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Abstract

This dissertation investigates the concept of ‘bilingualism’ and the implementation of different CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning)-type bilingual programmes (BPs) at secondary education in the region of Castilla-La Mancha (CLM), central Spain, from a critical, sociolinguistic, ethnographic perspective. This region has experienced a dramatical social transformation due to the rapid proliferation of BPs in most public (i.e. state-run) and semi-private (state-subsidised private) schools for over two decades. Since the first BPs were implemented in the region back in 1996, the evolution and subsequent ‘explosion’ of BPs have become a major controversial issue in the political, social and educational arenas due to the social inequalities currently emerging in the school communities attempting to ‘become bilingual’. This Critical Sociolinguistic Ethnography (CSE) was carried out in three bi/plurilingual (Spanish/English/French) secondary schools in one of the provinces comprising the region of CLM.

The methodological design combines traditional ethnographic techniques, such as participant-observation and field notes, with interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1982; Rymes, 2009; Goffman, 1981, 1992), to identify interactional patterns or recurrent sequences of action and activities in the CLIL classrooms. Building on Heller’s “critical social perspective on the concept of bilingualism, combining practice, ideology and political economy” (2007: 2), this dissertation aims at examining language ideologies circulating among stakeholders (teachers, families, students) and social categorisation processes in situated classroom practices. Departing from this premise, this study explores discourse in daily meaning-making practices in relation to wider social, political, economic and ideological changes tied to the new economy. In particular, it looks into identity construction related to moral (“good”, “appropriate”) and linguistic (“native”/“non-native”; “bilingual”/“non-bilingual”) configurations out of which tensions, dilemmas and contradictions emerge in the process of appropriating and legitimising BPs in my three focal schools.
The analysis shows that the bilingualism movement in CLM has given rise to social categorisation, social inequalities and identity construction processes related to the reconfiguration of bilingualism, bilingual selves and the BPs. Likewise, these processes are linked to the restructuration of material and symbolic resources underpinning the institutional legitimisation of bilingualism under the conditions of the 21st century.
Resumen

Esta tesis investiga el concepto de “bilingüismo” y la implementación de diferentes Programas Bilingües (PP.BB.), basados en la metodología CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), en centros de secundaria de la región de Castilla-La Mancha (CLM) desde una perspectiva crítica, sociolingüística y etnográfica. Esta región ha experimentado una drástica transformación social debido a la rápida proliferación de PP.BB. en la mayoría de escuelas públicas y concertadas durante más de dos décadas. Desde que los primeros PP.BB. comenzaron a implementarse en la región en 1996, la evolución y posterior “explosión” de PP.BB. se han convertido en un tema candente en el panorama político, social y educativo por las desigualdades sociales que están apareciendo actualmente en las comunidades escolares cuya gran aspiración consiste en “llegar a ser bilingües”. Esta Etnografía Sociolingüística Crítica (ESC) se ha llevado a cabo en tres escuelas de secundaria bi/plurilingües (español/inglés/francés) localizadas en una de las provincias que forman parte de la región de CLM.

El diseño metodológico combina las técnicas etnográficas tradicionales, como la observación de participantes, con la sociolingüística interaccional y otras tradiciones (Gumperz, 1982; Rymes, 2009; Goffman, 1981, 1992), con el fin de identificar patrones o secuencias recurrentes de acción y actividades en el aula CLIL. Basada en Heller (2007) acerca de la “perspectiva social crítica sobre el concepto de bilingüismo, combinando práctica, ideología y economía política” (p. 2), esta tesis tiene como objetivo examinar las ideologías lingüísticas que circulan entre los agentes sociales implicados (profesorado, familias, alumnado), y los procesos de categorización social que ocurren en las prácticas educativas situadas. Partiendo de esta premisa, este estudio explora los disCURSOS en las prácticas diarias de creación de significado en relación con otros cambios sociales, políticos, económicos e ideológicos más amplios ligados a la nueva economía. En concreto, se investiga la construcción de identidad relacionada con las configuraciones
morales ("bueno", “apropiado”), y lingüísticas (“nativo” / “no-nativo”; “bilingüe” / “no bilingüe”), a partir de las cuales emergen tensiones, dilemas y contradicciones en el proceso de apropiación y legitimación de los PBs in mis tres centros escolares objeto de este estudio.

El análisis muestra que el “movimiento del bilingüismo” en CLM ha dado origen a procesos de categorización social, desigualdades sociales y otros de construcción de identidades, que se encuentran relacionados con la reconfiguración del bilingüismo, las identidades bilingües y los PP.BB. De la misma forma, estos procesos están relacionados con la reestructuración de los recursos materiales y simbólicos que sustentan la legitimación institucional del bilingüismo en las condiciones actuales del siglo XXI.
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PART I: INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER 1

SITUATING THE CRITICAL SOCIOLINGUISTIC ETHNOGRAPHY OF CLIL IN CASTILLA-LA MANCHA (CLM)

1.1. Introduction

“Social life must be explained, not by the conception of those who participate in it, but by deep causes which lie outside of consciousness.”
(Durkheim, 1970: 250).

Back in 2014, when I started working in the English language teaching field, I came across some students who had previously studied in some of the broadly-known ‘bilingual schools’. At that time, the number of these type of schools was increasing in the autonomous community of Castilla-La Mancha (CLM, hereafter) (central Spain) as a consequence of the regional language-in-education policies in force. The term ‘bilingual’ began to be widely used due to the inclusion of an additional language in the ordinary curriculum (namely, English). Nevertheless, as a result of the European language policy mandates promoting plurilingualism, these schools included sometimes more than one language in their original ‘bilingual’ programme (French, Italian or German), thus becoming ‘plurilingual’. For the purpose of my dissertation, I will therefore use ‘bilingual’ when referring to Spanish-English, and ‘plurilingual’ to address Spanish-English/French. To avoid confusion, I will use ‘bilingual programmes’ (BPs, hereafter) to refer to any type of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) programmes.

From my experience, most of those bi/plurilingual students I was teaching proved to have better academic results than their peers and some were even proud of having belonged to one of these prestigious schools. Not only students but friends
of mine were also working in different bi/plurilingual schools as English language teachers. When discussing about the implementation of these bi/plurilingual programmes and their role as English specialists, they became critical of the real - or fake - benefits of these programmes for students’ academic future and prospects in the job market. From their career perspective, they complaint about the unequal conditions for teachers to achieve a full-time position in primary and secondary education stages in different parts of the country. In this sense, they – as English language specialists – found more difficulties than other content-subject colleagues who were officially accredited with a B2 or C1 level of English - according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). As a matter of fact, these accredited bilingual teachers were prioritised over the ‘non-bilingual’ teachers in the Spanish public examination to become civil servants in the education field. In the case of CLM, these circumstances were not less controversial – and remain as such today. Political economic changes in the last decade have caused controversial social issues in terms of prospective bilingual education, including the current initiatives undertook by regional educational authorities.

One of the major phenomenon in the education system of the autonomous community of CLM – and Spain, extensively –, has been the rapid implementation of the so-called ‘bilingual programmes’ (Spanish-English) in both public (i.e. state-run) and semi-private (i.e. state-subsidised private) schools. In this dissertation, I shall address them as ‘CLIL-type bilingual programmes’ (García, 2011; Relaño Pastor, 2018a). It has meant such a transformation in the social and institutional order that current bi/plurilingual education has become one of the main controversial topics underpinning political and economic interests. According to David Marsh (2018), the main problem relies on the lack of teaching innovation in the CLIL classroom. He points out methodology as the key element in bilingual education success, as the actual CLIL teaching practices are mostly based on memorising techniques, repetition tasks and a lack of critical thinking. Despite having both advocates and opponents in different social and political sectors, the bilingualism effects and its implications are unquestionable. During the last two decades, the proliferation of these bi/plurilingual education programmes has given rise to a new
socio-political panorama, where multiple struggles, complexities, tensions, dilemmas and ambivalences have emerged in these bi/plurilingual schools, which are precisely the focus of my inquiry.

Initially, this dissertation was going to be based on a revision of multilingual education in Spain, understood from a CLIL perspective, and the way these linguistic programmes were being implemented in the region of CLM. It was not until I started doing my fieldwork in the focal schools and got deeply involved in the daily life and practices of each school that I could feel that something else was going on beyond the ordinary classroom. I then decided that I should adopt a critical ethnographic perspective in order to put familiar things into question (Heller, Pietikäinen and Pujolar, 2018). This approach would allow me, on the one hand, to account for the pedagogical and sociolinguistic implications of these linguistic programmes, and, on the other hand, to explore the role of languages in the co-construction, (re)production or perpetuation of identities and other social processes embedded in interactional events. In this critical sociolinguistic ethnography (Heller, 2011), language is actually the key cornerstone and point of departure. I particularly find the critical sociolinguistic ethnography (CSE, hereafter) approach to have strong analytical potential to depict, construct and deconstruct realities, beliefs, attitudes and ideologies within the manifold social processes that have become relevant in my research. For the purpose of this dissertation, language is understood as a set of resources used for social change, a ‘commodity’ in some cases. From this perspective, certain languages hold a specific added value serving political and economic interests. This is exactly where this study departs from.

It is true that ethnography is much about impressions, feelings, emotions, engagement and negotiation with the participants, but it is ultimately a human activity. In the process of my ethnography, I became aware of daily nuances that led to contradictions, tensions and dilemmas in twofold ways: with my own initial research expectations and with what it was institutionally expected by the schools. On the one hand, I departed from a set of hypotheses that this dissertation aims at proving right or wrong. In addition, other research questions emerged in the process of my ethnographic fieldwork. On the other hand, my focal schools, as
institutionalised entities, hold diverse values, beliefs and positions within the social order. In this regard, each school community behaves accordingly to maintain their status and image projected onto society.

During this initial process, there was a turning point regarding my first research questions. After conducting various interviews with some of the teachers involved in the different bi/plurilingual programmes, I realised that certain dominant discourses were circulating regarding how participants (students and teachers) were categorised, positioned and evaluated. Therefore, I eventually decided to put the questions of social processes, power relations and inequalities into the centre of my inquiry. In other words, I committed myself as a researcher (with my own beliefs and moral issues) to voicing social difference from a qualitative perspective. I thought that ‘immersing’ myself into these school communities could provide me with an inner perspective of how these bi/plurilingual education programmes were being implemented and what consequences they were having at a social level in terms of identity construction processes and ideologies.

From a more personal experience, living in a traditionally rural, poor area ‘somewhere in La Mancha’, accustomed to a static society regarding innovation, advances and change, it was an appealing challenge for me to deepen into these aspects to comprehend the complexities beneath the public surface. In the progress of my investigation, one of the issues I became fascinated with was a large amount of private language schools (in Spanish, ‘academias’), competing in the local linguistic market and promoting intensive English courses to get a prestigious certificate, some even assuring effective learning in a very short period of time (see Figure 1). This “bilingual craze” (Relaño Pastor, 2018a) has spread out dramatically mainly among young people who urge to be officially accredited to compete in the labour market.

Most news and reports propagated by the regional administration authorities about the new bi/plurilingual education programmes - since they were first implemented in the region back in 1996 - have appraised the success of their implementation and the beneficial effects on learners. In this line, research on CLIL and other types of BPs have emphasised cognitive development among English
language learners who attend these bilingual schools. It was surprising how once I got involved in everyday classroom practices, such effects seemed to be reduced to very few students in each school. The bilingual track management and the curricular organisation of the subjects taught in an additional language are accomplished differently by each school administration. I then wondered what other factors were influential but taken for granted in the process of teaching and learning within these bi/plurilingual communities, both inside and outside the classroom.

*Figure 1. Advertisement of a local language school promoting successful intensive English courses: “Get your official accreditation in just two months”.*

Therefore, the importance of taking a critical ethnographic sociolinguistic approach is rooted in its potential to better understand the impact of those linguistic programmes into the transforming social order of bi/plurilingual schools. More specifically, the methodological and analytical tools this approach offers provides a holistic perspective on the way ideologies, policies and practices come into play. In fact, the cornerstone of this study relies on the “critique” (Heller, 2011), by reflexively engaging in social processes embedded in power relations and social struggle within
specific bi/multilingual communities. In so doing, this ethnography will contribute to explaining social life “by deep causes which lie outside of consciousness” (Durkheim, 1970, p. 250).

Before moving onto the research goals, it is relevant to mention that this dissertation draws on the data collected as part of a larger coordinated research project (MUEDGE). Therefore, all data presented in the following chapters, particularly in Part IV (Data analysis and results), have been incorporated to a larger corpus collected from 2015 until 2019. Nevertheless, these data have not been taken into consideration for the total count of data collected as part of my own fieldwork (see Chapter 6). Apart from that, this dissertation has been structured around the three articles included in Part IV. They will discuss some of the results of my data analysis framed within the theoretical and methodological apparatus described in Part II and III, with the aim to answer the research questions and goals of this CSE (see section 1.2 and 1.3).

1.2. Goals

As stated above, this dissertation focuses on a CSE of bilingualism and CLIL-type bi/plurilingual programmes in the region of CLM. For this purpose, this study investigates situated discursive and linguistic accounts of the construction of language ideologies and identities through CLIL practices within what I define as ‘the bilingualism movement’ in CLM. I approach bilingualism as a social movement – or a sort of mobilization - in this context where different ideologies, motivations and beliefs influence social structure and political behaviour (Walder, 2009).

---

1 The collection of data has been possible thanks to the fellowship awarded by the Ministry of Education, which allowed me to be a member of the coordinated project ‘Multilingual education in the global era: Markets, desire, practices and identities among Spanish adolescents in two autonomous communities’ (MUEDGE). Project 1: 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. Ana M. Relaño (P.I.). Sister Project: APINGLO-CAT, led by Dr Eva Codó, Department of English & German, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
My situated ethnography (see Chapter 4 for the theoretical grounds) is centred on two semi-private schools (San Teo and San Marcos) and one public school (High Towers). The main aim of this study relies on the triangulation of language ideologies, language policies and classroom practices in order to make sense of the social world around these school communities. By adopting a critical sociolinguistic lens, and paying special attention to language, this study aims at better grasping deeper social issues linked to wider political and economic processes. By understanding language as social practice, this investigation explores which roles certain languages play in social processes of identity construction and the (re)production of ideologies. It also looks into the connections established with power relations and social categorisation processes by interpreting languages as symbolic and material resources people have access to and/or control under specific conditions and for what purposes. In other words, this dissertation aims at placing language, ideologies and practices as key aspects to comprehend the concept of ‘bilingualism’, and the implementation of bi/plurilingual/CLIL education programmes against the backdrop of globalisation and neoliberal forces ruling the 21st century.

In this context, everyday situated practices are key to understand the intricacies of social interaction in institutional settings in relation to the communicative, social, historical, political and economic conditions under which interaction takes place (Copland and Creese, 2015; Patiño-Santos, 2016). It is therefore an ambitious critical sociolinguistic ethnography informed by a socio-political perspective to study circulating discourses and emergent practices within these bi/plurilingual communities.

1.3. Research questions

Among the set of my research questions established in order to achieve the aforementioned goals, one overarching question vertebrates the whole process of this investigation: how are CLIL-type bilingual programmes implemented in CLM? This first inquiry looks into the origin and evolution of regional language-in-education
policies amended and approved in CLM over two decades with the resulting consequences in actual practice. In this region, different models of CLIL-type bilingual education programmes have been implemented in mainstream education, mainly primary and secondary schools. Thus, the point of departure of this dissertation relies on the structural, organisational and pedagogical transformation of traditional teaching practices from the language policy level to actual classroom practices. Other key research questions are the following:

1) How are these bilingual education programmes organised in the region of CLM?
2) How are language-in-education policies appropriated and understood differently in these bilingual programmes?

My second set of research questions investigates the dominant discourses circulating among stakeholders (i.e. teachers, students, families) mirroring not only the values, beliefs and attitudes towards the concept of bilingualism itself, but also those meanings associated to the fact of ‘being’ or ‘becoming’ bilingual in this sociolinguistic context of CLM. It particularly explores each specific educational site and classroom practices, where these bi/plurilingual programmes are conceptualised, acknowledged or contested through discourse and interaction:

3) What are the circulating dominant discourses regarding bilingualism and bilingual programmes?
4) How are these CLIL classroom practices co-constructed, negotiated or disputed in interaction at three focal schools?

In my micro-analysis of classroom practices and interaction, I pay attention to three key issues: the role of language(s) in the process of meaning-making negotiation; 2) the way content is organised, taught and acquired through English; and 3) how teachers and students construct both academic and linguistic knowledge. From this analytical lens, I then focus on the ideologies circulating among teachers regarding
their own practice and how they integrate content and language. As already stated, I encountered different tensions and dilemmas emerging during my fieldwork, which were closely related to the way these BPs had been institutionalised internally in each school and appropriated differently by the school administration due to the vagueness of the regional mandates, which have been amended over the years. Likewise, these research questions go further to examine what language ideologies are co-constructed and transmitted in interaction. For this purpose, the role that languages (namely, English and Spanish) play in the process of teaching and learning is key to better grasp the values assigned to each language. Through a close analysis of classroom interactional events, this investigation also pays attention to bilingual identity construction processes regarding teachers and students involved in the BP.

My last and most critical research question is: what social categorisation processes occur in these bilingual schools? It aims at discovering social difference, inequalities, and exclusion. Consequently, this study considers the socio-political context of bilingualism in CLM in order to elucidate what type of social categories are emerging, and the way these are shaped, (re)produced and maintained or contested, in some cases, by the social agents involved in these bi/plurilingual schools. The ultimate aim of this research is to reflect political and institutional changes, along with the potential short and long-term consequences for the current educational system.

In short, this CSE builds on recent critiques on content and language integrated learning and aims at providing a ‘twisted’ angle towards the type of bi/plurilingual education programmes that are enacted by these institutions parallel to the changing language-in-education policies in CLM. ‘Data analysis and results’ (Part IV) will shed light on the extent to which these regional policies may affect social difference and inequalities among agents in the local school communities under study. For that purpose, schools are understood as institutions embodying power, arranged according to specific social structures, organization and dynamics serving political and economic interests of the current world. Social actors, thus, play the role of agents of change, production and reproduction of such social processes embedded
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1.4. Structure and organisation

In this section, I will describe the structure of this thesis and the organisation of the chapters. The eight chapters comprising this dissertation are organised according to the four main parts that, corresponding to different conceptualisation levels, contribute to enhancing the relevance of these institutional sites as the focus of my research.

Part I (“Introduction”) is divided into Chapter 1 and 2. They are both devoted to contextualizing this dissertation. These chapters mainly situate the critical sociolinguistic ethnography focused on CLIL-type bilingual education programmes in the autonomous community of CLM. Chapter 1 provides an overview of the rationale, main goals and research questions, an overall description of the organisation of this dissertation and a brief clarification on some ethical concerns. It therefore examines my research approach decisions and positioning in the ethnographic fieldwork. Chapter 2 offers some background information about the Spanish education system in terms of the socio-political, legal and historical factors that may have had an essential role in the evolution and transformation of bi/plurilingual educational settings. These two introductory chapters are fundamental in order to fully understand the remaining chapters, particularly the data analysis in Part IV and the resulting discussion and conclusion.

Part II (“Theoretical Framework”) includes Chapters 3 and 4. Chapter 3 provides an overview of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), ranging from the main theoretical grounds to research carried out in Europe and Spain, where a brief account of critical studies on CLIL are included to root this CSE of CLIL in CLM. Within this section, I will describe and explain the case of this autonomous community as a mirror of Madrid regarding the socio-political factors influencing the
development of different CLIL-type bilingual programmes. Chapter 4 is completely focused on the theoretical foundations of this dissertation’s approach, which constitutes the cornerstone and unifying thread of my research. This chapter mainly covers its anthropological roots from North America and its evolution into the current European Linguistic Ethnography. It follows with the theoretical and methodological grounds of Linguistic Ethnography and concludes by rationalising the need for such approach in the region of CLM, where the proliferation of CLIL-type bilingual programmes has completely transformed the social, political and linguistic scenario.

Part III deals with the “Methodological framework”, which is divided into two chapters. Chapter 5 is devoted to a full ethnographic description of the three research sites, including an overview of the organisation and management of the BP implemented at each school, as well as the most relevant aspects for which these schools are highly demanded in the local community. Chapter 6 is focused on the ethnographic process itself, from a description of the different methods used in the data collection phase - paying a special attention to participant observation, to the types of data and amount of sets collected. This chapter concludes with a reflexive section about school access, negotiation with stakeholders and particular cases of gatekeeping, which I found particularly relevant for this research as these aspects became an essential component throughout my fieldwork. Part IV mainly presents my data analysis in three different articles. These papers discuss some of the results of this CSE but they are presented as “published” (Chapter 7) and “in progress” (Chapter 8).

The last chapter of this dissertation is dedicated to other results that are currently being analysed for a further publication based on a case study of a CLIL teacher working at a state school under very specific labour conditions. This has been thoughtfully considered to be one of the key chapters due to the potential research interest as a whole single paper taking into consideration the particular circumstances in which my fieldwork was accomplished. The general discussion following the last chapter will shed light on the most relevant issues emerging throughout this dissertation by adopting a critical angle towards the current situation of bilingualism and BPs in the region of CLM. The final conclusion constitutes a
reflection on the whole research and ethnographic process, departing from my own position as a researcher in the fieldwork to the way this dissertation might contribute not only to enhancing existing research on CLIL, ideologies and practices in bi/plurilingual contexts from a CSE perspective, but also to voicing current tensions, dilemmas and ambivalences resulting from the ‘bilingualism movement’ in vogue.

1.5. Ethical considerations

This dissertation has been accomplished by considering different ethical concerns regarding the data collection methods and fieldwork process. On the one hand, the three schools kindly accepted to participate in this research voluntarily, being previously informed about the object and aims of this study, the data treatment and the rights they had over this data at any time during the process of the investigation. Furthermore, they were provided with my personal contact details so that they could always communicate with me if it were necessary.

With regard to the participants, they were also informed and supplied with consent forms (see Appendix 1). As most of them were underage students, these consent forms had to be signed by their families/legal tutors, and then handed in to their English/CLIL teacher in charge - or the coordinator of the programme. In any case, they were always requested to give their permission for audio recording before being interviewed or observed while teaching in their classrooms. It is relevant to highlight, though, that all the participants and the three focal schools are addressed anonymously through pseudonyms in order to keep their privacy.
CHAPTER 2

OVERVIEW OF THE SPANISH EDUCATION SYSTEM: SOCIO-POLITICAL, LEGAL AND HISTORICAL FACTORS

2.1. Introduction: Towards a bilingual education model

Bilingual education has been one of the most politicised issues in the transforming social and political arena over the last decade. Before moving onto the explanation of the origin, evolution and current situation of bilingual education in CLM, it is crucial to understand various political, social and economic shifts within the state education system in order to better grasp how, why and the extent to which the ‘bilingual phenomenon’ in this region has reached unquestionable evidence, thus becoming a sort of ‘trend’ within the local/national school market.

Education in Spain has always been in the spotlight of the socio-political panorama. It reached its peak after the central government delegated educational responsibility to the regional administration back in the 1990s. Not only has the education system endured political changes in the central government with its corresponding new laws on education, but it has also had to face the regional administration mandates under opposing political parties at different historical times, understanding education in quite divergent (ideologically-based) ways.

Having grown up myself in a town where the stigmatisation of public schools has been traditionally taken for granted and having studied in public schools from primary to higher education, during my fieldwork I became aware that the implementation of these CLIL-type bilingual programmes in public schools did gradually affect how institutions and individuals constructed these educational sites regardless of the socioeconomic background of their students. With the recent exponential growth of diverse kinds of bi/plurilingual education programmes, schools have made efforts to maintain their prestige through diverse measures, innovative programmes or a wide range of extracurricular activities in an attempt to stand out
among the rest of schools at the local and national level. On the other hand, the increasing social and political interest in bilingual education, particularly in public schools at the regional and national level, has paved the way to achieve a more democratic education system.

Despite this apparently equitable language planning and policy, once I started carrying out interviews with teachers and observing classroom interactions, I realized how many complexities emerged regarding this ‘bilingualism movement’ based on the distinction between public and semi-private schools. In the next section, I will explain the historical and political shifts that have affected the still existing ‘gap’ between public and private education sectors. This information will be useful to better grasp what type of bilingualism is appropriated and understood by both educational sectors, but also how these institutions co-construct the concept of ‘becoming bilingual’.

2.2. Public vs. private education

The double-streaming into public and semi-private schools has been one of the most politically controversial issues regarding the schooling system in the Spanish territory. As stated before, even though nowadays both educational sectors are in theory equal in rights and duties, the traditional dichotomy between public and private remains visible. In this sense, the institutionalisation of these bilingual education programmes have also influenced how society construct and assess both types of schools. Before looking back at the origin of this historical polarisation between public and (semi-)private, I will first describe, in general terms, what semi-private schools are and how they are sustained in order to get a glimpse of the social and political connotations this concept has entailed until the present time. This brief account will be useful to fully understand the impact and evolution of these institutions.

Semi-private schools, widely known as “colegios concertados”, are partially subsidized by the government but privately-owned. These schools are supposed to
admit every kind of student regardless of their socio-economic background, academic performance or district they belong to. Despite that, these schools have always attracted traditional, upper-middle social classes, mainly due to the families' investment in their children's schooling. To be more precise, the schooling up to the 4th grade of Compulsory Secondary Education (CSE, hereafter) must be free. Nevertheless, in A levels (Bachillerato) (i.e. two pre-university academic years of specialised streaming), families are required to pay a specific amount of fee depending on the school's requirements and the services they offer. Apart from that, these semi-private schools often suggest the payment of extra services established by the foundation of each school (even during CSE) – with which most families agree. These private funding is supposed to be destined for the improvement of the school's facilities and services that students can benefit from throughout their schooling period. This is one of the reasons why these types of schools have become prestigious since they were first created back in the 1980s. Over the years, these semi-private schools have proliferated across Spain, while public centres have experienced a detrimental effect due to the recent cutbacks in the public educational system. Thus, semi-private education has become a top reference model compared to the disadvantaged public education. This trend has been also supported by educational authorities based on an exponential increase of social demands for these semi-private schools competing in prestige.

In the 80s, two factors were crucial in the inclusion of these semi-private schools into the educational system, which has traditionally been socially divided into schools for the ‘poor’ (public) and schools for ‘the rich’ (private/semi-private – religious). On the one hand, the birth rate increased due to the so-called ‘baby boom’ in the 1980s, which favoured a higher demand of schooling. On the other hand, in 1992 the state government in force expanded compulsory secondary education up to the age of 16. This implied an exponential increase of students enrolled, which the public education system on its own was not able to cope with. Since then, a mixed or dual system emerged: 1) public education, ideologically pluralistic and secular, advocating for the right of free education for all; 2) private education, based
on the school’s ideology (mainly Catholic) and private funds, likely to be subsidised under specific legal requirements (Llera and Pérez, 2012).

With regard to the historical grassroots of this schooling model, it is relevant to emphasise that its very beginning dates back to the end of Franco’s dictatorship¹ (1939-1975), when the traditionally private schools (owned by religious institutions at that time) were officially categorised as ‘concertados’ under an agreement between the Socialist Workers’ Party (PSOE) – the first democratic political party governing during the Spanish Transition² – and the institutions running those schools, most belonging to the Church. This agreement was an attempt to democratise compulsory education, i.e. public and free for all, thus promoting equity among public and semi-private schools. As there were not enough public schools to achieve this aim or funding to build new ones, the state government took advantage of those private schools under specific conditions. This way, part of the total expenses and the teachers’ salaries would be covered by the government in exchange for the whole integration of these schools into the public education system (although they are not categorised as ‘public’ but ‘semi-private’/‘concertados’). Some of the requirements of this agreement were based on prioritising admission of those socioeconomically disadvantaged, those living closer to the educational centre or having siblings already enrolled. Initially established for primary and secondary levels, this arrangement was later expanded to infant education (ages 3 to 5) in some autonomous communities (Calero, 2006).

Over the next two decades during the post-Franco era and the institutionalisation of democracy in Spain, the public education network (including the concertados) improved. The student-teacher ratio diminished, the freedom of education was established, a more democratic school functioning was open to the whole school community, and a more systematic and organized regulation along

---

¹ Francisco Franco ruled over Spain under a severe dictatorship after the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) until he died in 1975. Religious schools proliferated during the dictatorship based on the regime’s dogma (Catholicism), which were then categorised as ‘concertados’ (subsidised but privately owned) and private schools (privately funded).

² The Spanish Transition (Spanish: La Transición Española) starts from 1975, when Francisco Franco died, going through the establishment of the Spanish Constitution in 1978 until the victory of the Spanish Socialist Workers’ Party (PSOE) in the 1982 general elections.
with school inspections were also part of the improvements, among others. Despite these institutional, educational and social changes, Spain, compared to other European countries like Ireland or Finland, holds less public schools and more private and semi-private educational centres (see Figures 2 and 3).

*Figure 2. Distribution of students in primary education into public, semi-private and private schools in 2015 in different EU countries. (Own elaboration from data provided by *El Diario*, 2017)*

According to the 2015 Eurostat statistics\(^3\) (*El Diario*, 2017), 68% of Spanish students are enrolled in public primary schools, whereas 28% of students attend semi-private schools and 4% in private centres (see Figure 2). Similar figures are shown in secondary education (69% in public schools, 28% in semi-private and 3% in private) (see Figure 3), which implies a fewer number of students demanding public education.

---

\(^3\) Eurostat is the statistical office of the European Union (Luxembourg). It aims at providing high quality statistics for Europe based on comparisons between countries and regions.
education compared to the EU average of 81%. In terms of academic results, the last PISA\textsuperscript{4} report 2012 (OECD, 2013) elucidated that Spain’s scores were below the OECD\textsuperscript{5} average, “despite a 35% increase in spending on education since 2003 and numerous reform efforts at national and regional levels” (p. 1). Besides, in terms of equity, it showed that it deteriorated over the same period, emphasising that “socio-economically advantaged students outperformed less-advantaged students” (p. 1).

\textit{Figure 3.} Distribution of students in secondary education into public, semi-private and private schools in 2015 in different EU countries. (Own elaboration from data provided by \textit{El Diario}, 2017).
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\begin{itemize}
\item The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) is an ongoing triennial survey assessing 15-year-old students near the end of compulsory secondary education, particularly how they have acquired key knowledge and skills. The PISA 2012 survey focused on mathematics, with reading, science and problem-solving minor areas of assessment. PISA 2012 first included extra assessment of the financial literacy of young people.
\item The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development is an international organisation where the governments of 34 democracies work together, as well as with more than 70 non-member economies to foster economic growth and sustainable development.
\end{itemize}
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Results have also highlighted that private school students outperformed their state counterparts, but several studies have argued this hypothesis as lacking other social and economic factors involved in these merely quantitative results on learners' performance in specific areas such as mathematics and science. Even though semi-private schools were officially categorised as such in order to function as a complement to the public education system, their institutional bond with the Church – which owned most private schools during the dictatorship – makes it hard to achieve a social and political consensus on education-related issues still in the 21st century. Apart from that, disparity also emerges regarding quantifiable factors based on the growth and evolution of both public and private schools. In this sense, various studies have emphasised the differences among social classes (Calero and Bonal, 1999) in terms of access and results due to the opposing ideological positions and language policies undertaken by each autonomous community, which were gradually assuming education-related competences since 1980. It was not until the 1990s that the remaining autonomous communities took part in the decentralisation of school management, thus regulating their own regional education system.

Other research has adopted a more critical stance by highlighting the disparities occurring between public and semi-private schools in Spain (Bonal, 2002; Bonal et al, 2005; Llera and Pérez, 2012; Rodríguez-Martínez, 2018). According to Rodríguez-Martínez (2018), the last Organic Law of Education (LOMCE, 2008) meant a significant twist towards the private initiative, a reconfiguration of the whole education system. One relevant factor contributing to foster the competence among schools was the freedom of school choice, thus creating different school categories. Interestingly enough, from 1990 to 2011 the number of private schools (including semi-private) dramatically increased (up to 45%). This phenomenon is even more notable in compulsory secondary education, which implies a detriment to public schools (from a 92% of the total public schools in 1992-1993 to a 67% in 2011). According to these figures, differences among autonomous communities are remarkable. In regions like CLM, Extremadura, Canarias or Andalucía, there seems to be a higher presence of public schools than in, for instance, Madrid and the Basque Country. The political parties governing in the former communities where
public schools outnumbered private (and semi-private) schools were mostly left-wing, while in the latter the governing parties belonged to more conservative sectors (also nationalists, depending on the geographical and political context).

Leaving aside the politically and ideologically-based circumstances, it is important to highlight that in the case of CLM, bilingual education in semi-private and fully private schools was not regulated until 2014, when the first decree was approved (Decreto 7/2014) with the aim to administer uniformly bilingual education sections (see the next two sections of this chapter). Subsequent regional mandates were established as amendments of this first regulation, complying with European language-in-education policies in an attempt to achieve high quality education models.

2.2.1. Freedom of school choice: Socio-political factors and competing schools

Given the fact that bilingual education programmes have revolutionised the schools’ image onto the social community and their internal structuration (i.e. curricula management and organization, human and material resources’ distribution, etc.), it is not surprising that each institution is finding its own ways to outstand from the rest to attract more students. Indeed, the current legal disposition about the freedom of school choice has favoured this situation, but it has also become a key social factor to be considered so as to understand the evolution of semi-private/public schools in competition in CLM. In this regard, the two opposite political parties in force since 2012 have disagreed. In 2012, the regional conservative party – known as “PP” (Partido Popular) – approved the Decree 163/2012, thus establishing a new regulation regarding the student admission process in all centres maintained by state funds (i.e. both public and semi-private) so as to allow all citizens to access in equal conditions. That was called “one schooling district” (distrito único de escolarización), which guaranteed the families’ right to freely choose the school they considered more appropriate for their children regardless of the area they lived in. This same regulation had been previously approved by the Education Law of CLM in 2007 (Ley
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Before 2012, the admission process was based on a “zoning model” (modelo de zonificación), which prioritised access to families living close to the educational centre. This selection measure conveyed both positive and negative effects on the social construction and organization of schools. On the one hand, selections were equally made regardless of the socioeconomic background of the families. Moreover, all schools were demanded on average at the same level every year. On the other hand, upper-middle class families who really wished to opt for semi-private schools did not have priority over the residents settled around the school area.

Some argue that this regulation prevented schools from taking innovative educational initiatives or projects to compete in the local school market, just as they are currently struggling to become the most prestigious schools in the area. Therefore, freedom of school choice has been regarded as an obstacle for equality and social cohesion, and even as a threat in the social and education arena. Likewise, the OECD on Equity and Quality in Education (OCDE, 2012) warned about the possible risks that the freedom of school choice could have on segregation and social inequalities in terms of academic performance and socioeconomic background. According to Fernández Soria (2007), “the freedom of school choice will lead to higher competition, as “parents are given a new mechanism of control” (p. 46). He also points out in his article that research on the reason motivating a school’s choice illustrates that families select a centre based on basic moral principles (OCDE-CERI, 1994:42). In this regard, private schools are usually highly demanded due to the sense of belonging to a particular group sharing values, beliefs and moral – (religious-based) principles.

Those advocating for the freedom of school choice argue that the zoning model was very restrictive, but they also support the idea of having competing schools somehow forced to outstand by means of innovative projects or pedagogical programmes, which in turn improves the quality of education. For the opposing sector, the freedom of school choice was deemed as an instrument for families to find alternative ways to the declining public education sector undergoing severe working, economic and social conditions because of the economic crisis originated
back in 2008. One of the proven negative effects of the freedom of school choice was the threat for those schools not fulfilling families’ expectations. In fact, some of these public schools were becoming a sort of ghetto, which placed the centres on the edge of the closing down. The OECD-CERI (1994) warned that the freedom of school choice was ultimately producing social and ethnic regroupings within the legal framework. Nowadays, the regional government ruled by PSOE in coalition with Podemos (left-wing party born from the social outrage bursting in Spain in 2011), is planning to abolish the one schooling district model in favour of the zoning model. In this regard, advocates for the unique district model complain that this possible new regulation will threaten families’ right to freely choose among schools.

As a result, language planning efforts from the central and regional governments have been made so that public schools could also enter this competition and obtain higher enrolment rates. That is why public schools, in unfavourable economic and social situations compared to the privileged semi-private schools being more and more demanded, started implementing Spanish/English CLIL-type education programmes (e.g. MECD/British Council, European Sections, Bilingual Sections and Linguistic Programmes), which will be further explained in section 2.4.

2.3. Language-in-education policies: The origin of bi/multilingual programmes in CLM

As already stated, the autonomous community of CLM has experienced a dramatic socio-political and educational transformation in the last years, which cannot be understood without considering the reality of the Spanish educational sector. Over the last two decades, academic outcomes – particularly on foreign language proficiency - have proven to be shameful compared to those of our European counterparts (PISA, 2012). Regarding multilingual matters, Europe was paving the way in promoting and implementing diverse multilingual education programmes. In the case of CLM, regional authorities, so as not to be left behind, urged the
development of BPs, thus aligning with the European language policies in force. In this historical juncture, I found the case of CLM really interesting as a research focus: it was a gold mine due to the social, political and linguistic transformations that the school communities were undergoing.

Being immersed in the ‘multilingual-European wave’ promoting language learning, CLM has become more and more concerned about the importance of linguistic knowledge, mainly English, as a form of capital (Bourdieu, 1986). The high unemployment rate (particularly among young people) resulting from the global economic crisis in 2008, as well as the strict language requirements to access university studies and the high demand of graduates/postgraduates with proficient language skills are some of the reasons why our current society is completely involved in a kind of ‘rat race’, where the most trained and the most linguistically skilled will have a better access to the labour market. Parallel to these changes, the first bilingual initiatives were launched in the region over two decades ago, when the craze for bilingualism (Relaño Pastor, 2018a) started spreading out over the country as a sort of social movement. The first initiative resulted from an agreement between the British Council and the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport (MECD) (‘MECD/British Council Agreement’) back in 1996. This agreement pioneered the implementation of the so-called ‘Bilingual and Bicultural Project’ through a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) approach. This new pedagogical paradigm encouraged Spanish public schools to opt for this type of bilingual education model in line with the EU efforts to democratise English language learning.

In my ethnography, bi/multi/plurilingual education is understood as the integration of a second/third language in the schools’ curricula, thus teaching different content subjects in the foreign language. In most cases, English is the medium of instruction as the preferred second language. That is the reason why the term ‘bilingual programmes’ has been widely associated to English, the hegemonic language in Europe and beyond par excellence. Nevertheless, schools in CLM have also moved forward to introducing another EU foreign language within their linguistic programmes, namely French (19), German (1) and Italian (1), compared to the significant spread of English programmes (489), which have also taken the form of
‘plurilingual programmes’ by adding one more language of instruction into the curriculum (French/English; English/French) (see Figure 4).  

Figure 4. Number of bi/plurilingual programmes and the languages involved in CLM (2018-19). (Own elaboration from data provided by Portal de Educación de la Junta de Castilla-La Mancha, 2018)

Despite the “explosion” of these linguistic programmes, an important aspect to consider for my ethnography is that the total number of bi/plurilingual schools (public and semi-private) has decreased from 529 to 440 (2016-2018). As a result, according to the ‘Comprehensive Memory of the Decree’ (Memoria Comprensiva del Decreto, February 2017) regulating the Integral Plan of Foreign Language Teaching

---

in the Autonomous Community of CLM (Decree 47/2017, July 25th), the 607 ongoing linguistic programmes have been reduced to 520 in the academic year 2018-19 (see Appendix 8). In this sense, it is important to take into account that some schools are allowed to implement more than one programme depending on the languages chosen for the development of some curricular subjects; that is, schools may offer two bilingual tracks at different educational levels (e.g. English & French), or they could also include two languages within the same (plurilingual) track, thus teaching some curricular subjects in the second language, and others in the third language.

*Figure 5. Number of bi/plurilingual programmes in infant and primary, compulsory secondary education, A levels and vocational training. (Own elaboration from data provided by Portal de Educación de la Junta de Castilla-La Mancha, 2018)*
Still, the linguistic programmes implemented in infant and primary education have always outnumbered the rest of educational stages, being notably followed by compulsory secondary education (see Figure 5). In an attempt to modernise the education system, public, semi-private and private schools tried to respond to the social demands by implementing new linguistic programmes to foster language competence in a second and/or third language. In this sense, public schools were left behind compared to semi-private schools which had already taken the initiative to carry out different types of bilingual programmes. That is why the regional administration has tried, over the years, to promote, expand and improve the organisation and management of these bilingual and plurilingual programmes in public schools through the amendments of language-in-education policies.

*Figure 6. Number of public and semi-private schools with a bi/plurilingual programme. (Own elaboration from data provided by *Portal de Educación de la Junta de Castilla-La Mancha*, 2018).*
Today, the number of public schools offering one of these linguistic programmes raises up to 360 against 80 semi-private schools in the region (see Figure 6). In order to better understand this evolution and the socio-linguistic transformation in CLM, in the next section I describe and explain the shifts, changing nomenclatures and amendments of the regional language planning and policy since the first bilingual education initiatives started to be launched in the region.

2.4. Transforming bi/plurilingual education through language policies: From Europe to CLM

The evolution of bi/multilingual education in CLM has been tightly linked with the increasing demand for foreign linguistic competence and the social and political issues that have emerged during their actual implementation at schools. Over the last two decades, the schools in this region have progressively enacted different types of bilingual education programmes, which have undergone manifold nomenclatures and phases during this process. I thus consider essential to revise and explain the process of institutionalisation of these bi/plurilingual programmes in order to understand the complexities emerging in real educational contexts.

Under the strong influence of European language-in-education policies to promote “plurilingualism, linguistic diversity, mutual understanding, democratic citizenship and social cohesion” (Council of Europe, 2014; European Commission 2010, 2012), bi/plurilingual education programmes in La Mancha have experienced different changes since 2005. In fact, the Order of February 7, 2005 of the regional Ministry of Education and Science (Consejería de Educación y Ciencia) established the ‘European Sections Programme’ (English/French) (Programa de Secciones Europeas) in public schools (Infant, Primary, and Secondary). There were only 31 linguistic programmes implemented in La Mancha schools at the beginning, but then in 2006 (Order of February 28, 2006) the number increased up to 46 in the region (see Figure 7 for statistics between 2010 and 2019). In the following years, new orders were published in order to promote these programmes and attract as many
schools as possible. It was not until 2011 that the new term was coined: ‘Bilingual Sections Programme’ (Article 147 of the Law 7/2010 of Education in CLM, July 20th).

From 2011 to 2014, the number of schools in CLM implementing one of these programmes increased dramatically (from 200 to 475). That year, a new and more complete regulation came out with the ‘Plan of Plurilingualism’ (Decree 7/2014, January 22nd), amended over three years later by the ‘Integral Plan of Foreign Language Teaching in the Autonomous Community of CLM’ (Decree 47/2017, July 25th), (Plan Integral de Enseñanza de Lenguas Extranjeras de la Comunidad Autónoma de CLM), currently regulating bi/plurilingual programmes in infant, primary and secondary education.

*Figure 7.* Number and evolution of bi/plurilingual programmes in Castilla-La Mancha from 2010 to 2019. (Own elaboration from data provided by Portal de Educación de la Junta de Castilla-La Mancha).
According to these figures, after an explosion of BPs from 2011 to 2015 (particularly due to the Plan of Plurilingualism in 2014, which regulated the Bilingual Sections), the number of such programmes came to a halt. Even though back in 2013 the regional authorities foresaw that CLM would be completely bilingual by the academic year 2018, the truth is far away from the initial hope. Is it because of the disenchantment regarding unfulfilled expectations and promises? Or is it due to fears when facing the difficulties in the actual classroom, particularly core subjects like science or maths? Is it because the regional administration demands have become more rigid in terms of second language learning and exposure time? A further discussion on the possible reasons will be provided in the final conclusions. In any case, after such a ‘boom’ of linguistic programmes, the regional administration decided to block any possibility of adding new bi/plurilingual schools. It was only allowed to provide a continuum in bilingual education from primary to secondary; for instance, if there were only monolingual primary schools in a local area but the secondary schools in the same district had implemented a bilingual programme, those primary schools opting to become bilingual would be allowed (and vice versa). This way students were able to follow their bi/plurilingual education from one educational stage to the other.

In the next three subsections, I shall provide a more accurate explanation of the different programmes and regional policy documents that have regulated their implementation, with a special emphasis on institutional and methodological changes that are fundamental to comprehend the magnitude of their effect onto the social order.

2.4.1. Plan of Plurilingualism and Integral Plan of Foreign Language Teaching in the Autonomous Community of CLM

The first regional language policy document to regulate the implementation of a CLIL-type bilingual education was the ‘Plan of Plurilingualism’ (approved in 2014) (see Appendix 8). It was not in force until last July 2017, when new amendments
were made on the current ‘Integral Plan of Foreign Language Teaching in the Autonomous Community of CLM’. In fact, the first ‘Linguistic Programmes’ (Programas Lingüísticos) were implemented under the provisions of this regional plan, but have experienced different nomenclatures throughout the years.

One of the most relevant aspects of this regulation was the establishment of three levels of implementation: Initiation, Development and Excellence. According to the ‘Comprehensive Memory of the Decree’ (Memoria Comprensiva del Decreto, February 2017), the highest figure of schools corresponds to the initiation level (272 schools), followed by development (270 schools) and excellence (65). This three-stage school labelling was based on two criteria in order to divide schools into one of these categories: 1) the number of content subjects taught in English (i.e. one, two, or three or more); and 2) the availability of teachers accrediting a minimum B2 level (intermediate) of English according to the Common European Framework for Reference of Language Learning (CEFR, 2001). One of the requirements to become a school of ‘excellence’ was having at least one teacher accredited with a C1, which was rarely found among schools.

In line with the European language policies on the enhancement of multilingualism, this Plan of Plurilingualism aimed at achieving youngsters’ competence in a second or even third foreign language departing from the 4th grade of Compulsory Secondary Education, which became “a priority for the European language policies, in the first place, and in the second, for educational administrations in general” (MECD, 2017). As stated in previous sections, the main aim of these bi/plurilingual programmes was to make second language learning accessible for all. Likewise, these programmes were particularly designed to be implemented in any school – public, private or semi-private – in an attempt to “democratise English language teaching” (Relaño Pastor, 2015; 2018) and turn CLM into a bilingual community in four years’ time since this regulation was approved in 2014. According to the former regional Ministry of Education, “CLM [would] be bilingual by 2018” (El Diario, 2014), in hopes of achieving “excellence” (i.e. a top-quality education system) and equal opportunities for all children. In fact, this gradual implementation of bi/plurilingual programmes starts in infant and primary education,
where all pupils receive English-medium instruction. On the contrary, in secondary education, students voluntarily – or else under their families’ decision - access these programmes with no legal restrictions or admission measures whatsoever. Following the regional administration mandates, students are not allowed to be streamed. In bilingual curricular subjects, the ones opting for this type of education are gathered together. However, in mainstream curricular subjects, students from both bilingual and non-bilingual streams remain together as belonging to a heterogeneous group. This measure ensures balanced groups in order to avoid marginalisation or unequal conditions among students no matter the option they take for their education. This is actually one of the key issues my critical ethnography focuses on. Once I started observing how these programmes were working in real practice and conducting my interviews with teachers, I could spot some contradictions and dilemmas emerging in discourse and in the classrooms on the basis of the regional administration mandates.

Three years later, regional authorities became aware that the former plan might not be enough to comply with EU language-in-education policies. Thus, amendments were made on the Plan of Plurilingualism, being renamed as the ‘Integral Plan of Foreign Language Teaching in the Autonomous Community of CLM’ (July 2017). These initiatives aligned with the European Commission directives on the improvement of youngsters’ training in order to be competent enough to access the labour market. One of the actions promoted by the European Union is language learning and multilingualism as a key element to succeed in a more and more demanding Europe not only in terms of language skills but also intercultural awareness and mutual understanding among our European counterparts One of the controversial aspects of the previous language policy (Plan of Plurilingualism) was the three-stage implementation process. Under the current regulation, the division of schools into three different levels of implementation - Initiation, Development and Excellence – is removed and substituted by a flexible system of percentages on the basis of the foreign language exposure time. That is, in compulsory secondary education, bi/plurilingual schools would devote at least 200 minutes per week and between 30% and 50% of the curriculum taught in at least one foreign language.
Furthermore, they would promote linguistic immersion through the development of classroom activities, with a special emphasis on content and language integrated learning with the aim to improve students’ communicative competence in a second language.

Before these regional administration mandates were established, bi/plurilingual education in CLM had undergone a few initiatives since the “bilingualism boom” started. One of them was applied to public schools (‘MECD/British Council Agreement’), and the other was based on semi-private centres (the ‘BEDA programme’). Both initiatives are key to better understand my ethnographic fieldwork in one public and two semi-private schools and how they have appropriated these actions into their daily school life.

2.4.2. MECD/British Council Agreement in CLM

Back in 1996, one of the pioneering bilingual projects in La Mancha region was initiated by the British Council under an agreement with the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport (MECD) (‘MECD/British Council Agreement’) (see Appendix 8), last renewed in April 2013. This agreement has contributed to the expansion of bilingualism among public schools all over Spain willing to opt for the implementation of a bi/plurilingual curriculum. This initiative promoted the implementation of the ‘Bilingual and Bicultural Project’ through a Content and Language Integrated Learning approach (CLIL, or AICLE in the corresponding Spanish term), “as a unique experiment within the Spanish public education system” (Arellano et al., 2015), ranging from infant, through primary up to secondary level. The aim of these programmes was “to provide children from the age of three to sixteen with a bilingual, bi-cultural education through an integrated Spanish/English curriculum based on the Spanish National Curriculum and aspects of the National Curriculum for England and Wales” (p. 9). In primary, all schools involved in this project teach social sciences (geography and history) as core CLIL subjects, while the other subjects in the project are selected depending on the availability of teachers with an intermediate level of
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English. At secondary level, content specialists need to be accredited with a B2 or C1. Participating schools also provide their students with the possibility of obtaining the IGCSE (International General Certificate of Secondary Education), which is offered to students in elite private English schools.

After being first launched in Madrid schools, it was very positively and widely appraised, thus becoming an enviable model of bilingual (Spanish/English) education demanded by most families in the capital city of Spain, and extensively, by other autonomous regions like CLM. Having official recognition in the ‘State Official Bulletin’ (BOE, May 2000), this bilingual project aligns with the European language policy mandates regarding children’s competence of more than two languages (other than their first language) and language learning at a very early age (i.e. second stage of infant education). Therefore, this programme has challenged the traditional model of foreign language teaching and learning, which is expanded up to the end of CSE (p. 9). In line with European initiatives regarding the integration of language and culture, the purpose of this agreement is mainly “to provide, since a very early age, a model enriched with bilingual education through the curricular integration of two languages and two cultures” (Convenio MECD-British Council, 2017) [my own translation]. This integrated content-based curriculum implies a different teaching approach focusing on the acquisition of content subjects through the medium of English. The innovative angle differs very much from the traditional methodology based on learning the foreign language through systematic, mechanical grammar exercises with hardly any attention to communicative skills.

Against the current backdrop of globalization processes, this programme encourages diversity and cultural awareness and expects “students to be able to manage in different cultures and be better prepared to face the 21st century demands in a more and more competitive and multilingual Europe” (Convenio MECD-British Council, 2017) [my own translation]. Another specific objective in terms of mobility is to facilitate teacher and student exchanges with other schools. On the one hand, this means an opportunity for students to use their English knowledge in real contexts with peers in another country, which makes them understand the utility of the second language learning. On the other hand, it allows teachers to improve their language
skills and learn new teaching strategies to be applied in their CLIL classes. Apart from that, students can obtain the certification of studies under both educational systems (in the UK and Spain).

Currently, 84 public infant/primary schools and 44 public high schools belong to this bilingual education agreement all over Spain. Furthermore, they are all part of the regional network of bi/plurilingual schools under the regulations in force. I particularly chose one of these public high schools in the local area - called ‘High Towers’ - because the school’s reputation after implementing this type of programme improved considerably against the resistance of other public schools to adjust to the regional education demands. What I found in this focal school was not exactly a bed of roses, particularly from the point of view of one of the teachers I could interview. I was then intrigued by learning the process that this school community had experienced from being considered a low-quality school to be assessed as one of the most prestigious in town (see a full description of this school and its BP in section 5.2). In fact, the MECD/British Council programmes were originally created to compensate serious needs, such as poor school infrastructures, the location of the centres in marginal neighbourhoods, or the threat to be closed down. Thus, the implementation of these programmes meant a significant revival of those very low demanded centres socially considered as “difficult to work in” – such as the case of High Towers. In CLM, there are only fourteen schools belonging to this agreement (seven primary, seven secondary), which have proved to obtain higher marks than the average in the last two decades. In this regard, semi-private schools have been competing against public schools by improving their bilingual initiatives: the so-called “BEDA programmes”.

2.4.3. The ‘BEDA’ Programme

Parallel to the regional administration mandates on bi/plurilingual education and the MEC/British Council programmes, which were only expected to be implemented in public schools, there is a quite well-established network of semi-private schools from
infant to A levels that have traditionally belonged to the BEDA programme (Bilingual English Development and Assessment). This programme has also contributed to the dramatic expansion of bi/plurilingual education programmes in Spain. Founded and shared by the whole religious community of private and semi-private schools (excluding Catalonia and the Basque Country), it has been a remarkable and unique characteristic of those educational centres. In fact, it was originally created to be gradually implemented as a form of Spanish/English bilingual education through three basic building blocks: 1) qualitative and quantitative increase of English language exposure by teaching different subjects in English, thus promoting an English atmosphere inside the school; 2) specific teacher training; 3) external Cambridge evaluation for teachers, students and staff. Despite these ambitious goals, the actual implementation took place in four different stages: 1) Model for Reinforcement; 2) Bilingual Model; 3) Bilingual Excellence Model and 4) Reference Model. It is in the second stage where the native language assistants are introduced and when they start participating in European projects, as well as carrying out linguistic immersion activities. In the third model, this programme offers trips abroad and student exchanges to English speaking countries, where students can spend part of their - or the whole – academic year immersed in the English culture and have as much exposure to the language as possible.

In the private education sector, apart from offering services like canteens, extracurricular activities and parental control through schools’ platforms, BEDA programmes were considered a marker of distinction within the local/regional school community. Nowadays, the schools traditionally belonging to the BEDA network share the same regional bi/plurilingual education regulations as the rest of bi/plurilingual schools, thus having to adjust themselves to the language policies in force since the Plan of Plurilingualism was approved in 2014. Even so, most semi-private schools have opted for keeping their BEDA affiliation with the aim of still receiving Cambridge support for external examination, student exchanges and trips abroad.

While regional governments have decreed the Integral Plan of Foreign Language Teaching in the Autonomous Community of CLM for every educational
institution – including public schools –, semi-private schools are no longer outstanding in that sense due to the increasing proliferation of BPs in public schools. Similarly, a huge number of languages school are emerging offering even intensive English courses to get a prestigious certificate. Within this “bilingual competition” among schools in CLM, other socio-political decisions on education issues need to be brought to the fore in order to better understand the reconfiguration of these schools into ‘bi/plurilingual’ sites. In the next chapters, I shall provide theoretical grounds about CLIL as top educational paradigm in need of more critical, qualitative research along with an overview of the main assumptions of CSE and its potential to explore CLIL situated practices.
PART II: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
CHAPTER 3

CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING: A CRITICAL ETHNOGRAPHIC PERSPECTIVE

3.1. Introduction to CLIL

CLIL for ‘content and language integrated learning’ (i.e., the use of a second language in non-language subject teaching) has spread out internationally as a model of bilingual education since it was first coined as such in 1994. Taking into account that bilingual education in the 21st century embodies diverse approaches and methodological practices varying from context to context and educational systems among countries at different times (García, 2011), CLIL is regarded as a modern educational pedagogy facing the challenges of contemporary societies. This way, CLIL-type bilingual programmes have become a mainstream phenomenon in education. National and European language policies have fought together to incorporate CLIL into a wider range of settings and learners. Political discourse has embraced CLIL as the ultimate way of foreign language learning due to its potential of covering two core areas: language and subject. Language-in-education policy has adopted CLIL to foster foreign language learning and multilingualism, which aims further at international cooperation, transnational mobility and cultural integration (Eurydice, 2006). Nevertheless, among the increasing amount of CLIL studies, we can hardly find publications about the implications and potential effects of CLIL in real practice from a rather qualitative, ethnographic approach. Within this scenario, CLIL research has recently taken a more critical stance hinting at possible deficiencies or risks, and it has highlighted the need of more empirically-based studies to account for a down-to-earth set of conclusions about how CLIL is being enacted in specific learning contexts. Therefore, the critical sociolinguistic ethnographic perspective this study adopts would hopefully provide CLIL researchers and practitioners with empirical tools to critically question the complexities involved in CLIL learning and teaching processes.
In this section, I will provide an overview of the main CLIL assumptions and principles that have placed this pedagogical framework as a top paradigm. Dating back to the origin and development of French immersion programmes in Canada, I shall describe and explain the main differences and similarities between CLIL, immersion and content-based instruction. This section will be followed by an account of CLIL research in Europe and Spain. I shall conclude this chapter section with the critical viewpoints on CLIL-type provisions in the Spanish context, and I will then narrow it down to the case of CLM, still struggling to find the most appropriate way to accommodate CLIL to every school setting.

