Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (2010), **30**, 211–227.
© Cambridge University Press, 2010, 0267-1905/10 $16.00
doi:10.1017/S0267190510000127

Language Socialization in the Workplace

Celia Roberts

This survey article looks first at the changing demands of the workplace in a globalized economy. The new work order creates a new word order, and the workforce has become a "wordforce" (Heller, in press) with new genres of language and communication. These changes have taken place at a time when global flows of people, from less wealthy and secure societies to more wealthy and secure ones, have created multilingual workplaces. Both sets of changes challenge the traditional notion of second language socialization, and this is the focus of the next section. The workplace represents a complex, dynamic setting where migrants experience a double socialization: into the hybrid discourses of the workplace, which all newcomers experience, and into the specific language and cultural practices that realize these discourses. The new language requirements of the workplace produce for migrant workers and professionals a "linguistic penalty" (Roberts & Campbell, 2006) since the communicative demands of the selection process may be greater than those of the job itself. The last section of the article is concerned with language socialization in multilingual settings where language socialization into the dominant language is only part of the story. There is a contrast between the low status multilingualism of migrant workers, and staff in globalized and international organizations who are being socialized into new lingua franca interaction. The article concludes with an example of how the complex linguistic and technical environment of a high-tech multilingual company produces radically different conditions for language socialization which challenge how this notion can be used in the 21st century.

INTRODUCTION

The notion of the workplace as a site where language socialization takes place is becoming increasingly complex and contested. The reasons for this include the way in which boundaries between work and other aspects of social life become problematic, the changing nature of work itself, and the continuing changes in the communicative environment at work. What counts as a workplace or a location for preparing for work is not easy to define. The boundaries between education and work are no longer patrolled by time, with a period of formal education leading seamlessly to work. People move back from work to education, do internships as part of formal education, and on- and off-site training and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

continuous professional development are routine (Duff, 2008; Vickers, 2007). Similarly, the home is often now the workplace as teleworking and training become common. Also, working parents socialize their children into work practices in their narratives of what happened at the office (Paugh, 2005). Language socialization in the workplace is, therefore, a combination of both formal and informal learning (Scollon & Scollon, 1995) and cannot be readily separated off from the professional socialization and training that takes place outside of the formal, physical workplace.

Work itself has also radically changed. The collapse of much traditional manufacturing in western societies, the "new work order" (Gee, Hull, & Lankshear, 1996; Hull, 1997), and new technologies have had a paradoxical effect on our understanding of the workplace as a key site for language socialization. On the one hand, the new work order has led to a "new word order" (Farrell, 2001, p. 57; Iedema, & Scheeres, 2003). The workforce has become a "wordforce" (Heller, in press) which manufactures talk and texts. Communications has become the most demanded competence in an increasingly competence-driven world (Matthewman, 1996). On the other hand, the new technologies that have helped to create the new work order have refocused linguists on the multimodality of everyday activities. Language interacts with the texts and materialities of these new technologies which themselves facilitate new forms of language (Goodwin 1995; Heath & vom Lehn, 2008; Kleifgen, 2001).

Changes in the nature of work itself have occurred at much the same time as global flows of people have transformed employment. While the physical location of some workplaces has led to a particular ethnolinguistic group tending to be employed over others, in large urban centers, many organizations are characterized by "superdiversity" (Vertoveç, 2007, p. 1024) where no single ethnic group stands out but where employees are from many different backgrounds. Along with new technologies, globalization challenges traditional notions of community as homogeneous or geographically placed. A more dynamic view of community as heterogeneous and plural better represents living and working in the city. Similarly recent theorizing about space, language, and culture has raised questions about language choice and mix (Blommaert, Collins, & Slembrouck, 2005a). Rather than language practices being determined unproblematically by specific domains, with, for example, a particular language used in one domain rather than another, they are highly situated and dependent upon the context of the particular interaction and the mutual resources of the speakers (Blommaert, 2007; Blommaert, Collins, & Slembrouck, 2005b; Duff, 2005). So within a workplace, there may be a constant tension between "interactional regimes" (Blommaert et al., 2005b, p. 208) and the more creative and hybrid language practices of individuals in particular contexts.

Current theories on language and globalization (Blommaert et al., 2005a) also raise questions about the notion of language socialization in the workplace. The foundational studies on language socialization took place in small-scale societies where the notion of a community was relatively stable. The young child or novice gradually learned how to use language and learned through language how to conduct themselves within this relatively homogeneous community. More recent research has extended these studies to include the life span and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

complex, heterogeneous societies where the idea of single, fixed communities and a set of established linguistic standards and practices no longer obtain (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002). The originators of language socialization theory, Ochs and Schieffelin (1983; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986) have themselves played a leading role in criticizing any static notion of socialization into a community, the stereotypes such research can produce, and the possible underplaying of more general or universal practices. For example, Ochs wrote the following:

> Language socialization research is aware that generalizations of this sort have several undesirable effects: for one thing, cultures are essentialized, and variation in communicative practices within communities is under-emphasized. . . . Our accounts also seem like fixed cameos, members and communities enslaved by convention and frozen in time rather than fluid and changing over a course of a generation, a life and even a single encounter. . . . [W]e have tended to over-emphasize the unique communicative configurations of particular communities and underspecify over-arching, possible universal, communicative and social practices that may facilitate socialization into multiple communities and transnational life worlds. (Ochs, 2000, p. 231)

Ochs also stressed that socialization is a two-way street with more or less experienced members learning from each other. This more dynamic and transformative notion of language socialization, along with responses to Ochs's critique, are illustrated in the following examples.

