Journal of Academic Writing
Vol. 3 No. 1 Summer 2013, pages ii-xii

Editorial

Student Learning and ICLHE – Frameworks and Contexts

Introduction

This issue of the *Journal of Academic Writing* explores the topic of dynamic content and language integration in higher education, with a special focus on student learning, and reports on a 2012 colloquium on this topic[1] held in Gothenburg, Sweden. This was the second colloquium aimed at sharing and enhancing understandings of ICLHE (Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education) through the exchange of knowledge and experience among lecturers and students involved in integrated forms of teaching and learning. The first colloquium was arranged in Cape Town, South Africa in January 2011, as reported in a special issue of *Across the Disciplines* (Gustafsson 2011), and focused on teacher collaboration. In this issue, and as a reflection of the second colloquium, our aim is to promote papers that emphasise the student learning experience in ICLHE learning environments. It is our hope that these two special issues begin to allow a more nuanced understanding of ICLHE work.

While the seven articles of this issue place student learning at the core of the papers in various ways, five of the seven articles also relate that learning to academic writing. The intersection of content and language in higher education often takes place in the area of academic writing, as it is through academic writing, in one form or another, that most higher education students are assessed. **Bergman *et al.*** exemplify a central concern with the issue of learning and explore what the differences are when a course moves from an English for specific purposes focus to an ICL focus over a period of ten years. Both students' and teachers' perspectives and experiences of this move are provided in their account, which highlights how the change of emphasis in the delivery also allows for greater focus on learning and communication processes rather than merely products. **Smit's** article, and the longitudinal study she has conducted, explores the student perspective on what is essentially an English as medium of instruction (EMI) setting and the corresponding English as a lingua franca (ELF) communication dynamics for students and faculty in a hotel management programme. She finds that the EMI-context always already has ICL-affordances and Smit thus provides a strong argument for turning such EMI-contexts and their inherent integrative

[1]This colloquium, and the previous one held in Cape Town in 2011, were part of a South Africa/Sweden research-collaboration project entitled 'Creating effective partnerships between content and language teachers to enhance higher education learning in multilingual contexts'. The project, funded by the Swedish Research Council and the International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) was intended to support international collaborative research endeavours between the Cape Peninsula University of Technology, South Africa and Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden. All members of the research team—Magnus Gustafsson, Andreas Eriksson, Christine Räisänen, and Ann-Charlotte Stenberg, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden; Cecilia Jacobs, Stellenbosch University, South Africa; and Jenny Wright, Bridget-Wyrley-Birch, and Chris Winberg, Cape Peninsula University of Technology, South Africa—collaborated on the colloquium and acted as reviewers of the articles for this issue.

affordances into deliberate ICLHE contexts. In the third article in the issue, **Leibowitz** studies feedback practices in another EMI-setting for health science education. Leibowitz analyses the student response to an attempt to make feedback processes more deliberate and push them in a direction of English for specific purposes (ESP) and academic writing. She argues that the assessment of this move towards ICL proves demanding and will require multiple cycles, but predictably, the students' comments suggest that in the first cycle of the revision to the feedback practices, the focus is one of language. Leibowitz argues that the integration with 'content' may require exploring further in subsequent cycles. **Thomas'** article is one that describes adding writing or communication interventions with a focus on writing-to-learn in an arts and design programme that has previously only had separate academic writing courses or interventions. The concomitant focus on writing processes for students and the close collaboration with disciplinary faculty is one that appears to generate an ICL learning environment that promotes content learning. In a more explorative study to assess an ICL-programme in mechanical engineering, **Eriksson and Carlsson** find that student and faculty understanding of ICL shows great motivation for the ICL-components but also significant variation from product-orientation to process-orientation with very few articulations of ICL as writing-to-learn. The sixth article, written by **Wolff**, is one that begins to describe the challenges involved for students in a typical interdisciplinary ICL-context in mechatronics. Wolff shows the scope of knowledge structures and disparate discourses that students are expected to negotiate in this type of ICL-setting. Again, once such structures and discourses are highlighted, the students appear to be able to make the connections and make the most of ICL affordances. In the final article in this issue, **Paretti** uses activity theory to explore the difficulty of assessing ICL-programmes. The study looks at two versions of using portfolio assessment and finds that portfolio assessment may well be an effective assessment method but it requires well-designed reflection pieces to support student learning as well as programme development.

