Impoliteness in Online Comments in The Johnny Depp and Amber Heard Trial

By

Alaa Noori Jabbar
Babylon University, The college of education for human sciences/Iraq

Nesaem Mehdi Al-Aadili
Babylon University, The college of education for human sciences/Iraq

Abstract

This research examines the impoliteness strategies and conventionalized impoliteness formulae in online comments in the Johnny Depp and Amber Heard Trial. Employing Culpeper's (2011) impoliteness theory and Culpeper's (2010 conventionalized impoliteness formulae, this research tries to reveal that these strategies and formulae which are effective linguistic devices that can strengthen the impolite propositional content of the message by lowering the authoritativeness and definitiveness of the comment and by signaling the sub-themes which are instilled in the commenter's mind while motivating him to express his ideas towards the domestic abusive case. The data consists of 30 randomly selected online comments shows that these strategies and formulae are not static matters in communication that is used to create social disruption but depends on the commenter's consideration and goals. The method used in this study is descriptive qualitative research. The data were analyzed using a referential method. Such a method analyses the data with reference to the theory employed in this study. The analysis of the online comments which were selected randomly reveals that the mostly used impoliteness strategies are, in sequence, negative impoliteness, positive impoliteness, sarcasm or mock impoliteness and bald on-record impoliteness strategies. The associating the other with a negative aspect explicitly is the most used sub-strategy in the negative impoliteness. Patronizing behavior is the mostly used impoliteness formula followed by pointed criticism, encroachment, insults, and then exclusion respectively. It has been found that there are four sub-themes related to impolite comments: mocking comments, comments focusing on self, comments about the idea of abuse and comments about general speculations.

1. Introduction

The rise of social media has exaggerated emotions and personal opinions towards many controversial topics especially those related to celebrities. It gives commenters the full freedom to cast aspersions or use abusive language which contains a lot of the impoliteness formulae. For example, many posts on social media include insults, accusations, or immature and dramatic language, and these upset readers (Chen& Ng, 2017: 181). The goal of the study to analyze the impact of cyberbullying and virtual abuse of online comments linguistically by showing the impoliteness strategies mostly used by the English native speakers' comments towards a domestic abusive accusation case. The escalated nature of online comments activates negative emotions and responses which can be studied linguistically. The allegations and reactions in the in the Johnny Depp and Amber Heard case provide data that can shed light on the prevalence types of impoliteness strategies of online comments. The study relies on the impoliteness strategies model adopted by Culpeper (2011) and the conventionalized impoliteness formulae by Culpeper (2010). The researcher collects 30 comments, divided equally by gender to determine which strategy is often used by each one especially when the case can be classified as an intimate partner violence. How does the social media linguistically

affect the commenter's opinions to determine the victim and perpetrator. It has been noted that most of the aspersions and the abusive language are directed to Miss Heard and her team of lawyer, even those who decided to present the testimony. The study tries to find out the sub-themes that motivates the online commenters to use impoliteness for the domestic abusive case. It attempts to answer the following questions (Olaleye et al., 2021):

1)   What are the impoliteness strategies mostly used by English native speakers towards the intimate partner violence topic?
2)   What are the conventionalized impoliteness formulae often used in online comments for such case?
3)   How the impolite online comments can be tackled by the two genders?
4)   What are the sub-themes related to the impoliteness online comments concerning the intimate partner violence case?

The online comments have been collected randomly from videos on YouTube specifically Law&Crime Network and ET Network. They are analyzed pragmatically by the researcher himself following the chosen model.

2.   Literature Review

Communication is basically the problem of a speaker who encodes the mind into words and listeners who decodes words back into thought. There are numerous definitions of pragmatics, and one of them has been proposed by Crystal (in Kasper, 2001:2) that the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication. According to Kasper (2001:2), pragmatics indicates the communicative actions include not only using speech acts (such as apologizing, complaining, complimenting, and requesting) but also engaging in different types of discourse and participating in speech events of varying length and complexity (Soto Ferrari et al., 2021).

Pragmatics, as Levinson (1983:21), states the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding. Yule (1996:4) shows that one of the advantages is that pragmatics allows human being to discuss about the speakers' implied meaning, their purposes, and the sorts of actions that they are showing when they speak. Meanwhile, the disadvantage is the hardness for human being to be consistent and objective when they have to analyze those concepts. Thus, pragmatics is an interesting study to be learnt because it is about how someone tries to understand other people linguistically. However, it is also a complicated study since it is about a deep understanding of what people have in their mind (Sumarno, Setiawan, & Sunaryo, 2021).

From all the above opinions given by those scholars above, pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics which studies how people comprehend and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation which is usually in the form of utterances or conversations. Therefore, pragmatics is the studybfrom the aspects of meaning and language use that is dependent on the speaker, the addressee and other features of the context of utterance.

