What’s All the Yakkin About?  
Using Critical Discourse Analysis to Understand the Implications of Yik Yak

Yasmin Rioux  
*Indiana University of Pennsylvania*

**Abstract**  
In this paper, the author uses Critical Discourse Analysis, or CDA, to analyze and examine the maintenance, establishment, and advancement of existing hegemonic structures as depicted through contemporary language use on the social media site, Yik Yak. By collecting popular, or “upvoted” Yaks from four institutions across the United States, the author gained insight into contemporary Yakkers’ use of language when discussing matters pertaining to age, gender, and class. Also, the analysis of language in regards to the described topics shed light on how Yakkers contribute to the maintenance of current hegemonic structures, power inequalities, and imbalances between groups. The analysis of contemporary language use through a popular social media site such as Yik Yak, is important as it enables a better understanding of what ideologies are being reinforced in digital discourse and what societal power constructions are being supported and continued by fellow Yakkers, who, through their votes and comments, contribute to systems that are conducive to sustaining social inequalities.
Introduction

Social media has become increasingly popular over the past decade. The rise of Facebook, Pinterest, and Twitter has not only enabled users to interact and connect with others on a global scale but also to contribute to the creation of new types of discourse communities that have vast audiences and unprecedented numbers of contributors. In 2013, Yik Yak was created, causing more disagreement than other social media platforms due to its highly controversial feature: user anonymity. While the continuation of such social media outlets is inevitable and contributors’ involvement unavoidable, the question arises of how such platforms can be used as sites of insight into contemporary societal power structures and ideologies. Using critical discourse analysis helps shed light on these existing hegemonic structures and how these are supported, continued, and maintained in interactions on popular social media platforms.

Yik Yak—An Overview

Yik Yak was released on the app market in November, 2013, by two recent Furman University graduates, Brooks Buffington and Tyler Droll. The college- and university-geared app allows users to contribute to the Yik Yak community with their written Yaks, which can then be “upvoted” or “downvoted” by other users to thereby “control what’s hot” (Yik Yak, 2015). Other users can also comment on Yaks, which will then lead to a Yak potentially being promoted to the “Hot,” instead of the “New” tab. In addition to viewing the “basecamp,” or area of one’s geographic affiliation, a user can also “peek” into other communities, or “herds,” to examine the local Yaks elsewhere (Yik Yak, 2015). New on Yik Yak is a “feature that asks users about to post a threatening Yak if they’re sure it’s a good idea” (Fabris & Subiano, 2015).
Compared to other popular social media outlets, Yik Yak allows its users to post, or “Yak,” anonymously as it “encourages less-inhibited commentary, and allows the best posts to rise to the top” (Koenig, 2014). The idea of anonymity is not only novel to social media but also one of Yik Yak’s most prominent, controversial, and popular features. As Buffington states, anonymity “allows you to talk about certain topics you can’t talk about on Facebook […] your mom or teacher is on Twitter or Facebook. . . . This is a more open discussion.” Instead of usernames, Yakkers can select from outdoor-themed symbols—such as fire, paddles, maps, flashlights—and add a color of their liking. Yik Yak also lists six specific rules on the app (see Appendix A), which one can choose to “agree” to or “cancel” out of, the latter disabling one from writing Yaks.

The ability to post anonymous Yaks—and the resultant negative comments that have circulated through the “herd” (meaning the other Yakkers in a person’s designated area, assigned based on a user’s location as well as academic and geographic affiliation)—have caused Yik Yak’s reputation to become increasingly questionable (Fabris, 2015; Fabris & Supiano, 2015; Koenig, 2014; Schmidt, 2015). While the creators’ original intentions for Yik Yak were to use it as a “tool for observational campus comedy” (Koenig, 2014), it more recently has been described as a platform for students to “anonymously air gripes against their professors” (Fabris, 2015). Currently, most users are college students, but some administrators and faculty have discovered Yik Yak for themselves as well (Fabris & Supiano, 2015).

