

Congrès AFSP Paris 2013

ST14 Gouverner les Langues

Jeff Millar
Doctoral Candidate
York University,
Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics,
S561 Ross Building, 4700 Keele Street,
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M3J 1P3
jmiller@yorku.ca

“Language Governance and the Neo-Liberalization of Citizenship: A Comparative Case Study of Language and Naturalization Policies.”

Introduction

The governance of language, the governance of citizenship, and the relation between them can be fruitfully examined by looking at policies of language requirements for naturalization. In recent years, both Canada and the UK have adopted more formalized procedures for naturalization including citizenship tests on knowledge of language and society. The use of formalized public policy instruments such as citizenship tests as well as mandatory ‘integration courses’ has proliferated across Western Europe over the last 10 or 15 years and has been associated with the emergence of a ‘civic integration’ paradigm within the immigration and citizenship policy domain (Joppke, 2007). Although the extent to which this civic integration paradigm represents a convergence of policies around a particular model of citizenship is still debated, it does represent a ‘thickening’ and a ‘reevaluation’ of citizenship (Joppke & Morawska, 2003) which raises questions as to the nature and role of these instruments in the contemporary governance of migration and citizenship in liberal, Western nation states.

This paper examines the relation between the governance of language and citizenship by posing two questions. The first question, which is how investigation of citizenship testing practices is framed in the majority of the literature on citizenship test from a variety of disciplinary perspectives (migration studies, citizenship studies, legal studies, political sociology) is ‘What model of citizenship do citizenship language (and knowledge of society) tests represent? After surveying the responses to this question in the current literature, I then go on to explain the limitations of these responses. I then reformulate the investigation of the government of language and citizenship as the question of ‘What mode of governance do citizenship language tests reflect?’ To answer this question I apply a governmentality approach (Foucault, 1982; 1991; 1994, 2009) to analyze the Canadian and British citizenship testing regimes to illustrate how the mobilization of the concepts of language and citizenship within the naturalization policy domain reflects a neo-liberal, or advanced liberal mode of governance (Rose, 1996; 1999).

What model of citizenship do formalized naturalization tests represent?

In order to investigate the relationship between the governance of language and citizenship within the immigration and naturalization policy domain, I will first summarize the

literature on citizenship testing from the fields of migration and citizenship studies, political theory and political sociology, as well as the literature from the field of applied and socio-linguistics specifically addressing the aspect of citizenship *language* testing. These literatures, despite taking a variety of legal, sociological, and political theoretical perspectives, share a common formulation of the investigation of the issue of citizenship (language) testing in terms of the question ‘What model of citizenship (or ‘What kind of immigration policy’) do citizenship tests represent? Depending on which perspective from the above mentioned is taken, the criteria for coming up with an answer to the question have been: normative criteria based on liberal political principles; various typologies of models of citizenship, drawn either from the fields of political theory or sociology; a combination of the above typological approach and a consideration of the effects of neo-liberal modes of governance on the form of contemporary citizenship; and the extent to which policies of citizenship language testing are based on exclusionary ideologies and notions of national belonging, and the extent to which they function as gate-keeping measures for the control (i.e., restriction) of immigration. Each of these is discussed in turn, and critiques provided.

The literature on citizenship testing by liberal political theorists adopts a normative stance by asking whether these policies are compatible with liberal political tenets (see, e.g., the edited collection by Bauböck & Joppke, 2010). These liberal political theorists evaluate the contents of the tests and other requirements for naturalization to determine whether they meet the conditions of political liberalism. While some argue that only very minimal naturalization requirements, such as residency, are justifiable on liberal grounds, thus making citizenship tests objectionable from a liberal perspective (see e.g., Carens in Bauböck & Joppke, 2010), others argue that requiring some knowledge of society and language is also defensible according to liberal principles (see, Hansen in Bauböck & Joppke, 2010). Others argue that citizenship tests are ‘illiberal’ on consequentialist grounds by identifying the exclusionary effects of new testing regimes, for instance on the numbers of naturalizations (absolute as well as rate of naturalization), or differential effects on certain population groups (see Groenendijk & Van Oers in Bauböck & Joppke, 2010; Ryan, 2009). The majority view from amongst these writers is that citizenship tests of the civic integration paradigm violate liberal principles and that they thus serve as an example of ‘illiberal’ liberal practices (see, e.g., Guild, Groenendijk, & Carrera, 2009).

