Author(s): Dlaske, Kati; Barakos, Elisabeth; Motobayashi, Kyoko; McLaughlin, Mireille

Title: "Languaging the worker : Globalized governmentalities in/of language in peripheral spaces"

Year: 2016

Version:

Kati Dlaske*, Elisabeth Barakos, Kyoko Motobayashi and
Mireille McLaughlin

"Languaging the worker: Globalized governmentalities in/of language in peripheral spaces"

Abstract: In the introduction to the special issue "Languaging the worker: globalized governmentalities in/of language in peripheral spaces", we take up the notion of governmentality as a means to interrogate the complex relationship between language, labor, power and subjectivity in peripheral multilingual spaces. Our aim here is to argue for the study of governmentality as a viable and growing approach in critical sociolinguistic research. As such, in this introduction, we first discuss key concepts germane to our interrogations, including the notions of governmentality, languaging, peripherality and language worker. We proceed to map out five ethnographically and discourse-analytically informed case studies. These examine diverse actors in different settings pertaining to the domain of work. Finally we chart how the case studies construe the issue of languaging the worker through a governmentality frame.

Keywords: governmentality, sociolinguistics of globalization, peripherality, work, multilingualism

1 Languaging the worker: setting the scene

Work has long been of interest for scholars of language, not least because control and management of language in the workplace is an inherent part of employment (Hua 2014; Boutet 2012; Cameron 2000). Recently, researchers have mapped out ways in which linguistic practices and ideologies are mobilized in the global workplace (Angouri 2014; Duchêne et al. 2013; Heller 2003).

The shifting trajectories of power concerning contemporary globalized and globalizing capitalism are transforming the whole world of work: the places and

*Corresponding author: Kati Dlaske, Department of Languages, University of Jyväskylä,
Jyvaskyla, Finland, E-mail: kati.dlaske@jyu.fi
Elisabeth Barakos, Aston University, Birmingham, England
Kyoko Motobayashi, Ochanomizu University, Tokyo, Japan
McLaughlin Mireille, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

spaces of work are multiplying, new types of workforces and new modes of work are emerging, the boundaries of labor and leisure are blurring and, concordantly, what is envisioned as 'the worker' is changing (e. g. Duncan 2008; Gill 2002; Rose 1996a). Moreover, these transformations reconfigure not only workers' relation to language(s), but more fundamentally, the "thinginess" of language itself, its (perceived) ontological nature (cf. Urciuoli, this volume). In other words, the conditions of work are changing and, with them, so, too, are the ways in which 'workers' and 'language(s)' are imagined and called into being. Such transfigurations call for new approaches in critical language studies; favoring an engagement with the ways in which human beings are repositioned and reimagined as workers and language users. This special issue takes up this challenge by drawing on the Foucauldian notion of governmentality, understood here broadly as being comprised of complex rationalities and technologies geared towards calling into being particular kinds of subjectivities (Foucault 2006a; Bröckling et al. 2000; Gordon 1991).

Starting from the notion that language figures both as a means and as an object of government, 'conduct of conduct' of social actors (Foucault 1982; cf. Rose 1996a; Pennycook 2006) we seek, through this special issue, to expand the theory and practice of governmentality research and to contribute to understandings of the sociolinguistic dimensions of contemporary governmentalities in the workspace. Our aims are: (1) to explore the multiple ways in which social actors are languaged, i. e. called into being through linguistic and other interactional practices, simultaneously as workers, multilingual language users and subjects of movement and social change; (2) to trace the conditions under which power and knowledge become (re)distributed across and within diverse spaces of work; and (3) to reflect on the social and political consequences of these transformative processes. To this end, the studies address under-researched multilingual minority language contexts in the domain of work, but also mobility across spaces. More specifically, we focus on four multilingual, economically, socially and/or geographically peripheral spaces as particularly relevant sites for this exploration. Combining aspects from the governmentality perspective with ethnographic and discourse analytical approaches, we explore data from Finnish Lapland, Wales, Acadie and the Japanese diaspora in South America. In these sites, we engage with a variety of actors in diverse domains of work ranging from the corporate sector, the field of cultural production, the tourism industry and language teaching. Through their mobilities, these actors embody different aspects of globalization: international volunteerism, transnational labor migration, corporate globalization, and global cultural circulation. While on the one hand drawing on the governmentality perspective, the studies apply on the other a variety of sociolinguistic approaches including linguistic

anthropology, critical sociolinguistics, language policy and critical discourse studies. The papers in the collection demonstrate how the notion of (globalized) governmentalities allows for insights into the complex ways in which power, labor and language intersect and change the ways in which multilingualism is socially experienced, enacted and exploited in our late modern world.