Theoretical Background/Approach

Van Dijk (1993) has described that those involved in critical discourse analysis (CDA) want to gain “more insight into the crucial role of discourse in the reproduction of dominance
and inequality” (p. 253) and that the overall approach of critical discourse analysis focuses on the relationship between societal power, power differences, and language (Fairclough, 2001; van Dijk, 1993; Wodak, 2001). Wodak (2001) pointed out that Critical Discourse Analysis “regards ‘language as social practice’” (p. 1), and emphasizes the understanding of the context in which language is used. Further, “CDA aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signaled, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use” (Wodak, 2001, p. 2). The construction and maintenance of power relationships and language are seen as inextricably interconnected, and it is therefore the researcher’s goal to “know what structures, strategies or other properties of text, talk, verbal interaction or communicative events play a role in these modes of reproduction” (van Dijk, 1993, p. 250).

CDA assumes that language is reflective of the society and discourse communities in which it is used (Fairclough, 2001; van Dijk, 1993). Further, individuals within such contexts are inevitably affected by or are contributors to existing power inequalities and struggles, which leads to the reproduction and therefore maintenance of such power relations (Fairclough, 2001; van Dijk, 1993; Wodak, 2001). Van Dijk (1993) pointed out, “In order to relate discourse and society, and hence discourse and the reproduction of dominance and inequality, we need to examine in detail the role of social representations in the minds of social actors” (p. 251). Discourse can then be viewed as fully embedded in and reflective of dominance, where the maintenance of hegemony and power-driven ideologies is continually perpetuated by the members of the most powerful group(s) within a given society (Fairclough, 2001; Wodak, 2001). Also, it is important to note that through the continuous construction of power-based discourse, “dominant structures stabilize conventions and naturalize them” (Wodak, 2001, p. 3). This
suggests that, over time, members within a discourse community or society—on both ends of the power spectrum—do not perceive power inequalities as existent anymore but view them as normal, everyday language, which then leads to the maintenance and continuation thereof (Fairclough, 2001; van Dijk, 1993; Wodak, 2001). As language is such an integral and common aspect of society (Fairclough, 2001; Wodak, 2001), power constructions and dominance are oftentimes “enacted and reproduced by subtle, routine, everyday forms of text and talk that appear ‘natural’ and quite ‘acceptable’” (van Dijk, 1993, p. 254).

Considering individual participants or groups of speakers, Fairclough (2001) has said, “It is the prerogative of powerful participants to determine which discourse type(s) may be legitimately drawn upon” (p. 39), which further suggests the maintenance of enacted power through language. Another important aspect to consider when doing CDA is ideology and language (Fairclough, 2001; Romera, 2015; Wodak, 2001). As the dominant group within society does not only control language and discourse structures but also decides which ideologies will become or remain dominant within a group, CDA “takes a particular interest in the ways in which language mediates ideology in a variety of social institutions” (Wodak, 2001, p. 10). In addition, it is important to note that compared to other approaches in discourse analysis that seek to examine underlying power discrepancies in discourses, “CDA does not primarily aim to contribute to a specific discipline, paradigm, school or discourse theory” (van Dijk, 1993, p. 252). Instead, it relies on multidisciplinary approaches that allow for the application of theories to take place.
Power, Access, and Yik Yak

Considering power and language relations in mediated interactions of participants, speakers/writers and listeners/readers are frequently in situations that do not require face-to-face interactions, placing the role of contributor or consumer on all participants (Fairclough, 2001). Further, face-to-face interactions allow or require individuals to adjust their message for an intended or given audience that can, oftentimes, respond to a message. However, “media discourse is designed for mass audiences, and there is no way that producers can even know who is in the audience, let alone adapt to its diverse sections” (Fairclough, 2001, p. 41). Power enactment is given solely, if temporarily, to the producer who is in control of what is being said, how it is being said, and who an ideal audience member would be (Fairclough, 2001). In addition, individuals who use media outlets for messages “do not represent equally all social groupings in the population” (Fairclough, 2001, p. 42), and oftentimes those who are represented most frequently are those in power, who determine not only the language structure but also its maintenance through reproduction. In the case of Yik Yak, its primary users are college students, suggesting that an analysis of Yaks can shed light on the power and access within this given subgroup and show what elements of language are promoted, reproduced, and therefore accepted by others as useable and maintainable language despite inevitable discrepancies in user representation.

