence and social evaluation, localised practices may acquire normative significance (Kakoulli-Constantinou, 2018). Its contribution is thus a micro-to-macro account in which stance, footing, facework, and multilingual practice are analytically interconnected, while uptake provides the mechanism through which their consequences become observable and potentially recurrent.

6.4 Implications

Theoretically, the study demonstrates the value of analysing stance, footing, and facework as interconnected processes rather than independent categories. Methodologically, the study demonstrates why corpus-level frequency mapping should be combined with fine-grained qualitative interactional analysis: quantitative patterns establish recurrence, whereas sequential interpretation explains pragmatic function. Practically, the findings suggest that multilingual digital communities require context-sensitive distinctions between constructive criticism, playful confrontation, and relational aggression, while demonstrating that multilingual language use can facilitate affiliation, identity work, and participation.

6.5 Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations delimit these findings. First, the unequal distribution of analysed comments across the six channel contexts—ranging from 224 comments in Korean Englishman to 49 in Easy Languages—reflects naturally occurring differences in audience engagement density and community activity rather than a balanced quota sample. Although this variance mirrors channel-specific participation patterns, it means that corpus-level frequency comparisons are skewed toward larger, highly interactive channels and should therefore be interpreted as context-dependent tendencies rather than uniform cross-channel metrics. Furthermore, the corpus captures publicly visible participation and cannot capture the perspectives of silent viewers, deleted comments, or reactions that were never expressed publicly. The purposive sample also limits the generalisability of the findings beyond the selected YouTube environments, and translation or interpretation may affect the analysis of humour, culturally marked expressions, and pragmatic force. In addition, recurrent interactional practices provide some evidence of normative orientations, but do not indicate that all community members share them; they provide evidence of interactional association, not causal relations. Longitudinal studies are needed to evaluate the possible stability or change of these norms. Future research could apply the SFFN framework across different digital environments using larger cross-platform datasets and explore variation through comparative multilingual studies without conflating language with culture. Future

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

multimodal research incorporating audiovisual cues, emojis, images, and platform reactions may further clarify how stance and facework are distributed across different semiotic resources.

7. Conclusion

This study examined how multilingual YouTube commenters use stancetaking, footing, and facework to negotiate interpersonal relations and community participation. The findings demonstrate that viewers do not merely express opinions: they construct affective and epistemic positions, shift between affiliative, expert, and critical footings, and use politeness, mitigation, confrontation, and multilingual resources to negotiate alignment and disagreement. Crucially, the interactional consequences of these practices depended on uptake and context; apparently confrontational expressions could foster solidarity, whereas other forms of disagreement could lead to escalation and boundary formation. Ultimately, the Stance–Footing–Facework–Norm Negotiation (SFFN) framework is not bound to YouTube alone; its recursive architecture offers a potentially transferable analytical lens for examining any multimodal, asynchronous digital environment. The framework may also be applied to other emergent interactional spaces, allowing comparative analysis of how micro-level stancetaking and footing, mediated by uptake and facework, may contribute to emerging community norms.

References

Agustina, I., Sinaga, R., & Ginting, P. (2025). Teaching digital pragmatics: Politeness strategies

and face negotiation in real-time game-based interaction. *Elsya: Journal of English Language Studies*, *7*(2), 174–188. https://doi.org/10.31849/elsya.v7i2.25061

Arundale, R. B. (2023). The emergence of social order in everyday interacting: Re-conceptualizing

a venerable sociological concept in light of conversation analysis. *Frontiers in Sociology*, *8*, 1102449. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2023.1102449

Bourdieu, P., Thompson, J. B., & Raymond, G. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (Vol. 138).

Harvard University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge

University Press.

Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511975752

Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse:*

Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction (pp. 139–182). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.164.07du

Dynel, M. (2012). Swearing methodologically: The (im)politeness of expletives in anonymous

commentary on YouTube. *Journal of English Studies*, *10*, 25–50. https://doi.org/10.18172/jes.179

Englebretson, R. (2007). Stancetaking in discourse: An introduction. In R. Englebretson (Ed.),

Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction (pp. 1–25). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.164.02eng

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

Eragamreddy, N. R. (2025). The impact of AI on pragmatic competence. *Journal of Teaching*

English for Specific and Academic Purposes, *13*(1), 169–189. https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP250122015E

Flowerdew, J. (2013). *Discourse in English language education*. Routledge.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave

Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Goffman, E. (1979). Footing. *Semiotica*, *25*(1–2), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1979.2.1-2.1

Graham, S. L., & Hardaker, C. (2017). (Im)politeness in digital communication. In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh, & D. Z. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 785-

814). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-37508-7_30

Hassan, B.-E. A. (2019). Impolite viewer responses in Arabic political TV talk shows on YouTube.

