

Elisabeth Barakos*

Language policy and governmentality in businesses in Wales: a continuum of empowerment and regulation

DOI 10.1515/multi-2015-0007

Abstract: In this paper, I examine 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. For this purpose, the study focuses on a particular site: private sector businesses in Wales. Therein, I trace two major discursive processes: first, the Welsh Government's national language policy documents that promote corporate bilingualism and bilingual employees as value-added resources; second, the practice and discourse of company managers who sustain or appropriate such promotional discourses for creating and promoting their own organisational values. By drawing on concepts from governmentality, critical language policy and discourse studies, I show that promoting bilingualism in business is characterised by local and global governmentalities. These not only bring about critical shifts in valuing language as symbolic entities attached to ethnonational concerns or as promotional objects that bring material gain. Language governmentalities also appear to shape new forms of 'linguaging' the minority language worker as self-governing, and yet, governed subjects who are ultimately made responsible for 'owning' Welsh.

Keywords: language policy, governmentality, Wales, bilingualism, empowerment, business

1 Introduction

Now more than ever, businesses are keen to provide the highest standard of services, and reflecting client needs is an integral part of good customer care. Your efforts to use Welsh will be appreciated by your customers in Wales, and through appreciation comes loyalty, trust and other benefits. By incorporating the Welsh language as part of your corporate and business plan you will be contributing to a shared vision of a truly bilingual country (Welsh Language Commissioner 2013: 3).

*Corresponding author: Elisabeth Barakos, School of Languages and Social Sciences Aston University Birmingham, United Kingdom, E-mail: e.barakos@aston.ac.uk

The above quotation stems from the Welsh Language Commissioner's recent promotional publication 'Making Welsh your business', which aims to persuade businesses to incorporate bilingualism in their corporate practices. The Commissioner's rationale can be seen, at least in part, as an instance of recent socio-economic and socio-political developments that have positioned minority languages, multilingualism and multilingual workers as assets and value-added resources in the global economy (Jaffe 2007; Duchêne and Piller 2011; Heller and Duchêne 2012). Neoliberal rationalities of efficiency, competition, high quality service provision and consumer choice show how languages become instrumentalised as a commodity and used as marketing and quality management tools for profit-making endeavours (Duchêne 2009; Heller 2010; Urla 2012; Duchêne and Del Percio 2014).

An evident manifestation of these developments is the present language policy agenda of the devolved Welsh Government. A politically, economically and geographically peripheral site in relation to its strong English neighbour (Coupland 2013: 133), Wales is shaped by a dynamic and conflicting relationship between English and Welsh. The former is the dominant language of national and international business; the latter is the lesser-used and highly local language without monolingual speakers. As Boutet (2012: 207) points out, localisation processes unfold politically through "nationalistic claims" and through the "defense of 'small' or minority languages" in times of globalisation. Indeed, post-devolution Wales has seen a burgeoning interest in marketing Welsh at national and local levels through policy initiatives that have aimed to revitalise and fortify values of identity, culture and the community (Coupland et al. 2006). Within these global-local polarities, language has become increasingly mobilised "as a resource for creating 'a sense of place', authenticity, [and] distinction" (Jaworski and Thurlow 2013: 189).

Concomitant to these processes are the Welsh Government's (2012: 16) policy to extend the use of Welsh as a language of "daily lives at home, socially, or professionally". Recently, the Welsh language policy agenda has strategically embraced the issue of language use in the domain of work and the economy through new policies, language laws and techniques of marketing, promotion, persuasion and enabling (Chrïost Mac Giolla 2005; Pertot et al. 2009). The aim of this step has been to further normalise bilingualism, increase the prestige and status of Welsh in every aspect of life and nurture a dialectic relation between language and economic development (Williams and Morris 2000; Williams 2010; Williams 2013).

Given the dearth of research on Welsh-English bilingualism in private business (see, however, Puigdevall i Serralvo 2005; Barakos 2012, 2014), the central goal of this article is to examine how language policy operates as a

vehicle for both empowering minority language speakers in the domain of work and as a means of exerting power over them. My understanding of empowerment stems from Bröckling's (2003: 323–324) conceptualisation of the term as a value orientation and an organising tool. Empowerment denotes a mode of enabling individuals to act on their own, participate and assume responsibility. As power relations are inherent, such overt modes of self-determination are not free of control. Rather, power becomes re-distributed and plays out in the guise of discourses about enablement and agency (see also Bröckling 2007; Kauppinen 2013). In the face of the entanglement of power, empowerment and language policy, the study focuses on a particular site: private sector businesses in Wales. Therein, I trace two major discursive processes: first, the Welsh Government's national language policy documents that promote corporate bilingualism and bilingual employees as value-added resources; second, the practices and discourses of company managers who sustain and appropriate such promotional discursive practices.

Methodologically, the paper draws on Foucault's (1991) notion of governmentality, which examines the exercise of power through the governing of the state and the governing of individuals (see Introduction to this issue on *governmentality*). In the words of Cruikshank (1999: 4), governmentality thus details “the forms of action and relations of power that aim to guide and shape (rather than force, control, or dominate) the actions of others [...] or oneself”. In addition, this paper is inspired by critical and discourse-oriented approaches to language policy (e.g. Milani 2009; Wodak 2009; Johnson 2011; Wodak 2012). Following Walters (2012: 144), it is important to “move to the outside” in terms of our analytical focus of governmentality, i.e. “to identify how certain ways of thinking and doing recur across sites”. In this vein, the paper traces multi-layered language policy processes, which find themselves at the nexus of policy power and interpretative agency (Pennycook 2006; Johnson 2013b; Johnson and Ricento 2013). This approach to policy aligns with Foucault's multi-layered conception of governmentality (Johnson 2013b: 119) as not limited to the state, but as “something that goes on whenever individuals and groups seek to shape their own conduct or the conduct of others” (Walters 2012: 11). Furthermore, Johnson (2013a: 41) claims that “power is not just contained in the policy text alone, nor is it perpetrated solely by the will of the state, but is enacted (or, perhaps performed) in micro-level practices and discourses” (see also Pennycook 2006; Johnson and Johnson 2014). Foucault's understanding of governmentality thus aids to trace the constitution of individual subjectivity through discursive power regimes.

In view of the complex nature of language policy and governmentality, the study aims to show that power is not only exerted by top-down elite

government agents. Local corporate bodies and their context-specific needs and wants also re-create potentially unequal power relations that have consequences for the minority language worker's participation in the field of business. I further show that promoting bilingualism in business is characterised by local and global governmentalities that bring about critical shifts in valuing language as symbolic or material gains. The paper suggests that such governmentalities shape new forms of 'linguaging' the minority language worker as self-governing and governed subjects who are defined by language skills and contribute to the organisational values of the companies they represent.

The article is divided into six sections. After this introductory section, the second section describes the intersection of governmentality, language policy and critical discourse studies as the theoretical framing of the study. The third section charts Welsh language policy developments in economic life. Section four presents the research site, the data and the methodological operationalisation of the study. The fifth section presents selected study findings, illustrating the operation and manifestation of the promotional discourse about 'the value of Welsh' in the data of national and corporate policy documents and the practices of company managers. Based on this investigation, the sixth and concluding section discusses the social and political implications of power relations, which become discursively distributed across discourses, texts and practices, for contemporary regulatory policy regimes in multilingual Wales.

2 Governmentality, critical language policy and discourse studies

This study applies Foucault's notion of governmentality to multi-layered language policy processes in the Welsh private sector business context. Distinctively, governmentality focuses on how power mechanisms operate as an assemblage of macro- and micro-contexts, practices and discourses (Foucault 1991; Lemke 2002). It is conceived of as a continuum, which operates from political government to self-regulatory practices, or "technologies of the self" (Lemke 2002: 57). In tracing contemporary modes of regulation, Foucault focused on neoliberal modes of power and governance that materialise through concerns to 'totalize' and to 'individualise' (Gordon 1991: 3). Indeed, such drives for empowerment and enabling individual responsibility to exercise choice (Lemke 2002: 59; see also Bröckling 2007; Kauppinen 2013) are well-reflected

in the current promotional and regulatory Welsh policy developments in the field of work. Examples of the latter will be provided in the discussion section of the paper.

