Cómo referenciar este artículo / How to reference this article

Relaño Pastor, A. M. (2019). Language Socialization and CLIL Teachers' Agency in Castilla-La Mancha Bilingual Programs: Appropriations and Transformations. *Foro de Educación*, *17*(27), 65-89. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.14516/fde.702

Language Socialization and CLIL Teachers' Agency in Castilla-La Mancha Bilingual Programs: Appropriations and Transformations[1]

Ana María Relaño Pastor
e-mail: anamaria.relano@uclm.es
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha. Spain

Abstract: Language socialization research in bilingual and multilingual settings, particularly across EFL (English as a Foreign Language) and ESL (English as a Second Language) contexts, has addressed the processes by which novices are «apprenticed» or mentored into the linguistic and nonlinguistic ideologies, values, practices, and stances (affective, epistemic, and other) of sociocultural groups to ultimately become «competent members» of these learning communities. However, one of the unexplored bilingual education contexts from a language socialization perspective refers to «Content and Language Integrated Learning» or CLIL, defined as «inclusive of a wide range of educational practices provided that these practices are conducted through the medium of an additional language and both language and the subject have a joint role». Taking these premises as a point of departure, this article discusses the language socialization processes CLIL teachers undergo to become competent members of the bilingual school communities (BSC) that have proliferated extensively in Castilla-La Mancha (CLM), Spain, in the last decade. Drawing on ethnographic data collected in four different bilingual state-funded and state-funded private schools in this region, the article analyzes the case of San Marcos' teachers' narratives of becoming and doing CLIL as «meta-agentive» discursive sites that display the ideologies and practices of professional personhood at stake in CLIL programs. The article further advances the latest ethnographic CLIL agenda interested in revealing the social processes involved in the organization of exclusionary practices in the era of the «bilingual» craze and pressure across different Spanish autonomous communities.

Keywords: Language socialization; narrative; CLIL; agency; professional identity.

Received: 12/07/2018
Accepted: 20/04/2019

[1] Data presented in this chapter belong to the research Project «The Appropriation of English as a Global Language in Castilla-La Mancha Schools: A multilingual, situated and comparative approach» – APINGLO-CLM – (Ref.: FFI2014-54179-C2-2-P), funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (MINECO), 2015-2018.

1. Introduction

Language socialization research in bilingual and multilingual settings, particularly across EFL (English as a Foreign Language) and ESL (English as a Second Language) contexts, has addressed the processes by which novices are «apprenticed» or mentored into the linguistic and nonlinguistic ideologies, values, practices, and stances (affective, epistemic, and other) of sociocultural groups to ultimately become «competent members» of these learning communities (Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Duff, 2010; Duff & Talmy, 2011; Duranti, Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). However, one of the unexplored bilingual education contexts from a language socialization perspective refers to «Content and Language Integrated Learning» or CLIL, defined as «inclusive of a wide range of educational practices provided that these practices are conducted through the medium of an additional language and both language and the subject have a joint role» (Marsh, 2002, p. 58). CLIL research in Europe and Spain has proliferated extensively in the last decade (Cenoz, Genesee & Gorter, 2014; Dalton-Puffer, 2012; Dooley & Masats, 2015; Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010; Pérez-Cañado, 2012; Ruiz de Zarobe, 2013). More specifically, the centrality of language in CLIL research includes the analysis of the role of language in the CLIL classroom (Llinares, Morton & Whittaker, 2012), as well as research on second language acquisition, systemic functional linguistics, discourse analysis, and sociolinguistics (Llinares & Morton, 2017). However, ethnographic studies that address the complex, multiple realities of CLIL-type bilingual programs in relation to language ideologies and wider social and political processes of globalization and neoliberal forces are still scarce (Relaño-Pastor, 2018a). In Spain, some of the scholars who have adopted an ethnographic lens to examine CLIL classroom practices insist on the analytical complexity of this type of bilingual education and the need to consolidate the ethnographic agenda in CLIL research (Codó, forthcoming; Codó & McDaid, 2019; Codó & Patiño-Santos, 2017; Fernández Barrera, 2017; Labajos Miguel & Martín Rojo, 2011; Martín Rojo, 2013; Pérez-Milans & Patiño-Santos, 2014; Relaño-Pastor, 2015, 2018a, 2018b). Particularly, the study by Codó and Patiño-Santos (2017) on CLIL teachers' working conditions from an ethnographic politico-economic perspective is especially pertinent to this article. According to these scholars, the CLIL research agenda should incorporate the analysis of the «material conditions under which CLIL has been implemented, the social inequalities engendered by CLIL programmes and the ways in which CLIL impacts the daily lives of the institutions and agents implementing the programme» (p. 16).

In line with the ethnographic, political economy perspective the aforementioned scholars have put forward, this article discusses the language socialization processes CLIL teachers in Castilla-La Mancha (CLM, hereafter) undergo as part of the CLIL-type «bilingual» programs the Spanish educational system has progressively institutionalized across the different autonomous communities. As Codó & Patiño-Santos (2017) point out, CLIL teachers' «daily struggles» and their «ambivalent stances» towards their profession have not been addressed much in CLIL research. One exception is Morton (2016), who has focused on how CLIL teachers display their identity in talk about how they do CLIL and choose to position themselves toward

Foro de Educación, v. 17, n. 27, julio-diciembre / july-december 2019, pp. 65-89.
e-ISSN: 1698-7802

their professional competence in the CLIL classroom. However, the perspective adopted here, language socialization, has not been addressed in CLIL research. By analyzing how CLIL-type bilingual teachers narrate how they became CLIL teachers and how they were socialized to ways of doing CLIL in «bilingual» schools, the article focuses on CLIL teachers' agency, understood as the «socioculturally mediated capacity to act» (Ahearn, 2001, 2012) to transform the professional constraints they have come across with the institutionalization of bilingual programs in CLM.

The article is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the language socialization perspective adopted in this article to analyze CLIL-type bilingual teachers' agency in narratives of becoming and doing CLIL; Section 3 contextualizes the data collected in our study; Section 4 analyzes the language socialization processes CLIL teachers from one of the four focal schools of our ethnography narrate regarding how they became CLIL teachers, the challenges they face in everyday CLIL practice, and the tensions and dilemmas involved in the construction of competent membership to the bilingual school communities under discussion in this article. The article concludes with a discussion of how the analysis of agency in CLIL teachers' narratives can shed light to the different processes of language socialization these teachers face and are transformed by as well as the implications for further ethnographic research on CLIL.

2. A language socialization perspective to CLIL-type bilingual programs

As one of the most promising fields of linguistic anthropology in North America (U.S. and Canada), the paradigm of language socialization has consolidated over the last thirty years to understand how children and other novices are socialized «through» language as they are socialized «to» use language (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin, 1990; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986) to become competent members of a particular community «by acquiring knowledge of its functions, social distributions, and interpretations in and across socially defined situations» (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986, p. 168). Language socialization is rooted in the notion that the process of acquiring a language is part of a much larger process of becoming a person in society (Ochs, 2002, p. 106), and as such language socialization is a fundamental interactional achievement (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002, p. 108).

The understanding of language socialization processes in the field of multilingual education has focused predominantly in second language (L2) socialization, defined as «socialization beyond one's first, or dominant, language and encompasses second, foreign, and (concurrent) bilingual and multilingual learning contexts» (Duff, 2012, p. 565) in highly diverse contexts. However, this definition can also apply to a variety of multilingual education contexts, such as the CLIL ones discussed in this article, where language learning and socialization are at play [for a revision of LS research in the field of bi/multilingual education and its synergies with other ethnographic sociolinguistic approaches, see Codó and Relaño-Pastor (in press)].

