Author/s:
Fompudie, Celine Elizabeth

Title:
Fostering students' dialogic imagination: the potential of CLIL to promote cosmopolitan learning

Date:
2023-02

Persistent Link:
https://hdl.handle.net/11343/331707

Fostering students' dialogic imagination: The potential of CLIL to promote cosmopolitan learning

Celine Fompudie

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5221-7282

Master of Education

February 2023

Melbourne Graduate School of Education

The University of Melbourne

Submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Education.

Abstract

In the context of global connections, there has been a widespread recognition of the potential of language learning to promote intercultural skills. However, current language teaching practices seem to promote a fixed notion of culture by focussing on teaching cultural achievements and celebrations. In order to recognise the complexity of cultural practices engendered by globalisation, this thesis argues that the teaching of intercultural skills in language education might be best conceived within a cosmopolitan paradigm.

This thesis adopts a view of cosmopolitanism as a cultural attitude towards others based on our dialogic imagination. What makes a cosmopolitan attitude possible is our imagination, our capacity to explore and incorporate other ways of living and thinking. The thesis develops a view of cosmopolitan learning as a teaching approach aimed at fostering students' dialogic imagination by providing them with the necessary conditions to develop a cosmopolitan attitude. The thesis articulates the idea that to be cosmopolitan, learning needs to be dialogic, transformative and ethical.

To explore how intercultural competence and understanding might be better developed from a cosmopolitan lens, this study examines the potential of the Content and Language Integrated Leaning (CLIL) approach to foster students' dialogic imagination. CLIL emerged in transnational Europe in the mid-1990s as an innovative approach to language learning whose key principle is to teach content in an additional language. A case study of a year 9 class studying history in French was conducted and data was generated from classroom discourse and students' interviews.

Findings shows that by creating transnational and translingual spaces, CLIL promotes an interactive learning space where students critically engage and dialogue with a multiplicity of voices, suggesting that the CLIL approach has the potential to promote cosmopolitan ideals. Furthermore, the study demonstrates that adopting a cosmopolitan lens to the teaching of intercultural understanding and competence allows us to articulate a dynamic view of culture that recognises the cultural complexity brought about by globalisation.

Thesis declaration

I declare that:

(i) the thesis comprises only my original work towards the Master of Education;

(ii) due acknowledgement has been made in the text to all other material used;

(iii) the thesis is fewer than the maximum word limit in length, exclusive of tables, maps, bibliographies and appendices

Signed:

Name of student: Celine Fompudie

Date: 06/02/2023

Acknowledgments

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor Russell Cross for his guidance, encouragement and invaluable advice throughout the completion of this thesis. I also want to extend my gratitude to Yvette Slaughter for her support and feedback. I would also like to acknowledge Fazal Rizvi, whose lecture on transnationalism inspired this thesis.

Secondly, I would like to thank the students who participated in this study. This project would not have been possible without them. I want to thank them for their enthusiasm, their curiosity, and their love of languages.

I would also like to thank my school principal Sheereen Kindler, not only for allowing me to conduct this research project but also for believing in me and for supporting language learning. I want to extend my gratitude to all the wonderful teachers I have worked with over the years and who have inspired me and supported me.

Finally, I want to thank my family for their ongoing and unconditional support and their patience throughout the completion of this thesis. I want to thank Patrick for his encouragement, his insights and our conversations. I want to thank my two daughters, Aimee and Lucie, for their love, their affection and their cosmopolitan spirit! Aimee thank you for always “me donner du courage” when I needed it.

Table of Content

List of tables

Chapter 1
Introduction

> *Cosmopolitanism begins with the simple idea that . . . we need to develop habits of coexistence: conversation in its older meaning, of living together, association. And conversation it its modern sense, too*. (Appiah, 2006, p. xvii)

Language learning and the teaching of intercultural skills and understanding

In the context of increased globalisation, there has been growing recognition of the potential of language learning to promote intercultural skills and understanding. The objectives of language learning, as expressed in policy documents, emphasise intercultural communication, respect for diversity, tolerance and global citizenship (Starkey, 20017, 2010). The Australian Curriculum, for example, claims that the "development of intercultural understanding is a central aim of learning a language" (ACARA, n.d.) while in Europe, learning a language is seen as "an essential condition for intercultural communication and acceptance of cultural differences" (Council of Europe, 2014). In Victoria, language learning is seen as enabling students to develop an "understanding of and respect for diversity and difference" (VCAA, n.d.) and facilitating "effective participation in Victoria's multicultural, multilingual and multi-faith society" (Department of Education and Training, 2015, p. 5). This potential has also been recognised by researchers (Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999; Kramsch, 1993; Savignon, 2007) and has led to the emergence in the 1990s of a new teaching paradigm, the Intercultural Language Teaching (ILT) approach, whose main principle is to support students' acquisition of an intercultural competence as well as a linguistic competence.

However, despite policy intentions, Starkey (2007) and others (e.g., Lo Bianco, 2009) have noted that language pedagogies used in the classroom fail to develop students' intercultural understanding. As Carr (1999) observed some two decades ago, the development of intercultural skills through the study of languages is often seen as an automatic outcome and language teachers are left with no effective pedagogical tool to teach 'culture'— and little has seemed to have changed since. More recent attempts to develop teaching methods to support students' intercultural skills such as ILT, for example, have only had a limited impact as the

most widely used pedagogical approach in language classrooms remains the Communicative Language Teaching approach (CLT) (Lo Bianco, 2009; Savignon, 2007, 2018). Based on a functional view of language, CLT promotes the development of a native speaker like communicative competence, and culture is concerned with learning the cultural practices and achievements of the target country (Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999; Lo Bianco, 2009). Researchers argue that by emphasising the notions of 'native speaker' and 'target country', CLT perpetuates a fixed view of both language and culture that does not reflect the complexity and the plurality of linguistic and cultural practices. Instead, it presents a simplistic and stereotyped vision of the country that do not enable students to develop intercultural understanding (Risager, 2007; Starkey, 2007). Moreover, several scholars (Pennycook, 2006; Risager, 2007) note that the notion of native speaker is at odds with the complex linguistic reality of today's world and Pennycook (2006) even argues that promoting a native speaker like competence is "one of the great crimes of the global hegemony of communicative language teaching" (p. 113).

In this context, some scholars in language education (Guardado, 2012; Guilherme, 2002; Quist, 2013; Ros i Solé, 2013; Starkey, 2007, 2010) argue that the teaching of intercultural skills in language classes may instead be best conceived within a cosmopolitan paradigm. They argue that it might offer researchers and educators the conceptual tools to understand intercultural competence and understanding in a way that recognises the blurring of cultural differences. Recognising the limits of traditional language teaching approaches, this thesis engages with the concept of cosmopolitanism to examine how intercultural skills and understanding are fostered in the language classroom.

The cosmopolitan paradigm

Cosmopolitanism is believed to have originated in Greece in the 4th century BCE where the Cynic philosopher Diogenes declared himself a *kosmopolitês,* a citizen of the world (Appiah, 2006; Delanty, 2009). The term is made up of *politês* or citizen, who belongs to a city, the *polis,* and *cosmos* which refers to the universe. By using this oxymoronic construction, Diogenes wanted not only to reject the idea that people belong to a particular community but also to question one's own identity against traditional views of what it meant to be a good citizen. As such, it was an act of individual freedom which, according to Delanty (2009) "gave the cosmopolitan imagination a critical sensibility" (p. 21).

The term has re-emerged in several academic disciplines in recent years in the context of increased globalisation. Rizvi (2009) notes that the concept has been explored as "a political philosophy, a moral theory and a cultural disposition" (p. 253). For Appiah (2006), cosmopolitanism means entering a conversation across boundaries of identity. Conversation, he explains, includes talk but it is also a "metaphor for engagement with the experience and the ideas of others" (p. 85). We are all members of the same "global tribe" (p. xi) and as such we have moral obligations towards each other.

Cosmopolitanism as a cultural attitude towards others has been further explored by thinkers from various disciplines as a response to the cultural changes brought about by globalisation. By creating transnational spaces in which individuals develop relationships beyond traditional national boundaries, globalisation has affected the way we think about culture (Rizvi, 2011). As argued by Tomlinson (1999), the main cultural consequence of globalisation is what he calls the *deterritorialisation* of culture. Globalisation has weakened the link of culture to a specific place leading to the production of hybrid forms of culture (Delanty, 2009; Pieterse, 2015; Rizvi, 2011; Tomlinson, 1999) through the "intermingling of these disembedded cultural practices" (Tomlinson, 1999, p. 141). Similarly, Beck (2006) recognises that our cultural environment is characterised by "blurring differentiations and cultural contradictions" (p. 3). Thus, as Hansen (2011) further explains, cosmopolitanism is the expression of "cultural creativity" (p. 11).

For several thinkers (Appiah, 2006; Beck, 2002; Delanty, 2006, 2009), what makes a cosmopolitan attitude possible is our imagination, our capacity to explore alternative ways of living and thinking. For Appiah, conversations – in the sense of living together – across boundaries of identity require the "sort of imaginative engagement you get when you read a novel or watch a movie or attend to a work of art that speaks from some place other than your own" (2006, p. 85). Beck (2003, 2006) explicitly stresses the *dialogic* nature of the cosmopolitan imagination. The dialogic imagination is a critical dialogue between reflecting on our own assumptions, beliefs and practices, in relation to how things are also seen from the perspective of others. He calls this "the *internalized* other" (2002, p. 18, emphasis in the original). Similar to Beck, Delanty (2009) emphasises the dialogic nature of the cosmopolitan imagination. For him, cosmopolitanism is best understood as a form of cultural translations in which new horizons open up in the creative dialogue of cultures (2009, p. 192). Being a cosmopolitan means to enter a complex and critical dialogue with other ways of living and

thinking, what he calls “a translation of perspectives” (p. 87) in order to create “a third culture” (p. 192).

If the key feature of a cosmopolitan attitude is the dialogic imagination, cosmopolitan learning must then be concerned with fostering a dialogic imagination. Although some scholars are beginning to identify key features of cosmopolitan learning (Baildon & Damico, 2011; Starkey, 2010; Rizvi, 2009), Wahlström (2016) and Hansen (2011) argue that a cosmopolitan attitude cannot be taught according to a pre-set curriculum and teaching approach. Instead, Wahlström (2016) suggests that cosmopolitan learning should be best understood as an approach to teaching characterised by its “*potentiality*” (p. 45, emphasis in the original). We cannot know in advance if students will develop a cosmopolitan attitude, but we can provide the necessary conditions to encourage them to use their dialogic imagination.

Drawing on the idea of cosmopolitan dialogic imagination (Appiah, 2006; Beck, 2002; Delanty, 2006, 2009), I argue for three key principles or conditions of cosmopolitan learning necessary to encourage students to develop their dialogic imagination. I draw on Hansen’s (2011) view of cosmopolitan learning for the first two while the third principle is based on Rizvi’s interpretation (2009). Developing Appiah’s idea that conversation is learning, Hansen (2011) suggests that an aspect of cosmopolitan learning is about “learning how to converse with others” (p. 98). The first principle is concerned with providing students with a *dialogic learning experience* in which students are encouraged to reflect on their own views and consider alternative viewpoints. Drawing on Delanty’s view cosmopolitan imagination as “a form of cultural translations” (2009, p. 192), Hansen (2011) claims that cosmopolitan education should be a *transformative experi*ence where knowledge is not transmitted but actively co-created through a process of cultural translations. Drawing on Appiah (2006), Rizvi (2009) also advocates for a view of cosmopolitan learning that recognises our responsibilities and obligations towards other people. Thus, a third principle of cosmopolitan learning is concerned with providing students an *ethical learning experience* where students are encouraged to examine global issues and the different ways they might affect different communities.

Research aim

I have argued above that although the potential of language teaching to promote intercultural skills and understanding is widely shared, current language teaching practices seem to promote a fixed notion of culture and have left teachers with no effective pedagogical tool to teach 'culture' in a way that recognises the complexity of cultural practices. Further, informed by a cosmopolitan perspective on language education, this study also argues that the teaching of intercultural skills must equip students to be able to deal with cultural complexity and hybrid forms of culture. Research on cosmopolitanism has sought to define an attitude to read the world and its cultural complexity based on the concept of dialogic imagination, our capacity to engage with others.

To explore how intercultural competence and understanding might be better developed from a cosmopolitan lens, this study examines the potential of Content and Language Integrated Leaning (CLIL) as a pedagogic alternative to communicative approaches that dominate mainstream language teaching. CLIL is an innovative approach to language teaching whose key principle is to teach content through a foreign language. With this approach, language and content are taught in an integrated way and are equally important. It therefore differs from mainstream communicative approaches in that the aim is not to develop a native like communicative competence but to reproduce a natural and authentic linguistic environment. Even though culture in CLIL has not been the focus of thorough research (Coyle, 2007) it is understood that, in contrast to CLT, CLIL is not concerned with the 'target culture' of a specific country, but a more dynamic view of culture where students explore culture through a focus on engaging in understandings of content from different perspectives (Sudhoff, 2010).

This study therefore aims to examine the potential of CLIL to foster students' dialogic imagination, informed by a cosmopolitan perspective on culture and language. As suggested by Wahlström (2016), this study is concerned with evaluating the *potentiality* of the CLIL pedagogy to foster students' dialogic imagination by providing the necessary conditions to promote cosmopolitan learning**.** Following the idea of potentiality defined by Wahlström (2016), it is important to stress, that the study is not concerned with evaluating whether students have in fact developed a cosmopolitan attitude, but the extent to which the three principles

above – dialogic, transformative, and ethical learning – are evident within the conditions for learning, thereby suggesting the *potentiality* of CLIL to support cosmopolitan learning.

Research questions and scope

To address this aim, the study seeks to examine a CLIL teaching environment by examining whether it provides the necessary conditions to encourage students to develop their dialogic imagination. It will be guided by the three principles of cosmopolitan learning outlined earlier and will be articulated around three research questions:

1. How are students engaged in dialogic learning experience in CLIL?
2. How do students use their creativity in CLIL classes?
3. How does CLIL enable students to think as responsible global citizens?

To answer the research questions, I undertook a case study of a Year 9 CLIL class in Melbourne studying history in French. As I elaborate in Chapter 3, the study adopted a sociocultural analytical framework based on Bakhtin's philosophy of dialogic imagination, and the main source of data was based on classroom interactions supplemented by student data collected through interviews. It is important to acknowledge at this point my role as a teacher researcher in this study.

Overview of the thesis

In the next chapter, I further explore the three principles of cosmopolitan learning and how they have been applied to language education. I then turn to Bakhtin's philosophy of language and his notion of dialogic imagination as it can provide useful concepts to put cosmopolitanism in practice in language education. I finally review the research literature on CLIL in the light of these Bakhtinian concepts to provide a first assessment of the potential of CLIL to foster students' dialogic imagination and support cosmopolitan learning. In Chapter 3, I present the case study design I have developed to fulfil my research aim as well as the methodological assumptions underpinning this design. I discuss the advantages and limits of my approach and present the framework used to analyse the data. In Chapter 4, I present and analyse the findings, before discussing the results and their implications in Chapter 5.

Chapter 2
Dialogic imagination in CLIL classes: Using Bakhtin to put in practice cosmopolitan learning in language classes

In the introduction, I argued that the main feature of a cosmopolitan attitude is the dialogic imagination, the capacity to use our imagination to enter "conversations across boundaries of identity" (Appiah, 2006, p. 85). The dialogic imagination is a critical dialogue between our own ways of thinking and the beliefs and practices of others or as Beck (2002) explains the capacity to internalise the viewpoints of others. Cosmopolitan education must then be concerned with promoting students' dialogical imagination. Drawing on Hansen (2011) and Wahlström (2016), I introduced a view of cosmopolitan education based on its potentiality to foster students' dialogic imagination by providing the necessary conditions for students to use and develop their dialogic imagination.

As noted by Canagarajah, (2012, 2022) cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan learning remain under explored by linguists and language scholars. Some scholars in applied linguistics and language education (Guardado, 2012; Holliday, 2011; Obelleiro, 2012; Ros i Solé, 2013; Starkey, 2007, 2010) have begun calling for a cosmopolitan perspective on culture and language but research on the topic is sparse. However, in the past two decades, scholars (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Carr, 1999; Quist, 2013; Kramsch & Malinowski, 2014; Hirst & Renshaw, 2004) including CLIL experts (Coyle, 2007; Llinares & Whittaker, 2019) have turned to Bakhtin's notion of dialogic imagination to examine the increasingly complex linguistic practices brought about by globalisation. They note that languages, like culture, travel across national boundaries and; linguistic practices, like cultural practices, are characterised by creativity and hybridity. As suggested by Quist (2013), Bakhtin's dialogic imagination has a lot in common with the cosmopolitan dialogic imagination. In this chapter, I argue that it can offer language educators conceptual tools to put in practice cosmopolitan language learning.

This chapter reviews the literature that has engaged with cosmopolitan learning as it relates to language education, and culture in particular, and is structured in three parts. First, I further describe the three principles of cosmopolitan learning and examine various attempts to implement them in language education. Second, I turn to Bakhtin and analyse his concepts and

their contributions to cosmopolitan learning. Finally, I review research on CLIL in relations to these three principles of cosmopolitan learning and in light of these Bakhtinian concepts.

Cosmopolitan learning and language education

A dialogic learning experience

The first condition is concerned with providing students with a *dialogic learning experience* in which students are encouraged to be curious, to reflect on their own views and consider alternative viewpoints. Drawing on Appiah's idea that cosmopolitanism begins with the ability to converse, Hansen (2011) suggests that cosmopolitan learning should be about learning "how to converse with others" (p. 98) and "how to respond to other people's responses to the world" (p. 98). Nussbaum (1997) stresses that a cosmopolitan education should aim at developing students' capacity for "narrative imagination", our ability to be "an intelligent reader of another person's story" (p. 11) by combining their imagination with their own knowledge and experience. Thus, dialogic learning can only occur if students are given opportunities to "venture beyond … local settings" (Nussbaum, 1997, p. 14) and experience "blurring differentiations and cultural contradictions" (Beck, 2006, p. 3). From a cosmopolitan perspective, the language classroom is a space where culture is deterritorialised – not linked to a specific territory (Tomlinson, 1999) – and where students encounter complex and hybrid forms of cultures.

In language education, Ros i Solé (2013) has taken up this idea and has developed an approach to cosmopolitan language education focussing on a dialogue between complex cultural and linguistic practices. Building on the notion of the intercultural speaker developed by Byram in the late 1990s (Byram and Zarate, 1996; Alred, Byram & Fleming, 2002), she proposes to adopt the notion of the cosmopolitan speaker. She argues with others (Risager, 2007) that by focussing on confronting perspectives 'between one's own country and one's interlocutor's countries', the concept of the intercultural speaker (Byram, 1997, as quoted in Risager, 2007) remains trapped within a national paradigm. This leads to a focus on the cosmopolitan speaker replacing that of the intercultural speaker (2013). Drawing heavily on Beck's *dialogic* view of cosmopolitanism, Ros i Solé's cosmopolitan speaker goes further and recognises the blurring

of cultural differentiations and individuals' multiple attachments. However, in her description, the cosmopolitan attitude is characterised by what she calls a "flâneur-like disposition" (p. 326). By "adopting the gaze of the spectator and observe and study the world around him" (p. 334), her cosmopolitan speaker lacks commitment to social justice.

A transformative learning experience

The second condition of cosmopolitan learning involves offering students *a transformative learning experience.* For Delanty (2009), processes of cosmopolitanism involve the creation of something new – what he calls "a third culture" (p. 192) or "a shared normative culture" (p. 193). He further explains that these processes of cosmopolitanism 'take the forms of translations between things that are different' (p. 79). Drawing on Delanty's concept of 'third culture' (2009), Hansen (2011, 2014) claims that cosmopolitan education should be a transformative or creative experience. For Hansen (2014), self-transformation occurs through creativity, that is "how people bring into being, quite literally, that which was not here before" (p. 7). A cosmopolitan view of education, he argues, is not about transmission of knowledge but about "cultural creativity" (p. 11).

In her interpretation of language cosmopolitan learning, Quist (2013) emphasises the dialogic and creative aspects. Drawing on Beck, she argues that "through our dialogic imagination, we form and reform our multifaceted selves in a constantly shifting dialogue with others" (p. 336). Her main contribution is to develop the idea of dialogic imagination as a pedagogical tool by bringing together cosmopolitanism and Bakhtin's theory of language, which I will explore further in the next section. She uses the Bakhtinian concept of 'authoring' (Holquist 1983; Vitanova, 2005) to describe the creative or transformative process in which students enter when appropriating others' language for their own purposes. For Quist, the dialogic imagination is a pedagogical tool used to open up "spaces in the classroom where students can use their creativity to engage with people, views, situations – social, cultural, political, historical or every day – in dialogic ways and from a position of justice, equality and respect for the other" (2013, p. 336). However, even though she refers to Appiah's argument that we have obligations to strangers (2006) and stresses the importance of developing ethical relations, she does not explain how this can be addressed in the classroom.