At this stage, I would like to introduce Foucault's (1977, 1980) concept of the *dispositif* (or apparatus), which has found increasing use in governmentality studies¹ (see also Walter 2012: 76). The *dispositif* is a network of relations, an apparatus of control that operationalises governmentality. It is an "ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions" (Foucault 1980: 194). In sum, these heterogeneous discursive and material elements produce, exercise and maintain power structures. As I conceptualise language policy as a process phenomenon that navigates between structure and agency, it is within the *dispositif* that important connections between elements of language policy can be found. For example, a specific discourse about the added value of Welsh bilingualism, which forms part of the *dispositif*, may figure at one time as a government rationality that is articulated in institutional language policy documents. At another, it may be recontextualised into a language law or in managers' corporate practices of using Welsh for marketing and recruiting purposes. So it is in the "totalities of discourses and practices" as a more comprehensive "object of study" (Peltonen 2004: 206) that the *dispositif* is best captured.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, Pennycook's (2006) term 'language governmentality' proves particularly useful. It can be understood with a view to "how decisions about languages and language forms across a diverse range of institutions [...] and through a diverse range of instruments [...] regulate the language use, thought, and action of different people, groups, and organizations" (2006: 65). I argue that this conceptualisation of governmentality enables us to establish a nodal point to critical discourse analytic approaches regarding language policy. These approaches share with governmentality an interest in examining the macro-levels of policy power and the micro-levels of text, discourse and practice as necessarily coupled (see e.g. Wodak 2006; Johnson 2011; Unger 2013). Besides this major concern, power and its discursive manifestation (Wodak and Meyer 2009: 9) is common ground in governmentality and critical discourse studies of language policy. The inseparable connection of power and discourse as regulatory mechanisms is further heightened by Martin-Rojo (2001: 62), who argues: "The question of power not only entails the regulation and control of discourses, but also how the control over individuals, social groups, and classes is exercised through them".

1 I am indebted to Alexandre Duchêne for pointing this out.

As Milani (2009: 301) has skilfully demonstrated in his research on the politics of language tests in Sweden, the combination of governmentality and critical discourse analysis in particular allows us to understand how certain political proposals and practices become “*streamlined, rationalised and legitimated* through claims to knowledge”. In the present study, I specifically incorporate perspectives from the discourse-historical approach in critical discourse studies (Reisigl and Wodak 2009; Wodak 2009; Reisigl 2011) to analyse language policy and governmentality processes. The concept of discourses, then, is used here to denote “context-sensitive linguistic practices that are located within fields of social action, are related to a macro-topic and encode particular beliefs, values and positions” (Barakos 2014: 47). In this vein, I view language policy to be a discursive and social action, in the sense that it is both the product of discourse and producing discourse in socially situated contexts and across spatio-temporal scales. Following Lemke (2003: 130), I argue that language policy texts are discursive tools of social structuration that form part of larger social processes and chains of action. They are material artefacts and tools for organising what can be said and done and what is left unsaid. Texts (spoken, visual and/or written) relate to structured knowledge (discourses) and are realised in specific genres; these must be viewed in terms of their situatedness (Wodak 2011). While criticism has been targeted at earlier methodologies in the discourse-historical approach, which have proposed a “multi-level yet somewhat ‘static’ definition of context” (Krzyzanowski 2014: 419) and which treat text as somewhat bounded analytical categories (Heller and Pujolar 2009: 198), the combination of governmentality and critical discourse studies contributes to unravelling these fixities: it allows for a process-based lens to recognise socially situated subjects and discursive and non-discursive practices in creating and organising knowledge through policy.

‘Languaging’, then, is also conceived as a process phenomenon as it is through ongoing discursive and non-discursive processes that language policy actors and their agency, such as material language policies, are shaped, recontextualised and organised. Languaging is a broader phenomenon that captures language as ideologically shaped, socially constructed and entangled with power and workers as embodying organisational structures and late-capitalist values (see Introduction, this issue). Finally, the historical, socio-political and organisational embedding of languaging as a process is central to analysing language policy. Similarly, governmentality studies emphasise the need to “reflect on the historical and social conditions that rendered a certain historical knowledge of society ‘real’” (Lemke 2002: 61). It is also here that the critical impetus of this study can be located.

The combination of governmentality, language policy, and discourse studies helps to account for the dialectic between policies and practices: between the linguistic and discursive power of the policy per se and the power of social actors that (re)construct, live and breathe such policies. In this vein, this study regards governmentality as a window for “tracing not only policies and practices, but also actors and their subject positions in the discourses that form them” (Christie 2006: 378).

3 Welsh language and economic development: a new policy agenda

With a population of about 3.1 million, Wales is a relatively small country, situated in the west of the UK. Historically, the relationship to England has been characterised by assimilation, which, consequently, has affected the “status (or, rather, lack thereof) attributed to the Welsh language over time” (May 2000: 103). Following the latest 2011 census, 562,016 people in Wales, or about 19% of the population aged three and over, report the ability to speak Welsh (Office for National Statistics 2012; Welsh Language Commissioner 2014). Despite a drop of 2% compared to the 2001 census, confirming the fragile state of Welsh, various political, social and economic changes have enabled bilingualism to be gradually institutionalised in education, the media, governance and public life (Mann 2007: 213).

As a governing *dispositif*, the Welsh Language Act 1993 placed an obligation on the public sector to treat Welsh and English “on the basis of equality” within the public sphere and the administration of justice in Wales. The law established the Welsh Language Board whose statutory duty was to promote and facilitate the use of Welsh as well as agree and monitor Welsh language schemes with public sector bodies. These schemes detail the measures taken to promote the use of Welsh in service provision to the public in Wales. The private sector was not affected by the law but was encouraged to implement Welsh language schemes on a voluntary basis. The law provided the basis for a series of language policy documents following the advent of Welsh devolution in 1998.

As Musk (2010: 182) rightly claims, since the beginning of devolution, “launching a newly devolved Wales as a bilingual nation was placed firmly on the political agenda”. Indeed, the face of government and politics in Wales has changed, creating distinctive political institutions and public policy agendas. The rising autonomy has paved the way for the resurgence

of nationalist ideologies and endeavours to market a unique Welsh national identity in a globalised economy (Blackledge 2002: 206; Coupland et al. 2003: 157; Mooney and Williams 2006: 609). Responding to a public consultation on the Welsh language, the Welsh Government published a policy statement, *Dyfodol Dwyieithog/A Bilingual Future* (2002), which was characterised by the principle of treating Welsh and English with parity and of offering a language choice to citizens in terms of service provision. These principles were transferred to the Welsh Government's language strategy *Iaith Pawb/Everyone's Language: a national action plan for a bilingual Wales 2003* (henceforth *Iaith Pawb*).² The language strategy was the first Action Plan developed to implement the *Dyfodol Dwyieithog/A Bilingual Future* policy. *Iaith Pawb* was introduced in 2003 by Rhodri Morgan (Labour Party), the then First Minister and leader of the Welsh Assembly Government from 2000 to 2009, and Jenny Randerson (Liberal Democrats), the Minister for Culture, Sport and the Welsh Language. In view of this, it is important to bear in mind that the language strategy was produced under the period of New Labour (from the 1990s until 2007), which propagated the concept of “a consumerist or marketised conception of choice as a key organising principle for public service reform” (Clarke, Newman, and Westmarland 2008: 2). So, the politically-promoted citizen's right to choose health care services, education, public services and the like also stretched to a choice over language matters.

The ensuing language policy initiatives have gradually embraced the nexus of language and economic development, with a view to creating economically and socially sustainable Welsh-speaking communities. In this vein, the Welsh Government asserts that “the future vitality of the language is inextricably linked to the economic and social future of those [Welsh-speaking] communities” (Welsh Government 2012: 6). The government also acknowledges that, in view of the continuous growth of Welsh in a range of public and private sector businesses, “the language is now acquiring an increasingly significant presence in the workplace”. It goes on to argue that “Welsh language skills are important to the future success of many Welsh-based businesses” (Welsh Assembly Government 2010: 28).