2. 1 Jonathan Culpeper Impoliteness Theory

Politeness strategies are seen as a presumptive strategy; it is unmarked and socially neutral, the natural presupposition underlying all communication. However, there are other times in which people use linguistic strategies to attack face or to strengthen the face threat of an act, i.e., they tend to be impolite. For this reason, there comes the emergence of the theory

of impoliteness (Fauziati, 2014:411).

The first scholar to mention when talking about impoliteness is Culpeper. He uses the term impoliteness to refer "communicative strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony (Culpeper, 1996: 82) Another scholar is Bousfield who claims that impoliteness is not seen as failed politeness but strategy to attack face (Bousfield, 2008: 72). It is the reason why impoliteness has become increasingly popular object of the study in recent years.

Bousfield (2008) states that "impoliteness constitutes the communication of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face threatening acts (FTAs) which are purposefully delivered: (1) unmitigated, in contexts where mitigation is required, and/or, (2) with deliberate aggression, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, 'boosted', or maximized in some way to heighten the face damage inflicted (Bousfield, 2008: 72)

Thus, Culpeper (1996:86) argues that the key difference between politeness to support face (politeness) or to attack face (impoliteness). To account for the aspect of impoliteness, Culpeper proposes an impoliteness framework which is parallel but opposite to Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness. In summary, in particular contexts certain impoliteness activity is not regarded as marginal activity but actually an essential part of communication process.

2.1.1 The impoliteness Strategies

Based on Brown and Levinson's model of politeness strategy, Culpeper wrote a seminal article on impoliteness. He identified impoliteness as "the parasites of politeness" and the politeness strategies are the opposite of impoliteness strategies (Culpeper, 1996: 8). The opposite here refers to its orientation to face. Politeness strategy is utilized to enhance or support face which can avoid conflict while impoliteness strategies are used to attack face which cause social disharmony. As Culpeper defines impoliteness as the use of strategies to attack the interlocutors face and create social disruption. For this Culpeper proposes five super strategies that speaker use to make impolite utterances as follows:

2.1.1.1 Bald on record impoliteness

Bald on Record impoliteness strategy directly produced FTAs and impositions of the same kind as in the politeness strategy. The FTA is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where face is not irrelevant or minimized. More importantly it is the intention of the speaker to attack the face of the hearer (Culpeper, Bousfield and Wichmann, 2003: 1553-1554)

When you command your x-friend
[1] Get out of my house, right now
2.1.1.2 Positive impoliteness

The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants. An individual positive face is reflected in his desire to be liked, approved of, respected and appreciated by other. This can be done through the following ways, such as:

2.1.1.2.1   *Ignore, snub the other*
2.1.1.2.2   *Fail to acknowledge the other's presence.*
2.1.1.2.3   *[2] S1: I came here just to apologize for …[interrupted]*
2.1.1.2.4   *S2: Thank you, Sir.*
This example is where the S2 interrupts S1 and ignores what he is about to say.
2.1.1.2.5   *Disassociate from the other*
For example, deny association or common ground with the other; avoid sitting together.

[3] S1: I am not going anywhere with that monster.
2.1.1.2.6   S2: He is not invited.
S1 not allow himself to be going around with a third person by saying that he is monster. S1 keeps away the distance between them, the contact among them is constrained by him who refused to go with that person.

2.1.1.2.3 Be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic
[4] S1: You can't make me.
S2: Of course, we can. We're your parent.
S1 shows he has no personal involvement of or receiving no personal advantage of something. In this situation, S1 should be worried or interested with his dad, but he is not. He is not showing that she understands or cares about his father attention, and therefore he feels free to act fairly.

2.1.1.2.4 Use inappropriate identity markers.
For example, use title and surname when a close relationship pertains, or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains.

[5]S1: Tell me you did not go to Disney land, Ruby Allen!
S2: And Epcot Center.
Calling someone's full name is not suitable for the situation because the way between S1 and S2 feel and behave toward each other is very close. They know each other very well, like each other a lot and they see and talk each other a lot. Using full name makes their relationship look awkward and makes them like strange to each other.

2.1.1.2.5   Use obscure or secretive language
For example, attribute the other with jargon, or use a code known to others in the group, but not the target.

[6] S: Hey, listen Hellbender. You're not gonna tell me anything I don't know about illness.
S1 is talking to the addressee, and she does not call him by his name but with an unclear, difficult to understand and undefined name. In the example, the word 'Hellbender' is not known to many people which is like rude and offensive name, and it expresses that he is very angry to the addressee and shows that he does not respect him.

2.1.1.2.6 Seek disagreement
The criterion of the strategy is to select a sensitive topic in conversation.

*[7] Son***:** *You can't make me*.
Father: You need to get out of the house, make friends, be a teenager. I don't share your view to stay in the city.

