# 1. Introducing Global CLIL: Critical, ethnographic and language policy perspectives

Eva Codó
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0884-6807

## Abstract

This introduction conceptualises CLIL as the European practical and ideological apparatus for standardising elite multilingualism. The chapter begins with a brief historicisation of the appearance of CLIL, and discusses the ways in which CLIL has been legitimised and cemented discursively. It then moves on to reviewing existing criticality in CLIL research and identifies the research gaps the volume intends to fill. The remaining of the chapter is devoted to delineating the contours of a new research agenda for the field, an agenda that is critical, interpretive, socially-anchored and socially-concerned. One key focus is the global uptake of CLIL. This chapter argues for the need to comprehend the life of CLIL outside Europe, and the practices and forces of CLIL exportation and localisation.

## Multilingualism, linguistic standardisation and CLIL

Multilingualism is the new language standard (Gal 2012; Moore 2015). As in the modern ideological distinction between standard and dialect, multilingualism –the contemporary standard– is an iconic sign (Gal 2012, p. 34). Multilingualism indexes contemporaneity, cosmopolitanism, openness, flexibility and self-responsibility. It is a *sine qua non* of geographical and social mobility, as well as of individual and collective material prosperity. But, we may ask, what are the contours of this new standard? If we take a basic, technical perspective, multilingualism refers to a "multiplicity of languages and their coexistence" (Coulmas 2018, p. 25). However, as Coulmas himself shows, capturing the multiple and intersecting meanings of multilingualism is far from being unproblematic. This is because multilingualism is a *keyword* in William's sense (1976), because it encapsulates the tensions and contradictions of our current world. Indeed, multilingualism is at the same time democratising and hierarchising; evident and problematic; embraced and contested.

The standardisation of multilingualism has a clear geographical referent: Europe. This is not because Europe is particularly diverse or because European states have historically been great defenders of multilingualism; quite the opposite (see Bauman and Briggs 2003). However, since World War II, Europe has been invested in the ideological defence of multilingualism (Eurydice 2006)[1] or linguistic diversity as it is often officially labelled. But are these two terms paramount? No, they are not, for outside scholarly circles, linguistic diversity stands for the *wrong* kind of multilingualism. That is the kind of multilingualism in regional, minority or migrant languages or language varieties that is appreciated discursively –as a source of richness that must be preserved– but questioned ideologically and demised practically as an obstacle to the modernity and progress conferred by the *right* type of multilingualism. But

how is that aspirational type of multilingualism acquired, and what is entangled with its acquisition? This is what this volume aims to discuss.

This book[2] is devoted to the critical examination of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), which is conceptualised here as *the* European ideological and practical apparatus for standardising the desirable kind of multilingualism. This is the type that includes competence in several European state languages –the famous 1+2 policy (European Commission 1995)– and that works to benefit the political and economic project of the European Union (EU). As Bourdieu (1991) showed a long time ago, the inculcation of the standard is a long process of ideological and symbolic domination which takes place through the actions and selections of key state institutions, most notably the education system. This book argues that in introducing foreign languages (FL) as languages of instruction in schools, CLIL has done more than simply advance FL development: it has naturalised FL-mediated student selection and hierarchisation (see e.g. Fernández-Agüero and Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020); it has (de)legitimised and (de)authorised certain voices/speakers (Heller and Martin-Jones 2001); and it has disciplined actors to serve the neoliberal order. The collective enterprise of this volume is to bring to light and examine all these processes. In so doing, this book problematises the focus of most CLIL research either on language outcomes and achievement, or on stakeholders' perspectives, where these are most often understood as separable from actors' positions and material realities. So, this book argues for the significance of socially-anchored research epistemologies to comprehend the impact of CLIL in its full complexity. The second major gap this volume attemps to fill is the relative paucity of research on CLIL's global dimension, that is, the life of CLIL outside Europe. It seeks to understand not only the meanings of CLIL in dissimilar ecologies of education, language and culture, but also the practices and forces of CLIL exportation and localisation, and the tensions it encounters (see Relaño-Pastor and McDaid, this volume). Having outlined the rationale and motivation for this book, it is now time to situate CLIL historically, politically, ideologically and scientifically.

**Historicising CLIL: A selective account**
We can say that CLIL has been the most popular language education initiative of the last three decades in Europe, despite substantial differences in penetration and appeal among countries (see Eurydice 2017). It is usually defined as "a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content *and* language" (Coyle, Hood, and Marsh 2010, 1, italics in the original). Two clarifications are in point. Firstly, the additional language used as medium of instruction is usually not a language widely spoken in the local context. Secondly, the educational goal is the advancement of both language and content without neither being harmed in the process (e.g. Coyle 2002, p. 27, speaks of "safeguarding" content). It must be noted here that although this is the classic definition of CLIL (Hüttner and Smit in this volume call it "programmatic") –and one that is often quoted– the varied realities of CLIL invalidate some of its central tenets (or rather, the way they have been traditionally understood), in particular the symmetrical and equally explicit dual focus and the central role of the additional language as medium of instruction (for a "realistic" definition of CLIL see Hüttner and Smit, this volume).

Propelled by the 2002 Barcelona European Council's decision to intensify language provision,[3] CLIL was devised (and presented) as the European opportunity to revolutionise the world of foreign language learning, particularly in compulsory education. Although the

label CLIL included forms of multilingual education that were already present in several countries (García 2011), and despite the fact that, in many ways, it was an update and re-articulation of existing pedagogies, like Content-Based Instruction, Canadian immersion, Task-Based Learning and various forms of communicative language teaching, CLIL was presented as distinct and distinctive, and as conducive to a paradigm shift in FL teaching (Pérez Cañado 2018).

During the early years of the 21st century, CLIL spread quickly –although unevenly– around Europe. The CLIL "movement" (as some called it, Ludbrook 2008) was propelled by a huge propaganda machinery. Indeed, the success of CLIL cannot be understood as dissociated from the multiple discursive efforts to sell it. "*A-new-language-pedagogy-for-a-new-globalised-world*" was the essence of pioneer CLIL discourses, which were produced and spread both by European Union bodies and by enthusiastic academics. Such was the glorifying rhetoric around CLIL that some authors referred to it as a sort of "cult" movement (Maley 2007).

The story of CLIL is emblematic of late modern language policymaking. It was engineered and promoted by a partnership of supranational agencies (such as the European Commission or the Council of Europe) and academics, many of whom, in particular the early promoters, were consultants for the agencies mentioned (see Staquet 2019). Both groups had interlocking interests in advancing a new form of language education. On the institutional-political front, CLIL was viewed as a key tool for buttressing Europe's economic standing in a globalised and tertiarised economy, where language and communication were taking centre stage (Duchêne and Heller 2012), as well as for strengthening the socio-political cohesion of the EU. In fact, CLIL is but the culmination of the concerted European efforts at creating a new language standard for what was viewed as a new political unit.