In the context of CLIL-type bilingual programs, a LS perspective implies, then, to attend to how English competence is socialized in these programs through the interactional practices legitimated in and outside the classroom (i.e. circulating narratives about bilingualism and the role of CLIL teachers as socializing agents). In addition, these interactional practices are imbued with language ideologies related to participants' ideas, beliefs, values about how English should be taught in CLIL programs as well as the role of CLIL teachers in these bilingual programs. In fact, as language socialization agents, CLIL-type bilingual teachers feel responsible for socializing students to the academic content of their subjects through the use of English. This includes both, teachers who can certify their level of English according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), and «native» English teachers, whose linguistic capital is not questioned (Relaño Pastor & Fernández, 2019). However, the acquisition of English competence, far from being a set of measurable skills certified by the English language industry, cuts across dimensions of power, agency and professional identity. Therefore, the evaluation of English competence is not a «neutral or value-free process» but conditioned «by the ideologies we hold about ourselves» (Baquedano-López & Mangual Figueroa, 2012, p. 540). As Mangual Figueroa and García Sánchez (2018) point out «defining competence as an individual set of skills to be displayed discounts the social nature of language and the power and the value associated with what counts as appropriate in school» (p. 2).

Bearing this in mind, this article analyzes the narratives of «becoming a CLIL teacher» and «doing CLIL» that emerged in the different individual and group interviews we conducted with CLIL teachers in CLM bilingual schools (2015-2018). From a language socialization perspective, narratives of personal experiences are understood as communicative practices that tell about the self «in terms of others in present, past and imagined universes» (Ochs & Capps, 1996, p. 28), socializing individuals to particular ways of being and doing. As Miller, Koven & Lin (2012) point out, the study of narratives as a powerful socialization means imply that the linguistic practices of any community «occurs in a wide range of circumstances» (p. 190), including the occasioning of narratives emerging during ethnographic fieldwork (Patiño-Santos, 2018; Relaño-Pastor, 2018b). Following previous research on narratives of personal language experiences (Relaño Pastor, 2014, 2018b, 2018c), narrative will be understood in this article as «a situated, sense-making, mutually achieved social practice individuals engage in at different points of time and space, which is embedded in multiple discursive practices» (Relaño-Pastor, 2018c, p. 581).

In addition, as main language socialization agents in the implementation of bilingual programs in CLM schools, agency attributed to CLIL teachers will be understood in this article, following Ahearn (2001), as the «socioculturally mediated capacity to act» (p. 112). One of the main premises of language socialization concerns how «all parties to socializing practices are agents in the formation of competence» (Ochs & Schieffeling, 2011, p. 5). By focusing on «the meta-agentive discourse» (Ahearn, 2012, p. 284) displayed in personal narratives of «becoming a CLIL teacher» and «doing being» a bilingual-CLIL teacher, the article illustrates how bilingual teachers, «talk about their own actions and others' actions, how they

Foro de Educación, v. 17, n. 27, julio-diciembre / july-december 2019, pp. 65-89.
e-ISSN: 1698-7802

attribute responsibility for events, and how they describe their own and others' decision-making processes» (Ahearn, 2012, p. 284) regarding their participation in the bilingual programs across the different schools in our data. Following Duranti (2004), two dimensions of agency, namely «the enactment of agency» (performance) and «the linguistic encoding» of agency (p. 454), will be taken into account. In addition, agency as both language use (enactment) and language structure (encoding) can also be integrated with a social theory of agency that attend to social processes and the production and reproduction of social systems by social actors (Ahearn, 2001, 2012; Duranti, 2004). In this article, agency will be analyzed with regards to three dominant language socialization processes involved in the appropriation of English in bilingual schools in CLM. On the one hand, teachers' agency in the language socialization process of becoming a CLIL teacher, which participating teachers report as mediated by schools' administrative power to act on their behalf, depriving them of their right of choice. On the other hand, their agency in the language socialization processes involved in the practice of doing CLIL, which entail full agency and creative transformations. Both of these language socialization processes are part and parcel of the collective agency the bilingual schools in our study undertake to sustain their own, distinctive bilingual ethos in the local academic community.

3. Contextualizing school site and participants: the bilingual school community (BSC) at San Marcos

The prolific implementation of Spanish-English CLIL-type bilingual programs in Castilla-La Mancha has already been documented in previous research conducted by the APINGLO-CLM team[2]. In the academic year 2018-2019[3], a total of 519 «bilingual and plurilingual projects» (488 in English as the medium of instruction) in 439 schools across the five provinces of this region were implemented. The ethnographic data collected by our team from 2015-2018 includes long-term participant observation in four focal bilingual schools in CLM (i.e. San Marcos, a state-funded, religious private school, San Teo, state-funded lay private, Sancho, state-run primary, and High Tower, state-run secondary). Given the large set of data we have collected in these four schools[4], this article focuses in particular on the case of San Marcos school. Particularly, the analysis includes the participating teachers in the bilingual program, that is, three science teachers (i.e. physics, biology and technology) and three English teachers (i.e. the bilingual program coordinator, Gabriela, the oldest teacher in the English department, Julia, and César, who during our fieldwork also taught citizenship education in year 2 of compulsory secondary education). Due

[2] For more information, visit: https://blog.uclm.es/apingloclm/

[3] See Consejería de Educación, Cultura y Deportes – Castilla-La Mancha (2018).

[4] We have collected about 194 hours of classroom audio recordings in CLIL subjects (i.e. biology, physics, technology, geography and history, religion and ethics) and English classes, 6 video recordings, 93 questionnaires with secondary students about the everyday use of English, 55 semi-structured interviews with different stakeholders, 12 class group discussions with 300 secondary students, 2 media and language landscape diaries (see Poveda, this issue), 9 language biography body drawings with 25 primary students, 260 photographs, and over 25 website data and institutional documents of language-in-education policies in this region.

to the constraints of fieldwork access (Poveda, Giampapa and Relaño-Pastor, forthcoming), we were able to audio-record Gabriela's interview only, have informal chats with César and conduct one of the class group discussions in our data with his year 4 secondary students (see Poveda's analysis of bilingual students' discourses in this issue), as well as observe a set of four English classes organized in collaboration with the English language assistant, Peter, in Julia's classroom.

3.1. *St. Marcos school*

St. Marcos school is a religious state-funded private school, which first started what teachers describe as «the path to bilingualism» in 2010 with the implementation of the BEDA (Bilingual English Development and Assessment) program. As a religious school, San Marcos belongs to the network of Catholic Bilingual Schools in Castilla-La Mancha[5]. In addition to this program, San Marcos has also implemented the bilingual program regulated by the regional Plurilingualism Decree, *Plan Integral de Enseñanza de Lenguas Extranjeras de la Comunidad Autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha*-Integral Plan for the Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha (last amended in February 15, 2018). This decree regulates the distribution of human and material resources in CLM bilingual schools, where teachers must certify a B2 level of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) to be able to teach content subjects in English. In addition, the decree also favors CLIL as the preferred teaching methodology as well as the centrality of English language assistants supported by the Spanish Ministry of Education program *Auxiliares de conversación extranjeros en España* [Foreign Language Assistants-FLAs- in Spain] to sustain these programs.