The FTA performed in the example [7] is seek disagreement where he gives argument in which he doesn't have the same opinion with his father. By giving that argument or opinion, he wants to cause his father to be upset or angry, so he won't ask her to go outside home.

2.1.1.2.7 Make the other feel uncomfortable
For example, do not avoid silence, joke, or use small talk.

[8] Son: If you want me to be a teenager, don't send me to support group, make me a fake ID so I can go to clubs and drink gimlets and take pot.

Father: *You don't take pot*.

The son tries to frighten his dad to stop forces his hanging out because his father always gets a bit anxious if he does not go outside home for a while. He wants his father to know that problems or unpleasant things may happen if he is hanging around with other teenagers.

2.1.1.2.8 Use taboo words
Swear, or use abusive or profane language.

[9] S: I'm doing good. I get to knock off an hour early today. You know why? Because I kissed my boss' ass.
It is not appropriate for someone to use such as kiss someone's ass. Furthermore, it is not appropriate to talk about personal problem with the boss to other.

2.1.1.2.9 Call the other names-use derogatory nominations.
[10] S: You're yellow, you moron.
2.1.1.3 Negative Impoliteness
The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee negative face wants (Culpeper, Bousfield, and Wichmann, 2003:1555). This can be done through the following ways, such as:

Frighten- instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur.

Condescend, scorn or ridicule- emphasize your relative power. Be contemptuous. Do not treat the other seriously. Belittle the other (e.g., use diminutives)

[10] S: Could you, please, help this little babyish man to do his job?
The speaker is condescending and ridiculing the man, he is belittling the man's ability about the matter at hand.

2.1.1.2.3 Invade the other's space- literally (position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits) or metaphorically (e.g, ask for or speak about information which is too intimate given the relationship).

2.1.1.2.4 Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect- use the pronouns 'I' and 'you'. Personalize someone.
[11] You should have told me about that at the time, shouldn't you be truthful?
The situation above is about a father that is implying that the son has not truthful earlier.

2.1.1.2.5 Put the other's indebtedness on record.
2.1.1.3 Off Record Impoliteness
This performed by means of an implicatures but in such a way that one attributable intention clearly outweighs any others.

2.1.1.4 Withhold Impoliteness
This refers to the absence of politeness work where it would be expected. For example, failing to thank somebody for a present may be taken as a deliberate impoliteness (Culpeper, 1996: 356-57) To Culpeper, Brown and Levinson touch on the face-damaging impoliteness of withholding politeness work by saying that "politeness has to be the communicated, and absence of communicated politeness may be taken as the absence of a polite attitude" (Culpeper, 1996:357)

2.1.1.5 Sarcasm or mock politeness
According to Culpeper's (1996:356) sarcasm or mock politeness is of course the opposite of Brown and Levinson's social harmony that is achieved through off-record politeness. The FTA is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously

insincere, and thus remain surface realizations.

[11] Patient: I had a couple headaches last month and I have trouble concentrating. I was also thinking it might be fibromyalgia.

Doctor: Excellent diagnosis.
As the patient thinks he is an expert on diagnosing himself with the help of internet, the doctor decides to play along and agree with the patient.

2.1.2 Conventionalized Impoliteness Formulae
A conventionalized impoliteness formula is a form of language in which context-specific impoliteness effects are conventionalized (Culpeper,2010:3243). This issue is approached on the basis of conventionalized politeness formulae reported by the work of Marina Terkourafi who argues that they arise as a result of regularities of co-occurrence between unchallenged expressions and particular types of contexts. It is argued that indirect experiences play a key role in the conventionalization of impoliteness formulae, and especially experience of metadiscourse (e.g., comments, debates and rules about impoliteness events). The study proposes to investigate the regularities of expression in impoliteness contexts. The method focuses on context associated with impoliteness events. The researcher collects online comments accompanied by participant evidence that somebody has constructed them as impolite. Culpeper makes a list of conventionalized impoliteness formulae which was devised on the basis of frequency in specific types of contexts. It is something that has in common with Terkourafi's account of politeness formulae and it is, from a methodological point of view, the most effective way to identify impoliteness formulae (Culpeper, 2010:3244)

The conventionalized impoliteness formulae identified are as follows.
Patronizing behavior (including condescending, belittling, ridiculing and demanding behavior) such as be condescending or treat people in a service capacity as if they were beneath you 'belittling the other'

[11] S: What would YOU know about that? (condescending)

[12] S: They are always LIITLE PEOPLE in events. (Belittling the other)
Insults (including derogatory statements and implications) producing or receiving a display of low values for some target.The insults can be divided into:

1)   Personalized negative vocatives: such as [you] [fucking / rotten/fat/ little/etc.] [moron/fuck/plonker/dickhead/berk/pig/ shit/bastard/ loser/liar/minx/ brat/ slut/squirt/ sod /bugger]
2)   Personalized negative assertion: such as [you] [are] [so /such a] [shit/stink/thick/stupid/ bitchy/bitch/hypocrite/ disappointment/ gay/nuts/ nuttier than a fruit cake/ hopeless/pathetic/fussy/terrible/ugly/etc.]
3)   Personalized third person negative references: such as [the] [daft] [bimbo]
4)   [she] [is] [nutzo].
Pointed criticism (including expressions of disapproval and statements of fault, weakness or disadvantage): producing and perceiving a display of low values for some target. Such as [that/this /it] [is/was] [absolutely/extraordinary/unspeakably/etc.] [bad/rubbish/ crap/horrible/terrible/etc.]

Encroachment: producing or perceiving a display of infringement of personal space (literal or metaphorical) such as encroach on someone's personal space; remember, the minimum radius is two feet.

Exclusion: (including failure to include and disassociation): producing or perceiving a

display of infringement of inclusion. Such as talk about people in the third person whilst they're standing next to you.

Failure to reciprocate producing or perceiving a display of infringement of the reciprocity norm such as never write a thank-you note. (Culpeper, 2010: 3241)

In fact, the pragmatic level is precisely the level at which Culpeper thinks that this method can make the greatest contribution: it is a good at capturing pragmatic strategies in which impoliteness formulae may or may not be embedded.

Methodology

To answer the research questions, the researcher gathered 30 online comments that followed news stories after the domestic abuse allegations filed by Heard against Depp. This case is selected because of its convenience and the strong and divisive content related to gender and violence that resulted from this story. These comments are selected from posts within two months after the allegation to attempt to get first reactions rather than subsequent changes in the case and media responses to it.

CM No.	Comment	Pragmatic Analysis
1	F: Don't speak for abused women, Amber. She speaks for mean spirited, jealous women that abuse men.	"*Don't speak for abused women, Amber*" "is a bald on-record impoliteness strategy, employing warning as a sub-strategy. It implies adopting 'patronizing behavior' formula when she treats Amber in a service capacity as if Amber was beneath her. The commenter uses this strategy where there is an intention on the part of the speaker to attack the face of the addressee. Then, she adopts the positive impoliteness in particular disassociating from the other when she says, "She speaks for mean spirited, jealous women that abuse men". Here she chooses the 'insults' impoliteness formula when she describes the women that Amber speaks to as 'mean', and 'jealous.
2	M: It is so toxic and ridiculous to say to him. You're killing me when he is begging her for space because he isn't OK. She really is a monster.	The commenter uses the positive impoliteness strategy particularly, making the use of obscure and secretive language sub-strategy when she tries to accuse him of abusing her. Then, he says "she is a monster" which is also a positive impoliteness and the use of calling the other names when he uses the noun 'monster' . 'Pointed criticism' is the impoliteness formula in which it includes producing a display of low values for some target.
3	M: I believe that everything Amber did is self-inflicted, beginning with the article CHOSE TO PUBLISH… and should receive nothing for its backlash … her case has been weak and her lies evident, therefore, she has none but herself to fault for the outcome.	The comment applies the negative impoliteness strategy which is realized by associating Amber with a negative aspect explicitly. It is clear when he describes the case as weak and it has evident lies. The impoliteness formulae used is called 'pointed criticism' because it includes a statement of fault such as "she has none but herself to fault".
4	M: There's a juror or two who doesn't want a guilty verdict. The question is, 'Can they listen to things they don't want to hear?	The comment follows the sarcasm or mock impoliteness strategy when he uses the rhetorical question which implies the negation i.e., that some jurors can't listen to things they don't want to hear. The impoliteness formula used here is called 'encroachment' which implies that he encroaches on the justice system representatives that they may be unfair to diagnoses the victim.

