


**Please cite the Published Version**

Archer, Dawn , Grainger, Karen and Jagozinski, Piotr (2020) Introduction: Politeness in Professional Contexts. In: Politeness in Professional Contexts. John Benjamins. ISBN 9789027207425

**Publisher:** John Benjamins

**Version:** Accepted Version

**Downloaded from:** <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/625155/>

**Usage rights:**  In Copyright

**Enquiries:**

If you have questions about this document, contact [openresearch@mmu.ac.uk](mailto:openresearch@mmu.ac.uk). Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

## Introduction: Politeness in professional contexts

Dawn Archer<sup>1</sup>, Karen Grainger<sup>2</sup> and Piotr Jagodziński<sup>1</sup>

Manchester Metropolitan University<sup>1</sup> and Sheffield Hallam University<sup>2</sup>

This edited collection, on *politeness in professional contexts*, has been written with three target audiences in mind: academics, professionals and practitioners. Politeness – and especially facework (or relational work) more generally – is relevant to almost every sphere of social life.<sup>1</sup> Yet, only a handful of publications deal specifically with the way(s) in which politeness theory can be applied to professional contexts (e.g., Holmes and Stubbe 2003; Jamet and Jobert 2013; Fernández-Amaya 2012; Terkourafi 2015; Jagodziński et al. 2018). These extant publications tend to be overtly academic in orientation, moreover. We mean, by this, that they seek to enrich “professional practice based upon a knowledge of and/or insights from facework and (im)politeness research” without necessarily being interested in changing “the way interaction in professional contexts is perceived and conceptualized by the practitioners themselves” (Archer and Jagodziński 2018:168).<sup>2</sup> This edited collection is made up of **twelve** chapters, which not only theorize about but, in some cases, also seek to operationalize “politeness and facework concepts” for “real world” settings (ibid). The settings drawn upon, moreover, are of crucial importance to human achievement, fulfilment and well-being: namely, medical contexts (see Section 1), business and organisational contexts including workplace email interactions (see Section 2), and legal and security contexts (see Section 3). After providing a brief outline

---

<sup>1</sup> The term, *facework*, is associated primarily with Goffman, and relates to the actions an interlocutor engages in “to make what [s/he] is doing consistent with face” (Goffman 1967: 5); *face* being an image that our interlocutor might claim based upon what others seem to be assuming about him or her. The term, *relational work*, was used by Watts (2003) and associated relational researchers as a means of distinguishing discursive politeness research from Goffmanian-inspired approaches to politeness, such as Brown’s and Levinson’s (1987), which were considered (by Watts and others) to focus too much upon the mutual maintenance of face needs. *Relational work* is thus meant to emphasise how an interactional negotiation of face relationships involves not only politeness (or the mutual maintenance of face needs) but also impoliteness (i.e., deliberate face attack) and other forms of inappropriate (versus appropriate) behaviour.

<sup>2</sup> With the exception, perhaps, of some of the papers in Jagodziński, Archer and Bousfield (2018).

of each chapter, based on its professional context (in Sections 1-3), we highlight the different notions of politeness and facework that have been drawn upon by the authors (in Section 4) and then summarize their (shared versus diverging) approaches to context, politeness theorizing and professional practice/training (in Sections 5-5.3).

## **1. Introduction to Part 1: Politeness in medical contexts**

The four chapters on politeness in medical contexts explore the relevance of facework to interaction in health care settings. The study of talk is now fairly widely acknowledged as being able to shed light on the day to day operation of the organisation and, importantly, on the quality of care (Harvey and Koteyko 2013; Iedema 2007). However, the study of politeness, and specifically politeness in hospitals, remains generally under-researched (Iedema 2007; Graham 2009; Mullany 2009; Locher and Schnurr 2017). Such studies of interaction in health care contexts can extend and contribute to politeness theory itself by observing the ways in which not only personal face considerations are at play, but also professional and institutional ones (see e.g., Kong 2014 for a discussion of the relationship between different face types and (professional) identity roles). The four chapters in this section apply variations of politeness theory to a wide variety of medical participants and contexts, using a variety of analytical methods. They apply concepts of politeness and face to professional and institutional interaction in ways, moreover, that can inform professional practice whilst extending our theoretical understanding of face, rapport and politeness.

The chapter on general practitioner (GP) training - by Tristan Emerson, Leigh Harrington, Louise Mullany, Sarah Atkins, Dick Churchill, Rachel Winter and Rakes Patel - has a particularly applied agenda as they argue that the micro-linguistic analysis that is involved in the study of politeness can provide new insights into GP training that otherwise uses a

simplistic notion of "rapport" (see Chapter 2). By applying Spencer-Oatey's (2008) more sophisticated concept of rapport management in interaction, as well as the concepts of professional and personal face (Othaber and Marquez-Reiter 2011) to simulated GP consultations, they unearth some of the detrimental aspects of current advice to trainee GPs in the UK context. Through detailed qualitative analysis of two training scenarios they argue that a slavish adherence to the concepts of "patient-centred care" can, in fact, be detrimental to the overall professional goals of the encounter. In one illustrative case, the trainee's attempt to establish "rapport" gives the patient a false impression that all is well with their test results. The situation then has to be retrieved as the doctor works the situation around to delivering bad news. Emerson et al. argue that politeness theory, including concepts of face sensitivity and rapport management taken from Spencer-Oatey and Franklin (2009) and extended to include "personal" and "professional" face, can provide candidate GPs with a "linguistic toolkit" with which to reflect on their interactional behaviour in consultations. They further suggest that the data they have collected and analysed for this study can be the basis for developing useful additional GP training tools.

Malgorzata Chalupnik's chapter also aims to have a practical application of Spencer-Oatey's notion of rapport, but this time in the context of encounters between members of a medical team (see Chapter 3). She looks specifically at requests and indirectness and relates them to leadership styles within the inter-professional team. She makes the point that effective inter-professional communication has beneficial and sometimes life-saving effects on treatment and points out that there is therefore a need for improved research and training into discursive strategies in these situations. As with Emerson et al. (Chapter 2), the data are from simulated encounters (in this case a simulated accident/emergency case) but are arguably "natural", nonetheless, since these simulations are genuine training tools used in UK medical training. Chalupnik makes effective use of a combined method of quantitative and qualitative analysis

of politeness features in interaction. The quantitative analysis looks at delegating tasks (using a version of Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) coding of directives) and active listenership (using Knight and Adolph's 2008 coding scheme for verbal and non-verbal indicators). The qualitative analysis looks at rapport management, based on Spencer-Oatey (2000) and Goffman's (1967) notion of face. Quantitative findings suggest that the most effective team leaders were perceived to be those who combined indirectness with giving direction. The qualitative analysis shows how such interactions are managed in terms of mitigation strategies and general rapport-orientation strategies. Indicators of active listenership are also shown to be higher in those candidates that were more favourably evaluated. On the basis of these findings, Chalupnik argues that verbal strategies that *flatten* professional hierarchies can lead to increased efficiency in meeting a task goal. She concludes that effective leadership can include enhanced rapport-building strategies and that politeness and task urgency can effectively occur side by side. This, *she suggests*, challenges normative ideas about leadership as well as challenging assumptions made within politeness studies concerning relational work and mitigation strategies being in tension with the “maximum efficiency” (Brown and Levinson 1987) that is required in task-oriented and urgent work settings. However, she points out that the evaluations made by the health professionals involved may be context and culture-specific and could put non-British candidates (whose use of indirectness may be conventionally different) at a disadvantage. She suggests, therefore, that pragmatics awareness training could be usefully included in communication skills training for health professionals.