In fact, the European language standardisation agenda goes back a few decades. The creation of the Council of Europe (CoE) was pivotal in that respect. Sokolovska (2016, 2107) traces the role of this supranational institution in advancing and consolidating a distinctive language policy for Europe. Upon its creation, the CoE had, as one of its central missions, to disseminate the idea that language learning was essential to European post-war reconciliation. Languages were conceptualised as political tools that would unite and equalise the people(s) of Europe rather than hierarchise, divide and confront them. Linguistic diversity was construed not only as the reality of Europe, but as a core value that was to be nurtured and celebrated. While initial attempts were made at establishing English and French as the additional languages of Europe to ensure mutual understanding and enhance proximity and unity, these attempts failed (Sokolovska 2016). The auxiliary language of Europe was to be *plurilingualism* (Sokolovska 2017). Readers will have noticed the irruption of the prefix *pluri* here. This is not accidental. As of the 1960s, the European diversity agenda began to take the shape it has today, that is, it became pluralised (not focused on the promotion of one or two languages only), and most importantly, it became individualised. In other words, it was the citizens of Europe –not its states– that were to become multilingual, or rather *pluri*lingual (this *multi/pluri* contrast is key and builds on the French distinction between societal or institutional *multilinguisme* and individual *plurilinguisme*). Sokolovska (2017) describes this as a win-win situation.

> In the light of past logics, today's concept of plurilingualism, defined as a degree of communicative ability developed in a number of languages over the lifetime and according to one's needs, could be nuanced and be interpreted as a win–win linguistic solution, allowing nation-states to keep their prerogatives by encouraging the study of their official languages and allowing individuals to have, theoretically, unlimited freedom in choosing other languages to learn. (p. 479)

The European project of plurilingualising citizens required intense investment in FL teaching and learning. It must be mentioned here that the conceptualisation of multilingualism of European international agencies like the CoE has always worked to defend nation-state interests. The CoE's concern with a pluralised view of diversity was linked to an egalitarian and non-conflictual approach to inter-state relations. In the 1950s, there was already worry about the ascent of English as a lingua franca and about its geopolitical implications on both a continental and a global scale. This is where the pluralisation agenda of the CoE fitted in. However, the languages that were to be promoted as FLs were the languages of European nation-states, and not other languages that could potentially challenge state nationalist agendas (see Sokolovska 2016 for a discussion of the instrumentalisation of regional minority languages in the language disputes within the CoE). Education was viewed as a key instrument for sustaining and promoting European (state) linguistic diversity. In Sokolovska's analyses, we can observe how efficiency in FL learning was a source of concern already in the late 1970s and early 1980s. This led to intense work on the part of the CoE to build and consolidate its expertise in matters to do with language teaching and learning. All this work crystallised in a number of language education initiatives of which CLIL has been, by far, the most popular.

Scientifically, CLIL emerged as a timely response to a perceived stagnation in the field of foreign language teaching, especially, in relation to student achievement in mainstream education. Communicative Language Teaching was never systematically implemented in the regular school EFL classes, often overpopulated and shaped by a rigid, grammar-based curricula. To this was added the post-modern demise of one-size-fits-all FL methodologies (Kumaravadivelu 1994). Practitioners were encouraged to devise their own FL pedagogies rather than follow a set of prescriptive and decontextualised teaching rules; it was claimed that we had entered the post-method era. In addition, the consolidation of the knowledge- and information-based economy also brought with it the realization that mastery of academic registers and genres would be essential for a plurilingual European-citizenry-in-the-making to be competitive globally. Here, proponents of CLIL were inspired by Cummins' (1980) distinction between BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills) and CALP (Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency). CLIL aimed to remedy the deficiencies in CALP of traditional EFL classes, mostly oriented to developing general language proficiency.

We can claim that the political and scientific agendas of CLIL fed each other. While European agencies funded projects generously to prove the benefits of CLIL, for many a scholar, CLIL constituted a new research niche on which to build a career. Often, these researchers acted as pioneers in the promotion of CLIL at local, regional or national levels. They were no doubt guided by their belief in the advantages of CLIL, but it is undeniable that, by disseminating CLIL and encouraging their implementation, they simultaneously reinforced their own expert positions and facilitated research contexts for themselves and their associates.

**The CLIL rhetoric**
As was mentioned, the CLIL discursive apparatus has cemented the approach solidly. It is interesting to analyse how this is done, and what ideologies, concepts and arguments the CLIL rhetoric has drawn upon. Unfortunately, there is little research in this area. One exception is Staquet (2019), where a key scientific text from the early days of CLIL, i.e., Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010), is analysed from the perspective of ideologies of language and the discursive genres employed. After a meticulous analysis, the author describes the text as hybrid, because it deploys a skilful mixture of technocratic genre-type features (combining reporting and prescription based on expert advice) with characteristics typical of promotional genres, such as product differentiation through positive evaluation and a promissory rhetoric.

One of the key selling points of CLIL has been its adaptability. Indeed, promoters have shied away from establishing boundaries or prescribing what should constitute correct CLIL ("there is neither one CLIL approach nor one theory of CLIL," Coyle 2008, p. 101). In fact, CLIL is often described as an elusive phenomenon (see Hüttner and Smit, this volume), a chameleon (Arnold 2010) or an umbrella construct (Cenoz, Genessee and Gorter, 2013) that can denote a range of non-traditional, non-instruction-focused language learning practices in distinct contexts: from extra-curricular activities −such as sports or cooking conducted in a FL (usually English)− to immersion-type school programmes with a large part of the curriculum being taught in a FL. The malleability and adaptability of CLIL −which has unquestionably aided its rapid extension− aligns it theoretically with the precepts of the post-method pedagogies mentioned earlier, which, according to Brown (2002), should be guided by the principles of particularity (adequacy to context), practicality and possibility (feasibility).

CLIL can in fact be considered a sort of discourse predator in the sense that it has appropriated for itself a large number of the key concepts of contemporary education.[4] One such case is inclusiveness and social justice. The CLIL discourse has emphasised its liberationist agenda over and again, building on the idea that CLIL aims to democratise FLs −considered to be elite capitals− by facilitating access to them through public schooling (Escobar and Evniskaya 2013). This social equity argument is grounded on the ideology of linguistic instrumentalism (Wee 2003), which claims that access to English will by itself guarantee upward socioeconomic advancement for individuals and societies (for a critique, see Piller 2016, among a long list). The access-to-English-for-all argument obviates not only the fact that social class mediates opportunities for language learning outside school, i.e. in extracurricular, leisure time and vacation activities (McDaid 2020), but also that teacher types, hours of exposure and forms of language education may vary greatly across and even within schools (Alonso-Belmonte and Fernández-Agüero 2021).

Yet, instrumentalist ideas do not sustain CLIL only indirectly. Language-as-human-capital theories have repeatedly been drawn upon to justify CLIL (and the European strategy for plurilingualism more generally). In some areas, for example, in central Spain, human capital and language commodification theories unmistakably undergird CLIL (or "bilingual programmes", as they are locally called). These programmes are viewed as essential for the building of a competitive workforce to the extent that they aspire to become a sort of infrastructure to bilingualise the whole region ("Madrid, a bilingual community" reads the slogan of such bilingual programmes in the Madrid area, cited in Hidalgo McCabe and Fernández-González, 2019, p. 74). Employability, access to first-rate tertiary education and

global career prospects are all said to be dependent on the plurilingual communication skills developed by CLIL. Thus, CLIL programmes sell English as one more curricular commodity to be purchased to guarantee one's future (Relaño-Pastor 2018). Interestingly, as Hidalgo McCabe and Fernández-González (2019) show, the emphasis on employability and self-capitalisation has been an evolution of CLIL discourse in the Madrid region, which initially underscored the development of a sense of European belonging as main aim. This is not accidental. Holborrow (2018) makes a similar claim in relation to Europe. Following Zappettini (2014, cited in Holborrow, p. 522), she claims that in the post-Euro-crisis scenario, social Europe has given way to "enterprise Europe", which manifests itself daily on countless fronts.[5] It is not surprising, then, to see this evolution also materialising in the discourses of and around CLIL.