An ethical learning experience

Finally, the last condition of cosmopolitan learning is concerned with the recognition that we have responsibilities and obligations towards other people, near or distant, as members of a shared humanity (Appiah, 2006). For Rizvi (2009), cosmopolitan learning is about teaching about processes of and discourses on global connectivity and the social inequalities they might produce. Cosmopolitan pedagogy should thus be directed at examining global issues and the ways they affect communities differently. The goal of cosmopolitan learning is for students to develop "a critical and global imagination" (Rizvi, 2009, p. 257) in order to act morally towards the humanity as a whole and soften social inequalities. This last principle is concerned with providing students an ethical learning experience

Drawing on Appiah and Rizvi, some language educators (Guilherme, 2002; Starkey, 2007, 2010) have adopted an interpretation of cosmopolitan learning focussing on this third principle and believe a cosmopolitan language education must provide students with a learning space where global issues and processes of inequalities are examined. As such, they stress the importance of the content taught in language classes. Starkey (2010), for example, observes that in language classroom materials, "others" are usually represented through topics such as holidays or daily routines, which do not allow students to grasp cultural complexities and tend to promote stereotypes. For Starkey (2010), cosmopolitan language education requires addressing global issues in a way that allows students to question dominant and alternative discourses and to make connections between local, national and global perspectives. A unit on the topic of fashion in a French textbook (Starkey, 2010) for example, included links with India where the clothes are actually made and encouraged students to explore issues of inequality.

Some language educators and scholars have attempted to develop a cosmopolitan approach to language learning in order to promote a more complex view of culture and encourage students to develop intercultural skills and understanding. The approaches developed have adopted different foci. Starkey (2010) and Guilherme (2002), for example, proposed an ethical view of cosmopolitan language education focussed on teaching global issues and developing cosmopolitan citizens. Ros i Solé's focus (2013) on cosmopolitan speakers aimed at recognising the blurring of cultural differentiation and the multiple cultural attachments people navigate through dialogue. Finally, Quist's approach (2013) of cosmopolitan learning focuses on the creative aspect of the cosmopolitan learning. Drawing on Beck's view of dialogic

imagination, she attempts to draw parallels with Bakhtin's concept of dialogic imagination. In the next section, I follow Quist's approach and I explore Bakhtin's dialogic imagination to see how his philosophy can help us to put cosmopolitan learning – a defined in my introduction – in practice in the language classroom.

Bakhtin's dialogic imagination

In recent years, linguists and educators (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Carr, 1999; Quist, 2013; Kramsch & Malinowski, 2014; Hirst & Renshaw, 2004) have turned to Bakhtin and his dialogic view of language to help explain and understand language practices as well as inform pedagogy. In this section, I examine both Bakthin's concept of dialogic imagination and the cosmopolitan view of dialogic imagination. As noted by Quist (2013), the two concepts have much in common and I discuss how Bakhtin can provide us with conceptual tools to put in practice the three principles of cosmopolitan learning outlined in the introduction – dialogic, transformative, and ethical – in language education.

Born in Russia in 1895, Bakhtin described himself as a "philosopher, a thinker" in an interview given to Duvakin in 1973 (Emerson, 1997 as quoted in Vitanova, 2010, p. 12), His work is primarily dedicated to the study of the novel, and has been explored in recent years by philosophers, linguists and education scholars. He has been associated with post-structuralism and is viewed as preceding it (Swain and Deters, 2007). Like post-structuralist thinkers such as Barthes and Foucault, he rejects the structuralist view of language developed by Saussure as an abstract and fixed system of signs based on the relationship between a signifier and a signified. He shares with post-structuralist theorists a view of language as plural and heterogeneous and a conception of meaning created through social interactions. But, unlike post-structuralist theorists, Bakhtin recognises the key role played by individuals (Swain and Deters, 2007). Within the field of educational research, his work has often been associated with that of another Russian thinker, Vygotsky. They both share a sociocultural conception of language seen as socially and historically constructed (Hall, 2002; Swain & Deters, 2007).

As observed by Quist (2013), cosmopolitanism and Bakhtin's theory of language overlap in many ways. Both stress the importance of *dialogue*, *creativity* and *responsibility* in our

relations with others. Both have in common, although with differences, the concept of dialogic imagination. Bakhtin's concept of dialogic imagination is actually the expression chosen by Holquist (1981) as the title of his translation of four of Bakhtin's major essays about the novel in which he developed his dialogic theory of language. Since the first publication of *The Dialogic Imagination* in 1975, linguists and language educators have turned to Bakhtin as his theory of language provides useful conceptual tools to deal with the linguistic complexities of today's world. Thus, scholars adopting a Bakhtinian approach argue that in our interconnected world, the notion of languages as separate entities has become obsolete and insufficient to study language practices characterised by plurality and hybridity (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Blackledge, Creese & Takhi, 2014; Hall, Vitanova & Marchenkova, 2005; Kramsch & Malinowski, 2014). This resonates with a cosmopolitan understanding of the world: in the same way as global connectivity has blurred cultural differentiations, linguistic practices have also become more complex.

A dialogic view of language

As with cosmopolitanism, dialogue is central to Bakhtin's philosophy and its concept of dialogic imagination has a lot in common with the cosmopolitan dialogic imagination. For Bakthin (1981), "the word is born in dialogue as a living rejoinder within it" (p. 279). Dialogic is first used by Bakhtin to describe the novel in which, he argues, unlike in poetry, characters are not a determination of "a single and unified authorial consciousness" (1984, as quoted in Renfrew, 2015, p. 78) but the authors themselves of a "fully weighted ideological conception of [their] own" (1984, as quoted in Renfrew, 2015, p. 78). Using Dostoevsky's novels as an example, Bakhtin argues that in his novels, characters are not "Dostoevsky's finalizing artistic vision" (1984, as quoted in Renfrew, 2015, p. 78), but they have their own voice and represent different worldviews. Echoing Appiah's conversation metaphor (2006), Bakhtin (1981) argues that what makes a novel dialogic is thus not merely the literal dialogue of several characters but the genuine "interaction of several consciousnesses" (p. 18) what Appiah (2006) describes as the "engagement with the experience and the ideas of others" (p. 85).

Bakhtin (1984) uses the novel as a metaphor for language use in general as for him, the dialogic nature of Dostoevsky's novels is in fact "an almost universal phenomenon, permeating all human speech and all relationships and manifestations of human life, everything that has meaning and significance" (as quoted in Renfrew, 2015, p. 79). Words, Bakhtin argues, are not

neutral and like the characters in Dostoevsky's novels, they carry with them different representations of the world. Thus, at the core of his theory lies the concept of utterance, the "concrete discourse" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 276) where meaning is dialogically produced. The word as a sign is "half someone else's" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 293), it does not belong to anybody and does not have a fixed meaning as it has been "in other people's mouths" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 293). The meaning of an utterance is then unique to a speech situation as it can only occur dialogically through the encounter of two or more voices under particular circumstances. Bakhtin's dialogic theory of language is then a meaning making process in which meaning is always negotiated in an ongoing dialogue of voices or as Juzwik puts it "meaning takes shape through the negotiation of difference" (2004, p. 542). This resonates with the cosmopolitan approach to dialogic imagination, which allows us to explore different ways of thinking in order to negotiate our interactions with others (Appiah, 2006). As stated by Holquist, (1990) dialogism refers to "a necessary multiplicity in human perception" (p. 22).

Bakhtin (1981) stresses the particular circumstances in which meaning is produced and the important role of the socio-historical contexts of speech events in shaping the meaning of utterances. Thus, he developed the concept of *chronotope* to refer to the inseparability of language from its context. Chronotope, literally 'time-space', was first developed as a device of literary analysis to refer to a particular combination of time and place resulting in specific narrative forms with their clearly identifiable features. Specific chronotopes trigger specific people, actions and meanings. He then developed his concept to recognise that "language, as a treasure-house of images, is fundamentally chronotopic" (1981, p. 251). This concept of chronotope can help us analyse how a specific context can lead to particular cultural and linguistic practices. Indeed, some scholars interested in examining translingual practices (Blommaert, 2015; Renfrew, 2015) draw on Bakhtin to argue that language, like literature, is not "immune from the chronotopic determinations" (Renfrew, 2015, p. 125) and that chronotopes shape what happens in discursive events. I established earlier in this chapter that a cosmopolitan language classroom is a space where culture is deterritorialised, that is, it is not associated with its traditional territory. To provide students with a dialogic learning experience, the chronotope offered by the CLIL environment needs to be one that promotes a deterritorialised view of culture and language.

Speaking, a creative experience

In another similitude with cosmopolitanism, Bakhtin argues that negotiating meaning dialogically in a unique speech situation is a creative process, which resonates with the *transformative* dimension of Hansen's cosmopolitan learning. Indeed, as noted by Holquist (1990), one of the most radical implications of Bakhtin's thought is his concept of authorship, the idea that "anyone who speaks thereby creates" (Holquist, 1983, p. 315). According to Bakhtin, words do not have abstract fixed meanings but only come to life and acquire real meanings through their utterances. Thus, as Holquist (1983) explains, in order to "invest [words] with life and meaning … we must all, perforce, become authors" (p. 314). For Bakhtin (1984), speakers are seen as authors who use their creativity and what he calls *addressivity,* our "quality of turning to someone" (as quoted in Quist, 2013, p. 334) to produce various utterances that embody both an individual perspective and also a sense of collective experience. Similarly, processes of cosmopolitanism occur when something new is created through cultural translations (Delanty, 2009), the capacity to "incorporate the perspective of others into one's own culture".

If meaning occurs dialogically in unique speech situations, then new language is constantly created. According to Bakhtin, language is *heteroglossic* as each utterance contributes to the ongoing creation of linguistic variations. Bakhtin (1981) develops the concept of *heteroglossia* to refer to the internal stratification of language into not only linguistic dialects but also "socio-ideological languages" (p. 271-272) such as "social dialects . . . professional jargons, languages of generations and age groups . . . languages of the authorities" (p. 263). Language is thus necessarily "ideologically saturated" (p. 271) and always "broadening and deepening" (p. 272).

Of all the concepts developed by Bakhtin, *heteroglossia* is probably the one that has drawn the most attention from sociolinguists and language educators. Blommaert and Rampton (2011) note that increased mobility and technological advances have profoundly changed the way people use language, and multilingualism and translanguaging are becoming the norm. Those linguistic transformations parallel the cultural changes described and recognised by cosmopolitan thinkers as both are characterised by the blurring of traditional boundaries and hybridisation processes. Thus, in the context of globalisation, Blackledge and Creese (2014) suggest using the concept of heteroglossia as an analytical tool through which to "view the social, political, and historical implications of language in practice" (p. 1).

As noted by Kramsch and Malinowski (2014), the popularity of the concept of heteroglossia as a pedagogical tool among language educators reflects the shift that has operated in language teaching in recent years. They further observe that the objectives of language learning are not only concerned with speaking the language accurately but also with demonstrating the ability to code switch and to operate between languages. Thus, they argue that by making visible linguistic variations and competing worldviews, heteroglossia can be seen as promoting intercultural understanding in the language classroom. In their study of second language learning in Australia, Hirst and Renshaw (2004) examine the heteroglossic potential of the language classroom in promoting intercultural understanding. In their study of heteroglossic texts, Doecke, Kostogriz, and Charles (2004) argue that by incorporating "a multiplicity of social voices" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 263 as quoted in Doecke et al., 2004) and contrasting perspectives in their writing, students develop critical language awareness.

An ethical attitude

Finally, the last dimension of cosmopolitan education identified in the introduction stresses the importance of providing students with an ethical learning experience. Similarly, the philosophy of language developed by Bakhtin is also concerned with the ethical dimension of speaking situations. Several authors (Brandist, 2002; Juswik, 2004; Renfrew, 2015; Vitanova, 2010) have stressed the ethical dimension of Bakhtin's philosophy. As reminded by Steinby and Klapuri (2013), individuals' participation in an event contains a moment of "ought" (p. xvi), in other words "the obligation to perform an ethically responsible act" (p. xvi), As with cosmopolitanism, responsibility in Bakhtin's thought is concerned with how individuals engage with the world and with others. Echoing Appiah (2006), Bakhtin argues that because our existence is necessarily shared with others, we are *answerable*, we have a responsibility towards others. Refusing to show *answerability* is, according to Bakhtin, to live with an "alibi in being" (1993, as quoted in Renfrew, 2015, p. 30). Thus, as summarised by Juzwik, (2004) answerability in the context of language use stresses "the unique responsibility that characterizes the individual's responses to others in everyday interactions and in textual production" (p. 538).

The ethical dimension of Bakhtin's dialogism has attracted the attention of numerous scholars in literacy education (Dyson, 1993; Juzwik, 2004; Halasek, 1999, as cited in Juswik, 2004).

Drawing on Bakhtin's dialogism and influenced by his predilection for difference, Dyson (1993) has developed a view of literacy learning based on the idea that students must practise encountering and responding to a wide variety of cultural voices and differences. From this perspective, ethical teaching means giving students the opportunity to engage dialogically with differences and voices beyond their immediate environment. From a Bakhtinian point of view, an ethically dialogic pedagogy puts at the centre voices of others. As with cosmopolitanism, it calls for a pedagogy where other voices and perspectives are explored and meanings are negotiated.

This section sought to demonstrate that Bakhtin's philosophy of language can provide conceptual tools to adopt a cosmopolitan lens on language education. As Quist (2013) suggested, cosmopolitan dialogic imagination and Bakhtin's dialogic imagination have a lot in common and the literature on Bakhtin supports the vision of a dialogic imagination based on a dialogic, transformative and ethical experience. As shown in this section, Bakhtin has been well-researched by linguists and language education scholars and this study seeks to build on this knowledge to further explore cosmopolitan language education.

CLIL and cosmopolitan learning

Traditionally, research on CLIL has focussed on academic outcomes and language proficiency, Coyle, Hood and Marsh admitted in 2010 that culture was often referred to as the "forgotten C" of the framework (p. 54) as its role has not been clearly articulated and more research is needed. Although, researchers have started to examine the processes of learning in CLIL classrooms (Dalton-Puffer and Smit, 2007), research on the role of culture in CLIL is still sparse. Drawing on sociocultural theories of language learning, some of this research offers interesting insights on the potential of CLIL to promote cosmopolitan education. In this section, I review and examine research on CLIL in relations to the different aspects of cosmopolitan learning.

The CLIL pedagogical approach

CLIL emerged in Europe in the mid-1990s as an innovative approach to language teaching in the context of increasing transnational connections within Europe (Mehisto, Marsh & Frigols, 2008). CLIL is now starting to be used throughout Australia and the Victorian government is encouraging schools to adopt this approach. CLIL is a flexible and integrated approach to language teaching whose key principle is to teach a non-language subject through a foreign language. As such, it offers a pedagogic alternative to the widely used communicative approach.

The conceptual framework driving the CLIL model lies on four interrelated dimensions: content (the subject or topic taught), communication (language), cognition (thinking processes) and culture. Coyle et al. (2010) describe CLIL as a form of education that goes beyond language learning and further state that "CLIL offers a rich potential for developing notions of pluricultural citizenship and global understanding" (p. 55). By learning content through an additional language, the aim of CLIL is not to teach students to develop a native like communicative competence but to encourage them to use language to explore new perspectives. Thus, CLIL seems to offer a rich learning environment with the potential to offer students the three dimensions of cosmopolitan learning.

Culture is at the centre of the framework developed by Coyle and it permeates throughout the other Cs: content, cognition and communication (Coyle, 2007). Drawing on Vygotsky and Bakhtin, Coyle et al. (2010) support a dynamic view of culture constructed through interactions. They further explain that if students are to develop intercultural skills, culture cannot be taught in a few lessons about traditions and celebrations. They argue that intercultural understanding needs to be developed through encountering and interacting with different people in different contexts.

CLIL as a dialogic experience

CLIL experts (Coyle et al., 2010; Dalton-Puffer, Nikula & Smit, 2010) agree that CLIL is based on a sociocultural theory of learning according to which people learn through interactions. Coyle et al. (2010) situate CLIL within a dialogic learning approach where "learners are encouraged to construct their own meanings from activities requiring interactions with peers

and the teacher in the vehicular language" (p. 35). Echoing Bakhtin's concept of chronotope and its incidence on the language created, Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010) stress the importance of the context on the language acquisition process. Several studies have shown that CLIL classrooms provide students with more space for interactions and that CLIL students seem to be more competent interactionally (Dalton-Puffer & Llinares, 2013; Llinares & Whittaker, 2010). In a study comparing CLIL and EFL classes, Nikula (2007) notes that CLIL students have more opportunities to initiate conversations and express themselves than students in more traditional language classes. She also observes that because CLIL is content based, students bring to class their own knowledge on which they can build more knowledge.

In their study analysing the roles of language in CLIL, Llinares, Whittaker, and Morton (2012) use a framework developed by Scott and Mortimer (2003) to examine classroom interactions and their impact on the learning process. Drawing largely on Bakthin's theory of language, this framework was first developed to analyse language interactions in science classrooms. They found that there are more opportunities for genuine negotiation of meaning than in a traditional class as learning content in a different language requires participants to collaborate more with each other and the content seems to be manipulated and talked about by students more than in traditional class.

CLIL experts (Coyle et al., 2010; Mendez Garcia, 2012; Sudhoff, 2010; Wiesemes, 2009) have stressed the potential of CLIL to provide students with opportunities to consider and discuss alternative viewpoints. Coyle et al. (2010) observe that the integrated nature of CLIL can give students a greater "cognitive flexibility" (p. 10) and the ability to think in different languages and therefore develop "different thinking horizons" (p. 10). They agree with other authors (Mendez Garcia, 2012; Wiesemes, 2009) that studying in a different language has the potential to provide students with the opportunity to operate in alternative cultures and consider different perspectives on a topic. Similarly, Sudhoff (2010) suggests that using authentic resources and educational materials from other countries to explore alternative perspectives and discuss different viewpoints can support the development of students' intercultural skills. He also stresses the importance of the content facet of the CLIL approach in enabling students to consider different perspectives. He explains that studying historical events or environmental issues might encourage students to explore different views. Echoing Beck's definition of dialogic imagination, Sudhoff (2010) argues that CLIL has the potential to allow "for analysing, (re)constructing, comparing, contrasting and relativising one's own cultural

perspective and foreign cultural perspectives" (p. 30). In that sense, CLIL can be seen as providing students with a dialogic learning experience encouraging them to explore alternative ways of thinking.

In a study comparing writing and speaking in a history CLIL class, Llinares and Whittaker (2010) look at the interpersonal function of language defined by Halliday as the linguistic choices that a speaker makes to enact their relations with others (Halliday, 1993, as cited in Llinares & Whittaker, 2010). As pointed by Haworth (2010), this concept can be linked to Bakhtin's concept of *addressivity* (1986, as cited in Quist, 2013), our capacity to respond to otherness in our utterances. Thus, Llinares and Whittaker (2010) analyse the students' use of modality as evidence of their command of the interpersonal function of language. They found that although CLIL students used little modality, they showed a more frequent and varied use than students learning in their native language. They explain this difference by their observation that CLIL teachers tend to open up the discussion to alternative views and interpretations as well as relating to students' personal experiences more than teachers teaching content in the students' first language.

The literature on CLIL seems to suggest that CLIL has the potential to provide students with a dialogic learning experience, as it tends to provide more space for interactions. However, empirical evidence is limited and the claim by CLIL experts that the content focused nature of CLIL has the potential to enable students to consider different perspectives has not been documented. This study will seek to describe how students in CLIL contexts navigate multiple perspectives and interact with multiple voices.

CLIL as a transformative experience

Coyle et al. (2010) have stressed the socio-constructivist framework underpinning the CLIL approach and argue that the content aspect of CLIL is also about students "creating their own knowledge" (p. 42). Drawing on Vygotsky, Cross (2012) argues that students' language communicative competence can only develop from "being engaged in creating understanding" (p. 435) from the language. His study focuses on creativity and its pedagogical implication in CLIL. The study found that the integration of content and language of the CLIL approach enables students to be creative with the language. He further notes that rather than performing language "on cue", they seem to be able to "transform their understanding of the content into

language" (p. 440), by "making their own creative choices on what language to use" (p. 431). He also stresses the role of students-teacher interactions in creating new meanings. During his classroom observations, he notes that "both teachers and students were involved in a process of creating and transforming all available resources to move from "not knowing" to "knowing""(pp. 441-442).

The creative potential of CLIL can also be found in translanguaging practices. If the CLIL approach's core principle is to teach content through language, Coyle et al. (2010) remind us that translanguaging has its place in a CLIL classroom. Blackledge and Creese (2014) define translanguaging as "the flexible use of linguistic resources by multilingual speakers" (p. 182). In their study examining the pedagogical potential of translanguaging in CLIL classrooms, Lin and He (2017) have identified two ways translanguaging is used. First, as a scaffolding strategy, students in CLIL classrooms use a variety of linguistic resources to "help one another to negotiate meaning" (p. 232). They observed translanguaging sequences during which students and the teacher co-construct "translingual chains of meaning" (p. 233) by moving back and forth between students' first language and the target language. Second, referring to Garcia and Li Wei's research on translanguaging and education (2014, as cited in Lin & He, 2017), they argue that the creative translanguaging practices of CLIL students enable them to negotiate and affirm complex identities. As explained by Garcia and Li Wei,

> translanguaging, as a socio-educational process, enables students to construct and constantly modify their sociocultural identities and values, as they respond to their historical and present conditions critically and creatively. It enables students to contest the "one language only" or "one language at a time" ideologies of monolingual and traditional bilingual classrooms. (Garcia and Li Wei, 2014, as quoted in Lin & He, 2017, p.237)

In their research on CLIL and translanguaging Lin and Yi Lo (2017) insist that translanguaging practices should be seen as more than code switching between different languages but should also include the ability to "shift fluently between different social languages" (p. 28). Developing a Bakhtinian approach, they argue for an heteroglossic view of translanguaging drawing on a variety of linguistic resources including both their language and the target language as well as social-ideological languages (everyday and academic languages). They further advocate for a dialogic approach to CLIL teaching, where students have the opportunity

to engage creatively in "translation practice" (Lemke, 1990, as quoted in Lin & Yi Lo, 2017, p. 28), between the various linguistic resources present in the classroom.