The data examined in Karen Grainger's chapter is relatively rare in that it focuses on one of the allied medical professions: occupational therapy (see Chapter 4). It involves the detailed qualitative analysis of encounters with a stroke patient undergoing rehabilitation. Using the notions of personal and professional face orientation, and applying the essentially moral basis of polite behaviour, Grainger argues that both therapist and patient collaborate in constructing

an optimistic outcome of rehabilitation therapy. This is part of an institutional moral order that places the main responsibility for recovery with the motivation that the patient may show. In this non-curative medical context, “hope work” (Perakyla 1991) is negotiated interactionally in order to uphold a professional version of reality in which sustained effort in rehabilitation therapy is the key to recovery. The analysis shows that, when this professional definition of the situation is momentarily challenged by the patient, the therapist works to re-establish this moral order, even possibly at the expense of giving the patient false expectations of how much can be achieved through therapy. The chapter does not make specific recommendations for communication skills training but the implications for practice echo those in Emerson et al. (see Chapter 2). Namely, that health professionals could benefit from a reflexive and critical awareness of their communicative practices since unswerving adherence to a prescribed professional ethos (such as motivation, optimism or rapport) is not always in the best interests of the patient.

Olga Zayts and Fefei Zhou's chapter looks at a somewhat different medical context: interaction involving a health professional giving advice to the general public on-line (see Chapter 5). It is a very valuable area for the application of politeness theory, nonetheless, given the increasing use of mobile health apps as a common form of medical consultation; particularly in China (where the data are taken from). Zayts and Zhou's main analytical framework is that of relational work (Locher and Watts 2005) through which they focus on the practice of advice-giving. The particular app under analysis deals with post-partum recovery for new mothers and looks at how the competing discourses from traditional Chinese practices and modern neoliberal beliefs are negotiated on-line. The main focus is the way humour is used as a relational strategy. The authors argue that there is considerable potential face-threat involved in criticising traditional practices that advice-seekers may mention and so medics posting advice conduct extensive relational work in order to negotiate an appropriate “equilibrium”

with their audience. While humour is used for relational purposes, potential risks to professional or expert face are countered by drawing on medical terminology and historical knowledge to present themselves as a credible source. Overall, the analysis of interactional norms on digital platforms is relatively new and thus worthy of examination. Despite this being a non-institutional and digital (not face-to-face) context, the notion of professional face still applies. Such studies also extend our understanding of how politeness works in novel professional settings, of course.

## **2. Introduction to Part 2: Politeness in business and organisational contexts (including emails)**

The five chapters on politeness in business and organisational contexts explore the relevance of facework to business, institutional, and organisational contexts. There are numerous points of convergence between the chapters in terms of i) their theoretical underpinnings, ii) their epistemological and ontological perspectives, iii) the way the authors conceptualise (im)politeness, facework, and rapport-management, and iv) the way the authors conducted the analysis. Before we move on to the brief summaries of each chapter, it is perhaps useful to emphasise at least some of those commonalities with a view to helping the reader form an overarching view of Section 2 of the present collection. The first two chapters in Section 2 utilise Spencer-Oatey's (2000, 2005, 2008) rapport management framework to explain and analyse their datasets. Both chapters thus emphasise the dynamic, negotiated, and context-dependent nature of politeness and rapport in institutional context(s). This is especially pronounced in Rachel Mapson's chapter, as she concentrates on the way interpreters of British Sign Language evaluate (im)politeness *in situ*, in the course of the interaction with their clients (see Chapter 7). The two chapters emphasise, further, that (im)politeness poses a specific

interactional challenge in the analysed settings. In Caroline Debray's case, impoliteness impacts the interpersonal dynamic among group members, in this case, the university students working on various projects (see Chapter 6). Similarly, Mapson clearly demonstrates how impoliteness impacts the rapport between the client and the interpreter, as well as the strategies the interpreters adopt when faced with a challenging task of translating impoliteness from one code to another. The strength of both chapters lies not only in the nuanced analysis of unfolding interactions, but also in the way the authors challenge some of the deeply rooted theoretical claims reproduced in extant subject literature. Debray challenges the preconception that troubled working relationships will always be characterised by open conflict. The author's analysis shows that the linguistic performance of group members involved in an ongoing conflict can be marked by the use of strategies aimed at mitigating or avoiding conflict. Similarly, Mapson convincingly dispels the myth of the interpreter as conduit. The analysis clearly demonstrates that the interpreter's linguistic choices play an active part in negotiating the interpersonal relationships of the involved parties. Interestingly, this active negotiation of interpersonal relationships is also a feature of both Jagodziński's and Marsden's chapters, where emphasis is placed on the fluid boundaries between the transactional and the relational, and the difficulty – or even the superfluity – of separating the two categories when analysing service encounters. From a methodological perspective, an interesting feature of Piotr Jagodziński's and Vera Freytag's chapters is the fact that both researchers were themselves members of the examined Communities of Practice (Wenger 1999) (henceforth CofP). This fact clearly contributed to the authors' familiarity with the norms of the examined communities and helped to demonstrate that it is indeed possible to meaningfully separate the researcher's and the participant's identities without jeopardising the quality and the objectivity of the analysis. In Jagodziński's chapter, the fact that he was the member of the examined community of practices served as a springboard for further theorising about the nature of the relationship



between lay and professional perceptions of conflict and (im)politeness, leading the author to argue for the academic treatment of “folk” perceptions as something that can usefully inform (im)politeness research. In this way, he has demonstrated that a potential methodological hurdle, may, in fact, be turned into a convincing argument in the process of supporting and developing an inter-professional dialogue between linguistics and professional (call centre) practitioners. This is an overarching theme of the entire volume, addressed to a greater or lesser extent in each chapter. It is ultimately up to the reader to assess how effectively each author in Section 2 approached the task. The brief summaries presented below might provide the reader with further help in deciding on the reading order and evaluating the relevance of the subject matter of each chapter.