As mentioned earlier, the most powerful participants have the power to regulate discourse, which is also reflected in mediated interactions where producers, and therefore messages, according to Fairclough (2001), tend to “favour certain interpretations and ‘wordings’ of events, while excluding others” (p. 43), which can be viewed as a type of implied or “hidden
power” (p. 43). As “texts are the relevant units of language in communication” and “readers/hearers are not passive recipients in their relationships to texts” (Wodak, 2001, p. 6), the issue of power, language, consumers, and producers is further complicated, especially if anonymity of the producer is granted, as is the case for Yik Yak.

The issue of access and accessibility is also taken into account as a crucial element of discourse and power as power within society is oftentimes related to “privileged access to socially valued resources” (van Dijk, 1993, p. 254). In terms of media and other forms of interactions, access can pertain to the idea “that language users or communicators have more or less freedom in the use of special discourse genres or styles, or in the participation in specific communicative events and contexts” (van Dijk, 1993, p. 256). This is an important facet of the Yik Yak sphere as the app relies on individuals who possess smartphones: Only those who are able to download the app onto such a device have access to the described discourse community and can contribute to what is being said or neglected. Clearly, this eliminates all who cannot afford the still-pricey smartphones or those who do not have a data plan that allows them to continuously be online, giving a clear communicative advantage to those Yakkers who can afford a phone plan with unlimited data. As the primary Yik Yak users are college students, it cannot be assumed that all potential participants’ data plans allow them unlimited access to their Yik Yak sites, thereby privileging those who can purchase unlimited or large amounts of data and phones that support app installation. This further suggests that access and power are continued and advanced through those with increased socioeconomic standing.

Finally, Fairclough (2001) mentions that control in language can be exercised through constraint, specifically by placing “constraints” on “contents” (pp. 38-39), meaning that “what is
said or done” (p. 39) is influenced, controlled, or enacted by those in power. Considering Yik Yak, this should suggest that those in power determine what is being “Yakked” and what will receive the most “upvotes” which will therefore enter the mainstream and become acceptable and naturalized (Wodak, 2001). Consequently, the app does not present voices of less privileged and, therefore, less powerful individuals within society.

Method

In order to collect data for the current CDA approach, I selected four higher education institutions located on the West Coast, on the East Coast, in the Midwest, and in a southern state in the United States. To further analyze the local herds there, I selected the three most upvoted Yaks in the “Hot” section from each location on the same day. I chose Yaks from the “Hot” instead of the “New” section as such Yaks have already been voted as more favorable than other Yaks within their given herds, suggesting that they represent the preferred language, the ideological content within their community, or both. Therefore, the Yaks can then be examined in regards to the ideologies and language structures that are supported, reinforced, and maintained by the majority of Yakkers. In order to present the Yak/reply dyads more clearly, my transcription of data lists descriptions of “Original Yak,” “Replies,” and the number of “Upvotes” to shed light on the number of active Yakkers who have contributed to the examined Yak’s status. The transcription is presented exactly as found on Yik Yak. Also, the repliers to Yaks are listed with a verbal description of the symbol and color (Pink Flame, Blue Anchor, Green Paddle, etc.) they choose on Yik Yak. Yakkers were not given pseudonyms as such might entail gender identities, which are not provided on Yik Yak (for full transcript see Appendix B).
Analysis

For this study, I collected twelve Yaks and identified the following themes related to power: age, class, and gender. The distribution is as follows:

- Age: one Yak
- Gender: six Yaks
- Class: two Yaks.

Also, three Yaks can be classified as neutral as they mention location specific details, such as “Quent, you will be missed,” that require an insider’s perspective of the given herd and cannot be interpreted from an outsider’s approach or through CDA.

Age

In some circumstances, age is equated with elevated power as it suggests a person’s increased repertoire of experience and wisdom (Fackler, Chambers, & Bourbonniere, 2015).