As discussed above, research on the transformative potential of CLIL has focussed on linguistic creativity (Cross, 2012) including the heteroglossic practices of the CLIL classroom and seems to indicate that CLIL students are creative in the ways they use their language resources. However, research on CLIL has been mainly conducted by language educators and research on the acquisition of content knowledge in CLIL classes is sparse. In this context, this study seeks to further describe how students use their various linguistic resources but also if and how they are able to learn through what Delanty calls "cultural translations" (2009, p. 194) and Bakhtin refers to as *addressivity*, the capacity to produce new meanings by incorporating other perspectives in one's own knowledge (Bakhtin, 1986, as cited in Quist, 2013).

CLIL as an ethical pedagogy

Several authors have emphasised the role of content in developing students' intercultural competence. As explained by Coyle et al. (2010), content in CLIL can be "thematic, cross-curricular, interdisciplinary or have a focus on citizenship" (p. 28). In line with Rizvi's view of cosmopolitan learning (2009), they list examples of possible topics such as climate change, water, genocide, global communication, etc., which have in common to focus on global issues (p. 28). Rodriguez and Puyal (2012) as well as Sudhoff (2010) have also linked the intercultural potential of CLIL to the choice of topics covered in class and call for teachers to choose topics that might contribute to the "construction of people's cultural identity" (Rodriguez & Puyal, 2012 p. 110) such as world wars, evolution theories, political systems (Sudhoff, 2010). In a case study about the teaching of the Holocaust in a CLIL class, Wiesemes (2007) warns of the potential limit of CLIL in developing intercultural skills. He notes that there is a risk that the teaching of history might be reduced to facts and that learners might "express their emotions in a limited manner" (p. 286). However, he concludes that teaching sensitive topics in a CLIL lesson is possible as his study showed through students' interviews that despite their limited language skills, students have demonstrated they can relate to historical events learnt in class to their own moral landscape.

The third research question of this study is concerned with the potential of CLIL to enable students to think as responsible global citizens. CLIL scholars suggest that the content

dimension of CLIL has the potential to give students opportunities to explore global issues but the empirical evidence is limited and stresses the limits of CLIL in enabling students to critically investigate issues with limited language skills. Building on Wiesemes's research (2007) on CLIL history classes, the study will seeks to analyse what content students are learning and if this content enables them to think ethically as global citizens.

Conclusion

In this section, I elaborated on my view of cosmopolitan learning based on three dimensions. To foster students' dialogic imagination, it is necessary to provide students with the conditions to learn dialogically, creatively and ethically. I then turned to Bakhtin's philosophy as his view of language provides useful conceptual tools to implement language cosmopolitan education. From a Bakhtinian perspective, a dialogic language learning experience must provide students with opportunities to engage with several voices and to recognise the heteroglossic reality of today's language practices. The second dimension of cosmopolitan language learning is concerned with providing students opportunities to learn creatively by actively participating in the negotiation of meaning. Finally, ethical learning means that students must be given opportunities to explore global issues and discuss multiple and alternative ideas and perspectives. Finally, my review of CLIL research showed that experts agree to define CLIL as a teaching approach promoting a view of learning through dialogues and interactions. Research also shows that CLIL tends to offer more space for interactions than a traditional language classroom as well as more space to actively and creatively negotiate meaning than content classrooms. Research also suggests that the content focus of CLIL has the potential to promote intercultural skills. However, research is limited and does not comprehensively explore the three dimensions of cosmopolitan learning guiding this study.

Chapter 3: Research design

This chapter outlines the research design used for the study, which involved a teacher researcher case study of a Year 9 CLIL class studying history in French. I first outline my methodology that explains the reasons why I have located my research within an interpretive paradigm. I then describe the case I studied and explain why a case study design seemed the best method to fulfil my research aim. This is followed by an explanation of how the data was collected and analysed, based on a framework developed by Scott and Mortimer (2003) and adapted by Llinares et al. (2012) on the roles of languages in CLIL classes as it relates to the three conditions for developing dialogic imagination. Finally, I discuss the quality and integrity of the study, including ethics.

Research methodology

Researchers carry with them their own assumptions about the nature of reality and the nature of knowledge. Those assumptions or "beliefs that guide action" (Guba, 1985, as quoted in Creswell, 2007) influence the way in which the research is designed and conducted. There is no one accepted typology of research paradigms (Merriam, 2009) but that proposed by Carr and Kemmis has been influential (1995, as cited in Merriam, 2009). They identify three paradigms: positivist, which assumes that reality is objectively and scientifically observable and measurable; interpretive, for which there are multiple realities subject to individuals' interpretations; and critical, which adds a transformative goal to the interpretive worldview (Carr & Kemmis, 1995, as cited in Merriam, 2009).

This research project falls within the interpretive paradigm. An interpretive paradigm contends that reality is complex and that there are multiple interpretations of a single phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). Knowledge cannot be found out there in a fixed reality, but it is constructed through individuals' interpretation of their experiences leading the researcher to look for the complexity and the multiplicity of views (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009). Research driven by interpretive epistemological assumptions seeks to *describe* the interactions between individuals in a specific context and *understand* the participants' views of the phenomenon studied

(Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009). Delanty also stresses that "the cosmopolitan imagination is both an experience and an interpretation of the world" (2009, p. 6). Thus, to understand the pedagogical role of dialogic imagination in promoting students' intercultural skills, adopting an interpretive research paradigm will allow to describe the experience and understand the views of people involved.

Finally, if according to an interpretive view of knowledge, people develop "subjective meanings of their experiences" (Creswell, 2007, p. 20), Creswell notes that interpretive researchers should acknowledge that their findings are shaped by their own background and experiences and position themselves in the research. This research topic arose in the past few years, when I was teaching French and Humanities to high school students using the CLIL pedagogy. I noticed that students in the CLIL program, not only had a higher level of language proficiency compared to mainstream language students, but they also seem to be able to engage with, use and think in two languages. I share the widely acknowledged idea that learning language can foster intercultural understanding (Carr, 1999) but with this project, my aim is to uncover how the CLIL pedagogical approach, teachers can promote intercultural skills through the use of dialogic imagination. I recognise the implication of my position and my beliefs for ethics and the research design in general, particularly for the way data is analysed and interpreted. I address this in this chapter.

Research method

Defining the case

Before describing the case that informed this study, it should be acknowledged that although case study designs have been used for decades across many disciplines (Creswell, 2007), there is disagreement among researchers about its definition. For Stake, a case study is not a methodological choice but "a choice of what is being studied" (2008, as quoted in Merriam, 2009, p. 40). However, Yin's (2009) as well as Merriam's (2009) and Creswell's (2007) definitions emphasise the research design. The second area of contention is about the case itself. While some researchers such as Creswell (2007) and Merriam (2009) define the case as a bounded system, for Yin (2009) a case study is "an empirical inquiry that investigates a

contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (p. 18).

The study adopts an approach to case study closer to Yin's understanding, where the emphasis is on the study of a phenomenon relative to context. In this case, the *phenomenon* being studied is cosmopolitan learning, as defined in the previous chapters, within the *context* of a year 9 history class on the aftermath of World War I being taught in French using the CLIL approach.

Research Site and Participants

The class chosen is part of an immersion program offered by the school, in which students who opt in study humanities and drama in French following the CLIL approach. The program is designed for students with no knowledge of French and is offered from year 7 to year 9. Thus, the year 9 class involved in this study had been in the program for nearly two and a half year. It was deliberate to choose Year 9 students as due to their long experience studying according to the CLIL approach, they would be able to provide thick and rich data.

The class comprises 21 students within a public co-educational secondary school located in inner Melbourne. In 2017, it had 835 students. Socio-economic data collected from the federal Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) suggests that the population of the school is relatively advantaged with 39% of the students in the top quartile (My school, 2021). The student population is also linguistically and culturally diverse with over 50 ethnic groups represented and 58% of students with a language background other than English (My school, 2021).

The school offers a rich language program. In addition to the French CLIL program, the school also offers a French first language program in which students study French, humanities and mathematics based on the French curriculum, and a Japanese CLIL program in which students learn science in Japanese based on the Victorian curriculum.

I taught this unit myself in June 2017 over 3 weeks. The unit taught was a history unit on the effects of WWI and is based on the Victorian curriculum. Table 1 presents an overview of this unit.

Table 1: Overview of the unit

Week/lessons	Focus	Key texts and activities
Lesson 1	The main events of the WWI	Students discussed the main events of the war and choose one aspect or event of the war that they found significant and explain why it was significant.
Lesson 2	The human toll of the war	Students used information from secondary sources to describe the human cost of the war in different countries. 1.
Lesson 3	The trauma of the war	Students analysed primary sources to understand the long-term impact of the war on people. Key sources: 2. The Skat Players (Otto Dix, 1920) 3. Je ne peux oublier - I can't forget (Jean Giono, 1937). Jean Giono was a French writer who fought during WWI.
Lesson 4	The Peace conference	Students participated in a role-play re-enacting the Peace conference.
Lesson 5	The Treaty of Versailles	Students analysed primary sources to understand the content of the Treaty of Versailles and its impact on Germany.
Lesson 6	The consequence of WWI	The class participated in a collaborative writing task. Students and teacher wrote the beginning of an essay explaining the consequences of WWI. (Students had to finish this task as homework).
Lesson 7	The significance of ANZAC	Students read and discuseed the opinions in English of significant Australian people (politician, general, historian, etc.) about the significance of the ANZAC tradition.
Lessons 8 and 9	Writing task	Students had to create their own character (nationality, age, profession, etc.) and write a personal letter after the war is over.

Strengths of case study methods

Although case study methods have some limitations I will discuss later in relation to integrity, they have a number of strengths that support the interpretive methodological paradigm informing my design. Researchers agree that the case study's main strength is its ability to deal with a wide range of data (Freebody, 2003; Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). As Freebody puts it, case studies are "empirically omnivorous" (2003, p. 82), allowing researchers to understand the complexity of a specific phenomenon. Wiesemes (2007) developed a methodology for CLIL classroom research based on a case study approach. He argues that case studies are best suited for CLIL research as it allows researchers to use a wide

range of data. At the centre of his research framework is classroom data based on video, which is combined with and complemented by teacher and learner data collected from interviews and teaching and learning material.

According to Merriam (2009), because of the wide range of data generated by case studies, the knowledge produced from case studies is often "more concrete" (p. 44) and "more contextual" (p. 45) than knowledge obtained from other types of research designs. Rooted in real-life situations, case study results offer a "rich, vivid and holistic" (p. 44) description of the phenomenon being researched. In educational research, case study methodology has been especially popular due to its narrative emphasis and potential to impact on and improve practice (Freebody, 2003). Merriam (2009) further observes that case studies have been used effectively to study educational innovations. Wiesemes (2007) also argues that the focus in CLIL research has been mainly on language and claims that case study methods can help combine research into both content and language.

Finally, case study methods are well-suited to CLIL research because of the theoretical background underpinning CLIL. CLIL experts agree that CLIL is based on a sociocultural theory of learning according to which language is shaped through interactions in an ongoing dialogue between social, historical and political circumstances and individual motivations (Coyle et al., 2010; Dalton-Puffer et al., 2010). This thesis has adopted a Bakhtinian perspective on language and literacy learning as outlined in the previous chapter, and therefore recognises the importance of context in shaping discursive events (Blommaert, 2015) and the ongoing dialogue between the language and the context in which it is produced and received. A case study method enables us to examine how a unique context – here a CLIL classroom – impacts on how the language is used and learning occurs.

Data handling techniques

Data generation

For the purpose of this study, I have adapted the design framework developed by Wiesemes (2007) as it allowed me to draw from different sources of data while emphasising the

importance of classroom data. Thus, this study used two main techniques to generate data: classroom audio recordings and semi-structured interviews with students and took place in June 2017.

Classroom audio-recordings

According to Wiesemes (2007), because CLIL research is rooted in classroom practice, it is crucial to collect evidence of actual classroom practices, which is why classroom data is at the centre of his CLIL research framework. As explained in the previous chapter, learning according to cosmopolitan principles occurs creatively through dialogue. Thus, classroom data for this study focusses on classroom discourse and consists of classroom audio recordings. In order to collect classroom data for this project, eight lessons of 48 minutes each were audio recorded in full. Following ten Have's template (as cited in Freebody, p. 100), relevant whole classroom interactions were selected and transcribed.

Semi-structured interviews with students

In his framework, Wiesemes (2007) contends that classroom data should be supplemented by teacher and learner data. For this project, student data was collected through semi structured interviews. A research interview is "a conversation with a purpose" (Dexter, 1970, as quoted in Merriam, 2009, p. 88). The purpose of interviewing people is to find out things that we cannot observe such as feelings, thoughts, intentions and the way people organise and interpret the social world (Patton, 2002). As explained earlier, this study adopts an interpretive paradigm and therefore seeks to understand the participants' views on their CLIL learning experience.

Interviewees were selected following both a maximal variation sampling strategy and an intensity strategy both based on the students' level of engagement in class. The former strategy allows for multiple perspectives on the phenomenon (Creswell, 2012), while the latter allows to identify "information rich" (Patton, 2002, p. 234) participants. Seven students were interviewed. The number of students to be interviewed were determined through the observations because in qualitative research, the number is not an important factor, what matters is the "potential of each person to contribute to the development of insight and understanding of the phenomenon" (Merriam, 2009). Interview took place after the whole learning sequence was finished. They lasted between 15 and 20 minutes.

There is a range of interview types, from highly structured interviews to conversational formats (Merriam, 2009; Creswell, 2012). For the purpose of this study, semi-structured interviews were conducted, guided by a certain number of issues to explore but no predetermined questions. The advantage of such an approach is that it allows the researcher to respond to the situation and to new ideas to be brought up by the interviewees (Merriam, 2009). Since, the objective of the interviews is to understand how the participants make sense of their experience, it is necessary to allow for some flexibility in the interview format. Although the interviews did not follow a set of predetermined questions, they were built around some particular themes including motivations, language, content and pedagogy. Moreover, the interviews were conducted after the teaching sequence so that, as suggested by Merriam (2009), specific behaviours or events could be explored.

Data analysis

To analyse the classroom data, the transcriptions of classroom discourse were coded and annotated using the analytical framework outlined below, developed by Mortimer and Scott (2003) which has also been used by Llanares, Morton and Whittaker (2012) to examine interactions in CLIL classrooms. By focussing on classroom interactions, the framework allowed me to examine whether the CLIL environment was likely to promote the three dimensions of cosmopolitan learning and encourage students to use their dialogic imagination.

Mortimer and Scott (2003) originally developed the framework to analyse classroom discourse in science classrooms and how interactions can contribute to meaning making as the basis for learning. Informed by sociocultural theories, their framework draws partly on Bakhtin's theory of language and the importance of the dialogic nature of understanding and learning. They argue that learning occurs when students are engaged in dialogue, be it through social interaction with other people, or through the exploration of multiples ideas or "voices" (2003, p. 12). As such, their framework provides an analytical tool to examine whether classroom interactions are dialogic and how learning occurs. Llinares et al. (2012) adapted this framework to analyse CLIL classroom discourse and examine how the content is being taught. For my analytic framework, I mainly follow the interpretation of the framework given by Llinares et al. (2012, p. 16) which divides the analysis of the classroom into three levels:

- *focus*,
- *approach* and

- *action.*

At the *focus* level, the analysis is concerned with the content being talked about and whether it allows for global issues to be explored and with the language used to talk about this content. In other words, at this level, the analysis is concerned with unpacking the integrated nature of content and language. According to Dalton-Puffer (2007, as cited in Llinares et al., 2012), looking at the types of questions asked by the teacher gives an insight into the type of content students are exploring. She further explains that it is important to analyse teachers' questions and identify their functions in order to determine how they contribute to students' learning the subject content. In her own analysis of CLIL classes (2007, as cited in Llinares et al., 2012), she identifies five types of questions:

- questions for facts
- questions for explanation
- questions for reasons
- questions for opinion
- metacognitive questions

The second aspect of the analysis, *approach*, is interested in how the content is communicated and which voices and ideas are expressed and heard. In other words, the analysis helps determine whether the view of language promoted in the classroom is dialogic and moving away from a monolingual target language orientation. To do so, Mortimer and Scott's framework have developed their own concept of *communicative approach* (2003). It is worth clarifying that Mortimer and Scott's concept of communicative approach does not refer to the language teaching approach mentioned in Chapter 1 but to the way communication takes place in the classroom between students and teacher. Their communicative approach model lies on two key dimensions. The first dimension seeks to examine whether the classroom talk is *dialogic*, or *authoritative*. They define a dialogic approach as a communicative system where "more than one voice is heard" (p. 34) and where a variety of different ideas and viewpoints are explored. An authoritative approach is one where only one viewpoint is presented. The second dimension is concerned with whether the talk is *interactive* – as in whether students are actively participating – or *non-interactive*. According to their framework, the lesson can be dialogic but non-interactive if multiple ideas are explored (including those offered by students in other phases of the lesson), but only the teacher is talking about these ideas while omitting students' direct participation. At this level, the concept of voice (Bakhtin, 1984, as cited in

Renfrew, 2015) is important and the analysis is concerned with identifying which voices are present in the classroom.

Finally, the last aspect of the analysis, *action*, seeks to examine "how" learning occurs and whether students have the opportunities to learn creatively by examining the pattern of classroom interactions.

Table 2 below summarises the three levels of analysis and outlines the analysing questions developed by Mortimer and Scott (2003) and how they apply to this study.

Table 2: The three levels of analysis

Focus	What **content** is being talked about? Does the content allow students to *ethically* engage with global issues? What and how is **language** used to talk about this content? Does the language use in the classroom promote a *dialogic* view of language? How do students **learn** both the content and the language? Are students encouraged to learn *creatively*?
Approach	**How** is the content communicated about? **Who** talks, and **whose** ideas get talked about? Does the communicative approach dominating the lessons allow for *dialogic* learning?
Action	Does the **pattern of discourse** allow for *dialogic* learning?

To analyse the language used against each of these analytic constructs, I also draw on Llinares et al. (2012) and Lin's framework of "bridging multiple resources" (2012, in Lin & Yi Lo, 2017). Llinares et al. differentiate between two classroom language registers (p. 16). The *regulative register* refers to the language teachers and students use to "organise the social world of the classroom" (p. 16). Lin calls this register "everyday oral language" (2017, p. 28). The *instructional register* (Llinares et al., 2012, p. 16) refers to the language used by students and teachers to talk about key ideas and concepts of the specific content being studied, or Lin's "academic oral language" (2017, p. 28). The other framework, developed by Lin (2012, in Lin & Yi Lo, 2017), is useful as it differentiates between first language (L1) and second language

(L2), and also recognises the importance of translanguaging practices in the language classroom.

A summary of the discourse analysis approach used in this study and how it related to the three conditions of cosmopolitan learning is outlined below in Table 3 to offer a useful framework allowing to examine the dialogic imagination in action.

Table 3: Three conditions of cosmopolitan learning and how they relate to the analytical framework, (adapted from Mortimer & Scott, 2003 and Llinares et al., 2012)

Research questions	**Conditions of cosmopolitan learning**	**Analysing framework questions**
How are students engaged in dialogic learning experience in CLIL?	A **dialogic** learning experience The language classroom needs to be a space where : • multiple voices are represented • language and culture are deterritorialised from the traditional territory to which they are associated.	*Focus*: What and how is language used to talk about the content? Does the language use in the classroom promote a *dialogic* view of language? *Approach:* How is the content communicated about? Who talks, and whose ideas get talked about? Does the communicative approach dominating the lessons allow for *dialogic* learning? *Action*: Does the **pattern of discourse** allow for *dialogic* learning?
How do students use their creativity in CLIL classes?	A **creative** learning experience • The acquisition of content is seen as a dynamic and creative process where students and teachers negotiate meaning through rich interactions. • Students use language creatively.	*Focus* Is language used *creatively* to talk about the content? How do students learn both the content and the language? Are students encouraged to learn *creatively*?

How does CLIL enable students to think as responsible global citizens?	An **ethical** learning experience • Students are encouraged to engage with a wide range of social and historical voices from a variety of places in the world.	*Focus* What **content** is being talked about? Does the content allow students to *ethically* engage with global issues? *Approach* **Who** talks, and **whose** ideas get talked about?

Translation of data

Because the language of instruction is French, the classroom data is in French and English. The extracts provided in the thesis were translated in order to give the reader a better understanding of the data and ensure its credibility. However, the data was analysed using the raw, untranslated data. Although the dynamic equivalence approach is more widely used as it "aims at complete naturalness of expression." (Nida, 1964, as quoted in Pietryga, 2020), the extracts were translated using a formal equivalence approach (Nida, 1964, as cited in Pietryga, 2020). A formal equivalence approach was preferred as the aim of the translation was not to ensure readability but to provide a faithful translation and expose the potential mistakes made by students when using their L2. In the translated extracts, the italicised text was said in English in the original classroom interactions, the non-italicised text was said in French.

Research quality and integrity

Potential limits of this study

Although case studies have a number of strengths as I have argued in the previous section, I also acknowledge they have some limitations. In this section, I discuss strategies put it place to ensure the study's credibility.

Credibility is concerned with the truthfulness of the findings or in other words whether the reader can be confident the findings are a true reflection of the phenomenon examined (Rodrigues, 2018; Nassaji, 2020). Some researchers have noted that case study designs can be criticised for a lack of rigor in collecting, analysing and drawing conclusions from the data

(Patton, 2002; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). Patton (2002) also argues that teachers might teach differently because they know they are being observed.

