International Journal of Information Communication Technologies and Human Development
Volume 14 • Issue 1

Defining the Presence of Misrecognition in Multilingual Organizations:
A Literature Review

Erin Mires, University of Louisville, USA
Matt Bergman, University of Louisville, USA*
Ehren R. Green, University of Louisville, USA
Kevin Rose, Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis, USA

ABSTRACT

Research indicates the multilingual aspects of organizations can create power divisions and rules that drive workplace practices. From an international human resources development perspective, language management is strategic and planned through the headquarters of the organization. Yet the rational ideas of organizational members are what are truly valued in multilingual workplaces. These rational ideas create power struggles and biases that are formed against individuals who possess certain linguistic capabilities, regardless of the individual's other traits or accomplishments. These biases have been labeled the phenomenon of misrecognition. This literature review explores the presence of misrecognition in multilingual organizations. A need to determine how the phenomenon of misrecognition exists in multilingual organizations was discovered.

KEYWORDS

Diversity, Language, Misrecognition, Multilingual, Multinational Corporation, Power

INTRODUCTION

Evidence from multilingual organizations indicates the multilingual aspects of organizations can create the social effect of power divisions and rules that drive workplace practices (Fredriksson et al., 2006; Gaibrois & Steyaert, 2017; Hanks, 2005; Matos, 2009). Although language management is strategic and planned through the headquarters of the organization, the rational ideas of organizational members are what are truly valued in multilingual workplaces (Hanks, 2005; Haynes & Ghosh, 2011). Due to the value of rational ideas in multilingual workplaces, biases are frequently formed against individuals who possess certain linguistic capabilities, regardless of the individual's other traits or accomplishments. These biases have been labeled the phenomenon of misrecognition (Gal & Irvine, 1995; Jaffe, 2003; Matos, 2009; Oakes, 2017). In particular, due to misrecognition, employees of multilingual organizations who do not fluently speak the corporate language of the organization are found to be of lesser caliber in the eyes of employees of multilingual workplaces who do speak the corporate language (Matos, 2009). As a result, employees who do not fluently speak the corporate language in a multilingual workplace often lose out on jobs, professional development, and other career progressing opportunities (Matos, 2009; Offerman et al., 2013).

DOI: 10.4018/IJICTHD.299407 *Corresponding Author

WHAT IS MISRECOGNITION?

The phenomenon of misrecognition, as found in society as a whole, has been defined as the assumption that individuals who possess certain linguistic traits are of higher social, political, intellectual, and ethical clout than individuals who do not possess the same linguistic traits (Matos, 2009). Misrecognition is related to the theoretical construct of transference, which can have both positive and negative effects on the relationships of individuals in the workplace, depending on the personality and behave (Ritter & Lord, 2007).

Due to transference, the societal effects found within organizations tend toward the human desire of homogeneity, even though homogeneity does not exist within societies (Huang, 2009). Homogeneity in workplaces can become a barrier to knowledge (Huang, 2009). The understanding, recognition, and defining of the phenomenon of misrecognition in multilingual workplaces is critical to breaking down these negative organizational societal effects (Huang, 2009).

The symbolic power of groups is backed by Bourdieu's theory of symbolic power that fuels the particular interests of social relations. In 1995, Bourdieu's theory of symbolic power led researchers to create a definition of misrecognition to recognize the phenomenon in diverse cultures where symbolic power was present (Gal & Irvine, 1995; Hancock, 2008). Within society, this definition has been used to help build legitimacy of minority groups, limiting the power struggles created by misrecognition (Smyth, 2002). Studies of the societal impact of misrecognition (Blackledge, 2005; Ghosh, 2011; Hancock, 2008; Smyth, 2002) indicate that the negative implications and chaos created when misrecognition is not controlled—such as increased crime, increased racism, and negative economic impact—could be mimicked from a business perspective in organizations where misrecognition is present (Matos, 2009).

The purpose of this article is to integrate the literature relating to misrecognition in multilingual workplaces in a matter that readily communicates the criticality of understanding misrecognition as it presents itself in multilingual organizations. This analysis and integration of literature analyzes language policies in organizations as they are exerted as a form of power, misrecognition as the outlier of linguistic theories, and multilingual language policies in multilingual organizations.

METHOD

The term "misrecognition" is still young in its academic and operational use, with Gal and Irvine making the connection between Bourdieu's works and use of the term misrecognition during their research published in 1995. Due to its infancy, "misrecognition" as a single search term returned few results. Therefore, the following four keywords were also used in an initial literature search of primary peer reviewed literature: misrecognition, multilingual, power, and diversity. However, the four-keyword search did not yield any results.

Due to the initial search strategy yielding zero results, parameters were not used to narrow the search, but rather to expand the search. Thereby, a tiered approach was used. The first tier was to use the original four keywords. The second-tier approach was to remove misrecognition and replace it with bias. Tier three was to replace multilingual with language, and tier four was to replace diversity with organization. A few results occurred in tier two and three, but by far the most useful search result was utilizing tier four with the keywords of bias, language, power, and organization. These broad terms produced a sufficient amount of results, allowing the researchers to find articles that had critical pieces of information relating to the topic, even if the study's focus was not entirely in line with the focus of this research study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Linguistic Diversity

Linguistic diversity in organizations is commonly based on the theories of social identity and relational demography, which assume that individual's value social interaction with other individuals who possess the same or similar qualities to oneself (Matos, 2009). In particular, social identity theory is the perception that individuals belong to a particular group based on the relation that the behaviors and attitudes of the group have to one's own self-image (Srivastava et al., 2018; Turner & Haslam, 2012). Studies of the perception of belonging by individuals produced evidence that the social categorization that occurs due to social identity creates bias and discriminatory behavior. The bias and discrimination create attitudes that favor the in-group at the expense of the out-group (Turner & Haslam, 2012). The social categorization occurs in many identities from race to linguistic attributes and includes emotional involvement and absolute commitment to the in-group (Chattopadhyay et al., 2004). Thereby, individuals in multilingual workplaces tend to feel drawn to other members of the workplace within the same social category, in this case those who speak the same natural language, due to a shared linguistic attachment (Chattopadhyay et al. 2004; Turner & Haslam 2012).

Relational demography further emphasizes the linguistic attachment found through social identity theory. Relational demography is the extent to which an individual is similar or dissimilar from other members of a group, team, or organization (Ilmakunnas & Ilmakunnas, 2011). Individuals in multilingual organizations use this concept to determine similarity to other members of the workplace based on demographics (Chattopadhyay et al., 2004). The outcome of the determination of relational demography is attributed to workplace commitment, absenteeism, and in-group or out-group behaviors such as engagement (Chattopadhyay et al., 2004). Both social identity and relational demography theory, thereby, are contributors to the linguistic barriers created through language demographics and will create an in-group/out-group effect in multilingual workplaces if other demographic differences do not supersede linguistic barriers (Chattopadhyay et al., 2004; Ilmakunnas & Ilmakunnas, 2011; Matos, 2009; Turner & Haslam, 2012).