5	M: I don't think she (Amber's lawyer) was prepared and spoke logically to make a point during the closing argument. I don't think she spoke a well-educated lawyer, more like a retail store clerk. All the titles he has mean nothing. I am professional and I know. I think AH legal team made it worse than good. I think the vibs of AH team was very bad. Juries can see it. AH legal teammates were not likable by general public people or jury.	The comment is a negative impoliteness strategy recognized through the associating the other (Amber's lawyer) with a negative aspect explicitly sub-strategy that she was not 'prepared well and didn't speak logically' especially when the commenter classifies himself as a professional in legal affairs. The impoliteness formula followed is 'pointed criticism' when the commenter tends to involve expressions of disapproval and showing several weaknesses in the legal team's work of Amber.
6	M: Reporter said earlier that "this judge orders lunch meals for the jury but not dinner so if they don't have a verdict by the end of the day, they will go without dinner" LoL	The commenter adopts the sarcasm and mock impoliteness strategy which is realized through utilizing the joking sub-strategy i.e., the commenter uses sarcasm for expressing his opposite feeling which means not the real meaning of what he says. The impoliteness formula is 'pointed criticism' in which the commenter uses this formula to criticize the delay to have a verdict.
7	F: What kills me how Amber doesn't even have enough acting skills to drop the resting rage face. She is incapable of being a sympathetic character, she's exactly as Johnny describes her.	The commenter uses the positive impoliteness strategy through utilizing invading the other's space, i.e., he invades her space when he shows that Amber doesn't have acting skills even though she is a professional actress, so she is incapable of being sympathetic character. The impoliteness formula is 'encroachment' because he is producing a display of infringement of personal space literally.
8	M: The sad thing is that if Johnny wins (like he should) he will never see the money, there is no way Amber will ever get work again; therefore, she will never be able to pay him. I know its more about clearing his name and I hope the jury do that but he was forced to hand over 7mil in the divorce settlement for her to waste but she will get away with not having to pay him …	The commenter applies the positive impoliteness employing the use of be disinterested and unconcerned with the other when he says "If Johnny wins, he will never see the money" because Amber will not gain money so she will never be able to pay him. "I hope that jury do that, but he was forced to hand over7mil" is a negative impoliteness strategy utilizing ridiculing and scorning sub-strategy. The impoliteness formula is 'exclusion' which is including failure to include and disassociation.
9	F: I hate the way she tries to make him feel uncomfortable by staring him down. She is still trying to control her victim.	The commenter involves the positive impoliteness strategy, particularly make the other feel uncomfortable sub-strategy. The impoliteness formula is' patronizing behavior' which includes condescending, belittling, ridiculing and demanding behaviors. Amber tries to adopt a hostile behavior by just starring to control him completely.
10	M: Due to lack of interest, Amber's future in the Movie Industry has now been cancelled. She has gone red, and like a newspaper, she has been read.	The commenter implies the negative impoliteness strategy employing the use of ridiculing sub-strategy. 'Pointed criticism' is the impoliteness formula which includes expression of weakness or disadvantages such as 'lack of interest' and 'she has gone red'.
11	M: It will be Good if they stay away from each other … it's over!!! Move on.	The commenter utilizes the positive impoliteness strategy employing disassociating from the other sub strategy. He follows the impoliteness formula of 'failure to reciprocate' when he produces a display of infringement of the reciprocity norm.
12	M: You can see how aggressive Amber is with another women, she's snippy aggressive and defensive. She's angry and it shows how quickly when Amber is controlled with something how easily she could and did go off the rails …. Explosive person …	The commenter follows the positive impoliteness strategy using calling the other names i.e., the derogatory nominations when Amber has been called as aggressive, snippy, and defensive woman. The impoliteness formula is 'insults which includes derogatory statements and implications when producing a display of low values for Amber.

13	M: I would say Amber actually displays psychopathic traits, superficial charm, lack of empathy, an ability to lie and displaying no remorse or guilt. If she loses this case, she could really lose it.	The commenter applies the negative impoliteness strategy in particular the use of associating the other (Amber) with a negative aspect explicitly when he produces that Amber displays psychopathic traits, lack of empathy and an ability to lie. The impoliteness formula used here is 'insults' when the comment involves derogatory statements or producing a display of low values for some target.
14	F: What tip me off on not believing Amber is the fact she never stopped looking at the jury. The jury isn't talking to you! Look at the person talking to you.	The commenter uses the negative impoliteness strategy employing the use of scorning and ridiculing sub-strategy. She keeps looking at the jury trying to use eye to eye contact strategy to convince them about her lies but she forgets at the same time to look at the person talking to her. Patronizing behavior is the impoliteness formula
15	M: If this woman doesn't get charged with perjury, everyone in America then has every right to commit the same offense imo.	The commenter uses the negative impoliteness strategy applying the use of invading the other's space sub-strategy. The impoliteness formula is called 'encroachment' which produces a display of infringement of personal space literally.
16	F: She has the audacity to be argumentative, rude, and snaky to an attorney while the entire world is watching. Can you imagine how she acts at home without cameras? Absolutely disgusting.	The commenter uses the negative impoliteness strategy particularly the use of associating the other with negative aspects explicitly such as 'argumentative', 'rude', and 'snaky'. The impoliteness formula is called 'encroachment'. Then, she returns to use the negative impoliteness strategy when she says, "can you imagine ….?" Utilizing the use of invading the other's space sub-strategy. The patronizing behavior is the impoliteness formula in which Amber treats people in a service capacity as if they are beneath her.
17	F: If Amber hadn't already lost the jury, she did by the end of this cross examination Her answers were evasive and snarky. She expected the jury to believe everyone else was lying except her.	The commenter apples the positive impoliteness strategy by the use of disassociating from the others. Exclusion is the impoliteness formula where she produces a display of infringement of inclusion. Then, she also uses the negative impoliteness strategy when she describes Amber's answers as evasive and snarky. The commenter adopts associating the other with negative aspect explicitly. The formula of impoliteness used here is 'encroachment' which includes expressions and statements of fault, weaknesses and disadvantages, i.e., producing a display of low values for some target.
18	F: The lack of respect that Amber brings in the court, is disgusting. All of her lies are sickening.	The commenter adopts the negative impoliteness strategy employing the use of invading the other's space sub-strategy. Encroachment is the impoliteness strategy (showing weaknesses and disadvantages) when he encroaches Amber's personal space as he describes her that she lacks the respect to the court. After that, he follows the same strategy when he describes her lies as sickening which can also be considered as an attempt to encroach her personal space.
19	F: I can't believe how much she mocked him in the recordings and called him names. The mocking voice she did was disgusting and horrendous to do to anyone you really love.	The commenter utilizes the negative impoliteness strategy in particular the use of condescending and scorning sub-strategy. The pointed criticism is the impoliteness strategy when she criticizes the way Ms. Amber treats Johnny. Then, he also uses the negative impoliteness strategy particularly the use of associating the other with negative aspect explicitly. Encroachment is the impoliteness strategy adopted when the commenter encroaches on Amber's personal space as he describes her voice as disgusting and horrendous.