Taken from the Southern US herd, a Yakker states:

*(Excerpt Age: “Little Brother” Southern)*

1 Yakker: My little brother is starting as a summer freshman next week. He thinks I’m letting him live with me instead of the dorm because I’m nice, but really I’m excited to have a live-in designated driver.

Fairclough (2001) has pointed out that those in power can determine what is being said, what ideology is being enforced, and what may become naturalized (see also Wodak, 2001). The given sample exemplifies how the person in power exerts her or his control over a younger individual who will then be used at the Yakker’s disposal. By explicitly stating that the brother’s assumptions are wrong and that the Yakker’s actual plan for the sibling is very different, the Yakker positions him- or herself as more powerful within the given context. The Yakker refers to
his or her sibling not only as “littler brother,” which places the Yakker above him in regards to age, but also as “Freshman,” meaning that the Yakker holds more power as he or she has more experience in the academic context which is then equated with higher power status (Fackler et al., 2015). The Yakker’s statement is challenged with a reply:

4 Green Anchor: I guess living with a sibling can’t be too bad. I mean, you’ve been doing it for the most part of your life.

And the Yakker agrees:

6 Yakker: Yea, and we’ve always gotten along really well.

This interaction presents a certain form of performance (van Dijk, 1993, p. 251) by the original Yakker who is quick to change his or her approach and recognize the problems in his or her performance as pointed out by Green Anchor. This reply results in Yakker changing his or her mind and ending the performance.

Gender

Contrasted with the age-related Yak, the Yaks exemplifying underlying gender ideologies are not challenged. Further, compared to the class-based Yaks, the replies to gender-based Yaks are fully commentary- and statement-based and no questions are raised.

(Excerpt Gender: “Spanking” South)

1 Yakker: Girl: spank me I’ve been naughty. Me: it’s okay sweetheart it happens. You don’t need to be spanked just don’t do it again.

3 Black Boot: I like being spanked.

While quoting “Me,” the Yakker presents himself or herself as the one who controls the situation between himself or herself and a girl. While she is described as asking to be spanked, the Yakker condescendingly releases her from her punishment and gives her a condition that will help her
from future spanking as well. Fairclough (2001) points out that the assumptions that individuals hold in regards to power are reflected in language and mirror larger, societal ideologies since “ideologies are closely linked to language, because using language is the commonest form of social behavior” (p. 2). The Yakker’s post reflects the gender-based power inequalities, which are still common in today’s society. The Yak is not challenged in any way, suggesting that such unequal power distribution has become largely accepted by the other members in the herd (Romera, 2015; Wodak, 2001). Also, as the Yak was taken from the local Yik Yak community’s “Hot” list, this Yak further supports the idea that this behavior is not only accepted but is also strongly encouraged by peers.

The West Coast Yik Yak community also presents a Yak that reflects the above-mentioned power inequalities.

(Excerpt Gender: “Blow Job” West)

1 Yakker: I want a blow job without the blow.
Again, the Yakker might perceive that he has the social status and permission to post such Yaks, and again he is not being challenged or questioned by fellow Yakkers.

2 Pink Flashlight: I want some blow job without the job.
3 Green Balloon: I want a blow job.
4 Blue Balloon: I need blow and job.

Contrasted with the age-related Yak, no Yakker feels compelled to challenge the potential assumptions and implied ideological attitudes the original Yakker is making in regards to sexual fantasies and cravings. Yakker positions himself as dominant by bluntly stating his sexual desires, which suggests his assumption of authority in regards to such expressions within the
discourse community. All responses are fully accepting of the naturalized phenomenon of gender inequality (Romera, 2015; Wodak, 2001).

The following example, taken from the Midwestern sample, reveals similar underlying power structures and perceptions of gender.

(Excerpt Gender: “Hottie” Midwest)

1. **Yakker**: If you thought you had a bad weekend, my roommate threw a hottie on his shoulder at spring awakening and she legit perioded on the back of his shirt SuperBad style [serious emoticon with gun]

Similar to the previous examples, the one described here is also not replied to in a challenging or questioning manner:

4. **Blue Hook**: kinda hot, tbh [to be honest]
5. **Purple Mushroom**: haha
6. **Grey Shovel**: turnt af
7. **Pink Anchor**: Nice. How did it smell?
8. **Black Lantern**: “perioded”
9. **Black Hook**: What the fuck man.
10. **Pink Sailboat**: Oh god. As a girl that’s fucking sad.