Beyond the intensification of English acquisition, the CLIL experience is also claimed to develop the abilities and character dispositions that corporations purchase in their employees as bundles of soft skills (Urciuoli 2008): creativity, peer collaboration, coping-with-indeterminacy strategies, problem-solving, etc. Although some scholars, such as Dalton-Puffer (2008), cautiously limit the benefits of CLIL to language development, others see CLIL as transforming students' (and teachers') subjectivities, as we shall discuss later. However, what is most interesting about CLIL is the concerted effort by academics and policymakers to clad it in a social equity rhetoric that actually (and perhaps unnoticeably so) works to background the strong neoliberal underpinnings of the policy.

The egalitarian ethos of CLIL (Marsh 2002) is postulated not only as a socio-political goal; it is presented as being built-in, somehow wired to its essence and workings (Van de Craen and Surmont 2017). In this vein, CLIL is said to be effective in all contexts and with all learners – provided recommendations on proper implementation are followed. Claims such as these have effectively erased social class from the field. This is not strange, given that this research space has been dominated by language acquisition/learning scholars, who have traditionally paid little attention to social class (Block 2014). This equalising rhetoric is often sustained by cognitive arguments tied to the increasing influence of neuroscience on education. Doing CLIL is claimed to bring cognitive advantage for children (Van de Craen and Surmont 2017) because learning through a FL is said to be cognitively more demanding than learning through one's L1. But as we have said, one of the key effects of this cognitive focus has been the individualisation, and therefore, de-socialisation of CLIL research. As we can see, there are multiple "benefits" discursively associated with CLIL –apart from language learning outcomes. These benefits are often referred to as the "added value" of CLIL (Marsh 2012).

A further idea that the CLIL rhetoric has spread (especially in the early years) is the voluntary, grassroots and bottom-up nature of CLIL initiatives (see Llinares, Morton and Whittaker 2012). This bottom-up framing –apart from being inaccurate in many cases and not major trend in some countries (see Alonso-Belmonte and Fernández-Agüero 2021)– has contributed to the romanticisation of CLIL (Paran 2013 argues that CLIL has been construed as a "near-panacea"), presenting it as a policy for the people demanded by the people. What is more, it has served to obscure the school marketisation policies that have favoured its extension (Hidalgo McCabe and Fernández-González 2019). A telling example of the romanticisation is found in Pérez-Vidal (2013). The author presents it as a cure-all for long-standing socio-educational ills in Spain, as well as and an indispensable tool for global connectivity and socio-professional success. Her depiction of students', teachers' and

families' enthusiasm for CLIL is mesmerising. She even goes as far as to depict CLIL as the materialisation of some sort of contemporary mindset.

> CLIL is a motivating force for the stakeholders mentioned, but also and most importantly, for the learners themselves who probably see that CLIL fulfils some of the demands of their mindsets, such as new technologies, access to mobility and global communication (p. 76)

A further line of CLIL marketing has consisted in presenting it as the vanguard of modernity in education (Coyle 2010). Concepts like "innovation, "quality teaching" and "academic excellence" have become indissociable from it (see e.g. Van de Craen and Surmont 2017). CLIL has been said to revolutionise schools, to have the capacity to "transform" (Pérez Cañado 2018, p. 370) everything it touches, so not just schools, also teachers and students, and in fact, whole educational systems by virtue of aligning them once and for all with European standards. This narrative has been particularly successful in countries such as Spain where the education system has severe reputational issues (Sunyol 2019).

From the beginning, CLIL has discursively embraced the flag of plurilingualism –in line with the diversified language policy of European bodies. This was also a strategic move to symbolically distinguish CLIL from English-Medium Instruction (EMI), severely attacked for its overt (neo)colonial agenda (see Piller 2016), and to reinforce CLIL's versatile character. The initial plurilingual message was that CLIL might be implemented to foster additional languages of various standings, i.e. not only an array of foreign languages, but also second, heritage or minority languages, as well as socially-dominant languages that might have been minoritised as languages of instruction (see Relaño-Pastor and McDaid, this volume). Despite the rhetoric, the truth is that, in most contexts, CLIL has become resignified as English-medium teaching (95% of CLIL teaching is done in English according to data in Nikula, Dalton-Puffer and Llinares 2013). Hüttner and Smit (this volume) refer to CLIL programmes as "locally diverse responses to the global status of English".

Be it as it may, the –at least on the surface– plurilingual ethos of CLIL extends beyond the choice of language of instruction. It also refers to the status and role of other languages (in particular students' L1s) in the classroom. CLIL scholarship takes a laid-back stance in relation to L1 use. L1s are not banned from CLIL classes, but are understood as positive learning tools, as scaffolding resources to help students construct knowledge. Recently, scholars of CLIL have embraced translanguaging as teaching pedagogy (Nikula and Moore 2019) aligning CLIL with more sociolinguistically-oriented approaches to multilingual education. Finally, CLIL has even been tied to discourses of sustainability. In Genesee and Hamayan (2016), the context-adaptable nature of CLIL programmes are said to make them more sustainable than other initiatives.[6]

For a long time, the CLIL discursive machinery successfully deactivated criticism. Though the claims about the benefits of CLIL were often commonsensical assumptions rather than empirically demonstrable arguments (Paran 2013), the established regime of truth propelled researchers to search for ways of improving CLIL design or implementation –but to not to challenge its assumed goodness. Then, in a sort of pendulum effect (Pérez Cañado, 2016), some academics began to cast a more pessimistic (or rather, sceptical) light on CLIL, as we shall see in the next section. Although these contributions were deemed "critical", they did not aim at social critique, that is, at describing and explaining the mechanisms of social

inequality (Heller 2001) and the ways in which CLIL is implicated in creating, sustaining or reinforcing them. This is, broadly speaking, the gap this book intends to fill.

## Criticality in CLIL

Criticality was marginalised in early CLIL research, partly because it was at odds with the political agenda of advancing it, partly because most CLIL research was undertaken within paradigms that did not incorporate a critical gaze and partly because of the social justice flag that CLIL hoisted. In recent years, however, some critical voices have begun to been heard. Echoing concerns about excess of celebration, Cenoz, Genesee and Gorter (2013) demanded more contextual empirical analyses of CLIL that allowed researchers and practitioners to discern what works and what does not, where and why.

> We believe that it is time for CLIL scholars to move from celebration to a critical empirical examination of CLIL in its diverse forms to better identify its strengths and weaknesses in different learning contexts (p. 258).

