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Abstract: This issue marks the 10th year anniversary of the Journal of Politeness Research: Language, behaviour, culture. Ten years ago, founding Editor-in-Chief Christine Christie established the journal as an “international and multidisciplinary forum for research into linguistic and non-linguistic politeness phenomena” (Christie 2005: 1). Under her editorial guidance, the journal published a great number of papers which embodied this founding principle. In 2010, Derek Bousfield and Karen Grainger took over the editorship and in 2013 Karen Grainger became the sole Editor-in-Chief, and the Journal of Politeness Research has grown and matured further under the stewardship of Bousfield and Grainger. Today, with the invaluable contributions of authors and reviewers, and the continuous support of the journal’s readership, editorial team and advisory board, the journal remains a flagship for and a pioneer of research into all kinds of politeness phenomena. To celebrate this 10th year anniversary, it is worth reviewing in detail what has been achieved so far, and to take a look at promising future developments of politeness research.

2005–2010: Conception and early years

In the early 2000s, research on linguistic and non-linguistic politeness phenomena was already flourishing in a diverse number of disciplines, not in least thanks to the seminal publication of Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson’s (1987 [1978]) book Politeness: Universals in Language Usage. Despite the surge of research in politeness in the field of pragmatics and a diverse number of other disciplines, including sociolinguistics, social anthropology, cultural studies, sociology, communication studies, computing, psychology, gender studies, and business, there was no unified platform to bring these different publica-
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tions on politeness together. However, in 1998 the Linguistic Politeness Research Group was formed by a collection of scholars from English Universities. This group agreed there was a need for a peer-reviewed journal that provided a focussed outlet for politeness research, and in 2005, the first issue of the _Journal of Politeness Research: Language, behaviour, culture_ was launched.

In the introduction to the first issue, then Editor-in-Chief Christine Christie evidences the need for a journal of politeness research by reviewing a select number of publications on politeness in a diverse number of fields. She points out that the diversity of research output on politeness in journals in disparate fields has meant that important empirical studies and theoretical insights that have the potential to advance the field are not easily accessible, and therefore not capable of contributing to its further advancement as much as they could (and should). The aim of Christie and her colleagues on the editorial board was to provide such a unified platform, one that brings together key theoretical debates which enable advancement of theory, and endorses empirical studies that broaden our understanding of social and cultural phenomena and that contribute to the development of methodologies for describing and explaining politeness phenomena.

As Bousfield and Grainger (2010) note, under Christie’s editorship, the first few years of the journal established it as a cohesive and high impact outlet for research on politeness across disciplines, languages, cultures and contexts. Papers published in the journal have often contributed to the development of the field in multiple areas at once, and they reflect scope, applicability, importance and impact. It is impossible to capture the richness of publications in the journal in this period within the limitations of this introduction, but one such significant publication of this time is Locher and Watts’ (2005) conceptualization of relational work as key to coming to a better understanding of “politeness”. The field was also advanced by other theoretical explorations, such as Holtgraves’ (2005) exploration of politeness as a social construct, Terkourafi’s (2005) “frame-based” view, Spencer-Oatey’s (2005) approach of rapport management, Arundale’s (2006) constructivist notion of face, O’Driscoll (2007) on Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs), Christie (2007) on the relation between Relevance Theory and politeness, and Haugh’s (2007) methodical critique of the discursive approach to politeness. Arundale (2006), for instance, argues that different from Brown and Levinson’s (1987) dialectical understanding, “face” is a dynamic phenomenon reflective of the co-constructed nature of self in interaction. His conceptualization of face as both relational and interactional has been influential in moving the field forward, and Arundale’s (2006) article has also inspired debate about the relation between face and identity (see Garcés-Conejos Blitvich et al. 2013).
This period furthermore saw the application of politeness to a range of different languages and cultures such as French (Beeching 2006; Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2006), Spanish (Arnáiz 2006; Márquez Reiter 2008; Félix-Brasdefer 2008), Greek, (Koutsantoni 2007; Bella 2009), Turkish (Daller and Yıldız 2006), Chinese (Kádár 2007), Korean (Byon 2006), Setswana (Kasanga and Lwanga-Lumu 2007), Israeli (Kampf and Blum-Kulka 2007), Japanese (Pizziconi 2007) and Persian (Sharifian 2008). The special issues encouraged the extension of politeness research to different contexts, such as “Politeness at work” (guest edited by Mills and Beeching 2006), “Politeness in health care settings” (guest edited by Locher 2010). It is also worth mentioning the extensive work that has been published on speech acts (e.g., Kampf and Blum-Kulka 2006; Wouk 2006; Davies et al. 2007; Ogiermann 2009), including a special issue on Apologies in 2007 (guest edited by Grainger and Harris). Also in this period, there were important developments and conceptualizations of impoliteness (e.g., Culpeper 2005; Piirainen-Marsh 2005), helped along by the publication of a special issue on Impoliteness in 2008, guest edited by Bousfield and Culpeper. There can be little doubt that the Journal helped in establishing the study of impoliteness as one of the most fruitful and stimulating lines of enquiry in the field.

