Critical Multilingualism Studies
an interdisciplinary journal

Linda McIntosh
University of New England

UNLEARNING WHITE ANGLO-AUSTRALIAN CITIZENSHIP: AN AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC EXAMINATION OF THE REPRODUCTION OF RACIOLINGUISTIC IDEOLOGIES

In this article, I utilize critical autoethnography to examine how racialized individuals are produced through interactions concerning the English language requirements for Australian citizenship. I also investigate the ways in which white listening subjects position themselves as authoritative and authorized to assess the language practices of racialized individuals, and how through this process white listening subjects take on the role of gatekeepers to the citizenship process (Blackledge, 2005; Urciuoli, 2020). I begin this autoethnographic research by discussing Australia's settler colonial history, and the subsequent implementation of the White Australia Policy in the early part of the 20th century, and how this history has framed the Australian national identity as white and English speaking. I discuss how this ideology continues to influence current attitudes towards Australian citizenship, including my own. I then discuss my own experiences as a white listening subject, examining them critically through a raciolinguistic lens (Rosa & Flores, 2017).

Keywords: autoethnography ◆ raciolinguistics ◆ white listening subject ◆ language testing ◆ citizenship

Early in my career as an English language teacher, I sat in on a short presentation about a proposed, elective course on Australian citizenship. At the conclusion of the presentation, one attendee indicated to the presenter that he did not require the course as he was already an Australian citizen. I knew both this man and his wife, and so with interest I asked him afterwards if his wife was also an Australian citizen.

"No. Her English is not good," he replied.

McIntosh, L. (2025). Unlearning White Anglo-Australian Citizenship. An Autoethnographic Examination of the Reproduction of Raciolinguistic Ideologies. *Critical Multilingualism Studies, 12*(1), 138–161. ISSN 2325–2871.

I was very surprised by his answer. In fact, I thought that his comment about his wife's English was rather rude. As far as I could determine, they both spoke English with similar levels of proficiency.

Later, I repeated this conversation to some colleagues, wondering why this individual had been so rude about his wife's English. No one could give me further insight into his statement; however, one colleague made the following comment;

"How did *he* pass the citizenship test? *His* English isn't good enough to pass the test!"

I was even more surprised by this comment. Personally, I had considered that the individual in question had excellent English skills. An illustration of his skills lay in the fact that the previously mentioned presentation and conversation about Australian citizenship had been undertaken completely in English.

At this point in time, I had no idea of the advanced levels of English, literacy and knowledge about Australia currently required of prospective Australian citizens. Part of my lack of knowledge regarding the rigours of acquiring Australian citizenship was due to the fact that I was born an Australian citizen due to *jus soli* and *jus sanguinis*, or 'right of the soil' and 'right of the blood' – I was born in Australia to white Anglo-Australian parents who were also Australian citizens (Extra et al., 2011, p. 10). That we spoke English as a family and had the right to consider ourselves Australian citizens was taken for granted. My family epitomized "the unconditional belonging of the unmarked white middle class" (Urciuoli, 2020, p. 2).

Introduction

In this article, I utilize critical autoethnography to explore the ways in which race is discursively constructed in the context of English language proficiency for Australian citizenship. Based upon the work on raciolinguistics by Rosa (2019); Rosa and Flores (2017) and Alim et al. (2020), I use a raciolinguistic lens to examine the ways in which the English language and white European culture and values have become deliberately linked to the Australian national identity, and how this relationship is reproduced in interactions surrounding aspirational citizens. I explore how these perspectives influence wider community attitudes regarding who is and who isn't fit to become an Australian citizen. I also examine my own complicated dealings as a "white listening subject" (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Khan, 2022; Rosa & Flores, 2017), exploring my own experience of the ignorance of white-English privilege and the white-English assumption regarding the right to assess the language practices of racialized migrants.

The narratives shared in this article stem from my experience as both a community member and a researcher undertaking critical autoethnographic research in the regional community of Albury-Wodonga in south-east Australia. They depict short verbal exchanges regarding language requirements for citizenship which highlight prominent and telling attitudes regarding language and race that are often unconsciously held by myself and members of the community in which I live. They demonstrate how the general acceptance and normalisation of powerful language ideologies have become deeply ingrained at all levels of Australian society, and illustrate how these ideologies are discursively reproduced and reconstructed in commonplace interactions (Blackledge, 2005, pp. 4, 213; Lee, 2015, p. 81; Piller et al., 2021, p. 709; Wodak et al., 2009, p. 8).

Australian citizenship

Throughout this piece, I will use the term "citizenship" to describe the rights, responsibilities and privileges that are accorded to an individual who is a legal member of a nation-state, according to international law (Rubenstein, 2016, p. 112). In contrast, "permanent residency" in Australia describes the residential rights of those who have been granted a visa ensuring that they can live and work in Australia for an indefinite period of time, subject to certain requirements. Many humanitarian migrants and migrants with refugee backgrounds in Australia are granted permanent residency automatically (Department of Home Affairs, 2023). Although permanent residents experience many of the benefits included with Australian citizenship, they are nevertheless denied the right to vote and the right to travel on an Australian Passport (Klapdor et al., 2009, p. 2).

Since the introduction of the revised *Australian Citizenship Act 2007*, Australian citizenship has become increasingly difficult to acquire, as the Australian Government has tightened the conditions that prospective citizens must meet. The tougher conditions include the introduction of a rigorous citizenship test administered entirely in English which claims to measure an applicant's English language proficiency and their understanding of Australian values and beliefs (Klapdor et al., 2009, p. 17; Ryan, 2013, pp. 147-158). A prescribed booklet, *Our Common Bond* (Commonwealth of Australia, 2020), provides the information about Australia and the Australian "values" on which the Australian citizenship test questions are based. The introduction of this test has meant that many permanent residents of Australia, particularly former refugees or humanitarian migrants with low English proficiency or literacy skills, find it difficult to become full, legal members of the state.