In our deliberations for the issue and for the colloquia we have chosen to use the term ICLHE (Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education) rather than CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), as the term CLIL has its origins in research emanating from the schooling context. Our research has shown that there are issues peculiar to higher education, such as disciplinarity, which make this ICL approach distinctly different in the higher education context, hence our preference for the term ICLHE. And, yet – the term remains fraught with tension and ambiguity giving rise to substantial variation in the practice, methodology, and research it potentially covers.

To assist readers, therefore, we will try to map the terrains of ICLHE as it has evolved over the past ten or so years in our reading and educational work and relate the seven articles of the issue to these emerging understandings of ICLHE. The ICLHE terrain has changed much since the late 1990s. Early on, papers and debates appear to have focussed primarily at the level of practice with little attention to the theorising of this practice or addressing meso-levels like curriculum studies and accreditation work. Increasingly, these subsequent levels have been making their way into the ICLHE-literature with the corresponding move from the descriptive practice-orientation early on to a greater emphasis on the curricular and the programmatic levels including assessment and accreditation. Since we, as researchers and practitioners, come, on the one hand, from the southern tip of Africa, and on the other hand, from the northern parts of Europe, our perspective will be one that aims to combine these angles in ICLHE. In offering this tentative map for debate, we do not presume to have any definitive positions. We offer instead some issues to ponder as we advance this work we currently call *Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education* (ICLHE).

What do we understand by ICLHE?

We have already alluded to the tension in the acronym both in the introduction above and in the editorial to the ICLHE special issue of *Across the Disciplines* (Gustafsson *et al*. 2011). Predictably, understanding ICLHE takes on very many dimensions but when we allow ourselves to problematise the 'ICL' part of the acronym for a moment, already a large number of interpretations and approaches present themselves. The notion of ICL implies a false

separation of Content and Language, which most researchers would realise are inextricably bound in practice. However, the practice of language development in Higher Education, particularly *English* development in Higher Education, has been to separate the language from the disciplinary content, hence the need for a focus on the integration of language and content, one might argue. One of the questions we believe scholars need to consider carefully is to what extent this false separation in the *naming* of this field perpetuates separate approaches to the teaching of language and content, and when, in the future development of 'an ICLHE approach', maintaining this distinction in the *naming* does more harm than good.

If we unpick the ICL acronym we have three core constructs: 'Integration', 'Content', and 'Language'. Yet these fundamental concepts underpinning our work are understood in various ways by the people working and researching within this area and thus by the students who encounter ICLHE-informed learning environments. Drawing on our exposure to ICL through the ICLHE conferences in Europe (Wilkinson 2004 and Wilkinson and Zegers 2007, 2008) and South Africa; our ICLHE South Africa/Sweden research co-operation project; as well as our own research, and that of our colleagues in related areas such as WAC (Writing Across the Curriculum) and WID (Writing in the Disciplines), we have encountered a range of interpretations of the three constructs 'language', 'content', and 'integration'. 'Language' has been interpreted in the following ways: *first* language, *second* language or *foreign* language; English; multilingualism, bilingualism, or plurilingualism; academic literacies and academic literacy practices; discourses of the academic disciplines; as well as the generic forms of academic texts. In short, we do not have consensus about what we mean by the 'L' in ICL. This lack of consensus is the case for the second construct as well. 'Content' has been interpreted as: university subjects and modules; disciplines of study; disciplinary content or disciplinary practices; as well as knowledge forms and structures. The third construct, 'Integration', is understood as: dovetailing the structure and sequence of subjects and curricula; joint lessons, team-teaching and shared classroom materials; the design and marking of joint assessment tasks; collaborative partnerships between language and content lecturers; as well as collaboration across disciplines and contexts (such as the academy and the workplace). So, we do not have consensus about what we mean by the 'I' in ICL either. Perhaps a construct like 'integration' simply does not reflect the complexities of our various activities, courses, and interventions. While integration, in its interpretations, is a shared feature of our work, it could be suggested that there is more to ICL than the current interpretations.

This is but a quick look at how differently scholars and practitioners seem to understand the three constructs making up the ICL acronym. Naturally, the lack of consensus and the many varied understandings are perhaps necessary given the many local contexts in which ICLHE practice and research has evolved. Then there are of course the differing interpretations of the whole, the 'ICL'. ICL is generally seen as an approach to teaching in higher education but here the commonality ends. The rationale for this approach and the intended goals differ quite radically across different contexts.