20	M: How can they continue to allow her to lie and not hold her in contempt? I've never seen a judge have so much constraint and patients with a defendant.	The commenter applies the sarcasm and mock impoliteness strategy by using the rhetorical question which implies negation as a sub-strategy. The pointed criticism is the impoliteness formula because he produces the infringement of inclusion. So, he criticizes the way of treatment adopted by the judge towards Amber.
21	M: Heard gave herself away when she ironically said "What actual survivor of domestic violence wants that"!Good point Heard, no true victim would notify.	The commenter uses the sarcasm or mock impoliteness explicating by the use of the rhetorical question which implies negation i.e., she wants to say no actual survivor of domestic violence wants that. Exclusion is the impoliteness formula because it includes failure to include and disassociation, i.e., producing or receiving a display of infringement of inclusion.
22	F: Heard's anger at Ms. Vasquez shows how little concern she has for listening to other people to listen to her truths.	The commenter uses the positive impoliteness strategy utilizing the use of inappropriate identity markers sub-strategy. He wants to show that Amber is angry most of the time to the extent that she can't listen to others. Patronizing behavior is the impolite formula when she treats the people around her as if they are beneath her.
23	M: If lying was in the Olympic, Amber Heard would have won Gold, Silver and Bronze altogether.	The commenter uses a sarcasm and mock impoliteness strategy, utilizing the joking as a sub-strategy. The impoliteness formula is called 'encroachment' which is producing a display of infringement of personal space metaphorically. He makes conditional clauses to exaggerate the lies she has said at the court.
24	F: The irony is she recorded all this to make him look bad but she's just proving his innocence.	The commenter adopts the positive impoliteness strategy utilizing disassociate from the other sub-strategy. Amber wants to prove her allegations about Johnny's abusive behavior by using recorded documentaries, but all this evidence is used against her. The impoliteness formula used is called 'exclusion' in which he is producing or perceiving a display of infringement of inclusion.
25	F: The "I don't want to be with you anymore" audio is heartbreaking. He's not saying to be mean; he's not saying it as a threat to break up.	The commenter utilizes the positive impoliteness strategy employing disassociate from the other sub-strategy when Johnny says "I don't want to be with you anymore" which his will to disassociate from her because of her abusive behavior. The impoliteness formula is called 'failure to reciprocate' which is producing or perceiving a display of infringement of the reciprocity norm.
26	F: She shouts, she doesn't listen, she is manipulative. It's difficult to have a decent conversation with someone like that.	The commenter uses positive impoliteness strategy employing the use of calling the other names such as 'manipulative'. The impoliteness formula is called 'patronizing behavior' which includes condescending, belittling, ridiculing and demeaning behavior i.e., Amber treats people in a service capacity as if they were beneath her.