The chapter by Caroline Debray focuses on the analysis of a long-term relational conflict among 8 students working on projects at a UK university over a period of 8 months (see Chapter 6). The author has transcribed 25 hours of interactional material, concentrating on how the group interactionally managed the conflict with one problematic member called Allen. Debray’s analysis has revealed a number of interactional strategies that the interactants used to deal with Allen. What makes Debray’s study particularly interesting is that her analysis reveals what might be described as an interesting interactional paradox. More specifically, “team members were much more willing to disagree, argue and provide negative feedback to interlocutors with whom they had positive relationships than with those with whom relationships were strained”. As pointed out by Debray “[t]his finding raises further questions regarding the conceptualisation of disagreements-as-conflicts”. Debray provides a useful list of specific (linguistic) behaviours towards David (a British team leader for an oil and gas company), some of which include “accepting decisions without questioning”, “backing down quickly in an argument”, and “withholding face-to-face feedback”. These strategies might be of particular interest to institutional stakeholders, as Debray emphasises that the interactants’

were aiming at “avoiding a negative reaction at all costs, even to the detriment of their performance”. This crucial conclusion underlines the critical usefulness of the findings of (im)politeness research for organisational and business contexts, as it clearly demonstrates how individual members’ linguistic performance may have an impact on the functioning of the entire institution.

Similarly to the above, Rachel Mapson’s chapter focuses on the interactional management of impoliteness, albeit in a markedly different context of sign interpreting (see Chapter 7). This context is marked by interpreters’ unique interactional position. They are both recipients and speakers, but they are not the originators of the message. Utilising Spencer-Oatey’s (2002, 2005, 2008) rapport management framework, Mapson clearly illuminates not only the complex nature of the interaction between the speaker and the interpreter, but also takes into account cross-cultural considerations and context-specific influences. Throughout the chapter, Mapson convincingly argues that (im)politeness poses a real challenge to professional sign language interpreters. Through semi-structured group discussions, Mapson reveals seven main influences on interpreters’ interactional decisions related to (im)politeness. They relate to, for example, self-preservation, intention, and un/familiarity. Mapson consistently advocates for the conceptualisation of interpreting as a process rather than a product. This approach, in turn, aligns with her chosen approach to the analysis of rapport management, which focuses on the interactional negotiation of (im)politeness. Mapson concludes her chapter with a strong and - given her findings - fully justified call for the abandonment of the “historical perception of the interpreter as a conduit”. Given Mapson’s analysis, the complexity of the interaction between the interpreters and the clients requires a much more nuanced and context-sensitive treatment than the conduit metaphor would allow for.

The central theme of Jagodziński’s chapter is that call centre professionals’ language practices can be situated at the intersection of lay and scholarly understandings of (im)politeness

phenomena, and the nature of linguistic communicative behaviour more broadly (see Chapter 8). He argues that call centre language practices, such as heavy language regulation, language policing, styling, and their underpinning ideologies (Jagodziński and Archer 2018) escape categorisation based on dichotomies such as “lay” versus “theoretical” (Kádár and Haugh 2013: 86) or “folk linguistic” versus “professional” (cf. Niedzielski and Preston 2000; 2007). His argument centres around a general observation that the members of the examined call centre CofP are not professional linguists, per se, yet they engage in what could be described as nuanced and at times highly sophisticated (meta)theorising. For example, Jagodziński’s (2013) fieldwork revealed that the kind of communication training advocated by call centre practitioners, as well as the language-related assumptions hidden in various in-house training materials, are, at least partially, underpinned by elements of social-psychological, linguistic, and marketing research (cf. Jagodziński and Archer 2018). Based on these initial observations, Jagodziński takes this argument further and adopts a folk-pragmatic (Niedzielski and Preston 2007; 2009) approach to examine the nature of the relationship between aspects of (im)politeness research and call centre linguistic practices. Following Haugh’s (2018: 163) call, the chapter can be seen as a modest but important contribution to the metatheorization of (im)politeness research, specifically to examine what call centre quasi-theories can contribute in this respect.

Vera Freytag’s chapter analyses the use of directives in emails in a multilingual workplace (see Chapter 9). The author analysed 300 British English and 300 Peninsular Spanish e-mails written by native speakers of the respective languages. The author used a triangulatory approach to data collection and supplemented the analysis of emails with a small-scale perception study, in which she elicited metapragmatic comments regarding the use of directives. This was done through the use of an online questionnaire sent to both the English and Spanish e-mail writers. Freytag’s analysis revealed that both Spanish and English email

writers “employ a shared set of head act and modification strategies for the realization of directives”. What is especially interesting, however, is that Freytag’s analysis revealed a high level of directness in both Peninsular Spanish and British English emails. This runs contrary to a finding in the extant politeness literature, which predicts that speakers of British English tend to employ indirectness and clearly orient to negative face. Freytag has also concluded that the choice of a particular strategy depends on contextual and cross-cultural factors and variables such as sex, social distance, or power. Interestingly, Freytag points to the fact that in workplace contexts politeness concerns may be overridden by effectiveness concerns: something that was supported by the evidence elicited in the form of metapragmatic comments.

The last chapter in Section 2, by Liz Marsden, is a study of relational work in a sole trader’s intercultural business emails (see Chapter 10). Contrary to Freytag’s study, the author was not only a participant observer, but was participating in the email exchanges with her customers, whom she provided with proofreading services. Compared to other chapters in Part 2, this study has a unique, longitudinal character, in that the author has analysed email exchanges taking place over three years (2011-2014). Marsden has revealed how “non-salient politeness practices develop in dyadic interactions and how the historicity of the relationship can be a crucial resource drawn upon to increase closeness between participants” (Kadar and Haugh, 2013:78). To that aim, Marsden has used a corpus of 1072 business-to-consumer emails. The major finding of the chapter is that relational work through emails is not only achieved through self-disclosures, but also through using computer-mediated communication affordances such as cues and media sharing. Moreover, Marsden provides tangible evidence for the fact that building a relationship through email in a business context is clearly a function of time, requiring the exchange of as many as 100 emails. This, Marsden writes, is how much time is needed to allow your interlocutor into “further circles of one’s self” (Goffman, 1971:192).