In the local market of bilingual programs in CLM (Relaño-Pastor & Fernández-Barrera, 2018), San Marcos has distinctively attracted attention not only in terms of the BEDA and regional bilingual programs, but also due to the trilingual program (French-English and Spanish), whose name comes from the inclusion of CLIL subjects in French (history and geography) in year 3 of compulsory secondary education. Overall, bilingual students in San Marcos also benefit from an exchange program with a French school and one-week school trips in the U.K. In addition, the material and human linguistic resources supporting the bilingual and trilingual programs at San Marcos also include English native language assistants and the accreditation as one of the Cambridge English examination centers in CLM, which offers extracurricular English classes to prepare bi/trilingual students for the Cambridge exams[6].

[5] The BEDA program started to be implemented in the Catholic schools of Madrid in 2007. It is described as a «flexible» bilingual program, which consists of «the gradual implementation of Spanish-English bilingual education» by means of three main pillars: 1. Gradual «qualitative and quantitative» implentation of English teaching; 2. Teacher training; 3. Cambridge external evaluation for students, teachers and administrative staff (my translation, for more information, visit: https://www.eccastillalamancha.es/beda/).

[6] For information about the requirements to become an authorised Cambridge English examination center, see https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/find-a-centre/exam-centres/how-to-become-a-centre/

Foro de Educación, v. 17, n. 27, julio-diciembre / july-december 2019, pp. 65-89.
e-ISSN: 1698-7802

3.2. *Data description*

The analysis focuses on a set of 3 semi-structured individual interviews (two with Ernesto, the physics teacher and one with Gabriela, the coordinator of San Marcos' bilingual program) as well as 2 group interviews (one with 5 of the 7 secondary CLIL teachers and another with the technology and biology CLIL teachers). After the interviews were thematically analyzed, I selected a corpus of narratives related to how these teachers became CLIL-type bilingual teachers and how they went about doing CLIL in their respective subjects. For those interviews conducted in Spanish, we have included the English translation and kept the interview excerpts in the original language in Appendix 1, together with an explanation of the transcription conventions.

In the following section, I analyze the narratives emerging in our ethnographic interviews as sites of «meta-agentive discourse» (Ahearn, 2012) that CLIL-type bilingual teachers construct with the researchers to display their own stances towards what it means to become a CLIL teacher and engage in CLIL practices in the bilingual classroom.

4. Analysis: Meta-agentive narrative discourse in the making of CLIL programs

The analysis focuses on the language socialization processes CLIL teachers narrate about their belonging to the bilingual school communities of our project. The four focal schools in our study have implemented their bilingual programs according to the availability of human resources who comply with the minimum linguistic requirement of a B2 level of English, as it is currently contemplated in the regional administration's guidelines for the implementation of bilingual programs. One of the latest amendments (February 15, 2018) of the Decree 47/2017 that regulates the teaching of foreign languages specifies that compulsory secondary, upper secondary and vocational training teachers will need to certify a C1 level of English for the academic year 2022/2023. In addition, article 30 of this order includes a specific reference to CLIL methodology, which should integrate content and the chosen L2 (English in our case) in all the different classroom activities as well as in students' assessment instruments. For the first time since the first bilingual programs were implemented in Castilla-La Mancha in 2005, the use of Spanish in the classroom is regulated and allowed in the classroom on the provision of keeping the CLIL methodology in three case scenarios: 1. with students with «specific educational needs»; 2. to acquire «specific terminology and basic notions in both languages» (Spanish and English); 3. to make the message comprehensible, to introduce and summarize subject contents, or in those cases where Spanish can be used as a learning resource for meaning-making purposes.

These policy regulations impinge upon schools' decision-making practices to become a CLIL teacher as well as on the understanding and implementation of CLIL among teachers participating in these bilingual programs. Therefore, the negotiation of teachers' agency to participate in these programs and become competent members of the BSCs under study, as well as their capacity to act in the language

socialization processes involved in the practice of CLIL cuts across dimensions of power, marginalization and exclusion (García Sánchez, 2012).

The following narratives, understood as sites of meta-agentive discourse, a locus of talk about professional selves in relation to others' actions, attribution of responsibility and moral evaluations about one's and others' portrayed events (Ahearn, 2001; Ochs & Capps, 2001) illustrates the dominant language ideologies and language socialization processes involved in the making of competent professional selves and legitimate bilingual programs.

4.1. *Becoming a CLIL teacher: language socialization and the appropriation of agency*

Ethnographic data in our study show that the decision to become a CLIL teacher in this type of bilingual programs was determined by the linguistic accreditation (at least a B2 level of English) requirement established by the regional educational administration. In the narratives about the making of the bilingual programs in each school, English departments and English teachers were constructed as the promoters of these CLIL initiatives to compete in the local market of bilingual schools. In the case of state-funded private schools, different marketization strategies were at play such as the inclusion of native British teachers, the creation of parallel trilingual programs, or the participation in the Cambridge national school[7] (Relaño Pastor, 2018c), whereas in the case of the two state-run schools (one primary and one secondary), their belonging to the British Bilingual School Projects sponsored by the British Council[8] in accordance with the Spanish Ministry of Education (1996-present) marked its recognition and prestige.

In the following narrative, Esteban, who held a PhD in physics, loved using and speaking English, had been accredited with a C1 level of English and hoped he could teach physics abroad one day, evaluates the process of socialization to English:

Excerpt 1. «It's a frenetic race» [Interview with Esteban, physics teacher (3ESO) at San Marcos. Participants: [ES (Esteban) and FR, (Frances) researcher. The interview was conducted in English]

1. ES: = you know (.) so now we're living the process in which (.5) nobody knew
2. English (2.5) twenty years ago
3. FR: Yeah
4. ES: And now everybody is (.) speaking English eh: you know (.) more or less
5. B1 B2 (.) and now hh it's a frenetic race hh to get eh (.) B1 (.) B2 (.) C1 (.) C2
6. (.) proficiency (.) masters hh [etcetera]
7. FR: [yeah] =

[7] More information about the Cambridge National Schools Project can be found at: http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/es/cmp/national-schools-project/

[8] For more information, visit the British Council website: https://englishagenda.britishcouncil.org/global-projects/track-record/bilingual-schools-project-spain

Foro de Educación, v. 17, n. 27, julio-diciembre / july-december 2019, pp. 65-89.
e-ISSN: 1698-7802

This narrative exemplifies how the appropriation of English in CLIL-type bilingual programs initiates with the process of being socialized to the required English competence to be able to participate in the frenzy race [*frenetic*] Esteban refers to (line 5). In fact, content specialists across our data evaluated their participation in the bilingual programs in terms of their agency and right of choice to belong to the different bilingual school communities. The meta-agentive narrative discourse discussed below sheds light on a continuum of agency, from a process of agentlessness in the socialization to the bilingual program to a process of full agency in the language socialization process involved in the integration of language and content to sustain the CLIL practice.

Excerpt 2. «From tomorrow onwards» [Interview with Esteban (ES), San Marcos' physics teacher in compulsory secondary education. Participants: ES and FR (Frances, researcher). The interview was conducted in English].