Despite the expansion of studies on lifelong and "lifewide language socialization" (Duff, 2008, p. 258), there is still only a rather meagre trickle of workplace and professional socialization research. In Garrett and Baquedano-López's (2002) introduction to their review, looking back in 2002 over the previous 16 years, only 5 of the 48 studies they referenced related to workplace and professional socialization. One reason for this is that the methodology used in such studies is hard to carry out in workplaces. The core methodological features are that the research is ethnographic, holistic, longitudinal, and based on naturally occurring data. Such studies also require evidence of learning, both in terms of cognition and social interaction. Even in longitudinal studies, research on the shop floor or the office cannot readily capture the changes in how activities are accomplished over time. Another factor is that access to workplaces to carry out ethnographic studies is not easy to obtain, often because researchers are assumed to be either spies or troublemakers. Thus, many studies of language use in the workplace are connected to language and cultural training, since this may be the only way in which employers are willing to offer their organization as a field site for research. Teachers can act as ethnographers, collecting data from the workplace to produce research-based teaching materials.

Given the paucity of relevant research in the workplace, this review takes a rather elastic definition of language socialization research so that the workplace theme can be adequately discussed. It includes studies of socialization in formal off-site research examples of socialization based on ethnographic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interviews rather than naturally occurring data. It also includes examples of second language use where the environment creates conditions for socialization, even though there is no systematic evidence collected of language learning taking place over time.

THE WORKPLACE AS A SITE OF SOCIALIZATION

The "interactional regimes" (Blommaert et al., 2005b) of the workplace make it a site where everyone at some stage is new to the environment and has to be socialized into its particular linguistic and cultural environment. This socialization can be seen as consisting of three parts: corporate or institutional discourses, professional discourses, and the social or personal aspects of the workplace (Roberts & Sarangi, 1999). The communities of practice model (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998) have traced the gradual process of becoming a full participant in the workplace where there is not only one overarching community of practice but also multiple local communities depending on the particular sites of engagement that employees are subject to or contribute to creating.

Corporate discourses differ (and are dynamic) in different parts of the world but since virtually all management training resources are produced in the West (Jack, 2009; Poncini, 2003), this hegemonic discourse is what Scollon and Scollon (1995) have called "the Utilitarian Discourse system." (p. 107) It is empirical, deductive, individualistic, egalitarian, and institutionally sanctioned. New employees are inducted either formally or informally into the unique forms of text and talk, and the particular way things are done and categorized in any one institution (Iedema, 2003; Mawer, 1999).

Socialization into professional discourse occurs in formal training contexts both outside the workplace and within it (Roberts & Sarangi, 1999). Several studies have charted the processes of shaping a professional identity through acquiring new discourses and values in healthcare, scientific, legal, and vocational settings. Erickson (1999), in medicine, and Arakelian (2009), in nursing, documented how relative novices learn to be professional learners in the workplace. Hobbs (2004) analyzed how progress (treatment) notes are used in medical socialization. Mertz (2007) studied the novice law student socialization through Socratic dialogue and the reworking of legal texts in different contexts. Similarly, Jacoby (1998) looked at how adults master new registers and genres in the process of becoming physicists, and Vickers (2007) documented the processes of becoming a core member of an engineering team through observation, scaffolding, ridicule, and opportunities to talk through design processes.

In a very different setting, the African American cosmetology school, Jacobs-Huey (2003) charted how students become so-called hair experts. Like the student lawyers in Mertz's (2007) study, role-play is a key method for developing the scripts of the new profession and being evaluated on their competence in using them. One element of these scripts is the use of metaphors and proverbs socializing the apprentices "into shared moral ideologies and behaviour" (Jacobs-Huey, 2003, p. 294). Another element is the use of *metacommunication,* the talk about talk, when a student breaches the prescribed linguistic code. So despite the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

constant changes in workplace practices noted in the following paragraphs, the apprenticeship model of learning to become expert remains, and notions of what constitutes professionalism continue to be relatively stable, as part of the so-called *habitus* of a particular profession (Bourdieu, 1991).

The third aspect of workplace socialization relates to the personal and social discourses at work. As language work (talk and text as institutionalized tasks in the workplace) takes on an increasingly central role, the interrelationship of professional and personal or social discourses becomes ever more key. This has always been the case with the caring professions, but now that talk is work in call centers, shop floor team meetings, and workplace training sessions, the presentation of self is part of most people's working skills and requires an assertive persona that is by no means a cultural universal (Katz, 2000; see later in this article for how this plays out in terms of power and inequality). The Wellington Language in the Workplace project in New Zealand has made a particular study of politeness and humor in the relational work done within the contexts of power in organizational life (Holmes, 2005; Holmes & Stubbe, 2003; Daly, Holmes, Newton, & Stubbe, 2004; see also, in Australia, Willing, 1997). Workplace studies in Sweden (Gunnarsson, 2009) have shown how migrant workers and professionals have learned to use humor and developed high levels of pragmatic competence in this area. This has involved not only a linguistic view of appropriateness but also adaption to the flattened hierarchies of the Swedish workplace (Andersson, 2009; Nelson & Andersson, 2005, as cited in Gunnarsson, 2009).

The informal socialization of office workers (Li, 2000) and care workers (Duff, Wong, & Early, 2000) illustrate the significance of pragmatic and social skills in the necessary face work of daily interactions in the workplace. Li's case study traced the experience of a Chinese woman, Ming, from the employment preparation course into the workplace as a filing clerk in a U.S. medical equipment company. It was only in the workplace that her "indirect communicative style" (p. 67), particularly realized in how she made requests, brought along from her early socialization and work experience in China, changed to a more assertive style as she faced up to the unacceptable behavior of local American office workers. This longitudinal study goes beyond the pragmatics of making requests to wider issues of self-presentation and identity. It also explored the mix of the "new American way" of requesting: "directly, truthful and things a little bit sweeter," as Ming noted in her diary (p. 75) with the inductive way of making requests from her early habitus. Her new assertiveness, in which she requested coworkers to be more polite, exemplifies the transformative nature of language socialization in which the so-called novices become experts in managing the local politics of the office and contribute to changing the communicative environment.

