This paper presents insights into Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) programs in Queensland. CLIL programs use a second language as the medium of instruction to deliver mainstream subjects, such as science, maths or history, as a form of intensive language learning. The paper presents an analysis of pedagogical considerations and domains, elicited from interviews with CLIL programs directors at different Queensland schools, using a variety of second languages in their CLIL programs. The analysis is guided by a synthesis of CLIL pedagogies and theories of bilingual education, as well as a research framework inspired by three concepts: Fields of Visibility, Technical aspects of program enactment, and Forms of Knowledge. The paper concludes that CLIL is a promising teaching design model as a response to renewed calls for languages learning in Australia. However, the demands of CLIL programs require CLI program directors and teachers to apply a multitude of pedagogical considerations: subject-specific concepts; available teaching resources in the second language; translation and simplification of materials; students’ access to learning through modified language. CLIL programs therefore need to be supported through resources and focussed professional development opportunities.
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Introduction
This paper presents insights into an alternative pedagogy based on teaching and learning in more than one language, when the medium of instruction in some subjects is a second language. It offers an analysis of pedagogical practices and domains in eleven bilingual CLIL programs that currently exist in Queensland state high schools (and one in an independent school), delivering mainstream curriculum areas such as maths, science and social science in a language other than English in Years eight, nine and ten. CLIL, or Content and Language Integrated Learning, is an internationally used term for what is known as ‘second language immersion programs’ in Queensland and Australia.

The research findings presented here are based on a number of projects focussed on interviews with Queensland CLIL program directors, document analyses of school websites...
and official Education Queensland documents, and ethnographic data collection by the researcher/participant, who was also involved in CLIL programs as teacher and parent of two students between 2004 and 2012. The general aim of these research projects was to gain insights into CLIL programs in Queensland and to situate them within the practices of other CLIL programs worldwide. The more specific question addressed in this paper aims at illuminating the pedagogies employed by program directors and teachers involved in the eleven CLIL programs in Queensland. A number of contextual factors, namely the use of seven different languages in programs separated by large distances with no overarching institutional support, indicate the necessity to speak of pedagogies, rather than a consistent CLIL pedagogy, in Queensland.

Research into CLIL programs enables policy makers to consider intensive language learning approaches in contemporary times, when languages learning is given a growing importance for Australia’s future role as a global player. The Draft Shape of the Australian Curriculum: Languages states that the development of a National Languages Curriculum offers an opportunity “to work productively towards strengthening this country’s role and relationships globally” (ACARA, 2011, p.7). CLIL programs are part of a larger discourse focussing on the role of languages learning as a fundamentally economic policy strategy to increase the skills base of Australians (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009, p.15). The critical role of languages, Asian languages in particular, is for example at the heart of the federal White Paper Australia in the Asian Century (Commonwealth of Australia, 2012). In Queensland, there is currently a review into the mandatory languages policy in state school provisions (Chilcott, 2013). At a time when languages education is receiving renewed attention from state and federal policy makers, research on CLIL programs can contribute to an understanding of intense language learning models to stimulate debate on future policy directions and planning. In the Australian Council for Educational Research Review on Second Languages and Australian Schooling, the author Jo Lo Bianco dedicates several sub-sections to CLIL pedagogies and declares them as amongst the most promising design developments in the area (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009). The sentiment that part-time linguistic immersion is a viable way to integrate languages into current curricula is echoed in other research settings where English is the dominant language, for example the United States (Tochon 2009).

The following table is an overview of CLIL programs in Queensland:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School and Location</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Start Year of Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benowa SHS (Gold Coast)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield SHS (Brisbane)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore SHS (Brisbane)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanthorpe SHS (Stanthorpe)</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Lagoon SS</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using two languages as media of instruction is a worldwide phenomenon, with a variety of contexts and intentions informing different approaches to this classroom situation. In the United States, the term CBI, or Content-Based Instruction is widely used to describe a classroom setting that includes many English as a Second Language learners and their specific scaffolding needs in language and content instruction (Hall, Haley & Austin, 2004). A variation of this exists in the ‘dual focus’ programs, widespread for example in California, where classes with approximately 50% native English speakers and 50% native Spanish speakers use both languages in classroom instructions to provide dual second language learning opportunities (Lessow-Hurley, 2005). Multilingual school settings may also be called ‘bilingual programs’ and much research exists on such French/English programs in Canada (e.g. Bialystok, 2001; Cummins & Swain, 1986; Genesee, 1987). In Australia, bilingual education often refers to indigenous first-language programs; however, most of these have now been disconnected from actual curriculum content areas and exist more as extended community languages programs (Devlin, 2009).