Recently, the discursive manifestation of such explicit claims about the economic value of Welsh can be traced in *Iaith Fyw: Iaith Byw/A living language: a language for living 2012–2017* (henceforth *Iaith Fyw*). This

² For critical commentaries on this policy and its legacy, see e.g. Williams (2004), Coupland and Bishop (2006), Musk (2006), Coupland (2010), Selleck (2013), and Barakos (2014).

five-year strategy aims to “breathe new life into the language” and to “see it thriving in Wales” (Welsh Government 2012: 4–12). Compared to the prior document *Iaith Pawb*, discourses have shifted from notions of language choice and the creation of a bilingual society to enabling, facilitating and normalising Welsh language use in areas such as the workplace, private business and customer service provision (Williams 2013). Another novel policy thread is the emphasis on enforcement powers and the imposition of duties. This coercive thread derives from the Welsh Language Measure 2011, the new legislative framework. It has set up the office of Welsh Language Commissioner, dissolved the former Welsh Language Board and has, for the first time, imposed duties on certain types of private bodies to provide Welsh services. Undoubtedly, this step towards legal imposition constitutes a radical change to the prior voluntary approach of the Welsh Language Act 1993. However, the boundaries between what constitutes the public and the private sector are blurry. The Welsh Language Measure explicitly affects those bodies that provide a service of a public nature. These are effectively privatised utilities such as gas, water and electricity suppliers as well as telecommunications companies and bus and railway services (Welsh Language Commissioner 2012a).

The new turn in Welsh language policy indicates a shift from hitherto laissez-faire approaches in the field of economic life to greater regulation, empowerment and shifting responsibilities to act in favour of Welsh. These conditions for bilingualism in private business make up elements of control that operationalise governmentality. Let us turn next to the research site, the data and the methodology of the study.

4 Welsh bilingual businesses as a research site

The data for this paper are one strand of a larger research project involving a survey about bilingualism in Welsh private sector businesses and a critical discursive study of socially situated political and corporate language policy discourses and practices (see Barakos 2014). For the present article, the study draws on two data sets which capture some of the multiple layers of language policy and the modes of government to guide and direct behaviours with respect to language: one is the Welsh Government’s national language policy documents *Iaith Pawb* (2003) and *Iaith Fyw* (2012), which promote the value of Welsh as an economic resource and which discursively promote the government itself as a facilitator in safeguarding Welsh. The other data set comprises interview

and corporate policy data gathered during ethnographic fieldwork from January to March 2011 with nine private sector businesses in Wales. The companies chosen for this study are drawn from different industries (financial institution, consumer transportation, law firm, business consultancy, estate agency, telecommunications), size groups (four large and five small and medium-sized enterprises) and sociolinguistic environments (Cardiff and Gwynedd, north-western Wales). Six of the nine sampled companies have voluntarily adopted written language policy documents. Regarding the new legal framework for Welsh, only the telecommunications business would fall under the scope of the Language Measure.

In order to understand the way social actors construct their work practices, I interviewed company managers as both consumers and producers of language policy about their experiences with bilingualism in business and their attitudes towards the current shift from voluntarism to obligation. The interviews were conducted through the medium of English. With the aim to understand the way businesses manage such work practices as well as the way they discursively promote themselves as active policy agents, I also examined the voluntary corporate language policy documents of the specific businesses. The documents were produced at crucial, discursive moments from 2003 to 2011, when the use of Welsh in private business was not legally obliged but strongly encouraged through top-down strategies of marketing and persuasion. Some of the documents were based on the former Welsh Language Board's language policy template, while others were individually formulated. As one commonly shared feature, the corporate policy documents outline the type, scope and current (as well as future) commitments of Welsh-language service provision internally and externally (for training and recruitment, operational media relations, advertising, customer services, corporate social responsibility) and are tailored to the companies' corporate purposes. Together, the interview and company policy data show the underlying rationalities of the Welsh Government in constructing the 'value of Welsh' and bilingual employees in the domain of work. Moreover, they shed light on the discursive and social practices of managerial employees who appropriate such promotional discourses in text and talk.

In understanding the type of data collected, we need to be aware that interviews in particular are self-reported and subjective, based on the participants' individual perceptions and reported practices and ideologies. Interviews need to be treated as "situated interactions between two people" (Lampropoulou and Myers 2013: para. 6), with the role of interviewers, as Silverman (2006: 112) observes, being that of "active participants". Interviews can thus be considered "one kind of interaction, in which both

or all participants construct the event moment to moment, and there are complex shifts in the roles and relations of interviewer and interviewee(s)” (Abell and Myers 2008: 158, see also Briggs (1986) for the notion of interviews as communicative events and as dictated by metacommunicative norms).

In order to methodically operationalise the analysis and account for the complex nature of governmentality and policy processes, I draw on elements from Wodak’s (2008: 31) four-level context model. The first level consists of analysing the immediate co-text (e.g. the specific utterances used in the language strategies, company policy and interview data), and the second of the intertextual and interdiscursive relationships (e.g. between the national policy and the interview data). The third level examines the extralinguistic conditions (e.g. of elite bodies such as the Welsh Government or the companies interviewed), with the broader socio-political/historical contexts, in which the discursive practices are embedded (e.g. the socio-political background of Welsh language policy processes), forming the fourth level. While it lies beyond the scope of the present study to examine each level to the full, I specifically address the co-textual, intertextual/interdiscursive and broader contextual levels. On this basis, I am able to establish links between the investigated discursive data and their wider social embedding. Ultimately, such an approach shifts the focus of discourse analysis away from analysing texts as mere products to investigating discourse as part of wider social processes.

In the following examination, I analyse and discuss selected passages of discursive data – those ‘discourse fragments’ (Jäger and Maier 2009) or traces of policy processes that are most relevant in constructing the link of language, language workers and the economy as ‘value-added’. First, I analyse the context-specific policy discourses of the Welsh Government as to how bilingualism is commercialised and the link of language and economic development rationalised. Then, I illuminate managers’ voices and reported practices as they experience, enact, and exploit such processes. I apply the term ‘language worker’ broadly as referring to active participants involved in both the production and consumption of communicative, client-facing work and service provision (see also Introduction to this issue on *language worker*). In bringing these different structural and agentive forces together, it is my aim to map the nature of the connections existing between these heterogeneous elements of Foucault’s *dispositif* and its attendant power dimension. This way, it can be shown that governmentality emerges from an alignment of the administrative structure of state language policy with the local knowledge produced in corporate settings.

5 Key results and discussion

5.1 State language policy as administrative structure

Although the Welsh private sector has so far not been legally obliged to provide bilingual services, the absence of legislative government intervention does not translate into the absence of language governmentality as it materialises discursively through administrative structure. The following extracts from the Welsh language strategies *Iaith Pawb* and its successor *Iaith Fyw* offer an illustrative example of the assemblage of techniques of authoritative knowledge dispersion, overt empowerment and regulation (or a *dispositif* of discipline). These techniques materialise in terms of shifting value allocations (Bourdieu 1991) of Welsh and new avenues for access to the language as a productive and marketable resource. The two language strategies mirror critical decisions on language policy issues that are the result of processes of drafting, public consultation periods, redrafting and adoption of the final version. The documents have been influenced by ministers, local government representatives, interest groups, public and private sector stakeholders, individuals and social movements (Williams 2013). While space constraints do not allow me to trace the genesis of each policy text and its transformations, I will focus on key language-related government rationalities as they are articulated in the material technologies of the two language strategies.

5.1.1 Welsh as a symbolic and ‘living’ language

Both language strategies continue with a foreword by the Welsh Ministers, outlining the vision of creating a truly bilingual Wales. Taking a closer look at extracts from these ministerial forewords, the Welsh Government asserts:

(1) *Iaith Pawb* 2003

The Welsh Assembly Government believes that the Welsh language is an integral part of our national identity. The Welsh language is an essential and enduring component in the history, culture and social fabric of our nation. We must respect that inheritance and work to ensure that it is not lost for future generations.

(2) *Iaith Fyw* 2012

We would want to see [...] an increase in people’s awareness of the value of Welsh, both as part of our national heritage and as a useful skill in modern life.

Both extracts show that Welsh is constructed as an enduring and stable socio-cultural resource, linked to Welsh heritage. As Heller, Pujolar and Duchêne (2014: 553) argue, the value of language as one among other heritage products is “derived from their ability to index national authenticities”. Specifically, extract 1 implies a sense of authentic belonging and an ideology of ownership of language. This is not only indicated by the repetitive deictics *we/our* (as in “our national identity”; “we must respect”). The inclusive title of *Iaith Pawb*, meaning ‘Everyone’s Language’, also indicates that Welsh is overtly constructed to belong to every citizen in Wales (cf. Musk 2006; Selleck 2013).