3.2. Main assumptions in CLIL programmes

“Bilingual education is good for education” (Fishman, 1980). This well-known dictum has become a core idea in bilingual education research both in North American and European contexts. The spread of CLIL over the last two decades has increased dramatically, not only in North America and Europe, but also in Asian and Latin American scenarios (e.g., Banegas, 2011; Yassin, Marsh, Tek & Ying, 2009; Lin, 2006). Initially, Canada and North America pioneered in bilingual teaching models, and due to their well-acknowledged tradition - they have become a prototype for the design of European bilingual programmes. Not only that, but even CLIL has been also introduced to a wider range of learning settings.

Back in the late 1950s, French immersion programmes in the English-speaking communities in Montréal (see section 3.2.1 on the differences and similarities between CLIL, immersion programmes and content-based instruction) meant a significant step towards the explosion of other bilingual education projects, which led to numerous investigations proving its successful outcomes (Cummins and Swain, 1986; Cummins, 1989; Genesee, 1987, 1994, 2004; Krashen, 1996, 1997, 1999; Swain and Cummins, 1982). Since then, bilingual education has been the object of academic research in different contexts across time and space, and it represents one of the major challenges in the 21st century. As a matter of fact, CLIL
has turned out to be a powerful tool attempting at social change and inequalities (Lorenzo, 2007). In this regard, global political and socioeconomic forces have paved the way for the adoption of CLIL, thus being currently acknowledged as a trend in the field of education, and more specifically, in foreign language teaching.

Even though CLIL, as a concept implying a set of principles and revolutionary pedagogical practices, may differ across countries in terms of the language of instruction, the institutional needs and the social demands, what makes CLIL stand out from other types of bilingual education approaches is that it “is a dual-focused approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language” (Mehisto, Marsh, and Frigols, 2008: 9). Three main principles have characterised CLIL as the most revolutionary methodology. First, it assumes that language is used for both learning and communicating. Secondly, content is what determines the type of language used for learning. Third, fluency is given priority over accuracy when using the language to convey subject-related contents. Therefore, during the learning process, emphasis is given to cognitive aspects (i.e. acquisition of knowledge and skills) through the use of different pedagogical techniques such as conceptual frameworks to help learners fix contents, cooperative learning (or peer/group work), and development of higher-order thinking skills - according to Bloom’s taxonomy (i.e. analysing, evaluating, creating). Another relevant premise of CLIL is the authentic input it provides (Gallardo del Puerto, Gómez Lacabex, and García Lecumberri, 2009), taking for granted that meaningful learning occurs in real life contexts. For this reason, textbooks have been adapted to this methodology and are provided with more visual artefacts, or some even include tasks based on the communicative approach. Apart from these premises of CLIL methodology, what CLIL stands for is integration, and integration is currently one of the aims of education nowadays. Beyond that, integration entails breaking barriers and, in the case of CLIL, opening to new approaches and re-thinking teaching practice (Ruiz de Zarobe and Jiménez Catalán, 2009).

Most publications framed within bilingual education have focused on CLIL effectiveness and benefits in second language learning based on the positive
outcomes. In fact, several authors have claimed that CLIL education has proved to be more effective than traditional L2 instruction (Genesee 1994, in Pérez-Cañado, 2013). In fact, more and more European higher education institutions have adopted a foreign language to teach university courses. The most preferred language tends to be English, which is becoming preeminent in different types of bi/plurilingual programmes across Europe (Wilkinson 2004; Eurydice 2006). Compared to immersion programmes and content-based instruction, CLIL has been adopted as the panacea to revolutionise old grammar-based educational approaches by shifting to a more authentic communicative method in any of its hundreds types of programmes, particularly in Europe. In the next section, the three confusing terms ‘CLIL’, ‘immersion’ and ‘content-based’ will be briefly explained regarding their commonalities and dissimilarities.

3.2.1. CLIL, immersion programmes and content-based instruction

These three terms have caused confusion in the way they are often referred to. Sometimes, CLIL and immersion, or CLIL and content-based instruction (CBI, hereafter) are used indiscriminately. Even though the three of them share essential properties and are pedagogically similar, they also differ in many aspects. Against this controversial framework, some authors explored the common features between CBI, immersion and CLIL with regard to their goals and target language, the sociolinguistic profile of teachers and students, and the integration of both content and language from a pedagogical and instructional perspective (Cenoz, Genesee, and Gorter, 2014; Cenoz, 2015). On the one hand, CLIL has been widely described as an umbrella term which covers over a dozen educational approaches, among which we can find bilingual and multilingual education, and immersion programmes (Mehisto, Marsh, and Frigols, 2008, p. 12). However, the most widespread type of CBI/CLIL programmes is immersion. Some authors have defined immersion as a type of CBI (Cenoz and Zarobe, 2015); for others, CLIL and CBI are often considered as two different labels to refer to the same reality (Coyle et al, 2010; Dalton-Puffer,
2007; Van deCraen, Ceuleers, and Mondt, 2007). Even though some scholars acknowledge the differences between CLIL and CBI - including immersion - (see, e.g. Lasagabaster and Sierra, 2010; Pérez-Cañado, 2012), others consider both terms as synonymous (Ruiz de Zarobe, 2008: 61, footnote), understanding that the term ‘CLIL’ is commonly referred to in Europe, whereas CBI is mostly used in the USA and Canada (Coyle, Hood, and Marsh, 2010; Ruiz de Zarobe and Jiménez Catalán, 2009) (see Cenoz, 2015 for a full discussion on similarities and differences between both programmes).

Originating in Canada back in 1960s, immersion programmes have received a lot of attention, being highly worldwide acclaimed due to its well-known efficiency and success (see Teresa Navés for a full account of Canadian immersion programmes, 2009, pp. 22-40). The main difference between immersion programmes and CLIL is that the former consist of teaching content in the minority or regional language, especially in contexts where two languages co-exist. It is not the case of CLIL programmes, which have been implemented in monolingual regions in some European countries. Beyond this main assumption, the concept of ‘immersion’ implies manifold aspects to consider. First, the teaching in the additional language must cover at least half of the total amount of instruction in primary education or at least for seven years (Tedick et al, 2011; Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2013). In addition, Swain and Johnson (1997) identified core features of immersion programmes, among which it is important to highlight the following: 1) the medium of instruction is the L2; 2) the curriculum must be the same as for L1; 3) extra support for the L1; 4) additive bilingualism; 5) L2 exposure mainly in the classroom; 6) homogeneous students’ L2 level to access the programme; 7) bilingual teachers; 8) the classroom culture is that of the L1 (pp. 6-8)

According to Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009), both bilingual approaches differ substantially rather than be alike. The fact of using an additional language close to students’ socio-cultural context in immersion programmes implies a psycho-affective factor that CLIL programmes lack. On the contrary, CLIL means teaching through the medium of English (Dalton-Puffer, Nikula, and Smit, 2010) regardless of the socio-cultural and linguistic background of learners. Despite being the hegemonic
language of instruction par excellence in CLIL contexts, this approach by definition refers to ‘an additional’ language and not only to English, i.e. it could be any language other than the first language, including foreign, second or minority languages (see Eurydice, 2006; Marsh, 2002).

In terms of CBI, these programmes share with CLIL the same essential properties, societal settings, pedagogical techniques, target language, content, educational objectives and implementation. In this sense, such as CLIL, CBI has been well considered an ‘umbrella term’, thus including manifold approaches bringing together language and content although the emphasis placed on language and/or content may differ slightly (Stoller, 2008: 59). Indeed, the main target is subject matter expertise, which puts aside language development and in a secondary place. For this purpose, CBI takes alternative forms and programmes depending on the role they play in the curriculum, the educational level, and the emphasis on language or content.

In the next section, I will provide some accounts of the institutionalisation of CLIL in EU educational contexts through various language-in-education policy documents, as well as some relevant research carried out from different perspectives towards this pedagogical approach, putting a special emphasis on the need of more qualitative research approaches to empirically acknowledge - and fully understand - the complexities underneath the CLIL reality in most European counterparts.

3.3. CLIL in Europe

CLIL (‘AICLE’, in Spanish, or ‘EMILE’, in French) is considered the ultimate educational movement in the European scenario, in which teaching and learning through a second language implies the use of one of the current hegemonic languages (namely, English, French and German, in this hierarchical order), dominating most bilingual education programmes. Societal, political and economic shifts in the last two decades have generated a growing interest in language
learning. Internationalisation and mobility are two fundamental factors influencing the important role of languages, particularly language repertoires and varieties carrying values and beliefs related to economic assets. Foreign language teaching and learning has then changed its primary pedagogical focus to a more communicative-oriented approach providing the necessary knowledge and tools to develop competences such as production and comprehension, which are key to take advantage of the social opportunities that the current globalized world offers. That is why CLIL has experienced an explosion across Europe and has gradually become an established teaching approach (Järvinen, 2006), very much in line with EU language-in-education policies promoting greater intercultural understanding and mobility among European citizens and elsewhere.

The evolution and history of CLIL implementation in the European context has been sustained by EU policy initiatives promoting plurilingualism through the improvement of foreign language education to achieve the 1+2 policy mandate put forward by the European Commission (1995), i.e., to achieve mastery in at least two other (European) languages apart from the L1. In the 1990s, in Europe, CLIL was conceptualised in order to respond, on the one hand, to the foreign language deficits – particularly learners’ communicative competence – and, on the other, to enhance Europe’s multilingualism, as the hegemonic foreign language par excellence had been English. It was in the late 1990s when the concept started a vital expansion, gradually becoming a well-recognised model of content-based education. CLIL is then viewed as “an inspirational challenge” (Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010: 269) within the more and more demanding educational field fighting for the implementation of bilingual programmes in mainstream education.

Parallel to the increasing CLIL actions in the last two decades, research on this field has also developed considerably in the European context (see Coonan, 2005; Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010; Dalton-Puffer and Nikula, 2006; Marsh, 2002; Lorenzo et al, 2007; Smit, 2007). According to Wolff (2005), the vast majority of CLIL research has brought to the fore the effects of CLIL on the acquisition of the foreign language and L1 competence, content subject learning and teachers’ and students’ perspectives and evaluation of this type of bilingual education. Apart from that, a
great amount of CLIL literature deals with basic recommendations on CLIL provision (Eurydice, 2006; Marsh et al 2001; Marsh, 2002) based on the experiences in each European country. In this regard, Marsh has led the ‘CLIL movement’ attempting at spreading out its miraculous virtues resulting in successful outcomes. Likewise, Do Coyle has become a referent in good CLIL practice, providing pedagogical guidelines to ensure a proper application. In the UK context, CLIL lacks consistent empirical research on this matter - contradictory as it may seem – even though its official language is the most widely used in CLIL projects. Given the fact that the existing literature about CLIL provisions relies more on descriptive, quantitative aspects rather than deepening into specific teaching practices themselves, several authors are advocating for more empirical and longitudinal research on actual teaching practices in order to look into the possible deficiencies or hidden angles that CLIL implementation may generate in certain educational settings and under which specific variables. Few qualitative-oriented research has focused on stakeholders’ attitudes and perspectives by means of questionnaires, interviews and lesson observations (e.g. Mehisto and Asser, 2007- in Estonia CLIL schools).

Being a token for innovation in the foreign language teaching scenario, CLIL has been resignified in Europe as a potential construct to defeat its lack of language proficiency while promoting foreign language teaching and learning (Cenoz, Genesee and Gorter, 2014). Pérez-Cañado (2012), describes CLIL implementation in Europe as being “highly variegated” (p. 319), as this teaching approach and its actual practice may vary from country to country and even from regions, such as the case of Spain, which has a decentralised system. This means that unified CLIL measures or standard guidelines do not exist (unlike Austria or France). As a consequence, numerous factors and circumstances may affect how CLIL is implemented in the whole continent, such as admission criteria in CLIL tracks, the content-subjects taught in L2, the target language level required or the evaluation of CLIL application in educational centres. Despite CLIL flexibility to adjust differently to each specific context, some authors have highlighted common characteristics among CLIL European partners (Fortanet-Gómez and Ruiz Garrido, 2009; Marsh, 2002). Concretely, Pérez-Cañado (2012) stresses the importance of all CLIL models
to incorporate the target language in the curriculum and a specific number of subjects taught in that language for a minimum of four years. Most CLIL provisions are carried out by combining the L1 and a foreign language, but English is the most widely chosen, followed by French and German.

Another relevant characteristic is that bilingual education is discontinued in upper secondary education due to the institutional pressure on the university entrance exams, which are elaborated in the official language. One of the research gaps regarding CLIL provisions is the lack of studies establishing links between learning outcomes and classroom practices. It is crucial for the development and improvement of bilingual education programmes to be analysed and questioned from different angles providing clues to better achieve both research and pedagogical aims in real practice. Learning outcomes have often been ascribed to organizational and pedagogical aspects of CLIL, but some studies have emphasized other sociocultural phenomena (see Bonnet, 2012) that may remain unnoticed unless a more critical stance is taken from a qualitative approach. To do so, it is necessary to establish collaborative connections between researchers in the field and the social agents involved in such studies in an attempt to bridge the gap between the academic world and actual classroom practice (Infante et al. 2009). In the next section, I will provide an overview of the research carried out on CLIL provisions in the Spanish educational system, which has seen a recent explosion of this type of BPs into mainstream education.

3.4. CLIL in Spain

CLIL, as a concept entailing a new methodological approach to English language teaching, has landed in the Spanish education sector without much noticing. The unrelenting growth of bilingual schools (state and subsidised) has quickly established a new pedagogical paradigm within the Spanish education system. Indeed, from the language policy level down to stakeholders in different educational settings around Spain, the term ‘CLIL’ is becoming very much acclaimed and valued
as an in-vogue methodology. According to Pérez-Vidal (2013), CLIL means “the ultimate opportunity to practice and improve a foreign language” (p. 59). In a country traditionally lacking foreign language competence, with a grammar-based approach fostering basically mnemonics, the adoption of CLIL in mainstream education has meant a significant shift in the conceptualisation of the teaching practice itself, which has led to a burst of research and open discussion spaces to reflect upon CLIL and share teachers’ practices and concerns. Nevertheless, there are many differences among regions. One of the most relevant aspects is the level of English required for teachers to be part of the BP. In most autonomous regions like Asturias (holding the highest percentage of students enrolled in the English track), or Andalucía, a B2 (intermediate level) is required; however, in Madrid the requirement is a C1 (advanced level) (Torres Menárguez, /2018).

In terms of research, CLIL has experienced a growing number of publications about the effectiveness of content-based BPs across different regions in Spain. According to Tom Morton (Fernández-Barrera, 2018), Spain is “a centre for CLIL practice and CLIL research because, for better or worse, it’s being seen as a policy initiative” (p. 96-7). In an interview I had the privilege to carry out with him about CLIL methodology in Spain, he stated that the increasing investment into bilingual education was attracting a lot of research. In his view, CLIL research in Spain was “active and “healthy”. Nonetheless, he argued that the term CLIL was being used appropriately (particularly in the context of CLM - according to its definition), since language objectives were not taking into account and English was being used as a mere medium of instruction in most schools. Despite that, the overwhelming majority of CLIL studies have proven support for this type of learning in contrast with traditional teaching methods. These investigations, as previously mentioned, have focused on the academic performance and ultimate results of CLIL from a quantitative-oriented approach. However, attention to other specific areas of CLIL are taken for granted. Nowadays, scarce research is bringing to the fore issues related to CLIL implementation and training, which are two of the most criticised aspects in the social and political arena. Since BPs were first implemented at schools, many autonomous communities started paving the way of academic
research taking bilingual education as a primary focus. In Catalonia (Escobar, 2009, 2013; Muñoz, 2005; Navés and Victori, 2010; Pérez-Vidal and Garau, 2010; Pladevall, 2015), and the Basque country (Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010), CLIL has strengthened more rapidly than in any other Spanish community, being pioneers in establishing this methodology into mainstream education. In other communities such as Madrid, some studies have analysed the situation of teachers in bilingual projects (Fernández and Halbach, 2011), but others have adopted a more critical lens towards the construction of inequalities (Hidalgo and Fernández-González, forthcoming); in Andalusia, attention has been paid to CLIL evaluation and consultancy (Lorenzo, 2010; Lorenzo, Casal, and Moore, 2009), and also interactional aspects (Moore, 2011). CLIL research is also present in Murcia (Lova Mellado et al, 2013) and Castilla y León (Durán-Martínez et al, 2016; Durán-Martínez and Beltrán-Llavador 2017), with a focus on teachers' assessment of this type of bilingual programmes. In all these studies, it becomes particularly relevant that certain aspects appear as recurring key issues analysed from different angles which help elucidate what is going on in bilingual schools across regions. The most common issues discussed by these scholars are training opportunities for teachers involved in the bilingual programme, human and material resources (i.e., language assistants, native teachers, use of ICT), school organization, and assessment.

Even though CLIL “is mainly conceived of as a promising course of action to improve current foreign language skills in the country” (Manzano Vázquez, 2015: 137), actual practice shows that there are still multiple teaching, linguistic, organisational and institutional challenges to be effectively implemented. In fact, one of the cornerstones of CLIL implementation are teachers. The CLIL approach conveys new methodological and structural dynamics affecting not only the school organisation and the entire educational community, but also classroom management, which is where CLIL takes place. In this regard, teachers are expected to work together and cooperate in many decision-making processes both in and outside of the classroom itself. Nevertheless, in many educational contexts, CLIL teachers are facing manifold challenges when dealing with their classes. Different investigations have stressed the need for more training actions not only in terms of
the new pedagogical approach but also language competence (Laorden and Peñafiel, 2010; Lorenzo et al., 2009; Lova Mellado et al., 2013; Pérez-Cañado, 2016; Ruiz de Zarobe and Jiménez Catalán, 2009). Despite some initial resistance to comply with the regional/national/European mandates on language-in-education policy, teachers involved in CLIL programmes find training courses essential for a good quality implementation, since they entail the development of language skills in order to get a better command, and they also provide teachers with the opportunity to share their experience in daily teaching practice. In this regard, as CLIL teacher training is scarce in many autonomous communities, numerous platforms and websites have been created by teachers willing to improve their methodology, thus sharing their own teaching materials, relevant links with resources or their own concerns and feelings in the classroom (e.g. see the webpage by Isabel Pérez, 11/02/2016; and the blog 'Innovación y Desarrollo Docente', 13/09/2017).

3.4.1. Critical voices in CLIL research

Within the wide field of CLIL research, critical voices have emerged in recent years. Despite having both advocates and opponents, and been sometimes described as sharing common features with CBI and immersion programmes (e.g. Dalton-Puffer et al. 2014; Llinares and Lyster, 2014), the huge flexibility and broad range of options that CLIL offers makes itself ambiguous and lack a clear-cut set of pedagogical principles (Cenoz, Genesee and Gorter, 2014). Yet, CLIL has experienced such an ‘explosion’ that it has been also introduced in European international schools, which have become an emblem of elite education in some autonomous communities, such as the case of Catalan international schools (Sunyol, 2017; Codó and Sunyol, 2018). Nevertheless, according to Bruton (2011), CLIL needs more descriptive and deeply explored teaching practices that may characterize CLIL as a coherent, homogeneous methodological apparatus. The conceptualisation and pedagogical implementation of CLIL has been questioned (Bruton, 2011, 2013; Cenoz, Genesee and Gorter, 2014). In fact, several platforms and associations gathering families’ and
teachers’ concerns about the effects of these CLIL programmes on the Spanish education system have given rise to different investigations in search of answers towards which model of foreign language teaching is most appropriate in terms of equity and effectiveness. Despite the great amount of CLIL research in the Spanish context, mostly proving its benefits and positive results, it is still noticeable the insufficient command of additional languages. As the platform ‘Acción Educativa’ asserts in its critical report on the implementation of CLIL in Madrid schools (2017), there seems to be historical factors that may explain the lack of communicative skills in a foreign language. One of the reasons why the Spanish education system has been left behind other European countries relies on the scarce financial support and constant changes in educational policy in the last two decades.

Some of the most controversial critical voices have highlighted the methodological weaknesses of CLIL (e.g., Bruton 2011, 2013; Cenoz, Genesee and Gorter 2014; Pérez-Cañado, 2012, 2016). The lack of teacher training and cooperation among teachers, the organisation of the CLIL curricular subjects and the establishment of different groups of students have given rise to rather critical claims on the implications of the CLIL approach. Several authors assert that CLIL provisions are creating two education rates: the fast (best) bilingual track and the slow (worst) non-bilingual track. This way, non-CLIL tracks are automatically considered as ‘slow’, ‘bad’ or ‘lazу’ in terms of both behavioural aspects and learning outcomes, whereas CLIL tracks are socially well regarded as being the ‘best’, ‘brilliant’ and ‘hard-working’ academic group. According to Lorenzo (2007: 35), “CLIL is bilingual education at a time when teaching through one single language is seen as second-rate education”. Despite been once related to the academic elite (Coyle, 2009), nowadays this gap seems to be shrinking due to the current language-in-education policies in Europe promoting equity and integration. Nonetheless, stakeholders in some educational settings are claiming that those inequalities still exist. In this regard, it is important to highlight some research carried out in multilingual settings from a critical perspective exploring social change, difference and inequalities (Codó, forthcoming), such as the case of Catalan schools (Codó and Pérez-Milans, 2014; Codó and Patiño-Santos, 2014, 2017) or CLM, where some
research has looked into students’ language ideologies emerging in bilingual schools (Poveda, 2018) and also discourses about bilingual commodification, which are co-constructed through interaction (Fernández-Barrera, 2015) (see Appendix 12). This region has been regarded as a mirror of Madrid in terms of the implementation of BPs. As a matter of fact, both autonomous communities share common features and socio-political, economic and linguistic factors influencing the way bilingual education programmes have been institutionalised. Not only has the institutionalisation of the BPs altered the status quo of the educational system itself but also the conceptualisation of schools as institutional spaces for social reproduction. In these educational sites, languages have been assigned different values in relation to global processes of change.

3.4.2. The case of CLIL in CLM: Mirroring Madrid’s “bilingualism”

Immersed in the ‘bilingualism movement’, the region of CLM has experienced a significant transformation parallel to the socio-political changes in an attempt to face challenges in contemporary society and respond to social demands. In this regard, the regional administration has made a frantic effort to enact bilingual education programmes (understood as the implementation of a Spanish/English curriculum), but it has not been an easy way. Not long ago, the language policy regulating BPs (Law 7/2010, July 20th) incorporated one foreign language to teach “non-linguistic areas” (i.e., content areas) through CLIL.¹

Compared to other EU education systems regarding foreign language competence, Spain has traditionally remained in a low-ranking position (PISA report, 2012). As a result, the aforementioned initiative aimed at increasing the students’

¹ The 147 article of the Law 7/2010, July 20th, of Education in Castilla-La Mancha, regulates the Bilingual Sections and explicitly establishes that a foreign language will be taught in non-linguistic areas and subjects through the integration of content and languages. [My own translation]
level of English provided them with the opportunity to follow an official bilingual and bicultural curriculum in state schools adopting CLIL guidelines (Ruiz de Zarobe and Lasagabaster, 2010). Foreign language teaching in mainstream schools in Spain and CLM has focused on a rather traditional system based on written grammar and vocabulary exercises. The explosion of growing interest in CLIL in several European countries has contributed to pursuing alternative methods and approaches to second language teaching in CLM with the aim of achieving top quality education, which is one of the major goals of the regional language-in-education policies. Particularly after the rapid implementation of BPs in the region of Madrid, the adjunct region of CLM realised that the “castellano-manchego” schools could not be left behind. Interestingly enough, both regions governed by the conservative party ‘Partido Popular’ undertook this language learning initiative as an emblem of modernisation. Since 2004, the proliferation of BPs in the compulsory school system in Madrid has brought to the fore new forms of (re)producing social distinction through the institutionalisation of “English as a marker of social prestige among state and charter schools” (Hidalgo and Fernández-González, forthcoming).

The same way Madrid’s BPs have contributed in the last decade to shifting views on language learning and conceptualising or re-interpreting schools as institutions for social reproduction, in CLM the scenario of bilingual education does not differ much from that of Madrid. BPs in both cases have meant a means to survive in the local and global competitive educational market. In this sense, whereas subsidised and private schools traditionally belonged to the elitist network of schools in both regions, it is remarkable how state schools have particularly struggled to become part of the BP to attract middle class students. In order to understand these complex circumstances, other social factors must be taken into account. In the last decade, the social and demographic reality in Madrid has dramatically changed due to the progressive incorporation of migrant communities into the Spanish educational system, which have had a great impact on the transformation of the regional state school system. Parallel to these demographic and social shifts, but at a much smaller scale, the public sector in CLM has been
also transformed in the last two decades, highly influenced by the proliferation of BPs (see section 2.2).

In terms of CLIL provisions, even though there has been scarce explicit reference to the term ‘CLIL’ in language-in-education policies regulating bilingual education programmes in the region, the scope and definition of this concept may not be clear enough in this educational context. According to my ethnographic research in three different bilingual schools in CLM, CLIL - as a type of bilingual education – is understood by CLM school communities in their own terms. That means every school has implemented ‘CLIL’ according to their own necessities, interests and human and material resources with the aim of being regarded as a ‘bilingual’ school by the regional administration. Therefore, CLIL is deemed as an innovative, quality-based approach to the teaching of content subjects in a second language – in the broadest sense. Nonetheless, in the context of CLM more ethnographic research needs to be carried out so as to elucidate whether CLIL has contributed to diminishing the gap between Spaniards' language proficiency level and our EU counterparts’. In the next chapter, I shall explain the importance of CSE as a whole theoretical framework towards CLIL in multilingual settings.
CHAPTER 4

CRITICAL SOCIOLINGUISTIC ETHNOGRAPHY AS THEORY TO EXPLORE SITUATED PRACTICES IN MULTILINGUAL CONTEXTS

4.1. Introduction

As already established in the rationale (Chapter 1), this study is a Critical Sociolinguistic Ethnography (CSE), which was carried out as part of a larger coordinated research project (MUEDGE). It aims at exploring the implementation of different forms of multi/bilingual education in the region of CLM to better understand language ideologies, stakeholders’ positions (parents, teachers, students, administrators and policy makers) towards the concept of bilingualism itself and BPs, as well as globalisation processes and socio-political, economic transformations in this autonomous community. In other words, its main target is to comprehend the meanings and values currently associated to English from a multilingual perspective, by looking into communicative practices inside and outside the classroom in order to understand the role and function of the different languages at play.

Critical sociolinguistic ethnography (Heller, 2011), being historically attached to sociology and anthropology, stems from the assumption that language conditions social life and human action. The point of departure remains in the conceptualisation of society as reconfigured around processes through which individuals seek access to symbolic and material resources. Language, in turn, becomes key in social processes, such as those related to identity construction, ideological positioning and power relations. Therefore, language is not an abstract entity, but rather a social and political resource around which social phenomena are constructed and reproduced. That is why this dissertation examines the nature of situated events from an ethnographic perspective to make sense of the processes embedded therein. By putting social activity and situated practices in the centre of inquiry, this study aims
at comprehending these “as socially constructed and transversed by relations of power” (Heller, Pietikäinen and Pujolar, 2018: 2).

In this chapter, I shall sketch out the main assumptions that define CSE as a framework and its connection with other strands of social studies, such as anthropology or sociology. Then, I will focus on the foundations of this approach anchored in North American Linguistic Anthropology and the special link it currently holds with the UK Linguistic Ethnography (LE), where scholars researching on language and society have gathered together and established a critical discussion forum. The next section will deal with Linguistic Anthropology (LA) and LE methodological foundations, as well as the ontological and epistemological assumptions these approaches depart from. This section will also include some of the criticisms that ethnography has received in terms of its empirical apparatus. In the last part of this chapter, I will conclude with a brief account of the main reasons why I opted for this critical ethnographic approach to bilingualism and BPs in CLM in order to better grasp multilingual educational contexts (specifically in my research, bi/multilingual schools in CLM), as well as the ways in which language policies have been enacted in the actual classroom (Tollefson and Pérez-Milans, 2018). In order to understand these theoretical and methodological decisions, it is essential to establish the basis of this approach by explaining the foundations of CSE in order to better grasp its apparatus and the fundamental role it plays in the development of this dissertation.

4.2. The roots of Critical Sociolinguistic Ethnography: North American Linguistic Anthropology

Critical Sociolinguistic Ethnography (CSE) has traditionally positioned alongside North American anthropological traditions such as LA (cf. Duranti, 2003), thus sharing many of the theoretical underpinnings (Copland and Creese, 2015). The work of scholars such as Frederick Erickson, John Gumperz and Dell Hymes initially paved the way for what it is currently known as ‘Linguistic Ethnography’ (LE), and
became the referent in this field. Since their research was widely acknowledged, the study of language, culture and society has developed and consolidated in this particular area, thus providing resourceful theoretical grounds for current LE in Europe and the UK (Pérez-Milans, 2016).

The historical progression of LA in the US was accurately described by Duranti (2003), who identified three key paradigms supporting the importance of language in the field of anthropology. The first paradigm started in the first half of the 20th century when Franz Boas (Boas, 1911) documented and described indigenous languages, followed by Sapir, and Whorf (Sapir, 1949; Whorf, 1941). This paradigm advocated for the “Boasian view of language as an integral part of - and simultaneously a window on culture” (p. 323). In this regard, LA was primarily interested in linguistics and secondarily with anthropology. From 1960s onwards, the focus shifted to anthropology, placing linguistics in a secondary place. Gumperz, Ferguson and Hymes stated the significance of the context for language research. Gumperz and Hymes developed their ethnography of communication about how language is used in particular contexts, thus becoming pioneers in the study of the dialectical relationship between both linguistic and socio-cultural features. From then on, other scholars have produced research based on social practices, such as Ochs (1988, 1993), Silverstein (1976, 1992), Bauman (1983, 1986, 1992), Goodwins (1986, 1992), Briggs (1986, 2003), Blommaert (1992, 1999) and Agha (1999, 2003), among others. They all belong to the third paradigm emerging from the late 1980s and 1990s, which highlighted the role of language in interaction to explore the construction of contexts, social relationships and identities.

Being LE strongly influenced by research carried out in the anthropological field in early twentieth-century modern anthropology (Boas, 1911; Malinowski, 1929; Mead, 1947; Sapir, 1949), this approach has been additionally applied to other disciplines. As a matter of fact, Aaron Cicourel’s and Pierre Bourdieu’s work is linked to sociological research. On the one hand, Cicourel’s studies emphasise the role of language in interaction and social structures and categorisation processes; on the other, Bourdieu’s (1989) sociological accounts highlight the symbolic power language holds and the fundamental role it plays in cultural and social reproduction.
At that time, European departments of linguistics and anthropology were two separate disciplines. Later in the US, the development of the field of sociolinguistics emerged out of a fusion of varied methodologies from other areas (dialectology, sociology). In the last decade, LA has experienced a rebirth due to the wide range of research projects emerging: literacy, language change, social issues (social identity construction in multilingual and multicultural contexts, language use in the media and language socialisation, among others). In his review of the history of LA (Duranti, 2008), the third paradigm has adopted and developed new concepts which have a closer connection with contemporary social theory, such as indexicality, heteroglossia, and agency.

As part of the historical continuum of the linguistic anthropological research that influenced current LE, it is important to take into consideration Hymes and Gumperz’ “ethnography of communication” (1972). It was based on blending linguistic and ethnographic methods to analyse language use in particular contexts. As an approach to language and social interaction, the ethnography of communication seeks to observe and discover meanings of communication and socially situated uses of language through the analysis of communicative practices. Its methodological apparatus consists of participant observation in everyday social life and interviews. This method was founded by Dell Hymes (1962), who stated that language was culturally shaped. He then launched a new ethnographic approach of language use (1964) and suggested a new paradigm based on linguistic relativity (1966), implying language use and how people think of it and use grammatical rules appropriately. In the 1980s and 1990s the focus turned to the role of languages in interaction and how contexts were fundamental in the construction of identities and social relationships (cf. Duranti, 2003). Hymes and Gumperz (1972) shed light on a new perspective towards the analysis of the role of language in society from different theoretical insights rather than developing a whole method. Both placed interaction as the starting point to analyse language behaviour. This meant a reaction against the dominant Chomskyan orientation to the study of language as monolithic entities, i.e., a bounded abstract system. In 1960s and 1970s the so-called “Chomskyan revolution” flourished, thus establishing a tradition for the study of language as an
innate cognitive faculty (Duranti, 2000: 270). In opposition to this cognitivist view of language in its pure linguistic form, Gumperz’ research (1982) was based on the relationship between the linguistic sign and social life, that is, a conceptualisation of the social world as dynamic, fluid and changing, where historical, political and economic forces interact, thus (re)producing social inequalities through the language social actors use in situated contexts.

Another important aspect within ethnography as a field is non-verbal communication. Scholars like Goodwin (2000) claimed that communication is multimodal, thus people, places, events and any other visual perception play a key role for a holistic comprehension of situated practices. The notion of context as a process of meaning-making in interactional events needs to be understood as multi-scalar (Blommaert, 2010; Cicourel, 1993; Hymes 1972: 53). In this sense, linguistic anthropologists\(^1\) share with linguistic ethnographers the interest in context-dependent communicative events; what people say needs a context to be understood and interpretable in a specific way. According to Goodwin and Duranti (1992), context and words are mutually shaping each other. From this perspective, language practices, identities and social relations are constructed within the sociolinguistic order they are part of. That is the point with indexicality, one of the most important areas of research within LA addressing how language choices are shaped by and shape social constructs and processes. This term implies treating actions and speech as signs which point to specific aspects of the event/context in which they take place (e.g. people, objects, practices, beliefs).

Following Charles S. Peirce and his suggestion about the linkage between sign and referent, or what he calls “indexes”, linguistic signs have a strong relation with a specific contextual referent; therefore, contexts are in turn ratified or changed by semiotic signs. In this line, Gumperz’ theory of conversational inference (1982) was based on discourse interpretation. His research showed how cultural assumptions affect the way individuals interpret conversational exchanges. Thus, indexicality and inferencing provide a way of grasping how circulating ideologies are

\(^1\) For a full discussion of linguistic ethnography vs. anthropology, see Rampton 2007.
co-constructed, disputed or appropriated by social agents in discourse, in such a way that ideologies become integral to situated sense-making practices.

The amalgam of all these intertwined paradigms, disciplines, traditions and theories has converged in LE as an emergent field which offers an interdisciplinary approach combining linguistics and ethnography with the aim of improving social realities (Shaw, Copland, and Snell, 2015). According to Copland and Creese (2005), “its empirical nature and bottom-up orientation to date require working from evidence towards theory” (p. 26). This approach can critically and rigorously identify micro particularities that are linked to macro social processes. Through varied documentation techniques (audio and video transcripts and other textual artefacts), LE research aims at describing, analysing and interpreting linguistic signs in ongoing communicative practices. In these social encounters, language is central. The same way LE seeks to understand language in situated contexts, CSE aims at exploring language and social difference. Put it simply, it examines how unequal relations are discursively constructed through social categorisation processes, which at the same time legitimise social inequalities in a specific situated context (Heller, 2011).

In the next section, I provide a more detailed description of what LE entails from a European perspective along with the main assumptions of some scholars researching the dynamic relationship between the linguistic order and the social world.

4.3. European Linguistic Ethnography and UK Linguistic Ethnography

LE would not be what it is today if it had not been by a wide range of scholars in the UK sharing common interests within the field of socio and applied linguistics. As mentioned before, research carried out by Frederick Erickson, John Gumperz and Dell Hymes contributed to building the pillars of linguistic ethnography as a consolidated field nowadays. Defined as an ‘umbrella’ term, combining both linguistics and ethnography, it has constituted a whole theoretical and
methodological framework, thus establishing a tradition in “the new intellectual climate of post-structuralism and late modernity” (Creese, 2008: 229).

In the last half of the 20th century, LE as a solid theoretical and methodological apparatus has faced many challenges, but it has been quickly developing in the UK over the last 15 years. One of the key areas shaping LE in the UK is the New Literacy Studies (Creese, 2008; Maybin and Tusting, 2011; Rampton et al., 2004), but it has also received a strong influence from other traditions. In his review of the development of LE in the UK, Rampton (2007) highlights relevant influential traditions like those neo-Vygotskian approaches to cognitive development (Bruner, 1985; Mercer, 1995), critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1992; Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995), interactional sociolinguistics (Martin-Jones 1995; Rampton 1995), and interpretive applied linguistics for language teaching (Brumfit and Johnson, 1979; Pennycook, 1994; Widdowson, 1984).

Coming from diverse backgrounds, a group of UK scholars from a wide range of disciplines gathered together in the so-called ‘Linguistic Ethnography Forum’ (LEF2), all engaged in ethnography and applied linguistics, as well as some anthropologists involved in communicative practices. The UK Linguistic Ethnography Forum (UKLEF) was officially established in 2000 by David Barton, Angela Creese, Janet Maybin, Ben Rampton and Karin Tusting, who shared an interest in exploring the interrelationship between language and social life. LEF currently brings together scholars conducting linguistic ethnographies both within and outside the UK borders with the aim of engaging in methodological and theoretical debates, paying particular attention to key issues and resemblances and divergences between the UK LE and LE research elsewhere. It was not until 2003 when the UKLEF was created as a Special Interest Group of the British Association of Applied Linguistics (BAAL), which offered the appropriate guidance and organisational procedures. The prominent influence of applied linguistics has made LE a distinctive field within sociolinguistics.

In fact, LE has allowed researchers to work bottom-up, from discourse outwards. Rampton (2007) appreciates the importance and scope of LE as being “an overall shift from the inside moving outwards, trying to get analytic distance on what’s close-
at-hand, rather than a move from the outside inwards, trying to get familiar with the strange" (p. 590-591). This means that LE has the potential to challenge and examine oversimplifications in ‘familiar’ encounters to understand the complexities of social realities from a more distant angle (Rampton et al, 2014).

For the purpose of this dissertation, LE then provides a powerful lens towards social processes and ideologies being (re)produced in the focal bilingual educational settings understood as particular local communities sharing and shaping values, beliefs and attitudes regarding the concept of bilingualism and the types of BPs implemented in CLM schools. After a brief description about LE in Europe and its importance the UK, I shall explain the most relevant ontological and epistemological principles of LE and some empirical criticisms to ethnography as a solid theoretical approach.

4.4. Theoretical and Methodological foundations in Linguistic Ethnography

Originated in the UK, LE has been adopted by scholars elsewhere from different fields of knowledge. Nevertheless, its ontological and epistemological roots have influenced how researchers have approached language, culture and identity over the last decade, which will be fully described in the following section. LE, on the one hand, provides the methodological tools to explore how social processes function and what they mean to people in specific contexts and under specific circumstances. On the other hand, LE serves as a solid theoretical framework to describe, explain and account for the complexities. In so doing, LE aims at identifying, describing and understanding complexities of real life through empirical research. For the purpose of this dissertation, this kind of research seeks to explore situated social events that are unique of a particular period and of every specific moment in which they occur.

In terms of its theoretical grounds, Creese (2008) points out that although LE is rooted in Hymesian ethnography of communication (Gumperz and Hymes, 1972; Rampton, 2007) and draws on Interactional Sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1982) and micro-ethnography (Erickson, 1996), it rather rests upon other disciplines such as
anthropology, sociology and applied linguistics, thus sharing the focus on meaning-making processes and the dialectical relationship between language and culture, and by extension, social structures. Despite sharing its orientation with other fields in sociolinguistics (notably Critical Discourse Analysis (Blommaert, 2005)), LE differs from other approaches in its methodological and theoretical foundations. Moving back to its primarily conceptual foundations, LE was described in a discussion paper published by the UK Linguistic Ethnography Forum\(^3\) back in 2004 as follows:

*Although LE research differs in how far it seeks to make claims about either language, communication or the social world, linguistic ethnography generally holds that to a considerable degree, language and the social world are mutually shaping, and that close analysis of situated language use can provide both fundamental and distinctive insights into the mechanisms and dynamics of social and cultural production in everyday activity.* (Rampton *et al.*, 2004: 2).

According to this statement, one of the premises of LE is the relationship between language and society, which are mutually shaping each other. This assumption allows an interdisciplinary approach to the understanding of other dimensions, processes and structures beyond the pure linguistic sign. As a matter of fact, both linguistics and ethnography complement each other resulting in a holistic approach. In this line, LE is described as “the conjuncture of ethnography and linguistics” (Rampton *et al.*, 2004), a combination of two fields of study that gathers together insights from linguistics and from ethnography with the aim of better understanding how locally situated language practices are related to the sociocultural context. The methodological role of linguistics that “ties ethnography down” attempts to make complete sense of social life through the linguistic lens. LE then offers a dual focus based on both finely-tuned methods for discourse analysis and more reflexive, interpretive approaches to the complexities of social practices and structures (Rampton *et al.*, 2004). This dichotomy may create tensions between the micro and the macro dimensions, that is, a more ‘closed’ and abstract focus on linguistic

\(^3\) Collaboratively drafted by Ben Rampton, Karin Tusting, Janet Maybin, Richard Barwell, Angela Creese and Vally Lytra.
aspects, and a more ‘open’ angle to contextual factors and the researcher’s role and positionality. That is why “undoing the macro/micro dichotomy” (Heller, 2014) implies a dialectical relationship between structure and action which is observable out of recurrent patterns of situated social practices. This methodological dimension allows to identify relevant aspects of situated action, such as the way social categorisation is constructed in terms of inclusion and exclusion (see section 6.1).

Apart from the theoretical assumptions, ethnography itself can also be regarded as a set of methodological principles offering different techniques (e.g. fieldwork with participant observation, interviews, focus group discussions). According to Tusting (2013), methodologically speaking, the focus is on participant observation in specific contexts and the emic perspectives of participants (Maybin and Tusting, 2011; Rampton et al., 2004; Tusting and Maybin, 2007) paying attention to reflexivity and the role of the researcher in context. Theoretically, indexicality and recontextualisation cues play an important role in understanding the relationship between language and context, and how language is used in meaning-making processes to explore how local and global contexts are constructed through semiotic practices (Blommaert, 2001). Contextualisation is then a central factor which LE addresses in a distinctive and unique way due to its incorporation of anthropological concepts.

In terms of analytical focus, LE takes interaction as the primary focal point in which wider social structures and economic and political processes are embedded. That is why, according to Erickson and its micro-ethnographic research (1990), an interpretive, empirical approach like this is needed to make sense of the daily life and meanings constructed by social actors in immediate situated practices they are engaged in. As Blommaert points out (2007), ethnography describes “the sometimes chaotic, contradictory, polymorph character of human behaviour in concrete settings” (p. 682) in order to understand, on the one hand, participants’ perspectives, and on the other hand, micro-events understood as components of social structuration, reproduction and transformation.

As for social organisation and social processes that occur in situated interactions, LE looks for patterns and systematicity within social practice, thus
allowing us to tell a story, “our own story […] which illuminates social processes and generates explanations of why people do and think the things they do” (Heller, 2008: 250). In this regard, LE remains open to data, and it is actually our data what counts as reliable, scientific evidence. In other words, it is out of the corpus of data that LE makes sense as a consistent methodological apparatus.

4.4.1. Ontological and epistemological principles

Epistemology and ontology are common features of ethnography (Blommaert, 2007). Within the LE field, it is actually the combination of linguistics and ethnography what makes this discipline align itself “with a particular epistemological view of language in social context” (Creese, 2008: 229). That is, it accounts for social life events from a post-structuralist perspective, which has been affected by globalisation and increasing mobility. In the field of sociolinguistics, ethnography is considered a social practice, that is, an activity involving participants in interactional events. According to Heller (2009), “doing ethnography therefore means entering into […] an ongoing conversation with many interlocutors” (p. 251). In doing so, an ethnographic perspective needs to include data collection techniques which properly describe and account for the phenomena in situated events, that is, what is happening, under which circumstances these occur in space and time, and how social actors interpret these phenomena in relation to wider processes. For this purpose, LE offers a whole apparatus to better understand the social world by listening to the data. In this regard, a close analysis of language use in daily communicative practices is crucial to comprehend how we can really make sense of the world around us. These meaning-making practices can only be grasped through the analysis of the internal organisation of semiotic data (verbal or non-verbal), which index agents’ stance, ideologies and positioning underpinning social and institutional processes.

The innovative angle of this dissertation relies on the combination of methods and the bottom-up perspective – contrary to traditional top-down approaches - that
LE allows in order to understand the emphasis this approach puts onto social events. Thus, this study explores how schools as institutions serving local-regional-national-international socio-political regimes position themselves regarding bilingualism and BPs. In the course of the BPs institutionalisation, manifold dilemmas, tensions and contradictions emerge from the linkage between 1) language policies that are enacted, appropriated negotiated or contested by social actors, 2) official institutional discourse and 3) participants’ voices and positioning. For this purpose, LE’s analytical methods provide permeable tools to account for the connection between situated practices, identity construction and larger-scale processes of globalization and neoliberalism.

4.4.2. Empirical criticisms to ethnography

In recent studies, ethnography has received an increasing interest among diverse disciplines and branches of scholarship, even though it has also been highly confronted. Ethnography becomes an established and unquestionable practice in anthropology for which it has become a distinctive method. Nevertheless, there has been lack of consensus about whether we could call linguistic ethnography a ‘theory’ per se in the field of social sciences. Several UK scholars have come to a full discussion on the issue of the scope and the utilitarian principle of linguistic ethnography (e.g. David Barton, Angela Creese, Janet Maybin, Ben Rampton and Karin Tusting). LE theory goes beyond the notion of language as the only key feature; it considers the socio-cultural context and the social agents. There is a set of fundamental assumptions that make LE be framed as a theoretical and methodological perspective. For ethnographic studies, social events are contextualised as situated practices whose meaning and function vary depending on who perform those actions constructing the event.

In the past 30 years, ethnography was taken for granted, marginalised within social sciences until it was later placed at a central position, particularly in anthropology and sociology, and more recently, psychology and applied areas like
medicine and education. Over these years, some scholars have approached ethnography from a critical perspective. According to Hammersley (1990, 1992), it lacks a theoretical apparatus as such even though its main goal and commitment is to produce theoretical (and ‘thick’) empirical descriptions of the social world in particular settings or groups. In opposition to quantitative research, ethnography advocates for qualitative methods through which social structures and phenomena are identified. In his critical reflection on “what’s wrong with ethnography?”, the concept of theoretical description remains unclear: “descriptions cannot be theories, but all descriptions are theoretical in the sense that they employ concepts and theories” (1990: 598). In fact, the emphasis of ethnography is on naturally occurring phenomena that shape (and are shaped by) the organization of the social world. In this sense, he suggests a “reproduction model” based on the assumption that ethnographic descriptions of what happens (“who does what, when and how”) reproduce a part of the world (1990: 605).

Ethnographic descriptions consist of accounts of a social microcosm representing the social world in which social action and human agency take place within a bounded, internally structured system. It is based on the empirical application of theories, or what he calls “inductive, discovery-based approach” (1990:601) through which social processes are understood. This approach also pays attention to ethnographers’ role on putting theories into practice while using them, that is, theory is constructed on-the-go, that is, out of the description of events in specific time-place locations. To put it bluntly, theories describe universal phenomena, but descriptions per se are about situated events. This is where Hammersley’s argument on the contradictory concept of ethnography as “theoretical description” comes from. As a counterargument to this critical standpoint, in his “critical realist ethnography” in a medical setting about racism, Sam Porter (1993) suggests Bhaskar’s theory of critical realism (1989a) in an attempt to better explain the relationship between social structure and human agency in particular settings. According to his theory, “the social world is reproduced and transformed in daily life” (1989a: 3-4). That is, society and human agency co-exist in a mutually shaping
relationship, and social phenomena result from a set of structures shaped (and which shape) human action.

Departing from this assumption, I therefore appreciate the importance of LE as a whole theoretical and methodological apparatus with the additional critical angle that CSE provides in order to explore social processes occurring in situated discursive events to better understand bilingual education in CLM.

4.5. The need for a Critical Sociolinguistic Ethnography in CLM: Why a “critique”?

Underneath these theoretical and methodological premises lies the key question: why a “critique”?, following Heller (2011). In the next few paragraphs, I shall explain the need for a “critical” sociolinguistic ethnography of BPs in CLM and, more specifically, in Ciudad Real, one of the five provinces that are part of this region.

As the proliferation of CLIL-type bilingual programmes in the traditionally monolingual region of CLM has generated a new sociolinguistic panorama within the educational field, the need for research in this particular context has recently attracted some scholars, who have mostly adopted a quantitative approach towards the implementation of such programmes (de Diezmas, 2013, 2014, 2017; Fernández Cézar, et al. 2009; Prado-Osma, 2015; Ruiz Cordero, 2016). Most of these publications emphasise the need of more specific teacher training (de Diezmas, 2014; Fernández Cézar et al., 2009; Ruiz Cordero, 2016), and cognitive-related aspects regarding second language acquisition and how learning a second language through these programmes might affect specific skills in L1 in secondary education (de Diezmas, 2013, 2017). Other current studies have analysed the integration of the ICTs (Information and Communications Technologies) into the bilingual curriculum in secondary education (Prado-Osma, 2015).

As stated before, the methodological and analytical perspectives adopted in these investigations have been based on quantitative and rather descriptive methods, thus lacking a critical stance. However, qualitative studies about the
implementation and development of such BPs based on epistemological interpretations illuminated by data and a close analysis of situated interactional practices have not been accomplished in this region yet. Indeed, the scope of the existing research on CLIL and bilingual education in CLM has focused mainly on the academic/linguistic results of those students attending bilingual classes in order to prove the high quality of these programmes. In the field of sociolinguistics, there has been very scarce research paying attention to the social phenomena taking place at bilingual schools and the emergence of tensions, contradictions and other controversial issues regarding the sociolinguistic order in the CLIL classroom under conditions of the 21st century demands.

Other research has looked into a more social dimension and the human and material conditions under which certain CLIL programmes have been implemented, engendering social difference, hierarchies and inequalities produced and/or reproduced in the daily lives of the agents involved. This is the case of Martín-Rojo’s (2013) and Pérez-Milans and Patiño-Santos’ (2014) ethnography conducted at a school in Madrid enacting a CLIL Spanish-English programme along with a Spanish-intensive programme for migrant students. Following these ethnographic studies and others carried out in bi-multilingual education contexts both in Spain (Codó and Patiño Santos, 2014; Mijares and Relaño-Pastor, 2011; Relaño Pastor, 2015, 2018b,) and elsewhere (García, 2014; Pérez-Milans, 2013; Unamuno, 2014), this dissertation embraces bilingual education programmes in CLM from an underexplored critical angle to understand how such programmes have been implemented in regional schools, and the relationship of language-in-education policies, language practices and discourses around the social implications of those politically and ideologically-based actions.

Increasingly engaged with much of the studies carried out within the branch of social sciences, this CSE has opted for a combination of methods. This way, this approach can help establish linkages between linguistic practices, institutional mandates about policies and wider socio-political, moral and economic orders (Martin-Jones, 2007) indexing processes of production and reproduction of social inequalities. In the last decade, there has been an increasing interest in this kind of
empirical research and, more specifically, on CSE as the set of methodological foundations adopted by some scholars in educational settings (Blackledge and Creese, 2010; Heller, 2006; Heller and Martin-Jones, 2001; Martín-Rojo, 2010; Nussbaum and Unamuno, 2006; Pérez-Milans, 2013; Rampton, 2006). Drawing on “a critical social perspective on the concept of bilingualism, combining practice, ideology and political economy” (Heller, 2007: 2), this study eventually aims at reflecting on the implications of language ideologies tied to this particular context where the socio-linguistic order has been transformed on the basis of social organisation and categorisation processes resulting from the socio-political and economic changes of the 21st century.

Resting upon CSE as the theoretical and methodological framework, a close analysis of situated events in these bilingual schools will provide insightful accounts of how social actors (i.e., teachers, students, coordinators of BPs, heads of schools and families involved) engage, negotiate, contest, resist or comply with the institutional order in and out of the school walls, and what mechanisms of the social world intersect with meaning-making practices in specific time-place contexts. Following national/international language school entities and institutions, and EU language-in-education policies, the regional administration in CLM seeks to progress hand in hand along the same path of our European counterparts through the implementation of these bilingual programmes. But at what costs? The main aim is to better comprehend the social dimension and implications that the enactment of such language policies has had in CLM, taking into account the sociocultural background and economic growth of this region in the last decades, even though it was severely stroke by the national economic crisis in the last decade affecting the whole welfare state. In this complex, politically and socially changing context, a CSE constitutes a proper theoretical and methodological approach to the study of social change and institutional transformation through meaning-making practices. Ethnographic methods of data collection and analysis of audio-recorded interactions and transcriptions allow researchers to look closely at participants' linguistic practices across time and space. The empirical foci rests upon participants’ trajectories, stances and experiences within a specific educational organisation, with
its own institutional functioning involving not only discourse in interaction but also material artefacts through which meaning-making practices take place.

CLIL, as a very much appraised methodology and an increasing focal field of study in European educational research, has, however, received strong severe critiques stressing the drawbacks resulting from an integrated learning of content and language. As stated before, in the existing literature on bilingual education matters in the region of CLM, the scarce research has brought to the fore rather quantitative accounts. The most recurrent topics in quantitative CLIL research are: the need of content-subject materials in the language of instruction; the lack of training and pedagogical support for content-subject teachers, insufficient administrators’ awareness of subject-specialists’ needs when dealing with their CLIL sessions, and even the lack of assessment criteria according to CLIL parameters (Banegas, 2012; Pavón and Rubio, 2010). In addition, existing critical research has shed light on the tensions emerging between subject-specialists and language teachers (Costa and Pladevall-Ballester, forthcoming). In this sense, a particularly striking critique has been put forward by Anthony Bruton (2011, 2013) (see section 3.4), questioning the not-so-beneficial CLIL education in terms of quality language teaching and learning. In order to better understand why this study adopts a critical perspective towards the current situation of bilingual education in CLM, it is necessary to point out the theoretical and methodological foundations of CSE as an interpretive approach within the broad field of social sciences and its potential to illuminate specific clues for research purposes (see previous sections in this chapter).

Drawing on Heller’s notion of “critique” (2001), this study addresses bilingual education in CLM from a critical lens, as it “is fundamentally about identifying and explaining the construction of relations of social difference and inequality” (p. 117). This approach entails a better understanding of the unequal distribution of resources and power in the local community in which language plays a fundamental role. The critique approach I take in this research is based on how local processes are shaped, reproduced, or tied to global processes. From this critical angle, this research focuses on one particular dimension: the triangulation between situated language
practices, language ideologies and language-in-education policies in relation to wider processes of social structuration and categorisation (Cicourel, 1993; Giddens, 1984; Heller, 2001), and identity construction (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005; Pavlenko and Blackledge, 2004; Ochs, 1993) against the backdrop of neoliberalism and globalisation. The critical ‘twist’ towards the study of these social changes provides significant insights on inequalities generated out of the forces of governmentality (Foucault, 1991), understanding social agents as neoliberal subjects serving political and economic interests of the global economy. This critique will therefore shed light on the deeper linkages between those micro and macro processes, between the local and the national-global, between language and the social word. In other words, the emphasis is placed on how the relationship between the micro and macro impacts social agents’ ideologies, beliefs, practices and identity as bilingual or non-bilingual selves involved in the dynamics of the 21st century.

Increasing interest in ‘critique’ arose particularly from 1960s onwards in the field of sociology and anthropology. Researchers were concerned mainly about social processes and social struggle given the changeable socio-political and economic conditions of contemporary societies. Instability, uncertainty and vulnerability of nations and the world economy made scholars reflect on social changes susceptible to cause inequalities. This historical, social, political and economic conjuncture needs to be explored in-depth from both the local and institutional logics in relation to the dilemmas and contradictions emerging in late modernity (Appadurai, 1990; Bauman, 1998).

With the help of ethnographic methods and analytical tools, and from a critical perspective, my research is grounded on the evidence of discourses, practices and policies being implemented in the three focal educational sites immersed in the ‘bilingualism movement’. I therefore analyse the extent to which the institutional order plays an important role in the construction of identities and (re)production of ideologies at the local level which are embedded in wider social, political and economic processes.
PART III: METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK
CHAPTER 5

RESEARCH SITES: THREE BI/PLURILINGUAL SCHOOLS IN “LA MANCHA”

5.1. Introduction

As already stated in previous chapters, this CSE is based on long-term fieldwork (2014-2017) carried out in three bilingual schools that have implemented one of the CLIL-type bi/plurilingual programmes (Spanish/English/+French) in the province of Ciudad Real (CLM). The choice of these three school communities as research sites was originally motivated by the lack of qualitative studies on CLIL or any other type of bi/plurilingual education programmes in the region of CLM (see Part II, Chapter 3 for a full explanation of the theoretical grounds). In addition, these focal sites were selected under specific conditions and criteria that are described further below.

In the city where my fieldwork was conducted, some pioneer schools had already enacted one of these types of programmes and others were on the way of fully implementing these policies in any of the levels established by the regional mandates (Initiation, Development or Excellence). When I first established contact with most bi/plurilingual schools in the local area, only a few of them had enacted these programmes at a ‘development’ level in secondary education (semi-private), and just one was labelled as being a school of ‘excellence’ (public), under the provisions of the former Plan of Plurilingualism, which urged all schools in CLM to implement one of the CLIL-type bilingual programmes. As a result of this revolutionary language policy in force, more and more schools have been undertaking this initiative in order not to be left behind in the ‘bilingualism movement’.