Language and citizenship

Piller et al. (2021, p. 707), note that the construction of Australia as a white and English-speaking nation-state has its origins in Australia's settler-colonial history. This link between English and the Australian identity is not an incidental pairing, but one which has been shaped by successive government policies and supported by the Australian education system and the media (Ellis et al., 2010; Heller & McElhinny, 2017). In this pairing, the hegemonic power of standard English in Australia reinforces the claims and privileges of its "native" speakers, whilst simultaneously disenfranchising those whose language practices diverge from it (Davies & Davis, 2024; Heller & McElhinny, 2017).

Australia's settler colonial history began with the arrival of eleven ships carrying British soldiers, settlers and convicts who arrived on the continent in 1788, declaring it "Terra Nullius" (nobody's land) and claiming it for Great Britain. What followed was a sustained, remorseless and systemic act of violence towards the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples of Australia, who were considered languageless and in need of remediation by the invading settlers. The resulting process of "civilization" where English was imposed as part of a colonial exercise of control, caused a mass extinction of many Indigenous languages, and has shaped the ways language continues to be viewed in Australia today (Amery & Gale, 2023, pp. 754-755; Heller & McElhinny, 2017; Rosa & Flores, 2017, p. 624).

This exercise of control through language continued with the establishment of the Commonwealth of Australia in 1901 and the drafting of *The Australian Constitution* (Arcioni, 2020, p. 3). The Australian constitution, although conceived and written in English, makes no explicit mention of English as the "official" language of Australia (Clyne, 2003, p. 16). Instead, it was implicitly understood by the authors of the constitution that English would be spoken by all residents of Australia. The constitution was designed to ensure that the Australian parliament would retain the right to determine who was eligible or ineligible for Australian citizenship; to exclude those who were considered "aliens" or any individuals who were not British subjects and did not speak English (Arcioni, 2020, pp. 3-4; Pillai, 2021, p. 2; Ryan, 2013, p. 68).

The assumption that the people of Australia would be white English-speakers helped to lay the foundation for the *Immigration Restriction Act of 1901*, more commonly called the *White Australia Policy,* which impacted Australia's immigration patterns for many years (Arcioni, 2020, p. 4; Ndhlovu, 2025, p. 140; Piller et al., 2021, p. 707). Whilst the *White Australia Policy* wasn't a monolithic law, it was a common line of thought underpinning a series of exclusionary laws enacted during and effective from 1901 and only finally eliminated in the 1970s by the

Racial Discrimination Act 1975 (Jupp, 2011; Klapdor et al., 2009, pp. 6-8; National Museum Australia, 2023).

With the cessation of the *White Australia Policy*, Australia saw a large arrival of migrants from not only Europe, but also Asia and from elsewhere around the world. The general expectation that these migrants, and especially their children, would eventually adopt English and become "Australian" remained, although as part of a policy of multiculturalism, the languages spoken by Indigenous Australians and these migrants were considered acceptable as home languages (Beresford, 2012; Freeman & Staley, 2018, p. 176; Jupp, 2011, pp. 46-47). Although the *White Australia Policy* had been officially discarded, the attitudes cultivated during its existence lingered. The not-so-vague impression that Australia was a white, English-speaking nation-state remained, even as the make-up of the population slowly changed, especially in Australia's large urban centres. The media, politics and the education system of the time all largely reflected this, and generations of Australian born children, of which I am one, grew up amongst these prevailing attitudes. A fertile ground for the seeds of pervasive national monolingual ideologies, which equate language with nationality and assume monolingualism is a global norm (Blackledge, 2005, p. 54; Clyne, 2005, p. 27; Ellis et al., 2010, pp. 440-441).

The adoption of a test for Australian citizenship in 2007 was due to growing concerns, amongst politicians and bureaucrats in particular, regarding the maintenance of social cohesion in the midst of an increasingly diverse population, and a concern that the national identity of Australia no longer entirely reflected that of settler-colonial, Anglo-Australian culture and values (Costello, 2006, p. 79; Fozdar & Spittles, 2009, pp. 497-499). Consequently, the test was supposedly designed to promote Anglo-Australian values which were linked to the role of the worthy citizen, as part of a process which has been labelled "nation-ness" (Fortier, 2021, p. 20). In this process, rather than explicitly linking citizenship with ethnicity as had been done during the period when the *White Australia Policy* was in effect, citizenship instead became linked to white Anglo-European culture, values and the English language.

The literature on the negative impact of the requirement for proficiency in a national language in order to access citizenship is extensive. A number of scholars have explored the relationship between citizenship and language, raising issues about the discrimination, marginalisation and social injustice which arises through the use of language proficiency tests for citizenship and citizenship ceremonies (e.g., Blackledge, 2011; Khan & Blackledge, 2017; Piller, 2001; Shohamy, 2007). In the Australian context, McNamara (2005) used the example of the "Shibboleth test" to highlight how language tests are used to determine who may or may not be considered as belonging to a particular group or community. Also in the context of citizenship

testing in Australia, Ndhlovu (2025), discusses how language tests have been used since Australia's Federation in 1901 to exclude individuals due to race or political motives, and how this practice is continued in the present iteration of the Australian citizenship test. Scholars have also looked at the ways in which proving competency in a national language ('*jus linguarum'*), along with a knowledge and understanding of the values and beliefs held by the host community, has increasingly become a moral requirement for citizenship (e.g., Fortier, 2021, 2022; Kraft & Flubacher, 2020; Milani, 2007; Pulinx & Van Avermaet, 2017). Morrice (2017) discussed how citizenship tests create non-citizens, usually migrant women who have had limited opportunities to receive formal education, whilst Bassel and Khan (2021) have linked the positioning of women of colour as social problems with lingering colonial attitudes in the current British citizenship process. Further studies have discussed the concept of language as a gatekeeping device for citizenship, with the framing of "national" languages as beneficial to "integration" (considering this an exclusionary rather than inclusionary term) and the demonstration of loyalty to a host community, whilst immigrant languages are framed as problems requiring solutions (e.g., Extra et al., 2011; Flubacher & Busch, 2022; Spotti, 2017).