To ensure the credibility of this study a number of techniques were used. Triangulation is the main strategy recommended by researchers to maximise the credibility of the study (Patton, 2002; Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). Triangulation, according to Patton, is the use of different sources of information and multiple methods of data collection. As explained earlier, the study was designed following the research framework developed by Wiesemes (2007), and interviews were conducted following the observations and were used to complement and confirm the data collected through observation. Results from other studies were also used to confirm results from this study. Triangulation can also include the use of different sampling strategies. Students interviewed were chosen using two sampling strategies – maximal variation and intensity – in order to take into account a wide range of different perspectives on the topic and enhance the credibility of the study.

Another strategy used to ensure credibility is "prolonged engagement" (Guba & Lincoln, 1985, as cited in Creswell, 2007). Prolonged engagement allows the researcher to immerse themselves long enough in the site of their study to build trust with the participants and promote authentic responses and credible data. It is important to acknowledge my role as a researcher participant. In this case, my role was that of a "participant as observer" as defined by Merriam (2009) meaning my researcher's activities were subordinate to my teacher's role. The study itself was conducted over three weeks but I had taught the class for a year and a half prior to the research. The degree of familiarity between myself, the teacher researcher, and the students involved in this study meant that students' behaviour in class was likely to be authentic and generate credible data.

My position as a *participant as observer* also raises issues in term of confirmability of the data. Confirmability is concerned with "assuring that data, interpretation and conclusions are not simply constructs of research imagination" (Rodrigues, 2010, as quoted in Rodriges, 2018, p. 57). It questions my ability as a researcher to interpret data and draw conclusions in an objective way. One strategy to establish confirmability is to describe the data in a very rich and detailed manner and to include rich quotes from the participants in order to demonstrate that the conclusions are directly derived from the data. Long and translated extracts of classroom discourse are provided and discussed in the next chapter.

Ethical considerations

This study considered the key ethical principles of any research project, such as confidentiality, informed consent, and data access and ownership (Patton, 2002). For this study, the techniques used – classroom interactions and interviews – raise some ethical questions (Merriam, 2009). As Stake (2005) observes, "qualitative researchers are guests in the private spaces of the world. Their manner should be good and their code of ethics strict" (as quoted in Merriam, 2009, p. 231). Interviewing high school students poses some ethical challenges in regards to the power relationship between them and the researcher. The audio recording of the lessons can also raise some concerns as it may affect the way participants usually behave and in this case put students in an uncomfortable situation. Students were informed about how the lessons would be recorded and as shown by their level of participation, they seem to quickly forget about the recording. Participation in the interviews was voluntary. My position as a teacher researcher seemed to have been an asset, as students knew me, and they did not have to interact with an adult they did not know.

As a result of having considered these issues, an ethics application (Ethics ID: 1748886; See Appendix A) was submitted and approved by the University of Melbourne. A permission to conduct research was also sought and granted by the Department of Education. Permission from the school principal was also granted. Students and parents were given plain language statements about the study and were informed that participation was voluntary (See Appendices B and C). Students and parents consent was obtained prior to the start of the study (See Appendix D).

Summary

In this chapter, I presented my research design. This research project falls within the interpretive paradigm as it seeks to describe a complex phenomenon – the pedagogical role of dialogic imagination in promoting students' intercultural skills – and understand participants' views of this phenomenon. In order to *describe* the role of the dialogic imagination in CLIL, I outlined the reasons why a case study design seemed to be the best approach while also acknowledging potential limits and strategies to mitigate them. I explained data consisted of

classroom discourse and students' interviews and was analysed using the classroom interactions framework developed and adapted from Scott and Mortimer (2003).

In the next chapter, I present the findings using the focus, approach, action framework (Scott & Mortimer, 2003; Llinares et al., 2012) and attempt to describe the different aspects of dialogic imagination in a specific CLIL setting: a year 9 history class studying WWI in French.

Chapter 4
Analysis

Using the discourse analysis approach outlined in the previous chapter, in this chapter I present and analyse the data collected through audio-recorded classroom interactions and students' interviews. The chapter is organised following the three conditions of cosmopolitan learning – dialogic, transformative and ethical – and how they relate to the discourse analysis approach I have adapted from Mortimer and Scott (2003) and Llinares et al. (2012).

How are students engaged in dialogic learning experience in CLIL?

In this section, I begin to apply the framework I have adapted from Scott and Mortimer (2003) and Llinares et al. (2012) to explore the dialogic nature of the CLIL learning experience. Table 3a below, extracted from Table 3 in the previous chapter, summarises the key questions guiding this level of analysis.

Table 3a: A dialogic learning experience

Conditions of cosmopolitan learning	Analysing framework questions
A **dialogic** learning experience The language classroom needs to be a space where : • multiple voices are represented • language and culture are deterritorialised from the traditional territory to which they are associated.	*Focus*: What and how is language used to talk about the content? Does the language use in the classroom promote a *dialogic* view of language? *Approach:* How is the content communicated about? Who talks, and whose ideas get talked about? Does the communicative approach dominating the lessons allow for *dialogic* learning? *Action*: Does the **pattern of discourse** allow for *dialogic* learning?

At the *focus* level, the analysis is concerned with the dialogic nature of the language. At the *approach* level, the analysis examines classroom interactions by looking at what type of

"communicative approach" (Scott and Mortimer, 2003, p. 33) is used in the classroom. Communicative approach here does not refer to the language learning communicative approach mentioned in chapter 1 but to the way the content is communicated through in the classroom. Scott and Mortimer's analysis (2003) here lies on two key dimensions. The first dimension represents a continuum between *dialogic* and *authoritative* talk while the second dimension represents a continuum between *interactive* and *non-interactive* talk. As I explained in Chapter 3, a dialogic talk in the classroom is one that allows multiples voices to be heard. Voices include not only participants in the class, but also people, ideas, perspectives encountered during the lesson. On the contrary, an authoritative communication system only allows one voice to be heard. An interactive talk refers to a class where students are given opportunities to participate actively whereas a non-interactive communication style looks like a lecture format lesson. Finally, at the *action* level, the analysis is concerned with describing the pattern of interactions and whether students are given the opportunity to express their views.

The focus level: The language use promotes a dialogic view of language

Deterritorialization of language

In this CLIL classroom, the main language used to talk about the content is French. The content talked about is WWI and the lesson is happening in an Australian high school where the typical language of instruction in a history lesson is English. French as a language of instruction is disconnected from the space it is normally used as a language of instruction (i.e., French language class or schools in French speaking countries). By using French outside of a typical French class to perform an activity that is normally performed in English, students and the teacher are blurring boundaries between language and space. Similar to the deterritorialization process of culture caused by globalisation (Tomlinson, 1999), French is taken out of its traditional assigned territory; it is *deterritorialized*, and used to learn content defined by the Australian curriculum.

In Extracts 1, 2, and 3, the class is talking about the Peace Conference, which took place in France in 1919. Thus, the topic itself has a connection to the language. However, this is not always the case. For example, at the end of the unit, students had to write a letter in French written after the war by a person of their choice. They had to create their own character and some chose Australian or German characters. In those cases, French became completely

detached to the content students were writing about. Again, the language was being *deterritorialized*, detached from the context in which it is usually spoken. By blurring the link between space and language, and moving from teaching the target culture in the target language, CLIL seems to promote a cosmopolitan ideal. This idea of the language being disconnected to the content was also stressed by students during the interviews. One student with Japanese background noted that "it was weird to study Japanese history in French" (referring to a unit on medieval Japan, studied in year 8), and "funny" to learn about [her] own culture in French.

CLIL promotes heteroglossic language practices

The analysis of classroom discourse shows that language use in the classroom promotes a dialogic view of language through translanguaging. In the following exchange (Extract 1), all participants rely on both French (L2) and English (L1) to explore the content. Student 1 understands the question asked in L2) but starts her answer in L1. I interrupt Student 1 and prompt him to answer in L2 by giving him the beginning of the sentence (line 3). The student then tries to answer in L2 but switches back to L1 as he does not know the word he wants to use (line 4). I then ask other students how to say "injured people" in French (line 5). Student 2 is able to translate the word in L2 and Student 1 can then make a full sentence adding more information (line 8). Finally, I prompt the whole class to complete the sentence by asking a question about causes (line 9) and Student 1 finishes the sentence (line 12) using the scaffold provided (line 9). In this exchange, translanguaging happens quickly in the flow of interactions. Although the main language spoken is French (L2), the teacher and students turn to translanguaging for different reasons. Translanguaging is used by students as a way to draw from their various linguistic resources and by the teacher as a scaffolding strategy.

Extract 1

1	T:	C'est une source primaire. Tu as raison mais pourquoi ?
2	S1:	*It's about*…
3	T:	En français : ça parle de …
4	S1:	Ca parle de *injured people*.
5	T:	Ok. Alors comment on dit *injured people* ?
6	S2:	Blessés
7	T:	Très bien. Ça parle des blessés …
8	S1:	Ça parle des blessés qui sont traumatisés.
9	T:	Traumatisés à cause de quoi ? Ça veut dire quoi 'à cause de' ?
10	S1:	*Because of* ?
11	T:	Ok.

12	S1:	A cause de la guerre.

		Extract 1
1	T:	It's a primary source. You are right but why?
2	S1:	*It's about…*
3	T:	In French : it is about …
4	S1:	It is about *injured people*.
5	T:	Ok. How do we say *injured people*?
6	S2:	Injured.
7	T:	Very good. It is about injured people …
8	S1:	It is about injured people who are traumatised...
9	T:	Traumatised because of what? What does 'à cause de' mean?
10	S1:	*Because of*?
11	T:	Ok.
12	S1:	Because of the war.

The exchange in Extract 1 also shows the intricate connections between language and content. I ask questions on both content (line 1; line 9) and language (line 5, line 9). While asking content focused questions, I also ask questions about language and provides scaffold so the students can understand and express the content. The focus is constantly moving from content to language in the flow of interactions.

Heteroglossia according to Bakhtin not only includes linguistic variations but also social-ideological languages. In the Extracts 2 and 3 below, students not only shift fluently between L1 and L2 but are also able to operate in L2 using a variety of registers. Extracts 2 and 3 are examples of everyday oral language in contrast to the previous extracts, which were examples of academic oral language (Lin & Yi Lo, 2017).

		Extract 2
1	S1:	Madame ?
2	T :	Sophie ?
3	S1:	Il est où le truc pour le chauffage ?
4	S2:	Là.

		Extract 2
1	S1:	Madame ?
2	T :	Sophie ?
3	S1:	Where is the thing for the heater ?
4	S2:	There.

		Extract 3
1	S1:	J'ai fini
2	T:	Fini ? Très bien.
3	T:	Allez 30 secondes !
4		30 secondes !
		10 secondes !
		Elles sont longues mes secondes !
		Ok. Fini ?

		Extract 3
1	S1:	I am done.
2	T:	Finished ? Very good.
3	T:	Come one, 30 seconds !
4		30 seconds !
		10 seconds !
		My seconds are pretty long !
		Ok. Finished?

The approach level: The communicative approach used supports interactive-dialogic interactions

Most interactions are interactive-dialogic interactions

Most learning sequences adopt an *interactive-dialogic* communication style where multiple perspectives are explored and students are given opportunities to actively co-create their understanding and express their ideas. In this learning sequence (Extract 4 below), students watched a one-minute long video presenting the main protagonists of the Peace Conference held in Versailles in 1919. In the following exchange, I want to check students' understanding of the situation prior to the beginning of the conference.

		Extract 4
1	T:	Qu'est-ce que tu as vu ?
2	S1:	Euh … *people*
3	T:	Comment on dit *people* ?
4	S1:	Personnes
5	S2:	Des personnes importantes
6	T:	Des personnes importants ? Oui tu as raison. Quelles personnes
7		importantes ? Pourquoi ils sont importants ?
8	S2	*They represent* …
9	T:	En français. Comment on dit *they represent* en français ?
10	S2:	ils … représentent…
11	T	Très bien. Ils représentent. Ils représentent quoi ?
12	S2:	pays

13	T:	Très bien. Leur pays. Sophie ? Tu veux dire autre chose ?
14	S3:	Ils vont signer leur traite de Versailles.
15	T:	Alors pas le traité encore. Mais que font-ils ?
16	S3:	Ils vont parler des punitions pour l'Allemagne
17	T :	Très bien. C'est pas encore le traité. C'est avant le traité. Le traité c'est
18		à la fin de la conférence.

Extract 4

1	T:	What did you see ?
2	S1:	*Um … people*
3	T:	How do you say *people*?
4	S1:	People.
5	S2:	Important people.
6	T:	Important people? Yes you're right. Which important people? Why are
7		they important?
8	S2	*They represent …*
9	T:	In French. How do you say *they represent* in French?
10	S2:	They… represent…
11	T	Very good. They represent. They represent what?
12	S2:	Countries
13	T:	Very good. Their country. Sophie? Do you want to say something else?
14	S3:	They are going to sign the Treaty of Versailles.
15	T:	So not the treaty yet. But what are they doing?
16	S3:	They are going to talk about punishments for Germany.
17	T :	Very good. It's not the treaty yet. It's before the treaty. The treaty is at
18		the end of the conference.

In this exchange (Extract 4), I try to check students' understanding of the short video they have just watched. I start with a very open-ended question asking students what they saw and heard. This is typical of a language-learning lesson where students would listen to a spoken text for the first time and write down what they heard. Starting the activity with this type of question means that the following exchange will be guided by students' understanding and contributions. Thus, I rely on students' understanding to build up knowledge collectively. Student 1 says that they saw people, to which Student 2 says that they were important people. Drawing on this question, I ask why they are important. Two more students jump in to explain they represent their country.

This sequence sits on the *interactive-dialogic* end of the continuum developed by Mortimer and Scott (2003) as students' ideas are explored and valued and their contribution leads to learning. In the interactive-dialogic approach, the teacher listens to students' ideas and views. Although I know where I am heading, I am letting students express their ideas first and build

knowledge collaboratively on their contributions. I could have chosen to introduce the Peace Conference and its main protagonists myself without asking for students' contributions. Instead, my contributions consist of a lot of repeating what students say in order for everybody to hear and understand. In this example, students and the teacher are reaching an understanding together through open-ended questions. This approach is more powerful as it allows the knowledge to be built up collaboratively and students' voices to be heard.

Extract 4 was illustrative of the type of exchange that regularly occurred within this setting. In another example, Extract 5 below, students are performing a role-play. They are pretending to be leaders of some of the countries present at the Peace Conference in Versailles in 1919. Some of their utterances have been prepared; others are spontaneous reactions to the various positions expressed at the conference. I interfere very little in this exchange, only repeating or rephrasing what the students have said and acting as a facilitator.

		Extract 5
1	S1:	Mesdames et Messieurs. Nous ne sommes pas d'accord. Nous ne
2		voulons pas punir l'Allemagne parce que la guerre est finie, nous avons
3		vu assez de destruction… ?
4	T:	Parfait. Donc les Etats-Unis ne veulent pas punir l'Allemagne, il y a
5		eu assez de destructions. Des réactions ? La France ?
6	S2:	Nous ne sommes pas d'accord parce que quelqu'un doit être puni. Et
7		l'Allemagne doit être punie.
8	T:	Très bien, très bien, merci beaucoup. Qui veut réagir ? Qui veut
9		parler ? L'Australie ?
10	S3	Nous sommes d'accord avec Clemenceau. L'Allemagne doit être
11		punie.
12	T:	Qui veut réagir ? Les Etats-Unis ?
13	S1:	Si vous punissez l'Allemagne vous allez commencer une autre guerre.

		Extract 5
1	S1:	Ladies and Gentlemen. We don't agree. We do not want to punish
2		Germany because the war is finished, we have seen enough
3		destruction… ?
4	T:	Perfect. So, the United-Stated doesn't want to punish Germany, there
5		has been enough destruction. Any reactions ? France ?
6	S2:	We do not agree because someone has to be punished. And Germany
7		must be punished.
8	T:	Very good, very good, thank you very much. Who wants to react ?
9		Who wants to talk ? Australia ?
10	S3	We do not agree with Clemenceau. Germany must be punished.
11		
12	T:	Who wants to respond ? the United-States ?
13	S1:	If you punish Germany, you are going to start a new war.

This sequence is *interactive* as all students participate in the exchange. It is also *dialogic* as voices from the past and from different places interact through students' utterances. In this example, it is not only students' voices that can be heard but voices representing different opinions that are dialoguing through students. What makes this sequence dialogic is as Bakhtin puts it the "interaction of several consciousnesses" (Bakhtin, 1986, as quoted in Renfrew, 2015, p. 79). Through role-play, students explore and engage with different representations of the world.

Similarly, in the interviews, students stressed the idea that studying history in French made them see things from different perspectives. One student explained that learning in French "helps you understand about the world" and made you "think from a different side". Another recognised that if she had studied history in English she would have used different sources of information for research and therefore would have encountered different perspectives on the topic. Finally, another student noted that learning about the Gallipoli campaign in French made her realise that similar events can have a different significance for different people.

Interactive-authoritative interactions

Some learning sequences adopt an *interactive-authoritative* approach. Extract 9 is an example of an interactive authoritative communicative approach. The learning sequence is *interactive* as both the students and I are actively engaged in the communicative sequence and knowledge is co-constructed through the dialogue. I use questions to encourage students to participate and build knowledge together. However, the exchange is also authoritative. I only use display questions as, in this sequence I know exactly what I want students to say. I even ignore some answers (line 24) as although the comment was correct, it was not relevant to the content I was trying to deliver.

Non-interactive interactions

In this study, very few examples of the *non-interactive* communicative approach have been found. As explained by Mortimer and Scott (2003), the best example of this approach is the lecture format. Given, the limited language skills of the students and the fact they are learning both content and language simultaneously, this format seems impractical, as I need to monitor students' understanding throughout the lesson. Below (Extract 6), is one of the longest

teacher's utterances. Lines 2 to 4 consists of a series of sentences each rephrasing the same idea in order to support students' understanding while the rest of the paragraph elaborated on that idea.

		Extract 6
1	S:	La guerre a causé beaucoup de blessés.
2	T:	Très bien. Le peintre dit ça parce qu'il connait la guerre. Il a
3		participé à la guerre. Donc il dénonce la guerre. Il est contre la
4		guerre. Il prend une position contre la guerre. Il y a eu des milliers
5		de blessés qui ont été blessés physiquement et traumatisés
6		mentalement et psychologiquement. D'accord ?

		Extract 6
1	S:	The war has caused a lot of injuried people.
2	T:	Very good. The painter says that because he knows the war. He
3		participated in the war. So he condemns the war. He is against the
4		war. He takes a position agains the war. There were thousands of
5		people injuried and mentally and psychologically traumatised.
6		Ok ?

All learning settings including CLIL are a mix of different communicative approaches (as defined by Scott & Mortimer, 2003) used at different times with different teaching purposes. However, it seems that CLIL privileges interactive approaches as shown by this study. Extracts 2 and 8 are representative of the nature of exchanges in this CLIL setting. They are examples of what Scott and Mortimer (2006, in Llinarres et al., 2012) call "tensions" between authoritative and dialogic discourse in classroom talk. This study seems to confirm what other studies (Coyle et al., 2010; Dalton-Puffer, Nikula & Smit, 2010) have demonstrated. CLIL seems to promote an interactive learning environment. Even, during authoritative learning sequences, students are still required to participate actively in order to create their own understanding.

The action level: Patterns of interactions are usually teacher initiated

The pattern of interaction dominating classroom talk in this CLIL setting is the I-R-F-R-F pattern, meaning Initiation-Response-Feedback-Response-Feedback. For example, in Extract 4, I initiate the exchange by posing a question (line 1). Students 1 and 2 respond (R). I then

give students some feedback ("Yes, you're right", line 6) and elaborates on Student 2's answer (F), asking why these people are important. Student 2 then adds that they represent their countries (R). The elaborative feedback given is followed by a further response by the student. This chain of interactions is in fact more complex, as between the main utterances I-R-F-R-F, participants explore language through a dialogue between L2 and L1, as I encourage students to speak French. Scott and Mortimer (2003) support this type of interactions as they allow teachers to take into account students' ideas and build on students' contributions.

Nikula (2007) is critical of the restrictive nature of teacher initiated I-R-F pattern, as she claims it does not give students the opportunity to develop their own ideas. This study has found that the majority of interactions were initiated by the teacher. Student-initiated interaction occurred mainly from students with the best language abilities. It is possible that limited language skills discouraged some students to initiate interactions. This raises the issue of the language as a barrier for learning and the role of L1 in the CLIL classroom.

How do students use their creativity in CLIL classes?

In this section, I look at the creativity aspect of learning in CLIL settings. Using the discourse analysis framework explained in chapter 3, I examine how students learn and whether they are encouraged to use their creativity in the learning process. Table 3b below summarises the key questions guiding this level of analysis.

Table 3b: A creative learning experience

A **creative** learning experience	*Focus*
• The acquisition of content is seen as a dynamic and creative process where students and teachers negotiate meaning through rich interactions. • Students use language creatively.	Is language used *creatively* to talk about the content? How do students learn both the content and the language? Are students encouraged to learn *creatively*?

A transformative meaning making process

According to Bakhtin (1981; Renfrew, 2015), meaning can only occur dialogically through the encounter of two or more voices under particular situations. The exchange in Extract 1 offers an example of dialogic learning during which participants work together to transform knowledge and create meaning. By exploring content using French, a language that they are not familiar with, students are being forced to make meaning through the negotiation of difference (Juzwik, 2004, p. 542). In Extract 1, learning happened dialogically between all the participants, and between L2 and L1. This is an example of what Lin and He call "a translingual chain of meaning" (2017, p. 233) during which students and their teacher work together using multiple language resources to create new meanings.