1. FR: So it almost seems like hh >I mean< when when was the decision to become
2. a bilingual to to: (.) have a bilingual program? (.) how many years this is been hh
3. going on?
4. ES: Yeah eh::: in my case (.) well (.) I started three years ago (.) [four years
5. ago]
6. FR: [yes] but [that was before]
7. ES: [I was imposed] eh eh well I was imposed hh eh it was imposed from [the:]
8. FR: [yes] =
9. ES: = direction (.) If you (.) if you want (.) of the: of the school you know [because]
10. FR: [yeah] =
11. ES: = eh: do you know English? (.) yes (.) ok (.) eh:: from tomorrow onwards,
12. you will teach eh:: [physics]
13. FR: [yeah] =
14. ES: = And you say ((ha ha ha)) OH MY GOD [((ha ha ha))]
15. FR: [yeah (.) yeah] =

We conducted two semi-structured interviews with Esteban, one in Spanish and one in English, together with numerous informal talks during our fieldwork. The «imposition» Esteban refers to in line 7 initiated the process of being socialized to teaching content subjects in English, particularly in state-funded private schools where those specialists who could certify either a B2 or C1 level of English were assigned to transform the content subjects they have been teaching up to that moment in Spanish into bilingual (*en bilingüe*) subjects. The central event of Esteban's narrative (lines 12-15) captures the celerity schools in CLM embark upon to start their bilingual programs («from tomorrow onwards» – line 11 –), and the range of emotional responses content specialists shared, from shock and surprise to frustration, resignation or disbelief. In this case, Esteban portrays his surprise with laughter, loudness and rising intonation in line 14, enacting this way the lack of agency he underwent in the process of becoming a CLIL teacher.

In San Marcos, the two other specialists in biology and technology who were instructing in English also shared similar narratives of becoming a bilingual teacher. Juan Luis (JL), the science teacher in year 3 of CSE, started working in San Marcos after more than ten years in the private food sector. He held a B2 from the

official school of languages and had been teaching for fourteen years as part of the permanent staff of science teachers. Juan José (JJ), the math and technology teacher had worked in a private company as well and used English in his job. He was a former student of San Marcos who decided to change careers and applied for a teaching position at this school. At the time of the group interview he had been in San Marcos for nine years. In the following extract, Juan Luis and José Javier co-construct how they became part of the bilingual program.

Excerpt 3. «I started to teach directly» [Interview with Juan Luis (JL), San Marcos' biology teacher, and Juan José (JJ), San Marcos's technology and maths teacher in compulsory secondary education. Participants: JL, JJ and AL (Alicia), researcher). The interview was conducted in Spanish – see Appendix 1 –]

1. JL: and:: I started as a science teacher I mean my thing (.) science or chemistry or
2. anything related to it
3. AL: uhm
4. JL: then: like I don't know (.) a few years ago (.) I don't know five or six years ago
5. Antonio hh told me (.5) start thinking about introducing something (.) in English (.) in
6. what you [teach] and so
7. AL: uhm uh
8. JL: I mean (.) he never told me:: (.) >the the the the< idea he had about the bilingual
9. sections
10. AL: uhm uh
11. […]
12. AL: So it was the school's proposal [right]
13. JL: [yes] =
14. AL: = to start [including content]
15. JL: [yes yes yes yes] =
16. AL: = in English (.5) ok (.) but without any guidelines right
17. JL: No
18. […]
19. AL: and how did you start in the bilingual program
20. JJ: I was working in the private sector before (.) and then (.) I knew English because:: I
21. had always needed it (.) to: work abroad: (.)
22. AL: uhm uh =
23. JJ: = and all that (.5) and then when I decided to change: (.) to change my life for good:
24. (.) one of the options that I considered was (1.5) coming here (.) and then I talked to
25. Antonio (.) I was a former student (.5) and:: and then he told me he wanted to start a
26. a bilingual project (.5) because there was nothing at that time (.5) there was nothing (.5)
27. and:: (.) they offered it to me (.) and then I started to teach directly::::

This collaborative narrative portrays a shared vignette across the four schools in our data that has to do with the schools' decisions to start their bilingual programs with the availability of human resources at their disposal. From a language socialization perspective, this narrative illustrates two language socialization processes indexing different capacities to act, namely, the process of acquiring the required level of English to participate in the bilingual programs, and the process of becoming a content specialist in English medium instruction. Bilingual teachers must then embrace new roles in a new language while keeping their recognition as experts of the subjects they teach. Becoming a CLIL teacher conveys also the negotiation of linguistic and

Foro de Educación, v. 17, n. 27, julio-diciembre / july-december 2019, pp. 65-89.
e-ISSN: 1698-7802

academic expertise in the interactions that sustain the CLIL practice. That is, as CLIL teachers, the goal is for students to learn academic content, so when they have to instruct in English without any prior CLIL training, each one of them embraces this professional challenge differently. The central event in this narrative frames JL and JJ as agent-less in the process of becoming part of the CLIL teaching staff. Both refer to Antonio, the head of secondary studies in San Marcos, who requests from them to «start thinking about» introducing English in their classes. Following the two dimensions of agency in language proposed by Duranti (2004), that is, «performance and encoding» (p. 454) to understand how the enacting of agency (performance) is linguistically encoded, this narrative illustrates how both teachers have no agency in the decision-making process of implementing CLIL subjects. The difference, however, has to do with the depiction of the same event, the start of a bilingual program, and their positioning towards this decision. On the one hand, JJ felt confident with his level of English after using it in his previous job. He had been accredited the B2 and C1 certifications when he started working in San Marcos, portraying his decision to become a CLIL teacher as an offer he accepted without delay «to teach directly» (line 25). On the other hand, JL constructs the school as responsible for choosing teachers on the criterion of English competence without further implementation guidelines. The evaluation of this decision is also different in both cases. JJ embraces full agency to start instruction in English «directly» (line 25), which means without any CLIL methodology, but as if the classes took place in Spanish. On the contrary, JL evaluated his level of English with resignation and emphasized the lack of the material conditions needed to improve his English competence:

Excerpt 4. «I resign myself to English» [Interview with Juan Luis (JL), San Marcos biology teacher, and Juan José (JJ), San Marcos technology and math teacher in compulsory secondary education. Participants: JL, JJ and AL (Alicia), researcher). The interview was conducted in Spanish – see Appendix 1 –]

1. JL: = and English I mean (.) I resign myself to (.5) [to it]
2. AL: [I see] =
3. JL: = I don't like (.) English but oh well (.) [as things go]
4. AL: [it is what it is] =
5. JL: = nowadays in the world (.4) I don't like English
6. AL: so you are not thinking about getting any other [certificate at this moment]
7. JL: [I don't know] (.) not at this moment because I can't [I mean]
8. AL: [I see] =
9. JL: = I don't have time to start with it (.) but I haven't rejected the idea
10. AL: uhm uh

The lack of agency in the decision-making process of becoming a CLIL teacher contrasted with the full responsibility bilingual schools attributed to these teachers to engage in the practice of CLIL. However, the bilingual ethos created in each of these schools fostered different environments of participation and attribution of agency to the language socialization processes of becoming and doing CLIL.

4.2. *Doing CLIL: the enactment of full agency*

This section illustrates with representative events of one long narrative told in the interview we conducted with the science teachers at San Marcos the main challenges CLIL teachers portrayed in their narratives regarding how to best approach CLIL instruction and how they enacted their agency in this process. Although CLIL teachers expressed their familiarity with CLIL, they complained they had not received enough training and had to find their ways to teach in the CLIL classroom. The amount of hours they had to invest in class preparation, searching for adequate materials and resources, including video-watching of «real» science, math, technology, or biology classes collected from different English websites, was evaluated as time-consuming, but necessary to find innovative ideas that could work in the classroom (see Fernández-Barrera in this issue for CLIL teachers doing science).