As we can see from this quote, the hegemonic critical gaze of CLIL scholarship has been concerned with refining research questions and methodologies rather than with investigating social inequality. Still, these early critical studies were important to question the boundless optimism of the early years. This stance was most distinctively embodied by Bruton and his collaborators (García López and Bruton 2013). They exposed the links between the favourable conditions under which CLIL programmes were implemented in some Spanish regions (overt or covert selection of students and teachers; more material resources; lower student-teacher ratios, etc.) and the moderately positive findings obtained. They went on to claim that many of the benefits attributed to CLIL programmes were connected to the methodological innovations put in place (student-centred methodologies; use of authentic materials; peer collaboration; focus on functional language use, etc.) and not to CLIL per se (they refer to the benefits of CLIL as "collateral effects"). They called for a methodological diversification in CLIL research to shed light on "what is really happening in CLIL classes" (p. 267) to better "determine the real advantages of CLIL programmes in comparison with mainstream practice" (p. 268). A further issue with the existing CLIL research that Bruton and associates identified had to do with the focus on "favourable" school contexts, that is, schools with committed staff and motivated students/families. They claimed that this narrow focus had biased perception studies and results, and pleaded for increased attention being paid to "average" schools, that is, moderately or non-enthusiastic contexts of implementation, especially in the public sector. If the inclusive agenda of CLIL was to be fostered, they argued, it was particularly pressing to understand how low- and under-achieving students coped with the demands of CLIL and what teaching methodologies are put into practice to help them succeed. Following this plea, in recent years CLIL researchers have started to pay attention to the handling of diversity in CLIL classrooms (see e.g. Bauer-Marschallinger et al. 2021; Casas Pedrosa and Rascón Moreno 2021).

It is true that some authors working from language acquisition/learning perspectives (e.g. Lasagabaster and Sierra 2010; Llinares et al. 2012) have taken a critical line in relation to the processes of elitisation/segregation that CLIL may produce. They have questioned the existence of student selection, both overt and covert, to access CLIL programmes as well as the criteria employed for such selection. In so doing they have warned about the potential for social inequality inherent in certain forms of CLIL implementation. However, as mentioned earlier, these instances of social critique are limited in scope and value; they aim to refine

practice but are grounded on similar methodologicised views of education. This perspective, which undergirds CLIL as a whole (see Pérez-Milans, this volume), holds that achieving socially equitable results is just a matter of doing CLIL "*the right way*". A recent line of research has tried to throw further light on processes of student stratification driven by CLIL (Fernández-Agüero and Hidalgo-McCabe 2021). Quite originally, this study examines streaming *within* CLIL programmes based on FL performance (in "high exposure" vs "low exposure" strands). Although the authors basically focus on exploring the affective dimension of CLIL streaming processes, they point towards a possible correlation between socioeconomic (dis)advantage and CLIL stream placement, and suggest this thread needs to be properly pulled – as we will also propose later.

We can conclude that the issue of social inequality seems to be the elephant in the room in current CLIL research; although many scholars refer to it and are concerned about it, it has not been openly or systematically analysed. One exception is the study by Hidalgo McCabe and Fernández-González (2019). Taking a political-economy perspective, they dissect the neoliberal rationality that is at the root of the rapid increase in the number of Spanish-English Bilingual Programmes (BPs) in the city of Madrid and its surrounding region. They show how the creation of a single educational district in 2013 was pivotal in that process. Parental choice introduced competitiveness as the logic governing the system. Competition among schools, naturalised as the warrantor of quality performance, got articulated around the offer of BPs. These were framed as not-to-be-missed chances for self-capitalisation, as student passports to brilliant (and cosmopolitan) professional futures. Under the illusion of an open system in which families freely decided, a number of issues were obscured: choice as a form of system governance that is underlain by unequal material conditions; an invisible and relentless process of school segregation hinging on the dual strategic redistribution of symbolic and material resources; the naturalisation of even tighter processes of school tracking, student hierarchisation, and capitalisation/decapitalisation; and finally, the ongoing subjectification of principals as managers, families as clients, and students (and their families) as responsible capital nurturers (Park 2016). Along similar lines, Codó and Patiño-Santos (2018) link the implementation of CLIL to the intensification of market logics in state education in Catalonia. They identify three subject positions among the CLIL teaching body, i.e. the entrepreneurial head, the activised civil servants and the maximally flexible temporary teachers, which unequivocally align them with the contemporary neoliberal work order. They pay particular attention to the structures of power and inequality that CLIL implementation feeds from –in particular in relation to the temporary staff (for the development of this research avenue, see also Codó, this volume). Having laid out the principal lines of existing critical inquiry in CLIL research, we move on to addressing the research programme that this volume puts forth.

**A new research agenda for the field of CLIL**
As we discussed, CLIL is often described as an approach or a method for improved language learning; but this volume shows that it is actually much more than that: it is a policy, a form of practice, an ideology, a brand, a social process, an ethos and a moral order. Therefore, CLIL research requires a lot more than assessment of implementation and results; it requires historicisation and thick description (Geertz 1973); it requires understanding the life of CLIL in its complex significance, the lived experiences of actors and the local rationalities of CLIL (see Smala, this volume): why CLIL is possible or even desirable here and now; what it does for the social actors involved; what indexical meanings are attached to it (see Anderson et al.,

this volume); who is ready to invest and who is not; what tensions/contradictions actors have to navigate and how they manage (see Pérez and Unamuno, and Hüttner and Smit, this volume); in sum, how CLIL alters the social order of schools with what consequences for whom (see Codó, this volume). Answering (some of) these questions is one major contribution of this book.

It should be clear by now that this volume is not yet another collection of CLIL papers but that it aims to delineate the contours of a new research programme. Like CLIL itself, the book has a dual and integrated focus. It has a dual focus in that it seeks to appeal to sociolinguists and socio-cultural researchers of education as well as to "classic" CLIL scholarship. It has an integrated focus because it argues that language education policies do a lot more than simply teach language: they categorise and hierarchise students, and mystify social selection (Heller and Martin-Jones 2001). They do that, increasingly, through moralised meritocratic discourses of self-responsibilisation and self-capitalisation (Sunyol 2019), and through the advancement of the neoliberal subjectivities of the self-reflexive, self-managing and self-pushing individual (Sunyol and Codó 2020).[7] Through her concept of the "self-made speaker", Martín Rojo (2019) has shown how additional language learning, of commodifiable global codes in particular, has become one of the terrains where this neoliberal rationality has thrived most. Applying this perspective to CLIL programmes, Hidalgo McCabe and Fernández-González (2019) have shown how in Madrid schooling, CLIL has become pivotal in drawing the fault line not only between achieving vs non-achieving students, but crucially, between the elite-aspiring, self-responsible and prepared-for-the-future citizens-in-the-making vs those that, of their "own choice", head for the existential precariat. In overlooking the study of all these processes, existing CLIL research has missed a big part of the story. In this publication, we aspire to redress that absence.

*A critical ethnographic perspective to CLIL policymaking*
This volume seeks to complexify the CLIL account. Complexity is defined as a situated account of social actors' processes of sense making, in this specific case, in relation to the language policy they design, encounter, endure or implement -depending on their social position. Actors' sense making is not an end in itself; it is researchers' entry point into lived social reality. It is their way of throwing light into how individual and professional histories intersect with institutional trajectories (Tollefson and Pérez-Milans 2018) and result in situated forms of policymaking. It is also their way of pinning down the ambivalence inherent in all human undertakings and how that ambivalence is apprehended and navigated. This research agenda necessitates epistemological tools that reveal rather than erase complexity. Ethnography, with its multiple entry points into processes of intelligibility, is the only paradigm with the potential for accomplishing the task.