LANGUAGE AND POWER

Habitus

The phenomenon of misrecognition can historically be traced to Bourdieu's linguistic and power writings that discuss habitus as the social actor. Habitus, Bourdieu's first anthropologic concept, is a social actor's structured state of mind that identifies an individual's concepts of freedom, creativity, and the unconscious (Bourdieu, 1991). Social identity and relational demography drive an individual's control of a situation, yet the unconscious structure of one's mind is what determines the similarity or dissimilarity to another individual (Bourdieu, 1991; Turner & Haslam, 2012). Habitus, therefore, explains the social dispositions and reasons for actions of individuals along predetermined socially acceptable lines (Hanks, 2005). Society is impressed on individuals through habitus and language plays a large role in the societal impression due to the limitation of communication that changes perspectives on cultural implications (Hanks, 2005). Habitus in multilingual workplaces, therefore, can lead to an individual's struggle with management due to perceived power based on the internal determination of one's control over a situation that is impacted by language (Bourdieu, 1991; Everett & Jamal, 2004; Hanks, 2005; Turner & Haslam, 2012).

Field

Bourdieu's second anthropologic concept that relates directly to linguistics is field. Field is the divided roles and historical processes that have shaped the social organization of individuals (Bourdieu, 1991). When found in organizations, the concept of field identifies the power struggles between employee

positions, and when filling a vacant position (Bourdieu, 1991; Hanks, 2005). Particular research by Hanks (2005) found that organizational positions are most often filled based on relation to the previous occupant rather than based on the knowledge, skills, and attributes required by the organization. The organizational error emphasized by field is the basis for the academic belief that the educated have a standard of language proficiency that creates access to power through organizational positions, to which individuals without the same language proficiency do not have access (Hanks, 2005). The suppression of access to positions of power based on language creates a symbolic domination when a corporate language is used in organizations (Fredriksson et al., 2006; Hanks 2005). The symbolic domination creates a very visible social hierarchy built on power that is, in reality, a linguistic hierarchy built on a lack of language diversity throughout the hierarchy (Hanks, 2005). The structural access to power created throughout the linguistic hierarchy suppresses the fundamental values, cultures, and structures of languages other than the corporate language and deepens the power struggles between the corporate language and other languages used in the organization (Everett and Jamal 2004; Fredriksson et al., 2006; Hanks, 2005).

Misrecognition

Language management within an organization is often strategic, yet regardless of the strategy written by an organization, the rational ideas of an organization's employees are what are truly valued (Hanks, 2005). Thereby, when a linguistic hierarchy is created, biases are formed against individuals who possess certain linguistic traits, regardless of any other capabilities they may possess (Matos, 2009). The biases created from the linguistic hierarchy fall under the theory of misrecognition. In particular, the concept that employees of multilingual workplaces who do not speak the corporate language are seen in the eyes of other members of the workplace to be of lesser caliber is attributed to the theory of misrecognition (Bourdieu, 1991; Gal & Irvine, 1995; Matos, 2009).

MULTILINGUALISM

Transference

Research on multilingual work environments indicates that linguistic differences create tension in workplaces, leading to a strong pull for monolinguistic workplace environments (Maccoby, 2004; Rodriguez, 2006). Yet, owing to the social identity and relational demography theories, a monolingual workplace may be difficult to implement due to human instincts to find a common space and mutual understanding (Chattopadhyay et al., 2004; Ilmakunnas & Ilmakunnas, 2011; Turner & Haslam, 2012). A human's draw to commonality is known as transference (Maccoby, 2004; Rodriguez, 2006).

Transference was first introduced in the field of psychology in 1912 in Freud's work *Zur Dynamik der Übertragung* (de Haan, 2011). Transference is an individual's personal and unconscious need to fill a void that is not being satisfied in one's relationships (de Haan, 2011). In relation to a multilingual workplace, transference frequently occurs between leader-follower as one's perceptions and expectations are created through the relationships built in the workplace. These relationships establish linguistic boundaries and are frequently maintained through social identity theory (Ritter & Lord, 2007; Turner & Haslam, 2012). If the linguistic boundaries built through the need to fill a relationship void have a negative effect on the workplace, then social identity theory and the theory of reasoned action suggest that the cause of the negative impact may be overlooked (Turner & Haslam, 2012).

Theory of reasoned action

The theory of reasoned action states that the actions of an individual are motivated by a desire to comply with other individuals (Muniz, 2007). Beyond transference, the theory of reasoned action explains the collectivist differences of culture. As early as 1991, findings within the theory of reasoned action

found that even individuals who yearn to remain part of an individualistic culture tend to feel more at ease among individuals of the same culture (Trafimow et al., 1991). Cultural differences, therefore, drive recruiting and retention within organizations due to an individual's level of comfort and ease with an organization's culture (Muniz, 2007). The theory of reasoned action, therefore, suggests that multilingual offices will be more successful if the multilingual nature of the employees is allowed to be represented in the workplace culture (Muniz, 2007).

LANGUAGE POLICIES AS AN EXERCISE OF POWER

Language in multinational and multilingual organizations is more than a basic means of communication. It is the foundation of knowledge creation, a creation of symbols and signifiers, and a form of national and cultural identity (Vaara et al., 2005). Much of the literature that exists in the fields of organizational development and organizational management view language as a communication challenge that can be manipulated through policies and structure. However, it is much more than a simple communication challenge that corporate language policies can manipulate. Instead, organizational language is an exercise of power that creates power struggles that lead to the phenomenon of misrecognition (Fredriksson, et al., 2006; Matos, 2009; Vaara et al., 2005).

Seminal research on the topic of language in organizational practices and polices indicate that language has been central to the selection processes, rationalities and policies, as well as unwritten rules and domination since the early analysis of this topic (Clegg, 1975; Clegg, 1987; Silverman and Jones 1974). However, these early analyses of language and its treatment within organizations are exceptions to the norm of analytical treatment of the role of language in organizations (Vaara et al., 2005). In fact, it is safe to say that language analysis has been primarily focused on utilizing the reconceptualization perspective on language within society rather than within organizations (Peltokorpi & Vaara, 2012). Within the past decade, the view of language analysis solely within society has begun to change and incorporate language analysis in the workplace through the work of scholars such as Vaara, Teinari, Piekkeri, Santti, and Peltokorpi. However, none of these scholars have focused research on the presence of the phenomenon of misrecognition in multilingual organizations.