These different multilingual settings are connected to a variety of pedagogical approaches; however, the Queensland programs are understood here as most closely related to CLIL settings and are therefore framed within CLIL pedagogical theories. The programs are here referred to as CLIL, with an understanding that the term ‘immersion’ is still used by most teachers, students, and parents involved.

The data analysis methodology chosen for the research project is based on a theoretical framework developed from three components: 1. An analysis of the governing practices around CLIL programs, in particular when revealing pedagogical decisions and approaches (this part is informed by Mitchell Dean’s work on governmentality (Dean, 1999)); 2. A consideration of the factors that contribute to pedagogical agency in unique classroom contexts, here informed by conceptualisations offered by Emirbayer & Mische (1998); and 3. Relevant domains of inquiry in the theory of pedagogy as described by Robin Alexander (2004), for example the characteristics of the children in the CLIL student cohorts, and the planning of teaching and learning to motivate students in a challenging learning environment. The rationale for this approach lies in the context in which CLIL programs operate in Queensland. While there are some expected commonalities in these programs based on the bilingual setting and their nature as small specialist programs mainly within large mainstream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ferny Grove SHS (Brisbane)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsity College, (Gold Coast)</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robina SHS (Gold Coast)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lakes College (Bris.)</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indooroopilly SHS (Brisbane)</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
state high schools (and the governing responses this situation implies), each program is expected to demand high levels of individual pedagogical agency of its programs directors and teachers, as there are no directives from any governing or policy-making body.

The paper begins with an overview of CLIL research, both worldwide and in Australia, and engages with existing pedagogical frameworks proposed for CLIL settings. It then links these insights with concepts relevant in the theory of pedagogy and outlines how the concept of agency can provide a binding element between general frameworks of CLIL pedagogy and contextual demands in local programs. The methodology section which then follows provides a scaffold in which to present the research findings, and also contributes to the theoretical understanding through its conceptualisation of governing demands and levels in delivering a specific educational program. The aim of this paper is to contribute to existing knowledge about CLIL program pedagogies by analysing how contextual problems and obstacles create a need for innovative solutions in individual programs.

Situation CLIL pedagogies

Research into bilingual education, in particular in Europe, has been focussing for almost twenty years on the concept of integrating language-learning pedagogies with subject-specific content teaching methods (Marsh, D. 1994; Mehisto, Frigols & Marsh, 2008). In particular, the CLIL concept has been embraced by practitioners and researchers in the field of Teaching English as a Second Language, and bilingual programs which teach curriculum through the medium of English are now widespread in non-English-speaking countries (Deller & Price, 2007). The content-driven nature of the CLIL approach puts the suitability for integration of subject pedagogies at centre stage (Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010), and this highly contextualized and cognitively demanding second language environment has been connected to successful language and content learning (Cummins, 1984).

One model of CLIL pedagogy which is widespread in the CLIL teaching community is Coyle's 4Cs Model (Coyle, 2008, 2007). Influenced by the early work of Mohan and his Knowledge Framework (1986) and constructivist learning theories based on Lantolf (2000) and Vygotsky (1978), the 4Cs model incorporates Content, Communication, Cognition and Culture to build on the interrelationships of an integrating learning framework. Content here refers to the subject matter, topics and interdisciplinary content approaches, including subject-specific pedagogies as part of the curriculum, with Communication focussing on the simultaneous use of language of, for and through learning, highlighting the principles of communicative language learning (Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010, p. 32ff). Language in this conceptualisation is seen as the tool for communication in authentic contexts, with CLIL classrooms providing the need to use language while learning it at the same time.