The most prominent dissenting voice from this ‘illiberal liberalism’ thesis is Christian Joppke, who believes that by and large the requirements of civic integration-type citizenship tests are compatible with liberal principles, and that ‘illiberal’ uses of these tests by certain governments are the exception rather than an example of the ‘exceptionalism’ inherent in liberalism itself, according to some of its critics (Joppke, 2007; Bauböck & Joppke, 2010). Indeed, Joppke sees along side the civic integration paradigm a general trend towards the liberalization of naturalization policy across Western Europe, for example in the shift to a *jus soli* basis for citizenship, increasing tolerance for dual citizenship, and a shortening of residency periods for naturalization (Joppke, 2010). Another insight that Joppke provides is the comparison he draws between the kinds of requirements that are part of the civic integration paradigm (such as mandatory integration courses) and certain kinds of neo-liberal social policies, such as active labour-market policies which are applied to the domestic, native born population, and which reflect a more ‘disciplinary’ sort of liberalism, thus representing a shift away from classical liberalism (Joppke, 2007, p. 16). This integration of an analysis of neo-liberal economic and social policy within consideration of the changing nature of contemporary citizenship is also

taken up by proponents of a ‘neoliberal communitarian’ model of citizenship discussed below, and will be part of the analysis offered in the present paper.

Another body of literature on citizenship tests adopts a typological approach to answering the question of what model of citizenship do citizenship tests, including tests of language proficiency, conform to (for an overview, see Wallace Goodman, 2010). Based also on political theoretical models of liberal, republican, and communitarian citizenship, this work examines the testing regimes and instruments themselves as well as the political discourses surrounding their implementation to determine what model they fit. The common finding is that these tests are implemented in the context of a citizenship discourse centered around themes of active citizenship, participation, responsibilities of citizenship, common norms and values, community, etc., and thus represent a shift away from the liberal model of citizenship to a republican and / or a communitarian model (or some hybrid or variant form of one or the other, e.g., liberal communitarian, neo-republican, libertarian liberal, etc.).

One problem with both liberal normative and comparative typological writings on citizenship testing is that many of the criteria for evaluating whether a test is liberal or not or to which model of citizenship it belongs are not objective but subjective. For instance, one’s evaluation of whether a particular requirement is liberal or not depends on the version of liberalism to which one ascribes. This is particularly the case with the language requirements. For some, language is a neutral medium of communication and thus requiring a certain level of proficiency for naturalization is perfectly compatible with liberalism in that it ensures the full participation in society and exercise of the rights of citizenship. However, others view language as a marker of ethnic identity and thus any requirement of knowledge of language is *de facto* a demand for cultural assimilation. Likewise, one’s view of language will effect how one characterizes a language requirement for citizenship as either part of a liberal, republican or communitarian model of citizenship.