Having lived in this city since I was born, I was really intrigued by the parallelism and divergences between state-funded and state-subsidised schools and how BPs were being implemented by adopting a critical sociolinguistic ethnographic perspective in order to voice social difference and inequalities underneath the current ‘bilingualism movement’, which is officially regulated by the regional
administration. Beyond my research aims and naïve optimistic spirit at the beginning, I then realised that the whole process of negotiation with the schools’ management team was going to be a challenging task, facing manifold difficulties, unexpected tensions and even gatekeeping issues, which will be further explained in the next chapter. After individual semi-structured interviews with the heads of some of the most well-known and highly demanded bilingual schools in the local area, I eventually discarded those centres at the initiation level and selected the ones with a more solid implementation of such programmes, such as ‘development’ or ‘excellence’ levels. This way, I believed these foci would provide insightful accounts of the complexities, tensions and dilemmas that the school communities were facing due to the transformation of the social and institutional order.

As it has been already mentioned in Part II, this study does not aim at comparing or evaluating BPs at these schools, whether successful or not, but, on the contrary, the main focus is to understand the functioning, organisation and evolution of different types of CLIL programmes and how each institutional site has appropriated and adjusted to the language-in-education policies promoting a more plurilingual education for all. Even though, ideologically, both state and state-subsidised schools may have for long been positioned on opposite sides, it is however interesting to understand the status-quo and the consequences of the implementation of CLIL-type bilingual programmes in CLM. At a broader scale, I aim at making sense of wider social, economic and political factors affecting how schools are complying with EU bilingual education mandates.

In terms of my research aims, the three focal schools were mainly distinguished by their BP, which was appropriated differently in each one of them. The three schools are interestingly the most well-acknowledged educational centres in the local area. In fact, they are socially constructed as ‘top’ bilingual schools. One of them, High Towers, is a state secondary school, and the others belong to the state-subsidised network, called San Marcos (religious) and San Teo (lay). Whereas the latter have traditionally boosted a historical prestige and have been considered top schools in the local area for decades, High Towers’ distinctive features make it unique in terms of its successful BP, which has completely transformed the school’s
image and status in the local area. In the next section, each school site is fully described by paying attention to the most relevant aspects regarding its social and linguistic background, as well as the origin, evolution and organisation of their BP.

5.2. High Towers’ School: From exclusion to prestige

High Towers’ School is a secondary public school located in the city centre, inside a green area. From what my ethnography can tell (see Relaño-Pastor, Fernández-Barrera, 2018), it has undergone a remarkable transformation in the last decade at both the institutional and the social level. Years before the implementation of the BP, it was originally labelled as ‘a special needs school’ by the regional and local administration (Order of June 7, 2016)¹. These special needs schools have been traditionally located in rural areas where the working conditions generally entail extra difficulties and greater challenges for teachers. In fact, it is in these urban areas where teachers have to deal with at-risk students due to their socio-economic background. This implies social discrimination, behavioural problems or special educational needs. Nevertheless, most students nowadays come from local middle-class families.

For the purpose of my ethnography, schools’ social image, status and reputation are key issues to be examined. In this case, High Towers’ prestige has dramatically improved since the first MEC/British Council BPs were implemented back in 2004. Indeed, within the school community, it is considered one of the best-running bilingual programmes. This is mainly due to the British teachers hired to work as language assistants, who are socially constructed as authentic in terms of their “native” English accent. Despite supporting content subject teachers in the classroom contribute to enhancing an English atmosphere at school with their presence, these native teachers have been in the spotlight of the internal struggles

at this school. According to specialist teachers, these language assistants are not qualified enough to teach as they are undergraduates with no pedagogical training, but they are supposed to help specialists by carrying out specific classroom activities.

Figure 8. High Towers’ main entrance

In terms of the actual implementation and management of the BP, this school obtained the label of ‘Excellence’ on the basis of three curricular subjects taught in English (i.e., science, history and geography, and music), and also the availability of one of teachers accredited with a C1 level of English (Elsa, the music teacher; see Section 8.1.) Taking into account that regional language policies do not allow students to be separated and be placed in linguistically – and academically - homogeneous groups, schools can only establish two groups depending on the language of instruction; that is, groups are generally heterogeneous (bilingual and non-bilingual) in the ordinary curricular subjects (out of the bilingual programme). However, in CLIL subjects, students are divided into two groups: bilingual and non-bilingual. This was precisely what caught my attention as a researcher looking into
social organisation processes, with a special emphasis on difference and inequalities in institutional sites (see Part III).

One of the main reasons of the increasing demand of students’ enrolment in the bilingual programme has to do with other language initiatives within the school, such as school trips and students exchanges to Ireland. Immersed in the local and global linguistic market, emerging schools like High Towers have made a great effort to reach the top and maintain its prestige in competition with other schools in the area. In doing so, the methodology and assessment carried out in English based on the Cambridge IGCSE (International General Certificate of Secondary Education) has become a distinctive feature of its successful programme. In my ethnography, the students in the 4th grade of CSE were specifically trained in the English subject classes with the aim to obtain this certificate. This type of qualification system is internationally well-known and recognised as “a mark of quality and evidence of real ability [in English]”2.

5.3. San Teo’s School: Towards excellence and elitism

San Teo’s School, founded in 1978 as a lay semi-private school, is nowadays constructed as the most elitist schools in the local area. It is located in the outskirts of the city and close to a traditionally working class neighbourhood, where new residential areas have been settled by wealthy families coexisting with the traditional Gypsy communities placed across the school site. Despite being isolated from the city centre, this school has maintained its prestige throughout the years, mainly due to varied innovation initiatives such as the BPs. Even though the school community at San Teo value its BP as promoting a ‘bilingualism of excellence’, at the policy level this bilingual programme was categorised as being at the ‘development’ level according to the former Plan of Plurilingualism. Thus, the school fulfilled the regional requirements regarding the availability of teachers with an accredited B2 level of

---

English and the fact of offering two curricular subjects taught in English. Its unique BP makes San Teo distinguishable from other schools in town. In this sense, the inclusion of English native teachers functioning as specialist teachers provides the BP with an exquisite opportunity for students to learn a type of English socially assessed as ‘authentic’. This is actually an extraordinary situation as compared to most of the other local schools, whose native teachers function mostly as language assistants in the English-subject classes, as a mere support in the classroom. In San Teo, the only C1 teachers are English-subject specialists, who are not entitled to teach content subjects other than English but are considered part of the cornerstones of the BP. Both English native teachers and C1 English specialists are labelled as “bilingüistas”, a dominant social category that indexes a sense of belonging and membership to the BP (see Chapter 7). Given these circumstances, San Teo is placed at the top of all bilingual schools in the local community offering the most prestigious bilingual education through the English language.

*Figure 9.* Stairs in the main hall with its distinctive values and corresponding translation into the three languages taught at this centre (English, French and German).
The history of San Teo’s first steps towards bilingualism dates back to 2007, when the school started to implement an initial bilingual project in both primary and secondary levels. A year later, the school hired two British teachers to be part of the BP. Since then, these native teachers have been inherent to the school’s atmosphere. Their role has changed over the years parallel to the amendments of different regional language-in-education policies, but they are still key to sustain the bilingual programme at this school. Nevertheless, this is possible thanks to the families, who must pay an extra fee of 39 euros per month for the hiring of these native teachers. As compared to other bilingual schools, San Teo is the only one who charges parents for this extra school service. In fact, in the rest of schools, these native teachers are hired by the regional authorities and are positioned as language assistants free from any charges for the families.

*Figure 10.* Cambridge National School Project plaque “supporting bilingualism” at the entrance of San Teo and next to a Domund poster.

---

3 Domund is an acronym for World Mission Day: one Sunday in the year to celebrate missionary activity.
As stated before, the circumstances at San Teo differ from the rest of local schools. Regarding the teaching practice at this school, the native teachers and the content subject specialists are expected to co-teach in the bilingual curricular subjects. However, in most cases, it is the native teacher who controls the whole teaching practice both in primary and secondary education. In primary, the content subjects taught in English, apart from English classes, are natural and social science, and arts and crafts, whereas in secondary the selection of the content subjects included in the bilingual curriculum may vary year after year (e.g. biology, technology, arts and crafts, religion, ethics, philosophy or social sciences).

*Figure 11. American High School Diploma at the entrance of San Teo*
A notable difference between San Teo and other bilingual schools is that all students are expected to participate in the BP, although they have the curricular choice of following a non-bilingual track. Very few students choose this option, though; those who do have the right to be instructed by the subject specialists must be present at all times along with the native teacher, thus providing them with extra academic support in Spanish. In several occasions, and depending on the specialists’ availability, these non-bilingual students are pulled out of the ordinary classroom for academic purposes.

In its attempt to outstand from the rest of local schools and become a national reference school\(^4\), San Teo is also immersed in the Cambridge National Schools Project\(^5\) (see Figure 10), which provides English assessment and Cambridge English official certification with special discounts on the exam fee. Furthermore, the school has recently implemented the International Baccalaureate program (academic year 2016-17), thus offering the students the possibility of obtaining the Dual High School Diploma (U.S.A and Spain) (see Figure 11). Currently, it has been awarded as one of the best schools among other 300 in Spain with the Dual Diploma within the Academica International Studies\(^6\).

\(^{4}\) A label referring to those schools carrying out successful innovative projects such as those involving bi/plurilingual programmes.

\(^{5}\) More information about the Cambridge National Schools Project can be found at: http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/es/cmp/national-schools-project/

\(^{6}\) See webpage: https://www.academica.school/los300mejores
5.4. San Marcos’ School: Historical prestige and Christian values

“Un centro de referencia por su excelencia educativa y por la sólida formación en valores humanos y cristianos”.
(City Council, 2015)

San Marcos’ School shares with San Teo’s the reputation of being one of the most prestigious bilingual schools in the local market due to its bilingual programme. Belonging to the semi-private (religious) school network, like San Teo’s, it implemented the ‘development’ level under the provisions of the Plan of Plurilingualism. San Marcos’, first built in 1915 by a traditionally highly recognized religious order, currently holds historical prestige, boosting elitism and high social status. As a matter of fact, this religious order has always tried to achieve and maintain its great reputation all over the country, spreading out their strong sense of belonging to a “family” based on the Christian dogma and its normative teaching system, thus considering this aspect unique and essential in the development of the students.

*Figure 12.* San Marcos’ classroom: a Christian cross on the wall
Receiving more than 1,300 students each year from infant through primary up to A levels, it is located in a traditional humble, working-class neighbourhood close to the city centre. Being located at a walking distance from the railway station, San Marcos' area was mostly settled by workers of the Spanish state-run railroad system. Nevertheless, this neighbourhood has suffered several changes over the last two decades in terms of its architectural aesthetics and its socioeconomic level, thus remaining divided into two opposite areas: the traditional modest one and the growing sophisticated with two-storied semidetached houses, thus being divided by a road to which the school faces the main entrance (See Figures 12 and 13). The gap between those two opposing areas in the same neighbourhood is noticeable from the aesthetic aspect of the infrastructures at both sides of the road. The railroad system which connects this city with some of the most important and big cities in Spain, particularly Madrid - 50 minutes far from the city by train- has contributed to the growth and development of the university campus as well as the construction of the new University General Hospital (in 2005), which has become the main referent in CLM. The fact that both the campus and the hospital were built at a very close distance from the train station had a considerable influence on the settlement of new workers - mainly from both the medical and academic fields - on the nearby traditional neighbourhood. Despite this socio-economic context, this school has traditionally enjoyed a great reputation and it is nowadays considered the most prestigious educational institution in the capital city. More specifically, this institution is considered a reference school due to the high-quality education it promotes, as well as its students’ extraordinary results and academic excellence, which places the whole school among the 100 best schools in Spain.\footnote{“El cariño, el respeto, y afecto que tienen los ciudadrealeños a este centro de reconocido prestigio a nivel nacional y que figura entre los 100 mejores colegios de España”.
(Former mayor on local digital newspaper, El Digital Castilla-La Mancha, 2014)}

Even though parents can choose the school they prefer for their children, there seems to be a selection of students particularly in those educational stages.
where a tuition fee is required on a monthly basis, i.e., infant and A levels (non-compulsory). That means that the four compulsory years in secondary education are free for all students. The difficulty in being selected to study in this school relies on the high number of students enrolled each year. According to the head of the school, the school’s selection process is based on specific priority requirements, such as the distance from the school to the students’ parents’ work place, or the fact or having siblings already enrolled in the school.

With regard to its prestige in terms of bi/plurilingual education, the most distinctive aspect is its multilingual programme (or “trilingual” programme, as stakeholders usually refer to). In this sense, English is not the only second language but also French. This way, students in the 3rd grade of compulsory secondary education can choose whether they attend the subject of geography and history in the French language, thus receiving an exposure of both English and French within this optional branch. Furthermore, these trilingual students are offered the possibility of getting involved in an exchange programme with a school in Bordeaux (France), which implies spending around eight days with a host family and experience how school life is in each country by attending some of the classes in the corresponding host school.

*Figure 13.* The trilingual classroom. The Spanish, French and European flag.
Although bilingual and non-bilingual students are separated into two different groups only in the CLIL classes, these trilingual students are gathered in one single class within a homogeneous group labelled as “trilingual”. In its attempt to promote foreign language learning, the school also offers a 10-day immersion programme in Dublin (Ireland) just for the bilingual group in the 2nd grade, summer camps and extracurricular language classes (English, French and German). Thus, as optional subjects, students can also attend English/French/German language classes once a week before their ordinary classes. In these classes, students can revise grammatical concepts, practice their oral skills or solve their doubts from their homework exercises. For this purpose, native language assistants are hired, who teach a total of eighteen hours per week including both the ordinary English language subject on the curriculum and the extracurricular English class in the mornings once every week. However, these native assistants only teach once per bilingual group every two weeks, being supported by the English subject teacher at all times. Generally, these classes tend to develop students’ oral skills which are not so much developed throughout the ordinary curriculum of the subject itself. This way, non-bilingual groups are disregarded and left apart without the native teachers’ support.

Regarding the subjects taught in English – or the corresponding Spanish term ‘non-linguistic disciplines’ – those subjects are chosen each year by each school depending on the resources and the teachers qualified (i.e., having at least a B2 level of English according to the CEFR). In 2014, these non-linguistic disciplines in primary education were arts and crafts and science, apart from the inclusion of German at this stage from 2013. In secondary, these disciplines were maths and science in the 1st grade, science and citizenship in the 2nd, and arts and crafts in the 3rd grade. The total amount of hours that students receive in English is seven hours on a weekly basis, apart from four hours devoted to the English language subject itself.

As for bilingual teachers (i.e., teachers qualified to teach in English or French), some of them are currently preparing to take the B2 and C1 level in order to live up to the school’s expectations about the type of bi/plurilingual education provided. In
fact, this school is one of the Cambridge exam preparation centres in the city, thus keeping close contact with private Cambridge schools. In fact, San Marcos originally belonged to the BEDA network, traditionally been shared by all semi-private religious schools, promoting an “English atmosphere”, teacher training and students and teachers’ assessment by Cambridge. Since the Plan of Plurilingualism was amended, all public and semi-private schools share the same bi/plurilingual education regulations. Looking back in history, San Marcos’ bilingual programme started in 2001-2002, but in 2013 the European Sections (Secciones Europeas) were implemented. From primary to secondary education, there seems to be a continuum in the bi/plurilingual programme, thus offering three different branches or groups in primary and two in secondary, in which case the fact of following bi/plurilingual education depends on the families’ decision.

The next chapter provides full details of the different types of data collected in each educational site, as well as an ethnographic reflection upon the fieldwork process itself. In this regard, Chapter 6 emphasises the importance of adopting an emic perspective towards this kind of research with the aim of better understanding the complexities underpinning the implementation of CLIL-type bilingual programmes in these institutional spaces.
6.1. Introduction

This chapter is fully devoted to describing, explaining and reflecting upon the ethnographic process, while including some of the main aspects of CSE research: data collection methods and data sets, fieldwork, and reflexivity. One of the main methodological benefits of this kind of empirical approach to the study of social action is that it provides useful analytical tools to complexify social realities and day-to-day practices so as to “make the familiar strange” (Erickson 1990: 92); that is, to uncover the “invisibility of everyday life”. In so doing, this dissertation seeks to explore discourse in daily meaning-making practices and social categorisation in relation to local-regional-national-international processes of socio-political, economic, ideological and cultural changes tied to the new globalised economy shaping the model of the traditional society and nation state, out of which tensions and contradictions emerge regarding the construction and legitimisation of language-in-education programmes. For this purpose, it is important to establish the methodological apparatus in which certain participants are involved as key agents discursively making sense of the social world, as well as other substantial ethnographic aspects that become relevant to provide a holistic perspective on the storytelling of this CSE.

The present chapter therefore describes the different methods and tools used for data collection purposes, as well of the data sets and a reflexive stance towards CSE as an approach. The next section (see 6.2.) presents the different data sets collected during the fieldwork period (i.e. interviews, classroom observations, focus group discussions, policy documents and other institutional artefacts), thus highlighting the importance of gathering different types of ethnographic data for a full understanding of the complexities underpinning this type of research. Different data
sources also serve to incorporate a holistic approach so that the ethnographer creates “a whole picture, one that leaves nothing unaccounted for and that reveals the interrelatedness of all the component parts (Hornberger, 1992: 186; 1994: 688). In this regard, a holistic angle helps to make sense of the relationships established between ideologies, discourse and practice in multilingual settings - foci of this dissertation. Section 6.3. concludes with a reflexive stance from my position as a researcher about the meaning and implications of the whole ethnographic process, ranging from issues related to school access and negotiation with stakeholders to gatekeeping matters in two of the three research sites.

The importance of including these methodological aspects into one single chapter relies on how I – as a researcher and ethnographer – position myself towards this critical ethnographic research and how I conceive what Nancy H. Hornberger (2013) calls “rich points” in ethnography, drawing on Agar’s (1996) conceptualisation of this concept. I adapt this notion from my experience in the fieldwork and adjust my research accordingly. Thus, these points became key moments in my ethnography. Building on Hornberger (2013), rich points are those ethnographic moments where unexpected events happen, dismantling the ethnographer’s assumptions about the potential of his/her own conceptual tools to understand the social world the researcher sets out to describe, analyse and interpret. According to this author (2013), “methodological rich points make salient the pressures and tensions between the practice of research and the changing scientific and social world in which researchers work” (p. 102). It is during this conflicting process that the emic approach plays a fundamental role in ethnographic studies; i.e., the researcher navigates between theory and data, attempting to make sense of the events in which individuals participate as members of the social apparatus. The rich points therefore arise around the social construction of ideologies, beliefs, and assumptions of the particularities emerging in context. For the purpose of this dissertation, I therefore take and adapt three important elements discussed by Agar (1996: 32) as the rich points of ethnography: participant observation, data, and coherence, which will be further explained in the next sections.
6.1. Data collection methods and ethnographic tools

The methodological procedure followed for data collection is mainly based on ethnographic documentation of what participants do as social actors, at what specific moments and places. In this regard, data collection comprises a set of methods with an attempt to obtain “the whole picture”; that is, as much information as possible about the type of participants involved, what they do, in which situated events, what they say and how they say it, for what purposes they perform in a specific way, and the potential implications of such social practices. As I already pointed out in the first chapter of this dissertation (see section 1.5. about ethical considerations), all the data gathered in the fieldwork have been treated and kept as strictly confidential, thus safeguarding participants’ anonymity under an agreement between the researcher and participants through a previous informed consent they voluntarily filled in (see Appendix 1).

In the first place, long-term participant observation allowed me to compile a corpus of daily communicative practices in each educational site. This corpus is mainly composed of audio recordings and their corresponding transcriptions (see Appendix 6 for conventions). Nevertheless, some of the initial classroom observations could not be recorded until I was provided with all the consent forms signed by the students’ families in each group I was observing. This was one of the most time-consuming tasks – and most sensitive issues - of the fieldwork process. I then became aware of the possible constraints of doing this type of ethnographic research – particularly involving minors.

In terms of types of data, I collected the following: 1) classroom interactions in content subjects taught in English and one particular subject – Geography - taught in French as part of the Multilingual Programme implemented in one of the schools (see section 5.4.), along with their corresponding detailed field notes (see Appendices 2 and 3 for samples); and 2) semi-structured interviews with different stakeholders (head of schools, BP teachers and coordinators, students, and families) – both individually and in small groups; and 3) focus group discussions with students (see Appendices 4-6). Out of these school sites, data were also
collected among local and regional authorities, such as language policy makers/planners and educational inspectors on these language-in-education matters. Other data include institutional documents (e.g. language-in-education policies implemented in CLM since 2014), teaching materials from different CLIL subjects, and pictures of the schools’ physical spaces (see Appendices 8-10). Regarding the classification of these collected data, I created a table (see Appendix 11) including the total amount of classroom observations in the three focal school sites. Apart from that, I also classified other types of data (i.e. interviews, focus group discussions and workshops) collected in each school (see section 6.2.)

With regard to data analysis, I invented another a model of interactional analysis to deeply explore different dimensions of each unit lesson (see Appendix 12). The information provided in each table covers the following contextual, pedagogical and interactional aspects: 1) classroom information (number and types of participants in terms of age and gender, and students' language repertoires, role and academic performance); 2) episode context (i.e. what is going on at a specific moment, students’ behaviour, classroom management and organisation, and communicative method; 3) activity type and sequences of action (i.e. the kinds of educational activities taking place, CLIL strategies and sequential structure and stages of each activity); 4) interactional patterns (classroom interaction model and participation frameworks). Classroom data was transcribed according to Jefferson’s original conventions for conversation analysis (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). For Ochs (1979), transcriptions are not a mere methodological approach but a “theoretical move”.

Even though all these aspects become relevant for the classroom discourse analysis, I consider interactional analysis as highly insightful for the purpose of this CSE. Exploring situated interactional events in different BP subjects has provided me with insightful accounts of what kind of interactional ritualisation patterns occur through turn-taking, translanguaging and other forms of addressing and being addressed in the classroom. As a matter of fact, this sort of micro-analysis of interactional practices has brought to the fore manifold tensions, dilemmas, ambivalences and contradictions within the bilingual classroom and beyond. Issues
around legitimacy, authority, and inclusion/exclusion have emerged throughout the analysis of classroom interactions in bilingual schools in CLM (see final chapter on published results). What seems to be deemed as “normal”, or “natural”, becomes “strange”. At least, it can lead to questioning *de facto* discursive practices embedding ideologies and beliefs about what bilingualism entails in these educational contexts.

Nevertheless, for this type of CSE study, critical reflexivity becomes a key methodological issue entailing engagement in manifold ways: with one’s fieldwork data, with participants, and one’s own ideological and sociocultural construct diagonally across the research context (Hornberger, 2013). Without collaboration on the part of the participants involved in the fieldwork and a deep knowledge and understanding of the contextual factors, this type of research would be scientifically untrustworthy. This notion of reflexivity and negotiation with participants will be further developed in section 6.3. Before that, the next section will provide descriptive statistical information about all the data sets collected during my fieldwork and my own research process by following specific classification criteria.
6.2. Data sets

As I mentioned before, data sets were organised and classified according to different criteria (see Appendix 11 and Figure 14 below). On the one hand, Appendix 11 illustrates the classification of all the classroom observations in the three school sites by the content subjects observed during the fieldwork, and those which could be recorded or not. Apart from these three high-level criteria, I also divided the sessions into two different educational stages (primary and secondary). According to the table in Appendix 11, there is a total amount of 27 audio recordings of classroom interactions in San Marcos, 88 in San Teo, and 16 in High Towers. The huge difference between them relies on gatekeeping issues that will be further explained in the next section.

In terms of content subjects, all of them were part of the BP except the English language subject, which was only observed in San Marcos due to the distinction between bilingual and non-bilingual students. Thanks to the open access I encountered there, I could observe and record a total of 11 sessions in the bilingual group (plus 6 non-recorded), and 4 sessions in the non-bilingual group (plus 7 non-recorded) along the four grades in compulsory secondary education. Due to time restrictions and the main purpose of this dissertation, the analysis of such English language sessions has not been accomplished yet. As a matter of fact, the data analysis included in the articles comprising Chapter 7 is focused on specific subjects that are common in two of the focal schools (e.g. science, in the 1st grade), but other other classroom interactions have also been explored for further research (e.g. biology, in the 3rd grade; religion, ethics, and physics, in the 4th grade).

In primary, I managed to observe 8 unit lessons in the 5th and 6th grade (students aged 10-12) at the beginning of my fieldwork in one particular semi-private school – San Teo. The main reason was the hiring of “native” teachers of English to teach content subjects in English in primary and secondary education, and the resulting inclusion of these teachers (labelled as “bilingüistas”) in the BP (see Chapter 7, section 7.3 for a full understanding of this distinctive social category). Despite narrowing-down my research goals in secondary education, I was intrigued
by the way the bilingual teaching practice was carried out in both stages. In this regard, I was encouraged by these teachers and the BP coordinator to observe just a few primary sessions due to the high level of English and brilliant performance of the little ones in the bilingual subjects (natural and social science). I must admit it was a rather surprising and very entertaining experience, but it was not within my research interests at that moment. However, these few observations in primary education provided me with a wider angle and a more holistic perspective towards the functioning of the BP at this school, the role of these native teachers within the school and, by extension, within the whole bilingualism movement in CLM.

*Figure 1. Amount of audio recordings classified by data collection method and schools/participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORDINGS</th>
<th>Classroom Interactions</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>Workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Teo</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Towers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University students (English studies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (approximate recording time)</td>
<td>121 (100.83h)</td>
<td>32 (30h)</td>
<td>6 (5h)</td>
<td>1 (50 min.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, Figure 13 shows the total amount of recordings with the corresponding approximate recording time, classified by data collection method, schools and type of participants (including classroom interactions). As the table below illustrates, there are other types of data not mentioned before as part of the classroom observations at the school (in Appendix 11). This is the case of the
interviews conducted with schools’s teachers, native language assistants and BP coordinators, but also with 1) local and regional authorities (i.e. the former and the current local language policy planners, the regional language planner, and the local inspector on bilingualism); 2) a group of four mothers whose children attend San Teo’s school, who were willing to voice their opinion and to know more about the BP at the school; 3) five individual interviews with San Teo’s students (Bachillerato); 4) focus group discussions with students in the three school sites; and 5) one workshop with San Teo’s students carried out for over a period of four weeks along with another researcher from the research project we are both members of. This workshop focused on their linguistic practices in and out of the school setting and provided insightful accounts of how they conceive their own language repertoires and the use they make of them depending on the purpose. An extra activity that was developed out of secondary education was a focus group discussion with some of my students from the English Studies degree. All these students had been part of a BP in any of the schools in CLM – including the three focal schools in this dissertation. This discussion activity aimed at deepening a bit more into the evolution and maturity process these bilingual students had experienced from their primary education through secondary up to higher education, particularly a degree related to languages.

6.3. Access, negotiation and gatekeeping: a reflexive stance

As stated in the previous chapter, getting access to schools was not an easy task. In the process of the schools’ selection, it was crucial for me to take advantage of my acquaintances working in different educational sites. Not only did they play an essential role as intermediaries between the school’s administration and me as a researcher, but they also built relationships of trust with participants in the fieldwork. In this regard, it is widely known that opening doors is not a common habit among institutions, particularly schools, where strangers are suspected of threatening the social order. I must admit that every school I first visited was kindly open and helpful.
Later on, gatekeeping issues emerged in two of these focal school, thus constraining but reconfiguring my fieldwork at the same time. As Erickson (1986) pointed out referring to the paradoxical nature of ethnography as being an interpretive process, ethnography is all about demonstrating and demystifying a process in which “induction and deduction are in constant dialogue” (p. 21). In this regard, my CSE considers the emic perspective and reflexive attention to the role of the researcher as key in the ethnographic fieldwork. In fact, LA discussions on methods (Duranti, 2000) emphasise the key role played by the fieldworker. On the one hand, participation in social encounters, activities and events provide a much wider angle from which field notes taking and recording make sense. On the other hand, systematic fieldnotes are crucial in the understanding of social life under research, since they document significant information that would not be otherwise taken into consideration for the data analysis and the whole comprehension of what is going on would become unfeasible. One important aspect of the field notes task is the chance to reflect upon the experience of observing and participating in such events, as well as participant’s non-verbal communication (e.g. behaviour, facial expressions), or information about the physical spaces.

Another crucial component in the whole process of data collection are participant-related “rich points” as key elements in this CSE. According to Hornberger (2013), these rich points find themselves intertwined around questions of authority, collaboration, reflexivity and representation. I particularly consider authority and reflexivity the most controversial in terms of scientifically-based research. Both issues arose throughout the whole process since I started carrying out my fieldwork in the school sites until I eventually developed the data analysis plan. Questions around who is entitled to properly interpret data or speak for the participants – which participants? - assaulted me as a novice researcher. I eventually realised that qualitative research was about gathering all the pieces of data together as a single, meaningful unit.

As Heller (2001a) points out regarding adopting a critical stance, researchers doing this kind of critique must decide “what position to take about such processes and what, if any, action that might lead to” (p. 117). Bearing in mind my innate
impulse to standing up for the weakest, injustice or inequality, I could not commit myself to investigate the contradictions, tensions and social transformation that I initially realised as emerging in discourse and situated practices. The more I inquired during the fieldwork, the more solid reasons I found to base my critique on this social aspect. Apart from that, being a ‘local’ researching bilingual schools in the very same city became quite a controversial issue in terms of both personal commitment to ethnography and to the participants who were mostly acquaintances voluntarily accepting my presence in the fieldwork for such a long period of time and willing to collaborate on my research. My role as a researcher in such a ‘close’ space, particularly in a town where everybody knows each other, was indeed a challenge but also a major concern regarding the ‘critique’ my work was based on. However, my position as a ‘local’ researcher was changing throughout the whole process of collecting data. Since the very beginning, I was aware of what others might think about me as a young girl both working at university and researching these schools’ BPs. It was relatively easy for me initially to get involved in the schools’ daily life, but then it turned into a challenging experience having to deal with teachers’ fears, concerns or even disconformity that some of them confessed. In this sense, negotiation became an essential strategy in order to build – or even break - social relationships with my participants. It was very important for me to make them feel comfortable in their classroom and also make myself and my research trustworthy.

In the first two semi-private schools I started my fieldwork in, I initially felt I was somehow invisible in the classroom until the moment I suggested recording the curricular sessions on a daily basis. At the beginning, my participants were all glad of having me there researching those schools I particularly chose for my study. Nevertheless, a few teachers were not at all convinced about having me there research and I could feel the anxiety my presence might be causing in some cases. Very few rejected me from their classes but that became a clue to try to understand deeper institutional processes going on and social agents’ concerns. Students, on the other hand, found it entertaining to have someone else in the classroom, but it was a little disturbing for them at first. Once they got used to it, my presence was assumed and unnoticed most of the times. According to Rampton et al (2014), the researcher’s
presence in the field site defies standardisation, thus introducing a new element in the social order that might be unexpectedly changed. That is actually what needs to be reported. Ethnographically, it was relevant how social agents’ behaviour, linguistic practices and classroom management changed over time during my fieldwork in these schools.

My participation in the fieldwork as a researcher - and at the same time as an outsider - allowed me to listen to different discourses both inside the staff room and outside of the school, where some of the interviews were carried out with teachers/coordinators of the BPs and families. I could notice that dominant discourses about the concept of bilingualism and bilingual programmes were circulating among my participants as if they were already institutionalised within these “imagined” bilingual communities. In my ethnography, I departed from the idea that language policy texts are recontextualised in sites of implementation as “a process of appropriation” (Mortimer, 2012, 2013). Therefore, these schools are interpreted as institutionalised entities appropriating English and BPs in their own terms, thus leading to diverse tensions and dilemmas during the process. More specifically, schools –as institutions - are understood as key sites over social inequality due to the relations of power that access and control symbolic and material resources (Bourdieu, 1991). Although the three schools were expected to share commonalities regarding the structure, aims and organisation of the BP at each school, I was intrigued to dig into complexities of everyday life in order to better grasp how social difference is co-constructed and (re)produced regarding the three schools’ social status, and students'/teachers’ identities on the basis of those power relations and the symbolic capital embedded in these institutional sites (Giampapa, 2016).

One of the cases of gatekeeping access was San Marcos’. Despite the school’s warm welcome in the first fieldwork visits and its apparent willingness to open its doors, I encountered some trouble when scheduling the class observations with particular teachers due to a few misunderstandings of what my role was supposed to be at this school. Some of the teachers involved in the BP apparently complaint to the BP coordinator about me attending most of their CLIL sessions on
a daily basis. They confessed that they felt a bit pressured with their lesson planning, as – according to some of them – their teaching materials had to be very well-prepared in advance with the additional difficulty of the English language use. Having emphasised a few times in informal conversations with them that my goal was not to evaluate neither their linguistic skills nor their content expertise, this rejection was somehow significant in the course of my fieldwork. Attempting to access occasionally to specific subjects taught by the most willing teachers, this inconvenience was cordially mediated by the BP coordinator through a long negotiation process between myself and those teachers in opposition to open their classroom door for research purposes. The whole process ended up in a restrictive amount of class observations gathered in a very single week of the month during one term. For better or worse, these events were eventually included as part of relevant data for my study considering how these teachers understood my role as a researcher and how they positioned themselves as participants in such fieldwork.

Another gatekeeping case was in the public school (High Towers). Even though it was open at the beginning, the only teacher willing to collaborate was Elsa, the music teacher (see Chapter 8). There was a particular case which shocked me in this school when I suggested conducting a focus group discussion with students in the 4th of CSE. The head of school and teacher of the English language subject initially accepted me in his classroom; therefore, I could observe his English classes for a few weeks. Nevertheless, when day of the focus group discussion came, I was surprised to see that he had already adapted the questions I previously sent to him (as he requested with the excuse to be prepared for the activity). I found myself set aside as a mere spectator of the whole show he had arranged for his students. The activity was structured around my questions about bilingualism and BPs, but he applied the activity to the Hunger Games context, since they had been watching the film and discussing about the main aspects. The format was similar to that of a quiz contest. Divided into groups, students were encouraged to answer each one of the questions he had included in a Power Point presentation. Thus, he decided when students should receive one point for each complete or coherent answer, sometimes requesting my opinion as if I were a member of the jury. I really felt he had completely
appropriated the whole activity for his own benefit. After that session, I was indirectly requested to stop observing these English classes with the excuse of students’ preparation for their IGCSE exam.

In retrospect, I truly believe these first steps to access the school sites as a researcher actually provided me with a more strategic angle and negotiation skills about how to react in similar circumstances for future ethnographic studies. According to Nadai and Maeder (2005), “one learns about field access, field roles, handling relationships in the field, writing and organising field notes and the like, but hardly about what constitutes an adequate field for a given research question” (p. 2). From my experience I can tell that fieldwork, as the cornerstone of every ethnographic research, sometimes seems an abstract entity that becomes defined and precise while being conducted.
PART IV: DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS
CHAPTER 7
PUBLISHED RESULTS: APPROPRIATIONS, IDEOLOGIES AND IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION IN CASTILLA-LA MANCHA SCHOOLS

7.1. Introduction

This chapter comprises a set of three articles discussing some of the findings arising from the data analysis, which brings to the fore language appropriations, ideologies and identity construction in the target schools of this dissertation. The three papers share the CSE as the theoretical and methodological frame (see Chapters 4 and 6), that is, they are all based on common linguistic ethnographic research carried out from a critical perspective, but each article explores a particular theme of relevant research interest. Differing in focus and the data sets used for such analysis, these papers are presented chronologically in three separate subsections within this chapter, thus aiming at answering the research questions included in Part I of this dissertation (see Chapter 1).

The first article included in Section 7.2. was published in 2017 under the title ‘Language Appropriations, Ideologies and Identities in Bilingual Schools in CLM (Spain)’. It mainly presents some preliminary results from an initial analysis of the data collected during my fieldwork in three different bilingual schools in CLM. The publication of this paper was possible thanks to the three-month-research stay I accomplished in IOE UCL (University College London), funded by the Spanish Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport (2016). After attending some of the doctoral seminars during my stay, I had the chance to meet Sara Young and Emma Brooks, the two editors for Bellaterra Journal of Teaching and Learning Language and Literature. I was then formally invited to submit an article for a Special Issue monograph on language ideology in language teaching. To be honest, the inspirational atmosphere at IOE UCL made me get intellectually involved in university life, academia and research activities. This stay meant a turning point in
the process of my dissertation and my career as a novice researcher. Without doubt, the main goal was this publication as a single author.

‘Language Appropriations, Ideologies and Identities in Bilingual Schools in CLM (Spain)’ examines language ideologies and identity construction through the appropriations of the English language in two prestigious secondary bilingual schools (San Marcos and San Teo). This article aims at exploring the transformation of such identities based on certain language ideologies regarding bilingualism and bilingual programmes. As a result of the changing language-in-education policies enacted by these schools, specific beliefs and values have been assigned to the English language per se and the BP in these institutional spaces. Data analysis therefore looks into commodification of English and the resulting construction of elitism and “bilingual selves” through the appropriation of the BPs. In this regard, issues of capitalization, legitimacy and appropriateness will be further discussed through a close analysis of interactional and interview data in order to understand the relationship between language policies, ideologies, and practices in these bilingual educational settings.

The second article included in Section 7.3. – in which I am a co-author – is the product of a conference presentation for the ‘2nd Whole Action Conference of COST Action IS1306 "New Speakers in Europe"’ held in 2016 by the Universität Hamburg; however, it was eventually published three years after the conference event took place in the Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development. Even though this presentation was tightly linked to the conference main topic (“new speakers in Europe”), the cornerstone of our paper was then developed and properly adjusted in line with the concept of “native speakers” that emerged in our research. Therefore, the actual article was titled ‘The “native speaker effects” in the construction of elite bilingual education in CLM: Tensions and dilemmas’. As the title suggests, the paper addresses the potential effects and educational implications of “native speakers” (i.e. English native teachers) in the construction of eliteness in one of the two semi-private target schools of this dissertation (San Teo). More specifically, the paper discusses how this school has adjusted itself and adapted its own management to the regional language-in-education policies by hiring native
teachers of English, who are attributed added values of elitism and linguistic prestige in the local educational market. Parallel to San Teo’s transformation into an elite school, the inclusion of native English teachers in these education programmes unfolds tensions and dilemmas regarding the CLIL teaching practices, which have turned into unstructured partnerships between content-subject and native English teachers.

The last section of this chapter incorporates the most recent article I have submitted for *Foro de Educación*. Despite being accepted and peer-reviewed, it has not been published yet as it is under revision. I therefore included the latest amended version before the final proofs. “Doing CLIL in the science classroom: a critical sociolinguistic ethnography in La Mancha secondary schools” took shape after presenting in the ‘Sociolinguistics Summer School 8 - COST New Speakers Training School’ held in Barcelona in July 2017. I was given the opportunity to present my research in a CSE workshop led by Monica Heller, whose analytical contributions served as feedback for my own research. For this workshop, I decided to include data analysis from the science and biology sessions observed during my fieldwork in two prestigious semi-private bilingual schools (San Teo and San Marcos). Therefore, this paper addresses how content and language are being integrated in both content subjects from a critical sociolinguistic perspective towards the teaching and learning practice. For this purpose, this article explores talk-interaction in order to better grasp the relationship between language ideologies, language-in-education policies and discursive practices, resulting in social categorisation processes regarding what and who counts as “bilingual”.

All in all, the three articles in conjunction, grounded on the same theoretical and methodological apparatus and sharing the same contextual framework, can provide insightful accounts of what “bilingualism” and “bilingual programmes” actually mean in these educational contexts in terms of social difference and inequalities. This whole chapter will serve to better understand wider social, political

---

1 *Foro de Educación* is a Spanish peer-reviewed academic journal edited by FahrenHouse (Salamanca). Established in 2003, it covers any kind of research on educational matters and has been accepted to be indexed in the Emerging Sources Citation Index.
and economic processes and their consequences - at a more local/regional level - for institutional spaces such as these bilingual school communities in CLM.
Abstract
This article addresses language ideologies and identities through the appropriations of the English language in two prestigious secondary bilingual schools in La Mancha City (pseudonym), as part of a team-based linguistic ethnography carried out in the region of Castilla-La Mancha (Spain). Since the exponential increase in different types of bilingual programmes (Spanish-English), language ideologies circulating among the local ‘imagined’ bilingual communities as well as bilingual identities of school stakeholders have been transformed and (re)shaped within the era of ‘bilingualism fever’. By drawing on linguistic and ethnographic empirical insights on CLIL classroom practices and interviews, this article explores how bilingual identities are co-constructed in relation to language policies, language ideologies and appropriations of English within the institutional spaces as a marker of distinction, elitism and prestige in the local/global market.
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Résumé
Cet article traite des idéologies linguistiques et des identités à travers les appropriations de la langue anglaise dans deux prestigieux lycées bilingues à La Mancha City (pseudonyme), dans le cadre d'une ethnographie linguistique menée par une équipe dans la région de Castilla-La Mancha (Espagne). Depuis l'augmentation exponentielle des différents types du programme bilingue (espagnol-anglais), des idéologies linguistiques circulant parmi les communautés bilingues locales « imaginées » ainsi que les identités bilingues des parties prenantes de l’école ont été transformées et (re) façonnées dans l’ère de la « fièvre de bilinguisme ». En s’appuyant sur les connaissances empiriques linguistiques et ethnographiques sur les pratiques CLIL en classe et sur les entretiens, cet article explore comment les identités bilingues sont co-construites en relation avec les politiques et les idéologies linguistiques et les appropriations de l’anglais dans les espaces institutionnels en tant que marque de distinction, d’élitisme et de prestige dans le marché local et global.

Mots clé: appropriations, bilinguisme, ethnographie linguistique, identités, idéologies

Resumen
Este artículo aborda las ideologías lingüísticas e identidades a través de las apropiaciones de la lengua inglesa en dos prestigiosos centros de secundaria bilingües en La Mancha City (pseudónimo), que forman parte de una etnografía lingüística en equipo llevada a cabo en la región de Castilla-La Mancha (España). Desde el aumento exponencial de diferentes tipos de programas bilingües (español-inglés), las ideologías lingüísticas que circulan entre las
comunidades ‘imaginadas’ como bilingües a nivel local, así como las identidades bilingües de los agentes sociales implicados en los centros, se han transformado en la era de “la fiebre del bilingüismo”. Tomando la etnografía lingüística como acercamiento metodológico empírico para analizar las prácticas de CLIL en el aula y las entrevistas, este artículo explora cómo se co-construyen las identidades bilingües en relación con las políticas lingüísticas, las ideologías y las apropiaciones del inglés en los espacios institucionales como marca de distinción, elitismo y prestigio en el mercado local y global.

**Key words:** apropiaciones, bilingüismo, etnografía lingüística, identidades, ideologías

**Introduction**

Over the last two decades, bilingual education in the central autonomous community of Castilla-La Mancha has been transformed by the effects of increasing globalisation and the dominance of English as a lingua franca (ELF) (Seidlhofer, 2005). There have been significant transformations not only at the institutional level but also in terms of ideologies and identities. Having Castilian as the official language, central Spain has traditionally held a monolingual view of the sociolinguistic regional panorama. However, through the new linguistic landscape a more plurilingual perspective has emerged. Social demand for foreign language competence, mainly English, has increased. In turn, language policy makers have prioritised foreign language learning through mainstream education.

Consequently, an exponential increase in bilingual education programmes was initiated as part of a signed agreement between the Spanish Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports (MECD) and the British Council (1996), thus implementing the ‘Bilingual and Bicultural Project’ through a Content and Language Integrated Learning approach (CLIL). CLIL is defined as a dual-focused educational approach emerging in the early nineties which involves an additional language as a medium of instruction for learning and teaching of both content and language (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010).

In a region which has traditionally felt ashamed of its citizens’ poor English skills (compared to other European countries), the schools of Castilla-La Mancha have successfully reimagined themselves as bilingual communities. Here, the term ‘bilingual communities’ refers to those Spanish speakers involved in the process of teaching/learning English as part of one of the Linguistic Programmes implemented in most schools of the region. The desire of these school communities is to be able to function equally well in both English and Spanish, transforming dominant self-perceptions and ideas of what it means to be bilingual.

Despite the efforts made in order not to be left behind the rest of the European
members in terms of bilingual education and English proficiency, the common feeling of inferiority remains. This is illustrated by the following extract from an interview conducted with Julia, the English language teacher in San Marcos’ School, one of the focal educational sites in this article:

Extract 1. San Marcos’. Interview with Julia.

From a comparative point of view with the rest of Europe […] we are shameful. The English are, for example, worse without doubt. But we are shameful. And it is weird if you go to the Netherlands or Denmark, or other countries, the normal thing is that they have their language, maybe because they think they are a corpuscle. I think all people there are bilingual. I think governments here in Spain expect us to be compared with that. What I don’t know is if we will because maybe the motivations are different, the historical background is different, or many other stories, but I think that the fact striving for this is because they say ‘damn it, if the Dutch can do it, why can’t I?’

An English teacher for many years, Julia’s scepticism about becoming bilingual brings to the fore ideological and identity issues which have emerged from the rapid implementation of so-called ‘Linguistic Programmes’ currently practised in most primary and secondary schools in Castilla-La Mancha.

In this article, I consider these schools in Castilla-La Mancha to be “imagined” bilingual communities (Anderson, 1991; Pavlenko & Norton, 2007), in the process of reconfiguring their institutional identities. For this purpose, this article discusses what being bilingual actually means, in two school communities of Castilla-La Mancha, by addressing the following questions:

1) How is English appropriated in these institutional spaces?
2) What language ideologies circulate among stakeholders’ discourse and how are they socially constructed, reproduced, transformed or contested in daily classroom practice?
3) How do language ideologies shape and how are they shaped by participants’ and schools’ identity as members of an “imagined” bilingual community?

Drawing on Heller’s social perspective, the purpose of this article is to discuss different conceptions, beliefs and values concerning bilingualism as a rather “materialist approach which privileges language as social practice, speakers as social actors and boundaries as products of social action” (2007, p. 1). This way, bilingualism is understood as ideology and practice; it is therefore through situated social practices that this paper attempts to describe the extent to which language policies influence ideologies and identities, and how these two dimensions are interactionally co-constructed from a sociolinguistic ethnographic approach. This may be defined as a qualitative approach based on epistemological and ontological ways
of understanding the social world through a close analysis of communicative situated practices (Heller, 2006; Copland & Creese, 2015).

Section two of this paper gives an overview of the language policies implemented in Castilla-La Mancha as central to understanding ideological and identity shifts, while section three focuses on the methodology, and briefly describes the two schools under study. Section four, explores the commodification of English, elitism and bilingual identities. The last section comprises a critical reflection on the most relevant issues discussed in this article: the language ideologies emerging in discourse and interaction regarding the concept of bilingualism, the appropriations of English and legitimisation of certain language practices as well as social categorisation processes in these bilingual schools.

**Language policies in La Mancha: ideological and identity shifts**

In Castilla-La Mancha, bilingualism and bilingual education have been two politically and socially controversial issues since the initial implementation of the so-called ‘bilingual programmes’ (BPs, hereafter) in both primary and secondary schools. In 1996, the first BPs implemented in La Mancha region (‘MECD/ British Council Agreement’) had two main goals: to increase the students’ level of English, and to offer students the possibility of attending an official bilingual and bicultural curriculum in state schools following CLIL parameters (de Zarobe & Lasagabaster, 2010).

These BPs under European language-in-education policies (LiEP) have undergone several nomenclatures in the last decade. In 2014, they became Programas Lingüísticos (‘Linguistic Programmes’) under the provisions of the regional Plan de Plurilingüismo (‘Plan of Plurilingualism’). These Linguistic Programmes made it possible for any school, state, private or state-subsidised, to opt into this type of bilingual education. One of the main goals of the Plan of Plurilingualism is to make Castilla-La Mancha bilingual by 2018 (see: El Diario, 2014). As the number of schools implementing one of these Linguistic Programmes has increased dramatically since 2005, it seems that language policy makers in this region are on the way to realising the dream of becoming Spanish-English bilingual.

Every school is expected to implement one of the Linguistic Programmes promoted by the Plan of Plurilingualism. Students can choose the bilingual curriculum, thus attending one, two or three subjects taught in English alongside the corresponding English language subject. Programmes can be adapted by schools according to the availability of teachers qualified to teach content subjects in English. Teachers involved in the programme are required to reach a
minimum B2 level (intermediate) of English according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Language Learning (CEFR, 2001). Despite having their own bilingual education programmes, the two state-subsidised religious schools selected here as objects of study have opted into the regional Linguistic Programmes.

Spaniards’ lack of communicative skills in a second language has become an outstanding feature of their traditional ‘monolingual’ identity. This was strictly reinforced by nationalist ideologies during the Franco dictatorship (1939-1975), and for many decades the Spanish education system was constrained to a rather draconian monolingual model. This placed Spain behind those European countries which had quickly recognise the importance of English language competence in an increasingly globalised world; hence the urgent implementation of new LiEP.

In today’s plurilingual and multicultural scenario, English has become the global language for communication: an instrument or a product of New Capitalism, for which “knowledges are produced, circulated and consumed” (Fairclough, 2002: 164). In this sense, English carries a symbolic capital that enables individuals to gain access to the global market (Bourdieu, 1985). However, LiEP have also been attempting in the last decade to achieve a more varied sociolinguistic reality not only in terms of multilingualism, understood as the varieties of languages in the whole European territory, but also plurilingualism, reflecting the languages individuals may use in a specific geographical area. LiEP in Europe aim at achieving social cohesion and integration of European nations, including minority languages and identities. In this sense, both the Council of Europe and the European Commission promote linguistic diversity to “enable citizens to communicate in two languages other than their mother tongue” (Barcelona European Council, 2002). The adoption of CLIL programmes was one way of achieving this. The explosion of interest in CLIL spread across the European Member States, putting a special emphasis on early language learning but at the same time challenging existing effective pedagogical practices.

LiEPs in Castilla La-Mancha are key to understanding more clearly the significant ideological shift from considering ‘being monolingual’ as shameful towards a feeling of pride attached to ‘becoming bilingual’. Languages have gained value both in the political and social arena, and have transformed the school communities. The symbolic capital attributed to certain languages by social actors, is tightly linked with wider ideologies embedded in political and economic processes (Bourdieu, 1985). One dominant linguistic ideology which circulates among education stakeholders’ discourse is that “students following this
programme are expected to be able to manage themselves in different cultures and to be better prepared to face the 21\textsuperscript{st} century demands in a more and more competitive and multilingual Europe” (MECD, 2016).

Language learning in Spain has always focused on a traditional method which lacks emphasis on communicative skills (Gálvez, 2000); the implementation of bilingual programmes was therefore intended to shift language pedagogy towards a more communicative approach to linguistic competence. These first bilingual programmes combined Spanish and English, while some trilingual programmes included French or German. Since then, bilingual schools in Castilla-La Mancha have acquired a prestigious status. The programmes have been provided with the support of a native English assistant for every state school so as to promote this type of bilingual education, and thus encouraging all schools to implement the regional language policies. In this sense, these native language assistants represent the Chomskyan “ideal speaker” concept (1965), as they are regarded as authentic speakers of English, and thus considered key to the process of implementation of such programmes. In subsidised schools, these native English assistants are hired by the school itself.

Bilingual education in this region thus carries an added symbolic value of “pride and profit” (Duchêne & Heller 2012, pp. 4-7), since it is within institutional sites that language is utilised as a source of pride and prestige to compete in the market place. Schools’ linguistic resources are used to promote a top-quality education that will open doors to students when accessing higher education and the job market. In this way, the English language per se is commodified as embedding power and capital (Park, 2011) against the backdrop of globalisation processes related to transnational mobility and neoliberal forces.

Whereas language policy makers are adopting the English language as a source of pride, prestige and profit in the local and global market, institutional sites are in turn appropriating English (Lin, Wang, Akamatsu, & Riazi, 2002) in their curricular activities and linguistic practices to construct their own identity as bilingual school communities. School stakeholders as local agents socially construct their “bilingual selves” (Pavlenko, 2006) through the circulation and transformation of ideologies related to the concept of bilingualism and bilingual programmes.

In the case of institutional spaces in Castilla-La Mancha, appropriating the English language into the daily functioning and communicative practices serves two functions. It is a marketing strategy to attract students, that is, bilingual education as a service and foreign
language learning as a product (see the customer metaphor by Holborow, 2007); it is also a way to co-construct their identity within an “imagined” bilingual community (Anderson, 1991; Pavlenko & Norton, 2007). No rigid measures are taken at the national/regional level in designing the bilingual curriculum; this allows schools to adjust LiEP on their own terms. Schools’ own management of their bilingual programmes thus implies a sense of ownership/membership (Pavlenko & Norton, 2007) of a particular social group, that of a specific school community whose bilingual programme stands out as distinctive and prestigious.

Methodology: data collection and description of sites
Linguistic ethnographies provide analytical tools and empirical methods to better understand meaning-making in situated social practices (Copland & Creese, 2015). In this article, I adopt a linguistic ethnographic perspective in order to explore the relationship between language ideologies and identity construction through situated appropriations of the English language in two educational settings which have implemented the Linguistic Programmes.

Data collection
Data collection in two institutional sites in La Mancha City involved long-term participant observation (2014-16), fine-grained field notes, school artefacts (e.g. school brochures, pictures from institutional spaces and teaching material) and institutional documents of the LiEP implemented in Castilla-La Mancha. I also audio-recorded the following: 1) classroom interactions in content subjects taught in English; 2) semi-structured interviews with teachers, students, bilingual programme coordinators, educational inspectors and language policy makers; and 3) focus group discussions with students in the BP. These data were collected with the aim of identifying the language ideologies circulating amongst participants, and underpinning the curricula developed by the schools.

Focus group discussions and interviews were analysed in terms of relevant content issues that are key to better understand the triangulation of language ideologies, identities and policies. Furthermore, classroom audio-recordings were analysed by taking into account recurrent interactional moments in the course of an educational activity in a particular CLIL Science lesson. Following Heller and Martin-Jones (2001), the research uses a linguistic ethnographic lens: it pays close attention to turn-taking, participation frameworks, language choice and social categorisation with the aim of tying processes of identity construction to language ideologies (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004) that circulate widely in Castilla-La
Mancha’s bilingual school communities and which contribute to legitimate (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991) bilingual selves.

**Description of sites**

San Marcos’ and San Teo’s belong to the state-subsidised group of schools in La Mancha City that have opted to implement one of the Linguistic Programmes on the development level. Both fulfil the two official requirements: availability of teachers with an accredited B2 level of English and providing at least two curricular subjects taught in English. Through their bilingual programmes, the institutions are currently aiming to become national reference schools: these are educational institutions which carry out successful innovative projects such as those involving bilingual programmes. In most bilingual schools in Castilla-La Mancha, the native language assistants provided by the regional administration (for state schools) and those hired by subsidised schools (as in the case of both schools under study) generally come from either the UK or the US.

**San Marcos’**

Built by a religious order, the school is located in a traditionally working-class neighbourhood near the city centre where new wealthy families have settled in recent decades. Lately, the school has implemented the ‘Multilingual/Trilingual Programme’ (Spanish-English-French), which creates a group of students in the 3rd grade of Compulsory Secondary Education (CSE) labelled as ‘trilingual’. Students in Grades 1, 2 and 4 are separated into two different groups only when attending CLIL and English language classes. This establishes two categories for each group: bilingual and non-bilingual students. It is in English language classes with the bilingual group that the native English assistant supports the English language teacher every other week by preparing and delivering different oral activities related to English/American culture. However, these assistants are not necessarily required to be trained teachers.

**San Teo’s**

San Teo’s, also a religious school, was built in 1978 on the outskirts of the city; it is now surrounded by both the traditional Roma communities and the newly arrived upper middle-class families. Regarding the BP, all students are integrated into the CLIL classroom, although parents can choose whether they want their children to follow it or not. If students are enrolled in the BP, they are required to pay extra fees to receive the privilege of being taught by a native English teacher. While the term ‘native speaker’ is problematic, the term will be used for the purpose of this article in the way that participants utilised it, that is, as
encapsulating those speakers whose first language is English.

**Data analysis: commodification, elitism and bilingual selves**

In order to account for the appropriations of the English language that, in turn, (re)shape language ideologies and identities in La Mancha City, it is necessary to understand the role of education as a key site in the production and reproduction of social order, and school as an institutional space which manages linguistic resources and constructs what counts as ‘appropriate’ and ‘legitimate’ in terms of knowledge, language choice and participation of speakers as social agents (Heller & Martin-Jones, 2001). Classroom interactions were transcribed following Conversation Analysis (Sacks, Jefferson, & Schegloff, 1984) to better grasp essential interactional information. For this paper, however, the original interview transcripts have been simplified, as content is the focus of the analysis here. The following data analysis will be structured according to three main emerging issues: 1) commodification of English; 2) elitism and bilingual community membership; and 3) appropriation and bilingual selves.

**Commodification of English: Capital and success**

The way these institutional spaces in La Mancha City have incorporated the English language into their daily practices relies on sharing and shaping dominant ideologies of English as a profitable commodity, rather than merely a means of communication. English is seen as a useful tool to gain access to many social spheres, and to have better job opportunities in the future. This ideology is reflected in the extract below. The trilingual students in San Marcos’ were asked about their opinion on the bi/trilingual programme. (See transcription conventions in Appendix.)