### 3. Introduction to Part 3: Politeness in legal and security contexts

The three chapters making up this section on legal and security contexts explore areas that have been understudied - and, in some cases, effectively ignored - by politeness and facework researchers (to date). As Archer (2017) notes, for example, although the courtroom is probably the most studied legal context when it comes to politeness, impoliteness and facework strategies, the facework implications of judges' interaction strategies remain an understudied research area, nonetheless. Karen Tracy's chapter is particular noteworthy, in this regard, because it contrasts the facework strategies used by judges in two courtroom contexts: oral arguments heard by a panel of judges in the US appellate court (see also Tracy 2011; 2016) and small claims hearings heard by a single judge (see also Tracy and Caron 2017). Tracy begins her chapter with a review of (some of the) extant research on facework, politeness and identity (see Chapter 11). She then provides a background for the two court activities, and analyses both their differing (judicial) questioning practices and the facework implications thereof, before concluding that future politeness theorizing needs to better attend to - by further foregrounding - context (see also Section 5.1, this chapter). One facework-related difference of note, for example, is that the appellate court judges tended to be impolite, rude or verbally aggressive only rarely. Instead, they adopted a stance akin to (what, for Tracy, equates to) "impersonal professionalism" (see Chapter 11). The judges in the small claims hearings tended to engage in verbally aggressive behaviour with some regularity, however. This is in spite of there being no particular mandate to suggest the need for such verbal aggression on the judges' part (cf. a criminal lawyer's need to undermine a witness's testimony during their cross-examinations, sometimes to the point of chastising them: Archer 2011a). Tracy provides the example of a judge who, annoyed by a litigant's lack of preparation prior to the start of the session, responded with "extreme case formulations ("Nobody read..."), reprimands ("You haven't done that?") and complaints ("I don't know why we give people orders if they won't

read 'em'"))", all of which served "to upgrade the seriousness of the failure and threaten the other's positive face in consequence" (cf. Brown and Levinson 1987). Another judge, in the same small claims setting, used a (long) questioning sequence that not only sought to "limit the litigant's freedom to act, and hence the person's negative face" but also effectively suggested "a sceptical stance" on his part, thereby threatening the "litigant's positive face" (see Chapter 11). Tracy goes on to link such "pursuit[s] of a topic through a sequence of questions" to Culpeper and Terkourafi's (2017) argument that future politeness theorizing should be detached from a (single) speech act unit in her concluding comments (see Section 5.2, this chapter).

Dawn Archer, Cliff Lansley and Aaron Garner deal with a massively under-explored professional context when it comes to facework: interactions between Air Marshals (AMs) or Behavioural Detection Officers (BDOs) and persons of interest in an international airport setting (see Chapter 12). They focus, moreover, on a particular use of facework, *which is also under explored (within the area of linguistics at least): namely, the strategic use of small talk for transactional purposes. This equates to AMs and BDOs using* what is normally considered *phatic communication* as an intelligence-gathering technique such that they can extract "targeted information from a person" of interest "in a manner that [hopefully] does not disclose the true intent of the conversation" (NCIS, 2013) to them. For these authors, in particular, seeking to enrich "professional practice based upon a knowledge of and/or insights from facework and (im)politeness research" is not just as an academic exercise (Archer and Jagodziński 2018: 168). Rather, it is a means of changing the way interaction "is perceived and conceptualized" in such contexts - especially by practitioners (ibid. See also Section 6.3, this chapter). They thus report on their participation in a Behavioural Detection programme for European airport and intelligence/security agencies (Lansley et al. 2017). They also highlight a study they undertook in an international airport, which – in line with the findings of their

chapter – confirms the transactional value of small talk when it operates covertly from within a phatic veil. Archer et al.’s work has notable implications for our (linguistic) theoretical understanding of small talk, in particular, given that small talk is nearly always distinguished from “transactional”, “instrumental”, “goal oriented” or “means-end rational” talk within the extant linguistic literature (see, e.g., Maynard and Hudak 2008:662, and also Section 5.2, this chapter). The authors’ main motivation, though, is to demonstrate the techniques that AMs and BDOs can use, when initiating their small talk with others, and contrasting these with examples of “chat-downs” (Price and Forrest 2012:248), as a means of highlighting the differences between them. They note, for example, how a chat-down in an aviation setting is akin to a verbal pat-down, and thus tends to be much more *overtly transactional* discursively speaking. A border control official’s questions are focussed on establishing a would-be-traveller’s (true) identity, nationality, travel history and (imminent to future) travel plans, for example. Although some small talk may be evident in their interaction with these would-be-travellers - in the form of, say, a greeting - greetings do not have to be reciprocated; nor does the official (have to) give their name to the would-be-travellers, generally speaking. Small talk used transactionally by AMs and BDOs, in contrast, is designed to give passengers the sense they are chatting with someone who *only* has “a genuine (albeit passing) interest in” them (even though they do, in fact, have a means-end rationale for engaging with them too). As such, greetings and/or names do tend to be exchanged, along with other types of self-disclosure(s). Such interactions can also involve the establishment of a shared mutual reality, and/or mutual face enhancing behaviours.

Dawn Archer’s solo-authored chapter explores the negotiation tactics used by a US police negotiator during a barricade incident, prior to outlining the ensuing facework implications for him and his subject (see Chapter 13). Like Archer et al. (Chapter 12), Archer is very much interested in changing the way interaction “is perceived and conceptualized” in such contexts

- especially by the practitioners themselves (Archer and Jagodziński 2018:168). She thus reports on training that she has been developing, in consultation with UK police negotiators, which draws on an understanding of facework in conjunction with linguistic concepts such as *reality paradigms* (see also Sections 5.2 and 5.3, this chapter). Archer (2002, 2011b) used the latter to, first, explain courtroom participants' use of diverse - and often opposing - truth filters when making sense of their world (Archer 2002, 2011b) and, then, to demonstrate the way(s) in which this impacted upon their understanding (as well as treatment) of the other. More recently, she has applied it to a barricade incident, which ended with the death of the subject, in order to show that the negotiator's "perception of reality" diverged to such an extent to be evident in his facework (Archer et al. 2018:186). The negotiator undermined the subject's "want to have freedom of action", for example, "by repeatedly ordering him to "keep his mouth shut/shut up", to "man up" and "take care of [his] problems" (ibid: 190). This was taken to highlight his worldview that "real" men behave rationally, rather than being like the subject, that is, "unable to cope due to being rejected by a girlfriend" and suffering "with depression" in consequence (ibid:189). Archer's chapter expands on – as a means of operationalising – the reality paradigm concept specifically for police negotiators, such that they can, first, "identify" and, then, "attempt to influence subjects' mental models of their world(s)". By way of illustration, she notes how a subject's "consistent use of 'I can't go back'", in a second barricade incident, "pointed to a 'belief-world' that" the negotiator "had to attend to" if he hoped to end what had quickly become a standoff. He did so by offering his own *belief*-world, namely, that the subject "was 'gonna be okay'...and that, as" he "did not 'wanna hurt anybody...everyone [else was] gonna be just fine today'" too. The negotiator then set about persuading the subject "he had a future worth living for". He moved him towards this "new *outer reality*" (ibid:196) linguistically by getting him "to think about" his "experiences in a new kind of way" (Voutilainen 2012:236-7, 242). This included offering him not only "an