Finally, it is important to acknowledge the contribution during this period of the late Geoffrey Leech. In volume 3(2) of the Journal (2007), he proposed a new pragmatic framework for studying linguistic politeness phenomena in communication. His proposed model comprises a common principle of politeness (Leech 1983, 2003, 2005) and a Grand Strategy of Politeness (GSP), which he claimed allowed for explanation of communicative politeness phenomena in Eastern languages as well as in Western languages. This chapter appeared remodelled in his 2014 publication of The pragmatics of politeness.

2010–2015: Further growth and maturation

In 2010, Derek Bousfield and Karen Grainger took over the editorial role from Christine Christie. In the opening editorial of their first co-edited journal issue, they note that the first issue of the first volume of the Journal of Politeness Research featured research “discussing and (re)introducing issues and positions which were to presage many of the debates that we see in current issues of the journal” (Bousfield and Grainger 2010: 162). Indeed from 2010 onwards the journal has taken forward key debates around politeness as relational work...
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(Zayts and Schnurr 2013; Estellés Arguedas and Albelda Marco 2014; Grainger et al. 2015), rapport management (García 2012), politeness as identity work (Garcés-Conejos Blitvich et al. 2013; Georgakopoulou 2013), politeness as facework (Al-Adaileh 2011; Kádár and Roe 2012; Hatfield and Hahn 2014), the interrelations between identity and face (Bucholtz and Hall 2013; Joseph 2013; Miller 2013) and fundamental epistemological questions such as the role of the analyst (Haugh 2012; Kádár and Mills 2013). An example is the special issue guest-edited by Garcés-Conejos Blitvich (2013) on identity and facework. Garcés-Conejos Blitvich points out that the advent of discursive approaches to politeness has problematized the strict boundary between “face” and “identity”. In her introduction, she investigates the interrelationships of these two concepts, questioning whether their theoretical conceptualization as discrete phenomena is justified and to which extent face and identity can also be seen as fuzzy or overlapping concepts. Her comprehensive theoretical overview is one of the most downloaded articles of the *Journal of Politeness Research*. It provides both a reflection for what has been done in the area until then, and a starting point for future work on politeness and identity, whilst the other articles collected in the special issue inform theoretical debate with contributions of empirical evidence (Georgakopoulou 2013; Joseph 2013; Miller, 2013; Garcés-Conejos Blitvich et al. 2013) and further theoretical reflection (Bucholtz and Hall 2013).

This period saw further theoretical debate on the basis of empirical findings (e.g., Cook 2012; Hasegawa 2012; Clark 2013; Schlund 2014) and expansion of existing topics and the introduction of exciting new avenues in the field, such as advancement of research on impoliteness (e.g., Bayraktaroğlu and Sifianou 2012; Dynel 2012; Mugford 2012). The journal also encouraged scholarship on an increasingly varied set of contexts, cultures and languages. For example, 2011 saw the publication a special issue on politeness research across legal contexts (Archer 2011a, 2011b; Cecconi 2011; Harris 2011; Johnson and Clifford 2011; Luchjenbroers and Aldridge 2011; Tracy 2011), and papers on historical politeness (Archer 2011b; Cecconi 2011; King 2011; Terkourafi 2011; Kádár 2012), the prosodic expression of linguistic (im)politeness in Romance languages (Estellés Arguedas and Albelda Marco 2014; Gili Fivela and Bazzanella 2014, Hidalgo Navarro and Cabedo Nebot 2014; García Negroni and Caldiz 2014; Devis Herraiz and Cantero Serena 2014) and politeness research in Africa (Bouchara 2015; Grainger et al. 2015; Hampel 2015; Johns and Félix-Brasdefer 2015; Lauriks et al. 2015; Makoni 2015). These latter two special issues have arisen out of the need to expanding politeness research to other geographical areas (also see Brown 2010, 2013; Kádár and Mills 2013; Hatfield and Hahn 2014; Peterson and Vaattovaara 2014) and to further investigating politeness in non-verbal forms, such as the complex relationship between prosody and politeness. As Hidalgo
Navarro (2014: 1) notes, the phonic aspect of (im)politeness is still emerging. A similar perspective is taken by McKinnon and Prieto (2014: 189) and Mapson (2014). Mapson examines non-manual features (typically seen to be part of prosody) in British Sign Language, and points out that “the breadth of literature on linguistic politeness in spoken languages is not reflected in the more specialized field of sign linguistics” (Mapson 2014: 161). Her analysis problematizes the categorization of politeness strategies in frameworks developed on spoken languages (e.g., Blum-Kulka et al. 1989) and posits the need for further research into the area of sign language and politeness, for example in the form of further cross-linguistic studies between British Sign Language and American Sign Language.