*Extract 2. San Marcos’: Focus group discussion*  
(Helena (H): researcher; Ana (A): student)

1 H: What do you think about the bilingual programme?  
2 A: It will improve our level and it will be better for our future  
3 H: Why?  
4 A: Because every day English and other languages are more useful in our lives and when I talk with my mother she told me I don’t know English ↓ (@@@@) and it’s if you don’t know English it’s bad for you.

From Ana’s perspective, language learning implies personal improvement and greater opportunities to develop language skills, which in turn embeds enhanced possibilities of getting a better job. By aligning herself with the dominant ideology circulating among
parents’ discourse, Ana brings to the fore the ‘good/bad’ dichotomy about the presence or absence of English (line 2). Knowing English is categorised as ‘good’ as opposed to the negative aspect of lacking such knowledge embodied by previous generations of ashamed parents that could not learn English in the mainstream education (line 5). In this sense, it is remarkable how this student positions herself in a more privileged place than her mother was able to enjoy. The falling intonation emphasises Ana’s mother’s sadness and shame; this immediately evokes laughter from other students and consequently Ana’s clarification about the ‘sad’ point of lacking knowledge of English. This echoes the discourse of not knowing English as something which is considered as ‘bad’. This links to the interview with Julia, the English teacher at San Marcos’, where Julia gives a sceptical view of overcoming that shame in relation to other European countries which boast a higher level of English (see extract 1 in Introduction).

In San Teo’s, commodification of English takes tangible shape in the form of additional fees (39 euros/month) paid by those parents whose children receive bilingual education. Capital is not only symbolic but also material in the economic sense. Even though bilingualism is offered to all students in Castilla-La Mancha, the availability of language assistants who are native speakers of English is limited in most state bilingual schools of the region. State-subsidised centres have enough private financial support to hire their own teachers; the teachers involved in the bilingual programme who are considered ‘native speakers’ fulfil the language requirements. However, they do not necessarily have any CLIL or specialised-subject training (e.g. Technology, Science, Religion, or Arts and Crafts). Yet in San Teo’s, these native speakers of English do function as CLIL teachers. The added value English takes in this particular school context is reinforced by the presence of the ‘native speaker’.

Native speakers of English is seen as an integral part of San Teo’s bilingual programme. For families, the term ‘native’ was conceptualised as being inclusive of those Spanish teachers with a C1 level of English (CEFR). Nevertheless, in an interview, mothers claimed that they were paying for those native teachers as “an extra”. Families’ conceptions of the native speaker tightly connect with the Chomskyan “ideal speaker” perspective (1965), which is imbued in the image the school projects as part of their bilingual identity construction. Similarly, this institution appropriates the term ‘native’ in order to construct what they imagine as ‘a real bilingual identity’. Nativism is therefore commodified as “extra”, that is, native English teachers are constructed as objects providing goods to be consumed.
Elitism and bilingual community membership

In these bilingual institutional spaces, appropriating English knowledge (understood not only as the language itself but the actual native English teachers embodying it) as part of the school’s daily communicative practices makes the school socially acknowledged as ‘better’ than any other school in the local community. The co-construction of bilingual identities is therefore a cause-and-effect of the social image the schools ‘sells’ to the local community. In this way, ownership and membership (Pavlenko & Norton, 2007) are two features shared by bilingual schools in Castilla-La Mancha that make them distinguishable both from each other and from other non-bilingual schools, all of them competing for prestige.

According to one of the two native English teachers in San Teo’s, Sandra, the school is constructed as offering “the best bilingual classes” in La Mancha City due to the availability of native English teachers that make this school unique in the local area. This is illustrated in the following extract:

Extract 3. San Teo’s. Interview with the native English teacher

((Sandra (SR))

And then other teachers say yes really good their English was really good the parents in general all the comments that I’ve heard from parents are really positive like it’s really good you know we are really really pleased we’ve got the best bilingual classes in ((La Mancha City)) you know

From Sandra’s position as a ‘native’, the construction of this school as ‘proper bilingual’ is reliant on how she aligns herself with teachers’ and parents’ discourse about having native English teachers in the bilingual programme. Sandra brings to the fore the ‘nativist’ ideology of the ‘ideal speaker’ by positioning herself as an “animator” (Goffman, 1981) of the voice of other teachers and parents for whom a native English language is regarded as the most desirable form of knowledge. In fact, she evaluates students as having a ‘good’ English level as a consequence of “the best bilingual classes” in secondary education: these are classes that Sandra herself teaches.

Likewise, when Claudia, the coordinator of this bilingual programme was asked about teachers’ required language accreditation, she acknowledged that native teachers were the reason why the school was constructed as having “a bilingualism of excellence”:

Extract 4. San Teo’s. Interview with Claudia, the BP coordinator

((Claudia (C))

Now we are forcing a bit with the C1 but actually our eh well we are bilingualism
of excellence [...] but what happens our bilingualism is actually taught by the native

At language policy level, and even though the constructed identity of the school as a ‘top’ bilingual community is linked to the native English teachers, the school did not fulfil all the requirements to implement the ‘excellence’ stage of implementation of the BP. In order to be officially categorised as an ‘excellence’ bilingual school, at least one of the specialised-subject teachers must hold a C1 level accreditation, which was not the case in San Teo’s. As a consequence, native English teachers in this school are the ones sustaining this ‘imagined’ bilingual community of members, boosting the prestigious and distinctive quality of their bilingual programme.

**Appropriation: ‘bilingual selves’**

San Teo’s School’s elitism and authenticity are attributed to the nativist ideology of the English language contributing to the construction of valued bilingual identities. In fact, this particular institutional site as an ‘imagined’ bilingual community has coined the neologism: ‘bilingüistas’ (an English equivalent might be ‘bilinguist’). This category only makes sense within this bilingual community, as it originally referred to their English native teachers but then extended its meaning to non-English native teachers with an accredited C1 level also involved in the BP. This social category based on native-like speakers of English therefore (re)shapes ‘bilingual selves’ in San Teo’s. Through the appropriation and transformation of the adjective ‘bilingual’, teachers have created a new noun by adding the Spanish suffix ‘–ista’ (‘-ist’), which entails connotations related to professional jobs or doctrines of which one is in favour. This category that defines the identity of San Teo’s as being a prestigious bilingual school presumably includes the ‘good’ teachers. As the BP coordinator pointed out in an interview, this school community feels “very lucky to have the bilingüistas” (interview with Claudia, BP coordinator).

In San Marcos’, identity construction also functions in the intersection of social categorisations and linguistic appropriations; the process is however slightly different and so is the management of the BP. In fact, the English language assistants teach only in the English-subject lessons while supporting the English language teachers whose students belong to the bi/trilingual group. The reason for such an arrangement relies on official language policies, which prevent the segregation of students in pure bilingual/non-bilingual groups for all subjects so as to avoid creating ghettos. It is precisely this categorisation of bilingual/non-bilingual students that creates a core elitist group of pupils privileged over those
disregarded as ‘not good enough’ to become a member of the bilingual elite. In the words of Ernesto, the Physics teacher in this school, this bilingual/non-bilingual dichotomy sets a clear-cut distinction among students by establishing categories according to their academic and intellectual performance:

Extract 5. San Marcos’. Interview with Ernesto, the Physics teacher

Here it is definitely polarised [between bilingual and non-bilingual groups]. The bilinguals are the smartest and the others are silly, lazy… […] Sometimes one has the feeling that being bilingual here means belonging to the most elitist intellectual class.

Ernesto’s critical voice is representative of the dominant ideology among the school community regarding what ‘being bilingual’ entails for stakeholders. Bilingual identities seem to be socially co-constructed under the grounds of social categories of what counts as ‘appropriate’ bilingual selves, thus appropriating the term ‘bilingual’ with significant connotations to actually label those students intellectually outstanding (lines 2-3). In real classroom practices, San Marcos’ bilingual students are categorised and evaluated by CLIL teachers according to ‘appropriate’ or ‘inappropriate’ participation. These two categories can be inferred from the language choice and use in the course of an interaction between the teacher and the students, as well as what the teacher considers as “good” or “bad” learners depending on whether they comply with the school’s expectations about those students following the bilingual curriculum (i.e. “good” bilingual students are constructed as highly-skilled, well-behaved and successful, whereas non-bilingual ones are deemed as lazy, poorly-skilled and rather badly-behaved). In this sense, interactional patterns are key to better analyse the co-construction and reproduction of those social categories and how they affect participants’ identity in the classroom.

In the following extract, Juan, the Science teacher in the first grade of CSE corrects some exercises on a photocopy by nominating students. In the process of this interactional sequence, turn-taking, positioning of both teachers and students, and language choice are central to grasp how these ‘bilingual selves’ are co-constructed or contested:

Extract 6. San Marcos. Science class, 1st grade of CSE
((Juan (J), Science teacher; Daniel (D), Luisa (L), Students (Ss)))

1 J: Ok (.) do you agree? all of you?
2 Ss: Yes
3 Ss: yes
4 (2.0)
5 D: Eh (0.5) stems
6 (4.0)
7 J: Vamos (.) que no lo has hecho
Come on (.) you haven’t done it
(1.0)
8 D: No ((laughter))
(3.0)
9 J: Continue please
(1.0)
10 D: These (.) eh these are the main reproductive organs
11 J: Stamens (.) these are the main reproductive organs (.) ok
12 D: Sepals (.) eh coloc (.) collectively
13 J: Collectively
14 D: collectively these are called the
15 J: A bit more English accent please
(3.0)
16 J: And style?
(1.0)
17 D: Eh style (.) (xxx) the (.) pistils [to the pistils]
18 J: [to the pistils] ok (4.0) good (.) eh Luisa Ramírez
(1.0)
19 L: Es que el otro día los escribí (.) y los he metido esta mañana (.) y es que
the other day I wrote them down (.) and I took them this morning (.) and it
20 J: han desaparecido=
they have disappeared=
21 L: = No pero es que creo que las metí en algún libro o algo y no sé dónde las he dejado
= No but I think I put them into a book or something and I don’t know where I left them
22 J: de verdad (.) eso se llama organización
seriously (.) that is organisation
23 L: Ya
yeah
24 J: Ya
Yeah
((background noise))
25 J: No sabéis ni en qué día vivís hijos míos (6.0) can you read it (.) in another paper (.) please?
You don’t know what day it is today, my dear boys (6.0) can you read it (.) in another paper (.) please?

In this extract, Daniel’s and Luisa’s participation is deemed ‘non-appropriate’ according to the school’s ideological standpoint of what belonging to the bilingual group implies (i.e., clever, hard-working, highly-skilled students). It can be noted how Juan negates Daniel’s inappropriate response by switching to Spanish to emphasise he has not done his required homework (lines 7-9). After demanding that Daniel (back to the English language) continue correcting the exercise, Juan’s turn in line 19 evaluates negatively Daniel’s English accent when reading the exercise aloud; this categorises him as not fulfilling the standards required
for the students to belong to the BP. Juan’s critical intervention silences Daniel, who is asked by Juan again after a few seconds. As Daniel’s response is deemed ‘appropriate’, Juan evaluates it as “good” and starts a new turn by nominating another student, Luisa (lines 21-24). Unlike Daniel, Luisa intervenes in Spanish for excusing herself for not having these exercises (line 26), which leads to the subsequent negotiation turns in Spanish by Juan and Luisa until the end of this sequence. The teacher interrupts her with a sarcastic utterance (“han desaparecido” / “they have disappeared”), thus demonstrating his disappointment (line 27), which is immediately followed by Luisa’s excuse again trying to convince her teacher whose turn overlaps and, once again, interrupts her explanation (lines 28-32). After this teacher-student exchange in Spanish, Juan switches to English and turns back to the main task by politely asking Luisa to read the exercise from one of her classmates’ photocopies so that they can continue with the activity.

From this sequence of action, it is significant how this teacher shapes students’ performance as bilingual speakers by drawing on what he considers as a ‘good’ or ‘appropriate’ English accent, particularly taking into account that he has an accredited B2 level of English. According to what he explained in an interview, he truly believes that “it is good to be forced to learn English” as “the future is going to be like this, even though we don’t like it”. Thus Juan, a (non-English native) CLIL teacher, positions students as ‘good’ or ‘bad’ bilingual learners through their interactional categorisation as ‘appropriate’ or ‘inappropriate’ participants. This social categorisation influences identity construction and determines whether these students deserve to belong to the bilingual school community.

**Conclusion**

This article has shed light on some of the ideological dimensions of the concept of bilingualism in Castilla-La Mancha. The conceptualisation of this term has proven to be rather controversial in terms of what stakeholders understand by “being/becoming bilingual”. This co-construction of the concepts of bilingualism and being/becoming bilingual seems to be tightly related to the LiEP enacted by the institutional sites of this study, as each single school manages the institutional demands on bilingual education in their own terms depending on the school’s resources.

The analysis of interactional and interview data has revealed how ideologies are co-constructed in discourse and legitimated in situated classroom practices for specific social, economic and political purposes in the intersection of wider social, economic and political
processes of globalisation and neoliberalism.

In relation to the dominant language ideologies in Castilla-La Mancha, this article has provided insights into the commodification of English as a useful tool to compete in the job market, as well as on the construction of “bilingual selves” through the appropriation of the English language and native teachers as an emblem of elitism within an “imagined” bilingual school community. Similarly, stakeholders’ identities are legitimised through social categorisations of ‘good/bad’ and ‘appropriate/inappropriate’ labels regarding three different aspects: 1) bilingualism as ‘excellence’; 2) bilingual students as ‘brilliant’; 2) ‘bilingüistas’ as teaching ‘the best’ bilingual classes. Labelling and categorising participants in those terms has led not only to the establishment of elitist school communities, but also inequalities between bilingual/non-bilingual (excellent/worse) schools and students who cannot benefit from specific linguistic resources. The “bilingüistas” or the CLIL teachers are assigned the best group of students, as those following the bilingual curriculum tend to be considered as excellent pupils in terms of academic performance. Therefore, some tensions and dilemmas seem to exist regarding the management of bilingual education in Castilla-La Mancha; this leads to complexities in the social order of these schools striving to become bilingual.
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Appendix

*Transcript conventions* (adapted from Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974)

@@@ indicates laughter

(1.3) time elapsed in tenths of seconds

(.) micropause

[word] overlapping speech

(( )) nonverbal behaviour, transcriber note

(words) non-audible segment, uncertain

word=word no interval between adjacent utterance

---

1 Names of participants and places have been anonymised throughout this paper.
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The ‘native speaker effects’ in the construction of elite bilingual education in Castilla-La Mancha: tensions and dilemmas

Ana Maria Relaño-Pastor and Alicia Fernández-Barrera

Departamento de Filología Moderna, Facultad de Letras, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Avenida Camilo José Cela, s/n. 13071 Ciudad Real, Spain

ABSTRACT
This article focuses on the ‘native speaker effects’ (Doerr, N. M., ed. 2009. The Native Speaker Concept: Ethnographic Investigations of Native Speaker Effects. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter) pertaining to the construction of eliteness in Spanish-English CLIL-type bilingual programmes in the autonomous community of Castilla-La Mancha (Spain). We focus our attention on St. Teo’s school, one of the target schools of the sociolinguistic ethnography carried out in state-run and state-run private schools in La Mancha City (LMC) – 2015/2018. Data includes long-term participant observation, audiotaping of classroom interactions in the CLIL subjects, semi-structured interviews with different stakeholders, and institutional documents of the language-in-education policies implemented in the region of Castilla-La Mancha. We discuss how St. Teo’s has adapted competitively to local bilingual education policies by relying on native speakers of English as guarantors of educational elitism, distinctiveness and linguistic prestige in the highly commodified market of English. The analysis brings to the fore how the inclusion of English native teachers in St. Teo’s bilingual programme has had an immediate effect on the current English-medium teaching practices, resulting in asymmetrical partnerships between content and native English teachers and causing tensions and dilemmas among teachers participating in the bilingual programme.
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Introduction
The teaching of English as a foreign language in the autonomous community of Castilla-La Mancha (CLM, hereafter), Spain, has evolved significantly in the last two decades with the implementation of different ‘Content and Language Integrated Learning’ (CLIL)-type bilingual programmes in public (i.e. state-run) and semi-private (i.e. state-funded private) schools. 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 will be implemented in the academic year 2018–2019. Among them, fourteen schools (seven primary and seven secondary) were involved in the ‘Bilingual Schools Project’ of the MEC/British Council agreement signed in 1996, while the rest have been progressively implemented against the backdrop of regional language planning efforts to democratise English language learning for all the students in this region as well as European language-in-education policy initiatives to promote ‘plurilingualism, linguistic diversity, mutual understanding, democratic citizenship and social cohesion’ (Council of Europe 2014; European Commission 2012). These bilingual programmes have undergone different language planning phases over the last decade and are currently regulated by the 2017 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 on 15 February 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 favours CLIL as the preferred teaching methodology as well as the centrality of English ‘native’ language assistants (NLAs) to sustain these programmes.

The study of these local language-in-education initiatives, following an ethnographic, political economy language policy perspective (Hornberger and Johnson 2007; Relaño-Pastor 2018a; Ricento 2015; Tollefson 2013; Tollefson and Pérez-Milans 2018), must be approached by examining the intersection of stakeholders’ language ideologies, situated classroom practices, and wider economic processes of late modernity. In our case-study, we adopt an ethnographic perspective to the study of CLIL-type bilingual programmes in Castilla-La Mancha. Despite the rapid proliferation of CLIL research, both in Europe and Spain, in the last two decades (see recent state-of-the-art articles by Cenoz, Genesee, and Gorter 2014; Dalton-Puffer 2012; Dooley and Masats 2015; Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe 2010; Pérez-Cañado 2012; Ruiz de Zarobe 2013), there is a scarcity of ethnographic studies that address the complex and multiple realities of these CLIL-type bilingual programmes in relation to language ideologies and wider social and political processes of globalisation and neoliberal forces (Codó and Patiño-Santos 2018; 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 and Patiño-Santos 2018; Labajos Miguel and Martín Rojo 2011; Martín Rojo 2013; Pérez-Milans and Patiño-Santos 2014; Relaño-Pastor 2015, 2018b).

In this article, we discuss the ‘native speaker effects’ (Doerr 2009), or “the effects produced by the ideologies of the ‘native speaker’” (15) that sustain the construction of elite CLIL-type bilingual schools in the local market of Castilla-La Mancha. Following Doerr (2009), these effects are based on ‘the binary opposition of “native” and “non-native” speakers and [produced] by its related premises regarding nationhood, linguistic community, and linguistic competence, as they intersect with other kinds of relations of dominance’ (16). We understand ‘elite bilingualism’ (De Mejía 2002, 2013) as involving “individuals’ personal choices” that recognize the value and prestige of learning more than one language due to ‘lifestyle, employment opportunities, or education’ or ‘because of the multilingual-multinational nature of the organizations they work for, they need to interact with speakers of different languages on a daily basis’ (De Mejía 2002, 41). The right of choice becomes then a decisive factor in this type of ‘optional bilingualism’ (De Mejía 2013) for individuals who decide to be educated bilingually ‘due to a perception of the advantages that will result from this decision’ (2). In the local educational market of La Mancha City (LMC), where this ethnographic study was undertaken, St. Teo’s school is the only bilingual school that hires English native teachers to teach content-subjects in CLIL-type bilingual programmes as compared to the rest, which count on native speakers of English as language assistants who work under the supervision of English subject teachers as ‘cultural ambassadors’ expected to improve bilingual students’ communicative competence.

By focusing on interviews conducted with St. Teo’s bilingual teachers, this article addresses how elite bilingual education is sustained by language ideologies that are based on idealised models of native speakers of English as legitimate, authentic, and owners of English as a desirable commodity. We understand language ideologies as a set of beliefs and attitudes about language and language users that are shared by individuals, socialised in interactions, and indexed through the performance of particular speech acts and stances, which are central to understand the construction of elite education in this article (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002; Ochs 1993; Relaño-Pastor 2018b; Woolard and Schieffelin 1994).

The article is structured around the following main questions: How is eliteness constructed in bilingual schools in LMC? What are the language ideologies involved in the institutionalisation of
elitism through bilingual programmes? What are the resulting social categorisation processes and educational implications of the ‘native speaker effects’? We address these questions from the critical sociolinguistic ethnography (CSE) perspective we have adopted in our research, which discusses the relationship between CLIL classroom practices, stakeholders’ language ideologies (i.e. ideas, values and beliefs related to the concept of bilingualism and the role of languages, namely English and Spanish, in bilingual programmes), and circulating discourses about how implied stakeholders are adapting to the competitive global market of English.

In section 2, we review the role of the native speaker ideology in the construction of elite education and its relationship with neoliberalism in the global market of English. The methods section (section 3) focuses on the critical sociolinguistic ethnography perspective adopted in this article to analyse CLIL-type bilingual programmes, including a brief contextualisation of St. Teo’s School. In section 4, we analyse how St. Teo’s teachers respond to the changes and transformations that have taken place since the implementation of a bilingual programme originally sustained by native language assistants from the U.K. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of the tensions and dilemmas that the inclusion of native English teachers in these elite education programmes brings to the fore and its relationship with the commodification of English as a global language (Gao and Park 2015; Park and Lo 2012; Park and Wee 2012).

**Eliteness and the native English teacher**

According to Thurlow and Jaworski (2017), eliteness and elite discourses around bilingualism and bilingual education must be analysed by taking into account the social meanings particular subjects assign to them at a particular time and space. That is, when addressing elite discourse, we should understand ‘the places, moments and ways people lay claim to eliteness, how they position themselves (or are positioned by others) as elite or non-elite and for what ends’ (244). This situated perspective to the study of eliteness and elite bilingual education is at the core of critical sociolinguistic ethnography (see Codó and Sunyol 2018) as well as political economy perspectives to language-in-education policies such as CLIL-type bilingual programmes in the European context (Codó and Patiño Santos 2018; Relaño-Pastor 2018a). As Flores (2017, 525) points out, bilingual education in the twenty-first century, beyond being a tool for social transformation, has become ‘a tool for social reproduction’, which produces ‘governable subjects to fit the political and economic needs of modern society’. In addition, Martín Rojo (2018, 545) analyses the neoliberal logic underlying the emerging ‘discourses of personal enterprise and language as profit’ governing language policies, Spanish-English bilingual programmes in the Madrid region and language practices in the multilingual classroom. In her opinion, the ideology of neoliberalism is reconfiguring a new social order sustained by new subjectivities who ‘have internalized legitimated and dominant discourses on language profit and self-capitalization’ (560). In addition, from a political economy perspective applied to the construction of eliteness, the study of elite education would involve, following Del Percio, Flubacher, and Duchêne (2017, 2), the analysis of ‘the technologies and processes governing the valuation of [symbolic and material – Bourdieu 1977; Gal 1989] resources as well as their production, circulation, and consumption within a given place and at a specific moment in time’.

The construction of eliteness/elite bilingual education we discuss in this article is molded by the dominant language ideology of the English native speaker. In their critique of global English, Park and Wee (2012) insist on the need to address the inequalities caused by the appropriation of English in situated contexts, included the ones emerging from the distinction native/non-native speakers. These scholars analyse how English becomes a highly commodified entity people use and talk about in everyday life, subjected to multiple ‘interdiscursive connections among multiple sites of metalinguistic discourse, through which images of personhood associated with English are circulated, reinforced, and reproduced’ (135). Moreover, Doerr (2009), following Pennycook (1994), revisits the three emerging language ideologies related to the ‘native speaker’ concept, namely “its link to nation-states, an assumption of a homogeneous linguistic group, and an assumption of a
'native speaker's' complete competence in his/her 'native language'” (17). In addition, she points out that these ideologies are related to the three semiotic processes Gal and Irvine (1995, 974) propose to explain how language ideologies mediate between social structures and forms of talk, namely ‘iconicity, erasure, and fractal recursiveness’. For the purpose of this article, these three processes, which Doerr (2009, 17–19) highlights to explain the dominance of the concept of the native speaker, will be relevant in our data analysis. For example, ‘iconicity’ would explain why individuals associate the idea of belonging to a particular nation-state as implying membership into one particular linguistic community (e.g. native teachers in St. Teo’s come from the U.K. – being a native speaker of English is an iconic representation of belonging to the U.K.); ‘erasure’ or ‘the process by which differences between social groups are essentialised as being immutable and homogeneous’ would also be relevant to understand the shared dominant ideology in our research that ‘all native English teachers at St. Teo’s speak English uniformly’ and how the diversity of linguistic practices among English speakers is erased or understood in terms of different accents and pronunciations; finally, ‘fractal recursiveness’, defined as a ‘projection of an opposition, salient at some level of relationship, onto some other level,’ like ‘fractals’ that are reflected onto multiple levels (Gal and Irvine 1995, 974), would equally help to understand the pervasive ideology of native speakerism that sustains the ‘native’/non-native teachers dichotomy (e.g. ‘native’ teachers can teach better than ‘non-native’ teachers; bilingual programmes with ‘native’ teachers are better than bilingual programmes with ‘non-native’ teachers). In addition, other scholars such as Creese, Blackledge, and Takhi (2014) state that the authenticity and legitimacy of the ‘native’ speaker, however much questioned by scholars in applied linguistics (Moussu and Llurda 2008), continues to be dominant for teachers and students in different educational contexts in the same way as the ‘native speaker fallacy’ (Phillipson 1992) – the idea that native speakers of the target language are the best teachers in bilingual education programmes – proves beneficial for the sustainability of the industry of English language education. Moreover, Pennycook (2012) wonders whether ‘it is worth keeping the notion of native speaker at all’ in applied linguistics and second language education research: ‘if we can become rather than pass as a native speaker, has the distinctive character of nativeness perhaps become redundant?’ (76). By reviewing extensive research on the concept of the native speaker, Pennycook asserts the durability of this concept due to the global spread of English as the language of globalisation and ‘the capital to be gained from teaching and learning English’ (78).

In the case of St. Teo’s bilingual programme, ‘native speakerism’ (Holliday 2006) conveys a myriad of language ideologies related to the linguistic practices that organise this programme, namely the teaching partnerships between content specialists and native English teachers. In section 4, we analyse in detail how the ideology of the native English teacher is embraced as an icon of eliteness, while at the same time it becomes contested and disputed by teachers in these partnerships. Our analysis will focus on the transformation of the role of Sandra, one of the three English native teachers at St. Teo’s. We discuss how Sandra’s native speakerism has evolved since the beginning of the implementation of the bilingual programme by taking up different subject positions negotiated and resisted by those teachers participating in these partnerships. Overall, the final section will discuss the implications of ‘the native speaker effects’ that sustain the elite model of bilingual education in St. Teo’s.

**Our perspective: A Critical Sociolinguistic Ethnography (CSE)**

In this article, we analyse data collected as part of the ongoing critical sociolinguistic ethnography (CSE) conducted at St. Teo’s (2015–2017), one of the four focal bilingual schools in LMC.

CSE research (Copland and Creese 2015; Heller 2011, 2006; Heller and Martin-Jones 2001; Martin-Jones 2007; Martín Rojo 2010; Patiño-Santos 2012, 2016; Pérez-Milans 2013; Rampton 2006) has been increasingly developed in educational settings in the last decade, paying particular attention to bi/multilingual contexts where linguistic practices are the focus of analysis (Heller and Martin-Jones 2001). From this perspective, classroom practices are scrutinised as situated interactional events that are understood and interpreted in relation to wider processes and discourses about the role of
language in specific contexts. Drawing on Heller’s ethnographic approach to sociolinguistics (2011), a critical stance to situated social practices would imply ‘describing, understanding, and explaining the relations of social difference and social inequality that shape our world’ (34). In addition, this scholar advocates for a political economy perspective to address “the importance of understanding the material basis of social organization, and how material conditions constrain how we make sense of things” (10). This would mean, on the one hand, to explore “how language works as situated social practice, and how it is tied to social organization” (10), and, on the other hand, drawing on Bourdieu’s concept of language as symbolic power (1992), to analyse the role that language plays in the process of constructing the social production and distribution of symbolic and material resources (Heller 2011).

Data collection

Our ethnographic data include long-term participant observations (2015–2017), audiotape recordings and field notes of classroom interactions in content subjects taught in English, semi-structured interviews with stakeholders (i.e. teachers, students, bilingual programme coordinators, language policy makers and educational inspectors) – both individually and in small groups – focus group discussions with bilingual students, pictures of the physical spaces and teaching material, as well as institutional documents of the language-in-education policies implemented in the region of Castilla-La Mancha since 2014, when CLIL-type bilingual programmes (English-Spanish, French-Spanish, or any other additional language) were encouraged to be implemented in ‘all’ CLM schools (Plurilingualism Decree 2014). For the purpose of this article, we focus on a corpus of ten semi-structured interviews (2 group and 8 individual interviews) with teachers involved in St. Teo’s bilingual programme. Particularly, we base our analysis on the narratives that emerged around elite education and the role of native English speakers in our ethnography. Following previous narrative research in European and North American contexts (Relaño-Pastor 2014, 2018a, 2018b), we approach the analysis of these narratives from a social-interactional angle (De Fina and Georgakopoulou 2008, 2012), which considers narratives as social practices, as situated communicative events co-constructed by participants and open to interactional stancetaking (Jaffe 2009). Additionally, we draw on recent research on the production of narratives and storytelling practices in different ethnographic contexts, which recognises how ‘the circulation of certain narratives spreads beliefs about people and the world, as well as language ideologies, forms of membership and notions of what is morally/ethically acceptable’ (Patiño-Santos 2018; Relaño-Pastor 2018a). Interview extracts have been included in the original language along with the translation into English. For a full understanding of the transcription conventions, see Appendix 1.

Description of school site: St. Teo’s

Our ethnography shows that St. Teo’s school shares the reputation of being one of the most prestigious, elite bilingual schools in the local market of LMC. San Teo’s elitist spirit is socially acknowledged in terms of the socioeconomic background of the students attending this school (mainly from upper-middle class families holding in some cases influential public service positions), the school facilities and educational opportunities it offers. The most salient ‘elite’ distinction shared by stakeholders in San Teo’s is its bilingual programme – which many teachers feel really proud of – being inclusive of native English teachers who can teach different content subjects in addition to English. This is an extraordinary situation as compared to most of the local schools, whose native teachers function mostly as language assistants in the English-subject classes. Institutionally, according to the Plurilingualism Decree (2014) bilingual programmes should be organised depending on the percentages of time of English exposure they can offer to students. The decree specifies that ‘the time of exposure to English during break periods would not be taken into account in the calculation of the percentages of time of exposure to the foreign language’ (4706). The amount of time of exposure
would depend on the number of teachers accredited with a B2 or C1 level of English competence, as well as the number of content subjects that can be taught in English (a maximum of 50% of the total numbers of subjects in the curriculum and minimum of 25% in primary and 30% in secondary education). In St. Teo’s, the only C1 teachers are English-subject specialists, who are not entitled to teach content subjects other than English, but are considered part of the bilingual programme. Both English native teachers and C1 English specialists are labelled as ‘bilingüistas’, a coined term indexing membership to the bilingual programme.

As compared to other local schools, St. Teo’s values its bilingual programme as promoting a ‘bilingualism of excellence’ due to the inclusion of native teachers who can guarantee maximum time of exposure in English including daily instructional breaks.

Regarding the history of St. Teo’s bilingual programme, in 2007 the school started for the first time to undertake different bilingual projects in both primary and secondary education. A year later, the bilingual programme became unique and distinctive from the ones implemented in other bilingual schools in the local area with the hiring of two British teachers, who would dramatically transform the school’s social order and stakeholders’ conceptualisation of what bilingualism and bilingual education meant up to that moment. The roles assigned to these native teachers have changed over the years, from being language assistants to having full control of teaching practices in CLIL subjects. Nowadays, these native teachers, as the narratives will show, have become fundamental for the sustainability of prestige and elitism in the local school market. As compared to other bilingual schools in LMC, St. Teo’s is the only one who charges parents an additional fee of 39 euros per month to hire native teachers (the school fee reaches up to 65 euros per month), while in the rest of schools these teachers work as language assistants without any extra charge for the families. In addition, native teachers and content subject specialists are expected to co-teach in the bilingual curricular subjects. In primary education, the content subjects taught in English, apart from English classes, are natural and social sciences, as well as arts and crafts, whereas in secondary education the selection of content subjects included in the bilingual curriculum may vary year after year (e.g. biology, technology, arts and crafts, religion, ethics, philosophy or social sciences). All students are expected to participate in the bilingual programme, although they have the curricular choice of following a non-bilingual track. Very few students choose this option, but those who do have the right to be instructed by the subject specialists, who must be present at all times along with the native teacher, thus providing them with extra academic support in Spanish.

In addition, St. Teo’s keeps its elite reputation as the best bilingual school in town by means of other commodified educational resources, such as the Cambridge National Schools Project⁴ and the International Baccalaureate programme (academic year 2016–2017), which offers a Dual High School Diploma (U.S.A and Spain).

In the following section, the analysis of teachers’ discourses and narratives gathered in semi-structured interviews collected as part of our sociolinguistic ethnography will shed light on the construction and reproduction of elitism, sustained by the dominant language ideology of the native speaker, which emphasises what counts as legitimate content/linguistic expertise and who is regarded as a legitimate bilingual student/teacher.

Data analysis

At the local level, San Teo’s keeps an enviable reputation due to a bilingual programme mainly sustained by three English native teachers. The inclusion of these teachers has transformed the organisation of the bilingual programme as well as classroom teaching practices. Among them, one of the most controversial ones is the organisation of teaching into partnerships between native English teachers and content specialists, who should be accredited with a B1 level of English. The following analysis focuses on the case of Sandra, one of these three native English teachers, who has become the backbone of the bilingual programme in secondary education.
Constructing the native self: Sandra’s case

Sandra was leading the way; she educated me, so to speak [Interview with Pedro, head of St. Teo’s school]

The first native English speaker in the history of St. Teo’s who was assigned different content subjects in the bilingual programme was Sandra. At the time of our fieldwork, she had been delivering English-medium instruction for over 10 years. Sandra holds a bachelor degree in Spanish literature and has two children attending St. Teo’s. She moved to Spain in 2007 and took up different teaching jobs as a language assistant (lector), mostly to improve students’ fluency and conversational skills. When she first started at St. Teo’s, she was teaching 10 hours a week until progressively she was offered the current full time position of 32 weekly hours in secondary education. These also include two hours a week of Cambridge English exam preparation for both students and teachers. Despite her lack of expertise in the different content subjects that St. Teo’s has assigned to her, Sandra is aware of how her native speakerism has been highly valued at the different schools she has worked at, although in some cases, as she puts it in one interview, ‘teachers didn’t know what to do with me’. Currently, according to the head of St. Teo’s, Sandra’s role is ‘fundamental’ to the sustainability of the bilingual programme. That is, not only can she transmit knowledge in English, but she can also speak Spanish quite fluently, which makes her teaching even more reliable and independent from the specialists’ language support.

Since we initiated our fieldwork, she has been teaching different subjects in secondary education: science, biology, technology, arts and crafts, religion and philosophy. As excerpt 1 illustrates, Sandra feels rather confused about what is expected of her every year she is given new subjects (lines 6–7), particularly those she openly claims to reject (e.g. religion and philosophy in 3rd and 4th year of compulsory secondary education, respectively) (see excerpt 3, line 18, for the case of religion). More specifically, she narrates her experience – and resistance – about teaching philosophy, in which she does not feel very comfortable because of the pressure of the new external exams at the end of secondary education. She explains the adjustments she had to make due to the difficulties of having to teach in English with a Spanish book, which made her decide to translate the units into English (lines 13–21).

Excerpt 1: ‘I am not entirely sure, to be honest, what’s really expected of me’. [Interview with Sandra (SR), the native English teacher; Frances (FR), researcher]

In this narrative, Sandra positions herself as having to comply with the school’s mandates to serve the community of students and families who align themselves with the dominant ideology of the native
speaker, thus strengthening the elitist stance in the local school market. Due to her status as a native speaker of English, she is required to teach a variety of subjects she is not qualified for (lines 4–9) every academic year. She openly evaluates the effect of this administrative decision as being ‘difficult’ and ‘horrible’, particularly in the case of subjects she does not like (line 13). One of the most dramatic effects of Sandra’s native speakerism has to do with the lack of agency to choose which subjects to teach, which in the case of religion and philosophy she suffers especially by working extra hours on the preparation of lesson plans and materials in English on her own. San Teo’s continues disposing of her linguistic expertise and legitimacy as a speaker of English as an economic strategy to attract families in the local market of bilingual schools in LMC. In fact, in the group interview we conducted with St. Teo’s parents, Sandra’s role in the bilingual programme was highly praised as a reassuring economic investment in their children’s education (Relaño-Pastor 2018c).

Another ‘effect’ of the teaching partnership arrangement has to do with the numerous difficulties Sandra found to organise bilingual instruction with the content specialists, especially when it came to help students who lagged behind and needed an explanation in Spanish.

Excerpt 2: ‘I explain things in Spanish’ [Interview with Sandra (SR), the English native teacher; Frances (FR), researcher]

1 SR = it’s just kind of (.) it’s difficult to: (.5) I mean obviously we’re all sort of colleagues and you
2 know (. ) we kind of (.0) >you know we get on well with each other < anyway
3 (. ) I mean () some teachers (.5) eh: do just kind of (.5) you know they can see
4 the classes under control () I mean () if the teachers see that especially hh in
5 like physics () for example () there are some kids in the class hh with (.5) learning difficulties (.5)
6 FR uhm uh
7 SR so in those eh: () instances () the teacher will (.5) say () >or even I sometimes I
8 mean I explain things in Spanish< (. ) [sometimes]
9 FR [uhm uh] =
10 SR = I am talking I can see they understand or not like > anyone explains this to me<
11 FR FR = and the kid might be like I can’t explain in Spanish right () sometimes the
12 teacher will hh when we start talking in Spanish hh sometimes the teacher will (.) sort of [(jump in)]

As she describes in this narrative, these teacher partnerships would work as long as the classes are ‘under control’ (line 4). Even though she plays the main role in the organisation of this teaching arrangement (her subjects are supposed to be taught in English), she admits using Spanish with students with learning difficulties, who are also attending these bilingual classes (lines 4–8). As she clarifies, these are the moments when the content specialist would also intervene in Spanish (line 12). As Creese (2006, 450) asserts for the partnerships between English as an additional language (EAL) and content specialists in the U.K. classrooms, both teachers must deal with different professional pressures as part of their assigned professional roles. In the following section, we discuss the tensions and dilemmas that St. Teo’s partnership teachers associated to ‘the native speaker effects’. We focus on the target subjects of biology and religion, whose classroom practices we observed regularly during the academic year (2015–2016).

### Evaluating the native self: Tensions and dilemmas

In the following extract, Sandra evaluates St. Teo’s decision to make her teach different subjects every year despite her resistance to teaching some of them like religion, which she considers ‘rubbish’ (line 18).

Excerpt 3: ‘I’ve taught everything’ [Interview with Sandra (SR), the English native teacher; Frances (FR), Ana María (AM) and Alicia (A): researchers]

1 SR = yeah↑ I’ve taught everything↓ except (.) pretty much except↑ maths =
2 AL = uhm uh =
3 SR = and Spanish (.) [they’ve]
4 AL [uhm uh] =
5 SR = changed my subjects a lot > which < hh obviously there’s no other teacher that would have to
In this narrative, Sandra portrays herself as very much aware of how St. Teo’s takes decisions over which content subjects she can teach as compared to content specialists, who would never be required to teach beyond their expertise knowledge (lines 5–7). She evaluates religion and biology as the two opposites of the subjects she is enforced to teach. Her resistance to teach religion contrasts with her passion for the teaching of biology. As a matter of fact, Sandra shared with us how delighted she was when students praised her as ‘the biology teacher’, even though the content specialist was supposed to be present in the classroom at all times (see excerpt 5). The native speaker ideology at play in this narrative has to do with the instrumental added value San Teo’s assigns to native speakerism in order to serve families’ interests in elite bilingual education. Consequently, content specialists critically responded in their narratives to the organisation of the bilingual programme in teaching partnerships, as it is the case of Aitana, the religion teacher, and Ricardo, the biology specialist.

After working in the counselling department in charge of students with special education needs, Aitana became the religion teacher in the 3rd and 4th year of compulsory secondary education. When the school decided to include this subject as part of the bilingual programme, Sandra was asked to deal with these classes in partnership with Aitana, even though she was not qualified and confessed to being a non-believer. Therefore, Sandra’s detachment as compared to Aitana’s fervent passion for her religion classes has given rise to different tensions in the classroom.

Excerpt 4: ‘We are losing our minds’ [Interview with Aitana (AT), the religion teacher; Alicia (A) researcher]
Aitana assesses the bilingual programme as positive in terms of providing good English training taking into account the job market requirements and university access (lines 1–5). However, further in this interview, she brings to the fore the current craze for English language learning. She truly believes that ‘we are losing our minds’ (lines 12–15), and reflects on her own situation at St. Teo’s having to co-teach with Sandra, who has no catholic beliefs whatsoever or the required qualifications certified by the church to teach religion. Given these circumstances, she emphasises how hard it was for her to integrate Sandra into her ordinary religion classes and to transmit the catholic faith to someone who does not believe at all (lines 19–23). She categorises Sandra as a ‘bilingüista’, a coined term made up by the English subject teachers in St. Teo’s. ‘Bilingüistas’ includes native teachers and those C1 English specialists, who are also evaluated as ‘being native’ not only by teachers but also by families. Aitana positions herself as reaffirming her field of specialisation and strong religious beliefs over Sandra’s native speakerism, which is questionable ‘to transmit [the christian religion]’ (lines 31–33). Likewise, Sandra admitted that she was not satisfied with St. Teo’s decision of having her teaching religion along with the specialist, even though this decision was based on the open range of possibilities this subject offered in terms of oral activities and debates where students could practice and improve their speaking skills. In fact, for most stakeholders, pronunciation acquires a major importance; that is why the school relies on native teachers in charge of most of the curricular subjects. Interestingly enough, the ethics teacher, who evaluates ‘native teachers’ as being ‘very good for the pronunciation and vocabulary’, is also included in the ‘native’ category due to her previous 3-year-experience in the U.S. In her opinion, ‘the most important thing is to deliver a good lesson’, no matter the mistakes a non-native teacher might make. This is the only case we can find at St. Teo’s where a non-native teacher is left alone delivering a content subject in English without Sandra’s support.

Another tension among teachers participating in these partnerships is the unbalanced teaching roles between the native teacher and the content specialist. Unlike Aitana’s case, where she is present at all times in the classroom, Ricardo, the biology specialist, remains aside playing a secondary role; in fact, his role in the classroom transformed progressively from being present all the time to eventually only appear in the classroom twice a month, just after each unit was covered by Sandra and before the exam took place. This way, Sandra was not only in control of the teaching practice (i.e. class preparation, materials, exams, corrections, etc.), but also of the whole class. Ricardo’s role, however, ended up being limited to clarifying doubts and explaining confusing concepts in Spanish, as well as dealing with family meetings.

As the following narrative highlights, Ricardo shows a sceptical angle about the concept of bilingualism (lines 4 and 5). He admits that he ‘would never be confident enough’ to teach in English no matter the language level he could ever achieve (lines 6–12).

Excerpt 5: ‘I don’t believe in bilingualism’ [Interview with Ricardo (R), the Biology teacher; Alicia (A) researcher]
specifying the role of native English teachers in the construction of elite bilingual education. More the organisation of bilingual instruction in teaching partnerships. Both position themselves as questions and native teachers embrace, dispute, or reject the dominant social order imposed by pervasiveness of native speakerism emerging in teachers become discursive sites of struggle (Heller and Martin-Jones2001) by means of which content configuration of Sandra as a distinct elite bilingual school in the local market of La Mancha City. The ideology of the native speaker permeates the whole school organisation and becomes as a strategy of marketisation to attract families and sell the bilingual programme as unique in the local market with the inclusion of native English teachers. In fact, English language learning has become a desirable commodity and ‘neoliberal preoccupation’ (Kubota 2014, 13) that justifies families’ economic investment in native and native-like English teachers like San Teo’s bilingüistas.

Concluding discussion

This article has discussed the effects produced by the ideologies of the ‘native speaker’ at play in the construction of St. Teo’s as a distinct elite bilingual school in the local market of La Mancha City. The pervasiveness of native speakerism emerging in teachers’ narratives has illustrated how schools become discursive sites of struggle (Heller and Martin-Jones 2001) by means of which content specialists and native teachers embrace, dispute, or reject the dominant social order imposed by the organisation of bilingual instruction in teaching partnerships. Both position themselves as questioning the role of native English teachers in the construction of elite bilingual education. More specifically, our ethnographic data has illustrated the tensions and dilemmas regarding the reconfiguration of Sandra’s ‘native’ self in the organisation of St. Teo’s bilingual programme.

In the pursuit of creating a distinct bilingual programme, St. Teo’s administration builds its model of elite education in the local market of English education by relying on idealised models of the native speaker as the emblem of a bounded speech community belonging, in this case, to the U.K. In addition, the unquestionable linguistic competence of the native speaker emerges as a dominant ideology that equally structures the organisation of St. Teo’s bilingual programme. We have analysed how Sandra’s professional self has been gaining added value at St. Teo’s over the last decade and has been shaped by the changeable regional language-in-education policies and stakeholders’ interests in the production of marketable discourses and narratives about her ‘native’ self. Her professional development has gone
hand in hand with a process of progressive upskilling of her ‘native’ self despite her personal teaching dilemmas and demanding labour conditions. On the contrary, in the case of content specialists, the inclusion of Sandra as a co-teacher of their subjects has resulted in a process of expertise deskilling coupled with different emotional stances ranging from frustration, disbelief and mistrust, in addition to feelings of professional inadequacy for lacking the required linguistic accreditation. The narratives told by Aitana and Ricardo concerning the role of Sandra in the bilingual programme also illustrate different strategies of resistance to the emergence of social categories such as the ‘bilingüistas’ and the educational implications of the native speaker effects in their professional status.

Overall, the ethnographic perspective adopted in this article to explain the construction of elite-ness/elite education at St. Teo’s brings to the fore the importance of recognising the multidimensionality of social actors’ circulating discourses and language ideologies about bilingualism, bilingual education, and the native speaker. Only by complexifying the role of the native speaker in relation to linguistic practices, circulating discourses, language-in-education policies and wider political economy processes, we will be able to understand the manifold dimensions of the social processes involved in the construction of elite bilingual education.

Notes
1. See ‘Castilla-La Mancha contará el próximo curso con una red de centros bilingües y plurilingües de calidad y refrendada por la comunidad educativa’ [Castilla-La Mancha will count on a network of quality bilingual and plurilingual schools endorsed by the educational community], retrieved from http://www.educa.jccm.es/es/noticias.
2. 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.
3. The school’s and participants’ names in this article are pseudonyms to keep anonymity.
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Appendix 1

Transcription conventions (adapted from Sacks, Jefferson, and 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
::: Elongated sounds
hh Inhalations
@ Indicates laughter
uhm Shows continuing listenership
uh ° ° Soft talk
(1.3) Time elapsed in tenths of seconds
( ) Micropause
[ ] Overlapping speech
(())) Nonverbal behavior
( ) Non audible segment
= No interval between adjacent utterances
ABSTRACT

This presentation discusses CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) Science education in two bilingual (Spanish/English) schools in Castilla-La Mancha (Spain), a region which has recently implemented the ‘Bilingual or Plurilingual Projects’ under the provisions of the new ‘Integral Plan of Foreign Language Teaching in Castilla-La Mancha’.

By taking a critical sociolinguistic ethnography perspective, this article examines how CLIL is understood and accomplished in the actual science classroom through English as the medium of instruction. This empirical approach serves as the framework to reflect upon the pedagogical transformation of traditional core areas, such as science, and the ideologies circulating among teachers regarding their own practice in science classes. By looking into interactional events in situated classroom practices, the analysis will shed light on three key issues: 1) the role of language(s) in the process of meaning-making negotiation; 2) the way content is organised, taught and acquired through English; and 3) how teachers and students construct both academic and linguistic knowledge. From a CLIL perspective, it will scrutinise daily teaching practices and how teachers struggle to appropriate this methodology to integrate content and language while facing challenges, problems and limits in the science classroom. Data come from CLIL science interactions in the 1st grade of compulsory secondary education at two state-funded private bi/plurilingual schools in La Mancha City (pseudonym), as well as semi-structured interviews carried out with the science teachers involved in the bilingual programme. For this purpose, the CSE lens contributes to better understand how CLIL science education works by establishing links between language policies, teachers’ ideologies and situated practices in relation to wider social processes.

KEYWORDS: CLIL, critical sociolinguistic ethnography, language ideologies, meaning-making, classroom practices.

1. Introduction

The introduction of English as the medium of instruction has transformed the teaching practice and learning experience in many bilingual schools in Spain. Despite the vast research carried out on CLIL, teachers’ daily practice involving struggles, dilemmas and challenges in the CLIL classroom have hardly been analysed. This study addresses CLIL in science classes by taking a critical sociolinguistic stance towards the actual teaching-learning process with a focus on talk-in-interaction. In this regard, this paper proposes a close-up analytical model of what language resources are used in the classroom, how they function and what wider processes take place in the integration of content and language in non-linguistic curricular subjects, such as science, with the aim to better grasp how learning is accomplished and what ideologies are embedded in interaction regarding the teaching of CLIL science.

CLIL, as a form of bilingual education, has become a growing phenomenon in Spain after following different European initiatives promoting plurilingualism and linguistic diversity (Council of Europe, 2014), in an attempt to meet the requirements of the European Union that all citizens master two other languages in addition to their mother tongue (European Commission, 2012). In the autonomous community of Castilla-La Mancha (CLM, hereafter), bilingual education has undergone a significant transformation due to the urgent implementation of different «Content and Language Integrated Learning» programmes in
Chapter 7. Published results: Appropriations, ideologies and identity construction in Castilla-La Mancha schools

state-run schools and state-funded private schools in the last two decades. Among the five provinces comprising the whole region, nearly 600 bilingual programmes have been implemented and developed by incorporating a foreign language as the medium of instruction within the curriculum (being English the most common second language; then, French, German and Italian). The proliferation of these type of bilingual programmes in primary and secondary schools has become a rather contentious issue in the social arena underpinning political and economic interests serving the global market demands.

In this paper, I shall address science classes taught through English as “CLIL science classes”, even though it is not purely CLIL what is done in the two focal bilingual schools, nor teachers and coordinators of the bilingual programmes are fully aware of what this term implies as a whole pedagogical approach. In fact, while in the rest of our European counterparts CLIL has been established as the most innovative methodology, like in some regions of Spain (the Basque Country and Catalonia), it was not until last year that the Spanish equivalent term for CLIL, “AICLE” (Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lengua Extranjera), was first mentioned in the new Integral Plan of Foreign Language Teaching in Castilla-La Mancha, as an attempt to establish more standardised guidelines for all bilingual schools. Among these schools, fourteen (seven primary and seven secondary) were involved in the Bilingual Schools Project of the ‘MEC/British Council agreement’ (former Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports) signed in 1996, which only involves state-run schools and establishes science as one of the core CLIL subjects within the bilingual curriculum. It is not the case of state-funded private schools, which select CLIL subjects according to the availability of teachers accredited with a B2 or C1 level of English according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Language Learning (CEFR, 2001).

The importance of this study relies on how a micro-analysis of naturally occurring data can provide a framework to understand how language functions in these educational contexts where students and teachers are engaged in day-to-day conversation. It is actually through interaction how participants problematize and negotiate language and content, facing challenges and struggling to solve potential problems in the classroom. Zooming out, the analysis will shed light on how talk-in-interaction reflects the sequential organization of local activities, how content is organised, and science knowledge constructed, transferred and comprehended through English as the medium of instruction. From a CLIL perspective, this analysis provides the necessary tools to scrutinize teaching practices in science classes and how teachers struggle to appropriate CLIL practices into the bilingual curricular subject, thus trying to integrate content and language, and bringing into play science knowledge and linguistic knowledge.

This paper is organised in five different sections. The next one dealing with a critical sociolinguistic ethnography perspective on CLIL science education has been divided into two subsections: a general review of the most relevant critical sociolinguistic ethnographies carried out in educational settings, and a brief overview of CLIL science research in Spain with an emphasis on the reasons why the subject of science is focus of this research. In section 3, I will provide a summary about the data collection methods and the participants involved in the data analysis, as well as a description of the focal schools where science is one of the core CLIL subjects, including some information about their distinctive bilingual programme. Section 4 will focus on the analysis of interactional and interview data from both schools regarding the teaching of science in each bilingual programme. The conclusion will discuss the insights on this type of critical approach on multilingual educational settings from an interactional perspective.
2. A Critical Sociolinguistic Ethnography perspective on CLIL science Education

Building on the tradition of ethnographic research in educational settings being reconfigured by globalisation and neoliberal forces (Codó and Patiño Santos, 2014; Copland and Creese, 2015; Heller, 2006; Pérez-Milans, 2013; Rampton, 2006), this study approaches CLIL science education from a Critical Sociolinguistic Ethnography (CSE, hereafter) (Copland and Creese, 2015; Heller, 2006, 2011; Heller and Martin-Jones, 2001; Martin-Jones, 2007; Martín Rojo, 2010; Patiño-Santos, 2012, 2016; Pérez-Milans, 2013; Rampton, 2006) in two secondary schools which hold traditional prestige in the local area, thus interpreting multilingual classroom practices as situated interactional events.

Drawing on Heller (2007), a critical social perspective on the concept of bilingualism understood as ideology and practice under the conditions of the political economy governing the globe serves as the frame for this investigation, which reflects on the pedagogical transformation of traditional core areas, such as Science, and on the ideologies circulating among teachers in CLIL contexts regarding the way the teaching of science is done through English and the value that belonging to a bilingual science “community” has in the current society. In addition, Heller (2011) explains that ethnography allows us to «discover how language works as situated social practice» (p. 10). On the one hand, «a political economy perspective» provides the lens to understand “how material conditions constrain how we make sense of things” (p.10). On the other hand, engaging in «critique» means «describing, understanding, and explaining the relations of social difference and social inequality that shape our world» (p. 34). Even though this study is not deeply focused on social organization and categorisation processes, it brings to the fore what other processes of negotiation, participation frameworks and knowledge construction take place in the CLIL classroom, as well as the social implications of this type of bilingual education in these particular educational sites.

Within the frame of neoliberalism, being part of the “bilingual craze” entails a set of beliefs, attitudes and even a specific status attributed not only to the added value the English language embodies in these institutional settings (i.e. proficiency means better access to the labour market) (Author, 2017), but also to the membership in this “imagined” bilingual community that science knowledge allows. An ethnographic lens contributes to looking for patterns and systematicity within social practice, thus allowing us to explain how people make sense of the things they do in situated events. The goal of this study is therefore to understand the construction of science knowledge and science teacher discourse within these two bilingual communities in La Mancha City (pseudonym) they proudly feel part of, and how CLIL is interpreted and accomplished in the science classroom. Before the data analysis, I will provide with an overview of CLIL science research.

An overview of CLIL science research

Content and language integrated learning’ (i.e., the use of a second language in non-language subject teaching) has spread out internationally as a model of bilingual education. Over the last two decades, CLIL research both in Europe and Spain has consolidated (Cenoz, Genesee and Gorter, 2014; Dooley and Masats, 2015; Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010; Pérez-Cañado, 2012; Ruiz de Zarobe, 2013) and has been highly praised by the European
Commission and the Council of Europe as a distinctive methodology combining the learning of academic content with the learning and use of an additional language (Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010). In the European context, it is widely assumed that any additional language can be used as the medium of instruction; however, CLIL is mostly associated with English in most European countries including Spain.

Despite the vast amount of CLIL research, there is a scarcity of sociolinguistic, ethnographic studies that address the complexity of these type of bilingual programmes, particularly in the science classroom. In the Spanish context, some exceptions examining CLIL classroom interactions and stakeholders’ views about CLIL as situated linguistic practices are Labajos Miguel and Martín Rojo (2011), Martín Rojo (2013), Pérez-Milans and Patiño-Santos (2014), Relaño Pastor (2015, 2018a, 2018b), and Codó and Patiño (2017).

More critical studies towards CLIL include the need of content-subject materials designed in the language of instruction, insufficient teacher training, and the lack of assessment criteria according to CLIL parameters (Banegas, 2012; Pavón and Rubio, 2010). In addition, existing critical research has shed light on the tensions emerging between subject-specialists and language teachers (Costa and Pladevall-Ballester, forthcoming), and other authors have analysed teachers’ narratives on what being bilingual means and on their own CLIL teaching practice in neoliberal educational settings (Relaño Pastor, 2018; Relaño Pastor and Fernández Barrera, forthcoming). In the next subsection, I will shed light on some research carried out on CLIL science and the current status of this field of knowledge in the education system in Spain.