In a presentation at the ICLHE conference in Maastricht in April 2013, Ute Smit and Emma Dafouz presented a conceptual model of ICL such as it has grown out of their discourse analysis in a collaborative project (Smit and Dafouz 2013). The model grows out of their knowledge of Spanish and Austrian higher education pedagogical contexts. While there is no relation between our respective projects, the rationale of their model also emphasises the need for a holistic conceptualisation of ICLHE work, while the scope of their model also indicates that the field might defy holistic articulation. We mention this model both because it is an elegant model of great potential with which we need to familiarise ourselves, and because it might explain the limited consensus in the field of ICLHE work. The model is articulated as an elaborate six-component Venn-diagram for which we ideally need a shared core discourse. The components of the diagram are 'Roles of English'; 'Academic Disciplines'; '(language) Management'; 'Agents'; 'Practices and Processes'; 'Internationalisation and Glocalisation (ROAD MAPPING)'.The model effectively shows how the range of functions for languages in different contexts, the many different disciplines, and the way we manage language at the different levels at work (including language policies for instance) are central components that affect design, delivery and conceptualisation of ICL. As

the model also includes the actors included at any given moment, as well as the many practices involved along a continuum of internationalisation and glocalisation, it holds great potential to address and help negotiate the dynamism inherent to ICLHE. It is not our intention here to discuss the model in detail since it is work in progress and Smit and Dafouz are still building and revising it. However, we believe it serves its purposes well since it helps show the many perspectives, actors, and purposes involved in ICL works. The six overlapping components of 'ROAD MAPPING' might be hard to unite in one discourse but it may still prove possible to design bridging strategies between them. The design of such strategies will require continued discourse analysis of the components and greater understanding of the conceptual frameworks at work in any given ICLHE context.

What frameworks are we drawing on to understand ICLHE?

In trying to understand what frameworks are at work in the ICLHE-related literature, a reader would have to be able to take on a large body of literature from very many different fields. So for instance, the CLIL-literature's importance is unquestioned even if it spans a wider educational area (Smit and Dafouz 2012 and Dalton-Puffer 2011). Similarly, the WAC-literature and literature on interdisciplinarity offer many useful examples (Thaiss *et al.* 2012 and Paretti and McNair 2008). On the more specific ICLHE-scene, Cecilia Jacobs recently reviewed the ICLHE-conference proceedings[2] and noted significant variation also in that body of work. Nevertheless, it seems possible to say that very many frameworks are appropriated to varying degrees in ICLHE-related scholarship.

Two sets of frameworks seem particularly frequent. The first one that many researchers in the emerging field of ICLHE draw on, comes from English or Language Studies. Within language studies and the ICLHE context, increasingly, researchers also work with issues of language policies, bilingualism, and multilingualism. The second framework commonly drawn on is Genre theory, where researchers adopt different orientations, such as *Rhetorical Genre Studies* (RGS), which has its roots in North America; *Systemic Functional Linguistics* (SFL), which has its roots in Australia; and *English or Language for Specific Purposes* (ESP), which seems to enjoy more of an uptake in Europe. *Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) and Writing in the Disciplines (WID)* are also constructs that many researchers in the field favour. As with genre theory, there is a corresponding variation in interpretations or orientations in using the WAC/WID perspectives, which we believe is also reflected in ICLHE versions of WAC/WID.[3]

Looking closer at the first framework, we see first of all that the majority of the specific ICLHE literature draws on **English or Language Studies** in contexts other than first language contexts. However, there is significant variety also within this large body of literature and our research team reported coming across a maze of acronyms, such as:

- ***ESL*** *(English as a Second Language)*
- ***EFL*** *(English as a Foreign Language)*
- ***EAP*** *(English for Academic Purposes)*
- ***ESP*** *(English for Specific Purposes)*
- ***EMI*** *(English as a Medium of Instruction)*
- ***ELF*** *(English as a Lingua Franca)*
- ***SLA*** *(Second Language Acquisition)*

[2]In attempting to map the terrain of ICLHE, Cecilia Jacobs reviewed the conference proceedings of the 2003 ICLHE conference, as well as the two publications arising from the 2006 ICLHE conference, for her keynote for the ICLHE 2013 conference (Jacobs 2013). They signal to her, and the team, a seminal body of work in this emerging field.