In this introduction to the special issue, we commence by focusing on a series of key themes and concepts that are germane to our studies and in need of critical review and discussion. These themes, which run as coherent threads through our case studies, comprise the notions of governmentality, languaging, peripherality and language worker. Subsequently, we introduce the papers, comment on their ordering and proceed to explore how they tackle the issue of languaging the worker through a governmentality frame.

2 Key themes and concepts

Over the past twenty-five years or so, governmentality studies have expanded into a research field in its own right. Inspired by Foucault's later work on power and subjectification, governmentality studies' focus lies on different modes of government, 'conduct of conduct' of social actors, at the grassroots level of everyday life and the relationships of these modes of government to broader political rationalities (e. g. Gordon 1991; Barry et al. 1996; Bröckling et al. 2000; Dean 2010).

As 'conduct of conduct', government forms a mode of power which, as Foucault (1982) explains,

> does not act directly and immediately on others. Instead it acts upon their actions [–] on existing actions or on those which may arise in the present or the future. [–] The exercise of power consists in guiding the possibility of conduct and putting in order the possible outcome. [–] Faced with a relationship of power a whole field of responses, reactions, results, and possible inventions may open up (Foucault 1982: 220, 221).

Freedom of the subjects to (re)act, in the most unpredictable ways, is thus inherent in the notion of government. Government, therefore, is a process of subjectification in which the subject emerges as a subject in a double sense of the notion: subject as subjugated to control and regulation and subject with identity and capacity to act (Foucault 1982: 212). As such, subject is not a product, but rather 'a relation of production' ('Produktionsverhältnis', Bröckling 2007: 22).

Although the shift in Foucault's analytics of power, from 'discipline and punish' to guidance through freedom, marks a shift in the analytical focus, it does not mean turning one's back to the notion of discipline. As a form a power,

government does not exclude the exercise of discipline, nor is discipline antithetic to freedom. Rather, in the contemporary entrepreneurial logic, self-discipline is recast as a form of freedom, a necessary condition for realizing one's potential (cf. Bröckling 2007; Kauppinen 2012). The multiple power relations examined in the contributions of this special issue are emphatically relations of government, which are not only based on the (seemingly) free will of the subjects, but also show themselves, in many cases, as acts of enablement, entitlement and empowerment; be it through the question concerning training (volunteer) labor force or implementing language policies. At the same time, however, the power relations, and the processes of subjectification, operate on the basis of control, regulation and (self-)discipline; becoming a voluntary heritage language teacher requires embracing the notions of language and the self put forward by the training institutions, being 'empowered' to use one's 'own' language at work requires the capability and willingness to do so – those unwilling or unable to comply will meet the consequences.

If government refers to the guidance of the conduct of others (or oneself), "governmentality is about how to govern" (Gordon 1991: 7). In other words, it entails a whole "complex of notions, calculations, strategies and tactics through which diverse authorities [–] have sought to act upon the lives of each and all in order to avert evils and achieve such desirable states as health, happiness, wealth, and tranquility" (Rose 1996a: 152; see also Foucault 2006a). Initially, Foucault introduced the notion of governmentality to bring in the dimension of state in the analysis of power (Gordon 1991). However, the analysis was not only about the conscious and direct actions of state authorities. Rather, the focus hinged on complex, often competing and overlapping rationalities, 'logics' of government, linked to social and material technologies working as the operational 'means and mechanisms' geared towards calling into being particular kinds of subjectivities (Foucault 2006a; Bröckling et al. 2000; Gordon 1991; Dean 2010). Moreover, in this analysis, the state was not the origin, but rather an effect of multiple governmentalities. From this point of view, then, today, the state is not vanishing, but rather undergoing an increasing governmentalisation, i. e. a dispersion of power to an increasing number of different authorities (e. g. Rose and Miller 1992; Dean 2010). In the present special issue, Motobayashi and Barakos especially shed light on these processes in their respective contexts.