In their study of migrant workers training to become long-term resident care aides, Duff et al. (2000) described a similar gap between formal training and informal socialization in the workplace. The more formal and technically specific focus in the English language training program did not prepare the trainees for the emotional labor of communicating with residents with a wide range of English language competence (including no English at all) and often with mental and linguistic abilities impaired by the aging process. Affective, personal, and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

social modes of talk and bodily language were more important in the healthcare aide jobs than accurate English grammar or medical terms.

These three aspects of workplace language socialization—corporate, professional, and social or personal—interact to produce new identities with new ways of being, feeling, and articulating the self in new moral worlds. These changes have always been central to the study of language socialization. In the workplace these identities are collaborative achievements (Ochs, 1993) within organizations, in professional socialization, and in the context of gendered migration (Holmes, 2006; Katz, 2000; Gunnarsson, 2009).

THE "NEW WORK ORDER"

While some aspects of working life remain stable, the globalized economy and working practices produced by the rapid expansion of new technologies has led to a "new work order" (Gee et al., 1996). This order is supported by the discourses of what have become known as "new capitalism" or "fast capitalism." The need to constantly change products and customize them to survive in the globalized marketplace has led to a restructuring of the workplace, which, in turn, has created new language and literacy demands that affect even the low-paid worker. These demands arise from an increased use of technologies, more multitasking at all levels, more flexibility required of workers as hierarchical structures are flattened, and, generally, a more "textualised workplace" (Iedema & Scheeres, 2003, p. 336) in which there is increasing reliance on written instructions and Web-based materials, so both new and well-established employees have had to be socialized into these new practices (Hull, 1997). Many studies of workplaces have shown how routine activities are mediated by digital technologies (Goodwin, 1995; Heath & vom Lehn, 2008; Hindmarsh, Heath, & Fraser, 2006; Lemke 2002; Suchman, 1992).

The new work order has created a "new word order" (Farrell, 2001) or "wordforce" (Heller, in press). There are new work genres, and new work and professional identities are constructed and negotiated through talk on the shop floor (Hull, 1997; Iedema & Scheeres, 2003; Kleifgen, 2001); in health settings (Cook-Gumperz & Messerman, 1999; Greatbatch, Luff, Heath, & Campion, 1993); and in call centers (Budach, Roy, & Heller, 2003; Cameron, 2000; Friginal, 2009a, 2009b; Heller 2002; Roy 2003) where there is a constant tension between the highly routinized scripts of interaction and the emotional labor of dealing on a daily basis with often irate or frustrated customers and being expected to adapt to their style of communicating.

The globalized economy is paralleled by the global movements of people. "Superdiversity" (Vertoveç, 2007) is the norm in most large cities, and few places in the world remain untouched by migration or the effects of the diaspora, as the studies by Li (2000) and Duff et al. (2000) described earlier show. Global flows of people to more wealthy and secure societies have created workplaces where staff are bilingual or often multilingual. However, the dominant language of the nation state produces and enforces a linguistic capital that serves to maintain and reproduce linguistic and ethnic inequalities. Migration and mobility create

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the need for "double socialization" (Li, 2000, p. 61) into the workplace. So, in addition to the socialization processes that all new employees face, relative newcomers are expected to learn to participate in the linguistic and cultural practices of work in a new country.

The extensive literature on workplace language and cultural awareness training demonstrates the amount of retraining and more formal socialization expected of the migrant and international worker and professional (Belfiore, 1993; G. Bell, 2003; J. Bell, 1995; Goldstein, 1993; Grünhage-Monetti, Halewijn, & Holland, 2003; Hawthorne, 1997; Holmes, 2000; Mawer, 1999; O'Neill & Gish, 2001; Roberts, Davies, & Jupp, 1992;). Some of this training has been questioned as being too narrow (Goldstein, 1997) or not sufficiently critical of the positioning of migrant workers within the new work order (Farrell, 2000). Some of these evaluation studies of language training take a wider and more ethnographic perspective, seeing the "workplace as the curriculum" (Mawer, 1999). However, few of them are framed by theories of second language socialization or examine the "exposure to similar communicative experiences in institutionalized networks of relationships" that contribute to the production of "shared culture and shared inferential practices" (Gumperz, 1997, p. 15).

This "double socialization" and the shift to language work in the new work order produce new regimes of inequality that, despite the relative stability of some work practices, as noted earlier, make language socialization in the workplace problematic. First, as McCall (2003) discussed, there is a linguistically divided labor market, similar in many ways to the traditional two-tier labor market. Many low-paid, so-called entry-level jobs are insecure, isolated, in poor and noisy conditions, and organized into ethnic work units (Campbell & Roberts, 2007; Goldstein, 1997; Gunnarsson, 2009; Roberts et al., 1992; Waldinger & Lichter, 2003). These are often the only jobs that minority ethnic workers, particularly relatively new arrivals, whatever their educational background, can obtain. Under these conditions, there is little opportunity to be socialized into the dominant language. Indeed, as McCall (2003) argued, those areas where there is relatively little talk, or certainly little talk in the majority language of the organization, are the areas where there is little power: "In the workplace power is exercised precisely in those areas where language is most intense" (p. 249). Goldstein's study of female Portuguese factory workers in Toronto illustrated how the assembly line workers chose to speak Portuguese on the line to assert their ethnic solidarity and so both in terms of place and language were isolated from the "intense" areas of English language work. Even non-Portuguese-speaking migrant workers were socialized into speaking Portuguese on the assembly lines (Goldstein, 1997).