Coyle clearly links the Cognition part of her model to pedagogies built on cognitive engagement, problem-solving and higher-order thinking, citing for example the Queensland Productive Pedagogies model and its focus on intellectual challenge (p. 29), as well as linking it to the development of conceptual, procedural and metacognitive knowledge dimensions, as envisaged by a revised version of Bloom’s taxonomy offered by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001, cited in Coyle et al., 2010, p. 31). Both at the micro level of classroom interactions and the macro level of socially interacting with speakers of the second language, Coyle’s CLIL pedagogy foregrounds the need for a deep involvement with unfamiliar ideas encountered in intercultural contexts, which describe the Culture part of her model (p. 39-40).
In Queensland, one influential publication shaped the pedagogical outlook in ‘immersion’ programs since its publication in 1995. Michael Berthold, himself the founder of the first French immersion program in Queensland in 1985 (Smala, 2009), offered an account of the first years of CLIL programmes in Queensland and the main pedagogical structures used (Berthold, 1995) in his edited book *Rising to the Bilingual Challenge*. This volume, clearly focussed on Queensland issues and contexts, still remains the main source of information for all following program founders in Queensland. The pedagogical model presented by Nicole Davies in chapter 7 of the book describes a dual focus approach for language and content teaching that is based on a combination of established subject teaching methods, such as experimenting, retrieval charts, labelling and analysing exercises, and second language learning activities, such as teacher modelling, cloze exercises, building up language patterns (Davies, in Berthold, 1995, p. 101).

How do these CLIL pedagogies correspond to concepts commonly used in pedagogical theory? Robin Alexander’s 2004 paper *Still no pedagogy? Principle, pragmatism and compliance in primary education* provides an overview of how pedagogy can focus on a ‘number of distinct but related domains of ideas and values’ (Alexander, 2004, p. 11). He presents these as (p. 11):

- children: their characteristics, development and upbringing;
- learning: how it can best be motivated, achieved, identified, assessed and built upon;
- teaching: its planning, execution and evaluation; and
- curriculum: the various ways of knowing, understanding, doing, creating, investigating and making sense which it is desirable for children to encounter, and how these are most appropriately translated and structured for teaching.

CLIL pedagogies need to consider the academic and bilingual development of children, and how learning can be achieved simultaneously in and through a language that is not the learner’s first language. The planning of teaching materials is therefore a central concern for all CLIL teachers, as curriculum materials are often not available in the second language and special attention needs to be given to the preparation of content into understandable segments. Birch (in Berthold, 1995) has proposed a focus on scaffolding subject content in CLIL classrooms with Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development (1978) in mind, as well as taking related concepts from second language teaching methodology, like Krashen’s (1981) comprehensible input concept, into consideration. Both approaches postulate that learning occurs when learners are exposed to information just above their current understanding.

In recent years, researchers have also focus on the question of how CLIL program experiences are ‘feeding back’ into a broader understanding of pedagogy in general. Van de Craen (2007) reports that experiences in teaching Belgian primary school students in CLIL programs have led to revised principles of language development in primary school children in both their native and non-native language, and Smala (2012) has shown that due to their use of transnational language communities via the internet, CLIL programs can be sites for developing global competencies and skills, including digital literacies and a deeper awareness of world issues.

Robin Alexander (2004) sets these domains of ideas and values into the contexts of schools and policies, influenced by a greater context of culture, self and history (p. 12). It is this broader view of the context in which CLIL pedagogies are enacted in Queensland that requires a look at a further concept, that of agency. Emirbayer and Mische (1998) define agency as
a temporally embedded process of social engagement, informed by the past (in its ‘iterational’ or habitual aspect) but also oriented toward the future (as a ‘projective’ capacity to imagine alternative possibilities) and toward the present (as a ‘practical-evaluative’ capacity to contextualize past habits and future projects within the contingencies of the moment (p.962)

This paper argues that CLIL pedagogies in Queensland are not only influenced by the teaching and curriculum requirement of dual language and content learning, but also by contextual conditions that necessitate individualised techniques and strategies at different school sites. Individual program directors operate in a context that gives them little official policy or pedagogical direction, and are therefore agents of their CLIL programs on a variety of levels. Operating within a milieu that is influenced by long-standing (and not necessarily updated) key works, in particular Berthold’s book, and habitual practices associated with immersion, program directors also have to act and respond to acute needs and circumstances brought on by contextual demands. The following section outlines the research methodology that illuminates some specific areas in which pedagogical practices are enacted in CLIL environments in Queensland.

**Research methods and data analysis framework**

The aim of this research is to gain insight into pedagogical practices in CLIL programs across Queensland. The research project was informed by Mitchell Dean’s analytics of government as tools of analysis, to illuminate levels of agency in responding to different domains of CLIL pedagogy at individual school sites in Queensland. An analysis of government is concerned with the means of calculation, the type of agency, the forms of knowledge and techniques, the entity to be governed (how it is conceived), and the outcomes and consequences (Dean, 1999, p. 11). In the examined CLIL context, the focus was on how program directors constructed pedagogical practices in their school programs.