[3]See, for example, Thaiss (2001) and Russell (2001) for corresponding accounts of the understandings of the WAC-acronym and the WAC-literature.

- ***CLT** (Communicative Language Teaching)*
- ***CALL** (Computer Aided Language Learning)*

Two observations come to mind when we look at this list. First, we note that the many approaches represent the flexibility of the work that gets done under a term like ICLHE and the many types of students for whom the approach needs to work. Our second observation is that the many acronyms also represent approaches to language and communication that make very different and probably conflictual assumptions about learning. So, while CALL might be combined, as it were, with the other acronyms, it is far more difficult to imagine how a student from an ELF-background and one from an SLA-setting would connect under a term like ICLHE. We also need to be aware that ICLHE work often happens in first language contexts and that English studies does not always provide the optimal language studies perspective for any given intervention.

In many ways the situation is very similar for students who encounter ICLHE under the second framework introduced above—genre-related or WAC/WID-related approaches. It is difficult, from a student-learning perspective under an ICLHE-approach, to think of students integrating language and content in comparable ways if they come to genre from RGS and ESP perspectives, respectively. Yet, our various teaching contexts require precisely this ability to adapt our approaches to the student profiles we encounter. So, the many different pedagogical contexts in which we employ ICLHE-approaches demand of us a conceptual framework flexibility that also, however, introduces the conceptual tensions of which we need to be aware.

A third framework that seems to be emerging as a popular one among researchers in the field of ICLHE, particularly in South Africa, is the New Literacy Studies, where *Discourse theory, academic literacies theory*, and issues of *identity* are drawn on from this body of work.

As we pointed out in our 2011 introduction (Gustafsson *et al*. 2011), this field sees most published articles authored by language specialists with a focus on the 'L*'* in ICLHE, with very few content specialists represented as authors, and very little focus on the 'C*'* in ICLHE. There is also very little focus on the 'I*'* in ICLHE, in published articles in this field, and where they do occur these authors tend to approach ICLHE from the perspective of educational work or learning theory with ethnographic approaches. Researchers also draw on frameworks from Activity Theory and Interdisciplinarity. So far these frameworks are not as widely used, but what is interesting about them and the authors who use them is that they allow for a focus on the 'I' in ICLHE, by exploring issues such as the integration of *professional practice,* the context of *non-academic settings,* and by drawing on areas such as *boundary studies* to theorise the integration of *content subject knowledge, academic disciplines,* and language.

We find it appropriate that the seven articles in this issue of the *Journal of Academic Writing* reflect this scope and amalgamation in the ICLHE literature. The language studies perspectives are present in at least five of the articles. Genre as such is less pronounced as a framework but is, nevertheless, present and influential on intervention design in at least four of the articles. The New literacies approach, similarly, is at work in two or even three of the articles.

Although our drawing on different bodies of knowledge to theorise ICLHE work allows for richness and a variety of interpretations, this reality makes *naming* problematic, which in turn limits articulating this work in powerful ways. The current, and potentially inherent, conceptual and theoretical variation in ICL has also been observed in a recent review of the overlapping CLIL-literature (Smit and Dafouz 2012). Smit and Dafouz suggest that while the variation and openness might require clarification, it also allows for a shared over-arching perspective or a placeholder of sorts. It is true that both ICLHE and CLIL serve as decent umbrella terms for their respective fields of activities but we are, nevertheless, concerned with the loss of clarity and the potential conceptual conflicts in the various frameworks.

Apart from the diversity of the approaches implied in all of these acronyms and the theoretical-methodological difficulties that come with such diversity, a further implication of

this list is that we as ICLHE researchers need to draw on the same disparate literature for an in-depth meta-analysis of the field of ICLHE. Most of us are not in a position to take on this meta-analytical task. Therefore, the onus instead is placed on us as ICLHE-readers to read the texts we come across with an eye to this list and to check for theoretical-methodological validity before we jump to conclusions.

For us, then, this rich and dynamic situation still calls for a need for a common *language of description* through which shared meaning-making can be made. One of the challenges in moving this field forward would be to find commonality across the range of conceptual frameworks and analytical tools that we are using to theorise our work. This will make for more powerful positioning of ICLHE as a body of knowledge and will also start addressing the problem of '*naming'*. However, to reach a common language of description and shared meaning-making we need to interrogate some of the premises underlying our thinking and informing our ICLHE practices.

How do these frameworks inform our understandings of ICLHE?