One set of literature which does provide a sophisticated analysis of language within citizenship testing regimes is the applied linguistic and sociolinguistic literature on language testing regimes for purposes of immigration and citizenship. This literature generally agrees with the normative critique of citizenship tests as ‘illiberal’ within the liberal political theoretical literature. While drawing on the citizenship studies literature which has documented a retreat from multiculturalism and a return to assimilation (Joppke & Morawska, 2003; Brubaker, 2003), as well as the post-national critique of the notion of national citizenship itself (e.g., Shohamy, 2009; cf. Soysal, 1994), the applied and sociolinguistic literature contributes a language ideology perspective to the analysis which identifies the justification for citizenship language testing as based on a monolingual national language ideology dating back to the Herderian formulation of ‘one nation one language one state’ which was the basis of the 19th century nationalist movements in Europe (Extra, Spotti, & Van Avermaet, 2009; Hogan-Brun, Mar-Molinaro & Stevenson, 2009). It sees the use of these tests as reasserting an ethnic (ethnolinguistic) notion of the national identity and national belonging and as part of restrictive immigration policies (Piller, 2001; Kofman, 2005). While this literature makes an important contribution to the understanding policies of citizenship language testing, they could benefit from the adoption of a governmentality perspective (Milani, 2009). With their reliance on ideologies of language as determining policies on citizenship language testing, these analyses fail to specify the way that language is implicated in strategies for the governance of citizenship and immigration, in particular neo-liberal or advanced liberal governmental rationalities and technologies of government.

One attempt at explaining the contradictions at the bottom of the ‘illiberal liberalism’ thesis as well as the hybrid nature of contemporary citizenship, combining aspects of republican, liberal and communitarian models of citizenship, has been the proposal of the notion of ‘neoliberal communitarianism’ (Schinkel and Van Houdt, 2010; Van Houdt, Suvarierol, & Schinkel, 2011). ‘Neoliberal communitarianism,’ as its name suggests, combines aspects of neo-liberal governance in the form of ‘responsibilization’ and features of ‘thick citizenship’ in the form of cultural assimilation (Schinkel & Van Houdt, 2010). The incorporation of an analysis of a neoliberal mode of governance in the discussion of the increasingly communitarian aspect of contemporary citizenship is the most significant contribution of the neoliberal communitarian model. However, by specifying ‘communitarianism’ as cultural assimilation and characterizing language testing requirements as cultural assimilation it fails to extend the analysis in terms of a neo-liberal mode of governance to the role of *language* within the citizenship testing regimes.

In order to address the limitations of the approaches discussed above, I propose to reframe the question of the relation between language and citizenship within the increasing formalization of naturalization testing not as an issue of ‘what model of citizenship do these policies represent?’ but rather as a question of ‘what mode of governance do these policies around language and citizenship reflect?’ In order to do this, I must first outline the approach taken to the governance of language and citizenship.

Governmentality approach to the government of language and citizenship

What is meant by ‘governance’ or ‘government’ of language and citizenship? The approach to governing language adopted for the present analysis is an approach in terms of governmentality, that is the perspective on governing in the modern nation-state which sees statecraft not as the defense of sovereignty over a territory but rather as an ‘art of government’ whose goal is the well being of a population (Foucault, 2009, p. 105). The exercise of governmental power is aimed at effecting ‘the right disposition of things,’ and consists of “a mode of action upon the action of others” or ‘the conduct of conduct’ (1982, p. 221; cf. 1994, p.237).

Public policies, such as those around language and citizenship can be investigated as ‘technologies of government’. Similar to political sociology literature on public policy instruments (*instruments d’action publique*) (e.g., Lascombes & Simard, 2011), the study of technologies of government (*technologies de gouvernement*) investigates the form they take as governmental apparatuses (*appareils*) and operationalized forms of knowledge (*savoirs*). In addition to an overarching concern with population, ‘governmentality’ has “political economy as its major form of knowledge, and apparatuses of security as its essential technical instrument” (2009, p. 108). It is through such technologies of government that those who govern endeavor “to structure the possible field of action of others” (Foucault, 1982, p. 221).

Another contribution of a governmentality approach is the way it views the ‘subjects’ of government, that is, those who are subjected to governmental modes of power. Rather than simply subjecting individuals as objects of a disciplining power, governmental “power is exercised only over free subjects, and only insofar as they are free” (Foucault, 1982, p. 221). Thus, issues of subjectivation, that is the creation of subjects of government as free agents capable of action, is a key interest from a governmentality perspective.