		Extract 7
11	T:	Alors, la source n'est pas fiable. Pourquoi ?
12	S1:	… parce que c'est … *from his point of view*.
13	T:	Très bien. Comment on dit ça en francais ? Comment on dit *point of*
14		*view* en francais ?
15	S2:	Son opinion.
16	T:	Oui son opinion ou son point de vue.

		Extract 7
11	T:	So the source is reliable. Why ?
12	S1:	… becuase it's … *from his point of view*.
13	T:	Very good. How do we say this in French ? How do we say *point of*
14		*view* in French ?
15	S2:	His opinion.
16	T:	Yes, his opinion or his point of view.

Students also demonstrate creativity in their understanding and use of the language. In Extract 7 above, I ask a student how to say 'point of view' in French. Instead of giving the literal translation (point de vue), the student answers spontaneously with the French synonym 'opinion'. The student did not seem to know the direct translation so he went through another translingual chain of meaning (point of view – opinion in English – opinion in French). This is an example of how students use their language resources creatively to express ideas.

In these exchanges (Extracts 1 and 7), students become authors. As Bakhtin explains (1981), they use their creativity and draw on their multiple linguistic resources to produce utterances.

By incorporating new linguistic resources in their own repertoire. They create utterances that embody both their own individual perspectives and a different practice.

"Piecing it together": Students' views on their learning

Findings from the analysis of classroom discourse seem to be confirmed by student data. In the interviews with students, the idea of *piecing things together* emerged. Students mentioned going back and forth between French and English, having to think more about how to say something in order to find a way to match their ideas with their French language resources. One student explained that when writing in French "she can't translate exactly from English to French; she had to switch it around". Another one explained how she has to "think about it [what she wants to say] in English and then think about the main words [she] knew in French that [she] can use and just go from there". One other student mentioned that "it was not difficult to switch from English to French". When writing, the same student said that she "[writes] straight away in French but with some notes in English if not sure". Some students also mentioned that French was present outside the CLIL setting, in the English class especially. One student explained how "sometimes [she writes] in English and sometimes French pops into it". Finally, some were able to recognise that operating throughout several languages helped them expand their linguistic resources.

> Having 2 or 3 languages will extend my vocabulary. Because I know some words in French and I might not know them in English. And I know some words in Japanese and don't know them in English. It extends the vocabulary and it makes you think in other ways.

As students engaged in those sorts of translingual dialogues in their head, they create new meanings. This reinforces the idea that students in CLIL settings are creative with both the language and the content they are learning as they can transform their understanding of the content into language. By doing so, students become authors in a Bakhtinian sense (1983) as they are able to use somebody else's language to express their own ideas.

How does CLIL enable students to think as responsible global citizens?

In this last section of the analysis, I explore the ethical aspect of the CLIL pedagogy and whether CLIL has the potential to enable students to think as responsible and global citizens. On the *approach* level, the analysis is concerned with the variety of voices heard and talked about in the class. The first section of this chapter already covered this aspect and the study finds that CLIL offered a dialogic learning experience where multiples voices are heard. The following section is concerned with the *focus* level of analysis and examines the nature of the content talked about in CLIL.

Table 3c: An ethical learning experience

An **ethical** learning experience	*Focus* What **content** is being talked about? Does the content allow students to *ethically* engage with global issues?
• Students are encouraged to engage with a wide range of social and historical voices from a variety of places in the world.	*Approach* **Who** talks, and **whose** ideas get talked about?

A critical approach to content

The content of the teaching sequence examined in this study is concerned with the consequences of WWI, therefore it could be argued that this topic itself is likely to enable students to explore a global issue and look at different perspectives. However, in CLIL, due to students' limited language skills, the risk is to reduce the content taught to a list of facts and dates, instead of promoting cognition and higher order thinking. In his analysis of a CLIL history class, Wiesemes (2007) reminds us that to be able to apprehend the complexities of historical events studied and develop an ethical attitude, students must learn more than historical facts.

Informed by Dalton-Puffer's range of teacher questions (2007, as cited in Llinares et al., 2012), the analysis identified a wide variety of teacher questions. It found that although factual questions were used in some teaching sequences, other types of questions more likely to support students' critical thinking were frequently used as well. Factual questions were often used to recall prior knowledge or to analyse historical sources. For example, in Extract 8 below,

I ask a series of factual questions in order to open up the problem and explore students' knowledge of a specific event, here the Peace Conference.

		Extract 8
1	T:	Alors aujourd'hui, aujourd'hui on va parler des enjeux de la
2		conférence de paix. Alors quand s'est terminée la guerre ?
3	S1:	Euh… *eleventh November*
4	T:	En francais
5	S1:	Novembre onze
6	T:	Très bien. Le onze novembre.
7		Qu'est-ce que c'est la conférence de paix ?

		Extract 8
1	T:	So today we're going to talk about's at stake at the peace conference.
2		So when did the war end ?
3	S1:	Um… *eleventh November*
4	T:	In French.
5	S1:	Novembre eleven.
6	T:	Very good. The 11th of Novembre.
7		What's the peace conference ?

Questions for opinions were frequently asked in the form of evaluating questions. For example, in Extract 9 below, I ask students which country they think will want to punish Germany the hardest (line 1). This question asks them to evaluate the situation and make a judgement based on their historical knowledge. It requires students to manipulate their existing knowledge and critically analyse the situation in order to form an opinion. However, the limit of such questions in CLIL is that students do not always have enough language and/or confidence to express their opinion in the language spoken in class and need the teacher to support them. In the same extract, I continue by providing some scaffold in the form of factual (lines 15–16) and non-factual questions asking students to consider causes (line 3, line 10) and consequences (line 13) of particular events, to help students address this challenge. As a result, students were able to show their ability to manipulate the content even though the teacher has to step in to help with the language by giving one word to finish the sentence or rephrasing so everyone can understand.

		Extract 9
1	T:	Alors quel pays va être le plus dur avec l'Allemagne ?
2	S1:	la France
3	T:	La France ? Oui. Pourquoi la France ? Est-ce que tu penses que la
4		France sera le pays le plus dur avec l'Allemagne ?
5	S1:	Oui la France a perdu des millions de …

6	T:	Très bien. La France a perdu des millions de quoi ?
7	S2	Soldats
8	T:	Soldats très bien. Donc la France va probablement être dure avec
9		l'Allemagne parce qu'ils ont perdu beaucoup beaucoup de soldats.
10		Pour quelle autre raison ?
11	T:	le plus près de l'Allemagne
12	S3:	Oui, la France est le pays le plus proche de l'Allemagne. Et alors quelle
13	T:	était la conséquence de ça ?
14	S3:	Beaucoup de dégâts.
15	T:	Très bien. Beaucoup de destruction. Pourquoi ? la guerre s'est passée
16		où ? les combats ? en Angleterre ?
17	Ss:	Non
18	T :	En Allemagne ?
19	Ss:	Non
20	T:	Où ?
21	S4 :	En France
22	T:	En France et en ?
23	S3:	Italie
24	T:	Oui et en ? Belgique. Le front de l'ouest, c'est en France et en
25		Belgique.

Extract 9

1	T:	So which country is going to be the hardest on Germany ?
2	S1:	France
3	T:	France ? Yes. Why France ? Do you think France will be the hardest
4		on Germany ?
5	S1:	Yes France lost millions of…
6	T:	Very good. France lost millions of what ?
7	S2	Soldiers.
8	T:	Soldiers very good. So France is probably going to be hard with
9		Germany because they lost a lot, a lot of soldiers. For what other
10		reason ?
11	T:	The closest to Germany.
12	S3:	Yes, France was the closest country to Germany. And so what was the
13	T:	consequence of that ?
14	S3:	A lot of damage.
15	T:	Very good. A lot of destruction. Why ? where did the war take place ?
16		the fighting ? in England ?
17	Ss:	No
18	T :	In Germany ?
19	Ss:	No
20	T:	Where ?
21	S4 :	In France
22	T:	In France and in ?
23	S3:	Italy
24	T:	Yes and in ? Belgium. The western front is in France and in Belgium.

Dalton-Puffer also argues that in CLIL, scaffolding for higher order thinking can often be provided in the form of elicitation or is negotiated throughout learning activities. For example, in one activity students were asked to read the main articles of the treaty of Versailles and identify the articles that they thought were the most unfair for Germany. This activity allows students to critically explore the content rather than just remembering facts. It also enables them to do so with limited language skills. Extract 10 below shows the class conversation following the activity. The questions asked are about opinion (lines 1 and 3) and reasons (line 5). In explaining the reasons why a particular clause is unfair, Student 2 is able to give an acceptable answer, although she finds it difficult to elaborate.

		Extract 10
1	T:	Alors quel article vous semble injuste ?
2	S1:	L'Allemagne doit payer des réparations à la France et à l'Angleterre.
3	T:	Alors c'est juste ou c'est injuste ?
4	S1:	C'est injuste.
5	T :	Pourquoi c'est injuste ?
6	S2 :	Parce que d'autres pays sont responsables aussi.

		Extract 10
1	T:	So which article seems the most unfair to you ?
2	S1:	Germany must pay reparations to France and England.
3	T:	So is it fair or unfair ?
4	S1:	It's unfair.
5	T :	Why is it unfair ?Pourquoi c'est injuste ?
6	S2 :	Because other countries are responsable too.

As explained in Chapter 2, supporting students' dialogic imagination in class means that the content must be taught ethically and explored in a global and critical way. The choice of content is essential as it needs to encourage students "to venture beyond . . . local settings" (Nussbaum, 1997, p. 14) and to think about and examine global issues. As such, studying WWI allowed students to do that. As pointed by Wiesemes (2007), the risk with CLIL is to reduce the content to a list of facts. However, the analysis of this data in terms of questions asked in this CLIL setting shows that the content studied can be explored by students in a critical way. With appropriate scaffolding, CLIL allows students to manipulate complex and cognitively demanding content and critically analyse this content. It is also worth noting that because this is a humanities class and students follow the Victorian curriculum, the *content* of the lesson includes historical skills such as "analysing the different perspectives of people in the past"

(VCAA, n.d.). This allows teachers to include the teaching of these skills when planning the content aspect of the lesson.

Summary of Chapter

This chapter presented and analysed the data based on the discourse analysis framework explained in chapter 3. Below is a summary of the key points developed in this chapter.

1. *The language used to talk about the content was deterritorialized from the space it is normally used*. French was not used in a humanities class in France or in a traditional French language class but in a humanities class in an Australian high school where the normal expected language of instruction is English.
2. In the study, *language was used in a dialogic way*. Students were able to operate between languages and to create hybrid forms of language by engaging in heteroglossic language practices.
3. *The communicative approach was mostly interactive* but shifted from the dialogic to the authoritative ends of the continuum. Even within a more authoritative exchange, the communicative approach remained interactive, as the teacher needed the students to be actively involved in their learning process (due to their limited language skills). This can be explained by the necessity to incorporate different types of teaching sequences but the study clearly finds that the CLIL approach heavily relies on classroom interaction and dialogues between teachers and students
4. The pattern of interactions observed during these lessons (I-R-F-R-F) was found to be mainly teacher initiated.
5. *Meaning was co-constructed occurred through translingual chains of meaning*. Students and the teacher engaged in dialogues using multiple linguistic resources to negotiate new meaning. Understanding did not occur through the teacher lecturing students but through interactive and rich translingual dialogues
6. Despite limited language skills, *students were able to critically engage with the content.* Far from being engaged in a memorisation exercise aimed at remembering facts and events, students were given opportunities to explore and manipulate the content through

a wide range of teacher questions, elicitation, specific activities and the use of non-locally produced learning resources.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

Overview of chapter

To explore how intercultural competence and understanding might be better developed from a cosmopolitan lens, this study aimed to examine the potential of CLIL to support cosmopolitan learning. As Appiah (2006) explained, cosmopolitanism means that we need to develop conversations with others. Conversation, for Appiah, encompasses the ability to speak to one another but also to live together with all our differences. To begin these conversations with others, he argues that we need to use our imagination, our capacity to explore alternative ways of living and thinking.

In the introduction, I argued for a vision of cosmopolitan learning based on its potentiality. Thus, this study was interested in evaluating whether CLIL can provide the necessary conditions for cosmopolitan learning to happen. It aimed to determine whether CLIL gives students the opportunity to use their imagination, not whether students actually display a cosmopolitan attitude. Based on current research in cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan learning outlined in Chapter 2, I then presented three key principles that should guide cosmopolitan learning. First, cosmopolitan learning needs to be *dialogic*. The language classroom needs to be a space where multiple voices are represented and students can engage interactionally with a variety of people, ideas and situations. Second, the learning process needs to be *transformative.* In a cosmopolitan classroom, learning does not happen through the transmission of knowledge but students acquire new knowledge through creativity by actively engaging in processes of "translations between things that are different" (Delanty, 2009, p. 79). Finally, the third principle of cosmopolitan learning is concerned with providing students with an *ethical* learning experience. In the language classroom, this means that students are given the opportunity to explore global issues in a critical way.

In this chapter, I discuss the results from the previous section in order to evaluate whether the CLIL approach has the potential to support cosmopolitan learning. I also discuss the different implications of these findings. I then conclude by reflecting on questions the study raises, and areas for further research.

Discussion: Does CLIL have the potential to develop cosmopolitan speakers?

CLIL and dialogic learning

The CLIL approach is by nature dialogic and informed by sociocultural theories of learning where "learners are encouraged to construct their own meanings from activities requiring interactions with peers and the teacher" (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 35). Research on CLIL has already shown that CLIL classes provide students with more space for interactions than traditional language classes (Nikula, 2007; Llinares & Whittaker, 2010). The study confirms previous research and finds that most interactions are interactive-dialogic interactions. In line with previous research, the study affirms that the focus on content seems to allow students to bring in their own ideas and express their opinions. Moreover, the study also finds that the focus on both content and language means that students are given more opportunities to dialogue with different voices. For example, when participating in historical role-plays, students were able to converse with a variety of historical voices. The use of typical language-teaching tasks in the form of listening comprehension activities or role-plays seem to contribute to promoting an interactive teaching approach. Role-plays for example are very common in traditional language classes where students use them to apply newly acquired language in a pretend situation. Used in a history classroom, as evidenced in this study, they allowed students to participate actively in learning activities as well as to explore different viewpoints. Overall, the study's findings reinforce the idea observed by others that CLIL promotes interactions and a dialogic approach to learning where students are given opportunities to engage in dialogues with each other and with their teacher.

The study also shows that in CLIL the language used is deterritorialized from the space in which it is normally used. Similar to the deterritorialization processes of culture observed by Tomlinson (1999), the content is talked about with a language deterritorialized from his traditional context. For example, students learnt about Australia's participation in WWI in French and some students wrote letters from the point of view of a German or Australian protagonist in French. This deterritorialisation of language has several implications. First, this leads to the creation of a transnational space where the traditional boundaries between language and territory have been blurred. Thus, the blurring differentiation of the link between language and space leads to the creation of a very specific context, which will have an effect on how the

language is used. Second, by creating hybrid spaces in which a language is not linked to a particular territory, the CLIL approach embraces a cosmopolitan view of the world characterised by "blurring differentiations and cultural contradictions" (Beck, 2006, p. 3).

Echoing Bakhtin's concept of chronotope and its influence on the language created, Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010) stress the importance of the context on the language acquisition process. The concept of chronotope stresses the inseparability of language from its context. In other words, specific contexts trigger specific ways of talking and using language. One of the key findings of this study was the crucial role played by translanguaging in learning, whether it was used by the teacher as a pedagogical tool or by students to express meaning using all their linguistic resources. It can be argued that CLIL, as a chronotope, triggers translingual practices. By using a language in a space the language is not traditionally linked to, CLIL seems to provide the necessary conditions for translanguaging to occur.

The heteroglossic nature of CLIL observed in the study also supports the idea that CLIL can provide a dialogic learning experience. Building on Bakhtin, Blommaert and Rampton (2011) argue that heteroglossic practices are a reflection of today's complex linguistic practices characterised by the blurring of traditional linguistic boundaries. First, by recognising the complexity of language practices characterised by creativity and hybridity (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Canagarajah, 2012; Risager, 2007) and encouraging students to manage and operate within this complexity, CLIL seems to promote cosmopolitan learning. The study clearly highlights the heteroglossic nature of CLIL settings. In the study, students constantly operated in a complex language environment and demonstrated their ability to use all of their linguistic resources in both French and English, in both every day and academic language. Second, by encouraging students to operate between languages and language registers, CLIL moves away from the concept of native speaker seen by some as a contradiction to the complex linguistic reality of today's world. By doing so and endorsing a complex view of language practice, CLIL seems to be able to provide a dialogic learning experience, where students have the opportunity to use all their linguistic resources and engage in a complex dialogue of languages. This idea is supported by Doecke et al. (2004) who believe that encountering and practising linguistic variations and competing worldviews promotes intercultural understanding.

Finally, the focus on content also allows students to explore a wide range of ideas. As Sudhoff (2010) and others (Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010; Rodriguez and Puyal, 2012) have claimed, learning content in an additional language has the potential to open somebody's horizons. Moreover, Sudhoff (2010) rightly claimed that using learning resources from different countries is likely to allow students to explore new perspectives. Drawing on Sudhoff (2010), I argue that by learning about historical events using teaching resources not produced within their national (Australian) context, students are given the opportunity to dialogically engage with new voices and explore alternative viewpoints. Learning about WWI in French meant that students were exposed to sources from different countries, and had to question the significance of particular events – for example, the Gallipoli campaign – for different peoples. Students learned through what Delanty calls 'cultural translations' (2009), the capacity to 'incorporate the perspective of others into one's own culture'.

Transformative learning

A cosmopolitan view of education also promotes the idea that learning is a creative process, which occurs when students actively engage in 'translating' between things that are familiar and new things (Delanty, 2009). Researchers on CLIL have already stressed the creative aspect of the CLIL approach (Coyle, 2007; Cross, 2012). Coyle (2007) reminds us that in CLIL students are encouraged to "create their own knowledge" (p. 42) while Cross (2012) observed how students in CLIL settings were able to use their creativity in the choice of language they make. The study confirms the idea that students in CLIL settings are able to learn in a creative way. The study shows that not only do students use the language creatively but they are also able to learn content by comparing, contrasting and exploring a wide range of ideas.

The findings of the study show that students in CLIL classes are able to express ideas using a wide range of linguistic resources. Students showed they were able to operate between languages and actively and constantly use all the linguistic resources available to them to engage in translingual dialogues with each other but also within themselves as shown in Extracts 1 and 7. Thus, CLIL seems to support heteroglossic language practices where students are able to create hybrid forms of language by incorporating different linguistic practices to create their own utterances. Dialogues occur at different levels between the teacher and students and among students themselves, again evidenced in extracts 1 and 7, which show students engaging in multilingual interactions using all their linguistic resources to

communicate and express their ideas and opinions. Students became author in a Bakhtinian way (Bakhtin, 1983), as they were able to use somebody else's language to express their own ideas.

The dual focus of CLIL on content and language means that students use their creativity to not only express ideas using a variety of language resources but also to express new meanings. Knowledge is not transmitted but is negotiated through rich and complex interactions between students, the teacher and the multiple voices present in class. Students engaged in a rich process of dialogic interactions between other people's perspectives and their own, and between their own language and French to create new meaning. Classroom interactions presented in this study show participants (students and myself) engaging in multilingual talk to reach new understandings. Thus, student understanding happened in a dynamic way through an ongoing negotiation of meaning using all linguistic resources available. Interviews with students also support this idea as students talked about their ability to use multiple languages to "piece things together" and create new meanings. As observed by Lin and He (2017) in their study, this study indicates that students and teacher were engaged in co-constructing knowledge through translingual chains of meanings.

From a cosmopolitan perspective, students learn through translations (Delanty, 2009). The translingual meaning making process also involves "translating between things that are different" (Delanty; 2009, p. 79), whether it is the language or the content. Thus, translating is a dynamic, creative process through which students incorporate both familiar and new linguistic resources as well as the perspectives of others on the content learned. This is what Beck (2002) refers to as "the *internalized* other" (p. 18, emphasis in the original), the ability to internalise others' perspectives to create new ideas. The study suggests that the CLIL approach allows students to develop a cosmopolitan attitude by internalizing others' perspectives into their own ideas of the world. Again, this was demonstrated by how students were able to use a language that was not theirs, but also to incorporate into their own thinking others' perspectives to discuss for example the significance of specific events such as the Gallipoli campaign.

Ethical learning

Cosmopolitan learning recognises that we have responsibilities towards others and supposes that students are given the chance to examine global issues and the ways they affect different

people in different places. Thus, the goal of cosmopolitan learning is to help students develop "a critical and global imagination" (Rizvi, 2009, p. 255). As noted by Starkey (2010) and others (Guilherme, 2002) it is important to stress that the choice of the topic taught is important and some topics might allow for more opportunities to examine global issues and questions processes of inequalities than others. The topic studied in this learning sequence allowed students to engage with a global issue as well as issues of inequalities (i.e.: self-determination of peoples, and place of women in the war, for example).