In terms of CLIL science research, there seems to be an increasing interest - but still scarce qualitative research -, as it is one of the most common subjects selected to be part of the bilingual curriculum (Spanish/English). Some authors have analysed how knowledge is constructed in CLIL science classrooms from an interactional perspective at different educational levels, ranging from studies on teachers’ negotiation of language, content and membership in a CLIL science classroom at a multilingual university (Moore and Dooly, 2010), to other studies focused on how knowledge is constructed through meaning-making processes (Evnitskaya and Morton, 2011); CLIL learning has also been examined through tasks to measure fluency and lexical repertoire (Escobar Urmeneta and Sánchez Sola, 2009), and it has also taken a dialogic perspective on teacher-led discussions in the CLIL classroom (Escobar Urmeneta and Evnitskaya 2014). The novelty of this investigation relies on a combination of methods and analytical tools in elucidating the importance of ethnography for a more comprehensible account of what is going on in the CLIL science classroom and at which costs bilingual programmes are being implemented in CLM.

Science, as a field of knowledge, has traditionally been regarded as really complex and also a guarantor of prestige and success in current societies. Living in the 21st century, it seems the world is ruled by technology and scientific advances that make our lives easier and more comfortable, from one spot of the Earth to the other, and that is precisely what globalisation stands for. Science can also be considered as a trend or a lifestyle; however, societies conceptualise this field as being the key for a better future, accessing the labour market more easily and sometimes entailing a higher social status.

Particularly in Spain, the dichotomy established in the education system between the Arts and Humanities track, on the one hand, and the Science, on the other, has given rise to two opposing positions in which students (and teachers) are placed - just by selecting one option or the other in their higher secondary education (Bachillerato). This choice will determine their future career as they will have to study specific areas of each track and then
take a final exam after they finish their two academic years only if they are determined to
access university studies. Nevertheless, students are somehow pre-selected in their last
academic year in secondary education (4th of ESO), as they must choose among different
optional subjects that will prepare them for the more specific areas in the next two years. The
reality behind this fact is that students – and teachers – are unanimously categorised and
tagged under two completely opposing labels: the brilliant, well-behaved students, and the
lazy, badly behaved students. In a nutshell: the good and the bad ones. The controversial
issue in these terms is that the Arts and Humanities track is often regarded as a “mishmash”,
that is, an option for the least brilliant students or those who misbehave. Taking this for
granted, parents’ preferences for their children move towards the sciences track, with the
hope to be in a better academic atmosphere that will allow them to learn as much as possible
along with their peers. This “good-bad” dichotomy has broadened from the distinction
between Arts/Humanities and Science, being nowadays applied to bilingual and non-
bilingual curricular tracks. Being science one of the most common CLIL subjects included
in the bilingual programmes in CLM, the contrast between “good” and “bad” has
significantly intensified. Students belonging to the CLIL science subject are supposed to be
the most academically successful, which is not a sine qua non condition for being respectful
and disciplined, as teachers may expect.

In the analysis, teachers and students are considered active participants in the
classroom interaction, in which they collaboratively engage in the construction and
acquisition of linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge. All participants have their own
expectations on what roles they play, and which participation frameworks are established in
the classroom. CLIL science teachers appropriate academic discourse in order to make it
comprehensible for their students. It is through meaning-making processes that students
make sense of science knowledge and other linguistic and metalinguistic aspects. These
situated classroom practices will be analysed in the next section in relation to language
policies and wider social and political processes where English and science play a
fundamental role.

3. Data, methods and participants

The data analysed in this paper come from a CLIL science lesson (1st grade of compulsory
secondary education) in two state-funded private schools in La Mancha City. Both lessons
belong to a larger corpus of recorded classroom data collected from 2014 to 2017 as part of
a research on a critical sociolinguistic ethnography of bilingual programmes in CLM.
Ethnographic data include long-term participant observations, audiotaped recordings of focus
group discussions with bilingual students, classroom interactions in content subjects taught
in English, as well as and field notes and semi-structured interviews with teachers, students,
bilingual programme coordinators, language policy makers and educational inspectors. Other
ethnographic artefacts consist of pictures of the physical spaces and teaching material,
institutional documents of the language-in-education policies implemented in the region of
CLM since 2014, when these bilingual programmes were urged to be implemented in all

By offering a fine-grained analysis of the extracts selected from two different
classrooms and educational contexts but in the same curricular area, identical levels of
secondary education, participants’ age and similar pedagogical approach and sociolinguistic
context, this paper aims to illuminate how learning is achieved in the CLIL science classroom and what ideologies are embedded in discourse and practice. Before deepening into the analysis, it is important to know the context of each educational site and the bilingual programme they have implemented.

The bilingual schools

San Marcos’ (religious) School and San Teo’s¹ (lay) School belong to the “imagined” community of bilingual schools that stand out among the rest of educational sites due to their unique and distinctive bilingual programme. Regarded as two of the best bilingual schools in the local area, both include science in the bilingual curriculum (i.e. taught in English).

On the one hand, San Marcos’ School’s Trilingual Programme is the only one in the city including a second additional language, French, in history and geography in the 3rd grade. The school hires every year a native English assistant from the U.K., Ireland or USA to teach in the English classes, whose role is mainly a linguistic support for the English language teacher. This school is also one of the Cambridge English examination centres in the city and offers foreign exchange programs (France) and one-week school trips (Great Britain), as well as extracurricular English classes to train those bi/trilingual students.

On the other hand, San Teo’s School has traditionally boasted about its enviable reputation in terms of top quality education, strict standards and a top bilingual programme, unique in town due to the native teachers hired every year to teach CLIL curricular subjects. These teachers are maintained by those families whose children are enrolled in the bilingual curriculum thanks to an extra monthly fee. The native teachers at San Teo’s are supposed to co-teach with the content subject specialists, who must be present at all times in the classroom as a support and, in some instances, they are also responsible for providing students with extra academic support (in Spanish) out of the ordinary classroom. San Teo’s currently belongs to the Cambridge National Schools Project, providing English assessment and Cambridge English official certification. In addition, it has recently implemented the International Baccalaureate programme (academic year 2016-17), which provides students with the possibility of obtaining the Dual High School Diploma (U.S.A and Spain).

4. Data analysis

Themicro-level conversation analysis that follows will shed light on how talk-in-interaction is organized and what processes of negotiation of meaning-making occur in the construction of science knowledge. The classroom interaction excerpts will be presented sequentially for a full understanding of the development of the lesson. The excerpts are included in the original language in which they took place and provided the translation into English in those cases. For a full understanding of the transcription conventions, see Appendix I.

4.1. San Marcos’ School

The participants are twenty-six students aged 11-12 and a science teacher accredited with a B2 level of English. As he narrates in one of the interviews, he started teaching following the

¹ The schools’ and participants’ names presented in this article are pseudonyms to keep anonymity.
school’s demands about eight years ago. The following excerpts belong to a CLIL science lesson dealing with ‘the tilted axis of rotation’, belonging to the Earth’s seasons unit. In this session, the textbook is used along with a photocopy with some activities in English. First, the teacher explains the difficult concepts thus anticipating potential problems. Afterwards, they need to put the knowledge acquired into practice.

Excerpt 1: “We put this at the beginning in the key words”. [Science class, 1st grade of CSE, 13/05/2015. Juan Luis (JL), the science teacher; Roberto (R), María (M), Pablo (P) and Carlos (C), students; undetermined students (Ss)]

1. JL: do you need an explanation?
2. Ss: yes (0.3)
3. JL: “hasta qué lado está la altura de la” (undetermined) a ver (.) shh (.) Earth orbits "to which side it is the height of the" well
4. the sun on a tilted axis (.) Do you remember what’s a tilted axis?
5. R: yes
6. M: yes
7. JL: the tilt of the axis?
8. Ss: la inclinación=

9. JL: the tilt=

10. R: =la inclinación

11. JL: esto lo pusimos al principio in the key words (.) tilt (.) inclinación and a tilting axis we put this at the beginning tilt

12. (undetermined) ing (.) quiere decir inclinado. (0.3) do you know how many degrees:?

13. P: thirty three=

14. C: AHÍ VA: (.) DIBUIJAS BIEN (0.3) “hay que hacer la pelota a los profesores” (.) si no:: WOW: (.) YOU DRAW WELL (0.3) “we must suck up to the teachers”, otherwise::

As the interaction shows, Juan Luis, the science teacher, is trying to explain in a sort of “Spanglish” what a tilted axis is, a specific concept that may cause some trouble understanding. That is precisely one of the key words they will be asked for in the exam. In fact, in the development of every content unit, the teacher requires them to write them down on their notebooks with the corresponding translation in Spanish. According to the current language policy, CLIL subjects must be completely taught in English, and content is prioritised over language, which should not be penalised in assessment. However, Juan Luis is very much concerned about an accurate understanding of the concept itself regardless of the language repertoire he selects for that purpose.

After reading a text in English about the concept, he asks them whether they need an explanation, replied by an expected affirmation (line 2). After a small attempt to explain in Spanish, he then switches to English to address the whole class a ‘yes/no’ interrogative (lines 3-4), functioning as a remediation sequence, thus checking previous knowledge (it is notable the grammatically wrong structure of the question without the corresponding inversion in the question). Despite the students’ positive answer in both languages (Spanish and English), he
then simplifies the question by rephrasing the expression into “the tilt of the axis”, changing the adjective “tilted” by the noun “tilt”, which he assumes everybody knows. The teacher then switches to Spanish to clarify that this concept was supposed to be noted down in the key words list. Providing translations for both “tilt” and “tilting axis”, with a special emphasis on the spelling of the “-ing” suffix to explain a grammar point about how adjectives are formed, then switches back to English to ask another ‘yes/no’ question. It is noteworthy how one of the students jokes about his teacher’s way of drawing on the blackboard. It appears to be a flattering comment which unfolds another pragmatic purpose. The student quietly confesses me that they must “suck up to the teachers”, implicitly stating that they would not succeed otherwise. However, these students are portrayed as brilliant compared to those non-bilingual students, which implies a set of expectations for both teachers and students in the bilingual programme.

In his daily struggle to make himself understandable, his most common discourse strategy is repeating sentences or expressions with little grammar variation, sometimes rephrasing, or using Spanish to translate or clarify ideas, as the following excerpt shows.

In his daily struggle to teach also linguistic knowledge, he sometimes includes grammatical explanations, as the following excerpt illustrates.

Excerpt 2: “It’s a false friend” [Science class, 1st grade of CSE, 13/05/2015. Juan Luis (JL), the science teacher; Roberto (R), Manuel (M), and Carlos (C), students; undetermined students (Ss)]

1. JL: I repeat (. ) the movement (. ) of the earth around the sun is called revolution (. )
2. not translation (. ) os acordáis de esto? (. ) que translation no es traslación (. ) es do you remember this? (. ) that translation is not revolution (. ) it
3. traducción (. ) it’s a false friend is translation (. )
4. C: ah eso lo estamos dando oh we are studying that
5. JL: el qué? los [false friends?] what? the [false friends?]
6. C: [false friends]
7. JL: pues eso (. ) que se parece pero no es (. ) >entonces claro< traslación translation so that’s it (. ) it is similar but not the same (. ) >so then< revolution translation
8. (. ) no (. ) REVOLUTION (. ) y si alguien quiere ((writes on blackboard)) saber el and if someone wants to know the
9. verb (. ) to revolve (. ) so the earth revolve:ives around the sun↑ (. ) ok? rotates ve:rb
10. around its axis but revolve:ives around the sun↓ (. ) yes?
11. R: yes
12. JL: se traslada: alrededor del sol (. ) me estáis escuchando todos? (. ) entonces it revolve:ives around the sun (. ) are you all listening to me? (. ) so
13. revolve es trasladarse (. ) to revolve (. ) the name revolution, yes? ok so I repeat
14. (. ) earth seasons are the result of the tilt of earth axis (. ) the axis of rotation hits
15. its tilt along the whole movement of revolution (. ) do you understand?
16. Ss: yes
17. M: yes
18. JL: os habéis fijado el dibujo que tenéis vosotros↑ (. ) page ninety-three. (. ) page ninety-three
Juan Luis initiates the sequence by using the present tense in “I repeat” (line 1), which is followed by a literal explanation they have already read in their textbooks. He then anticipates a linguistic related problem with the Spanish word “traslación” and its English equivalent “revolution” (not “translation”), thus avoiding a common mistake Spanish students make with this false friend. He repeats and clarifies again the meaning of this false friend in Spanish. Along this teacher-led discourse, students are provided with little space to contribute to the conversation. It is when the teacher mentions the word “false friend” that one of them openly states in his L1 they have already studied that in their English classes, anchoring the term into his linguistic knowledge. In this moment, Juan Luis answers back in Spanish and tries to engage this student by asking an already known answered. After repeating for the third time the difference between “translation” and “revolution”, he provides the corresponding verb (“to revolve”), that immediately introduces in the next sentence (lines 9-10), which ends with a very common discourse marker to check understanding. Not giving much time for them to process all this information or receiving a positive answer as a signal of understanding, he then reformulates the previous utterance by adding a new term (“rotate”) which might be easier to associate for the students as being a cognate – Latin term - in their L1 (English ‘rotate’ vs. Spanish ‘rotar’). This way, Juan Luis attempts to explain the difference between two concepts related to the topic of this unit: ‘to rotate around the axis’ and ‘to revolve around the sun’, thus constructing a semantic network belonging to the academic domain. Once more, he checks students’ understanding, which becomes successful this time, but he still reinforces the concept by translating the whole expression (line 12). Yet he changes his conversational tone to a more authoritative one by requesting their attention. After a significant pause, he assumes they are listening to him but he does not seem very sure about it, that is why he repeats again the translation of “revolve” and provides its corresponding noun form “revolution” (it is noticeable how he confuses “noun” with “name”). Followed by two conversation markers (“yes”, “ok”) in their interrogative form, he then initiates another sequence by repeating again “I repeat”, this time retaking the initial statement containing the problematic terms as a trigger for his previous explanation (lines 13-15). After a unanimous “yes” to confirm understanding, his initiation sequence shows a change of activity, in a tone which might be interpreted as satisfaction for accurate understanding. With a subtle ‘yes/no’ question, he is trying to make them focus on a meaningful picture in their textbook which condenses the content of his previous explanation. This implies another pedagogical strategy to ensure satisfactory comprehension, but he is still doubtful about the proper assimilation of that knowledge. Switching back to Spanish, he justifies his own use of the L1 to make a fully comprehensible explanation (lines 21-22). It is important to highlight how his utterances reflect a more relaxed attitude in the use of colloquial language, as he incorporates a fixed expression meaning “clear as water”.

In retrospect, he narrates in an interview how he was involuntarily involved in CLIL science at the beginning of the bilingual programme due to his English level accreditation.
The school administration suggested the progressive introduction of English to teach some of the contents. The following excerpt illustrates the organisation of the content in his CLIL science classes.

Excerpt 3: “I decided what I considered” [Interview with Juan Luis (JL), the science teacher, and José Julio (JJ), the maths teacher in San Marcos’ School; Alicia (AL), researcher]

1. JL: exactamente (.) yo decidía que:: (.) lo que a mí me parecía que podía: (.) entrar en esquema
2. AL: uhm uh
3. JL: que resumiera los conceptos que estaba explicando y tal y que a ellos les fuese (.) sonando y que digo que ya sabéis que hoy en día hh si buscas información por ahí vais a encontrarla en inglés (.5) [entonces]
4. AL: [uhm uh]
5. JL: that I could summarise the concepts I was explaining and so and that they were ringing a bell to them and I tell them you already know that nowadays hh if you look for information you are going to find it in English (.5) [so]
6. AL: [uhm uh]
7. JL: =que entendáis las palabras (.5) que encontráis (.) entonces fue a raíz de eso (.5) de las key words (.5) [un]
8. AL: [uhm uh]
9. JL: =that you understand the words (.5) that you find (.5) as a result of that (.5) of the key words (.5) [a]
10. AL: [uhm uh]
11. JL: =esquema (.) que sintetizaba las ideas de lo que era el tema (.5) y cosas así (.5) hacer texto y:: buscar hh actividades (.5) cómo dar esto para que: and then last year and the year before we started looking for information (.5) doing the text a::nd looking hh for activities (.5) about how to teach this so as to:
12. AL: [uhm uh]
13. JL: y ya pues el año pasado y el anterior empezamos a buscar información (.5) a
14. AL: [uhm uh]
15. JL: fuera en plan bilingüe
16. AL: be like bilingual
17. JL: be like bilingual

He openly states that he had to decide himself what materials and how to teach science concepts in English (lines 1-2). What really mattered was that students could become familiar with some English terms; that is why he started using the key words list, which synthesises the main ideas of each content unit. A year after that, he began preparing his own material and English activities under the belief that his teaching practice would become “like bilingual” (lines 14-18). Further in his interview, he claims that the bilingual track implies “an extra difficulty” apart from the second language factor, as this subject is “much more complicated” because of all the specific vocabulary it entails. For him, if students only know the English term, “they are losing things in their lives”. That serves as a justification for his preference to teach first the basic concepts in Spanish and then in English, so that the students can accurately understand the concept and then relate the Spanish terms with their equivalent in English. Nevertheless, the language policy in force establishes the use of the L2 at 100% of the CLIL teaching practice. As the following excerpt shows, he is aware of his own
teaching practice. He critically thinks about traditional pedagogies not working properly in bilingual settings. Likewise, he believes it is not enough to teach in a traditional way with an English text and make students memorise it.

Excerpt 4: “The mistake? To me? Frankly? The level of English” [Interview with Juan Luis (JL), the science teacher, and José Julio (JJ), the maths teacher in San Marcos’ School; Alicia (AL), researcher]

1. JL: no les puedes dar de forma clásica con un texto en inglés [y::]
   you cannot teach in a classical way with an English text [a::nd]

2. AL: [claro] =
   [sure] =

3. JL: =y empóllatelo (.) entonces claro (no determinado) las otras maneras (.)
   =and cram (.) so well (undetermined) the other ways

4. [...]

5. JL: yo creo para mí ese es el fallo (.) el fallo? (.) yo para mí? (.) sinceramente? (.)
   el nivel de inglés
   I think that to me that is the mistake (. ) the mistake? (. ) to me? (. ) frankly? (. )
   the level of English

From a critical stance, he truly considers that CLIL education fails because of the low level of English of most students enrolled in the bilingual track. That is why, further in the interview, he declares he has to adapt the contents, thus lowering the level of difficulty so that they can all perform accordingly. In this regard, he appropriates a CLIL-type model of education in his daily practice focused on reading and underlying the main ideas on their textbook just “to simplify the explanations”, as he claimed further in the interview.

Unlike San Marcos’ students, San Teo’s are believed to have a higher level of English mainly due to the native teachers involved in the bilingual curriculum. In the next subsection, an analysis of CLIL science classes is provided in order to establish links between both educational sites to better understand the intricacies in this CLIL subject and the implications it has in these “imagined” bilingual communities.

4.2. San Teo’s School
The participants are two teachers and twenty-one students aged 11-12. One of the teachers is Sandra, the native speaker coming from the U.K., and the other one is the subject specialist with no English skills. Both must be in the same classroom but it is actually Sandra who deals with the whole organisation of the bilingual subjects. Specialists’ role consists of assisting her and the students when necessary, with exceptional cases of non-bilingual students who are taken out of the ordinary classroom to receive extra academic support while their peers are attending English-medium instruction. Sandra is not an expert in the science field or the other CLIL subjects she teaches at this school (Arts and Crafts, Technology, Philosophy or Biology, depending on the school’s choice). Even though she is aware of her lack of content expertise in most areas, after more than ten years at this school (first, as a language assistant), she is satisfied with the freedom she is given to prepare and organise her classes and with the
high level of English her students obtain when they finish their secondary studies (up to a B2). The following excerpts belong to a CLIL science classroom dealing with the reproduction process. Her teaching practice is usually based on following the textbook, writing key terms and drawing diagrams/outlines on the blackboard that students will copy at the end of the lesson.

In Excerpt5, Sandra is explaining the reproduction process after having read one paragraph on their textbook. There are two particular students who stand out from the rest as being completely opposed. Jaime is a very active, talkative boy, typically stereotyped as “the clown”. He is usually curious about science and keeps participating in the class – sometimes without permission. On the other hand, Federico, is portrayed by Sandra as one of the best students in the class, properly participating in the class but very demanding sometimes.

Excerpt 5: “In Spanish fecundación, and not fertilización” [Science class, 1st grade of CSE, 09/10/2015. Sandra (S), the English native teacher; Jaime (J), Federico (F), María (M), Tomás (T), Luisa (L), and Víctor (V), students; undetermined students (Ss)]

1. S: a female and a male (. ) for sexual reproduction: they need (.) a female (. ) and
2. a male (. ) The female produces female gamets (. ) the male produces male gamets (. ) and when a female gamet and a male gamet unite (.) it forms a::
3. J: [baby]
4. F: [a new] individual
5. S: a ver (. ) a baby come on
6. J: ((@ @))
7. F: a new individual?
8. S: a new individual [. ]
9. [...] Ss:
10. S: e::h (0.3) what is the name of when they unite and form the cygot? (0.3) fertili::=
11. Ss: =sation=
12. S: =sation (. ) <fertilisation> (. ) in Spanish?
13. Ss: fertilización
14. J: fertilización
15. T: fertilización
16. L: [fertilización]
17. V: [fertilización]=
18. S: =fertilización
19. J: fertilisation
20. S: fertilización?
21. J: fecundación (. ) lo he dicho mal ((@ @)) I have said it wrong
22. M: “fecundation”
23. S: vale: (. ) fertilisatio:n is when (. ) a >male gamet and female gamet> unite (. )
24. ok? (. ) and it forms the cygot >in Spanish> fecundación (. ) and not fertilización
25. Ss: ((@ @))

By using specific terms to explain how new individuals are formed (“male”, “female” and “gamets”) she leaves the utterance incomplete expecting the students to fill in the gap with the accurate answer (“a new individual”), but Jaime immediately answers with a more concrete noun (“baby”), which is closer to his experience. Almost at the same time, Federico
answered accurately but Sandra did not realise. She switches to Spanish to emphasise that “baby” was not exactly the accurate word and that is when Federico interrupts to provide the right expression (line 8). Sandra’s subsequent turn corroborates and continues constructing knowledge by asking a ‘yes/no’ question about a very specific term, which is properly provided by students and immediately checked by Sandra. After that, Sandra keeps constructing semantic network related to the reproduction process, but the conversation turns into a linguistic debate. By requiring students to answer an open question, as a way to recall what they have previously studied, after a short pause, she utters the beginning of the word as a support (“ferti-“) It is noteworthy how students can fill in the gap with the accurate word ending (“-sation”). Just then, she anticipates a potential translation problem by requesting the accurate Spanish translation. After a few attempts (“fertilización”, “fertilización”) followed by Sandra’s repetition of the word in a not very convincing tone, Jaime eventually takes the floor by uttering the accurate word (“fecundación”), and excusing himself for having mispronounced “fertilisation” (lines 19-22). Even María seems to play with both languages as she utters the Spanish accurate term with an English made-up word ending in “-ation”, with the corresponding English pronunciation (line 22). In this excerpt, it is noticeable how students apply common grammar rules to form nouns from Spanish to English and vice versa, constructing – while playing – new academic and linguistic knowledge. In fact, most English words ending in “-ation” have their Spanish equivalent ending in “-ción” (English “fertilisation”; Spanish “fecundación/fertilización”). Taking the floor again, Sandra initiates the sequence to check understanding (“vale”), which is one of the most recurrent Spanish words she incorporates in her discourse for this particular purpose. This marker changes the debate into a clarification in English, providing the accurate translation in Spanish and negating the word “fertilización”. However, this word does exist but it rather applies to the plant kingdom. As a non-Spanish-native teacher, she may not know how to solve this confusion, but she eventually solves the problem, triggering students’ laughing.

As she claims in an interview, students “learn a lot more vocabulary than they would ever learn in a normal English class”. Despite having some freedom in her teaching practice, the contents the students learn are constrained to those in their textbooks, and Sandra’s daily use of the blackboard as a support. The following excerpt shows her opinion on students’ learning of both linguistic and academic knowledge, which for her is achieved thanks to a more relaxed and dynamic development of her classes compared to previous years.

Excerpt 6: “Now like their English is a lot better” [Interview with Sandra (S), the English native teacher; Alicia (A), researcher]

1. S: [2.5] yeah I start… yeah because the whole (1.5) class is just a completely
different dynamic in the class now (.) like before like I said it was (.) very
much (.) just make them understand what was in the book
[…]
2. the kids were really like really concentrated to understand and
3. understand (.) now like their English is a lot better (.) they (.) I just need to talk
4. really (.) when they don’t understand they tell me but it’s a lot more a lot more
5. relaxed [I think]
According to her, what the students need is just her talking and talking instead of just being very concentrated on understanding what is in the book (lines 4-6). She also compares her students’ language competence and claims that now “their English is a lot better”. In this case, Sandra’s practice in the classroom seems rather traditional although she stated in an interview that she would like to have more time to do experiments, for example, in her science classes. This lack of time is emphasised in an interview carried out with her regarding the occasions in which she switches to Spanish to explain because “it’s just easier […] and quicker”. She is really sure about her teaching practice and what teaching CLIL science means for her. As the following excerpt illustrates, according to her “it is not only an English class”, thus prioritising the understanding of concepts rather than language learning. In this sense, the learning process takes place no matter the language used in the classroom.

Excerpt 7: “It is not only an English class. It is a biology class”. [Interview with Sandra (S), the English native teacher; Alicia (A), researcher]

1. S: I don’t think it matters (.) we sometimes >(.) explain things in Spanish
2. because at the end of the day it is NOT only an English class (.) it IS (.) a biology
3. [class]
4. A: [uhm uh]=
5. S: =so you can (.) you know (.) there can’t be the situation they are not
6. learning because it’s in English
7. […]
8. S: =sometimes they’ll ask a really specific question that you know you need to
9. talk for (.) some time about in >it’s just easier< [and]
10. A: [yeah]=
11. S: =quicker=
12. A: =and quicker=
13. S: to explain in Spanish and say >(you understand?)< right (.) ok (.) and then
14. go back to English

In fact, when these demanding students request a more complicated explanation, there seems to be a compartmentalised use of languages in the classroom which she is aware of and accustomed to doing it. The next classroom interaction is an example of how she deals with those situations where students keep interrupting to ask questions that seem to be meaningful for a teenage student who is curious about concepts closer to his experience.

Excerpt 8: “Was it a stupid question?” [Science class, 1st grade of CSE, 09/10/2015. Sandra (S), the English native teacher; Antonio (A), the science specialist; Jaime (J), Tomás (T), Pedro (P) and María (M), students; undetermined students (Ss)]

1. S: another disadvantage of sexual reproduction that is not in the book is that it’s very slow (-)vale? (.) think of humans (.) nine months for one baby no? (.) mmm pandas is longer (.)
the gestation for pandas is one year and something (.) no? they take a very long time to have
the babies (.) the bigger the animal (.) the longer the period of gestation (.) so e:::h (.) it’s
very difficult to create a lot of descendants (.) asexual living thing:ngs can create millions of
descendants in a very short time (.) sexual no (.) sexual living things don’t (.) it’s very slow (.) ok? (.) any questions?=

2. J: =no
3. S: do you understand the difference between sexual and asexual?
4. J: teacher (.) if you can’t…? ((@@)) bueno na:
   well nothing
5. S: tell me
6. T: a ver lo que ibas a decir
   let’s see what you were going to say
7. S: was it a stupid question?
8. P: de ti no me fio Jaime
   I don’t trust you Jaime
9. J: si no sabes lo que voy a decir
   you don’t know what I am going to say
10. S: venga (.) sorpréndeme
    ok (.) surprise me
11. ((@ @))
12. A: a ver (.) Jaime (.) no he entendido tu pregunta
    well (.) Jaime (.) I don’t understand your question
13. J: a ver (.) que si por ejemplo (.) tu novia está embarazada
    So (.) if for example (.) your girlfriend is pregnant
14. M: hala::
    come on:
15. J: y tú tienes tres hijos (.) si tú tienes tres hijos y cada hijo han sido nueve meses
    and you have three children (.) if you have three children and each child has
    been nine months
16. A: pues veintisiete meses
    so twenty-seven months
17. J: pues ya está (.) y cuántos años?
    that’s it and how many years?
18. A: pues dos años y: tres meses
    two years and three months
19. J: venga ya está (.) ya hemos salido de::
    ok well then we have already cleared u::p
20. C: lo que hace la experiencia
    what experience does
21. J: ya hemos salido de dudas
    we have already cleared up our doubts
22. A: shh (.) ya hemos (.) conclusión ((background noise)) dos años y (tres meses) (.)
23. esa era la conclusión (.) no? (.) pasar los meses a años (.) venga seguímos
    shh (.) we have already (.) conclusion ((background noise)) two years and (three
    months) (.) that was the conclusion (.) right? changing months into years (.) come on let’s
    continue

In this case, after a long, monologue explaining the disadvantages of sexual reproduction in terms of the gestation period, and giving the concrete examples of sexual living things (e.g. “humans” and “pandas”), Jaime takes the floor to answer Sandra’s question about whether they have any doubts, but then, after Sandra’s ‘yes/no’ question to check understanding, he solicits Sandra’s attention to request specific information. Using a conditional negative clause and the pronoun “you” as the subject, he stops and laughs, and backs out as if he were regretting or ashamed of requesting apparently personal information; or maybe because it was a very complicated structure to be addressed in English. Sandra, after insisting with a command (“tell me”), does not leave the floor to Jaime and immediately silences him with a
negative comment about his question (as being “stupid”). Not only is Sandra suspicious of Jaime’s purpose, but also his peers (lines 7 and 10). Suddenly, Sandra intervenes in Spanish ironically changing the conversational tone from the academic domain to a more colloquial, relaxed style (line 10), which triggers students’ laughing. It is in the middle of chaos when Antonio, the science specialist, initiates turn to catch their attention and indirectly requesting Jaime to repeat his question (line 12). Then, Jaime retakes the initial statement with a Spanish marker (“a ver”, in English “well”) and continues in the same language with another if-clause in the affirmative form, but including a concrete example from the hypothetical personal life of his teacher (having a pregnant girlfriend). This intimate question triggers students’ exaggerated reaction as being rude or inappropriate in that context. Jaime, then, justifies his question building the initial hypothesis into a longer question about the years it takes to have three children if each one needs nine months to be born. As Antonio’s answer does not completely clear up his doubt (“twenty-seven months”), his willingness to know more specifically how many years it takes as a whole process makes him inquire again (lines 16-17). It is noteworthy how Jaime incorporates the first-person plural form when solving the problem (“we have already cleared up our doubts”), as if that were a general concern for most of his peers. By including the whole group into his request, Jaime is legitimising his role in the classroom the same way Antonio, who is most of the time quiet while Sandra is explaining, legitimises his participation in the conversation as a mediator for appropriate understanding and knowledge construction, but also for keeping the group under control. In fact, in line 23, by using the plural form (“seguimos”, in English “let’s continue”), he is not only implicitly instructing students to be quiet and soliciting Sandra’s turn to continue with the development of the lesson, but also including himself as a legitimate participant in the process of teaching-learning.

5. Conclusion and discussion

The data analysis presented in this article has provided preliminary findings as an attempt to show a holistic and comprehensive account of interactional processes through which CLIL is accomplished in science classes, and how linguistic and academic knowledge is constructed, negotiated, or disputed by teachers and students. In addition, the analysis offers a glimpse of what CLIL science teaching means and how teachers appropriate this methodological concept into their daily practice.

In general terms, both teachers struggle to accomplish the science subject syllabus while incorporating an additional language. These efforts may concentrate on making students understand the main contents of the textbook, which sometimes is reduced to a rather authoritative teacher-led discussion, lacking the students’ voice which would contribute to a more dynamic interaction and to the learning process itself. Having received scarce or none CLIL teacher training, Sandra and Juan Luis conceive the bilingual programme of each school and its efficiency in terms of memorising key words from each content unit with the corresponding L1 translation, and an accurate understanding of the main contents. Given that one of the most arduous tasks for science teachers is to transform abstract concepts into understandable pedagogical explanations, the use of both Spanish and English provides Sandra and Juan Luis with tools to transfer science knowledge and relate new terms, as well as to build bridges between L1 and L2. While Sandra – as a native speaker of English –
considers the use of Spanish as a tool to quickly solve complex doubts, Juan Luis, on the other hand, believes that teaching in English is an “extra difficulty” apart from having to deal with challenging science concepts. In this regard, there seems to be a compartmentalised use of languages in both classrooms. In San Teo’s, the Spanish language is represented by the specialist teacher who just intervenes in very few occasions. As the analysis has shown, he functions as a linguistic mediator when chaos occurs in the classroom or when Sandra finds difficulties when solving a problem. In the case of Juan Luis, the compartmentalised use of languages is highly remarkable. His English is reduced to simple structures, instructions, ‘yes/no’ questions to check understanding or to revise concepts in a reflective way, expecting answers that are sometimes silenced with subsequent questions or explanations. In addition, his way of constructing knowledge is based on repeating sentences with definitions, reformulating explanations from the textbook or to construct semantic networks related to the main concepts. However, Spanish is used as a support when dealing with complex explanations implying complicated grammar structures or specific vocabulary with the aim to clarify previous comments. It is noteworthy – unlike San Teo’s – how Spanish is also used for colloquial expressions that may ease a quite limited use of English constrained to the academic domain.

In this sense, San Marcos’ and San Teo’s have appropriated a CLIL-type bilingual education programme into their own terms taking into account the school’s mandates, resources and availability of teachers accredited with the minimum language level required to teach in one of these programmes. In the case of Juan Luis, he conceives his experience of teaching science as a first step for his students to become familiar with English terms, and Sandra’s way of constructing science knowledge is based on reading the textbook and reformulating with her own words to make it simpler. Nevertheless, in both cases there seems to be scarce space for interaction among students, or between them and the teacher.

Ethnography has then contributed to a better understanding of the intricacies of these multilingual educational contexts where CLIL is mostly accomplished in the science classroom and appropriated differently by teachers. In addition, the interactional perspective along with a critical stance provide a different angle from which CLIL science education is analysed, focusing on how participants make sense of the world around them, negotiating, disputing or aligning with the ideologies circulating among teachers. Further steps need to be taken in this regard in order to better elucidate the cost of implementing these bilingual programmes in this region under the conditions of the 21st century within the frame of English as a global language. Even though the goal of the former reginal administration was “to make every school bilingual by 2018” (Plan of Plurilingualism, 2014), the complexities emerging in these bilingual schools have given rise to unexpected tensions, obstacles and challenges that need to be addressed so that teachers, students, families and regional authorities can come up to their expectations in terms of what being bilingual means and what is at stake in these bilingual schools. More importantly, this type of analysis can serve as a turning point in the bilingual education system to reflect upon the extent to which the science subject is the most/least appropriate to teach in a second language in order to comply with the teachers’ needs, which would imply certain amendments regarding the language-in-education policies.
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APPENDIX I: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS (adapted from Sacks, Jefferson, and Schegloff, 1974)

↑  rising intonation
↓  falling intonation
CAPS  louder than surrounding talk
><  speech faster than normal
:::  elongated sounds
· hh  inhalations
@  indicates laughter
uhm uh  shows continuing listenership
° °  soft talk
(1.3)  time elapsed in tenths of seconds
( . )  micropause
[ ]  overlapping speech
(( ))  nonverbal behavior
(  )  non audible segment
=  no interval between adjacent utterances
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CHAPTER 8
OTHER RESULTS: WORK IN PROGRESS

8.1. “I have been suffering a lot in this project”: A case study of a CLIL music teacher’s resistance in Castilla-La Mancha.

“I have been suffering a lot in this project. I have been thinking to leave, like ten times or more, because I have received an enormous pressure”.1

(Interview with Elsa, the music teacher in High Towers’ School, 11/02/2016)

Introduction

Within the bilingualism movement that has transformed the institutional and social order in CLM, it is essential to mention, as part of this CSE, the case of Elsa. She is a music teacher in a state secondary bilingual school (High Towers) for whom the BP has meant a bittersweet experience full of professional obstacles on the way, but also personal satisfaction coming from her students’ development and academic results. After more than two decades being a passionate music teacher in the state sector (17 years working in the same school and 14 years as an essential CLIL teacher in the BP due to her C1 level of English), Elsa nowadays feels undervalued and taken for granted by both the school team and the regional administration. Having started to learn English as an adult because of a pending personal challenge, Elsa managed to obtain her C1 certificate thanks to a huge sacrifice, living abroad for a long time and studying hard in her free time, from one language school to another. Eventually, this official language certification allowed her to be part of the BP in High Towers, which unexpectedly became a whole obstacle course.

---
1 The interview extracts provided are in the original language. Elsa was always willing to speak English during the interviews.
Contradictory as it may seem, as a “deeply believer of CLIL” (Interview 11/02/2016), Elsa is an extraordinary example of struggle and resistance within the BP in a rather controversial, competitive and prestigious school in the local area.

High Towers’ BP was implemented under the ‘MECD/British Council agreement’ (See Section 2.4.2.), which established the two subjects of Geography and History, and Science to be mandatorily taught in English as part of the bilingual curriculum. According to Elsa, music was not initially included in the plan, but she was the only C1 teacher at this school, a sine qua non for schools to be categorised as being “of excellence” (i.e. offering a top quality education). As stated in Chapter 2 about the three levels of the BPs implementation determined by the Plan of Plurilingualism (2014), schools labelled as “of excellence” were required to count on at least one C1 teacher as well as including three or more subjects in the bilingual track. With the inclusion of Elsa and the music subject into the BP, High Towers’ would experience a significant shift from being a very low demanded school - due to its poor prestige - to being considered one of the best bilingual schools in town (see Section 6.2 for a full description of the school site). That is precisely the struggle and huge pressure that Elsa has been suffering all this time; from the linguistic constraints and hardships in her daily practice to the institutional demands and political interests at both internal (school administration) and external levels (regional mandates). These aspects have marked her long trajectory at this school, thus shaping her identity as a relentless CLIL music teacher in a constant battle.

**Elsa’s trajectory as a CLIL music teacher: reflections on the self**

“When I began, I was completely scared, I didn’t know what to do. I hadn’t received any type of specific preparation or training for that”. (Interview with Elsa, 11/02/2016)

In the first interview carried out with her, she openly confesses she was “completely scared” when she was included in the BP due to the lack of CLIL teacher training. Not only did she have to deal with her own linguistic and teaching difficulties, but also with the pressure coming from the system itself and even her colleagues.
According to her, some of them showed disagreement with the whole BP and with her being part of it due to a future reduction of the non-bilingual staff. As the following excerpt illustrates, she was considered a potential threat by another music teacher:

Excerpt 1
Another music teacher from my department was in this team, and she didn’t want me to follow the programme because […] I was threatening her post.

This competitiveness among teachers was what she found particularly embarrassing. According to her, the BP development “has been a mess most of the time, quite complicated”. In the following excerpt, Elsa recounts other teachers’ critical opinion about her own role and duties as a CLIL music teacher, which were apparently “against nature”:

Excerpt 2:
When I began to do that, just long time ago, ten years or more, other teachers quarrelled with me a lot, and complained a lot, because they thought I was doing something against all of the teachers, against nature - they told me that. You have to – they told me – you have to be focused on music, your own subject, and forget about other stupid things. You are doing this and you are triggering all the problems for all of us.

According to these statements, Elsa is portrayed as an evil creature, an enemy for all the teaches at this school. For them, Elsa should only constrain herself to the contents of her subject, thus disregarding other relevant aspects in the CLIL teaching practice, which are considered as “stupid things”. The common fear among these teachers relies on losing their post in this school. In Elsa’s words, “posts are being replaced with bilingual people, so they are complaining”. For better or worse, this is the panorama nowadays within the education system. More specifically, this is how regional authorities are dealing with the increasing demand of “bilingual profiles”2 in state schools all over Castilla-La Mancha that have implemented one of

---

2 The term “bilingual profiles” refers to those teachers who are accredited with an English certificate, a minimum B2 level according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. This official accreditation allows these teachers to work within both the bilingual and non-bilingual track.
these CLIL-type education programmes. In this regard, Elsa explains that these posts are being replaced by young teachers, who are proficient in English, thus prioritised over more experienced teachers; therefore, they can better fit within the institutional demands arising from the language-in-education policies.

Nonetheless, the initial conflicting situation in Elsa’s school seems to have reversed over time. Further in the interview, Elsa narrates how, after resisting all these years, she currently feels less pressure because of her English level accreditation, being the only teacher with a C1 official certification, which places the school and herself in a higher position in terms of reputation and respect:

Excerpt 3
I am living just in a peaceful way now mainly because I am a C1 and the only C1 of my team of teachers. The headmaster has an enormous respect because I am the only C1. […] Because of that, my centre is receiving another name ["BP of excellence"], so my school is receiving a recognition because of me, so I am in a better position now, in a position of respect.

This way, her linguistic competence is commodified as a source of pride, as an asset that every teacher would ever aspire to. Nevertheless, she has never felt recognised at all by the administration nor her own colleagues. In the state sector, a very common discourse exists about teachers – as civil servants – who work hard and others who work very little but receiving the same salary. As the following excerpt shows, Elsa establishes a parallelism in this regard with the fact of being involved in the BP, which for her implies a huge amount of work without receiving any compensation or reward whatsoever:

Excerpt 4:
When you are a civil servant you won’t be ever recognised in any way, mainly if you are a teacher. Just two types of teachers: teachers who work very hard and teachers who don’t do anything at all. And this is a reality in a bilingual project or outside the BP. You’ll receive the same salary because there is any type of inspection or control of your work, so most of my colleagues at school usually tell me “you are a pringada” […] You are so stupid that you are working for nothing and sometimes I feel I am a pringada.

---

3 A slang term meaning “a loser” or “a wretch”.
For Elsa, being a *pringada* implies much more; it means standing against the opposing team, against the system itself. In this regard, it is widely known that music, as a subject in secondary education, has not traditionally been highly appraised - even less popular among BPs. Music, like P.E., arts, and ethics are socially deemed as trivial (or weak) subject matters compared to the scientific disciplines (i.e. science, biology, technology). These fields are becoming more and more important in any student’s life, thus embedding an added – symbolic - value attached to the opportunities that a profound scientific knowledge may offer in the labour market (Fernández-Barrera, forthcoming). 

Within this scenario, Elsa has been resisting, facing challenges and doing her best while learning and motivating herself at the same time. As she states in the interview, struggling within the BP at this school is “a question of pride”:

Excerpt 5:
I spent a lot of time trying to improve myself just to do this better, and I was feeling so bad when the rest of the people wanted to… to take me off of this, so I decide to struggle, it was a question of pride in some way, well, I am feeling much better doing this because I am learning every day, and I am feeling more motivated as well.

When reflecting upon her own daily teaching practice, she is really aware of how CLIL is being done in her classroom. In this sense, she states she has “improved as a teacher much more, not only in CLIL because [she is] applying some methodologies of CLIL in Spanish”. On the contrary, in terms of language proficiency, she becomes critical by claiming that her accent is “awful” and her intonation “is even worse”, although she finds herself more fluent and confident compared to the English teachers:

Excerpt 6:
I have been learning a lot of English even though my pronunciation is so bad, and I have more fluency speaking English than English teachers, believe me, because they don’t have as much as vocabulary I have been learning in the last few years. I don’t pronounce, and my intonation is not as good as good as them, because I haven’t spent a lot of time abroad or I learnt as an adult person, but
sometimes they don’t feel so confident speaking English, so I have improved a lot of knowledge in general.

According to her narrative, Elsa constructs her own identity as a CLIL teacher in terms of vocabulary and fluency in the language of instruction. This is a process that seems to occur parallel to her own teaching-learning experience since she got involved in the BP. In fact, she critically reflects upon her own teaching practice and how CLIL should be done in the classroom taking into account the conditions of each group.

Excerpt 7:
There are some parts of CLIL that work better than others. This is very good working in groups, because they are feeling fine. [...] But sometimes it is better to work with the complete group, maybe when they have to understand something, and it is new for them. [...] So it depends on the type of activity but some activities of CLIL work very well even in very big groups. [...] I use a lot fill gaps. Because the gaps have to be chosen carefully, some key words, sometimes I choose grammatical expressions that I think will useful in English as well, because we are working both things, and we shouldn’t forget that we are working with content and language.

As an expert on CLIL and education (also teaching at university in Education Studies), she is able to analyse her practice in the classroom from a self-critical perspective. She knows exactly what CLIL means. Being a quite resourceful person, Elsa carefully selects the activities and materials that work better with each group of students. She actually prepares her own teaching material (see Appendix 9) and makes a really good use of ICTs as well as audiovisual artefacts.

Despite the titanic personal efforts and the school’s internal fights she daily deals with, Elsa truly believes that her students compensate her struggle and the lack of recognition from the regional administration. In this sense, she slightly mentions a symbolic financial compensation provided by the government (10€ per month for each bilingual group), which means nothing to her for all her daily work and the burden she has been carrying all along. Her actual compensation and greatest motivation is her group of students improving every day and developing critical thinking skills:
Chapter 8. Other results: Work in progress

Excerpt 7
The best for me, as a teacher, the best are the students. [...] They are extremely motivated just in general, and they are getting good results and learning a lot. And sometimes you are feeling they are getting something real, you see your results and you see that little persons are getting more creative, and more critic, more analytic.

Facing the linguistic challenge but also the added difficulties when teaching this traditionally unappealing subject, Elsa considers that all her job is fruitful in the end. In terms of assessment criteria, she confesses she does not evaluate their English language proficiency, but the development of other skills. That is what really counts for her. In fact, when asked about her opinion about the functioning of the bilingual programme in general terms, she feels quite positive but becomes critical about the social difference and inequalities that most teachers find between bilingual and non-bilingual students.

The bilingual programme: bilingual and non-bilingual students
During the interview, Elsa assesses the BP very positively not only in terms of her students’ results, but also their mindsets. Parallel to her own learning process as a CLIL teacher, she truly believes her students have also undergone a major attitudinal change. Indeed, she narrates a shocking anecdote that happened to her when she was first involved in the BP, thus making a comparison between that time when her students laughed at her when she spoke English and now that they are all used to listening to English at school. This is what she calls “a change of mentality”:

Excerpt 8
The first year I was involved in the BP, I remember one detail which is quite significative in my opinion. I was doing an exam in a bilingual, in a class of the bilingual programme, but some students from the usual curricula haven’t done an exam because they were ill, so I took these students and put together with the other group and gave them the papers of the exam and I began to give instructions to the people who had to do the bilingual exam. They become to laugh at this fact because I was speaking English, they began to laugh a lot, they couldn’t stop laughing, it was crazy. Now, most of
the students are used to listening English around school and even sometimes they ask me to tell something or explain something in English, so it has changed the mentality and the way to watch things.

The dichotomy “bilingual”/”non-bilingual” is emphasised in the previous extract, and it has become one of the most dominant discourses among bilingual schools in CLM. From a critical angle, Elsa voices other teachers’ opinion about the BP at High Towers, emphasising the differences that can be found between the two categories. On the one hand, Elsa mentions that bilingual students are “all the time worried about their marks”; they are usually portrayed as highly motivated and focused on improving their marks. On the contrary, non-bilingual students are “a lot less motivated”. As a music teacher in both groups, she is aware of the admiration that non-bilingual students feel for those involved in the BP, which is “good for the rest of the students”. According to her, the main difference between the two groups relies on motivation, which is somehow influenced by socio-economic factors. Elsa describes her students as coming from middle-class families; however, she finds that the families of bilingual students are more concerned about their children’s education in general terms:

Excerpt 9
I receive a lot of phone calls and they send me messages asking about their sons. […] The parents of the Spanish group is a mixture, sometimes you find parents which are acting in the same way, but some others are not really worried about the results of their son, so I think these students are living in an atmosphere which is just enhancing their motivation.

This discourse appears to be widespread not only in this particular school, but also in other bilingual schools (e.g. San Marcos and San Teo). It has become so inherent in the BP that even teachers in High Towers use this discourse as a joke:

Excerpt 10:
Sometimes there is a kind of joke which is a bit silly or disgusting, they say oye, este es…cómo dicen…british? No, este es cabritish. Es british or cabritish? Just to discriminate. Is this in your group of british or is it cabritish?
Clarifying her disagreement with this type of “silly” joke, Elsa declares through a direct speech that other teachers distinguish between “british” (bilingual students) and “cabristish” (non-bilingual students). Both terms embed different connotations that shape the students’ identity. On the one hand, “british” implies belonging to the bilingual track and the BP implemented under the agreement between the Spanish Ministry of Education and the British Council. In this context, the term “british” may also entail other nuances in relation to the students’ socio-economic background and behavioural aspects. On the other hand, “cabristish” is a made-up word which actually sounds as an English term because of the suffix (“-ish”). The root of such word may come from “cabra” (goat), or even “cabrito” (kid: a young goat). The literal meaning of these terms might not elucidate the reason why these teachers use such categories to refer to both groups, as if they were two completely types of people, like enemies. Interestingly enough, “cabrito” figuratively means “lousy” or “crummy”, which would imply a negative behaviour on the part of the students. According to Elsa in the previous extract, this way of depicting both groups of students is based on discriminatory purposes. Even though no selection measures are allowed in order to be part of the BP, Elsa honestly believes there is a sort of social selection some way. She states that they have always tried to convince other people from the town so that more students are enrolled in the bilingual track. Unfortunately, in her words, “[they] don’t want because they know they have to do an effort”.

Apart from these social categorisation processes within the BP, one of the most critised aspects is the student exchange programme. Voicing her colleagues’ opinon on this matter, this exchange programme seems to be only prepared for students who are involved in the BP. Therefore, not all the students have the same linguistic and material resources, nor the opportunity to take advantage of this activity that would enhance their English skills. The same happens with the native language assistants, who barely support the CLIL teachers due to the lack of teacher training or education-related background whatsoever. But this is a different story.

Despite being positive towards her students’ development within the BP, at the end of the interview she gets sceptical about the future of the programme due to personal, politic and economic interests that seem to be prioritised in this country:
Excerpt 11:
So at the end in this country is related to political issue and personal interest. I think this programme won't work at the end because there are a lot of personal interests involved in this, and there is not any support to teachers, not only economical questions, other types of supports. [...] So, even sometimes when I have asked permission to do some courses I have some problems.

As this excerpt has illustrated, her disconformity with how institutions work remains evident. No support is provided to CLIL teachers who are willing to improve their practice, not only linguistically but also methodologically, which would eventually result in a higher quality education. In this regard, when asked about the challenges to face in the future, she convincingly claims that “the challenge is the system” rather than the students. At a more internal level, “the challenge is the other teachers […], the envy”.

All in all, for Elsa, being part of the BP does not entail a challenge due to the specific linguistic constraints and the methodological difficulties that the CLIL practice implies; on the contrary, her major obstacle is the internal battle among teachers in this school, where personal and political interests seem to be leading the BP towards the wrong way to succeed. Elsa is only one little piece of the bilingualism machinery, but her voice might hopefully function as a loudhailer on behalf of other CLIL teachers undergoing the same shifts, in the same battle, resisting with the hope that the system will ever change for the better.
DISCUSSION: THE BILINGUALISM MOVEMENT IN LATE MODERNITY

Against the backdrop of late modernity, globalisation forces have influenced social, political and economic transformations. While the whole world is currently trapped inside the new era, bilingual education has not stayed safe from the wage of neoliberalism. In the case of Spain and CLM, the bilingualism movement has severely impacted the socio-political and educational panorama. And it seems to stay in our societies for long.

In CLM, a region where conventional ideologies are still highly valued, governments and institutions are making a great effort to adjust themselves and face social, political and economic changes. Both the university development and the arrival of more than 8,000 young students every year from different sociocultural backgrounds may have had a considerable influence on the urge to learn languages as the key to achieve a better future job. With the dramatically increasing demand of implementing BPs in the region of CLM in the last decade, it becomes apparent that “language policy makers in this region are on the way to realising the dream of becoming Spanish/English bilinguals” (Fernández Barrera, 2017). Nevertheless, the evolution of the implementation of CLIL-type education programmes in this region has raised significant questions related to inequalities, tensions, conflicts and contradictions within the school communities that have heated the political and social arena. Even the media have echoed some of the most criticised aspects regarding the implementation of BPs in CLM. “Becoming bilinguals hastily” (Auñión, 2013), “mass exodus from the BP” (Barnés, 2018), or “the bilingualism ‘boom’ fills the classrooms with teachers not speaking English fluently” (Torres Menárguez, 2018) are some of the most critical headings from national digital newspapers1. These dominant discourses illustrate the evolution of the BPs in this region over a 5-year time frame (2013-2018), bringing to the fore the actual pedagogical consequences

---

of such a rapid proliferation of BPs and the resulting critiques by families and experts in bilingual education matters.

Since bilingual education started to gain strength in some regions of Spain in the early 21st century, the hasty implementation of BPs in CLM has spotlighted potential risks in terms of quality education standards. With the hope that all schools in CLM would be bilingual by 2018, it turns out that currently not only are there fewer bilingual schools than expected, but also many schools have withdrawn from the BP. According to the second headline (in the subheading) (Barnés, 2018), 100 schools withdrew from the BP in the region of CLM. This unexpected “exodus” meant a significant reverse situation pointing to linguistic, structural and organisational deficiencies. Families argue that the BP failure was due to the lack of teachers’ linguistic expertise compared to students’ advanced English knowledge. In line with these complaints, Julia, the English teacher in San Marcos, also claimed that “we are shameful compared to the rest of Europe” (see section 7.2.) regarding the level of English students obtain, contradictory as it may seem after so many years studying the language in mainstream education. Apart from Julia, Juan Luis (the science teacher in San Marcos) believed that the BP failure was due to the students’ poor English proficiency, particularly when dealing with difficult curricular subjects such as science (see section 7.4.). Under these circumstances coupled with the lack of teacher training, he admitted adapting the contents to their level.

Unlike these CLIL teachers’ criticism towards the way BPs were being implemented in schools, San Teo’s bilingüistas (see section 7.3.) offered a rather positive opinion about the BP management. Sandra (the “native” English teacher) considered this school as having “the best bilingual classes” in town, mainly due to the inclusion of native speakers of English as an emblem of authenticity and legitimacy, thus sustaining this prestigious BP. Fieldwork showed, however, that all that glitters is not gold. Tensions, dilemmas, ambivalences and manifold intricacies were underpinning the BP functioning at this school. That was precisely the case of teacher partnerships (e.g. in religion and biology), where Sandra (see sections 7.3 and 7.4) was positioned differently depending on the specialist teacher’s demands.
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and what the school expected from her every academic year she was requested to change her subjects according to the school’s mandates.

On the other hand, Elsa’s case in the public school was representative of the unequal conditions of these CLIL teachers in CLM bilingual schools (see working paper in Chapter 8). The tensions and dilemmas were in this case translated into a lack of support from the regional administration and the opposing interests within the school team resulting in personal fights in order to be better positioned in terms of prestige and status within the school internal hierarchy and the local/regional school community. Being well-prepared as a CLIL teacher and very engaged with the BP at this school for many years, Elsa’s case illustrates the suffering and pressure that these teachers have to face in everyday life in terms of work overload, personal investment and all the linguistic, human, and material barriers implying potential risks on the actual teaching and learning practice.

Against the wave of bilingualism across Spain and CLM since 2014, there has been an increasing number of anti-bilingual education platforms and social groups advocating for other pedagogical changes other than the inclusion of BPs into mainstream education. In this line, my data analysis has revealed the complexities, contradictions, and ambivalences already emphasised by critical social media, as the next section illustrates.

The opposing sector

As stated before, complexities, contradictions, and ambivalences have emerged in bilingual school communities while social actors have been making sense of the world around them in everyday life activities, facing personal frustration and helplessness. Within this complex socio-political apparatus, opposing stances have been taken from diverse sectors to contest and resist the implacable effects of the bilingualism movement. Despite the regional language planning efforts to amend specific objectives of the regulation in force, there is an emerging opposing sector (mostly teachers and families supported by trade unions) publicly visible online, on
platforms and (social) media, where they argue for a different type of bilingual education programmes (“What bilingualism do we want?”², Soy Pública, 2016) and a more efficient and inclusive implementation of such programmes based on previous rigorous research on this matter (Acción Educativa webpage). This opposing sector concerned about the effects of the implementation of BPs started to be shaped in Madrid. They mainly drew attention to actual “hidden” deficiencies, injustice and inequalities taking place in educational contexts, particularly between the semi-private and the public sector. It is via these platforms where they criticise the inappropriate human and material conditions to implement a successful plurilingual system in a monolingual region like CLM with a traditionally scarce exposure to a second language. In this region, thanks to the online platform Soy Pública-Castilla-La Mancha, the public educational sector has mobilised. Social claims against the type of bilingual education being implemented in schools began in 2011, when the former regional government decided to cut back on teaching staff and other educational needs. The disconformity within the public sector boosted with the rapid proliferation of BPs under the regional administration demands. Since then, mostly sceptical parents and specialist teachers who are required to accredit a B2 level of English to be part of the BP are actively taking part in the opposing sector in fight for their children’s and their own interests within the public school network. According to one of the teachers in San Teo, “we are getting crazy and this is getting out of hand” (interview with Aitana, the religion teacher). This is the confession of a content-specialist teacher in one of the semi-private focal schools who has to face challenges and obstacles due to the co-teaching practices she is involved in along with Sandra, the native teacher. After interviewing different teachers in the three schools and taking part in informal conversations with other teachers in the local / regional area, the pieces of my ethnographic puzzle started to make sense. Some of the most disputed issues (e.g. the three-stage implementation process and the absence of a standardised methodology for all bilingual schools) were addressed and amended in the Integral Plan of Foreign Language Teaching in the Autonomous

² Own translation ("¿Qué bilingüismo queremos?", Soy Pública, 2016)
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Community of CLM (Decree 47/2017) (see Section 2.4.1.), but others remain visible in everyday educational practices.