The form of government in contemporary liberal nation-states has been shaped by the economic orthodoxy of neo-liberalism, producing a variant of liberal governmental rationality

dubbed ‘advanced liberal’ political rationality (Rose, 1996, 1999). Advanced liberal political rationality shares the premises of neo-liberalism and so entails neo-liberal economic policies (flexibilization, activation labour market policies) as well as neo-liberal social policy, which applies an economic logic (the enterprise form) to social government (Rose, 1996, 1999)¹. This perspective is similar to the Advanced liberal political rationality is also a critique of the welfare state and classical liberalism as state form and mode of government. It entails a new form of the state, namely the ‘enabling state’ and also a new social actor, namely the active, enterprising subject (Rose, 199, 142). ‘Responsibilization’ of subjects through policies of active citizenship is the most fundamental aspect of neo-liberal rationality for the government of contemporary citizenship (Rose, 1996, p. 60).

In the following sections I will discuss in greater detail specific aspects of the Canadian and UK citizenship testing regimes in order to show how they instantiate a neo-liberal or advanced liberal mode of governance². Particular attention will be drawn to the following issues: responsibilization, notions of ‘participation’, and the concept of ‘community.’ In sum, the governance of language and citizenship, as reflected in the citizenship testing regimes has as its aim the subjectivation of the population, specifically the creation of responsibilized citizen/subjects who, through the exercise of active citizenship are responsible for ensuring their own well being, as individuals and collectively, through participation in the ‘community’.

Language and Citizenship Testing regimes in Canada and the UK

The citizenship testing regime in Canada was recently formalized by amendments to the Citizenship Act and changes to the naturalization procedure in 2009. The naturalization test was redesigned with the publication of a new study guide, *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship* (Canada, 2010[2009]), and the rewriting of the test questions to incorporate the content in the new study guide. Also, the language requirement to demonstrate knowledge of one of the two official languages of Canada, already part of the 1977 Citizenship Act, was also formalized, first by specifying the required level of language proficiency (defined in relation to the Canada Language Benchmarks (CLB), level 4), and subsequently by requiring objective evidence of language proficiency as part of the application for naturalization (Paquet, 2012).

The current citizenship language testing regime in the UK came into effect in 2005. The plan for the test was announced in the 2002 White Paper *Secure Borders, Safe Haven* and the legislated in the subsequent Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act of 2002. The testing regime was to formalize the already existing requirement, under the 1981 Nationality Act, for applicants for naturalization to demonstrate sufficient knowledge of life in the UK and of the English language. The content of the test, in terms of knowledge of society was set out in the study guide *Life in the UK: A journey to citizenship* (Home Office, 2007[2004]). In formalizing the knowledge of language requirement, the new testing regime eschewed a one size fits all approach of having one standard of language proficiency required, adopting instead a threshold of language proficiency (defined as ESOL entry level 3 or CEFR B1) beyond which applicants

¹ Cf. the analysis of the ‘new governance’ (*new gouvernance*) characterized by privatization, contractualization, voluntarism; a ‘steering’ role of the state; partnerships between public/private, profit/non-profit, etc. (see e.g., Lascoumes and Simard 2011, p. 15).

² Cf. the sociolinguist Milani’s (2009) application of a governmentality approach in his study of a proposal for a Swedish citizenship language test.

would have to take the life in the UK test while those with a level of proficiency below the threshold would simply have to demonstrate improvement (defined as one ESOL level) by passing a course in English as a second language (ESOL) with citizenship content. This model was labeled by its proponents as ‘light touch’ testing. The citizenship content of the ESOL course route within the testing regime was elaborated in the *Citizenship Materials for ESOL Learners* (Home Office, 2010[2006]).