27	M: She was being called a gold digger. So, she thought donating the money would make her look good. If you see her telling on that show about donating it, she looks so angry. Not a cheerful giver. The announcement was self-serving. She never planned on donating the money. She is evil.	The commenter adopts the positive impoliteness strategy when he calls her the other names such as 'gold digger' and 'evil'. Insults is the impoliteness formula adopted in these sentences. Insults include derogatory statement and implications i.e., producing or perceiving a display of low values for some target.
28	F: I'm awfully embarrassed for AH lawyer. I mean she's terrible but also, it's hard to defend AH bs. Like she said "I'm trying' I feel for her shem.	The commenter utilizes the negative impoliteness strategy employing the use of condescending and ridiculing for Amber's lawyer. The impoliteness formula is patronizing behavior. Then, he uses the negative impoliteness strategy in particular associating the other with a negative aspect explicitly when he says, "she's terrible" "it's hard to defend". In this comment, two impoliteness formulae have been applied, firstly, it is 'pointed criticism' when the commenter criticizes the lawyer by using the expression of disapproval 'awfully embarrassed and statement of fault. Secondly, by using 'insults' when his comment includes a derogatory statement in "she's terrible".
29	F: It's so creepy the way she's constantly looking at the jury, especially while the lawyers approach the judge! She just stares at them for too long.	The commenter applies the positive impoliteness strategy utilizing the use of obscure and secretive language when he says, "the way, she's looking at the jury, is so creepy". She wants to communicate her refusal to such deeds. The impoliteness formula used is called 'patronizing behavior' when she treats the lawyers as if they're beneath her.
30	F: I truly feel for AH's lawyers. Poor things, they've got nothing to work with and are probably being treated horribly by her. Now their careers are wrecked.	The commenter uses the negative impoliteness strategy particularly associating the other with a negative aspect explicitly. She means that Amber's legal team will be affected negatively due to Amber's position in the case. The impoliteness formula is 'patronizing behavior' when she shows that this legal team is being treated very badly because of Amber's behavior when she supposes "they are probably being treated horribly by Amber".

Analysis Results

Most of the impoliteness strategies and formulae are used to insult, encroach or criticize Amber Heard or her legal team accusing her of lying under oath or using manipulative behavior to gain the sympathetic of the jury. They treat Amber as a perpetrator who deserves impolite comments. The reason why most of the impolite comments directed to Amber is due to the revealing facts that commenters infer throughout three months of the trial procedures sessions including the testimonies of witnesses and audio- recording materials which have proved in one way or another that Ms. Amber is the perpetrator not victim.

It has been found that the mostly impoliteness strategy used in the online comments in the Jonny Depp and Amber Heard trial is the negative impoliteness strategy which involves the use of sub-strategies deployed to damage the addressee's negative face wants and the associating the other with a negative aspect explicitly, condescending, scorning and ridiculing, invading the other space are the mostly used sub-strategies respectively in those comments. This strategy has been used about 14 times out of 35 sentences. Female tends to use this strategy more than male (8/6).

In the second rank is the positive impoliteness strategy which involves the use of many sub-strategies deployed to damage the addressee's positive face wants and disassociating from

the other, calling the other names, using obscure and secretive language, making the other feel uncomfortable, be disinterested and unconcerned with the other are the most used sub-strategies respectively. This strategy has been used about 13 times out of 35. Male tends to use this strategy more than female (8/5).

Sarcasm or mock impoliteness strategy gets the third rank. It is used by someone to express his opposite feeling which means not the real meaning. On the surface level, the comment sounds polite but its real meaning is the opposite. It has been used about 5 times out of 35. The sub-strategies of using the rhetorical question which implies the negation, and the joking are the mostly used respectively in the comments. Male tends to use this strategy more than female (5/0)

The least used impoliteness strategies in the online comments are the bald on record impoliteness strategy which is used where there is an intention on the part of the commenter to attack the face of the addressee. It is used for 1 time out of 35 by a female commenter. It is also noted that off record impoliteness strategy which is more indirect and requires that the commenter does not impose the addressee; therefore, face is not directly threatened. The reason why the commenters don't use this strategy is that this strategy often requires the addressee to interpret what the commenter is writing which is not in need purposely.

Concerning the conventionalized impoliteness formulae. It has been figured out that the 'patronizing behavior' is the most used formula which includes condescending, belittling, ridiculing and demeaning behaviors such as treat people in a service capacity as if they are beneath you. The researcher thinks that the physiognomy of Amber Heard has motivated them to use this formula. It has been used about 11 times out of 35. Female has the bigger share than male (8/4).

The second rank impoliteness formula is 'pointed criticism' which includes expressions of disapproval and statements of fault, weaknesses or disadvantages. It has been used about 8 times out of 35. Male has the bigger share than female (6/2) due to the male's intuition to criticize and show the disapproval without redressing more than females.

Encroachment had the third rank in which the commenter produces a display of infringement of personal space whether literally or metaphorically. It has been used about 7 times out of 35. Females uses this formula more than male (5/2). The fourth rank is for 'insults' formula which includes derogatory statements and implications. It has been used about 4 times out of 35. Male uses this formula more than female (3/1). The last used impoliteness formula is 'exclusion' which includes failure to include and disassociation. It has been used equally between male and female (2/2). 'Failure to reciprocate' impoliteness formula has only been used for 1 time by a male commenter.