ICLHE is a fairly new acronym and some might argue that the *field* of ICLHE emerged from English language teaching methodology and earlier work in the area of CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning); a term coined by David Marsh, in workshops, as early as 1994. This work is characterised by an approach where subjects and disciplinary content are taught in a target language (usually not the first language of the students), so it allows students to focus on and learn to use the target language as they learn the subject content, or as Marsh so eloquently puts it:

> the development of an integrated educational approach which actively involves the learner in using and developing the language of learning; the language for learning; and language through learning. (Marsh 2005: 6)

Most literature refers to CLIL as an *approach*, and one might argue that ICLHE too is an approach which draws on other conceptual frameworks to theorise the approach. If one looks at the range of frameworks we have been drawing on, some of them appear to be incommensurable, while others have more synergy. For example, frameworks that view language as sets of generic reading and writing skills which can be unproblematically transferred from one context to another, would be incommensurable with frameworks that view language as social practices embedded in particular contexts. Yet we find ICLHE researchers and practitioners drawing on both these sets of understandings. On the other hand, there are numerous examples where researchers have drawn on different conceptual orientations to theorise different aspects of their ICLHE work, such as *Rhetorical Genre Theory*, *Activity Theory*, and *Situated Learning Theory*, which are often invoked together very successfully. In our own work, we have found it useful to bring together insights from both *Rhetorical Genre Theory* and *New Literacy Studies*.

Some of the frameworks used, such as those we have grouped under the headings *English or Language Studies, Genre theories,* and *New Literacy Studies*, privilege language over content. As mentioned earlier, very few of the frameworks privilege content over language, but there are the frameworks that originate in fields like Maths Education, Medical Education and the like. Other frameworks, such as *Learning Theories*, *Activity Theory,* and *Theories of Interdiscipinarity* offer a more neutral perspective, privileging neither language nor content, but emphasise the integration element.

If ICLHE wants to present itself as a theoretically coherent body of knowledge, then as language and writing scholars working within ICLHE frameworks need to interrogate some of the premises underlying our thinking and informing our ICLHE practices, such as:

- **The extent to which *text* is privileged above *practice* and vice versa.** This has implications for particular pedagogies and research methodologies. For example, if we are working from the premise where *text* is privileged above *practice,* then

the focus of our pedagogy would be on the text itself as a container of meaning, with scant attention to the practices which surround the text. And conversely, if we are working from the premise where *practice* is privileged above *text,* then our research methodologies would be more ethnographic than linguistic.

- **Whether we see student populations as *homogeneous* or *diverse* and how this impacts on teaching.** For example, if we see our student body as diverse and 'difference' is the norm in our classrooms (and this is certainly the case in the South African context), there can be no 'standard' forms but rather hybrid discourses which need to be negotiated among students in the classroom (New London Group 1996).

- **Whether we see disciplines as stable or as contested sites.** Paul Trowler, in his recent work, cautions against the essentialising of disciplines and argues that disciplines are not static or homogeneous (Trowler 2012 and Trowler, Saunders and Bamber 2012). These points have implications for ICLHE, because if we are working from the premise that *disciplines are stable,* then our pedagogy and research will be informed by a position that sees disciplinary forms and practices as generic and static. However, if we are working from the premise that *disciplines are sites of contestation,* then we will see disciplinary forms and practices as dynamic and situationally contingent.

- **The notion of 'transfer' and the assumptions underpinning this premise**. This premise is based on an assumption that discrete sets of language 'skills' can be unproblematically transferred from one context to another, and speaks to 'generic' understandings of literacy and writing development. Alternatively, if one understands language as inextricably bound to context and comprising complex sets of practices, the very notion of transfer is called into question.

- **Whether we see our approaches as *normative* or *transformative.*** Lillis and Scott, researchers working in the UK Academic Literacies tradition, describe the *normative approach* as identifying and inducting students into academic and disciplinary conventions and the *transformative approach* as situating and contesting academic and disciplinary conventions (Lillis and Scott 2007: 13). Our own work has shown that much of ICLHE practice happens in that grey area between the normative and the transformative.