Pragmatics, *29*(4), 521–544. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.18025.has

Herring, S. C. (2005). Computer-mediated discourse. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton

(Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 612–634). Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470753460.ch32

Herring, S. C., & Androutsopoulos, P. (2015). Computer-mediated discourse 2.0. In D. Tannen,

H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 127–151). Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584194.ch6

Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse.

Discourse Studies, *7*(2), 173–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365

Ivaturi, K., & Phang, C. W. (2019). Framing norms in online communities. *Information &*

Management, *56*(1), 15–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2018.05.015

Jacknick, C. M., & Avni, S. (2017). 'Shalom, Bitches': Epistemic stance and identity work in an

anonymous online forum. *Discourse, Context & Media*, *15*, 54–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2016.11.002

Kakoulli-Constantinou, E. (2018). Teaching in clouds: Using the G Suite for education for the

delivery of two EAP courses. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, *6*(2), 305–317. https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP1802305C

Kakoulli-Constantinou, E., & Papadima-Sophocleous, S. (2020). The use of digital technology in

ESP: Current practices and suggestions for ESP teacher education. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, *8*(1), 17–29. https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP2001017K

Kapoor, S. (2022). 'Don't act like a Sati-Savitri!': Hinglish and other impoliteness strategies in

Indian YouTube comments. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *189*, 4–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.12.009

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

Krippendorff, K. (2004). Reliability in content analysis: Some common misconceptions and

recommendations. *Human Communication Research*, *30*(3), 411–433. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2004.tb00738.x

Liang, M.-Y., Tsai, S.-P. J., & Tsai, I.-T. (2023). 'I'm not blue or green. I'm black': The

participatory entextualization of translingual memes and metapragmatic comments in transnational sociopolitical discourse. *Discourse & Society*, *34*(4), 439–459. https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265221141321

Locher, M. A., & Watts, R. J. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness*

Research, *1*(1), 9–33. https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.9

Locher, M. A., & Watts, R. J. (2008). Relational work and impoliteness: Negotiating norms of

linguistic behaviour. In D. Bousfield & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice* (pp. 77–99). Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208344.2.77

Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., & Bracken, C. C. (2002). Content analysis in mass communication:

Assessment and reporting of intercoder reliability. *Human Communication Research*, *28*(4), 587–604. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2002.tb00826.x

McCambridge, L. (2022). Describing the voice of online bullying: An analysis of stance and voice

type in YouTube comments. *Discourse, Context & Media*, *45*, 100552. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2021.100552

McEntee-Atalianis, L., & Vessey, R. (2025). Putting negotiation on a 'principal-ed' footing: A

corpus-informed discourse analysis of person deixis in diplomatic debates. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *247*, 42–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2025.07.013

Melnyk, L., & Feld, L. (2022). Sentiment analysis and stance detection on German YouTube

comments on gender diversity. *Journal of Computer-Assisted Linguistic Research*, *6*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.4995/jclr.2022.18224

Mısır, H., & Güler, H. İ. (2024). Translanguaging dynamics in the digital landscape: Insights from

a social media corpus. *Language Awareness*, *33*(3), 468–487. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2023.2285401

Partington, A., Duguid, A., & Taylor, C. (2013). *Patterns and meanings in discourse: Theory and*

practice in corpus-assisted discourse studies (CADS). John Benjamins.

Pitzl-Hagin, M.-L. (2024). Emergent pragmatic conventions in spoken ELF corpus data: Micro

diachronic analysis of inclusive vs. exclusive multilingual practices. *Corpus Pragmatics*, *8*(3), 175–200. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-024-00166-1

Ren, W., & Tahir, I. (2026). Pragmatic translanguaging among Indonesian multilingual youth on

social media. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *260*, 64–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2026.04.003

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English

Schatzki, T. R. (2002). *The site of the social: A philosophical account of the constitution of social life and change*. Penn State Press.

Wei, Y., & Wang, Y. (2025). Expressing stance: A cross-linguistic study of effective and epistemic stance marking in Chinese and English opinion reports. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *240*, 18–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2025.02.009

Ethical approval and consent to participate

Not applicable

Conflict of Interest Consent for publication

Not applicable. The study relies exclusively on publicly available digital data without human participant involvement.

Availability of data and materials

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

Not applicable.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

© 2026 Sougand Akbarian Publications | SOUGAND in English