alternative future” but ways of getting “to that future via both a re-interpretation of his current predicament and...the promise of specific future actions on” the negotiator’s “part that, importantly, were”, first, “contingent upon” the subject “promising and then performing reciprocal (imminent) future actions” for him. Archer also identifies other mental worlds a negotiator might use (or listen out for), when attempting to influence their subjects, relating to wants intents knowledge, etc. (cf. Werth 1999). **These mental worlds have the added benefit of being things negotiators can identify (more easily) at the word or statement level in real time: especially where statements involving “(not) want to/(not) wanna”, “(not) going to/(not) gonna”, “promise, will”, etc., are repeated several times. “Promise” and “will” equate to direct and indirect forms of promising, of course.** A second speech act that negotiators are believed to make extensive use of is that of complimenting or face enhancement more generally. As Archer notes, complimenting/face enhancement have been “much discussed by politeness researchers” in particular. A third influencing strategy of note – that of promoting similarity – has received little attention to date, however, in spite of Brown and Levinson’s (1987:108) assessment of it as “a way of implying common ground”, “such that a relational connection can be created/maintained for the duration of that interaction (Haugh, 2011)”. Archer concludes by asserting that these are but a few of the many “concepts already drawn upon by negotiators” that “can be linked to facework” (see also Section 5.3, this chapter).

#### **4. Notions of politeness, facework and relational work adopted in this edited collection**

Linguistic politeness as an area of academic study has developed considerably over the last three decades or so and there continues to be much debate as to how politeness can, or should, be defined. This debate springs, at least in part, from the ambiguity of the word “polite”, which has an everyday lay meaning as well as being used in a technical sense. The “first wave” of politeness theorising (Grainger 2011; Culpeper 2011) constructed the study of politeness as an

outgrowth of traditional pragmatics (see, e.g., Brown and Levinson 1987), and understood politeness to be the avoidance of committing face-threatening acts. In the “second wave”, scholars such as Eelen (2001) and Watts (2003) argued that politeness studies should be about the discursive struggle over the very meaning of what it is for ordinary people to be polite. Locher and Watts (2005) argued that politeness is a sub-set of wider “relational work” and still others (e.g. Arundale 2006; Spencer-Oatey 2008) that politeness is not just about avoiding face-threat, but is generally about doing “facework” - that is, paying attention to the face needs of participants in interaction via linguistic, paralinguistic and non-verbal means. A third, and most recent, “wave” of politeness theorising tends to take the view that there are insights from all these approaches that can usefully be applied to interactional data (see Grainger 2011; Haugh and Culpeper 2018). While definitions and boundaries remain fluid and debatable, we can broadly say that doing relationship work in interaction involves doing facework, which may involve the lay concept of politeness but is not confined to it. This notion of politeness is reflected in the chapters in this book. The folk idea(s) of politeness as appropriate behaviour are clearly important in professional contexts as, arguably, a large part of behaving professionally involves knowing how to follow the norms of etiquette in a particular context. Some of the chapters, for example Chapter 5 on relational work in digital health care (Zayts and Zhou) and Chapter 7 on politeness in sign language (Mapson) deal precisely with these lay evaluations of politeness. Other chapters, such as Jagodziński’s “Towards folk pragmatics of call centre service encounters” (see Chapter 8), demonstrate that in business and organisational contexts the dichotomous view of “lay” vs “professional” concepts of (im)politeness cannot be upheld easily, and that professional practitioners come up with their own understandings of what constitutes polite versus impolite linguistic behaviours. Most of the chapters in this book agree, however, that the broadly understood notion of politeness includes the way in which professional identities and relationships are reflected and constructed through talk. For

example, Marsden, in her longitudinal study of business correspondence, demonstrates how those relationships are built through email exchanges over an extended period of time (see Chapter 10). Similarly, Mapson shows how interpreters, by virtue of their professional roles and identities, are faced with a challenging task of negotiating politeness norms, not only between the interactants themselves but also across codes (see Chapter 7). Inasmuch as the idea of “face” provides the unifying theoretical underpinning for many of these chapters, what the **above** mentioned chapters also have in common is the emphasis on the difficulty involved in drawing a meaningful distinction between the transactional and the relational, as well as between lay (folk) and professional (scholarly) understandings of **(im)politeness** and rapport management. Jagodziński, in particular, advocates for the importance of taking into account professional practitioners’ understandings of **(im)politeness** as a valuable means of promoting dialogue with and between professional practitioners. He argues for the treatment of call centre professionals as interactional stakeholders capable of articulating their own justified and nuanced conceptualisations of language and communication, which may both inform and be informed by academic theorising. Given our mention of the blurring of the transactional and the relational, above, we should perhaps mention – once again – the work by Archer et al. **(Chapter 12)**, which has sought to show that small talk can be both **transactional and relational** simultaneously, **especially** when used as a covert means of gleaning information from strangers (see also Section 4, this chapter). The notion of facework as a strategy has been heavily criticised by researchers in the recent past: even though, as this volume reveals, facework in institutional settings does tend to have a strategic bent. Whether this means politeness and facework researchers should look again at the issue of intentionality is for future work to decide.

## **5. Context, politeness theorizing and professional practice/training**

When taken collectively, the **twelve** chapters making up this edited collection allude to three matters that are worthy of brief attention prior to moving on to the contributions themselves. Namely, how best to deal with *context* when it comes to our understanding(s) of politeness and facework more generally, the future of *politeness theorizing*, and the consequences (of the authors' work, as well as related work) for *professional practice/training*. We will deal with each, in turn, beginning with context.