Raciolinguistic ideologies and the white listening subject

According to Blackledge (2005, p. 32), language ideologies are complex and lie beneath many of the opinions and values held by a society, they are influenced by that society's history and culture as well as global events. Language ideologies refer to perspectives about language held at a societal level that are generally unquestioned, and persist, disguised within wider social norms and attitudes, with the purpose of maintaining political power and control (Blackledge, 2005, p. 32; Milani, 2007, pp. 10-13; Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994, p. 56). Lippi-Green (2011, p. 67) defines ideologies as false beliefs perpetuated by powerful societies against those who are marginalized, in order to maintain a power balance in their own favour. In this way, language ideologies such as monolingual ideologies, endow some languages with greater value than others, thus reproducing social inequality and furthering the goals of dominant social groups (Blackledge, 2005, p. 33; Yazan, 2019, p. 4).

According to Flores and Rosa (2015, p. 151; Kubota et al., 2021, p. 760), raciolinguistic ideologies have their basis in monolingual ideologies and describe the process wherein language becomes considered synonymous with race (Rosa, 2019; Rosa & Flores, 2017, p. 621). Consequently, a raciolinguistic perspective examines how racial identities are constructed and re-constructed through language in social interactions (Alim et al., 2020). In this way, language is viewed as a social practice rather than an entity in and of itself (Alim et al., 2020; Blackledge, 2005, p. 4), a tool that may be used for the control and homogenisation of a

population. This manufacturing of race through language also works to posit individuals from minority groups as outsiders, as those who do not belong within a society and are not worthy of being considered true, productive members of a community (Urciuoli, 2020, p. 7).

One key foundational construct of the raciolinguistic perspective is that of the "white listening subject" (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 151; Rosa & Flores, 2017, p. 630), a continuation of the white gaze, which describes the practice of white listeners negatively evaluating the language practices of minority groups, or racialized subjects. This negative perception is tinted by hegemonic ideologies surrounding the dominant language code and culture (Kubota et al., 2021, p. 760; Rosa & Flores, 2017, p. 630). In this perspective, the white listening subject is positioned as a normative speaker of the dominant language, an ideology supported by institutionalized policies, education and the wider social environment. This ideology ultimately places the white listening subject in the position of being able to judge and ultimately declare the language practices of racialized speakers as deficient or abnormal (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 151).

Literature on raciolinguistics in relation to citizenship issues include Khan's (2020, 2022) work examining the ways in which language testing for citizenship in the UK has become a racialized border making process, where prospective citizens must prove their loyalty and potential usefulness to the state through a high level of proficiency in English. Drangsland (2024) furthers the concept of raciolinguistic borders, examining how the enforced acquisition of a particular language as a requirement for citizenship works to marginalize individuals, negatively impacting their sense of permanence within a community, and hence their perceived value within that community. In a similar vein, Muliro (2020), talks about the fear of the "other" in relation to the increasing tightening of national borders, and the resultant unequal differentiation between insiders and outsiders. Also in the context of borders and language, Piller et al. (2021) explore how the white English-speaking Australian identity is affirmed and re-established through a popular reality television show looking at immigration and border security in Australia. Scholars have also discussed the question of how race or un-belonging is constructed through everyday communicative events (e.g., Lee, 2015; Urciuoli, 2020).

In the light of this research, the contribution of this project comes from the expressed need to continue to tell the lived experiences of racialized individuals in the context of naturalisation for citizenship (Badenhoop, 2021, p. 445). This article offers insights into ideologies about language and race that underlie many perceived "commonsensical" policies concerning integration and citizenship requirements in the Australian context and offers a unique, personal perspective on whiteness and its problematic links to the English language. Most importantly, the narratives in this article bring attention to the disproportionate impact of Australia's

upgraded citizenship requirements on migrants with refugee backgrounds, particularly those who are women.

Methodology

Autoethnography has been described as a means of examining aspects of culture, society, the political structures and the historical context that circumscribe and influence these, through the personal stories and lived experiences of an individual who is both the researcher and the subject of the research, and who is emplaced within the society and culture under study (Boylorn & Orbe, 2021, p. 5; Ettorre, 2017, p. 357). According to Sparkes (2018, p. 3), the autoethnographic researcher must demonstrate a willingness to reveal their own weaknesses and emotions. As such, autoethnography provides insights into the thoughts and perceptions of the researcher as they work to make meaning of their own life and the lives of those around them, thus highlighting the complexities and contradictions that make us human (Adams et al., 2014, p. 2; Le Roux, 2017, p. 203). Autoethnographic research also involves a reflexive investigation into the ways in which the culture and the values of those amongst whom the researcher lives, influence the researcher's own personal opinions and behaviours (Spry, 2001, p. 711; Yazan, 2019, p. 5). In this way, autoethnographic research begins as an exploration of the self, of personal values and understanding, and extends to build an understanding of the values and behaviours of the wider community amongst whom the researcher lives (Chang, 2008; Le Roux, 2017, p. 198).

Personal narratives are an integral component of autoethnographic research. According to Ettorre (2017, p. 357), personal narratives may be used to expose social injustice and the resulting emotional toll that occurs due to deep-rooted inequalities entrenched in human societies. Personal narratives also enable us to gain an understanding of the experiences of those with whom our lives are intertwined, yet whose lives and experiences are different to our own (Davids, 2022, p. 19).

In critical autoethnography, the purpose of the research is not only to understand the values and behaviours inherent within the culture in which the researcher is embedded, but also to analyse the resulting narratives in the light of current theory and scholarship in order to build understanding and aid interpretation, thus adding to the existing body of scholarly knowledge (Anderson, 2010, p. 378; Hughes & Pennington, 2017, p. 26; Sparkes, 2018, p. 3). Boylorn and Orbe (2021, p. 3) highlight that like critical ethnography, a major goal of critical autoethnography is to expose societal injustice.

My choice of critical autoethnography as a research methodology arose due to a concern that many current methods of doing research on issues such as integration and the naturalisation process in Australia are based on colonial research methods which ignore the perspectives of the indigenous and marginalized peoples they study (Ndimande, 2018, p. 383). Treated as objects of the studies, these peoples' diverse opinions, beliefs and ways of understanding the world are often rejected in favour of an academic assertion that truth can be determined by objective observation (Davids, 2022, p. 22; Ettorre, 2017, p. 358; Jackson & McKinney, 2021, p. 5). The resulting knowledge ultimately benefits and almost exclusively deals with the issues and values held by those in powerful positions in society (Harding, 2019, p. 175). By utilising critical autoethnography as a research methodology, my aim has been to turn the focus of the research onto myself and the society in which I live, to examine the ways in which our understandings and attitudes regarding language and race are politically informed and cultivated, and so continue to perpetuate social injustice (Boylorn & Orbe, 2021, p. 3).