Second, unlike the usually supportive conditions for early language socialization, second language socialization in the workplace often occurs in a relatively hostile environment, (Katz, 2000; Li, 2000; Mawer, 1999; Roberts et al., 1992). Misunderstandings, racist comments, and the deliberate noncontact of some groups in relation to others both limit opportunities for socialization and actively construct resistances to it. However, some recent studies present an alternative view (Andersson, 2009; Duff et al., 2000, described earlier). Andersson's study in a Swedish hospital setting documented the use of communication strategies

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and humor and found that the local Swedish staff were patient listeners. Even when second language speakers had to use several communication strategies as they struggled to convey their intent, the local staff allowed them to finish their turn at talk.

Third, the language and literacy demands of the new work order, and its associated ideologies, can serve to exclude bilingual and multilingual workers even when they are considered expert speakers of the dominant language in their country of origin or in the multilingual community in which they grew up or now reside (Blommaert, 2007). Expertise, Blommaert argued, is relative. A speaker's use of English perceived as expert in, for example, Nigeria or the Philippines is downgraded to limited or inappropriate in the specific contexts and genres of the workplace in the new country. Hull (1997) and Katz (2000) described the linguistic and performance demands of multilingual workers in high-tech Silicon Valley companies in California. A similarly assertive stance was required of linguistic minority nurses retraining in the United Kingdom whose English was expert in their own country but rated as inappropriate in British hospitals (Arakelian, 2009).

Several studies in Canada have shown how speakers of English or French who were considered experts, linguistically, within their own communities can be disadvantaged by dominant norms and workplace ideologies. In their studies of francaphone novice nurses in Quebec, Parks and Maguire (1999) found that the nursing reports and care plans they had been taught to produce were different from the conventional practices in both French- and English-speaking hospitals. Bilingual call workers in French Ontario also found they were excluded from the better-paid bilingual jobs because of the commodification, standardization, and codification of the dominant language, French. The ideology of a pure standard French, which was the stated call centers' requirement, excluded local vernacular French speakers from the better-paid bilingual worker jobs. Their French did not meet this new standard of bilingualism, and so, despite being bilingual, they were hired as English monolingual speakers (Roy, 2003; Budach et al., 2003). The effect of globalization in the new international call centers has local, exclusionary repercussions, even for bilingual and multilingual speakers and shows that there is a linguistic marketplace (Bourdieu, 1991; McCall, 2003) that determines what counts as linguistic capital and sets the standards for language socialization.

THE "LINGUISTIC PENALTY"

The call center studies in Canada and the United Kingdom document how the corporate discourses of the new work order impose a "linguistic penalty" (Roberts & Campbell, 2006, p. 1) on those who do not meet their standards of language and communicative competence. Early work on gatekeeping encounters in linguistically diverse societies established the gap between the sociolinguistic demands of the selection and assessment processes and those of the workplace (Brindley, 1994; Gumperz, Jupp, & Roberts, 1979; Mawer & Field, 1995; McNamara, 1997; Roberts et al., 1992). More recently, equal opportunity commitments and the widespread use of competency-based criteria in recruitment and training have

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

done little to narrow the gap. The socialization required to be successful in the selection interview or assessment outstrips the language and interactional demands of the job or assesses language and communication skills that are not relevant to the job (Roberts & Campbell, 2006). On the analogy of the ethnic penalty, which describes the discrimination experienced by black and minority ethnic groups (Heath & Cheung, 2007), there is a linguistic penalty that excludes on the basis of language. (Other research suggests that the selection interview does not assess accurately for the interactional demands of the job, e.g., Friginal, 2009a, but this is outside the scope of this article.)

A recent study has shown that job interviews for low-paid, entry-level jobs in the United Kingdom require an astute performance by candidates that combines blending institutional, professional, and personal modes of discourse with a standard narrative structure (Campbell & Roberts, 2007; Roberts & Campbell, 2006). Candidates' responses also have to be what Iedema (2003) termed *bureaucratically processable*. In other words, they have to "fit their stories into boxes" (Roberts & Campbell, 2005, p. 45). The formal language socialization through language training and work preparation courses is far removed from the competency-based interview, which itself is distant from those areas of work, away from the language-intense areas, where linguistic minorities and relatively new arrivals are routinely positioned. Language socialization for entry into reasonably secure, if low-paid, work is a bigger hurdle than language socialization within the workplace itself.

A follow-up study (Roberts, Campbell, & Robinson, 2008) looked at the role of promotion interviews in contributing to what Phillips (2003) has called the snowy peaks of senior management: the fact that most companies had only white majority group members at the top. This study showed that the gradual process of socialization into management discourses was essential to success at the promotion interview. Access to informal interactional networks helped those from minorities to be socialized into what Roberts et. al (2008) called *talking like a manager*. However, there were tensions and struggles for those considering promotion since they were expected to be "authentic" members of the shop floor community. Going for promotion was seen as a double betrayal of this community and of their own ethnic group. So language socialization for promotion to management in this mosaic of affiliations and tensions is not a straightforward matter of gradual participation in a new community of practice.

Socialization into the competences of the promotion interview depended upon learning its communicative and rhetorical styles. The overriding orientation was to the self as a project, always self-aware and self-reflecting for the benefit of the organization the candidate aspired to be a manager in. Candidates born and educated abroad were less likely to produce this self, a synthesis of the utilitarian discourse of claims and evidence with euphemized feelings and informality. This group of candidates tended to be judged as either too emotional or too impersonal, relying on a generalized assertive style that did not blend the hybrid discourses of the selection interview.