Excerpt 5. «I explain just a few little basic things in Spanish» [Interview with Juan Luis (JL), San Marcos' biology teacher, and Juan José (JJ), San Marcos's technology and maths teacher in compulsory secondary education. Participants: JL, JJ and AL (Alicia), researcher). The interview was conducted in Spanish – see Appendix 1 –]

1. JL: but in first year (2.5) at the beginning (.) the first lessons (2.0) I::: (.) I mean
2. (1.0) officially everything should be in English but I personally believe that if it is
3. bilingual it's bi (.) lingual (.5) you can't teach content exclusively in English
4. AL: uhm uh
5. JL: when that would be for the rest of their lives (.5) [I will have]
6. AL: [uhm uh] =
7. JL: = I will have to see as well (.) how to say that in Spanish
8. […]
9. JL: [so] I:: teach (.) some things (.) in Spanish for example in physics (1.0)
10. when I explain some things (1.0) given that it is the first year they study physics (.)
11. AL: uhm uh
12. JL: I explain just a few little basic things in Spanish (1.0) they get the idea and then
13. from that moment on we build in English (.5) with exercises in English (.) and then they
14. see that in English (.) and control English
15. AL: I see
16. JL: but the concept in physics (.5) they have understood it already
17. AL: I see (.) if it is already difficult to understand it
18. JL: exactly
19. […]
20. JL: we must evaluate content
21. AL: okay
22. JL: we must evaluate content (.5) the (.) English is evaluated in the English class
23. JJ: exactly
24. […]
25. AL: >well< you've heard about CLIL right? (.) have you used it in the classroom::?
26. JJ: this is almost imagination (1.5) I mean there you have the imagination to implement
27. activities that can help you and are useful for: learning what you want them to learn
28. AL: uhm uh uhm uh
29. JL: so then (.) I: (.) the unit about arthropods I have worked in groups
30. (.) I have already started with the vertebrates (.) and I am going to work in groups as

Foro de Educación, v. 17, n. 27, julio-diciembre / july-december 2019, pp. 65-89.
e-ISSN: 1698-7802

31. well but in a different way (.) so it's not always the same
32. AL: I see
33. JL: and so on (.5) some [group-work] works more (.) some work less (1.0) but deep
34. down I also miss (1.0) I don't have much time to search the internet [to]
35. AL: [I see]
36. JL: = to find (.) ideas
37. JJ: yes (.) I feel the same

This collaborative narrative shows how CLIL teachers enact full agency when it comes to engage in CLIL practices. First, they portray themselves as having the room to organize the integration of language and content according to their own teaching philosophies and language ideologies related to bilingualism and bilingual education. For example, JL relies on monoglossic views about the role of English and Spanish in the CLIL practice. That is, he believes that content should be first introduced to CLIL students in their home languages before they are provided with the explanation in English (lines 13-15), separating both languages for the acquisition of content. From a language socialization perspective, this means that CLIL teachers, as main socializing agents of content subjects, prioritize the process of being socialized through students' first languages to academic content over the process of being socialized to English through content-subjects. In addition, since the understanding of CLIL is limited to the idea of learning content in a different language without problematizing the integration of language and content, content-acquisition is similarly considered the object of evaluation (lines 20-23) in the CLIL classroom in contrast to the assessment of English in the English classroom. A dominant belief in our ethnography about the integration of language and content had to do with the idea of «teaching as you do in Spanish», meaning that CLIL teachers had to find their ways to transmit the academic content in English (i.e. resources and learning materials on internet, mostly) experiencing with innovative methods to teach «in» English. Those who felt more linguistically secure like JJ evaluated the experience of doing CLIL as an opportunity to use one's imagination and try out a range of classroom activities that would eventually work in his class. In both cases, we find similar challenges to the ones described by Codó & Patiño-Santos (2017) in the Catalan context, where the sustainability of the CLIL-type PEP program framed by the «Framework for Pluringualism» (p. 7), relied on dedicated teachers who embraced different professional selves in the CLIL program depending on their working conditions as permanent/non-permanent teachers, therefore investing extra time and effort to align with the neoliberal order of Pinetree school. In the case of San Marcos, despite being part of the permanent teaching staff, JL and JJ had no choice but complying with the school mandates to become bilingual teachers by no choice and «flexible» workers that contribute to strengthen the competing ethos created among bilingual schools in CLM (Relaño Pastor, 2018c).

4.3. *Belonging to San Marcos bilingual school community*

Language socialization research, as discussed in section 2, further addresses how individuals ultimately construct their membership into particular communities. As Ochs and Schieffelin (2012) agree, «the process of becoming a recognized

member entails an accommodation to members' ideologies about communicative resources, including how they can be used to acquire and display knowledge, express emotions, perform actions, constitute persons, and establish and maintain relationships» (p. 7). This idea of «competent membership» is not an easy endeavor and needs to be problematized to include, as García Sánchez (2012) points out novices' contradictions, constraints and affordances regarding «the everyday and institutional production of negatively marked categories and forms of membership» (p. 163). Marginalization, as she points out, is structurally produced by «institutional policies and practices towards individuals with stigmatized identities» (p. 163).

In the case of San Marcos, not all the students belong to the bilingual program. The so-called non-bilingual students share the subjects that are not part of the bilingual program with bilingual students, but they are separated in science, geography and history, technology, physics and English. Belonging to the bilingual school community implies participating in a common bilingual project, namely *el camino hacia el bilingüismo* (the path to bilingualism), that San Marcos' CLIL teachers construct as a community of potential English speakers who will be open to a different language and culture and have better chances in the job market. As César, the citizenship education teacher, assessed during the group interview we conducted: *hay que abrirles la cabeza al mundo. No es un bilingüismo puro y duro que van a salir hablando perfectamente inglés […] y luego aparte de cara a un futuro laboral pues que consigan mediante el inglés llegar más fácilmente a un puesto de trabajo* (you have to open their minds. It is not a pure and hard bilingualism that will allow them to speak English perfectly […] and then, on the other hand, in terms of a future job, well, they should be able to enter the job market more easily through English). The construction of bilingualism, as this excerpt indicates, is based on the instrumental value of English as a resource for participating in a competitive job market. In fact, language socialization to San Marcos' bilingual community also entails the socialization to student identities shaped by the labor market demands on entrepreneurship and competitiveness. When asked about what CLIL teachers thought about the students who joined the bilingual program, the emerging social category of competitiveness was coupled with the identity of the good, motivated student (Fernández Barrera, 2017). Julia, San Marcos' English teacher evaluated these students in the following way: *los chicos que se meten en estos programas es que son muy buenos en todo, en inglés, en matemáticas, física, en lo que les pongas* (those kids who join these programs are very good at everything, English, maths, physics, whatever you put them in). This way, competent membership to San Marcos' bilingual school community also cut across social categorization processes involving hierarchies of bilingual/non-bilingual programs, teachers and students (Relaño Pastor, 2018a).

As previous sections have illustrated, the language socialization processes of becoming a CLIL teacher and doing CLIL present numerous challenges for CLIL teachers in terms of the agency they can embrace and practice in the classroom. In addition to this, another of the challenges has to do with parallel language socialization processes involving non-bilingual students. In the following collective narrative that emerged during the group interview with San Marcos' CLIL teachers,

Foro de Educación, v. 17, n. 27, julio-diciembre / july-december 2019, pp. 65-89.
e-ISSN: 1698-7802

language socialization to San Marcos' bilingual community also entails different types of professional agency with regards to bilingual and non-bilingual students.