Extract 2 exemplifies the interdiscursive conflation of symbolic and more material value allocations attached to Welsh. Specifically, in *Iaith Fyw*, language is valued as “national heritage” and concurrently mobilised as a “useful skill”. Noteworthy is the fact that, unlike the prior action plan *Iaith Pawb*, whose rationality has been one of a ‘truly bilingual Wales’, discourses about the “the value of Welsh, economically and culturally” (Welsh Government 2012: 29) emerge as a strongly repeated element throughout the new strategy. Given the predominance of value discourses, the policy focus has shifted from overtly constructing Welsh as an idealised token belonging to everyone in Wales to Welsh as an increasingly instrumental, ‘living’ language with material worth (as is also suggested by the document’s title ‘A living language: a language for living’).

The increasing instrumental role of Welsh finds further expression in the specific policy sections addressing the economic benefits of bilingualism as a unique selling proposition. The following extract illustrates this promotional argument more accurately.

(3) *Iaith Pawb* 2003

The strategy identifies key drivers of the economy, such as innovation, entrepreneurship, skills development and promoting information and communication technologies, and there are a range of programmes in place for promoting these throughout Wales. Welsh-speaking communities will benefit from the economic and employment opportunities that business development will bring the local population. [...] Providing services through the medium of Welsh should be seen as a way of providing distinctive and better quality services to customers.

In *Iaith Pawb*, the government establishes the relation between economic development and the Welsh-speaking communities by promoting its proactive programmes for “business development” in the “local population”. In this fragment, commodification processes are made concrete and persuasive

through mobilising high quality customer service provision through Welsh and interlocking the local Welsh-speaking citizenry with “key drivers of the economy”. Bilingualism is thus discursively promoted as an entrepreneurial phenomenon in the service of the established Welsh-speaking communities. Towards the end of the fragment, the policy’s promotional argument about the nexus of language and high quality service provision and customer-orientation is further intensified through the obligational modal “should” (“Providing services through the medium of Welsh should be seen as a way of providing distinctive and better quality services”). This explicit command, under the guise of endorsing a good service, mirrors the political power pervading this overtly promotional policy discourse.

Similarly, the new policy *Iaith Fyw* advances the aim to bring the use of Welsh into communities across Wales “by developing a clear strategy in relation to how benefit could be gained from the Welsh language as an economic asset” (Welsh Government 2012: 34). *Iaith Fyw* further identifies the workplace as a strategic policy area, that is, as “one of the key areas which determines language use” (Welsh Government 2012: 37). Next to the construction of the workplace as a “key area” of language use, Welsh Government language policy discourse has been characterised by neoliberal governmentalities that have celebrated the individual’s choice to Welsh as a language of service and deployable resource in the workplace. To exemplify, the next extract shows that Welsh-English bilingualism is positioned as a distinctive promotional strategy of service choice in the business sector.

(4) *Iaith Fyw* 2012

In this sphere, as in so many others, quality is key. Why should Welsh speakers settle for services that are not of the highest quality? And why should the Welsh Government subsidise services for Welsh speakers which are not able to replicate the quality of consumer experience that they could experience through the medium of English?

This discourse fragment reveals the construction of the Welsh speaker as a hybridised “citizen-consumer” (Clarke et al. 2007; Mautner 2010: 55), for whom a high quality service through the medium of Welsh counts (as in “quality is key”). This knowledge is presupposed through the strategic use of rhetorical questions, which also intensify the force of the utterances. Furthermore, the explicit comparison to English language services reflects an ‘either-or’ bilingualism, which treats languages as separate codes for separate functions (Blackledge and Creese 2010) – here equal service choice functions that should “replicate” the same quality of consumer experience.

The techniques of empowerment charted so far in official policy discourse can be subsumed under what Heller and Duchêne (2012a) label ‘pride’ and ‘profit’ against the conditions of the globalised economy. As evidenced in the policy extracts, these two complex tropes are intertwined and partly conflated. Language as ‘pride’ is framed in terms of “cultural treasures, exemplary of tradition, usually national tradition” (Gal 2012: 22). It is linked to mobilising feelings of pride in belonging and membership, the community or the nation (Heller and Duchêne 2012: 4). Language as ‘profit’ is framed in a narrower mode and alienates the traditional value of language as a cultural asset. In fact, the value of language is exploited as “a means to material gain” (Gal 2012: 22). In the Welsh context, these concepts work in tandem and produce an element of “distinction” (Blackledge and Creese 2012: 117) to goods or services.

5.1.2 Language ownership and responsibilities

The next two discourses fragments show that the connection between empowerment (through enabling free language and service choice) and coercion (through regulating this choice) are blurred. Indeed, as Cruikshank (1999: 72) claims, “relations of empowerment are simultaneously voluntary *and* coercive”. Language ownership is twinned with notions of responsibility for Welsh (see McLaughlin for language ownership and affect, this issue). That is, the individual’s freedom to choose Welsh also involves obligations to act on behalf of government bodies and the collective Welsh community. Extract 5 is taken from the conclusion of *Iaith Pawb*.

(5) Iaith Pawb 2003

But survival of the language ultimately depends on individuals taking ownership of the language. This means people getting involved in the community driven initiatives to promote the language, parents passing the language on to their children and individuals being prepared to use it in social and business settings. We have no doubt that there is a positive future for the language if the people of Wales embrace our vision. Working together, we can create a truly bilingual Wales.

Here, the government invokes the topos³ of responsibility as part of common-sense reasoning and commonly accepted forms of knowledge deployed for

³ Topoi are “parts of argumentation that represent the common sense reasoning typical for specific issues” (van Dijk 2000: 97). They are best approached from the angle of “commonplace” phrasing, when people will draw on a shared repertoire or topos to convey and legitimate their (public) viewpoints, often reproduced as an uncritical judgement (Myers 2005: 536).

making others act. Responsibility for the language discursively oscillates between individual and collective action. It starts from “individuals” being prepared to act to “the people of Wales” who need to embrace the vision to a collective “we can create a truly bilingual Wales”. The government’s promotional claims are intensified through perspectivation strategies, realised through verbs of thinking (“we have no doubt”) and intensification strategies, realised through the adverb “together”. In addition, the use of deictic ‘we’, as yet another means of perspectivation, fluctuates between an addressee-exclusive (as in “we have no doubt”) and addressee-inclusive (“we can create”) notion. The latter ‘we’ is used ambivalently as it may encompass all the people of Wales. This inclusive policy practices serve as a means of overtly empowering the Welsh citizen to act in favour of Welsh.

Extract 6 shows that the notion of shared responsibility for the language is recontextualised and reconstituted from the prior policy *Iaith Pawb* into the new policy *Iaith Fyw*.

(6) *Iaith Fyw* 2012

It is vital that we continue working to encourage people and organisations to use Welsh, while at the same time making full use of the opportunities afforded by the Welsh Language Measure by enabling the Welsh Language Commissioner to impose duties upon various bodies via standard [...] However, the future development and survival of the language depends on the commitment of the people of Wales, and must be owned by all of us.

While the government highlights its own position as a responsible policy actor in promoting the use of Welsh (“it is vital that we continue working”), it clearly “encourages” other bodies (“people and organisations”) to follow in this vein. Encouragement to language use here features as an attendant element of the discourse about enablement that pervades this fragment. More strikingly, unlike the prior policy *Iaith Pawb*, responsibility becomes coupled with powerful discourses about imposition (as in “to impose duties upon various bodies”). Imposition is intensified through intertextual references to the Welsh Language Measure and the Welsh Language Commissioner as the authoritative body of enforcement. The use of deontic modality (as in “must be owned”) in the final sentence further acts as an intensifying strategy (Reisigl and Wodak 2009: 94) and lends authority and certainty to the claims made. Hence, the encouraged free agency of organisations and individuals to act in favour of Welsh is “stripped” (Johnson 2013b: 133) by imposing duties.

The discursively constructed collective ownership of Welsh (“must be owned by all of us”) and the concomitant responsibility for the language in

social and business settings are a clear evidence of the principle of subsidiarity that shifts decision-making about language and service choice from political bodies down to the lowest level (see also Dorostkar 2014).⁴ Underlying this shift is not only a political argument used for language survival. In essence, the argument also seems to function as a political disclaimer which protects the government from accusations of failing to deliver on its promised policy commitments. As Coupland and Bishop (2006: 42), drawing on Fairclough (2000), argue, *Iaith Pawb* discursively promotes “the individuals’ moral responsibility to their own communities”. The discourse fragments have shown that *Iaith Fyw* clearly recontextualises this established policy logic. In this vein, the Welsh civil society is holistically turned into a primary subject of language work through being enticed to actively consume language policy through the use of Welsh.