While Pink Anchor asks, “How did it smell?” which appears to be a rhetorical question as her or his initial statement is a simple “nice,” this suggests a response of acknowledgement rather than an inquiry. In addition, no one replies to the question, further suggesting that such a question does not seek an answer. Fairclough (2001) has argued that those in power determine which language and discourse forms are acceptable and usable in a given context (p. 39). Black Hook supports the original Yakker’s implied ideologies by replying with a non-questioning “What the fuck,” which presents him as supporter of Original Yakker’s gender perceptions (van Dijk, 1993). In addition, the Yakker describes his roommate having “thrown a hottie,” who then bled on his shirt, over his shoulder, demonstrating that it is acceptable to describe women as nameless things
that can be thrown on one’s back like a sack and, if things don’t go as planned, it is also okay to ridicule the woman. Pink Sailboat’s reply also lacks any form of empathy toward “the hottie,” who was most likely embarrassed as a result of bleeding on someone’s shirt. Instead Pink Sailboat sarcastically states that bleeding on someone is “fucking sad.” Due to the interaction’s context and the varying meanings and implications of “turnt af,” Grey Shovel’s response is not analyzed here to avoid potential confusion or wrongful interpretations.

In regards to gender, Romera (2015) has pointed out that public perceptions and depictions of gender “sustain a social collective knowledge about the sexes” and “contribute to the construction of a collective idea of what it means to be a woman or man in society” (p. 206). Such representations of ideology reproduce ideas of what it means to be a man—here presented as in control and powerful enough to legitimize what can be said and what not (Fairclough, 2001)—and a woman—the objectified “hottie” that disgustingly bleeds on a man (Romera, 2015). The fact that none of the “hottest” voted Yaks are challenged or questioned suggests that numerous Yakkers have accepted gender inequalities and perceptions of gender and therefore can be viewed as “contribut[ors] to the social construction of gender identity” (Romera, 2015, p. 206).

Class

Compared to age and gender, the two class-based samples are followed by extensive replies that raise sincere and interactive questions among other Yakkers.

(Excerpt Class: “Housesitting” West Coast)

1 Yakker: I’m housesitting for this rich couple and they have this huge beautiful home but they still use 1 ply toilet paper smh.
2 Black Socks: That’s how u stay rich.
Yellow Paddles: They just bought that because they knew you’d be the one there. The real tp is under the sink

Pink Sailboat: You only have access to their peasant tp.

Grey Socks: Older couple?

Grey Socks: Like 70s?

Black Anchor: Where? House party?

It becomes clear that all Yakkers involved, aside of Black Anchor, are fully aware of existing class inequalities. Yakker reveals certain expectations she/he has of a “rich couple,” such as the use of high-quality toilet paper as they can clearly afford better than “1 ply.” Pink Sailboat refers to “peasants,” and although the term is outdated, such a statement further suggests an awareness of varying classes and existing power differences within his or her social contexts. Grey Socks appears to be familiar with the couple and raises two genuine questions, a feature which was not present in the age or gender interactions.

Similarly, the Midwestern sample that addresses class emphasizes an ideology of power and financial status.

(Excerpt Class: “24k” Midwest)

Yakker: Workig from home today, sold a $24k contract in my bathrobe.

#LebowskiDressCode

As the other examples, the current one was upvoted enough (41 times) to achieve the “Hot” status, which suggests the other Yakkers’ admiration, acceptance, and support of his/her accomplishment and idea that obtaining large amounts of money increases one’s status and reputation. The replies to this Yak are as follows:

Red Shovel: That’s how you do it

Blue Flame: I made 24k today in my pajamas

Yellow Tent: Need an assistant?