After all the changes in the recent official language policies, those against bilingual education in CLM argue that one of the most important reasons why the type of bi/plurilingual education programmes currently being implemented at schools may fail is that a B2 level of English is not enough to become a proficient speaker. For these BP opponents, teaching a content subject implies much more knowledge and different skills of the second language – and of interdisciplinary contents - than one may initially expect. This situation might lead to the impoverishment of the contents, thus minimising the standard requirements and, consequently, the quality of the academic results. Thus, BPs, once regarded as uncertain, unstable, politically-based systems, have recently experienced an increasing student-teacher ratio in bilingual groups, becoming more and more acclaimed in the local community. What started as a privileged condition for being a ‘bilingual' student in a limited 'bilingual' group has reversed due to the increasing demand of BPs. Indeed, that was the case in the three focal schools I observed: bi/plurilingual groups packed in very small classrooms versus less plentiful non-bi/plurilingual groups, which were mostly led by unmotivated, hopeless teachers regarding their students’ academic success. Most specialist teachers found it inappropriate to deliver their subject contents adequately with such a large group, with the aggravating circumstance of having to use a foreign language they did not fully command. Interestingly enough, some of the most dominant discourses of resistance already highlighted in the media are related to the language barrier, but there are other circulating discourses among teachers regarding their own concerns and anxiety due to unpredictable situations: “the bilingual programme is an extra difficulty due to the second language”, (interview with the science teacher in San Marcos); “it is the fear of the unknown” (interview with the maths teacher in San Marcos). In this particular school, content-specialist teachers claimed that they were really afraid of unknown circumstances and manifold language difficulties they have to face in their daily bilingual classes, particularly in science-related subjects, which required a wider knowledge about science terminology and a full command of the language of instruction to explain
abstract concepts (see section 7.4). Linguistic and methodological constraints with which these content-specialist teachers have to deal with in their everyday classroom practices reveal the necessity of teacher training and higher human, material and even economic support from the regional administration. Some of them confessed that they had to invest in their own language learning and also their professional career – in the cases of teachers who were highly motivated, engaged and committed to the kind of bilingual education implemented in their workplace. Even though fears and uncertainty have been shared by most stakeholders, the social normalisation of bilingualism seems to have permeated individuals and institutions as a lifestyle and a savoir être within these bilingual school communities without even noticing.

Another problematic issue has to do with the native language assistants’ role and their questionable teaching skills. These teachers have become a really valued asset for those schools becoming bi/plurilingual, particularly for specialist teachers having to deal with the new linguistic order and organisation of their curricular subjects, with the corresponding difficulties in specialised content-subject vocabulary. Not only have native teachers inflamed the school dynamics and teacher partnerships, but also internal school fights among specialist teachers echoing deeper tensions and dilemmas throughout their personal trajectories at the school. That was the case of Elsa in High Towers (see section 8.1), who self-regards as a “loser” having to deal with work overload as a CLIL teacher, but also with her colleagues’ rejection and envy for being part of the BP, which positioned her in a more respectful position within the school due to her C1 level of English. Cases like Elsa’s, who confesses in an interview that her job as a music CLIL teacher has meant suffering, struggle and resistance, is one of the most salient critical voices of this ethnography. Although she is not against CLIL/bi/plurilingual education, she is aware of the other side of the coin from her personal and professional perspective (see Chapter 8 for a closer analysis of her discourse). Being the only CLIL teacher in the public school that I was kindly allowed to follow in her daily teaching practice, she is a crucial element to holistically – and critically - comprehend all the possible dimensions of my CSE.
Within these logics, the English language has gained an added value as playing a major role in the social structure and co-construction of bilingual school communities. Therefore, the symbolic capital attributed to language is central to understand the reconfiguration of these bilingual schools as “elite” educational sites, thus forging students’ and teachers’ identities as “bilingual”.

**Symbolic capital and “elite” bilingual school communities**

Within the frame of bilingual education in the 21st century, English has been added such symbolic value that it has had a significant impact on institutional settings, thus becoming sites for social struggle in competition for social prestige. It is therefore relevant to highlight the global context where languages have gained new values and power in our current society, but it is also key to understand why some languages, such as English, has reached a top position in the “imaginary” list of the most valuable languages in the world. This symbolic capital has become a focus of research in the branches of social science. The relevance of this symbolic capital for my dissertation relies on its attributed tight links with wider ideologies embedded in political and economic processes (Bourdieu, 1977; 1992). Against the backdrop of globalisation, neoliberalism and transnational mobility processes, the English language per se has been highly commodified, as it embeds power and capital (Park, 2011), not only in business and political spheres but also in the education field, particularly, with the recent ‘boom’ of bilingual education initiatives in Castilla-La Mancha. It is also relevant the case of international schools in Catalonia, where languages other than Catalan have transformed these schools through the appropriation of other linguistic resources in which elitism and prestige are embedded in the form of internationalisation programmes to compete in the global linguistic market (Sunyol, A. 2017; see also Codó and Patiño-Santos, 2014) .

For sociolinguistic ethnographers and anthropologists of education, “sociopolitical structure not only influences and mirrors but is also constituted in language learning and teaching events and interactions in everyday classrooms”
Therefore, the social and cultural context is crucial to examine language and society; that is, how language functions in specific everyday life activities where participants are interactionally engaged, thus (re)producing social structures and categorisation processes. Taking into consideration all the different contextual dimensions (social, political, economic and historical background), CLIL practices have been deeply explored in order to better grasp how language-in-education policies have been adjusted and appropriated differently, thus transforming the status quo of each school site. In so doing, it is important to understand how these contexts influence and are influenced by the enactment of language-in-education policies, but also how social identities shape and are shaped by the appropriation of CLIL-types bilingual education programmes and the symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1992) assigned to English. From the perspective of language as a social practice, there seems to be a connection between power relationships, social organisation, and identity construction in bi/multilingual contexts. From this Bourdiean perspective, bilingual schools are understood as discursive spaces of social and cultural reproduction, which are bounded by institutional norms and ideological barriers. In this study, I particularly drew on Heller’s social perspective (2007) to discuss different beliefs, conceptions, values and attitudes regarding BPs and bilingualism, interpreted as a “materialist approach which privileges language as social practice, speakers as social actors and boundaries as products of social action” (p. 1).

In a nutshell, relations of power, language ideologies and negotiation of identities are fundamental to understand how institutions appropriate linguistic, material and economic resources and utilise them as assets to compete in the marketplace. Languages have thus gained value both in the political and social arena, and have transformed the social order of the bilingual school communities in CLM in terms of social structuration, and the inequalities arising from the categorisation processes therein. In this regional context, “monolingual and monoglossic ideologies” (Busch, 2011, p. 545) have traditionally prevailed, thus regarding languages - and language varieties - as bounded linguistic apparatuses. In contrast, the current language-in-education policies are adopting English as a
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form of capital, that is, a source of pride, prestige and profit in the local school market and the global market of English (Fernández Barrera, 2017). Likewise, educational sites in CLM are appropriating English and language-in-education policies regarding CLIL and bilingual education (Lin et al., 2002) in their own terms and under each school’s conditions. This way, English is included in curricular activities and daily practices to create bilingual school communities. From the language policy level, this action means an attempt to enable individuals to gain access to the global market. From this perspective, English becomes an instrument through which “knowledges are produced, circulated and consumed” (Fairclough, 2002: 164). Building on this idea, English has become a product of consumption which plays a crucial role in how school stakeholders as local agents co-construct, (re)produce or contest their “bilingual selves” (Pavlenko, 2006) through the circulation of language ideologies regarding BPs and the concept of bilingualism itself. Nevertheless, there seems to be much at stake in terms of social, political and pedagogical aspects within the reconfiguration of these bilingual school communities and bilingual selves.

What is at stake?

In a country where different pluri/multilingual communities coexist (i.e. autonomous communities of the Basque Country, Catalonia, Valencia and Galicia), it seems that becoming bilingual in “Don Quixote’s land” is regarded as a very simplistic process even though empirical evidence in the fieldwork has revealed that many complexities underpin the “being bilingual” condition. The data analysis and the results presented in Chapter 7 and Chapter 8 have shed light on the different ideological dimensions of the concept of ‘bilingualism’ depending on each school’s appropriations of the regional language-in-education policies; that is, how these institutional spaces manage and adjust the regional administration demands on bilingual education programmes in their own terms (linguistic, material and human resources available in each site). Among different (and controversial) conceptions regarding “being/becoming bilingual” in these educational contexts, constructions of
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membership to these BPs is tightly related to legitimacy and authenticity issues emerging in situated classroom practices and stakeholders’ discourse.

The co-construction of bilingual selves is therefore linked to social, economic, and political purposes in the intersection of wider globalisation processes, in which neoliberalism plays a fundamental role. Neoliberal forces seem to influence the institutionalisation of BPs and the dominant circulating language ideologies regarding the role of English language education. Considered the lingua franca *par excellence*, English is appropriated and somehow exploited in these educational sites as a commodified powerful tool to succeed in the more and more competitive global market (Gao and Park, 2015; Park and Wee, 2013). The most salient form of English commodification is the appropriation of native teachers as an emblem of elitism and pride, being the only legitimate and authentic speakers of English, socially demanded as guarantors of a pure English accent and pronunciation (see section 7.2.). As a matter of fact, ‘native speakerism’ (Holliday 2006) and the ‘native speaker effects’ (Doerr, 2009) are addressed in section 7.3 with the aim of understanding how elitism is co-constructed by positioning the role of native teachers as portraying an idealised model of the native speaker of English (such as Sandra’s case). It is therefore in these school sites where teachers (native and specialists), forced by the school’s demands on the BP functioning, work in teacher partnerships embracing or rejecting the dominant social order imposed by regional, national and supranational mandates on bilingual instruction. Marketability strategies as such in this semi-private school have brought to the fore unequal labour conditions. In this regard, native teachers’ linguistic expertise has been prioritised over specialists’ content knowledge. This ideology prevails among stakeholders in my three focal schools and seems to serve political and economic interests of the local market. At the same time, dominant language ideologies regarding bilingualism underpin teachers’ emotional stances of resistance to the management of the BPs, with the resulting educational implications of the native speaker effects in specialists’ labour conditions and social status within the school community.

With regard to students’ and teachers’ bilingual identities, we found that social categorisation processes determined those who were legitimised as “good” or “bad”,
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thus establishing binary hierarchies and diverse social status of: 1) students (bilingual as excellent / non-bilingual as lazy); 2) teachers (bilingüistas / specialists; native CLIL / non-native CLIL); and 3) schools (initiation, development, excellence). In this regard, these categorisation processes embedded in discourse and classroom practices have given rise to inequalities between different social categories, which leads to further intricacies in the social order of these competing bilingual schools.

Among the implications of this bilingualism movement, interactional data analysis in the CLIL science classroom of the two semi-private schools (San Teo and San Marcos) offered representative accounts on how linguistic and academic knowledge was constructed, negotiated or disputed by stakeholders in situated events (see section 7.4). The processes involved in this knowledge construction through English implied a set of obstacles for teachers in order to make the content units – and themselves – understandable. Depending on their linguistic and professional profile, teachers adapted their practice to the school’s mandates but also their own linguistic limitations and their conception of bilingualism and the BPs. This CSE has contributed to a better understanding of how CLIL-type bilingual programmes have been appropriated differently by teachers even though, in the case of Sandra and Juan Luis, they share common teaching strategies when facing linguistic, content or communicative obstacles in the CLIL classroom.

Overall, unbalanced access and distribution of linguistic and material resources in bilingual schools have proved that the enactment of regional language policies do not fulfill schools’, teachers’ and students’ demands. In this sense, the main goal of these language policies on democratising English language learning for all seems to be still far from reality. Therefore, the cost of the bilingualism movement and the institutionalisation of BPs in CLM needs to be fully understood, explained and further assessed in terms of social structure and reproduction in favour of future improvements from the language policy level to the actual classroom practices.
CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The CSE perspective towards bilingual education in CLM adopted in this dissertation has attempted to describe, analyse, understand and explain what types of BPs have been implemented in bilingual schools, how they have been managed, organised and implemented differently by the three focal schools, and what implications they have had on the social, political and educational spheres in relation to wider social processes. This dissertation was initially pushed forward by the eagerness to answer an overarching research question regarding the ways in which BPs were implemented in CLM. In the process of my inquiry, I then realised the necessity of finding an answer to more specific questions related to the social transformations of these bilingual school communities. In the context of my research, throughout the fieldwork carried out in three secondary schools (one state, two semi-private), evidence of social inequalities was latent after the analysis of interview data and classroom practices. Long-term participant-observation and audio-recorded interviews and classroom practices were key to spot tensions, dilemmas and contradictions among the stakeholders involved in these bilingual schools. It was in the course of the fieldwork that I could really find CSE essential for a better understanding of social change in the local sphere, but also a fundamental standpoint to deepen in such an unexplored field of bilingual education in CLM. Whereas most studies have been focused on rather quantitative methods and quantifiable accounts, I have addressed language as a social construct and adopted a critical angle to uncover distinct voices that would account for the implications of language policy enacted in these educational settings.

One of the most important contributions of this CSE is that it has shed light on the ideological dimensions of the concept of 'bilingualism' in CLM (see section 7.2). Although this conceptualisation has proven to be rather controversial regarding what my participants understand by “being bilingual”, this discursive construction of bilingualism seems to be tightly linked to the enactment of language policies at each of the school sites. As the analysis showed, each school manages the regional administration demands on their own terms depending on the schools’
resources and the type of marketisation strategies used to “sell” their BP, particularly in the cases of semi-private schools (San Teo and San Marcos). Data analysis has revealed how ideologies are discursively legitimated for specific social or political purposes. In this regard, one of the most dominant language ideologies circulating in CLM schools is the commodification of English as a valuable tool to compete in the labour market. Likewise, a reflexive viewpoint has allowed me to uncover that bilingualism is socially co-constructed as a “commodity”; that is, an asset providing future privileges at whichever cost. As a result, English is embodied by native teachers who play a key role in shaping students’ bilingual identities. Regarding specialist teachers and bilingüistas, they are upskilled or deskilled in terms of content expertise or language proficiency, respectively. This depends on the different social categorisations and hierarchies legitimised or decapitalised by stakeholders through interaction. As shown in the results, resistance, frustration, disbelief and mistrust have been the common positioning and emotional stances towards the social order imposed by the organisation of the BPs.

The co-construction of bilingual identities in the focal schools seems to be a cause-and-effect of the social image the schools project onto the local community. In this regard, the sense of belonging and pride of ownership have increased parallel to the particular conceptualisation of “being bilingual” in relation to the way these bilingual schools have appropriated BPs. In the process of identity construction, the unequal distribution and access to linguistic resources has influenced the labelling and classification of students, teachers and schools into different social categories. As a matter of fact, one of the most remarkable effects of the implementation of BPs has been the uneven power relations negotiated, disputed or resisted within the hierarchical order of each bilingual school community and the distinction of social status among other bilingual and non-bilingual schools competing in the local market. These power relations have been particularly visible in teachers’ discourses and in the CLIL classroom (in the case of teacher partnerships in San Teo between the native teacher and the content-specialist, but also in High Towers between the native language assistant and the
music teacher). The notion of the “native speaker” as an ideology prevailing among my participants (particularly in San Teo) has been discussed as one of the cornerstones of this dissertation (see section 7.2). Native speakerism emerging in teachers’ narratives has been questioned, disputed or embraced as imposed by the organisation of the BP and the teaching practice in partnerships. Elite education is therefore built by the school’s administration by relying on the idealised model of the “native speaker” as an emblem of prestige and elitism. However elitist this ideology might be considered, San Teo's case is only an exceptional example of how bilingualism is permeating the social order and the construction of schools as sites of struggle and social structuration.

The last contribution of this dissertation is related to the complexities and ambivalences emerging in the actual teaching practice (see section 7.4). Results have emphasised the daily struggles CLIL teachers have to face in the classroom, which entails considerably static classroom dynamics: teacher-led discussions, scarce interaction among students, lists of keywords and memorising techniques. These teachers attempt to compensate their lack of linguistic (or content) knowledge by the use of compartmentalised languages (Spanish and English) in order to achieve students’ successful learning outcomes. This is a frequent discursive practice through which teachers appropriate bilingualism and bilingual education programmes, thus complying with the regional mandates on bilingual instruction. Interactional analysis of classroom data has illustrated recurrent patterns of action that account for the way teachers and students negotiate meaning and co-construct linguistic and scientific knowledge (in the case of Sandra and Juan Luis). Despite teachers’ efforts to adjust themselves and the teaching practice to the regional bilingual education mandates, the analysis of interactional data has brought to light the type of bilingual instruction being implemented in these schools.

As I pointed out in the introduction section, I define these BPs as CLIL-type bilingual education programmes due to the lack of CLIL awareness and good CLIL practices that this methodology entails by definition. Therefore, content and language integrated learning seems to move a step forward from what bilingual
schools in CLM understand as bilingual education and how teachers align with the EU mandates through the appropriation of the English language on their own terms depending on the schools’ demands and available resources. In opposition to this dominant conceptualisation of bilingual instruction, we find Elsa’s case in the public school as representative of good CLIL teaching practices. On the other side of the coin, she is also the voice of the unequal conditions of these CLIL teachers in CLM bilingual schools. The tensions and dilemmas are in this case translated into a lack of support from the regional administration and the opposing interests within the school team. This results in personal fights in order to be better positioned in terms of prestige and status within the school internal hierarchy and the local/regional school community. Being well-prepared as a CLIL teacher and engaged with the BP at her school for many years, Elsa’s case illustrates the suffering and pressure that these teachers have to face in everyday life in terms of work overload, personal investment and all the linguistic, human, and material barriers implying potential risks on the actual teaching and learning practices.

Personally committed to social issues and, above all, injustice and inequalities, I positioned myself as a critical sociolinguistic ethnography researcher towards the unequal conditions of social actors struggling, resisting or contesting the inexorable bilingualism movement regardless of the highly acclaimed beneficial effects of these types of bilingual education programmes. I therefore asked myself what this story can do about those communicative practices transforming the social order. Understanding schools as institutions embodying power and social actors as agents of change and (re)production of social structures and processes, this dissertation has tried to reflect upon the potential short and long-term consequences of political and institutional changes for the current educational system. The critical angle I provide to the analysis and understanding of the ‘bilingualism movement’ can serve as a turning point in the Spanish education system to deeply examine how BPs have been implemented and at what cost. Bilingualism in CLM as a social movement is an enlightening case of the effects of neoliberalism and globalisation processes in interaction with language ideologies and discourse.
Conclusions and future directions

Schools, teachers, students and subjects have been the focus of this CSE in order to describe, analyse and explain the logic of 'bilingualism' in CLM, as well as the ‘what’s’, ‘how's’ and ‘why's’ in the complex social realities resulting from the implementation of BPs. Thus, the ultimate aim of this dissertation underlying a constructive ‘critique’ relies on an improvement of the BP implementation, its structure and organisation by taking into consideration teachers’ demands, families’ claims, and students’ necessities in favour of more equal opportunities and a better quality bilingual education for all.

Ultimately, this study has paved the way to future qualitative ethnographic studies of CLIL and BPs in the region of CLM. From a self-critical perspective, this dissertation lacks students’ voices to account for narratives about what they understand by “being bilingual” and the way they conceptualise bilingual education. However, data collected in the fieldwork about students’ opinion and positioning is expected to be further analysed for future research. Apart from that, bilingual teachers’ trajectories in terms of their professional and linguistic development, along with their emotional stances towards bilingualism and bilingual instruction should also be addressed. What I would particularly like to explore is the social reality of non-bilingual schools (their functioning and critical viewpoint compared to bilingual schools) to know exactly how they position themselves against the unyielding bilingualism movement and their expectations for prospective bilingual education. This future research would imply expanding and complementing the story that this dissertation has tried to accurately tell about the transforming (social and linguistic) lives of individuals.

All in all, I honestly think that, parallel to the development of my research, I have been learning to be and become both a researcher and an ethnographer in plurilingual contexts. What is more, these four years of PhD studies have meant a significant shift in my personal and professional life, but also the beginning of a future career as a restless researcher in search of social justice in bi/plurilingual education contexts.


CONCLUSIONES Y DIRECCIONES FUTURAS

La perspectiva de la Etnografía Sociolingüística Crítica (ESC) adoptada en esta tesis sobre la educación bilingüe en Castilla-La Mancha (CLM) ha tenido como objetivo describir, analizar, entender y explicar qué tipos de programas bilingües se han implementado en las escuelas, cómo se han gestionado, organizado e implementado de diferentes formas por las tres escuelas objeto de estudio, así como el tipo de implicaciones que han tenido a nivel social, político y educativo en relación con otros procesos sociales más amplios. Inicialmente, esta tesis fue impulsada por el deseo de encontrar respuesta a la pregunta de investigación general acerca de las formas en las que los programas bilingües se habían implementado en CLM. Durante el proceso de búsqueda, fui consciente de la necesidad de responder a otras cuestiones más específicas relacionadas con las transformaciones sociales que estaban sufriendo estas comunidades escolares bilingües.

En el contexto de mi investigación, a lo largo del trabajo de campo realizado en tres centros de secundaria (uno público, dos concertados), las evidencias de las desigualdades sociales salieron a la luz tras el análisis de datos de entrevistas y de las prácticas en el aula. La observación de participantes a largo plazo y las grabaciones de entrevistas y prácticas docentes fueron clave para identificar tensiones, dilemas y contradicciones entre los participantes involucrados en estas escuelas bilingües. Fue en el transcurso de mi trabajo de campo cuando realmente me di cuenta de la importancia de la ESC, esencial para un mejor entendimiento de los cambios sociales a nivel local, pero también como una perspectiva fundamental para profundizar en un campo tan inexplorado como es la educación bilingüe en CLM. Mientras que la mayoría de los estudios se han centrado en métodos cuantitativos y hechos cuantificables, en mi caso, he abordado el lenguaje entendido como una construcción social, desde un punto de vista crítico, con el fin de descubrir las distintas voces que explicarían las implicaciones de las políticas lingüísticas promulgadas e implementadas en estos contextos educativos.
Una de las contribuciones más importantes de esta ESC es que ha esclarecido las dimensiones ideológicas del concepto de “bilingüismo” en CLM (ver sección 7.2). Aunque esta conceptualización ha resultado ser controvertida sobre lo que mis participantes entienden por “ser bilingüe”, esta construcción discursiva del bilingüismo parece estar estrechamente ligada a la promulgación de las políticas lingüísticas y su implementación en cada una de las escuelas. Tal y como ha mostrado el análisis, cada centro gestiona las demandas de la administración regional en sus propios términos dependiendo de los recursos con los que cuenta cada escuela y el tipo de estrategias de marketing empleadas para “vender” su programa bilingüe (en concreto, en los casos de los centros concertados: San Teo y San Marcos). El análisis de datos ha revelado cómo las ideologías están discursivamente legitimadas para fines sociales o políticos específicos. En este sentido, una de las ideologías lingüísticas más dominantes que circulan entre las escuelas de CLM es la mercantilización del inglés como una herramienta valiosa para competir en el mercado laboral. De la misma forma, el punto de vista reflexivo me ha permitido descubrir que el bilingüismo se construye socialmente como una “mercancía”; es decir, como un bien que ofrece futuros privilegios a cualquier coste. Como resultado, el inglés es personificado por los profesores nativos que juegan un papel primordial en la construcción de identidades bilingües de los estudiantes. En cuanto a los profesores especialistas y los bilingüistas, se les atribuyen mejores o peores cualidades profesionales según el nivel de conocimiento sobre el contenido de la materia, o del dominio de la lengua, respectivamente. Esto depende de las diferentes categorías sociales y jerarquías que se legitiman o “descapitalizan”, a través de la interacción, por los participantes involucrados. Como muestran los resultados, la resistencia, frustración, reticencia y desconfianza han sido los posicionamientos y actitudes emocionales hacia el orden social impuesto por la organización de los programas bilingües.

La construcción de las identidades bilingües en los centros escolares parece ser una causa-efecto de la imagen social que las escuelas proyectan en la comunidad local. En este sentido, se han incrementado el sentimiento de pertenencia y el orgullo de “propiedad” paralelamente a la conceptualización de lo
que significa “ser bilingüe” en relación a la forma en que estas escuelas se han apropiado de los programas de educación bilingüe. En el proceso de esta construcción de identidades, la distribución y acceso en desigualdad de condiciones a los recursos lingüísticos ha influenciado el “etiquetado” y la clasificación de estudiantes, profesores y escuelas en diferentes categorías sociales. De hecho, uno de los efectos más notables de la implementación de los programas bilingües ha sido la creación de relaciones de poder asimétricas que se negocian, discuten o resisten dentro del orden jerárquico establecido en cada una de las comunidades educativas bilingües, y la distinción de estatus social entre otras escuelas bilingües y no-bilingües compitiendo en el mercado local. Estas relaciones de poder han sido particularmente visibles en los discursos del profesorado y en el aula CLIL (en el caso de las colaboraciones entre profesores/as de San Teo entre la profesora nativa y el especialista en la materia, pero también en High Towers entre el asistente de conversación nativo y la profesora de música). La noción de “hablante nativo” como ideología que prevalece entre los discursos de mis participantes (concretamente, en San Teo), se ha abordado como uno de los pilares fundamentales de esta tesis (ver sección 7.2). Este concepto de “hablantes nativos” ha emergido en las narrativas del profesorado y se ha cuestionado, debatido o aceptado como algo impuesto por la propia organización del programa bilingüe y de las prácticas en el aula centradas en la colaboración entre profesores. La educación bilingüe es, por tanto, construida por la administración de los centros, que a su vez se apoya en el modelo idealizado de “hablante nativo” como emblema de prestigio y elitismo. Independientemente de lo elitista que esta ideología pueda considerarse, el caso de San Teo es solo un ejemplo excepcional de cómo el bilingüismo está permeando en el orden social y la construcción de escuelas como espacios de lucha y estructuración social.

La última contribución de esta tesis está relacionada con las complejidades y ambivalencias que emergen en las prácticas docentes reales (ver sección 7.4). Los resultados han enfatizado las luchas diarias a las que el profesorado de CLIL tiene que enfrentarse diariamente en sus prácticas, lo que conlleva a unas dinámicas considerablemente estáticas en el aula: discusiones dirigidas solamente por el profesor, escasa interacción entre los estudiantes, listas de palabras clave y
técnicas de memorización. Estos profesores intentan compensar su falta de conocimiento lingüístico (o de contenido) a través del uso compartimentalizado de las lenguas (español e inglés), con el fin de alcanzar resultados de aprendizaje exitosos por parte de los estudiantes. Esta es una práctica discursiva frecuente a través de la cual los profesores se apropian del bilingüismo y de los programas de bilingües, cumpliendo así con los mandatos regionales sobre educación bilingüe. El análisis interaccional de los datos de aula ha demostrado que surgen patrones de acción recurrentes que explican cómo los profesores y los estudiantes negocian el significado y co-construyen, a su vez, conocimiento lingüístico y científico (en el caso de Sandra y Juan Luis). A pesar de los esfuerzos del profesorado por adaptarse ellos mismos y también su práctica docente a los mandatos que rigen la educación bilingüe en CLM, el análisis de los datos interaccionales ha sacado a la luz el tipo de educación bilingüe que se está implementando en estos centros.

Tal y como remarqué en la introducción de esta tesis, defino estos programas bilingües como “programas de educación bilingües tipo CLI” debido a la falta de conciencia sobre CLIL y las buenas prácticas que esta metodología conlleva por definición. Por tanto, el aprendizaje integrado de lengua y contenido parece estar un paso por delante de lo que las escuelas bilingües en CLM entienden como educación bilingüe, y cómo el profesorado se ajusta a los mandatos de la Unión Europea a través de la apropiación del inglés en sus propios términos, es decir, dependiendo de las exigencias de los centros y los recursos disponibles. En contra de esta conceptualización dominante de la educación bilingüe, encontramos el caso de Elsa en el centro público, como ejemplo representativo de buenas prácticas de CLIL. Sin embargo, ella es también la voz de las desigualdades que sufre el profesorado de CLIL en las escuelas bilingües de CLM. Las tensiones y los dilemas se traducen, en este caso, en la ausencia de apoyo por parte de la administración regional y en los intereses opuestos dentro del propio equipo docente. Esto implica enfrentamientos personales para lograr una mejor posición en términos de prestigio y estatus social dentro de la jerarquía interna del colegio, así como de la comunidad educativa local y regional. Siendo una profesora de CLIL bien preparada y muy comprometida con el programa bilingüe de su centro durante muchos años, el caso
de Elsa ilustra el sufrimiento y la presión que este profesorado tienen que soportar y enfrentarse en su día a día en cuanto a la sobrecarga de trabajo, la “inversión” personal y todas las barreras lingüísticas, humanas y materiales que conllevan riesgos potenciales sobre las prácticas docentes y de aprendizaje.

Personalmente comprometida con temas sociales y, sobre todo, la injusticia y las desigualdades, me he posicionado desde la etnografía sociolingüística crítica hacia las condiciones de desigualdad que sufren los agentes sociales involucrados, luchando, resistiendo o retando al inexorable “movimiento del bilingüismo”, independientemente de los tan aclamados efectos beneficiosos de estos tipos de programas de educación bilingües. Por tanto, me preguntaba qué puede hacer y contar esta historia sobre las prácticas comunicativas que transforman el orden social. Entendiendo las escuelas como instituciones que personifican el poder, y los actores sociales como agentes de cambio y (re)producción de estructuras y procesos sociales, esta tesis ha intentado reflexionar sobre las posibles consecuencias a corto y largo plazo de los cambios políticos e institucionales en el sistema educativo actual. El punto de vista crítico que adopta el análisis para entender el “movimiento del bilingüismo” puede servir como punto de inflexión en el sistema educativo español con el fin de examinar en profundidad cómo se han implementado los programas bilingües y cuáles son sus implicaciones. El bilingüismo en CLM como un movimiento social es un caso revelador de los efectos del neoliberalismo y los procesos de globalización en interacción con las ideologías lingüísticas y el discurso.

Las escuelas, el profesorado, el alumnado y las asignaturas han sido el foco de esta ESC con el fin de describir, analizar y explicar la lógica del “bilingüismo” en CLM, así como “el qué”, “el cómo” y el “por qué” de estas complejas realidades sociales, que son el resultado de la implementación de los programas bilingües. Así, el principal objetivo de esta tesis, en la que subyace una crítica constructiva, consiste en una mejora en la implementación de los programas bilingües, su estructura y organización, teniendo en cuenta las exigencias del profesorado, las demandas de las familias y las necesidades de los estudiantes, en favor de
oportunidades más equitativas y una educación bilingüe de mayor calidad para todos.

Por último, este estudio ha sentado las bases de futuros estudios etnográficos y cualitativos sobre CLIL y los programas bilingües en la región de CLM. Desde la autocrítica, en esta tesis hay una ausencia de voces de los estudiantes que muestren las narrativas acerca de lo que ellos entienden por "ser bilingüe", así como la forma en que ellos conceptualizan la educación bilingüe. Sin embargo, se espera poder analizar el resto de los datos recogidos en el trabajo de campo sobre la opinión y posicionamiento de estos estudiantes para futuras líneas de investigación. Además, deberían examinarse las trayectorias de los profesores bilingües en términos de su desarrollo lingüístico y profesional, junto con sus actitudes emocionales sobre el bilingüismo y la educación bilingüe. También me gustaría explorar la realidad social de los centros no-bilingües (su funcionamiento y punto de vista crítico comparado con el de las escuelas bilingües), para saber exactamente cómo se posicionan contra el implacable “movimiento del bilingüismo”, y sus expectativas para el futuro de la educación bilingüe. Esta investigación futura desarrollaría y complementaría la historia que esta tesis ha intentado contar con exactitud acerca de las vidas (sociales y lingüísticas) de los individuos en transformación.

En definitiva, paralelamente al desarrollo de mi investigación, considero que he estado aprendiendo a ser y a convertirme en una investigadora y etnógrafa en contextos plurilingües. Además, estos cuatro años de estudios de doctorado han supuesto un cambio significativo en mi vida personal y profesional, pero también el comienzo de una carrera futura como una incansable e inquieta investigadora en busca de justicia social en contextos educativos bi/plurilingües.
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APPENDICES
Appendix 1: Consent forms

Spanish version

CONSENTIMIENTO INFORMADO

Estimados padres y madres:

Nos dirigimos a ustedes para informarles de que se llevará a cabo una actividad elaborada por varios investigadores de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha en colaboración con la Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona. Dicha actividad consistirá en un debate-discusión oral sobre el bilingüismo y el programa bilingüe en el que su hijo/a se encuentra matriculado. Para tal fin, se realizarán grabaciones audiovisuales con el fin de poder analizar los datos posteriormente. Por tanto, los investigadores de este proyecto de investigación les solicitan su autorización para la realización de dichas grabaciones, para lo cual sólo tendrán que rellenar y firmar el formulario que aparece a continuación. Para cualquier consulta, pueden contactar con Alicia Fernández Barrera: alicia.fbarrera@uclm.es (Tlf. xxxxxxxxx) o Ana M. Relaño, anamaria.relano@uclm.es (Tlf. xxxxxxxxx).

Aprovechamos la ocasión para enviarles un cordial saludo y agradecerles de antemano su colaboración.

Director

Coordinador-a Programa Bilingüe

Firmado:

Yo, ________________________________, con DNI / NIE / Pasaporte nº: ______________ y como padre /madre o tutor /a de ________________________________, a petición de los responsables del proyecto de investigación “La apropiación del inglés como lengua global en la escuela castellano-manchega: Un acercamiento multilingüe, situado y comparativo”, realizado por miembros del grupo LADIC (Lenguaje, Discurso, Interacción y Cultura) de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, doy mi permiso y autorización para lo siguiente:

- Grabación de la voz y de la imagen de mi hijo /a o tutelado /a durante las clases
- Trascipción de las grabaciones
- Análisis de las trascipciones, el sonido y las imágenes
- Difusión exclusiva en medios académicos de las trascipciones y de los resultados del análisis

Los responsables de la investigación se comprometen a hacer un uso responsable de los datos, con fines exclusivamente académicos, garantizando el anonimato de cualquier alumno/a, profesor/a, así como del centro educativo.

En Ciudad Real, a ___ de _____________ de________

Firmado:
INFORMED CONSENT

We would like to inform you that a group of scholars from the Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha in collaboration with the Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona are doing a research project at our school. They will be carrying out some research activities throughout this academic year. Those activities are mainly the observation and analysis of the bilingual programs (Programas Bilingües). Particularly, they will study the implementation and development of these programs at the school. To that end, several activities and sessions will be audio and/or videotaped. Therefore, the school and the project researchers ask for your consent to audio/videotape your son/daughter in the classroom. The identity of participants will be always protected and all the information related to your son/daughter will remain confidential. If you agree to participate, please fill in the form below.

Should you require further information, do not hesitate to contact us: Alicia Fernández Barrera - alicia.fbarrera@uclm.es (Tlf. xxxxxxxxx) or Ana M. Relano - anamaria.relano@uclm.es (Tlf. xxxxxxxxx).

Kind regards,

The school headmaster

The project coordinator

Signature

I, ________________________________________, with DNI / NIE / Passport nº: ____________
and as father/mother/legal tutor of the student ________________________________________, on request of the coordinators of the research project “The appropriation of English as a global language in Castilla-La Mancha Schools: A multilingual, situated and comparative approach”, carried out by members of the LADIC group (Language, Discourse, Interaction and Culture) from the Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha. I do consent and give my permission to the following:

• My child will be audio and/or video recorded during the lessons
• The recordings will be transcribed
• The transcripts, the images and the sounds will be analysed
• The transcripts analysis will be distributed exclusively on academic media.

I keep the right to listen and watch the recordings and to deny my consent to the former activities if I consider doing so by any reason in the future. The research coordinators do commit to make a responsible use of the data, with exclusively academic aims and guarantee the anonymity of every student, teacher and the school.

In Ciudad Real on the ___ of ____________________

Signature
Appendix 2: Sample of field notes

OBSERVATION GUIDE

General:
Name (your name): Alicia
School (School visited): San Marcos
Class (Class attended): SCIENCE 1ºD (J.J) – grupo bilingüe (clases extraescolares de 8:00-9:00 los viernes)
Date and meeting time (date of classroom observation and duration of period): 23/10/2014 (12.15)
Participants (Teacher, students, other participants –age, gender, linguistic background, any other information you can gather):
30 students aged 12-13 (11 boys & 19 girls), one of them is Asian. They all belong to the “bilingual group”, having this only subject taught in English (apart from their ordinary English classes)

Activities:
Language (language spoken with students; among students):
The teacher speaks both Spanish & English (translating some important information or specific terms into Spanish sometimes). Students speak Spanish among themselves and they sometimes ask their teacher in Spanish, too. However, when they are asked, they answer in English. They only asked the teacher in Spanish to check if they understood directions correctly or if the question is complicated.
Materials (textbook, photocopies, visual, use of technology, other):
Book in Spanish, photocopy in English, use of laptop to carry out a reading activity and projector to show some images.
Interaction: Turn-taking (who initiate, holds, controls the floor?; length of teacher/students’ turns; who talks more? –TTS (teacher’s time of speaking) versus STS (student's time of speaking)):
90% TTS vs. 10% STS:
The teacher holds and controls the lecture (explaining, giving directions to students or making questions). Students just answer the questions made by the teacher or talk among themselves.
Integration of language and content (balanced; more attention paid to language/content; how it is achieved):
More attention to content: the teacher repeats important information to check if his students understood what he said (e.g. the worksheet with one exercise counted as part of their final mark, but students seemed surprised at that (maybe the teacher did not warn them in advance?)
Lesson Plan (is there a clear one? Hidden?):
Aim: carry out one exercise about human beings – which will be taken into account for the final mark) & explain different types of bacteria. The goal is that students can understand the contents/meaning of what the teacher is explaining and also that they can associate the English terms with the Spanish ones.

Classroom layout:
30 students – Why are some of them together? It seems these students are brilliant and work hard when they are together without disturbing their partners.
Social Scene:  (Wide Angle View)

Here you are describing the social scene for those who will read your notes. Describe social dynamics you notice when you come in. Describe the general atmosphere and feelings expressed by others. This section describes the context from a wide-angle view. It should contain lots of details about the class you have visited and how you found your way throughout the day’s interactions. You should describe the people, the physical spaces you encounter since you arrive at school, and how you felt before, during and after the classroom observation. This section is usually about one or two paragraphs long.

Before the classroom, I had great expectations about what we would find, but it was not as I had expected. Once we came in, the room seemed very small to fit all those students running around and shouting. There was a Christian cross on the front wall and one picture showing the Virgin Mary (THE SAME IN EVERY CLASSROOM). Suddenly, the teacher asked them to sit down and be quiet (in English). They started asking us – in Spanish- about who we were, where we came from, what we were doing there…After introducing ourselves and telling them about our job/goal there, the teacher started his lecture. He asked the students to accomplish one reading comprehension exercise based on the topic “human beings”. They did it quickly and the teacher asked them to hand it in.

Throughout the whole lecture, the teacher was controlling and holding the floor. Sometimes students asked him in English, and then they looked at us full of pride. Students seemed to make an effort to ask or talk in English, but they failed sometimes and used Spanish. Some of their questions were grammatically correct and even well-pronounced.

The negative aspect is that this teacher made some grammar mistakes (e.g. “listen it”), although he sometimes corrected himself. I could notice he was nervous and he often looked at us.

After the classroom observation, I think that the use of the English language in class is not a strong requirement, and that students feel comfortable in class, even motivated to speak English as much as possible, at least when asking their teacher. (Maybe more motivated due to our presence there? – we will see)

Focused Observations:  (Zoom Lens View)

Here you are zooming in on the interactions taking place in the classroom between teacher and students, as well as the ones among students (side conversations, for example). Describe your interactions as accurately as you can. Be careful to report behaviors rather than imputing motive. For example, “Carlos ran in, smiling, jumping and waving a paper.” vs. “Carlos was happy.” HAPPY TELLS US NOTHING REALLY.
This is the longest section of the field note, several paragraphs. It should capture from the beginning to the end of an activity you want to focus on. Things to pay attention to:

Language: Spanish? English? Both? Other languages?
Spanish – to clarify relevant info. (e.g. “Como sabéis, esto cuenta para nota”) but the contents were explained mostly in English (80% S vs. 20% E)
Students answer in E when it comes to specific terms that they have learnt from the key words list. However, they sometimes ask in S when they do not understand & teacher answers in S to clarify. The teacher dictates some types of bacteria in S because they already have the corresponding terms in E. Then, he asks students to tell him the correct English word for “bacilo”, and they answer properly.

Dialogue: Sometimes, special things that really strike you will be said. Try to remember and write as precisely as you can what teacher/students said, if possible.
St: “¿Tenemos que copiarlo nosotros?” (Ven que el profesor empieza a dibujar una bacteria en la pizarra)
T: “Habéis entendido lo que hay que hacer?”
St (raising her hand up): “In English or Spanish?”
T: As you want
St: (answering in S): …
T (writing on the blackboard “DNA”): “Recordad, en Español es ADN” (y explica las siglas de DNA en inglés y de ADN en español sin escribirlas en la pizarra).

Roles: What roles did the teacher play? (facilitates, guides, scaffolds, keeps authority; is friendly with students; other) keeping authority and trying to make students pay attention to him

Strategies: What kind of teaching strategies were used to carry out the activities of the day? problem solving? Were games used? Any other? Trying to catch students’ attention and making them “refresh” some contents previously covered

Lesson Plan: Can you tell the teacher is following one? How? Not a real plan, sometimes clumsy/messy

Use of materials: whether appropriate to students’ need; easing the activity; fun, difficult, etc.
Book in S and one photocopy in E. When explaining concepts in E, he does not make any reference to the book.

Reflection (Lens on Self)

Here you state your thoughts and opinions about what happened at your classroom visit. You should also use this space to reflect on how the project readings inform your observations. This is also a good spot to note questions for further exploration in subsequent sessions.

The lesson seems quite clumsy/messy, as the teacher tries to catch students’ attention very often. He does not take advantage of the whole time spent on this class, too much time taken to explain concepts, but not real activities involved so that students can understand the contents better or work in pairs/groups in problem solving. Students seem to pay attention to him sometimes, mostly when he speaks in Spanish. Good group, high participation but noisy sometimes.
Appendix 3: Sample of classroom interactions

San Marcos, Science 2nd grade of CSE (11/12/2014)
[Juan Luis, the science teacher; Laura, Lucía, Marcos, Ana, Jorge, Pedro, José, students; Ss, undetermined students]

Excerpt 1. Beginning of the class. (“You should be prepared already!” 01:48 – 04:44)

1. Juan Luis: A ver (.) (por favor) cuánto tiempo llevamos aquí ya?
2. Ss: [((ruído))]
3. Juan Luis: [Vamos a ver chicos↑ >no no no no no< (.) vamos a ver (.) desde que (hemos entrado) en clase ya sabéis cómo hay que estar aquí (.) que hace falta traer dos pupitres porque es bilingüe
4. Laura: (no determinado) no me he acordado
5. Juan Luis: Es igual↑
6. Laura: Es verdad
7. Juan Luis: Es igual↑ [pero:]
8. Lucía: [porque no] tenía sitio↑
9. Juan Luis: Nunca ha ido ahí pero su sitio está ocupado está ocupado o sea da igual (.5) si ya sabéis que cuando toca bilingüe (.) hay que traer dos mesas (.) o por lo menos dos sillas (.5) eh: lo que no podemos estar es a estas horas así (1.0) [entonces]
10. Marcos: [Voy a por una silla?]
11. Juan Luis: Sí (.) vete a por una silla:
12. Ss: ((ruído))
13. Juan Luis: Si si como caber cabrás pero no hay (.8) como caber cabrás pero no hay (.) así que
15. Juan Luis: [Si tenéis] que traer dos sillas y dos mesas ya teníais que haber ido↑ (.7) no una
16. Ss: [>Yo yo yo yo<↑]
17. Ss: [((ruído))]
18. Ana: [(hay una mesa sin silla)]
19. Ss: ((ruído))
20. Juan Luis: Ok (.) sh:: (.) let’s continue (.) we:: now (.) we must finish (.) the unit (.) ok?
21. Ss: ((murmullo))
22. Juan Luis: We have (. ) read (.) sh:: ( . ) we have read (1.0) angiosperms and gymnosperms ( . ) yes?
23. Ss: ((murmullo))
24. Juan Luis: So: (1.0) we have seen (. ) how (. ) plants (. ) how angiosperms (.5) are fertilised (.5) yes? (.) so we are going to see (.5) a video (1.0) and while you are
25. Ss: ((murmullo))
26. Juan Luis: Be quiet please (1.0) be quiet please (1.0) be quiete plea:se
27. ((murmullo))
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41. Ss: [Hala↑]
42. Ss: [((murmullo))]
43. Juan Luis: Do you want to see the video >the video< (. or not?)
44. Ss: [Yes↑]
45. Ss: [Yes]
46. Juan Luis: So:: what do you have to do?
47. Ss: [Be quiet]
48. Juan Luis: [Ah::]
49. Ss: [((murmullo))]
50. Juan Luis: You know it but you (.5) don’t do it

Excerpt 2. “What are you doing?” (06:10 – 07:04)

51. Juan Luis: What are you doing? (3.0) what do you must to do?
52. (1.0)
53. Jorge: Be quiet
54. Pedro: Be quiet
55. Juan Luis: It’s simple (3.0) (I repeat) (. do you want to see the video >the video<?
56. Ss: [Ye::s↑]
57. Juan Luis: Are you sure?
58. Ss: [Ye::s↑]
59. (5.0)
60. José: Lo puedes poner (no determinado)
61. (3.5)
62. Juan Luis: Sit down proper please
63. Ss: (((murmullo))
64. Juan Luis: Be quiet
65. (11.0)
66. Juan Luis: (It doesn’t sound) sorry (2.0) I am going to (no determinado) (1.5)
67. voy a buscar una cosilla
68. (Sale del aula)
**San Teo, Biology in the 3rd grade of CSE (22/02/2016)**
[Sandra, the native teacher; Carlos, Miguel, Ana, María, students; Ss, undetermined students]

**Excerpt 1. Class revision. (“Will es voluntad”. 01:03 – 3:30)**

1. SR: In the last (1.5) class (. ) w studied the central nervous system (1.0) no?
2. María: Uhm uh
3. SR: O:
4. Ss: Yes
5. SR: Yes (.) no? (.5) there we have studied the peripheral nervous system
6. Carlos: Pero el peripheral no lo hemos (.5) estudiado
7. SR: Por eso (. ) today (.5) in the last class we studied the central nervous system (.)
8. ok (. ) to reme:ber (. ) central nervous system or CNS (. ) is formed of (. ) what?
9. Ana: The brain and the spinal cord
10. SR: The brain and the spinal cord (.5) ok the brain and the spinal cord form the
11. central nervous system (1.0) the bra::in hh is protected by:: by what?<
12. Carlos: By the skull
13. SR: By the skull (.5) or the craneon (.5) which is a:: (no determinado) of bone (.)
14. no? (.) and between the craneon and the brain (. ) there are three membranes (. ) do
15. you remember the name of the membranes?
16. Carlos: Meninges
17. SR: Meninges ( . ) and between these membranes what is there?
18. Ss: ((murmullo))
19. SR: The cerebrus vinal fluid (. ) the cerebrus vinal fluid i:s eh:: (.5) is what? (.)
20. why is it there?
21. Ss: ((murmullo))
22. Miguel: (El córtex)
23. SR: No (no determinado) vale? ( . ) no contact vale? >ok< (. ) now (. ) the brain is
24. divided (. ) into three parts (. ) the cerebrum (. ) cerebelum and the brain stem (.5) the
25. cere:brum (.5) is eh:: the biggest part (. ) no? ( . ) and it controls voluntary things (.)
26. eh: like will (.5) what’s will?
27. Carlos: Voluntad
28. SR: Voluntad (. ) no? (. ) when you decide to do something (. ) when you think about
29. it (.5) and you decide to do it (.5) controls things like language (. ) intelligence and
30. that type of thing (.5) the cerebelum (1.0) eh:: controls balance and the voluntary
31. movements ( . ) that we make ( . ) like walking running riding a bicycle ( . ) picking
32. something up


1. SR: If you think of a situation of a lot of stress (.7) in the momento (.5) do you cry?
2. ( .5) normally no no? (. ) but when you start to relax it’s when you start to cry or not?
3. Ss: Uhm uh
4. SR: Sí (. ) no? (. ) or if you are very very angry (. ) when you are >very very very
5. angry< hungry no (. ) angry
6. Ss: (((@@@))
7. SR: Normally (. ) >well sometimes you cry when you are hungry< (((@@@)) (. ) but
8. you are angry (. ) in the moment (. ) normally you don’t cry (. ) but as you body starts
9. to relax (. ) this is when you start to::
Appendix 4: Models of semi-structure interviews

Model of interview with teachers, coordinators of bilingual programmes and headmasters

1. Datos personales y trayectoria laboral:
   a. ¿Cuánto tiempo lleva en el centro?
   b. ¿Desde cuándo tiene a su cargo la coordinación/puesto como profesor-a del centro?
   c. ¿Cuál ha sido su trayectoria de aprendizaje del inglés?
   d. ¿Qué preparación ha recibido para impartir su asignatura en inglés?
   e. ¿Cuáles son los principales retos a los que se enfrenta en su trabajo?
   f. ¿Está satisfecho con su trabajo o tiene aspiraciones/iniciativas a llevar a cabo en el centro para poder completar su satisfacción?
   g. ¿Cuál es su filosofía/opinión (de la coordinación del programa bilingüe/la suya propia si es profe) de su asignatura?

2. Sobre el centro:
   a. ¿Cuál es su opinión sobre el centro? Como padre/madre y como profesor/a
   b. Como padre/madre: ¿cuál es el motivo principal de elegir este centro para su hijo? ¿Están cursando sus hijos el PB? ¿Qué opinión tiene del PB?
   c. ¿Cómo definiría a este centro?
   d. ¿Cuál ha sido la evolución del centro en los últimos años? ¿Ha ascendido su prestigio en gran medida por los programas bilingües? ¿Cuál es su composición sociodemográfica?
   e. ¿Qué retos tiene el centro en estos momentos?
   f. ¿De cuáles se siente satisfecho/a de haber superado? ¿Cuáles otros necesitan trabajarse todavía?
   g. ¿Hay competencia con otros centros? ¿Algún otro centro de CR con PB le resulta innovador y efectivo en el aprendizaje de los alumnos?

3. Sobre los programas bilingües y profesores del centro:
   a. ¿Puede hablarnos brevemente del desarrollo e implementación de los PB?:
   b. ¿Cómo se han integrado los PB en la filosofía educativa del centro? ¿Cómo y por qué se decidió incorporar al centro el programa bilingüe/las secciones lingüísticas?
   c. ¿Cuál es la motivación del centro por la apuesta de los PB de la sección lingüística?
   d. ¿Qué grado de aceptación han tenido los PB por parte del alumnado y familias? ¿Y por parte del profesorado?
   e. ¿Cree que es beneficioso para el alumno que tengan cada año diferentes materias en inglés o sería mejor que solamente se impartieran ciertas asignaturas en inglés durante toda la ESO?
   f. ¿Estaría a favor de incorporar un PB en Bachillerato?
   g. ¿Cree que los PB establecen diferencias entre profesores de inglés que enseñan a los mejores alumnos y están más preparados y aquellos otros menos capaces de abordar los retos del programa bilingüe?
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h. ¿Qué beneficios tiene el PB para las clases de inglés como lengua extranjera? ¿Algunas desventajas?
i. ¿Ha supuesto el PB una modificación o renovación de contenidos de la materia de inglés?
j. ¿Se ha notado una mayor motivación por parte del profesorado para conseguir la certificación lingüística requerida para impartir en el PB?
k. ¿Qué percepción tiene el departamento de inglés con respecto al PB y al profesorado que imparte las DNL? ¿Ha cambiado su percepción con el tiempo? ¿Por qué?
l. ¿Cómo se percibe el PB entre el resto del profesorado que enseña DNL? ¿Se nota un nivel desigual de satisfacción entre profes de PB y los de no bilingüe?
m. ¿Qué tipo de enseñanza de inglés a través del contenido se hace en el programa bilingüe?

n. ¿Se sigue el enfoque CLIL o AICLE (aprendizaje integrado de contenidos y lengua extranjeras en el centro)? Si no, ¿se ha pensado por parte del profesorado del PB o sugerido en el centro la incorporación de esta metodología? ¿Si ha oído hablar de CLIL ¿Qué retos supone CLIL para la enseñanza?
o. El British Council está actualmente formando a profesorado en CLIL o AICLE en centros de CLM, ¿habéis tenido constancia de esto? ¿Os gustaría recibir formación de este tipo? ¿Qué tipo de formación en la enseñanza bilingüe reciben los profesores?
p. ¿Qué piensa sobre no penalizar la lengua en los exámenes de materias en inglés? ¿Cree que los alumnos aprenden de esos errores lingüísticos o les preocupa más la nota final?

q. ¿Cuál es su opinión sobre los intercambios culturales como parte del PB?

4. Sobre alumnado:
   a. ¿Cree que existe una segregación de alumnado, “buenos versus malos”, según si van o no al PB?
   b. En términos generales, ¿cuál es la razón principal de que haya alumnado no bilingüe?
   c. ¿Cree que el PB va en detrimento de la educación de los estudiantes no bilingües?
   d. ¿Sus expectativas del alumnado bilingüe se cumplen? ¿Cómo son sus resultados?
   e. ¿Cuáles han sido los cambios o evolución en el alumnado desde que se implantaron los PB? ¿En qué aspectos se perciben los cambios?
   f. ¿Qué nivel de inglés tienen los alumnos de este centro? ¿Con qué nivel del Marco terminan en Bachillerato?
   g. ¿Cuántos de ellos deciden dedicarse al estudio universitario de lenguas, en concreto, la lengua inglesa?

5. Sobre el bilingüismo
   a. ¿Cómo definiría el bilingüismo de los chicos y de los profesores?
   b. ¿Qué nivel de bilingüismo se alcanza con la participación en el PB?
   c. ¿Qué hace bilingüe a este centro?
   d. ¿Cuál es su opinión sobre el bilingüismo/multilingüismo en general?
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Model of interview with students (4\textsuperscript{th} grade of CSE)

**Explain why these interviews:** we would like to know about youth’s experiences with bilingualism/bilingual programs (the idea is to let them talk).

1. **Background:** English language learning experiences (at school/outside school/any immersion English experiences?)
   a. When did you join the BP? How did you join the bilingual program at this school? Did you or your parents choose?
   b. Any requirement/test to access? (transiciones sistema educativo: primaria-secundaria, primer-segundo ciclo ESO, ESO-Bachillerato)

2. **Tell me about the idea of ‘being bilingual’**:
   a. What does being bilingual mean to you?
   b. Do you think you are bilingual? Why? /Why not?
   c. Any other ideas: what one needs to do to be bilingual; what type of linguistic resources one must have access to, etc.; what you personally do.

3. **What is your opinion about Bilingual Programs?**
   a. How are they organized? (activities and resources used)
   b. Why are there so many schools with bilingual programs nowadays?
   c. Could you tell us 3-5 things you like about the bilingual school here and 3-5 things you don’t like so much?
   d. Which CLIL subject is the most difficult/the easiest for you due to the language used?
   e. Do you have friends who attend bilingual programs in other schools? What do they say about these programs?
   f. How different do you think your experience is compared to your friends in non-bilingual schools?
   g. What do you think about your bilingual teachers? (good/bad experiences)
      a. Native teachers’ role
   h. Do you need extra support to follow the BP? (Family, additional English classes, private tutors…)
   i. How important is the bilingual program for you and your family? Why?
   j. What do you expect from the bilingual program? How can the BP influence your future?
   k. Reasons/benefits of the BP that your teachers may have emphasised

4. **Higher Education/Future expectations**:
   a. Would you like to continue with bilingual education?: Bach/University in Spain/abroad. Which studies? Why?
   b. Immersion experiences abroad: before or after university? When? Where? Why?
   c. What do you think you will use English for? (Jobs, relationships, daily communication, etc.)
   d. If you have children, will you promote bilingualism? How? (bilingual schools, speaking English to them, living in another country)
5. **Do you use English outside school in everyday life? How?** (películas en inglés, música, redes sociales (cuentas que sigues en inglés, etc.)):
   a. Leen textos (libros, narrativa, etc. o textos de trabajo) en otros idiomas / en inglés...
   b. Las series / películas se ven en VO, se ven en inglés, se hace uso de subtítulos (todas las combinaciones posibles: mismo idioma original, en castellano, etc.).
   c. Internet/Youtube/Redes Sociales en otros idiomas: qué estrategias utilizan los miembros de la familia (lengua original, traductores automáticos, consultarse entre sí...)
   d. Does any member of your family speak English or other languages?

6. **Bilingual experiences: Can you share any experiences about bilingualism with us** (trips, exchanges, penfriends...etc.)?
   a. **Linguistic immersion/exchanges:** when/how long? Where? Who did you go with? How was your experience? Language learning impact?
   b. **Friendship:** how many? How did they start? Still in touch? In which countries? Through media? Purpose: to meet new people or have boyfriend/girlfriend?