Excerpt 6. «The production in English of a non-bilingual group is minimal» [Group interview with CLIL teachers. Participants: GR (Graciela), English teacher and coordinator of San Marcos' bilingual program; JU (Julia), English teacher; CE (César), English teacher and citizen education teacher at the time of the interview; ES (Esteban), physics teacher; JL (Juan Luis), science teacher; AL (Alicia): MA (May), researchers). The interview was conducted in Spanish – see Appendix 1 –]

1. AL: Of course (.) have you noticed: (.) in the English subject (.) I don't know
2. (.) any advantages or disadvantages (.) in [terms of bilingual students]
3. JU: [There's a huge difference] (.) but much (.) much
4. AM: And what (.) what do you do with=how (.5) >I mean< how do you deal with that
5. JU: You just adapt yourself to it (.) you adapt the material (.) to what you have in front
6. of you [to the type of]
7. AL: [uhm uh] =
8. JU: = classroom [you have]
9. AM: [uhm uh]
10. JU: so if you have a bilingual classroom (.) you can afford certain things
11. AL: Uhm uh
12. JU: you bring different material (.) you can use more resources (.) audiovisual materials
13. (.) because it's (.) I don't know (.) it also pays off (.) because of course
14. MA: I see (.) yes
15. AL: Uhm uh
16. JU: whereas (.) if you have non-bilingual classrooms hh then you have to adapt yourself
17. (.) you leave out content (.) [you leave out]
18. AM: [uhm uh] =
19. JU: = things hh [leave out hh text]
20. ES: [and it's all much simpler]
21. ((@@@))
22. JU: [Everything is simpler everything] (.5) anyways
23. AL: I have seen that (.5) yes
24. JU: And you oblige them to read (.) >I mean they< (.) the production in English of a
25. non-bilingual group is minimal
26. AM: Uhm uh
27. AL: Uhm uh
28. […]
29. CE: Yes I am lately trying to speak more English in class (.5) or in Spanglish
30. AM: Uhm uh
31. CE: So that they can also feel useful (.) they can feel they are learning a language (.)
32. That well it's ((useful))
33. AL: [uhm uh]
34. CE: Eh:: we're reading more:: (.) [we are]
35. AM: [uhm uh] =
36. CE: = >I mean< (.5) participation
37. AM: Uhm uh
38. CS: It seems (.) seems that they like I dictate to them [to see]
39. AM: [Uhm uh] =
40. CS: = if they understand you (.) [they like that]
41. AM: [uhm uh]

As this narrative exemplifies, English teachers construct different professional identities regarding bilingual/non-bilingual students in terms of the adaptation of classroom materials, use of learning resources, and technology as well as the use of English. As language socialization agents of the same subject with different groups of students, they engage in very different processes of English language learning and attend to opposite expectations among their bilingual/non-bilingual students. That is, the «huge» difference Julia refers to in line 3 indexes the unequal distribution of resources for non-bilingual students, who are not considered legitimate participants of the community of English language learners and are not expected to meet the same goals in the English class as the bilingual students will do. In lines 23-24, Julia evaluates the production of English with non-bilingual students as minimal and the result of obliging them to read aloud. Similarly, César embraces his agency to transform current English learning practices with non-bilingual students by trying to use more English in the classroom through reading aloud or dictating practices so non-bilingual students can also feel the usefulness of learning English (lines 28-37). In addition, he portrays these students as enjoying the process of being socialized to English when he decides to use more English and less Spanglish or Spanish in the classroom.

In all, belonging to San Marcos' BSC conveys complex language socialization processes leading to different ways of performing and enacting agency among CLIL teachers, who have to align and distance themselves from the decision-making processes they have to face regarding how to socialize bilingual/non-bilingual students in the same subjects «to» English, and, «through» English, to a variety of content subjects.

5. Concluding discussion

This article has incorporated the lens of language socialization to the latest ethnographic research on CLIL in Spain to further understand the complexity involved in the organization of teaching and learning in different CLIL-type bilingual programs. Although much has been written about the positive aspects of CLIL to improve Spanish students' English competence, there is still a lack of ethnographic studies that address CLIL practices across dimensions of power and inequality in the market of English as a global language (see the articles by Poveda and Fernández-Barrera, this issue).

The narratives of becoming and doing CLIL demonstrate that the situated meanings and local values attributed to English as the one and most important aspirational language, guarantor of upper social mobility, job security, and integration in the labor market, involves different language socialization processes unequally distributed to ultimately belong to these bilingual school communities. On the one hand, becoming a competent CLIL teacher entails the socialization to English at the institutionalized CEFR levels to participate in the bilingual programs. On the other hand, the process of becoming a linguistically accepted member of the community of CLIL-type bilingual teachers also entails not only the socialization to CLIL methodologies that incorporate students' communicative repertoires but it

Foro de Educación, v. 17, n. 27, julio-diciembre / july-december 2019, pp. 65-89.
e-ISSN: 1698-7802

also requires socialization to more inclusive language ideologies about the roles of languages in the CLIL classroom.

The analysis of agency as the capacity portrayed by San Marcos' teachers in the narratives to engage in different language socialization processes has illustrated how they attribute responsibility for theirs and others' actions and describe the struggles they face to implement policy mandates regarding the making of the bilingual program. This way, the understanding of narratives as a site of meta-agentive discourse reveals how science teachers at San Marcos must come to terms with the school's decisions for participation in the bilingual program while they struggle to do their best in CLIL classes. Despite the lack of professional development opportunities to sustain the CLIL practice, they invest their time and effort resorting to Internet and other resources to improve the everyday teaching practice. In the case of San Marcos' English teachers, who must socialize both bilingual and non-bilingual students, the narrative in excerpt 6 exemplifies how they have different expectations from both type of students and engage in very different teaching methodologies (i.e. communicative vs. grammar-based methods).

Belonging to the bilingual school communities created around CLIL-type bilingual programs becomes then a collaborative process that engenders models of professional personhood that calls into question the institutionalized local and global commodification of English language teaching in late-modernity. Furthermore, belonging to these bilingual school communities as the endpoint of language socialization (Baquedano-López & Kattan, 2008) must also be addressed from a multidimensional perspective that establishes the relationship between local practices, institutional processes and social structures.

6. References

Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual review of anthropology*, *30*(1), 109-137.

Ahearn, L. M. (2016). *Living language: An introduction to linguistic anthropology*. Chichester, U.K.: John Wiley & Sons.

Baquedano-López, P., & Kattan, S. (2008). Language socialization in schools. In Hornberger, N., & Duff, P. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Vol. 8: Language Socialization* [2nd ed.] (pp. 161-73). New York: Springer/Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Baquedano-López, P., & Mangual Figueroa, A. (2012). Language socialization and immigration. In Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language Socialization* (pp. 536-64). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Bayley, R., & Schecter, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Language Socialization in Bilingual and Multilingual Societies*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2014). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics, 35*(3), 243-262. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt011

Codó, E. (forthcoming). *Global CLIL: Critical, Ethnographic and Language Policy Perspectives*. London: Routledge (Routledge Critical Studies in Multilingualism Series).

Codó, E., & McDaid, J. (2019). English language assistants in the 21st century: Nation-state soft power in the experience economy. *Language, Culture and Society, 1*(2). John Benjamins.

Codó, E., & Patiño-Santos, A. (2017). CLIL, unequal working conditions and neoliberal subjectivities in a state secondary school. *Language Policy, 17*(4), 479-499. doi: 10.1007/ s10993-017-9451-5.

Codó, E., & Relaño-Pastor, A. M. (in press). Researching multilingual education: Ethnographic perspectives. In Siry, C., & Fernández, R. (Eds.), *Methodologies for research on teaching and learning*. Luxembourg: Sense Publishers (Bold Visions in Education Research Series).