Red Shovel: I sold a 385k contract last week drunk as a skunk on the airplane

Red Shovel: And yea tent I actually do the last one just quit
It becomes apparent that the tone for the two class- and finance-related examples is relatively different from age and gender. While the age or gender ones exemplify humor, sarcasm, and an overall sense of not being taken seriously, the current sample’s tone is serious, the questions genuine, and most replies either inquiries and interactions (3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11-12, 14, 15–17, 18, 19, 20, 21) or signs of support and agreement (3, 4, 6). Red Shovel’s reply (11–12) exemplifies the underlying ideological assumptions of one who is in power and can therefore delegate assignments and have others do the “shit I don’t want to do.” Clearly, he is perceived as being in control of what is to be done and by whom.

Discussion

Romera (2015) pointed out, “Not only is public space [Yik Yak] used to transmit ideology, but it also constructs and legitimizes it at the same time” (p. 206). The listed examples contribute to such claims as they are laden with ideological assumptions and the associated power inequalities that govern them, making Yakkers (original and repliers) contributors to the maintenance and continuation of current hegemonic structures without challenging existing
power inequalities and distributions in and across society. Yakkers become “social actors” (van Dijk, 1993, p. 251) whose language exposes accepted and normalized ideologies within given discourse communities and beyond as Yakkers exist and interact outside of their herd as well. As the collected Yaks have been upvoted enough to attain the “hot” status, they have already been selected by other discourse community members as containing the most acceptable and common content and language structures. While upvotes so innocently tell the users to “control what’s hot” (Yik Yak, 2015), such a statement really asks: “What ideology would you like to reinforce? What discourse structures will you reproduce to maintain and promote societal power constructions?” Producers on and consumers of Yik Yak eventually determine what language use is “best” and may eventually become naturalized and accepted (Wodak, 2001). Yakkers do so by perpetually contributing to a language that reinforces mechanisms that maintain inequalities and, resultantly, privilege the most powerful members within society.

Romera (2015) pointed out, “The ‘everyday life package’ is a safe and effective cover to transmit the ideology of groups who hold power” (p. 252). Here this suggests that the implied ideologies and power distributions presented by the given Yaks have become so normalized and natural to others in the Yik Yak community that they are not questioned and do not stand out as something unusual. It is important to note that Yik Yak presents a unique discourse community, which at times prompts its users to “perform” rather than present themselves and their standards as they might be in other spheres of life (see “Age” example; Rightler-McDaniels & Hendrickson, 2013; van Dijk, 1993;). Rightler-McDaniels and Hendrickson (2013) noted, “The possibility . . . may compel an individual to deviate from their incorporated standards,” which
leads to a community in which “participants cull social bonds as affiliates within this dynamic text” (p. 180).

Yik Yak offers a platform that is controversial and provocative but also insightful as it grants insight into current language use and the implied ideologies and hegemonic structures that users reproduce, contribute to, and maintain. As this new platform evolves, its role in language formation and use may continue to indicate existing power inequalities that become increasingly acceptable among Yik Yak users and those outside of the given sphere as this platform acts, to some degree, as a reflection of its broader social context in which it exists.
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Appendix A

Yik Yak App Rules

1. You do not bully or specifically target other yakkers
2. You DO NOT bully or specifically target other yakkers.
3. Zero-tolerance policy on posting people’s private information
4. Don’t clutter people’s feeds with useless or offensive yaks. If you see a useless or offensive yak, make sure to do your part by downvoting or reporting it.
5. If your yaks continue to be reported, you will be suspended.
6. Ride the Yak.
Appendix B

Data

**College**: Southern US

**Original Yak**: My little brother is starting as a summer freshman next week. He thinks I’m letting him live with me instead of the dorm because I’m nice, but really I’m excited to have a live-in designated driver

Upvotes: 78
Replies: 4

1. **Green Anchor**: I guess living with a sibling can’t be too bad. I mean, you’ve been doing it for the most part of your life.
2. **Original Poster**: yeah, and we’ve always gotten along really well
3. **Purple Fire**: legit
4. **Yellow Map**: HAH like he’s gonna DD for you

**Original Yak**: Girl: spank me I’ve been naughty. Me: it’s okay sweetheart it happens. You don’t need to be spanked just don’t do it again.