Most of the chapters in this book take an ethnographic perspective; they are the result of authors' sustained engagement with the field, in some cases, for more than a decade. Through ethnography, hidden realities are uncovered, new analytical threads are pursued, erased actors are showcased, and most importantly, empirical dialogue is harnessed to problematise policy celebration. We follow Jaspers (2022) in viewing educational policy as profoundly dilemmatic, and in that sense, potentially reproductive and transformative within the same space. This perspective calls for a close examination of the tensions, ambivalences and deliberations of all policy agents (including those traditionally been considered 'policy

subjects'), but also of the interstices of practice, of those cracks through with policy leakages may be observed.

In this volume, we align ourselves with contemporary approaches to language policy that supersede static, text-based or mechanic views of policy implementation (see Tollefson and Pérez-Milans 2018, for a comprehensive overview of topics and methods in current research on language policy). Rather, we view policy *as a verb* (Street 1993; Codó 2022), that is, as a process that is constantly being (un)done and enacted, as an understanding of aims, means and outcomes that is ordinarily being constructed and negotiated by actors. Policy is practice, but it is also ideology. We argue that all types of policy reveal and construct a historically-situated moral order (Patiño-Santos 2016): what is considered socially beneficial and what is not; which kinds of conduct are considered positive and which are not; who embodies policy ideals and who does not, and a long list of contrasting qualities. This moral order crystallises in specific institutional ethos that act as orders of inclusion and exclusion.  For researchers, then, policymaking, understood as all the above, is a window from which to investigate, simultaneously, constraints and opportunities, subjectivities and institutions, categorisations and self-positionings.

This angle is necessarily interpretive and critical. For this reason, this book is situated in the tradition of critical ethnographies of language policymaking (Martin-Jones and Da Costa Cabral (2018)).  We understand criticality as a situated account of the consequences of certain types of policymaking for specific groups of actors. In short, who the "winners" and who the "losers" might be, how and why that might happen, and in what ways actors might get advantaged or disadvantaged. Our critical gaze entails evaluating policymaking in terms of social structuration, that is of what kinds of inequalities feed into and might be created or reinforced, and what their intersection with specific facets of policy design or implementation might be. We put forth a critical perspective that shies away from "best practice" approaches because they ideologically erase locality. Our idea of criticality, grounded on sustained ethnographic field engagement, by contrast, builds on an emic understanding of actors' situated logics and practices. We view them as the result of the intersection of individual histories with changing cultural, political and economic orders.

Martin-Jones and Da Costa Cabral (2018) underscore the multi-scalar nature of language-in-education policy processes and the need to investigate them in all their indexical complexity. This is precisely one of the objectives of this book. We do this most tellingly in trying to comprehend the metamorphosing of CLIL into a global phenomenon. This can only be done by simultaneously paying attention to the forces operating at various scales of policymaking which materialise into particular local practices and meanings. Having laid the epistemological groundings of this volume, the following section outlines some of the key lines of investigation that we envisage for a critical CLIL scholarship.

***Research avenues for critical CLIL***
It was mentioned that this volume tries to shine a light on CLIL "blind spots". Four of them are presented in what follows. Logically, they cannot possibly cover all terrains of investigation with the potential for unveiling the links between CLIL and inequality, but we believe that these four will be particularly fruitful.

One analytical thread that has to date not been properly pulled is the social class dimension. In the face of the classed structuring of English learning opportunities (Block 2014) and of the suffocating egalitarian CLIL rhetoric, this is imperative (in this line, see Smala, and also Patiño-Santos and Poveda, this volume). The few existing social-class inflected studies of CLIL have focused on exploring the intersection between CLIL, school choice and middle-class parenting. In Smala et al. (2013) CLIL is described not just as a middle-class strategy for student capitalisation but even as a moral obligation for parents; in that sense, choosing the right school is part of being a good (middle-class) parent. And choosing the right school entails spending a great deal of time and effort into evaluating schools and opting for programmes that capitalise students in particular directions, i.e. equipping them for global mobility. CLIL is seen as doing that. In fact, CLIL has been successful because in many countries it has capitalised on the anxieties of the middle-classes and has become a sort of branding strategy for schools and programmes (Dalton-Puffer et al. 2010). However, the question arises, is this always the case? CLIL-as-branding is effective because it interacts with the parental anxieties mentioned, but does it work equally for those above and for those below the middle classes?

In Codó (2021), I discussed in detail the efforts of elite schools to distinguish their "English immersion" programmes from CLIL. In these spaces of distinction, CLIL is stigmatised as developing the wrong type of English (construed as heavily Spanish accented) that is learnt from the wrong kind of teacher (local teachers); CLIL is seen as emplacing the student geographically and in terms of social class. Instead of indexing cosmopolitanism, CLIL indexes locality. Similarly, on the other end of the social spectrum, CLIL is met with scepticism. In Codó (2022), I discussed how working class or low middle-class parents mistrusted CLIL. They feared their children (all high achievers in English) might be disadvantaged by CLIL, especially when the school subject was a challenging one, such as Technology. These parents were not the CLIL enthusiasts that are often depicted in the literature (Pérez-Vidal 2013). In fact, their discourse paralleled the ambivalent stances of the students in the school, both low and high achievers, and is in line with findings by Flors-Mas (2013) among working class adolescents in Catalonia. This leads to a number of questions: what does CLIL do for whom? How do the conditions under which CLIL is done impact what sense actors make of CLIL and what students get out of the programme? What are the connections between those conditions and social class? We contend that there are many insights to be gained from a social class-attentive approach to CLIL not only in relation to processes of student selection or achievement results, but also as refers to the *structures of feeling* (Williams 1977) that may reveal in CLIL implementation through, for example, teachers' and students' symbolic (dis)engagement with CLIL.

Connected to the above is a second line that we contend critical CLIL research needs to engage more deeply with: the study of processes of subjectification within neoliberal governmentality regimes (Martín Rojo and Del Percio 2019). Flores (2013) describes the European plurilingual project –of which CLIL is a key component as we said earlier– as a "tool of neoliberal governance that reinforces rather than challenges current relations of power" (p. 509). Europe's plurilingualisation strategy constitutes a way of reinforcing Europe's world expertise in matters to do with languages and language learning, as two of the chapters in this volume show. As we saw, this is not new but part of a much longer strategy that began after WWII. Flores understands this as yet another imperialistic move (we shall come back to this idea below).

> To position European society as the originator of these ideologies erases the history of European marginalization of the language practices of much of the world's population. This historical erasure, in turn, risks positioning plurilingualism as a tool for the justification of a new form of linguistic imperialism -one that seeks to impose a European conceptualization of linguistic fluidity over the rest of the world. (p. 513)

The previous quote takes us to discuss the kind of plurilingual subjectivity advanced by the European agenda. The ideal plurilingual subject is one who feels at ease drawing unproblematically on their different languages. This is precisely the type of imagined citizen that CLIL aspires to produce, as we observe in the CLIL literature: "flexible and adaptable professionals who can adapt to the varied, unforeseeable and complex situations they will encounter" (Pérez Cañado 2018, p. 370). These risk-cheering subjectivities are essential to become "successful citizens with a substantial contribution to make to society" (Pérez Cañado 2018, p. 370). For Flores, equally problematic is the agenda of normativisation and universalisation running through EU texts. He argues for a "resistant" plurilingualism that "engages with subaltern perspectives' to "resist neoliberalism's corporatist agenda" (p. 517). As we mentioned, the subjectification processes driven by CLIL implementation have begun to be explored in the CLIL literature (Codó and Patiño-Santos 2018; Hidalgo McCabe and Fernández González 2019; for the case of educators. In this publication, we aim to continue this line of investigation (see Patiño-Santos and Poveda, Codó, and Giampapa and Fernández Barrera, this volume) by providing answers to the following questions: How is CLIL shaping CLIL and non-CLIL teachers' identities and subjectivities? What are these new teacher subjectivities? What disciplinary regimes are put in place? How are they connected to processes of marketisation and neoliberalisation of education? How is CLIL changing the social order of schools? Similar questions, we believe, should be asked in relation to other stakeholders, such as families and school management.