Studies carried out on licensing and membership examinations for international medical graduates form part of a wider literature on this group (Erickson & Rittenburg, 1987; Spike, 2006). These studies of high-stakes gatekeeping

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

encounters involving well-qualified professionals represent challenges that are broadly similar, in terms of communicative and rhetorical styles, to the job interviews for low-paid work (McNamara, 1997; Sarangi & Roberts, 2002). Mistica, Baldwin, Cordella, and Musgrave (2008) discussed how the communication skills of interacting with patients and conveying medical information accurately in simulated consultations correlated with overall final grades in the Australian context. Such simulations are widely used in health contexts for assessments. Whereas role-play and simulations are used in educational contexts as part of professional socialization, as discussed earlier, when used for assessment and selection they raise some awkward questions. Simulation requires several abilities in addition to communicative and rhetorical competences: the ability to manage both the outer performance and inner psychological experience of being assessed; the ability to manage the frame ambiguity of both the consultation and the assessment (Seale, Butler, Hutchby, Kinnersley, & Rollnick, 2007); and for international medical graduates, the "double consciousness" (E. L. Bell, 1990, p. 461) of compartmentalizing the personal and private spheres of their life and yet using personal qualities such as empathy in the consultation. These studies of the linguistic penalty in access to training, employment, and promotion show that language socialization into and in the workplace is problematic. There are different versions of the self required at different stages of the employment process as well as resistances and tensions within the apprenticeship period.

SOCIALIZATION INTO THE MULTILINGUAL WORKPLACE

The double socialization into a workplace officially dominated by the state or majority language implies that learning the practices of the workplace would go hand in hand with majority language socialization. However, studies have shown that for many workers, contact was most frequent either with those who shared a first language other than that of the majority or with speakers with very different styles and varieties of this majority language (Clyne, 1994, 2003; Day, 1992; Duff et al., 2000; Goldstein, 1997; Jupp, Roberts, & Cook-Gumperz, 1982). Since workplace language policies, work teams, and the linguistic backgrounds of those employed are all dependent on economic and structural factors, the communicative environment rarely remains stable. This raises the question of what linguistic communities of practice newcomers are socialized into, the extent to which such communities change over time, and the sociopolitical realities on the ground that cause these changes. For example, in a food factory in a small town in the United Kingdom, successive groups of workers, first from Pakistan, then Kurdish workers from Iraq and Turkey, and more recently from Eastern Europe, as well as the company's restructuring meant that changes in the linguistic makeup of the food-processing lines outstripped the opportunities for socialization into English, the official language and the language of opportunity, or indeed into any one language of the processing line (Roberts et al., 2008).

Although the globalized economy and the rhetoric of multilingualism used in corporate discourse would appear to imply that those who are multilingual

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

are assets to the organization, the evidence is rather mixed. The literature suggests that there is a persistent gap between the official rhetoric of institutions and the policies on the ground and the linguistic ideology that underpins both of them, either explicitly or implicitly. Heller and Roy have shown that the so-called purity of the standard French required in call centers was at odds with the celebratory rhetoric around local vernacular French (Heller, 2002; Roy, 2003).Similarly, Duchêne (2009) described the commodification of multilingualism in a call center. His ongoing work in a Swiss international airport has shown the structuring work that linguistic ideologies do in positioning workers with the wrong kind of multilingualism. The neoliberal discourse that promotes the hiring of those with multilingual resources does not work through into status and pay. Even baggage handlers are doing language work. They are listed as interpreters and translators and expected to do language work as part of their duties. However, there is no recognition of this in terms of salary or official status (Duchêne). In such contexts, unofficial language policy and language socialization tend to reinforce unequal boundaries between different types of language workers and the languages they speak. The use of a language other than the state or majority languages, while functional and indeed of direct benefit to the organization, does not grant its user any more power than if they were monolinguals.

Other studies of socialization into the multilingual workplace are in contexts where bilingualism, multilingualism, and lingua franca usage (Firth, 1996) are ratified as functional and statusful practices; for example, international business negotiations and the interaction between what are termed *bilingual professionals* (Day & Wagner, 2007). These contexts contrast in several ways with workplaces discussed earlier. Firstly, they are not ethnically and linguistically stratified but relate to activities where participants have more or less equal status or valued skills, such as the international professional sportswoman or man in the Netherlands (Kellerman et al., 2005). Second, they are not tied to a particular geographic area. Third, and arising from the first two, language socialization in these contexts is a matter of choice dependent on the particular activity (Day & Wagner, 2007). Choices relate to choice of linguistic code both for the whole activity and in code-switching within it (Mondada, 2004; Poncini, 2003; Rasmussen & Wagner, 2002) to create a new "bilingual interactional order" (Day & Wagner; Mondada, p. 19). This order is not created in terms of difficulties or deficiencies in communication but as a pragmatic response to the functional requirements of the workplace event.

Studies of the use of English as a lingua franca in international domains demonstrate a similar defocusing of the problematics of language differences. Firth (1995, 1996) showed that interactants, in Ochs's (2000) terms, rely on "over-arching, possible universal, communicative and social practices" (p. 232), which underplay cultural differences, play up orderliness across these differences and so "facilitate socialization into multiple communities and transnational life worlds" (Ochs, 2000; p. 232). Similarly, other lingua franca studies have shown how the pragmatic norms of the speakers' first language give way to new more informal norms (Rasmussen, 1998; Wagner, 1995), suggestive of a new "lingua franca interaction" (Day & Wagner, 2007, p. 398).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CONCLUSION

Micro-interactional studies like these document the complex and dynamic use of strategic choices in language code and style shifting, which suggest that, as workplaces become increasingly multilingual, so also will the process of language socialization. The study of a multilingual circuit-board manufacturing plant in California's Silicon Valley (Kleifgen, 2001) highlighted many of the themes in this overview and will be used, by way of a conclusion, to draw them together. In particular, Kleifgen's micro-interactional analysis confirmed the highly situated and creative use of language that is part of the linguistic environment of such high-tech multilingual work spaces (Kleifgen; Kleifgen & Frenz-Belkin, 1997).