## **5.1 Context**

Tracy (Chapter **11**) calls attention to an insight that is not only true of - but has been a motivator for - this particular edited collection, in addition to the special issue co-edited by Jagodziński, Archer and Bousfield (2018). Namely, the need to pay as much attention to how “people seek[ing] services” or “work[ing] as professionals” engage in facework, as we have to “informal exchanges between friends and acquaintances” (**in previous research**). For Tracy, this means paying more attention, in particular, to how *institutional* contexts will differ based on activity so that we have a better understanding of them practically, and can use our more nuanced understandings, in turn, to more effectively refine extant theories relating to (im)politeness and facework. Tracy has found that oral argument, for example, has “little in common with ordinary conversation or even other institutional activities where argument and disagreement are common, as for instance occurs in academic discussion (Tracy, 1997)”. Archer makes a similar point, when it comes to a better appreciation of professional practice (see Chapter **13**). Indeed, one stated motivation for her project with police negotiators is to make their training “particularly sensitive to changing contexts” by explicitly considering how, for example, a barricade incident differs, linguistically (and especially relationally) speaking, from a suicide bid. When taken collectively, Archer and Tracy's work suggests that it may even be insufficient to refine our current politeness concepts, theories and models so that they

become activity-type specific, if we are to fully appreciate the effect(s) of context on participants' facework (choices). We say this as, in both of the barricade incidents Archer has studied for example, the negotiators sought to get their subjects to relinquish a firearm and exit a house (in one case) and a car (in the other). One succeeded, the other did not. In the former case, there was much more evidence of face enhancement. In the latter, much more evidence of face aggravation. There were places, however, where the successful negotiator used tactics that were face threatening to the point of being potentially patronising. When the subject stated he had made mistakes, for example, the negotiator "mirrored his description back to him", using the same language, "before stating that, at only 'twenty two years old' he was 'still a kid'". As Archer notes, the "likely strategy, here, was to signal...he was young enough to change his future (and hence do something about the man he had become in order 'to survive day to day' in prison)". The subject disagreed, by stating "his belief that he had 'fucked [his] life forever'". This prompted a reciprocal (more emphatic) disagreement from the negotiator, albeit quickly followed by a self-disclosure "that he had 'a son that's twenty two' who was (also) 'still a kid' (as a means of justifying his youthful assessment of [him])". The negotiator then went on to broach another, potentially face-threatening topic: the subject's "addiction problem", likening it to his "biggest obstacle". By exploring different examples of the same activity type, Archer is hoping to determine what makes one negotiation more successful than another, even when both display evidence of face-threatening behaviour and disagreement(s). To what extent such nuances can then be represented in (by being factored into) a facework theory or model is a matter for future research to determine.

Chapters 2-5 within the "medical contexts" section also make it clear how it is not only one's physical environment but also the professional and institutional identities being sustained within the organisation which are extremely relevant to the way relationships and interactions are managed. Medics and patients alike are subject to explicit institutional directives to "create

rapport” (Emerson et al. and Chalupnik) or to remain optimistic (Grainger). The analyses provided in these chapters demonstrate that attempts to hold the professional “line” can sometimes backfire in terms of genuine patient welfare.

A further important facet of context is the digital or on-line context. This cuts across several of the book sections, in particular, Zayts and Zhou's chapter on an on-line medical advice forum (see Chapter 5), Marsden's longitudinal study of business email correspondence (see Chapter 10) and Freytag's chapter on the use of directives in a multilingual workplace (see Chapter 9). All **three** contributions serve to highlight the fact that computer mediated communication is in every walk of life and has, or is developing, its own norms and characteristics.

Finally, the national cultural context of interaction is something that has long interested politeness scholars, and it continues to be of great relevance to professional communication. The cross-cultural aspects of **(im)politeness** are taken up by Freytag, **in particular**, as part of her analysis of a large corpus of workplace emails written by native speakers of English and Peninsular Spanish. Freytag's findings point to the fact that, in institutional contexts, communicative effectiveness may take precedence over politeness. It is also worth reiterating, once more, that the deeply held belief of English politeness as being primarily oriented towards negative face (cf. Brown and Levinson 1987) **is** not reflected in her analysed data.

## **5.2 Politeness theorizing**

Given our mention of the possible need to rework existing theory, this is an opportune moment to highlight that several of the chapters touch on (albeit different) issues relating to politeness theorizing. Tracy, for example, concurs with Culpeper and Terkourafi's (2017) argument that future politeness theorizing should be detached from – so that it is not unduly influenced by – the notion of a speech act as a single unit (see **Chapter 11**, and also Section 4, this chapter). As

Culpeper and Terkourafi (2017: 16) note, the “basic building block of” possibly the most influential politeness model – that of the Brown and Levinson (1987) – “is the Face Threatening Act (FTA), and that notion is clearly aligned with speech act theory” (henceforth SAT). Yet, it has long been accepted that, as speech acts are shaped by numerous factors in their context-of-use – not least the speaker, hearer and “the broader activity or event in which they occur” – traditional SAT cannot fully capture their “complexities” (Culpeper and Terkourafi 2017:17-8). Even when speech acts (co-)occur in conventionalised ways in certain activity types, moreover, it does not follow that their face-threatening potential remains stable across those activity types or even within the same activity type (as noted in Sections 4 and 5.1). It remains the case, nonetheless, that professionals share Austin’s (1962/1975) notion that speakers “do” things with their words, be it complimenting, promising, insulting, etc., and that these moves can be face enhancing or face threatening in some contexts. As such, Archer continues to draw upon the notion of speech act (following Archer et al. 2018), albeit seeing them as “reasonably accurate approximations of the prototypical instances of verbal behaviour describable by means of” in her case “the English verbs used as labels” (Verschuere 1999: 132).

As noted in Section 4 (of this chapter), Archer’s own contribution to politeness theorising is shaped by her desire to operationalise the concept of “reality paradigm”, for police negotiators specifically, such that they are able to identify – as a means of influencing – “subjects’ mental models of the world”. Archer believes this to be particularly important, for police negotiation, as “mental models” to do with belief, obligation, (not) knowing, tentativeness, etc., “have the capacity to” not only “shape how a subject understands his/her world”, but “how s/he makes inferences from/predictions based on what others have said or done (and decisions about how to act in consequence)”. For example, the negotiator “needed to convince” the subject “to surrender a firearm, and end” the “barricade incident”, which “meant convincing him he had a future”. His tactic was to tell the subject he “was ‘gonna be okay”, etc., that is, project “an

immediate future reality for” him “that was different to” the subject’s “prediction he would be killed by police snipers”.

Archer et al.’s work offers an amendment to our politeness and facework theorizing, too (see Chapter 12). In this case, we must adjust our (linguistic) understanding of small talk so that we allow for times when it can be used transactionally, albeit under a phatic veil. This also applies to other contexts, such as medical interactions, as the chapter by Emerson et al. discusses (see Chapter 2). Whether this means arguing that small talk is simultaneously relational and transactional, or on relational-transactional continuum, is debatable, however, as it is more likely that small talk works transactionally only when speakers hide their means-end rationale under a phatic veil. To know this for sure would require further research, of course.