The study shows that it is possible to teach a complex topic such as WWI without reducing the content to a list of facts. The content taught in this learning sequence was defined by the Victorian curriculum which includes both historical knowledge and historical skills such as "analysing the different perspectives of people in the past" (VCAA, n.d.). The learning activities as well as the resources from multiple countries used allowed students to critically engage with the content. The content talked about in this setting was dynamic and presented to students in a way that allowed them to actively manipulate and interact with it. This reinforces the observation made by Wisemes (2007) that despite their limited language skills, students have demonstrated that they can relate historical events learnt in class to their own moral landscape. Unlike a traditional language class where the cultural content usually consists of national celebrations and traditions, the content learned in a CLIL lesson requires students to use and develop higher order thinking skills such as comparing different perspectives on events. This stresses the importance of the cognition dimension of the CLIL framework.

To develop a critical and global imagination, students must be given the opportunity to explore alternative worldviews and respond to a wide range of voices (Appiah, 2006; Dyson, 1993). The study suggests that CLIL allows students to dialogue with multiple voices and consider different points of view. Despite limited language skills, students used their imagination to explore different perspectives on certain events. CLIL seems to support a pedagogy where students practise responding to wide variety of cultural voices and differences. For example, this was particularly the case when comparing countries' conflicting views on Germany. In that sense, CLIL evidenced clear potential to provide students with an ethical learning experience.

Implications

The two main implications of the findings are theoretical. The first one is concerned with the theoretical paradigm defining the teaching of intercultural skills in language teaching. The second implication aims to further define the concept of culture in the theoretical framework of the CLIL pedagogy.

Adopting a cosmopolitan paradigm in language teaching

In this thesis, I have argued that teaching intercultural skills needs to be resituated within a cosmopolitan paradigm. Drawing on Ros i Solé (2013) and her concept of cosmopolitan speaker, I argue that the model of the cosmopolitan speaker should replace that of the intercultural speaker. Adopting a cosmopolitan paradigm in language means recognising the complexities of cultural practices and moving away from the notion of target country. The aim is not to teach culture or to measure students' intercultural skills but to provide students with the right conditions to use and develop their dialogic imagination. It is about creating a transnational space where students and teacher can encounter and respond to a wide variety of voices. Students are not seen as passive learners accumulating information about other people's views and traditions. Instead, they play an active role in *translating* the differences they encounter into something new.

The key characteristic of the cosmopolitan speaker is their ability to use their dialogic imagination (Appiah, 2006; Beck, 2006; Delanty, 2009) to explore and consider other ways of thinking and living. Drawing on Quist's view of the dialogic imagination as a pedagogical tool (2013), I suggested that a cosmopolitan language education must aim to provide students with the necessary conditions to use and develop their dialogic imagination. I identified three key conditions that will allow students to use their imagination. Their learning experience must be *dialogic* – students must have the opportunity to dialogue with a wide range of voices, ideas, and situations; it must be *transformative* – students must create their knowledge through rich interactions; and it must be *ethical* – students must examine global issues beyond national boundaries and in a critical way that enables them to question processes of inequality.

The advantage of this model is that it provides teachers with a pedagogical framework in which to "do difference" (Carr, 1999, p.112). As noted by Carr (1999), the teaching of intercultural

skills is often seen as an automatic outcome and teachers do not have any effective pedagogical tool to address culture in the classroom. As argued before, cosmopolitan learning needs to be defined by its potentiality (Wahlström, 2016). Thus, the focus is on the pedagogy itself and not on the outcomes. The three dimensions of cosmopolitan learning can be used as a pedagogical framework guiding teachers when developing lessons or units of work. The cosmopolitan speaker approach thus advocates for a pedagogy guided by cosmopolitan principles likely to foster students' cosmopolitan attitude.

The role of culture in CLIL

CLIL experts (Coyle et al., 2010; Lorenzo, Casal & Moore, 2009; Mendez Garcia, 2012; Rodriguez & Puyal, 2012; Sudhoff, 2010) agree that studying a subject through a different language is likely to develop students' intercultural skills and promote global citizenship. However, although culture is at the core of the CLIIL framework, it is "sometimes referred as the forgotten C" (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 54), as there is currently little research exploring the role of culture in CLIL. This study has helped clarify why the development of intercultural competence seems to be intrinsic to CLIL and how to define the role of culture in the CLIL framework.

CLIL seems to provide the right conditions to promote cosmopolitan learning and encourage students to use their imagination to venture beyond their local environment and explore, confront and make their own other ideas and worldviews. The dual focus at the core of the CLIL approach leads to the creation of a transnational space characterised by hybrid forms of language and culture. Thus, the context created by CLIL, or *chronotope*, triggers specific communicative learning events where students and teachers keep encountering and responding to a wide variety of voices. This is in line with the way Coyle attempted to describe culture in the CLIL framework by stating that intercultural understanding needs to be developed through interacting with different people in different contexts (Coyle, 2007).

By using a cosmopolitan lens to look at culture in a CLIL setting, the study also helps understand how this dialogue of voices can support intercultural learning. Displaying a cosmopolitan attitude happens when something new is created through cultural translations (Delanty, 2009); that is, the capacity to "incorporate the perspective of others into one's own

culture". By interacting and responding to a multitude of voices, students in CLIL settings are creating what Delanty (2009) calls a "third culture" (p. 192). The notion of culture in the CLIL approach moves away from the notions of native speaker and target country and reflects a more complex view of the cultural reality in line with cosmopolitan ideals. Culture in CLIL is not a fixed notion that can be defined and planned according to a list of learning outcomes. It is a creative process through which students actively attempt to *translate* between their own ideas and assumptions and other's ideas and beliefs. It is both a collective and an individual response to the dialogue of voices encountered in class.

Areas for future research

As suggested by Canagarajah, (2012; 2022), there needs to be more research in the field of language and language education exploring the concept of cosmopolitanism. Although some scholars have started to adopt a cosmopolitan lens on language education (Guardado, 2012; Holliday, 2011; Obelleiro, 2012; Ros i Solé, 2013; Starkey, 2007, 2010), research remains sparse (Canagarajah, 2012; 2022). This study indicates that adopting a cosmopolitan lens on language education allows us to promote a view of culture characterised by complexity and hybridity. The study also demonstrated that a cosmopolitan approach fits well with the dynamic view of culture promoted by CLIL experts (Coyle, 2007). More research exploring the role of culture in language education and in CLIL adopting a cosmopolitan lens is therefore needed.

The second area identified for future research is concerned with the relationship between Bakhtin's theory of language and cosmopolitanism. Drawing on Quist (2013), this study demonstrated that there is lot in common between the two approaches and that Bakhtinian concepts can help us put cosmopolitanism into practice in the field of language education. Linguists and language educators have for the past two decades used Bakhinian concepts to explain the linguistic complexities we live in (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Carr, 1999; Quist, 2013; Kramsch & Malinowski, 2014; Hirst & Renshaw, 2004). Building on this research, more research further exploring what these concepts have to offer to cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan language education would be beneficial.

Finally, the project was limited to one language and one teacher, therefore it would be interesting to explore the role of dialogic imagination in a different CLIL context and compare the results with this study. To further confirm the results of this study, research investigating multiple CLIL settings would be beneficial.

Conclusion

In the context of increased globalisation, the teaching of intercultural skills has been recognised as an important goal of language education. However, researchers (Lo Bianco, 2009; Starkey, 2007) have noted that despite policy intentions, language pedagogies used in the classroom have failed to develop students' intercultural understanding. By emphasising the notions of 'native speaker' and 'target country', these pedagogies promote a fixed view of both language and culture that do not reflect the complexity and the plurality of current linguistic and cultural practices (Risager, 2007; Starkey, 2007).

In this thesis, I argued that the teaching of intercultural skills and understanding in language classes needs to be conceived within a cosmopolitan paradigm. According to Appiah (2006), cosmopolitanism means entering a conversation across boundaries of identity. Conversation, he explains, includes, talk but it is also "a metaphor for engagement with the experience and the ideas of others" (2006, p. 85). For cosmopolitan thinkers (Appiah, 2006; Beck, 2002; Delanty, 2006, 2009), what makes a cosmopolitan attitude possible is our capacity to use our imagination to explore and dialogue with different perspectives and ways of thinking. Drawing on Delanty (2006, 2009), I have emphasised throughout the thesis the dialogic nature of the cosmopolitan imagination. In order to foster students' dialogic imagination, I have identified and described three principles of cosmopolitan learning: cosmopolitan learning needs be *dialogic*, *transformative* and *ethical*.

In conducting this research, I argue that cosmopolitan learning should be best understood as an approach to teaching characterized by its *potentiality*. Thus, the study sought to evaluate the *potentiality* of the CLIL approach to support cosmopolitan learning. I turned to Bakhtin's philosophy of language and its idea of dialogic imagination as it provides useful concepts to

put cosmopolitanism into practice in language education. I examined whether CLIL has the potential to provide the necessary conditions to develop students' dialogic imagination.

By creating transnational spaces where the language used is deterritorialized from its traditional context, CLIL creates an interactive learning space where students encounter and respond to a multiplicity of voices. The study suggests that CLIL students learn creatively both the content and the language through the negotiation of translingual chains of meaning. The study also shows that the focus on content allows students to critically examine global issues, although this is dependent on the choice of topic. According to Appiah (2006), displaying a cosmopolitan attitude is to be able to participate in "conversations" (p. xvii), to live with and communicate with people. If language education is to really promote intercultural skills, it must then endorse a dynamic and complex view of culture. By focussing on both content and language, this study shows that the CLIL approach has the potential to foster student's dialogic imagination and promote cosmopolitan ideals.

References

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). (n,d.). *Intercultural Understanding.* https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/general-capabilities/intercultural-understanding/

Alred, G., Byram, M., & Fleming, M. (2002). *Intercultural Experience and Education.* Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853596087

Appiah, K.A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. W.W. Norton.

Baildon, M., & Damico, J. (2011). *Social studies as new literacies in a global society: Relational cosmopolitanism in the classroom*. Routledge.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. University of Texas Press.

Beck, U. (2002). The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society, 19*(1-2), 17-44.

Beck, U. (2006). *The cosmopolitan vision*. Polity Press.

Blackledge, A., Creese, A., & Takhi, J.K. (2014). Beyond multilingualism: Heteroglossia in practice. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn : Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 181-215). Routledge.

Blommaert, J. (2015). Chronotopes, scales, and complexity in the study of language in Society. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *44*, 105–116.

Blommaert, J. & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities*, *13*(2), 1-22.

Brandist, C. (2002). *The Bakhtin circle : Philosophy, culture and politics*. Pluto.

Byram, M., & Zarate, G. (1996). Defining and assessing intercultural competence: Some principles and proposals for the European context. *Language Teaching, 29*(4), 239-243. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800008557

Canagarajah, S. (2012) *Translingual practice : Global englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2022). Foreword. In R. Schecter & C.E. James (Eds.), *Critical approaches toward a cosmopolitan education* (pp. vx-vxiii). Routledge.

Carr, J. (1999). From 'sympathetic' to 'dialogic' imagination: cultural study in the foreign language classroom. In C. Crozet, A.J. Liddicoat & J. Lo Bianco (Eds.), *Striving for the third place. Intercultural competence through language education* (pp. 103-112). Language Australia.

Council of Europe. (2014). *Language Policy.* From https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Division_EN.asp

Coyle, D. (2007). Content and Language Integrated Learning: Towards a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 10*(5), 543-562.

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL : content and language integrated learning.* Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches*. SAGE Publications.

Cross, R. (2012). Creative in finding creativity in the curriculum: The CLIL second language classroom. *Australian Educational Researcher, 39*(4), 431–445.

Crozet, C., & Liddicoat, A. (1999). The challenge of intercultural teaching: Engaging with culture in the classroom. In J. Lo Bianco, A. Liddicoat, & C. Crozet (Eds.), Striving for the third place: Intercultural competence through language education (pp. 113-123). Language Australia.

Dalton-Puffer, C. & Smit, U. (2007), *Empirical perspectives on CLIL classroom discourse.* Peter Lang

C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (2010). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Delanty, (2006). The cosmopolitan imagination: critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *British Journal of Sociology*, *57*(1), 25–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2006.00092.x

Delanty, G. (2009). *The cosmopolitan imagination: The renewal of critical social theory.* Cambridge University Press.

Department of Education and Training. (2015). *Unity through diversity*. Retrieved from http://www.education.vic.gov.au/Documents/about/programs/cultures/unitydiversity.pdf

Doecke, B., Kostogriz, A., & Charles, C. (2004). Heteroglossia : a space for developing critical language awareness? *English Teaching : Practice and Critique, 3*(3), 29.

Dyson, A. H. (1993). *Social worlds of children learning to write in an urban primary school*. Teachers College Press.

Freebody, P. (2003). *Qualitative research in education: interaction and practice*. SAGE.

Glen Eira College. (n.d.). From https://gec.vic.edu.au/

Guardado, M. (2012). Toward a critical multilingualism in Canadian classrooms: making local inroads into a cosmopolitan identity. *TESL Canada Journal, 30*(1), 151-165.

Guilherme, M. (2002). *Critical citizens for an intercultural world. Foreign language education as cultural politics*. England: Multilingual Matters.

Hall, J.K. (2002). *Teaching and researching language and culture*. Pearson Education.

Hall, J.K., Vitanova, G.,& Marchenkova, L. (2005). *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning : new perspectives.* L. Erlbaum

Hansen, D. (2011). *The teacher and the world: a study of cosmopolitanism and education*. Routledge.

Hansen, D. (2014). Cosmopolitanism as cultural creativity: new modes of educational practice in globalizing times. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *44*(1), 1-14.

Hirst, E., & Renshaw, P.D. (2004). Diverse voices, dialogue and intercultural learning in a second language classroom. In Van Der Linden, J., & Renshaw, P. (Eds.), *Dialogic Learning* (pp.87-107). Springer.

Holliday, A. (2011). *Intercultural communication and ideology.* SAGE Publications Ltd. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446269107

Holquist, M. (1983). Answering as authoring: Mikhail Bakhtin's trans-Linguistics. *Critical Inquiry, 10(*2), 307–319.

Holquist, M. (1990). *Dialogism : Bakhtin and his world*. Routledge.

Juzwik, M. (2004). Towards an ethics of answerability: Reconsidering dialogism in sociocultural literacy research. *College Composition and Communication*, *55*(3), 536–567. https://doi.org/10.2307/4140698

Kramsch, C. J. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C, & Malinowski, D., (2014). The ambiguous world of heteroglossic computer-mediated language learning. In Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 155-178). Springer.

Lin, A. M. Y., & Lo, Y. Y. (2017). Trans/Languaging and the triadic dialogue in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classrooms. *Language and Education*, *31*(1), 26–45. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2016.123012

Lin, A. M. Y., & He, P. (2017). Translanguaging as dynamic activity flows in CLIL Classrooms. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *16*(4), 228–244.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.

Llinares, A., & Whittaker, R. (2010). Writing and speaking in the history class: Data from CLIL and first language contexts. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*, (pp. 125–144). John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Llinares, A., Morton, T., & Whittaker, R. (2012). *The roles of language in CLIL*. Cambridge University Press.

Lo Bianco, J. (2009). *Second languages and Australian schooling*. Australian Council for Educational Research.

Lorenzo, F., Casal, S., & Moore, P. (2010). The Effects of Content and Language Integrated Learning in European Education: Key Findings from the Andalusian Bilingual Sections Evaluation Project. *Applied Linguistics, 31*(3), 418–442.

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL : content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Macmillan Education.

Mendez Garcia, M. del C. (2012). The Potential of CLIL for Intercultural Development: A Case Study of Andalusian Bilingual Schools. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 12*(3), 196–213.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: a guide to design and implementation.* Jossey-Bass.

My school. (2011). From https://www.myschool.edu.au/

Nassaji, H. (2020). Good qualitative research. *Language Teaching Research 24*(4), 427–431, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820941288.

Nikula, T., Dalton-Puffer, C., & Llinares, A. (2013). CLIL Classroom Discourse: Research from Europe. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 1*(1), 70–100. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.1.1.04nik

Nikula, T. (2007). The IRF pattern and space for interaction: comparing CLIL and EFL classrooms. In Dalton-Puffer, C. & Smit, U. (Eds.), *Empirical perspectives on CLIL classroom discourse.* Peter Lang.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity : a classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Harvard University Press.

Obelleiro, G. (2012). A moral cosmopolitan perspective on language education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 9*(1), 33–59.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Sage Publications.

Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows.* Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Pieterse, J.N. (2015*). Globalization and culture: global mélange.* Rowman & Littlefield.

Pietryga, M. (2020). Application of Formal and Dynamic Equivalence to Chosen Press Releases Published by the European Commission Related to the Issue of the Coronavirus Pandemic. Półrocznik Językoznawczy Tertium, 5(1), 97–115. https://doi.org/10.7592/Tertium2020.5.1.Pietryga

Quist, G. (2013). Cosmopolitan imaginings: creativity and responsibility in the language classroom. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 13*(3), 330-342. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2013.804536

Renshaw, P. D. (2007). A commentary on the chronotopes of different 'cultures of learning': Transforming classrooms from trading-places into relational-places of learning. *International Journal of Educational Research, 46*(3), 240–245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2007.09.003

Renfrew, A. (2015). *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Risager, K. (2006). *Language and culture: global flows and local complexity*. Multilingual Matters.

Risager, K. (2007). *Language and culture pedagogy: from a national to a transnational paradigm*. Multilingual Matters.

Rizvi, F. (2009). Towards cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 30(3),* 253-268. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596300903036863

Rizvi, F. (2011). Experiences of Cultural Diversity in the Context of an Emergent Transnationalism. *European Educational Research Journal, 10*(2), 180-188.

Rodrigues, S. (2018). *Analysing talk in educational research*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Rodríguez, L. M. G., & Puyal, M. B. (2012). Promoting intercultural competence through literature in CLIL contexts. *Atlantis, 34*(2), 105–124.

Ros i Solé, C. (2013). Cosmopolitan speakers and their cultural cartographies. *The Language Learning Journal, 41*(3), pp.3326-339. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2013.836349

Savignon, S. (2007). Beyond communicative language teaching: What's ahead? *Journal of Pragmatics 39*(1), 207–220. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.09.004

Savignon, S.J. (2017). Communicative competence. In Liontas, J.I. (Ed.), *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*. John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0047

Scott, P. & Mortimer, E. (2003). *Meaning making in secondary science classrooms ??*. McGraw-Hill International Ltd.

Starkey, H. (2007). Language education, identities and citizenship: developing cosmopolitan perspectives. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 7*(1), 56-71.

Starkey, H. (2010). Language learning for human rights and democratic citizenship. In C. Ros i Solé, C., & Fenoulhet, F. (Eds.), *Mobility and localisation in language learning* (pp. 79-106). Peter Lang.

Steinby, L. and Klapuri, T. (2013). The acting subject of Bakhtin. In Steinby, L. (Ed.), *Bakhtin and his others : (Inter)subjectivity, chronotope, dialogism* (pp. xi-xxiv). Anthem Press.

Sudhoff, J. (2010). CLIL and intercultural communicative competence: foundations and approaches towards a fusion. *International CLIL Research Journal, 1*(3), 30-37.

Swain, M., & Deters, P. (2007). "New" mainstream SLA theory: Expanded and enriched. *The Modern Language Journal 91*, p. 820-836.

Tomlinson, J. (1999). *Globalization and culture*. Polity.

Victorian Curriculum And Assessment Authority. (n.d.). From https://victoriancurriculum.vcaa.vic.edu.au/languages/non-roman-alphabet-languages/introduction/rationale-and-aims

Vitanova, G. (2010). *Authoring the dialogic self: Gender, agency and language practices*. John Benjamins Pub.

Vitanova, G. (2005). Authoring the self in a non-native language: A dialogic approach to agency and subjectivity. In Hall, J.K., Vitanova, G., & Marchenkova, L. (Eds.), *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning: New perspectives* (pp. 138-158). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wahlström, N. (2016). Cosmopolitanism as communication? On conditions for educational conversations in a globalized society. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 60*(1), 32–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2014.996592

Wiesemes, R. (2007). Developing a methodology for CLIL classroom research: A case study of a CLIL classroom where the Holocaust is taught. In Dalton-Puffer, C. & Smit, U. (Eds.), *Empirical perspectives on CLIL classroom discourse* (pp. 275-290). Peter Lang.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: design and methods.* SAGE Publications.

Appendix A: Ethics Application (Ethics ID: 1748886)

THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS

PROJECT APPLICATION FORM

How To Use This Form

1. **Consider and refer to relevant guidelines and regulations.**
   References to specific guidelines are provided, with hyperlinks, throughout this form. The primary guide for human research ethics in Australia is the ***National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007) - Updated May 2015***. Human research ethics applications at the University of Melbourne are reviewed and approved under the warrant of the *National Statement*. References to the *National Statement* are abbreviated (e.g. ***NS* §2.1**.)

2. **Use plain English.**
   Use clear, non-technical language in your application. Be concise. Spell out the first instances of acronyms and abbreviations. Avoid jargon. Do not repeat information. Following these directions ensures effective review of your application. It will avoid unnecessary delays which result if applications are not clear and concise.

3. **Consider ethical principles.**
   Your application will be reviewed according to the principles of ethical research outlined in the *National Statement*, namely:

   - **Research Merit and Integrity** (***NS* §1.1 - §1.3**)
   - **Justice** (***NS* §1.4 - §1.5**)
   - **Beneficence** (***NS* §1.6 - §1.9**)
   - **Respect** (***NS* §1.10 - §1.13**)

4. **Use the current version of the application form.**
   Ensure that you are using the current version by downloading **this form** each time you prepare a new application.

5. **Detailed instructions for specific questions are available online.**
   If you are unsure about how best to answer a particular question, consult the Human Research Ethics **Guidance Document**. That document provides detailed guidance on how to answer specific questions in this form.

