



CITIZENSHIP FOR THE LEARNING SOCIETY

EUROPE, SUBJECTIVITY, AND EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Naomi Hodgson

WILEY Blackwell

Citizenship for the Learning Society

Europe, Subjectivity, and
Educational Research

Naomi Hodgson

WILEY Blackwell

This edition first published 2016

© 2016 Naomi Hodgson.

Editorial organisation © Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain.

Registered Office

John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

Editorial Offices

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA

9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK

The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

The right of Naomi Hodgson to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and author have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services and neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for damages arising herefrom. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Hodgson, Naomi, author.

Title: Citizenship for the learning society : Europe, subjectivity, and educational research / Naomi Hodgson.

Description: Hoboken : Wiley, 2016. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2015045048 (print) | LCCN 2015047236 (ebook) | ISBN

9781119152064 (pbk.) | ISBN 9781119152071 (Adobe PDF) |

ISBN 9781119152088 (ePub)

Subjects: LCSH: Citizenship—Study and teaching—Europe. | Education—Research.

Classification: LCC LC1091 .H63 2016 (print) | LCC LC1091 (ebook) | DDC

370.11/5094—dc23

LC record available at <http://lccn.loc.gov/2015045048>

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Cover image: Kandinsky, *Delicate Tension*, 1923. © Peter Horree / Alamy

Set in 11.25/12pt Times by SPi Global, Pondicherry, India

Printed and bound in Malaysia by Vivar Printing Sdn Bhd

Preface

The topic of citizenship education in Europe has rightly received much attention, both at the national level and at that of the European Union itself. The changing status of the Union reflects both its deep history (in effect, the origins of Western thought) and a significant facet of the flux of contemporary global politics. The self-understanding of those who live and work within the Union, as well, no doubt, as the perspectives of many who do not, are profoundly affected by these changes.

There can be no doubt that in the time since Naomi Hodgson first conceived of *Citizenship for the Learning Society*, its pertinence has steadily increased. The European Union, habitually struggling with its identity, now finds itself challenged on two fronts. The strength of its internal cohesion, and indeed of the scale of the project, has been a source of continual self-examination – involving doubts about the viability of its formidable bureaucracy, contestation over the reach of its legislation, and differences over how far a common identity is desirable. Among its member states, the United Kingdom has been the most consistently quarrelsome, with its commitment to the Union newly in question. The new nationalisms that beset the wider Europe in the 1990s have shown a minor resurgence, albeit in more peaceful and democratic forms. At the same time, and in a darker and altogether more threatening way, the growing economic disparities within the Union have raised the prospect of the effective expulsion of some of its members. On another front, Europe finds itself newly challenged by global unrest. War, political upheaval, and economic desperation outside the Union have led to new and critical pressures in terms of immigration, while the ongoing realignment of superpowers has created a dynamic whose implications are real enough, however hard they may be to assess. It is difficult to fathom the massive challenges

these matters raise in terms of human rights and international law, or the tensions they cause along borders, within and around the Union, literal and metaphorical, even as it is hard to credit the petty anomalies that also arise, in, for example, puffed-up notions of national identity and the absurdities of citizenship tests.

Amidst these practical changes, the significance of citizenship comes more fully to the fore, in both legal and notional terms. The efforts of the Union over at least the past two decades actively to promote a sense of belonging and identity among citizens have inevitably turned to educational institutions as a means to put this into effect. But they have not just done this, for the vision has been one that has embraced the new age as that of the learning society. The rhetorical force of this expression, aligned no doubt with ‘the knowledge economy’ and a range of neoliberal assumptions, has not been lost on policy-makers and planners, and the reiteration of the term has become *de rigueur*.

The present book comes to the market, so it would seem, alongside a range of other worthy studies of these developments. Indeed the prestige of the study of citizenship education has earned it a respectable share of European funding research, just as it has been the focus of innumerable, often earnest, doctoral projects. But appearances can be deceptive. In fact, the book you are now reading is altogether more original and important. Let me explain why.