Analyses of these testing regimes have characterized them in much the same way as the literature reviewed above. For instance, Van Oers (2009, 2010) argues that the implementation of the UK testing regime is part of a general shift “from a liberal understanding of citizenship...towards a thicker, communitarian concept” (2010, p. 101), and identifies communitarian, emancipatory liberal, libertarian, neo-republican arguments behind the introduction and subsequent development of the UK citizenship testing regime. Further, Van Oers claims that while the test was justified with a communitarian discourse (themes of e.g., shared civic identity, community cohesion, etc.) it has been implemented in a way that can still be defended on liberal grounds (i.e., inexpensive costs, high pass rate, ‘light touch test’ procedure). On the Canadian testing regime, Paquet (2012) argues that the test is not an example of the civic integration paradigm dominant in Western Europe. Unlike the UK test, which does reflect the aims of civic integration and the use of testing for immigration control, the Canadian test is aimed instead at the promotion of citizenship (i.e., naturalization).

These characterizations of the Canadian and UK testing regimes suffer from the same weaknesses as the literature reviewed above. While they do provide insights into the respective testing regimes and the justifying discourses surrounding their implementation, some of the specific claims are questionable, in particular Paquet’s claims that “the introduction of a standardized test was primarily a technical decision” (2012, p. 255), and that “the test has a minimalist conception of citizenship” (p. 253).

What I propose to carry out in the final section of the paper is to analyse these testing regimes from a governmental perspective in order to show that there are underlying similarities between the two testing regimes resulting from their adoption of a similar approach to societal governance through the technologization of language and citizenship.

What mode of governance do formalized language and naturalization tests reflect?

The ‘reevaluation of citizenship’ (Joppke & Morawska, 2003), which citizenship testing regimes reflect and to which they also contribute, is also a function of the governmentalization of citizenship. The ‘thickening of citizenship’ with (neo-)republican or communitarian features, is part of the technologization of the notion of citizenship itself. Furthermore, the ‘return of assimilation’ which Brubaker (2003) observes, with its concern over multiple social and economic processes of ‘integration’ at the aggregate level of population groups rather than a single process of cultural assimilation of individuals, has affinities with a biopolitical rationality of government (Rose, 1999). From this perspective, naturalization policies, including citizenship language tests, are part of a governmental apparatus (*dispositif*) of security (Foucault, 2009). However, this ‘securitization of citizenship’ is related to a broader notion of security than ‘national security’ and concerns over threats of terrorism or extremism (although it is often hard to disentangle these themes within media and political discourses surrounding citizenship and immigration policy). The governmentalization of the citizenship domain, and the notions of citizenship and language within it, is part of a general concern over societal and human security.

The broader context for policies of citizenship language testing is an array of political discourses and state strategies over the last two decades in terms of social cohesion, integration, social inclusion/exclusion, civil renewal, all of which reflect the biopolitical concern with the well-being of the population (Rose, 1999). In the contemporary conjuncture, these concerns and strategies reflect the dominance of a neo-liberal economic orthodoxy and take the form of governments' attempts to deal with the social and economic consequences of neo-liberal economic and state restructuring.

In Canada, there has been a shift in the post-war citizenship regime, based on the state provision of welfare (health, pensions, unemployment benefits) and a sense of Canadian identity grounded in notions of social citizenship (Jenson & Phillips, 1996; 2001; Brodie, 2002; 2008). The result of neo-liberal economic and state restructuring in Canada has been a neo-liberal citizenship regime in which "the politics of neo-liberalism...is providing many of the terms in which citizenship is now being reconstituted" (Jenson & Phillips, 2001, p. 71). The key aim is to "reinvent society and solidarity within the context of...the ascendance of the neo-liberal state form" (Brodie, 2002, p. 379). This new approach to social governance has produced a new political subject, as the 'Social Canadian' of the post-war citizenship regime has been replaced by the 'Entrepreneurial Canadian' and the 'Volunteer Canadian' (p. 390) within a 'Canadian Way' discourse whose themes of active citizenship aim at the responsabilization of individual citizens.