The contemporary era of globalization produces increasingly global governmentalities that enter into competition and dialogue with those of nation states (Urciuoli 2008; Bröckling 2007; Cameron 2000). A case in point is neoliberalism, which, in the perspective of governmentality studies, is not merely an economic phenomenon, but rather a political project, deriving its logics from the sphere of the economic (cf. Bröckling et al. 2000; Foucault 2006b). As such, neoliberalism

can be characterized as a governmentality which aims at an "economization of the social" (Bröckling et al. 2000) guided by the notion "that humans are, could be, or should be enterprising individuals" (Rose 1996a: 154), embracing the values of goal-orientedness, competitiveness, flexibility and responsibility.

In tandem with the economization of the social, the neoliberal agenda pursues a reorganization of the economic with globalized markets and a mobile workforce as central goals. Aided by technologization and digitalisation, today's workplaces and the nature of work have transformed to combine a local responsiveness with global outreach. Physical labor has become increasingly blended with/replaced by immaterial, affective and intellectual labor. The current 'knowledge economy', or 'information age', requires adaptations to how, where, under which conditions, with which linguistic and other resources and through which channels work is carried out. New types of workforces and workplaces emerge, (see Dlaske 2015, this volume), while traditional job roles such as teachers and company managers get more complex by demanding new skills and foci such as greater customer orientation, total quality management, diversity management, virtual communication and cross-cultural management. With an ever more linguistically and culturally diverse workforce, corporate social responsibility has become interlocked with responsibility for languages and multilingual workers within and across institutions, and the need to manage this accordingly (through language policy). Unlike the industrial age, workers no longer only implement work but are expected to be mobile, affective, flexible and work creatively, collaboratively, transnationally as well as virtually. The idea of flexibility manifests itself not only in terms of time and space, but also in the blurring of the boundaries of work and leisure up to the point that work becomes a new form of leisure, as is the case in the current trend of working holiday tourism (Dlaske, this volume). Linking to the blurring boundaries of work and leisure, a growing reliance on volunteer work is shaping the vision of what counts as work. In the current vision, defined increasingly by globalised capitalism, 'voluntarism', working either as a volunteer or performing unwaged work alongside paid work, appears not only as a lifestyle choice, but also as a keystone of globalised companies and national economies (cf. Baines 2004; Maes 2012). As Dlaske suggests in her contribution on the volunteer work scheme Workaway, the merging together of work and holiday leads to a 'culturalisation' of the economic, to a notion of unpaid work as cultural experience, allegedly stripped off its economic connections, thus laying ground for new forms of exploitation.

Language plays a central role in the organization of work. Industrialization, for instance, brought about an increased yet limited access to upward social mobility. Often time, language served as the basis to legitimate the unequal distribution of life chances. People working the industrial floor were, for

instance, understood as not having the linguistic skills required for management (McLaughlin 2014). In this, language standardization played a central role in establishing particular types of hierarchies. Today, what counts as labor has changed and so has the role language plays in structuring work. Older forms of stratification based on linguistic standardization remain salient, particularly for workers who are constructed as working class. But the increased salience of "creative capitalism" and the language industries has opened up new spaces for the languaging of workers. Increases in the population's educational achievement coupled with the restructuration of the global manufacturing industry has meant that policy makers in western nation-states have often turned to linguistic skills as a way to sell their labor force. This can be done through standardizing ideologies, as in call-centres (Duchêne 2009; Heller 2010) and language teaching (Motobayashi, this volume) or through authenticating ideologies in the marketing of niche products to global publics (Kelly-Holmes 2000, McLaughlin, this issue; Barakos, this issue). Speakers are thereby languaged differently: the marketing of authenticating ideologies often gives speakers resources to challenge the fixed hierarchies of standardizing language ideologies. Because access to resources is at stake, however, participants often challenge hierarchies by mobilizing discourses of language ownership to negotiate the new lines of inclusion or exclusion of the commodification of language (McLaughlin 2015). And then there are always those who are less in the position to negotiate or challenge hierarchies: in the contemporary, these participants are increasingly part of a mobile and flexible workforce, expected, for instance, to do affective work selling tourist experiences for little pay and oftentimes with scarce linguistic resources as is the case for the workaway participants Dlaske met during her fieldwork in Lapland.