Researcher positionality

I am a white, English-speaking woman, who has benefited from the educational and socioeconomic opportunities available through speaking English, the symbolic power of whiteness (Bourdieu, 1991), and the certainty of belonging in Australia. Consequently, I have no personal experience with issues relating to accessing citizenship, racialisation or deficit language perspectives. It was not until I commenced work as a TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) teacher, that I began to begin to comprehend the reality of these issues for many the students of colour that I taught. Davids (2022, p. 24), notes ironically "that 'black' and colonized women know a lot more about 'white' women and the impositions of Anglo-normativity, than is the case conversely." This is true to my experience as a TESOL teacher, and has come to be even more noticeable in my role as an autoethnographic researcher within my own community. As Chang (2008) asserts, a crucial objective of the autoethnographic process is that it should be transformative for the autoethnographer, and I believe for me that this has been the case.

The data

Adams et al. (2014, p. 46), describe the process of autoethnography as looking inward at the self, at the thoughts and emotions of the researcher, and then outward at the people, community and cultural norms in which the researcher is situated. Adams et al. (2014, p. 47) call this starting point of autoethnography an "inside-out trajectory", in relation to the point in time when an incident stirs our emotions or an event makes us begin to question or reevaluate things we

think we already know. The narratives in this article arose from my documentation of personal experiences and interactions as a relatively new English language teacher. In this process, I worked to reflexively chronicle the ways in which my own ideologies about language influenced my teaching practices and my interactions with others within my community. The experiences that I documented were short and memorable, and were transcribed as soon as possible after they occurred so that I was able to remember salient comments and feelings, as well as the context of the interactions. The three narratives depicted in this piece mark the point when I began to question what I knew about Australian citizenship and its entanglement with the English language and whiteness.

Ethical considerations

One of the major ethical considerations in autoethnographic research is how to represent and protect the identities of those who inevitably feature in the resulting personal narratives. In an autoethnographic account, it is not possible to write only about oneself; we live surrounded by other people; our lives and experiences are entwined with those with whom we live and work (Sparkes, 2018, p. 639). Maintaining the confidentiality of those who feature in my critical narratives has required careful thought, and I have worked to ensure that the identities of the participants in the following narratives cannot be deduced from the contexts of the narratives (Adams et al., 2014).

Discussion

Reproducing racialized subjects

The short narrative at the beginning of this article, provides an insight into one way in which racialized subjects and their counterparts, white listening subjects, are regularly and hegemonically reproduced in discussions concerning citizenship and settlement in Australia. It also highlights my own naivete, as a white Anglo-Australian who took Australian citizenship for granted.

In the narrative, my colleague and I, as professional educators working closely with migrants, and as unmarked white English-speaking Australian citizens (Urciuoli, 2020, p. 4), were secure in the knowledge that our language practices largely reflected that of Standard Australian English (SAE), the language code posited as the ideal in Australian social and civic life. We have never had our language practices and consequently our right to Australian citizenship questioned. At the time of this narrative, my colleague also had a greater understanding than I, of the institutionally legislated policies surrounding the Australian citizenship testing regime

and its inclusion of language proficiency as a requirement for citizenship. My colleague had worked with a large number of individuals who had been aspirational Australian citizens, and seen some succeed but many more fail the citizenship process. Due to this experience, my colleague appeared inured to the fact that a certain level of English language proficiency was required to gain Australian citizenship.

More troubling to me however, was that throughout our discussion we both unconsciously positioned ourselves as white listening subjects, authoritative and discerning, and capable of adjudicating over the language practices of racialized others, even ones who had successfully attained citizenship status (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 150; Urciuoli, 2020, p. 8). Furthermore, at the time neither my colleague nor myself considered our short discussion as racializing. Instead, discussions such as the one we shared, are generally framed within the guise of "caring", as coming from a desire to "teach" migrants what they need to know about the English language and culture in order to become "Australian like us" (Rosa, 2019). We unconsciously reflected the state informed ideology, that official requirements regarding English proficiency for citizenship were equivalent to the concern that without a "reasonable level" of English, migrants to Australia would not be able to function (Australian Government, 2017, pp. 5, 8; Ndhlovu, 2025; Settlement Council of Australia, 2016, p. 5; van Kooy, 2021, p. 9). Consequently, the imposition of English language proficiency requirements for Australian citizenship could be considered as a logical undertaking, one which was implemented for migrants' own benefit (Milani, 2007, p. 32). An ultimate outcome of this line of thought, is that the act of considering a racialized person's language as "not good enough" is not considered a racist comment, but rather one that reflects a commonsense solution to the integration of migrants into Australian society (Khan, 2020, pp. 336-337; Piller et al., 2021, p. 710; Urciuoli, 2020, pp. 11-12).

Due to their "poor English skills", the two individuals at the heart of our discussion were placed into a hierarchy of competence (Khan, 2020, pp. 336-337), and positioned as less capable and less qualified than Standard English speaking Australian citizens. The unspoken, but tacit understanding throughout the exchange was that both individuals were personally responsible for their low levels of English proficiency, however, with the appropriate amount of effort and a desire to prove themselves, they would be able to remedy this lack (Rosa, 2016, p. 165; Urciuoli, 2020, pp. 4, 13). Yet, as can be seen from the narrative, even with the attainment of citizenship and the accompanying requisite attainment of English language proficiency, the assessment process does not end. Racialized citizens are continually reassessed by white listening subjects who determine that their language practices do not meet the hegemonic norm and as such are considered as remaining unworthy of citizenship. Both this man and his wife, through their settlement experiences as migrants with refugee backgrounds to Australia, have

come to the almost inevitable acceptance of two major Australian attitudes about language. That is, English is the only language of importance in Australia, and they are unlikely to ever speak it well like "native" Australians do. As Khan (2020, p. 334) notes, "both language and citizenship contain a 'promise' and desire to be accepted by the Other, in this case the State", yet due to hegemonic expectations surrounding how English should be spoken in Australia, the promise is never quite fulfilled.