Dean’s (1999) chosen phrase for such an undertaking is the Analytics of Government:

> [Analytics of government] is a study of the organized practices through which we are governed and through which we govern ourselves, what we shall call here regimes of practices or regimes of government. . . . These regimes involve practices for the production of truth and knowledge, comprise multiple forms of practical, technical and calculative rationality, and are subject to programmes for their reform. (p.18)

Mitchell Dean’s theoretical framework of how practices are produced and rationalised provides a suitable framework to capture the layers of pedagogical decisions in a CLIL program in Queensland. This analysis of the driving concerns for programs directors of CLIL programs is concerned with the calculated decisions that must be made in order to address necessary demands and constraints of teaching in two languages, as well as the types of agency that are necessary as a teacher and communicator enacting an individualised specialist pedagogical approach (Dean, 1999, p. 11). Such a theoretical framework therefore uncovers the thought processes that lead to certain pedagogical decisions, program policies and on-the-ground practices (Dean, 1999). In order to examine the decision-making processes behind CLIL pedagogies, this paper adapts Dean’s dimensions of analysing the driving forces behind the agency used by stakeholders (Dean, 1999, p. 26): Fields of Visibility, Technical aspects of program enactment, and Forms of Knowledge (Dean, 1999, p. 30-33). An analysis of CLIL pedagogy therefore has to be understood as linking micro level activity with macro level interdependencies (past, present, and future) at societal and school levels, informing the framework of pedagogical domains and contexts presented in this paper.
The main data corpus used in this paper was elicited during semi-structured interviews with eight program directors of Queensland CLIL programs in European languages. One person was interviewed at each school site, and six of these contributed to quotes used in this paper. Ethical clearance for the project was obtained from both the University of Queensland and Education Queensland. Interviews, which lasted between 30-40 minutes, were recorded in 2011 across different settings in Southeast Queensland and were then transcribed. The interview questions were developed with Dean’s Dimensions of Analysis (see Table 2) as guidelines, but also included spontaneous questions to follow themes that interviewees introduced during the interviews. After transcription, the analysis drew from a corpus of just under 100 pages of interview data. Data presented here has been selected from this interview data, but is limited in the scope of themes and topics elicited during interviews.

Due to the small number of programs, schools are not identified by language or setting, but by unidentified numbers only (School, or S, 1-12). When it was unavoidable to mention a language, the school number is not identified so that no cross-referencing is possible in that instance. Official documents on school and education department websites were examined in a triangulation procedure across data sources to establish if interview narratives confirmed themes and categories which, through my pedagogy framework ‘angle of repose’ (Richardson, 1994, p. 522, quoted in Creswell, 2000, p. 126) had become evident from the interviews with program directors. This procedure is conducted by providing ‘corroborating evidence collected through multiple methods, such as observations, interviews and documents to locate major and minor themes’ (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p.127).

The following table provides an overview of how this analytical framework can be applied to CLIL pedagogies in Queensland:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(based on (Dean, 1999))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fields of Visibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visible expressions of pedagogical practices produced and rationalised (through documents etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Connecting to local structures and agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What problems are to be solved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What objectives are sought?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical aspects of program enactment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘By what means, mechanisms, procedures, instruments, tactics, techniques, technologies and vocabularies is authority constituted and rule accomplished?’ (Dean, 1999, p.31).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How is pedagogical authority established in CLIL programs in Queensland?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms of Knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘What forms of thought, knowledge, expertise, strategies, means of calculation, or rationality are employed in practices (…) ?’ (Dean, 1999, p. 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Which specific forms of truth are established?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Which particular pedagogical domains and contexts are to be addressed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fields of Visibility of CLIL pedagogies in Queensland

For teachers involved in CLIL programs, daily pedagogy incorporates practices both as subject teacher and as second language teacher. In CLIL, all subject teachers become also language teachers. Ideally, subject teachers work together with the language-specific teachers, who design a work program of supportive of subject matter requirements, both in terms of vocabulary and grammar development. However, syllabus constraints sometimes necessitate explicit language teaching measures in subject classroom in order to progress in the planned subject work program. In other words, sometimes the students do not yet have the required knowledge of the second language to do the activities in their subject area. The following is an example of such a situation, and the pedagogical intervention the teacher had to apply in order to progress in the subject:

*I know [the language teacher] only teaches past tense in year 9. It's very difficult for me when I am in a Science experiment, when I have to do and analyse, when I have to do a Science report. A Science report has to be written in past tense. In Year 8, we have to do a Science report. I can't ask the [the students] to do it in past tense. So they have to do it in present tense because they know they haven't learnt it. It's not my job, I don't have the time to teach conjugation. So I sometimes have to write on the board some past tense sentences, but I briefly explain to them that it's past tense, but I don't teach [the language]. So they can sometimes, yes, they know sometimes about past tense, but they use it, but I don't teach it. It is not easy to, I know sometimes I am teaching something, but I know they won't really understand because they haven't learnt it in [their language studies]. So it's quite difficult for the students to understand.* (S 1)

The teacher is not really comfortable in his role as language teacher; there are several references to language teaching not really being their job. CLIL subject teachers at other school sites said similar things, for example ‘I am first and foremost a science teacher, not a language teacher, and I don’t really want to spend too much time on language activities in my class’ (S 4). Yet, most teachers also reported that they regularly had to do such language teaching activities to progress in their own planned work program. This situation points to a gap in CLIL provisions in Queensland. CLIL subject specific teachers who do not have a background in language teaching should ideally have opportunities to develop their understanding in language teaching. While such provisions are available sporadically at some school sites, offered for example by external government agencies like the German Goethe Institute (Smala, 2012a), a more desirable option would be an accredited graduate degree which offers an overview of language teaching strategies for CLIL settings. The University of Melbourne now offers CLIL specific pathways within their postgraduate education degrees, mainly undertaken by primary CLIL teachers in Victoria. In order to address questions of equity for students in secondary CLIL programs, more attention might be needed in providing CLIL secondary teachers with the necessary professional development opportunities to enable pedagogical decisions based on language needs of their students. The necessity to work across disciplines also becomes apparent in the yearly planning stages. The following quote describes the challenges a CLIL pedagogy encounters when embedded in mainstream curriculum structures:
Okay, obviously it takes time and you have to see the big picture and we have to say, ‘Okay, what do we want students to do at the end of the unit?’ For example, in astronomy our thing was, okay, students in Year 8 had to try to compare/contrast two planets. Now, all along we would include in the language that we teach them, language structures that will help them to write this essay at the end. So you have to have always I mean, we here always have in mind a type of grammatical, linguistic thing that we want to develop with the children, as well as the content of the subject. Now, it is difficult sometimes because it might take a little bit of extra time. It might also it also takes a lot of work to prepare the resources and you cannot and it is difficult because when suddenly our head of department says, ‘Oh, we are not going to do this topic any more. We are going to do this one’ overnight, we are not prepared. For example, if I write a unit in Year 8 for chemistry that I think is at the end of the year and suddenly I am requested to teach at the beginning of the year, well, it is not suitable at all for the children. So all our units, there is a progression and if I write my third unit in science in Year 8, I know what the students have done in the first two units and I can build on that, re-enforce, revisit in that last unit and revisit the language structures. I can see that the students are a lot more confident in their work, when they have these language structures under control. (S 6)

Progression in CLIL is always progression of both the language and the content. If external factors disrupt the carefully planned scaffolding of language units supporting the development of content units, CLIL classrooms are facing challenges not experienced in mainstream classroom. However, as CLIL in Queensland is required to follow the mainstream curriculum at the same time and pace as mainstream English-only classes, cooperation between heads of language and subject-specific departments is a central feature reported in all examined CLIL programs. The quote above indicates that CLIL programs need fixed term topics that enable CLIL teachers to prepare the necessary linguistic resources to guide their students through the mainstream curriculum at the same pace as mainstream English-only students.