Hodgson leads the reader through a convincing demonstration of the ways in which research in citizenship education has itself become an agent in the construction of European citizenship – an agent that is, for the most part, unrecognised, hiding as it does behind the cloak of objectivity and detachment. Given the scale of research funding and of the extent of European university education, this is a matter of wide-ranging importance. It is a major achievement of this book that it shows the significance of this surreptitious construction of subjectivity in the person of the researcher. The attentive reader will find here no simple, formulaic solution to this problem but rather a patient revealing of ways in which things might be done otherwise, with benefits to research and education, and ultimately to society as a whole.

The critique of research and research methods training embedded in the book is complemented by its innovative and experimental approach to its central topic – that is, to the nature of Europe, to its self-understanding and constitution, as manifested in notions of citizenship and the learning society. The book provides a series of vantage points that, in combination, offer the reader not only new ways of understanding what is at stake here but also new prospects for realising their own

positioning in relation to the project of such research. Indeed, the implications of the argument are wider than these remarks indicate because appreciation of what is said in this text should lead to a radical reassessment of so many of the taken-for-granted assumptions in educational and social science research. It is a conscientious contribution to the renewal of that practice.

Hodgson brings to these complex matters a clarity of style and approach, as well as an unwavering personal commitment, that are exemplary for rigorous thought about philosophical questions regarding education. It is an invaluable addition to the series.

Paul Standish
Series Editor

Acknowledgements

Much of what is presented in the chapters that follow has been developed from articles or conference presentations.

Chapter 2 draws in part on the following publication:

Hodgson, N. (2010a) 'European Citizenship and Evidence-Based Happiness', in Smeyers, P. and Depaepe, M. (Eds) *The Ethics and Aesthetics of Statistics*, Dordrecht: Springer. Reprinted with permission of Springer.

Chapter 4 is a reworking of the following papers:

Hodgson, N. (2009a) 'Narrative and Social Justice in Educational Research from the Perspective of Governmentality', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 43 (4) pp. 559–572. Reprinted with permission of John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Hodgson, N. and Standish, P. (2009) 'The Uses and Misuses of Poststructuralism in Educational Research', *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 32 (3) pp. 309–326. Reprinted by permission of Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Hodgson, N. (2009b) 'The Educationalisation of Social Problems and the Educationalisation of Educational Research: The Example of Citizenship Education', in Smeyers, P. and Depaepe, M. (Eds) *Educational Research: The Educationalisation of Social Problems*, Dordrecht: Springer. Reprinted with permission of Springer. This appeared in revised form as: Hodgson, N. (2008) 'Citizenship Education, Policy, and the Educationalisation of Educational Research', *Educational Theory*, 58 (4) pp. 417–434. Reprinted with permission of John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Hodgson, N. and Standish, P. (2006) 'Induction into Educational Research Networks: The Striated and the Smooth', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 40 (4) pp. 563-574. Reprinted with permission of John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Hodgson, N. (2009c) 'The Language of Education and the Language of Educational Research: The Knowledge Economy, Citizenship and Subjectivation', in Smeyers, P. and Depaepe, M. (Eds) *Educational Research: Proofs, Arguments, and other Reasonings*, Dordrecht: Springer. Reprinted with permission of Springer.

Chapter 6 draws in part on:

Hodgson, N. (2011a) 'Citizenship and Scholarship in Emerson, Cavell, and Foucault', *Ethics and Education*, 6 (1) pp. 85-100. Reprinted by permission of Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Chapter 7 is a reworking of the following publications:

Hodgson, N. (2010b) 'What Does It Mean to be an Educated Person?' Winning essay of the PESGB Student Essay Competition 2009, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 44 (1) pp. 109-123. Reprinted with permission of John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Hodgson, N. (2009d) 'European Citizenship: Economy, Parrhesia, and Sublimation', Proceedings of 2nd IoE-Kyoto Colloquium.

The following develop the work that informs Chapters 2, 3, 6, and 7:

Hodgson, N. (2011b) 'Dialogue and its Conditions: The Construction of European Citizenship', *Policy Futures in Education*, 9 (1) pp. 43-56. Reprinted with permission of Sage.

Hodgson, N. (2012) 'Seeking a Common Language: European Citizenship and the Governance of Dialogue', in Besley, T. and Peters, M. (Eds) *Interculturalism, Education and Dialogue*, New York: Peter Lang. Reprinted with permission of Peter Lang.