Language is at the core of every culture, no matter the geographic origin. With language a cultural core, the natural language, or language to which one best relates, is the heart and symbolic identity of many nations and ethnic cultures (Vaara et al., 2005). Through Vaara et al.'s (2005) analysis, it is determined that language is a central element in the selection process of an organization's employees, exacerbating the organizational rationalities, rules, and language domination. The Multinational Corporation (MNC) has built-in tensions created by the multiple cultures, nationalities, and languages that are at odds due to the exacerbation created by its inherent diversity (Vaara et al., 2005). Vaara et al. (2005) argue that due to the tension and conflict created by an MNC's diversity, language policies in organizations have power implications that have a significant impact on organizational performance. In the study, previous works were analyzed through the examination of social interaction, identity construction, and domination structures. The poignant research statement, and ultimately, conclusion, argues that corporate language policies should not be a practical solution to communication problems. Instead, it is determined that language policies must be viewed and executed as an exercise of power (Vaara et al., 2005).

To cope with the influence of communication and language in international organizations such as MNCs, companies have explicitly created structure and policies for corporate communication (Fredriksson et al., 2006; Peltokorpi & Vaara, 2012). Language policies governing communication in international organizations can be encapsulated by the sociolinguistic description used in society for decades as the ideas, laws, and rules that are used to achieve a particular language change of a group (Ghosh, 2016; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). Language, therefore, is commonly used throughout various organizational practices as a means of achieving the desired change through language-sensitive recruitment, training, operations, and policies (Harzing & Feely, 2008). The changes surrounding

language can be even more apparent during disruptive periods of organizational development such as mergers, acquisitions, and joint ventures (Vaara et al., 2005). The proper use of language policies and practices can have positive impacts on organizations, to include reducing language barriers, increasing coordination, knowledge transfer, learning, understanding, and creating a collective organizational and team identity (Tietze, 2008). Yet, proper use and misuse of language policies can create the power struggles associated with language policies. This study incorporated the power struggles created due to language policy into its analysis through interview questions. Doing so helped determine how the phenomenon of misrecognition existed within multilingual organizations, and the phenomenon's relationship to language policies and practices.

THE OUTLIER OF LINGUISTIC THEORIES

Matos's (2009) study assessed the misuse of power relating to language by reviewing the linguistic theories that support the use of a minority language in in-group interactions even when other languages are available. The in-group interactions isolate the corporate language as a representation of status and authority that is only used in interactions where the corporate language is required, or when group members need to speak from a position of authority. Based on the theoretical background of relational demography grounded in in-group relationships corresponding to power, Matos (2009) hypothesizes that the proportion of Spanish-speaking employees in an organization is associated with the perception of advancement opportunities for minority-language group members. The majority of the results of the study fall in line with social identity and relational demography. However, there are a minority of results that contradict the majority and the hypothesis (Matos, 2009). When these results are assessed from a framework of power, it becomes obvious that the concept of misrecognition is at play in the organization. Certain individuals in the organization who do not speak English were identified as being of a lesser caliber than those who did possess the ability to speak English. Additionally, it was found that individuals who spoke English at a fluent level were identified as being of higher caliber than others who spoke English only as a secondary or tertiary language (Matos, 2009). The theoretical foundation for an additional analysis to assess misrecognition in Matos's study could not be completed. It was, therefore, recommended by Matos (2009) that the assessment of misrecognition be the topic of future research.

Matos's (2009) study researched the boundaries of language policy and practice and went beyond the structural component of these organizational issues and focused primarily on the employees of the organization and their reactions to language. Researching the topic through the lens of relational demography, linguistic diversity, and workplace attitudes, Matos (2009) discovered the anomaly in the research. This anomaly was attributed to the phenomenon of misrecognition, a commonly researched theme in multilingual sociological academia, yet a remarkably non-researched phenomenon within multilingual organizations. The phenomenon of misrecognition was the primary focus of this study, and had to be, therefore, understood in its societal context prior to assessing the phenomenon in multilingual workplaces.

MISRECOGNITION IN SOCIETY

The Unrecognized Use of Language as Power in Societies

In November 2002, the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act was passed into law in the United Kingdom (UK). This law included a section that required the spouses of British citizens wishing to apply for British citizenship to demonstrate their proficiency in English, Welsh, or Scottish Gaelic (Blackledge, 2005). Although seemingly unremarkable to some, this piece of legislation exacerbates the relations of power in the UK relating to linguistics. The Russian theorist, Bakhtin (1994), emphasized the dialogicality of language, maintaining that relations of power transform the voices of authority

within society. The social model of language referred to by Bakhtin (1994) recognizes that the authority of a voice within society will likely remain the authoritarian voice when it belongs to individuals of power (Bakhtin, 1994). In multilingual societies, which are, arguably, nearly every modern society throughout the world, the social model of language fuels the "us" and "them" mentality, particularly when language becomes a discriminatory political discourse. The use of language can become a tool to debase one group and to characterize the in-group as the all-powerful (Wodak, 2002).

Questions relating to this social model of language that should be asked when determining whether power struggles may exist due to the use of language include: In what manner are people named and referred? What traits, characteristics, qualities, etc. are attributed to them? What arguments are used to justify the specific individuals or social groups in order to legitimize discrimination, exploitation, or other means of exerting power? From which perspective is the language discrimination expressed? Is the language discrimination overtly communicated? (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001). These questions refer to the membership categories that individuals are members of and often include linguistic characteristics. For example, many media outlets refer to individuals in discriminatory terms related to their gender, age, race, language, or other individual characteristics. A newspaper may report a story that refers to a black youth. In this case, the individual is almost always referred to in a negative light when using these particular traits. Although the two individual words of black and youth have no negative connotation when used alone, society and historical context have created a negative connotation when the two words are used together to refer to an individual (Blackledge 2005).

The discriminatory implication of words, known as predication, is also frequently seen in relation to language in society. Predication in relation to language is the result of assigning qualities to a person in a linguistic manner (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001). Frequently, predication leads to the negative and abusive use of power to show force and discrimination against a group of individuals. In political and social discourse, predication is frequently used when discussing immigrants. Immigrants and their descendants may be referred to as lazy, greedy, oppressive based on their culture, third-world, etc. These linguistic terms have been used so repetitively in contexts relating to immigrants that the linguistically assigned qualities become so familiar within society that they are deemed to be accurate depictions (Blackledge, 2005). Predication continues to exacerbate the power of the in-group over the out-group further emphasizing the linguistic power of the in-group.