One practice that most CLIL programs engage in is the translation and development of teaching materials, or booklets, for common units in the subject areas taught in CLIL (usually maths, science and social science). These materials not only translate the content matter, but are also infused with language-specific scaffolding activities that support the learning of the content matter. Materials are kept in a depository for all CLIL teachers to use and are sometimes even shared across schools which use the same language for their CLIL programs. While these materials are still based on an assumed language progression and are reported to be very useful in the general preparation of the yearly CLIL program, they can also help counter external disruptions due to changed work program progressions in subject areas. In the quote below, a CLIL program director describes a typical situation involving the development of booklets for CLIL (here referred to as immersion) programs:

So we follow exactly the same curriculum as the mainstream subject, so I am one of the teachers of Science in the immersion program. When we first started the program we had to make the decision of whether to translate our textbooks essentially, which would give us not only exactly the same concepts but the same exercises as well, or whether to draw on mother tongue materials and then modify them for use in our classroom. What we discovered was we collected a whole range of resources in [the second language] aimed at [the second language native speaker] high school students that covered the same concepts but we discovered that they were just linguistically too complex, especially in the first year. So we tend to translate our textbooks as we go
along. So that's how we have been approaching things so far. Because we have one class per year level, there's normally the one teacher response for a particular Year level of a subject. So I am the only person teaching Year 9 immersion Science. We have one teacher who does both Year 8/9 immersion mathematics and the same for SOSE [Studies of Society and the Environment]. So as that teacher, you are responsible for that year level. But now that we are a few years into the program, we have started to re-use our materials and, yes, most subjects have a booklet per term. The exception to that is where a unit has been changed, which can be a shame for us. (S 5)

What this process of translating and developing booklets also involves, is described in this quote from another school:

> When [the teachers] go about that, there's the dual task there, to translate for the content and the skills that are the goal of a particular unit and then also at a level that the kids can access for language or reasonably be expected to with assistance. So the language is always going to be challenging but it's just a matter of trying to make it less challenging for them. You do need to do both, to simplify the language as well as maintaining the content. (S 4)

Subject teachers are therefore involved in language-specific pedagogy not only in practical responses in their classroom, but also in planning stages when they develop appropriate content translations accessible to second language learners. The careful preparation of content materials in translated forms is one of the main problem-solving strategies employed in CLIL pedagogy in Queensland. Alexander’s (2004) pedagogical domain of planning and executing what needs to be learnt requires of CLIL teachers multiple layers of consideration: concepts used in the mainstream; available resources; translation and simplification of materials; access through modified language. The next section looks at how pedagogical authority is established in CLIL programs as part of the school landscape of Queensland.

**How is pedagogical authority established in CLIL programs in Queensland?**

Education Queensland, the overseeing institutions for government-run schooling in Queensland, commissioned two independent evaluations of the existing CLIL programs in 2006 and in 2011, focussing on student retention rates and performance outcomes in Year 12 (the CLIL programs cover Years 8, 9 and 10, but many CLIL students continue mainstream language studies in Years 11 and 12). Both reports are not publically accessible and would only be available through a ‘Freedom of Information’ application. Until about 2010, a Handbook for Immersion Education was available on the Education Queensland website, stating that a formal evaluation of all Education Queensland Language Immersion Programs was conducted in 2006, finding that ‘the immersion program model of language education is extremely effective’ (cited in Education Queensland, 2007, p. 3). However, this document has since then been removed from the Education Queensland website, and the subsection of Education Queensland responsible for its production, The Queensland LOTE [Languages Other Than English] Centre, has been closed and re-established in a much smaller form due to government changes in Queensland in 2012.
CLIL programs in Queensland, however, were never explicitly bundled in any LOTE Centre activities, and have never had an umbrella organisation responsible for potential standardisation or accountability measures. Education Queensland usually supports CLIL programs by assigning two extra positions to a school establishing a program, but the last successful establishment of new programs in state high schools was in 2008 (new Spanish, Italian and Japanese programs, Smala, 2012b).

At the school level, authority is established through selection processes, parent interviews and signatures, and gatekeeping processes. The CLIL program directors advertise the program in local primary schools (which do or do not teach the same language as used in the CLIL program) and invite interested students and parents to apply for a place in the program. While this is not explicitly denoted in all schools, most schools are aiming for cohorts of high-achieving primary students who can slot into the Year 8 CLIL program (first year of high school education in Queensland) without too many problems. In many cases, there are more applicants than places, but this is not the case in all schools. When there are more applicants than places, CLIL directors can establish gate-keeping standards based on grades, behaviour and expected motivation:

*The selection process is an academic one. We receive applications from interested families in Year 6/7. We interview the students, just to see what’s in the application that rings true. We look at report cards. So, we have looked at the application as to why students want to do it and that is significant if there’s a connection. That could be that mum or dad have lived in [the target country] or that their grandfather lives there. So there is a connection that makes the learning relevant for them. Then we look at their behaviour; you know, what sort of worker they are in the class. And then we will offer them a position.* (S 4)

There is a certain ‘streaming’ mentality connected to the enactment of CLIL in Queensland, although this ‘streaming’ or ‘elite’ aspect of CLIL as a specialist program in mainstream schools might be problematic for the ‘equal provisions’ philosophy underlying all public schooling. Furthermore, this quote reveals that CLIL program directors in Queensland might actually actively look for identity connections their students have with the target language. This is quite in contrast with official Education Queensland policy which states the following in the document *Choice of Languages — factors for schools to consider*:

*Choice of the languages should not be guided by the desire to maintain mother-tongue languages in the community. Mother-tongue maintenance, which may serve small constituencies within the school community, is not the driving aim of mainstream language programs in Queensland. The Government provides for these constituencies throughout the state via the After Hours Ethnic Schooling (AHES) program. (Education Queensland Strategic Initiatives Teaching and Learning Branch, 2010)*

Does CLIL pedagogy in Queensland need to consider, nevertheless, first-language learners who access these programs as part of language maintenance and language transfer opportunities beyond the home? There is some evidence that it could. Many individual CLIL program have two or three students in their classes, who not only have some connections to the language, but actually speak the language at home. This situation requires of the teacher a pedagogical approach that utilises the abilities of the native or background speaker student as a class asset, as well as providing these students with cognitive challenges for language learning progression and maintenance of their existing skills.
In other words, there is the danger that native of background speaker students become bored by the slow progression of language and content unit. Several schools, e.g. S 7 and S 8, have addressed this challenge by accepting native or background speakers only into the second year of the CLIL programs, allowing non-native speaker students to develop advanced language skills before the native or background speakers join them.

**Forms of knowledge**

CLIL programs in Queensland are above all very successful language learning programs that simultaneously address some of the calls for more global skills, for example in the recent White Paper Australia in the Asian Century (Commonwealth of Australia, 2012). The paper states that “as a nation we also need to broaden and deepen our understanding of Asian cultures and languages, to become more Asia literate” (Executive summary). While CLIL programs exist in both Asian and European languages, they provide an environment of language and intercultural immersion few mainstream second language programs can rival. Available data from 2006 shows, that 1,401,550 school students were formally studying a second language in mainstream school classes in Australia (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009, p. 39). In comparison, only a few hundred students across Australia participate in CLIL programs, but all program directors in Queensland reported that CLIL cohorts almost entirely continue their language studies into Years 11 and 12 and achieve high results in their Year 12 exams. More specific data about retention would be available in the Education Queensland reports, which are not publically accessible at the moment.

Some aspects of a philosophy of teaching seem to be present in all CLIL programs examined in Queensland. Apart from an acknowledged cognitive challenge in learning content and a second language at the same time, these forms of truths often include a focus on developing intercultural understanding amongst Australian students. There is an international outlook in most programs, with most of them engaging in extensive exchange programs with schools from the target language countries. CLIL program directors and teachers often construct their role as at the forefront of providing global skills to their students, as seen in these exemplary quotes:

> You cannot be a 21st century citizen if you don’t have another language. (...) There is more than Australia and there’s more than English. The (...) immersion program (...) makes them more aware of the 21st century and the global world in general. (S 8)

> If we are going to make a difference, give these kids a different world view or expand their world view to appreciate other cultures, you have got to give the kids the language of the everyday, mundane things that happen in life. The teaching of this living language of blogging a friend and having a pen pal and all those sorts of things, that type of language, functionally related language, is critical in expanding these kids’ horizons, their world views and all the rest of it. (S 2)

This construction of the role of CLIL programs resonates with Reimers’ (2009) three interdependent dimensions for global competencies in the 21st century: 1. A positive disposition towards cultural differences; 2. The ability to speak, understand, and think in languages foreign to the dominant language of one’s native country; and 3. Deep and critical knowledge and understanding of world history, geography, and global topics such as health, climate and economics and their challenges (p.25). Referring back to Emirbayer and Mische’s (1998) definition of agency, it becomes clear that many CLIL program directors and teachers...
see their role as enabling social and linguistic engagement between people speaking a variety of languages. This orientation “toward the future (as a ‘projective’ capacity to imagine alternative possibilities) and toward the present (as a ‘practical-evaluative’ capacity to contextualize past habits and future projects within the contingencies of the moment” (p.962) is enacted by CLIL teachers in their focus on second language skills through the deep engagement with subject-specific and mundane language, and their vision of bilingual students as an alternative possibility to the monolingual mainstream.