The chapters by Emerson et al. and by Grainger (see Chapters 2 and 4) both make use of the distinction between personal face and professional face. As they both acknowledge, while this is not a new development, their work does underscore the fact that “face” is applicable to more than just the individual social actor; when people occupy professional roles their face needs become institutionally relevant and influenced. This is something that is often overlooked in non-institutional studies. Similarly the extension of politeness studies into the digital sphere can lead to new conceptions of what counts as (im)polite.

### **5.3 Professional practice/training**

Archer (Chapter 13) and Archer et al. (Chapter 12) are particularly emphatic about their aim of improving practitioners’ understanding of politeness and facework. Indeed, both identify training opportunities that they have previously engaged with or are currently engaged in. Whilst their approaches to training differ (in the sense that the latter keep linguistic terminology to a minimum and focus, instead, on small talk as an elicitation technique for intelligence



gathering), neither train participants in the same way they might learn about politeness and facework concepts (theoretically) in a Higher Education setting. Although not directly stipulated in their chapters, both do use video and/or audio recording when training police negotiators, airport personnel and other professionals, however (Archer, p.c.). Their training practices thus fall in line with Emerson et al.'s and Chalupnik's suggestion(s) that data videos can be used as discussion points designed to raise metalinguistic awareness in professionals (see Chapters 2 and 3). Arguably, this kind of metalinguistic awareness-raising has the potential to hone professionals' skills in critical reflection without putting them in a communication straight-jacket (cf. Chapter 8, and also below). There would arguably be a need to explicitly grow awareness of the cultural differences between an individual's own taken-for-granted practices and those of the less familiar cultures they are interacting with, however (so they do not assume, falsely, that there is only one way of doing facework – their way).

It is worth noting, in closing, that some (im)politeness researchers and theorists remain deeply sceptical about the effectiveness of explicit 'politeness training' (O'Driscoll p.c.). There are both theoretical and practical reasons for this scepticism. An overarching theoretical reason might have to do with the fact that there is no one unified, coherent, and fully predictive theory of (im)politeness. As a consequence, by adopting their chosen approaches and methodologies, researchers subscribe to the ontological and epistemological assumptions behind them. In so doing, they contribute to what Haugh (2018) refers to as "sterile eclecticism" in impoliteness research. Explicit teaching of (im)politeness in any professional setting would necessarily mean either overt or covert imposition of the tenets of the chosen paradigm, such as pragmatic (cf. Brown and Levinson 1987) or discursive (Watts 2003). Practically speaking, translating the various theoretical approaches with their distinctive terminologies (cf. the debate surrounding the notion of what constitutes rudeness vs impoliteness in Bousfield and Locher 2008) into institutionally deliverable and teachable units to uninitiated audiences seems a

daunting, if not an impossible, task. It is not a surprise, then, that the aforementioned scepticism is also noticeable in the present volume, with a number of authors refraining from advocating for explicit training in politeness or facework.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, the chapters by Chalupnik and Emerson et al. or Jagodziński (both of whom use training materials as data) suggest that, in fact, practitioners' may be hampered by being told explicitly how to "create rapport" or "do leadership" (see Chapters 2, 3 and 8). Jagodziński, further, points to the dangers of succumbing to an illusion that academic (im)politeness researchers will be able to provide the professional practitioner with the unequivocal answer to the pertinent question, "So what is it that I need to say to the customer?" A potential way out is to recognise that professional practitioners utilise their own Stocks of Interactional Knowledge (henceforth SIKs) (Peräkylä and Vehviläinen 2003), that is, their own strategies, (quasi)-theories, and interactional heuristics – some of which may usefully enter into a dialogue with impoliteness theorising and, as a consequence, inform or be informed by (im)politeness research. This is in line with Haugh's (2018) call for theorisation of impoliteness being advanced "through approaching the study of (im)politeness in different languages and cultures on their own terms." As demonstrated in the current volume, recognising those terms involves acknowledging that professionals coming from different CofPs – be they medical, legal, security, business or educational – have the capacity to reflect upon their own communicative practice, and, in consequence, will not always remain passive in the face of the dominant (communication training) ideologies (cf. Woydack 2019).

## References

---

<sup>3</sup> Interestingly, there have been attempts at operationalising facework for communication training purposes made by for example Domenici and Littlejohn (2006).

Amaya, Lucía F., Maria De La O Hernández Lôpez, Reyes Gómez Morón, Manuel Padilla Cruz,

Manuel Mejias Borrero and Marianna Relinque Barranca. 2012. *New Perspectives on (Im)Politeness and Interpersonal Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Archer, Dawn and Piotr Jagodziński. 2018. "Applying im/politeness and facework research to professional settings: An Introduction". Special Issue of the *Journal of Politeness Research* 14 (2): 167-178.

Archer, Dawn, Rebecca Smithson, and Ian Kennedy. 2018. "Achieving influence through negotiation: An argument for developing pragmatic awareness." In *Legal Pragmatics*, ed. by Dennis Kurzon, and Barbara Kryk-Kastovsky, 181-202. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Archer, Dawn. 2002. "Can innocent people be guilty?". A sociopragmatic analysis of examination transcripts from the Salem Witchcraft Trials. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 3 (1): 1-30.

Archer, Dawn. 2011a. "Cross-examining lawyers, facework and the adversarial courtroom". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (13): 3216-3230.

Archer, Dawn. 2011b. "Libeling Oscar Wilde: The Case of Regina vs. John Sholto Douglas". *Journal of Politeness Research* 7 (1): 73-99.

Archer, Dawn. 2017. "Impoliteness in legal settings". In *Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness*, ed. by Jonathan Culpeper, Michael Haugh and Daniel Kadar (eds.), 713-737. London: Palgrave.

- Arundale, Rob. 2006. "Face as relational and interactional: A communication framework for research on face, facework, and politeness". *Journal of Politeness Research* 2 (2): 193-216
- Austin, John L. 1975. *How To Do Things With Words*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. ed. J.O. Urmson and M. Sbisà. Cambridge: Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (original work published 1962).
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House, and Gabriele Kasper. 1989. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, Jonathan and Marina Terkourafi. 2017. "Pragmatic approaches (Im)politeness". In *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness*, ed. by Jonathan Culpeper, Michael Haugh and Daniel Z. Kadar, 11-39. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 2011. "Politeness and impoliteness." In *Interdisciplinary Studies in Pragmatics, Culture and Society*, ed. by Karin Aijmer and Gisle Anderson, 391-436. New York: Springer.
- Domenici, Kathy and Stephen W. Littlejohn. 2006. *Facework*. London: Sage Publications.
- Eelen, Gino. 2001. *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Goffman, Erving. 1971. *Relations in Public; Microstudies of the Public Order*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.
- Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face to Face Behaviour*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Graham, Sage Lambert. 2009. "Hospitaltalk: Politeness and hierarchical structures in interdisciplinary discharge rounds". *Journal of Politeness Research* 5 (1): 11-31

Grainger, Karen. 2011. "'First order' and 'second order' politeness: Institutional and intercultural contexts". In *Discursive Approaches to Politeness*, ed. by Linguistic Politeness Research Group, 167-188. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Harvey, Kevin and Koteyko, Nelya. 2013. *Exploring Health Communication*. New York: Routledge.