The intensification, mitigation, or both of the discourse of the in-group is known as framing, and is another well-studied and understood component of misrecognition relating to language found in society. A newspaper article from the United Kingdom discussing the language tests required for citizenship had a direct quote from a minister within the United Kingdom's government. The newspaper preceded the quote with a statement framing the quote as controversial. The framed statement read, "In a move likely to provoke a storm of protest…" (Blackledge, 2005, p.25). This technique, in addition to using multiple voices to frame one voice to hold more power than the other, is another form of social discourse that emphasizes the power of the in-group (Curseu et al., 2016). On the same topic of required language testing to gain citizenship, another government official was quoted as saying, "There are situations…where sometimes people are not encouraged or persuaded to learn English" (Blackledge, 2005, p.26). The use of "sometimes" and "there are situations" lead readers of this quote to believe that there are sometimes situations where people are encouraged or persuaded to learn English that result in positive situations. In the case of this quote, the use of language implies that not being persuaded or encouraged has a negative outcome. The use of predication and framing in discourse relating to language continues to widen the divide between those who speak a particular language and those who do not, using language as a show of power within society (Curseu et al., 2016). In addition to these unrecognized, or unobvious, shows of power through language within society, there are also shows of power using language that are recognized and obvious.

The Recognized Use of Language as Power in Societies

The modern Western societies often publicly show pride in their diversity and acceptance of immigration and cultural variety. Yet, although accepting, to an extent, with their immigration and political asylum laws and regulations, the dominant social ideology relating to diversity is homogeneity (Blackledge, 2005; Jones & Dovidio, 2018). Much of the political and social regulations for immigrants require the dismissal of their past cultures and languages in favor of blending into society and learning English in order to be successful. Studies of language and power, along with misrecognition within society indicate that language use, this example being English, is linked to power and political and social positioning in society (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2002; Blommaert, 1999; Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998; Coder, 2011; Creech, 2005; Gal, 1998; Gal & Irvine, 1995; Gal & Woolard, 1995; Ghosh, 2011; Guo, 2013; Hancock, 2008; Kone, 2010; Kroskrity, 1998; Smyth, 2002; Tomic, 2013; Woolard, 1998).

Language ideologies are influenced by changes at all social and political levels from local, to regional, national, and even at global levels. Thereby, inherently, there are power struggles between individual language choices and those forced upon an individual through the language identities required or asserted by the social and political situations in which they live. What is important to recall, is that these language ideologies are more than just an attitude and practice, but also the values, beliefs, and practices that are associated with the cultural intricacies of a language (Blackledge, 2005). Therefore, any forced choices on an individual involving language, whether in a social situation or in an organization, are also forcing changes in their values, beliefs, and practices. This concept relates back to Bourdieu's model of habitus and field previously discussed, and has been seen through the multiple studies on language, power, and the phenomenon of misrecognition in society (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2002; Blommaert, 1999; Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998; Coder, 2011; Creech, 2005; Gal, 1998; Gaibrois & Steyaert, 2017; Gal & Irvine, 1995; Gal & Woolard, 1995; Ghosh, 2011; Guo, 2013; Hancock, 2008; Kone, 2010; Kroskrity, 1998; Offerman et al., 2013; Smyth, 2002; Tomic, 2013; Woolard, 1998).

Throughout global societies there have been numerous examples of the changing of language use that have led to the control, or the attempt to control, of populations through symbolically changing the in-group of the society by forcing language (Blackledge, 2005; Oakes, 2017). When a language change occurs, individuals not in the in-group must come to terms with their new identity, whether through a change to a minority group, a change in their place in society, or a more intense change in the governing of a region. Throughout the process of acceptance of the new identity, individuals may negotiate their position through the use of resources within their own group, the majority group, and even via institutional help. However, as the dominant language identity becomes more accepting of itself, the amount of negotiation will decrease as monolingualism is reiterated and authority sets in (Blackledge, 2005). Blackledge's (2005) research on this process is further backed by Bourdieu's work, such as his statement that, "Cultural and linguistic unification is accompanied by the imposition of the dominant language and culture as legitimate and by the rejection of all other languages into indignity" (Bourdieu, 1998, p.46).

The unification of language and culture, thereby, becomes the national habitus, amounting to the division of who belongs to the culture and who does not, creating the cultural and language divisions with inherent power struggles that are seen with the phenomenon of misrecognition. The divisions found within society relating to language are created in the same manner as divisions of other diversity issues such as race, gender, and economic status (Blackledge, 2005; Oakes, 2017). Schmidt (2002) refers to the language divisions found within society as imagined communities that are just as real within society as the boundaries of nations, but whose own socially-constructed boundaries are ever-changing and being redefined by the construct of new national habitus. Reisigl and Wodak (2001) further emphasize the relationship and importance of language as compared to other diversity boundaries and issues by stating that language practices and cultural traits, to include traditions and customs, have a pseudo-casual connection to race and, frequently, one can often represent the other

in the power struggles found in society. Blackledge (2005) found an example of the pseudo-casual connection in his analysis of political and media discourse relating to language that suggests that the language practices of Muslim groups are racialized in Great Britain in the same way the cultural practices of Muslim groups are racialized.

Referring back to the example of language testing for citizenship in Great Britain, Piller (2001) studied the impact of the policy on minority groups and found that language testing was used more as a means of social control rather than an objective standard of language proficiency. Instead, the tests were a means of establishing and maintaining a boundary between nationals and non-nationals in order to protect the privileges of nationals. Interviews by Piller (2001) of candidates who took the tests indicated that the tests were administered unfairly and were commonly used to gate-keep certain ethnic groups, such as Muslims, while allowing other ethnic groups to an exemption to the test. The use of the language test example in this literature review is not meant to spark outrage nor argument; it is meant to emphasize how language is a diversity issue that can lead to the same power struggles as other diversity issues such as race and gender.

Language Misrecognition in Society

It may be obvious to readers that in multilingual societies linguistic power relationships exist naturally due to the linguistic capital of a particular domain (Blackledge 2005). In Blackledge's (2005) book *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*, he describes a scene in Great Britain, where a Sylheti-speaking woman must have a discussion with her child's English-speaking teacher about the child's progress in school. In this case, although the woman may be multilingual, if she does not speak English she is unable to activate her linguistic capital and the situation transforms into one where the language of English creates dominance. The dominance created by the use of the English language in the situation is constructed by Bourdieu's (2000) structuring structures, wherein a socio-linguistic environment exposes acts of dominance and submission through a natural linguistic construct. The natural linguistic construct, however, is not naturally created, but created through the submission of the mother to the linguistic dominance of the teacher (Blackledge, 2005; Brock-Utne, 2015). Bourdieu (2000) emphasizes that these acts of submission and dominance are neither conscious nor deliberate, but are involuntary reactions of constant and repetitive discursive acts that produce a social order grounded in language. Bartlett (2014) further describes this concept as rooted in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), where power is realized through language, rather than power being interwoven in language. Thereby, Bartlett demonstrates how interpersonal, experiential, and textual language within society or, as is the connection here, organizations lead to voluntary and/or involuntary acts of power.