Consejería de Educación, Cultura y Deporte – Castilla-La Mancha. (2018). *Castilla-La Mancha contará el próximo curso con una red de centros bilingües y plurilingües de calidad y refrendada por la comunidad educativa.* Retrieved from https://www.castillalamancha.es/actualidad/notasdeprensa/castilla-la-mancha-contará-el-próximo-curso-con-una-red-de-centros-bilingües-y-plurilingües-de

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2012). A Postscript on Institutional Motivations, Research Concerns and Professional Implications. *AILA Review*, *25*(1), 101-103. doi: https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.25.07dal

Dooly, M., & Masats, D. (2015). A critical appraisal of foreign language research in content and language integrated learning, young language learners, and technology-enhanced language learning published in Spain (2003-2012). *Language Teaching 48*(3), 343-372. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444815000117

Duff, P. (2012). Second Language Socialization. In Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language Socialization* (pp. 564-587). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Duff, P. A. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *30*, 169-192. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048

Duff, P. A., & Talmy, S. (2011). Language socialization approaches to second language acquisition: Social, cultural, and linguistic development in additional languages. In Atkinson, D. (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 95-116). Milton Park, Abingdon: Routledge.

Duranti, A. (2004). Agency in language. In Duranti. A. (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 451-473). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (Eds.). (2012). *The Handbook of Language Socialization.* Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Fernández Barrera, A. (2017). Language appropriations, ideologies and identities in bilingual schools in Castilla-La Mancha (Spain). *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature, 10*(2), 41-58.

García-Sánchez, I. M. (2016). Language socialization and marginalization. In Bonvillain, N. (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of linguistic anthropology* (pp. 159-174). London: Routledge.

García-Sánchez, I. M., & Mangual Figueroa, A. (2018, April). *Communicative Competence: Looking within and across public schooling contexts to examine power, learning, and evaluation*. Panel presented at the 2018 AERA Annual Meeting, New York City.

Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 31*(1), 339-361. doi: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085352

Labajos Miquel, D., & Martín Rojo, L. (with López Muñoz, M.). (2011). Content integration in bilingual education: Educational and interactional practices in the context of MEC-British Council partnership in Madrid region. In Escobar Urmeneta, C., Evnitskaya, N., Moore, E., & Patiño, A. (Eds.), *AICLE-CLIL-EMILE: Educació plurilingüe. Experiencias, research & polítiques* (pp. 65-81). Bellaterra: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona.

Lasagabaster, D., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2010). *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Llinares, A., & Morton, T. (Eds.). (2017). *Applied linguistics perspectives on CLIL* [Vol. 47]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

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

Marsh, D. (2002). *CLIL/EMILE-The European dimension: Actions, trends and foresight potential*. University of Jyväskylä, Finland: UniCOM, Continuing Education Centre.

Martín Rojo, L. (2013). (De)capitalising students through linguistic practices: A comparative analysis of new educational programmes in the global era. In Duchêne, A., Moyer, M., & Roberts, C. (Eds.), *Language, migration and social inequalities: A critical perspective on institutions and work* (pp. 118-146). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Miller, P. J., Koven, M., & Lin, S. (2011). Language socialization and narrative. In Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language Socialization* (pp. 190-208). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Morton, T. (2016). Being a language teacher in the content classroom: Teacher identity and content and language integrated learning (CLIL). In Preece, S. (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and identity* (pp. 382-395). London: Routledge.

Ochs, E. (2002). Becoming a speaker of culture. In Kramsch, C. (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization* (pp. 99-120). London: Continuum.

Ochs, E., & Capps, L. (1996). Narrating the self. *Annual review of anthropology*, *25*(1), 19-43. doi: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.25.1.19

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2008). Language socialization: An historical overview. In Duff, P., & Hornberger, N. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Vol. 8: Language Socialization* (pp. 3-15). New York. Springer.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2012). The theory of language socialization. In Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language Socialization* (pp. 1-21). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Patiño-Santos, A. (2012). The discursive construction of school failure: A critical ethnographical sociolinguistics in a school in Madrid. *Spanish in Context, 8*(2), 235- 256. doi: https://doi.org/10.1075/sic.8.2.03pat

Patiño-Santos, A. (2018). «No-one told me it would all be in Catalan!» – narratives and language ideologies in the Latin American community at school. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *250*, 59-86. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2017-0055

Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2012). CLIL research in Europe: Past, present, and future. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15*(3), 315-341.

Pérez-Milans, M., & Patiño-Santos, A. (2014). Language education and institutional change in a Madrid multilingual school. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *11*(4), 449-470. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2014.944532

Poveda, D., Giampapa, F., & Relaño-Pastor, Ana M. (forthcoming). Gatekeeping the interactional order: Field access and linguistic ideologies in CLIL-type bilingual education programs in Spanish secondary schools. *Qualitative Research*.

Relaño Pastor, A. M. (2014). *Shame and Pride in Narrative: Mexican Women's Language Experiences at the U.S.-Mexico Border.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Relaño-Pastor, A. (2015). The Commodification of English in «Madrid, comunidad bilingüe»: Insights from the CLIL Classroom. *Language Policy, 14*(2), 131-152. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-014-9338-7

Relaño-Pastor, A. (2018a). Bilingual Education and Neoliberal CLIL Practices. In Tollefson, J. W., & Pérez-Milans, M. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning* (pp. 505-525). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Relaño-Pastor, A. (2018c). Understanding Bilingualism in Castilla-La Mancha: Emotional and Moral Stancetaking in Parental Narratives. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada, 31*(2), 578-604. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2017-0057

Relaño-Pastor, A. M. (2018b). Narrative Circularity, Disputed Transformations, and Bilingual Appropriations at a Public School «Somewhere in La Mancha». *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* [250 special issue], 87-112.

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2013). CLIL implementation: From policy-makers to individual initiatives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(3), 231-243. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2013.777383

Rymes, B. (2014). *Communicating beyond language: Everyday encounters with diversity*. New York: Routledge.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 696-735. doi:10.2307/412243

Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 15,* 163-191.doi: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.15.100186.001115

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(3), 331-350. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.00233.x

7. Transcription conventions (adapted from Sacks, Jefferson, & Schegloff, 1974)

↑	rising intonation
↓	falling intonation
CAPS	louder than surrounding talk
.	at the end of words marks falling intonation
,	at the end of words marks slight rising intonation
-	abrupt cutoff, stammering quality when hyphenating syllables of a word
!	animated tone, not necessarily an exclamation
> <	speech faster than normal
____	emphasis
:::	elongated sounds
· hh	inhalations
ha ha	indicates laughter
uhm uh	shows continuing listenership
° °	soft talk
time elapsed in tenths of seconds	
(.)	micropause

[ ]	overlapping speech
(( ))	nonverbal behavior
( )	non audible segment
=	no interval between adjacent utterances

8. Appendix

8.1. *Appendix 1*

Excerpt 3. «Empecé a dar clase directamente» [Interview with Juan Luis (JL), San Marcos' biology teacher, and Juan José (JJ), San Marcos's technology and math teacher in compulsory secondary education. Participants: JL, JJ and AL (Alicia), researcher)]