Haugh Michael. 2018. "Afterword: Theorizing (im)politeness." *Journal of Politeness Research* 14(1): 153-165

Haugh, Michael and Culpeper, Jonathan. 2018. "Integrative pragmatics and (im)politeness theory". In *Pragmatics and its Interfaces*, ed. by Cornelia Ilie and Neil Norrick, 213–239. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Haugh, Michael. 2011. "Humour, face and im/politeness in getting acquainted." In *Situated Politeness*, ed. by Bethan L. Davies, Michael. Haugh, and Andrew J. Merrison, 165-186. London: Continuum.

Haugh, Michael. 2018. "Afterword: Theorizing (im)politeness", *Journal of Politeness Research* 14 (1): 153-165.

Holmes, Janet and Maria Stubbe. 2003. *Power and Politeness in the Workplace*. London: Longman.

Iedema, Rick. 2007. "Communicating Hospital Work." In *The Discourse of Hospital Communication: Tracing Complexities in Contemporary Health Care Organizations*. ed. by Rick Iedema, 1-17. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Jagodziński, Piotr and Archer Dawn. 2018. "Co-creating customer experience through call centre interaction: Interactional achievement and professional face." *Journal of Politeness Research* 14 (2): 179-199.
- Jagodziński, Piotr and Dawn Archer . 2018. "Co-creating customer experience through call centre interaction: Interactional achievement and professional face", *Journal of Politeness Research* 14 (2): 179-199.
- Jagodziński, Piotr, Dawn Archer and Derek Bousfield. 2018. "Special Issue: (Im)politeness in professional contexts". *Journal of Politeness Research* 14(2). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jagodziński, Piotr. 2013. "Impoliteness strategies in a British airline call centre: A pragmatic analysis of customer service interactions". Unpublished PhD dissertation Adam Mickiewicz University.
- Jamet, Denis and Manuel Jobert (eds). 2013. *Aspects of Linguistic Impoliteness*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kádár, Daniel and Michael Haugh. 2013. *Understanding Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kong, Kenneth. 2014. *Professional Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knight, Dawn, and Adolphs, Svenja, 2008. "Multi-modal corpus pragmatics: The case of active listenership." In *Pragmatics and Corpus Linguistics*, ed. by Jesús Romero-Trillo, 175-190. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Lansley, Cliff, Aaron Garner, Dawn Archer, Ramona Dimu, Cristi Blanariu, and Sorin Losnita. 2017. "Observe, Target, Engage, Respond (OTER): High-stake behaviour analysis using an integrated, scientific approach within an airport context." EIA White Paper Series: EIA/SRI/OTP (April 2017). Accessed online 24 May 2018.

Leech, Geoffrey. 2014. *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Linguistic Politeness Research Group (eds). 2011. *Discursive Approaches to Politeness*. Berlin: Walther de Gruyter.

Locher, Miriam and Stephanie Schnur. 2017. “(Im)politeness in health settings” In *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness*, ed. by Jonathan Culpeper, Michael Haugh and Daniel Kadar, 689–711. London: Palgrave.

Locher, Miriam and Derek Bousfield (eds). 2008. *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

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

Maynard, Douglas W. and Pamela L. Hudak. 2008. “Small talk, high stakes: Interactional disattentiveness in the context of prosocial doctor-patient interaction.” *Language in Society* 37: 661-688.

Mullany, Louise. 2009. “Introduction: Applying Politeness to Health Care communication”. *Journal of Politeness Research* 5 (1): 1-10.

Niedzielski, Nancy and Dennis Preston. 2000. *Folk Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Niedzielski, Nancy and Denis Preston. 2007. “Folk Pragmatics” In *Handbook of Pragmatics*, ed. by Jef Verschuren and Eline Versluys, 1-12. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Niedzielski, Nancy and Dennis Preston. 2009. “Folk Pragmatics” In *Culture and Language Use*, ed. by Gunter Senft, Jan-Ola Östman and Jef Verschueren, 146-155. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Orthaber, Sara and Rosina Marquez-Reiter. 2011. “‘Talk to the hand’. Complaints to a public transport company”. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(15): 3860-3870.
- Peräkylä A. 1991. “Hope work in the care of seriously ill patients.” *Qualitative Health Research* 1 (4): 407- 433.
- Peräkylä, Anssi and Sanna Vehvilfinen. 2003. “Conversation Analysis and the Professional Stocks of Interactional Knowledge.” *Discourse and Society* 14: 727-750.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen, 2000. *Culturally Speaking: Rapport Management through Talk across Cultures*. London: Continuum
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2002. “Managing rapport in talk: Using rapport sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations”. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (5): 529-545
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2005. “Rapport management theory and culture” *Interactional Pragmatics* 2 (3): 335-346
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen (ed). 2008. *Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory* (2nd edition). London: Continuum
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2008. “Face, (im)politeness and rapport”. In *Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory*, 2nd edition, ed. by Helen Spencer-Oatey, 11-47. London: Continuum.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen & Franklin, Peter. 2009. *Intercultural Interaction: A Multidisciplinary Approach to Intercultural Communication*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Terkourafi, Marina. 2015. *Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Im/politeness*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.



- Tracy, Karen and Mary Caron. 2017. "How the language style of small claims judges does ideological work". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 36 (3): 321-342.
- Tracy, Karen. 1997. *Colloquium: Dilemmas of Academic Discourse*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Tracy, Karen. 2011. "A facework system of minimal politeness: Oral argument in appellate court". *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture* 7 (1): 123-145.
- Tracy, Karen. 2016. *Discourse, Identity, and Social Change in The Marriage Equality Debates*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Verschueren, Jeff. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Voutilainen, Liisa. 2012. "Responding to Emotion in Cognitive Psychotherapy." In *Emotion in Interaction*, ed. by Anssi Peräkylä, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, 235-254. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Watts, Richard. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, Etienne. 1999. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Werth, Paul. 1999. *Text Worlds: Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Woydack, Johanna. 2019. *Linguistic Ethnography of a Multilingual Call Center*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.