From these discursive constructions of value-added corporate bilingualism in official government language policy discourse, let us next move from the regulatory state-centric space to levels of the self: to a multitude of corporate bodies, managers’ voices and practices that are connected to languaging the autonomous and governable language worker as citizen-consumers. It is the aim to problematise the mutual connection between government rationalities and the managers’ rationalities and practices. It is also here that governmentality emerges: in the alignment of the administrative structure of the state with the knowledge locally produced in other sites (here workplaces).

5.2 From the level of the state to levels of the self: language policy as agency

In this section, I will trace company managers, as self-governed and governable subjects or language workers, in their own local promotion of corporate bilingualism. These language workers are socially constituted actors in producing and circulating knowledge about bilingualism. While government bodies discursively enable participation and access to Welsh in the domain of work through policy initiatives, institutions such as private sector businesses and the language worker are empowered to exercise language and service choices and are enabled to make informed decisions about using and promoting Welsh.

⁴ In a European policy context, the principle of subsidiarity holds that member states are responsible for implementing and steering language policy matters at their own will and discretion. This principle is anchored in article 5 of the European Union Treaty (Dorostkar 2014: 103).

Languaging here brings about a liberating and enabling force. Yet, this participatory approach nurtures potential tensions between the locally constrained context of managers' own practices and discourses, the national political action and the global context of the society in which the current enablement discourses about Welsh are (re)produced and negotiated.

5.2.1 Language as a selling proposition

In the data emerging in the transcripts of the manager interviews, it is striking that the managers collectively identify Welsh and bilingualism as a skill for work and key selling proposition, with language constituting a vital base of profit for the companies (Grin et al. 2010). Many informants consider enabling communication in the clients' language of choice as part of their explicit marketing strategy, with the aim to

- be service-oriented (meet customer needs and wants; create customer goodwill),
- establish a relationship with the local community,
- keep up with the competition,
- increase efficiency of knowledge transfer and facilitate interaction,
- increase flexibility in the market.

The symbolic value allocations of Welsh become intertwined with the participants' shared conceptualisation of Welsh and bilingualism as a commodity. Welsh is not only marketed and exploited as a 'tool' to underline companies' affiliations to Welshness. It also becomes a vital means of creating a brand of which language forms one, but by no means the only part, against the backdrop of what Duchêne (2009: 30) identifies as a continuous interaction between internationalising and localising principles. The branding strategy is exemplified by Sarah,⁵ a marketing and PR executive of a transportation business in Cardiff. She stresses the nexus of language and corporate identity as a means of demarcation and links it to marketing endeavours with the aim to build a distinctive "brand Wales".

- (7) Sarah: Most things, to be honest, we are quite good at. Well, I got a Welsh language policy which is in front of me just because it helps remind me what we are doing < shows policy to me > . When we really started to emphasising on the Welsh factor that was when we rebranded in March 2009.

I: So that was quite a recent thing.

⁵ Pseudonyms were used to protect the identities of the interviewees.

Sarah: Yes. There was like bits and bobs in Welsh before then but the rebranding was when we really committed to being totally bilingual. The reason for that was, well not the reason, but what came out of the rebranding revealed was that we were not focusing enough on our Welshness. So we were not doing enough considering the fact we are Welsh. [...]. So what came out of the rebranding was that we were the national airport for Wales and that we need to emphasise our Welsh roots. And that is how we are going to be marketing ourselves. And then that obviously incorporates the Welsh language so that's how the emphasis grew after rebranding. After the rebranding exercise, or as part of the rebranding exercise, the emphasis grew then on the Welsh language as well as everything else celebrating being Welsh. [...] So it's more than just language. You see visuals across the place of like Visit Wales branding. And it's just kind of playing on this whole brand Wales thing.

For Sarah, establishing an authentic brand necessitates embracing the language, culture and the historical “Welsh roots”, with Welsh indexing the Welsh nation and identity (as in “celebrating being Welsh”). In her argumentation for creating a holistic corporate brand Wales, the manager intertextually refers to “Visit Wales”, a tourist website that markets and develops Welsh tourism. Her rationality appears to overlap with the Welsh Government strategy *Iaith Pawb*, which includes specific sections on the link between language and the tourism industry. The strategy states “to use the Welsh language and bilingual culture to help promote Wales as a distinctive tourism product in the UK” (Welsh Assembly Government 2003: 25).

Clearly, the added value of authenticity is invoked as a marketing strategy to sell the company's products (Da Silva and Heller 2009). This tendency is also described by Jaworski and Thurlow (2013). In the semiotic landscape of transportation businesses, they identify the interplay of “localising and globalising communicative practices [...] where languages, and especially ‘small’, minority languages are used as a resource for creating ‘a sense of place’, authenticity, distinction, and exoticity of travel destinations” (2013: 189). I would argue that such glocalising practices (Robertson 1995) mirror Heller and Duchêne (2012: 9) claim that the new economy demands flexibility, distinction and authenticity through targeted customer service, niche markets and tailored advertising that mobilises a sense of “marketing of place” (Urry 2005: 23; Kelly-Holmes 2013: 123).

The perceived utilitarian value of Welsh is further mirrored in the voluntarily drafted corporate language policy documents of the sampled businesses. These documents overtly empower the Welsh language by affording it discursive

space and assigning it explicit functions in a corporate context. At the same time, the scope of Welsh language provision and use is explicitly controlled through selection and Welsh is constructed as a language for marketing purposes and quality management. The following extract is taken from the individually formulated corporate language policy document of Sarah's transportation business in Cardiff.

- (8) With [company] being the national [company] for Wales, Welsh identity and creating a 'sense of place' is an integral part of its brand ethos. The Welsh language is an important tool which can be utilised to demonstrate the [company's] desire to exhibit its 'Welshness'. In addition, as the national [company] and a very visible organisation in Wales it is responsible conduct to be supportive and active in promoting the use of Welsh, which will bring further benefits including improvement to the quality of customer service, attracting new customers, increasing customer loyalty, gaining a competitive edge over competitors and enhancing public relations.

Sarah's rationalities about the importance of branding and exhibiting "Welshness" articulated in extract 7 are clearly mirrored in the policy text. This has to be viewed against the background that it was her who formulated the corporate language policy back then in 2009. Furthermore, the corporate rationalities also discursively echoes the Welsh Government's call for supporting "Welsh identity" and the community, and for bilingualism to be linked to economic advancement. This nexus is established by re-creating, rationalising and streamlining various arguments from *Iaith Pawb* and *Iaith Fyw* into corporate policy discourse. First, providing customers with "a sense of place" for Wales is used metaphorically to transmit a sense of belonging and local distinctiveness. The term refers intertextually to the government logic of *Iaith Pawb*, which argues for incorporating "a sense of place toolkit" (Welsh Assembly Government 2003: 24) in tourism operators. This toolkit, which serves as the technology of promotion, involves "finding and disseminating best practice to tourism operators on how to create a sense of place, and how to sustain and exploit it – and the Welsh language and Wales' bilingual culture will be integral parts of this" (Welsh Assembly Government 2003: 24).

Second, the corporate policy linguistically objectifies Welsh as a tool with economic utility and commodifies "Welsh identity" by establishing a Welsh-branded corporate identity as part of a holistic "brand ethos". Third, by alluding to the topos of responsibility ("it is responsible conduct"), the policy seems to presuppose that national and visible institutions, such as the

transportation business, are responsible for supporting and promoting Welsh. Finally, the commodification of Welsh is illustrated by enlisting the economic advantages that accrue from operating bilingually (as in “attracting new customers”; “increasing customer loyalty”) and by integrating the element of “gaining competitive edge”, which specifically echoes rationalities of contestability. Overall, such discursive techniques are a means to inform, promote and persuade. Or, to use Fairclough’s (2010: 184) words, the policy purpose continuously oscillates between ‘telling’ and ‘selling’. Clearly what we are witnessing here is the construction of Welsh as an embodiment of the company. The genuine value is grounded not only in the capacity to satisfy customer wants and needs but also in the ability to generate good public relations. In Foucault’s (1977) understanding, the *dispositif* has a dominant strategic function in this social context between the said (the discursive) and the unsaid (the practices).