Through these involuntary acts of recognition and misrecognition of language, hence the name of the phenomenon, the minority and majority language speakers begin to recognize one particular language as dominant and misrecognize other languages as minorities. Thereby, linguistic social orders make it difficult for minority speakers to access certain rights, such as the mother's right to know her child's progress in school (Blackledge, 2005). The inability for the mother to access her rights is due to the misrecognition of English as the most important, if not the only important language in that particular society, making it dominant (Blackledge, 2005; Bourdieu, 2000).

Bourdieu's (1991) work has been used to classify the struggles between linguistic groups and racial groups in numerous studies, to include Hancock's (2008) analysis of the tension between races in a post-Civil Rights period. Hancock's (2008) analysis reinforces the perpetuation of symbolic power and misrecognition between groups in any social context where a dominant social order is created through recognition and misrecognition. However, in Hancock's study on the dominant suppression of the Caucasian race on African Americans in Chicago, it is outright stated that the view of the dominant group was not analyzed, creating a bias in the research by assessing only one side of the situation. Similar to this research study, the focus of Hancock's (2008) study was on the intentions and motivations of particular individuals. However, by assessing only the minority group, Hancock's (2008) intent to reveal the mechanisms through which symbolic power operates in a particular social

organization will not be complete, without also understanding the intentions and motivations of the dominant group. This research study ensures that both the majority and minority groups are included in the sample.

MULTILINGUAL LANGUAGE POLICIES

Institutional Theory

Language policies are a form of business planning, which is used, primarily, as a mechanism of control that can fundamentally change the organizational identity and culture (Oakes et al., 1998). Although nearly several decades old, a research study by Oakes, Townley, and Cooper (1998) uses institutional theory in conjunction with Bourdieu's work to assess language policies and power in business. Institutional theory focuses on how the institutional field influences and controls the function of an organization (Oakes et al., 1998). Frequently throughout an organization's history, changes in rules and policies occur in order to give the appearance of legitimacy, leading to the convergence and homogenization of practices (Oakes et al., 1998). Oakes, Townley, and Cooper's study ultimately concludes that the use of business planning illustrates the importance of utilizing language policies for issues of power and control in order, specifically, to "consecrate linguistic and discursive competencies" (1998, p.284). Though over 20 years old, the inclusion of this study in this literature review is important, in order to emphasize that the use of institutional theory to review language in multilingual organizations emphasizes the need for language policies. However, the use of institutional theory in this study is not relevant, as there is little to no focus on the population of the organization, which is critical to assess when determining how misrecognition exists in multilingual organizations. Thereby, the theoretical foundation of Bourdieu's work in relation to social identity and relational demography are ideal for this study.

Project DYLAN

Ludi (2010) expands on the argument that language policies are a reflection of organizational power. Using the framework of project DYLAN, a study on the relationship between language dynamics and management diversity, Ludi (2010) determines that linguistic diversity, the use of up to ninety languages for external and internal communication, can increase employee engagement by creating an emotional attachment through language. Additionally, linguistic diversity facilitates new knowledge, and encourages creativity and innovation through cognitive diversity improvement. It is also crucial to note that multiple monolingual competencies do not equate to multilingualism. Ludi (2010) concludes that linguistic diversity and utilizing English as a corporate language can coexist. Therefore, monolingual individuals and organizations are at a disadvantage in our global marketplace and organizations should encourage multilingual environments (Ludi 2010). This study provides a foundation for the determination of how misrecognition exists as a potential issue in multilingual organizations, as multilingual organizations become increasingly popular due to the competitive advantage that multilingualism brings to an organization.

English as a Corporate Language

The concept that monolingual organizations are at a disadvantage in the modern world is further developed in an article that examines the multilingual environment at Siemens. The article begins by explaining the use of English as a corporate language in many MNCs in order to facilitate the communication between the headquarters and regional offices ("Siemens Speaks," 2007). A common language helps facilitate communication efficiency and overcomes multiple translation requirements while creating a sense of cohesion and belonging in the organization. Yet, the establishment of English as a corporate language does not mean that it is used throughout an MNC for all official business.

The article concludes that in these multicultural environments, the fluency of English is varied and English may not be the mostly widely shared language in all workplaces ("Siemens Speaks," 2007).

Picking up on the conclusion of the article on Siemens, Fredriksson, Barner-Rasmussen, and Piekkari (2006) state that due to the vast variety of languages in most MNCs, there is a need for language to be organized. This organization of language can include anything from instituting corporate policies or establishing conscious ambiguity. Without organization, languages have been closely linked to identity and power struggles, and due to a language's strong ties to nationalism, there is a depth to language identity that supersedes all attempts to mask it with a single corporate language (Fredriksson et al., 2006). To further explore the use of a common corporate language in multilingual organizations, Fredriksson, Barner-Rasmussen, and Piekkari (2006) used a qualitative assessment to interview 36 employees of Siemens. Fredriksson, Barner-Rasmussen, and Piekkari's (2006) research aimed to determine whether the common corporate language of Siemens was used as expected by headquarters, or if there were discrepancies to the corporate policy due to actual linguistic practices. The findings indicated that there were discrepancies. In fact, many employees of Siemens believed there to actually be two corporate languages, English and German. Due to the historical significance tying the organization to Germany, many individuals at headquarters still used German in their day-to-day work (Fredriksson, Barner-Rasmussen, and Piekkari 2006). Therefore, Fredriksson, Barner-Rasmussen, and Piekkari (2006) concluded that top-management alone cannot make a common corporate language the most used language of an organization. Instead, if a common corporate language is desired to ease communication issues, it should not be mandated in all workplaces or communication practices (Fredriksson et al., 2006).

The European Union (EU) is a unique representation of a political organization that parallels the need for multilingual acceptance in large organizations. Throughout its lifespan, the EU has increased its official languages to over 20, making it the largest multilingual organization in the world, and setting a standard for multilingual management (Creech, 2005). Within the EU, all languages are considered equal in status, forcing all legislation and official communication to be translated into each language. The linguistic equality policy has both operational and financial consequences, slowing down the natural ebb and flow of the organization. Additionally, verbatim translation is impossible between so many languages, leading to interesting translation discrepancies that become official and legally binding documents (Creech, 2005).

Although the technicality of language equality is present in the EU, the policy is not represented in practice. The use of national languages in geographic areas has led to unique circumstances that beg the question of whether diversity or unity is more important (Creech, 2005). Ultimately, the inclusion of numerous English-speaking nations to the EU, as well as the translation, operational, and financial issues have led to English becoming the predominant language, paralleling the idea of a corporate language in multilingual organizations (Creech, 2005). The use of a formal language for communication with the acceptance of linguistic diversity is critical in the organization and operation of the EU, but can lead to the potential for the presence of the phenomenon of misrecognition. Thereby, emphasizing the need for multilingual organizations, particularly those with an extensive number of operational languages, to determine how the phenomenon of misrecognition exists in multilingual organizations. This research study set the foundation for the determination of how the phenomenon of misrecognition exists and, ideally, leads to future studies of how to limit its presence in organizations such as the political entity of the EU.