2015 and beyond: retrospect and prospect in politeness research

Looking back over research published in the Journal of Politeness Research: Language, behaviour, culture over the years, several key themes emerge. These relate to the development of politeness theory and practical applications of politeness methodology in different topic areas, languages and cultures, as well as in a variety of mediums of communication. When looking at theoretical development of politeness theory, it is useful to employ Grainger’s (2011) distinction of politeness research into three waves (also see Culpeper 2011; and Kádár and Haugh 2013). Following Grainger (2011: 169), the first wave of politeness theory contains research by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) Leech (1983) and Lakoff (1973, 1989), and is predominantly informed by J. L. Austin’s (1962) and Paul H. Grice’s (1975) work. The second wave of politeness research can be attributed to critiques (e.g., Eelen 2001; Mills 2003; Watts 2003, 2005) of Gricean approaches to politeness, and is mainly informed by the “discursive turn” in politeness research (e.g., Locher 2004, 2006a, 2006b; Locher and Watts 2005; Linguistic Politeness Research Group 2011; Mills 2011). The third wave Grainger introduces captures sociological/interactional approaches to politeness such as those put forward by O’Driscoll (2007), Arundale (2006), Haugh (2007), and Terkourafi (2005). From these three waves, the Journal of Politeness Research has published research that predominantly falls into the second and third wave. Perhaps this is a result of the time in which the journal came into existence, but it also seems this is where current research on politeness theory is at.
The collection of research in the present issue can be seen to belong to both second and third wave approaches of politeness research, with contributions from van der Bom and Mills on discursive politeness and Mitchell and Haugh’s conceptualization of (im)politeness as social practice falling more clearly into the second and third waves of politeness research. Van der Bom and Mills’ paper aims to provide an exemplification of the way that the discursive approach can work in relation to the analysis of data. They first trace the development of the discursive approach to politeness and address its critiques, and then argue that discursive approaches should be seen as constituting an approach to the analysis of politeness rather than mostly a critique. They support their argumentation by providing step-by-step discursive analysis, discussing the selecting of an extract of a conversation between a group of close friends of Dutch and Italian origin, the examination of interactants’ evaluations and interaction itself, as well as the different resources (Agha 2006) participants bring to the discourse. As such, this paper is very accessible to both undergraduate and graduate students with an interest in politeness (see Christie 2005: 1), and might serve useful in teaching the discursive approach to students.

Mitchell and Haugh’s paper is exemplary of the third wave of politeness research. In their study, they provide an insightful analysis of agency in relation to social action, arguing that a focus on agency in theorizing impoliteness allows for an understanding of how producers can be held accountable for impolite stances because of their presumed agency, while recipients do not just simply invoke social norms or perceived speaker intentions when evaluating a producer’s talk or behaviour as impolite, but can also be seen to display their own agency (to various degrees) in construing the speaker’s actions as a particular kind of action. Thus, when one interactant in the dataset is asked about an interlocutor’s negative response, he makes it clear that his evaluation of the response is derived from him exercising agency in choosing how to respond. Their argument is grounded in the idea that evaluations of impoliteness necessarily involve evaluators as construing the speaker’s action as a particular kind of social action, and holding them accountable for that particular kind of social action in relation to particular aspects of the moral order (Haugh 2013, 2015). They support their claims by a close interactional analysis of instances of potentially impolite actions in interactions between Australians and Americans. Mitchell and Haugh’s paper is particularly insightful because it opens up a new perspective on evaluations of (im)politeness. Their use of the term agency can be seen as a form of mediation that lies between norms of politeness and (perceived) speaker intentions, and as such it allows for an understanding of how recipients evaluating interaction are affected by norms of politeness while ac-
counting for individual differences across speaker evaluations of (im)politeness in interaction. It should also be noted that this research furthermore incorporates research on Haugh’s (2015) three stage conceptualization of the moral order (Haugh 2015), leaving ample of scope for further exploration of agency, politeness and the moral order.