6. **Where possible, avoid printing this form.**
   Consult your HEAG to find out if they still require hard copies of your application. If you must print this form, consider printing double-sided and in grayscale (black and white).

7. **Save your completed application as a PDF and upload it to Themis.**
   Refer to your local Human Ethics Advisory Group (**HEAG**) for detailed instructions on how and when to submit your application.

ANSWER ALL OF THE QUESTIONS IN THIS FORM

Ethics ID number: *(assigned by Themis)*	1748886.1	
Project Title: *(as recorded in Themis)*	Dialogic imagination in CLIL classrooms: towards a pedagogical tool to promote intercultural understanding	
Responsible Researcher: *(as recorded in Themis)*	Russell Cross	
Application Type: *(mark with an "X")*		**Minimal Risk**
	X	**Standard Project**

1. Project Details

1.1 Project Summary

Summarise your research project in plain language.
[Limit: 300 words]

A) Aims and Objectives

[Briefly describe the broad aims and objectives of this project.]

In the context of increased globalisation, governments around the world have recognised the potential of language education to develop students' intercultural understanding and help them to become global citizens. However, intercultural understanding is often seen as a natural outcome of language learning and language teachers are left with no effective pedagogical tool to teach 'culture'.

The Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) pedagogy emerged in transnational Europe in 1990s as an innovative teaching approach whose key principle is to teach a non-language subject through a foreign language. Unlike immersion, in CLIL the teaching and learning of the language and content are integrated and equally important. Due to its integrated nature, CLIL has the potential to create hybrid cultural and linguistic spaces and to promote intercultural understanding.

This project seeks to examine how students in CLIL classes use and are encouraged to use their 'dialogic imagination', in order to potentially develop an effective tool to address culture in language classrooms. The dialogic imagination is a concept developed both by the Russian linguist Batkhin (1981) and the German cosmopolitan sociologist Beck (2002) and refers to our capacity to use various resources to negotiate our interactions with others.

B) Key Question(s)

[What question, or questions, does the project intend to examine? Where relevant, state the specific hypothesis to be tested.]

What is the role of the dialogic imagination in CLIL spaces?

To address this question, the study will be articulated around four interrelated objectives:

1. To examine the use of languages in CLIL classrooms
2. To examine how the cultural aspects of the content are addressed
3. To examine the classroom interactions
4. To understand students' perceptions of their learning experience

C) Research Design

[Outline the research design/approach. In particular, note the type(s) of participants, and type(s) of data collection.]

This research is a case study of a year 9 class learning History through French based on the CLIL pedagogy. The data will be collected using classroom observations, students' journal, students' work and semi-structured interviews with some of the students. The researcher will be taking the role of teacher-researcher teaching a unit of work over a 4-week period. Interviews will be conducted a few weeks after the observations with some students. The researcher knows this group of students as she taught them for 1.5 years but is currently on leave.

While this positioning has advantages in terms of data trustworthiness (i.e., an insider or emic perspective on the dynamics of this class as a group), the researcher has also reflected on the implications of this in potential bias in analysis of the data analysis and, specifically with regard to ethics, for dependency/conflict of interest around power dynamics — this is addressed in 2.2(b – Recruitment) and 4.4 (Conflict of Interest).

Specific Guidelines Checklist		
Type an "X" in the left-hand column beside all items that apply to your research project. Linked sections of the National Statement contain relevant guidelines and requirements that you need to address when completing your application.		
X	**Children and/or young people (< 18 years old)** will be recruited as participants.	→ **Refer to *NS* §4.2.**
X	**People in dependent or unequal relationships** will be recruited as participants. (There are pre-existing relationships between participants and researchers, or between participants and others involved in facilitating or implementing the research. E.g. student/teacher, patient/doctor, employee/employer.)	→ **Refer to *NS* §4.3.**
	People in countries other than Australia will be recruited as participants.	→ **Refer to *NS* §4.8.**
	One or more of the following describes the research project: • it will be about **Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander individuals or peoples**, their health, or their culture(s), language(s) or histories; • it will be about the impact(s) or effect(s) of some phenomenon or phenomena on **Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander individuals or peoples;** • it will *specifically target* **Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people** to be recruited as participants; • it will be conducted in a geographic location where a significant number of the population are likely to be **Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander.**	→ **Refer to *NS* §4.7.** → **Refer to *Values and Ethics*.** → **Refer to *GERAIS*.** → **This application is ineligible for minimal risk review.**
	One or both of the following describes the research project: • it will *specifically target* **women who are pregnant** to be recruited as participants; • it will be focused on **women who are pregnant and/or the human foetus** (including human foetal tissue or human embryos).	→ **Refer to *NS* §4.1.** → **This application is ineligible for minimal risk review.**
	People who may be involved in illegal activities will be recruited as participants, ***and the research project could potentially expose such activities.***	→ **Refer to *NS* §4.6.** → **This application is *likely* ineligible for minimal risk review.**
	People with cognitive impairment, intellectual disability, or mental illness will be recruited as participants.	→ **Refer to *NS* §4.5.** → **This application is ineligible for minimal risk review.**
	People who are highly dependent on medical care will be recruited as participants.	→ **Refer to *NS* §4.4.** → **This application is ineligible for minimal risk review.**
	None of the above applies to this research project.	

Additional Modules Checklist		
Type an "X" in the left-hand column beside all items that apply to your research project. This checklist will help you determine if you need to complete any other modules in addition to this application form. Linked sections of the *National Statement* contain relevant guidelines and requirements that you need to address when completing this form and any applicable additional modules.		
	This research project will involve the **creation of a databank** (i.e. your stored data will be made available to other parties for secondary use in future research projects).	→ **Refer to *NS* §3.2.** → **Complete and attach the *Privacy and Databanks Module*.**
	This research project will involve the **collection of information for a databank** (i.e. your stored data will be made available to other parties for secondary use in future research projects).	→ **Refer to *NS* §3.2.** → **Complete and attach the *Privacy and Databanks Module*.**
	This research project will involve **accessing information from an existing databank** (i.e. you will be accessing and making use of stored data that was previously collected – not for this specific project – by other parties).	→ **Refer to *NS* §3.2.** → **Complete and attach the *Privacy and Databanks Module*.**
	This research project will involve obtaining identifiable (or potentially identifiable) **personal information (including health information)** about individuals ***without their consent.***	→ **Complete and attach the *Privacy and Databanks Module*.**
	This research project will involve the collection and/or use of **human tissue/biological samples or materials** (e.g. blood, saliva, cheek swabs, hair, human embryonic or foetal tissue).	→**Refer to *NS* §3.4.** → **Complete and attach the *Body Tissue and Genetic Research Module*.**
	This research project will involve **human genetics.**	→ **Refer to *NS* §3.5.** → **This application is ineligible for minimal risk review.** → **Complete and attach the *Body Tissue and Genetic Research Module*.**
	This research project will involve **medical interventions, therapies or trials.**	→ **Refer to *NS* §3.3.** → **This application is ineligible for minimal risk review.** → **Complete and attach the *Interventions, Therapies and Trials Module*.**
	This research project will involve **administration of ionising radiation.**	→ **Complete and attach the *Ionising Radiation Module*.**
	None of the above applies to this research project.	

2. Background and Method

2.1 Background and Significance

Provide a summary of background information. Explain the significance of the proposed research in the context of this background. **Refer to *NS* §5.2.5.**

[Limit: 500 words]

A) Background:

[What is the current state of research/knowledge/discourse in this area?]

The concept of dialogic imagination was first developed by the Russian philosopher Bakhtin in 1981 to refer to our capacity to interpret utterances that are constantly involved in a dialogue between socially and historically constructed meanings and our personal intentions (Bakhtin, 1981). For the German sociologist Beck, the dialogic imagination is the key characteristic of the cosmopolitan attitude (2002). For him, it refers to our capacity to use our imagination to negotiate our interactions with others as well as the clash of cultures within oneself by 'comparing, reflecting, criticising, understanding and combining contradictory certainties'.

Several researchers have recognised the potential of this concept in language learning (Carr, 1999). For Carr, the dialogic imagination as defined by Bakthin provide a 'theoretical toolkit' for the language teacher to not only talk about cultural differences but also 'do differences' in order to go beyond a national vision of culture and reflect the hybrid and changing nature of culture in a globalised world. She sees 'language encounters are cultural interstices where multiple voices carrying traces of political, historical and social contexts intermingle with students' own multiple voices'. Quist shares Carr's view of dialogic imagination but goes further and includes in her interpretation both the batkhinian and the cosmopolitan approaches. For her, the dialogic imagination is a pedagogical tool encouraging students to use both their creativity and their responsibility towards others.

B) Significance of This Research:

[Explain the significance of the proposed research project in light of existing research, knowledge or understanding. How does your research help to fill a gap in the literature? You may include relevant references, within the word limit.]

Despite ambitious language education policies promoting intercultural understanding and global citizenship education, some educational researchers argue that language pedagogies used in the classroom fail to develop students' intercultural understanding (Lo Bianco, 2009; Starkey, 2007)). As pointed out by Carr (1999), the development of intercultural skills through the study of languages is seen as an automatic outcome and language teachers are left with no effective pedagogical tool to teach 'culture'.

The teaching of intercultural skills in the past two decades has been based on the concept of the 'intercultural speaker' (Carr, 1999; Quist, 2013; Risager, 2007). However, although this concept emphasises interactions between cultures, it remains trapped within a national paradigm (Risager, 2007) and some argue (Risager, 2007; Starkey, 2007) that the teaching of intercultural skills in language classes may be best conceived within a cosmopolitan paradigm. A cosmopolitan perspective recognises a more complex and hybrid view of culture and emphasises an ethical responsibility towards others. Although some (Carr, 1999; Quist, 2013) have recognised the potential of the dialogic imagination to provide a pedagogical tool to address culture in the language classroom, Quist argues that it has largely been overlooked by the concept of the 'intercultural speaker'. Both Quist and Carr recognise the need to explore further the potential of the dialogic imagination to address culture in the language classroom.

Finally, few studies of CLIL have examined its potential to foster intercultural skills and promote global citizenship. The CLIL theoretical framework lies on four interrelated dimensions 'the four Cs': content, communication, cognition and culture. As noted by Coyle (2007), culture is the 'forgotten C' of the CLIL framework as very few studies have been undertaken.

Thus, this project seeks to complement current research in three areas:

(1) it will resituate language teaching within a cosmopolitan paradigm
(2) it will explore the potential of the dialogic imagination as a pedagogical tool in language classrooms
(3) it will explore the potential of CLIL spaces in promoting objectives of intercultural understanding and global citizenship.

2.2 Research Design and Method

Provide details of your research design and your proposed method. **Refer to *NS* §5.2.5 - §5.2.6.**

Attach a copy of any measures, scales, questionnaires, survey instruments (including online surveys), interview questions/themes, and/or focus group topics/questions to be used.

A) Participants (or Recruitment Targets, such as medical records):

[Describe the sample, i.e. the intended participants or recruitment targets. Explain the basis on which this sample was chosen. Include the number and age range and any other relevant demographic characteristics of participants, as well as any eligibility constraints (i.e. inclusion/exclusion criteria). If the project involves using records or previously-collected data/samples, rather than direct contact with human participants, state that.]

The whole class of Year 9 will be participating in the study.
The students participating in the interviews will be selected following both a maximal variation sampling strategy and an intensity strategy both based on the students' level of engagement in class.

B) Recruitment:

*[Describe how recruitment will occur. Explain how potential participants will be identified and approached. Who will do this? Refer to **NS §2.2**. If you will be using records or data only, and you will be completing the Privacy and Databanks Module, state "N/A." If you will be using records or data only, but you will not be completing the Privacy and Databanks Module, explain how the records/data will be identified, collected and accessed.]*

The participants are Year 9 students enrolled in a CLIL program. They have been in this program studying History in French for 2.5 years. The Department of Education and Training will be contacted for approval and the school principal will also be contacted. Students and parents will be given appropriate information about the study and asked to give written consent if they wish to be volunteer research participants.

The recruitment process will be handled by a teacher that is not otherwise connected to this class group (i.e., someone who is neither the students' regular History or French teacher, or the teacher-researcher teaching the unit of work). This teacher will spend 5 minutes explaining the project to the class at the end of one of their regular lessons, per the key points outlined in the PLS, and what to do if they wish to volunteer as a participant (i.e., sign a consent form with their parents, and return those signed consent forms for collection to the teacher-researcher for her records).

In addition, it will also be explained to the students that their decision to participate will have no effect on any assessment or tests they do as part of their school work for History/French, as marking will be done separately (See 4.4 – Conflict of Interest).

C) Participant Incentives:

*[Do you propose to reward and/or reimburse and/or compensate participants in any way? If yes, give details here and comment on the special considerations discussed in **NS §2.2.10** and **NS §2.2.11**. If no, state "N/A."]*

N/A

D) Participant Task(s):

[What will participants be asked to do? What is the approximate time commitment required of each participant? If using records or data only, state "N/A." If your research will be conducted in schools during class time, give details of the alternate activity arranged for students in the class who will not be participating in the research.]

Students will be participating in their normal History lessons in French. They will be asked to engage in normal learning activities as required by the teacher.

Students will also be asked to keep a reflective journal. This will be done in class at the end of each week. As suggested by O'Toole (2013), in order to help students structure their journal, they will be asked to write a response to a specific question which will encourage them to actively think about their learning and their participation in the learning activities.

Students participating in the interviews will be asked to talk about their learning experience.

E) Data/Material Collection Technique(s):

[What data/materials will be collected? Where will the data be collected? List/describe all sites.]

- Participant observation

Data will be collected from lesson observations. The researcher will be participating as the teacher. Lessons will be voice-recorded and transcribed. Field notes will be taken directly after each lesson. Students who did not give consent will have those portions of the class transcript removed from the data set for analysis.

- Reflective journal

Reflective journals will be scanned. Journals written by students who did not give consent will not be scanned.

- Student works

They will be scanned, unless students did not give consent.

- Semi-structured interviews

Some students will be interviewed in order to reveal students' perceptions of their experience as CLIL learners. Interviews will be conducted following the observations so that specific behaviours or events can be explored in the interviews. Interviews will last for 15-20 minutes and will be guided by a certain number of issues to explore but no predetermined questions. Questions will address issues about behaviour and experience, opinion and values, and feeling.

F) Data Analysis:

*[How will data/materials be analysed? What methods/techniques/theories will be used? If qualitative methods will be used, refer to **NS §3.1**.]*

Analysis of the observation transcripts will be done using two different frameworks in order to identify characteristics of dialogic imagination:

- To analyse the classroom interactions, the study will use the framework developed by Mortimer and Scott (2003, as cited in Llinares et al., 2012) and adapted by Llinares et al. (2012) in their study of CLIL classrooms. This framework lies on the division of classroom talk into three levels: focus, approach and action.
- Coyle, Hood and Marsh's framework (2010), especially their third category - the language through learning – given that this foucses on when students have to negotiate new meanings using existing and new repertoires

Journals, student works and journals will be analysed using category construction analysis in order to find evidence of features of dialogic imagination.

3. Risks, Benefits and Monitoring

3.1 Potential Risks to Participants	Does your research project pose any potential risks to participants? What are those risks? How will they be negated, minimised or managed? **Refer to *NS* §2.1.** **Note that the risks you identify here should also be described in your Plain Language Statement (PLS). Attach a copy of any distress protocol or adverse event protocol (if applicable).**

A) Potential Risks

[Identify, as far as possible, any potential risks to participants associated with the research project. Risks may arise from the nature of questions that participants are asked (such as discussing sensitive or distressing topics), or the tasks that participants will do, or the procedures that they will undergo. Potential risks might be physical, psychological, emotional, social, legal or economic in nature (this list is not exhaustive). Risks also may be associated with the research setting (e.g. outdoors, in unsecure housing, or in countries other than Australia). If you believe that any potential risks are minimal, please state this and explain why.

Potential risks are minimal as students will only participate in normal lessons and no sensitive issues will be discussed during the interview. Inconvenience risks for this research include students giving up time to participate in interviews. Students will not have to give up time to complete their journal as this will take place during normal class time.

B) Risk Management Strategy

[Describe what measures you have in place to negate, minimise or manage the potential risks you have identified. Depending on the type(s) of risks involved, participants may also need additional support (e.g. external counselling) during or after the study. Attach or include a copy of any distress protocol or adverse event protocol which you have developed.]

Participation in the project is voluntary so it will be up to the students to decide whether they want to give up time to participate.

3.2 Potential Risks to Non-Participants	Does your research project pose any potential risks to non-participants? (This could possibly include risks to researchers or independent contractors.) If so, how will these risks be minimised? **Refer to *NS* §2.1.**

[Describe any potential risks and your risk management strategy for non-participants, if applicable. Risks to non-participants might include things such as potential breach of privacy, stigmatisation of a particular group, or knowledge about familial genetics. If you believe that any potential risks to non-participants are minimal, please state this and explain why.]

There are no potential risks to non-participants. All students will still have access to the CLIL unit, which would be a normal part of their school routine.

3.3 Risks, Benefits and Justification	In light of the risks and expected benefits of the research project, explain how the expected benefits of the research justify any risks it may pose. **Refer to *NS* §1.6 - §1.7 and *NS* §2.1.**

A) Expected Benefits

[Describe any expected benefits of this research. Include potential benefits to the community or society, and any specific potential benefits to participants, beyond general positive feelings that may arise from participating in research and having one's voice heard. Note that it is generally not necessary to demonstrate specific benefit to participants in order to show that research is ethically justifiable.]

As the overall objective of this research is to describe the way dialogic imagination can be used as a pedagogical tool to foster students' intercultural skills, this research is likely to benefit teachers by providing them with an effective pedagogy. Students will also potentially benefit from the findings of this research as they might develop intercultural skills. Finally, policy makers concerned with students' development of intercultural skills and the promotion of global citizenship education might be interested in supporting a pedagogy that can meet such objectives.

B) Justification of Risks by Expected Benefits

[Explain how the expected benefits of the research justify the risk(s) which you identified in questions 3.1 and 3.2. Pay particular attention to any risk(s) to participants that are greater than inconvenience.]

The benefits of this research outweigh its risks as risks are minimal and only include inconvenience types of risks.

3.4 Management and Monitoring	How will researchers manage and monitor conduct of the research project? **Refer to *NS* §5.5.**

A) Management

[Provide details of how and by whom the research project will be managed, throughout the life of the project, to ensure that it complies with the protocols set out in this application, and with all relevant legislation and regulations. Address cases where several people are or may be involved in recruiting, interviewing, obtaining data or data analysis.]

The project will be managed by Celine Fompudie under Russell Cross's supervision. Celine Fompudie has received ethics training as part of her Master when completing Conducting Educational Research (EDUC90729). Russell Cross has done ethics training as both a HEAG and HAPS ethics committee member.

B) Monitoring

[If the research will be carried out at some distance from the responsible researcher (i.e. interstate or in countries other than Australia), describe the systems in place to ensure compliance with the research protocols you have outlined in this application. If the research will be undertaken by a student, describe how the student will be supervised to ensure compliance with the protocols, including details of any local supervision to be organised for research conducted overseas or interstate.

All data will be digitally stored in a password protected laptop.

During field work Celine will meet with her supervisor on a fortnightly basis.

C) Independent Contractors

[If any independent contractors (i.e. persons not listed in Themis as researchers on this project) will be carrying out any part of the research, provide details of the contractors involved, explaining their role and their qualifications/experience to fulfil this role. Include details of any training that will be provided to the contractors. Confirm that the contractors will be provided with a copy of the approved ethics protocol, and advised of their responsibilities in relation to the research. If no independent contractors will be involved, state "N/A".]

N/A

4. Consent

4.1 Obtaining Informed Consent	**Type an "X" in the left-hand column beside as many of the following options as apply** to your research project. **Use the space provided below** to explain how you will obtain informed consent from participants. If you seek a waiver of consent, or the use of opt-out consent, use the space provided to justify your request. **Refer to *NS* §2.2, *NS* §2.3.**	
X	**Written consent** will be sought from (or on behalf of) participants.	→ **Refer to *NS* §2.2.6.** → **Attach a copy of your consent form(s).**

	Verbal consent will be sought from (or on behalf of) participants.	→ **Refer to *NS* §2.2.5 - §2.2.6.** → **Explain why you have chosen this form of consent, and how an individual's consent to participate will be recorded.** → **Attach a copy of your consent script(s).**
	Consent will be implied, rather than explicitly obtained.	→ **Refer to *NS* §2.2.5 - §2.2.6.** → **Explain why you have chosen this form of consent.**
X	**Third parties (e.g. parents/guardians of minors) will provide consent** on behalf of participants.	→ **Refer to *NS* §2.2.12.** → **Explain who will be providing consent on behalf of participants and why.**
	Third parties (e.g. community elders, school boards) will be involved in whole of community participation decisions.	→ **Refer to *NS* §2.2.13.** → **Provide details of which third parties will be involved, why they will be involved, and how this will be accomplished.**
	This application seeks a **waiver of consent.**	→ **Explain why you are seeking this option. Justify your request by referring to the conditions described in *NS* §2.3.10 - §2.3.11.**
	This application proposes to use **opt-out consent.**	→ **Explain why you are seeking this option. Justify your request by referring to the conditions described in *NS* §2.3.6.**

[Write your responses here. If you will be obtaining consent from participants, describe who will obtain consent. Explain how it will be established that potential participants are competent to understand the research and to participate voluntarily, particularly if they are in a dependent relationship with the researcher(s). If you will not be obtaining consent from individual participants, justify your request for a waiver of consent, or for use of opt-out consent.]