Not surprisingly, these different premises have huge implications for ICLHE, and particularly for academic writing, research and pedagogy. For instance, and with reference briefly to the normative-transformative, our research has shown that the process of shifting towards a more transformative ICLHE agenda involves content and language practitioners collaboratively interrogating their ways of knowing, as well as the modes and tools they draw on to create such ways of knowing. We believe that this collaborative interrogation is explicit in at least three or four of the articles in this issue of the *Journal of Academic Writing* and in many ways implicit in all. Similarly, the understanding of disciplines as stable or contested is also problematised in many of the articles. We also see in these articles the problematic interplay between text and practice and how there might be considerable tension along that dimension for the actors involved in any given intervention (students, 'content' lecturers, and 'language' lecturers).

How do our different contextual agendas drive ICLHE-work?

As researchers in our three-year ICLHE South Africa/Sweden research co-operation project, we have been privileged to be part of its two ICLHE colloquia (South Africa in 2011; Sweden in 2012). At these two colloquia, which drew researchers from as far afield as South Africa, Sweden, Spain, Norway, Austria, the Netherlands, the UK and the US, it became clear to us

that different contextual agendas were driving ICLHE work in different ways, in different places. For example:

- In South Africa this work is driven by an agenda to widen access to Higher Education. This *access* goes beyond formal access to a university education and to particular higher education programmes. It includes 'epistemological access', a phrase coined by a South African researcher, Wally Morrow, which refers to *access to knowledge* and to the *'goods' of the university* (Morrow 2007, 2009). The South African ICLHE agenda is underpinned by issues of social justice and a desire to *contest* the practice of separate, generic language classes for so-called 'deficient students';

- In Europe, ICLHE work appears to be driven by a foreign language learning agenda, which is underpinned by issues of internationalisation and multilingualism. This work also seems to be driven by a policy imperative arising from the Bologna declaration;

- In the US, ICLHE work appears to be driven by a '*writing'* and '*professional communication'* agenda which is underpinned by issues of *first language proficiency* and *becoming expert*.

These contextual nuances are played out in the different institutional spaces where we situate our ICLHE work, and often pull us in very different directions both theoretically and in the practice of ICLHE.

Another issue that was brought into sharp relief at the two colloquia was the need for a *shared ontology* within which to frame ICLHE-work. We were challenged at these colloquia to look more closely at the various '*ways of being'* of ICLHE and to consider what these ontological shifts mean for the practice of ICLHE broadly.

These colloquia also highlighted a number of *enabling and constraining factors* for ICLHE work. Enabling factors seem to include a like-mindedness and a sense of shared purposes among the agents involved. Valuing interdisciplinary work also strikes us as an enabling condition for successful ICLHE work that would allow a profoundly embedded learning environment and a willingness to cross the kinds of boundaries we might be encountering in ICLHE - like contextual, disciplinary, or even geographical to name but a few.

Apart from practical issues like heavy workloads and the scarcity of ICLHE-informed language lecturers, the corresponding constraining factors seem to include, at least for now, the apparent belief that some disciplines as superior to others. Similarly, where disciplines define themselves as bounded rather than permeable and open, ICLHE work becomes more difficult. Linked to disciplinary status and character, we also find the perceived incompatibility on research methods, which appears to be a stumbling block for many ICLHE collaborative ventures. Another constraining factor is the managerial culture of higher education. Such managerialism does not always prioritise the enhanced learning obtained in ICLHE designs since an intervention or a design might at first sight appear more costly than 'business as usual'.

These enabling and constraining factors point to the need to shift the research lens from *micro*- to *macro*-level analyses of ICLHE. Our future challenge, then, is to interrogate ***how*** and ***what*** brings Content and Language together ***(or not)*** in the first place, by piecing together the macro-level picture of higher education, and asking questions like:

- What, at a macro level, *allows* ICLHE work to prevail in some contexts and *not* in others?

- What is it about disciplinary structures and ways of knowledge-making which make some spaces more conducive to ICLHE than others?

A Final Remark

The seven articles published here might not answer all of our questions, and our three-year, two-site collaborative project is similarly insufficient to address them all. Still, we hope that on the one hand the articles help outline the issues and questions and offer some partial answers that have implications for the macro-structural level of (ICL)HE. On the other hand, the articles also exemplify the conceptualisations, the frameworks, and the contextual span of ICLHE and imply ways in which to interrogate ICLHE. Thus, they might generate subsequent ICLHE work by colleagues with an ICLHE bent among readers.