5.2.2 Language skills as organisational values

As we have seen so far, the value of Welsh in the domain of business is constructed as part of broader discourses about total quality management and service provision (cf. Urla 2012 for the Basque bilingual business context). The following discourse fragments exemplify yet another striking interdiscursive element, that of ‘skills discourses’. Urciuoli (2008: 212) defines these as “discourses that sell skills or skills-related products or that offer workers advice or exhortation about acquiring, assessing, and enhancing their own skills”. For example, Ifan, a language policy manager of a telecommunications business in Bangor, argues that taking on more Welsh-speaking staff “gives us more flexibility with the services we offer here”. The language manager’s lived corporate culture of flexibility reflects that Welsh language skills are not only linked with service offer. Rather, they are also interlocked with the fetishized flexible skills repertoire of the language worker. After all, it is the latter who is ultimately empowered to act according to organisational values and yet responsible for the frontline service provision (see also Bröckling 2007 and Dlaske, this issue). In this vein, the empowerment to act is limited and reinforced by the social and discursive structures that facilitate this behaviour in the first place.

There are, however, ambivalent perceptions among managers about the role of Welsh as a desirable or an essential skill for employment. To exemplify, Dylan, finance director of a Bangor-based consultancy, perceives language to be a desirable rather than essential criterion, responding to the question of whether Welsh would be considered in recruitment.

- (9) Dylan: We don't have a rule that the candidate has got to be a Welsh speaker. In fact, we would say that the first criterion is always that the best suited candidate gets the job, irrespective of language. On the other hand, if all else was equal, then we would, especially up in Bangor, we really would prefer to employ a Welsh speaker.

In this account, Dylan illustrates the pivotal role attached to Welsh language skills in recruitment and specifically for employment “especially up in Bangor”, which is characterised by a higher Welsh-speaking population.⁶ Dylan's narrative also suggests that language can be both a means of inclusion and exclusion at the same time (Hua 2014: 239). While having the desired Welsh skills set may open doors for some to the job market in Bangor, it may exclude non-Welsh speakers from participating. This is reflected in Dylan's articulated condition “if all else was equal” and the company's collective preference (“we really would prefer”) to employ a Welsh-speaking candidate.

A somewhat different account is provided by Kathryn, partner of a Cardiff-based law firm. The observed commodification of language skills also leads to tensions about who gets paid for the skill and thus has access to employment, or put differently, who is included in and excluded from participating in the job market. Here, Kathryn responds to my question of whether Welsh was considered in recruitment processes.

- (10) Kathryn: I think also, if I am really honest, that if I had somebody here from the equal opportunities commission, asking me about my diversity policy, the fact that I end up recruiting so many Welsh speakers could be perceived as negative, something that is against us. [...] So, if I carried on wanting to recruit more Welsh people, I mean I recruited them on merit rather than on the fact that they spoke Welsh, I think then I would possibly end up closing the door on ethnic minorities who ought to be given the same level of opportunity to secure their position in this law firm as anybody else.

In this fragment, Kathryn voices concerns of discrimination over the recruitment of more Welsh-speaking staff by discussing policies relating to equal opportunities (“my diversity policy”). She stresses the potential negative publicity that may arise from recruiting more Welsh speakers (“could be perceived as negative”) and that may eventually do more harm than good to the law firm

⁶ Bangor is located in the community of Gwynedd, where over half of the population are Welsh-speaking with 65.4% (Office for National Statistics 2012).

(“something that is against us”). Her concerns are intensified through the intertextual reference to the “equal opportunities commission” as an authorial, powerful body. Similar to Dylan’s argument in extract 9, the manager reports she recruited on the basis of academic achievement (“on merit”) rather than Welsh language skills. Her narrative demonstrates that “language workers are imagined in relation to the organizations for which they work” (Urciuoli and LaDousa 2013: 175). In this specific case, the law firm is imagined to assure equal opportunities for all, which is reflected in terms of its inclusive company values. Unlike Dylan’s account, the law firm’s recruitment policy aims to provide “the same level of opportunity” to all “ethnic minorities”, irrespective of their language skills and of managerial preferences.

As shown in the managers’ narratives thus far, Welsh language skills have become imagined as organisational values. These are also reflected in the companies’ own policy practices. Evidence of the latter is provided in the following fragment from a Cardiff-based financial institution’s corporate policy document.

- (11) [Company] considers applicants’ linguistic abilities as one of a number of skills when assessing their suitability for posts in Wales. [Company] recognises its role in the training and development of staff and encourages them to exercise and improve their fluency in Welsh. [Company] appreciates the importance of a satisfactory quality of bilingual service and has recently undertaken a linguistic skills audit of its Welsh workforce.

The framing of Welsh as an economic resource finds expression primarily through references to the role Welsh subsumes in training and recruitment. Interestingly, knowledge of Welsh is not explicitly deemed essential for employment but is considered “one of a number of skills” an applicant may offer. On the other hand, language skills appear to be especially relevant for delivering “a satisfactory quality of bilingual service”. Good service provision is thus coupled with a good linguistic performance of staff. In this fragment, the underlying technique of encouragement as one means of empowerment resembles the style of reasoning used in official policy discourse (as discussed in extract 6 of *Iaith Fyw*). In the predicates discernible here, positive attributes are attached to the company as a supportive and responsible policy agent (“consider”; “recognise”; “appreciate”; “undertake”). Yet, ultimate responsibility is implicitly shifted to staff that is made accountable for delivering a quality bilingual service through improving “their fluency in Welsh”. By these means, employees as language workers are covertly turned into “entrepreneurial agents responsible for company success” (Urciuoli 2008: 213). The discursively encouraged mode of employees’

self-determination regarding Welsh is de facto a relevant means of corporate governance. Given the voluntary nature of the language policy documents, bilingual workers are not necessarily required to comply with such regulations. Rather, they are languaged to be committed to the corporate values and the bilingual mission through the *dispositif* of organisational values, i.e. the ensemble of such corporate policy goals and human resource practices.

The corporate rationalities about language skills further mirror the Welsh Government's current priority of Welsh as a utilitarian skill, as exemplified in *Iaith Fyw*'s action points to "promote the recognition of Welsh as a skill in the workplace and develop opportunities for people to learn Welsh in the workplace" (Welsh Government 2012: 39). It is also in this way that the discursive patterns discernible across the corporate policy data and the manager narratives reinforce the social structures that shape them.

6 Conclusion and implications

The aim of this paper was to examine language policy as a multi-layered phenomenon in the field of corporate bilingualism in Wales and to trace how language is reimagined as work resources. In order to interrogate the interwovenness of the macro-levels of policy power and the micro-levels of text, discourse and practice as *dispositifs*, I have used governmentality, critical language policy and discourse studies as a window for such an inquiry. The analysis focused on two salient Welsh Government policy documents, *Iaith Pawb* and its successor, *Iaith Fyw*. It also included Welsh corporate language policy discourse through managers' voices, their reported practices and company language policy documents as layers of language policy and modes of government to guide and normalise people's conduct with respect to language. This concluding section considers the implications of the instrumentalisation of bilingualism for the minority language worker as an empowered and regulated socio-economic subject.

Under neoliberalised and globalised conditions which restructure power within society, language policy has emerged as a fluid structural and agentic site, with discourse and practice as coupled elements. Language policy as structure, which is never devoid of agency, establishes a top-down material framework for policy initiatives in various political and corporate contexts and addresses the diverse Welsh publics' wants and needs. Under these conditions, minority language workers remain controlled and structured, with language materialising as an object, a promotional tool or a 'thing' in Urciuoli's words (see discussion, this issue). Language policy as agency evolves through practices

as well as rationalities articulated from both the top-down and the enabling of the manager, employee, customer and citizen to act in the favour of promoting Welsh language use on the ground.

In the Welsh national policies, language is principally tied to social constructs such as identity, nationhood and culture. It is conceived as a localised, territorially-bound community language in times of globalising practices, on the premise of ultimate minority language survival. Furthermore, these ethnonational concerns are coupled with nurturing the link of language and economic development in order to create sustainable Welsh-speaking communities. While Welsh language skills become discursively promoted and reified as a tool, ideologies of ownership, belonging and responsibility co-occur. Therefore, despite language policy as a guiding and structural principle, the decision-making process about active language promotion and its usage in various domains is shifted to the lowest administrative level – the reified citizen-consumer as well as other social actors in business contexts.