In other words, as Urciuoli emphasizes in her contribution to this special issue, work shapes how language is imagined and how subjects are positioned in relation to language(s). Conversely, ideologies constructing language as a bounded object (a "thing" in Urciuoli's words) inform how subjects access and negotiate work under the current conditions of neoliberal capitalism. But these ways of thinking language as a bounded object are constantly to be reproduced. In this special issue, we look at the role work and the economy plays in reproducing or challenging ideas about the "thinginess" of language. We look at language as part of the process of making workers. We also take the latter to be subjects socialized into language and through language at an interactional and broader discursive level. In modern societies, this process often becomes institutionalized through written documents, bureaucratic means, cultural practices and symbolic representations – technologies that enable "government at a distance" (Rose 1996b) and shape the phenomenon of governmentalisation.

Given these developments, combining the two fields, critical language studies and governmentality studies, is timely. Governmentality studies provide a lens to analyze the changing and multiple power/knowledge relations in the regulation of human beings in the contemporary world of work. Meanwhile, critical language studies open up the perspective of language use in these processes, lending at the same time the means for a detailed analysis that roots the discursive in the interactional.

Thus far, critical language studies have made little use of the theoretical and analytical potential of the governmentality perspective to examine the contemporary changes in the domain of work (but see Kauppinen 2013; Urciuoli 2008; Inoue 2007; Boutet 2012). Concurrently, beyond the domain of work, a body of research exploring the possibilities of combining insights between governmentality and critical language studies is emerging (cf. Pennycook 2006; Milani 2009; Kauppinen 2012; Rampton 2014; McIlvenny et al. forthcoming). On the other hand, the research tradition of governmentality studies, despite its sustained interest in governmentalities at work, has paid scarce attention to the language dimension (cf. e. g. Donzelot 1991; Rose 1999; Bröckling 2007).

Recently, Ben Rampton (2014) has argued that the field of sociolinguistics – and more specifically, Gumperzian sociolinguistics – shares many parallels with Foucauldian theory. Both posit that language does not merely reflect social life: it structures it. Foucault uses the notion of discourse to analyse how power circulates in institutions, while sociolinguists map out the ways ideologies of language structure institutions to create social hierarchies. Foucauldian theory and sociolinguistics both share an interest in the tensions between authority and creativity, structure and social change. Finally, critical sociolinguistic takes an interest into the ways language policy comes into being, is traversed by language ideologies and informs the worlds of what is possible, what is legitimate and what is marginalized. As such, one can argue – as Rampton has – that the parallels between sociolinguistics and Foucauldian theory were always already there (Rampton 2014).

Using the term *languaging*, we explore how social actors are brought into being through linguistic and other interactional practices, how they get related to languages and how in these processes languages emerge as 'things' to relate to in the first place. From the governmentality perspective, we engage with new forms of "languaging" the workers as self-governing, and yet governed subjects who are ultimately made responsible for their choices such as 'owing', learning, teaching, speaking, or not-speaking certain languages (see Barakos in this issue). The term *languaging* has been used in a variety of domains with different senses (e.g., Swain 2006; Lado 1979; Ramanathan and Makoni 2007; García and Wei 2013). Generally speaking, however, the suffix *–ing* indicates the emergence of a

process-oriented inquiry into language across disciplines. In the case of this special issue, it indicates a similar orientation to subjectivity – taking subjectivity as a process rather than a product. The papers in this volume also have a process-oriented focus on the ways in which workers are produced and reproduced by "linguistic" rationalities. Being the product of discourse and producing discourse, language workers are simultaneously multilingual language users, subjects of movement, and socially situated workers. Such forms of "languaging" the workers as autonomous and governable subjects are ultimately exercised at the levels of the self. Seen in this way, we capture languaging as a broader process phenomenon that sees language as ideologically invested, socially constructed and entangled with power and that positions workers as embodying organisational structures and late capitalist values. Focusing on the languaging of workers contributes thus to further sociolinguistic understandings of the role language plays in the production, reproduction or transformation of inequalities, as work undergoes important transformation in the globalized economy.