The pain of unbelonging

A subsequent incident opened my eyes to the frustration and anguish that the failure to be accepted and the unfulfilled desire to belong as a citizen brings. One morning, a woman walked into an English conversation class that I was teaching, vibrating with anger. The other students in the class and I were a little taken aback as she was shaking and incoherent. After a few minutes spent trying to calm down, she was finally able to speak. She stood in front of the class, and with tears falling down her face cried out her frustration, "Me! Me angry! Me live in Australia for five years! Me learn English! Me write the alphabet! Me want citizen!" Every time she cried "Me" she thumped her chest with her fist in emphasis. This woman went on to tell me that a friend of hers had just become an Australian citizen, and she could not understand why she could not gain her Australian citizenship too.

All I could do was listen. I didn't know what to say. I had no words of comfort and I felt powerless to help her. I remember thinking to myself, "I don't know what to do… she is *never* going to gain Australian citizenship, she can barely read and she is so hard to understand!" I felt conflicted and deeply uncomfortable by her display of emotion.

This woman's story is the same as that of many women who come to Australia as permanent residents on *Women at Risk visas*. As a woman from a poorer country experiencing civil unrest, she has had barely any schooling and never learned to read in any of the languages she speaks. Due to the effects of past trauma and a lack of formal education, she finds learning difficult and exhausting, and although she works hard, her progress is slow.

According to Morrice (2017, p. 603), testing regimes for citizenship have the greatest impact on women, particularly those with refugee backgrounds. In 2006, one Australian politician, Andrew Robb, actually tried to claim that introducing a citizenship test would benefit migrant women with refugee backgrounds as they would be motivated to learn English (Fozdar & Spittles, 2009, p. 500; Ryan, 2013, pp. 70, 97). But motivation isn't the issue. Motivation does not undo years of trauma, poor nutrition, subsequent illness and a lack of formal education opportunities. As Milani (2007, p. 34) states, language testing for citizenship is a punitive and

exclusionary process, based on a hegemonic norm of language use that is difficult to attain for those whose language practices do not meet the desultory requirements of the state. Instead it creates racialized subjects, individuals who are considered language deficient and unworthy of fully belonging to the nation-state (Blackledge, 2005, p. 213).

As I contemplated this woman's passionate speech and my own ineffectual and conflicted response, I began to question my own assumptions regarding English language proficiency, integration and citizenship in Australia. My first instinct was to consider the injustice that she was experiencing through the perspective of her "low" levels of English language proficiency. I began with the assumption made by many support workers in the migrant settlement process, that the solution to all of her problems was that she should continue to improve her English language skills. However, throughout her settlement experience, this woman has all too often heard the implicit refrain, "Your English still isn't good enough," and the promise of citizenship and a "good" job remain just out of reach (Rosa, 2019). As Rosa (2016, p. 165) notes, this issue is not a linguistic one, it is "a politico-economic problem" fueled by raciolinguistic ideologies that must be addressed at a government and societal level. This woman's problem does not lie in her language practices, it lies in the hegemonic, colonially constructed power structures that govern Australia, which expect her to sufficiently demonstrate an ability to take on expected norms of whiteness, as evidenced by a predetermined level of English and formal literacy acquisition, before she will be considered worthy of citizenship. Until she manages this monumental task, she remains a threat to the Australian Government's concern with social control through the assimilation and integration of a diverse citizenry into a homogenous whole (Commonwealth of Australia, 2008; Howard, 2006; Khan, 2020, p. 337; Milani, 2007, p. 23).

The white listening subject

Later that same year, I had the opportunity to teach an elective class about Australia and Australian Citizenship to migrants with lower levels of English proficiency. Many of the students were former refugees, who had lived in Australia for between three to five years. They were all women, and most had had little or no formal education before arriving in Australia. Although they were learning to read and write in their core English classes, many were far from literate and some may never become "truly competent" at reading more than a few short, simple sentences. The students did however, love Australia, and were grateful to be living in what they considered to be a beautiful and safe country. The dream of attaining Australian citizenship was a universally cherished goal.

The purpose of the class was to help students improve their English through studying Australian values and culture. There was no expectation on the part of myself or the other staff at the

language school that any of the participants would be ready to sit the Australian citizenship test at the conclusion of the course. After several weeks of teaching however, I struggled with the realisation that a number of the students expected that they would gain the required skills to pass the citizenship test during the course. This fact was later confirmed by a colleague who had had a conversation with one of the students. The absolute excitement and expectation of achievement in the eyes of one of the students nearly brought me to tears, because I did not share the same confidence. I had realized what these students were up against, and I knew they were unlikely to achieve the extremely high levels of English and literacy required to pass the citizenship test in the time we had available. Significantly, in 2007, Piller and McNamara (2007, p. 1), undertook an assessment of the English language used in the previous iteration of the citizenship booklet on which the current booklet and test are based, stating that it would challenge "many native speakers of English with limited education and/or limited familiarity with texts of this type" (see Appendix for examples of practice questions provided for the citizenship test).

Again, I felt helpless and guilty. I stood in front of the class and said, "I'm sorry. You need more English to gain Australian citizenship. The test is only in English. You need English, English, English." My message was understood; their English was not good enough.

Milani (2007, p. 23) discusses how when individuals, such as myself in the above situation, refer to a higher "linguistic order" such as that determined by the Australian Government in regards to English language proficiency and citizenship, the exercise becomes not only a boundary making one, but also one which uses language to determine the social positioning of others. In and of itself, my comments might be considered innocuous, however, the issue is the cumulative intertextual effect (Blackledge, 2005, pp. 9-10), the fact that these students will regularly hear comments such as mine throughout the settlement process and begin to link comments such as these together to create a view of their own language practices compared to that of a "native Australian speaker". These microaggressions tell them that their English is not yet good enough, and they remain unsuitable to become Australian citizens, not yet ready to belong (Urciuoli, 2020). These microaggressions also promote the idea that the problem lies with them, that their poor English skills are due to the fact that they need to work harder, to practice more, to become less "other", and the overall message of language deficiency starts to become commonsense (Blackledge, 2005, pp. 33, 44).