Hodgson, N. and Standish, P. (2014) 'Professor, Citizen, Parrhesiastes', in Laker, J., Mjrnaus, K., and Naval, C. (Eds) *Citizenship and Democracy in the University: Theory and Practice in Europe, Canada, and the United States*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. Reprinted with permission of Palgrave Macmillan.

Hodgson, N. (2016) "'Too Busy for Thoughts": Stress, Tiredness and Finding a Home in the University', in Smeyers, P. and Depaepe, M. (Eds) *Educational Research: Discourses of Change and Changes of Discourse*, Springer. Reprinted with permission of Springer.

I would like to thank the publishers of the above for permission to reuse this material here.

Contents

Preface	vi
Acknowledgements	ix
1 Introduction	1
Part One	41
2 Constructing Europe: Citizenship, Learning, and Accountability	43
3 Environment, Heritage, and the Ecological Subject	69
4 The Subject and the Educational in Educational Research Between Part One and Part Two	88 125
Part Two	135
5 1933, Or Rebirth	137
6 America, Or Leaving Home	167
7 Plato, Or Return to the Cave	188
8 Conclusion	206
References	215
Index	223

1

Introduction

CITIZENSHIP IN THE LEARNING SOCIETY

Educational responses to social problems are often triggered by a sense of crisis. Increased individualism, the breakdown of the traditional family, lack of voter engagement, a lack of skills in the workforce, radicalisation, globalisation, environmental degradation, and, of course, the global economic crisis are among the pressing issues currently seen to require (educational) policy solutions. Educational research is expected to produce findings that provide such solutions. Education policy is part of the solution to these present and future problems: it is to produce the right citizens with the right knowledge and skills to respond to and adapt to these socioeconomic challenges.

In this book, the focus is on how 'citizenship' is addressed in the context of education or, more specifically, learning, which is understood as central to the government of individuals and societies in Europe today. In particular, the focus is on the ways in which a form of European citizenship has taken shape, a form that no longer takes the nation-state as its frame of reference, that articulates the individual in relation to a shifted conception of time and space in which we are asked to account for ourselves in particular ways that make our citizenship evident.

Bernard Crick, who had chaired the UK Advisory Group on Citizenship, wrote:

Nearly everywhere that there is citizenship education in schools – say in every country in the European Community (including

Citizenship for the Learning Society: Europe, Subjectivity, and Educational Research,
First Edition. Naomi Hodgson.

© 2016 Naomi Hodgson. Editorial Organisation © Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain.
Published 2016 by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

now, or very soon, England, last of all as usual), the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand – some historically contingent sense of crisis has been the trigger, not a reflection that knowledge of the political and social institutions of a country should be a normal entitlement of children growing towards an all too adult world (Crick, 1999, p. 338).

The introduction of citizenship in general is understood by Crick as a response to the need to address particular social problems, then, not in the name of providing a political education. Educational research has provided numerous critical responses to the citizenship education introduced in the UK and elsewhere. For example, critics sought to show, from a social justice perspective, how the citizenship education curriculum further entrenched historical exclusions – for example, along race or gender lines – or from a neo-Marxist perspective, how the curriculum was designed to stifle dissent (reviews of such literature are provided by, for example, Davies, 2001 and Osler and Starkey, 2005). The lack of a strong political dimension to the citizenship education curriculum was seen to continue a historical trend of wanting to avoid the charge of indoctrination (see for example Davies, 1999; Pring, 1999). In the response of educational research, what ‘citizenship’ is has largely been taken for granted. That is, it is taken to refer to the relationship, or the contract, between the individual and the state, determined by one’s place of birth but also of residence. The ‘rightness’ of the current policy articulation of citizenship for a democratic society is thus often assessed according to normative accounts provided by liberal political theory, Critical Theory, feminist theory, etc. In philosophy of education, studies of citizenship often drawn on liberal political philosophy in the Anglophone tradition (McLaughlin, 2000; Bridges, 1997; White, 1996). But as Andrew Barry *et al.* (1996) have argued, the current form of government cannot be theorised in term of ‘the oppositions that have sufficed for so long: State and civil society, economy and family, public and private, coercion and freedom’ (p. 2). These binaries cannot take account of:

a form of government that combines action by political and non-political authorities, communities, and individuals. And the relations of force, of power, of subordination, of liberation and ‘responsibilization’, of collective allegiance and individual choice that are brought into being in these new configurations (p. 2).