In this special issue, we draw on the category of the *language worker*, expand its meaning in alignment with the governmentality approach and appropriate its use to our context-specific peripheral spaces. Boutet (2012) identifies language workers as "emblematic figures of late capitalism". The shift to the tertiary, service-based economy has nurtured communication and multilingualism as flexible skills, tools and commodities as part of the work process (Duchêne 2009; Heller 2010; Urciuoli 2008). The value of language has come to oscillate between essentialist markers of ethno-nationalist identity and marketable goods and services. Language work is placed at the centre of production and consumption, while, at the same time, it emerges as a terrain of control, management and power struggles (Duchêne and Heller 2012).

As we demonstrate in this special issue, the language worker is not only conceived as someone in traditional language-related professions such as education and translation. Rather, it is increasingly someone "whose training, certification and evaluation will spawn a set of related professions" (Heller 2005: 6), such as language managers, tourism providers and cultural producers. In this vein, we argue that today no worker or work process is 'without language', as it is in and through language and discursive practices that the production and consumption of resources materializes and their access is negotiated. Positing the centrality of language in work also allows us to investigate the ways in which shifting language practices structure or challenge social hierarchies. Accordingly, the language worker or manager is someone generally involved in communicative work as an agentive, controlled and regulated subject. As we illustrate in the contributions in this special issue, language workers come into being as active participants involved in both the production and

consumption of communicative acts, whether in client-facing work or in the provision of language and other services.

The contributions in this issue focus explicitly on *peripheries*. However, this is not to essentialise the notion of periphery, but rather to highlight the fruitfulness of attending to regions rendered peripheral by centers. As Pietikäinen and Kelly-Holmes (2013) point out, 'peripherality' and 'centrality' are mutually constitutive, relative to each other and relative to the point of view (see also McLaughlin 2013; Kauppinen 2014). Moreover, regions, or spaces, can be at the same time peripheral in one sense (e. g. geographically) and central in another (e. g., centers of global tourism). The regions examined in the contributions of this special issue can all be regarded as 'peripheral', albeit in somewhat different terms and to different degrees.

The region of Lapland in the far north, for instance, easily appears, when viewed from the global and national centers, peripheral in geographic, economic and social terms, both on a global scale and in relation to the respective nation states (i. e. Finland, Sweden, Norway and Russia). Japan, on the other hand, can hardly be regarded as geographically peripheral on the global scale. However, the community of Japanese diaspora in South America is peripheral in relation to multiple "centers": in its relation to the global North, in relation to Japan, and in relation to the South American mainstream society. Despite these differences, we argue that such economically, socially and/or geographically peripheral spaces are particularly illuminating of the key concern of this special issue: the languaging of workers in the contemporary era of globalization. As the contributions show, each in a somewhat different way, peripheral spaces throw processes of globalization, and not least the aspect of globalized mobility itself – between centers and peripheries and different peripheries – particularly clearly into relief (cf. also Pietikäinen and Kelly-Holmes 2013; Da Silva et al. 2007). In connection to this, the examinations also illuminate the ways in which geographically and economically peripheral regions, and herein especially the domain of work, have become core areas of neoliberal restructuration (cf. Heller and Duchêne 2012), and how language in general and multilingualism and minority languages in particular gain new significance in these processes.

3 Introducing the papers

The papers in this special issue allow us to think through the interrelationship between language, labor and subjectivity at the peripheries, through the lens of governmentality. The actors addressed in the papers of this volume are situated simultaneously as workers, multilingual language users, and subjects of

movement and social change. Despite the divergence of the cases, the papers converge on the theme pertaining to the interplay between globalization, the fabrication of subjects and the allocation of resources in the domain of work; all the while paying attention to language.

This special issue grew out of a conference panel entitled: "Languaging the worker: globalized governmentalities in/of language in peripheral spaces", organized by Mireille McLaughlin and Kati Dlaske, at the 2013 Annual Meeting of the Society for Linguistic Anthropology in Chicago. Although each research started out as an independent case study, joint efforts in establishing commonalities between the visible cases, gave our exploration the character of a multi-sited ethnography (e. g., Marcus 1995; cf. Duchêne and Heller 2012).

The special issue consists of four individual papers followed by a commentary by Bonnie Urciuoli. The first two papers, authored by Elisabeth Barakos and Mireille McLaughlin, both touch upon governance and ownership of minority languages. While Barakos explores this through the Welsh context, McLaughlin does so by employing a multi-sited ethnography in Acadie. The two papers that follow, authored by Kati Dlaske and Kyoko Motobayashi, deal with translocally and transnationally moving subjects, such as volunteer tourists (Dlaske) and international language teacher volunteers (Motobayashi).