A third line is linked to the political project underlying CLIL. We argued that any process of language standardisation is a disciplinary regime (Foucault 1995/1977) intent on creating a new type of citizen. Earlier, we claimed that CLIL promises to generate in students the dispositions valued by global corporatised capitalism. In that sense, the good CLIL student will be aligned with the "good worker" as defined by contemporary capitalism (Harvey 2005). To the extent that "good workers" will generate income for themselves and their countries, they can also be considered "good citizens". But, we would like to argue, there is a wider citizenry agenda undergirding CLIL that is being exported alongside CLIL-as-pedagogy, and that is being constructed as Europe's contribution to the world. In many a study (e.g. Marsh 2012), the notion of CLIL is equated with democracy, social cohesion, and tolerance and respect for cultural and linguistic diversity, which is presented as the generator matrix for all forms of diversity. Out of a "shared culture of languages" (Beacco 2007, cited in Flores 2013, p. 512), it is argued, new forms of solidarity will develop that will transcend localist nation-state identifications. The objective seems to be the creation of a new ideal of society (a single unified-in-its-diversity European citizenry (Dearden 2014)). In exporting CLIL, therefore, Europe seems to be doing a lot more than simply exporting a language teaching methodology; it is selling an ideal of citizenship for the world, grounded on the peaceful and interactive coexistence of heterogeneous identities, allegiances and practices. CLIL can be seen as one of Europe's current soft power instruments. This volume urges for close attention to be paid to the processes whereby CLIL is being exported outside of Europe, and what is travelling with it (see Relaño-Pastor and McDaid on CLIL in India, this volume, and Anderson et al. on CLIL in Colombia). While this publication aims to "decentre" Europe

as *the* CLIL terrain by analysing CLIL as an emerging reality in distant parts of the world, it cannot but "centre" Europe and the European-based transnationally-operating forces propelling CLIL exportation (EU development funding, publishing houses, accreditation bodies, academics, consultants, national institutes of culture, etc.). This process re-inscribes old-standing hierarchies of knowledge and expertise between Europe and the Global South that are grounded on and re-activate the colonial imaginary (see Relaño-Pastor and McDaid, this volume). In that sense, any critical approaches to CLIL as a global enterprise must unavoidably try to unpack the entanglement of CLIL with ongoing colonialism and coloniality (Quijano 2017).

This takes us to a fourth dimension of CLIL that, we claim, deserves due attention, i.e. the state dimension. We argue that comprehending the politics of CLIL requires a dual focus on the macro forces of penetration as well as on the ways in which CLIL connects to the politics of language and their histories in each state context (see Smala, this volume). For this reason, rather than provide a survey of CLIL education in selected countries, this volume aims to focus on comprehending the logics, value and significance of CLIL in each of the contexts explored. This will explain the fervour in the reception of CLIL and its socio-political imbrication.

In countries with faltering economies, CLIL −resignified as English− has come to represent the key to employability and social mobility. In those spaces, CLIL programmes have become new marketing instruments, either to benefit (further) the private educational sector (see Anderson et al., this volume) or as political instruments in the name of social equity. This discourse has been hard to challenge and has turned CLIL policy into a vote-winner (Dearden 2014), interestingly for both conservative and progressive parties (Jurado 2019). Both have hoisted the flag of CLIL for different reasons, but with surprisingly similar discourses.

Another example of the ways in which CLIL has been politically instrumentalised at the state level is to question language-in-education policies aimed to extend knowledge and use of regionally minoritised languages. In some nation-states, the advent of CLIL has endangered fragile linguistic ecologies in education, and has even sparked social conflict (for a detailed account of the reasons and consequences of such conflicts in the Catalan-speaking territories of Spain see Bros Pérez 2015). Interestingly, although, in practice, experiences of school immersion in regional languages such as Catalan, Galician or Basque in Spain, share many pedagogical practices with CLIL, in the literature, these have generally been discussed as different realities (for notable exceptions see Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe 2010, and Pérez-Vidal 2013).[8] A similar situation happens in policymaking. This contrasts with actors' perceptions of the situation. In fieldwork conducted in Catalonia by the APINGLO-Cat research team (see also Patiño-Santos and Poveda, and Codó, this volume), CLIL teachers working in schools located in dominant Spanish-speaking areas saw themselves as being embarked in a similar project as they did in the 1980s and 1990s to extend the knowledge and use of Catalan through education.[9] We believe it is necessary to explore these ideological associations and dissociations more deeply to understand how they shape local, regional, and state policymaking in particular directions.

**The structure of this book**

To facilitate readers' navigation through its main foci and threads, this book has been organised into two main parts. The first one focuses on the local and localised appropriations of CLIL, and it aims to accomplish one of the key objectives of the book, that is, to bring to analysis four non-European contexts of CLIL policy implementation. Chapter two, by Ana María Relaño-Pastor and Jessica McDaid, explores the narratives constructed by the EU-funded CLIL@India project leaders to make CLIL relevant and meaningful to a group of Indian educators. In such a complex multilingual environment, CLIL promoters find it hard to defend the innovative and agenda-setting character of CLIL, and must skilfully navigate the (neo)colonial tension inevitably linked to CLIL exportation/importation. Chapter three, by Simone Smala, analyses the rationales and consequences of the irruption of CLIL in the educational scene of the Australian state of Queensland. The author historicises bilingual, immersion and CLIL-type education in Australia, and analyses the emerging popularity of these programmes as tied to the contemporary evolution of the socio-educational ecologies of each state, and to the class-based narratives of parenting that have become hegemonic in recent decades. Chapters four and five place the lens on two very different Latin American contexts. In Chapter four, Carl Edlund Anderson, Liliana Cuesta Medina, Rosa Dene David and Jermaine S. McDougald discuss the paths of CLIL penetration in Colombia as, mainly, a banal marketing tool for the private education sector. Departing from a Global South perspective, inflected by profound socioeconomic inequities, the authors consider the missed opportunities of CLIL in Colombia and put them into dialogue with the social justice agenda of the European CLIL pioneers. One original element of this chapter is the focus on the role of European publishers in CLIL dissemination and in its indexical packaging. Chapter five, by Ana Cecilia Pérez and Virginia Unamuno, brings our attention to the Argentinian context. The chapter is focused on deciphering the way in which educators make practical sense of the idea of integration in a public secondary school in the province of Córdoba. The authors adopt a multi-level approach in which local sense-making processes, embodied in situated interactional classroom practice, cannot be disentangled from the institutional and curricular policy decisions that frame CLIL initiatives.