1. JL: Y:: yo entré a dar ciencias digamos lo mío (.) ciencias o química o relacionado
2. AL: uhm
3. JL: Luego: pues no sé hace (.) ya bastantes años (.) no sé a lo mejor cinco o seis años
4. Antonio hh me dijo (.5) ve pensando introducir algo (.) en inglés (.) en lo que digas y
5. tal
6. AL: uhm uh
7. JL: Claro (.) no me dijo nunca:: (.) >la la la la< idea que tenía él de ya de de cosas de
8. estas de: (.) secciones bilingües
9. AL: uhm uh
10. […]
11. AL: Entonces se sugirió por parte del centro [no?]
12. JL: [sí] =
13. AL: = que se empezara [a incluir contenidos]
14. JL: [Sí sí sí sí] =
15. AL: = en inglés (.5) vale (.) pero sin ningún tipo de instrucciones no?
16. JL: No
17. […]
18. AL: Y tú cuándo empezaste a darla?
19. JJ: yo antes trabajaba en una empresa privada (.) y bueno (.) sabía inglés porque:: lo
20. había necesitado siempre (.) para: trabajar fuera: (.)
21. AL: uhm uh =
22. JJ: = y eso (.5) y entonces cuando decidí: (.) pegar cambiazo a mi vida (.) una de las
23. opciones que valoré fue (1.5) venirme aquí (.) y entonces hablé con Antonio (.) yo era
24. antiguo alumno (.5) y:: y bueno me dijo pues que querían poner en marcha u:n (.5)
25. u:n proyecto bilingüe (.5) porque en aquel momento no había (.5) no había nada (.5)
26. y:: (.) me lo ofrecieron a mí (.) y entonces empecé a dar clase ya directamente:::

Excerpt 4. «Me resigno al inglés»

1. JL: = el inglés digamos que (.) me resigno (.5) [con él]
2. AL: [ya] =
3. JL: = el inglés (.) no me gusta pero en fin (.) [tal y como va]
4. AL: [es lo que hay] =
5. JL: = hoy en día el mundo (.4) no me gusta el inglés
6. AL: Entonces no tienes pensado sacarte más pero bueno [de momento]
7. JL: [no lo sé] (.) de momento no porque no puedo [o sea]

Foro de Educación, v. 17, n. 27, julio-diciembre / july-december 2019, pp. 65-89.
e-ISSN: 1698-7802

8. AL: [ya] =
9. JL: = no tengo tiempo para ponerme y tal (.) pero no lo descarto
   AL: Uhm uh

Excerpt 5. «Les explico cuatro cosillas básicas en español»

1. JL: Pero en primero (2.5) al principio (.) los primeros temas (2.0) voy::: (.) es que
2. claro (1.0) oficialmente debe ser todo en inglés pero yo creo personalmente si es
3. bilingüe es bi (.) lingüe (.5) no puedes enseñar y que aprendan unos contenidos
4. exclusivamente en inglés
5. AL: Uhm uh
6. JL: Cuando eso va a ser para el resto de su vida (.5) [tendré]
7. AL: [uhm uh] =
8. JL: = yo también que ver cosas (.) cómo se dice eso en español
9. […]
10. JL: [y entonces] yo:: doy (.) ciertas cosas (.) en español por ejemplo en física (1.0)
11. pues cuando expli… explico ciertas cosas (1.0) puesto que además es el primer
12. año que ven física (.) física
13. AL: Uhm uh
14. JL: Les explico digamos cuatro cosillas básicas en español (1.0) ellos te hacen su
15. composición de lugar y luego a partir de ahí ya construimos en inglés (.5) con
16. ejercicios en inglés y tal (.) y ya luego ellos lo ven en inglés (.) y controlan el
17. inglés
18. AL: Claro
19. JL: Pero ya el concepto físico (.5) lo han entendido primero
20. AL: Claro (.) si ya es de por sí difícil entenderlo
21. JL: Claro
22. […]
23. JL: Se deben evaluar contenidos
24. AL: Vale
25. JL: Se deben evaluar contenidos (.5) la (.) el idioma ya se evalúa en la clase de
26. inglés
27. JJ: Efectivamente
28. […]
29. AL: >bueno< habéis oído lo de AICLE no? lo habéis usado en clase:?
30. JJ: Esto es casi imaginación (1.5) o sea está la imaginación para montar
31. actividades que te: resuelven y sean útiles para: aprender lo que quieres que
32. aprendan
33. AL: Uhm uh uhm uh
34. JL: Entonces pues eso (.) yo: (.) del tema de los artrópodos lo hecho de una manera
35. en grupos (.) ahora he empezado con los vertebrados (.) voy a trabajar también en
36. grupos de otra manera (.) para que no sea siempre lo lo mismo
37. AL: Claro
38. JL: Y tal (.5) algunos te funcionan más (.) otros te funcionan menos (1.0) pero en
39. el fondo yo también echo de menos (1.0) tampoco tengo tiempo de buscar por internet
40. (.) [para]
41. AL: [Claro] =
42. JL: = para encontrar (.) ideas
43. JJ: Sí (.) yo también

Excerpt 6. «La producción de inglés que hace un grupo de inglés es mínima»

1. AL: Claro (.) habéis notado: (.) en la asignatura de inglés (.) no sé (.) algunas
2. desventajas o ventajas e:n (.) en [cuanto a los alumnos bilingües]
3. JU: [Hay muchísima diferencia] (.) pero mucha (.) mucha
4. AM: Y qué (.) qué hacéis con=cómo (.5) >o sea< cómo lidiáis con eso
5. JU: Pues adaptas (.) adaptas el material (.) a lo que tienes enfrente [al tipo]
6. AL: [uhm uh] =
7. JU: = de clase que [tengas]
8. AM: [uhm uh]
9. JU: Entonces si la clase es bilingüe (.) te puedes permitir ciertas cosas
10. AL: Uhm uh
11. JU: Llevas el material diferente (.) puedes utilizar más recursos (.) materiales
12. audiovisuales (.) porque es (.) no sé (.) es que además es agradecido (.) porque claro
13. MA: Claro (.) sí
14. AL: Uhm uh
15. JU: Mientras que (.) si tienes clases no bilingües hh pues tienes que adaptar (.)
16. quitas temario (.) [quitas]
17. AM: [uhm uh] =
18. JU: = Cosas hh [quitas hh texto]
19. ES: [Y todo más simple]
20. ((@@@))
21. JU: [Todo más simple todo] (.5) en fin
22. AL: Sí ya lo he visto (.5) sí
23. JU: Y les obligas a leer (.) >o sea ellos< (.) la producción de inglés que hace un un
24. grupo no bilingüe es mínima
25. AM: Uhm uh
26. AL: Uhm uh
27. […]
28. CE: [Claro] yo estoy últimamente intentando en las clases pues (.) intentar
29. hablarles más en inglés (.5) o en espánglish
30. AM: Uhm uh
31. CE: Para que ellos se sientan también útiles (.) que están aprendiendo un idioma (.) que
32. [bueno que]
33. AL: [uhm uh]
34. CE: Eh:: estamos leyendo má::s (.) [estamos]
35. AM: [uhm uh] =
36. CE: = >en fín< (.5) la participación
37. AM: Uhm uh
38. CS: Parece (.) parece que les gusta que les hagas dictados [a ver]
39. AM: [Uhm uh] =
40. CS: = si te entienden (.) [les gusta]
41. AM: [uhm uh] =

9. Acknowledgments

Data presented in this chapter was collected as part of the research project «The Appropriation of English as a Global Language in Castilla-La Mancha Schools: A multilingual, situated and comparative approach» – APINGLO-CLM – (Ref.: FFI2014-54179-C2-2-P), funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (MINECO), 2015-2018. We are particularly indebted to the teachers who kindly

Foro de Educación, v. 17, n. 27, julio-diciembre / july-december 2019, pp. 65-89.
e-ISSN: 1698-7802

accepted to be interviewed and shared their CLIL stories with us. Special thanks to Ulpiano José Losa Ballesteros for patiently transcribing these interviews and moving this project forward.

This publication has been possible thanks to the 2019 funds granted to the Research Consolidated Group LADIC, UCLM, co-financed by the European Union and the European Regional Development Fund.

página intencionadamente en blanco / page intentionally blank