Situating her paper within second wave politeness research, Fukushima argues for a greater consideration of attentiveness. She notes that with the development of interpersonal pragmatics, there has been a growing need to investigate interpersonal relationships and greater importance is placed on evaluation in the discursive approach. Attentiveness is a concept that serves both these developments and takes into account (im)politeness from a non-linguistic perspective, thus contributing to a deeper understanding of politeness that encompasses both linguistic and non-linguistic (im)politeness more generally. In her paper, Fukushima defines attentiveness at length, comparing it to the notion of heart and omoiyari, and then offers a model of detailing the stages leading up to the demonstration of attentiveness.

Dynel provides a state-of-the-art overview of impoliteness studies, and indicates a few prospective research directions to enrich them. In the first part of her paper, she reviews a number of current methodological and theoretical issues that give rise to continuous debates, such as the problem of using labels, the status of (perceived) speaker intention, the conceptualization of sanctioned face-threat, the tenability of impoliteness taxonomies, and impoliteness formulae. The second part of her comprehensive overview is an exploration into a variety of different discourse domains, with suggestions for possible routes for further research in the field of impoliteness studies.

Kádár and Márquez Reiter offer a socio-pragmatic examination of instances of what is generally known in social psychology as “bystander intervention”. Their paper reflects a growing interest in the moral and emotional bases of polite behaviour, which arguably is a predictable development of studies on impoliteness and evaluations of politeness. Kádár and Márquez Reiter draw on the work of scholars such as Holtgraves (2005) and Spencer-Oatey (2007) in arguing that more scholarly attention should be paid to the neglected aspect of the relationship between (im)politeness and (im)morality. In doing so, they propel current research on (im)politeness forward by offering analysis of a yet unexplored territory: that of the interface between metapragmatics, (im)politeness and (im)morality in the interactional arena of bystander intervention. Kádár and Márquez Reiter draw on instances of bystander intervention in the US T.V. reality show Primetime: What Would You Do?, analyzing four interactions of bystander intervention. In contrast to Mitchell and Haugh (this issue), Kádár and Márquez Reiter argue that morality is not a social practice in and of itself
per se, but rather a phenomenon that people perceive and define. Their paper offers valuable insight into issues of first and second order politeness, by examining participants’ action of intervening and the way in which this is articulated (politeness1) in relation to theoretical conceptualizations of ritual, (im)politeness and (im)morality, as well as participants’ metacommunicative orientations to (im)politeness and (im)morality.

While the majority of the papers in this special issue deal with spoken face-to-face interaction, Maíz-Arévalo’s paper on jocular mockery in computer-mediated communication (CMC) represents an important and growing area of research into politeness in mediated contexts. In a guest-edited special issue on CMC, Locher (2010: 3–4) already pointed out that there is still ample scope for integrating politeness research further into CMC data analyses in other fields, and notes the need for politeness scholars to focus attention to online interaction to a greater extent. Locher stipulates we should pay more attention to CMC data because of the potential it offers to examine the negotiation of norms and politeness, the relation between face, identity and online communication, and the ways in which forms of computer-mediated communication differ from face-to-face interaction (taking into account restrictions that the medium). Maíz-Arévalo’s paper caters for these points by examining how jocular mockery plays out and contrasts in two distinct on-line communities: one Spanish and one English. Her examination addresses the following questions: (i) What triggers jocular mockery in the Spanish and the British corpora? (ii) How is jocular mockery “framed” by the participants? and (iii) How do interlocutors respond to it?

Data not only provide insight into the lesser explored dimensions of politeness and CMC communication, notably jocular mockery in particular, but also reveals how data relate to constructions of self-identity and face.

As is visible in the scope of papers selected for this special issue, we have aimed to reflect both the diversity of themes in politeness research studied at the moment, and the recent advancements and trends in the field. The topics included in this issue range from discursive politeness, to politeness as social action, the relationship between politeness and morality, linguistic and non-linguistic politeness, politeness in computer-mediated communication and impoliteness. Regrettably, it is beyond the scope of this issue to provide a fully comprehensive collection of the politeness articles on emerging and expanding aspects of the field. It is hoped, however, that it provides an indication of where the field currently stands theoretically and methodologically. We hope this issue serves as a significant contribution to the advancement of the field, and
that the *Journal of Politeness Research* continues to serve as a catalyst for innovation in politeness studies.

Collectively, the papers that have been published in the *Journal of Politeness Research* so far epitomize our commitment to developing politeness research in lesser-studied cultures and languages, and our aims to continue the further theoretical and methodological development of the field. The journal has played a pivotal role in establishing politeness research worldwide, and we continue to encourage contributions from lesser-studied cultures, language and topic areas for future research.

The editorial team is grateful for the substantial contribution of the reviewers, scholars, colleagues at DeGruyter, and the advisory board in making this journal a success.

We look forward to the continued growth and new developments of the journal in the years to come.
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