Upvotes: 51
Replies: 1

1. **Black Boot**: I like being spanked

**Original Yak**: The guy version of resting bitch face is resting rape face

Upvotes: 33
Replies: 1

1. **Yellow Map**: a trash stache makes it that much worse

**College**: East Coast

**Original Yak**: Where holding someone’s hand in public is more serious than having sex.

Upvotes: 262
Replies: 3
1. **Grey Sailboat**: Everywhere.
2. **Grey Socks**: Sad…but true.
3. **Black Hook**: [recycle symbol]

*Original Yak*: I wanna dress up as the nun from GoT and follow people home from trin when they’re leaving with some random dude and just shame bell them till I get my ass kicked

Upvotes: 165
Replies: 1

1. **Pink Binoculars**: best Halloween costume idea ever.

*Original Yak*: Quent, you will be missed.

Upvotes: 161
Replies: 0

**College**: West Coast

1 **Original Yak**: I want a blow job without the blow

Upvotes: 116
Replies: 4

1. **Pink Flashlight**: I want some blow job without the job
2. **Green Balloon**: I wan a blow job
3. **Blue Balloon**: I need blow and job

2 **Original Yak**: They should make more realistic Gatorade commercials where hungover people try to drink it without sitting up all the way.

Upvotes: 96
Replies: 1

1) **Pink Boot**: there is. YouTube Gatorade is great for hangovers.

3 **Original Yak**: I’m housesitting for this rich couple and they have this huge beautiful home but they still use 1 ply toilet paper smh

Upvotes: 82
Replies: 6
1. **Yellow Paddles**: They just bought that because they knew you’d be the one there. The real tp is under the sink.

2. **Black Socks**: that’s how u stay rich

3. **Pink Sailboat**: You only have access to their peasant tp

4. **Grey Socks**: Older couple?

5. **Grey Socks**: Like 70s?

6. **Black Anchor**: Where? House party?

**College**: Midwest

1 *Original Yak*: If you thought you had a bad weekend, my roommate threw a hottie on his shoulders at spring awakening and she legit perioded on the back of his shirt SuperBad style [head with gun emoticon]

Upvotes: 41

Replies: 7

1. **Blue Hook**: kinda hot, tbh

2. **Purple Mushroom**: haha

3. **Grey Shovel**: turnt af

4. **Pink Anchor**: Nice. How did it smell?

5. **Black Lantern**: “perioded”

6. **Black Hook**: What the fuck man.

7. **Pink Sailboat**: Oh god. As a girl that’s fucking sad.

2 *Original Yak*: Working from home today, sold a $24k contract in my bathrobe. #LebowskiDressCode

Upvotes: 32

Replies: 16

1. **Red Shovel**: that’s how you do it

2. **Blue Flame**: I made 24k today in my pajamas

3. **Yellow Tent**: Need an assistant?
4. **Red Shovel:** I sold a 385k contract last week drunk as a skunk on the airplane.

5. **Red Shovel:** And yeah tent I actually do the last one just quit.

6. **Grey Shovel:** I’ll work for you!!

7. **Yellow Map:** Finance

8. **Yellow Tent:** Mal-21 what are some tasks I would take on?

9. **Red Shovel:** dealing with shit I don’t want to do like filling paper work, doing my schedule, organizing my drafts and answer the phone etc.

10. **Grey DoubleP:** The dude abides.

11. **Grey Shovel:** Yo, software/web developer. I’ll automate your daily tasks;)

12. **Yellow Tent:** I would like to, but I’m not sure how flexible you are with me working. Only available Monday, Friday, Saturday. Thank you though.

13. **Green Sailboat:** what job do you guys have?


15. **Red Shovel:** I’m an architect as well as holding my real estate license.

16. **Grey Shovel:** so can I work for either of you ;p

**3 Original Yak:** just a friendly reminder: park your cars away from bars tonight

Upvotes: 28

Replies: 3

1. **Pink Balloon:** I stay by the ones on division/state. Can’t wait to see the damage they do.

2. **Yellow Hook:** Why?

**Pink Balloon:** If the Hawks win the city is going to go apeshit, that’s why!!