I had become an unwilling gatekeeper to not only English, but Australian citizenship, torn between encouraging the students to learn about Australia and extend their English language skills on the one hand, and protecting them from pre-emptively trying for something that I

believed they could not yet achieve, on the other. I was also albeit unwittingly, reproducing the same hegemonic ideology that underlies the Australian Government's policies regarding citizenship; to be Australian is to speak English like a white person. My words, however nicely I tried to say them, reinforced the "commonsensical" notion that the students' language practices were deficient, they did not sound white enough, and so remained unsuitable and ineligible for Australian citizenship (Blackledge, 2005, p. 44).

I no longer wondered why a man would say that his wife's English was not good enough, as I had now said it too.

Conclusion

In this article, I have sought to demonstrate the ways in which the identities of both racialized subjects and white listening subjects are reproduced in short, routine conversations regarding English language requirements for Australian citizenship. Although these language requirements are based on standards set by the Australian Government, the raciolinguistic ideologies underlying the English language benchmark are often thoughtlessly duplicated by support workers and English language teachers such as myself. Based on a knowledge of the Australian citizenship process, and a desire to protect migrants from attempting a task they are not yet ready to undertake, the resulting negative messages concerning the language practices of racialized individuals are no less damaging.

The first key implication of my research is that it is not enough to say that language testing for citizenship is a racist endeavour, it is critically important to understand the ways in which the language practices of racialized individuals are framed in everyday conversations and discussions, and how racialized messages may be unintentionally reproduced. All too often, white listening subjects assess the language practices of migrants as deficient or as "not yet good enough", rather than seeing these language practices as the complex and sophisticated linguistic resources that they really are (Alim et al., 2020). We need to view the diverse language practices of migrants as assets to the settlement process, as empowering repositories of earned knowledge that can be creatively used to ease them into their new lives and communities, rather than as problems to be solved.

Finally, those like myself, who wish to work against the hegemonic power of the white listening subject, must be reflexive in our examination of the messages that we send regarding language and race. We must shift our focus from the language practices of racialized individuals, to a critique of the hegemonic norms that we promote through our conversations and our teaching, and the unequal power we wield towards racialized others (Rosa, 2019).

Appendix

The Australian Government has not released the rota of questions from the Australian Citizenship Test (Ryan, 2013, p. 173), however the following questions are examples of the practice questions provided in the Australian Citizenship booklet, *Australian citizenship: Our Common Bond* (Commonwealth of Australia, 2020, pp. 44-46). Although the practice questions are provided in a number of different languages, the actual test questions are only administered in English. The full set of practice questions can be found at https://immi.homeaffairs.gov.au/citizenship/test-and-interview/our-common-bond.

4. What happened in Australia on 1 January 1901?
    a. The Australian Constitution was changed by a referendum
    b. The separate colonies were united into a federation of states called the Commonwealth of Australia
    c. The Australian and New Zealand Army Corps was formed

14. Which arm of government has the power to interpret and apply laws?
    a. Legislative
    b. Executive
    c. Judicial

15. Which of these is a role of the Governor-General?
    a. The appointment of state premiers
    b. Signing all Bills passed by the Australian Parliament into law
    c. The appointment of the Head of State

16. Which of these statements best demonstrates Australian values about freedom of expression?
    a. Everyone can peacefully express their opinions within the law
    b. People with different views from me need to keep quiet
    c. Only approved topics can be discussed

18. In Australia, can you encourage violence against a person or group of people if you have been insulted?
    a. Yes, if you do not intend to carry out the violence
    b. No, it is against Australian values and the law
    c. Sometimes, if I feel very offended

References

Adams, T., Holman Jones, S., & Ellis, C. (2014). *Autoethnography*. Oxford University Press. https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.une.edu.au/lib/une/detail.action?docID=1784095

Alim, H. S., Reyes, A., & Kroskrity, P. V. (2020). The field of language and race: a linguistic anthropological approach to race, racism, and racialization. In H. S. Alim, A. Reyes, & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Race* (pp. 1–24). Oxford University Press.

Amery, R., & Gale, M.-A. (2023). Language, land, identity, and wellbeing. In C. Bowern (Ed.), *The Oxford Guide to Australian Languages* (pp. 754–762). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198824978.003.0065

Anderson, L. (2010). Analytic autoethnography. *SAGE Qualitative Research Methods, 35*(4), 373–395. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241605280449

Arcioni, E. (2020). Constituting citizenship – the evolution of Australian citizenship law. In A. Sarat (Ed.), *Law and the citizen* (pp. 1–19). Emerald Publishing Limited. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/une/detail.action?docID=6324640

Australian Government. (2017). *Strengthening the test for Australian Citizenship* Commonwealth of Australia. https://www.homeaffairs.gov.au/reports-and-publications/submissions-and-discussion-papers/strengthening-the-test-for-australian-citizenship

Badenhoop, E. (2021). Citizenship matters: towards an interdisciplinary and global perspective on naturalization. *Citizenship Studies, 25*(4), 445–455. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2021.1919367

Bassel, L., & Khan, K. (2021). Migrant women becoming British citizens: care and coloniality. *Citizenship Studies, 25*(4), 583–601. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2021.1926075

Beresford, Q. (2012). Separate and unequal: an outline of Aboriginal education 1900–1996. In Q. Beresford, G. Partington, & G. Gower (Eds.), *Reform and resistance in Aboriginal education* (Revised ed., pp. 85–119). UWA Publishing. https://search-informit-org.ezproxy.une.edu.au/doi/10.3316/informit.9781742583891

Blackledge, A. (2005). *Discourse and power in a multilingual world*. John Benjamins. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/une/detail.action?docID=622468

Blackledge, A. (2011). Inventing English as convenient fiction: language testing regimes in the United Kingdom. In G. Extra, M. Spotti, & P. Van Avermaet (Eds.), *Language testing,*

migration and citizenship: cross-national perspectives on integration regimes (pp. 66–86). Bloomsbury. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/une/detail.action?docID=454772