Some of the comments includes a variety of content, as well as emotions, ranging from calm to hostile. Most of them are negative comments and mocking ones, these mixed reactions can be divided into:

1)   Mocking comments: the comments in mixed reactions category took a mocking or sarcastic impoliteness strategy which follows the rhetorical question form to convey the sarcastic tone.
2)   Comments about the topic of abuse: the theme of abuse and its seriousness motivates the commenters to take a stand. The idea of abuse is not attached to a certain gender rather than the other. The description of the characteristics of 'the typical abuser' can be formulated by both the positive and negative impoliteness strategies and the different impoliteness formulae.

3) Comments focusing on self: some of the commenters focus their comments on themselves life histories, personal expertise that seem to have the purpose of proving something.

4) Making general speculations: some of the commenters want to make the pointed criticism to Amber or her legal team. They only want to express their negative musings to what happened or why.

Conclusion

Online comments are the best way of understanding the impoliteness strategies and formulae that are used by someone else's perspectives. To express the impoliteness strategies, the present study concludes that those comments can be classified according to the sub-themes and each one is related in one way or another to specific impoliteness strategies or formulae, i.e., the idea behind the sub-theme is related to a specific strategy of impoliteness or a formula. A conventionalized impoliteness formulae approach the work of Marina Terkourafi's where it is argued that they arise as a result of regularities of co-occurrence between unchallenged expressions and particular types and context in which the present study represents the retrospective online comments.

The analysis of the online comments which were selected randomly reveals that the mostly used impoliteness strategies are, in sequence, negative impoliteness, positive impoliteness, sarcasm or mock impoliteness and bald on-record impoliteness strategies. The associating the other with a negative aspect explicitly is the most used sub-strategy in the negative impoliteness. Patronizing behavior is the mostly used impoliteness formula followed by pointed criticism, encroachment, insults, and then exclusion respectively. It has been found that there are four sub-themes related to impolite comments: mocking comments, comments focusing on self, comments about the idea of abuse and comments about general speculations.

References

Brown,p. and Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Bousfield, Derek. (2008). *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chen, G. M.,&Ng, Y. M.M. (2017.Nasty online comments anger you more than me, but nice ones make me as happy as you. *Computers in Human Behavior*.

Chicago Tribune. (2016, August 16). Johnny Depp and Amber Heard settle divorce case. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from http://www.chicagotribune.com/entertainment/ct-amber-heard-johnny-depp-divorce-20160816-story.html

Cook, P. W. (2009). *Abused men: The hidden side of domestic violence* (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness.Journal of Pragmatics vol.25. Oxford: Elsevier.

Culpeper, J. (2005). *Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The weakest Link*. Journal pf Politeness Research:Language, Behavior, Culture1.

Culpeper, J.,Bousfield , Derek, Wichmann, Ann.(2003). *Impoliteness revisited: with special reference to dynamicand prosodc aspects*. Journal of Pragmatics vol.35. London:Elsevior.

Culpeper, J. (2010). *Conventionalized impoliteness formulae*. Journal of pragmatics.vol.42. London: Elsevier B.V.

Fauziati, Endang. (2014). *Linguistic Impoliteness: A Brief Literature Review*. Markhamah Agus Wijayato, Mifthakhul Huda (Eds.). Prosiding Seminar Nasional: Ketidaksantunan Berbahasa dan Dampaknya Karakter, Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University Press.

Kasper, Gabriele. (2001). *Pragmatics in Language Learning*. Cambrige: Cambridge University Press.

Olaleye, B. R., Ali-Momoh, B. O., Herzallah, A., Sibanda, N., & Ahmed, A. F. (2021). Dimensional Context of Total Quality Management Practices and Organizational Performance of SMEs in Nigeria: Evidence from Mediating Role of Entrepreneurial Orientation. *International Journal of Operations and Quantitative Management, 21*(4), 399-415. https://doi.org/10.46970/2021.27.4.6

Terkourafi, Marina, (2008). *Towards a unified theory of politeness, impoliteness, and rudeness. In: Bousfield, Derek, Locher, Miriam A. (Eds.), Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with Power in Theory and Practice.* Mouton de Gruyter.Berlin and New York.

Soto Ferrari, M., Romero Rodriguez, D., Escorcia Caballero, J. P., Daza Escorcia, J. M., & Chams-Anturi, O. (2021). A discrete-event simulation approach to assess the benefits of parking technologies in hospitals. *International Journal of Operations and Quantitative Management, 27*(2), 141-152. https://doi.org/10.46970/2021.27.2.4

Sumarno, A. P., Setiawan, M., & Sunaryo, S. A. (2021). Employees Performance Evaluation in Defense Ministry of the Republic of Indonesia based on Multicriteria Decision Making (MCDM) and System Dynamic (SD). *International Journal of Operations and Quantitative Management, 27*(3), 245-266. https://doi.org/10.46970/2021.27.3.4

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press