Consent will be sought from students and parents.

4.2 Limited Disclosure	Do you propose to use limited disclosure, concealment or deception for this research project? (Answer Yes or No. If Yes, use the space below to explain.) **Refer to *NS* §2.3.**	
	YES or NO:	**No.**

*[If NO, you may leave this space blank. If YES, provide a justification for the limited disclosure, concealment or deception. Comment on the special considerations discussed in **NS §2.3**. Indicate whether you intend to debrief participants, and justify that position. If you are seeking a waiver of consent for all participants, select NO.]*

4.3 Future Use of Data, Materials, or Tissues	Do you intend for the data and/or materials and/or tissues collected for this research project to be reused in future research? **Type an "X" in the left-hand column beside as many of the following options as apply** to your research. **Use the space provided** to specify which data/materials/tissues will be reused, if any. **Refer to *NS* §2.2.14.**	
X	Consent (or waiver of consent) will be **specific.**	→ Data/materials/tissues will be used *only* for this research project (i.e. **no future use**).
	Consent (or waiver of consent) will be **extended.**	→ Data/materials/tissues used in this research project may also be used in future projects that are *closely related* to this project, *or in the same general area* of research as this project.
	Consent (or waiver of consent) will be **unspecified.**	→ Data/materials/tissues used in this project may also be used in *any* future research.

[If data/materials/tissues from this research project will not be reused, select "specific" above and state "N/A" here. If data/materials/tissues will be reused, describe which of them will be reused explain and how such future use will occur. If different conditions of consent apply to different data/materials/tissues, explain which conditions apply to which data/materials/tissues. If you will also be completing the Privacy and Databanks Module, you may simply write "Refer to Privacy and Databanks Module" here.]

4.4 Conflict of Interest	Does your research present or involve any conflict of interest, whether potential, real, or perceived; or will the researcher(s) have dual roles in relation to the participants? (Answer Yes or No. If Yes, use the space below to explain.) **Refer to *NS* §5.4, University of Melbourne *Code of Conduct for Research* §2.5, and *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* §7.2.**	
	YES or NO:	YES

[If YES, explain what the potential conflict of interest is and how it will be managed. If applicable, you may also need to include a comment on the Plain Language Statement and Consent form declaring that potential conflict of interest. If NO, you may leave this space blank.]

There is a conflict of interest in the relationship between teacher-researcher and the student group. The teacher-researcher is not the students' regular History/French teacher in the semester the research is being conducted which helps to reduce the power relationship somewhat, but as she is still a former teacher with whom the students are familiar additional steps have been taken to avoid students feeling obligated to participate.

These steps include:

1. Working with a neutral 'third party' teacher who is not the regular classroom teacher or the teacher-researcher to be the one to outline the project and explain to students that they free to make their own decision with their parents about whether to participate in the study (See 2.2b)
2. Having any graded components of the unit of work assessed by the regular classroom teacher (i.e., not the teacher-researcher, teaching the unit of work for research purposes). This helps separate assessment from the research process.

It's worth noting that the existing relationshp between the teacher/researcher and the students is an asset to the study as it is necessary for the students to trust their teacher and feel confident in order to participate in the classroom activities.

4.5 Information for Participants	How will relevant information about the research project be provided to potential participants? **Attach a copy of any advertisement (print or online), Plain Language Statement (PLS), consent form, letter, email, telephone script, and/or debriefing statement** to be used. **Refer to *NS* §5.2.23.**

[Explain how participants will be informed about the research project. If applicable, explain what arrangements will be made for informing participants with low literacy skills, and/or for translation/interpreting of these materials for participants who are speakers of languages other than English. If you are seeking a waiver of consent for all participants, state "N/A."]

Students and parents will be informed by plain language statement outlining the project. Consent forms to participate in the project will be given to parents and students.

Plain Language Statement (PLS): Your PLS must satisfy the requirements set out in the *National Statement* (***NS* §2.2.1 - §2.2.3, §2.2.6**). The Office for Research Ethics and Integrity's website has **guidance on composing your plain language statement**, as well as an **example PLS template**. A list of PLS requirements is also provided at the end of this form. ***Ensure that your PLS is written in plain language. Ensure that the information contained in your PLS is consistent with the information in your application.***

Consent Form: Your consent form must satisfy the requirements set out in the *National Statement* (***NS* §2.2**). The Office for Research Ethics and Integrity's website has **guidance on composing your consent form**, as well as an **example consent form**. A list of consent form requirements is also provided at the end of this form. ***Ensure that your consent form is written in plain language. Ensure that the information contained in your consent form is consistent with the information in your application.***

5. Dissemination and Data Management

5.1 Providing Results to Participants	How will the results of the research project be provided to participants in an accessible format? **Refer to *NS* §1.5.**

[Describe how participants will be given access to the results of the research. If you will only be using pre-collected data and/or tissue, state "N/A". If you are seeking a waiver of consent, state "N/A".]

The results of the research will be presented by the researcher at a seminar at the end of the research project at the school during a lunch time session for those wanting to know about the outcomes and findings.

5.2 Reporting Project Outcomes	How will outcomes of the research project be made public? **Refer to *NS* §1.3.**

[Describe the format and means by which you intend to make the project's results public.]

This research project is part of a Master of Education and results will be communicated in the thesis and possibly journal article and conference presentation.

5.3 Data Management	How do you propose to manage the data collected in this research project? Specify what types of data will be collected, how they will be stored and in what format. How will access to the data be controlled and by whom? Discuss retention, security, and data sharing plans. What measures will be taken to protect participants' privacy, and their data? **Refer to *NS* §1.11, the *Australian Code for Responsible Conduct of Research* §2, and the University of Melbourne *Code of Conduct for Research* §2.1.**

A) Privacy and Confidentiality

[What measures will be taken to protect participants' privacy and the confidentiality of participants' data? Describe the format in which the data will be stored (e.g. digital video file, database of survey responses, paper forms.) Describe whether the data will be identifiable. That is, will it be possible for researchers or others to match data to specific participants? If so, how will this be possible? If not, how will such matching be prevented?]

Pseudonyms will be used for identifiers of students or the school in the thesis so they cannot be identified.

B) Security and Storage of Data

[What short-term storage will you use during the data collection phase? Whose responsibility will it be to manage this? What long-term storage will you use after the data collection phase? Whose responsibility will it be to manage this? Who will have access to unprocessed (raw) data? What security measures will be in place to control access to data?
NOTE: If your research will generate digital and non-digital data, separate this section into two parts: "Security and Storage of Non-Digital Data" and "Security and Storage of Digital Data."]

This research will only use digital data which will be securely stored in a password protected device. A copy will be back-up on the student researcher's University of Melbourne Google Drive.

C) Retention

[For how long will you keep the data generated by this research project? How will you ensure that data is retained if/when the researcher(s) leave the University? For data that are not intended to be kept indefinitely, how will you eventually dispose of the data?
*NOTE: the minimum retention period for research data and primary materials is five years after the last publication, or public release, arising from the research (**University Code §2.1**). Longer minimum retention periods apply for certain types of research – refer to the requirements of relevant regulations.]*

The data will be securely stored by the supervisor and destroyed 5 years after the completion of the research project.

6. Other Issues

6.1 Other Ethical Issues	Are there any other issues, not addressed above or in additional modules, which are relevant to the ethical review of your research project? **Refer to the relevant sections of the *National Statement* identified in the Specific Guidelines Checklist, if applicable.**

[Use this space to address any relevant ethical issues that are not addressed elsewhere in this application. If there are no other issues relevant to the ethical review of your research project, state "N/A."]

N/A

Attachments Checklist	
Review your answers above to determine which attachments (if any) are required for your application. **Type an "X" in the left-hand column beside all items that apply to your research project.** Attach a copy of the items you have selected.	
X	**Plain Language Statement (PLS) for Participants**
X	**Consent Form for Participants**
X	**Additional PLS(s)** (e.g. for parents, teachers, schools)
X	**Additional Consent Form(s)** (e.g. for parents, teachers, schools; or assent forms for children)
	Recruitment Materials (e.g. advertisement(s), posters, letter(s) or email(s) of invitation)
	Questionnaire(s) and/or Survey Instrument(s)
	Measure(s) and/or Scale(s)
	List of Interview Questions and/or Themes
	List of Focus Group Questions and/or Themes
	Participant Distress Protocol
	Adverse Event Protocol
	Debriefing Statement
	Approval(s) of research by an HREC external to the University of Melbourne
	Other External Approval(s) (e.g. schools, communities)
	Full Protocol (for Medical Research)
	Translations and/or Back-Translations (where languages other than English used)
	Privacy and Databanks Module
	Body Tissue and Genetic Research Module
	Ionising Radiation Module
	Interventions, Therapies and Trials Module
	Other Documents (e.g. contracts, agreements) – specify which:

Plain Language Statement (PLS) Requirements:

1. Clearly identify the University of Melbourne (i.e. by prominent placement of the University's logo) and the department(s)/ school(s)/faculty(-ies) involved. If printed, the PLS should be on University of Melbourne letterhead.
2. Clearly identify the title of the project, and the name(s) and contact details of the Principal Researcher and Other Researchers. For student projects, specify the student's level of study.
3. Clearly explain the purpose of the research project.
4. Clearly explain what participants will be asked to do, and provide an estimated time commitment.
5. If participants will be photographed, audio- or video-recorded, clearly state as much.
6. Clearly explain any risks arising from participation, as well as any procedures or measures in place to minimise such risks.
7. Describe any expected benefits to the wider community. If applicable, also describe any expected benefits to participants.
8. List any payments, incentives or reimbursements to be made to participants.
9. State that involvement in the project is voluntary and that participants are free to withdraw from participation at any time. Explain any implications of withdrawal, including whether it will be possible for participants to withdraw any data already collected from or about them.
10. Describe the likelihood and form of dissemination of the research results, including publication.
11. Describe the arrangements in place to protect the confidentiality of participants' data, and advise participants of any legal limitations to such confidentiality. If the sample size for the project is small, advise participants that this may make them identifiable.
12. The project HREC number (which is the ethics ID number assigned by Themis) and the date and version number of the PLS must appear on the PLS. If the PLS is printed, put this information in the footer.
13. Explain what will happen to participants' data after the research project ends (i.e. how long it will be retained, whether it might be used again for future research and if so who would have access.)
14. Include the following statement: "This research project has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of The University of Melbourne. If you have any concerns or complaints about the conduct of this research project, which you do not wish to discuss with the research team, you should contact the Manager, Human Research Ethics, Office for Research Ethics and Integrity, University of Melbourne, VIC 3010. Tel: +61 3 8344 2073 or Email: humanethics-complaints@unimelb.edu.au All complaints will be treated confidentially. In any correspondence please provide the name of the research team or the name or ethics ID number of the research project."
15. If the research is externally funded, state the amount(s) and source(s) of funding for the research.
16. If there are any potential conflicts of interest for any of the researchers, sponsors (if applicable) or institutions, disclose these potential conflicts of interest.
17. If any participants will be in a dependent relationship with any of the researchers, state that decisions about participation will not affect the dependent relationship. (E.g. students' grades will not be affected if they decline to participate or withdraw from the project at any stage).

Consent Form Requirements:

1. Clearly identify the University of Melbourne (i.e. by prominent placement of the University's logo) and the department(s)/ school(s)/faculty(-ies) involved. If printed, the consent form should be on University of Melbourne letterhead.
2. Clearly identify the title of the project, the name(s) and contact details of the Principal Researcher and Other Researchers. For student projects, specify the student's level of study.
3. If participants will be photographed, audio- or video-recorded, clearly state as much.
4. State that involvement in the project is voluntary and that participants are free to withdraw consent at any time, and to withdraw any unprocessed data previously supplied. Also state that the purpose of the project is research.
5. Describe the arrangements in place to protect the confidentiality of participants' data, and advise participants of any legal limitations to such confidentiality. If the sample size for the project is small, advise participants that this may make them identifiable.

Declaration by the Responsible Researcher

The information contained in this application is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, accurate.

I have read the University's current human ethics guidelines. I accept responsibility for the conduct of the procedures set out in the attached application in accordance with: those guidelines, with the **University's *Code of Conduct for Research***, and with any other condition laid down by the University of Melbourne's Central Human Research Ethics Committee (CHREC), its Human Ethics Sub-Committees (HESCs), or by the Human Ethics Advisory Group (HEAG) which will review this application. I have attempted to identify all risks related to the research that may arise in conducting this research. I acknowledge our obligations as researchers and the rights of the participants stipulated in the ***National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007) - Updated May 2015***. I certify that the research team has the appropriate qualifications, experience and facilities to conduct the research described in the attached application, and to deal with any emergencies and contingencies related to research that may arise throughout the life of the project.

If approval is granted, the project will be undertaken in strict accordance with the approved protocol and relevant laws, regulations and guidelines.

I, the Responsible Researcher, agree to:

- start this research project only after obtaining final approval from the HESC (if this is a standard project), or the HEAG (if this is a minimal risk project);
- carry out this research only where adequate funding is available to enable the research to be carried out according to good research practice and in an ethical manner;
- provide additional information as requested by the CHREC, HESC, or HEAG;
- provide progress reports to the CHREC, HESC, or HEAG as requested, including annual and final reports;
- maintain the confidentiality of all data collected from, or about, research participants and maintain security procedures for the protection of their privacy;
- submit an amendment if any modification to the research design or protocol is proposed (including any change of researchers) and to proceed with the research only after the amendment has been approved by the HESC (if this is a standard project) or by the HEAG (if this is a minimal risk project);
- notify the HESC (if this is a standard project) or the HEAG (if this is a minimal risk project) in writing immediately if any adverse event occurs during the course of the research;
- notify the HESC (if this is a standard project) or the HEAG (if this is a minimal risk project) in writing immediately if any complaints are received about the research;
- comply with an audit of the research undertaken, if requested by the CHREC, HESC, or HEAG;
- use only the data/tissue samples collected for this research, and for which HESC/HEAG approval has been given.

I certify that all members of the research team have read this application and the ***National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007) - Updated May 2015*** and that they have agreed to comply with the provisions of the latter.

Responsible Researcher Name	Signature	Date
Russell Cross		10/03/2017

Declaration by Human Ethics Advisory Group (HEAG)

For HEAG use only. Enter the date the application was received, then type an "X" in the left-hand column beside each item as applicable.		
Date Application Received:		
	Technical review has been completed by the HEAG.	The merit of the proposed research project set out in this application has been reviewed on technical grounds. **Refer to *NS* §1.1.**
	Ethical review has been completed by the HEAG.	The HEAG has reviewed the proposed research project set out in this application for compliance with the principles of Human Research Ethics.
	The **Minimal Risk** review process is appropriate for the proposed research project set out in this application.	**→ Complete Declaration A (below)**
	The **Standard Project** review process is appropriate for the proposed research project set out in this application	**→ Complete Declaration B (below)**

Declaration A (Minimal Risk):	The HEAG has reviewed this project. The HEAG considers the methodological/technical and ethical aspects of the proposal to be appropriate to the tasks proposed. **The HEAG grants approval for this research project to commence.** The HEAG considers that the researcher(s) has/have the necessary qualifications, experience and facilities to conduct the research described in the attached application in a manner that complies with the University's policy on the management of research data and records, and to deal with any emergencies and contingencies that may arise. *[Note: If the HEAG Chair is also a researcher in this project, the declaration should be signed by another authorised member of the HEAG.]*	
Name of HEAG Chair/Authorised Member	**Signature**	**Date**

Declaration B (Standard Project):	The HEAG has reviewed this project and considers the methodological/technical and ethical aspects of the proposal to be appropriate to the tasks proposed. **The HEAG regards this project as ready to submit to the HESC.** The HEAG considers that the researcher(s) has/have the necessary qualifications, experience and facilities to conduct the research described in the attached application in a manner that complies with the University's policy on the management of research data and records, and to deal with any emergencies and contingencies that may arise. *[Note: If the HEAG Chair is also a researcher in this project, the declaration should be signed by another authorised member of the HEAG.]*	
Name of HEAG Chair/Authorised Member	**Signature**	**Date**

Appendices B and C: Plain Language Statements

Plain Language Statement for Parents

Project: Dialogic imagination in CLIL classrooms: towards a pedagogical tool to promote intercultural understanding

THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

Your child has been invited to participate in a research project conducted by Celine Fompudie and supervised by Associate Professor Russell Cross from the Melbourne Graduate School of Education. The project has been approved by the Victorian Department of Education and the University of Melbourne's Human Research Ethics Committee.

This project is about the French Immersion program in which your child is currently enrolled and which is based on a teaching approach called the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). The project will examine the potential of CLIL to develop students' intercultural understanding and skills in order to develop an effective teaching strategy.

What will my child be asked to do?

Celine Fompudie, who taught in the French Immersion program from 2014 to 2016, will teach your child's History class from the … to the … . Your child will be asked to take part in normal learning activities. The lessons will be voice recorded and written work completed by your child will be scanned. Your child will also be asked to keep a learning journal in which he/she will reflect on his/her experience as a learner and participation in the lessons. Finally, your child might be asked to participate in a short 15-20 minute interview during which he/she will be asked to talk about his/her experience as a learner in the immersion program. The interview will be voice recorded.

Does my child have to take part?

Participation in the project is voluntary and will not affect your child's schoolwork in anyway. If you do not wish your child being voice recorded during lesson, the researcher will stop the recorder or erase the data. If you do not wish your child's written work to be scanned, the researcher will not do so. If you do not wish the information in your child's journal to be used for the study, the researcher will not scan it. If your child participates in the interview, he/she can stop the interview at any time and any information he/she has given the researchers will not be used in the study.

Will I hear about the results of this project?

When the project is completed, Celine Fompudie will come back to your child's class to discuss the results with the students.

What will happen to information about your child?

Celine Fompudie will write a thesis with the data collected during this project but your child will not be named in the report. All information will be stored on password-protected computers for five years after any publications that come from the study, and it will then be securely destroyed.

How do allow my child to participate?

If you would like your child to participate, please indicate that you have read and understood this information by signing the attached consent form and returning it to your child's teacher in the envelope provided.

Who can I contact for more information or if I have concerns this project?

For more information please contact Celine Fompudie fompudie.celine.e@edumail.vic.gov.au.

Celine Fompudie

Melbourne Graduate School of Education
The University of Melbourne Victoria 3010 Australia
T: +61 3 8344 8285 **F:** +61 3 8344 8529 **W:** www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au

Plain Language Statement for Students

Project: Dialogic imagination in CLIL classrooms: towards a pedagogical tool to promote intercultural understanding

You are invited to participate in a research project conducted by Celine Fompudie and supervised by Russell Cross from the University of Melbourne. This project is about the French Immersion program in which you are currently enrolled. My aim is to understand how this program helps you develop intercultural skills in order to identify an effective teaching strategy.

What will I have to do?

I will be teaching your History class from the … to the … . The lessons will be voice recorded. The written work that you will complete during this period will be scanned. You will also be asked to keep a journal which will also be scanned. You might also be asked to participate in a short 15-20 minute interview during which you will be asked to talk about your experience as a learner in the immersion program. The interview will be voice recorded.

Do I have to do this?

No. If you do not wish to be recorded during the lesson, I will stop the recorder or erase the data. If you do not want me to scan your work and/or journal I will not do so. You don't have to participate in the interview if you don't want to. If you choose to participate and change your mind later, I will not use the information you gave me.

Will I hear about the results of this project?

When the project is completed I will come back to your class to discuss the results with you.

What will happen to information about me?

I will not use your real name in the report so that people won't be able to identify you. All information will be stored on password-protected computers for five years after any publications that come from the study, and it will then be securely destroyed.

How can I participate?

If you would like to participate, please tell your parents or guardians and give them the attached letter and form. If they also agree, please sign the form together and return to your teacher in the envelope provided.

Who can I contact for more information or if I have concerns about this project?

For more information please contact Celine Fompudie fompudie.celine.e@edumail.vic.gov.au.

Celine Fompudie

Melbourne Graduate School of Education
The University of Melbourne Victoria 3010 Australia
T: +61 3 8344 8285 **F:** +61 3 8344 8529 **W:** www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au

Appendix D: Consent Form

Consent Form for Students and their Parent/Guardian

Project: Dialogic imagination in CLIL classrooms: towards a pedagogical tool to promote intercultural understanding

.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

Parent/Guardian name (please print):

Child's name (please print):

1. I consent to being part of the project named above, as explained in the information letter attached about the project. A written copy of that letter has been given to me to keep.

2. I understand that participation involves the lessons being voice recorded, my work and a journal being scanned and a short interview which will also be voice recorded.

3. I acknowledge that:

   • Participants can withdraw from the project at any time without giving an explanation, or withdraw any unprocessed data they have provided, and that this decision will have no negative impact on their work at school.

   • The project is for the purpose of research.

   • The confidentiality of the information provided will be safeguarded the best that it can within the limits of the law.

   • No real names of people or schools involved in the project will be used in any information arising from the study.

   • Information provided by participants will be stored securely by the University of Melbourne for five years after any information from the project is published.

I consent to the lesson being sound recorded	Yes / No (please circle)
I consent to my written work being scanned	Yes / No (please circle)
I consent to my journal being scanned	Yes / No (please circle)

Parent/Guardian signature: **Date:**

Child's signature: **Date:**

HREC: XXXXXXX; **Date:** 7/02/23; **Version:** X.X

Melbourne Graduate School of Education
The University of Melbourne Victoria 3010 Australia
T: +61 3 8344 8285 **F:** +61 3 8344 8529 **W:** www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au