As we have seen from the managers' talks and regulatory corporate policy practices, essentialist ideologies about Welsh become recontextualised from the political to the business field and have become amenable to commodification, in terms of capitalising on an authentic, bilingual corporate self and on bilingual employees as "entrepreneurial bundles of skills" (Urciuoli and LaDousa 2013: 185). The skills demanded by these companies now place language at the very centre. Employees' language skills are also twinned with presupposed expectations of a high-quality customer service. Minority language workers thus emerge as 'enterprising selves', to use Foucault's (2008) term: someone who is languaged into a flexible agent expected to adapt to the local context-sensitive requirements of the peripheral Welsh business site in a globalised economy. The bilingual citizen is languaged into a responsible consumer, which flags up the entanglement of entrepreneurialism and empowerment.

What this examination seems to suggest, then, is that language policy materialises as a terrain that delimits who is entitled to access language, when, where and to what end. These entitlements involve power relations, which, in Foucault's understanding, are not "intrinsically bad" and oppressive (Lemke 2002: 5). As this study has borne out, Welsh is indeed afforded more space by expanding endangerment discourses (see Duchêne and Heller 2007) to the workplace and the economy. New possibilities are instrumentalised and opened up for individuals to use Welsh and develop technologies of self to reclaim and capitalise on the language in new spaces. Yet, this empowerment comes at a price: first, the duty to take ownership for Welsh through participation and compliance with regulations and organisational values; and second,

the danger of being excluded from this discourse in the first place as a non-Welsh speaker on the Welsh labour market. In this vein, the promulgated voluntarism and freedom to choose to live your life through Welsh or English emerges as an empty signifier and as an oxymoronic “regulated freedom” (Cruikshank 1999: 44). As the analysis has borne out, the principle of empowerment operates on a continuum under the guise of democratic governance and materialises as a euphemism for implicit control and regulation (see also Allan 2013 for the notion of ‘masked control’).

Combining governmentality with a critical discursive approach to policy analysis moves our theorizations forward through an understanding that power is not dichotomous; it is neither built entirely from the ‘top-down’, nor from the ‘bottom-up’. Rather, power is recognized as flexible, re-created, and constantly negotiated; it is much more dispersed in that it encompasses the structure of the state and the locally variable agency of minority language workers as governable subjects, i.e. managers, employees, citizens and consumers. It is through this agency that a sense of self can be developed. In order to further address these complexities to the full, careful considerations should be made of the *de facto* agency, its conditionalities and historicities. This cannot be done without ethnographic and genealogical inquiries into how, under which conditions and with which resources the minority language workplace is constructed and lived under the persistent interaction of policy technologies, rationalities and local interactional practices in late modernity.

References

- Abell, Jackie & Greg Myers. 2008. Analyzing research interviews. In Ruth Wodak & Michal Krzyzanowski (eds.), *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences*, 145–161. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Allan, Kori. 2013. Skilling the self: The communicability of immigrants as flexible labour. In Alexandre Duchêne, Melissa Moyer & Celia Roberts (eds.), *Language, migration and social inequalities: A critical sociolinguistic perspective on institutions and work*, 56–78. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Barakos, Elisabeth. 2012. Language policy and planning in urban professional settings: Bilingualism in Cardiff businesses. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 13(3). 167–186.
- Barakos, Elisabeth. 2014. *The promotion of bilingualism in businesses in Wales. A critical language policy study*. Vienna, Austria: Vienna University PhD thesis.
- Blackledge, Adrian. 2002. What sort of people can look at a chicken and think dofednod?: Language, ideology and nationalism in public discourse. *Multilingua* 21. 197–226.

- Blackledge, Adrian & Angela Creese. 2010. *Multilingualism. A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Blackledge, Adrian & Angela Creese. 2012. Pride, profit and distinction. Negotiations across time and space in community language education. In Alexandre Duchêne & Monica Heller (eds.), *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit*, 116–141. New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 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.
- Briggs, Charles L. 1986. *Learning How to Ask. A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bröckling, Ulrich. 2003. You are not responsible for being down, but you are responsible for getting up. Über Empowerment. *Leviathan* 31(3). 323–344.
- Bröckling, Ulrich. 2007. *Das unternehmerische Selbst: Soziologie einer Subjektivierungsform*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Christof Mac Giolla, Diarmait 2005. Prestige planning and the Welsh language: Marketing, the consumer-citizen and language behaviour. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 6(1). 64–72.
- Christie, Pam. 2006. Changing regimes: governmentality and education policy in post-apartheid South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development* 26. 373–381.
- Clarke, John, Janet Newman, Nick Smith, Elizabeth Vidler & Louise Westmarland (eds.). 2007. *Creating citizen-consumers. Changing publics and changing public services*. London: Sage.
- Clarke, John, Janet Newman & Louise Westmarland. 2008. The antagonisms of choice: New Labour and the reform of public services. *Social Policy and Society* 7(2). 245–253.
- Coupland, Nikolas. 2010. Welsh linguistic landscapes ‘from above’ and ‘from below’. In Adam Jaworski & Crispin Thurlow (eds.), *Semiotic landscapes: Language, image, space*, 77–101. London: Continuum.
- Coupland, Nikolas. 2013. The centring and decentering of Wales and the Welsh language. In Sari Pietikäinen & Helen Kelly-Holmes (eds.), *Multilingualism and the periphery*, 133–153. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coupland, Nikolas & Hywel Bishop 2006. Ideologies of language and community in post-devolution Wales. In John Wilson & Karyn Stapleton (eds.), *Devolution and Identity*, 33–50. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Coupland, Nikolas, Hywel Bishop & Peter Garrett. 2003. Home truths: Globalisation and the iconising of Welsh in a Welsh-American newspaper. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 24(3). 153–177.
- Coupland, Nikolas, Hywel Bishop & Peter Garrett 2006. One Wales? Reassessing diversity in Welsh ethnolinguistic identification. *Contemporary Wales* 18(1). 1–27.
- Cruikshank, Barbara. 1999. *The will to empower. Democratic citizens an other subjects*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Da Silva, Emanuel & Monica Heller 2009. From protector to producer: The role of the State in the discursive shift from minority rights to economic development. *Language Policy* 8(2). 95–116.
- Dorostkar, Niku. 2014. *(Mehr-)Sprachigkeit und Lingualismus. Die diskursive Konstruktion von Sprache im Kontext nationaler und supranationaler Sprachenpolitik am Beispiel Österreichs*. Göttingen: Vienna University Press at V&R unipress.
- Duchêne, Alexandre. 2009. Marketing, management and performance: Multilingualism as commodity in a tourism call centre. *Language Policy* 8. 27–50.