Many CLIL program directors see the extensive exchange trip to the target country as the pivotal moment for such intercultural learning:

*The trip comes at the end of Year 10, just before finishing the program. We have three weeks at school and three weeks in a trip. During the home stay, three weeks in the family, the girls will be completely immersed in a [target country] family. They will discover what it is to go to a [target country] school, the [target country] breakfast and everything. After doing the trip, we have two weeks on the west part of [the target country]. So, for the girls it's quite fun after the trip, saying for example ‘Oh, now it makes sense. Now I understand why you told us we were rude in Year 8’ because they have been in a [target country] school in a class with 30 students in a small room and students can't freely talk and it's not fun. So, yes, during the trip the girls learn a lot about the culture.* (S 1)

Sometimes, however, these cultural differences start in the classroom interactions between teachers and students:

*First of all, they have to interact with their teachers. That's the first time they strike this intercultural barrier because most of the teachers aren't Australian born. I will give you an example. I know that every time a new [native speaker] immersion teacher begins at school that I will have 10 to 15 phone calls/emails from parents saying that the teacher is picking on their child or something, some related incident that occur in class. When you go and talk to the teacher, the teacher is totally unaware of it. When you talk to the students and you say, ‘Well, what exactly happened?’, and then you see what it is, is a misreading the way the teacher is behaving. So they will see a behaviour which they interpret as aggressive or critical and when you talk to the teacher, they are oblivious to that at all and I think that's where you see the intercultural straight away; that they have to interact with native speakers. Sometimes the teachers themselves haven't had much experience in Australia, so their challenge is reading the students. So you have got this negotiation that goes on, as the native speaker comes to terms with the different culture, as the student comes to terms with the teacher who exhibits behaviours of a different culture.* (S 4)

CLIL pedagogy for many Queensland CLIL teachers not only supports Claire Kramsch’s argument that in and through another language students discover subjectivities that will shape their lives (2009, p. 3), but also Pinar’s call for curriculum as an intellectual project of understanding (2003, p. 30). In response to terrorism threats and a focus on risk avoidance (Beck, 1992), the 21st century has seen a retreat from pluralism and ambivalence. CLIL pedagogy seems to re-establish spaces for pluralist and intellectually challenging perspectives, and the cultural differences that surface in deep involvement with unfamiliar ideas encountered in intercultural contexts might just be such a space.

**Conclusion**
CLIL programs occupy a small but important niche in Queensland schooling provisions that need to respond to renewed calls in national policy papers for languages learning and global engagement for Australian citizens. The intense language learning model inherent in CLIL programs is based on an extensive number of hours of second language exposure and an authentic communication need in classrooms using a second language as the medium of instruction. Furthermore, the vision of many CLIL program directors and teachers to provide the contingencies for Australian students to become 21st century citizens, linguistically skilled and interculturally experienced, indicates the possibilities for CLIL as a teaching design model for languages education for many more Australian students.

CLIL pedagogy simultaneously aims to develop concrete communication skills in a language other than the students’ native language, as well as working through mainstream requirements for curriculum content. It therefore offers its students a focus on both the language of communication and the language of academic cognition (Cummins, 1996). This is only possible by adapting teaching strategies that interactively segment and build up both the students’ linguistic skills and conceptual understanding in subject-specific areas. As a consequence, CLIL teachers face multiple layers of considerations in their pedagogical planning considerations: concepts used in the mainstream; available resources; translation and simplification of materials; access through modified language.

Several aspects of the programs, for example the exposure to native speaker teachers of the target language country, and in particular the exchange to the target language country offer opportunities for personal and individual encounters with the ‘other’, which represent both an intellectual-cognitive and an intercultural challenge. While CLIL pedagogy in Queensland is currently characterised by individual and dispersed agents operating in schools programs which are not connected by any standardising umbrella organisation, the hopes for the future include a broader application of this pedagogical approach in more schools and inclusion of the CLIL concepts in teacher training electives. The call for global skills in languages and intercultural understanding could then truly be answered in more than just a few programs.
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