The first paper, by Elisabeth Barakos, concentrates on the interwovenness between the macro-levels of policy power and the micro-levels of text, discourse and practice within business settings in bilingual Wales. Her paper, "Language policy and governmentality in businesses in Wales: a continuum of empowerment and regulation", examines how language policy acts as a means of both empowering the Welsh language and the minority language worker and as a means of exerting power over them. Barakos traces two major discursive processes: first, the Welsh government's state-level language policy documents that instrumentalise corporate bilingualism and bilingual employees as value-added resources; second, the practice and discourse of company managers who sustain, resist, or appropriate such promotional discourses for creating and cherishing their own organizational values. Barakos' paper shows that language governmentality materializes in multi-layered policy processes that shape new forms of languaging the minority language worker as self-governing, and yet, governed subjects who are ultimately made responsible for 'owning' Welsh.

The second paper, by Mireille McLaughlin, "Linguistic minorities and the multilingual turn: constructing language ownership through affect in cultural production", discusses minority language governance by linking the issue of language ownership to affect. As globalization brings minority language governmentality onto global terrains, cultural workers manage the tension between multilingualism and ownership through affective registers. Affect served to

reproduce the minority speaker as a particular type of subject, one "attached" to a community constructed as ideally monolingual, either in the past, present or future. This paper contributes to theorizing language and governmentality by understanding affect as a discursively produced register that serves to legitimate the distribution of resources. It follows the role affect plays in constructing linguistic minority subjects as agents of globalization. It flips cultural entrepreneur's understanding of themselves as liberal agents of linguistic change and shows how they are constrained by the political salience of monolingualism.

Linking also to the terrain of cultural production, Kati Dlaske's contribution, "Shaping subjects of globalisation: at the intersection of volunteerism and the new economy", investigates the languaging of workers within the volunteer tourism scheme Workaway. Drawing on aspects of governmentality studies, discourse studies and ethnographic approaches, Dlaske's study traces the translocal formation of the figure of the workawayer through two crucial technologies of subjectification: the Internet portal workaway.info and the actuality of everyday work in a Sámi heritage tourist resort in northernmost Finnish Lapland. The study shows how, despite the cosmopolitan humanism of the workaway scheme, the workawayer is gradually shaped to meet the requirements of the contemporary neoliberal world of work. If Workaway offers new languages and cultures with a flavor of romanticized multiculturalism, in the tourist resort the language learner turns into a language worker, the actual encounters with new languages and cultures are governed by straightforward market rationality.

The fourth paper, by Kyoko Motobayashi, also deals with a group of volunteers who work in a heritage community. However, her paper shifts our attention to the issue of state power within the process of governmentality. Motobayashi's paper, "Language teacher subjectivities in Japan's diaspora strategies: Teaching "my own language" as "someone's heritage language"", demonstrates the ways in which discourses, produced by state actors, have powerfully influenced the transformation of individual subjectivities. Her paper addresses the phenomenon of Japanese language teacher volunteers who are training to become teachers of Japanese as "heritage language" for the Japanese diaspora population residing in South America. Motobayashi's analysis illustrates the ways in which the cosmopolitan-aspired Japanese "native speakers", wishing to teach the Japanese language overseas, transformed themselves into those who are passionate about Japanese, as heritage language teaching in the South American context, and how these individual transformations constitute part of the state project; in this case, the Japanese diaspora strategy.

Bonnie Urciuoli reflects on the "thinginess" of language in neoliberal times, that is to say: the ways in which language is imagined as an object which can orient policy, social action and the incorporation of workers into capitalist

logics. Her article discusses the four other articles in this special issue to reflect upon the interdiscursive indexicality typical of contemporary flows of workers and ideas. She argues that entrepreneurial discourse now informs how social actors (are required to) imagine the thinginess of language: workers are increasingly interpellated to think of themselves as "bundles of skills" contributing to neoliberal agency: that of the corporation and not that of the worker. What we learn is languaging limits worker's agency and the affect they can display. They use affect and ownership to imagine themselves as proud and agentive in ways which remain informed by capitalist rationalities. What's more, we witness the corporatization of language, where language is imagined as a "neutral, apolitical and ageneric" entity amenable to generating profit. One could expect that this stance on language would enter into contrast with language activism, but instead, we find language activists mobilizing the idiom of language as an added value to reentextualize the discourse of language endangerment (especially in Barakos' article). Urciuoli concludes by pointing out that the line between the market and the state grows quite thin in these processes and that, strikingly, while speakers are brought to imagine themselves as choosing language and work, their agency in so doing is unequal and generally constrained.