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

Boylorn, R. M., & Orbe, M. P. (2021). Introduction: critical autoethnography as method of choice / choosing critical autoethnography. In R. Boylorn & M. Orbe (Eds.), *Critical autoethnography: intersecting cultural identities in everyday life* (2 ed., pp. 1–18). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429330544

Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as method*. Left Coast Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315433370

Clyne, M. (2003). *Dynamics of Language Contact: English and Immigrant Languages*. Cambridge University Press. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/une/detail.action?docID=217821

Clyne, M. (2005). *Australia's language potential*. University of NSW Press. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/une/detail.action?docID=291997

Commonwealth of Australia. (2008). *Moving forward ... Improving pathways to citizenship. A report by the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee.* Commonwealth of Australia. https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/download/26297540/928b5-44f74-49421-a6091-f00ef-b1a05-792db-91626

Commonwealth of Australia. (2020). *Australian citizenship: Our common bond*. Commonwealth of Australia. https://immi.homeaffairs.gov.au/citizenship/test-and-interview/our-common-bond

Costello, P. (2006). Worth promoting, worth defending: Australian citizenship. *The Sydney Papers, 18*(2), 77–83. https://search-informit-org.ezproxy.une.edu.au/doi/10.3316/agispt.20063020

Davids, N. (2022). *Out of place: an autoethnography of postcolonial citizenship*. African Minds. https://muse.jhu.edu/book/101915

Davies, T., & Davis, J. (2024). 'Unspeaking the empire': disentangling the colonial legacy of English education in Australia. *Changing English, 31*(1), 15–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2023.2290509

Department of Home Affairs. (2023). *Refugee and humanitarian visa options*. Australian Government. Retrieved 19 May 2023 from https://immi.homeaffairs.gov.au/visas/getting-a-visa/visa-finder/refugee-and-humanitarian#

Drangsland, K. A. (2024). Speaking racism – raciolinguistic frontiers, worth and belonging in the governing of refugees in Norway. *Geopolitics*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2024.2321175

Ellis, E., Gogolin, I., & Clyne, M. (2010). The Janus face of monolingualism: a comparison of German and Australian language education policies. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 11*(4), 439–460. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2010.550544

Ettorre, E. (2017). Feminist autoethnography, gender, and drug use: "feeling about" empathy while "storying the I". *Contemporary Drug Problems, 44*(4), 356–374. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091450917736160

Extra, G., Spotti, M., & Van Avermaet, P. (2011). Testing regimes for newcomers. In G. Extra, M. Spotti, & P. Van Avermaet (Eds.), *Language testing, migration and citizenship: cross-national perspectives on integration regimes* (pp. 3–33). Bloomsbury. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/une/detail.action?docID=454772

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149–171. https://login.ezproxy.une.edu.au/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/undoing-appropriateness-raciolinguistic/docview/1691427563/se-2?accountid=17227

Flubacher, M.-C., & Busch, B. (2022). Language advocacy in times of securitization and neoliberalization: The network LanguageRights. *Language Policy*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-022-09617-4

Fortier, A.-M. (2021). *Uncertain citizenship: Life in the waiting room*. Manchester University Press.

Fortier, A.-M. (2022). The speaking citizen: language requirements and linguistic neoliberal colonialisms. *Citizenship Studies, 26*(4-5), 447–453. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2022.2091226

Fozdar, F., & Spittles, B. (2009). The Australian citizenship test: process and rhetoric. *Australian Journal of Politics & History, 55*(4), 496–512. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8497.2009.01529.x

Freeman, L. A., & Staley, B. (2018). The positioning of Aboriginal students and their languages within Australia's education system: A human rights perspective. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 20*(1), 174–181. https://doi.org/10.1080/17549507.2018.1406003

Harding, S. (2019). Stronger objectivity for sciences from below. *Em construção*. https://doi.org/10.12957/emconstrucao.2019.42584

Heller, M., & McElhinny, B. (2017). *Language, capitalism, colonialism: Toward a critical history*. University of Toronto Press.

Howard, J. (2006). *John Howard's Australia Day address to the national press club*. Australianpolitics.com. Retrieved 31 December 2022 from https://australianpolitics.com/2006/01/25/john-howard-australia-day-address.html

Hughes, S. A., & Pennington, J. L. (2017). Autoethnography: introduction and overview. In S. A. Hughes & J. L. Pennington (Eds.), *Autoethnography: process, product, and possibility for critical social research* (pp. 4–33). SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483398594

Jackson, R. L., & McKinney, J. G. (2021). Critical introduction. In R. L. Jackson & J. G. McKinney (Eds.), *Self+culture+writing: Autoethnography for/as writing studies* (pp. 3–25). University Press of Colorado. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv1z52314

Jupp, J. (2011). Politics, public policy and multiculturalism. In M. Clyne & J. Jupp (Eds.), *Multiculturalism and integration: a harmonious relationship* (pp. 41–52). ANU Press. https://doi.org/10.26530/OAPEN_459378

Khan, K. (2020). Raciolinguistic border-making and the elasticity of assessment and believeability in the UK citizenship process. *Ethnicities, 21*(2), 333–351. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796820971441

Khan, K. (2022). Reconceptualising language tests for citizenship as raciolinguistic border regimes. *Citizenship Studies, 26*(4-5), 525–529. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2022.2091235

Khan, K., & Blackledge, A. (2017). 'They look into our lips': Negotiation of the citizenship ceremony as authoritative discourse. In T. M. Milani (Ed.), *Language and Citizenship: Broadening the Agenda* (pp. 89–112). John Benjamins. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/une/detail.action?docID=4877919

Klapdor, M., Coombs, M., & Bohm, C. (2009). *Australian citizenship: a chronology of major developments in policy and law*. Parliament of Australia. Retrieved 30 October 2022 from https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/BN/0910/AustCitizenship

Kraft, K., & Flubacher, M.-C. (2020). The promise of language: Betwixt empowerment and the reproduction of inequality. *International journal of the sociology of language, 2020*(264), 1–23. https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/ijsl-2020-2091