The second part of this book brings the lived experiences of CLIL actors to examination. The first two chapters, i.e. chapters six and seven, attend to students' perspectives and meanings, while chapters eight and nine, centre on educators'. In chapter six, Julia Hüttner and Ute Smit draw on Spolsky's extended language policy triangle to investigate the perspectives of CLIL vocational education students in Austria, and their views on their own agency and educators' role in improving CLIL teaching. In chapter seven, Adriana Patiño-Santos and David Poveda take a social class dimension to understanding CLIL students' identities and attachment to English in two secondary schools in Spain. In chapter eight, Eva Codó examines the ways in which the introduction of CLIL alters the socio-professional order of two schools in Barcelona. Taking a political economy stance, she investigates how CLIL contributes to creating new inequalities among teachers or deepen existing ones, and ties her observations to ongoing transformations of the teaching profession in Spain and globally. Finally, in chapter nine, Frances Giampapa and Alicia Fernández Barrera, continue to sustain the book's engagement with teachers' professional realities, and examine the narratives produced by two senior CLIL educators in the region of La Mancha. Their chapter pays close attention to the ways in which teachers' professional identities have been shaped by CLIL, and to the emotional cost of becoming a CLIL teacher in the social and institutional contexts analysed. The final commentary, by Miguel Pérez-Milans, brings the main argumentative threads of the book together and looks ahead into the future of critical studies in multilingual education.

The editor and contributors of this volume hope that this publication will inspire many a critical scholar of language-in-education to dive into the fascinating world of CLIL, and that it will equally inspire those already in the field to look at CLIL from socially-inflected critical perspectives.

## References

Alonso-Belmonte, I. & Fernández-Agüero, M. (2021). Teachers' narratives of resistance to Madrid's bilingual programme: An exploratory study in secondary education. *Linguistics and Education*, *63*, 1–10.

Arnold, W. (2010). Where is CLIL taking us? *Pulso* 33: 227–233.

Bauer-Marschallinger, S., Dalton-Puffer, C., Heaney, H., Katzinger, L. & Smit, U. (2021). CLIL for all? An exploratory study of reported pedagogical practices in Austrian secondary schools. Advanced online publication. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2021.1996533.

Bauman, R. & Briggs, C. L. (2003). *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Block, D. (2014). *Social Class in Applied Linguistics*. London/New York: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. London: Polity.

Bros Pérez, G. (2015). Content and Language Integrated Learning in the Catalan-speaking territories of Spain. *European Journal of Language Policy* 7(1): 43–62.

Brown, H. D. (2002). English language teaching in the "post-method" era: Toward better diagnosis, treatment and assessment. In J. Richards & W. Rebandya (Eds.) *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice (pp. 9-18). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*

Bruno, I., Clément, P. & Laval, C. (2010). *La grande mutation. Néolibéralisme et éducation en Europe*. Paris: Syllepse.

Casas Pedrosa, A. V. & Rascón Moreno, D. (2021). Attention to diversity in bilingual education: student and teacher perspectives in Spain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Advanced online publication. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2021.1997902.

Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2013). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics* 35(3): 243–262.

Codó, E. (2022). The dilemmas of experimental CLIL in Catalonia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 43(4): 341-357.

Codó, E. (2021). Non-localizable vs localizable English: New linguistic hierarchies in "democratizing" English in Spanish education. In R. Tupas, R. Rubdy, & M. Saraceni (Eds.),

*Bloomsbury World English Volume 2: Ideologies.* (pp. 233–252). London/New York: Bloomsbury.

Codó, E. & Patiño-Santos, A. (2018). CLIL, unequal working conditions and neoliberal subjectivities in a state secondary school. *Language Policy* 17(4): 479-499.

Coulmas, F. (2018). *An Introduction to Multilingualism: Language in a Changing World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coyle, D. (2002) Relevance of CLIL to the European Commission's Language Learning Objectives. In D. Marsh, (Ed.) *CLIL/EMILE The European Dimension: Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential* (pp. 27-28). Jyväskylä: UniCOM.

Coyle D. (2008) CLIL—A Pedagogical Approach from the European Perspective. In N. Hornberger (Eds) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education.* Boston, MA: Springer.

Coyle, D. (2010). Foreword. In D. Lasagabaster & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training* (pp. vii–viii). Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Coyle, D., Hood, P. & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (1980). The entry and exit fallacy in bilingual education. *NABE Journal*, *4*(3), 25-60.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2008). Outcomes and processes in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): Current research from Europe. In W. Delanoy and L. Wolkmann (eds.) Perspectives for English Language Teaching (pp. 139-157). Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T. & Smit, U. (2010). *Language Use and Language Learning in CLIL Classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a Medium of Instruction -A Growing Global Phenomenon*. London: British Council. http:// https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:4f72cdf8-b2eb-4d41-a785-4a283bf6caaa.

Duchêne, A. & Heller, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Language in Late Capitalism: Pride and Profit*. London: Routledge.

Escobar Urmeneta, C. & Evnitskaya, N. (2013). Affording students opportunities for the integrated learning of content and language: A contrastive study on classroom interactional strategies deployed by two CLIL teachers. In J. Arnau (Ed.), *Reviving Catalan at School: Challenges and Institutional Approaches* (pp. 158–182). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

European Commission (1995). *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society.* White Paper on Education and Training. COM (95) 590. Brussels. https://europa.eu/documents/comm/white_papers/pdf/com95_590_en.pdf

European Education and Culture Executive Agency, Eurydice (2006). Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/756ebdaa-f694-44e4-8409-21eef02c9b9b

European Education and Culture Executive Agency, Eurydice (2017). Key Data on Teaching Languages at School in Europe: 2017 Edition. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/73ac5ebd-473e-11e7-aea8-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF

Fernández-Agüero, M. & Hidalgo-McCabe, E. (2020). CLIL students' affectivity in the transition between education levels: The effect of streaming at the beginning of secondary education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*. Avanced online publication. DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2020.1795864

Flors-Mas, A. (2013). "L'idioma que ens connecta a tots". Els discursos sobre l'aprenentatge de l'anglès dels adolescents de Mataró. *Treballs de Sociolingüística Catalana*, *23*, 205–233.

Flores, N. (2013). The unexamined relationship between neoliberalism and plurilingualism: A cautionary tale. *Tesol Quarterly* 47(3): 500–520.

Foucault, M. (1995/1977) *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Gal, S. (2012). Sociolinguistic regimes and the management of "diversity." In A. Duchêne & M. Heller (Eds.), *Language in Late Capitalism: Pride and Profit* (pp. 22–42). London: Routledge.

García, O. (2011). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

García López, M. & Bruton, A. (2013). Potential drawbacks and actual benefits of CLIL initiatives in public secondary schools. In C. Abello-Contesse, P. M. Chandler, M. D. López-Jiménez, & R. Chacón-Beltrán (Eds.), *Bilingual and Multlingual Education in the 21st Century: Building on Experience* (pp. 256–272). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2016). *CLIL in Context: Practical Guidance for Educators*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heller, M. (2001). Critique and sociolinguistic analysis of discourse. *Critique of Anthropology*, *21*(2), 117–141.

Heller, M., & Martin-Jones, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Voices of Authority: Education and Linguistic Difference*. Westport, CT: Abblex.

Hidalgo McCabe, E., & Fernández-González, N. (2019). Framing "choice" in language education: The case of freedom in constructing inequality. In L. Martín Rojo & A. Del Percio (Eds.), *Language and Neoliberal Governmentality* (pp. 69–90). London/New York: Routledge.