Together, the papers in this special issue focus on labor and governance to develop a governmental approach on language and a linguistic understanding of governmentality. At a time when the social sciences are grappling with global mobilities, this approach gives insights into the effect of globalization on the production of linguistic subjectivities.

References

Angouri, Jo. 2014. Multilingualism in the workplace. Language practices in multilingual contexts. *Multilingua* 33(1–2). 1–9.

Baines, Donna. 2004. Caring for nothing work organization and unwaged labour in social services. *Work, Employment & Society* 18(2). 267–295.

Barry, Andrew, Thomas Osborne & Nikolas Rose (eds.). 1996. *Foucault and political reason. Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*. London: Routledge.

Boutet, Josiane. 2012. Language workers. Emblematic figures of late capitalism. In Alexandre Duchêne & Monica Heller (eds.), *Language in late capitalism. Pride and profit*, 207–229. New York: Routledge.

Bröckling, Ulrich, Susanne Krasmann & Thomas Lemke (eds.). 2000. *Gouvernementalität der Gegenwart. Studien zur Ökonomisierung des Sozialen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Bröckling, Ulrich. 2007. *Das unternehmerische Selbst. Soziologie einer Subjektivierungsform*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Cameron, Deborah. 2000. *Good to talk? Living and working in a communication culture*. Sage: London.

Dean, Mitchell. 2010. *Governmentality. Power and rule in modern society*. 2nd edn. London: Sage.

Da Silva, Emanuel, Mireille McLaughlin & Mary Richards. 2007. Bilingualism and the globalized new economy: The commodification of language and identity. In Monica Heller (ed.), *Bilingualism: a social approach*, 183–206. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dlaske, Kati. 2015. Shaping subjects of globalisation: At the intersection of voluntourism and the new economy. *Multilingua*. Ahead of Print, 2 September 2015. doi:10.1515/multi-2015-0002.

Donzelot, Jacques. 1991. Pleasure in work. In Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon & Peter Miller (eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*, 251–280. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Duchêne, Alexandre. 2009. Marketing, management and performance: Multilingualism as commodity in a tourism call centre. *Language Policy* 8. 27–50.

Duchêne, Alexandre & Monica Heller (eds.). 2012. *Language in late capitalism: pride and profi*t. New York: Routledge.

Duchêne, Alexandre, Melissa Moyer & Celia Roberts. 2013. *Language, migration and social inequalities: a critical sociolinguistic perspective on institutions and work*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Duncan, Tara. 2008. The internationalization of tourism labour markets: Working and playing in a ski resort. In Tim Coles & C. Michael Hall (eds.), *International business and tourism: global issues, contemporary interactions*, 181–194. London & New York: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel. 1982. The subject and power. In Hubert Dreyfus & Paul Rabinow (eds.), *Michel Foucault. Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*, 208–226. Brighton: Harvester Press.

Foucault, Michel 2006a. *Sicherheit, Territorium, Bevölkerung. Geschichte der Gouvernementalität I. Vorlesung am Collège de France 1978–1979*. Edited by Michel Sennelart. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Foucault, Michel. 2006b. *Die Geburt der Biopolitik. Geschichte der Gouvernementalität II. Vorlesung am Collège de France 1978–1979*. Edited by Michel Sennelart. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

García, Ofelia & Wei Li. 2013. *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gill, Rosalind. 2002. Cool, creative and egalitarian?: Exploring gender in project-based new media work in Europe. *Information, Communication and Society* 5(1). 70–89.

Gordon, Colin. 1991. Governmental rationality: An introduction. In Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon & Peter Miller (eds.), *The Foucault effect. Studies in governmentality,* 1–51. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Heller, Monica. 2003. Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(4). 473–492.

Heller, Monica. 2005. Language, skill and authenticity in the globalized new economy. *Noves SL: Revista de sociolingüística* Winter 2005. http://www6.gencat.net/llengcat/noves/hemeroteca/hivern05.htm. (accessed 10 December 2014).