The political context in which ‘citizenship’ is formulated today no longer refers to the discrete, sovereign nation-state in which the

concept emerged. Furthermore, the role of education itself, and within this, of research, has also shifted as Europe and its member states, and the rest of the developed world, have sought to resituate themselves in a global knowledge economy in which they compete with emerging economies. Citizenship no longer refers only to legal rights and to residence or birth in a sovereign territory, but to a disposition towards or orientation to a set of values relating to learning and self-improvement in a particular environment. In this book, the work of Michel Foucault is drawn upon to provide not only a way in which to understand and to critique the current context, through the perspective of governmentality, but also, with reference to his historical work on subjectivity and ethics, to explore how we might understand ourselves differently within it. Part of Foucault's turn to a concern with subjectivity and ethics in the Greco-Roman philosophical tradition came not only from the seemingly abstract death of God and death of Man, but from what he observed as the very real failure of political movements 'to offer an alternative to the modes of subjectivity, to the way in which human beings were constituted as subjects in the modern world', in their challenge to 'the ossified political regimes of his time' (Milchman and Rosenberg, 2007, p. 51):

The political movements of the left based their opposition to the prevailing power relations in society on the existence of a purported authentic subject or self, buried under a false consciousness and technologies of power, from which humankind had to liberate itself. Foucault believed that there was no authentic subject, no hidden human essence, the discovery and liberation of which would free us from relations of domination. Instead, new forms of the subject had to be invented, created, if the prevailing technologies of domination and control were to be challenged (p. 51).

He did not claim that such invention was something one achieved once and for all. As his understanding of philosophy as a way of life indicates, practices of subjectivation and desubjectivation, in his terms, were and are ongoing. Foucault was drawn to Greco-Roman literature not for the content of its ethics, but for 'the way in which the question of ethics was problematized', and in particular to the form of philosophy made possible by Socratic thought, 'based on care of the self, with a focus on self-fashioning' (pp. 52–53).

Foucault introduced the term 'subjectivation' in the context of his concern with how we constitute ourselves as ethical subjects:

While [his earlier term] *assujettissement* pertains to how one is produced as a subject through the exercise of power/knowledge, including the modalities of resistance through which that exercise can be modified or attenuated, subjectivation pertains to the relationship of the individual to him/herself; to the multiple ways in which a self can be construed on the basis of what one takes to be the truth (p. 54).

On this basis, one seeks a way of life, a way of acting in the world that corresponds to this truth and thus is an ongoing process of critique.

The concern in this book, then, is not primarily with how education can (through better designed curriculum or pedagogy) produce the desired form of active democratic citizenship for today's learning society or an imagined future society. Rather, it is with who the citizen is who is addressed by education understood as it currently is. This book is concerned in particular with the way in which 'European citizenship' is understood in current policy, the way in which the term 'citizenship' operates, and how learning is central to this. The focus is on European citizenship as a form of subjectivity; that is, the relation of the individual to him/herself that this understanding of citizenship constitutes. Examples of European educational and cultural policy and the practices that issue from it illustrate the particular self-understanding that is required of the European citizen by showing how we are addressed, and the ways in which we are asked to account for ourselves. The particular role that education plays in the constitution of citizenship, and thus of ourselves as subjects, requires an analysis that is not restricted to the educational scene but that takes into account the way in which education, or more specifically learning, appears across different policy areas concerned with fostering European citizenship. As such, examples are provided not only of education policy but also cultural policy in order to show the particular way in which Europe and the European citizen are understood and addressed and the role of learning in this mode of government. It is shown that notions of having a voice, articulating one's perceptions and opinions, and reflecting on and articulating one's identity in relation to Europe as a particular configuration of time and space is constitutive of a particular mode of subjectivation today.