In the UK, the approach to social governance in the wake of neo-liberal restructuring took the form of the 'Third Way' politics of the New Labour government. The political discourse of the Third Way reconciles seemingly incompatible opposites from the political left and right, reflecting a belief in social justice combined with a belief in economic growth and individual enterprise (Fairclough, 2000; 2010). Third Way social and economic policy aims to avoid the excesses of unregulated markets as well as intrusive state intervention (Fairclough, 2010). An example is the particular approach to dealing with issues of social inequality, poverty, and unemployment resulting from neo-liberal restructuring. Third Way policy in these areas addresses 'social exclusion' as part of a "social integrationist discourse whose central focus is on paid work" (Levitas, 1998, p. 7). The New Labour government in the UK eschewed redistributionist policies for combating poverty and inequality, and instead pursued 'welfare to work' policies, aimed at moving people off of benefits and into employment. The Third Way focus on employability is based on a concept of inclusion as an active obligation, where the responsibility for employability lies with the individual, with government merely providing opportunities for employment (p. 156-157). This responsabilization of the socially excluded as responsible for their own well-being ('inclusion') is an example of advanced liberal governmental rationality (cf. Rose, 1996).

A recurrent theme in the discussions surrounding the reform of the Citizenship Act is the notion of the responsibilities of citizenship. The notion of 'responsible citizenship' i.e., duty "to contribute to the development of the life of the country" was a key theme of a report of the parliamentary standing committee on citizenship and Immigration, *Canadian Citizenship: A sense of belonging* (Canada, 1994). A subsequent report a decade later, *Updating Canada's Citizenship Laws: It's Time* (Canada, 2005), proposed the addition of a preamble to a new citizenship act "in which the rights and responsibilities of citizenship are clearly addressed." Finally, when the citizenship test was redesigned in 2009, the new study guide, *Discover Canada* (Canada, 2009), was given the subtitle 'The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship,' and the section on rights and responsibilities of citizenship was given greater prominence at the

beginning of the study guide.³ With this greater emphasis on responsibilities of citizenship, *Discover Canada* reflects a shift to a more civic republican notion of citizenship in terms of active citizenship and participation in the ‘community.’

Both the Canadian and UK citizenship testing regimes technologize the concept of ‘community’ in the process of rendering it governmental (cf. Rose, 1999, 175). This is associated with a neo-liberal restructuring of civil society. ‘Government through community’ is described by Rose as the constitution of a sector “whose vectors and forces can be mobilized, enrolled, deployed in novel programmes and techniques which encourage and harness active practices of self-management and identity construction, of personal ethics and collective allegiances” (p. 176). In particular, the importance of the third sector within a restructured civil society as the field of action for the new citizens subject is reflected in the Canadian and UK citizenship testing regimes in the focus on practices of volunteering as a way for new citizens to participate in the community. For instance, the new Canadian citizenship study guide, *Discover Canada*, includes among the responsibilities of citizenship ‘Helping others in the community,’ which is specified as follows:

Millions of volunteers freely donate their time to help others without pay – helping people in need, assisting at your child’s school, volunteering at a food bank or other charity, or encouraging newcomers to integrate. Volunteering is an excellent way to gain useful skills and develop friends and contacts. (p. 8)

Likewise, the notion of community deployed within the UK citizenship testing regime is a Third Way version “infused with notions of voluntarism, of charitable works, of self-organized care, of unpaid service to one’s fellows” (Rose, 1999, p. 171). This is most evident in the content of the *Life in the UK* handbook as well as the *Citizenship Materials for ESOL*.

The revised version of the *Life in the UK Handbook* from 2007 included an additional chapter on ‘Building better communities,’ which outlined the responsibilities of citizens to contribute to the well being of their communities. Chief among the practices through which active citizens can make their communities more cohesive is volunteering. Volunteering, that is working for a good cause without payment is said to have many benefits for the individual, in terms of acquiring social capital (meeting new people) as well as new job skills as well as an opportunity to practice English language skills. The chapter also expresses the government’s perspective on the benefits of the ‘third sector’ of charities and not-for profit organizations for the collective benefit of the society and the economy.