Heller, Monica. 2010. The commodification of language. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39. 101–114.

Hua, Zhu. 2014. Piecing together the 'workplace multilingualism' jigsaw puzzle. *Multilingua* 33(1–2). 233–242.

Inoue, Miyako. 2007. Language and gender in an age of neoliberalism. *Gender and Language* 1(1). 79–92.

Kauppinen, Kati. 2012. *Subjects of aspiration*. Untersuchung von diskursiven Prozessen neoliberaler Regierung in einer postfeministischen Frauenzeitschrift. Finnische Beiträge zur Germanistik 28. Doctoral thesis. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang.

Kauppinen, Kati. 2013. 'Full power despite stress': A discourse analytical examination of the interconnectedness of postfeminism and neoliberalism in the domain of work in an international women's magazine. *Discourse & Communication* 7(2). 133–151.

Kauppinen, Kati. 2014. Welcome to the end of the world! Resignifying periphery under the new economy: A nexus analytical view of a tourist website. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 9(1). 1–19.

Kelly-Holmes H. 2000. Bier, parfum, kaas: Language fetish in European advertising. *Cultural Studies* 3(1): 67–82.

Lado, Robert. 1979. Thinking and 'languaging': A psycholinguistic model of performance and learning. *Sophia Linguistica* 12. 3–24.

Maes, Kenneth. 2012. Volunteerism or labor exploitation? Harnessing the volunteer spirit to sustain AIDS treatment programs in urban Ethiopia. *Human Organization* 71(1). 54–64.

Marcus, George. 1995. Ethnography in/of the world system: The emergence of multi-sited ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24, 95–117.

McIlvenny, Paul, Julia Zhukova Klausen& Laura Bang Lindegaardt (eds.). forthcoming. *New perspectives on discourse and governmentality*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

McLaughlin, Mireille. 2013. What makes art Acadian? In Sari Pietikainen & Hellen Kelly-Holmes (eds.), *Multilingualism and the periphery*, 35–54. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McLaughlin, Mireille. 2014. «I say they don't have education»: Industrialisation, mobilité sociale et militantisme linguistique au Canada, 1914–1952. Langage et société, 149. 127–142.

McLaughlin, Mireille. 2015. Linguistic minorities and the multilingual turn: Constructing language ownership through affect in cultural production. *Multilingua*. Ahead of Print, 20 August 2015. doi:10.1515/multi-2015-0008.

Milani, Tommaso. 2009. At the intersection between power and knowledge: An analysis of a Swedish policy document on language testing for citizenship. *Journal of Language and Politics* 8(2). 287–304.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2006. Postmodernism and language policy. In Tom Ricento (ed.), *An introduction to language policy: theory and method,* 60–76. Oxford: Blackwell.

Pietikäinen, Sari & Helen Kelly-Holmes. 2013. Multilingualism and the periphery. In Sari Pietikäinen & Helen Kelly-Holmes (eds.), *Multilingualism and the periphery*, 1–17.Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ramanathan, Vaidehi & Makoni Sinfree. 2007. Bringing the body back: The (mis)languaging of bodies in bio-medical, societal and poststructuralist discourses on diabetes and epilepsy. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies,* 4(4). 283–306.

Rampton, Ben. 2014. Gumperz and governmentality in the 21st century: Interaction, power and subjectivity. *Working papers in urban language and literacies*. Paper 136. http://www.aca demia.edu/8114068/WP136_Rampton_2014._Gumperz_and_governmentality_in_the_21st_ century_Interaction_power_and_subjectivity (accessed 15 December 2014).

Rose, Nikolas. 1996a. *Inventing ourselves. Psychology, power and personhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, Nikolas 1996b. Governing "advanced" liberal democracies. In Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne & Nikolas Rose (eds.), *Foucault and political reason. Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*, 37–63. London:Routledge.

Rose, Nikolas. 1999. *Governing the soul: the shaping of the private self*, 2nd edn. London: Free Association Books.

Rose, Nikolas & Peter Miller. 1992. Political power beyond the state: Problematics of government. *British Journal of Society* 43(2). 173–205.

Swain, Marrill. 2006. Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. In Heidi Byrnes (ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky*, 95–108. London: Continuum.

Urciuoli, Bonnie. 2008. Skills and selves in the new workplace. *American Ethnologist* 35(2). 211–228.