The means of understanding the current political context and the practices by which we are made subjects is taken in particular from

Foucault's understanding of governmentality (Foucault, 2002a). This enables us to approach the question of European enlargement and integration not in terms of a top-down relationship between the state and individuals but rather in terms of power relations and the production of a particular type of power in the interrelationship between actions. More recent secondary work in governmentality studies, in the fields of educational philosophy, sociology, and anthropology, updates Foucault's analysis and illustrates the operation of the particular neoliberal mode of governance in which the European context can be understood.

In recent European policy, learning has been central to the conceptualisation of society and of the individual, as it has sought to recast Europe as a learning society (Masschelein *et al.*, 2007). Following Foucault's concept of governmentality in their analysis of this current political rationality, Maarten Simons and Jan Masschelein describe this interrelationship in terms of the 'governmentalisation of learning' (Simons and Masschelein, 2008b, p. 192). Delanty (2003) cites the introduction of citizenship classes for immigrants in the UK, the introduction of citizenship education in England and Wales, and the Austrian proposal for a compulsory cultural programme for immigrants, as examples of the governmentalisation of learning and citizenship, or as he terms it, the 'governmentalisation of citizenship as a learning process' (Delanty, 2003, pp. 598–599). In this context, citizenship is something for which the individual is asked to be responsible, an aspect of one's life with which we should be explicitly concerned. Alongside our work, health, education, personal relationships, and social life, our citizenship is an object for personal improvement, and thus forms part of how we are made subjects today: citizenship is now related to 'projects to reform individuals at the level of their personal skills and competencies' (Barry *et al.*, 1996, p. 1). The way in which the individual is addressed in terms of citizenship is analysed here, then, from an educational perspective in the sense that the account is concerned with how education is construed in a particular mode of government, rather than with what education ought to do to produce a particular form of citizenship.

The emergence of neoliberalism during the 1980s and 1990s is often summarised with reference to former UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's phrase, 'there's no such thing as society'; society was rejected for the market, the citizen became a consumer (Delanty, 2003, p. 75). This political rationality, 'based upon principles of rights designed to enhance individual choice' (Ranson, 2003, p. 162), became pervasive in particular across the UK, America, New Zealand, and Australia. Its Thatcherite version was superseded, in the UK, by the

New Labour version: Third Way-ism (Delanty, 2003). Developed by the sociologist Anthony Giddens (1998), the politics of the Third Way combines neoliberalism 'with a basic commitment to the social welfare programme and the idea of the responsible state' (Delanty, 2003, p. 75). But this commitment to social welfare is not a return to 'the welfare state'; instead the individual citizen/consumer is addressed in terms of their responsibility, the possibility of access to knowledge to empower the individual to shape their own life (p. 76). In recent years, the role of the state has shifted further, becoming an enabler of individual responsibility, providing the framework within which individuals can take responsibility for their own education, health, and social care needs and further enabling the market to provide the direct services the consumer might require.

Of course, governments across European Union (EU) member states are not uniform in their style nor in their position or attitude towards the EU. The creation of Europe, however, has required shared practices and standardisation that make competing activities measurable, compatible, comparable, and, by these means, governable. These changes are marked by a shift from the use of the term 'government' to the discourse of 'governance'. The term is evident in the discourse of European integration, both at the level of the EU and its member states, but also across business and public services. The use of the term 'governance' is derived from academic texts, Cris Shore notes, and is described in one EU report as 'the post-modern form of economic and political organisations' (cited in Shore, 2006, p. 712). But 'despite this evidence of scholarly reading, the Commission's deployment of the term is noticeably narrow, partial and instrumental' (p. 712). The discourse of governance is associated with, in Romano Prodi's terms, 'an inherently more levelling and democratic institutional arrangement' (Prodi, 2000, in Shore, 2006, p. 712). Governance transcends government; it is 'a system in which power is located not in bounded, singular, or sovereign states, but in rules, processes, and multi-level institutions' (Shore, 2006, p. 712). It is a form of governing commensurate with the decentralisation associated with neoliberalism, but articulated in terms of transparency, accountability, and social justice in accordance with Third Way thinking.