This high-tech manufacturing plant is structured around natural teams in which workers are encouraged to organize their own work teams and use their shared language and cultural understanding to meet the production demands of the company. The data example analyzed was of a problem-solving task involving a Vietnamese supervisor and a machine operator. Kleifgen (2001) documented how they used what she termed a stripped-down version of Vietnamese, together with some code-switching into English to accomplish the troubleshooting task. This was not a simplified or pidginized version of Vietnamese but one influenced by American English styles of talking. The conventional Vietnamese personal references and honorifics were replaced by a more direct mode of talk that produced a symmetrical interaction to accomplish the task. As a solution to the problem was reached, the supervisor shifted back to forms that indexed more asymmetry, but this was done by using more directives rather than Vietnamese obligatory address systems. In this way, the interactants drew on language and interactional norms from two contrasting communicative systems to develop "a creative hybrid, showing remarkable social and linguistic adaption to the norms and constraints of the American workplace" (Kleifgen, p. 302).

This study illustrates many of the themes of this overview of language socialization in the workplace, even though it is a snapshot of language use rather than a longitudinal study of learning. It shows the changing and transformative potential of language use and the communicative environment (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002). Language socialization in multilingual workplaces can produce creative, hybrid interaction, new bilingual interactional orders, and changes in the behavior of majority speakers. These changes relate to changing cultural conventions and habitus and new identities and not just to linguistic competence. Another theme of Kleifgen's (2001) study relates to how language socialization is not only about acquiring new language but also about how and when to use different languages and styles in the microchoices and fleeting interpretive moments of interaction.

The Silicon Valley company exemplifies the new work order with its flattened hierarchies and where language socialization is in part mediated by the new technologies. The study also implicitly raises questions about the relationship between face work, language choice, and contexts of power: the extent to which ethnic work units are locally supportive and in the interests of management, but

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

also present fewer opportunities of socialization into the language and territories of power within the workplace.

This overview also reflects the current mix of old and new conditions for language socialization. In some settings, multilingualism is a recognized professional asset; in others, it is exploited without giving additional status and remuneration. In many contexts where monolingual policy and practices are enforced, language socialization into the majority language is the only route to more secure and well-paid work. And in these settings, the linguistic penalty experienced by many migrant workers is greater in gaining access to work than it is in the workplace itself.

The overarching context of the workplace determines the conditions for language socialization and the form it takes. Corporate and institutional priorities, ideologies and structures, the values and practices of different professions, and the particular social climate of the local work group construct these conditions and their dynamics. Language socialization, together with the individual agency of workers and apprentice professionals, is the consequence of these conditions. But what it will consist of in terms of language mix, switch, and shift within multimodal practices remains still relatively uncharted research territory. Future research will need to map this territory, with micro-analysis of the local contexts of production, as well as more long-term studies of what constitutes language socialization in the complex communicative environments and requirements of the 21st-century workplace.

REFERENCES

Andersson, H. (2009). *Intercultural communication at a Swedish hospital: Case studies of second language speakers in the workplace*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Uppsala, Uppsala, Sweden.

Arakelian, C. (2009). Professional training: Creating intercultural space in multi-ethnic workplaces. In A. Feng, M. Byram, & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Becoming interculturally competent through education and training*(pp. 174–192). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Belfiore, M. (1993.) The changing world of work. *TESLTalk, 21*, 2–20.

Bell, E. L. (1990). The bicultural life experience of career-oriented black women [Special issue: *The Career and Life Experiences of Black Professionals*]. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 11*, 459–477.

Bell, G. (2003). Back to school: Learning practices in a job retraining programme. In R. Bayley & S. Schecter, (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 251 – 268). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bell, J. (1995). Canadian experiences of training linguistically diverse populations for the workplace. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics,18*, 35–51.

Blommaert, J., Collins, J., & Slembrouck, S. (2005a). Spaces of multilingualism. *Language and Communication, 25*, 197–216.

Blommaert, J., Collins, J., & Slembrouck, S. (2005b). Polycentricity and interactional regimes in "global neighborhoods." *Ethnography, 6*, 205–235.

Blommaert, J. (2007). Sociolinguistics and discourse analysis: Orders of indexicality and polycentricity. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 2*, 115–130.