Holborrow, M. (2018). Language skills as human capital? Challenging the neoliberal frame. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 18(5): 520–532.

Jaspers, J. (2022) Linguistic dilemmas and chronic ambivalence in the classroom: Introduction. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 43(4): 281-294.

Jurado, G. (2019). *English language assistantship orogrammes as municipal public policy: A case study*. Unpublished BA Dissertation. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Department of English and German.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *Tesol Quarterly* 28(1): 27–48.

Lasagabaster, D. & Ruiz de Yarobe, Y. (2010). *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Camrbridge Scholars.

Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J.M. (2010) Immersion and CLIL in English: more differences than similarities. *ELT Journal* 64(4): 367-375.
Ludbrook, G. (2008). CLIL: The potential of multilingual education. *Dos Algarves: Revista Da Escola Superior de Gestão, Hotelaria e Turismo* 17: 18–27.

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

Maley, A. (2007) *Foreword*. In S. Deller & C. Price (Eds.) *Teaching Other Subjects Through English* (pp. 3-4). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marsh, D. (2002). *CLIL/EMILE The European Dimension: Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential*. Jyväskylä: UniCOM.

Marsh, D. (2012). *Content and Language Integrated Learning. A Development Trajectory.* Córdoba: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Córdoba.

Martin-Jones, M. & Da Costa Cabral, I. (2018). The critical ethnographic turn in research on language policy and planning. In *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning* (pp. 71–92). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martín Rojo, L. (2019). The "self-made speaker": The neoliberal governance of speakers. In L. Martín Rojo & A. Del Percio (Eds.), *Language and Neoliberal Governmentality* (pp. 162–189). London/New York: Routledge.

Martín Rojo, L. & Del Percio, A (2019). *Language and Neoliberal Govennmentality*. London: Routledge.

Moore, R. (2015). From revolutionary monolingualism to reactionary multilingualism: Top-down discourses of linguistic diversity in Europe, 1794-present. *Language & Communication* 44: 19-30.

McDaid, J. (2020) 'Rugby+: An ethnography of an English immersion sports camp in Ireland'. Unpublished MA dissertation. Department of English and German, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

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.
Nikula, T., & Moore, P. (2019). Exploring translanguaging in CLIL. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and BIlingualism* 22(2): 237–249.

Paran, A. (2013). Content and language integrated learning: Panacea or policy borrowing myth?. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *4*(2), 317-342.

Park, J. S.-Y. (2016). Language as pure potential. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 37(5): 453–466.
Patiño-Santos, A. (2016). Trapped in a moral order: Moral identity, positioning and reflexivity in stories of confrontation among Latin American teenage school girls in Madrid. *AILA Review* 29(1): 83-113.

Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2016). From the CLIL craze to the CLIL conundrum: Addressing the current CLIL controversy. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature 9*(1): 9-31.

Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2018). CLIL and pedagogical innovation: Fact or fiction? *Applied Linguistics* 28: 369–390.
Pérez Vidal, C. (2013). Perspectives and lessons from the challenge of CLIL experiences. In *Bilingual and Multlingual Education in the 21st Century: Building on Experience* (pp. 59–82). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Piller, I. (2016). *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice: An Introduction to Applied Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural Studies 21*(2-3): 168-178.

Relaño-Pastor, A. M. (2018). Bilingual education policy and neoliberal content and language integrated practices. In J. W. Tollefson & M. Pérez-Milans (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning* (pp. 505–525). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smala, S., Bergas Paz, J. & Lingard, B. (2013). Languages, cultural capital and school choice: distinction and second-language immersion programmes. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *34*(3), 373–391.

Sokolovska, Z. (2016). Imagining Europe's linguistic diversity in the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly. *Language & Communication* 51: 40–49.

Sokolovska, Z. (2017). Languages in "the United Nations of Europe": Debating a post-war language policy for Europe. *Language Policy* 16(4): 461–480.

Staquet, C. (2019). Les agendas politique et économique dans l'enseignement d'une matière par l'intégration d'une langue étrangère (EMILE). Une analyse interdiscursive de quelques termes non-didactiques entourant le concept. In Gola, S., Pierrard, M., Tops, E. & Van Raemdonck, D. (Eds.), *Enseigner et apprendre les langues au XXIe siècle: Méthodes alternatives et nouveaux dispositifs d'accompagnement*. Brussels: Peter Lang.

Street, B. (1993). Culture is a verb. In D. Graddol, L. Thompson, & M. Byram (Eds.), *Language and Culture* (pp. 23–43). Clevedon: Multlingual Matters.

Sunyol, A. (2019). *Multilingualism, Elitism and Ideologies of Globalism in International Schools in Catalonia: An Ethnographic Study*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Department of English and German.

Sunyol, A. & Codó, E. (2020). Fabricating neoliberal subjects through the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme. In L. Martín Rojo & A. Del Percio (Eds.), *Language and Neoliberal Governmentality* (pp. 135–161). London/New York: Routledge.

Tollefson, J. W. & Pérez-Milans, M. (2018). Research and practice in Language policy and planning. In J. W. Tollefson & M. Pérez-Milans (Eds.), *The Oxford Hanbook of Language Policy and Planning* (pp. 1–32). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Urciuoli, B. (2008). Skills and selves in the new workplace. *American Ethnologist 35*(2), 211–228.

Van de Craen, P. & Surmont, J. (2017). Innovative education and CLIL. *Research Papers in Language Teaching and Learning* 8(1): 22–33.

Wee, L. (2003), 'Linguistic instrumentalism in Singapore', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 24(3): 211–224.

Williams, R. (1976). *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, R. (1977). Structures of feeling. *Marxism and Literature* 1: 128-135.

---

[1] On p. 3 of the 2006 Eurydice report, it is claimed that "multilingualism is at the very heart of European identity".

[2] I would also like to express my gratitude to Adriana Patiño-Santos, Caroline Staquet and two anonymous reviewers for their perceptive feedback on earlier versions of this introduction.

[3] In the European Commission Action Plan 2004-2006 that followed the Barcelona European Council's agreement, CLIL is depicted as "having a major contribution to make to Union's language learning goals" (Eurydice 2006, p. 9).

[4] There are to be many parallelisms in the discursive defense and promotion of CLIL and translanguaging as revolutionary pedagogies with a social justice agenda. I thank Caroline Staquet for poiting this out to me.

[5] Bruno et al. (2010) poignantly point out that the discourse of the social and humanist values of Europe, which was foundational to the EU, as well as the insistence on the EU being a warrantor of continental peace, have been ways of neutralising the many contradictions inherent in the EU project and of masking its fundamentally market-oriented nature.

[6] This discourse is actually traceable back to Coyle (2010).

[7] My understanding of and interest in processes of neoliberal teenage subjectification through practices of English language mobility and learning has deepened thanks to my current engagement with ENIFALPO (English Immersion as Family Language Policy), ref PID2019-106710GB-I00, funded by MCIN (2020-2022) and co-headed by myself and Ana María Relaño-Pastor.

[8] Interestingly, the 2017 Eurydice report considers immersion-type education in regional minority languages a form of CLIL, and counts it as such in evaluating the extension of CLIL across Europe.

[9] "If we managed to succeed with Catalan, we shall also succeed with English," said one of the teachers informally in Santa Creu, a convent school located in the Barcelona metropolitan area (for details about this school see Codó, this volume).