AUDIT, VOICE, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The term 'audit society' has been used to describe these policy arrangements. In Shore's terms, 'audit society' or 'audit culture' refer 'to contexts in which the techniques and values of accountancy have

become a central organizing principle in the governance and management of human conduct – and the new kinds of relations, habits and practices that this is creating’ (Shore, 2008, p. 279). While he does understand this shift as symptomatic of neoliberalism, he gives it greater historical significance as ‘a process that is remodelling our public sector institutions, refashioning working environments, and transforming our sense of our “selves”’ (p. 280). He relates it also to what is termed the ‘risk society’ (Beck *et al.*, 1994), seen in the concern with quality assurance, risk assessment, and the restoration of trust in professional and political life. Ranson indicates the implications of the growth in the demand for accountability, noting a shift since the 1980s from accountability being a ‘general expectation’, that is, being more or less taken for granted, to being ‘a process of increasing specification and regulation’ and ‘from being conceived as “an event” to being embodied as a disposition’ (Ranson, 2003, p. 167):

There is an inexorable tendency for the event to become a continuous process, an orientation to shape and reshape the course of practice. There is an orientation to action embodied in the purposes and relations of accountability ... Those who initiate schemes of accountability want it to become a routine disposition of public service professionals shaping their modes of thinking, feeling, speaking and acting (p. 169).

As this and the idea of the governmentalisation of citizenship and learning indicate, the demand for auditing, accountability, and visibility applies not only to organisations and governments, but also to individuals. Nowhere is this more apparent than in education, where not only are school children subject to unprecedented levels of testing, but these scores produce statistics that enable the benchmarking and comparison between individuals, schools, regions, and countries. The same is evident at all levels of education, from ‘early years’ to university settings, in academic, vocational, and work-place learning, and for the teacher, researcher, and administrator as much as for the student. We are all cast as learners: we must all be aware of our performance level and our learning needs, and are required to address them. In higher education, for example, a university department’s ranking depends on an individual’s understanding herself as ‘research active’ and on the production of rankable publications (see Shore, 2008). The concern with accounting not only refers to explicitly quantitative measures, however, but also to narrative accounts: for example, students’ individual learning profiles, the requirement for educators to maintain learning journals for reflective

practice in order to facilitate continuous self-improvement, and the use of ‘blogs’ as a means of communicating one’s progress on a training course. Also, narrative and life history have become increasingly popular research methods in the social sciences in recent years. As Shore puts it, drawing on Foucault:

[T]hese new systems of audit are not, as they claim, just neutral or politically innocent practices designed to promote ‘transparency’ or efficiency: rather, they are disciplinary technologies – or techniques of the self – aimed at instilling new norms of conduct into the workforce (Foucault, 1977; 1980; Rose, 1999) (Shore, 2008, p. 283).

This context requires and produces a particular form of subjectivity. Techniques of governance, such as the auditing practices found across all aspects of our lives today, are understood as requiring ‘flexible selves’ (Shore, 2008, p. 284; Fejes, 2008), ‘workers who do not need to be supervised but who “govern themselves” through the exercise of introspection, calculation, and judgement (Rose and Miller, 1992)’ (Shore, 2008, p. 284). The required form of subjectivity, as will be explored further in this book, has also been identified as responsabilised (Rose, 1999), adaptable, entrepreneurial (Masschelein and Simons, 2002), and ecological (Simons, 2009; Simons and Hodgson, 2012). This mode of governance ‘seeks to act on and through the agency, interests, desires, and motivations of individuals’ (Shore, 2008, p. 284).

The shift in the mode of governance coincident with the enlargement and further integration of the European Union has been subject to widespread critique largely on the basis of a concern for the accountability of governing bodies to their citizens and for the possibility of democratic participation in these new post-national configurations. In earlier accounts, for example, in the work of Delanty (2003), drawing on Axel Honneth, Pierre Bourdieu, and Richard Sennett, and also in the work of Stewart Ranson (2003), which draws on Alasdair MacIntyre and Jürgen Habermas, the solution to this democratic deficit and lack of accountability was seen to lie in more dialogic arrangements, emphasising the value of narrative, and the need to enable citizens’ voices to be heard in a reconfigured public space. Since then, such language has become central to the way in which European and national governments have sought to address issues of accountability to their citizens and to encourage participation. New technologies have changed the possibilities for participation and critique as well as for monitoring and measuring and have been harnessed by