Using Bourdieu's and Foucault's Organizational Theories on Power

The idea of knowledge as power has been at the foundation of scientific inquiry since Sir Francis Bacon's 17th century urging of the importance of education. In Bacon's (1860) 17th century work, *New Atlantis*, he states, "The End of our Foundation is the knowledge of Causes, and secret motions of things; and enlarging of the bounds of Human Empire, to the effecting of all things possible." Over the years many organizational theorists have expanded upon the notion of the human empire,

otherwise known as the human expanse of knowledge, to go beyond scientific inquiry and include the causes and secret motions of why something occurs (Rodrígez García, 2001). Two of the most critical organizational theorists that have built upon Bacon's foundation of knowledge as power are Bourdieu and Foucault. It is critical for an organization's leaders and consultants to understand the similarities and differences of these two theorists, as when assessing organizational efficacy in relation to power one must decide from which lens to view an organization.

The differences between Bourdieu and Foucault can only be understood by first understanding the foundation of organizational theory from the perspective of power. In its most basic form, organizational theory in relation to power is the theory that power builds and breaks organizations. It is the categorization, analysis, assessment, and understanding of this power that varies depending on one's view of an organization (Dixon, 2007). When viewing an organization through these theorists' lenses, one finds new insights into the way power manifests itself within an organization. These new insights enable organizational leaders and or consultants to examine power with the purpose of understanding and potentially manipulating power for the organization's greater good (Dixon, 2007). Thereby, the importance of selecting a theoretical lens becomes critical to future organizational strategy, and an organization must determine whether they wish to pursue Bourdieu's assessment of power from the perspective of social restraint and indirect cultural mechanisms, or Foucault's systemic disciple and control, or both.

The Development and Purpose of Bourdieu's Organizational Theory on Power

Bourdieu's view of power comes from a relational and process-oriented perspective built on theoretical terms and processes that state that in all societies, whether internal to an organization or not, there are social restraints that produce indirect, cultural mechanisms of power (Everett, 2002; Geciene, 2002). The central theme of this theory is that power often stares one directly in the face, yet remains unrecognizable. Organizational academics and sociologists must learn to discover power "where it is least visible, where it is most completely misrecognized" (Bourdieu, 1991, p.165). Thereby, Bourdieu's definition calls power "symbolic power" due to its invisibility. This definition states that symbolic power is the construction of a reality as an "invisible power which can be exercised only with the complicity of those who do not want to know that they are subject to it or even that they themselves exercise it" (Bourdieu, 1991, p.164). Forms of power such as economy, society, and culture build this symbolic power. Both individuals and organizations can possess symbolic power as a tangible item that is proportionate to the power held by the symbolic capital, such as economy, and symbolic systems, such as society and culture, of the organization. For example, an organization can have symbolic capital such as economic success that brings about symbolic power. However, as soon as the economy crashes, this tangible power and the organization's symbolic capital are lost (Geciene, 2002).

In this theory, Bourdieu emphasizes the criticality of knowledge of symbolic capital and symbolic systems in order to construct the reality of the organization (Geciene, 2002). However, Bourdieu also stresses that the construction of symbolic reality can be improperly established due to one's view of the society in which they reside. Bourdieu describes this improper understanding of symbolic power as misrecognition:

> . . . the set of fundamental, pre-reflexive assumptions that social agents engage by the mere fact of taking the world for granted, of accepting the world as is, and of finding it natural because their mind is constructed according to cognitive structures that are issues out of the very structures of the world. (Bourdieu, 1993, p.168)

Bourdieu's organizational theory of power centers on social relations and relies on the idea that power can be possessed and used as an instrument for good or destruction (Geciene, 2002). Using Bourdieu's perspective of power emphasizes to organizations the importance of recognizing the social complexities that drive symbolic capital and symbolic systems in order to manipulate them for the good of the organization. However, the misrecognition of symbolic power and its components can lead to utter destruction of an organization due to misuse of power.

The Development and Purpose of Foucault's Organizational Theory on Power

Unlike Bourdieu's symbolic power built through symbolic capital and symbolic systems, Foucault's interpretation of power in organizations centers on discourses and the subjects of power. Foucault's study of institutional practices from an archeological perspective found that power and discourses interrelate and that power and knowledge lead to a repressive view of power and the building of regimes (Välikangas & Seeck, 2011). By Foucault's definition discourses are "structured and regulated systems of rules, which define who can say what, when, and how" (Caldwell, 2007, p.772). With this definition at the center of his work, Foucault went on to study the relation of discourse, power, and the impact on the subject, which often began with how discourses developed and how the discourses created the concepts of right versus wrong within the organization. Appearing outside of social context, these discourses define conditions and rules, which ultimately define the perspectives of subjects (Välikangas & Seeck, 2011). From Foucault's perspective, an organization's practices built on management and organizational theories create a power/knowledge regime that not only defines the organization, but also how the subjects of an organization perceive themselves. When this regime becomes commonplace, organizations consider the regime normal, rendering alternative theories and practices as obsolete (Välikangas & Seeck, 2011).

By viewing an organization through Foucault's eyes, one must understand not only the theories onto which one builds an organization, but also the practices that come from the theories and their impact on the organization's subjects' perspective (Dixon, 2007). Through this understanding and in hopes of altering the regime for the better good, an organization's leaders, consultants, or both will be better able to hold a neutral view of how power impacts the organization. Yet, just as Bourdieu's theory has limitations, so does Foucault's. What this lens of power fails to consider are the "broad social and organizational influences that gender, race, age, and sexual orientation have on an individual's range of choice" (Dixon, 2007, p.293). As Dixon (2007) explains, Foucault's work must be used only when the recognition occurs that Foucault's definition of power is both idealistic and pragmatic. Despite these limitations, viewing an organization through Foucault's lens can provide great insight into the systematic power struggle that exists within an organization.

CONCLUSION

The review of literature revealed a need to determine how the phenomenon of misrecognition exists in multilingual organizations. This determination was made based on the review of literature further examining the presence of misrecognition and numerous studies regarding the topic within multilingual societies. This literature review covered topics pertaining to language policies as an exercise of power, the outlier of linguistic theories known as misrecognition, misrecognition within society pertaining to the recognized and unrecognized use of language as power, multilingual language policies in organizations with specific focus on institutional theory, Project DYLAN, and English as a corporate language, and the need to include both Bourdieu and Foucault in this literature review. Through providing this thorough background on misrecognition in society, in addition to language and power issues within organizations, it may be easy to deduce that when viewing a multilingual organization as a subset of a multilingual society, the issues that arise in a multilingual society are likely to arise in a multilingual organization. This article integrated literature relating to misrecognition in multilingual workplaces in a manner that explicitly communicates the essential nature of understanding misrecognition as it becomes evident in multilingual organizations. Our analysis and exploration of the listerature outlines policies in organizations that address various power dynamics, presents misrecognition as a formative addition to more traditional linguistic theories, and provides best practice multilingual language policies in multilingual organizations.