Brindley, G. (1994). Competency-based assessment in second language programmes: Some issues and questions. *Prospect, 9*, 41–55.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Budach, G., Roy, S., & Heller, M. (2003). Community and commodity in French Ontario. *Language and Society, 32*, 603–627.
Cameron, D. (2000). *Good to talk? Living and working in a communication culture*. London: Sage.
Campbell, S., & Roberts, C. (2007). Migration, ethnicity, and competing discourses in the job interview: Synthesizing the institutional and the personal. *Discourse and Society, 18*, 243–272.
Clyne, M. (1994). *Inter-cultural communication at work: Cultural values in discourse*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Clyne, M. (2003). *The dynamics of language contact*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Cook-Gumperz, J., & Messerman, L. (1999). Local identities and institutional practices: Constructing the record of professional collaboration. In S. Sarangi & C. Roberts (Eds.), *Talk, work and institutional order* (pp. 145–182). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
Daly, N., Holmes, J., Newton, J., & Stubbe, M. (2004). Expletives as solidarity signals in FTAs on the factory floor. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*, 945–964.
Day, D. (1992). Communication in a multicultural workplace: Procedural matters. In H. Crischel (Ed.), *Intercultural Communication: Proceedings of the 17th International L.A.U.D. Symposium*. Duisburg, Germany: University of Duisburg.
Day, D., & Wagner, J. (2007). Bilingual professionals. In P. Auer & L. Wei (Eds.), *Handbook of multilingualism and multilingual communication* (pp. 390–404). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
Duchêne, A. (2009). Marketing, management and performance: Multilingualism as a commodity in a foreign call centre. *Language Policy, 8*, 27–50.
Duff, P. (2005). Thinking globally about English and new literacies: Multilingual socialization at work. In J. Anderson, M. Kendrick, T. Rogers, & S. Smythe (Eds.), *Portraits of literacy across families, communities, and schools* (pp. 341–362). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Duff, P. (2008). Language socialization, higher education and work. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (Vol. 8., pp. 257–270). New York: Springer.
Duff, P., Wong, P., & Early, M. (2000). Learning language for work and life: The linguistic socialization of immigrant Canadians seeking careers in health care. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*, 9–57.
Erickson, F. (1999). Appropriation of voice and presentation of self as a fellow physician: Aspects of a discourse of apprenticeship in medicine. In S. Sarangi & C. Roberts (Eds.), *Talk, work and institutional order* (pp. 109–144). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
Erickson, F., & Rittenburg, W. (1987). Topic control and person control: A thorny problem for foreign physicians in interaction with American patients. *Discourse Processes, 10*, 401–415.
Farrell, L. (2000). Ways of doing, ways of being: Language, education and "working" identities. *Language and Education, 14*, 18–36.
Farrell, L. (2001). The "new word order": workplace education and the textual practice of globalisation. *Pedagogy, Culture, and Society, 9*, 57–74.
Firth, A. (1995). Talking for a change: Commodity negotiating by telephone. In A. Firth (Ed.), *The discourse of negotiation: Studies of language in the workplace* (183–222). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On "lingua franca" English and conversation analysis. *Pragmatics, 26*, 237–258.
Friginal, E. (2009a). *The language of outsourced call centers: A corpus-based study of cross-cultural interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Friginal, E. (2009b). Threats to the sustainability of the outsourced call center industry in the Philippines. *Language Policy, 8*, 51–68.
Garrett, P., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 31*, 339–361.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gee, J., Hull, G., & Lankshear, C. (1996). *The new work order: Behind the language of the new capitalism*. Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.
Goldstein, T. (1993). The ESL community and the changing world of work. *TESL Talk, 21*, 56–64.
Goldstein, T. (1997). *Two languages at work: Bilingual life on the production floor*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
Goodwin, C. (1995). Seeing in depth. *Social Studies of Science, 25*, 237–274.
Greatbatch, D., Luff, P., Heath, C., & Campion, P. (1993). Interpersonal communication and the human-computer interaction. *Interacting with Computers*, *5*, 193–216.
Grünhage-Monetti, M., Halewijn, E., & Holland, C. (2003). *Odysseus: Second language in the workplace*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
Gumperz, J. (1997). A discussion with John J. Gumperz. In S. Eerdmans, C. Previgagno, & P. Thibault (Eds.), *Discussing communication analysis 1: John Gumperz* (pp. 6–23). Lausanne, Switzerland: Beta Press.
Gumperz, J., Jupp, T., & Roberts, C. (1979). *Crosstalk*. London: National Centre for Industrial Language Training.
Gunnarsson, B. (2009). *Professional discourse*. London: Continuum.
Hawthorne, L. (1997). Defining the target domain: What language skills are required for engineers and nurses? *Melbourne Papers in Language Testing, 6*, 5–20.
Heath, A., & Cheung, S. (2007). *Ethnic penalties in the labour market: Employers and discrimination*. Sheffield, UK: Department of Work and Pensions.
Heath, C., & vom Lehn, D. (2008). Construing interactivity: Enhancing engagement with new technologies in science centres and museums. *Social Studies of Science, 38*, 63–96.
Heller, M. (2002). Globalization and the commodification of bilingualism in Canada. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 47–63). London: Routledge.
Heller, M. (in press). Language as a resource in the globalized new economy. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *Handbook of language and globalization*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
Hindmarsh, J., Heath, C., & Fraser, M. (2006). (Im)materiality, virtual reality, and interaction: Grounding the "virtual" in studies of technology in action. *Sociological Review, 54*(4), 794–816.
Hobbs, P. (2004). The role of progress notes in the professional socialization of medical residents. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*, 1579–1607.
Holmes, J. (2000). Talking English 9 to 5: Challenges for ESOL learners at work. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 125–140.
Holmes, J. (2005). Story-telling at work: A complex discursive resource for integrating personal, professional, and social identities. *Discourse Studies, 7*, 671–700.
Holmes, J. (2006). *Gendered talk at work: Constructing gender identity through workplace discourse*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Holmes, J., & Stubbe, M. (2003). *Power and politeness in the workplace: A sociolinguistic analysis of talk at work*. London: Pearson Education.
Hull, G. (Ed.). (1997). *Changing work, changing workers: Critical perspectives on language, literacy and skills*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Iedema, R. (2003). *Discourses of post-bureaucratic organisation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Iedema, R., & Scheeres, H. (2003). From doing to talking work: Renegotiating knowing, doing, and talking. *Applied Linguistics, 24*, 316–337.
Jack, G. (2009). A critical perspective on teaching intercultural competence in a management department. In A. Feng, M. Byram, & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Becoming interculturally competent through education and training* (pp. 95–114). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Jacobs-Huey, L. (2003). "Ladies are seen not heard": Language socialization in a southern, African American cosmetology school. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 34*, 277–299.
Jacoby, S. (1998). *Science as performance: Socializing scientific discourse through the conference talk rehearsal*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jupp, T., Roberts, C., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1982). Language and disadvantage: The hidden process. In J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity* (pp. 232–256). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Katz, M. (2000). Workplace language teaching and the intercultural construction of ideologies of competence. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*, 144–172.
Kellerman, E., Van Der Haagen, M., & Koonen, H. (2005). "Feet speak louder than the tongue": A preliminary analysis of language provisions for foreign footballers in the Netherlands. In M. Long (Ed.), *Second language needs analysis* (pp. 200–224). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Kleifgen, J. (2001). Assembling talk: Social alignments in the workplace. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 34*, 279–308.
Kleifgen, J., & Frenz-Belkin, P. (1997). Assembling knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 30*, 157–192.
Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Lemke, J. (2002). Travels in hypermodality. *Visual Communication, 3*, 299–325.
Li, D. (2000). The pragmatics of making requests in the L2 workplace. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*, 58–87.
Matthewman, J. (1996). Trends and developments in the use of competency frameworks. *Competency, 4*, 2–11.
Mawer, G. (1999). *Language and literacy in workplace education: Learning at work*. London: Longman.
Mawer, G., & Field, L. (1995). *One size fits some! Competency training and non-English speaking background people*. Canberra, Australia: AGPS.
McCall, C. (2003). Language dynamics in the bi- and multilingual workplace. In R. Bayley & S. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 235–250). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
McNamara, T. (1997). Problematizing content validity: The Occupational English Test (OET) as a measure of medical communication. *Melbourne Papers in Language Testing, 6*, 19–43.
Mertz, E. (2007). *The language of law: Learning to think like a lawyer.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Mistica, M., Baldwin, T., Cordella, M., & Musgrave, S. (2008). Applying discourse analysis and data mining methods to spoken OSCE assessments. In *The 22nd International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Vol. 1. Proceedings of the conference*, October (pp. 577–584). University of Melbourne, University of Melbourne Press, Australia.
Mondada, L. (2004). Ways of "doing being plurilingual" in international work meetings. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 27–60). London: Continuum.
Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1983). *Acquisition of conversational competence*. London: Routledge.
Ochs, E. (1993). Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26*, 287–306.
Ochs, E. (2000). Socialization. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 9*, 230–233.
O'Neill, S., & Gish, A. (2001). *Apprentices' and trainees' English language and literacy skills in workplace learning and performance: Employer and employee opinion*. Leabrook, Australia: National Centre for Vocational Education Research.
Parks, S., & Maguire, M. (1999). Coping with on-the-job writing skills in ESL: A constructivist-semiotic perspective. *Language Learning, 49*, 143–175.
Paugh, A. (2005). Learning about work at dinner time: Language socialization in dual-earning American families. *Discourse and Society, 16*, 55–78.
Phillips, T. (2003). *Speaking at J. P. Morgan's leadership day, 2003.* Retrieved November 25, 2003, from http://www.cre.gov.uk
Poncini, G. (2003). Multicultural business meetings and the role of languages other than English. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 24*, 17–32.
Rasmussen, G. (1998). The use of address forms in intercultural business conversation. *Revue de Semantique et Pragmatique, 3*, 57–72.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rasmussen, G., & Wagner, J. (2002). Language choice in international telephone conversations. In K. Luke & T. Pavlidou (Eds.), *Telephone calls. Unity and diversity in conversational structure across languages and cultures* (pp. 111–131). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Roberts, C., Davies, E., & Jupp, T. (1992). *Language and discrimination: A study of communication in multi-ethnic workplaces*. London: Longman.