- Duchêne, Alexandre & Alfonso Del Percio. 2014. Economic capitalization of linguistic diversity: Swiss multilingualism as a national profit? In Johann W. Unger, Michal. Krzyzanowski & Ruth Wodak (eds.), *Multilingual encounters in Europe's institutional spaces*, 75–101. London: Continuum.
- Duchêne, Alexandre & Monica Heller (eds.). 2007. *Discourses of endangerment: interest and ideology in the defense of languages*. Continuum: London.
- Duchêne, Alexandre & Ingrid Piller. 2011. Mehrsprachigkeit als Wirtschaftsgut: sprachliche Ideologien und Praktiken in der Tourismusindustrie. In Georg Kreis (ed.), *Babylon Europa: Zur europäischen Sprachlandschaft*, 135–157. Basel: Schwabe Verlag.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2000. *New labour, new language?* London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2010. *Critical discourse analysis. The critical study of language*. Harlow: Longman.
- Foucault, Michel. 1991. Governmentality. In Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon & Peter Miller (eds.), *The Foucault effect. Studies in governmentality with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*, 87–104. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault, Michel. 2008. *The birth of biopolitics: lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–79*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. A. Sheridan Smith. London: Allen Lane.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. The confession of the flesh. In Gordon, Colin (ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977 by Michel Foucault*, 194–228. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gal, Susan. 2012. Sociolinguistic regimes and the management of diversity. In Alexandre Duchêne & Monica Heller (eds.), *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit*, 22–42. New York: Routledge.
- Garrett, Peter. 2010. *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gordon, Colin. 1991. Governmental rationality: an introduction. In Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon & Peter Miller (eds.), *The Foucault effect. Studies in governmentality with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*, 1–51. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Grin, François, Claudio Sfreddo & François Vaillancourt. 2010. *The economics of the multilingual workplace*. New York: Routledge.
- Heller, Monica. 2010. Language as resource in the globalized new economy. In Nikolas Coupland (ed.), *The handbook of language and globalization*, 349–365. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heller, Monica & Alexandre Duchêne, 2012. Pride and profit. Changing discourses of language, capital and nation-state. In Alexandre Duchêne & Monica Heller (eds.), *Language in late capitalism. Pride and profit*, 1–21. New York: Routledge.
- Heller, Monica & Joan Pujolar. 2009. The political economy of texts: A case study in the structuration of tourism. *Sociolinguistic Studies* 3(2). 177–201.
- Heller, Monica, Joan Pujolar and Alexandre Duchêne. 2014. Linguistic commodification in tourism. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 18(4). 539–566.
- Hua, Zhu. 2014. Piecing together the 'workplace multilingualism' jigsaw puzzle. *Multilingua* 33(1–2). 233–242.
- Jaffe, Alexandra. 2007. Minority language movements. In Monica Heller (ed.), *Bilingualism: a social approach*, 50–70. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Jäger, Siegfried & Florentine Maier. 2009. Theoretical and methodological aspects of Foucauldian critical discourse analysis and dispositive analysis. In Ruth Wodak & Martin Reisigl (eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 34–61. London: Sage.
- Jaworski, Adam & Crispin Thurlow 2013. The (de-)centering spaces of airports: framing mobility and multilingualism. In Sari Pietikäinen & Helen Kelly-Holmes (eds.), *Multilingualism and the periphery*, 154–198. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, David C. 2011. Critical discourse analysis and the ethnography of language policy. *Critical Discourse Studies* 8(4). 267–279.
- Johnson, David C. 2013a. *Language policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johnson, David C. 2013b. Positioning the language policy arbiter: governmentality and footing in the school district of Philadelphia. In James W. Tollefson (ed.), *Language policies in education. Critical issues*, 116–136. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, David C. & Eric J. Johnson 2014. Power and agency in language policy appropriation. *Language Policy*. Published online.
- Johnson, David C. & Thomas Ricento 2013. Conceptual and theoretical perspectives in language planning and policy: Situating the ethnography of language policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (219). 7–21.
- Kauppinen, Kati. 2013. At an intersection of postfeminism and neoliberalism: A discourse analytical view of an international women's magazine. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines* 7(1). 82–99.
- Kelly-Holmes, Helen. 2013. 'Translation in progress'. Centralizing and peripheralizing tensions in the practices of commercial actors in minority language sites. In Sari Pietikäinen & Helen Kelly-Holmes (eds.), *Multilingualism and the periphery*, 118–132. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Krzyzanowski, Michal. 2014. "Discourse and communication in the European Union. A multi-focus perspective of critical discourse studies". In C. Hart & P. Cap (eds.), *Contemporary critical discourse studies*, 407–432. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Lampropoulou, Sofia & Greg Myers 2013. Stance-taking in interviews from the qualidata archive. *FQS Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung* 14(1). Art. 12.
- Lemke, Thomas. 2002. Foucault, governmentality, and critique. *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture & Society* 14(3). 49–64.
- Lemke, Jay L. 2003. Texts and discourses in the technologies of social organization. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: theory and interdisciplinarity*, 130–149. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mann, Robin. 2007. Negotiating the politics of language. Language learning and civic identity in Wales. *Ethnicities* 7(2). 208–224.
- Martin Rojo, Luisa. 2001. New developments in discourse analysis: Discourse as social practice. *Folia Linguistica* 35(1–2). 41–78.
- Mautner, Gerlinde. 2010. *Language and the market society. Critical reflections on discourse and dominance*. New York: Routledge.
- May, Stephen. 2000. Accomodating and resisting minority language policy: The case of Wales. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 3(2). 101–128.
- Milani, Tommaso. 2009. At the intersection between power and knowledge. *Journal of Language and Politics* 8(2). 287–304.
- Mooney, Gerry and Charlotte Williams 2006. Forging new 'ways of life'? Social policy and nation building in devolved Scotland and Wales. *Critical Social Policy* 26(3). 608–629.

- Musk, Nigel. 2006. *Performing Bilingualism in Wales with the Spotlight on Welsh. A Study of Language Policy and the Language Practices of Young People in Bilingual Education*. Linköping, Sweden: Linköping University PhD thesis.
- Musk, Nigel. 2010. Bilingualisms-in-practice at the meso level: an example from a bilingual school in Wales. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2010(202). 41–62.
- Myers, Greg. 2005. Applied linguistics and institutions of opinion. *Applied Linguistics* 26(4). 527–544.
- Office for National Statistics. 2012. 2011 Census: Key Statistics for Wales, March 2011. Office for National Statistics.
- Peltonen, Matti. 2004. From discourse to 'dispositif': Michel Foucault's two histories. *Historical Reflections/Réflexions Historiques* 30 (2). 205–219.
- Pennycook, Alastair. 2006. Postmodernism in Language Policy. In Thomas Ricento (ed.), *An introduction to language policy. Theory and method*, 60–76. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Pertot, Susanna, Tom M. S. Priestly & Colin H. Williams (eds.). 2009. *Rights, promotion and integration issues for minority languages in Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Puigdevall i Serralvo, Maite. 2005. *The challenges of language planning in the private sector: Welsh and Catalan perspectives*. Cardiff, Wales: Cardiff University PhD thesis.
- Reisigl, Martin. 2011. Grundzüge der Wiener Kritischen Diskursanalyse. In Reiner Keller, Andreas Hirsland, Werner Schneider & Willy Viehöver (eds.), *Handbuch Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse. Theorien und Methoden*, 459–490. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Reisigl, Martin & Ruth Wodak 2009. The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 87–121. London: Sage.
- Robertson, Roland. 1995. Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity. In Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash & Roland Robertson (eds.), *Global modernities*, 25–44. London: Sage.
- Selleck, Charlotte. 2013. Inclusive policy and exclusionary practice in secondary education in Wales. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16(1). 20–41.
- Silverman, David. 2006. *Interpreting qualitative data. Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction*. London: Sage.
- Unger, Johann Wolfgang. 2013. *The discursive construction of the Scots language. Education, politics and everyday life*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Urciuoli, Bonnie. 2008. Skills and selves in the new workplace. *American Ethnologist* 35(2). 211–228.
- Urciuoli, Bonnie & Chaise LaDousa. 2013. Language management/labor. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42(1). 175–190.
- Urla, Jacqueline. 2012. Total quality language revival. In Alexandre Duchêne & Monica Heller (eds.), *Language in late capitalism. Pride and profit*, 73–92. New York: Routledge.
- Urry, John. 2005. The 'consuming' of place. In Adam Jaworski & Annette Pritchard (eds.), *Discourse, communication and tourism*, 19–27. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 2000. On the analysis of parliamentary debates on immigration. In M. Reisigl & R. Wodak (eds.), *The Semiotics of racism. Approaches in critical discourse analysis*, 85–104. Wien: Passagen-Verlag.
- Walters, William. 2012. *Governmentality. Critical encounters*. London: Routledge.

- Welsh Assembly Government. 2003. *Iaith Pawb. A National Action Plan for a Bilingual Wales*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.
- Welsh Assembly Government. 2010. *Economic Renewal: A new direction*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.
- Welsh Government. 2012. *A living language: A language for living. Welsh Language Strategy 2012-17*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.
- Welsh Language Commissioner. 2013. *Making Welsh your business*. Cardiff: Welsh Language Commissioner.
- Welsh Language Commissioner. 2014. 2011 Census: results and changes since 2001. <http://www.comisiynyddygyraeg.org> (accessed 17 December, 2014).
- Williams, Colin H. 2004. *Iaith Pawb: The doctrine of plenary inclusion*. *Contemporary Wales* 17. 1–27.
- Williams, Colin H. 2010. From act to action in Wales. In Delyth Morris (ed.), *Welsh in the twenty-first century*, 36–60. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Williams, Colin H. 2013. *Minority language promotion, protection and regulation: The mask of piety*. Houndsmill: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Williams, Glyn & Morris, Delyth. 2000. *Language planning and language use: Welsh in a global age*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2006. Linguistic analyses in language policies. In Thomas Ricento (ed.), *An introduction to language policy: theory and method*, 170–193. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2008. Introduction: discourse studies – important concepts and terms. In Ruth Wodak & Michal Krzyżanowski (eds.), *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences*, 1–29. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2009. *The discourse of politics in action. Politics as usual*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2011. Complex texts: analysing, understanding, explaining and interpreting meanings. *Discourse Studies* 13(5). 623–633.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2012. Language, power and identity. *Language Teaching* 45(2). 215–233.
- Wodak, Ruth & Michael Meyer (eds.). 2009. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.