FUNDING AGENCY

The publisher has waived the Open Access Processing fee for this article.

REFERENCES

Bacon, F. (1860). New Atlantis. In J. Spedding (Ed.), *The Works of Francis Bacon*. Brown.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1994). Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics. In P. Morris (Ed.), *The Bakhtin reader: Selected writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov* (pp. 103–113). Arnold.

Bartlett, T. (2014). *Analysing power in language: A practical guide*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315851938

Bernstein, S. D. (2013). Detecting and responding constructively to transference in the workplace. *Journal of Management & Organization*, *19*(1), 75–85. doi:10.1017/jmo.2013.5

Blackledge, A. (2005). *Discourse and power in a multilingual world*. John Benjamins Publishing Co. doi:10.1075/dapsac.15

Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2002). Ideologies of language in multilingual contexts. *Multilingua, 21*(2/2), 121-140.

Blommaert, J. (1999). The debate is open. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 1–38). Moutdon De Gruyter.

Blommaert, J., & Verschueren, J. (1998). The role of language in European nationalist ideologies. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Korskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: practice and theory* (pp. 189–210). Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Language and symbolic power*. Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason*. Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations*. Polity Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/

Brock-Utne, B. (2015). Language, literacy, power and democracy in Africa. *Education and Society*, *33*(2), 5–24. doi:10.7459/es/33.2.02

Caldwell, R. (2007). Agency and change: Re-evaluating Foucault's legacy. *Organization*, *14*(6), 769–791. https://org.sagepub.com/. doi:10.1177/1350508407082262

Chattopadhyay, P., Tluchowska, M., & George, E. (2004). Identifying the ingroup: A closer look at the influence of demographic dissimilarity on employee social identity. *Academy of Management Review*, *29*(1), 180–202. doi:10.2307/20159028

Clegg, S. R. (1975). *Power, rule and domination: A critical and empirical understanding of power in sociological theory and organizational life*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Clegg, S. R. (1987). Discussion note: The language of power and the power of language. *Organization Studies*, *8*(4), 61–70. doi:10.1177/017084068700800105

Coder, K. E. (2011). *"Shaking the world awake": An interfaith multiple case study of spiritually advanced social change agents* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 3468891)

Creech, R. L. (2005). *Law and language in the European Union: The paradox of a babel 'united in diversity*. Europa Law Publishing.

Curseu, P. L., Schruijer, S. G. L., & Fodor, O. C. (2016). Decision rules, escalation of commitment and sensitivity to framing in group decision-making: An experimental investigation. *Management Decision*, *54*(7), 1649–1668. doi:10.1108/MD-06-2015-0253

de Haan, E. (2011). Back to basics: How the discovery of transference is relevant for coaches and consultants today. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, *6*(2), 180–193. http://shop.bps.org.uk/publications/publication-by-series/international-coaching-psychology-review.html

Dixon, M. A. (2007). Transforming power: Expanding the inheritance of Michel Foucault in organizational studies. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *20*(3), 283–296. doi:10.1177/0893318906296089

Everett, J. (2002). Organizational research and the praxeology of Pierre Bourdieu. *Organizational Research Methods*, *5*(1), 56–80. doi:10.1177/1094428102051005

Everett, J., & Jamal, T. B. (2004). Multistakeholder collaborations as symbolic marketplace and pedagogic practice. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *13*(1), 57–78. doi:10.1177/1056492603261042

Fredriksson, R., Barner-Rasmussen, W., & Piekkari, R. (2006). The multinational corporation as a multilingual organization: The notion of a common corporate language. *Corporate Communications*, *11*(4), 406–423. doi:10.1108/13563280610713879

Gaibrois, C., & Steyaert, C. (2017). Beyond possession and competition: Investigating cooperative aspects of power in multilingual organizations. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *17*(1), 69–84. doi:10.1177/1470595817701508

Gal, S. (1998). Multiplicity and contention among language ideologies: A commentary. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Korskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: practice and theory* (pp. 3–47). Oxford University Press.

Gal, S., & Irvine, J. (1995). The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research*, *62*(4), 967–1001. https://sites.google.com/site/jrspone/

Gal, S., & Woolard, K. (1995). Constructing languages and publics: Authority and representation. *Pragmatics*, *5*(2), 129–138. doi:10.1075/prag.5.2.01gal

Geciene, I. (2002). Notion of power in the theories of Bourdieu, Foucault and Baudrillard. *Sociologija*, *1*(2), 116–124. http://www.ku.lt/wp-content/uploads/ 2013/04/2002_nr_02.116-124.pdf

Ghosh, R. (2011). The liberating potential of multiculturalism in Canada: Ideals and realities. *Canadian Issues, 2*(1) 3-8. Retrieved from http://www.acs-aec.ca/en/publications/ canadian-issues/

Ghosh, R. (2016). Gender and Diversity in India: Contested Territories for HRD? *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *18I*(1), 3–10. doi:10.1177/1523422315614929

Guo, Y. (2013). Language policies and programs for adult immigrants in Canada: A critical analysis. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, *45*(1), 23–41. doi:10.1353/ces.2013.0022

Hancock, B. H. (2008). Put a little color on that! *Sociological Perspectives*, *51*(4), 783–802. doi:10.1525/sop.2008.51.4.783

Hanks, W. F. (2005). Pierre Bourdieu and the practices of language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *34*(1), 67–83. doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.33.070203.143907

Harzing, A. W., & Feely, A. J. (2008). The language barrier and its implications for HQ-subsidiary relationships. *Cross Cultural Management*, *15*(1), 49–61. doi:10.1108/13527600810848827

Haynes, R. K., & Ghosh, R. (2011). Dialogue Circle: An Exercise in Embracing Racial/Ethnic Diversity and Supporting Inclusion. In S. Dhiman & J. Biberman (Eds.), *Managing in the 21st Century Transforming toward Mutual Growth*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Huang, H. (2009). *Globally distributed information technology work: A study of cross-cultural influences, communication, and management* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 900691994)

Ilmakunnas, P., & Ilmakunnas, S. (2011). Diversity at the workplace: Whom does it benefit? *De Economist*, *159*(2), 223–255. doi:10.1007/s10645-011-9161-x

Jaffe, A. (2003). Misrecognition unmasked? 'Polynomic' language, expert statuses and orthographic practices in Corsican schools. *Pragmatics*, *13*(4), 515–537. doi:10.1075/prag.13.4.04jaf

Jones, J. M., & Dividio, J. F. (2018). Change, challenge, and prospects for a diversity paradigm in social psychology. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *12*(1), 7–56. doi:10.1111/sipr.12039

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory*. Multilingual Matters Ltd. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/

Kone, A. (2010). Politics of language: The struggle for power in schools in Mali and Burkina Faso. *International Education, 39*(2), 6-20. Retrieved from http://www. iejcomparative.org/

Kroskrity, P. (1998). Arizona Tewa Kiva speech as a manifestation of a dominant language ideology. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Korskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: practice and theory* (pp. 103–122). Oxford University Press.