Roberts, C., & Campbell, S. (2005). Fitting stories into boxes: Rhetorical and textual constraints on candidates' performances in British job interviews. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 2*, 45–73.

Roberts, C., & Campbell, S. (2006). *Talk on trial: Job interviews, language, and ethnicity.* Retrieved from Department for Work & Pensions Web site: http://www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd5/rrs2006.asp#talkontrial

Roberts, C., Campbell, S., & Robinson, Y. (2008). *Talking like a manager: Promotion interviews, language, and ethnicity*.

Roberts, C., & Sarangi, S. (1999). Hybridity in gatekeeping discourse: Issues of practical relevance for the researcher. In S. Sarangi & C. Roberts (Eds.), *Talk, work and institutional order* (pp. 473–504). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Roy, S. (2003). Bilingualism and standardization in a Canadian call center: Challenges for a linguistic minority community. In R. Bayley & S. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 269–285). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Sarangi, S., & Roberts, C. (2002). Discoursal (mis)alignments in professional gatekeeping encounters. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 197–227). New York: Continuum.

Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.). (1986). *Language socialisation across cultures*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1995). *Intercultural communication*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Seale, C., Butler, C., Hutchby, I., Kinnersley, P., & Rollnick, S. (2007). Negotiating frame ambiguity: A study of simulated encounters in medical education. *Communication and Medicine, 4*, 177–188.

Spike, N. (2006). International medical graduates: The Australian perspective. *Academic Medicine, 81*, 842–846.

Suchman, L. (1992). Technologies of accountability: Of lizards and airplanes. In G. Button (Ed.), *Technology in working order: Studies of work interaction and technology* (pp. 113–126). London: Routledge.

Vertoveç, S. (2007). Superdiversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*, 1024–1054.

Vickers, C. (2007). Second language socialization through team interaction among electrical and computing engineering students. *Modern Language Journal, 91*, 621–640.

Wagner, J. (1995). Negotiating activity in technical problem solving. In A. Firth (Ed.), *The discourse of negotiation: Studies of language in the workplace* (pp. 223–246). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Waldinger, R., & Lichter, M. (2003). *How the other half works: Immigration and the social organization of labor*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Willing, K. (1997). Modality in task-orientated discourses: The role of subjectivity in "getting the job done." *Prospect, 12*, 33–42.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127 Published online by Cambridge University Press