Magnus Gustafsson, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

Cecilia Jacobs, Stellenbosch University, South Africa

References

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011) 'Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principles?' *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31,182-204

Gustafsson, M. (Ed.). (2011) Collaborating for Content and Language Integrated Learning [Special Issue]. *Across the Disciplines* [online] 8 (3). available from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/clil/index.cfm> [5 July 2013]

Gustafsson, M., Eriksson, A., Räisänen, C., Stenberg, A-C., Jacobs, C., Wright, J., Wyrley-Birch ., and Winberg, C. (2011) 'Collaborating for Content and Language Integrated Learning: The Situated Character of Faculty Collaboration and Student Learning'. *Across the Disciplines* [online] 8 (3). available from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/clil/gustafssonetal.cfm> [5 July 2013]

Jacobs. C. (2008) 'In Search of Discursive Spaces in Higher Education'. in *Educational Change in South Africa: Reflections on Local Realities, Practices and Reforms.* ed by Weber, E. Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 247-266

Jacobs. C. (2010) 'Collaboration as Pedagogy: Consequences and Implications for Partnerships between Communication and Disciplinary Specialists'. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 28 (3), 227-237

Jacobs, C. (2013) 'Mapping the Terrains of ICLHE: A View from the South'. [keynote address]. *ICLHE Conference*, 11 April 2013. Maastricht: Maastricht University

Lillis, T. and Scott, M. (2007) 'Defining Academic Literacies Research: Issues of Epistemology, Ideology and Strategy'. *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 4 (1), 5-32

Morrow, W., E. (2007) *Learning to Teach in South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press

Morrow, W., E. (2009) *Bounds of Democracy: Epistemological Access in Higher Education*. Cape Town: HSRC Press

Marsh, D. (2005) Project D3 – CLIL Matrix – Central workshop report 6/2005, Graz, 3-5 November 2005. [online] European Centre for Modern Languages, 6. available from <http://archive.ecml.at/mtp2/CLILmatrix/pdf/wsrepD3E2005_6.pdf > [5 July 2013]

New London Group. (1996) 'A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures'. *Harvard Educational Review* 66 (1), 60-92

Paretti, M., C., and McNair, L., D. (2008) 'Introduction to the Special Issue on Communication in Engineering Curricula: Mapping the Landscape'. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication* 51 (3), 238-241

Russell, D. (2001) 'Where Do the Naturalistic Studies of WAC/WID Point? A Research Review'. in *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing Across the Curriculum Programs*. Ed. by McLeod, S., H., Miraglia, E., Soven, M., and Thaiss, C. (2001) Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. [online] available from <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/millennium/> [5 July 2013]

Smit, U. and Dafouz, E. (2012) 'Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education: An Introduction to English-medium Policies, Conceptual Issues, and Research Practices across Europe'. *AILA Review* 25 (1), 1-12

Smit, U. and Dafouz, E. (2013) 'Towards a Dynamic Conceptual Framework for EMI/ICL' [conference paper]. *ICLHE Conference*, 12 April 2013. Maastricht: Maastricht University

Thaiss, C. (2001) 'Theory in WAC: Where have we been, where are we going?'. in *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing Across the Curriculum Programs*. ed. by McLeod, S., H., Miraglia, E., Soven, M., and Thaiss, C. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. [online] available from <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/millenium/> [5 July 2013]

Thaiss, C., Bräuer, G., Carlino, P., Ganobcsik-Williams, L. and Sinha, A. (eds.). (2012) *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places*. *Perspectives on Writing*. Fort Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press. [online] available from <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/wpww/> [5 July 2013]

Trowler, P. (2012) 'Disabling Dualisms: Essentialism, Social Constructionism and the Explanatory Power of Higher Education Research'. [keynote address] *The Higher Education Close Up 6 Conference*, 11-13 July 2012. Grahamstown, South Africa: Rhodes University

Trowler, P., Saunders, M. and Bamber, V. (eds.) (2012) *Tribes and Territories in the 21st century: Rethinking the Significance of Disciplines in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

Wilkinson, R. (ed.) (2004) *Integrating Content and Language: Meeting the Challenge of a Multilingual Higher Education*. Maastricht: Universitaire Pers Maastricht

Wilkinson, R. and Zegers, V. (eds.) (2007) *Researching Content and Language Integration in Higher Education*. Maastricht: Maastricht University Language Centre.

Wilkinson, R. and Zegers, V. (eds.) (2008) *Realizing Content and Language Integration in Higher Education*. Maastricht: Maastricht University Language Centre.