7. **Attitudes to critical stances about bilingual education:**
   a. What do you think on the following critical statements?
      i. Bilingual education simplifies contents/the level decreases
      ii. Teachers are not well prepared
      iii. Not everybody can participate: economic constraints, abilities, students with more learning difficulties, access through tests, etc.
      iv. A BP ending in 4ESO does not make sense
      v. Other comments?
   b. Would you recommend the BP to families opting to enrol their kids in this school?
Appendix 5: Model of focus group discussion with students

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION: BILINGUALISM. 3ºESO.

A) Being bilingual
   1. Definition of bilingualism: What does being bilingual mean to you?
   2. Do you think you are bilingual?

B) What is your opinion about Bilingual Programs?

C) How much do you use your English outside school in your everyday life?

D) Bilingual experiences: Can you share any experiences about bilingualism with us?

E) Future bilingual expectations: What do you expect from the BP?
Appendix 6: Transcription conventions

(Adapted from Sacks, Jefferson, & Scheglof...
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Appendix 7: Sample of interaction in interviews

Sample of interaction in interviews with teachers, coordinators of bilingual programmes and headmasters

INTERVIEW WITH GRACIELA, BP COORDINATOR IN SAN MARCOS (09/10/2015)
[Graciela (G); Ana María (AM) and Alicia (A), researchers]

1. G: Porque la Junta nos dice que todo chico que quiera [tiene que]
2. AM: [uhm uh] =
3. G: = entrar
4. AM: Uhm hu
5. G: Y la verdad es que hasta ahora tampoco tenemos [problemas]
6. AM: [Y la prueba] es un poco de todo no? [o sea::]
7. G: [De todo sí] (.) del nivel que [u::n]
8. AM: [Sí]
9. G: Tiene:: no podemos evaluar la destreza oral
10. AM: Sí
11. G: Lo que hacemos es una prueba de::
12. AM: Escrita no?
13. G: De multiple choice
14. AM: Sí
15. G: Un listening y un reading [un writing]
16. AM: [Sí]
17. G: Un texto [pequeñito]
18. AM: [Sí]
19. G: Y ya está [(no determinado)]
20. AL: [Eso se hace ahora] con el plan no? sí [(no determinado)]
21. G: [Lo hemos hecho siempre] (.5) siempre lo hemos hecho (.5) pero ahora
22. es un poco má:s
23. AM: Claro (.) [para]
24. G: [Flexible]
25. AL: Uhm uh
26. AM: [Claro]
27. G: [Más] flexible
28. AM: Claro
29. G: Pero es verdad que este año por ejemplo (.5) la demanda (.5) ha sido
30. acorde a la oferta
31. AM: Ah
32. G: Me entendéis? Yo creo que la gente hh tiene ahí criterio [los padres]
33. AL: [Uhm uh] =
34. G: = y han dicho pues soy realista [o sea sí]
35. AM: [uhm uh] =
36. G: = mi hijo
37. AM: Uhm uh
38. G: No: no va bien en inglés (.) [o va:::] 
39. AM: [Sí] = 
40. G: = Ahí (.) pues cómo le voy a meter una carga lectiva en en ciencias 
41. [o en matemáticas] 
42. AM: [uhm uh] 
43. AL: [uhm uh] 
44. AM: Uhm uh 
45. G: Para que encima [sus resultados] 
46. AM: [claro] = 
47. G: = sean peores 
48. AM: Pero en general las familias están muy motivadas no? [para] 
49. G: [Sí] = 
50. AM: = que los chicos entren en los programas [bilingües no?] 
51. G: [=sí sí sí<] muchísimo (.) lo que pasa que 
52. AM: [o te lo piden los padres?] (.) [lo piden lo piden] 
53. G: [Claro claro:] (.) te estoy…nosotros tenemos cuatro líneas (.8) y de 
54. las cuatro (.8) los bilingües (.5) [dos] 
55. AM: [Claro] = 
56. G: = Con un número mayor 
57. AM: [Sí] 
58. AL: [uhm uh] 
59. G: O sea que las dos clases bilingües tienen más gente 
60. AM: Uhm uh 
61. G: Que las que no lo son 
62. ((varios)) 
63. AM: El ratio de las bilingües dices que es mayor? [Del] 
64. G: [No] = 
65. AM: = Que tienen más gente o sea 
66. G: Es que se mezclan en las [clases] 
67. AM: [ah] = 
68. G: = en las asignaturas (.) no son clases (.) no son grupos puros 
69. AM: Ah (.) vale vale vale [ya] 
70. G: [Se] salen en las [clases] 
71. AM: [Salen] 
72. G: De inglés de ciencias y de [matemáticas] 
73. AM: Y hay más [que en las de contenido] 
74. G: [En esas clases hay más] chicos sí 
75. AM: Uhm uh 
76. G: Porque ellos quieren más y: y [haber] 
77. AM: [Claro] = 
78. G: = Tampoco puedes negarles 
79. AM: Sí 
80. AL: Y en los últimos años habéis notado un aumento de esos alumnos (.) 
81. que: (.) bueno (.) que deciden meterse por la rama de:: de los programas 
82. bilingües? [(o no lo sabes)] 
83. G: [Más o menos se mantiene] yo creo que es la tónica sí 
84. AL: Sí 
85. G: Se mantiene
INTERVIEW WITH ERNESTO, THE PHYSICS AND CHEMISTRY TEACHER IN SAN MARCOS
(11/02/2016)

[Ernesto (E); Ana María (AM) and Alicia (A), researchers]

1. E: [yo estoy] habilitado en B2 (.) pero ya digo C1
2. AL: [Claro]
3. AM: [Claro] exacto dijiste que tenías el C1
4. AL: [Sí:]
5. E: [Eso es] (.5) [Sí]
6. AM: [claro]
7. E: [Exacto]
8. AM: [Exacto] (1.0) Si sí [por eso]
9. E: [Lo que pasa] es que:: (.) la verdad (.) no sé (.5) si por otro lado dando equis
10. asignaturas o tendrás que tener u:n (1.0) no simplemente darlas (.) [tendrás]
11. AM: [si] =
12. E: = que tener un mínimo de:: no?
13. AM: Y la diferencia de en tu en tu propio desarrollo de la asignatura has notado
14. la diferencia del B2 al C1? (.) por ejemplo: a la hora de dar tus clases
15. E: Bueno lo que noto es que a mí concretamente (.) nosotros es que no somos de
16. inglés yo::
17. AM: Claro
18. E: Yo no soy de inglés (.5) entonces [eh::]
19. AM: [Sí]
20. (1.0)
21. E: Lo que pasa es que (.) yo sí que noto que:: (.) a mí dar clase y preparar la clase
22. (.5) eh: me sirve muchísimo (1.0) me sirve muchísimo (.5) claro yo: (.) cuando
23. llega:n vacaciones de navidad (1.0) unas vacaciones de una semana o más (.)
24. Semana Santa incluso (.) o verano (1.0) lo noto mucho (1.0) de hecho me tengo
25. que poner yo mismo a darme clase aquí
26. AL: @@@
27. AM: Uhm uh
28. E: En alto (1.0) claro
29. AM: Sí
30. E: Yo mismo me explico =
31. AM: = y de los recursos (.5) buenos ya nos [dijiste]
32. E: [claro] =
33. AM: = que miras por todos los lados de internet
34. E: Es que hay un montón de cosas que:: (.5) claro (.) exactamente (.5) es que
35. un coche de la vuelta (.5) dar la vuelta
36. AM: Claro
37. E: Pues generalmente en el lenguaje ordinario
38. AM: Sí
39. E: No sueles decirlo pero claro hh en física (.5) permanentemente tienes que
40. [decir]
41. AM: [claro] =
42. E: = oye hay que da la vuelta hh y cómo coño hh y cómo se dice adelantar hh [y
43. cómo]
INTERVIEW WITH MIGUEL ÁNGEL, HEAD AND SOCIAL SCIENCE TEACHER IN SAN TEO (01/04/2016)

[Miguel Ángel (MA); Ana MaríA (AM) and Alicia (A), researchers]
de otros insti compañeros que tengo en otros centros docentes en inglés y: y: comparo el bilingüismo y nosotros vamos ↑(.) yo les digo pues yo intento no hablar nada en castellano ↑ vosotros como ↑ >nada ↑<(.) hago un esquema en inglés ↑ hh nada al final de la clase ↑ >el examen ↑ < cincuenta por ciento ↑(.) o sea aquí los exámenes son totalmente en inglés(.) [no hay de hecho]

Sample of interaction in interviews with language planners and regional authorities

INTERVIEW WITH PATRICIA, THE FORMER LOCAL LANGUAGE PLANNER (10/04/2016)

[Patricia (P); Ana María (AM) and Alicia (A), researchers]

    1 PA: [eh:: fui] crítica(.) también(.) cuando estuve en la delegación >pues
    2 porque lógicamente< también pensé que es una labor que tienes que hacer(.) [si
    3 estás]
    4 AM: [uhm uh] =
    5 PA: = ahi pues habrá que:: mejorar los [aspectos]
    6 AM: [uhm uh] =
    7 PA: = que no te parecen adecuados o por lo menos dar tu opinión
    8 AM: = Uhm uh =
    9 PA: = hh eh: yo siempre he considerado que:: (.) que hay que ver(.) cómo ese
    10 (. ) profesorado (. ) eh (.) imparte esas asignaturas en inglés >es decir< el que te
    11 presenten un papel de B2 >eh< de haber hecho escuela de idiomas o Trinity o:
    12 Cambridge o: lo que sea >que todo era válido< [hh::]
    13 AM: [uhm uh] =
    14 PA: Pues eso: (.) no hace que esa persona(.)[pueda]
    15 AM: [uhm uh] =
    16 PA: = desempeñar su labo::r (.) [correctamente]
    17 AM: = [uhm uh] =
    18 PA: = en el aula: (.) impartiendo su asignatura (.) desde Ciencias Sociales o:
    19 matemá::ticas o: =
    20 AM: = uhm uh =
    21 PA: = o biología eh creo que no creo que tendría que demostrarlo(.) [como]
    22 AM: = [uhm uh] =
    23 PA: se hace en otras comunidades (no determinado) Madrid(.) cualquier eh::
    24 profesor que está en el programa bilingüe tiene que pasar por una especie de
    25 tribunal (.) [uhm uh]
    26 AM: [uhm uh] =
    27 PA: = impartiendo: una unidad didáctica ↓(.) [entonces]
    28 AM: [Uhm uh] =
    29 PA: = eh y yo creo que también como administración (.) así lo: comentábamos
    30 AM: Uhm uh
    31 PA: Como administración teníamos que ver eh:: (.) nuestros profesores (.) cómo
    32 están formados en este campo (.) no solamente a nivel lingüístico hh sino
    33 metodológicamente (.) para desarrollar su área
This appendix includes the following institutional documents:

1. Plan de Plurilingüismo (Decree 7/2014, January 22\textsuperscript{nd})
2. Plan Integral de Enseñanza de Lenguas Extranjeras de la Comunidad Autónoma de CLM (Decree 47/2017, July 25th)
4. MECD / British Council Agreement
I.- DISPOSICIONES GENERALES

Consejería de Educación, Cultura y Deportes

Decreto 7/2014, de 22/01/2014, por el que se regula el plurilingüismo en la enseñanza no universitaria en Castilla-La Mancha. [2014/897]

El aprendizaje de una o varias lenguas extranjeras –especialmente las habladas en los Estados de la Unión Europea– constituye una herramienta necesaria para el desarrollo personal y profesional de todo ciudadano que forme parte de una sociedad plural como la nuestra, atendiendo a sus intereses, deseos y aspiraciones. Las lenguas constituyen un elemento básico de identidad cultural y representan un valor fundamental de cohesión de una comunidad.

En este contexto, la Unión Europea realiza una apuesta en firme, a través de sus diversos programas educativos, en el marco de la cooperación internacional, trabajando en favor del plurilingüismo y la integración cultural.

Además, la realidad social europea, y un contexto de movilidad laboral, nos sitúan en un entorno internacional de diversidad lingüística. Esta nueva situación exige un marco educativo que atienda esta necesidad social, facilitando a los alumnos el aprendizaje de una o varias lenguas extranjeras, siguiendo para ello el marco delimitado por la Ley Orgánica 2/2006, de 3 de mayo, de Educación, cuyo artículo 2, apartado 1 j), establece como uno de sus fines, el compromiso con los objetivos europeos de mejorar la calidad y la eficacia de la educación y de la formación dentro de un marco de ciudadanía europea y donde el aprendizaje de idiomas juega un papel fundamental.

La citada Ley, en su artículo 102.3, referido a la Formación Permanente, propone que las Administraciones educativas promuevan la formación en lenguas extranjeras de todos los profesores, con independencia de su especialidad, estableciendo programas específicos de formación en este ámbito.

Además, la Ley Orgánica 8/2013, de 9 de diciembre, para la Mejora de la Calidad Educativa, en su artículo único, apartado ciento nueve, modifica la Ley Orgánica 2/2006, mediante la adición de la disposición final séptima bis en la que se prevé la relevancia de la educación plurilingüe en las diversas etapas educativas.

De conformidad con lo establecido en el artículo 37.1 del Estatuto de Autonomía, corresponde a la Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha la competencia de desarrollo legislativo y ejecución de la enseñanza en toda su extensión, niveles, grados, modalidades y especialidades, de acuerdo con lo dispuesto en el artículo 27 de la Constitución y las Leyes Orgánicas que, conforme al artículo 81 de la misma, lo desarrollen.

El artículo 147 de Ley 7/2010, de 20 de julio, de Educación en Castilla-La Mancha, regula las Secciones Bilingües y establece de manera expresa que en ellas se impartirá en una lengua extranjera áreas y materias no lingüísticas mediante el aprendizaje integral de contenidos y lenguas.

En ejercicio de estas competencias y con el fin de facilitar el aprendizaje de las lenguas extranjeras, el Gobierno Regional de Castilla-La Mancha ha destinado en los últimos años sus esfuerzos a afianzar un sistema educativo de calidad, mediante la implantación de las secciones bilingües, que asegure a los alumnos la adquisición de las competencias básicas necesarias para desenvolverse en la sociedad actual, facilitar el acceso a una formación integral, favorecer el intercambio cultural y lingüístico, prepararlos en aquellas competencias y habilidades que precisan la economía y sociedad europeas para ser competitiva e innovadora, así como promover su empleabilidad y su visión emprendedora.

Siguiendo las directrices y recomendaciones del Consejo de Europa y la Comisión Europea, la Administración educativa de Castilla-La Mancha adquiere el compromiso de dar respuesta a la creciente demanda de nuestra sociedad con el objetivo de reforzar la dimensión comunicativa, completar la implantación de programas bilingües en los centros educativos de la Región, y facilitar la formación de los profesores en la adquisición de la competencia lingüística necesaria y en la metodología específica que exige la aplicación de los programas de enseñanza bilingüe.

La Orden de 23/04/2007, por la que se modifica la Orden de 07/02/2005, por la que se crea el Programa de Secciones Europeas con el objeto de promover modelos educativos bilingües en los centros docentes en la Comunidad Autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha se ve superada por la Orden de 13/03/2008, de la Consejería de Educación y Ciencia, por la que se regula el desarrollo del Programa de Secciones Europeas en los centros públicos de Educación Infantil, Primaria y
Secundaria de la Comunidad Autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha. Las Secciones Europeas a que aluden las citadas Ordenes, han pasado a ser Secciones Bilingües con la regulación contenida en el artículo 147 de la Ley 7/2010, de 20 de julio, de Educación de Castilla-La Mancha.

Tras la experiencia acumulada, el Gobierno Regional ha considerado necesario implantar un programa más amplio del plurilingüismo, a través del Plan Integral de Plurilingüismo, donde se incorporarán las Secciones Bilingües existentes en la actualidad y se irán incorporando todos aquellos centros que reúnan los requisitos establecidos en este Decreto. Partiendo de la normativa actual, se persigue dar un paso más para establecer un programa integral en lenguas extranjeras en Castilla-La Mancha, que contemple la continuidad de los centros existentes inmersos en programas lingüísticos en otros idiomas y que articule un procedimiento de implantación de nuevas acciones.

El Plan Integral de Plurilingüismo se estructura en los Programas de Iniciación Lingüística, Programas de Desarrollo Lingüístico y Programas de Excelencia Lingüística. En cada uno de estos programas se irán incluyendo de un modo progresivo las actuales Secciones Bilingües.

En el procedimiento de elaboración de este Decreto ha intervenido la Mesa Sectorial de Educación y ha emitido dictamen el Consejo Escolar de Castilla-La Mancha.

En su virtud, a propuesta del Consejero de Educación, Cultura y Deportes, de acuerdo con el Consejo Consultivo de Castilla-La Mancha y, previa deliberación del Consejo de Gobierno en su reunión de 22 de enero de 2014, dispongo,

Artículo 1. Objeto.

Este Decreto tiene por objeto regular el plurilingüismo en la enseñanza no universitaria, mediante la implantación progresiva del Plan Integral de Plurilingüismo.

Artículo 2. Ámbito de aplicación.

1. Este Decreto será de aplicación en los centros docentes públicos no universitarios de la Comunidad Autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha que imparten enseñanzas en las etapas de Educación Infantil, Educación Primaria, Educación Secundaria Obligatoria, Bachillerato y Formación Profesional.

2. Los centros docentes privados concertados que imparten las etapas citadas en el apartado anterior podrán acogerse, dentro del ámbito de su autonomía, a lo dispuesto en este Decreto y cuantas normas lo desarrollen.


1. El Plan Integral de Plurilingüismo es el conjunto de actuaciones con el que la Consejería con competencias en materia de educación da respuesta a las necesidades de formación lingüística y metodológica del alumnado y del profesorado con el objetivo de favorecer y desarrollar el aprendizaje de las lenguas extranjeras.

2. El Plan Integral de Plurilingüismo está integrado por los siguientes programas:

   a) Programa de Iniciación Lingüística. En este nivel se pretende que los centros educativos puedan comenzar una aproximación al itinerario lingüístico.

   b) Programa de Desarrollo Lingüístico. En este nivel se encuentran los centros educativos que afianzan el proyecto inicial, a través del enriquecimiento curricular de contenidos y lenguas extranjeras.

   c) Programa de Excelencia Lingüística. Este nivel da respuesta a los centros educativos que consolidan la oferta curricular en el mayor número posible de disciplinas no lingüísticas en, al menos, una lengua extranjera.

3. Es prescriptiva la progresión del Programa de Iniciación Lingüística al Programa de Desarrollo Lingüístico. Con respecto al Programa de Excelencia Lingüística, la Consejería con competencias en materia de educación establecerá mediante Orden los requisitos necesarios para llevarlo a cabo.

4. Todos los programas se concretarán en los centros a través de sus respectivos Proyectos Lingüísticos de Centro (PLC), que serán incluidos en el Proyecto Educativo.

1. Se considerarán centros bilingües los centros docentes de Educación Infantil, Educación Primaria, Educación Secundaria Obligatoria, Bachillerato y Formación Profesional que implanten uno de los Programas Lingüísticos incluidos en el Plan Integral de Plurilingüismo de Castilla-La Mancha.

La incorporación de los Centros al Plan Integral de Plurilingüismo se hará de acuerdo con el procedimiento que establezca la Consejería competente en materia de educación.

2. Los centros bilingües promoverán la adquisición y el desarrollo de las competencias lingüísticas de los alumnos en relación con las destrezas de escuchar, hablar, conversar, leer y escribir, mediante el aprendizaje integrado de contenidos y lenguas extranjeras.

3. Los centros bilingües deberán reunir los siguientes requisitos:

a) Disponer de profesores acreditados con un nivel mínimo B2 del Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas, para impartir las Disciplinas No Lingüísticas (en adelante DNL) en la lengua extranjera de la enseñanza bilingüe. Se consideran DNL las asignaturas, áreas, materias o módulos que utilizan una o varias lenguas extranjeras como medio de comunicación para transmitir conocimientos no lingüísticos.

b) El número de profesores que cumplan los requisitos a que se refiere este apartado será el necesario para garantizar la impartición del horario establecido en los distintos programas y planes de estudio para cada DNL que se imparta en la lengua extranjera elegida, de acuerdo con la ratio alumno / unidad establecida para cada etapa educativa.

4. Los centros bilingües tienen los siguientes deberes:

a) Asegurar que los alumnos puedan cursar sus estudios por medio de Disciplinas No Lingüísticas.

b) Impartir las DNL en alguna lengua extranjera en Educación Infantil, Educación Primaria, Educación Secundaria Obligatoria, Bachillerato o Formación Profesional.

Artículo 5. Plantilla de profesorado de los centros bilingües.

1. La Consejería competente en materia de Educación aplicará a los centros bilingües los criterios sobre definición de la plantilla orgánica y de funcionamiento de profesorado establecidos con carácter general para el resto de centros docentes públicos, con las especificaciones que se establecen en el presente artículo.

2. Para la impartición de las DNL, los centros bilingües contarán en su plantilla con puestos de carácter bilingüe.

3. Cada curso escolar serán determinados por la Dirección General competente en la materia los puestos de carácter bilingüe necesarios para cada uno de los centros que se incorporen a alguno de los programas del Plan. La Consejería con competencias en materia de educación catalogará lingüísticamente los puestos de trabajo en los centros públicos con la finalidad de garantizar la continuidad de los programas.

4. Los puestos con perfil lingüístico que se determinen serán ocupados de acuerdo con los procedimientos de provisión, tanto provisionales como definitivos. A tales efectos, los profesores que accedan a dichos puestos deberán tener acreditado un nivel mínimo B2, según el Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas.

5. Los profesores que ocupen los puestos con perfil lingüístico garantizarán la impartición de las DNL en los cursos y etapas educativas donde se haya implantado la enseñanza bilingüe, sin perjuicio de que pueda completar su horario con otras enseñanzas atendiendo a lo establecido en la organización y funcionamiento de los centros educativos.

Artículo 6. Reconocimiento y certificación.

La Consejería con competencia en materia de educación establecerá el procedimiento para el reconocimiento y la certificación de méritos a los profesores que participan en los programas lingüísticos.
Artículo 7.- Plan de formación.

1. La Consejería competente en materia de Educación desarrollará un plan de formación, con la colaboración, en su caso, de otras instituciones, que garantice que el personal docente de los centros educativos de Castilla-La Mancha pueda alcanzar una competencia oral y escrita suficiente para comunicarse y para desarrollar su actividad profesional en una segunda lengua extranjera.

2. La Administración educativa facilitará a los profesores participantes formación de acuerdo a la disponibilidad, necesidades de los centros y de los propios profesores. Dicha formación irá encaminada a mejorar, tanto la competencia lingüística de los profesores, como la actualización metodológica y pedagógica que requieran. Para ello, el Centro Regional de Formación del Profesorado utilizará la estructura existente en la Comunidad Autónoma de Escuelas Oficiales de Idiomas, Centros de Educación de Personas Adultas, así como posibles programas lingüísticos de movilidad y cualquier otra actuación formativa que la Administración educativa considere pertinente.

Artículo 8. Participación de los alumnos.

1. En Educación Infantil y en Educación Primaria, la oferta de enseñanza en lengua extranjera del centro será para todos los alumnos de los cursos en los que esté implantado. Los centros adoptarán las medidas necesarias para que, si hubiera alumnos de nueva incorporación al centro, éstos progresen de forma adecuada.

2. En Educación Secundaria Obligatoria, Bachillerato y Formación Profesional, la incorporación de los alumnos al Programa Lingüístico será voluntaria. Los centros educativos se regirán por la normativa vigente en el procedimiento general de admisión, según los requisitos establecidos por el Órgano Gestor.

Artículo 9. Alumnos con necesidades específicas de apoyo educativo.

La Administración adaptará la oferta formativa dirigida a los alumnos con necesidades específicas de apoyo educativo al Plan Integral de Plurilingüismo, de manera que asegure su capacitación lingüística.

Artículo 10. Seguimiento y evaluación de los programas bilingües.

Con carácter general, y sin perjuicio de las funciones propias de la Inspección de Educación, la Consejería competente en materia de educación, a través de la Dirección General correspondiente, realizará anualmente el seguimiento de las medidas desarrolladas en relación con los programas bilingües. En este sentido, establecerá un sistema de evaluación que permita realizar un diagnóstico riguroso y transparente de la aplicación de los programas. Sus resultados servirán para la decisión de las posibles modificaciones que se estimen adecuadas del programa de aplicación en cada centro, con el objetivo de mejorar su desarrollo.

Disposición adicional. Garantía de puestos con perfil lingüístico.

La Administración garantizará a los centros que vayan incorporándose al Plan Integral de Plurilingüismo que éstos contarán con puestos con perfil lingüístico en sus plantillas.

Disposición transitoria. Incorporación de Secciones bilingües a los Programas.

Los centros que en el curso académico 2013-2014 cuenten con una Sección Bilingüe en su centro, pasarán a integrarse en uno de los Programas descritos en el presente Decreto con fecha 01/09/2014.

Disposición derogatoria. Derogación normativa

Queda derogada la Orden de 13/03/2008, de la Consejería de Educación y Ciencia por la que se regula el desarrollo del programa de Secciones Europeas en los centros públicos de Educación Infantil, Primaria y Secundaria de la Comunidad Autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha, en aquello que contradiga a este Decreto, hasta que se produzca el desarrollo del mismo.

Disposición final primera. Desarrollo.

La Consejería competente en materia de educación adoptará cuantas disposiciones sean necesarias para el desarrollo y ejecución de este Decreto.
Disposición final segunda. Entrada en vigor.

El presente Decreto entrará en vigor el día siguiente al de su publicación en el Diario Oficial de Castilla-La Mancha.

Dado en Toledo, el 22 de enero de 2014

La Presidenta
MARÍA DOLORES DE COSPEDAL GARCÍA

El Consejero de Educación, Cultura y Deportes
MARCIAL MARÍN HELLÍN
I.- DISPOSICIONES GENERALES

Consejería de Educación, Cultura y Deportes

Decreto 47/2017, de 25 de julio, por el que se regula el plan integral de enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras de la comunidad autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha para etapas educativas no universitarias. [2017/9118]

En el año 2010 la Comisión Europea estableció para todos los países miembros de la Unión Europea cinco objetivos cuantificables a alcanzar al término de la década, uno de ellos, referido a la Educación.

La Comisión Europea para catalizar los avances en cada uno de los objetivos propone siete iniciativas emblemáticas. En referencia a la educación se establece una iniciativa llamada «Juventud en movimiento» destinada a ayudar a los jóvenes a adquirir los conocimientos, las capacidades y la experiencia que necesitan para que su primer trabajo se convierta en realidad. Juventud en Movimiento forma parte de Europa 2020, la nueva estrategia de la UE, y propone veintiocho acciones clave cuyo objetivo es hacer que la educación y la formación se ajusten mejor a las necesidades de los jóvenes y animar a que un mayor número de ellos aprovechen las becas de la UE para estudiar o formarse en otro país. Todo ello aumentará la empleabilidad de los jóvenes y mejorará su acceso al mercado laboral.

La Unión Europea ha designado como una importante prioridad el aprendizaje de lenguas y por ello financia numerosos programas y proyectos en este ámbito como parte de sus esfuerzos para promover la movilidad y el entendimiento intercultural. Para la Unión Europea el multilingüismo es un elemento importante de la competitividad europea. Por lo tanto, uno de los objetivos de la política lingüística de la Unión Europea es que todo ciudadano europeo domine otros dos idiomas, además de su lengua materna. Para conseguirlo, propone a los estados miembros que en sus sistemas educativos correspondientes se tenga la posibilidad de aprender dos lenguas extranjeras desde una edad temprana.

En el ámbito nacional, la Constitución española de 1978, en su artículo 27, establece que la educación tendrá por objeto el pleno desarrollo de la personalidad humana en el respeto a los principios democráticos de convivencia y a los derechos y libertades fundamentales. Por este motivo, el fomento del aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras es una gran oportunidad para desarrollar una sociedad abierta, respetuosa con la diversidad cultural y preparada para la cooperación.

La Ley Orgánica 8/2013, de 9 de diciembre, para la mejora de la calidad educativa, que modifica la Ley Orgánica 2/2006, de 3 de mayo, de Educación, indica en el preámbulo que debido al proceso de globalización en que vivimos, el dominio de una segunda o, incluso, una tercera lengua extranjera se ha convertido en una prioridad para la política lingüística de la Unión Europea en primer lugar, y en segundo lugar para las administraciones educativas en general.

Así mismo el artículo 102.3 de la Ley Orgánica 2/2006, de 3 de mayo, pone en manos de las administraciones educativas la promoción de la formación en lenguas extranjeras del profesorado, así como el reconocimiento de su trabajo impartiendo docencia en lengua extranjera en centros bilingües (art 105.2 b).

Teniendo en cuenta las orientaciones normativas europeas citadas anteriormente, la Ley 7/2010, de 20 de julio, de Educación de Castilla-La Mancha, establece en el artículo 147, que el Gobierno Regional a través de la consejería competente en materia de educación impulsará la creación de enseñanzas integradas de contenidos y lengua extranjera en los centros docentes, ya que estas constituyen una herramienta valiosa para el desarrollo del plurilingüismo y los valores de convivencia e interculturalidad.

El Programa de Secciones Europeas se inició en el año 2005, mediante la aprobación de la Orden de 07/02/2005, de creación del Programa de Secciones Europeas con el objeto de promover modelos educativos bilingües en los centros docentes en la comunidad autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha. Con posterioridad, esta materia ha sido regulada mediante la Orden de 13/03/2008, de la Consejería de Educación y Ciencia, que regulaba el desarrollo del Programa de Secciones Europeas en los centros públicos de Educación Infantil, Primaria y Secundaria de la comunidad autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha, la Ley 7/2010, de 20 de julio, de Educación de Castilla-La Mancha y el Decreto 7/2014, de 22 de enero, por el que se regula el plurilingüismo en la enseñanza no universitaria en Castilla-La Mancha.

El aprendizaje de idiomas desde edades tempranas se convierte en una prioridad en nuestra comunidad autónoma y por ello, ya el Decreto 67/2007, de 29 de mayo, por el que se establece y ordena el currículo del segundo ciclo de Edu-
El Decreto 54/2014, de 10 de julio, establece el currículo de Educación Primaria en la comunidad autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha, que el alumnado adquiera, en al menos una lengua extranjera, la competencia comunicativa básica que le permita expresar y comprender mensajes sencillos y desenvolverse en situaciones cotidianas. En el artículo 14, sobre el aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras, se indica que la lengua castellana solo se utilizará como apoyo en el proceso de aprendizaje de la lengua extranjera, priorizando la comprensión y la expresión oral y además establece medidas de flexibilización y alternativas metodológicas en la enseñanza y evaluación de la lengua extranjera para el alumnado con discapacidad, en especial para quienes presenten dificultades en su comunicación oral.

El Decreto 40/2015, de 15 de junio, establece el currículo de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria y Bachillerato en la comunidad autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha, da la posibilidad al alumnado de estas etapas de estudiar al menos dos lenguas extranjeras y a partir de 4º de la ESO, hasta tres lenguas extranjeras.

En relación con la Formación Profesional, el aprendizaje de idiomas también es, para esta etapa educativa, un área prioritaria, tal y como se establece en la Ley Orgánica 5/2002, de 19 de junio, de las Cualificaciones y de la Formación Profesional. Además, en el artículo 3. h) del Real Decreto 1147/2011, de 29 de julio, por el que se establece la ordenación general de la Formación Profesional del sistema educativo, se dispone como objetivo general la utilización de lenguas extranjeras necesarias en su actividad profesional.

La importancia dada a los idiomas en la normativa de ámbito nacional, se traslada también a la normativa de nuestra comunidad. De esta manera, tanto el Decreto 55/2014, de 10/07/2014, por el que se regula la formación Profesional Básica en Castilla-La Mancha como los Decretos de currículo de Formación Profesional Básica, Formación Profesional de Grado Medio y de Grado Superior respectivamente hacen hincapié en la aproximación y uso de las lenguas extranjeras.

Por tanto, la Administración Educativa regional desde su capacidad de desarrollo normativo, teniendo en cuenta lo estipulado en la normativa estatal y europea, y aportaciones de los distintos miembros de la comunidad educativa y la experiencia acumulada en la implantación de programas bilingües en nuestra región, considera necesario dar un nuevo impulso al aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras, basado en el desarrollo de los currículos ordinarios por parte de los especialistas e incorporando las disciplinas no lingüísticas, no solo como un espacio de mejora de las competencias comunicativas a través de los contenidos propios de las mismas, sino también como un medio más de exposición a la lengua extranjera en un contexto normalizado potenciando así el aprendizaje relacional por encima del meramente memorístico.

Para ello, la formación del profesorado en materia de aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras, así como su formación didáctica y metodológica, aplicada a la enseñanza de idiomas en general y a los programas de enseñanza bilingüe en particular, es una prioridad del actual Gobierno regional. Por ello, desde el Gobierno regional se quiere definir un plan integral formativo para los docentes implicados de una u otra forma en el desarrollo de la enseñanza de las lenguas en los centros educativos castellano-manchegos.

Queda argumentado que este nuevo decreto se basa en lo establecido en los desarrollos normativos de las etapas educativas a las que va dirigido, siendo la seguridad jurídica que otorga esta nueva reglamentación, esencial para la consecución de los objetivos previstos. Con posterioridad a la entrada en vigor de este Decreto, y teniendo en cuenta el principio de eficiencia y proporcionalidad se desarrollará la normativa complementaria pertinente buscando el máximo aprovechamiento y racionalización de los recursos en aras de la consecución de los objetivos marcados en este Decreto.

Este decreto tiene como objetivos la consolidación de los resultados obtenidos a través de los actuales programas lingüísticos, pero unificando los modelos para garantizar la equidad y la igualdad de oportunidades, así como el desarrollo de una nueva normativa que repercuta positivamente por un lado, en la enseñanza de las lenguas extranjeras a través de las enseñanzas integradas de contenidos y lengua extranjera y, por otro lado, en el estudio de una segunda lengua extranjera desde edades tempranas.

En el procedimiento de elaboración de este decreto ha intervenido la Mesa Sectorial de Educación y ha emitido dictamen el Consejo Escolar de Castilla-La Mancha.
En su virtud, a propuesta del Consejero de Educación, Cultura y Deportes, de acuerdo con el Consejo Consultivo de Castilla-La Mancha y, previa deliberación del Consejo de Gobierno en su reunión de 25 de julio de 2017, dispongo:

Capítulo I. Disposiciones Generales. Objeto y ámbito de aplicación

Artículo 1. Objeto.

Este decreto tiene como finalidad establecer el marco normativo para las actuaciones de la consejería competente en materia de educación y en lenguas extranjeras en las etapas educativas no universitarias, dentro del Plan Integral de Enseñanza de Lenguas Extranjeras de la comunidad autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha.

Artículo 2. Ámbito de aplicación.

Este decreto es de aplicación en todos los centros docentes no universitarios sostenidos con fondos públicos de la comunidad autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha que impartan enseñanzas en el segundo ciclo de Educación Infantil, Educación Primaria, Educación Secundaria Obligatoria, Bachillerato y Formación Profesional Básica, de Grado Medio y de Grado Superior.


1. El Plan Integral de Enseñanza de Lenguas Extranjeras lo conforman una serie de iniciativas que pretenden mejorar las competencias comunicativas, en al menos una lengua extranjera, del alumnado de cualquier etapa educativa de las citadas en el artículo anterior que curse sus estudios en la comunidad autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha.

2. El objetivo central de este plan es el de crear una red de centros con proyectos bilingües o plurilingües que, a través de la enseñanza integrada de contenidos y lenguas extranjeras, den respuesta a las demandas del alumnado no universitario de la región en lo que se refiere a su formación lingüística, complementando el trabajo de los docentes especialistas en lenguas extranjeras desarrollado a través de sus currículos ordinarios.

3. La consejería competente en materia de educación promoverá el desarrollo de actividades educativas y de inmersión lingüística destinadas al alumnado de centros con proyectos bilingües o plurilingües, para complementar el trabajo realizado en las aulas.

4. La consejería competente en materia de educación impulsará medidas para introducir el aprendizaje de una segunda lengua extranjera desde edades tempranas.

5. Así mismo, la consejería competente en materia de educación elaborará un Plan de Formación específico para docentes que presten, o sean susceptibles de prestar, sus servicios en centros con proyectos bilingüe o plurilingüe, con el fin de garantizar la calidad y posibilitar la actualización lingüística y, sobre todo, metodológica de los mismos.

Capítulo II. Consideración de centros bilingües y plurilingües. Requisitos, incorporación e implantación.


Tendrán la consideración de centros bilingües los colegios de Educación Infantil y Primaria, los institutos de Educación Secundaria, los centros de Formación Profesional y las escuelas de arte que impartan determinadas áreas, materias o módulos profesionales no lingüísticos de una o varias etapas educativas, de las referidas en este decreto en una lengua extranjera.

Artículo 5. Centros plurilingües.

Tendrán la consideración de centros plurilingües los institutos de Educación Secundaria, los centros de Formación Profesional y las escuelas de arte que impartan determinadas materias o módulos profesionales no lingüísticos de una o varias etapas educativas en dos lenguas extranjeras, teniendo siempre una de ellas una carga lectiva predominante sobre la otra.

Artículo 6. Metodología de trabajo.

Todos los centros con proyectos bilingües o plurilingües promoverán la adquisición y desarrollo de las diferentes destrezas comunicativas en la lengua o lenguas seleccionadas, a través del aprendizaje integrado de contenidos y lengua extranjera.
Artículo 7. Incorporación de centros.

1. La incorporación de centros a la red de centros bilingües o plurilingües de Castilla-La Mancha se hará mediante convocatoria publicada al efecto por la consejería competente en materia de educación.

2. La solicitud de incorporación será presentada por la dirección del centro, a propuesta del equipo directivo, del claustro, o de cualquiera de los sectores representados en el Consejo Escolar.

3. La solicitud presentada por el centro tendrá que ir acompañada de una propuesta de implantación del proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe que incluirá los aspectos organizativos y metodológicos sobre los que se fundamentará el mismo. Dicha solicitud será aprobada en Consejo Escolar, previa aprobación por mayoría de los miembros del claustro que imparten docencia en la etapa educativa o ciclo formativo para el que se solicita el proyecto en los casos de centros de Educación Secundaria y Formación Profesional, o por mayoría del claustro en su totalidad en centros de Educación Infantil y primaria. Una vez presentada, la consejería competente en materia de educación resolverá teniendo en cuenta la idoneidad, coherencia, necesidad y viabilidad del proyecto, además de su adecuación a lo establecido en este decreto.

4. Los centros que provengan del modelo anterior de programas lingüísticos tendrán que solicitar la adaptación al nuevo modelo mediante el procedimiento que se establezca en la convocatoria, o comunicar la renuncia a los proyectos bilingües garantizando, en todo caso, que el alumnado que inició una etapa educativa en un programa lingüístico pueda terminarla dentro del modelo bilingüe.

5. El número mínimo de alumnos para la solicitud o continuidad de un proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe será de doce por cada nivel educativo. Este requisito podrá flexibilizarse por las especiales condiciones de centros ubicados en zonas rurales o por la especial consideración de las enseñanzas de formación profesional.

6. No obstante, la Dirección General competente en materia de enseñanza de idiomas podrá proponer, a través de las sucesivas convocatorias de incorporación de centros, la implantación de nuevos proyectos bilingües para garantizar la continuidad de estas enseñanzas entre las etapas de Educación Primaria y Educación Secundaria Obligatoria dentro de una localidad o zona concreta. En estos casos, la propuesta habrá de ser aceptada y aprobada por el Claustro y el Consejo Escolar.

Artículo 8. Autorización y modificación.

1. Los centros bilingües o plurilingües deberán cumplir con todos los requisitos establecidos en este decreto, siendo necesaria en todo caso la autorización expresa por parte de la consejería competente en materia de educación.

2. La autorización se hará de manera independiente para cada una de las etapas educativas y ciclos formativos.

3. Con carácter general se autorizará un único proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe por etapa educativa o ciclo formativo. Excepcionalmente, en centros de enseñanza secundaria, la consejería competente en materia de educación podrá autorizar más de un proyecto por etapa siempre que el planteamiento propuesto esté motivado, integrado en el proyecto educativo del centro, sea viable y acorde con la demanda de la localidad. En estos casos, los proyectos deberán cumplir con los requisitos establecidos por la normativa de manera independiente.

4. Los proyectos bilingües y plurilingües se integrarán dentro del Proyecto Educativo del Centro y tendrán una vigencia mínima de cuatro cursos escolares, sin perjuicio de lo dispuesto en el artículo once, que se prorrogarán de forma automática si no hubiese comunicación en contra por parte del centro. La modificación de las condiciones del proyecto habrá de solicitarse a la Consejería, en los plazos y términos previstos en la orden de desarrollo, durante el último curso de vigencia del proyecto. En todo caso será necesaria la autorización de la Dirección General competente en materia de enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras para la implementación de dichos cambios.

Artículo 9. Incorporación y adaptación de centros a los proyectos bilingües y plurilingües.

1. Para los centros de nueva incorporación la implantación se hará de forma progresiva desde el primer curso de cada etapa educativa o ciclo formativo, salvo en Educación Infantil donde la implantación se realizará de forma simultánea en toda la etapa.

2. Para los centros que provengan de los anteriores programas lingüísticos, la implantación continuará desde el nivel en el que se encontrara el programa lingüístico.
Artículo 10. Abandono del proyecto.

1. La dirección del centro podrá solicitar el abandono del proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe dentro del cuarto curso escolar desde su autorización o desde su última revisión. Dicha solicitud deberá contar con la aprobación por mayoría del Claustro y del Consejo Escolar.

2. La solicitud deberá estar motivada y requerirá de resolución expresa de la consejería competente en materia de educación que se hará efectiva en el curso siguiente.

3. Una vez autorizado el abandono, el centro deberá garantizar al alumnado de Educación Primaria y secundaria obligatoria la finalización de la etapa dentro del proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe.

Artículo 11. Revocación de la autorización.

1. La consejería competente en materia de educación podrá, mediante resolución, revocar a un centro la autorización para desarrollar un proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe en los siguientes supuestos:

   a) Cuando durante dos cursos escolares consecutivos el centro no cumpla con los requisitos exigidos por este decreto.
   b) Cuando, previo informe del servicio de inspección, se ponga de manifiesto que existen anomalías en el desarrollo del proyecto que desvirtúan de forma grave las condiciones en las que fue autorizado.

2. La revocación de autorización surtirá sus efectos a partir del curso siguiente al que se haya producido, debiéndose garantizar al alumnado de Educación Primaria y Secundaria Obligatoria la finalización de la etapa dentro del proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe.

Capítulo III. Estructura de los proyectos en las diferentes etapas educativas.


Los centros con proyecto bilingüe de segundo ciclo Educación Infantil y Primaria impartirán en la lengua extranjera elegida un mínimo de 200 minutos en cada uno de los niveles de Educación Infantil y un mínimo de un 25% y un máximo del 50% del total del horario lectivo en cada uno de los niveles de Educación Primaria.


Los centros con proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe en Educación Secundaria Obligatoria impartirán en la lengua o lenguas extranjeras elegidas un mínimo de un 30% y un máximo de un 50% del total del horario lectivo de cada uno de los niveles de la etapa.


Los centros con proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe en Bachillerato impartirán en la lengua o lenguas extranjeras elegidas un mínimo de un 20% y un máximo de un 50% del total del horario lectivo de cada uno de los niveles de la etapa.


Los centros con proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe en Formación Profesional Básica, de Grado Medio o Grado Superior impartirán en la lengua o lenguas extranjeras elegidas un mínimo de un 20% y un máximo de un 50% del total del horario lectivo de cada uno de los niveles.

Artículo 16. Condiciones específicas de lengua francesa, alemana o italiana.

En la etapa de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria los institutos con proyectos bilingües o plurilingües que utilicen las lenguas francesa, alemana o italiana, siendo estas ofertadas como segunda lengua extranjera, podrán ampliar su horario semanal general, hasta en dos periodos lectivos destinados a estas materias, siempre y cuando no suponga costes extraordinarios para el alumnado y sus familias.

Dicha modificación deberá contar con la aprobación del Consejo Escolar y la autorización expresa de la consejería competente en materia de educación que regulará además el proceso de solicitud.
En estos casos, el cómputo del porcentaje de exposición a la lengua extranjera previsto en el artículo 13 se hará sobre el horario general del centro y no sobre el horario ampliado.

Artículo 17. Oferta de áreas, materias o módulos.

La oferta de los proyectos bilingües y plurilingües en cada una de las etapas educativas deberá ceñirse a los siguientes requisitos:

a) En Educación Primaria será obligatoria la impartición en lengua extranjera, al menos, de un área a elegir entre Ciencias Naturales, Ciencias Sociales o Matemáticas.

b) En Educación Secundaria Obligatoria se impartirá en lengua extranjera, al menos, una materia a elegir entre las troncales generales o de opción.

c) En el resto de etapas educativas, la oferta de áreas, materias o módulos será abierta, siempre que estos tengan la consideración de no lingüísticos.

Artículo 18. Oferta de áreas, materias o módulos en centros.

Los centros educativos incluirán en su propuesta de organización del proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe las áreas materias o módulos que serán impartidos en lengua extranjera, teniendo en cuenta lo establecido en el artículo anterior. Dicha propuesta, una vez aprobada y con carácter general, tendrá una vigencia mínima de cuatro cursos escolares.


La consejería competente en materia de educación fomentará el contacto entre los centros de Educación Infantil, Primaria y Secundaria Obligatoria ubicados en las mismas zonas de influencia para favorecer la coordinación entre los proyectos y facilitar el paso del alumnado de una etapa a otra.

Capítulo IV. Participación del alumnado.

Artículo 20. Participación del alumnado con carácter obligatorio.

La enseñanza en lengua extranjera en Educación Infantil y Educación Primaria, así como en los Ciclos Formativos de Grado Superior autorizados, será obligatoria para todo el alumnado matriculado en los cursos en los que el proyecto bilingüe se encuentre implantado.

Los centros tendrán que adoptar todas las medidas necesarias para garantizar el éxito del alumnado que tenga una incorporación tardía, así como del alumnado con necesidades específicas de apoyo educativo.


1. La incorporación a los proyectos bilingües o plurilingües del alumnado en Educación Secundaria Obligatoria, Bachillerato y Formación Profesional Básica o de Grado Medio tendrá carácter voluntario y se producirá desde el inicio de la etapa.

2. Los consejos orientadores reflejarán la recomendación del equipo docente respecto a la incorporación, continuidad o abandono del proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe. Dicha recomendación no tendrá carácter vinculante para el alumnado y sus familias.

3. Cuando un alumno solicite su incorporación tardía a un proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe dentro de las etapas de participación voluntaria se requerirá informe del departamento de la lengua extranjera implicada que manifieste que la competencia lingüística del mismo es suficiente para que dicha incorporación se produzca con garantías de éxito.

Artículo 22. Permanencia o abandono del proyecto.

1. El alumnado deberá permanecer en el proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe hasta la finalización de la etapa. No obstante, el alumno o alumna, si son mayores de edad o su familia en el caso de ser menores de edad, podrán solicitar a la dirección del centro, a lo largo del último trimestre, de forma motivada, el abandono del mismo a la finalización del curso escolar. Dicho abandono deberá contar con el visto bueno de la dirección del centro.
2. Solamente a criterio de la junta de evaluación, debidamente motivado, y cuando esta entienda que la continuidad en el proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe pueda poner en grave riesgo la evolución del alumno en la etapa, podrá proponer la salida del mismo en la primera evaluación que se hará efectiva en el inicio del segundo trimestre.

Artículo 23. Continuidad en etapas obligatorias.

La Administración arbitrará las medidas necesarias para garantizar, a los alumnos y alumnas que así lo decidan, la continuidad en un proyecto bilingüe entre las etapas de segundo ciclo de Educación Infantil, Educación Primaria y Educación Secundaria Obligatoria.


La agrupación del alumnado se realizará con carácter general en grupos heterogéneos en aquellas materias o módulos que no se impartan en lengua extranjera.

Capítulo V. Plantillas y profesorado.

Artículo 25. Competencia lingüística de los docentes. Otros requisitos de formación.

1. Las áreas, materias o módulos no lingüísticos vinculados a los proyectos bilingües o plurilingües serán impartidos por profesorado que acredite un nivel de competencia lingüística de, al menos, B2 según el Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas.

2. La acreditación de dicho requisito se hará según dispone la Orden de 14/10/2016, de la Consejería de Educación, Cultura y Deportes, por la que se relacionan las titulaciones y certificaciones que, con referencia a los niveles que establece el Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas, acreditan el conocimiento de idiomas en el ámbito de competencia de la Consejería de Educación, Cultura y Deportes de la Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha.

3. Para la aprobación del proyecto se valorará la formación de carácter metodológico en el ámbito del aprendizaje integrado de contenidos y lengua extranjera que pueda ser aportada por los docentes implicados en el mismo.


1. Las plantillas de los centros dispondrán de profesorado suficiente con el nivel de competencia lingüística requerido para el desarrollo de proyectos bilingües o plurilingües, o en su caso, permitirán la incorporación de docentes a tal fin en cada curso escolar.

2. La adecuación de las plantillas de los centros a las necesidades del proyecto no supondrá, en ningún caso, el desplazamiento o supresión de docentes con destino definitivo en el mismo.

Artículo 27. Dotación de plantillas.

1. La consejería competente en materia de educación dotará progresivamente las plantillas de plazas con perfil bilingüe para garantizar la continuidad de los proyectos autorizados.

2. Las plazas serán ocupadas mediante procedimientos de provisión provisionales o definitivos en los términos que establezca la Dirección General competente.


La consejería competente en materia de educación regulará las condiciones y el procedimiento de reconocimiento y certificación de méritos de los docentes que participen en proyectos bilingües o plurilingües.

Artículo 29. Coordinador lingüístico.

Todos los centros con proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe contarán con la figura del coordinador lingüístico que será el responsable de armonizar las actuaciones de los docentes implicados así como de colaborar con el equipo directivo.
en la integración del proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe dentro del proyecto educativo del centro y en la coordinación con otros centros de su área de influencia de las etapas educativas obligatorias.

Artículo 30. Asignación de horas lectivas o complementarias.

Todos los docentes que participan en el desarrollo de un proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe dispondrán de la asignación de hasta dos horas lectivas y/o complementarias semanales en función de sus atribuciones, que serán fijadas por la consejería competente en materia de educación.

Artículo 31. Dotación extraordinaria.

1. La consejería competente en materia de educación podrá dotar de cupo extraordinario a los centros que desarrollen proyectos bilingües o plurilingües de forma proporcional al número de unidades y de proyectos autorizados en los mismos y en función de las necesidades específicas de cada una de sus plantillas.

2. Asimismo, adoptará las medidas necesarias para impulsar y promocionar los programas de auxiliares de conversación.

Capítulo VI. Evaluación.

Artículo 32. Evaluación.

La evaluación del progreso del alumnado se ajustará a la normativa vigente en cada etapa educativa.

La evaluación del alumnado con necesidades específicas de apoyo educativo se ajustará de igual forma a la normativa correspondiente a cada etapa educativa, así como a las circunstancias particulares de cada uno de ellos.

Artículo 33. Expediente del alumnado.

Los centros que desarrollen proyectos bilingües o plurilingües harán constar en el expediente de los alumnos su participación en los mismos, reflejando las áreas, materias o módulos cursados en lengua extranjera.

Artículo 34. Prueba de certificación lingüística.

El alumnado incluido en el proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe matriculado en 4º de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria o en el último curso de un Ciclo Formativo de Grado Medio podrá acceder a una prueba específica de certificación de nivel intermedio de Escuela Oficial de Idiomas (B1) en las condiciones que determine la consejería competente en materia de educación.

Artículo 35. Memoria final.

El equipo directivo, en colaboración con el coordinador lingüístico, elaborará anualmente una memoria final del proyecto que será remitida al servicio competente en materia de enseñanza de idiomas y que formará parte también de la memoria anual del centro.

Artículo 36. Seguimiento y valoración de proyectos.

La consejería competente en materia de educación realizará un seguimiento periódico del funcionamiento de los proyectos autorizados, elaborándose, además informes generales trienales que serán puestos a disposición de la comunidad educativa.

Capítulo VII. Plan de Formación Específico de Lenguas Extranjeras.

Artículo 37. Definición.

1. El Plan de Formación Específico de Lenguas Extranjeras es el conjunto de acciones formativas encaminadas a la mejora de la competencia lingüística, didáctica y metodológica del profesorado implicado en la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras.
2. Este plan de formación se elaborará al inicio de cada curso escolar por la dirección general competente en materia de enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras, en coordinación con el Centro Regional de Formación del Profesorado, y tendrá en cuenta los principios, objetivos y tipología de actividades recogidas en este Decreto.

3. El plan de formación incluirá las acciones formativas a desarrollar, los destinatarios de las mismas en función de las prioridades marcadas para cada curso escolar, así como la temporalización y las partidas presupuestarias asignadas para su desarrollo.

Artículo 38. Acciones formativas.

La consejería competente en materia de educación promoverá actuaciones que permitan la formación lingüística y, de forma preferente, didáctica y metodológica de todos aquellos docentes que intervengan en proyectos bilingües o plurilingües con el objeto de favorecer la actualización y especialización de los mismos, favoreciendo su participación.

Artículo 39. Objetivos y tipología de acciones formativas.

1. Se tendrán en cuenta las recomendaciones recogidas en el Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas a la hora de valorar la idoneidad de las acciones formativas impulsadas, dando prioridad a los contenidos metodológicos y didácticos sobre los puramente lingüísticos.

2. La inmersión lingüística y la observación serán los referentes del modelo de acciones formativas a desarrollar.

3. La consejería competente en materia de educación adoptará las medidas oportunas para favorecer las actividades de intercambio de docentes desarrolladas al amparo de proyectos europeos de carácter oficial.

Artículo 40. Gestión de acciones formativas.

La Dirección General competente en materia de enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras gestionará, en colaboración con el Centro Regional de Formación del Profesorado, las acciones formativas que conformen el presente plan.

Disposición adicional primera. Convenios específicos.

Los centros adscritos al Convenio firmado entre el Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte y el British Council, así como los centros adscritos al Programa Bachibac según acuerdo entre el Gobierno del Reino de España y el Gobierno de la República Francesa, tendrán a todos los efectos la consideración de centros bilingües y se regirán, por tanto, por la normativa general, sin perjuicio de las especificidades recogidas en sus convenios respectivos. Dicha consideración será automática.

Disposición adicional segunda. De los centros docentes privados concertados.

Los centros docentes privados concertados aplicarán lo establecido en este decreto, excepto los artículos 26, 27, 28, 30 y 31 y el Capítulo VII, adecuándolo a sus características y a los contenidos de sus respectivos conciertos.


Las referencias al Decreto 7/2014, de 22 de enero, contenidas en el Decreto 54/2014, de 10 de julio, por el que se establece el currículo de la Educación Primaria en la comunidad autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha y en el Decreto 40/2015, de 15 de junio, por el que se establece el currículo de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria y Bachillerato en la comunidad autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha, así como en cualquier otra normativa, deberán entenderse realizadas a este decreto.

Disposición transitoria. Centros con programas lingüísticos anteriores.

Los centros que provengan de un programa lingüístico anterior y soliciten la reconversión a un proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe contarán con dos cursos escolares completos para adaptar su oferta a las condiciones establecidas en el presente decreto y las disposiciones que lo desarrollen.

Durante el periodo de adaptación, y hasta que se autorice el desarrollo del nuevo proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe, los centros que a la entrada en vigor del presente decreto se encuentren imponiendo un programa lingüístico seguirán...
rigiéndose por la Orden de 16/06/2014, de la Consejería de Educación, Cultura y Deportes, por la que se regulan los programas lingüísticos de los centros de Educación Infantil y Primaria, Secundaria, Bachillerato y Formación Profesional sostenidos con fondos públicos de Castilla-La Mancha.

Disposición derogatoria. Derogación normativa.

Queda derogado el Decreto 7/2014, de 22 de enero, por el que se regula el plurilingüismo en la enseñanza no universitaria de Castilla-La Mancha, así como todas aquellas normas de igual o inferior rango que se opongan a lo establecido en este decreto.

Disposición final primera. Desarrollo normativo.

Se autoriza a la persona titular de la consejería competente en materia de educación a adoptar cuantas medidas sean precisas para el desarrollo y ejecución de este decreto.

Disposición final segunda. Entrada en vigor.

Este decreto entrará en vigor el día siguiente al de su publicación en el Diario Oficial de Castilla-La Mancha.

Dado en Toledo, el 25 de julio de 2017

El Presidente

EMILIANO GARCÍA-PAGE SÁNCHEZ

El Consejero de Educación, Cultura y Deportes

ÁNGEL FELPETO ENRÍQUEZ
MEMORIA COMPRENSIVA DEL DECRETO POR EL QUE SE REGULA EL PLAN INTEGRAL DE ENSEÑANZA DE LENGUAS EXTRANJERAS DE LA COMUNIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE CASTILLA-LA MANCHA PARA LAS ETAPAS NO UNIVERSITARIAS.