Maccoby, M. (2004). Why people follow the leader. In *Harvard Business Review on the persuasive leader* (pp. 119–144). Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation.

Matos, K. (2009). *Relational demography, linguistic diversity, and workplace attitudes* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 288056698)

Muniz, E. J. (2007). *The role of cultural values in organizational attraction* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 304743725)

Oakes, L. S., Townley, B., & Cooper, D. J. (1998). Business planning as pedagogy: Language and control in a changing institutional field. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *32*(2), 257–292. doi:10.2307/2393853

Oaks, L. (2017). Normative language policy and minority language rights: Rethinking the case of regional languages in France. *Language Policy*, *16*(1), 365–384. doi:10.1007/s10993-016-9411-5

Offerman, L. R., Matos, K., & DeGraaf, S. B. (2013). ¿Están hablando de mí?: Challenges for multilingual organizations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *29*(6), 644–660. doi:10.1108/JMP-10-2012-0315

Peltokorpi, V., & Vaara, E. (2012). Language policies and practices in wholly owned foreign subsidiaries: A recontextualization perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *43*(9), 808–833. doi:10.1057/jibs.2012.28

Piller, I. (2001). Naturalization language testing and its basis in ideologies of national identity and citizenship. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, *5*(3), 259–277. doi:10.1177/13670069010050030201

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and anti-Semitism*. Routledge.

Ritter, B. A., & Lord, R. G. (2007). The impact of previous leaders on the evaluation of new leaders: An alternative to prototype matching. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(6), 1683–1695. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1683 PMID:18020805

Rodrígez García, J. M. (2001). Scientia potestas est - Knowledge is power: Francis Bacon to Michel Foucault. *Neohelicon*, *28*(1), 109–121. doi:10.1023/A:1011901104984

Schmidt, R. (2002). Racialisation and language policy: The case of the U.S.A. *Multilingua*, *21*(2/3), 141–162. https://web.csulb.edu/~rschmidt/RSchmidt-Racialization-Multilingua.pdf

Siemens speaks several languages - despite what the management says: Multinational corporation remains a multilingual organization. (2007). *Human Resource Management International Digest, 15*(6), 16. 10.1108/09670730710820154

Silverman, D., & Jones, J. (1974). *Organizational work: The language of grading and the grading of language*. Collier Macmillan.

Smyth, J. (2002). Symbolic power and police legitimacy: The Royal Ulster Constabulary. *Crime, Law, and Social Change*, *38*(3), 295–310. doi:10.1023/A:1020656625353

Srivastava, S. B., Goldberg, A., Manian, V. G., & Potts, G. (2018). Enculturation trajectories: Language, cultural adaptation, and individual outcomes in organizations. *Management Science*, *64*(3), 1348–1364. doi:10.1287/mnsc.2016.2671

Tietze, S. (2008). *International management and language*. Taylor & Francis. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/

Tomic, P. (2013). The colour of language: Accent, devaluation and resistance in Latin American immigrant lives in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, *45*(1-2), 1–21. doi:10.1353/ces.2013.0018

Trafimow, D., Triandis, H. C., & Goto, S. G. (1991). Some tests of the distinction between the private self and the collective self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*(5), 649–655. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.60.5.649

Turner, J. C., & Haslam, S. A. (2012). Social identity, organizations, and leadership. In M. E. Turner (Ed.), *Groups at Work: Theory and Research* (pp. 25–66). Routledge.

Vaara, E., Tienari, J., Piekkari, R., & Santti, R. (2005). Language and the circuits of power in a merging multinational corporation. *Journal of Management Studies*, *42*(3), 595–623. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00510.x

Välikangas, A., & Seeck, H. (2011). Exploring the Foucauldian interpretation of power and subject in organizations. *Journal of Management & Organization*, *17*(6), 812–827. doi:10.5172/jmo.2011.812

Wodak, R. (2002). Discourse and politics: The rhetoric of exclusion. In R. Wodak & A. Pelinka (Eds.), *The Haider phenomenon in Austria* (pp. 33–60). Transaction.

Woolard, K. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Korskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 3–47). Oxford University Press.

Erin Mires is a Clinical Assistant Professor at the University of Louisville and a Learning & Development consultant for organizations from nonprofits to Fortune 500 companies. Current contracts include Leadership Southern Indiana, Norton Healthcare, Baptist Health System.

Matt Bergman, PhD, is an Associate Professor at the University of Louisville and is the author of Unfinished Business: Compelling Stories of Adult Student Persistence. Dr. Bergman's research is focused on student persistence, prior learning assessment, leadership, and degree completion programs. His work has appeared in refereed journals such as the Journal of Continuing Higher Education, Human Resource Development Review, Adult Learning, International Journal of Information Communication Technologies and Human Development, and his work highlighted in international media outlets including The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Post, The Chronicle of Higher Education, NPR, and TIME Magazine. In 2015, Bergman and his colleagues won the E. F. Holton III Outstanding Article of the Year. His program was the recipient of the 2019 ACHE Distinguished Program Award, 2019 AAACE Curriculum Innovation Award, and the 2013 AAACE Malcolm Knowles Award for Adult Education Program of the Year. His adult learner focused program was also acknowledged as a 2014 National Program of Distinction in the American Public and Land Grant Universities' MVP Awards for Campus Based Strategies for Student Success and the 2013 Innovation for Educational Attainment from the Gheen's Foundation and 55,000 Degrees based upon local implementation of his research. Dr. Bergman was awarded the 2018 ACHE South Outstanding Faculty Award, the Metroversity Outstanding Faculty for Adult Learners in 2015, and was a Top 4 Faculty Favorite at UofL in 2020/2021. He is a Fellow for Complete College America that serves as a teacher, administrator, and ambassador of degree attainment both locally and nationally.

Ehren Green is a Graduate Research and Teaching Assistant at University of Louisville currently pursuing her PhD in educational leadership and organizational development with a concentration in sport administration. Her research interests are in the intersection of intercollegiate athletics and organizational development.

Kevin Rose is an Assistant Professor of Organizational Leadership in the Department of Technology Leadership and Communication for the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology at IUPUI. His research focuses on understanding and improving the lives of people at work, with emphasis on constructs such as organizational citizenship behaviors, leadership and engagement.