Kubota, R., Corella, M., Lim, K., & Sah, P. K. (2021). "Your English is so good": Linguistic experiences of racialized students and instructors of a Canadian university. *Ethnicities, 23*(5), 758–778. https://doi.org/10.1177/14687968211055808

Le Roux, C. S. (2017). Exploring rigour in autoethnographic research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 20*(2), 195–207. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2016.1140965

Lee, E. (2015). Doing culture, doing race: everyday discourses of 'culture' and 'cultural difference' in the English as a second language classroom. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 36*(1), 80–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2014.892503

Lippi-Green, R. (2011). *English with an accent: language, ideology and discrimination in the United States*. Taylor & Francis Group. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/une/detail.action?docID=958316

McNamara, T. (2005). 21st Century shibboleth: language tests, identity and intergroup conflict. *Language Policy, 4*(4), 351–370. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-005-2886-0

Milani, T. (2007). *Debating Swedish language politics and ideology in contemporary Sweden* [PhD thesis, Stockholm university]. https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn%3Anbn%3Ase%3Asu%3Adiva-6831

Morrice, L. (2017). British citizenship, gender and migration: the containment of cultural differences and the stratification of belonging. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 38*(5), 597–609. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2015.1131606

Muliro, A. (2020, 2020/03/01). Editorial: Who belongs? *Development, 63*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41301-020-00251-3

National Museum Australia. (2023). *Defining moments: White Australia policy*. Retrieved July 21, 2023 from https://www.nma.gov.au/defining-moments/resources/white-australia-policy

Ndhlovu, F. (2025). Interrogating trickster discourse of coloniality in regimes of language testing. In F. Ndhlovu & S. J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (Eds.), *Language and decolonisation: An interdisciplinary approach* (pp. 136–150). Routledge.

Ndimande, B. (2018). Unraveling the neocolonial epistemologies: decolonizing research toward transformative literacy. *Journal of Literacy Research, 50*(3), 383–390. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X18784699

Pillai, S. (2021). *Post-9/11 Australia has pushed a tradition of exclusion to constitutional extremes*. Kaldor Centre for Internation Refugee Law UNSW Retrieved 30 October 2022 from https://www.kaldorcentre.unsw.edu.au/publication/post-911-australia-has-pushed-tradition-exclusion-constitutional-extremes

Piller, I. (2001). Naturalization language testing and its basis in ideologies of national identity and citizenship. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 5*(3), 259–277. https://link-gale-com.ezproxy.une.edu.au/apps/doc/A83342675/AONE?u=dixson&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=df2cfe92

Piller, I., & McNamara, T. (2007). *Assessment of the language level of the August 2007 draft of the resource booklet 'Becoming an Australian Citizen'*. FECCA. http://www.languageonthemove.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/citizenship-test-review_piller_mcnamara.doc

Piller, I., Torsh, H., & Smith-Khan, L. (2021). Securing the borders of English and Whiteness. *Ethnicities, 23*(5), 706–725. https://doi.org/10.1177/14687968211052610

Pulinx, R., & Van Avermaet, P. (2017). Integration in Flanders (Belgium) – Citizenship as achievement: How intertwined are 'citizenship' and 'integration' in Flemish language policies? In T. M. Milani (Ed.), *Language and citizenship: broadening the agenda* (pp. 17–40). John Benjamins. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/une/detail.action?docID=4877919

Rosa, J. (2019). *Looking like a language, sounding like a race: raciolinguistic ideologies and the learning of latindad*. Oxford University Press.

Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society, 46*(5), 621–647. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000562

Rosa, J. D. (2016). Standardization, racialization, languagelessness: raciolinguistic ideologies across communicative contexts. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 26*(2), 162–183. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/jola.12116

Rubenstein, K. (2016). *Australian citizenship law*. Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Pty Limited. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/une/detail.action?docID=4802955

Ryan, K. A. (2013). *Policy without evidence? The Australian Citizenship Test 2006-12* [PhD, Swinburne University of Technology]. Melbourne. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Policy-without-evidence-The-Australian-Citizenship-Ryan/ad8bbaa516924ace67dc11f9a6fc40432c90834b

Settlement Council of Australia. (2016). *Exploring options for regional settlement: SCoA Policy Paper*. SCoA. https://scoa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/SCoA-Regional-Settlement-Policy-Paper.pdf

Shohamy, E. (2007). Tests as power tools: looking back, looking forward. In J. Fox, M. Wesche, D. Bayliss, L. Cheng, C. E. Turner, & C. Doe (Eds.), *Language testing reconsidered* (pp. 141–152). University of Ottawa Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1ckpccf.14

Sparkes, A. (2018). Autoethnography comes of age: consequences, comforts, and concerns. In D. Beach, C. Bagley, & M. d. S. S (Eds.), *The Wiley Handbook of Ethnography of Education* (pp. 632–655). John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/une/detail.action?docID=5317474

Spotti, M. (2017). "Crawlers, footers and runners": language ideological attributions to adult language learners in a Dutch as L2 classroom. In P. Thalgott, J.-C. Beacco, H.-J. Krumm, & D. Little (Eds.), *The linguistic integration of adult migrants/l'intégration Linguistique des migrants adultes: some lessons from research / les enseignements de la recherche* (pp. 379–385). Council of Europe/Conseil de l'Europe, De Gruyter, Inc. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/une/detail.action?docID=5493947

Spry, T. (2001). Performing autoethnography: an embodied methodological praxis. *Qualitative Inquiry, 7*(6), 706–732. https://doi.org/10.1177/107780040100700605

Urciuoli, B. (2020). Racializing, ethnicizing, and diversity discourses. In H. S. Alim, A. Reyes, & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of language and race*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190845995.013.6

van Kooy, J. (2021). *Supporting economic growth in uncertain times*. Curtin University. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/APO-314128

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., Liebhart, K., Hirsch, A., Mitten, R., & Unger, J. W. (2009). *The discursive construction of national identity*. Edinburgh University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1r26kb

Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 23*, 55–82. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2156006

Yazan, B. (2019). Identities and ideologies in a language teacher candidate's autoethnography: Making meaning of storied experience. *TESOL Journal, 10*(4), e500. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.500