Citizenship Materials for ESOL were also revised in 2010, with the addition of new sections on ‘Volunteering’ and ‘getting involved in your community’. This was to align with the government’s community cohesion agenda, which was reflecting a shift from civic republican to more communitarian modes of participation where the ‘community’ is the field of action of the active citizen. Just as in the *Life in the UK Handbook*, this active citizenship takes the form of volunteering. In the new sections, volunteering is closely linked with ‘active citizenship,’ with one vocabulary activity even defining ‘active citizenship’ as ‘becoming very involved in the community by volunteering.’

A novel aspect of the *ESOL citizenship materials* is the emphasis on inter-community volunteering, that is, forms of voluntary activity outside of one’s own ethnic or cultural community. Indeed this focus on inter-community activities (including through practices of

³ In the previous study, *A Look at Canada* (Canada, 2007[1995]), the section on rights and responsibilities was at the very end of the study guide, on pages 38-39 out of 47.

volunteering) is a key feature of the community cohesion agenda, which focuses on establishing links between communities. This is motivated by a particular version of communitarian theory of societal cohesion based on fostering ‘bridging social capital’ as a way of developing a broader sense of community necessary for societal cohesion within an increasingly diverse society (for discussion of social capital see, e.g., Putnam, 1995). Language is one such form of bridging social capital, providing the means of establishing links with others outside of one’s own ethnic community and which, through such interaction, allows the imagining of a diverse society as a ‘community of communities.’

As the above demonstrates, the rendering of the notion of community as a technology of government accomplishes a governmentalization of civil society, which is a key feature of neo-liberal governance. While in liberal political theory, civil society is the counterweight to the state, and is seen as a realm of liberty of individual citizens, in the neo-liberal representation of the relation between the governing and the governed, civil society is mobilized as the field of action of the newly responsabilized citizen-subject. Civil society becomes an extension of the state’s governmental activity with the Third Sector, and the individual volunteers that make up that sector, providing the kinds of social welfare provisions that were once provided by the welfare state which is everywhere in retreat.

Conclusion

The overall picture that emerges from the preceding analysis is that Canadian and UK citizenship and language testing regimes make use of a similar governmentalization of ‘community’ and ‘participation’ with the ultimate goal of creating responsabilized citizen/subjects who, through the exercise of active citizenship are responsible for ensuring their own well being, as individuals and collectively, through participation in the community. Language and citizenship stand as the twin pillars of a new approach to ‘social governance’ (cf. Brodie, 2008) as both of these concepts are made technical, that is realized as practices, and deployed as forms of governmental intervention. Language and citizenship as practices, as sets of actions in the form of ‘active citizenship’ or ‘participation’, are conducted by states, through *inter alia* citizenship tests, by structuring the domain of activity of citizenship, of civil society, short of the ‘social’.

References

- Bauböck, R., & Joppke, C. (Eds.) (2010). *How liberal are citizenship tests?* Florence: European University Institute.
- Brodie, J. (2002). Citizenship and solidarity: Reflections on the Canadian Way. *Citizenship Studies*, 6(4), 377-394.
- Brodie, J. (2008). The social in social citizenship. In E. F. Isin (Ed.), *Recasting the social in citizenship* (pp. 20-43). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Brubaker, R. (2003). The return of assimilation? In C. Joppke & E. Morawska (Eds.), *Towards assimilation and citizenship: Immigrants in liberal nation-states*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Canada. (2007[1995]). *A look at Canada*. Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada.
- Canada. (2010[2009]). *Discover Canada: The rights and responsibilities of citizenship*. Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada.
- Canada. Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration. (1994). *Canadian citizenship: A sense of belonging*. Ottawa.
- Canada. Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration. (2005). *Updating Canada's citizenship laws: It's time*. Ottawa.
- Extra, G., Spotti, M., & Van Avermaet, P. (2009). *Language testing, migration and citizenship*. London: Continuum.
- Fairclough, N. (2000). *New Labour, new language?* London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. In Dreyfus, & P. Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 208-226). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 87-104). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1994). *Dits et écrits IV*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Foucault, M. (2009). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-1978*. New York: Picador.
- Guild, E., Groenendijk, K., & Carrera, S. (Eds.). (2009). *Illiberal liberal states: Immigration, citizenship and integration in the EU*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Hogan-Brun, G., Mar-Molinero, C., & Stevenson, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Discourses on Language and Integration: Critical perspectives on language testing regimes in Europe*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Home Office. (2010[2006]). *Citizenship materials for ESOL learners*. London: HMSO.
- Home Office. (2007[2004]). *Life in the UK: A journey to citizenship*. London: HMSO.
- Jenson, J. (1998). *Mapping social cohesion: The state of Canadian research*. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Jenson, J., & Phillips, S. D. (2001). Redesigning the Canadian citizenship regime: Remaking the institutions of representation. In C. Crouch, K. Eder, & D. Tambini (Eds.), *Citizenship, markets and the state* (pp. 69-89). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Joppke, C. (2007). Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, 30(1), 1-22.