La Dirección General de Programas, Atención a la Diversidad y Formación Profesional ha elaborado el decreto y la presente memoria comprensiva atendiendo a lo estipulado en el artículo 129 de la Ley 39/2015, de 1 de octubre, del Procedimiento Administrativo Común de las Administraciones Públicas y en el artículo 39 a, de Ley 4/2016, de 15 de diciembre, de Transparencia y Buen Gobierno de Castilla-La Mancha.

La Consejería de Educación y Ciencia creó las Secciones Europeas por Orden de 7 de febrero de 2005 con el objeto de promover modelos educativos bilingües en los centros docentes en la Comunidad Autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha y mediante la Orden de 13 de marzo de 2008 de la Consejería de Educación y Ciencia, se reguló el desarrollo del programa de Secciones Europeas en los centros públicos de Educación Infantil, Primaria y Secundaria de la Comunidad Autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha.

Posteriormente, se aprobó el Decreto 7/2014, por el que se regula el plurilingüismo en la enseñanza no universitaria en Castilla-La mancha y consiguientemente, la Orden de 16/06/2014, de la Consejería de Educación, Cultura y Deportes, por la que se regulan los Programas Lingüísticos de los centros de Educación Infantil y Primaria, Secundaria, Bachillerato y Formación Profesional sostenidos con fondos públicos de Castilla-La Mancha.

La actual administración educativa entiende que es necesario y adecuado una nueva revisión y planteamiento de los programas bilingües de la región por las razones que se aportan en el artículo segundo de la presente memoria.

Primero. Situación del programa de bilingüismo en nuestra comunidad.

A día de hoy, los datos más destacados acerca de la situación de la implantación de los programas bilingües en nuestra comunidad, son los siguientes:

a) N° de centros con al menos una Sección Bilingüe (curso 2016/2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENTROS</th>
<th>PROVINCIA</th>
<th>N° CENTROS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albacete</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciudad Real</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuenca</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Número de Secciones Bilingües por etapas educativas (curso 2016/2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVINCIA</th>
<th>INF y PRI</th>
<th>ESO</th>
<th>Bach</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albacete</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciudad Real</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuenca</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Tabla resumen de número de centros y programas por provincia, idioma y nivel de ejecución (curso 2016/2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº CENTROS</th>
<th>IDIOMA</th>
<th>NIVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUB.</td>
<td>CON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albacete</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciudad Real</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuenca</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALES</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Evolución del programa de secciones bilingües desde el inicio de la implantación.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURSO</th>
<th>Nº de PP.LL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005/6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/9</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasta el año 2010</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Número de maestros y profesores que han participado en los programas bilingües de centros educativos de titularidad pública durante el curso 2015/2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALBACETE</th>
<th>CIUDAD REAL</th>
<th>CUENCA</th>
<th>GUADALAJARA</th>
<th>TOLEDO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*PRIMARIA</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SECUNDARIA</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 2488

*Primaria: se incluyen los maestros que imparten en las etapas de Educación Infantil y Educación Primaria.
Secundaria: se incluyen los profesores que imparten en las etapas de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria, Bachillerato y Formación Profesional.

La cifra de 2488 se refiere a todos los maestros y profesores que han participado en los programas bilingües de los 438 centros de titularidad pública. Están contabilizados tanto los docentes titulares de la DNL, como los docentes que han sustituido a los titulares en el caso de baja.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincia</th>
<th>N° de cupos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albacete</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciudad Real</td>
<td>12.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuenca</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CLM</td>
<td>39.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) N° de cupos extraordinarios en centros educativos de Enseñanza Secundaria durante el curso 2015/2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etapa educativa</th>
<th>N° de cupos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESO</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachillerato</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO British</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACHIBAC</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Para el desarrollo efectivo de los Programas Lingüísticos se han concedido un total de 114.72 cupos. En la Memoria Económica se especifica la atribución de cupo extraordinario que corresponde a cada tipo de programa.

El gasto derivado del pago de complemento retributivo a los docentes participantes en este tipo de programas y de la dotación de cupos extraordinarios, se recogen y se detallan en la Memoria Económica del Decreto.

Segundo. Justificación para la elaboración del nuevo decreto.

Teniendo en cuenta la situación expuesta, la elaboración del Decreto por el que se regula el plan integral de enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras de la comunidad autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha para las etapas no universitarias, se justifica atendiendo a lo siguiente:

1. La administración educativa regional desde su capacidad de desarrollo normativo y teniendo en cuenta lo estipulado en la legislación estatal y europea, considera necesario dar un nuevo impulso al aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras, basado en el desarrollo de los curriculums ordinarios por parte de los especialistas e incorporando las disciplinas no lingüísticas como un
espacio de mejora de las competencias comunicativas a través de los contenidos propios de las mismas, pero también como un medio más de exposición a la lengua extranjera en un contexto normalizado potenciando así el aprendizaje relacional por encima del meramente memorístico.

2. El Decreto trata de reordenar el programa bilingüe y volver a un sistema equitativo, organizado, perdurable en el tiempo y que garantice una igualdad en la oferta plurilingüe de todos los centros en los distintos niveles educativos.

3. El nuevo modelo tiene como objetivo la consolidación de los resultados conseguidos a través de los programas lingüísticos existentes, pero unificando los modelos para garantizar la equidad y la igualdad de oportunidades, así como el desarrollo de una nueva normativa que repercuta positivamente por un lado, en la enseñanza de las lenguas extranjeras a través de las enseñanzas integradas de contenidos y lengua extranjera y por otro, en el estudio de una segunda lengua extranjera desde edades tempranas.

4. La eficacia tanto en la puesta en marcha de esta reglamentación como en la consecución de los objetivos planteados serán objeto de estudio y reflexión una vez se haya producido la total implantación del modelo.

5. La seguridad jurídica que otorga esta nueva reglamentación es esencial para la consecución de los objetivos previstos, ya que sigue lo estipulado por la normativa europea, estatal y la comunitaria de mayor rango legislativo.

6. Posterior a la entrada en vigor de este decreto, y teniendo en cuenta el principio de eficiencia y proporcionalidad se desarrollará la siguiente legislación complementaria:

   a) Orden por la que se regulan los proyectos bilingües y plurilingües en las enseñanzas de Educación Infantil y Primaria, Secundaria, Bachillerato y Formación Profesional de los centros educativos sostenidos con fondos públicos de la Comunidad Autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha.
   b) Orden por la que se establece el procedimiento para la incorporación de proyectos bilingües y plurilingües en centros educativos no universitarios sostenidos con fondos públicos de la Comunidad Autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha a partir del curso escolar 2017/2018.
   c) Instrucciones relativas al funcionamiento de los proyectos bilingües y plurilingües en centros educativos no universitarios sostenidos con fondos públicos de Castilla-La Mancha para el curso 2017/2018.

7. Teniendo en cuenta todo el desarrollo normativo que implicará el Decreto y la intención de iniciar su implantación en el próximo curso 2017-2018, así como la necesidad de los centros educativos de poder organizar con suficiente antelación toda la documentación, junto con el proyecto bilingüe o plurilingüe para su solicitud a través de la mencionada Orden, estimamos que este Decreto debe de entrar en vigor al día siguiente al de su publicación en el Diario Oficial de Castilla-La Mancha.

8. En la elaboración del presente decreto se ha tratado de garantizar en todo momento los principios de transparencia y participación a través de las siguientes iniciativas:

   a) En el Congreso – Fórum: “Otra mirada hacia la enseñanza bilingüe”, celebrado el pasado 21 y 22 de octubre 2016 ya se presentó un primer borrador y se elaboró una encuesta on-line para que todos los participantes pudieran responder y reflexionar acerca de cuestiones relacionadas con la enseñanza bilingüe y las líneas del decreto a través del Portal de Educación. Además, la encuesta fue extendida a muchos centros educativos, que también nos hicieron llegar sus aportaciones.
   b) Durante los meses de noviembre y diciembre de 2016 y enero de 2017, se constituyó una comisión regional compuesta por representantes de todos los sectores de la administración educativa y de las organizaciones sindicales, además de otras comisiones provinciales
conformadas por docentes de las diferentes etapas educativas, incluidas las Escuelas Oficiales de Idiomas. En ellas se ha llevado a cabo un proceso de intercambio de pareceres y se les dio la oportunidad de proponer nuevas iniciativas, ideas, experiencias, etc… que han sido tenidas en cuenta para la elaboración del presente decreto y que se considerarán en el desarrollo normativo posterior.

Toledo, a 21 de febrero de 2017.

D. Lucio C. Calleja Bachiller
Jefe del Servicio de Secciones Bilingües y Programas Europeos
CONVENIO DE COLABORACIÓN ENTRE EL MINISTERIO DE EDUCACIÓN, CULTURA Y DEPORTE Y EL BRITISH COUNCIL PARA LA REALIZACIÓN DE PROYECTOS CURRICULARES INTEGRADOS Y ACTIVIDADES EDUCATIVAS CONJUNTAS.

En Madrid, a 18 de abril de 2013

REUNIDOS

De una parte, Dª Montserrat Gomendio Kindelan, Secretaria de Estado de Educación, Formación Profesional y Universidades, en virtud del Real Decreto 138/2012 de 13 de enero (BOE de 14 de enero), y conforme a lo dispuesto en el artículo 14 de la Ley 6/1997, de 14 de abril, de Organización y Funcionamiento de la Administración General del Estado, actuando en nombre y representación del Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte.

De otra parte, el Sr. D. Roderick Stokes Pryde, en calidad de Director de la Delegación en España de la Fundación British Council, entidad jurídica debidamente constituida en el Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del Norte mediante Carta Real de fecha 7 de octubre de 1940 y con Carta Real suplementaria de fecha 26 de noviembre de 1993, con domicilio social en España en el Paseo del General Martínez Campos 31 de Madrid, y con capacidad para firmar Convenios de Colaboración según poder otorgado por Dña. Catherine Stephens y D. Andrew John Mackay, en sus respectivas calidades de Directora de Innovación y Secretario del British Council, y elevado a documento público por el Notario de Londres, Doña María Teresa Godoy Gómez, el día 15 de julio de 2009.

Ambas partes, en la representación que ostentan, tienen y se reconocen mutua capacidad legal para obligarse y, a tal fin...
MANIFIESTAN

Primero: Que el 15 de junio de 1987 fue firmado un Memorando de entendimiento sobre colaboración entre el Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia y el British Council, dentro del marco del Convenio Cultural entre el Gobierno de España y el Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del Norte de 12 de julio de 1960 cuyo propósito era orientar la colaboración y mutua cooperación entre ambas partes en áreas concretas de actuación y proyectos específicos.

Segundo: Que entre los referidos proyectos se incluyen el desarrollo curricular y la promoción de actividades educativas conjuntas en campos de sus respectivas competencias y de mutuo interés.

Tercero: Que, asimismo, es de interés de ambas partes fomentar el conocimiento mutuo de la cultura e historia de los países representados por las dos instituciones, así como el uso y conocimiento de sus lenguas respectivas.

Cuarto: Que constituye un objetivo a alcanzar para ambas partes, dentro del marco de colaboración de las dos instituciones, fomentar el intercambio de profesores, alumnos y también de experiencias didácticas y métodos de trabajo.

Quinto: Que para conseguir estos objetivos el Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia y el British Council, desde 1996 vienen formalizando convenios de colaboración (1996, 2008 y 2010) y renovaciones anuales mediante adendas, con el fin de desarrollar un proyecto curricular integrado para las etapas de Educación Infantil, Primaria y Secundaria que permita a los alumnos, al finalizar la educación obligatoria, continuar su formación en cualquiera de los dos países, así como impulsar la colaboración en la formación del profesorado español y británico.

Sexto: Que el resultado positivo de esta cooperación y su efecto favorable en la mejora de la calidad de la enseñanza aconsejan proseguir dicha colaboración, para lo cual formalizan el presente documento, con arreglo a las siguientes
CLÁUSULAS

PRIMERA: El presente Convenio de colaboración entre el Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte y el British Council, tiene por objeto desarrollar el proyecto curricular integrado, impulsar la colaboración en la formación del profesorado español y británico, así como desarrollar propuestas de investigación.

SEGUNDA: Este currículo integrado incluirá los contenidos que cada parte considere esenciales para el conocimiento de la realidad histórica, social y política de la otra parte, así como los principios metodológicos y didácticos considerados relevantes por ambas partes.

TERCERA: El currículo incluirá, en todo caso, los contenidos que cada parte estime necesarios para que los alumnos que lo sigan con aprovechamiento puedan, al finalizar la educación obligatoria, continuar su formación en cualquiera de los dos países.

CUARTA: El currículo se impartirá en ambas lenguas, de manera que los alumnos que lo sigan con aprovechamiento sean capaces al final de la enseñanza obligatoria de expresarse con fluidez y corrección en inglés y en español.

QUINTA: El currículo integrado será impartido en los centros de Educación Infantil, Primaria y Secundaria que figuren en el Anexo. La incorporación de nuevos centros, o la sustitución de los incluidos en el Anexo por otros, exigirá el visto bueno de las partes.

SEXTA: Ambas partes podrán controlar, a través de los Servicios de Inspección, el cumplimiento de los términos concertados en el currículo.

SÉPTIMA: El currículo integrado será impartido por profesores titulados, funcionarios y colaboradores seleccionados específicamente para este programa.

OCTAVA: Se estimulará la participación en el programa de profesores colaboradores con experiencia en el sistema educativo anglosajón para apoyar y orientar en el desarrollo del currículo.
NOVENA: Se fomentará la asistencia y participación de los profesores que imparten el currículo integrado en actividades de formación para el desarrollo del mismo.

Para ello, el Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte y el British Council diseñarán para cada curso académico un programa de formación que abarque las necesidades de formación de los profesores de las distintas etapas educativas con el fin de desarrollar adecuadamente el currículo integrado.

DÉCIMA: El currículo integrado se revisará periódicamente, teniendo en cuenta las modificaciones que se produzcan en los dos sistemas educativos y la evolución del programa.

UNDÉCIMA: El Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte y el British Council fomentarán la realización de estudios e investigaciones en el ámbito de la enseñanza en una segunda lengua.

DUODÉCIMA: Ambas instituciones se comprometen a desarrollar todas las cláusulas mencionadas anteriormente. Asimismo el British Council colaborará en la difusión internacional del programa.

DECIMOTERCERA: Para efectuar el seguimiento del presente Convenio de Colaboración se constituirá una Comisión, compuesta por tres representantes del Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, designados por la Secretaría de Estado de Educación, Formación Profesional y Universidades y tres representantes del British Council, designados por el Director del mismo.

Esta Comisión supervisará el desarrollo de lo previsto en el Convenio y resolverá las incidencias que surjan durante la vigencia del mismo.

DECIMOCUARTA: En la difusión y promoción de las actividades realizadas en desarrollo del presente Convenio figurarán los logotipos y mención del Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte y el British Council.

DECIMOQUINTA: El presente Convenio entrará en vigor en el momento de su firma siendo de aplicación para el curso académico 2013-2014 y podrá ser renovado, por voluntad de las partes, mediante una Adenda anual.
DECIMOSEXTA: Cualquiera de las partes podrá denunciar el presente Convenio comunicándolo a la otra parte interviniente por escrito con un curso académico de antelación, esto es, antes del comienzo del curso académico en el que se desee la terminación del convenio o, en su caso, prórroga.

Será causa de resolución del presente Convenio el mutuo acuerdo de las partes o la denuncia por causa justificada por cualquiera de las partes sin perjuicio de que las acciones ya iniciadas continúen hasta su terminación.

DECIMOSÉPTIMA: Las discrepancias surgidas sobre la interpretación, desarrollo, modificación, resolución y efectos que pudieran derivarse de la aplicación del presente Convenio deberán ser solventadas por la Comisión de Seguimiento a que se hace referencia en la cláusula decimotercera. Si no se llegara a un acuerdo, las cuestiones litigiosas serán de conocimiento y competencia del orden jurisdiccional Contencioso-Administrativo.

DECIMOCTAVA: Para la ejecución de las actividades a realizar en cada año académico se destinarán los fondos necesarios, en función de la disponibilidad presupuestaria, por parte del Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte.

Por su parte, el British Council colaborará, aportando sus propios medios.

Y en prueba de conformidad y para la debida constancia de todo lo convenido, ambas partes firman el presente Convenio, en ejemplar duplicado y en todas sus hojas, en el lugar y fecha al principio indicados.

\[\text{LA SECRETARIA DE ESTADO DE EDUCACIÓN, FORMACIÓN PROFESIONAL Y UNIVERSIDADES} \quad \text{EL DIRECTOR DEL BRITISH COUNCIL}\]

\[\text{Montserrat Gomendio Kindelan} \quad \text{Roderick Stokes Pryde}\]
ANEXO

RELACIÓN DE CENTROS DE EDUCACIÓN INFANTIL Y PRIMARIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centro</th>
<th>Población y Provincia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Benjamín Palencia</td>
<td>Albacete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Atalía</td>
<td>Gijón (Asturias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Ventanielles</td>
<td>Oviedo (Asturias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Comuneros de Castilla</td>
<td>Ávila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP La Moraña</td>
<td>Arévalo (Ávila)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Luis de Morales</td>
<td>Badajoz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Na Caragol</td>
<td>Arta (Baleares)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Sa Graduada</td>
<td>Mao (Baleares)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Jueces de Castilla</td>
<td>Burgos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Dª Mencia de Velasco</td>
<td>Briviesca (Burgos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Alba Plata</td>
<td>Cáceres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Eloy Villanueva</td>
<td>Santander (Cantabria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Federico García Lorca</td>
<td>Ceuta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP José Mª de la Fuente</td>
<td>Ciudad Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Maestro Juan Alcaide</td>
<td>Valdepeñas (Ciudad Real)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP El Carmen</td>
<td>Cuenca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Ocejón</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP San Vicente</td>
<td>Huesca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP San José de Calasanz</td>
<td>Fraga (Huesca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Joaquín Costa</td>
<td>Graus (Huesca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP San Juan de la Peña</td>
<td>Jaca (Huesca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Joaquín Costa</td>
<td>Monzón (Huesca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Quevedo</td>
<td>León</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Santa Marta</td>
<td>Astorga (León)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Ciudad de Jaén</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP El Quijote</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP San Juan Bautista</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Parque de Lisboa</td>
<td>Alcorcón (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP José Bergamín</td>
<td>Boadilla del Monte (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Félix Rodríguez de la Fuente</td>
<td>Coslada (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Cervantes</td>
<td>Fuenlabrada (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Severo Ochoa</td>
<td>Getafe (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Pío Baroja</td>
<td>Leganés (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Carmen Hernández Guarch</td>
<td>Tres Cantos (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Pintor Eduardo Morillas</td>
<td>Melilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Infante Don Juan Manuel</td>
<td>Murcia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Centro
CEIP José María Lapuerta
CEIP Azpilagaña
CEIP Cardenal Ilundain
CEIP José Mª de Huarte
CEIP Añorbe
CEIP Lorenzo Goicoa
CEIP Elvira España
CEIP Tello Téllez
CEIP Vegarredonda
CEIP San Mateo
CEIP Miróbriga
CEIP El Peñascal
CEIP Santa Clara
CEIP Los Doce Linajes
CEIP Infantes de Lara
CEIP Las Anejas
CEIP El Justicia de Aragón
CEIP Juan Lorenzo Palmireno
CEIP Juan Sobrarias
CEIP Gregorio Marañón
CEIP Hernán Cortés
CEIP Miguel Delibes
CEIP Narciso Alonso Cortés
CEIP Clemente Fernández de la Devesa
CEIP Riomanzanas
CEIP Buenos Aires
CEIP Agustina de Aragón
CEIP Fernando El Católico
CEIP Hilarión Gimeno
CEIP Jerónimo Blancas y Tomás
CEIP José Antonio Labordeña
CEIP Julián Nieto Tapia
CEIP María Moline
CEIP Montecanal
CEIP Ramón Sainz de Baranda
CEIP Ronda Norte
CEIP Rosales del Canal
CEIP Tenerías
CEIP Valdespartera
CEIP Valdespartera II
CEIP Cervantes

Población y Provincia
Cartagena (Murcia)
Pamplona (Navarra)
Pamplona (Navarra)
Pamplona (Navarra)
Añorbe (Navarra)
Villalba-Atarrabia (Navarra)
Tudela (Navarra)
Palencia
Guardo (Palencia)
Salamanca
Ciudad Rodrigo (Salamanca)
Segovia
Cuellar (Segovia)
Soria
Soria
Teruel
Alcorisa (Teruel)
Alcañiz (Teruel)
Alcañiz (Teruel)
Toledo
Talavera de la Reina (Toledo)
Valladolid
Valladolid
Medina del Campo (Valladolid)
Zamora
Benavente (Zamora)
Zaragoza
Zaragoza
Zaragoza
Zaragoza
Zaragoza
Zaragoza
Zaragoza
Zaragoza
Zaragoza
Zaragoza
Ejea de los Caballeros (Zaragoza)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centro</th>
<th>Población y Provincia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Compromiso de Caspe</td>
<td>Caspe (Zaragoza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Foro Romano</td>
<td>Cuarte de Huerva (Zaragoza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Ramón y Cajal</td>
<td>Cuarte de Huerva (Zaragoza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Los Albares</td>
<td>La Puebla de Alfidén (Zaragoza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Reino de Aragón</td>
<td>La Puebla de Alfidén (Zaragoza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Octavus</td>
<td>Utebo (Zaragoza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIP Miguel Ángel Artazos</td>
<td>Utebo (Zaragoza)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RELACIÓN DE INSTITUTOS DE EDUCACIÓN SECUNDARIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centro</th>
<th>Población y Provincia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IES Diego de Siloé</td>
<td>Albacete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Emilio Alarcons</td>
<td>Gijón (Asturias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Pérez de Ayala</td>
<td>Oviedo (Asturias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Vasco de la Zarza</td>
<td>Ávila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Llorenç Garcías i Font</td>
<td>Artá (Baleares)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Cap de Llevant</td>
<td>Maó (Baleares)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Comuneros de Castilla</td>
<td>Burgos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Cantabria</td>
<td>Santander (Cantabria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Clara Campoamor</td>
<td>Ceuta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Gregorio Prieto</td>
<td>Valdepeñas (Ciudad Real)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Torreón del Alcázar</td>
<td>Ciudad Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES San José</td>
<td>Cuenca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Castilla</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Sierra de Guara</td>
<td>Huesca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Eras de Renueva</td>
<td>León</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Laguna de Joatzel</td>
<td>Getafe (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Ciudad de Jaén</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Isaac Albéniz</td>
<td>Leganés (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Joaquín Araujo</td>
<td>Fuenlabrada (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES José Luis Sampedro</td>
<td>Tres Cantos (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Manuel de Falla</td>
<td>Coslada (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Profesor Máximo Trueba</td>
<td>Boadilla del Monte (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Parque Lisboa</td>
<td>Alcorcón (Madrid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES San Juan Bautista</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Villa de Vallecas</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Enrique Nieto</td>
<td>Melilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Los Molinos</td>
<td>Cartagena (Murcia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Basoko</td>
<td>Pamplona (Navarra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro</td>
<td>Población y Provincia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Padre Moret-Irubide</td>
<td>Pamplona (Navarra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Benjamín de Tudela</td>
<td>Tudela (Navarra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Alonso Berruguete</td>
<td>Palencia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Francisco Salinas</td>
<td>Salamanca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES María Moliner</td>
<td>Segovia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Virgen del Espino</td>
<td>Soria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Francés de Aranda</td>
<td>Teruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Alfonso X El Sabio</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Puerta de Cuartos</td>
<td>Talavera de la Reina (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Emilio Ferrari</td>
<td>Valladolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Galileo</td>
<td>Valladolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Claudio Moyano</td>
<td>Zamora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES María Moliner</td>
<td>Zaragoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Miguel de Molinos</td>
<td>Zaragoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Pedro de Luna</td>
<td>Zaragoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Valdespartera</td>
<td>Zaragoza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9: Sample of teaching material

Music. 1st grade of CSE (High Towers). Listening activity “Mood in Music”.

LISTENING ACTIVITY. MOOD IN MUSIC.

PART 1.
You’ll listen several scraps of musical works and you should do the following tasks:

1: Choose a couple of adjectives from the box below to describe each one

- Lively, scary, tender, gloomy, nice, loving, melancholic
- delighted, dull, mellow, quiet, bitter, calm, smooth, mournful
- spooky, peaceful, creepy, charming, cheerful, eerie, gay,
- shocking, let down, sweet, frightening, playful

2: Read the following sentences and choose those which are most suitable for every melody (some sentences would describe more than one melody):

- There are more than one melody sounding at the same time
- Its melody is mainly moving by steps (there aren’t big jumps between the notes of the melody), so it sounds quite sweet
- Its notes are quite high in pitch
- The ‘Tempo’ or speed of pulse is amazingly fast
- The note-lengths (figures musicales) are shorts, so it sounds frenetic and plenty of energy
- There are some fairly low sounds which are persistently repeated
Science. 1st grade of CSE (San Marcos). Reading activity “The force of gravity”.

THE FORCE OF GRAVITY

Why does everything you throw up into the air always come down again? Why don’t people who live in Australia fall off the Earth? Why does snow slide down a mountain, but never up a mountain?

A famous story tells us that Sir Isaac Newton, an English scientist born in 1643, asked himself why things always fell downwards after an apple fell off a tree and hit him on the head. According to Newton, all masses are attracted to the Earth by the force of gravity. In other words, the Earth tries to pull everything to its centre. We call this “pull” the force of gravity.

The sun has got gravity too. The force of the sun’s gravity holds the planets in their orbits and holds the solar system together. The sun’s force of gravity does not pull the planets to its centre because the planets orbit at a very high speed. The force of an orbiting planet is even stronger than the sun’s force of gravity. We call the force of an object moving in a circle with an outward force, centrifugal force.

Circle the correct answer.

1. Sir Isaac Newton was born in the 19th/17th/18th century.
2. Newton discovered that all liquids/people/masses are attracted by the force of gravity.
3. The Earth pulls things to its centre/side/bottom.
4. The sun holds the planets in their rotation/orbits/gravity.
5. Centrifugal force is the force caused by an object moving in a circle/upwards/downwards.

What household appliance uses centrifugal force?

Let’s Investigate

Use an encyclopedia or the Internet. Write a short biography about Sir Isaac Newton.
I am Amira: A storytelling experiment
by Anna Austen

Setting the Scene
Amira is a 13 year old girl from Aleppo in the North of Syria. The country had a civil war for four long years. Aleppo has seen some of the worst of the fighting. Part of the town is now under the control of ISIS - the other part is under the control of the government run by Assad. Both sides are bombing and causing casualties every day.

Ninety-five percent of the population of Syria are not involved in the war but it is affecting every part of their life. Many no longer know which side to support. Twelve million Syrians have had to leave their homes. Some are still in refugee camps in Syria, but by September 2015 over 4 million have left Syria. Many are in Turkey, Jordan and Palestine. However in the first part of 2015 many thousands have started making a longer journey towards Europe. This story tries to take a look at the reasons why this is happening.

Aleppo was a town of two million people including a substantial middle class with businesses of every kind. Many have gone now. In September 2015 about half a million people are still thought to be living there. Amira’s father is an IT business man. They are a IT savvy family with high aspirations for their kids. Her parents are trying to make a hard decision.
Day One - 1st September 2015, #Aleppo, #Syria

My 13th Birthday and first ever post on Facebook!

Life is getting serious when your dreams become the most comfortable place to be. I didn’t want to wake up this morning. I felt so safe, so happy and so secure. And then with a lunch all the realities of the day started flooding in. Firstly my stomach gave me an aching reminder that we hardly ate last night. Then I jerked my head up to look around quickly but it was ok everyone was there. Well when, I say everyone, Mum was already up making noises the other side of the make-shift curtain but that is the new normal.

Our house is fairly unrecognisable. We all sleep together downstairs in the farthest portion of our house from the road. Dad builds a barricade at the two doors into that area most nights. We seem to be boiling water all the time to try and avoid illness. This makes the kitchen damp and foggy. But at least the water supply has held out so far, other parts of the city are not so lucky. Electricity comes on for about 3 hours a day at the moment. So when it is on we are all busy taking full advantage.

When I woke up it took me awhile to remember that there was a good side to the day. I have made it to thirteen. Seems a small thing in the grand scheme of the crazy we are living through, but despite everything, everyone did stop to make a fuss of me. For a brief respite life felt back in place, we were all able to smile for a minute. My family’s love can get us through a lot of hardship.

Mum gave me one of her nicest headscarves - the blue one with white flowers. I love it and Zeinah, my sister, drew me the picture of me I’ve used as my profile picture. She wants be a great artist one day. I tease her.
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Students’ textbook. Science. 1st grade of CSE. Unit 2: “Kingdoms, Monera, Protoctista and Fungi”.

2

Kingdoms Monera, Protoctista and Fungi

Living organisms that are not animals

People used to believe that all living things that were not animals were plants, and fungi and plants were included in the same kingdom.

The development of the microscope allowed scientists to observe organisms that were classified in a new kingdom: Kingdom Protoctista.

As science progressed, we were able to distinguish between eukaryotic and prokaryotic cells, and prokaryotes were defined as belonging to the Kingdom Monera.

In politics, a kingdom is a territorial unit ruled by a monarch. The kingdom of Norway is interesting that in biology living beings are classified into kingdoms. However, except for the queen bee, there are no kings or queens! Debate with your classmates other kingdoms you know (for example, you could think about kingdoms in games, films or books).
Science. 1st grade of CSE (San Teo). Exam from Unit 1: “The living things”.

1. Explain the two reasons why the average temperature of the Earth is 15°C.
   - Because the Earth has a good position naturally cold and not very hot
   - The atmosphere retains the heat from the sun.

2. What other factors make life possible on Earth? Explain.
   - Liquid in a water state; the quanta of the Earth are made up of water. Atmospheres are a group of gases necessary for life and protect the Earth from the solar radiation.

3. Fill in the gaps, writing the words from the box.
   All matter in the universe is formed of very small units called __biomolecules___. They join together, connected by very strong forces called __chemical bonds__ and they form __organic biomolecules___.
   - There are two types. Inorganic biomolecules are found in __water and minerals__ and they include __living things and non-living things__.
   - Organic biomolecules are found in __carbohydrates__ and __proteins etc__ and they include __living things__ and __molecules__.

4. What are the three principles of “cell theory”?
   - All living things are formed of __cells__.
   - Cells are the smallest unit capable of the “vital functions”.
   - All cells come from __other cells__.
5. The three vital functions:

Nutrition consists of ... take substances to produce energy.

Interaction consists of ... process the information processing.

Reproduction consists of ... give rise to other living beings identical or similar to its parent(s) are two types sexual and asexual.

6. Put the characteristics in the correct column (ONLY WRITE THE NUMBERS): only number.

- The DNA is in the cytoplasm
- The DNA is in the nucleus
- It has a lot of different organelles
- The only organelles it has are ribosomes
- It has a rigid cell wall
- There are two types: animal and plant
- Bacteria are formed of these cells
- Animals, plants, protocists and fungi are formed of these cells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROKARYOTIC CELLS</th>
<th>EUKARYOTIC CELLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 5 4 1</td>
<td>8 6 3 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Write the names of the types of cell:

- [ ] Prokaryotic cell
- [ ] Animal
- [ ] Plant

8. Complete the information using the words in the box:
The interaction function consists of three phases.

The first is the perception of information in the form of receptors. It can come from inside the living thing or from the stimuli. To do this we have special parts called receptors.

The next phase is processing and coordination. We process the information and use it to prepare a coordinated response.

The last phase of interaction is the execution of the response. To do this we have special parts called effectors.

9. What are the advantages and disadvantages of sexual reproduction?

Advantages: the offspring are similar than the parent.

Disadvantages: the offspring are no identical than the parent but are similar.

10. Write whether the sentences are true or false and correct the false ones.

Heterotrophs produce their own food. False

Heterotrophs obtain their food from other animals.

Multiple fission produces two daughter cells of equal size. False

Multiple fission not produces two daughter cells equal sizes.

In sexual reproduction the descendents are identical to the progenitors. False

In sexual reproduction the descendents are not identical to the progenitors.

In a cell the mitochondria produces proteins. False

In a cell the mitochondria not produces proteins.

Bacteria are in the protoctist kingdom. True
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Vocabulary

English – Spanish

Layer

Develop

Neither … nor …

In order to

Capable

However

Waste

Allow

Repair

Either … or …

Spanish – English

Alimentarse de

Descendiente

Conjunto

Célula hija

Reino

Hongo

Eliminar

Diversidad

Capaz

Molécula

fiton? I don’t know very much
Appendix 10: Pictures of physical spaces

A common classroom in San Marcos

Poster in the hall of San Teo. “Values of Up” (activity done by students in the 4th grade of CSE for religion).
Poster in the hall of San Teo. “Christianity”.

San Teo’s students in the 3rd grade of CSE working on their posters about friendship.
English language class.
Sample of students’ notes during the workshop in the 4th grade of CSE (San Teo). “Places where English can be found”. 
Appendix 11: Data collected during fieldwork at the three schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVATIONS</th>
<th>SAN MARCOS</th>
<th></th>
<th>SAN TEO</th>
<th></th>
<th>HIGH TOWERS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>non-rec.</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>non-rec.</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>non-rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY EDUCATION</td>
<td>5º: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>5º: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>6º: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2º: 3</td>
<td>1º: 4</td>
<td>2º: 5</td>
<td>1º: 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1º: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>3º: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4º: 3</td>
<td>3º: 4</td>
<td>4º: 3</td>
<td>3º: 0</td>
<td>3º: 5</td>
<td>3º: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2º: 2</td>
<td>1º: 2</td>
<td>2º: 2</td>
<td>3º: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4º: 1</td>
<td>3º: 2</td>
<td>4º: 2</td>
<td>3º: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3º: 1</td>
<td>2º: 1</td>
<td>2º: 3</td>
<td>1º: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1º: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4º: 2</td>
<td>3º: 1</td>
<td>4º: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>3º: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>3º: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3º: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in French)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3º: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3º: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3º: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1º: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Crafts</td>
<td>2º: 2</td>
<td>1º: 5</td>
<td>1º: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3º: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2º: 1</td>
<td>1º: 7</td>
<td>3º: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2º: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1º: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>4º: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4º: 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>4º: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 12: Model of interactional analysis. Recurrent sequences of action and activities in each unit lesson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT LESSON: (subject, group, teacher; date and time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nº of Ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants and setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language repertoires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss’ role (active/passive?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What’s going on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normative?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities &amp; management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no interaction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conventionalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(communicative,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional/normative,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher/student-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centered?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type &amp; Sequences of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Activities (audiovisual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>texts, key grammar/vocab/pronuncia-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tion, testing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIL? (tools and techniques)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential structure and stages (role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shift?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactional Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom interaction Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Initiation-Response-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback/Initiation-Response-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(interactional rituals?;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turn-taking, transla-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naling, frontstage of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene, addressee &amp; ad-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dressed (un)ratified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants; solicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forms, animators; mon-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ological interactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space or change in foci-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ting?; inclusion/exclu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sion; Are they doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what’s expected of them?;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship management)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Interview (June 2017)

Interviewer: Dr. Morton, your recent research has focused on Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), in which academic content is taught through the medium of an additional (foreign, second) language. What is your opinion about CLIL research in Spain?

Morton: My opinion about CLIL research in Spain? Basically, I think it is quite healthy. In terms of quantity, there’s a lot, and when I speak to CLIL researchers or bilingual education researchers in other parts of the world, they always say that Spain is kind of like a centre for CLIL practice and CLIL research because, for better or worse, it’s being seen as a policy initiative in Spain, so the regional governments are putting
quite a lot of investment into bilingual education and that, in turn, attracts research. So, we have colleagues, I know quite a few people who work in Andalucía on CLIL research in Pablo de Olavide University, or people who work in the Basque country or Cataluña, of course the people I work with in Madrid… So, I would say healthy. It doesn’t mean there aren’t any problems and these might come up with other questions but the answer to that question is very active and healthy.

Interviewer: And what is your opinion about CLIL as a type of bilingual education programme? You know here in Spain we call this kind of bilingual education programmes ‘bilingual programmes’. So, what’s your opinion? Do you think that is a good label to define bilingual programmes in this monolingual community [Castilla-La Mancha]?

Morton: So, you are referring to communities like here, like Castilla-La Mancha? Whether we can use the term CLIL here as opposed to using it in a bilingual community such as the Basque country or… I don’t think it really matters that much whether the use or non-use of the term CLIL really is connected with whether the area or the context is monolingual or bilingual. There are other issues around the use of the term CLIL, about whether CLIL is best used to refer to a kind of a set of methodological principles for integrating content and language, or whether it is an adequate label to describe programmes. That’s why I am not so sure whether it is always clear to use the term CLIL to distinguish programmes. So, we have like immersion programmes in different countries, in Canada and Europe; we have them in the UK, in Wales and Ireland; then, we have content-based language instruction, English medium instruction. Some people would – I think – would like to use CLIL to distinguish the kind of European context where a foreign language such as English is used as a medium of instruction. But, then again, it does not always work because, in fact, there are some schools and some teachers who are teaching English, teaching content through another language, and perhaps they haven’t heard of the term CLIL before. They haven’t heard of it. I do teacher training and I go to – less now –, but when I first started 10 years ago, I would go to a school or teacher training centres, including in Castilla-La Mancha, Cuenca or Guadalajara, for example, and I would start talking about CLIL, and I realised that for my next session I should explain what CLIL is on the first day, because it was known as ‘bilingüismo’ or ‘bilingual education’.
**Interviewer:** Yeah, because here in our context in Castilla-La Mancha it seems that teachers that are involved in these bilingual programmes are not really very aware of their own CLIL practices, so that’s why it is a controversial issue to label this kind of bilingual education programmes as ‘CLIL’ programmes.

**Morton:** Yeah, because, you know… And seen from a different perspective, you could say if CLIL is as it is described by Do Coyle and David Marsh, and others who work in Spain like Phil Ball, if it is a set of methodological procedures, if teachers aren’t using that methodology, then it is difficult to call it ‘CLIL’, because, at the very least, to call something ‘CLIL’, according to those definitions, you need to have some attention to language objectives along with the content objectives. In many bilingual schools, English is used as a medium of instruction but it’s not really a focus of attention itself as language, so you could argue then that, perhaps, they are not doing CLIL, they are doing something more like EMI. They are using English as a medium of instruction.

**Interviewer:** And what do you think are the main challenges in the current implementation of CLIL (organization, school management, classroom practices, curricula)? What is your opinion?

**Morton:** Policy and school management are not my areas of research, so I am usually reluctant to say much about those areas. But I have heard this morning quite a lot about collaboration and how schools are managed, then it is very important, it is almost like a specialised area. Concerning what I know about more, I would say, two areas of concern would be – I think – the biggest one is teacher education and professional development, and not just about teachers’ language skills or language proficiency… about teachers’ knowledge about teaching and knowledge about how to integrate content and language. I think that is really important. Some efforts have been made to provide teachers with adequate training but it’s never going to be enough. And there needs to be more programmes, there needs to be more master’s level programmes and sustained programmes so teachers have long teaching practice and they have exposure to a range of options, methodological options for integrating content and language. And the other thing that may be lacking may be clearer principles for the integration of content and language than those that already exist. I think there’s some confusion at
times that content is mixed with aspects of language which may not have much to do with content, so, if teachers are teaching content and, then, they are only correcting a few mistakes, it is not really integrating content and the language. So, I think those two things go together: clearer, more – perhaps – theoretically based principles for the integration of content and language, which are then translated into methodological options. And materials even, and then, which teachers have the chance to learn how to use through professional development. So, I would say those are the key areas.

**Interviewer:** My next question is what is your experience working with CLIL teachers? How could we bring together CLIL teachers and researchers?

**Morton:** I think that’s another problematic area. I think it’s, in general, too much research is research on teachers and not research with teachers. So, we are researching them, or researching on them. Sometimes, we try to bring them in and, at the current project I am working with at the Autónoma [Universidad Autónoma de Madrid], we are developing tasks for the students to do with their teachers, so teachers are involved in developing the tasks that with the students they then do, and then we analyse their linguistic productions. But that’s not really all. We could go a lot further. I would really like to see types of teacher development and teacher research such as lesson study, which is used in Japan and more and more in Europe and the States, in which teachers are researchers; they are researching their own practice and they may work with a university researcher. But they are producing knowledge; they are not just willing participants in our research projects. So, I think that’s a real… I haven’t really found the answer to that because I haven’t really... A couple of teachers I know, there’s one at the Autónoma, who was, when I was collecting data at the beginning, she is now doing her PhD with us, that’s a teacher becoming a researcher, but that’s quite a rare case. So, we need to do it, and especially with content teachers, especially with teachers who are not language teachers, we need to find the ways in which we can work with them, to develop units, to develop lessons in which they become producers of knowledge along with us, rather than being just subjects of our research.

**Interviewer:** In your current work (with John Gray of the Institute of Education) you focus on different language teacher identities emerging in and through social interaction
in a range of contexts. Could you tell us about your research on teachers’ social interaction and the relationship between discursive practices and identity construction?

**Morton:** Ok. Well, this is going to be a book which will come out in a few months, hopefully, we are just finishing it. What we are trying to do in this book is… We know that teacher identity has become quite a hot topic at the moment. It’s coming… The focus that was dominant a few years ago on teachers’ beliefs and teachers’ knowledge, teacher cognition in general, has been… Recently, identity has kind of taken over a little bit, it’s been kind of one of the key ways to look at teachers and to understand what teachers do, and, obviously, who they are, who they see themselves as being, and there have been quite a lot of recent publications on teachers’ identity in many contexts. What we are trying to do is look at how identities are produced or emerge through discursive actions. So, we are trying to add something to that literature which perhaps is an angle that has not been explored so much. It’s been explored in other areas of looking at language and society, looking at the discursive production of identity. I am thinking of work by Elizabeth Stokoe and Bethan Benwell on discourse and identity over 10 years ago. So, there is a lot of work on identity and discourse but maybe not so much on teacher identity as it is produced in the moment during interaction in as far as possible naturally-occurring contexts. But, also, in this book, we consider research interviews or focus groups to be naturally-occurring contexts as well, just as natural as teaching in the classroom. We are still looking at the big issues of identity, we are looking at expert and novice identities, we are looking at something that has not been done so much in applied linguistics, social class, identity, political identity, which has been looked at by David Block, of course. We are looking at LGBT identity, teachers’ LGBT, or queer identity. So, these things have been looked at in the literature, but perhaps not so much through the details of the unfolding interactions that the teachers and the other, sometimes the other teachers… sometimes there might be an interview or researcher, and we think we can perhaps shed some light on these issues by looking at the way identities are produced in discourse.

**Interviewer:** And regarding teachers’ identity construction, what is the role of languages? Is there any particular language you are looking at?
Morton: It’s English because the title of the book is *Social Interaction and ELT Teacher Identity*. We were originally thinking about just having language teaching, but then, as a practical matter, most of our data comes from English language teachers, and there are some issues. There is one chapter in the book which looks at English as a lingua franca or international language, and how teachers see themselves in terms of their identity. So, we thought it would give the book a clearer focus if we just linked it to English language teacher identity in order not to try to cover too much all language teacher identity. But the language is English, basically.

Interviewer: Part of your research is focused on spoken interaction in classroom settings, what are the benefits of such analysis?

Morton: I think the benefits of this analysis are twofold: you can talk about benefits from the point of view of researchers who are interested in the nature of human interaction, social interaction, learning, psychological development, all these things… If you have a very close-up analysis of how people use different modes of communication in order to achieve their goals, learning goals in classroom situations, you might be able to uncover some surprising things they are doing that perhaps you didn’t expect. So, if you kind of set aside your theories for a moment and you look close-up at the interactional data, you might discover from the participants’ perspective that they are doing things and perhaps they were more competent than you imagined them to be before you looked at what they are actually doing. So, I think there’s a lot we can learn about the processes of human interaction or human sociality, as it is sometimes called, just from the point of view of knowledge, knowing how human beings accomplish the things they want to do in face-to-face interaction. And, if it’s learning, if learning is the goal, how learning is organised as a participants’ matter.

The second benefit is, perhaps not in such great detail or such rigour, but teachers can be offered tools which allow them to record their own interactions in the classroom and they may be able to have tools to classify what they do or to reflect on what they do. For example, teachers can use a simple tablet or mobile phone to record their teaching, and there are some programmes which allow them quite quickly to categorise events. And then, they can sit down with themselves, or researchers, or other teachers, and use these as tools for reflection. So, reflection becomes not just something that happens in a vacuum, you know, you write an essay about your teaching, you have
some data that you can use for reflection. So, it can be a real aid to helping teachers to reflect on their practice.

**Interviewer:** So, as feedback for teachers, I mean, for them to reflect upon their own practices.

**Morton:** Yeah, some people are writing about this and calling it ‘data-driven reflection’. So, you have some evidence of what you did, and video evidence is quite immediate. Of course, it can be transcribed if you want to transcribe it and look at it in more detail, but even without transcribing it, you can still code a lesson into different stages or events and use this as a basis for reflection.

**Interviewer:** My last question is more a reflection upon CLIL research in Spain. So, CLIL research has dramatically developed in Europe and Spain, from your point of view, what is still missing and what are the main challenges? Is there something missing in CLIL research?

**Morton:** I think not so much is missing but things are moving. I am thinking about the work done by what’s called the Graz Group. You know, people like Do Coyle, Oliver Meyer and Ana Halbach in Alcalá, which is looking at pluriliteracies. It is looking at… They started looking at combining content and language, you know, combining a subject such as Geography with a foreign language such as English, but looking at the role of language across the curriculum and the role of language in all learning. And that’s one of the things that myself and other CLIL researchers have discovered: that doing CLIL or researching CLIL raises lots of questions about the nature of language and literacy in all learning, not just for language learning and specific content subjects. So, I think CLIL… What has been missing, perhaps, and I think the work we’ve been doing with Ana Llinares and Rachel Whittaker at the Autónoma has contributed to filling this gap. It’s looking at the subject specific literacies that students are learning and, then, moving this beyond individual subjects to literacy across the curriculum. I think that’s maybe… there has been a gap but it’s starting to be filled and it may be where CLIL is going in the future, and may be breaking out of the kind of foreign language teaching and specific subjects but raising really deep questions and important
questions about the role of language in all learning, even in the so-called native language. So, I think that’s been missing.

I think a big thing that is still missing, there is a lack of involvement of content specialists in CLIL, by that I mean primary and secondary, and even tertiary teachers of content, and also content researchers. I’m talking about Mathematics educators or Science educators. I don’t think there’s enough dialogue between content specialists, whether they are teachers or researchers, and applied linguists, who have basically been dominant – I suppose – in CLIL research. I’m not sure there are too many signs of that changing but it does need to change. We need to bring in, especially, people in the content areas who are interested in language and discourse. And those people exist. I used to work in a School of Education (University of Leeds) and I worked with a Science educator, so they were very interested in discourse, but they had not heard of CLIL. So, there’s lots of potential to work together. And I think, also, what’s missing in CLIL, the more it has a language teaching background, it fails to engage with the way knowledge is organised in specific subjects. That’s another thing we need to look at. The way knowledge is structured or organised in different subjects and the implications for focusing on language. It may not be the same. We may not have the same approach to language and Mathematics as we have in Science, or History, or Philosophy, depending on the structure of knowledge in those subjects.

Interviewer: Thank you very much.
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Abstract

This presentation focuses on the emergent discourses about bilingual commodification (Heller, 2010) in the current “boom” era of the Bilingual Programmes. These situated discourses dealing with “bilingualism” have been analysed among a group of students attending a prestigious religious semi-private “bi-trilingual” school in Castilla-La Mancha, where the social actors co-construct those discourses through interactions (Gumperz 1982). From a critical discourse analysis perspective (Fairclough, 1995) and a critical interpretive approach (Tollefson, 2002), this linguistic ethnography analyses bilingual education in Castilla-La Mancha region as well as the links between the classroom social practice, the linguistic policies and wider social and ideological processes of globalization and neoliberalism in late modernity.
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1. Introduction

This article discusses the emergent categorizations of bi-multilingual students and the concept of “bilingualism” in Castilla-La Mancha region in the current era of the spread of English as a global language and the proliferation of discourses about the commodification of English in late modernity (Duchene & Heller, 2012), characterized by the increasing mobility of English language learners in Europe and high competitiveness in the linguistic market.

The aim of this study is to account for the status of English language learners by addressing their participation in a primarily bilingual Spanish/English programme (hereafter “BP”), but which is constructed as tri/multilingual
due to the additional inclusion of French. Data comes from fieldwork carried out at San Marcos School, a semi-private educational centre in the capital city of one of the five provinces of Castilla-La Mancha region where social accounts of bi-trilingual students are socialized through the linguistic appropriations of the different social actors – bilingual students, teachers and the BP coordinator – involved in the constructions of bilingualism, the bilingual programme and the bilingual student.

2. Theoretical background

This study first takes into account how the global spread of English under “the economic ideology of neoliberalism”, which “naturalizes the use of English as the language of global competitiveness” (Piller & Cho, 2013, p. 24), is appropriated by a group of students attending the Spanish/English bilingual programme at San Marcos school. The analysis focuses on those appropriations related to the ideology of English commodification, that is, the value assigned to English as a marketable skill to compete in the neoliberal job market.

In addition, the point of departure of this research also analyses how local practices at school (re)produce social and cultural dominant discourses embedded in wider social processes that legitimate language policies (Rampton, 2006). This “bottom-up” approach accounts for linguistic ideologies (re)constructed in interaction by different stakeholders at San Marcos School (mainly students, teachers and the BP coordinator), and how social categorizations of bilingual students, the bilingual programme and the bilingual teacher are approached through linguistic ethnography. It is by “zooming in” on everyday interactions in educational settings that we interpret and reproduce the relationship between the institutional regime and the local practices in which social actors are involved.

3. Fieldwork: San Marcos School

San Marcos is currently considered the most prestigious semi-private school in the aforementioned city in La Mancha. This school has traditionally enjoyed a great reputation, by its current Multilingualism Programme, thus receiving more than 1,300 students each year. The school is located in a traditional humble, working-class neighbourhood close to the city centre. After two decades of new workers settlement and socioeconomic changes, this neighbourhood has been divided into two opposite areas: the humble zone and the growing sophisticated one.

This religious school has kept boasting about its top-quality educational system and teaching staff, as well as the strong sense of belonging to a “family” based on the Christian dogma. Besides, these students have been generally labelled as “posh” and “rich kids” due to the high socioeconomic level of their family background.

Nowadays, within the frame of Globalization and English as the lingua franca and strict language requirements to access university studies, some private and semi-private schools are implementing new language teaching methods. In fact, the BEDA programme (Bilingual English Development and Assessment), founded and shared by the whole religious community of private and semi-private schools (excluding Catalonia and the Basque Country), has been a remarkable and unique characteristic of those educational centres. This programme consists of increasing the quality and quantity of the English teaching, teaching staff training and both teacher and student assessment.

This particular school in Castilla-La Mancha aims to promote foreign language learning by teaching different subjects in English and/or French, out-of-school language activities (English, French and German), students exchange (France and Ireland) and summer camps.

4. Data: Ongoing

Data comes from an ongoing linguistic ethnography conducted at San Marcos School. The analysis is based on a set of situated discourses elicited in focus group interviews with local students from the 3rd of ESO about their bi-multilingual experiences both inside and outside the school.

This data consists of classroom observations from the 1st year of ESO (Compulsory Secondary Education) to the 4th. The subjects implied in this research are Science, Maths, Citizenship, Geography in French, Technology, English and Physics. Two other sources are the linguistic profile questionnaires carried out in every year of ESO and focus groups discussions, particularly in the 3rd year of ESO, 2nd of Bachillerato and the 1st year of English Studies at the University of Castilla-La Mancha (UCLM). Particular attention has been paid to several informal
conversations and interviews with different teachers – including the BP coordinator. This data has been analysed within the frame of some institutional documents which establish the linguistic policy and legal bases of the BP: the Plurilingual Plan (in Castilla-La Mancha) and the BEDA programme.

5. Analysis

The main focus of analysis in this article are the different situated accounts of bilingualism as well as the emergent discourses regarding the bilingual programme, the bilingual student and the bilingual teacher. For the analysis of these discourses, the interactional sociolinguistic approach by Gumperz (1982) has been taken into account combined with a discourse analysis perspective (Creese, 2008) and the latest research on language as social practice (Blommaert & Rampton 2011, Márquez Reiter & Martín Rojo 2014).

The data analysed is based on focus group discussions carried out in three different classrooms/groups: the 3rd year of ESO (group B), 2nd year of Bachillerato (senior students) and 1st-year-university students (UCLM). The three of them could be considered as a continuum of their bilingual education trajectory as they mature and become more conscious of the aforementioned bilingualism accounts. Apart from that, several interviews with teachers have been analysed, including the BP coordinator and classroom observations (both in English and French).

5.1. Accounts of Bilingualism

With reference to bilingualism, for most students from the 3rd of ESO and 2nd of Bachillerato, the concept “bilingualism” implies speaking more than one language almost perfectly, and they also find it useful to travel abroad. The majority felt better when talking in a different language and they truly believed that the fact of speaking more than one language made it easier to find a job and have a better future, as one student (3rd ESO) states: “[…] it will be better for our future, because every day English and other languages are more useful in our lives. […] If you don’t know English, it’s bad for you”. This excerpt emphasizes the “moral value” of English widely spread in contemporary society as being a beneficial skill for all students.

On the other hand, they were aware of the generational changes in terms of bilingual education and the fact of considering themselves bilingual, since they were absolutely convinced that they were “more bilingual than ten years ago”. Nevertheless, one of the main differences between the discourses of students in the 3rd of ESO and those in the 2nd of Bachillerato is that the latter do not consider themselves bilingual compared to other European countries, which shows a more mature language awareness due to their exchange experiences. Following the generational trajectory, 1st-year-university students claimed that they would become bilingual after graduating.

In all these emergent accounts, English is constructed as a linguistic monolith that can be learnt over time with practice and “global English” is widely considered as the pathway to a better job in the future.

5.2. The Bilingual Programme

Regarding the BP, both stakeholders in San Marcos evaluated it very positively. It was constructed as an emblem of distinction and elitism that characterized this school as different from the rest, particularly because of the student exchange trips organized by the teachers. However, some 2nd of Bachillerato students noticed some lack of English content teaching in the BP, as the following excerpt from a focus group discussion with 2nd of Bachillerato students reveals:

Ana: also it wasn’t completely bilingual it was just a part of the subject so and the thing is to make a subject completely bilingual no?
Maria: I think the teachers shouldn't speak in Spanish
[…]
Ana: I would have preferred to do a whole subject in English and than having two subjects bilingual but half Spanish half English

[Focus Group Discussion: 2nd Bachillerato]

This critical view of the English content instruction disagrees with the one held by the BP teachers, for whom
content knowledge is prioritised over language learning. Students are not therefore penalized by their linguistic mistakes, which makes them feel more confident and encouraged to use as much English as possible when taking their exams.

5.3. The Bilingual Teacher

As for the accounts of the bilingual teacher, most of them were satisfied with their teaching performance and they also stated that “it is worse to press them to express themselves in English; it is more important for them to know the content” [interview with the BP coordinator]. Besides, they understand CLIL as “giving them the freedom to learn the contents” [the Physics teacher in the 4th of ESO] and then integrating English with the use of some extra materials in English and some key words. This is how BP teachers in San Marcos conceive “bilingualism”, that is, as an extra/optional communicative tool by which concepts are transferred and which they can “put on” or “put off” depending on whether the message is fully transmitted and understood by students or not.

5.4. Bilingual Students

Bilingual students were also constructed very positively in teachers’ discourses, as they evaluated these pupils as brilliant students or “the best ones”. The following excerpt shows how these bilingual students are stereotyped and labelled by their teachers:

I teach Science to bilingual groups and non-bilingual ones, and you have to "pull them forward", because, you know, bilingualism selects the good students and, to put it bluntly, the worst are left behind.

[Interview with the Science teacher].

This could be considered the dominant discourse about what counts as “bilingual” and the social distinctions constructed by the dichotomy “bilingual/non-bilingual students”, which seems to separate the students with a better academic profile from those who are not so good at school. Nevertheless, those students with an outstanding academic profile in the bilingual group tend to consider themselves “bilingual”, as they have spent one or two years abroad (with their parents’ economic support). These students claim that they are bilingual just by the fact that they can listen to music or chat with friends online in English. Overall, it seems that the bilingual/non-bilingual distinction is rooted in how much family support these students receive in terms of their “bilingual” education rather than in the students’ actual language skills, which are likely to depend on the extra “input” they obtain outside school.

6. Conclusion

This initial fieldwork shows that the value of English as lingua franca and as the “pathway” to compete in the neoliberal job market emerges through the narratives of the stakeholders at the BP in this school. Thus, belonging to the BP in this school implies being in the best position to win the “rat race” in which students are socially involved to achieve a better job in the future. That is how San Marcos is constructed as an elitist school where bilingualism “naturally” selects brilliant students, who are however critical of the effectiveness of the content language instruction (especially 2nd of Bachillerato students).

It is through linguistic ethnography that local practices and situated discourses about bilingualism and bilingual identity are socially (re)constructed against the backdrop of wider social and ideological processes, in which language policies play a fundamental role in the current implementation of BP’s such as the one at San Marcos School.
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