- Joppke, C. (2010). *Citizenship and immigration*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Joppke, C., & Morawska, E. (2003). Integrating immigrants in liberal nation-states. In C. Joppke & E. Morawska (Eds.), *Toward assimilation and citizenship: Immigration in liberal nation-states* (p.1-36). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kofman, E. (2005). Citizenship, migration and the reasserting of national identity. *Citizenship Studies*, 9(5), 453-467.
- Lascoumes, P., & Simard, L. (2011). L'action publique au prisme de ses instruments. *Revue française de science politique*, 61(1), 5-22.
- Levitas, R. (1998). *The inclusive society? Social exclusion and New Labour*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Milani, T. M. (2009). At the intersection between power and knowledge: An analysis of a Swedish policy document on language testing for citizenship. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 8(2), 287-304.
- Paquet, M. (2012). Beyond appearances: Citizenship tests in Canada and the UK. *Journal of International Migration & Integration*, 13, 243-260
- Piller, I. (2001). Naturalization language testing and its basis in ideologies of national identity and citizenship. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(3), 259-277.
- Putnam, R. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1), 65-78.
- Rose, N. (1996). Governing 'advanced liberal' democracies. In A. Barry, T. Osborne, & N. Rose (Eds.), *Foucault and political reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government* (pp. 37-64). London: UCL Press.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ryan, B. (2009). The integration agenda in British migration law. In E. Guild, K. Groenendijk, & S. Carrera (Eds.), *Illiberal liberal states: Immigration, citizenship and integration in the EU* (pp. 277-298). Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Schinkel, W., & Van Houdt, F. (2010). The double helix of cultural assimilationism and neo-liberalism: Citizenship in contemporary governmentality. *British Journal of Sociology*, 61(4), 696-715.
- Shohamy, E. (2009). Language tests for immigrants: Why language? Why tests? Why citizenship? In G. Hogan-Brun, C. Mar-Molinero, & P. Stevenson (Eds.), *Discourses on Language and Integration: Critical perspectives on language testing regimes in Europe*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Soysal, Y. (1994). *Limits of citizenship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Houdt, F., Suvarierol, S., & Schinkel, W. (2011). Neoliberal communitarian citizenship: Current trends towards 'earned citizenship' in the United Kingdom, France and the Netherlands. *International Sociology*, 26(3), 408-432.
- Van Oers, R. (2009). Justifying citizenship tests in the Netherlands and the UK. In E. Guild, K. Groenendijk, & S. Carrera (Eds.), *Illiberal liberal states: Immigration, citizenship and integration in the EU* (pp. 113-130). Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Van Oers, R. (2010). Citizenship tests in the Netherlands, Germany and the UK. In Van Oers, E. Ersbøll, & D. Kostakopoulou (Eds.), *A re-definition of belonging? Language and integration tests in Europe* (pp. 51-105). Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Wallace Goodman, S. (2010). Integration requirements for integration's sake? Identifying, categorising and comparing civic integration policies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(5), 753-772.